



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2019; 5(1): 84-91
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 12-11-2018
Accepted: 16-12-2018

Atri Saha
Assistant Professor,
Vidyasagar College for Women,
Kolkata, West Bengal, India

Democracy: A strategy in Nehru's foreign policy

Atri Saha

Abstract

Democracy informed Nehru's foreign policy, as he routinely informed Lok-sabha about his initiatives related to the foreign policy of India to achieve greater legitimacy in favor of his leadership as well as his foreign and domestic policies. Thus, democracy of Nehru had had a strategic significance for his foreign policy. But the basic research question is why his strategic significance failed to solve India-China dispute and other matters related to external and internal affair? Thus, to find the answer of these following queries, we went through several biographies and original writings of Nehru, we found that Nehru's failure were not rooted in his democratic strategies. Thus, the hypothesis is that Nehru's failures were due to the inconsistencies present within the philosophical premises which formed the framework of Nehru's foreign policy.

Keywords: Democracy, foreign policy, philosophical premises, Panchasheel, non-alignment

Introduction

India is the world largest democratic nation. It was a contribution of Nehru the first Prime Minister of India who tended to adhere to certain democratic path in formulation of his foreign policy. One of the very important aspects of Nehru's foreign policy was the consensus he was able to build around it. This consensus was democratically acquired in the sense that although external affairs belong exclusively to the union list and the competence of central government, Nehru regularly informed the representatives of the people in Lok Sabha by delivering long speeches on what he was going to do in matters of foreign policy. Nehru's approach in this regard helped him to achieve greater legitimacy in favor his internal, external and even economic policy. There were some examples of his time where the rulers subscribed to the same policy (e.g. Non-Alignment) but had not care for acquiring democratic legitimacy. The cases in point are Yugoslavia and Egypt. Thus, democracy for Nehru obviously had a strategic significance for his foreign policy.

In this chapter we will first deal with Nehru's concept and approach to democracy in general. Secondly, we will discuss how Nehru uses the democracy as a strategy to peruse his countries national interest. The sources to be consulted in this regard are primarily Nehru's own writings, supplemented by commentaries and interpretations.

A brief but critical glance at the existing literature shows that the scholars like Frank Mores (1959) ^[i], Gopal (1989) ^[ii] and M.J Akbar (1988) ^[iii] have highlighted only self-determination that Nehru always is thought to have urged by giving the right to the people of India to frame their own constitution without any external interference and must have the right to guide their own policies. But no scholars neither recent foreign policy writers like Pant (2016), Sumit Ganguly (2010) nor the biographers of Nehru like Gopal, Mickle Breacher, Frank Moraes have highlighted on the point that how Nehru applied Democracy in order to build consciousness within the citizens of India and to inform every members of Lok Sabha about the decisions which he used to take in the sector of foreign and internal policy, so that by democratic means he can make people's representative and citizens in favor of his policies. Rather, biographers have only discussed about the external and internal decision taken by Nehru periodically where as the foreign policy writers were totally concerned in pointing out the cause behind the failure of Nehru's objectives of foreign policy but none take any kind of initiatives to discuss about democratic decisions of Nehru in his foreign and internal affairs and none have tried to analyze that how Nehru used democracy as one of the paradigm in Nehru's foreign policies. Nehru's consciousness building in favor of his policy by using the term-democracy was not only applicable in his internal policy but he used this

Correspondence
Atri Saha
Assistant Professor,
Vidyasagar College for Women,
Kolkata, West Bengal, India

strategy in international level also. But, no scholars still now have tried to explain that how democracy as a premise interplayed itself within the objectives of his foreign policy, internal policies as well as in economic policies also and how it stood to be a barrier in the way of his success in fullest form.

Democracy a Premises in Nehru's approach

According to Nehru, democracy was a scheme of values and moral standards in life and the best form of government. In this regard Nehru maintained that when any dispute takes place, there are two major means to solve the problem. Firstly, the application of force was not at all adorable to Nehru because aggression invites huge intake of life and destruction of resources. Second, applying democratic ways means the ways discussions and finally accepting those decisions which probably is healthy for the mass. Thus, the second one is far better than the first one for mankind as it will help to establish peace and co-operation throughout the nation and outside and it is also vital in order to create a healthy external and internal environment for the nation. Moreover, Nehru always believed that the second is always for sustainable for India because according to him 'democratic methods inevitably implies trying to understand the other party's opinion, i.e a certain give or take, and a certain adjustment to whatever the final decision might be'. [Nehru 1958 vol-3: 31] As India is a country of various cultures, religions, castes, classes there is an immense possibility of the formation of variety of opinions over almost every subject which can result in authoritarianism but only free expression and thoughts can resolve all the problems. Nehru further said that democracy ensures free expression and freedom of thinking, and on the other hand, it demands acceptance of decisions taken; in other words, it tries to increase our tolerance level towards other people belonging to separate culture, religion and cast. Nehru always wanted fullest form of democracy (where political and economic both form of democracy will exist). According to him democracy is not a new word for the European nations as they are practicing this form of government from long days and it had also played a great part in the world's progress. Thus, Nehru's form of democracy accepted all citizens' not only elite class but ever citizens irrespective of their economic stander and democracy should have to reside in political as well as in economic sphere also.

Democracy of Nehru in political sphere: Nehru's democracy in political sphere is term 'Parliamentary Democracy'. Nehru said that it was not at all a new term because it came into existence 200 years ago but that form was not a proper democratic form because democracy in those countries was presumably 'male democracy' because there women had no right to vote earlier. But Nehru wanted to establish that form of democracy where ever citizens no matter to what societal category they belong to must have the right to access democratic right in its fullest form. Moreover, Nehru said:

"Problems which India was facing after independence can be solved merely by establishing a sound governmental structure but by the quality of human being, there education, their character and democracy is the only process which make it easier for those qualities

to develop who are talented and will help the nation to overcome the critical situation of post independence and remove those elements which will suppress the growth of the nation." [Nehru 1958 vol-3: 137]

Nehru initially preferred parliamentary democracy because the Indian were aware of its functioning and got more or less adapted to its practice during the period of colonialism in India. And lastly according to Nehru in a parliamentary democratic system only every member has importance no matter whether one belongs to majority or minority in this regard. Nehru said:

'The minority in a parliamentary government has a very important part to play. Naturally the majority, by the mere fact that it is a majority, must have its way'. But a majority which ignores the minority is not working in the true spirit of parliamentary democracy. [Nehru 1964 vol-4: 69]

According to Nehru parliamentary form of government only ensures true democracy because it paves the way for the gradual widening of the franchise till it became adult franchise. He even said that political changes (means in effect adult franchise ^[iv]) now only can be visible in its fullest form. And it was Nehru's earnest wish was that we should accept these political changes so that our citizens also can enjoy adult franchise but it can only be possible when education had spread a good deal as a result of the economic resolution. But in most Asian nations including India were suffering out of illiteracy that is why Nehru tried to arrange several education programmer not only inside the nation border but outsides also because Nehru believed that true enlightenment is possible through cosmopolitanism ^[v] not by enhancing nationalism.

Essentially, parliamentary form of democracy is based on laws and conventions. Thus Nehru suggested that every citizen should get conscious about their behavior so that they do not adopt any wrong tendencies which will give rise to dictatorship; thus citizen must show respect towards right to equality and should increase their tolerance towards other and for that we have to accept socialism which enhances equal distribution and equality among and due to this very reason Nehru stood for democratic socialism. And Nehru through his writings tried to make it clear that European citizens for not behaving in a proper manner democracy has failed in many countries of Europe because there citizen failed to show tolerance towards other as a result one party who are in majority side behaved like fascist and the other one behaved like a revolutionaries and the whole got lowered and democracy went into pieces. And Nehru was dead against this particular form of democracy which gave rise to elitist dictatorship.

Democracy in economic policy of Nehru: After independence India was undergoing through a major economic depression and without economic growth political democracy cannot exist because Nehru said that 'It is obvious that a vote by itself does not mean very much to a person who is down and out and starving'. [Nehru 1958 vol-3: 138] So from this statement it was clear that for a citizen food is far essential than a right to vote. Therefore, political democracy by itself is not enough except that it will pave the ways for the rise of economic democracy. But next

question that arises is that what is economic democracy for Nehru? How was it significant for him for India's foreign policy?

According to Nehru, his pattern of economic structure was neither like liberal democratic form of structure, nor was it like the Marxian socialist form; it was quite different from these two forms because this form will help the country people to come out of all the ravages of the Second World War and Partition and it was only possible when economic freedom must be based on equality, well-being of the masses and co-operative spirit. And Nehru also wanted to create a balance between rural and the urban sectors in his economic policies. Thus, he advocated a kind of mixed economic system where both public as well as private sectors will exist which is the healthiest way to establish economic equality and well being among all. Nehru was very much convinced with the matter that even in countries which were highly progressive basically capitalist nation's adored economic democracy and more supervising was that this form of economic democracy can only be possible when we introduce Socialism in our economic system thus Nehru observed that in Europe there were many countries which are socialistic. The Scandinavian ^[vi] countries according to Nehru were possibly the most advanced countries of Europe were examples. That was the reason why Nehru wanted to introduce socialist democracy for establishing true economic democracy in our country. Smith defined Nehru's concept of democracy in terms of societal structure where economic and social equality will reside and people will enjoy political, economic and social freedom.

Moreover, Nehru was aware of the fact that political democracy would never going to succeed in establishing peace and prosperity in that particular nation without economic democracy as one is very related to other. Therefore the basic objective of our nation was to bring an end to all differences between classes and to bring about more equality and more unitary society by striving for economic democracy, because, according to him, Indians had to think in term of ultimate upliftment of a nation and according to Nehru, only classless society can bring about true democracy. It is so because where class is there conflict is there and clashes will degenerate into fruitless violence and in this kind of situations only dissipates the limited energies of the nation. So the method of peaceful progress is ultimately the method of democratic progress. So, Nehru advised, his citizens to adopt those policies which will put an end to all processes which creates a difference between the rich and the poor. And it is possible only when we were able to remove all those obstacles which create difference and never ensure peace and co-operation.

Thus, we can notice that without economic equilibrium establishment of true democracy is impossible. Thus, to find this equilibrium in a democratic country one has to take the vast masses of the people into confidence one has to increase the sense of universalism among them and that can only help the country like India to become a developing nation where huge population resides having different culture, classes, castes and religion. People earlier used to conceive a patent ideology that democracy means only political freedom of a nation through (the right to give vote or adult franchise system) but Nehru clarified that full fledged democracy means to have total economic, social and political development of a nation.

The above analysis of Nehru's approach to various forms of democracy and his also preference for a certain form most suited to India of his times is designed to show that his approach to democracy was not just instrumental; it had substantive aspects. But the same serves him well in acquiring democratic legitimacy in favor of his foreign policy.

Democracy as major variable in Nehru's Foreign Policy
Jawaharlal Nehru being the architect of India's foreign and economic policies of India handled India's tumultuous domestic and foreign policies soon after independence very craftily. Nehru's major contribution lies in areas of external relations as he kept foreign affairs under his full control and used to take major decisions of foreign policies himself and his policies were characterized by ideological perspective including Panchasheel, Non-Alignment, anti-colonialism and anti-racism. As he was the major architect of foreign policy thus before constructing it he not only considered the other nation's foreign policies but also observed the trends in contemporary world politics.

Thus, Nehru started to observe the trends in contemporary world politics and his major findings was that every nation's foreign policy is good for his own boundary not for the development of the world. There were thrust for peace all over the world because countries like Afghanistan, North Korea and Indonesia there were struggles going on for freedom where as western nations were very engaged for participation in Cold War so a total undemocratic condition was prevailing throughout the world. Every nation was suffering from fear and tension which is totally against development and progress. Thus, Nehru tried to make every nation aware of a very necessary fact that until and unless peace will going to reside throughout the nation none of the foreign policy can bring prosperity for any of the nations throughout the world. And peace, development and progress can only be brought in through democratic policies. [Gopal 1989: 132-135] Due to this particular reason democracy was not only a major factor in Nehru's economic and state policies but it was indeed an inevitable part of his foreign policy also. According to Nehru if democracy is not there in any nation their either military form or autocratic form of government exist and both these forms indulge nationalism which gave rise to violence and disorder in the world and this particular chaotic condition led nations into darkness and no progress and development is possible under such environment. So according to Nehru for every nation peace should be the vital objective of their foreign policy and only through democratic means enhancement of peace is possible. Nehru said that ultimately foreign policy is the outcome of economic policy and until and unless India properly evolve her economic policy her foreign policy will be rather vague and in a democratic nation well faire state is a necessary thing and to up bring a complete well-fair state two things are very necessary firstly, a strong economic and foreign policy and secondly, peace and freedom. So to establish full-fledged democracy in India Nehru introduced Non-Alignment as a basic objective of his foreign policy.

The immediate question which arises was how could Non-Alignment establish democracy in India? According to Nehru the biggest problem of the world affair at that time was rivalry between two blocs which not only indulged in war but also were destroying the total economic structure of the world which was not at all in favor of the formation of

welfare states. Moreover, to Nehru, war is an undemocratic action which only led to disasters, inflation, economic depression etc which was unfriendly for human development and progress. So to establish democracy in nation we have to adore those means which will establish peace and eradicate war. Thus to activate this particular thing he introduced Non-Alignment. Thus in an interview Nehru announced:

‘Non-Alignment means not trying yourself off with military blocs of nations or with a nation. It means trying to view things, as far as possible, not from the military point of view, though that has to come in sometimes, but independently and trying to maintain friendly relation with all countries’. [Nehru 1964 vol-4: 381]

He further clarified that we should always try to approach any sort of domestic or international in our own way because by any chance we align ourselves definitely with any one power bloc we may perhaps achieve some good but it will be for a period of time but in long run this alignment will not only be harmful for India but also for the world peace. But our main stake is to establish democracy and peace throughout the world for that Non-Alignment was the most necessary things which will free us from all sort of dominations, racial equality and will help us to build a sovereign, democratic nation. Nehru realized that without the establishment of world peace by balancing the power in between the two power bloc through the establishment of world peace by balancing the power in between the two power blocs through the establishment of a neutral blocs (Non-Alignment bloc) it is not at all possible for any nation to achieve its fullest development and progress. Though Nehru being the founder of Indian foreign policy formulated the objectives of foreign policy by his own but before implementation he used to present his policies, and ideas to the Constituent Assembly which was acting also as India’s Parliament during the interim period between 1947 and 1950. This he did because as a democratic nationalist leader it was his foremost duty to keep the people informed of the policies to be adopted and the reasons behind them. Consider his speech to the Constituent Assembly on 8 March 1948:

I have taken interest in the various suggestions and criticisms made but I should like this house for an instant to turn its mind to any country today and think of its foreign policy--- whether it is the U.S.A, the U.K, or the U.S.S.R. These are supported to be the greatest powers, let them think of their policies and tell me if they has succeeded to achieve world peace or preventing world war.’ [Constituent Assembly 1948]

He further added that the objective which he has taken is best for not only India but also for the rest of the world, because Non-Alignment would help to establish peace which was the most urgent need of that hour. He argued that without establishment of peace no progress is possible at all. Nehru further addressed that he is a true democrat not an opportunist and being a democrat it was his duty to establish a well-fair society where equality, well-being, peace, sustainability will exist.

In defending the rationale behind advocating for *Panchsheel*---the second major aspect of his foreign policy--he said:

In people’s minds all over the world is the futility of war- that war does not solve any major issues, therefore all problem however difficult should be approached peaceful.[Nehru 1958 vol-3:304]

It was because, according, to Nehru peace and democracy are just two sides of the same coin and cooperation, peaceful coexistence, non-violence lie at the heart of democracy. That is why while conflict presents in all societies’ resilient democracies are capable of managing conflict in peaceful ways. Thus, the five principles of peaceful co-existence were first formulated in the preamble to the agreement between India and china in regard to Tibet, which was signed on April 29th, 1954. The five principles, which later came to be known as *panchsheel* are:

1. Mutual respect for each other’s territorial integrity and sovereignty
2. Mutual Non-aggression
3. Mutual non-interference in each other’s internal affairs
4. Equality and mutual benefit
5. Peaceful co-existence. [shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in>bitstream: retrieved on 27th December 216 at 10.23]

These five principles enhances peace, co-operation and non-interference of any kind- political, economic or ideological which is very necessary for betterment of mankind and eradication of hatred, violence and hostility and these are things are necessary object to build a democratic nation. Moreover, in U.N resolution ^[vii] on co-existence, it was clearly explained that,

“ ... realizing the need to promote these objectives and to develop peaceful and tolerant relations among states which is very necessary to sustain democracy is based on mutual respect and benefit, non-aggression respect for each other’s sovereignty, equality, and territorial integrity and non-intervention in one another internal affairs”. [Nehru 1999: 102-103]

So from the above it is clear now that *Panchasheel* has those objectives which enhance democratic principal like respect towards each other’s sovereignty and integrity, Peaceful-coexistence, Equality etc. And thus we can say that Nehru not only proposed those objectives in his foreign policy which encourages democracy but he proved himself to be a true democratic nationalist leader. It is because like Non-Alignment he also kept the proposal of *Panchasheel* in front of the parliament before its implementation in foreign policy of India. For instance, Nehru delivered a speech in Lok Sabha ^[viii ix] on September 17th, 1955 where he explained in detail the aims and objectives of *Panchasheel* so that every members of parliament get to know about *Panchasheel* and its objectives of Indian foreign policy. Nehru was so attached with democratic means that he even disclosed every foreign, economic and external policy in front of parliament before implementation. It was because Nehru believed that being a democratic leader it is his foremost responsibility to make his citizens aware of his decision taken in favor of his country’s economic and foreign policy.

So now we can say that Jawaharlal Nehru was the only person who sowed the flowers of democracy in India where diversity exist. He implanted democracy not in his state affairs but also in external and foreign affairs which is really exclusive. In western nation democracy means only the right of adult franchise system, but Nehru first made us aware that how can we implement democracy in the objectives of our foreign policy. Thus, he was a man of inclusive nature who lived a life absolutely devoted to Indian and for him this devotion rested on the edifice of democratic ideas.

India- Pakistan relation related to Kashmir issue

This still remains quite controversial, and new questions are being raised about then legitimacy of its accession to India. While addressing Kashmir Nehru's stated, "Yea, in mind these mountains rise, their perils dyed with evening's rose; and still my ghost sits at my eyes and thirsts for their untroubled snows". [Nehru 1936: 43] These lines enhance Nehru's deep attachment towards Kashmir his ancestral place and this attachment never allowed him to take any drastic decision on Kashmir issue. Nehru became very annoyed as Muslim Communal organization taking the help of Pakistan stated to play a communal politics in Kashmir and stated to convince Muslim residential to move with Pakistan otherwise they will lose their autonomy as government of India will going to access Kashmir forcefully by taking Maharaja in their side as he was Hindu by origin, so to stop this communal politics Nehru decided to access Kashmir through democratic means otherwise another communal riot will occur which economically unstable Kashmir will not able to sustain. Thus, this basic reason enforced Nehru to decide that, not to access Kashmir forcefully. In his statement regarding Kashmir and its possession in the Constituent Assembly on March 5th, 1948 Nehru made every Member of Parliament aware of his views that, Kashmir was a big factor for India due to its geopolitical location and as it is entangled in the relations between India and Pakistan, but then also Nehru decided that he would try to deal with Kashmir through democratic means and he will never try to acquire it forcefully as Hari Singh ^[x], the Maharaja of Kashmir wanted to join Indian territory not with Pakistan rather he will give importance to people's rule and sovereignty in Kashmir that means government of India will let the citizens of Kashmir to decide that with which country they want to stay willfully. Thus in this regard Nehru's popular argument was;

If many states have agreed to merge with India or come into closer contact with her, it is not because state ministry took a big stick and threatened them with consequences, but because of the forces arising from the people, and fundamentally as a result of the sudden withdrawal of an external force. [Nehru 1949 vol-1:175]

So we can find that being a national leader Nehru's aim was the freedom of the people, knowing and realizing that ultimately it will be for the people of the states to decide what their future will be, he will never compel them by using force of cohesion. But he never got a popular support from the house as his contemporary colleagues regarded him as a betrayal of democratic values. According to Jayaprakash Narayan, Nehru's secular ideas and over emphasize on democracy made him autocratic regarding the Kashmir issue, due to which Nehru totally ignored cabinet

and its members decision that, there would be no election in Kashmir, as Patel suggested that Kashmir should be acquired by the help of military as soon as possible as its geo-political position was very sensitive as it created a security dilemma for India. But Nehru remained stuck to his decision and expressed his annoyance towards the cabinet. Thus, in this aspect Narayan quoted a line of Maxwell that, "The cabinet system has never worked in India except in name, and in the 1950's Nehru rarely bothered ever to pretend that the cabinet was the center of the system". [Singh 2015: 89] Thus, we can observe that to keep democracy in Kashmir Nehru was breaking the interim democracy of his cabinet which is the heart of any ministry. Thus, in this regard Nehru replayed that;

One cannot ignore compulsion and naturally in considering the problem we the government of India have always to consider the interest of India as whole, the interest of its security and defense, but apart from that we do not wish to exercise any compulsion in the slightest over the growth of freedom. [Nehru 1949 vol-1: 175]

Moreover, Nehru tried to clarify that he wanted to make India a people's states so that the people should have the full sovereign power to decide what is good for them and no kind suppression will be allowed to be there because he wanted to establish full-fledge democracy in India. According to Nehru for development and progress, democracy is essentially a vital factor and democracy can only be there in its fullest form where peoples rule will reside in its true sense. In this regard he kept an example in front of the parliament members who were dead against Nehru's decision regarding Kashmir acquisition by democratic means and in this aspect Nehru said:

It was true we had a great gallantry of armies posted in Kashmir but them also it could never be possible to have Kashmir with us without the support of the large section of the population of Kashmir who are Muslim by origin. Being Muslim they choice to remain in India rather than going with Pakistan because they found it much comfortable to remain with a democratic nation who gives priority to people's freedom and liberty than to support an autocratic monarchy ^[xi]. [Nehru 1949 vol-1: 177]

His argument above made the members of parliaments except a few to stand by his decision. He was the only national leader who used to keep all his internal and foreign policies open to his citizens it was not because he was very much democratic but some other strategy was working behind all these activities that was to build coconscious in favor of his policy so that no opposition stands in the way of his decisions not even the communist party. Thus, through the application of democracy he actually wants to gain the support of all both in national and international level. And in case of Kashmir also he took the same strategy because he knew that cabinet will never going to support his decision of declaring an election in Kashmir and not acquiring Kashmir through military force, for that only Nehru took the Kashmir issue into international level so that he can gain popularity as a true democrat in international world and also to gain support from the countries all over the world. Whereas,

according to P. Anderson Kashmir was a gift of British government to Nehru, Nehru was well aware of the problems of Kashmir as he was a native residential of that region, so to keep Kashmir with India he choose Shekher Abdulla as the Chief Minister and gave no change to Dokra's or son of Maharaja Hari Singh to rule upon Kashmir, as Shekher Abdulla was very reliable member of Congress party and also the lion of Kashmir. Moreover Anderson tried to focus that democratic step taken in Kashmir, for example election of Kashmir in 1947 was just a strategy of Nehru so that he can able to establish himself as a true pioneer of democracy which will help him to maintain his popular image, but the actually story of election was that less than 5 percent of the nominal electorate cast a ballot, if full vote were been casted the result would have been different as per Anderson.

A Critical evolution of Democracy in Nehru's Policies

Nehru used democracy as a strategy in order to gain popular support of the world and to protect his nation from any kind of external attack and dispute as nation and national interest had a vast place in his foreign policy, and thus Nehru wanted to establish democratic government in India and whose both external and internal policies will be democratic in nature, which will help to sustain peace not only inside India but outside and this initiative of Nehru only made India world's largest democratic nation, but according to critics neither his strategy nor his democratic moves bought any success in terms of foreign policy of India. Because Nehru's Panchasheel failed to restrain Indo-China war of 1962 through its democratic flavor thus the border dispute between this two nations remained unsolved moreover in later years China began to introduce policies towards South Asia which were mainly 'Anti-Indian centric' as over years India has emerged as a big brother in South Asia who had an economic power, combined with regional military power, nuclear power etc which stood as a blockage in ways of China as a rising super power of south east Asia. Moreover, India's growing relationship between U.S.A, Japan stood as an obstacle in its ways towards becoming an Asian Dragon. In this regard China's famous dialog was 'One mountain cannot accommodate two tigers'. Thus to prevent rise of India, China stated to give fuel on the burning flames of insurgency movements in India. [Kumar 2013: 107-109] And thus insurgency movement grew up after Nehru in North East India because though Nehru promised to afford economic support and launch developmental programmers in North Easter states for the formation of a well-faire society over there but the congress government in later years failed to keep their promises and this states like Nagaland, Mizoram, Tripura suffered a lot as they got deprived from all those facilities which will help them to lead a slandered life as a result of which an anti-government feeling grew up within them and several insurgency movement grew there and China taking privilege of such crisis stated Mongolian politics over there taking this state in confidence they supplied arms to them so that they can fight against their government. This will create an anarchical condition within the internal politics of India and will hamper its interim peace and unity. [Kumar 2013: 108-110]

Similarly, in case of Kashmir the issue Nehru applied democratic means to solve this crisis but it brought no positive result as Kashmir issue still today is creating a security dilemma for India. Because in this age of 21st

century due to the advancement of Science and technology Pakistan is indulging cyber terrorism, bio-chemical terrorism in India in order to get an access on Kashmir which became a territory of India soon after independence. Thus, it proved that the democratic liberal policies of Nehru led India into security dilemma which acted as obstacles in the ways of progress of this nation. [Paul 2014: 2017-2023] Now, the most vital question is that Nehru the biggest democratic leader who's every policy both external as well as internal stood upon a democratic platform failed to solve all this above mentioned problems and bring stability within the relation between China and India why?

Generally Nehru's critics analyzed that his excessive liberal and democratic policies were only responsible for this failure which is already maintained earlier also but according to me a particular policy never fails as it is democratic or liberal in nature rather it fails when other nation denies to follow the rules of that particular agreement and break it. Moreover, Nehru's policies were never liberal in nature because Nehru himself said Lok Sabha on 4 December 1947:

When the house does have to face the question and take a decision which may led to war or peace, when one comes face to face with realities, one cannot rely merely on idealistic principles. And foreign affairs are utterly realist today. A false step, a false phrase makes all the differences. [Nehru 2004: 26-27]

So from this particular statement of Nehru we can well ahead understand that a nationalist leader who can detect this particular differences cannot take any liberal or idealist policies. But it was quite a true statement that his policies were all democratic in nature but it was made for the well-faire of the nation and its citizens, and not for leading the country people in the mouth of any unsolved problem which can lead a country in security dilemma in the upcoming years.

Moreover, it was beyond the imagination of Nehru that China being a socialist nation who believed in equality can break Panchasheel and declared war on China on 1962 on India only to keep its national interest. And Nehru gave the power to the Kashmir citizens to decide their own identity that whether they want to be the citizens of India or they want to go with Pakistan as he wanted to establish people's rule in India and he believed that democratic rule can only bring peace, development and progress within a nation.

So we can well understand that Nehru failed to solve the problems not because his democratic strategies were not well equitable to solve the external problems of India, rather something else was the cause behind it. Thus, to find the answer of this above raised quarry we went through parliamentary record during Nehru's period, Nehru's selective speech, and several secondary resources such as books on foreign policy of India, Autobiography of Nehru etc. So the basic hypothesis is that when these variables underpinned Nehru's world of thinking and his approach to democracy they failed to stand in a harmonious way. For example, Nationalism stood for national self-determination, which may take the form of a sovereign statehood. It implies that basic priority is given to state and to any extend a nation can go to fulfill its national interest. Here basic focus is given on state and its sovereign power not to citizen. Whereas Democracy identifies people sovereignty because

it is a system which is formed by the people for the sake of their own good, here the basic responsibility of a nation is not to achieve power but to look after its people's sovereignty and security. And lastly comes, cosmopolitanism which stood for the creation of world state and consequently demands a democratic environment throughout the world where people will respect each other's right, liberty and freedom by increasing their tolerance. Thus we can see that how one premise is contradicting other but Nehru tried to implement all this three premises in his external and domestic policies, as an instance Kashmir issue being a nationalist leader he wanted to accrue Kashmir and make it a part of India as its geographical position is very vital for security of India on the other hand being a true democratic leader he avoided of Kashmir that with which nation they want to stay with. And finally being a pioneer of cosmopolitanism he wanted that U.N being a universal organization of world peace should get the opportunity to solve Kashmir problem so that this particular problem which is cemeteries between India and Pakistan involves the whole world and results into another world war. But on the other hand Pakistan gave priority to nationalism and to keep its vital interest which was accession on Kashmir involved its whole motivation on that and went to any extend to achieve it. And thus we can interpret two things. Firstly, a policy can only be successful when the other nation respects the same policy. Secondly, the three premises were far different from each other so when Nehru tried to keep equal balance between these three premises it failed to bring any positive result.

Similarly, in the case of China-India relation India went for Panchasheel where India adopted all democratic policies to normalize the relationship in between these two nations. And on the other hand being a national leader he tried to keep his nation safe from Chinese attack by panchasheel and thirdly he wanted to establish world peace by insisting every nation to follow the rules of Panchasheel. But China on the other hand being a socialist nation gave priority to the national interest and attacked India as Nehru tried to help Tibet to become an independent nation. And in later years the states of India which lies just beside the Macmillan line of control china captured those areas as it was very vital for China on the perspective of its socio-economic and military betterment because by capturing those areas China can create a relationship with Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan by using the Karakoram range. And good relationship with these nations only helped him to become d the dragon of Asia, and because of this Panchasheel failed to prevent Indio-China war in 1962.

Thus the following lines do not specify that Nehru's external and internal policies were ill-relevant rather it is much adequate because without proper implementation of democracy no policy can bring well-being, peace, development and prosperity for a nation. So Nehru's policies were never been a failure but it failed to solve every problems of India because of its inharmonious premises stood as a barrier in the path of its achievement.

Conclusion

Nehru was a democratic leader through in practice he failed to prove so. As a socialist turned liberal, or liberal socialist Nehru had difficulties in implementing democracy when he became the Prime Minister of India.

Nehru did not give him credit as a democrat. None the less Nehru was responsible for initiating and maintaining a democratic façade in India in his life time. Two successful general election for Lok Sabha took place in which all citizens were allowed to vote. Nehru's political biographer Brecher gave him good marks for this. [Brecher 1958: 446] Pillai made a positive assessment of Nehru's liberal democratic ideas quoted from Nehru's autobiography to confirm Nehru's liberal democratic predilections: 'My roots are still perhaps partly in the 19th century and I have been two much influenced by the humanist liberal tradition to get out of it completely.' [Pantham& Deutsch1986: 269] Finally, Nehru even as a liberal was equally committed to social and economic equality ^[xii], which in a poor country like India at that time was a very difficult goal to be achieved. But the foundational values of Nehru and his co-nationalists have not been all lost because India is now a country that has been able to be become more equal than in the past; there is more satisfaction of individuals over their identity; there is more struggle for both equality and identity-India's democratic space has had no choice but to allow it even in the days of neo-liberal reforms, and creeping authoritarianism.

References

1. Akbar MJ. Nehru: The Making of India. (Roli Books Pvt, Ltd: Mumbai), 2012.
2. Ahluwalia, Montek Singh. Economic Reforms in India since 1991: Has gradualism worked. Journal of Economic Perspective. 2002; 16(3).
3. Bajpai Kanti, Pant Harsh V (eds.). India's Foreign Policy-a Reader, (Oxford University Press: New Delhi), 2014.
4. Bajpai Kanti, Pant Harsh V (eds.). India's National Security. (Oxford University Press: New Delhi), 2013.
5. Bajpai Kanti, Matto Amitabh (eds.). The Peacock and the dragon: India-China relation in the 21st century. (Har-Anand Publications: New Dehli), 2000.
6. Brecher Michel. Nehru: A Political Biography. (Oxford University Press: Delhi), 1959.
7. Brecher Michel. India and World Politics: Krishna Menon's view of the World. (Oxford University Press: London), 1968.
8. Nehru Jawaharlal. Discovery of India. (Oxford University Press: New Delhi), 2004.
9. Nehru Jawaharlal. Glimpses of World history. (Oxford University Press: New Delhi), 1990.
10. Nehru Jawaharlal. An Autobiography Jawaharlal Nehru. (Penguin books India: New Delhi), 2004.
11. Nehru Jawaharlal. Selected speeches. (Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: New Delhi), 1996, 1(1946-1949).
12. Nehru Jawaharlal. Selected speeches. (Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: New Delhi). 1996; 2:1953-1957.
13. Nehru Jawaharlal. Selected speeches. (Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: New Delhi). 1996; 3(1963-1964).
14. Nehru Jawaharlal. Selected speeches. (Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: New Delhi). 1996; 4(1963-1964).
15. Nehru Jawaharlal. Selected speeches. (Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: New Delhi) 1996; 5(1963-1964).

16. Nehru Jawaharlal. India's Foreign Policy, Selected Speeches, September 1946-April 1961. (Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: New Delhi), 1961.
17. Nehru Jawaharlal. The Unity of India Collected Writings 1937-1940. (The John Day Company: New York), 1942.
18. Pant Harsh V. India's foreign policy an overview. (Orient Black Swan: New Delhi), 2016.
19. Patel Sardar. For a united India. (Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: New Delhi), 1949.

ⁱ Mores Frank:1959:Jawaharlal Nehru A Biography: Jaico Publication House: Delhi

ⁱⁱ Gopal Sarvepalli: 1989: Jawaharlal Nehru A Biography: Oxford University Press: New York.

ⁱⁱⁱ Akbar, M.J: 1988: Nehru: The Making of India: Viking: New Delhi

^{iv} Adult franchise is a fundamental pillar of any democracy. Adult franchise means that the right to vote should be given to all adult citizens without the discrimination of caste, class, color, religion or sex. It is based on equality which is a basic principle of democracy. It demands that the right to vote should be equally available among all. To deny any class of persons from exercising this right is to violate their right to equality. Adult franchise is available to everyone above the age of 18 in India except lunatics, minors, criminals or anyone who has had this right revoked by the powers of any court for probable cause.

^v Cosmopolitanism is the ideology that all human beings belong to a single community, based on a shared morality. A person who adheres to the idea of cosmopolitanism in any of its forms is called a cosmopolitan or cosmopolite. A cosmopolitan community might be based on an inclusive morality, a shared economic relationship, or a political structure that encompasses different nations. In a cosmopolitan community individuals from different places (e.g. nation-states) form relationships of mutual respect. As an example, Kwame Anthony Appiah suggests the possibility of a cosmopolitan community in which individuals from varying locations (physical, economic, etc.) enter relationships of mutual respect despite their differing beliefs (religious, political, etc.).

^{vi} Scandinavia is a historical and cultural region in Northern Europe characterized by a common ethnocultural North Germanic heritage and mutually intelligible North Germanic languages. In English usage, *Scandinavia* sometimes refers to the area known as the *Scandinavia Peninsula*. The term *Scandinavia* always includes the three kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. The remote Norwegian islands of Svalbard and Jan Mayen are usually not seen as a part of Scandinavia, nor is Greenland, an overseas territory of Denmark. However, the Faroe Islands, also a Danish overseas territory, are sometimes included, as sometimes are Iceland, Finland, and the Finnish autonomous region of the Åland Islands, because of their historical association with the Scandinavian countries and the Scandinavian peoples and languages. This looser definition almost equates to that of the Nordic countries. In the local languages, *Skandinavia/Skandinavien* often means the European parts of Denmark, Norway and Sweden, whereas the name *Norden* is more commonly used for the extended region that includes Finland, Iceland, and overseas parts of Denmark and Norway.

^{vii} A United Nations resolution (UN resolution) is a formal text adopted by a United Nations (UN) body. Although any UN body can issue resolutions, in practice most resolutions are issued by the Security Council or the General Assembly.

^{viii} The Lok Sabha (House of the People) is the Lower house of India's bicameral Parliament, with the Upper house being the Rajya Sabha. Members of the Lok Sabha are elected by adult universal suffrage and a first-past-the-post system to represent their respective constituencies, and they hold their seats for five years or until the body is dissolved by the President on the advice of the council of ministers. The house meets in the Lok Sabha Chambers of the Sansad Bhavan in New Delhi.

^x Hari Singh (September 1895 – 26 April 1961) was the last ruling Maharaja of the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir in India. He was married four times. With his fourth wife, Maharani Tara Devi (1910–1967), he had one son, Yuvraj (Crown Prince) Karan Singh.

^{xi} An autocracy is a system of government in which supreme power is concentrated in the hands of one person, whose decisions are subject to neither external legal restraints nor regularized mechanisms of popular control (except perhaps for the implicit threat of a coup d'état or mass insurrection). Absolute monarchy (such as Saudi Arabia) and dictatorship are the main historical forms of autocracy.

^{xii} The Socialistic pattern of society adopted by Congress party in 1955 in Avadi Congress.