

Tribhuvan University

Re-assertion of Self in Jawaharlal Nehru's *Toward Freedom: An Autobiography*

A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English

In Partial Fulfillment of the Required for the

Degree of Master of Arts in English

By

Sunder Neupane

Roll No. 199 D

Regd. No: 6-2-568-25-2012

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

July 2019

Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Sunder Neupane has completed his thesis entitled “Re-assertion of Political Self in Jawaharlal Nehru’s *Toward Freedom: An Autobiography*” under my supervision. He carried out his research from February 2019 to July 2019. I hereby recommend his thesis to be submitted for viva voce.

.....

Lecturer, Pradip Raj Giri

Supervisor

Date:

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled “Re-assertion of Self in Jawaharlal Nehru’s *Toward Freedom: An Autobiography*” submitted to the central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Sunder Neupane has been approved by the undersigned member of Research Committee:

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head
Central Department of English

Date

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my thesis supervisor Pradip Raj Giri, Lecturer, Central Department of English for his continual cooperation, proper suggestion, genuine inspiration, insightful comment and motivation to accomplish this thesis. No expression of thanks can adequately carry out my deep felt appreciation for his cherished advice and splendid guidance during the course of this research work.

I am beholden to Head of Central Department of English, Prof. Dr. Ani Rudra Thapa for his encouraging advices. Similarly, I would be delighted to extend my gratefulness to respected Lecturers, Badri Prasad Acharya, Keshab Sigdel, Raj Kumar Baral, Shankar Subedi, Hemlal Pandey, Sarbagya Raj Kafle, Laxman Bhatta, Mahesh Paudyal, Jiblal Sapkota and other lectures as they contributed enormously to my understanding of the difficult subjects. The knowledge on the related theories gained from their classes filled me with confidence which inspires me to do this thesis.

I am rejoiced to grab this occasion to record my immense gratitude to my parents, Thanesh Chandra Neupane and Tika Maya Neupane, sisters Sushmita Neupane, Kabita Pokhrel, Supriya Neupane, for their constant encouragement, grandiose suggestions and profound dedication. I owe them a great deal for what they have done. Meanwhile my colleagues Sandhya Darai, Khusbu Das, Kaushal Ghimire, Dinesh Sharma, Ashish Pokhrel, Narayan Bhushal, Jiten Singh, Prakash Bista, Birendra Poudel and Binod Lamsal deserve a great share of thanks from depths of my heart for their help.

July 2019

Sunder Neupane

Abstract

This research paper examines Jawaharlal Nehru's Towards Freedom: An Autobiography as an assertion of political self while investigating the causes of ambivalence and growing conflict in Nehru's political self. It also scrutinizes the way his individual selfhood is discovered, created and asserted. An attribute of autobiography is to convey self and selfhood rather coherently but this autobiography at most instances fails to do so. Thus, this paper claims that Nehru's assertion of political self on the foundation of autobiographical enactment of selfhood goes through the process of self-effacement because of his shifting infatuation with different school of thoughts or political standpoint. So, this research paper deploys theory of "Identity Change" by Peter Burke and theory of "Derivative Discourse and Authentic Discourse" by Vinny Jain to examine his political self. Similarly, this paper applies Homi K Bhabha's and Robert Young's concept of Identity, hybridity, and ambivalence as a theoretical tool. Therefore, this paper helps the readers to understand the shifting and ambivalent political standpoint of a political figure implied in the autobiography contrary to the general function of autobiography to convey a sense of self.

Key Words: Identity, Socialism, Nationalism, Liberalism, Politics, Internationalism

Re-assertion of Self in Jawaharlal Nehru's *Toward Freedom: An Autobiography*

This research paper seeks to critically investigate the causes of conflict and ambivalence in Nehru's political self and shifting infatuation with different school of thoughts and political standpoint. Therefore, this research makes a point that Nehru's autobiography debunks the general notion of autobiography because it represents both the ethos of resignation and acceptance that painted his political self with ambivalence. This leads him to a sense of identity crisis. In order to analyze this, this paper uses theory concerning identity discussed in the essay "Identity Change" by Peter Burke and Vinny Jain's theory of "Derivative Discourse and Authentic Discourse" as methods to delve into the issue of authenticity of political discourse. Similarly, it also deploys Homi K Bhabha and Robert Young's concept of identity, ambivalence and hybridity. The study examines the way Nehru's act of asserting his identity and political self goes through the process of self-effacement due to his inclination to different school of thoughts and political position. In other words, Nehru's act of asserting his identity and political standpoint emerge from two different stances: they were from cosmopolitan position as socialist or Marxist and from national level as a religio-cultural nationalist. This further painted his identity and political self with ambivalence. His self is enmeshed in the perpetual process of becoming. In this way, the thesis argues that Nehru's *Toward Freedom* is an attempt to reassert his fixed political self amidst his inclination to different school of thoughts such as Gandhism, Marxism and Fabian socialism.

Jawaharlal Nehru is often regarded as an architect of modern India, a renowned barrister and nationalist statesman. Nehru's autobiographical work *Toward*

Freedom (1936) was entirely written when he was in prison during the Indian freedom movement. That is to say, it is a prison narrative which also encapsulates ethos of confession. For Nehru, the prison became a site for self articulation. Nehru began his autobiography with the story about how his ancestors had to flee Kashmir in order to grab “. . . fame and fortune in the rich plains below” (1). Initial section of his autobiography seems very much confessional in a sense that he exposes things like his ideological struggle with moderate leaders along with his father, his non-confrontational nature, flirting girls etc.

Nehru has always been a catchy point of discussion among political critics and historian, some critics and historians believe or assert him as a statesman under shade and tutelage of Mahatama Gandhi. But on the other hand he is often demonstrated as a leader who committed lot of blunders in the history of India that India still endures them. Regarding his autobiography, we can encounter him as a fragmented figure, who oscillates between East and West. While going through his autobiography we can observe him struggling to grab his identity. That is to say the way he represents his individual selfhood is very much appealing in a sense that he finds himself caught in state of dissatisfaction. This is what he calls “. . . engulfed in a dull routine of a pointless and futile existence” (31). Moreover, he was caught in state of perplexity. Dull pain within him due to influence of Western schooling and identity crisis are highly dominant in his autobiographical text. His autobiography can be observed as a journey from self-discovery to self-assertion. By means of his autobiographical enactment of selfhood he wants to eradicate his marked ambivalence and re-shape his political self in order to gain his political identity in Indian political atmosphere. Through autobiographical enactment of selfhood he urges to establish his identity.

Throughout his autobiography Nehru seems to struggle to grab or define his identity and political self. He, in his autobiographical text, tries to re-discover his selfhood as socialist or Marxist but on the other hand he was indomitable freedom fighter who falls under religio-cultural nationalist category. His technique to assert political self is no other than a dual track approach in a sense that from one ideological stance he is claiming his selfhood as a socialist or Marxist and from another as a religio-cultural nationalist under tutelage of Gandhi which befogs readers and debunks the general functioning of autobiography. Moreover, his political self is a queer amalgamation or the compromise position between socialism and Gandhism. In other words, his cosmopolitan identity as Marxist or socialist and national identity as religio-cultural nationalist is juxtaposed in his autobiography. His dual identities are always in conflict; that is why his assertion of political self always vacillates between Gandhism and Marxism or socialism. We can encounter romanticized version of political self in his autobiography. Nehru's assertion of identity and political self through autobiographical venture fails due to his oscillating or flexible stance.

Nehru in his autobiography tries to assert his political self on the basis of autobiographical enactment of selfhood. He presents his selfhood as a fragile person who begets dichotomy in mindset due to his shifting inclination with different political thoughts or standpoint. In other words, through autobiographical enactment of selfhood he tries to de-mystify his political self and ideological standpoint. Moreover, it is an attempt to re-discover and reframe his identity and political self. Due to his spirit of both resignation and acceptance he articulated a doubting and befogged kind of self which eventually leads him to the abyss or quagmire of identity crisis. So, his political self and ideological standpoint is contaminated by various

cultural ethos and political movements which denies smooth categorization and leads his selfhood in perpetual motion.

Autobiography is taken as a writing in which the narrator's self is simultaneously discovered, created and asserted. While going through his autobiography, we can observe him struggling to grab his identity and political self. Throughout his autobiography he tries to re-examine and define his identity and political self on the foundation of autobiographical enactment of selfhood but his assertion seems very much contradictory and ambivalent. Depiction of multifaceted political self is an appealing aspect of his autobiography. Self questioning or interrogation of self electrified the atmosphere of the autobiography, in a sense that self-interrogation is much more dominant than his assertion of self. The way Nehru represents his individual selfhood is catchy in a sense that he finds himself caught in state of dissatisfaction. Another striking feature of his autobiography is that, though he was born in prominent family he attempts to construct his identity as self-made man; he frequently dwells on the issue of his fragmented identity and disillusionment. In many of the cases, he presented his selfhood in ambivalent position, sometime as a moderate and sometime as radical. His ambivalent and slippery stance makes readers difficult to understand his attitude and standpoint.

Nehru's ambivalent position or heterogeneous political self is reflected in his autobiographical work. His identity as a colonized subject caused a sense of displacement and detachment with people. In other words, being a colonized subject he was mingled in ambivalence which eventually caused a sense of disillusionment in him. The domination of self interrogation over assertion of self is because of his mental turmoil. His spirit of resignation and acceptance makes his political self fragile. His attempts to construct his cosmopolitan self as Marxist and national self as

religio-cultural nationalist marched together that puts him in state of in-betweenness in terms of his own identity and political self. The conflict and identity crisis emerges within him is the result of his western schooling. This is to say he was amply overwhelmed by western socio and cultural ethos. His identity and political self that he asserted were sprouted out of the conflict between his inner consciousness and circumstances available. Cross fertilization of different cultural ethos implanted a state of self-conflict in his autobiography. His unstable or temporal political self is the result of his shifting infatuation with different school of thoughts and ideological stances. Moreover, his political self seems fragile and oscillating because he was innate socialist but dominant position of Gandhi in Indian political realm compelled him to be a religio-cultural nationalist to seek position in politics.

Jawaharlal Nehru's *Toward Freedom: The Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru* was written during his prison life. Numerous critics and scholar have examined and explored it from various approaches and served their perspectives. Many conclusions were served by various critics and scholar according to their purposes.

Hans Kohn, in his review entitled "An Autobiography by Jawaharlal Nehru" published by sage publication he talks about the ideological struggle between Nehru and Gandhi. Kohn dubbed Nehru as a representative of new Indian and tagged his autobiography as "a historical encyclopedia" (275). Kohn also talks about the state of dissatisfaction that Nehru encountered due to Gandhian technique of spiritualization of politics and traditionalism. Kohn argues in the line that a personal narrative can be a public history. He succeed to book the cause of ideological struggle between Nehru and Gandhi but he ignores other factors that were responsible for the clash for instance Nehru inclination with West and Marxism. On the other hand he fails to give credit to Nehru attempts to create cosmopolitan identity as Marxist and national

identity as religio-cultural nationalist at the same time which was the major source of conflict between them. Nehru's capitulation to present his selfhood as a cosmopolitan socialist or Marxist leader is discarded by him. Kohn very beautifully presents state of self conflict within Nehru but he paid lack attention towards the fact that Nehru was leading ethos of Marxism along with religio-cultural nationalist sentiment together, which were a central cause that brought ambivalence in Nehru's political self.

On the basis of Nehru's autobiography, Balkrishna Govinda Gokhale a renowned writer, historian in his research article entitled "Nehru and History" talks about differences in the historical consciousness of Nehru and Gandhi. Gokhale asserts that Nehru is a queer amalgamation of East and West whereas Gandhi as totally immersed in India. Gokhale exhumes the state of despondency created in Nehru's mind due to subjection of British imperialism and colonialism. Gokhale seems very much successful to expose the ambivalent nature of Nehru but he did not talk about Nehru's political self. Gokhale finding seems weak to address the inner mental conflict that Nehru endured due to his ambivalent nature. On the other hand, it ignores the fact that Nehru wanted to define his cosmopolitan selfhood as Marxist leader though he was a crucial part of Indian Nationalist Movement. Article of Gokhale is amply inundated to expose the cause of ideological struggle between Nehru and Gandhi. Gokhale asserts that the reason behind the creation of ideological conflict between them was because of their family background. Gandhi belongs to Bania caste who ". . . lived his childhood in the lingering memories of feudal past of Gujarat in western India and was raised in a family steeped in the Vaishnava tradition" (Gokhale 311). On the other hand he defines Nehru as Kasmiri Brahmin, son of a successful lawyer and social activist which disconnected their ideologies.

Bipan Chandra in his research article entitled “Jawaharlal Nehru and the capitalist class,” argues that the conflict emerged between moderate and radical, especially between Nehru and Gandhi was because of the political ideologies and standpoint they encapsulate. Chandra exhumes about how Nehru inclination to leftism became threat to capitalist people, he further talks about ethos of “radicalism” (Chandra 1307) within Nehru which brought ideological clash with Indian National Congress. The article argues that the economic depression of 1930s as the root cause for the rise of leftism in India. It examines the radicalism of Nehru which frightened the carrier of capitalistic system in India. Although Chandra succeed to unearth the hidden side of Nehru’s political self, Chandra paid lack attention towards Nehru affinity with Marxism which was the major cause that implanted ethos of radicalism within him. Chandra is amply inundated to expose the reason behind ideological struggle between moderate and radical but he discarded the fact that Nehru himself belongs to capitalist background and his Marxist outlook was the major source of mushrooming ambivalent in Nehru’s political self which Chandra blurred.

William Edward Burghardt Du Bois an American sociologist and historian in his review work entitled Nehru explains about the struggle faced by Nehru during his prison life and also tagged him as an “advocate of democracy” (90). It talks about how both the nature of radical and moderate were implanted in Nehru and glorified his humanistic approaches to politics. Nehru is presented as a statesman having qualities of cosmopolitan leader. This article highly celebrates the role of Nehru played for democracy, equality and social justice. Although he exhumes the greatness of Nehru, he seems weak to elaborate the state of self-conflict that he encounter due to his interaction with different cultural ethos. This research article also marginalized the fact that Nehru was religio-cultural nationalist, full energy was paid to depict him as a

democrat and socialist. His nexus with nationalist movement and infatuation with Marxism is discarded by Du Boris.

Almost all reviews and research articles demonstrate the reason behind ideological struggle between moderate and radical. This is to say more attentions were made to seek the reasons behind ideological struggle between moderate and radical. Some critics in their reviews talk about the role of Nehru in anti-colonial nationalist movement and dubbed him as “a historical encyclopedia” (Kohn 275). But the way he established himself as a revered freedom fighter and paramount political figure of Indian politics through his autobiographical enactment of selfhood is not explored by critics. Moreover, critics do not pay attention towards the way Nehru presented his selfhood in his autobiographical work. Nehru’s bourgeois reformist mentality is disregarded in all those reviews. Thus, this research paper will oscillate around how Nehru presented himself as a revered politician under the tutelage of Mahatama Gandhi. This research project explores the reason behind depicting his selfhood as self-made man and exhumes the causes of self-conflict within Nehru. Though various critics served their perspectives, they discard the fact that Nehru was amply overwhelmed by Western romanticized version of Fabian socialism and his attempts to create cosmopolitan identity as Marxist or socialist is the major cause of his self-conflict. Similarly, this paper exhumes the cause behind debunking general functioning of autobiography.

This research paper deploys theoretical framework proposed by Peter Burke in his theoretical work entitled Identity Change. While pondering over the theoretical insight given by Burke, he argues that primarily there are two mechanisms by which person’s identities change over time. First on the basis of identity control theory (ICT) and another is person holding multiples identities that shares meaning. Burke

theoretical insight can be useful to analyze drifting and dangling identity of Nehru. Insight introduced by Burke paved ways to examine and de-mystify Nehru's political self and those ideas will be significant to analyze Nehru "degree of commitment" (Burke 85) to a particular identity and political standpoint. Various theoretical notion proposed by Burke can be significant for critical examination of Nehru's "adoptive response" (Burke 93) to his political self. On the other hand, this research paper will adopt theoretical insight given by Vinny Jain in her theoretical construct "derivativeness" and the "authenticity" discourses. Ideas exhumed by Jain will be helpful to analyze the authenticity and derivativeness of Nehru's political ideologies or discourses. In order to unearth the level of organicity in leadership of Nehru, Jain insights will shed light. This theory of Jain helps us to shed light on Nehru's political self and also it can play tremendous role to measure the ethos of authenticity in Nehru political discourses. Similarly, Robert Young and Homi K Bhabha who are the crucial figures in postcolonial studies; argue that ambivalence exists at the site of colonial dominance and colonized subjects are always in ambivalence because of hybridity of different cultural ethos. Therefore, their insights and approaches help us to delve into Nehru's political thoughts and ideological stances.

Autobiography as a mode of writing where narrator's self is concurrently discovered, created and asserted, in same manner Nehru is trying to assert his political self and identity as self-made statesman. His autobiography is a voyage from self-discovery to self-assertion which seems incomplete due to his nature of oscillation to different ideological stances. His attempts to know India in his autobiography simultaneously go ahead with his assertion of self. Autobiographical text of Nehru can be encountered as an attempt to construct his homogenous selves. On the other hand his autobiography is an amalgamation of arguments with his contemporaries,

especially with those leaders who come under rubric called liberals, socialist and moderate. Through autobiographical enactment of selfhood he urges to define and assert his political self. Though his autobiography is all about series of argument, they are not closely argued because there reflected self-doubt and confusion which makes him highly complex individual. He endeavours to mark out the boundary of his political self but his shifting infatuation with two cultures and different school of thoughts amply led his attempts in ambivalent and futility. It looks as if his effort to de-mystify his political self is an attempt to escape away from himself because of his fluctuation subjectivity his assertion becomes no other than pompous show-up.

Ambivalence of ideology and West schooling functions as stumbling block in the path of his self-discovery and assertion of political self. His self is reluctant in nature. The point that this paragraph tries to make is that his fragmented or multifaceted self is the result of his oscillating infatuation with two cultures and various political thoughts which ultimately lead him to the state of perplexity and identity crisis. Due to his encounter with different cultural ethos, there created a state which Bhabha called hybridity which caused identity problem, a sense of in-betweenness and ambivalence within Nehru's identity and political self. And as a colonized subject and hybrid combination of cultures brought vagueness in his identity and political self. In other words, as a colonized subject he is always in-betweenness and ambivalent in terms of his own identity. His autobiography is painted with conflicts and tension which he wants to eradicate or escape via assertion of political self. Through his autobiography, he yearns to re-discover himself and assert his identity on the foundation of his political ideologies and autobiographical enactment of selfhood. In other words through, his political self he wants to "re-

indianize” (Gopal 788) himself in order to nab or have influence over Indian political climate.

After his return to India from Harrow and Cambridge he experienced a state of insipidity because multiple identities activated concurrently. As a barrister who studied various ideologies which were sprouted in Western soil, Nehru returned to India with multiple thoughts. With the recommendation and influence of his father Motilal Nehru and Gandhi, he emerged as a politician who favoured radical cluster. Situation of topsy-turvy appears in his life, because of this transfigured identity. Burke argues that one source of identity change is “. . . disturbance in situation” (94). His unexpected entry in political realm brought variation in his identity. According to Burke in this state “. . . events that are beyond the control of individuals which change the self-relevant meaning of the situation” (94). Moreover, in this moment of life Nehru experienced identity crisis because neither he is amply a barrister nor a politician. In this regard situation of Nehru cannot be fully countered or controlled which ultimately leads to “adoptive” (Burke 94) response to new cultural realm in order to grab his identity. Concurrent activation of multiple identities within Nehru caused conflict and state of perplexity. As a cross fertilization of various cultural ethos his identity is featured or painted with ambivalence. His failure to constitute particular political thought caused identity crisis and dampened his assertion of political self and also discarded a general functioning of autobiography in a sense that his selfhood is always in the process of becoming.

It was Peter Burke who claims that “when two identities are trying to control the same dimension of meaning to exist at different levels, they are in conflict” (86). As per Burke profess when two or more identities are activated simultaneously there emerges a conflict. Regarding Nehru his political identity as a nationalist leader and

professional identity as a barrister activated at the same period which sows seeds of inner conflict and identity crisis in political realm. In absence of agreement between multiple “identity standards” (Burke 81) the state of self conflict is seldom resolved. Nehru became failure to adopt what Burke called a “compromise position” (84). Limbo “degree of commitment” (Burke 85) to particular political standpoint emerged as a stumbling block to seek compromise position and no single identity of Nehru is salient which compelled him to be a multifaceted or fragmented self and finally painted his political self with ambivalence.

Nehru’s autobiography in various respects a depiction of self-isolated and self-alienated figure. Due to his multiple consciousnesses, his world seems fragile which oscillates back and forth. His autobiographical text is made more appealing by deploying self-questioning mood which refers to his emotional upheaval. Phrases like ‘battle within myself’ and ‘commotion within myself’ are frequently repeated which suggest his inner turmoil, doubts, and anxieties. Personal upheaval or inner turmoil dominated his autobiographical work rather than authorial impact. Nehru states that “Was it my fault that I could not enter into spirit and ways of thinking of my countrymen?” (390). Moreover, his tendency of self- interrogation suggests his dilemma and tension generated out of his encounter with multiple cultures. Technique of self- interrogation suggests waves of inner turmoil within him due to his failure to seek a “compromise position” (Burke 85) on particular political thought. Self-questioning mood that he deployed suggests that he has ideological uncertainty. The state of perplexity and uncertainty emerged due to his cultural hybridity. He feels detached and defenseless in absence of factual political self.

Nehru’s political self is painted with ambivalence. His ambivalence suggests his own complicated and split situation as a self ascribed Indian who is amply

inundated on Western model of progress, thought and philosophy. When he entered into Harrow and Cambridge it was the period when various political dogma or philosophies were emerging. London was often dubbed as a breeding ground of political thoughts and he was nabbed in grip of various political movements. Nehru in his autobiography asserts:

In thinking over the trouble and conflicts of the world, I forget to some extent my own personal and national troubles. I would even feel buoyant occasionally at the fact that I was alive at the great revolutionary period of the world's history. Perhaps, I might also have to play some little part in my own corner of the world in the great changes that were to come. (380)

In the above extract, Nehru's attempt to construct his cosmopolitan self is reflected. In other words he tries to give his selfhood a cosmopolitan outlook, which also refers to the fact that he was highly influenced by western political principles. It is clear that Nehru wanted to construct his selfhood, which is based on cosmopolitan norms and values. During his years long stay in England he was influence by different political movements, for instance, Ireland and the women suffrage movement, socialism especially Fabian socialism, liberalism, nationalistic bourgeoisie etc. Harrow and Cambridge implanted Western version of cultural ethos in Nehru which dampened his connectivity with India. He was influenced by the scientific theories propounded by westerner. His extending social exposure in west implanted ambivalence in his ideology. This is to say, progressive modern atmosphere in England influenced or beguiled him a lot.

Connectivity and shifting infatuation with numerous political approaches implanted British social and cultural ethos in him. Gokhale writes "He had travelled extensively to various European countries, the Soviet Union, and also to the United

States. His early vague kind of Cyrenaicism or the rational pursuit of happiness in life was soon overlaid with the influence of Marxism” (313). Being influenced by different political movements and dogmatic beliefs he fails to define his factual political self. He was vaguely attracted to non identical principle. That is to say his identity and political self are vulnerable in nature because his unchecked attractions to different school of thoughts and ideological stances.

Being influence by various political and social movements, there emerges contradiction between Nehru’s practices and ideologies. Moreover, the ideologies that he wraps-up were either “vague idealistic or outdated” (Gopal 313) according to the circumstances presented there, or they were swayed by western principle. No doubt that he wanted a transformation of society but due to his poor stance he seldom served applicable ideology and methods for the betterment of the society. His ideology is a negotiation between Gandhism or Gandhian religo-cultural nationalism and Marxism. In other words his political ideology has give and take relation with Gandhism and Marxism. Nehru entered into politics in such an era where globally there was unhealthy competition between “fascism and imperialism” (Gopal 1309). On the other hand two forces i.e. nationalist and socialist were in conflict. It was S. Gopal who defines this period as era of “universal confrontation” (1309). Global political atmosphere had great impact over Nehru which paved way for him to advocate for socialism. His vague attraction and non-committed nature to certain political thought did not allow him to assert his political self.

Nehru has very ambivalent nature towards both socialism and nationalism. S. Gopal writes that “Nehru thought that democracy and socialism could not be divorced ; other might hold that the two are contradictory and democratic socialism was only a facade to cover disinclination to alter the status quo” (791). His advocacy for

democracy and socialism along with his affinity with radicals and religio-cultural nationalist further more makes him conflicting figure. As a carrier of multiple selves or ideologies there generated clear cut dichotomy between his thought and practice. Formation of self is amply dampened by his ambivalent positionality. Story behind his failure to establish his political identity in the beginning of his political career is all because of his credulous nature. To sum up he was no other than alienated figure when he approached India again. Neither he could constitute nor abandon his political ideologies. Javed Majeed implies that “. . . his autobiographical text does not articulate the category of heroic and integrated form of individuality in the figure of a nationalist leader, but instead evokes a fragile subjectivity” (31). As Majeed claims that the major objective of his autobiographical text is not to depict him as a heroic or magnetic nationalist personality rather it is to articulate his fragmented and fragile self because of his nexus with two cultural phenomena. In other words the central goal of his autobiographical text is to resolve the tension and conflict which emerged because of his oscillating nature. In this respect his autobiography can be encountered as a depiction of conflict between inner consciousness and circumstances available for him. Civilizational or cultural gap between East and West brought ideological uncertainty in him. That is why his autobiographical enactment is painted with self-conflict and ambivalence.

By means of his autobiographical enactment of selfhood Nehru wishes to transform his heterogeneous self into homogenous self. That is to say, in order to establish his political identity in Indian political climate he identify with peasant and religio-cultural nationalists. Asserting his individual self as self-made magnetic personality is an attempts to transform his heterogeneous self to homogeneous self. By introducing his selfhood as self-made figure could blur his shifting infatuation

with West and creates his identity in Indian context or it is a technique through which he could 're-indianize" (Gopal 788) himself. Nehru's affords to "re- indianize" (Gopal 788) himself is an attempt to establish his school of thought and identity in Indian political atmosphere. Through process of identification with the masses he could establish his identity. When he identified with socially and economically marginalized people his multiple identities activated together which brought "conflict of meaning" (Burke 85). It is the position what Burke called a "compromise position" (85), because no identity is more salient than other. In such compromise position there one cannot encounter any focal identity because multiple identities activate at the same time. In such state where focal identity is absent there will be change in identity where individual have to struggle in order to grab his\her identity. Mentally he belongs to the identity served by West schooling but regarding his commitment he is amply East. His oscillating between identities served by Western cultural ethos and East further put him in state of identity crisis which he wants to eradicate on the foundation of Nehruvian discourses and his autobiographical enactment of selfhood. In this regard his autobiography is a voyage from self-discovery to self-assertion.

Though Nehru was influential leader of Indian nationalist movement, he had different opinion about it. He, in his autobiography, always represents Indian nationalism as "narrow nationalism" (400) and lambasted it. Due to his complex culture and ideology, he had vague or counter views towards nationalist movement initiated by Gandhi. Nehru in his autobiography writes "But the reason why the congress and other non-official organizations cannot do much for social reform goes deeper. We suffered from the disease of nationalism and that absorb our attention and will continue to do so till we get political freedom" (400). For Nehru nationalism is a 'disease' which functions as a stumbling block in the path of progress of India. He

had negative or antagonistic views towards nationalism because of his tendency to seek solution of problem from the perspective of “internationalism” (Majeed 314). Although he was a crucial part of Indian religio-cultural nationalist movement, he lambasted the movement because of his hybrid identity. In cosmopolitan level he dubbed his selfhood as Marxist and in national level as nationalist, so this position of in-betweenness of him implanted ethos of ambivalence in movement of nationalism. Moreover, there emerges clash between his cosmopolitan identity as Marxist and national identity as religio-cultural nationalist. By means of various discourses which were rooted in Western way of thinking he tries to craft his identity and assert his political self.

It was Vinny Jain who examines the nature and content of Nehru’s nationalism in the theoretical frame work of Derivative Discourse and Authentic Discourse. Jain served us three types of native reaction towards of colonialism and nationalism and also defines movement of nationalism as “idea of European Enlightenment” (363). Jain asserts that Nehruvian model of nationalism is model of “hybridity” (363). His notion on nationalism can be dubbed as model of hybridity in a sense that it was a compromise between Eastern model of nationalism and West’s views on nationalism. Nehru’s position on nationalism comes under what Jain calls “negotiation between the two worlds” (363). Being guided by “post enlightenment Western modernity” (Jain 363) and cultural ethos Nehru encapsulates vague and romanticized views on nationalism or it is a compromise between metropolitan west and traditional East. Though he was a dominant leader of Indian nationalist movement, he had vague or antagonistic attitude towards movement of nationalism. For Nehru, Gandhian nationalism is aloof from contemporary political standpoint and practices. His attempts to construct his cosmopolitan self as Marxist and national self as religio-

cultural nationalist further jeopardized his political self and identity. This is to say, his construction of selfhood oscillating between his self assertion and self effacement. His assertion of political self went through process of self-effacement because of his tendency to seek reconciliation between Marxism and religio-cultural nationalism which are divorce political principles. By asserting his political self as Marxist can erase his identity as nationalist that is why, Nehru's assertion of political self endures self-effacement. Although his autobiographical text is all about his assertion of political self, due to his reconciliatory gesture and affinity with different school of thoughts his act of asserting political self went through the process of self-effacement.

Conflict between self- imposed identity and imposed identity electrified Nehru's autobiography. His self-imposed cosmopolitan identity as Marxist or socialist and imposed identity as religio-cultural nationalist are always in conflict. The dichotomy in his political thought was sprouted out of his cultural hybridity. In other words Nehru can be dubbed as hybrid, ambivalent and in-between individual in Bhabhian terms. It is his hybrid identity causing ambivalence in his attitudes towards life and movement of nationalism. Nehru in his autobiography writes "It was all nationalism and patriotism and I was a pure nationalist my vague socialist ideas of college days having sunk into background" (38). He in his autobiographical text claimed that he is nationalist but at the same time lambasted the movement of nationalism and dubbed it as a disease, this ambivalent was culminated due to his cultural hybridity. This cultural hybridity did not allow him to reclaim his identity and political self because of his position lies at the state of in-betweenness.

Nehru is hooked on different political thoughts and enacted strange kind of selfhood in a sense that, he seeks an alliance between conflicting beliefs in order to

assert his identity. The contradictory space left by him marked his political self with ambivalence. His failure to draw a margin of demarcation between religio-cultural nationalism and Marxism painted his selfhood with ambivalence. Nehru's growing belief on different political standpoint crushed his assertion of political self. He in his autobiography writes:

But still the communist philosophy of life gave me comfort and hope. How was it to be applied to India? We had not solved yet the problem of political freedom, and the nationalistic outlook filled our minds. Were we to jump to economic freedom at the same time or take them in turn, however short the interval might be? World events as well as happenings in India were forcing the social issue to the front, and it seemed that political freedom could no longer be separated from it. (380)

In the above extract, Nehru's oscillating stance between Marxism and nationalism is reflected. It is very appealing that, he was a significant figure in Indian nationalist movement, but advocates for Marxism and socialism. This is to say his selfhood nestles between both nationalism and Marxism. State of ideological uncertainty in Nehru is depicted there. In other words, both ethos of resignation and acceptance to particular political standpoint he has. His identity as religio-cultural nationalist and Marxist goes at once, which confuses readers and debunks general functioning of autobiography.

Nehru's discourse on nationalism falls under what Jain calls a derivative discourse because it is rooted on western cultural ethos. Western notion on nationalism and Eastern approach to movement of nationalism is different because in the context of East it is more a cultural phenomena or weapon to fight back with colonialism and imperialism. Nehru has pre-supposition that Western notion on

nationalism is globally acceptable which befogged and implanted self-conflict in him. His ambivalent attitude towards nationalism further interrogates his assertion of political self. Jain argues:

The Westernized princely, Nehru came to face to face with the rural rustic, clad in rages and steeped in misery. He could never completely identify with them, they had to be led and educated, trained and civilized. He did not often understand them, for their passions lay in the realm of unreason and in the incomprehensible and left to themselves such upheavals were notoriously violent, leading to jacqueries, because at times like these the peasant were desperate and at white heat. (367)

In the above extract, Jain focuses on the issue that Nehru was amply westernized in nature and encapsulates vague kind of political self. Because of his west schooling and identity as a colonized subject he concurrently encountered crisis of identity and ideology. His vague kind of political self can never resolve the cultural agendas of peasant because it is way far from “existential reality” (Jain 356) of the masses. Jain claims that Nehru can never identify with the peasants because he could not closely argue the political track with his Marxist or vague socialist outlooks. Nehru’s attempts to seek reconciliation between religio-cultural nationalism and Marxism put him in state of identity crisis, because he neither could constitute himself as Marxist nor abandon movement of nationalism.

Nehru's discourse on the movement of nationalism was derivative in nature because it encapsulates ethos of “Western liberal education” (Jain 365). This is to say because of his West schooling and identity as colonize subject the existence of “organic”(Jain 358) leadership within him is not possible. It was Gandhi who was devoted towards authentic discourse but co-existence of both derivative discourse and

authentic discourse within Nehru because of his encounter with multiple cultures emerged as stumbling block to reach an agreement or resolution of his political self. Nehru experienced belongingness to nowhere because he is absolutely at a place of ambivalence and in-betweenness due to his oscillating infatuation with two cultures. He mistook the spirit or essence of Indian movement of nationalism that resulted in state of identity crisis and self-conflict. Aloysius in his book entitled Nationalism without a Nation in India writes that “Most scholars see Western nationalism as political and Eastern ones as cultural” (127). Nationalism in the context of East is primarily a cultural phenomena because through revival of native culture and heritage or through religio-cultural nationalism people counterattacked imperialism and colonization. By “. . . protecting and promoting language, race, religion, territory or history in competition and conflict with other nations” (Aloysius 127) they claim for nationalism and identity. His understanding of nationalism is swayed by western cultural ethos that sprouted self-conflict and identity crisis within him. Moreover, his “cosmopolitan nationalism” (Majeed 171) and Gandhian religio-cultural nationalism are in conflict, that makes him a leader who is devoid of fixed principles. Nehru identity and political self seem vague or complex in a sense that he is trying to re-structure society along with his multiple identities; they are a cosmopolitan nationalist and religio-cultural nationalist.

Nehru’s autobiography is a voyage from self-discovery to self-assertion. His spirit of nationalism and “internationalism” (Gokhale 313) frequently tussle for mastery. Being influenced by Marxism and socialism he in his autobiographical text lambasted landlords. He writes:

They did nothing at all for their tenantry, such as landlords in other countries have some little extent often done, and became complete parasite on the land

and the people. Their chief activity lay in endeavouring to placate the local officials, without whose favour they could not exist for long, and demanding ceaselessly a protection for their special interests and privileges. (63)

In the above extract, the act of scolding landlords can be encountered as an attempt of Nehru to debunk his identity as elitist nationalist and re-discover his identity as socialist leader. Throughout his autobiography he capitulated to define his self as a leader who is amply committed to social justice and equality. That is to say, he is not satisfied with his identity as bourgeois elitist nationalist leader, that is why he is endeavoring to articulate his political self and identity via his autobiographical enactment of selfhood. Furthermore, in his autobiography identity or his political self is the real object of quest.

Nehru's assertion of political self frequently dwells or oscillates between Marxism and religio-cultural nationalism. Double consciousness that he encapsulates frequently trammels his assertion. That is to say, his identity as religio-cultural nationalist and befogged Marxist or socialist is always in conflict. His attempts to seek reconciliation between them, makes him a complex ambivalent figure whose selfhood denies "self-categorization"(Majeed 171). Uncertainty of political philosophy that he encountered is result of his hybrid identity.

Robert Young in his article entitled "The Cultural Politics of Hybridity" claims:

Hybridization can also consist of forcing of a single entity into two or more parts, a serving of a single object in two, turning sameness into difference, as in today's hybrid shares on the stock market, although they, in the last analysis, are merely part of a whole that will have to be re-invoked at the wind-up date. Hybridity thus makes difference into sameness, and sameness

into difference, but in a way that makes the same no longer the same, the different no longer simply different. (qtd. in Ashcroft et al. 158)

From this extract, it is clear that Nehru enacted versatile kind of selfhood that is painted with ambivalence and in-betweenness in terms of his own identity. Hybridity caused a sense of displacement and developed double consciousness in Nehru which ultimately colored his political self and identity with ambivalence. This ambivalence created dilemma in Nehru. This is to say, because of his hybrid identity his selfhood is fragmented into multiple other selves which eventually generated a sense of identity crisis.

The ambivalences of Jawaharlal Nehru's ideology trammel him to grab his identity in Indian political and social atmosphere. He was such a figure who advocates for Marxism and social equality along with his aristocratic and religio-cultural nationalist consciousness. His tendency of advocating for Marxism and social justice along with his aristocratic religio-cultural nationalist convention did not allow him to assert his political self because they are quite divorce political philosophy. It is very appealing that Nehru wanted to lead Marxism and religio-cultural nationalism together, though he is a "self-proclaimed agnostic" (Jain 365). His ambivalent position as a vague Marxist and befogged nationalist created a sense of identity crisis. In other words, Nehru's self is a tremendous compromise or negotiation between Marxism and religio-cultural nationalism. Compromise between Marxism and Gandhian nationalism makes him a complex individual who experience a sense of displacement from both political thoughts. Nehru's fluctuations between Gandhian religio-cultural nationalism and socialism did not allow him to assert his identity and political self. He fails to internalize all his dogmatic beliefs in Indian set-up because of his tendency to approach problem from the perspective of "internationalism"

(Gokhale 313). To sum up, during that period to approach problem from the viewpoint of internationalism was not entertained in Indian cultural backdrop.

Nehru's political self frequently vacillates between Gandhism and Marxism which suggests the fact that he encapsulated a vague or queer kind of political self. In order words his political self is a cross fertilization or fusion of Gandhism and Marxism that makes him a conflicting figure, or he has no stable kind of self. When he plunged into political realm of India he was influenced by dogmatic beliefs of Gandhi, who occupied a prominent position in politics of India. Nehru decided to remain as a protege of Gandhi in Indian freedom struggle which blurs his identity as Marxist but cannot dampened his spirit of socialism which finally emerged as a stumbling block to assert his political self as religo-cultural nationalist. This is to say, both ethos of Marxism and Gandhism nestle within him which further aggrandized and jeopardize his political self. A vague kind of standpoint he developed due to his heterogeneous self. He not only had ambivalent attitude towards Marxism but also with Gandhism. Nehru in his autobiography writes, "I come to the conclusion that Gandhiji's difficulties had been caused because he was moving in an unfamiliar medium" (135-36). The phrase unfamiliar medium here refers to Gandhian technique of "spiritualization of political life" (Minor 430), which Nehru opposes and advocate for Fabian socialism. To wrap-up, Nehru's oscillating infatuation or inclination towards Western political thought created his ambivalent attitude towards Gandhism. Nehru's attempts to create a compromise position or a liminal space between Gandhism and Marxism to establish his identity and political self dampened his assertion of concrete self. Through autobiographical enactment of selfhood based on ethos of liminal space he tries to re-structure his self.

Autobiography of Nehru is more about reconstruction of self. The act of reconstruction of self and assertion of political self are done in his autobiography. This is to say, by asserting his political self through liminal space he wants to establish his identity because as a leader his identity is generated out of his political self. Roy Pascal defines autobiography as "The reconstruction of the movement of a life, or part of life, in the actual circumstances in which it was lived. Its center of interest is the self, not the outsider world" (qtd. in Kepnes 410). In same manner Nehru's center objective in his autobiography is to construct a selfhood which is rooted on a negotiation between Gandhism and Marxism. The dual track approach that he adopted makes him a conflicting individual. His failure to constitute particular school of thought makes his political self contradictory. So, his interdependence to various political thought painted his political self or identity with ambivalence. By asserting his political self in his autobiography, he wants to eradicate his ambivalent and oscillating self. In this regards via his autobiographical enactment of selfhood he urges to rediscover and re-define his political self. It was his stable political self which served him identity in Indian political climate and also eradicate his fragmented self or ambivalent self.

Autobiography of Nehru consists of many anecdotes where most of plots are coherent in nature, and each anecdote served his argument. Those anecdotes focus on the issue of personal feeling especially self conflict, self-search and self introduction. But many of the anecdotes are fragmented in nature because there are absent of apparent connection or unifying theme due to his fluctuating self. Furthermore what James Olney called "monument of self" (qtd. in Kepnes 410) is absent in most of the anecdotes. The frequent reshuffle of the plots and political standpoint suggest the fact that the arguments that he exposes via multiple anecdotes are temporal in nature.

Argument or positionality served by one anecdote becomes counter argument to another anecdote. Duality of mind is reflected in his series of anecdotes. Though he served multiple arguments especially on politics and society, he failed to retain his stable arguments. It is all because of his ambiguous nature. He at the same time prefers and abandons particular political ideology. For instance he advocates for Marxism but at the same time he also argues that life is not all about economy and material gain. In a nutshell, his ambiguous nature appears throughout his autobiography which emerges as a stumbling block to assert his political self which can provide him the thing that he is seeking for.

Autobiography is supposed to provide a clear sense of selfhood but in case of Nehru's autobiography it is discarded. Selfhood that he crafted is unique and distinct from that of general conventional autobiography because selfhood he asserted is fragmented and divided in nature. In other words, his selfhood is always in the process of becoming. Kepnes in the article "Autobiographical Fragments ": Becoming Self through the Other" writes:

The assumption of most autobiography is that the self exists within the individual and that life is a kind of unfolding. As Weintraub puts it, the task of life is translating potentiality into actuality. The unfolding may relatively uncomplicated, and in the case the autobiographer merely tells the tale of his or her achievements. On the other hand, this unfolding may be very difficult and often blocked by life's circumstances. In this case the autobiographer leads his reader on a search which is often unfulfilled. (412)

Like that of Kepnes's profess the selfhood that Nehru unfolded is difficult to locate and divided in nature because he was trammels by circumstances of his political life, because neither he could assert his selfhood as Marxist nor as nationalist. His

autobiography discards the “mythical framework” (qtd in Kepnes 411) of autobiography in a sense that his selfhood is perpetual in motion. Moreover his political self and standpoint moves in and out which does not allow resolution.

Nehru’s assertion of political self through autobiographical enactment of selfhood goes through process of self-effacement because of his hybrid identity. Reclaiming and reconstruction of political self and identity becomes a far cry for Nehru. Because of his cultural heterogeneity he enacted different version of self which rebuts his assertion. His cosmopolitan identity as a Marxist and national identity as religio-cultural nationalist are always in conflict which eventually nabbed him in a state of perpetual identity crisis. Nehru’s attempt to construct his self on the foundation of “global universalization” (Majeed 103) makes him a conflicting figure in nationalist movement.

A sense of displacement Nehru encountered because of shifting infatuation with different school of thoughts, cultural ethos and political standpoint. This is to say, his cosmopolitan self and national self frequently struggle for mastery. His ideological uncertainty emerged because of his identity as colonized subject. As a colonized subject, he was intermingled in the ambivalence and swayed by different cultures. His tendency to seek reconciliation between belief system of metropolitan west and conventional east makes him a highly complex individual, who is devoid of fix principles. His assertion of self resulted in self-effacement because his self was contaminated by various ideological stances that obstructed smooth categorization of his selfhood. His political self is perpetual in motion because his assertion amply relies on his temporal feeling and emotion.

Nehru’s de-emphasized to internalize particular school of thought that begets dichotomy in mindset. His objective to bridge the gap between various dissimilar

political thoughts affected his assertion of political self. In other words, his tendency of searching for organic connection between dissimilar ideological stances makes him a conflicting individual that finally led him to state of identity crisis. On the other hand his cultural hybridity is responsible for creating ambivalence or mixedness in his political self. The impact of two different cultures painted his political self or identity with ambivalence. A sense of displacement he experienced from both cultures makes him a multi-faceted self who is devoid of factual selfhood. To wrap up, his assertion of political self via autobiographical enactment of selfhood went through process of self-effacement, and his assertion and reclaiming of identity and political self becomes no other than a pompous show-up.

Through autobiographical enactment of selfhood, Nehru asserted political self which is open-ended in nature that can be questioned or open for debate. Throughout the autobiography, readers can observe a tension between his self-imposed identity as Marxist or socialist and imposed identity as religio-cultural nationalist. His failure to draw a line of demarcation between Marxism and Gandhian religio-cultural nationalism puts his assertion into disarray and paints his identity and political self with ambivalence and contradiction. Nehru's act of expressing sense of rootedness to different dissimilar political principles causes confusion in terms of his political self. Reconciliatory gesture towards all political standpoints caused ambivalence in his political self. In this manner, it is difficult to locate his political self because it is always in the process of becoming.

Works Cited

- Aloysius, Gonzaga. *Nationalism without a Nation in India*. Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Ashcroft, Bill et al. "The Cultural Politics of Hybridity." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Routledge, 1995, pp. 158-62.
- Burke, Peter J, "Identity Change." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, vol. 69, no. 1, 2006, pp. 81-96. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/20141729.
- Chandra, Bipan, "Jawaharlal Nehru and the Capitalist Class 1936." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 10, no. 35, pp. 1307-24. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/4537332.
- Du Bois, William Edward Burghardt. Review of *Toward Freedom: An Autobiography*, by Jawaharlal Nehru. *The Annual of the American Academy of Phylon (1940-1956)*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1943, pp. 89-91. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/1019940.
- Gokhle, Balkrishna Govind. "Nehru and History." *History and Theory*, Vol. 17, no. 3, 1978, pp. 311-22. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/25034742.

- Gopal, Sarvepalli. "The Formative Ideology of Jawaharlal Nehru." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 11, no. 21, 1976, pp. 788-790. *JSTOR*.
www.jstor.org/stable/4364645.
- Jain, Vinny. "Authenticity and Derivativeness: A Case Study of the leadership of the Peasant Movement in Awadh, 1919-22." *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 69, No. 2, 2008, pp. 355-70. *JSTOR*,
www.jstor.org/stable/41856422.
- - -. "Nationalism, Authenticity and Derivativeness; Retrieving Nehru." *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, vol.70, no. 2, 2009, pp. 363-79. *JSTOR*,
www.jstor.org/stable/42743902.
- Jalal, Mostafae. "Investigating Identity, Ambivalence, Hybridity: A Bhabhaian Reading of J.M. Coetzee's *Foe and Disgrace*." *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, vol. 7, no. 6, 2016, pp. 163-67.
- Kepnes, Steven D. "Buber's Autobiographical Fragments: Becoming Self Through the Other." *An Interdisciplinary Journal*, vol. 73, no. 3, 1990, pp. 407-22. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/41178525.
- Kohn, Hans. Review of *Toward Freedom: An Autobiography*, by Jawaharlal Nehru. *The Annual of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 191, May 1937, pp. 274-75. *JSTOR*. www.jstor.org/stable/1019940.
- Majeed, Javed. *Autobiography, Travel and Postnational Identity: Gandhi, Nehru and Iqbal*, Primus Books, 2015.
- Minor, Robert N. Review of *Gandhi's Political Philosophy: A Critical Examination*, by Bhikhu Parekh, vol, 32, no. 2, Spring 1990, pp. 429-30. *JSTOR*.
www.jstor.org/stable/1019940.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal. *Toward Freedom: An Autobiography*. Penguin Books, 1936.

- O UZ, Ayla. "Ambivalence and In-betweenness in Hanifkureishi's the Buddha of Suburbia and Doris Lessing's Victoria and The Staveney's." *International Journal of Social Science*, vol. 6, no. 3, 2013, pp. 1275-83.