

India

Jawaharlal Nehru

Jawaharlal Nehru went down in history and is remembered by his contemporaries as India's greatest political figure, an outstanding leader of the national liberation movement, a consistent fighter for peace, democracy and social progress, a staunch opponent of social injustice, colonialism, racism and national oppression, a sincere friend of the Soviet Union.

During several decades his name was linked inseparably with the struggle for India's liberation from colonial slavery, for its resurrection and establishment as a great sovereign state of Asia. Since August 15, 1947, when Nehru raised the three-coloured national flag over the historic Red Fort in Delhi he stood for seventeen years at the helm of independent India, leading her along the path of eradication of colonialism, the vestiges of feudalism and ages-old backwardness, towards national revival and rejuvenation.

Under Nehru's leadership India's government system was reorganised by setting up states according to the national-ethnic and language characteristics, which put an end to the British administrative system based on the "divide and rule" principle and the feudal fragmentation of the country; the initial agrarian reforms were carried out, undermining the traditional system of large landed estates, which had served for two centuries as the foundation of British colonial domination. He directed the restructuring of the national economy on the planning principle, laid the basis for India's industrialisation policy—the key prerequisite for her economic

growth. On Nehru's initiative and with Soviet assistance a large state sector was established in the economy, which is steadily growing stronger today. He was a consistent democrat, a fighter for equality, against the survivals of caste discrimination and religious-communal reaction, for India's strong national unity based on a combination of the principles of centralism and democracy.

Nehru's activities were not confined to the sphere of politics. He had sophisticated intelligence, an encyclopedic erudition, a profound philosophical frame of mind. In his immense literary heritage a universal education and broad interests, the originality and sharpness of wit combine with the sensitive approach, full of inner warmth, temperament and dramatism, of a man seeking and fighting, at times doubting and erring, but never abandoning his faith in progress. Nehru was a philosopher and a poet. One is apt to think that even if he had not been an outstanding political leader, his historico-philosophic writings alone would have entitled him to the attention and interest of posterity. Nehru's literary work, however, cannot be separated from his political biography. "The more action and thought are allied and integrated, the more effective they become and the happier you grow.... The happiest man is he whose thinking and action are co-ordinated," he said.*

He thought in concrete terms, with an eye to the tasks of the day but simultaneously he sought to gain an insight into the future. In his thinking he combined magnificently the day-to-day life of his long-suffering people, their great past and radiant future. For Nehru historical and philosophical meditation was not an end in itself but a search for an answer to the most important problems of concern to his homeland and all mankind. Nehru looked into the past in order to comprehend the present and to foresee the future.

It is from these positions that he wrote the first two books which came out in Russian — *The Discovery of India* and *An Autobiography*.

These books helped greatly to inform Soviet people of the history and contemporary problems of India. The book *Glimpses of World History* brought out recently in Russian is written in the same vein. The author's outlook is wider here. In his letters to his daughter from a British jail Nehru

* *Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches*, Vol. III, Delhi, 1958, p. 472.

presents a picture of the development of human society on a worldwide scale, dwelling upon the major events of world history, singling out and summing up the main aspects of the historical process. The history of India is described along with and in comparison with developments in other countries and parts of the world. This is a profound and original work of an historian, though not an academic research. Just as in *The Discovery of India*, Nehru attempts to comprehend the past of his country, in the given case, through the prism of world history so as to see its present more clearly and outline the ways of changing it. The past engages Nehru's interest primarily as a "pointer to the future". For him history is a school of life, experience, and struggle, the source of the origin of the world outlook. Nehru approaches it as an active political leader stimulated to research by the requirements of struggle and practice in general. "My fascination for history was not in reading about odd events that happened in the past but rather in its relation to the things that led up to the present. Only then did it become alive to me. Otherwise it would have been an odd thing unconnected with my life or the world," he said.*

Of particular interest is the world outlook of a man who was one of the acknowledged leaders of the national liberation movement, headed the independent Indian state and influenced its present and future over the last quarter-century more than anybody else.

Nehru approaches the history of mankind and of his country primarily as a rationalist thinker. He seeks within it an inner meaning, a logic of development and does not approach it with a priori, extra-historical categories. Such is also Nehru's attitude to the past of his homeland. It lacks—and in this respect Nehru differs favourably from many others—an uncritical admiration for antiquity, an idea, wrong by virtue of its narrow-mindedness, of the exclusiveness and separateness of India's historical path. Also noteworthy is the fact that Nehru's views are quite unaffected by religious or reactionary ethic mysticism fairly common in India. The traditions of not only European but also world rationalism, European and world intellectual culture critically interpreted by Nehru, who had gone through the school of classical European upbringing, influenced his historical concepts, especially in

* *Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches, 1949-1953*, Calcutta, 1954, p. 378.

relation to India, helped him to rid himself of bias, lopsidedness, idealisation, and to see his homeland just as it was in comparison with other countries—great and impotent, rich and poor, happy and unfortunate, free and suffering under the jackboot of the occupationists.

“It was in my blood and there was much in her that instinctively thrilled me. And yet I approached her almost as an alien critic, full of dislike for the present as well as for many of the relics of the past that I saw. To some extent I came to her via the West and looked at her as a friendly Westerner might have done,” he wrote.*

Having rejected abstract and fruitless quests of the meaning of history outside it as such, Nehru gradually discovered and later recognised the internal laws of historical development, and thereby made a fundamental step to a realistic, almost materialist—but not yet dialectical—interpretation of the historical process.

“In Asia, many historical forces have been at work for many years past and many things have happened which are good and many things which are not so good, as always happens when impersonal historical forces are in action. They are still in action. We try to mould them a little, to divert them here and there, but essentially they will carry on till they fulfil their purpose and their historical destiny.”** His recognition of the objective laws led Nehru to a comprehension of the upward spiralwise direction of the historical process—not without occasional regression—an understanding of it as an objective and progressive course of events, as an ascent, in the final analysis, from the lower to the higher.

These elements of Nehru’s world outlook positively influenced his political activities as well. He tried to approach them neither voluntaristically nor moralistically, nor from the viewpoint of religious requirements, but scientifically, attempting boldly to introduce them into the general, objectively necessary course of history, to bring them into line with progressive tendencies. It was precisely in conformity with the demands of the stormy period when he lived and worked, predetermined by all of mankind’s preceding development, that Nehru regarded the line of mass political struggle

* J. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, New York, 1946, p. 38.

** J. Nehru, *India’s Foreign Policy*, Delhi, 1961, p. 256.

as justified and realistic. This is precisely how he approached the planning of his country's policy. He abided consistently by the progressive scientific conception that the people was the genuine creator of history, while the activities of the political leaders should be subordinated to the struggle for meeting the aspirations and requirements of the masses. Here there is still no clear realisation of the historical role of the struggle between classes, but Nehru emphasised in this context that "the people were the principal actors, and behind them, pushing them on, were great historical urges.... But for that historical setting and political and social urges, no leaders or agitators could have inspired them to action."*

The influence of scientific socialism manifested itself perhaps most strikingly in Nehru's views on the historical process as being guided by objective laws and on the role of the masses. Nehru's world outlook formed under the influence of many schools, both Indian and European, which may prompt one to regard Nehru as not original, as an eclectic, and put a stop at that. This, however, would be quite unpardonable primitivism. Nehru is much more complex, and an oversimplified approach to the study of his views is impermissible. Nehru was characterised by a striving to comprehend and assimilate much of what had been accumulated in mankind's experience and to select what was best in it. Nehru sometimes used in the political struggle individual principles of various philosophical systems and this, of course, at times hid from his sight their incompatibility, irreconcilability, antagonism, and inevitably led to eclecticism, though he tried to avoid it in every way. He preferred "a mental or spiritual attitude which synthesizes differences and contradictions, tries to understand and accommodate different religions, ideologies, political, social and economic systems".**

Nobody had ever succeeded in producing a "synthesis of ideologies". Nehru knew this. Contradictory elements, divorced from their class soil outwardly, as it were, did not and could not find a unity and reconciliation in his own world outlook. Nobody can harmonise what is incompatible, antagonistic, contradictory in class character. As an honest scholar Nehru not infrequently revised critically his initial conceptual constructions devoid of a strictly defined class basis, seeking to go

* J. Nehru, *An Autobiography*, London, 1953, p. 282.

** R. K. Karanjia, *The Mind of Mr. Nehru*, London, 1960, p. 89.

ahead and develop his views. In this sense the direction of Nehru's political and social quests, the tendencies of their development were fruitful and retain their significance in India to this day. It is important, however, that in his quest for an answer to the most vital problems of the anti-imperialist struggle which he led and of the future of the former colonial countries Nehru sought to keep step with the times, with the 20th century, in which the road to socialism is the only one worth following.

He absorbed the traditions of ancient Indian culture and the rich history of its national liberation movement, in particular the philosophy and practices of Gandhism. He assimilated everything that West European democracy and bourgeois liberalism could offer. While receiving an education in its cradle—Great Britain—and experiencing disillusionment, Nehru turned to socialist ideas, initially in their Fabian interpretation. But once he turned to the ideals of equality and social justice, Nehru came close to the perception of many principles of scientific socialism thanks to the power of his critical, searching mind. Nehru did not resist this process. On the contrary, he avidly studied the theory and practice of scientific socialism in the belief that very much of it was acceptable to India. Nehru was one of the first leaders of the national liberation movement who were not afraid to speak of the epoch-making worldwide significance of Marxism-Leninism to the national-revolutionaries and the national-reformists. This is not surprising since Nehru himself saw in this science the ineluctable logic of historical development, the imperative demand of the time—the epoch of transition to socialism. Nehru repeatedly emphasised the favourable impact of scientific socialism on his world outlook. He wrote in this connection: "...The theory and philosophy of Marxism lightened up many a dark corner of my mind. History came to have a new meaning for me. The Marxist interpretation threw a flood of light on it, and it became an unfolding drama with some order and purpose, however unconscious, behind it. In spite of the appalling waste and misery of the past and the present, the future was bright with hope, though many dangers intervened. It was the essential freedom from dogma and the scientific outlook of Marxism that appealed to me."* This was a bold and original

* J. Nehru, *An Autobiography*, pp. 362-63.

statement, especially for India which still abided by its ancient and medieval traditions, for its peasantry, the petty strata of the urban population and a considerable proportion of the intelligentsia of Hinduist sentiments.

In another place Nehru pointed out: "A study of Marx and Lenin produced a powerful effect on my mind and helped me to see history and current affairs in a new light. The long chain of history and of social development appeared to have some meaning, some sequence, and the future lost some of its obscurity."*

Scientific socialism attracted Nehru not only as a theory. Its influence was particularly strong because Nehru admired the gigantic and unprecedented experiment in revolutionary remaking of the old world being carried out at that time in Soviet Russia.

"While the rest of the world was in the grip of the depression and going backward in some ways, in the Soviet country a great new world was being built up before our eyes.

"Russia, following the great Lenin, looked into the future and thought only of what was to be, while other countries lay numbed under the dead hand of the past and spent their energy in preserving the useless relics of a bygone age. In particular, I was impressed by the reports of the great progress made by the backward regions of Central Asia under the Soviet regime. In the balance, therefore, I was all in favour of Russia, and the presence and example of the Soviets was a bright and heartening phenomenon in a dark and dismal world."**

Only a very honest and sincere man and political leader unburdened by the traditions of feudal or bourgeois India, a man who had a critical view of capitalism and witnessed the birth of the new, Soviet socialist world could have said such prophetic words, which have retained their significance to date.

Nehru followed with keen interest the progress of social transformations in Soviet Russia. He made his first visit to our country with his father, Motilal Nehru, a prominent leader of the Indian National Congress party, as far back as 1927 in the days of the tenth anniversary of Soviet power. What he saw here led him to conclude: "...The Soviet revolu-

* J. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, p. 17.

** J. Nehru, *An Autobiography*, pp. 361-62.

tion had advanced human society by a great leap and had lit a bright flame which could not be smothered, and ... it had laid the foundations for that 'new civilization' toward which the world would advance."*

Was it not, indeed, a brilliant assessment of the genuine revolutionary process and a brilliant forecast for decades ahead?

Nehru had a profound interest in Lenin, his personality, theoretical and practical activities. Evaluating Lenin's role in history, Nehru wrote that "...millions have considered him as a saviour and the greatest man of the age".** Nehru described Lenin as "...a mastermind and a genius in revolution"***

Nehru's ideal was the unity of thought and action, theory and practice. The influence of the ideas of scientific socialism, his high assessment of the historic contributions of the USSR logically led him to recognise the need to carry out radical socio-economic reforms in India, to proclaim socialism at first as a relatively remote ideal of the social system and later as the ultimate goal of the political struggle.

In his speech at a session of the Indian National Congress party in Lucknow in 1936 Nehru said: "I am convinced that the only key to the solution of the world's problems and of India's problems lies in Socialism, and when I use this word I do so not in a vague humanitarian way but in the scientific, economic sense.... I see no way of ending the poverty, the vast unemployment, the degradation, and the subjection of the Indian people except through Socialism. That involves vast and revolutionary changes in our political and social structure, the ending of vested interests in land and industry.... That means the ending of private property, except in a restricted sense, and the replacement of the present profit system by a higher ideal of co-operative service.... In short, it means a new civilization, radically different from the present capitalist order."****

This statement was like a bolt from the blue. It was the first statement made by a national-revolutionary who proclaimed with such determination and consistency the inevi-

* J. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, p. 17.

** Ibid., p. 289.

*** J. Nehru, *Glimpses of World History*, New York, 1942, p. 638.

**** J. Nehru, *India's Freedom*, London, 1962, p. 35.

tability of India's transition to socialism. It was addressed to the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois audience of the Indian National Congress party in the conditions of the British colonialist reign of terror. It should be underscored that Nehru's description of socialism as a social system based on the abolition of private property and the domination of public property as the sole means of delivering the people from the abominable ages-old poverty was correct in principle. The reader will easily note, however, that while the goal itself, its presentation and definition are correct, the means of achieving it are either not outlined at all or have a reformist character.

Nehru perceived in the socialist remaking of society the logical result of mankind's historical development. He stressed that capitalism "is not longer suited to the present age", that the world had outgrown it. He pointed out that the scientific and technological revolution makes the need for socialism particularly obvious, and that the modern scientific approach is exactly the socialist approach.*

At the same time, Nehru was one of the first leaders of the anti-colonialist movement to indicate with striking clarity, forcefulness and farsightedness that the movement towards socialism was a specific requirement for the developing countries, an objectively predetermined path of progress for states which had thrown off the colonial yoke, for India in particular. In this thesis and its argumentation Nehru had anticipated many propositions put forward later by a number of Asian and African political leaders. Nehru posed clearly the question of the unacceptability of capitalism for the liberated countries in view of the fact that the latter had no time at their disposal to achieve progress by the same methods, at the same rates and in the same cruel forms of exploitation of man by man as the Western world had done at one time. Should we follow the British, French or American way? he asked. Do we really have as much time as 100 to 150 years to achieve our goal? This is absolutely unacceptable. In such an event we shall simply perish.**

In his statements on the socio-economic programme of the ruling Indian National Congress party after winning independence Nehru laid emphasis on the need for industrialisation and the enforcement of the planning principle to ensure independent national development. He said in this context:

* See J. Nehru, *India Today and Tomorrow*, New Delhi, 1959, p. 28.

** See J. Nehru, *Towards a Socialist Order*, New Delhi, 1956, p. 4.

“Broadly our objective is to establish a Welfare State with a Socialist pattern of society, with no great disparities of income and offering an equal opportunity to all.” *

One cannot but notice a measure of uncertainty and vagueness in this pronouncement though it reflects Nehru’s passionate desire for India to advance along the path of social progress. What is, indeed, a “Welfare State”? Where is it and the interests of which class or a coalition of which classes does it represent? What is “a Socialist pattern of society” and “an equal opportunity to all”? Admittedly there are many types of socialist society, although it is perfectly obvious that socialism is unique in its foundation rather than composed of different types and that “an equal opportunity” which is, incidentally, promulgated in the Constitution of India may mask and indeed masks the most flagrant and, unfortunately, growing social, class, property, caste and any other inequality of the formally equal citizens of the Republic of India.

Thus Nehru admitted the objective need for remaking the Indian society along socialist lines, although his interpretation of the very process, means, forms and methods of this remaking contained his specific, mostly subjective-idealistic and—it may be said—reformist concepts. They were attributable to the exceptionally intricate tangle of class antagonisms characteristic of modern India, its multistructural social system and, most important of all, to Nehru’s underestimation of the special historical role of the working class as the vehicle of the ideology of scientific communism, as the leader of all working people and, consequently, the majority of the nation. The alignment of class forces in the national liberation movement against the British colonial rule and later in independent India limited Nehru’s possibilities to translate his subjective ideals into reality. India was following the capitalist path, the contradictions inherent in capitalism were steadily growing, and the ideals of a “Welfare State” and a “Socialist pattern of society” remained somewhere in a thick fog. The bourgeoisie was growing fantastically rich, and a monopolistic elite was taking shape: 75 concerns were in control of the private industrial sector. Equal opportunities did exist, but the actual inequality increased at a fast rate.

The tremendous scale of the tasks facing the general democratic movement in India and providing the basis for broad

* *Jawaharlal Nehru’s Speeches. 1957-1963*, Vol. IV, Delhi, 1964, p. 151.

unity of national forces inevitably influenced Nehru's views and especially his policy. At times Nehru elevated to an absolute, as it were, the transient alignment of classes, which was conditioned by a definite level of the democratic movement and conformed to the objectives of its definite stage; this alignment of class forces, however, could not be preserved as soon as the question of socialist remaking was raised. The classes and class antagonisms made themselves felt with increasing urgency. Participants in the mass movements persistently demanded not so much "equal opportunities" as decent conditions of life for the working people and its improvement. Nehru, however, seemed, as it were, unwilling to go beyond the framework of the general democratic stage of the revolution in his analysis of the Indian society, to admit that the struggle for socialism required a radically different class orientation, that in a transition from the general democratic tasks to the socialist tasks the content, composition and correlation of the components of the united national front in the period of the anti-imperialist movement should, in the final analysis, change essentially, and new classes and new leading forces should come on the scene of the struggle.

Not that Nehru failed to admit the existence of classes and the class struggle in the country but he advanced the thesis on the possibility to resolve the class antagonisms by compromise and reforms based on class collaboration as the key guideline for national policy. He advocated a harmonious development of society on the basis of collaboration between classes. He believed that the growth of the influence of the propertied and exploiter classes in the country's economic and political life could be prevented by persuasion alone.

One cannot but note in this a definite influence of the liberal, bourgeois-democratic and simply reformist views, as well as Mahatma Gandhi's Utopian moralistic conceptions.

It is precisely these views and conceptions that were the starting point of the subjective criticism by Nehru and his followers of individual aspects in Soviet history, of certain principles of the theory of scientific socialism, of the communist movement in India. This reflected the profound contradiction in Nehru's world outlook, which he had never overcome, although he made some efforts to this end. The long-lasting and fairly deep isolation of India, its social thought and even Nehru himself from the achievements of Marxist-Leninist theory and the practices of the socialist construction in the

USSR and other countries also limited his possibilities for a full understanding of the processes of the formation of the new socialist world and especially the overcoming of the incredible difficulties facing the trail-blazers towards socialism, a society which he justly regarded as India's only saviour from the scourge of capitalism. Nehru was coming to accept really existing socialism gradually, with great subjectivism and reservations, particularly as regards the conception of class struggle and the historical role of the working class.

On the one hand, Nehru admits the scientific truth of the Marxist interpretation of history based on revealing the class antagonisms. "Marx constantly talks of exploitation and class struggle..." Nehru wrote. "But, according to Marx, this is not a matter for anger or good virtuous advice. The exploitation is not the fault of the person exploiting. The dominance of one class over another has been the natural result of historical progress.... Marx did not preach class conflict. He showed that in fact it existed, and had always existed in some form or other."* Criticising in his *An Autobiography* Gandhi's preaching of the principle of non-violence, Nehru writes: "If there is one thing that history shows it is this: that economic interests shape the political views of groups and classes. Neither reason nor moral considerations override these interests. Individuals may be converted, they may surrender their special privileges, although this is rare enough, but classes and groups do not do so. The attempt to convert a governing and privileged class into forsaking power and giving up its unjust privileges has therefore always so far failed, and there seems to be no reason whatever to hold that it will succeed in the future."**

It would seem nothing could be clearer. On the other hand, in the 1950s and 1960s Nehru nevertheless sought to reconcile his recognition of class struggle with Gandhi's conception of class harmony, contradicting his own perfectly realistic assessments of earlier years. "So while not denying or repudiating class contradictions, we want to deal with the problem in a peaceful and co-operative way by lessening rather than increasing these conflicts and trying to win over people instead of threatening to fight them or destroy them..." he said. "...The concept of class struggles or wars has been out-dated

* J. Nehru, *Glimpses of World History*, pp. 546-47.

** J. Nehru, *An Autobiography*, p. 544.

as too dangerous at a time....” * The inconsistency of these conclusions despite his clear understanding of the conception of class struggle is quite obvious.

Leaving aside the confusion and identifying of class struggle with war, the absolute contraposition of non-violence to violence, the peaceful and violent ways of resolving class contradictions, one would like to think that these words expressed not so much the evolution of Nehru's convictions at the end of his life as a pragmatic requirement issuing from the political line largely shaped by the right-wing forces in the leadership of the extremely heterogeneous, multiclass national-reformist ruling party—the Indian National Congress. These right-wing forces persistently strengthened their influence in that period, which led later to a division of the Congress and the emergence from its midst of the wing which continued Nehru's domestic and foreign policies.

The experience of political struggle and the country's socio-economic development inexorably contradicted Nehru's views. It failed to confirm the conception of class collaboration, the possibility of “re-education” of the Indian landlords and capitalists but, on the contrary, it abounded in sharp social conflicts, in the course of which the privileged classes protected their interests by resorting to any means of suppressing the protest of the working people and an overt coercion against them. Once it felt strong enough, the monopoly elite of the bourgeoisie not only sought to trample under foot the numerous and many-faced middle and petty bourgeoisie but also frenziedly strained to seize power, without stopping at the demand to dislodge the Indian National Congress party and the Nehru leadership along with it.

The heat of the class struggle, his sincere compassion for the oppressed and desire to improve their lot, his invariable dedication to the socialist ideals again compelled Nehru to make a sober assessment of the profundity and objective character of the class antagonisms in the Indian society.

Nehru could not, in the final analysis, fail to admit the existence in India of “privileged groups and classes” resisting radical reforms. He pointed out the fact that to protect their selfish interests these social strata (to which he ascribed not only the semifeudal landowners but primarily the monopoly elite of the national bourgeoisie) leant towards an accord

* R. K. Karanjia, *The Mind of Mr. Nehru*, pp. 76-77.

with imperialism and neocolonialism and might go against the interests of the country's national and social progress. The proclamation by the Indian National Congress party of socialist slogans did not lead Nehru to superficial idealisation of the Indian society. He realised that it is a far cry from a slogan to reality. Remaining a realist in its assessment he said that it was a capitalist economy with a considerable measure of government control, or a capitalist economy plus a public sector directly controlled by the state.*

As a farsighted politician Nehru was aware of the threat to the policy he was planning and pursuing to build in India a society after a "Socialist pattern", a threat to progress and democracy not only from the Indian society's traditional forces of feudal or religious-communal reaction but also from the growing capitalist monopolies. Shortly before his death, in the autumn of 1963, he wrote: "Monopoly is the enemy of socialism. To the extent it has grown during the last few years we have drifted away from the goal of socialism."** This was a bitter but true admission.

The years which have passed since Nehru's death have fully borne out his misgivings concerning the reactionary role of Indian monopoly capital, the feudal and semifeudal landlords and numerous political groups and parties, both in the centre and in the states, the right and the left extremist, which often joined forces in the struggle against Nehru and the Indian National Congress party. India's left, democratic forces, all supporters of the Nehru line waged and are waging now a determined fight against the anti-popular ambitions of monopoly capital and its allies.

Nehru's views on foreign policy were consistently progressive, and in this field there was no conflict which distinguished his concepts of socialism and his domestic policy. As a thinker and statesman Nehru made an outstanding contribution to the cause of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism, to safeguarding international peace, to the postwar change in the alignment of forces on the world scene in favour of the forces of national liberation, progress and socialism.

Nehru was a consistent fighter for peace and international security. He upheld peaceful coexistence and was an active champion of detente, of curbing the arms race and effecting

* See A. I. C. C., *Economic Review*, Delhi, September 15, 1957, pp. 6-7.

** *Congress Bulletin*, No. 9-11, 1963, p. 55.

general disarmament. He was one of the founding fathers of the policy of non-alignment which made the basis of India's peaceful foreign policy. As he saw it, non-alignment by no means implied passive neutrality.

Nehru organically combined positive neutrality with a consistent struggle against colonialism, and invariably emphasised the importance of this struggle. It will be recalled that he contributed effectively to the disintegration of the Portuguese colonial empire. In 1961 he ordered Indian troops to enter the Portuguese colonial enclaves in India (Goa, Daman, Diu) and expelled the last colonialists from the country.

Nehru's warning concerning economic dependence on imperialism is fully valid for India and other developing countries.

Nehru was one of the co-authors of the principles of peaceful coexistence — *panch sila* — which have been broadly recognised as the basis for mutual relations between Asian countries. He was one of the co-sponsors of the historic Bandung Conference, which was a milestone event in the process of uniting the newly-independent states of Asia and Africa in the struggle against imperialism, neocolonialism and racism, for peace, freedom and socio-economic progress.

Another historic contribution made by Nehru was his unwavering efforts towards unity and alliance with all progressive forces in the world arena. As far back as 1927 he took an active part in the Anti-Imperialist Congress of Oppressed Nations in Brussels. "Ideas of some common action between oppressed nations inter se, as well as between them and the Labour left wing, were very much in the air," he wrote. "It was felt more and more that the struggle for freedom was a common one against the thing that was imperialism, and joint deliberation and, where possible, joint action were desirable."* This was an important step towards a recognition of the need for unity between the national liberation and the revolutionary movements, including the working-class movement throughout the world. Revolutionary anti-imperialism as represented by Nehru responded to the appeal for broad cooperation and unity of action from the leader of the proletarian revolution — Lenin. India takes up positions along-

* J. Nehru, *An Autobiography*, p. 161.

side the world's progressive forces fighting against fascism and imperialism, Nehru declared.*

Nehru's constant desire for a mutual understanding with the Soviet Union was one of the most striking and fruitful manifestations of this line. The establishment and successful development of Indian-Soviet cooperation were inseparably linked with the personality of Nehru and his political line. The friendly relations between our countries, the basis for which was laid by his policy, have long become, to quote Leonid Brezhnev, "a most convincing manifestation of the great alliance between the world of socialism and the world born of the national liberation movement".** These relations are a model of peaceful coexistence and fruitful cooperation between states with different socio-economic systems, united by their common interests in the struggle for peace and international security.

The favourable development of Soviet-Indian relations throughout the period since India's independence found a profound expression in the Soviet-Indian Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation signed in August 1971. The official friendly visit of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Leonid Brezhnev, to India in November 1973 perpetuated all the positive achievements in the relations between the two countries over the preceding years, and was another important contribution to the development of their friendly bilateral relations, as well as to promoting detente and security in Asia and throughout the world. The joint Soviet-Indian Declaration signed at the end of the visit and other documents developing the basic principles of relations between the USSR and India and setting the guidelines for cooperation between them were warmly approved in both countries and highly appreciated by the democratic public of the world.

The main achievements of the Indian people, of the country's democratic forces in the economic and foreign policy fields are justifiably associated with the name of Nehru and the implementation of the Nehru line.

The Nehru line both in his lifetime and especially after his death was and continues to be the target of fierce attacks from

* See J. Nehru, *Presidential Address. Indian National Congress, 49th Session, April 1936, Lucknow-Allahabad, 1936, p. 5.*

** *Pravda*, November 28, 1973.

the reactionary forces seeking to prevent India's socio-economic renovation, to revise its positive foreign policy of peace, to undermine Soviet-Indian friendship. The right-wing forces often attempt to distort the genuine essence of Nehru's socio-philosophic and political views, to manipulate his name in pursuance of their selfish goals alien to the interests of the Indian people. These attempts, however, are doomed to failure.

Nehru's humanistic, democratic and socialist ideals have not been buried in oblivion after his death. A sharp controversy has flared up over them. The right-wing forces would like to turn them into a screen for pursuing a policy suited for the wealthy elite. In the meantime, the followers of the Nehru line are working to promote the country's economic and social progress, to translate into life the finest ideals of this outstanding leader of the Indian people. The progressive forces inside and outside the Indian National Congress party are seeking to repulse the right-wing forces both inside and outside the Congress, making for this purpose alliances for a joint struggle against reaction.