



The Idea of State in Nehru

Charusheel Tripathi

Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India
charusheel.tripathi@gmail.com

Available online at: www.isca.in, www.isca.me

Received 18th June 2017, revised 4th August 2017, accepted 11th August 2017

Abstract

The objective of this paper is to depict how the political writings of Nehru, primarily "The Discovery of India" and "Autobiography", contained a plethora of derivative as well as indigenous characteristics and ideologies that resulted in the culmination of the concept of state in India, during the pre-independence era. The Nehruvian strategy comprised of attempts to pose challenges to the internal discrepancies in India pertaining to the British rule as well as to the external or international disturbances of global politics and juxtaposed this with the progressive phenomenon in the West, that he deemed plausible for borrowing and applying to the Indian context, thus, subsequently laying down the framework for the conceptualization of an Indian state. This paper is hence, segregated into three sections:- The first deals with the misuse of power by the colonizers to construct a flawed idea of the state in India and Nehru's attempt to identify them and pose adequate challenges; the second deals with the Nehruvian ideologies and fundamental principles which were a result of the influences from the West and which assist him in conceptualizing the Indian state; lastly, the third section deals with the plethora of characteristics in Nehru's prospective vision of the state, that assist in the establishment of a strong case for an idea of state in the forthcoming post-colonial era.

Keywords: Jawaharlal Nehru, State, Democracy, Advaita/Vedanta, Religion, Socialism.

The Idea of State in Nehru

"Two roads diverged in a wood, and I took the one less travelled by; and that made all the difference".

—Robert Frost

The aptness of these lines is depicted in their unparalleled and uncanny resemblance to the dilemma that was brewing in the mind of a charismatic political figure and freedom fighter, who in an imprisoned state was trying to cull out a fathomable idea of a state. This creative architect made a constructive usage of his term as a class 'A' prisoner, who had access to newspapers, magazines and writing materials in his cell, by reading and writing about Indian and world history. Thus, being 'denied the freedom to act in the present, he turned to the past and made it his instrument for action in the future¹'.

This politician and philosophical thinker was Jawaharlal Nehru. He was born in a 'typical bourgeois²' family of a Kashmiri Brahmin lawyer, Motilal Nehru. After being home schooled till the age of thirteen, in theosophy and science by his tutor, Ferdinand T. Brooks, Nehru continued his education in Harrow and Cambridge and later returned to India, to be incorporated in the glorious struggle for independence under the supervision of the Indian National Congress party. This agitation against the British suzerainty resulted in his subsequent imprisonment for nine terms and provided him with the enforced leisure of prison life that eventually culminated in his three literary works of Glimpses of World History, An Autobiography and The Discovery of India and it is primarily in the latter two works that

he puts forth his conceptualization of the Indian state in a scattered manner.

The conceptualization of a notion of statehood by Nehru was a synthesis of the East and the West. He said, "I have become a queer mixture of the East and the West, out of place everywhere, at home nowhere. Perhaps my thoughts and approach to life are more akin to what is called Western than Eastern, but India clings to me, as she does to all her children, in innumerable ways"². This eclecticism of Nehru assisted him in carefully selecting the attributes coterminous with the values of both the civilizations.

The objective of this paper is to depict how these political writings of Nehru contain a plethora of derivative as well as indigenous characteristics and ideologies that resulted in the culmination of the concept of state in India, during the pre-independence era. During the late colonial rule in India the envisioning of a concrete notion of a state along with its desirable features was impossible as it would be like counting the chickens before they are hatched. But Nehruvian strategy was otherwise. He posed challenges to the internal discrepancies in India pertaining to the British rule as well as to the external or international disturbances of global politics and juxtaposed this with the progressive phenomenon and processes in the West, that he deemed plausible for borrowing and applying to the Indian context thus, subsequently laying down the framework for the conceptualization of an Indian state. This paper is hence, segregated into three section: The first deals with the misuse of power by the colonizers to construct a flawed idea of the state in

India and Nehru's attempt to identify them and pose adequate challenges; the second deals with the Nehruvian ideologies and fundamental principles which were a result of the influences from the West and which assist him in conceptualizing the Indian state; lastly, the third section deals with the plethora of characteristics in Nehru's prospective vision of the state, that assist in the establishment of a strong case for an idea of state in the forthcoming post-colonial era.

I

The lens through which the British rulers and administrators tried to perceive and understand its colony was highly parochialized and constricted. From the beginning there was a wave of distrust for the Indian natives and their societal norms and principles. These ways and mannerisms of East were considered to be mysterious, secretive, conservative, backward and at the same time, full of conspiracies, hence putting the onus of their betterment and well-being on the British, under the garb of white man's burden. 'The Englishman can seldom think straight on matters relating to these lands of supposed mystery. He never makes an attempt to understand that, somewhat obvious and very un-mysterious person, the Easterner. He keeps well away from him, gets his ideas about him from tales abounding in spies and secret societies, and then allows his imagination to run riot'². As a result of this stigmatization of the ruled by the rulers, what emerged was a police state whose primary responsibility was the protection of the territories and its inhabitants. Taking his personal plight into consideration, with reference to his days in prison, Nehru establishes a linkage between the penitentiaries and the modern state. He exclaimed how the basic functions of the government could be encapsulated in the tripartite zones of 'the prisons, the police, and the army'. There was hence a glorification of the protective role of the colonial state. The public finances were directed towards the maintenance of the army, military, police and civil administration and the areas of economic planning and fulfillment of the socio-cultural needs of the governed were dislocated and deliberately sidelined. This perspective of Nehru, regarding the duties and functions of the state during imperial rule, was synonymous to the Hobbesian idea of the minimalistic role of the state i.e. promising security in return for the withdrawal of the liberties of the individuals in the social contract. The primary aim of the Leviathan was to ensure that the subjects were safeguarded from internal and external harms, on the condition that they would willingly surrender their privileges to the state.

What the colonizers from Britain established in India was termed as 'suzerainty' i.e. the power possessed by a nation to exercise its rule over another country, which already has a ruler or princes. It was a subsidiary system where the real power was vested with the British government which aimed at protecting its vested material interests by ensuring minimal counter revolts or agitations through the technique of 'divide and rule'. While highlighting the case of the illegitimate and illegal use of power and force by the oppressors to maltreat and exploit the Indians,

Nehru intentionally made use of gender stereotypes like the 'manhood'¹ of the Indian nation being under threat and this leading to a derelict nation. A similar faux par is committed by him when he considers the State to be 'effete' and 'effeminate'¹ during the invasion by Nadir Shah. The use of these terminologies to depict the weakness and the lack of political prowess of the Indian state is a stark reminder of how a patriarchal association is created between the gendered view of women as a symbol of weakness and the limited or clipped strength of the state.

An array of criticisms was launched by Nehru towards the liberal party and its acceptance of the British proposal of a dominion status for India. Like Gandhi in Hind Swaraj, Nehru believed that the dominion status stood for the standardization of the status quo i.e. the same old structure of governance and administration, with 'responsibility at the centre' and this would only lead to the replacement of the white sahibs by the brown sahibs. The alternative forwarded by the Congress on the other hand argued for the creation of a new state, through independence and not just a new administration. 'We want fresh air in India, fresh and vital ideas, healthy cooperation'². They eulogized a state which was free from the clutches of the twin evils of capitalism and imperialism.

According to the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report on Indian Constitutional Reform (1934), the British conceived their rule in India to be a just and efficient administration by a parliamentary government, under the rule of law which was successful in maintaining social and political unity. Paradoxically, the Nehruvian framework thwarted this exaggerated version of benevolence of imperialism by portraying how it prevented political, economic and industrial growth as well as socio-cultural progress in terms of removal of obsolete and conservative norms and cultures of the traditional feudal societies in India. The political unity which the rulers claimed to have spread in the colony was an incidental and accidental side effect and later attempts were made to undo it by spreading disunity and sectarianism in order to instigate discord and communalism. The bureaucracy was laden with evils like red-tapism, corruption, nepotism and sycophancy and thus, the Indian civil servants were being misused for the creation of a fascist regime and network. Therefore, the Britishers had no idea of what India was!

'They seized her body and possessed her, but it was the possession of violence. They did not know her or try to know her. They never looked into her eyes, for theirs were averted and hers downcast through shame and humiliation. After centuries of contact, they face each other, strangers still, full of dislike for each other'. Under the British suzerainty, India was 'a servile state, with its splendid strength caged up, hardly daring to breathe freely, governed by strangers afar; her people poor beyond compare, short lived and incapable of resisting disease and epidemic, illiteracy rampant; vast areas devoid of all sanitary or medical provision; unemployment on a

prodigious scale, both among the middle classes and the masses’.

It was because of all these cumulative reasons that Nehru professed the idea of a new Indian state with a novel social outlook. He had faith in the idea that the two pre-requisites of a stable and progressive society were a set of fixed and unwavering principles and a dynamic approach and in continuation with this, he praised the Western civilization for its stable principles and norms, more focus on rights rather than duties and possessing a multifarious outlook. Unlike, Gandhi, who centered his criticism on the Western civilization alone, Nehru targeted the British colonial rulers and administrators and their racialism and simultaneously, upheld the progressive strands of their modernized civilization.

II

Besides laying down the onus of the creation of a new state in India, on the failure of the imperialists to resolve internal discrepancies and cleavages in the socio-cultural, economic and political structure of the Indian nation, Jawaharlal Nehru’s conceptualized an alternative idea of the state, along with its respective attributes, with the collaborative assistance of the ideologies, perspectives and discourses within the international paradigm i.e. the influences from the West. The earliest formative influence on Nehru was his tutor, Ferdinand T Brooks, in the two diverse fields of theosophy i.e. discussions on metaphysics, reincarnation, auras, supernatural bodies, Karma, and science. Though under his influence he became a member of the ‘Theosophical Society’, at the age of thirteen, it was merely a passing fancy. The latter approach of ‘scientific temper’¹ was a shield used by him against the dogmatic, mystical, speculative, retrogressive and degenerative norms, convictions and customs of India. It was a medium which amalgamated philosophy i.e. which concentrated on the ultimate purposes of life and neglected facts, with science i.e. concerned with facts and not the ultimate purpose of life. This conservatism and lumpenization in society resulted in the confinement of India to a ‘deep slumber’, from which Nehru wanted to resurrect it. According to him, the nature of science was not to dogmatize, but to experiment and reason and rely on the mind of man. The objective of a ‘living philosophy,’ i.e. a combination of science and philosophy, was to answer the problems of today and these solutions could be deciphered with the scientific method of observation and experimentation. He combined this pragmatism with the humanist spirit i.e. faith in the supremacy of individuals as rational beings, thus resulting in the synthesized process of ‘scientific humanism.’ Though this belief in science was a Western import, but the faith in reason was an indigenous feature. Apart from valourizing the positive outcomes of scientific inquiry and critical thinking, Nehru also highlighted its negative attributes. Hence, there was no blind allegiance to science or the fruits of modernization, as, it was *“uncommitted and isolated from moral discipline and ethical considerations, will lead to the concentration of power and the*

*terrible instruments of destruction which it has made, in the hands of evil and selfish men, seeking the domination of others and thus to the destruction of its own great achievements”*³. Thus, the relationship that Nehru established between science and modern state was on the basis of how the former could be channelized, under processes like industrialization for advancement in technical know-how, infrastructural development, increased standard of living, increased employment opportunities and progress of the state and help it compete with its contemporaries around the world.

A second inclination that Nehru developed during his college years was towards the ideal of Fabianism⁴. In Cambridge, he indulged in the works of George Bernard Shaw, Bertrand Russell, Keynes and Webbs. He was attracted to the principles of abhorrence of violence or revolutionary means to achieve one’s ends and shared allegiance towards the concept of democracy. Eventually, his enchantment with the Marxist doctrine of economic determinism, economic interpretation of history, non-duality of mind and matter and the dialectical process of thesis-anti thesis and synthesis, led him to adopt this new scientific outlook that ‘lightened up many a dark corner’ of his mind and was akin to his belief in Vedantic approach i.e. there is a non-dualistic philosophy where an absolute soul or ‘atma’ exists. He used this ideology in order to challenge the Fascist and Nazi aggression and to understand the global economic scenario.

In continuation with the principles of Fabianism, the other dominant theme that developed as well as took forward the Nehruvian conceptualization of a state in India, was socialism. His visit to European nations like Soviet Russia in 1926-1927 along with the indulgence in the labour union movements e.g. All India Trade Union Congress, mines, factory strikes and in the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities in Brussels led to the broadening of his vision towards socialism and resulting in his declaration that ‘I am a Socialist and a Republican’. He utilized his socialist outlook to thwart the basis of Fascism, capitalism as well as imperialism and said: ‘I am convinced that the only key to the solution of the world’s problems and of India’s problems, lie in socialism’. He incorporated both humanitarian and economic approaches in this doctrine which had the capacity of bringing about revolutionary changes in the socio-economic and political structure of the state. Nehru’s entrenchment in socialism was also a result of the Russian revolution and his study of the drudgeries of Indian peasantry. In context of the former, he said that the socialism and communism of the Russian variety appealed to him. Though both communism and capitalism had violence, but the violence of the capitalist order was inherent, while the violence in Russia was revolutionary by nature and aimed at the formation of a new order based on peace and cooperation and liberation of the masses. Nehru’s goal of creating a socialist state in India was also in lieu of his agony on seeing the prevalent agrarian structure and crisis in India. He said: *‘looking at them and their misery and overflowing gratitude, I was filled with shame and sorrow; shame at my own*

*easy going and comfortable life and our petty politics of the city, which ignores the vast multitude of semi- naked sons and daughters of India; sorrow at the degradation and overwhelming poverty of India. A new picture seemed to rise before me, naked, starving, crushed and utterly miserable*⁵. These experiences led him towards the declaration of 'Purna Swaraj' and the 'advancement of a socialist trend' in the country, in the Lahore and Lucknow session of the Indian National Congress, respectively. Some of the trends that he envisioned to be a part of this socialist state were nationalization of banks, industries, railways, transport and other services, state initiated welfare policies for the poor e.g. subsidies, employment opportunities etc. One major development under this scheme was the creation of the National Planning Committee, which was comprised of 29 sub-committees dealing with diverse fields and areas like defense, arms, resources (conventional and non-conventional), mining, education, transport, health, sanitation etc and he diverted all his energy in carrying forward his desire of a planned economy for the prospective liberated Indian state.

III

The state envisioned by Nehru can be defined as *"a classless society with equal economic justice and opportunity for all, a society organized on a planned basis for the raising or mankind to higher material and cultural levels, to a cultivation of spiritual values of cooperation, unselfishness, the spirit of service, the desire to do right, goodwill and love- ultimately a world order."*²

One of the inevitable constituent of this political entity, i.e. the state, is the unity and integration among its constituent states or principalities, inevitably culminating in the formation of a standard territory and boundary. During the early twentieth century, Mahatma Gandhi upheld the principle of non-interference in the internal administration of the princely states. In contrast to this, Nehru's study understood and explained how, these states were a symbol of stagnant growth, low literacy, conservatism, autocracy, banning of newspapers and public meetings and reckless wasteful expenditure. Therefore, he proposed reorganization of these princely states and their unification, in order to create a holistic view of state. He said, *"A democratic state will not function as a fifth column. It is clear that these 550 odd states cannot function separately as political and economic units. They cannot remain as feudal enclaves in a democratic India. A few large ones may become democratic units in a federation, the others must be completely absorbed. No minor reform can resolve this problem. The states system will have to go and it will go when British imperialism goes"*². This nationalist philosophy of Nehru was comprised of the agenda of unity among the units of the state and the methodology to achieve this vision of a centralized or quasi-federal state was negotiation, diplomacy as well as coercion, if need be. He believed that the use of force, violence and coercion was necessary for the functioning apparatus of the state as it

prevented it from instances of external aggression, armed rebellion and internal disputes and riots and should not be used in the evil spirit of hatred and cruelty. In collaboration with this, the state would also have to formulate coercive laws and regulations for the maintenance of peace, harmony and unity within its territorial jurisdiction.

India, according to Nehru was like an *'ancient palimpsest on which layer upon layer of thought and reverie has been inscribed and yet no succeeding layer has completely hidden or erased what has been written previously'*. He considered it as a process of 'Indianization' where different racial and cultural groups that migrated to India, adapted themselves to the latter's culture. This civilization showed its tremendous and applaudable capacity to adapt, adopt and tolerate differences, without misplacing its authentic identity. Coterminous with this was the idea of how different communities and groups which had migrated to India had eventually been woven into a common identity of being an Indian. Keeping in mind this analogy, Nehru prophesized that even if India got divided into India and Pakistan, due to world developments, it would gradually reunite and help in resuming the holistic view of the country once again.

In the Discovery of India, Nehru claimed that another reason for the national unity in India, which would further the process of creation of a strong, unified state, was its social structure. This social structure facilitated the maintenance of a democratic way of life in India. The three components of this social composition were the autonomous village community, the caste system i.e. Varnashramdharma and the joint family. Nehru justified the caste system on the grounds that it did not promote slavery, maintained equality and freedom within each caste and led to specialization and development of skill¹. His faith in the caste system was on the basis of how it was liable for promoting cohesion, cooperation and stability in the societal realm and this is evident in the lines where he quotes Sir George Birdwood- *"So long as the Hindus hold to the caste system, India will be India, but from the day they break from it, there will be no more India"*.

What Nehru missed out while favouring the caste system was that it led to the creation of out-castes and untouchables and the social norms and customs observed under it were no less than bondage or slavery; there were sub-divisions within the caste which further led to penetration of hierarchy and inequality; specialization was restricted to birth and this pre-determined division of labour led to boredom, monotonous nature of work, alienation and moreover, inequality and injustice. According to Prof. Neera Chandoke, the state and civil society are complementary to one another⁶ and the latter is the vantage point for understanding the state.

The state therefore, cannot be studied in isolation from the society. This symbiotic relationship between the state and civil society was also present in Nehru's vision, as depicted above, but its framework can always be put to test.

Synonymous with the virtues of unity and territorial integrity, Nehru subtly highlights three important constants while defining a state. The former most is the upholding of a constitution. In democratic states, constitutionalism has unparalleled significance as it looks into the making of laws, protection of civil liberties, checking the powers of the legislature, executive and judiciary and provides for democratic and deliberative methods of bringing about progressive changes in the social, cultural, economic and political structures which were deeply entrenched in feudalism. The second feature is the hoisting of the national flag and the announcement of 26th January as Independence Day. While lamenting the death of his father, he exclaimed that "Great crowds in Lucknow, gathered together at brief notice- the swift dash from Lucknow to Allahabad sitting by the body wrapped in our national flag, and with a big flag flying above"². A second instance where the national flag is commemorated and hoisted is during Nehru's visit to Mysore. But soon after his departure, the pole is broken and display of the flag is regarded as an offence. "This ill treatment and insult of the flag pained me greatly". Hence, it can be seen how the flag and the announcement of Independence Day gradually became iconic symbols of statehood and imagined citizenship. Lastly, the third feature pertains to the usage of a national language or lingua franca. Under this, Nehru proposed as well as envisaged the adoption of English as the language for technical and scientific communication, business purposes and international contacts as 'English is bound to remain our chief link with the outside world'. He also argues in favour of the assimilation of English words in Hindustani language so that the communication in the state becomes smoother and easier.

A major ideological framework within which Nehru's ideas on the state were conceived was with reference to religion. He believed that religion hindered the spiritual growth of individuals and confined them to the realm of salvation of the self rather than the common good or collective well being.

*'India is supposed to be a religious country above everything else, and Hindu and Muslim and Sikh and others take pride in their faiths and testify to their truth by breaking heads. The spectacle of what is called religion or at any rate, organized religion, in India and elsewhere, has filled me with horror, and I have frequently condemned it and have wished to make a clean sweep of it. Almost always it seems to stand for blind faith, dogma and bigotry, superstition and exploitation, and the preservation of vested interests'. 'And yet I knew well that there was something else in it, something which supplied a deep craving to human beings. How else could it have been the tremendous power it has been and brought peace and comfort to innumerable tortured souls?'*²

Nehru was a firm believer in agnosticism i.e. a person who believes that one cannot attain the knowledge of whether god exists or not. The root of this philosophy was Western science and this method was objective and pragmatic, as opposed to the subjective framework of religion which was burdened with

mysticism and self-delusionism due to its unrelenting faith in metaphysics. It was this very school of thought that further pushed him towards 'cyrenaicism' i.e. the Greek philosophy enriched in love for adventure, faith in man and human well being. His faith in the Vedantic philosophy of 'advaita' i.e. non dualism and upholding of the ultimate reality of 'atma' or the 'absolute soul' was a direct consequence of his agnosticism. There is a deep internal discrepancy with reference to the link that Nehru draws between his agnosticism and his faith in the Advaita philosophy. According to him, there were six systems of Brahmanical philosophy i.e. Nyaya, Vaisheshika, Samkhya, Yoga, Mimamsa and Advaita was one of them. Now the question arises that if all these philosophies were Brahmanical in nature, then how could he consider himself to be an agnostic! How can one claim to be a non-worshipper of god and religion and an ardent follower of one of the Brahmanical philosophies within Hinduism, at the same given point of time?

According to D. E. Smith, the definition of a secular state, in Nehru, was of a religiously neutral body⁷ i.e. 'a state protects all religions, but does not favour one at the expense of others and does not itself adopt any religion as the state religion' (Karachi Congress Resolution of 1931). Secondly, the process of secularization should extend to the social realm of day to day life which includes the 'social codes and rules of marriage, inheritance, civil and criminal law, political organization and indeed almost everything else'. Lastly, the inclusion of the provision of fundamental rights and the articles of 15, 25, 26, 28 and 325 further reinforced the secular agenda of the Nehruvian state in India, which is distinct from the Gandhian idea which provided equal amount of consideration and respect to all religious faiths.

The conceptualization of the state in Nehru is incomplete without the incorporation of the concept of democracy. His democracy is opposed to the Gandhian idea of a metaphysical form of democracy which 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'.² Contrary to this viewpoint, the idea of the liberal democratic nature of the Indian state of Nehru comprises of four pillars,⁷ as depicted by D.E. Smith and these are:

Individual Freedom: Freedom for the realization of human values and the creative development of the individual. Nehru wrote in 1933 that democracy for him was 'a means to an end of good life'.

Representative Government: Democracy is comprised of the elected representative of the citizens who help the state in achieving political sovereignty and legitimacy within the territorial jurisdiction. He included in this the practice of vote, adult suffrage, political parties, contestation by opposition parties and the role of political leadership which does not compromise with truth and adopts a consensual approach. "Real cooperation must be based on an appreciation of differences as

well as common points". Thus, this concept of consensus carries forward the case for an inclusive framework and deliberative democracy, similar to what Habermas proposes in his 'Three Normative models of Democracy', where reasonable policies and laws can be formulated through pragmatic argumentation, deliberation, bargaining, compromises and decision making⁸.

Economic and Social Equality: According to Nehru's understanding, the political economy comprising of a capitalist structures was incompatible with democracy as it led to concentration and accumulation of power by the elite or intelligentsia; penetrated the caste system and thwarted the idea of a healthy relationship between equality and freedom. Thus, he endorsed the adoption of a socialist democracy to meet these contradictions and create a balance through a welfare state a classless and caste-less society.

Self Discipline: Democracy is essentially 'a scheme of values and moral standards in life' and ensures self discipline within the individual as well as the community as a whole. The hallmarks of this social self discipline are the ideas of tolerance (not compromise) and use of peaceful techniques of communication like discussion, negotiation, conciliation, mediation and persuasion and the roots of these practices is found in the Indian tradition of 'Dharma' i.e. adherence to one's duties.

The Nehruvian model of democracy criticized the Westminster parliamentary model, on grounds of its orientation towards capitalistic tendencies, cost-benefit equations and profit orientation, but it did focus on the establishment of a constitutional democratic state.

Lastly, the existence of the idea of a state in Nehru's works can be justified from the fact that Nehru hinted at the prospective foreign affairs and international relations for an independent India. He said that the claim of independence did not stand for isolation. 'We are perfectly willing to surrender part of that independence, in common with other countries, to a real international order'², in order to help create a system of world cooperation and world peace. Dominion status would lead to isolation as the state would be confined to work within the rules and regulations imposed by the British authority and thus limit its prospect of establishing contacts (unilateral, bilateral and multilateral) with other nation and international actors. That is why; independence of the country from the clutches of colonialism was an un-compromisable demand. With regards to the foreign policy of the Indian state, Nehru put forth his desire to establish a federation which would be composed of China, India, Burma, Ceylon and Afghanistan.

Conclusion

Thus, the idea of a state in Nehru can be derived by indulging in a deep analysis of the features, attributes, ideologies and principles that Nehru takes cognizance of in his political works (primarily his Autobiography and The Discovery of India), prior

to the (Indian Independence Act, 1947). These diverse and multifarious concepts created the vision of the state as an organization comprised of a mélange of institutions and fundamental principles. The nature of this state was defined by: *'liberal democracy, constitutionalism, civil liberties and reciprocal duties, secularism, socialism, planned industrialization, development and planning, peaceful coexistence and national unity in a multicultural - multi-lingual state.*

"If I had eight hours to chop down a tree, I would spend six, sharpening my axe".

Abraham Lincoln

The aptness of this quote is depicted in its unparalleled application to the conceptualization of the idea of the 'state' in the Indian context. The phrase, chopping down a 'tree' is coterminous with the problem of formulating an authentic idea of the Indian state, with the assistance of a sharpened 'axe' i.e. a plethora of compatible and co-existing ideologies. To ensure the efficient enactment of this process, a creative architect was required, in order to serve as a catalyst for the evolution and generation of a modern concept of state and this engineer was Jawaharlal Nehru. But this claim, in no way insinuates to intimidate the role played by and the pertinent claims and queries posed by a plethora of thinkers, reformers and politicians that were brewing in the pre-Independence Indian mainland. Their contributions and sacrifices are as unparalleled and creditable as Nehru's himself.

References

1. Nehru Jawaharlal (2008). The Discovery of India. Penguin Books, New Delhi, India.
2. Nehru Jawaharlal (2004). An Autobiography. Penguin Books, New Delhi, India.
3. Khilnani Sunil (2002). Nehru's Faith. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 37(48), 4793-4799. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4412900>
4. Parihar R.R. (1962). Western Influence on Nehru's Political Ideas. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 23(1/4), 83-90. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41853914>
5. Reddy Agarala Easwara and Ram Sundar D. (1989). Jawaharlal Nehru and Modern India. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 50(4), 445-468. URL : <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41855452>
6. Chandhoke Neera (1995). State and civil society: Explorations in political theory. Sage Publications, London, UK.
7. Smith D.E. (1958). Nehru and democracy: The political thought of an Asian democrat. Orient Longmans, Bombay, India.
8. Habermas Jurgen (1994). Three Normative Models of Democracy. *Constellations*, 1(1), 1-10.

9. Parekh Bhikhu (1991). Nehru and the National Philosophy of India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 26(1/2), 35-48. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4397189>
10. Nehru Jawaharlal (1942). Toward Freedom: The Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru. John Day Company, New York.
11. Gandhi Mahatma and Gandhi M.K. (1939). Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule. Navajivan Publishing House, Ahemdabad, India.
12. Brecher Michael (1963). Towards the Close of the Nehru Era. *International Journal*, 18(3), 291-309. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40198834>
13. Khilnani Sunil (1997). The Idea of India. Hamish Hamilton, London, UK.