

Much of Nehru's world-view, particularly about the Indian masses, was built by his forays into the day-to-day world of peasantry as he was getting away from the hangover of his Harrow, Eaton and Cambridge days.

History[edit] The socialist movement began to develop in India with the Russian Revolution. However, in a group in Calcutta had contacted Karl Marx with the purpose of organising an Indian section of the First International. It did not materialise. Rama Krishna Pillai in Moscow, they met Lenin and conveyed their greetings to him. Many Indian Muslims left India to join the defence of the Caliphate. Several of them became communists whilst visiting Soviet territory. Some Hindus also joined the Muslim muhajirs in the travels to the Soviet areas. A first counter-move was the issuing of a fatwa , urging Muslims to reject communism. The Home Department established a special branch to monitor the communist influence. Customs were ordered to check the imports of Marxist literature to India. A great number of anti-communist propaganda publications were published. At the same time prices of essential commodities increased. These were factors that contributed to the buildup of the Indian trade union movement. Unions were formed in the urban centres across India, and strikes were organised. In , he published a pamphlet titled Gandhi Vs. Lenin, a comparative study of the approaches of both the leaders with Lenin coming out as better of the two. Together with Ranchoddas Bhavan Lotvala, a local mill-owner, a library of Marxist Literature was set up and publishing of translations of Marxist classics began. Among the twenty-one conditions drafted by Lenin ahead of the congress was the 11th thesis, which stipulated that all communist parties must support the bourgeois-democratic liberation movements in the colonies. Some of the delegates opposed the idea of alliance with the bourgeoisie, and preferred support to communist movements of these countries instead. Their criticism was shared by the Indian revolutionary M. Roy , who attended as a delegate of the Communist Party of Mexico. The founding members of the party were M. Roy made contacts with Anushilan and Jugantar groups in Bengal. However, only Usmani became a CPI party member. Colonial authorities estimated that persons took part in the conference. The conference was convened by a man called Satyabhakta , of whom little is known. Being outvoted by the other delegates, Satyabhakta left both the conference venue in protest. These four parties constitute the Left Democratic Front. Political parties[edit] At the Karachi session of the Indian National Congress , socialist pattern of development was set as the goal for India. Through the Avadi Resolution of the Indian National Congress, a socialistic pattern of development was presented as the goal of the party. It implies social and economic equality. Social equality in this context means the absence of discrimination on the grounds only of caste , colour, creed , sex, religion, or language. Under social equality, everyone has equal status and opportunities. Economic equality in this context means that the government will endeavour to make the distribution of wealth more equal and provide a decent standard of living for all. Elected in , the government of Narasimha Rao introduced economic liberalisation with the support of finance minister Manmohan Singh , the former prime minister of India. Communist parties represented in parliament are: Left Front parties remain an independent faction in the parliament critical of the policies of both the government and that of the mainstream opposition parties. It has 5 seats in the 16th Lok Sabha.

Chapter 2 : Provisions of Nehru Constitution and Why did Jinnah Oppose it

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

One of the major crimes he is said to have committed was rob Indians of their sense of the sacred. His critics say he created a void in the individual and collective life of his countrymen by producing a sense of guilt about their religiosity. It is a different matter that religiosity is often confused with the sacred. We are told that one of the misfortunes that befell India was the loss of sacred time with the demise of Mohandas Gandhi. With an irreligious Nehru firmly in control of the destiny of India, it was a long, harsh white night of secularism that kept us in a state of perpetual wakefulness. Communalism, in this telling, is a disorder arising out of this unnatural state of secularism forced upon us by Nehru. At the same time and by the same critics, Nehru is accused of not being Indian enough, of being western in outlook and attitude, an intruder of sorts. Here, too, he is contrasted with Gandhi, who is said to be authentically Indian. It is as if being Indian is sufficient to have a sense of the sacred. Or, the West lacks it completely. In this, he resembled Ram Krishna Paramhansa, who was so confident he went to other religions without even being conscious of his own. Swami Vivekanand, of course, was the greatest among them. His own relationship with Gandhi had an element of irrationality, for in many crucial matters they had fundamental differences. What connected Nehru and Gandhi was their common faith in the intelligence of the common masses of India. Gandhi forced the Congress to open its doors to the unlettered peasant masses and Nehru had his political training in the villages of Uttar Pradesh. In course of conversation, they would refer to some old story or quote a line from Tulsi Das. There is something in an old culture after all, which gives poise and distinction to life. When the first bucket came up our people wanted to start bathing. But the peasant asked them to wait as the first lot of water was dedicated to Kanhaiyajji what a sweet name this is. He said that he liked pouring out the first five mot fulls to Kanhaiyajji and other favourite divinities, but in any event the first should not even be touched. Our people told them that they were certainly not going to interfere with this old custom. They were Congressmen and between the Congress and the peasants there was sumati. Nehru formed his concept of the sacred based on his own interaction with the masses and, of course, the chief peasant Mahatma Gandhi, about whom he wrote: It has nothing to do with numbers or majority or representation in the ordinary sense. It is based on service and sacrifice, and it uses moral pressure. These myths have often come to my mind when I have watched the amazing energy and inner power of Gandhiji, coming out of some inexhaustible reservoir. It was political but much more a spiritual connect. He was aware of the limits of rationality and was sceptical of the claims of scientific truth. It was not for nothing that after Gandhi, it was Buddha who affected him the most. The Buddhist influence is so pronounced that you can see it on the Indian National Flag in the form of the Chakra from the Ashoka Stupa of Sarnath and the national emblem. Nehru is ambivalent towards Buddha. Is he passive and pessimistic? Is his path an escape from the struggles of life? Yet again, we look and behind those still, unmoving features there is passion and an emotion, strange and powerful than the passions and emotions we have known. Nehru thought highly of his people: One can only hope that he is not proved wrong by them.

Chapter 3 : G. S. Bhalla | Open Library

How Nehru Shaped India's Development. for industrialisation could not be forcibly attained over the backs of the Indian working class and peasantry. Unlike with the US or UK, India could.

Essays on Indian and world literature Saturday, July 14, Jawaharlal Nehru as a writer of English prose "I am not a man of letters," wrote Jawaharlal Nehru in one of his missives from jail to his daughter Indira, but of course he was. All through his life Nehru lost no opportunity to write. His words took the form of drafts and resolutions for the Congress party, essays on the great issues of the day for newspapers and journals, and letters to friends, family, and colleagues in the independence movement. When he became Prime Minister of India, Nehru wrote a long letter addressed jointly to his chief ministers every fortnight, containing his deliberations on domestic and world affairs. It is clear that, despite the burdens of his worldly commitments, words set down on paper were for Nehru a way of making sense of the commotion of life, politics and ideas. But Nehru was also a man of letters in a more abiding sense, as readers of any of his major works his autobiography, Glimpses of World History, and The Discovery of India know, and as The Oxford India Nehru, a selection of his most representative speeches and writings, again proves. That is to say that we can read Nehru not just for his ideas, or for insights into his personality, but also for the way in which expressed himself, for the grace and rhythm of his English. The Uses of English", "but [Gandhi and Nehru] showed how it could be used to unmake it - how the language could be a tool of insubordination and, ultimately, freedom. Gandhi was born in ; Nehru died in The sheer bulk of their spoken and written words combined, the published work of Gandhi and Nehru exceed volumes , as well as its historical span, ensured for the English language a countrywide currency. Second, though often ambivalent about the function of English in India, they kept a political commitment to English as a language of public communication. Finally, the forms in which they wrote - autobiographies, public and private letters, journalistic essays and articles, and works of history - helped to define how these genres came to be understood and used in India, by their contemporaries and those who came after. Indeed, Nehru deserves to be seen, independently of the political man, as one of the best Indian prose writers of the twentieth century. Many of these thoughts are still relevant; in fact, sometimes they seem never more relevant than today. Attacking the demands made by various communal organizations in , Nehru writes that communalism is "another name for social and political reaction", and that "it has often sailed under false colours and taken in many an unwary person". Writing in , Nehru remarks that although nationalism can be a rousing and unifying force, one of the problems with it is "the narrowness of mind that it develops within a country, when a majority thinks itself as the entire nation and in its attempt to absorb the minority actually separates them even more". Objecting to the very name of the Backward Classes Commission, he writes, "It is as if we are first branding them and then, from our superior position, we shall try and uplift them". In more than four decades of writing to convince, persuade, engage, describe, attack, defend, reminisce, synthesise, and understand, Nehru wrote upon every possible subject on which opinions were divided, from cow slaughter to public health to the national flag and anthem to divorce "Divorce," he opines with characteristic clarity, "must not be looked upon as something which makes the custom of marriage fragile". Iyengar even includes a letter to his chief ministers on the subject of brooms, observing that the commonly found short-handled ones make for tiring and backbreaking work and encourage "a certain subservience in mind", and insisting that municipal sweepers be supplied with long-handled brooms. The only phrase that mars these sonorous cadences is "ups and downs", which is a favourite Nehru phrase. In a letter written in from jail to Gandhi, also in jail following the success of the Dandi march, Nehru exulted that Gandhi had made a new India with his "magic touch", and remarked that "our prosaic existence has developed something of epic greatness in it. Nehru becomes a more interesting writer when irked or riled; the expression of annoyance or dissent adds muscle to his writing. Here, for example, is a paragraph from one of a series of letters he exchanged with the Englishman Lord Lothian in over the future direction of India. What exactly is this constitutional road? I can understand constitutional activities where there is a democratic constitution, but where there is no such thing, constitutional methods have no meaning. The word constitutional then simply

means legal, and legal simply means in accordance with the wishes of an autocratic executive which can make laws and issue decrees and ordinances regardless of public opinion. What is the constitutional method in Germany or Italy today? The mere fact that it is impossible for the great majority of the people of India to make their will effective shows that they have no constitutional way open to them. They can either submit to something they dislike intensely or adopt other than so-called constitutional methods. Such methods may be wise or unwise, under the particular circumstances, but the question of their being constitutional or not does not arise. Cutting and hacking away sentence by sentence, he leaves his adversary with no ground to stand on. And in an essay in the Tribune early in , he launches a broadside against organizations motivated by communal considerations: What are communal organizations? They are not religious, although they confine themselves to religious groups and exploit the name of religion. They are not cultural and have done nothing for culture, although they talk bravely of a past culture. They are not ethical or moral groups, for their teachings are singularly devoid of ethics and morality. They are certainly not economic groupings, for there is no economic link binding their members and they have no shadow of an economic programme. Some of them claim not to be political even. What then are they? As a matter of fact they function politically and their demands are political, but calling themselves non-political, they avoid the real issues and only succeed in obstructing the path of others. Nehru had a naturally metaphorical cast of mind. He is often found on these pages comparing history to a great river. Indeed, he thought a lot about history, and felt keenly the pressure of history. Elsewhere, he likens the taking of risks to the exhilaration of climbing the mountains, while those who hold back, desiring safety and security, are seen as living in the valley, "with their unhealthy mists and fogs". Although he read widely and well, Nehru was curiously not much given to quoting from the works of other writers, perhaps because he spent so much time on the move or else in prison, with limited access to books in either case. Despite frequent references to the defects and excesses of capitalism and the merits of socialism, for instance, he can only be found quoting Marx once on these pages. Gandhi appears to have been a more adventurous and open-minded reader, fond not only of the Gita and the works of Tolstoy, Ruskin and Plato but also of Walter Scott, Jules Verne and Goethe. Perhaps it is to these tendencies we may attribute one fault of his writing, which is a fondness for generalities and groupings and a disregard for bracing and often necessary specificities. Consider that, although he travelled widely for decades on end, and was a captivating speaker who drew huge crowds, his references to the Indian peasantry almost always take the form of the generalized description - "the sunken eyes and hopeless looks of the people", "the starving peasant" for whom "hunger gnaws at his stomach". There is no account in his letters or essays of an actual conversation with a peasant whose name is provided or who is seen as more than a downtrodden man or a hungry stomach, and it does not seem to have occurred to him that his work would be all the more forceful by his doing so. Yet the most stirring sentences of twentieth-century Indian writing in English were composed by Nehru. It was a situation made for a man of his talents and predilections. At the stroke of the midnight hour, when the world sleeps, India will awake to life and freedom," he begins, before moving onto a majestic seven-part sentence. And here is some more reading on Nehru:

Chapter 4 : Sahajanand Saraswati - Wikipedia

The following points highlight the top twenty-five contributions of Jawaharlal Nehru to Indian economy. Some of as an activity and of the peasantry as a social.

A clown from Singapore has asked Rahul Gandhi what he thinks is an intelligent question. Why was the growth rate during the rule of the Nehru family abysmal? India was not a municipal town. Second, they were all elected by the people of India through adult franchise, exactly like the Hindu Fuehrer has now been elected. Had the people thought that they had been failures they would not have been elected again and again in the case of Nehru and Indira. The Indian economy did not grow at a faster rate because India was abysmally poor and it was difficult to accumulate capital. China did because it was a homogeneous state and it had a Communist rule. He had to balance between growth and freedom and considering the complexities of India, Nehru did more than a decent job. The clowns who criticize Nehru do not have any clue as to the situation obtaining then. India was unique and it had no other model to follow. What was achieved was a miracle and without much violence or loss of life. One has only to compare India with China to realize this. I too was of the view that India should have followed the Chinese model, but now I know better. In the rural sector, the Planning Commission proposed to establish village cooperatives and panchayats councils as the major instruments of agricultural development, to involve the majority of the small peasantry in labor-intensive development schemes and community action projects. At the same time, the new development agencies were constituted on principles of universal membership and adult suffrage, which were intended to make them into major vehicles for democratic social transformation. Over time, they had the revolutionary potential of redefining the participant village community to include all families, regardless of caste and economic standing; and of shifting the balance of economic and political power away from the landed upper castes toward the low-status peasant majority. It was only after the new institutions took root, providing the poor with the rudiments of economic and social services, and creating the skilled popular leadership necessary to transform superior numbers into cohesive electoral blocs, that the conditions for democratic social change were expected to emerge. The Congress party was not assigned an important role in providing impetus to this process. Rather, as the links of dependence binding the peasantry to the dominant landed castes grew weaker and the capacity of the rural poor for political organization improved, it was anticipated that they would generate their own leadership to challenge the hegemony of the local notables dominating the Congress electoral machines. Under the system of local democracy, the Congress might adapt to the new political realities or it might be swept away. This was purely a miracle without any parallel in the world. This happened only because Nehru was a pristine democrat and a passionate lover of India and its diversity. The Crucial point is this. Nehru did not use the Congress Party as the Vanguard like the Communists did. He was too strong a democrat to take that step. We must all thank him for it. Let me mince no words. India was very fortunate that Nehru was at the helm when India won independence.

Chapter 5 : Peasant Movements of India (): Natures, Weakness, Activities, Post-War Phase

Nehru: The Invention of India is, as Shashi writes, "a reinterpretation of an extraordinary life and of a career of one of the major figures of the twentieth century." Nehru was a man who would one day help topple British rule and become India's first prime minister.

The following points highlight the top twenty-five contributions of Jawaharlal Nehru to Indian economy. Some of the contributions are: National Philosophy of India 2. The Nehru Strategy Industrial Development and Others. National Philosophy of India: In his view the need for such a philosophy was particularly great in a new country like India whose people were divided on religious, ethnic, linguistic and other grounds, economically undeveloped, socially static and politically inexperienced. Like most nationalist leaders Nehru was convinced that India had become deeply degenerate and required radical restructuring. Its regeneration consisted in modernising itself along the lines of modern European societies, which too had, for centuries, remained degenerate and turned the corner in the nineteenth century by comprehensively reorganizing themselves along the lines required by the modern industrial civilisation. For Nehru national unity or what he sometimes called national integration was the sine qua non of national independence. Over the centuries India had fallen prey to foreign rule because of such factors as the lack of a strong central government underpinned by a nationwide structure of authority, narrow regional loyalties, divisions among its people sometimes so deep that they did not mind inviting outside help to settle old scores, and the absence of public spirit and patriotism. Unless India put these right, it was doomed. Nehru thought that the Constitution of India had taken care of some of them and for the first time in its history given it a strong state, reconciling the regional aspirations for autonomy with the need for a central government strong enough to hold them all together and protect them against external threats. He was convinced that India needed a democratic form of government not only because the latter respected the Individual and was inherently desirable, but also because a diverse, vast and divided country could not be held together and governed in any other way. He also thought that it, especially the national and state elections, had the great advantage of drawing the masses into the conduct of public affairs and giving them a stake in the new polity. Nehru knew that parliamentary democracy depend for its success on a strong and united opposition, and that India not only had none but was unlikely to have one for some time. Since he was convinced that it was the only appropriate form of government for India, he explored ways of compensating for the absence of opposition. He regularly consulted and briefed opposition leaders, and unsuccessfully tried to involve them in supervising the work of government departments. He urged his party to think of itself in national terms, encouraged vigorous internal debates and even welcomed dissent. On many occasions he internalised the opposition and himself acted as the leader of opposition, publicly criticising his colleagues and even himself and acknowledging his mistakes. He also encouraged the press to play the oppositional role and chided chief ministers who tried to penalize over critical journalists. None of these came anywhere near filling the role of a strong opposition party but they did humanize the exercise of power and introduce a moderate degree of check on its abuse. Industrialisation was the third component of the national ideology. Though Nehru was persuaded that India needed to encourage cottage and small-scale industries to ease the problems of poverty and unemployment, he saw them as a temporary expedient only necessary until the country became fully industrialised. Unlike Gandhi he was convinced that India could not permanently eliminate poverty and satisfy the legitimate aspirations of its people without large-scale industrialisation. More importantly the modern world was industrialised, and a country that failed to keep pace with it remained weak and vulnerable to foreign domination. For Nehru industry, not agriculture, was the lever of economic development. He thought that industry-led growth transformed the economy far more quickly and effectively than agriculture-led growth. For Nehru agriculture was a primitive and culturally inferior activity. He did not therefore think much of agriculture as an activity and of the peasantry as a social class. Like Marx, by whom he was once deeply influenced, he found it difficult to integrate the two and ran into all kinds of difficulties. Nehru remained a socialist all his adult life and entertained the same broad view of it. Production was planned, organised on co-operative lines, and directed towards the satisfaction of human needs rather than

accumulation of profit, and the basic freedoms and rights of citizens were fully guaranteed. It was striking that unlike Marx and other socialists, Nehru did not define man as a producing being, or place much emphasis on popular participation, egalitarianism, gradual withering away of the state class struggle and new forms of communal living. His socialism was basically aesthetic and liberal, concentrating on the individual rather than the community and stressing self-expression, individuality, social justice and human creativity. By this Nehru meant not so much the development of science and technology, which was but a part and product of it, as fostering rational and empirical ways of thought and life. If it was to turn the corner and become a strong and vibrant society like Europe, it had to learn to think and behave scientifically. Such an approach applied to beliefs as much as to social practices. Nehru advocated economic planning on the ground that it was the only scientific way of running the economy. Nehru vigorously pleaded for a secular state, but his view of secularism was complex and vague. He distinguished between the spiritual and ideological-cum-institutional dimensions of religion. He was intensely hostile to the latter but deeply sympathetic to the former, especially during the pre-independence days and the last years of his Prime Minister-ship. Though he frequently talked about spirituality, he never clearly defined the term. Sometimes he equated it with morality. On yet other occasions Nehru gave the term substantive content and took it to mean a broadly advaita metaphysic, spirituality consisted in recognising the presence of a creative force or vital energy at work in all living beings and appreciating the unity of life. During his period in office as prime minister he remained his own foreign minister. Nehru insisted that India should follow an independent foreign policy, He justified this on three grounds. First, it was a necessary expression and an indispensable means of preserving Indian independence. Second, it was the only common ground on which Indians of different ideological persuasions could be united. Third India could not mediate between the superpowers, mobilise world opinion on important issues, retain a fresh and pragmatic perspective on world affairs, open up and reconstitute the rigid international system on a broader basis, and speak for the third world if it aligned itself to one of the power blocs. It mediated and contributed towards a better understanding between the two superpowers and between the metropolitan countries and their ex-colonies. It brought the countries of the third world together, helped forge common bonds between them, and made them a moderately effective world force. India also linked up with the progressive elements in the west and helped create a powerful world opinion in favour of peaceful co-existence and the economic development and territorial integrity of the new nations. The principal components of the Nehru Strategy of building modern India were the institution and strengthening of the planning process, establishment of the public sector in Industry, laying the base of modern agriculture by the overthrow of the feudal system, creation of a modern scientific and technological base and attainment of economic independence by systematic development of heavy and basic industries and maximum development of our natural and human resources. The concept of mixed economy itself was, and remains valid for mobilising all productive classes including the national bourgeoisie for promoting sustained and rapid economic growth. In the rural areas, while the concept of private ownership of land was an indispensable element for ushering in modernisation of agriculture, a co-operative sector was promoted along with the community development organisations to assist the process of social transformation. Politically the strategy implied an alliance of all productive classes, including owners of property. Hence the broad anti-imperialist alliance forged by Gandhiji was continued. This continuity imparted a great deal of strength to the process of modernisation in the initial stages. India must be industrialised as rapidly as possible. And industrialisation includes, of course, all kinds of industry—major, middling, small, village and cottage. However, rapid our industrialisation may be, it cannot possibly absorb more than a small part of the population of this country in the next ten, twenty or even thirty years. Hundreds of millions will remain who have to be employed chiefly in agriculture. These people must, in addition, be given employment in smaller industries like cottage industries and so on. Hence, the importance to agriculture and food and matters pertaining to agriculture. If agricultural foundation is not strong then the industry will not have a strong basis either. Certain basic and key industries have been given due consideration. The essential basis for development of industry is power—electric power. The progress made by a country can be judged by the electric power it has. There is much discussion about the public sector and the private sector. He attached great importance to the public sector. The pattern of society

that he look forward to is a socialist pattern of society that he looks forward to is a socialist pattern of society which is classless, casteless. As the socialist pattern grows, there is bound to be more and more nationalized industry, but what is important is not that there should be an attempt to nationalize everything, but higher production and employment. In a country like India, where money, trained personnel and experience are lacking, we have to take advantage of such experience, training and money as we have. We want to make this business of building up India a co-operative enterprise of all the people. Some people might talk about private enterprise and laissez faire, but practically nobody now believes in laissez faire. There is regulation and control all-over the world in regard to industry and imports and exports. Everywhere, even in the most highly developed countries of the capitalist economy, the State functions in a way which possibly a socialist fifty years ago did not dream of. This business of strikes and lock-outs should be faced. Apart from the wastage involved, this conflict is illogical and wrong. The only other way is to find mutual agreement, or if there is no mutual agreement, to bring in some third party in the shape of conciliator, arbitrator or tribunal. It wants to cross the barrier of poverty and reach the stage where growth becomes relatively spontaneous. The under-developed country is on this side of the barrier. There are certain cumulative processes at work which in a developed country, tend to encourage its growth further and further and which, in an under-developed country, pull it back all the time. The poor becomes poorer. Poverty becomes its own curse. Planning is essentially a process whereby we stop those cumulative forces at work which make the poor poorer, and start a new series cumulative forces which make them get over that difficulty. Defence does not consist in people going about marching up and down the road with guns and other weapons. Defence consists today in a country being industrially prepared for producing the goods and equipment of defence. You cannot have a factory producing tanks in the absence of other industrial development in the country. A factory producing aircraft can be created only, if there is large supply of technically trained people. Therefore, the immediate object should be, both from the point of view of economic development and that of defence, to build up industry, heavy industry in particular. All individuals in India should have equal opportunities of growth, from birth upwards, and equal opportunities for work according to their capacity. The process of bringing socialism to India, especially in the democratic way, will inevitably take time. It is interesting to see other countries where there are public enterprises; there they have arrived at the conclusion that they must give freedom to the man in charge. Of course, if there is a major loss, if the whole thing goes to pieces, then the man in charge will suffer. But the point is that he is given responsibility. Every person who has advised us, whether he is an American like Dr. Appleby or a great Russian leader like Mr.

Chapter 6 : Jawaharlal Nehru University's poster wars

*Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the Peasantry [Ravindra Kumar] on www.nxgvision.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

This story has been saved for today. Today we look at the life and work of Jawaharlal Nehru in India – one of the great political figures of the 20th century. This was especially true in the eastern hemisphere of the globe but it was true elsewhere as well. While the US remained dominant in the west the decline of Europe in the east opened the door for nations like India and others to have their long sought after independent states. We take it for granted today but securing independence and statehood does not necessarily mean a successful transition into statehood for most nations. We need only look at eastern Europe in the sixties after the fall of Communism to attest to this fact. After World War II and with the rise of many new states the odds were just as likely for these states to fail as it was for them to succeed. A lot of them did succeed though and many of the leading political thinkers of the day were surprised by their success. The success of these new states was often managed under the hand of very dominant historical figures. These were figures who more or less fathered the new nations from an independence or resistance movement of one form or another, to statehood and viability in the international order. In almost any other time period of history a character like Ben Gurion or Nasser or the many others of this era would have been viewed historically along the lines of an Abraham Lincoln or someone of that stature. Perhaps it was the abundance of these incredibly effective, determined and charismatic men during the post war era that has caused us to take for granted how exceptional and unique they were and how truly differently they shaped the second half of the 20th century compared to the first half. The man we are looking at today was this sort of historical titan for India. It could be argued that he was chief among all of these titans of this time. His name was Jawaharlal Nehru. The Influence of Nehru is a name that I have mentioned several times so far in this history of modern India but have yet to go into detail of his biography. Jawaharlal Nehru is among the most influential and important figures in the history of modern India that we will look at in this series and he was among the most important leaders of the newly independent states in the post World War II era. He was a man who bridged the gap between the Gandhian idea of civil disobedience to the pragmatic realities confronting a new nation called India after independence. Whereas Gandhi gave India a soul, Nehru was the man better equipped than any other to transition India from the British Raj to the state of India itself. During his own lifetime he was only half-jokingly referred to as the last British ruler of India. Nehru was as much culturally British as he was Indian having been trained and matured not only in the system of the British Raj but in British colleges and institutions themselves. More than anything else it was his own resolve at the helm of the new Indian state after independence that helped to establish India to its own course. Where other leaders might have taken India toward a more religious orientation or a more communist orientation or perhaps even a more capitalist and western orientation, Nehru did none of these. He was in fact among the authors of what would come to be known as the nonalignment bloc. The India we know today could not exist apart from the legacy and leadership established by Nehru. His father, Motilal was a founding member of the Indian National Congress and twice served as its president. Unlike some of his future compatriots in the Indian National Congress Nehru was neither born in poverty nor was he affiliated with the plight of the average Indian citizen. His life was one of privilege and prestige in the house of Motilal. In an earlier post when we looked at the origins of the Indian National Congress I pointed out how for the most part its membership in the beginning was made up of the elite among Indian citizens. These were the best, the brightest, and especially the richest. Young Nehru was educated by private tutors for most of his early life and eventually went to Trinity College in Cambridge. He was an intelligent man and benefitted greatly by soaking up the political environment of his home with Motilal. He was good at his studies, accomplished in natural science and legal training yet none of these seemed to trigger his passions. Still, it was not until the turn of the century when he seemed to suddenly awaken with a true fervor for politics and specifically Indian nationalism. The trigger for this awakening was likely a number of different sources but one that he specifically mentioned in his memoirs was the effect that the Russo Japanese War had upon

him. This was the first occasion when a non-white people rose up and defeated one of the great European powers. This event would have an effect throughout the imperialized world but especially upon Nehru. It was as if the Japanese defeat of the Russians at the turn of the century put a crack in the paradigm he had grown all too accustomed to. Suddenly it was not a foregone conclusion that imperialized people had to live under the hand of oppression from European powers. They could rise up and shake off the yoke of imperialism. They were not second class citizens or people. Nehru completed his schooling in England and this was where his political awakening took shape. It is also where his unique identity began to take root. He was fully Indian nationalist and yet able to move in and among the British like one of their own. When World War I broke out many in India were happy to see the British who had for so long oppressed them finally be humbled and receive a taste of their own medicine. Coming out of the war though he was much different than the man who had gone into it. By the standards of his day he was considered a radical and he saw that the time for true independence for India was at hand. Nehru was representing and quickly becoming the face and voice of a new Indian National Congress in these years along with a handful of others – not least of all was Gandhi. Nehru accepted Gandhi as his mentor in the political field. The older, founding generation of the Congress had always been dominated by moderates and elites. The new Indian National Congress of the 1910s and post World War I era was radicalized and intent upon true self rule and independence. This political and philosophical division and generation gap was only going to widen with Gandhi representing the leadership of the path that Nehru and his contemporaries were seeking to follow. Nehru proved a knack for politics and diplomacy. He was able to move in and out of different political circles and command influence and respect among them all. Even among the different voices and philosophies of the Indian National Congress during the interwar period, Nehru maintained close ties and relationships and exercised influence. It was not until the differences between some of these streams sharpened near the outbreak of WWII that he would ultimately have to distance himself from the likes of Mr. Bose and others whose philosophies were becoming so much more radical and separate from the vision of the Indian National Congress that he had to break political alliances with them. The Political Philosophy of Nehru His relationship with Gandhi is especially interesting as the two men were so dissimilar in their political views. He was a modern man of the 20th century and while he might have been personally interested in religion although that in itself is doubtful that interest had little if anything to do with his politics and political philosophy. He was not a mystic. He was a democrat. His political philosophy in fact in the post independence years would be known as secular democracy. He saw religion as a harm to politics and something that all too easily radicalized the masses and the ignorant toward self defeating means and ends. While he wanted unity in India, unlike Gandhi, he saw that unity coming through secularism and not through spiritualism. Within the Congress he was a leading voice for a move toward republicanism and democracy. When visiting the smaller provinces and princely states throughout pre-independent India Nehru was quick to note the suffering of the poor under the corrupt leadership not only of the British but also the princes in the princely states. He was born among the elites of India and had been raised with some the greatest luxuries available to any Indian of the time. Yet he directed these privileges and benefits toward a conviction and philosophy to empower the oppressed and downtrodden people of his own country. He wanted to equalize the access and standards among all Indians and not just a few. As he saw it this could not happen if one were acting as a Muslim or a Hindu or a Sikh or a Christian. One had to be acting as an Indian socialist and democrat to empower the people with greater resources and possibilities. Historically many look to Nehru as a voice of reason and moderation during these transitional years of the nation of India yet for all his moderation he was among the first of the Indian National Congress to call for a complete break from the British Empire as early as the 1920s. It was Nehru who called for complete national independence in and during this time period of the independence movement it was he who was pushing much faster than his mentor Gandhi for complete independence. In 1946 Nehru drafted a document which amounted to an Indian declaration of independence which stated: We believe that it is the inalienable right of the Indian people, as of any other people, to have freedom and to enjoy the fruits of their toil and have the necessities of life, so that they may have full opportunities of growth. We believe also that if any government deprives a people of these rights and oppresses them the people have a further right to alter it or to abolish it. The British government in India has

not only deprived the Indian people of their freedom but has based itself on the exploitation of the masses, and has ruined India economically, politically, culturally, and spiritually. The revenue derived from our people is out of all proportion to our income. Our average income is seven pice less than twopence per day, and of the heavy taxes we pay, twenty per cent are raised from the land revenue derived from the peasantry and three per cent from the salt tax, which falls most heavily on the poor. The British manufactured goods constitute the bulk of our imports. Customs duties betray clear partiality for British manufactures, and revenue from them is used not to lessen the burden on the masses but for sustaining a highly extravagant administration. Still more arbitrary has been the manipulation of the exchange ratio, which has resulted in millions being drained away from the country. No reforms have given real political power to the people. The tallest of us have to bend before foreign authority. The rights of free expression of opinion and free association have been denied to us, and many of our countrymen are compelled to live in exile abroad and cannot return to their homes. All administrative talent is killed, and the masses have to be satisfied with petty village offices and clerkships. We recognize, however, that the most effective way of gaining our freedom is not through violence. We will therefore prepare ourselves by withdrawing, so far as we can, all voluntary association from the British Government, and will prepare for civil disobedience, including nonpayment of taxes. We are convinced that if we can but withdraw our voluntary help and stop payment of taxes without doing violence, even under provocation, the end of this inhuman rule is assured. On the one hand is the radical battle cry for full independence and then on the other is the very reasonable, practical, even analytical evidence of British exploitation. He is part Thomas Jefferson but also part Trotsky and also part bureaucrat. This would all transcend Nehru and make up the Indian identity as well under his eventual leadership. Gandhi may have wanted a nation of moral truth seekers seeking enlightenment but Nehru modeled pragmatic yet bold and impassioned politics. As the British cracked down on the Congress leadership after the civil rights campaigns of that decade Nehru nominated Gandhi to step into the Indian National Congress leadership position while Nehru was in prison. Gandhi declined the nomination. The family business had certainly come full circle. Nehru saw the civil disobedience that Gandhi inspired within the Indian National Congress differently than the way Gandhi saw it. While civil disobedience might eventually change the mind and ways of the British Nehru saw that civil disobedience was more important for what it did to change the mind and ways of the Indian people themselves. The British would not, and did not, ultimately leave until it was in their political and economic interests to do so.

Chapter 7 : Power, Agrarian Structure, and Peasant Mobilization in Modern India - Majid Siddiqi

Nehru, Jawaharlal; Segni, Antonio Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru with Italian Pres. Antonio Segni, September Presidents of the Italian Republic The Kashmir region "claimed by both India and Pakistan" remained a perennial problem throughout Nehru's term as prime minister.

On behalf of the Carnegie Council I would like to welcome our members and guests and thank you for joining us as we welcome Shashi Tharoor to our Books for Breakfast program to discuss *Nehru: The Invention of India*. Our guest casts his storytelling mastery onto the life of Jawaharlal Nehru, a man of huge historical importance, political and psychological complexity, and enduring relevance. *The Invention of India* is, as Shashi writes, "a reinterpretation of an extraordinary life and of a career of one of the major figures of the twentieth century. In his writings he has explored the diversity of culture and traditions in his native India with an eye towards its dramatic past and another on its relevance to the future. His editorials, commentaries, and short stories have appeared in both India and Western publications. In addition, he is the winner of several journalism and literary awards, including a Commonwealth Writers Prize. On June 1, , Shashi was appointed Under Secretary General for Communications and Public Information at the United Nations, a position which if it did not exist would have had to be have been invented, for it suits him exceptionally well. Please join me in welcoming Shashi Tharoor. Thank you, Joanne, for that marvelous introduction. They really are so wonderful that they place upon speakers the obligation to try and live up to them, which I will seek to do. The first question that one might ask, especially in this country, is: Only a tiny handful of men have influenced the implacable forces of our time. To this small company of the truly great Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru belongs. He belongs to the even smaller company of historic figures who wore a halo in their own lifetimes. But the unspoken question behind this was "after Nehru, what? A transformation is still taking place in India that has altered in many ways the basic Nehruvian assumptions of post-colonial secular, socialist, democratic, non-aligned nationhood that Nehru stood for. I have traced some threads through the life that I then wrap up in a concluding chapter in which I analyze the legacy from a twenty-first century perspective. I have reinterpreted his life as a layman for lay people. In January , or so the story goes, Motilal Nehru, a twenty-seven-year-old lawyer from the north Indian city of Allahabad, traveled to Rishakesh, a town holy to Hindus up on the foothills of the Himalayas on the banks of the sacred river Gunga, the Ganges. Motilal was weighed down by personal tragedy. Married as a teenager, in keeping with custom, he had soon been widowed, losing both his wife and his first-born son in childbirth. In due course he married again, an exquisitely beautiful woman named Swarup Rani Kaul. She soon blessed him with another son, but the boy died in infancy. The burden was one he was prepared to bear, but he desperately sought the compensatory joy of a son of his own. This, it seemed, was not to be. In the bitter cold of winter, the yogi undertook various penances which, it was said, gave him great powers. The yogi asked Motilal to step forward, looked at him long and hard, and shook his head sadly: It is not in your destiny. The ancient Hindu shastras, he said, made it clear that there was nothing irreversible about such a fate; a great karmayogilike him could simply grant the unfortunate man a boon. He reached into his brass pitcher and sprinkled water from it three times onto the would-be father. Motilal began to express his gratitude, but the yogi cut him short. The accounts have only survived in second-hand accounts ascribed to the two people who traveled with Motilal, and Motilal himself was a fierce rationalist and secularist who, even if this had happened, would never have talked about it. So one never knows. There is very much in Indian tradition and culture this tendency to ascribe almost magical beginnings to great men or women, and what is interesting in this apocryphal story was the kernel of something that was undoubtedly true, which is that Motilal, his father, saw in Jawaharlal from the very earliest days a child of destiny. He remained the only son. He was given a completely spoiled, Little Lord Fauntleroy upbringing. And the illusion is not too far fetched. There is a photograph of him aged five with his buttoned-up Victorian costume and the proud pater familias looming over him. It is quite a tableau of bourgeois male Victorian authority that the father projected very much onto the son. The father was such a successful lawyer that he bought a house in what was the British part of town, had the first swimming pool,

had the first automobile in Nehru was initially educated at home. He learned about India from an Irish-French tutor, who insisted on exposing Nehru to Indian philosophy and traditions in English translations, so Nehru read the Upanishads and the Gita in English. He did have in the same household the traditional influence of his mother, who was very much a conventional Indian woman—“unlettered, non-Anglophone”—and a widowed aunt, and so he did get a sense of Hindu culture and tradition at home as well. His formal learning was very much schooled through the English language, English education. And even his introduction to Hinduism was conflated with theosophy, the briefly popular faith of Madame Blavatsky and others, popularized in the late-nineteenth century, which had a certain heyday for a while. The tutor was also a theosophist, and Nehru was even briefly admitted into the faith, although all concerned, including the convert, promptly forgot about it. At age fifteen he was then sent off to Harrow, ironically enough, the school attended fifteen years earlier by that arch-imperialist Winston Churchill. What was interesting about this period, which was otherwise quite undistinguished, is both the political awakening of Nehru, as he read works on Irish nationalism, but also the emotional maturing, the extraordinary flowering of correspondence between the father and the son. It is quite possible that they developed a closer relationship through these letters than might have been possible if he had been growing up under the same roof as his father, with all the normal distance this implies in a traditional Indian home, and particularly in that era. There is a marvelous surviving artifact, a postcard that Motilal Nehru sent to his son Jawaharlal—“who was not a particularly precocious child”—a postcard of the photographs of great Indian nationalist figures of the nineteenth century. Below a picture of Romesh Chunder Dutt, R. Dutt, one of the first Indians in the British Indian civil service, who was a historian, an economist, a literatur, a great translator, a novelist, and a president of the Indian National Congress, Motilal Nehru writes "future Jawaharlal Nehru. Here is Nehru in Cambridge, and later London because he went to be called up for the bar, leading a soft life, milking his father shamelessly for money so he could live high on the hog, having a good time, and his father trying by correspondence to inculcate in him the aspirations and goals that he wanted his son to fulfill. He has later been accused of acquiring his Fabian socialism there. There is no evidence that he took any of his classes very seriously. But as far as socialistic inclinations are concerned, it is true that he once danced with a waitress just to find out what she would talk to him about. He was not a good enough student to sit for the Indian civil service examinations, as his father wanted him to, so he returned to India with a second- class degree but a first-class education. That was more significant because he had spent that near-decade in England acquiring and imbibing a strong sense of the rights of Englishmen, and one day he would be outraged to discover that these rights would not be his because he was not English enough to enjoy them in India. He came back to a life of mediocre lawyering and partying in Allahabad. But, as happened to many others of his generation, he fell under the spell of Mahatma Gandhi, who returned from South Africa in and changed Indian nationalism from the politics of the drawing room to the politics of mass mobilization, moving away from the demands of the self-regarding and entirely English-educated elite to the demands of a nation awakening to find its voice. Initially this horrified Motilal. There was Gandhi arguing that one should break the law—in the name of a higher law and the dictates of conscience. But Motilal was appalled by this. He would much rather have challenged the laws in the courts, as he was trying to do, and worked within the system that was his training. And so there would be passionate arguments between father and son. But again, the measure of the relationship is that while Motilal Nehru was arguing with his son and telling him it was unthinkable that he should be even thinking of breaking the law, he was privately practicing sleeping on the floor to prepare himself for the rigors of imprisonment because he was determined that if his son was imprisoned he would go too. Mahatma Gandhi also became a second father figure to Nehru. Motilal initially was responsible for this because in order to talk Jawaharlal out of giving up his legal practice and becoming a political agitator, he invited Mahatma Gandhi to stay with him at his house in Allahabad. He was a sufficiently prominent figure that Gandhi accepted that invitation. Gandhi was impressed by both of them, but he urged Jawaharlal not to join him because Gandhi felt that he needed both Nehrus and that eventually he would win them both, which he did. Eventually Nehru got involved initially in a legalistic agitation, making speeches, then developed a taste for and became good at mobilizing the masses. Particularly his discovery of the Indian peasantry is quite a delightful thing to read about. For the rest of his life he always had this extraordinary romantic, almost

mystical, sense of attachment to the Indian peasants. Then began his career of defying the British, frequent jailings. He spent almost ten years of his life cumulatively in British jails. He wrote very well and successfully. His autobiography was on The New York Times best-seller list for many weeks. He wanted to harness him to his cause. This was a hotheaded, impatient figure, eager for change, determined too early to push for full independence before India was ready for it or the Indian masses had been mobilized adequately. He decided early on that co-opting Nehru would be the best thing because Nehru was going to be worthy of acquiring the mantle, but the alternative would be dangerous to the nationalist movement and could well create a split. Interestingly, there are two or three major occasions and several other minor episodes in which the two clashed and nearly came to a split. At one point, it was Gandhi who, outraged by a letter Nehru wrote him criticizing him for temporizing too much in his opposition to the British, wrote him a very sharp letter. Gandhi replied, "Clearly the differences of opinion between us are too vast. There is no meeting ground between us. Nehru instantly caved, writing back a letter addressed to "My dear Babuji" – a Babuji is a father figure – and asked, "Am I not your child in politics, though perhaps a truant and errant child? This is an example of the personal dimensions to this extraordinary historical partnership. For example, when Gandhi got Nehru elected president of the Congress at the age of 40, when nobody on the All India Congress committee that elected the president was prepared to support him and Gandhi pushed Nehru through, Nehru immediately wanted to agitate for full independence, and pulled up the flag and ended up going to jail for his pains. Six years later, when Gandhi again gets him elected to the presidency of the party, Nehru is much more mature and wise. The British have then just passed the Government of India Act, which calls for elections, deeply unsatisfactory elections with a limited franchise restricted to barely 10 percent of the Indian population, and with the pernicious doctrine of communal electorates, separate electorates for different religious communities, which was anathema to everything Gandhi and Nehru had stood for in India. And so Nehru opposed the idea of participating in these elections. But not only did the others decide that they had to do it, but Gandhi and the rest of the Congress Party not only decided to participate in the elections, but Nehru, as the president of the party, then had to lead the campaign, which is again an example of the ways in which Nehru constantly compromised what were seen as extreme and radical political positions in the interests of serving under Gandhi in the mainstream of the nationalist movement. Partition was a great trauma. Nehru and Gandhi were both bitterly opposed to it – Gandhi completely so until the very end; Nehru in the end began to make compromises when he saw that partition was unavoidable, and certainly was guilty of some tactical mistakes himself in helping get to the point where the partition became unavoidable. One of the criticisms I have of Nehru during this period, and with other anecdotes and examples, was the extent to which nationalist politics made someone like Nehru a master of the futile gesture. What is the legacy that emerges from his seventeen years as Prime Minister after independence? I will explain four major pillars and one abiding, overarching theme, that I have called in the subtitle of the book "the invention of India. Nehru could very easily have arrogated power to himself. Especially with the death of Gandhi, shortly after the death of the only serious rival he had in the party, Vallabhbhai Patel, who was Deputy Prime Minister and Home Minister, who had died two years after Gandhi, three years after independence, in , there were no challengers.

Chapter 8 : The Miracle of the Nehru Years – P A Krishnan's Writings

Today we look at the life and work of Jawaharlal Nehru in India - one of the great political figures of the 20 th century. The Global Landscape After World War II The end of World War II brought with it the end of imperialism and a surge in the birth of new states across the global landscape.

Peasant Movements of India Read this article to learn about the peasant movements of India ! The impoverishment of the Indian peasantry was a direct result of the transformation of the agrarian structure due to: Colonial economic policies, ii. Ruin of the handicrafts leading to overcrowding of land, iii. Colonial administrative and judicial system. The peasants suffered from high rents, illegal levies, arbitrary evictions and unpaid labour in Zamindari areas. In Ryotwari areas, the Government itself levied heavy land revenue. Often, the farmer had to mortgage his hand and cattle. Gradually, over large areas, the actual cultivators were reduced to the status of tenants-at-will, share croppers and landless labourers. The peasants often resisted the exploitation, and soon they realised that their real enemy was the colonial state. Sometimes, the desperate peasants took to crime to come out of intolerable conditions. These crimes included robbery, dacoity and what has been called social banditry. A Survey of Early Peasant Movements: In Bengal, the indigo planters, nearly all Europeans, exploited the local peasants by forcing them to grow indigo on their lands instead of the more paying crops like rice. The planters forced the peasants to take advance sums and enter into fraudulent contracts which were then used against the peasants. The planters intimidated the peasants through kidnappings, illegal confinements, flogging, attacks on women and children, seizure of cattle, burning and demolition of houses and destruction of crops. The anger of the peasants exploded in when, led by Digambar Biswas and Bishnu Biswas of Nadia district, they decided not to grow indigo under duress and resisted the physical pressure of the planters and their lathiyals retainers backed by police and the courts. The planters also tried methods like evictions and enhanced rents. The ryots replied by going on a rent strike by refusing to pay the enhanced rents and by physically resisting the attempts to evict them. Gradually, they learned to use the legal machinery and initiated legal action supported by fund collection. The Government appointed an indigo commission to inquire into the problem of indigo cultivation. Based on its recommendations, the Government issued a notification in November that the ryots could not be compelled to grow indigo and that it would ensure that all disputes were settled by legal means. But, the planters were already closing down factories and indigo cultivation was virtually wiped out from Bengal by the end of During the s and s, large parts of Eastern Bengal witnessed agrarian unrest caused by oppressive practices of the Zamindars. The Zamindars resorted to enhanced rents beyond legal limits and prevented the tenants from acquiring occupancy rights under Act X of To achieve their ends, the Zamindars resorted to forcible evictions, seizure of cattle and crops and prolonged, costly litigation in courts where the poor peasant found himself at a disadvantage. Having had enough of the oppressive regime, the peasants of Yusufshahi Pargana in Patna district formed an agrarian league or combination to resist the demands of the Zamindars. The league organised a rent strike—the ryots refused to pay the enhanced rents, challenging the Zamindars in the courts. Funds were raised by ryots to fight the court cases. The struggles spread throughout Patna and to other districts of East Bengal. The main form of struggle was that of legal resistance; there was very little violence. Many peasants were able to acquire occupancy rights and resist enhanced rents. The Government also promised to undertake legislation to protect the tenants from the worst aspects of Zamindari oppression. In , the Bengal Tenancy Act was passed. These included Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, R. Dutt and the Indian Association under Surendranath Banerjea. The ryots of Deccan region of western India suffered heavy taxation under the Ryotwari system. Here again the peasants found themselves trapped in a vicious network with the moneylender as the exploiter and the main beneficiary. These moneylenders were mostly outsiders—the Marwaris or Gujaratis. The ryots refused to buy from their shops. No peasant would cultivate their fields. The barbers, washermen, shoemakers would not serve them. This social boycott spread rapidly to the villages of Poona, Ahmednagar, Sholapur and Satara. The debt bonds and deeds were seized and publicly burnt. The Government succeeded in repressing the movement. As a conciliatory measure, the Deccan Agriculturists Relief Act was passed in Changed Nature of Peasant

Movements After Peasants emerged as the main force in agrarian movements, fighting directly for their own demands. The demands were centred almost wholly on economic issues. The movements were directed against the immediate enemies of the peasant—foreign planters and indigenous zamindars and moneylenders. The struggles were directed towards specific and limited objectives and redressal of particular grievances. Colonialism was not the target of these movements. It was not the objective of these movements to end the system of subordination or exploitation of the peasants. Territorial reach was limited. There was no continuity of struggle or long-term organisation. The peasants developed a strong awareness of their legal rights and asserted them in and outside the courts. There was a lack of an adequate understanding of colonialism. The 19th-century peasants did not possess a new ideology and a new social, economic and political programme. These struggles, however militant, occurred within the framework of the old societal order lacking a positive conception of an alternative society. The peasant movements of the 20th century were deeply influenced by and had a marked impact on the national freedom struggle. The Kisan Sabha Movement: After the revolt, the Awadh Talukdars had got back their lands. This strengthened the hold of the Talukdars or big landlords over the agrarian society of the province. The majority of the cultivators were subjected to high rents, summary evictions bedakhali, illegal levies, renewal fees or nazrana. The First World War had hiked the prices of food and other necessities. This worsened the conditions of the UP peasants. Mainly due to the efforts of the Home Rule activists, kisan sabhas were organised in UP. Madan Mohan Malaviya supported their efforts. In June, Baba Ramchandra urged Nehru to visit these villages. During these visits, Nehru developed close contacts with the villagers. In October, the Awadh Kisan Sabha came into existence because of differences in nationalist ranks. The Awadh Kisan Sabha asked the kisans to refuse to till bedakhali land, not to offer hari and begar forms of unpaid labour, to boycott those who did not accept these conditions and to solve their disputes through Panchayats. From the earlier forms of mass meetings and mobilisation, the patterns of activity changed rapidly in January to the looting of bazaars, houses, granaries and clashes with the police. The centres of activity were primarily the districts of Rai Bareilly, Faizabad and Sultanpur. The movement declined soon, partly due to government repression and partly because of the passing of the Awadh Rent Amendment Act. Towards the end of, peasant discontent resurfaced in some northern districts of the United Provinces—Hardoi, Bahraich, Sitapur. The issues involved were: The meetings of the Eka or the Unity Movement involved a symbolic religious ritual in which the assembled peasants vowed that they would: Pay only the recorded rent but would pay it on time; ii. Not leave when evicted; iii. Refuse to do forced labour; iv. Give no help to criminals; v. Abide by Panchayat decisions. The grassroot leadership of the Eka Movement came from Madari Pasi and other low-caste leaders, and many small Zamindars. By March, severe repression by authorities brought the movement to an end. The Mappilas were the Muslim tenants inhabiting the Malabar region where most of the landlords were Hindus. The Mappilas had expressed their resentment against the oppression of the landlords during the nineteenth century also. Their grievances centred around lack of security of tenure, high rents, renewal fees and other oppressive exactions. The Mappila tenants were particularly encouraged by the demand of the local Congress body for a government legislation regulating tenant-landlord relations. Soon, the Mappila movement merged with the ongoing Khilafat agitation. After the arrest of national leaders, the leadership passed into the hands of local Mappila leaders. Things took a turn for the worse in August when the arrest of a respected priest leader, Ali Musaliar, sparked off large-scale riots. Initially, the symbols of British authority—courts, police stations, treasuries and offices—and unpopular landlords jenmies who were mostly Hindus were the targets. But once the British declared martial law and repression began in earnest, the character of the rebellion underwent a definite change. Many Hindus were seen by the Mappilas to be helping the authorities. What began as an anti-government and anti- landlord affair acquired communal overtones. The communalisation of the rebellion completed the isolation of the Mappilas from the Khilafat-Non-Cooperation Movement. By December, all resistance had come to a stop.

Chapter 9 : The Life of Jawaharlal Nehru - Founding Father of India

What Stalin thought of Gandhi and Nehru. May 03 could hardly lead to real change that would better the legal position of the Indian proletariat, peasantry and the representatives of the.

Barnett, distinguished colleagues, and friends. Let me say at the very outset that I consider it an enormous privilege to have been allotted the very pleasant though for me formidable task of reading the keynote address to an audience consisting, as it does, of colleagues with large reputations. As I endeavour to rise equal to the task, let me also say how happy I am to be among friends and with Walter and Rosemary Hauser. When Walter Hauser wrote his Chicago thesis, peasant studies hardly existed, peasant movements were almost unknown to the academy, and agrarian structures were expressed solely in the reigning idiom of British policy or economic history. The very face of social science history has itself changed since the early sixties, in some cases and it must be added not necessarily to our advantage entirely beyond recognition. But the history then inaugurated abides. Rajendra Prasad, Jawaharlal Nehru, Mahadev Desai and tens of other nationalist leaders had written accounts directed at the iniquities of the Indian agrarian social order but mainly directed at the fact of British rule. Simultaneously, in those very years of the Indian nationalist movement, peasant movements had arisen that weakened the symbiosis of the power of the landed elite with the contingencies of the requirements of British rule. In a word, peasant movements and nationalist politics pressured policy making towards, first, modifying and then ending the era of landlordism in colonial India. Agrarian power at Indian Independence stood redefined. But, as students of history would know, class struggles are never simple if at all they are, when they are, what, purportedly, they are: Let us first consider how the history of rural political mobilization had been written, mainly in the sixties. In one significant area of scholarship peasant movements were seen to have been peasant wars. Within each of the six major upheavals of this century the middle peasantry was supposed to have played an initially revolutionary role. Modifications of this idea, whether in empirical refutation or as a qualified redefinition, were applied to India. Usually the answers sought were to affirm or deny this middle peasant thesis. Thus the major question, implicit in such a treatment of the subject proved to be: If so, how did the mobilization actually occur? This question had a longer and more lasting impact as over the years it was modified, to assert the case, albeit in structuralist terms, of, as it were, peasant insurgency against the social order as a whole, of which social order it was itself a part. To this theme we shall return. The questions that became dated pertained to the role that peasants played in the transformation of the social order. As a political peasantry must be led from the outside, it was also asked: Was it a revolutionary movement which heralded the consolidation of the bourgeois state Zapata in Mexico under an urban leadership? Or did the peasantry serve through rebellions to break up the existing state polity The Russian Revolution? Or did the peasants provide the social basis and an area for tactical retreat for a working class revolution Cuba, China? Were peasant movements millenarian? The theoretical armoury of social science scholarship on rural political mobilization began to be reconstituted. By the nineties the questions had indeed changed. But the anguish remained: Their cultures are dominated, never dominant, their futures always at the mercy of an unrelenting progress in which town dominates country, burghers rural folk, the bourgeoisie the peasantry. We can neither undo the past nor alter the course of the future in this regard. Yet, within social science concerns, we can try and reformulate some of our questions on lines which do not presume pace all social-historical scholarship a preordained social reality To do this we restrict our reflections to an outline of peasant movements in modern India, and examine this outline anew in light of existing scholarship. Beginning at the middle of the nineteenth century, which also corresponded with the end of the stage of direct plunder, British policy in India increasingly became one of support for landlords through whom the officialdom of empire sought to protect their dominions. Every now and then there was a deviation from this policy to accommodate the pressure generated by an unequal agrarian society which, under the impact of the market, produced peasant movements. Between and , with the exception of half a decade between and when prices of agricultural produce did indeed fall, there was a rise in prices over this entire period. The single greatest impact which such a rise in prices produced was manifest in a developing struggle between landlord and peasant for control

over the increased value of agricultural surplus. The landlord raised rents. The landlords asserted their proprietary rights, by emphasizing their power to evict tenants while the latter claimed, and were occasionally and with increasing frequency granted, occupancy rights. It is hardly necessary to state that our preceding remarks present an oversimplified picture of the background to the emergence of peasant movements. Many of those peasants who won tenancy and property rights against the landlords themselves became rent-receivers. They rented out the land rented in or acquired after a struggle from superior proprietors. Many others became rich cultivators. In the various peasant movements which emerged, we find that the actual mobilization was carried out in a hundred myriad forms. Some of these maybe reproduced as an elementary typology thus: The Blue Mutiny, Poor peasants and small landlords opposed indigo planters in Bengal. In this they were helped by moneylenders whose own credit resources stood threatened by the structure of the monopsonistic rights of the planters. The Pabna and Boora Uprisings, Rich cultivators, benefiting from the commercialization of agriculture and producing cash crops, protested to secure further their occupancy rights granted nominally in . In this they succeeded by when the Bengal Tenancy Act was passed. Later, by the middle twentieth century, such tenants were transformed into rent-receivers. This was granted in and But only a rich tenantry benefited from these movements. Peasant protest fed into the assertion of rentier claims of one section of rural society against another. The Deccan Riots, Up against a heavy land revenue demand of the state, ,cultivators lost their lands to moneylenders from the towns. The symbiosis of peasants with rural moneylenders was upset as the dependence of these latter on the moneylenders of the towns developed. The protest against the structure of legal authority which allowed such land transfer took the form of antimoney lender riots. Punjab Agrarian Riots, The state intervened to prevent alienation of land from peasants to moneylenders in but urban middle classes protested, in nationalist idiom, against government intervention. Riots broke out against moneylenders. Landlords we might recall were over the long term supported by British rule. Peasant Movements in Oudh. Small landlords and the rural poor supported and led the movement. Statutory rights of occupancy were secured in The movement marked a phase of retreat for landlordism. Planters of indigo were put to rout by the rural hierarchy was left undisturbed. The movement signified the emergence of the peasant as a symbol in a nationalist ideology. Agrarian Unrest in Uttar Pradesh, When prices slumped, peasants could not pay rents to landlords nor landlords revenue to the state. The Indian National Congress launched a no-rent no-revenue campaign of middle and rich peasants, supported by the rural poor, and small property holders. The movement marked a simultaneous retreat for landlordism and an attrition of the political domination of the colonial state. Peasant Struggles in Bihar, When prices fell in , the rents to which tenants had agreed in a period of rising prices became too heavy to bear. Peasants were evicted by landlords as the latter attempted to increase their power and control. The tenants movement that developed sought to regain control over the lands from which the peasants had been evicted. The popular basis of these struggles was provided by rich and middle peasants and occasionally poor peasants. Agricultural labourers were not even formally included in the programme of the Peasants Association till Share-croppers Agitation in Bengal, The share-croppers were mostly poor peasants with very small holdings who fought landlords for security from eviction and aright to at least two-thirds of the produce. Share-croppers were joined in their movement by small peasants with occupancy rights, small impoverished landlords and a few rich peasants. In legislation in and in these rights were recognized and pushed through despite landlord opposition by various governments in Independent India. The Telengana Rebellion, Hyderabad, A movement involving sustained armed struggle of rich peasants and the rural poor. The political consequences of the movement may be appraised at two levels. The popular unrest provided the basis for the absorption of Hyderabad State into the Indian Union. A glance at the preceding synopsis suggests two ideas that are of relevance to our discussion: While each of the movements, and all together, may well be said to be in some way representing anti-landlord tendencies in the colonial agrarian society as a whole, any single one of these movements does not exhibit any such features. Among the more remarkable conundra of our schema, poor peasant protest has strengthened rentier structures, anti-moneylender riots have stood opposed to the nationalist political idiom and movements under a communist leadership have served however inadvertently this may have come about; here we are not concerned with intentions to strengthen the domination of the rich peasantry, and, at a remove, even the

post-colonial state. Even when the Kisan Sabha in Bihar or the Communist Party in Bengal and Telengana did formulate demands for the peasantry, demands that would have an all-India character, the very specificity of each local variant of the agrarian structure as well as the sheer diversity of peasant communities in India prevented any generalized acceptance of their programme. Consequently, while it may be possible for us to say that in the colonial Indian economy a backward capitalism emerged plagued with all evils characteristic of under-development, and in the nationalist struggle against British rule representatives of the Indian middle classes as the urban counterparts of the peasantry came ultimately to dominate and even determine the politics of peasant protest, the gap between this statement and another with which one might highlight the cultural dimension of the mobilization process would still remain. In order to move towards a more credible version of the political mobilization process we need to disaggregate our story of peasant struggles. We might use the same sources but our focus would have to shift towards one main aspect of the problem: This leadership had little link, and a highly tenuous one when it did, with the over arching spread, control and domination of the modern state as that came to evolve, in its institutional form during the period of British rule and in its political expression in the decades since. Yet, it stood on the rural-urban continuum in its many manifestations and while it aided the process of mobilization through its strategic relevance to the peasantry, it simultaneously reinforced these self-images of culture and community which served to widen the distance between town and country and further the ideological disarticulation of Indian political society. The process of political mobilization among the Indian peasantry did not, as may be expected, respond to secular formulae of class struggle while the latter was indeed carried on and developed in some of the forms of the social class alignments we have just described. Instead, much of this mobilization was the consequence of those features of Indian society which, in their customary rooting did not share the modernity of the urban "social contract. In Champaran Bihar, and northern Oudh U. The use of religious beliefs and symbols in the mobilization process overlapped with the social identity of the community, strengthening thereby caste and communal identities. In Malabar, the Islamic religious identity of the Mappillas was a source of cohesion among the poor peasantry and for the linking up of this community with the urban-based sabhas of the richer Muslims. There is no evidence in this latter experience of any rift or tension between poor peasant protest, born of and in identification with the Islamic community to which they belonged, and their subservience to and acceptance of their richer, socially dominant, counterpart. The necessity of preserving Patidar Gujarat, and Kurmi U. The propensity of many a peasant movement leader to be peripatetic, a fact hardly explicable in the simple-minded terms of wanderlust, was a remarkable feature of political mobilization. Baba Ramchandra of Oudh, Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, Rahul Sanskritayana and Yadunandan Sharma of Bihar, Motilal Tejawat and Vijay Singh Pathik of Rajasthan, Janardan Sharma of Gujarat and scores of others roamed the Indian subcontinent, in and out of sects, religions, towns and villages, schools and monasteries, but hardly ever from one peasant movement to another. Each of such individuals experienced multiple identity crises - the stories are too many and the space too little for us to narrate any - as they protested against the social process from which they had all emerged: They looked for answers to the mysteries of life in holistic terms, moving as they did between the world and its renunciation, often several times in a single lifetime. Several of such leaders who knew as many languages as they did their many worlds could be observed in swarms, dotting the political landscape in