CHAPTER - IV
A DISCOURSE ON NATIONALISM
(BIPAN CHANDRA)

This chapter intends to analyze the ideological dimension of Indian nationalism in the voluminous works of the Marxist historian, Bipan Chandra. To be sure, Bipan Chandra’s polemics of nationalism goes in opposition to A.R. Desai’s economic reductionist or class reductionist explanation of Indian nationalism. The main difference between A.R Desai’s text “Social Background of Indian Nationalism” and multiple works of Bipan Chandra such as “India's Struggle for Independence”, “Essays on Indian Nationalism”, “Indian National Movement” etc. lies in the fact that former's interpretation is based upon the epistemological position of classical or fundamentalist Marxism which believes in mono-casualty whereas the latter's interpretation believes in causal pluralism of an Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci.

Generally it is argued that Marxist’s great historical failure lies in the non-conceptualization of national phenomenon as a major force for the mobilization of people. Marxist's problematic deals with everything under the category of class, but here one can remember that even ontological dialectic of Stalinism accepted the concept of “socialism in one country”. Thus it looks paradoxical when we talk about the ontological primacy of “International Class Struggle” on the one hand and “the socialism in one country” on the other. In fact, these two contradictory polemics coexisted side by side. Contrary to this position, the aim of our study has been to argue that the most influential European Marxist discussions on the national phenomenon show a recurrent thematic unity
and a relatively cohesive line of argument, despite important political and intellectual differences between them. The theoretical and epistemological bases of this thematic unity have been called the Marxist parameters of analysis of the national question. These are: (a) the theory of the universal evolution of the forces of production; This is the position that understands the process of social transformation as universally explicable in terms of developmental laws and capable of expression in universal and hierarchically defined stages of transformation, (b) the theory of economic reductionism in the last instance is the epistemological stance which defines the privileged causal status of the productive process and establishes that all meaningful process of social change occur through changes in the process of production which is located in the economic arena, and (c) the eurocentric bias in concrete discussion of the universal process of change.

Gramsci was the first conscious Marxist theorist who recognized the relative autonomy of superstructure of which national sentiment or community is a part. Civil society (hegemony) and Political Society (Coercion) are the two organs of superstructure. In view of the conflicting interpretations of the work of Gramsci, it has been argued that a class reductionist and a non-class reductionist reading of his work are equally possible. But from the point of view of the ongoing discussion on the national question, the originality and novelty in Gramsci’s legacy resides only in recovering and expanding his partial break with class reductionism. The non-class reductionist interpretation of Gramsci discloses an imaginative and original but nevertheless partial attempt to find solutions to the perennial Marxist problems of interpreting the national issue beyond the reductions of economism.
The concepts of historical bloc and national popular represent an original way of conceptualizing the specificity of the national arena. The constitution of historical bloc implies a radical reconstruction of the relational identity of the elements which constitute the arena of the social classes are part of a historical bloc is a only in so far as they merge their specific identity with other classes or strata participating in that relation, thus creating a political will which constitutes a more inclusive social and political grouping. Gramsci argues that the historical blocs a form of communality which attempts to become the national community, common culture is a crucial aspect in the crystallization of a national community. For him no hegemonic unit will emerge without claiming to represent society as a whole. A fundamental class becomes the organizer of a hegemonic unit, when in the context of historical bloc, the intellectuals and popular masses establish an organic link in which culture in the intellectual sense (knowledge) develops a connection with culture in its anthropological sense (shared experiences) in the specific case of Italy, Gramsci called upon the working class and its intellectuals to lead the historical bloc that was to constitute the Italian national community, through a national-popular collective will - a task which the Italian bourgeoisie had conspicuously failed to perform.

The notion of this collective will captures both the political and cultural specificity of the national community, at the same time suggesting an organic link between intellectuals and popular masses for the purpose of creating the basis for a stable hegemonic formation. The significant novelty in the Gramscian approach is that the configuration of historical bloc and national-popular is not ultimately reducible to the direct determination of any of the fundamental classes in the process of
production. Gramsci’s contribution to the development of Marxist theory is a set of analytical categories which enables us to think in a conceptual framework that breaks with class reductionism, but he himself fell short of this break. While the notion of national-popular collective will permits an understanding of the various forms of national existence at both political and the cultural level, this two-dimensional understanding is limited by Gramsci’s commitment to a consolidation of a national state that provides the conditions for a process of expansive hegemony.

The strategy for the construction of a new historical bloc is designed to convert this block into the national community, so that it can provide the basis for an integral state in an expanding hegemonic process. But herein lies one of the most serious limitations of the Gramscian discussion of the national question. The national community is important only insofar as it becomes the vehicle for the formation of a new political subjectivity in the form of the national popular collective will. The national phenomenon is only important to the extent that it becomes the basis for the formation of a cohesive national community that will be able to sustain a national state. The Leninist traces are evident. Gramsci’s notion of national-popular is a decisive on Lenin’s theory on the right of nations to self-determination because of the novel conceptualization of culture and the intellectuals but at the same time it remains trapped in the Leninist bias towards statism - the achievement and consolidation of a single state encompassing one single national community. Important traces of economic reductionism are to be found in Gramsci’s inability to conceptualize those aspects of the national question not connected with the urge to form a cohesive national state-as in the case of the ethno-national minorities that exist in every every Western
state. The ethno-national plurality of the national arena and the problematic connection between the nation and the state remain outside the Gramscian formulation of the national popular blinding this otherwise insight full theoretical analysis to important plural dimension of national existence. Thus it is clear that Gramsci puts nation above the class. The similar position has been taken by Bipan Chandra who considers the Indian national movement as an emergent effect of multi-dimensional phenomena—that is to say that it was a mass movement supported by all classes such as capitalist, intellectuals, peasant, tribal etc.

Before we deal with the discourse of Bipan Chandra on the Indian national movement—a war against British imperialism we must first of all define the the concepts of nation and state.

The French Revolution brought the concept of a liberal democratic nationalism opposed to dynasticism\(^1\). Nationalism is a historical category which emerged as a binding force in the capitalist society. Just as feudalism was governed by the principle of religion as a central force, the capitalism developed nationalism as a cementing force. It is a positivist deviation when we say that Marx considered ideology—be it religion, nationalism or democracy—as a false consciousness. By the feudal system the ruler dealt with the common people only indirectly; his direct relations were with the “estates” i.e., the nobility, who were in immediate control of the peasants. The revolutions of 1848 in Germany and Austria were inspired by democratic, national ideals. Raymond Aron has defined nationalism in the following manner:

“A national claim is called nationalist when an ethnic group,

though those who speak in its name, aims at total independence, the right to constitute itself as sovereign state. When ethnic groups protest against the inequalities of which they consider themselves victims but do not strive for separation, we speak of problems of national minorities” (2).

Commenting on the western nationalism the leading Indian sociologist Yogendra Singh writes:

“Historical experience of nationalism even in the western societies show that the crucial factors which contributed to institutionalization of nationalism and to their modernization were primarily through rational technological changes. The basic values or the religious world view of western society only accommodated these transformations. The growth of one has led to the obsolescence of the other. The relevant question, however which makes a material difference between successful or not successful transitions to modernization of which nationalism is a historical by product, is how successfully rational principles are applied for the growth of society” (3).

On the ethnicity and politics of India, Dipankar Gupta writes:

“When India was striking for independence, there was a substantial body of opinion which believed that India would be unable to function as a cohesive unity because of the diversity of religions, languages, castes and creed that inhabit this land mass” (4).

At this juncture let us turn our attention to the “polyethnic” society to use a current expression. Any society is polyethnic which includes groups that differ in culture, language, past history or colour of the skin-groups more or less conscious of their singularity or whole singularity is more or less clearly perceived by the majority of the population. The sense of belonging to a historic cultural group is currently expressed as national sentiment; Westerners speak of tribal consciousness or caste consciousness to designate this sense of belonging in reference to Africans or Asians groups of people. But we should make this point clear that race is a valid biological category which nation is related to political awareness. However, within a political society ethnic or national minorities are rarely placed on a footing of equality. National demands have been associated with both democratic ideology and industrial modernization. For example, the principle invoked in the condemnation of the order, or estates, in the French Revolution logically involved the equality of ethnic groups.

Advent of the industrial era aroused the interest of the masses in demands based on nationality. So long as most of them lived according to their own local custom in village communities, the language of the state and even the person of the sovereign mattered less than civil peace and the quality of administration. But when schooling becomes open to everyone, when a changing social order replaces a stable one and personal advancement becomes a normal ambition, all men begin to take interest in the nationality of the state. As society and state draw closer, national claims or claims to statehood inevitably become social and social claims become national. Comparable problems of “national minorities” and “equality of language” are arising or bound to arise in
Asia and Africa.

In societies that are sufficiently developed and homogeneous there are two factors which help to lessen the inevitable conflicts of individual competition: the almost universal rise in the standard of living brought about by economic progress, and the variety of forms that success may take place. But these factors do not immediately affect conflict between ethnic groups, races and nations quite contrary; never has the inequality among peoples been so great and never have these people been so conscious of this inequality within nations themselves as well as on the international stage, ethnic disputes, which are national at one extreme and racial at the other, seem certain to become more threatening. On this issue, Andre Beteille writes:

"Although ethnic differences have a bearing on social conflict a knowledge of the former is not enough to predict the pattern of latter. In order to understand the scale and intensity of conflict between ethnic group we have to take a number of factors into account. These are (1) the objective differences between them, (2) the social awareness of these differences and (3) the political organization of this awareness"(5).

Objective differences may be of two types (a) physical and (b) cultural. Cultural differences in turn, can be based on religion, language or region. There is no direct relationship between the degree of these differences and the extent to which people are aware of them. Cultural differences, particularly, are more difficult to measure. There is no general theory which can enable us to delineate in exact terms the relationship

---

between cultural differences and their organization into mutually antagonistic groups.

Rise of nation-state is a symbol of rationalization of cultural and political terrain of modern philosophy. The concept of nation has cultural connotation and it is a part of civil society, whereas state is a political concept and the rights of the state is guaranteed by the generalized normative pattern and the coercive power of the political authorities. Modern state is equal to legal coercion. In other words, state has the legitimate right to use physical violence. Nation has to do with common language, culture, symbol, beliefs and values which bind people together and develop a sense of belongingness through common consciousness. The modern state is a compulsory association which organizes domination. The major function of autonomous nation-state has to ensure the logic of industrial capitalism. The normal function of state will be to allow a condition for free competition of conflicting interests. But at times, it may regulate economy by progressive social policy.

Nation is not an empirical reality, rather it is a cultural construct which refers to specific sentiment of solidarity in the face of other groups. It belongs to the zone of values and it has a "cultural mission". The idea of the nation has intimate relation to cultural discourse. National affiliation need not be based on common blood i.e. race one should stand for nationalism not for imperialism which produces irritating effect. Nation, as a cultural and linguistic consciousness binds the ruled and ruler together, thus it generates preconditions for the validation of power.

Creation of a powerful nation through nationality as the highest principle has been the basic element of modern ideology. The struggle for power is a struggle for the preservation of culture. "Will to
"Power" is the basic quality of a politician. Peace means the displacement of the form of struggle or of the enemy, or of the circumstances of battle or finally the chance of selection and nothing else. Conflicts between nations stand for the "struggle for existence" in order to describe the inexorable character of the struggle of man with man. Here one can recall Max Weber for analyzing the relationship between politicians, citizens and intellectuals for their views on nation-state.

For Weber politics is a tough business and those who take responsibility for seizing the spokes of the wheel of political development must have strong nerves and should not be too sentimental to practice secular politics. It is argued that those who wish to invoice themselves in secular politics, must, above all, be without illusion and recognize the fundamental reality of an ineluctable eternal war on earth of men against men.

Weber condemned the double-edged gift of Bismarkian caesarian: the Universal suffrage, the equality of, in the truest sense of the word, even if he could not bring himself to agree with the older man’s pessimistic opinion that this measure would destroy not only the state but the nation’s cultural life as well.

The value-free character of science demands for establishing the ideal of the national state as the sole indisputable standard. There is no peace even in the economic battle for existence. The hidden future of human history is inscribed in people’s condition of existence, will to power and instinct to power are everywhere. In the fatherland you must have strong nerves and should not be too sentimental to practice secular politics. Real polik means, adaptation as a principle, there should be an application of extreme methods in a given situation in
contrast to application from a choice of various possible final positions on temporarity. The tension between the requirement of political ethics firmly centered on the concept of power and those arising from normative ethics of duty. Ethics is perhaps not the only thing in the world that is value. Other values exist. Conflict between rationality and irrationality (in Indian context, it is between secularism and communalism) based on fundamental value was an irreconciliable as the opposition between "God" and "Devil" one can conduce the argument by saying that the politician who acts reponsibly must come to terms with the conflict between political and ethical values. It is in the above mentioned arguments that we will deal with the ideological dimension of Indian nationalism given by Bipan Chandra who rejects the class reductionist approach to analyze the contributions of Gandhi, Nehru etc. in the liberation of India from the British empire. The Gramscian theoretical problematic of philosophy of praxis, hegemony, intellectuals, war of position and popular culture and national community have been successfully applied by Prof. Bipan Chandra in the interpretation of Indian National Movement against British Imperialism, which ruled India through the ideological hegemony and political coercion. Even through reforms and transformations in the Indian social structure by the colonial state were intended to appease the dominant sections of Indian society. Our this position will be clear if we analyse the discourses on nationalism by Bipan Chandra who makes the following statements in his texts:

(i) "The Indian national movement was undoubtedly one of the biggest mass movement, modern society has ever seen. It was a movement which galvanized millions of people of all classes and ideologies into political action and brought to its keen a might colonial empire. Consequently,
along with the British, French, Russian, Chinese, Cuban and Vietnamese revolution, it is of great relevance to those wishing to alter the existing political and social structure" (6).

(ii) "National leader from Dadabhai Naoroji, Surendranath Banerji and Tilak to Gandhijee and Nehru accepted that the India was not yet a fully structured nation, but a nation in the making and that one of the major objective and functions of the movement was to promote the growing unity of the Indian people through a common struggle against colonialism. In other words, the national movement was seen both as a product of process of nation-in-making and as an active agent of process" (7).

(iii) "The Indian national movement was one of the most radical of the anti-imperialist movement outside China. Its ideological development occurred between the 1880's and the 1940's based on firm anti-imperialism and a programme of social and economic reform" (8).

(iv) "The nationalist movement was fully committed to parliamentary democracy and civil liberties. From the foundation of the Indian National Congress, the nationalist and other mass organizations were organized along democratic lines. From the beginning the nationalists fought for the press, speech and association and other civil liberties. It was national movement which undertook as well as accomplished the task of making


(7) Ibid., p. 23.

parliamentary democracy and civil liberties indigenous"(9).

(v) "Indian nationalism from 1880s onwards was firmly rooted in a correct critique of the character of colonial economy but this critique was at the same time continued within the prospective at the capitalist character of modern economic development. Thus the national movement was under bourgeois ideological hegemony from the beginning"(10).

(vi) "There was a crucial difference between the strategy by Gandhiji from 1919 to 1947 and the strategy advocated unanimously by the left during 1933-37. The Gandhian strategy was 'Struggle-Truce-Struggle' (S-T-S)"(11).

(vii) Class weapon was a necessary weapon in the anti-imperialist struggle"(12).

(viii) "The Indian national movement had from the beginning, even when it accepted the bourgeois pattern of social development as its objective, two very important positive features: one was its basic orientation towards the people and the acceptance of the nation that politics must be based on the masses who must be politicized activated and brought into politics. The other was its ideological openness, it was to competition and contention by ideological currents. Even in the Gandhian era only two conditions were laid down for becoming a part of the congress-anti-imperialism and non-violence as a tactic or policy"(13).

(9) Ibid., p. 101.
(10) Ibid., p. 102.
(11) Ibid., p. 110.
(12) Ibid., p. 115.
(13) Ibid., p. 122.
(ix) "The fact that increasingly during the 1930s, the leadership of the national movement got divided into broadly left wing and right-wing stands, has tended to obscure the fact of a great deal of commonality among the two: The right-wing was as strongly anti-colonial and nationalist, humanist, reformist, democratic, secular, and developmentalist as the left wing"(14).

(x) "The leftist version of nationalism is secularism whereas the rightist model of nationalism in India has been that of Hindu communalism, the Indian version of fascism"(15).

(xi) "Nationalism is the best antidote to communalism struggle against communalism can not waged only or even primarily on a class basis. All secular forces can be united to oppose communalization of society and politics only around the much broader societal ideology of nationalism"(16).

(xii) "Moreover communalism can not be weakened unless a long term political and ideological struggle is waged against it"(17).

(xiii) "We believe that the acceptance of two basic ideas (a) of a society being divided into mutually hostile classes against each other and (b) of colonial domination and exploitation leading to a primary contradiction between colonial people and 'colonialism', opened up a fresh terrain of colonial society and nationalism"(18).

(15) Ibid., p. 99.
(16) Ibid., p. 107.
(17) Ibid., p. 108.
(xiv) It (national movement) is one concrete example of a long drawn out hegemonic struggle in which state power is not seized in a single historical moment of revolution but through a prolonged political process in which the main terrain of popular struggle is the national-popular. That is the moral, political and ideological on a national or societal plane in which the reserves of counter-hegemony are patiently built up over years, in which mass movements are occasional but politics is perpetual in which the struggle for state power goes through stages, each stage marking a step forward over the previous one in which masses play an active part and do not depend upon a standing army 'of cadre' and yet the cadre play a critical role, in which the movement goes through the inevitable 'passive' phase but the political morale is not only kept up but enhanced.\(^{(19)}\)

(xv) "We would like to suggest that the study of the rich experience of the Indian national movement and in particular of Gandhian political strategy and style of leadership, as distinguished from Gandhian philosophy would have a certain significance for the revolutionary, that is basic transformation of democratic, hegemonic states and societies."\(^{(20)}\)

(xvi) "From the middle of the nineteenth century and especially after 1914 an independent capitalist class developed in India. From the beginning it possessed one important characteristic. In the main, it did not develop an organic link with British capitalism, it was not integrated with foreign capital in India."\(^{(21)}\)

---

(19) Ibid., p. 91.
(20) Ibid., p. 92.
(xvii) "The two fold relationship of the capitalist class to imperialism, i.e. long term accommodation and dependence, led it to work for a non-revolutionary pattern of anti-imperialist struggle"(22).

(xviii) "Uneven development of capitalism the development of one part and under development of the other, and unequal distribution of the benefits of the development of system - has been a basic characteristic of modern capitalism"(23).

(xix) "Colonialism was the complete but complex integration and enmeshing of India’s economy and society with world capitalism carried out by stages over a period lasting nearly two centuries. The essence of India’s underdevelopment therefore, lay not in colonial policies but in the nature of its contacts with the world capitalist economy through trade and capital. Colonial policy was responsible not for limiting India’s contacts with the world market forces, but for making it a full through unequal member of the international economy"(24).

(xx) "Justice Ranade’s economic writings were a major weapon in this ideological struggle between colonialism and nationalists. The consequences of this struggle was the gradual erosion of the British hegemony over the minds of the Indian people; it was to weaken and then destroy the halo beneficence around British rule which had led the Indian people to acquiesce in this rule."(25).

(22) Ibid., p. 158.
(23) Ibid., p. 4.
(24) Ibid., p. 25.
(xxi) "Justice Ranade tried to separate economic issues from politics and reduce his emphasis on economic demands which he felt, could not be realized under colonial rule" (26).

(xxii) "Secularism - defined as separation of religion from politics and the state, equal regard for all religions, absence of discrimination among citizens on ground of religion and active opposition to communalism - was the basic constituent of the freedom movement's view of independent India" (27).

(xxiii) "Gandhiji was, above all, a great leader of the masses who mobilized millions to play an active role in the freedom struggle. In doing so, he had to confront the questions of the relationship between the masses and their leaders and spontaneity and organization" (28).

(xxiv) "From the late 1920, Jawaharlal Nehru, Subhash Bose, Congress socialists, the communists and various left wing groups popularized the vision of a socialist India. This was accompanied by the growing economic radicalism of Ghandhiji. Virtually abandoning the trusteeship theory, he declared in 1942 that the land becomes to those who work on it and to no one else" (29).

(xxv) "Jawaharlal Nehru was above all and in the finest and broadest sense of the term, a nationalist" (30).

(26) Ibid., p. 18.
(28) Ibid., p. 17.
(29) Ibid., p. 31.
(30) Ibid., p. 99.
"Subhash Bose was an inspirer and darling of young people, a militant agitator and a very good organizer. But he was not a builder of mass movement .......... Ghandhiji on the other hand, acquired his place in history, above all as the organizer, mobilizer and inspirer of great popular mass movements. He brought people into political motion"\(^{(31)}\).

"Politically the conflict was not between Hindus and Muslim - which is what communal ideologies assert - but between Hindu and Muslim communalism on one side and the secular nationalist forces on the other"\(^{(32)}\).

"Thus Muslim 'backwardness' or Muslim's failure to get employment became the product of Hindu 'progress or animosity or domination' while Hindu progress was declared to be constantly thwarted or frustrated by Muslim hostility"\(^{(33)}\).

"Communalism was not a remnant of the past - a hangover from the medieval period, a language of the past. It was a modern ideology that incorporate some aspects and elements of the past ideologies and institutions and historical background to form a new ideological and political discourse or mix"\(^{(34)}\).

"Communalism was a modern phenomenon that arose as a result of British colonial impact and the response of different Indian social classes, strata and groups. Communalism was a modern ideology

---

(31) Ibid., p. 95.
(33) Ibid., p. 3.
(34) Ibid., p. 6.
that used the popular traditional consciousness of Hindu and Muslims forming separate groups of religious, marriage and interdinning purposes in its effort to base modern politics of popular sovereignty on a religious identity"\(^{(35)}\).

\((\text{xxxii})\) "Communalism is not only in the present, it is of the present"\(^{(36)}\).

\((\text{xxxii})\) "Nationalism as well as communalism might try to appeal to the past - and to establish links with the ideologies, movements and history of the past. But that does not mean that either of them existed in the past"\(^{(37)}\).

\((\text{xxxiii})\) "Communalism was presented by the colonial administrators as the problem of the defence of minorities"\(^{(38)}\).

\((\text{xxxiv})\) "Communalism is not a dinosaur, it is not an ancient animal, it is a very modern animal"\(^{(39)}\).

\((\text{xxxv})\) "If communalism is basically an ideology, then it cannot be suppressed by force. No ideology can be suppressed by force. Ideology has to be fought at the level of ideas. This is what we learn from history"\(^{(40)}\).

\((\text{xxxvi})\) "I believe that communal ideology consists of three elements, one succeeding the other. First of all, according to communal ideology

\begin{itemize}
  \item \((\text{xxxv})\) "Ibid., p. 8."
  \item \((\text{xxxv})\) "Ibid., p. 9."
  \item \((\text{xxxv})\) "Ibid., p. 21."
  \item \((\text{xxxv})\) "Ibid., p. 243."
  \item \((\text{xxxv})\) "Khuswant Singh and Bipan Chandra: Many Faces of Communalism (Chandigarh: Centre for Research in Rural and Industrial Development, 1985) p.39."
  \item \((\text{xxxv})\) "Ibid., p. 51."
\end{itemize}
people who follow the same religion have common secular interests, that is, people who follow the same religion have not only common religious beliefs or interests, but they also have common political, economic, social and cultural interests. From this arises the notion of religions, community.... second, when one says that the interests of the Hindu Community are different from the interests of the Muslim community, or Sikh community, then one has taken the second step towards communalism. The third step is taken when it is said that not only are the interests of the followers of different communities different, but are hostile to each other”(41).

According to Bipan Chandra, the major historical events which took place during the Indian National Movement from 1857 to 1947 are as follows:

I. The first major challenge: The revolt at 1857.
ii. Civil rebellions and tribal uprisings.
iii. Peasant movements and uprising after 1857.
vi. Socio-Religious reforms and national awakening,
vii. An economic critique of colonialism.
viii. The fight to secure press freedom.
ix. Propaganda in the legislatures.
x. Swadeshi movement 1903-1908.
xi. The split in the congress and the rise of revolutionary terrorism.
xii. World war I and Indian Nationalism: The Ghadar.

(41) Ibid., pp. 45-46.
xiii. The Home Rule Movement and its Fallout.
xiv. Gandhiji’s Early career and activism.
xv. The Non Co-operation Movement 1920-1922.
xvi. Peasant movement and nationalism in 1920 s.
xvii. The Indian working class and the national movement.
xviii. The struggles for Gurudwara reform and temple Entry.
xix. The years of stagnation - Swarajist’s No - changers and Gandhiji.
xxii. Civil Disobedience - 1930-1932
xxiii. From “Karachi to Wardha - The year from 1932-1934.
xxiv. The rise of the left wing.
xxv. The strategic debate- 1934-1937.
xxvi. Twenty eight months of congress rule.
xxvii. The peasant movements in the 1930’s and 40’s.
xxviii. The Freedom struggle in princely India.
xxix. Indian capitalist and the national movement.
xxx. The development of a nationalist Foreign policy.
xxxi. The rise and growth of communalism.
xxxii. Communalism-the liberal phase.
xxxiii. Jinnah, Golwalkar and extreme communalism.
xxxiv. The crisis at Tripuri to the Cripps Mission.
xxxv. The Quit India Movement and the INA.
xxxvi. Post - war National Upsurge.
xxxvii. Freedom and partition.

There are two assumptions with regard to Indian nationalism. The first is that prior to 1947 nationalism was considered as
a radical movement against the British hegemonies imperialism. During the national movement the primary contradiction was between the British imperialism and the Indian people. It is also important to note that diverse contradictory yet complementary ideological and political viewpoints existed among the cognitive threshold of our nationalist leaders like Gandhi ji, Nehru ji and Subhash Chandra Bose over the issues of ideological political strategies as how to achieve independence and as how to build up our nation if freedom is achieved. Further it has to be noted that even the progressive or left people did not consider nationalism as a false consciousness or a bourgeois ideology to conceal class contradiction. However it has been asserted that the Indian National movement was primarily dominated by the bourgeois ideology and socialist ideology was a secondary manifestation of the reality. That is the reason that the entire strategy of national movement was based on the Gandhian political philosophy of non-violence and civil disobedience. Gandhi ji and Nehru ji were the hegemonic organic intellectuals and political practitioners during the later part of national movement. The early nationalists had the positive attitude towards the British rule. The difference between the early nationalists and the later nationalists lies in their respective perception, attitude and mental makeup regarding the British rule. Of course the later nationalists were critical polemical and revolutionary in order to achieve what Gramsci calls the war of position.

The second assumption with regard to the nationalism after 1947 is that it is conceptualized in terms of the achievement of social democracy, political democracy, self-reliant economy, development of science and technology. So far as the strategy of national security is concerned social justice, equality and the foreign policy of non-alignment
in the hostile world. Further nationalism is conceptualized as a medicine to eradicate the virus of communalism, casteism, corruption and crime within the boundary of our mother land. One can also argue that nationalism is a weapon to build up a strong, cohesive nation-state based upon the ideologies of federalism, democratic participation, developmental bureaucracy and cultural pluralism. Further we also observe that after the collapse of communism from the globe of world, the socialist content of Indian nationalism has weakened in the present situation. With the support of especially middle class Hindus the Bhartiya Janta Party has captured the state power in 1998, which by demonstrating the nuclear explosions has proved the thesis of aggressive nationalism. In order to counterbalance its position, Pakistan has also made an nuclear explosion and it is demonstrating one of the variant forms of fascism in the form of Islamic fundamentalism. It is also noticeable fact that Indian state represents a peripheral state system in the interlocking world capitalist system. Thus in order to neutralize the effects of various negative development, the Indian state has to become a strong and our civil society will have become a cohesive order. But this statement should not be understood in Hegelian and Nitzschian philosophy that state is a march of god on the earth and nation-state should develop maximum strength of “will to power” or “will to rule”. Now let us discuss the above mentioned two arguments, about the ideological position of Indian nationalism because the modern history of India and development in India after independence have been deeply rooted in the history of national liberation struggle - a war against imperialism and communalism.

The Indian national movement was deeply rooted in the social ethos of democratic debates and discussion within and outside
congress since its inception in 1885 by A.O. Hume. It is interesting to note that it was not the intended subjective disposition of A.O. Hume, a retired English ICS Officer, to treat the Indian national congress as a messiah of the Indian freedom movement but to treat it as a 'safety valve', or as a 'feedback process' to release the discontentment of the Indian suffering masses. But the unintended objective effect produced by the Indian National Congress and its western-educated intellectuals like Gandhi jee, Nehru jee etc. was something contrary to the expectations of the British officialdom. From its beginning in the last quarter of the 19th century, the Indian national congress struggled for the introduction of representative government and paid nearly as much attention to the defense of civil liberties specially the freedom of the press, as the promotion of its other economic and political policies. It also made an struggle against the British political diplomacy of “divide and rule” and the Machiavellian political discourse as a mechanism to maintain and reinforce its hegemony over the Indian population. Thus, the Indian national congress was trying to unite the various communities to fight against communalism which was nurtured by the British ruling classes ideology. Here one can say that the national movement was not hostile to the British people but to the British ruling class. However the effect of communal tension and disharmony could not sustain a theory of “free undivided India” rather we observe the partition of country into India and Pakistan on the religious ground, on the eve of disappearance of British rule in 1947.

The national movement assumed that India is not a structured nation; rather it is in the process of formation. The Indian National Congress mobilized the people on nationalist ideology against colonialism. The Indian national congress remained united despite its
ideological complexity, class heterogeneity, except a break in Surat in 1907, when some section of the leadership of both the moderates and extremists made an attempt to transfer the congress into a party of single political and ideological movement. The congress was based upon democratic ideology because within it leaders and members used to express their views openly and frankly. Before we deal with the counter hegemonic force created by the early nationalist and Gandhi jee and Nehru, we would like to deal with the hegemonic capitalist force which appeared with the arrival of British imperialism in India.

To be sure, nation is a category organically associated with capitalist social formation. The British made India as its colony in order to extract surplus value from it so that the British capitalism could develop rapidly. The under development of India was the product of the development of British capitalism. Capitalism is not only an economic organization, but also a socio-political organisation because we also see that economy does not operate in a pure form; rather it has a social base. The basic difference between feudal social formation and capitalist social formation, lies in the fact that the former is characterized by localized production and localized power structure whereas the latter is characterized by universalized commodity production and universalized power. It is in this sense that we can argue that one consequence of colonialism was the economic and political unification of the country along with its suitable repressive state apparatus in the form of modern rational bureaucracy and ideological state apparatus in the form of modern legal system and educational system.

Colonialism did not only integrated the Indian society into the world capitalist market but also developed internal capitalism by
breaking the relative village autonomy, union of agriculture and handicrafts etc. There was a massive development of communication system which linked the different parts of the country. The spread of new ideas and culture like individualism and hedonism created a new intelligentia imbued with a modern democratic rational and national outlook. The effect of modern education among the Indian Intelligentia was that there developed a sense of nationalism at the level of lexis and praxis. On the one hand the emergence of India nation was a major factors in the rise of nationalism on the other, the anti-imperialist struggle contributed powerfully to the making of the Indian nation. Initially the modern intellectuals developed a positive attitude towards the colonial rule under this illusion that British rule is God-sent which will make Indian and industrial power in the world along with the guarantees of freedom of press, democracy freedom and equality which the west has achieved as its cultural deposit. But the second half of the 19th century was to witness the gradual disillusionment of the Indian intellectuals. People like Dada Bhai Naoroji, Justice Ranade and R.C. Dutt developed this thesis that Indian's economic backwardness and poverty were not inherent in the inherent social structure of Indian society, but in the colonial linkage between India and Britain. Political disappointment was no less acute. The colonial administrator, statesmen and intellectuals no longer talked of preparing India for democracy and self-government. They declared Indian people as unfit for democratic self-rule and self mastery. When the Indian intellectuals demystified the motive of British rule, they create nationalist thought and elementary organizations to carry-on anti-colonial propaganda and agitation. But when the subjective realization of objective contradiction in terms of appearance of clash of interest between the Indian people and colonial ruler, they
develop a mass movement against imperialism. This fact was first of all realized by the middle class and lower middle class people of India.

According to early nationalist a basic obstacle in the path of industrial development was the colonial policy of free trade which was ruining the handicraft industries and which forced the infant and undeveloped modern industries of India into a pre-mature and unequal, hence, unfair, competition with the highly organized, developed and large-scale industries of Britain and other western countries. A major obstacle to industrialization, said the early nationalists and above all - Dada Bhai Naoroji among them - was drain of wealth from India. The Drain theory meant that India’s wealth was being exported and total annual was being exported without any adequate economic and material return. The drain was represented by the surplus of India’s export over imports. As a result of it the early nationalists urged Indian business men, professionals and the princes and zamindars to accumulate capital and invest it in modern industries. They pleaded for better organization of capital through the use and promotion of modern banks, insurance companies, etc. so that small scattered and lifeless atoms of wealth might be transformed into organized and living capital capable of infinite expansion. Thus it seems that the early nationalists were confused and illusioned so far as they were unable the “hidden wheel of history” i.e. the exploitative character of foreign capital.

The greatest illusion of the early nationalist reflected in their advocacy for taking positive measure for industrial development by the colonial state. Five of its aspects stood out in the thought of early nationalists. Firstly, the state should give the needed tariff production to India’s infant industries. Secondly, the states should help mobilize scattered
indigenous capital and saving of the middle classes and peasants through the development of state-aided or state-controlled banks. Thirdly, the state should make up the lack of capital in the hands of the private entrepreneurs by giving them loans directly or through financial corporations. It should extend subsidies to the needed extent to indigenous enterprises. Fourthly, the state should enable Indian economy to absorb foreign capital without letting the latter dominate Indian capitalists. It could do so by itself borrowing in foreign financial markets and then lending to the local capitalists. Fifthly, the states should itself pioneer industries in the public sector where the local capital was incapable of investing or unwillingly to invest. For example, in the case of steel or machine industry further the state should own and operate all those industries which needed enormous foreign capital. The process of disillusionment set in gradually after 1860 as the reality of social development falsified the hope. That is the reason the “Indian National Congress” became an anti-imperialist movement.

As the leader of mass anti-imperialist movement, the congress had to be based on widest possible unity of the Indian people. Unity was derived on the question of war against imperialism. Only once did a major and vertical split occur in congress history - that was at Surat at the height of the anti-partition of Bengal movement. Both the moderates led by Pherozshah Mehta and extremists led by Lokmanya Tilak and Aurobindo Ghosh made the error of trying to transform the congress into a party of a single political and ideological trend. The national movement was not yet based on the masses or their mobilization. Mehta and Gokhle died in 1915 and Aurobindo Ghosh had left politics in 1909. The extremists led by Tilak and remaining moderate leaders remedied the situation in
1916 when the two trends united again at the Lucknow congress. It was above all Tilak who picked up the movement from where unfortunately it had been derailed at Surat by both the moderate and extremists. The congress faced another situation of split during 1934-37. The rising left wing led by Jawahar lal Nehru challenged the established leadership on basic questions of the strategy and social ideologies of the national movement. The confrontations came to a head during 1936 on the question of office acceptance under the 1935 Act and collective - affiliation of the trade unions and the Kisan Sabhas to the congress.

In 1939 Subhash Chandra Bose broke away from the congress after he had been forced to resign from its presidentship which he had won after a heated contest. But there was no split as Nehru, the socialists and the communists, royalists and the most of the other left-wing groups and individuals refused to join him. Involved was the basic questions of the strategy - whether the congress should accept Gandhian strategy or leftist strategy. Gandhi ji was willing to let Subhash carry out his own strategy. The communists and socialists left the congress immediately after independence, believing that it was no longer the leader of a mass anti-imperialist movements but a bourgeois party of governance.

Now let us discuss why Gandhiji's political philosphy and strategy was accepted by Nehruji and others. We think that it was due to his humanist vision and anti-Machiavellian political discourse. Nehru ji combined his scientific socialist thought with that of Gandhi ji's theory of non-violence. Gandhiji could foresee a world where conflict would not be resolved through violence. He was above all, a great leader of the masses moved and mobilized millions to play an active role in freedom struggle. In doing so, he had to confront the question of the relationship
between masses and their leaders and spontaneity and organization he was of the opinion that it is not the leaders but the masses who create mass movement but leaders organize masses and make them travel on goal-oriented direction. In other words, leader shape the collective consciousness of the masses and convert it in organized, coherent direction. Thus there is a dialectical relationship between leaders and masses. So far the relationship between organization and spontaneity, we can argue that an organized party and a charismatic leader organically and dialectically interrelated. Further objectives conditions are not sufficient for mass movement, rather unless there is a subjective realization about the objective condition there can not be an emergence of mass movement. One can argue that the both structure and human agency are essential for the creation of mass movement. That is the reason Gandhiji trained his cadres in non-violence and service to the people in multiple form. But he also instructed them to be self-reliant, self-disciplined and self-service. Initially Gandhiji derived morality for anti-Machiavellian political discourse from religion, but later on in 1942 he revised his position and said that religion is to be confined to private life of an individual and public life and political discourse should be guided by humanism and secularism. Gandhiji also over the time revised his position on modern 'industries' use of machines and the caste system. In early 1920's he refused to oppose the varna system, opposing primarily untouchability and caste operations. However in 1940, he argued for the total abolition of the caste system. In early 1920's he did not favour inter-caste and inter-communal marriages. In the 1940's he him self performed such marriage in his ashram.

Gandhi-Bose conflict of 1939 throws a flood of light of Gandhiji’s conception of leadership over the strategy and tactics and
correlation of forces. However, we find a minor difference between Gandhiji and Nehruji. Infact, both of them developed a great deal in common such as deep respect for faith in the Indian people, moral integrity, deep humanism, commitment to democracy, civil liberties and secularism, healthy nationalism and internationalism, belief in a non-violence as a political method, and above all commitment to the poor and deprived. Both were Renaissance persons, rooted in traditional Indian culture yet deeply influenced by a modern thought. Though Nehruji was leftist, he argued that the future of the socialist movement in India depended on the capacity of the Marxian socialists to unite with the Gandhian. Further, Nehruji believed that though Sardar Patel, Rajendra Prasad and C. Rajgopalchari belong to right wing, they were as patriotic and strongly anti-imperialist as any other section of the national movement. Their right wingness lay primarily in their conservative economic outlook and not in their softness towards imperialism. Thus, we find that nationalist movement was based upon a judicious mixture rightist, leftist and centralist ideological universes. There was a combination of economic democracy and political democracy in the thought pattern of Nehruji as he rejected the capitalist developmental and civilization perspective and worked for the transformation of India in a socialist direction with the help of democratic method. In other words, Nehruji advocated not for revolutionary sociology of Leninist-Stalinist variety which leads to the developmental of dictatorship of proletariat. What Nehruji wanted, was a democratic socialism as the British Labor Party or the French Socialist Party advocated. Further, Nehruji considered socialism as a process not an event which will take place suddenly. One modification was made by Nehru, apart from others, in marxism is that he did not accept the
dictatorship of proletariat as a road to communism because for him civil liberty is of great importance for people because it will be the people who, through societal consensus, will bring about social change in India. Thus, democracy is the best anti-dote to Stalinist communism and Hindu communalism as an Indian variety of fascism. For Nehru, socialism means equality of opportunity, social justice and the ending of social and economic disparities. He not only reacted against Hindu communalism but also against Sikh, Christian and Muslim communalism which are the different forms of communal ideology. Nehru argued most convincingly that secularism could form only basis for national unity in a multi-religious society and communalism was anti-national and danger to national unity...... Let us discuss the political philosophy of Gandhiji and Nehruji in order to understand the ideological map of the Indian National Congress who launched a nationalist war against imperialism.

To start with Gandhiji was throughout his life committed to secularism in general and Hindu-Muslim Unity in particular. He launched a mass movement in defense of civil liberties which manifested in the Rawlatt Satyagraha (1919) the Non-co-operation Movement (1920) and the Individual satyagraha of 1940 in which the satyagrahi claimed the right to speak in public against co-operation with the British war effort in India. Though an orthodox religious believer he called a "respect for all religions" or "what we can call a federation of all religions". He also stood for the women’s liberation. That was the reason, the civil disobedience movement marked massive participation by women in prabhat pherries and Public demonstrations.

Gandhiji's thought and activity were in constant evolution. For example, initially he made an unity between religion and politics, but
when visualized communal holocaust of 1946-47 he separated religion from politics.

Further, he changed his attitude towards political strategy. Initially Gandhiji pleaded for non-violence as a political strategy of national movement, but in 1942 he gave the slogan of 'do or die'. We can also see Gandhiji's dynamic attitude towards machinery. In 1909 Gandhiji asserted that machinery is bad. But from 1934 onwards, he repeatedly said that he was not opposed to large-scale industry so long as it does not alienate labour from the system of production, and it is not controlled by private capitalists but by state system. Here it is important to describe the dynamic relationship between Gandhiji and Nehruji and between Gandhiji and Subhas Chandra Bose.

We have to answer the question: what was common between Gandhiji and Nehruji. When we look at the entire colour of nationalist movement we find firstly, that Gandhiji, liberal humanist and Nehruji, a radical humanist, shared a commitment to democracy and civil liberties. Both of them had an unqualified faith in the capacity of India's illiterate masses to fight against colonialism. Secondly, both of them possessed moral integrity of the highest integrity. Thirdly, both of them were great humanists which would be seen in their ideological orientation and expression in secularism, women's liberation, the breaking down of caste barriers and an international outlook, although Nehru's internationalism was based on a Marxist understanding of the unity of all working people. Nehruji combined Marxian philosophy with that of Gandhiji's political philosophy of non-violence as a method of protest. That is the reason Nehruji worked under Gandhiji. Thus, the relationship between Gandhiji and Nehruji was based on tremendous mutual respect.
which meant the differences and disagreement never led to a rupture in their relationship. In fact there was a unity of distinct between them.

So far as the relationship between Gandhiji and Subhash Chandra Bose is concerned, we can argue that it will be unhistorical to counterpose Mahatma Gandhi to Subash Chandra Bose. Both were staunch anti-imperialists and both were popular leaders of the Indian people. But the historical roles they performed were very different. Subhash Chandra Bose was an inspirer and darling of the young people, a militant agitator and a very good organizer. But he was not a builder of mass movement. Gandhiji on the other hand, acquired his place in history above all as an organizer, mobilizer and inspirer of great popular mass movement. Subhash Chandra Bose in 1939, argued for an immediate militant national struggle. But Gandhiji realised that the people and the congress were not yet ready for a struggle. On this issue Nehruji accepted the viewpoint of Gandhiji. Even other socialist leaders refused to side with Subhas Chandra Bose though it had played an enthusiastic role in his election as the congress president.

Now, let us discuss the ideological and political discourse of Jawaharlal Nehru. The entire tabulation of Nehruji's Political grammar revolves around the concepts of what we can call "evolutionary socialism", "economic democracy", "civil liberty", "nationalism" and "world peace through non-violence". We can make the following points about Nehru's vision of modern India and the modern world. It was not accidental that in 1942, Gandhiji declared Nehruji as to be his successor, the person who will speak his language after he is gone. The grounds on which Gandhiji visualizes a charisma in Nehruji's personality are as follows:

1. Nehru was in the finest and broadest sense of the term a nationalist.
(2) In economic field he set out to build the structure of self-reliant economy and society on the judicious combination of private sector and public sector.

(3) The policy of non-alignment was formulated in order to assert India's will for national independence.

(4) Nehruji was totally committed to participatory democracy. That was the reason he was hostile to Stalin's communist dictatorship and Hitler's political fascism. Nehruji was a passionate defender of the freedom of thought and expression, in general, and freedom of the press, in particular.

(5) He also support the federal and parliamentary form of democracy so that the 'unity in diversity' of Indian society could be maintained.

(6) For Nehruji secularism meant three things: (a) a fight against communalism (b) State and politics should be separated from religion and (c) equal respect for all faith and equal opportunities for those who profess any faith.

(7) He conceptualized socialism in terms of social justice, elimination of economic and social inequalities, and liberation of women and any weaker section of society. His socialism can be understood as an evolutionary process, not a sudden rupture in society and economy like Russia and China. For him, revolution would be a series of surgical operations enacted through the due process of law by a democratic legislature. That is to say, that he stood for democratic socialism since Nehruji believed that civil liberty and voting democracy are basic to socialism. His was a socialism with human face.

(8) He was hostile to the theories "possessive individualism", "acquisitive, monopoly capitalism" and "political-cum-military fascism".

(9) For him democracy should be based upon universal adult franchise,
equality, liberty, humanism, and peaceful co-existence of species, groups and nations.

(10) He accepted the Gandhian political strategy of "truth and non-violence" as a political method of protest and mass struggle. It seems that Nehruji developed this reductionist approach that the exercise of the vote will gradually educate the masses to vote in their own interest. But we know that all this required organization, mobilization, a party and an ideology.

(11) He nurtured the independence of the courts, even when they turned in a very conservative manner against his agrarian legislation. He gave full play and respect to the opposition. He was willing to back, fully the "free market of ideas".

(12) Elections were seen by Nehruji not only as expression of popular-will and popular-control but even more as means of mass democratic education.

(13) In fact, Nehruji was standing in frontal opposition to the rightwing and left wing versions of the notorious semi-racist and rice-bowl theory that the poor need rice more than they need democracy and civil liberties. He was also having negative attitude towards dictatorship, regimentation and authoritarianism. This sense of revulsion he helped impart to the Indian people and the Indian intelligentsia. This is one reason why the emergency of 1975-77 could not last for very long in India.

(14) According to Nehruji, Gandhiji and the Gandhians belong to the left-centre and could be gradually pulled further to the left by the socialist forces. But his socialist ideas were not based on dogmatic, monolithic bureaucratic and democratic centralism of U.S.S.R. variety. His socialism was of Gramscian variety.
Emphasis on rapid industrialization, planning public sector, development of heavy industry, science, technology, scientific cadre, atomic energy etc. were seen by Nehruji as necessary parts of the efforts to build up an independent, self-reliant and dynamic industrial order along with justice. In other words, he stood for "growth with justice".

Nehruji recognized both before and after independence that India was not yet a structured nation but a nation-in-the-making.

He linked colonialism and imperialism to world capitalism and made people realize during the 1930's that India's freedom struggle was part of the international struggle for human emancipation.

Nehruji saw communalism as a petty bourgeois phenomenon which was perpetuated by the middle classes for their failure in the theory of "economism".

In fact, Nehruji was a builder of modern India. He felt that nationalism could be and in fact, in the colonial and post-colonial situation had to be, articulated and integrated with socialist ideology and India as a nation could resist economic and political domination.

In final analysis Nehru did not believe that class struggle could be suspended during the process of nation building. But his theory of class struggle was linked with democratic method. Also he favoured trade unions and working class movement and the right of the people to protest and agitate and go on strike. This theory of Nehruji is what Ralf Dahrendorf calls the "institutionalization of conflict".

Thus, it is wrong to argue that after independence, nationalism has become an irrelevant category. In fact, in each successive stage of nation building, nationalism has to be defined according to the conjunction of contradictions in which one contradiction dominate the
social formation. We are living in an unevenly-structured-complex world economic system in which the core countries exploit and dominate the peripheral countries like India. Thus one of the basic task of independent Indian nationalism has to make an anti-hegemonic struggle, with the help of all peripheral countries of the world, against the hegemonic power of core countries of the world. Further, positive method to sustain nationalism has to be understood in terms of building, 'the national popular' so that interests of popular masses have to be taken into account by the ruling elite. For this, we will have to develop and mobilize the popular forces in conjunction with the state to strength the nation economically, politically and culturally. The country is today endangered by forces of communalism, regionalism, casteism, separatism, corruption and violence. In fact, there is a crisis in Indian society. Developments endangering national integrity in Punjab, Kashmir, Assam, Tamil Nadu are only extreme examples of the general tendency. The decisive forces have appeared in the country on caste line through mandalization and communal lines through the Ramjanama Bhoomi-Babri Masjid dispute. Thus forces of nationalism, democracy, developments and social equality and justice are unable to put forward a fresh agenda. It is also due to the political instability and institutional decay of all democratic institutions. In fact, there is a development of social fascism in the form of aggressive caste system and religious fundamentalism in contemporary India.

In order to preserve the spirit of nationalism in the present crises-ridden situation, we have to develop an alternative political culture or what Gramsci calls the "national popular culture". This is possible, if we make a struggle ideological-cum-political; first, in the field of ethic and politics, and then, in the field of economics and science.