

**THE NEMESIS
OF
NEHRU-WORSHIP**

**THE NEMESIS
OF
NEHRU-WORSHIP**

N. R. Waradpande

Sahitya Sindhu Prakashana

Bangalore - 560 001 (India)

**THE NEMESIS
OF
NEHRU-WORSHIP**

N. R. Waradpande

Sahitya Sindhu Prakashana
Bangalore - 560 001 (India)

'THE NEMESIS OF NEHRU-WORSHIP'. By N. R. Waradpande. An analysis of Jawaharlal Nehru's role as the first Prime Minister of India, and of the consequences of his policies during his tenure and also in the post-Nehru period.

Pages: 206

First edition: July 2001

Published by:

Sahitya Sindhu Prakashana

14/3-A, Nrupatunga Road

Bangalore-560 001

(India)

Rs. 70-00

ISBN : 81-86595-24-4

Cover design by:

U. T. Suresh

Typeset by:

Creative Graphics, Bangalore - 560 053. © 6800723

Printed at:

Rashtrotthana Mudranalaya, Bangalore - 560 019

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

During the decade preceding independence and a couple of decades after 1947, the personality of Jawaharlal Nehru acquired a larger-than-life image. Two factors operated to sustain this image: first, the fact that Gandhiji had named him his successor, and, secondly, his very long tenure as Prime Minister. As in the case of many other leaders, in the case of Nehru too a plethora of myths flourished. While his ambition to perpetuate dynastic rule was fairly visible, his anti-Hindu and pro-Muslim bias came to light only gradually and escalated after the demise of Gandhiji and Patel; and it took even longer for the public to realise the enormity of the fall-out of his short-sighted Kashmir policy, foreign policy, defence policy, etc. He was himself made to rue some of his ill-conceived policies - such as for instance in respect of China. Nehru's (unfulfilled) ambition to become a world leader played havoc with so important a matter as the defence of the nation.

Dr. N. R. Waradpande, reputed author of *'Aryan Invasion of India: A Myth'* and other pathbreaking works, has in the present book analysed threadbare the record of Nehru's role as the first Prime Minister of Bharat and also the far-reaching consequences of his policies not only during his lifetime but also in the post-Nehru period. Dr. Waradpande has provided an immense amount of documentation in support of his inference that Nehru's attitudes and actions virtually amounted to a war on Bharat's nationhood itself.

We are grateful to Dr. Waradpande for enabling us to bring out this most useful and thought-provoking book.

Our thanks are due to Dr. N. S. Rajaram who has at our request contributed a very useful Afterword dealing with the Nehruvian legacy in defence and foreign affairs, based on fresh material which has most recently come to light.

We are thankful to Creative Graphics for typesetting the text, and to Sri U. T. Suresh for designing the cover page.

Vishu Samvatsara - Gurupoornima

Ashadha Shuddha Poornima

5th July 2001

— PUBLISHERS

CONTENTS

Part I THE 17-YEAR WAR ON INDIA'S NATIONHOOD

Prologue: Some of Nehru's "Gifts" to India	2
1. War on Our Nationhood	3
2. In the Realm of Science	5
3. Planning for Poverty	7
4. Secularism = Hindu-baiting	13
5. "Preventing the Heavens from Falling"	33
6. The Ulcerization of Kashmir	42
7. Weakening India's Defences	50
8. How Nehru involved India in the China War	54
9. Nepal and Kalat	62
10. The 1965 War	63

Part II THE FALL-OUT OF THE NEHRU FIEFDOM

11. The Nehru Mantle	69
12. Balkanization	72
13. "A Bar per Thousand"	79
14. Popularization of Beef	81
15. The Crusade Against Indian Languages	83
16. One Party and One Dictator	107
17. Playing the Castes One against Another	109
18. Nehru and Social Reform	112

Part III A DIAGNOSIS OF THE NEHRU PHENOMENON

19. The Nehru Phenomenon	117
20. However Bad, It Was <i>Swaraj</i>	118
21. Nehru's Critics	119
22. In the Role of a Ruler	121

Part IV FACETS OF NEHRU'S PERSONALITY

23. As a Writer	125
24. As I Saw Him	127
25. No Speaker	128
26. Nehru's Intelligence	130
27. Nehru's Delusions	133
28. Judgement of Persons	136
29. Nepotism	138
30. Anglo-Communist Trojan Horse in the Freedom Movement	141
31. Hindu-baiting	143
32. Thoroughly Practical	144
33. A Typical Hindu Communist	146
34. Nehru and Gandhi	149
35. Nehru and Women	151
36. Nehru and Corruption	153
37. A "Man of Destiny"?	156

EPILOGUE NEHRUISM SANS NEHRU

38. After Nehru	159
39. "It is a Crime to be a Hindu"	160
40. The Emergency-Fame Indira Gandhi	164
41. Rajiv Gandhi's Sri Lanka Fiasco	173
42. The Mandal-Fame V. P. Singh	176
43. The Do-Nothing Narasimha Rao	178
44. The "Secularist" Bilge	181
45. Hope or Despair?	183

AN AFTERWORD by N. S. Rajaram

Nehruvian Legacy in Defence and Foreign Affairs	189
Index	201

PART I
THE 17-YEAR WAR ON
INDIA'S NATIONHOOD

PROLOGUE

SOME OF NEHRU'S "GIFTS" TO INDIA

- (1) India which was 32nd in the world in human development in 1947 has now become 139th. The countries, which are above India, include Pakistan and even Bangladesh, if we take account of prices prevailing in those countries. Sri Lanka is ahead of India in all criteria of development.
- (2) India ranks 70th in science.
- (3) The Indian army was the mightiest army in Asia in 1947. In 1962, after 15 years of Nehru-rule, the Chinese made mincemeat of it in a week. A year after Nehru's death, India had a military showdown with Pakistan in 1965. This ended in a stalemate, proving that India was unable to defeat even Pakistan.
- (4) Indian sway, in 1947, extended to Tibet which was culturally a part of India. Tibet was handed over by Nehru to China on a platter without even getting Chinese acquiescence on the Indo-Tibet border. This brought about the Sino-Indian war with disastrous consequences.
- (5) Kashmir had acceded to India and the whole world had recognized the accession. It is Nehru alone who questioned the accession and created the perpetual Kashmir problem by inserting Article 370 in the Constitution.
- (6) The Muslim problem could have been solved after Partition. In fact Partition was agreed to as one of the solutions to the problem. But Nehru made the problem insoluble by continuously instigating the Muslims against the Hindus. The frequency of Hindu-Muslim riots rose from 26 per year to 92 per year in the Nehru regime.
- (7) Nehru undermined the Constitution which had embodied many ideals of the freedom movement.
- (8) Hindu-baiting in the name of "secularism"; fillip to Muslim fundamentalism.
- (9) Nehru shut his eyes to the large-scale conversion of Hindus and the anti-Indian insurrection of the Nagas.
- (10) Nehru's policies encouraged terrorist movements, which have assumed menacing proportions today.

1.

WAR ON OUR NATIONHOOD

Jawaharlal Nehru had a term of 17 years of Prime Ministership, longer than any other Prime Minister of India. The whole of this term was without a challenge and there was never any doubt that as long as he was living, India could not have another Prime Minister. In fact the question was frequently asked "After Nehru who?". Nehru, unlike Gandhi, did not create a second line of leadership, nor did he name any successor as Gandhi had named Nehru.

Though Nehru did not name a successor, he preached a political philosophy continuously for 17 years of his office when he had access to or even monopoly of all the instruments of propaganda including education. This philosophy provided guidelines for his successors in framing their policies. Shastri was chosen as the Prime Minister after Nehru because it was thought that towards the close of his life Nehru had nominated him as his successor. There are many who think that Shastri deviated from the guidelines set by Nehru, since he ordered the army to carry the war into Pakistan. It is believed that "Nehru would never have done so." But whether "Nehru would have done so" or not, he did say clearly in Parliament that if Pakistan attacked Kashmir, the attack would not be fought merely in Kashmir, but also wherever it was militarily necessary to do so. Shastri therefore had no reason to suppose that he was deviating from Nehruism in attacking Pakistan. He did not repeal Article 370 even though he arrested Sheikh Abdullah at the time of the 1965 war. Nehru had also arrested Sheikh Abdullah, and therefore the arrest of the Sheikh is no proof of Shastri's deviating from Nehruism. Shastri agreed to take back many citizens of Sri Lanka even though they had settled in Sri Lanka centuries ago. This was quite in line with Nehru's policy about the settling of Jews and other foreign nationals and bringing infiltrators into India, in the belief that India has unlimited capacity to absorb foreign nationals, not being a nation but a museum of nationalities.

After Shastri, Indira Gandhi was selected as Prime Minister

merely because she was the daughter of Jawaharlal Nehru. At that time she had no other qualification.

It was only in 1977 that a non-Nehru and non-Congress government came to power. But it lasted for only 27 months and even those 27 months were beset with internal squabbles not leaving much time for the then Prime Minister for governance.

After these 27 months Indira Gandhi again came to power. After Indira Gandhi came Rajiv Gandhi, again on the strength of ancestry. There was a brief break after Rajiv Gandhi failed to secure absolute majority in Parliament, yielding place to V. P. Singh. But it cannot be said that apart from his estrangement from Rajiv Gandhi, V. P. Singh was in any way following a non-Nehru line.

Chandrashekhara was clearly a nominee of Rajiv Gandhi. P. V. Narasimha Rao was the only Prime Minister not belonging to the Nehru family who completed his full term. But there was nothing in his policies which could be called a deviation from Nehruism apart from the economic liberalization. But this was the result of international pressure and was not in any way a brain-child of Narasimha Rao.

So it can be said that Nehruism has ruled India for about half a century. Half a century is not a short time in a nation's history. The all-India power of the British lasted for 90 years. It is therefore rightly said that Nehru was the architect of modern India. An evaluation of modern India is therefore an evaluation of Nehru. We shall therefore start from modern India in every field and trace our steps back to Nehru to see if modern India has any reason to be thankful to Nehru.

2.

IN THE REALM OF SCIENCE

Nehru's admirers put his services to science as the greatest of his contributions. But where does India stand in science? Information-scientists have ranked India among the nations of the world in science. In expenditure on science and the size of scientific manpower India ranks fourth in the world; in scientific output measured by the number of research papers, it ranks 11th; in the quality of these papers India's rank is 70th. The list of 70 includes almost all the nations of the world barring those whose names are not likely to have been heard by the readers of these lines.*

Indira Gandhi once said, while inaugurating the Science Congress, that the money spent by her father on science was all wasted. Foreign technology is very often bought by spending valuable foreign exchange but it does not produce enough even to pay for its cost. The most deplorable spectacle of Nehru's services to science is seen in defence.

Nehru once declared proudly in Parliament that there were 5,000 scientists working in the Defence Science Organization. Now the number must have risen to 10,000. This department never felt the want of money. Before it demanded anything, it was asked to submit "expansion plans".

* Those Hindus (sorry, "Indians") who are satisfied with favourable comparisons with Pakistan may find solace in the fact that India is more advanced than Pakistan in information technology, Pakistan being last while India is last but one. They are not disturbed by the fact that the oft-repeated claim that India is pre-eminent in information technology is shown to be a delusion by the recent survey of 55 countries with regard to information technology. India ranks 54th in this.

What are then we to say about our massive growth in software-exports and the predominance of Indian technicians in this field the world over?

The answer is that a considerable part of the software-export consists of export of manpower. Export of manpower is a sign of economic backwardness. Secondly the ranking in information technology takes account of all infrastructures, computer availability, internet information and the allied information techniques such as telephone and T.V. Export of software does not speak of overall development of information technology within the country. It only shows that our software, like our trained manpower, has little demand within the country. In the internet services there is such a thing as a host computer and a guest computer. The host computer is the computer which provides information; the guest computer is that which receives it. 87 per cent of the host computers are in USA and Europe. India has less than six per cent. This means information comes from the developed countries and very little goes out from India: a picture of dependence as in all fields. (*Indian Express*, 17-4-2000).

When asked to do so no department is likely to say that it needs no expansion. Expansion therefore was for the sake of expansion, not for coping with expansion of work. A lot of foreign exchange was spent on equipment which went to the cupboards straight after arrival, and is lying there ever since. The reports of the Institute of Strategic Studies are revealing.

3.

PLANNING FOR POVERTY

A part from science, Nehru is praised for his economic plans and it is claimed that he brought about the industrialization of India. This claim is made in the face of all facts and figures published in newspapers day in and day out. India's GNP is less than that of Pakistan and if prices are taken into account even than that of Bangladesh. Sri Lanka has done very well as compared to India. Recently the UNDP published the ranking of 173 countries in human development on the basis of GNP, expectation of life and percentage of literacy. India ranks 139th on the combined criterion. Sri Lanka is well above India.

Dr. Bokare, ex-Vice-Chancellor of the Nagpur University, has supplied United Nations figures pertaining to the decades immediately after Nehru. In these figures the only countries behind India on all counts were Nepal and Ethiopia. Even Bangladesh had better infant mortality figures. Dr. V. M. Vaidya, Professor of Economics in the Nagpur University, along with his colleague Dr. S. P. Kulkarni, has published a study on the basis of the tables prepared by Ostler, Dutta and Abhijit Sen. The table is reproduced below:

Percentage of people below the poverty line

Year	Rural	Urban
1951	47.37	35.46
1954-55	64.24	46.19
1957	62.11	48.88
1960-61	45.40	44.65
1966-67	64.30	52.24
1970-71	54.84	44.98
1989-90	34.30	33.40
1990-91	36.43	32.76
1992	43.77	32.77

It will be seen from the table that poverty increased in the First Plan and even later it does not show any trend to decrease. In the case of rural poverty in 1991 we returned to the position nearer to that of 1951 than that which shows the maximum improvement. Urban poverty also reverted to the position of 1951 after some improvement in 1990-91. In other words no claim can be made that Nehru's planning in any way helped to reduce poverty. The percentage of people below the poverty line was 33-34 after 40 years of Nehruist planning.

Another salient fact is that rural poverty is consistently higher than the urban. Gandhiji wrote to Nehru right in the beginning of planning that the emphasis of planning should be on the villages. But in saying this Gandhi used his usual "spiritual" language and talked of the pristine simplicity and innocence of the villages and the unwholesome sophistication of the cities. Nehru could easily pick up such unfounded notions for criticism and reject Gandhi's suggestion out of hand. But if he had cared to see the hardheaded realism beneath Gandhi's playing the saint in all his utterances, he would have realized that since the majority of India lives in the villages, not starting development from the villages amounts to ignoring the majority.

The result was that employment opportunities in the villages were scarce and a large number of villagers flocked to the cities in search of livelihood. The rush to the cities was altogether unplanned and the cities which were built to cater for half a million or so had to bear the pressure of several millions. The millions who thronged to the cities could get food and clothing there but no shelter, not to speak of health-care and education. Their income in terms of rupees was higher than what they could have hoped for in the villages, but their living conditions were worse than what they were in their villages.

The 'Nehru Growth Rate'

The Nehru-worshippers describe the rate of growth, which is very often negative, as the "Hindu rate of growth" instead of describing it as the Nehru rate of growth, suggesting that Hindus are inherently incapable of anything better, and that but for Nehru they would have been much worse off. This way, the incompetence of any Indian ruler can be exonerated.

Objective figures show that Nehru cannot escape by blaming the Hindus. Sharat Joshi has recently given out figures that the selfsame Hindu country stood 32nd in the world when Nehru took over. It is not therefore the Hindu heritage but Nehru and Nehruism that are to blame for the comparative backwardness of India.

The most miserable performance of Nehru is in the field of education. Nehru was the popularizer of the convents, the hallmark of whose education is denationalization. A man who was enamoured of the convents was obviously incapable of thinking of the education of the masses. It is known to all that India is among the most illiterate countries in the world and at the beginning of the 21st century about 55% of the world's illiterates are in India.

Beneficiaries

A closer look at Nehru's planning reveals that about 10 crores of people have benefited by it. These 10 crores are made up of the English-educated, organized labour, etc. The bureaucracy has proliferated without corresponding work. This has eased the unemployment among the English-educated, as compared to what it was under the British. The frequent pay-revisions, D.A. hikes, family pensions, etc., have improved the lot of the English-educated considerably. This class was fattened under Nehru and its sense of nationalism and for public good was so blunted as not to feel any compunction at the thought that its prosperity is based on the poverty of the masses. The new philosophy that the Mughals were the "national rulers" and the British the fourth chapter of our book of civilization, made the intelligentsia incapable of feeling any horror at the military humiliation at the hands of the Chinese or the Pakistanis.

It is for these reasons that Nehru, instead of appearing as a villain who harmed the country in every field, was worshipped as a great man in the media as well as by the beneficiaries of the newer education which was of Nehru's own making.

There are many alibis for the damaging effects of Nehruist planning. Overpopulation is the oft-quoted. But Sri Lanka is not more advantageously placed as compared to India with respect to density of

population. To explain away Sri Lanka it is said that it is easier for a small country to progress. When China is mentioned, apologists for Nehru blame democracy and hail the Chinese dictatorship as the harbinger of progress! Narasimha Rao in his speech in America adopted this anti-democracy line. He forgot that Sri Lanka has harnessed democracy to progress. Pushed to the wall, these Nehru-worshippers blame the caste system. If this diagnosis is correct, we must give up all hope of progress because caste is going to stay with us till doomsday.

For that matter, the caste system was even more prominent a thousand years ago when India was the richest country in the world with the best educational system in the world.

These Hindu-baiters can be asked whether there is no caste in Sri Lanka and whether the Hindus with their castes had no glorious periods in their history.

The conclusion is inescapable that Nehruism is squarely to blame for India's poor development. The celebrated economist B. R. Shenoy used to say that India would have done better if Nehru had let it alone without his planning. This is borne out by the planning holiday of three years. India's rate of development was better in those three years.

Nehru's planning adviser Mahalanobis had said that India's plans were based on requirements and not on resources. Splendid ! No wonder the country has gone to dogs under a guardian who says that he will spend according to his requirements and not according to his income.

The same point is illustrated by an article in the Planning Special of the Marathi research monthly 'Navbharat'. This article makes the shocking revelation that no cost-benefit ratio was worked out in planning the Bhakra-Nangal dam and the dam will not yield benefits even equal to the money poured into it. Nehru himself later nearly admitted this when he wondered whether he would sanction the dam if such a proposal came before him again [S. Gopal]. No wonder Nehru's planning consisted of squandering away the nation's resources.

Apart from the inanities in socialist thinking, the other factor in such actions of Nehru was that his main concern was to impress foreign

dignitaries by exhibiting big dams and steel plants and securing international fame, no matter what happens to the country. A ten to twenty per cent improvement in the living standards of the poor will not be an item of exhibition and will not be noticed by foreign visitors; it will have to be detected by statistical studies.

This author was surprised to note that this revelation makes no impression on many educated Indians, even on those who have degrees in economics. They say that economic planning for the country is not like the planning of a baniya for opening a new shop. The baniya plans for profit whereas the national plans are for welfare, not for profits ! The fallacy in socialist thinking is that the problem of poverty can be solved by philanthropy and that there is surplus wealth somewhere waiting to be distributed; no new wealth needs to be created for mitigating poverty; and even if the new wealth has to be created it can be created out of nothing.

Under Nehru's planning, the nation has spent considerably on refrigerators, cars and other luxury items and very meagrely on food and education. For Nehru, progress meant use of imported luxury goods, the English language being the most sought after among these.

Nehru's weakness for the "imported" was apparent in his planning also.

The target of irrigation was 7.85 in the First Plan but the achievement was only 3.66; in the Second Plan the target was 7.84 and achievement 2.83; and lastly in the Third Plan in Nehru's lifetime the target of 10.38 came down to 4.52 in achievement. (*Economic Survey 1998-99* and *India's Agricultural Sector* by CMIE).

It may be said that the difference between target and achievement is usual and there is nothing to shout about in it. But in this case there is basis to believe that the gap between target and achievement was not merely a failure of implementation. It was a result of Nehru's agreement with the USA for the import of large quantities of wheat. This agreement was reached when there was a bumper crop of wheat in India (1955).

But there was a drought in 1965-67 and exactly at this time America stopped supplies of wheat because it was annoyed by Shastri's action of carrying the war into Pakistan territory. The government then realized that irrigation efforts should not have been slackened depending on American wheat.

But by this time the cost of irrigation projects shot up four times. Thus we missed 17 million hectares of irrigation potential. The poverty-elimination programme received a big jolt. Besides this the import and subsidized sale of US wheat for twenty years hit the Indian farmer hard.

4. **SECULARISM = HINDU-BAITING**

Righting National Wrongs

After science and industrialization, "secularism" is the second contribution for which Nehru is applauded. The Constitution in the days of Nehru did not describe itself as secular but Nehru went on asserting that India is a secular state. Nobody objected to this because it was thought that by "secular" Nehru meant non-theocratic, the usual meaning of the term in English. And this is a correct description of the state as envisaged by our Constitution.

But it soon became clear that by "secular" Nehru *did not* mean non-theocratic; he clearly meant *non-Hindu*. This is a clear affront to the Constitution and a part of Nehru's "hidden agenda" to sabotage the Constitution. The Constitution does NOT regard India as a non-Hindu state; in fact by the pictorial illustrations it makes it clear beyond doubt that India is a *Hindu Rashtra*.

There are pictures of (1) a Vedic hermitage, (2) Mohenjo-daro seals, (3) Rama's victory over Ravana, (4) Krishna propounding the *Gita*, (5) a scene from Buddha's life, (6) a scene from Mahavira's life, (7) Ashoka's *dharmavijaya*, (8) Gupta art, (9) Vikramaditya's court, (10) Nalanda university, (11) Orissa sculptures, (12) image of Nataraja, (13) Mahabalipuram scene of Bhagiratha bringing the Ganga, (14) Akbar's court, (15) portrait of Shivaji, (16) portrait of Guru Govind Singh, (17) Tipu Sultan and Rani Laxmibai signifying resistance to the British occupation and the War of Independence respectively, (18) The Dandi march of Gandhi and (19) Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose and his final blow to the British power.

The above illustrations show that unlike Nehru the Constitution does not regard the British occupation as "the fourth chapter of our culture or nationhood." The same is true of the Turko-Mughal occupation. Akbar is included because he renounced Islam, the main *raison d'être* for the Turko-Mughal invasions. The (wrong) supposition that like Kanishka he

became part of the culture of India must have prompted the inclusion of the picture of Akbar in the Constitution. In any case the Constitution does not share Nehru's perverted teaching that the Mughals were "national rulers."

The Constitution does not display the portrait of Christ along with those of Rama and Krishna nor does it in any way indicate that Islam is a part of our nationhood, obviously because these religions were not a spontaneous growth within India but were imposed by invaders. It should also be noted that the Constitution has made it clear beyond doubt that just as Islam is not a part of our nationhood, Hinduism as a religion which accepts the divine authority of scriptures is also not a part of our nationhood by outlawing untouchability.

The inclusion of Shivaji and Guru Govind Singh gives the lie to the Nehruist attitude to Shivaji which apprehends that reverence for Shivaji is inimical to national unity.

The proponents of *Hindu Rashtra* have no reason to suppose that the Constitution is not a Hindu Constitution.

Inclusion of Rama and Krishna indicates that the Constitution regards them as venerable parts of our nationhood; and the insult to *Ramjanmabhumi* and *Krishnajanmabhumi* is an insult to our nation and must be avenged. This is completely contrary to the "secularism" which Nehru preached.

Nehru's "secularism" bared its fangs at the time of the restoration of the Somnath temple.

The repeated desecration of Somnath was a protracted humiliation of the nation, and whenever indigenous rulers were strong they rebuilt Somnath. After independence it was naturally thought that such national insults should be requited and men like Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel took up the task of restoring Somnath.

This was anathema to Nehru and he wrote to the Jamsaheb of Navanagar, in whose realm the Somnath temple was situated, that he should not spend any government money on the temple, lest it should violate our "secularism" (*'Tarun Bharat'*, 28-2-2000).

N. V. Gadgil, who was a minister in the Nehru cabinet at that time, reports that he had been spending huge sums of government money on masjids and dargas at the behest of Nehru. (*'Government from Inside'*).

Nehru wrote to Kanhaiyalal Munshi, another minister in his cabinet, disapproving the enthusiasm the latter was showing in the cause.

Munshi replied that our nationalism is rooted in our cultural past and if this attitude is described as revivalism which is to be shunned, the whole concept of independent India will become meaningless. (*'Organiser'*, 28-2-2000).

Nehru tried to dissuade President Rajendra Prasad from inaugurating the temple but the President did not heed his advice. Nehru said that such actions would adversely affect relationship with Pakistan and the world. Obviously Pakistan's declaring itself a Muslim state did not have "a bad effect" on India and the world! Nehru himself used to attend Buddhist inauguration functions but this according to him did not compromise his "secularism" because, according to him, the Buddhists are not Hindus.

It will be fruitful to recall the British attitude to desecrated temples and contrast it with Nehruist secularism. The dispute about *Krishnajanmabhumi* went right up to the Privy Council which ruled that it is natural for the Hindus to claim these desecrated temples but it is not practicable to destroy the mosques that are standing on these sites. The Council therefore directed that Muslims should not be allowed to repair the masjids and they should be handed over to the Hindus when they are dilapidated enough to become unusable. This order was not implemented in the Nehru regime and the *Krishnajanmabhumi* issue which could have been solved by honouring the Privy Council judgment was unnecessarily made unsolvable.

"Secularists" keep the rift alive

A word must be said here about the *Ramjanmabhumi* and similar issues. Lakhs of people visit places like the *Ramjanmabhumi* and the *Krishnajanmabhumi* every year. They are told that the places were destroyed by Babar and Aurangzeb and that the Muslims of the day are

not prepared to undo the wrong. Can one expect that these lakhs will go away without harbouring hatred towards the Muslims ? Such places are spread all over the country and they are a standing reminder to the Hindus of their humiliation. Is it a wrong conclusion to draw that those who do not think that this state of affairs must be remedied want to perpetuate the Hindu-Muslim cleavage ?

The "secularist" answer to this is that the guides at such places should be prevented from telling these facts to the visiting public ! But in a democratic set-up the fact that the guides are prevented from narrating the history as they know it cannot remain a secret and the public will believe the fact of the demolition all the more strongly. The Nehruist solution is that the history as it is taught in schools itself must be changed so that even the guides do not know the ugly facts. Such complete suppression of history is not possible in a democracy and has not been possible even in totalitarian states like Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. People cannot be prevented from reading histories written in the pre-Nehru era and those written by internationally famous writers like Will Durant. You cannot fool all people for all time and lies can never be a solution to the abiding problems of any society.

Some people urge that the Hindus should be persuaded not to hate the contemporary Muslims for the wrongs perpetrated by their co-religionists centuries ago. This would be a strong argument if the contemporary Muslims were ashamed of the acts of Babar and Aurangzeb. Is there a significant movement among the Muslims which owns that the acts of Babar and Aurangzeb are something to be ashamed of ? The "secularists" preach day in and day out that the demolition of the Babari structure was a shameful act. They keep silent over the fact that the Babari structure itself was raised by demolishing a pre-existing temple.

When pressed about the demolition of the temple the "secularist" historians justify it by giving fanciful reasons such as that the temple was harbouring criminals etc. They will however not concede the right to the Indian government to demolish a mosque if it harbours criminals. Those who do all this are wanting to perpetuate the Hindu-Muslim record of hate.

This is clear from the fact that the "secularist" propaganda has

resulted in widening the rift between the Hindus and the Muslims. There are Muslims who may be believing the "secularist" propaganda. For such Muslims the Hindus who spread false stories against their past co-religionists deserve nothing but hate. The fundamentalist Muslims do not believe the "secularist" propaganda because they in fact take pride in the demolition of temples and to cast it in the teeth of the Hindus that they have done so. Such Muslims hate the "secularist" Hindus as much as they hate the "communal" Hindus because the "secularists" are depriving the Muslim heroes of their glory by preaching that they have never demolished the temples. The remaining class which does not believe the "secularists" but also does not regard demolition of temples as a pious act, are rendered unable to persuade their co-religionists to atone for the acts of the likes of Babar and Aurangzeb by handing over the sites of their demolished temples to the Hindus.

The "secularists", by their actions, are passing a slur on the Muslims by supposing that no Muslim or at any rate no sizable number of them will ever agree to hand over the sites of these temples to the Hindus even if they are shown evidence that on these sites stood the temples of Hindus. Even the chairman of the Babari committee, Shahabuddin, said that he is not only prepared to hand over the site of the Babari structure to the Hindus if it is proved that a mosque was built there by demolishing a Hindu temple but also will perform *karseva* to build a temple there. No "secularist" has ever said this. This shows that the "secularists" are not interested in solving the Hindu-Muslim problem; they want to aggravate it in order to disrupt this nation.

This was also Nehru's subconscious thinking. As to the other Congress "secularists" they find instigation of Muslims a profitable way for cornering Muslim votes in elections.

Nehru vis-à-vis Muslims

It is widely believed that in "secularism" Nehru carried forward the mission of Gandhi. Results however completely belie this notion. Gandhi had a sizable following among Muslims. Hundreds of Muslims joined his movements and braved the British prisons and *lathi-charges*. Gandhi defeated the Muslim League in the Frontier Province and the Congress

could form a government there. The Frontier Province voted unequivocally against Partition in the 1946 election. This was a great hindrance for Jinnah in realizing his dream. Thanks to Gandhi's influence, leaders of the Congress, freely elected by the Muslims, could challenge Jinnah's two-nation theory. This was no mean achievement.

Nehru was operating in an atmosphere much more favourable than that of Gandhi. Gandhi had no power, and no rewards to offer. He could only depend on appealing to the patriotism of the Muslims. All he had to offer for this was *lathi*-charges and prison-sentences. Nehru on the other hand was the undisputed ruler of India and could bestow favours.

Yet Nehru commanded almost no respect among the Muslim masses. This is clear from the fact that he found it necessary to court the support of the Muslim League for buttressing Congress strength in Kerala. For this a brazen justification was given that the Kerala Muslim League was Indian and therefore there was nothing wrong in soliciting its support! Was Jinnah's Muslim League non-Indian so that Nehru fumed and fretted against it? It is obvious that Nehru would not have won himself in a Muslim constituency against a Muslim candidate.

Immediately after Partition the Indian Muslims had begun to realize that they had nothing to gain by the establishment of Pakistan. Hardly a million of them could migrate to Pakistan. The rest had perforce to live in an India where their numbers made them a much smaller minority than they were in unpartitioned India where they were 1/4 th of the population. In partitioned India they became 1/10th. In unpartitioned India, the Muslims could not have been ignored by any government. No party could have won any election with the Muslims solidly against it. In partitioned India on the other hand it is possible for a party to come to power without getting a single Muslim vote. Balraj Madhok has pointed out that there are only 30 Lok Sabha constituencies where the Muslim vote can be decisive. So the Indian Muslims have really lost political power in India.

The Muslims at the beginning of independence saw this reality and were in a mood to revise the two-nation theory. This is clear from the fact that they were readily persuaded to accept Hindi as the national language and the directive for a common civil code.

The situation was thus extremely opportune for the re-education of Muslims, making them realize that their ancestors were the same as those of the Hindus, that their conversion to Islam had nothing to do with the realization of some higher spiritual truth, and that it was only a submission to the overwhelming brute-force of the invader; that now there was an opportunity for them to regain their patrimony, and disown the invaders who persecuted their forefathers. Hamid Dalvai said: "I have a right greater than that of the Hindus to hate the Turko-Mughal invaders. It is my forefathers who were the primary victims of these invaders and not the forefathers of the Hindus. That is why Hindus could stay as Hindus whereas I am a Muslim today."

Nehru's teaching was exactly the opposite. Instead of telling the Muslims that the Mughals were invaders with no affinity with this country, he started preaching that the Mughals were "national rulers"; that the Hindus should give up eulogizing Shivaji and the like. This was a clear instigation to the Muslims: "It is men like Shivaji and his admirers who have created the Hindu-Muslim cleavage." He started the light-and-shadow programme in the Red Fort for concocting history. The Muslim invaders were painted in glowing colours; calumnies were heaped on the Marathas. It was preached day in and day out that the separatist tendencies among the Muslims created by the military successes of Islam were not the cause of India's partition; that the cause was "communal" Hindu movements like the RSS.

This was plain and simple instigation of the Muslims against the Hindus. The background in which the RSS was formed justifies its formation. It is well known that frequent Hindu-Muslim riots took place under the British and generally the Hindus had the worst of them. Some Hindu leaders blamed this on the fact that the Hindus were not "consolidated" like the Muslims and therefore a movement for Hindu consolidation was needed. Nehru deliberately misrepresented the *result* to be the *cause* of the Hindu-Muslim cleavage.

Nehru had the opportunity to do what neither Gandhi nor the RSS could have done. He got the opportunity to rule India undisputedly and could have created a state of mind among the Muslims whereby they could look with pride to their Hindu past. If Nehru had made India as mighty

as, say, China, it would have had a decisive effect on the minds of Indian Muslims and they would have taken pride in being called Indians, or even Hindus. Nehru on the contrary made India even weaker than Pakistan as was proved by the 1965 war. When the Muslims saw that the Islamic country which their votes created is more powerful than the Hindu India which they despised, they had no reason to give up their Islamic nationalism in favour of a common nationhood with the Hindus.

Those who want to absolve Nehru of the charge of instigation should point out a single speech or any other effort by Nehru where he tried to persuade the Muslims to give up separatist ideas like foreign ancestry of Indian Muslims, and their separate language and culture. Nehru championed the cause of Urdu against Hindi, the underlying message being that Urdu is "secular" and Hindi is "communal". In two provinces U.P. and Madhya Pradesh low priority is given to the teaching of Urdu in schools and Hindi and Sanskrit are sought to be imposed on both Hindus and Muslims, he complained [S. Gopal]. In other words Nehru was perpetrating a falsehood that the languages of Hindus and Muslims are different and reviling the teaching of Hindi which was enjoined as the language of the Central Government by the Constitution and of Sanskrit, which has been the main promoter of India's common nationhood throughout history, as an imposition. It is impossible that he did not know that the Bengali Muslims are proud to own the highly Sanskritized Bengali as their language.

Nehru no doubt sometimes said that there is no such thing as Muslim culture apart from Hindu culture, but this had a meaning exactly the opposite of what the opponents of the two-nation theory would like to read in it. Nehru denied that there was any Hindu culture either, there was only a composite of the cultures of the invaders from the Aryans to the British, the Islamic invasion being the most effective in the historical period; the culture of the Turko-Mughal invaders is the mainstay of the current Hindu culture, its pre-Islamic heritage is of interest only to the "revivalists" and "chauvinists" who are the villains of the Hindu-Muslim cleavage.

"Nehru pressed his colleagues at the Centre and in the States to provide adequate representation to the minorities, specially the Muslims,

in the armed and civil services" [S. Gopal]. He bewailed that the Muslims were being considered aliens in India (*Ibid*). He insulted the Constitution which prohibits discrimination on the basis of religion by proposing recruitment of Muslims on the basis of their religion. If the Muslims were regarded as aliens in India it was a natural result of their voting in favour of Pakistan; and Nehru was punishing the innocent in place of the guilty by blaming the Hindus for this.

Outlawing Criticism of Religion

Nehru first revealed the real nature of his "secularism" to be nothing but a more virulent form of the British policy of instigating the Muslims against the Hindus, when the Muslims ran riot over the book *Religious Leaders* published by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan. In this book there is an article on Mahammad Paigambar. The article is written by an internationally acknowledged authority. The legal advisers to the government maintained that there is nothing objectionable in the article under the current laws. In order to attract the provisions of the law, it has to be held that the article has been written with the sole intention of wounding the religious feelings of the Muslims and that instruction and dissemination of truth was not its motive. It is impossible to say this about the article.

But the Muslims would hear nothing of this. They went berserk. The government did not deal appropriately with them. Instead Nehru addressed a meeting on the Ramlila grounds condemning the article as of no value. He did not elaborate by showing how the article does not instruct and impart information. He further said that he had informed the Home Minister to amend the present laws so that articles of this type can invite the strong arm of the law.

No such amendment is known to have been made to the laws. Most probably the legal pundits pointed out that any such amendment could be used by the Hindus as well for gagging the criticism of their religion by the missionaries, and any wording implying that Muslims and Christians alone have a right to harbour religious feelings, not the Hindus, will never be passed by Parliament. Nehru could not have been interested in any such amendment for the same reason.

The proof of this came soon. Lilavati Munshi, the wife of the founder of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, came out with some rabid remarks against Sri Krishna. The Hindu Mahasabha protested strongly against these remarks and demanded action against Lilavati Munshi. Nehru did not utter a word about it. Legal action was of course impossible under the law as it was. It is not the purpose of the law to stifle all criticism of religion. Nehru's speech coupled with his discriminatory approach to the religious feelings of Hindus and Muslims did its job : the instigation of Muslims. This was so revolting that the '*Daily Telegraph*', a U.K. daily, described Nehru's action as "mollycoddling" of the Muslims.

But it was not merely "mollycoddling". Nehru's later actions proved that it was plain and simple instigation. Those who want to take a charitable view of Nehru's Muslim policy, likening it to Gandhiji's attempts to "appease the Muslims" so that they join the freedom movement, should explain why Nehru encouraged the Muslims to back out of those solutions to which they had agreed. The Constituent Assembly resolved to make Hindi the language of the Union Government. The Constitution has specifically enjoined that the language of the Union Government should be primarily based on Sanskrit, and shall use only the Nagari script. A good deal of discussion had taken place before this provision was passed and Nehru's misconceptions, if at all they were honest, were adequately removed. Nehru is also not likely to have been unaware that the Indian languages from Kashmiri to Malayalam in Kerala are highly Sanskritized. Nehru posed ignorance of these facts and carried on a persistent campaign against Hindi as a threat to Urdu. There is no explanation for this except that he was using Urdu to instigate the Muslims against Hindi.

Another point for instigation was the common civil code. The Muslims joined issue with Dr. Ambedkar when the directive principle about the common civil code was passed. But after it was passed the Muslims did not protest against it. In fact, as Dr. Ambedkar pointed out, a large section of the Muslims *were* governed not only by a common code but also by the Hindu Law up to 1937. There was no difficulty whatsoever in introducing a common civil code when instead of doing so Nehru pushed in the Hindu Code.

It is difficult to describe these actions as appeasement. Appeasement implies that there was an unreasonable demand to start with which was wrongly conceded. When there was no unreasonable demand on the part of the Muslims, and Nehru himself took the initiative in the name of the Muslims in assuming such a demand and then satisfying it, the conclusion is inescapable that he was not appeasing but *instigating* the Muslims.

The disastrous effects of this instigation are not confined to this country. It should be noted that the fundamentalist movements in Muslim countries are the direct result of Nehru's instigation to Indian Muslims. Leaders up to Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in Pakistan were against fundamentalism. Ayub Khan even tried to restrict polygamy in Pakistan. But when the Muslims were told that even a Kafir country recognizes the *Shariat*, it was difficult for them to resist the mullahs who were demanding strict adherence to the *Shariat*.

It will be instructive to study the effect of Nehru policy on the frequency of Muslim-Hindu riots. The secularists charge the British of creating the Muslim-Hindu cleavage out of nothing. If this were so and if Muslim-Hindu unity was the lifework of Nehru, his 17 years' unchallenged rule should have made some progress in diminishing the cleavage. No apologist of Nehru will be able to claim that the frequency and severity of Muslim-Hindu riots became less under Nehru. Inquiries were instituted about 23 riots during Nehru's rule. The reports of these inquiries were never made public. There were widespread allegations that the reports were not published because the inquiries blamed the Muslims for taking the initiative in the riots in most cases. If this were not so, there seems to be no reason why the findings of the inquiry should have been kept secret from the public.

S. Gopal has reported a study which shows that there were about 26 riots per year in the 1950s, whereas towards the close of Nehru's regime there were as many as 92. The reason is clear. In the 1950s the policy of Sardar Patel was showing its effect, and though the Sardar died, men of his persuasion were holding power both in the provinces and at the Centre.

Nehru delivered his sermons after every riot to the Hindus, singing about the necessity for "national integration" and asserting that the Muslims could never be the initiators of these riots since they are a minority. [Speech after the Jabalpur riots] In his letter to Indira Gandhi he says that just as the Jewish problem is a Gentile one, the Muslim problem is really a problem of Hindu "communalism"! Not a single sermon of Nehru is addressed to the Muslims, pleading what they should do for bringing about "national integration."

It cannot be said that Nehru was convinced that the Hindus were the guilty party in all these riots. If this were so he would have highlighted the findings of the inquiries, which were available to him. He never did so. This proves that bringing about reconciliation between Hindus and Muslims was never his objective. His purpose was to instigate the Muslims by painting the Hindus as monsters, out to devour the innocent Muslims. It is no wonder that the frequency and severity of Muslim-Hindu riots increased under Nehru.

The special circumstance which prompted Nehru to enact Article 370 for Kashmir was simply that Kashmir, unlike any other state, was a Muslim-majority state. Anybody who has heard the speeches of Sheikh Abdullah would have no doubt that he was a Hindu-baiter. Yet Nehru talked about the misbehaviour of the Maharaja of Kashmir and not of Sheikh Abdullah. The only sin of the Maharaja was that he was a Hindu. Actions like the application of Article 370 encouraged the Muslims to consider themselves a group altogether separate from the Hindus.

Appeasement versus Instigation

In short, by no stretch of imagination can Nehru's Muslim policy be described as secularism and its objective to be bringing about rapprochement between the Hindus and the Muslims. It was pure and simple instigation of Muslims against the Hindus.

When I say this I am often asked whether Gandhi is not open to the same charge. "If Nehru's appeasement is described as instigation, by what logic can we absolve Gandhi of instigating the Muslims?"

Those who ask thus should read the following utterances of Gandhi:

"There is no doubt in my mind that in the majority of quarrels the Hindus come out second best. But my own experience confirms the opinion that the Mussalman as a rule is a bully and the Hindu as a rule is a coward. I have noticed this in railway trains, on public roads, and in quarrels which I had the privilege of settling. If the Hindus wish to convert the Mussalman bully into a respecting friend, they have to die in the face of the heaviest odds. Hindus must cease to fear the Mussalman bully, and the Mussalmans should consider it beneath their dignity to bully their Hindu brothers". ('Hindu-Muslim Tension : Its Causes and Cure', *Young India*, 5 June 1924, pp.110-111,127)

His further elucidation of the above statement a week later in the June 19, 1924, issue is an even more vehement denunciation of Muslim aggressiveness :

"The Mussalman, being generally in a minority, has as a class developed into a bully. The thirteen hundred years of imperialistic expansion has made the Mussalmans fighters as a body. They are, therefore, aggressive. Bullying is the natural excrescence of an aggressive spirit.

"The Hindu has an age-old civilization. He is essentially non-violent. Predominance of the non-violent spirit has restricted the use of arms to a small minority. The Hindus as a body are, therefore, not equipped for fighting, not knowing their use [use of arms] nor having the aptitude for them; they have become docile to the point of timidity or cowardice. The vice is, therefore, a natural excrescence of gentleness." (*Young India*, 19 June 1924, pp. 131-132).

"There can be no doubt that they [the Muslims] are too free with the knife and the pistol. The sword is no emblem of Islam. But Islam was born in an environment where the sword was and still remains the supreme law. The message of Jesus had proved ineffective because the environment was not ready to receive it. So with the message of the Prophet. The sword has to be sheathed if Islam is to be what it means - peace." (*Young India*, December 1926, p. 234).

Those who want to equate the attitudes of Gandhi and Nehru on

the Muslim-Hindu problem should say whether there is a single word in Nehru's sermons which shows such understanding of the problem.

Gandhi never encouraged the Muslims to back out of national agreements by himself making anti-national demands in their name. He did not encourage them to demand a separate code when they had agreed to accept a common code. He would not have advocated Article 370 for Kashmir when there was no such demand from the Muslims. He did not fight shy of declaring himself a Hindu in order to please the Muslims. His "secularism" did not amount to teaching the Muslims that Hindi is as foreign to them as English; he did not hail the Mughal invaders as "national rulers." His much-maligned statement about Shivaji being a "misguided patriot" had nothing to do with appeasing the Muslims; he was referring to the superiority of *ahimsa* to the sword in calling Shivaji misguided. In the same statement in which he called Shivaji misguided, he included Washington and Garibaldi, making it clear that Shivaji was a patriot. Later Gandhi wrote a preface to Shaha's biography of Shivaji (in Gujarati) in which he openly confessed that his earlier underestimation of Shivaji was the outcome of ignorance which was removed by Shaha's book.

Contrast to this Nehru's attitude. The Samyukta Maharashtra Movement proved that the name of Shivaji is not merely of historical interest; it can even be used for winning elections. This made Nehru realize that disrespect to Shivaji could cost him elections. He therefore went to the Raigarh fort to commemorate Shivaji. But even in the speech which was meant to pay tribute to Shivaji, he exhorted the audience to eschew the idea of converting the Muslims back to Hinduism. It is difficult to see the relevance of this exhortation. The organizers of the commemoration had not thought of launching any movement for the reconversion of Muslims by force or otherwise, nor had Shivaji any such programme; he blessed the reconversion of some newly converted Hindus, when the conversion had been under duress. This uncalled-for exhortation has no other explanation excepting that he wanted to instigate the Muslims against the admirers of Shivaji.

The Problem of Migrants

Gopal claims that Nehru's Muslim policy was in keeping with

Gandhi's and that Sardar Patel and Dr. Rajendra Prasad were not the true followers of Gandhi, at least as far as their Muslim policy was concerned. He alleges that Patel charged the Indian Muslims of being disloyal and wanted them to be treated as hostages for fair treatment of Hindus in Pakistan. Gopal does not quote the actual words of Patel but one cannot overlook the obvious fact that the overwhelming majority of the Muslims who voted for Pakistan were living in India and one cannot expect that they would overnight forget Pakistan and switch on their loyalties to India. If Nehru wanted us to ignore this fact in shaping our Muslim policy, he was obviously a hypocrite and did not have India's interests at heart. Indian Muslims cheer Pakistan and not India in friendly matches and this is expected in the background of Partition. A re-education of Muslims is needed if India has to absorb the Muslims as full-fledged citizens, not only in law but in emotion, not only *de jure* but also *de facto*. But Nehru thought that it is the Hindus alone who need re-education! It is impossible for anyone to believe that this view was honest and was not born of scant interest in the welfare of this country.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad is reported by Gopal to have said that merely taking action against the Hindus who attack Muslims without having any effective action against the Muslim attacks on Hindus in Pakistan "is driving the people away from us," and Nehru's exhortation to Hindus to behave in a civilized manner only "convinces the world of India's guilt."

This is horse-sense and it is a reflection on Nehru's patriotism that he did not see this. Patel rightly resisted Nehru's efforts to reserve certain residential areas in Delhi for Muslims. In fact one of the musts of the programme to absorb the Muslims as full-fledged citizens of this country is that separate localities of Hindus and Muslims must end. Especially, whole districts or even states like Kashmir with contiguous Muslim population must be converted into areas of mixed population.

But absorption of Muslims is exactly what Nehru *did not* want. He endorsed the attitude of those Muslims who say "We will lose our identity by national integration." In fact the goal of national integration is that the Muslims *should* lose their separate identity in all spheres except their mode

of worship. What they call their identity was imposed on them by force and fraud by foreign invaders in a bid to sever them from their parent nationhood. It is not something which is preservable.

Sardar Patel and Bidhan Chandra Roy, Chief Minister of Bengal, suggested to Nehru that the Pakistan government be informed that if Hindus migrated from East Bengal, India would expel an equal number of Muslims from West Bengal. Mohan Lal Saxena was the Union Minister for Rehabilitation. He ordered the sealing of Muslim shops in Delhi and Uttar Pradesh. Gopal praises Nehru for vehemently opposing these actions. It was contended that the Hindus living in Pakistan are no concern of the Government of India, on the contrary the Muslims living in India are Indian citizens and are the primary responsibility of the government. This view has to be examined because it sounds plausible.

The decision to form India and Pakistan was taken on the basis of the election held in 1946. This election was contested on the issue of Pakistan. The Hindus living in Pakistan voted for the Congress because the Congress promised them that it would stand for Akhand Bharat. The Congress could not stick to this stand and betrayed the Pakistani Hindus. This betrayal may be justified on the ground that the Congress had no choice, that if it had not agreed to Pakistan the alternative was not two but twenty divisions of India. But there, the justification ends. It cannot be carried to the extent of washing our hands clean of all responsibility towards the Pakistani Hindus.

On the other hand, the Indian Muslims had voted against the party which formed the Government of India and for a party which formed a government of another country. The Government of India cannot be expected to have any responsibility towards them. If the Muslims had been told this by the actions suggested by Sardar Patel, Bidhan Chandra Roy and Mohan Lal Saxena, the Muslims would have realized their folly in opting for Pakistan and tried to absorb themselves in the Indian nationhood. The implementation of the suggestion of Patel and these other ministers would certainly have helped in keeping the Pakistani Hindus in Pakistan and stopped the inflow of refugees which has been our perpetual problem.

The refugee problem has created the infiltrator problem because Pakistan has realized that India does not even protest when its nationals (both Hindus and Muslims) are thrown on India, that India has neither the power nor the will to stop their influx.

The realization among Muslims of the folly in opting for Pakistan would have facilitated the re-education of Muslims for being absorbed in the Indian nationhood. While expelling the Muslims as retaliation against Pakistan, screening on the basis of separatist leanings could have been resorted to. If this had been done even once, Pakistan would have stopped eviction of Hindus and the Indian Muslims would have stopped looking to Pakistan for protection against India.

It should not be forgotten that national integration expects that even Hindus have to give up several things which are associated with Hinduism, such as untouchability, *sati*, the rigours of the caste system enjoining strict restrictions against inter-caste dining and marriage, and deviating from the caste-vocation.

Gopal says that Gandhi supported Nehru's efforts to "protect the minorities and shun vengeance." This implies that Patel and Rajendra Prasad did not want to protect the minorities and were thinking of wreaking vengeance on them. This is an uncalled-for insinuation. Neither Patel nor Rajendra Prasad had ever suggested that protection available to other citizens should not be available to the Muslims and that programmes should be hatched to persecute them. What they did not approve of was Nehru's instigation of Muslims suggesting that they are not the progeny of Hindu ancestors but are successors of the Turk and Mughal invaders, that their language and culture is different, that they should have separate laws; Kashmir should have Article 370 simply because it is a Muslim-majority province. Gopal should produce evidence to show that Gandhi approved the above policies of Nehru. Gandhi resisted all attempts to sever the Muslims from the rest of the nation. He undertook a fast unto death to prevent the scheduled castes from being cut off from Hindu society by having a separate electorate. He would surely not have approved Nehru's policies to encourage Muslim separatism.

I once asked Dr. Zakir Hussain, "Gandhi swore that he was a

staunch Hindu and yet he had many Muslim followers, and could defeat the Muslim League in elections. On the other hand Nehru misses no opportunity to revile the Hindus and dislikes being called a Hindu himself. He describes himself as a pagan, he is so allergic to the word Hindu. Yet he cannot win any election in a Muslim constituency. How do you explain this ?”

Zakir Hussain replied, “The Muslims who went to Gandhi went for sacrificing something; the Muslims who go to Nehru go for getting something. Gandhi appealed to the higher emotions of the Muslims like patriotism; Nehru does not appeal to any such emotion of the Muslims” [he only promises them protection from the Hindus]. The words in the bracket were not used by Zakir Hussain but are directly implied by what he said. The distinction which Zakir Hussain drew between the Muslim followers of Gandhi and those of Nehru is so vital that equating both would amount to equating patriotism and treason.

Recently there was widespread criticism of Mulayam Singh, sometime Defence Minister of the United Front government, for his statement about the infiltrators from Bangladesh and Pakistan. He asked, “What is the harm if a brother comes to live in a brother’s house ?” He of course forgot to mention that this sharing of the house of the brother is a one-way affair and it is unthinkable that lakhs of Hindus from India will get such brotherly welcome in Pakistan or Bangladesh.

On this a large section of our intelligentsia said that a man who says this is not fit to be the Defence Minister of India.

This is strange. In what way are the utterances of Mulayam Singh different from those of Nehru and Indira Gandhi ? When there was an outcry against Pakistani infiltrators and the government had initiated action for ousting them, the Pakistan Prime Minister Liaquat Ali came to India and met Nehru. Nehru thereupon stopped the action against the infiltrators.

There was also an outcry against Fakhruddin Ali Ahmad for bringing 14 lakhs of infiltrators from Bangladesh into Assam. Nehru, instead of taking action against Fakhruddin, rewarded him with a berth in the Union Cabinet. The infiltrators are having a free passage to India ever since.

Ayub Khan thanked Nehru for easing the situation in the east by forbidding large-scale expulsion of illegal immigrants from Assam and Tripura. Nehru’s whole endeavour was to get such certificates from foreigners, regardless of its harmful consequences to India.

The Assamese uproar against the infiltrators continued in the time of Indira Gandhi and the Assamese launched a massive movement against it. Indira Gandhi, after winning the election in 1980 and having re-emerged as the unquestioned Prime Minister after her eclipse in 1977, declared whole-hearted support to the infiltrators and criticised the movement.

Our intelligentsia never regarded Nehru and Indira unfit to be Prime Ministers in view of these utterances. Many of them do not remember that Mulayam Singh was only carrying on the Nehru tradition and not doing anything new to deserve the judgement of being unfit to be Defence Minister.

There is no reason to suppose that Gandhi would have encouraged infiltrators from Pakistan. The polar difference between the Muslim policies of Gandhi and Nehru can be seen in its effect on the Muslims. The example of Humayun Kabir is instructive in this connection. I heard Humayun Kabir in 1939 when he delivered the inaugural address of our college social gathering. He strongly advocated India’s single nationhood and likened the Indian “minorities” to the minority party in the British Parliament, not to a group permanently professing a separate nationhood. The same Humayun Kabir in the Nehru era began talking in the strain of Jinnah alleging that “minorities” are treated unjustly in India. Even a ‘secular’ paper like *The Times of India* described Humayun Kabir’s wails as ‘minorityism.’

There is not a single example of Muslims’ cherishing Indian nationhood courting self-denial as a result of Nehru’s teaching. Nehru’s favourite Sheikh Abdullah had to be arrested for treasonable activities. Another of his favourites Fakhruddin Ali Ahmad brought Pakistani infiltrators into India. Even Abdul Gaffar Khan the ‘Frontier Gandhi’ began talking like Jinnah in the Nehru era. With his unchallenged political power Nehru could easily have re-educated the Muslims into a common

nationhood, an opportunity which Gandhi never had. Instead Nehru's policies led to Muslim fundamentalism and separatism. Gandhi did not wholly succeed in winning over the Muslims; Nehru on the contrary wholly succeeded in making them anti-national.

5. "PREVENTING THE HEAVENS FROM FALLING"

A part from economic planning, encouragement to science and "secularism", Nehru is praised for his supposed international stature. His admirers used to describe him as a world-leader. Gopal quotes Churchill's certificate to Nehru as "the light of Asia" as his supreme achievement. I have never seen any great man being thus evaluated by somebody's certificate. Churchill had expected that with the liquidation of the British empire, the prestige of Britain would suffer. But far from suffering, most of Britain's dependencies willingly accepted the overlordship of Britain. Nehru was largely instrumental for this trend. The English language spread in India much more under Nehru than it did under the British. Nehru reduced Indian independence from Britain to the status of a legal fiction. Why should then Churchill not laud Nehru ?

The role of Nehru, described by Churchill in laudatory terms, was referred to by Mao Tse-tung in rather unflattering terms — as a toady of imperialism.

Gopal admits that Nehru gave paternal advice to U Nu, Sukarno, Hatta and Shahrir and volunteered to mediate between Burma and the Karen insurgents. Gopal does not mention what happened to his "volunteering", but it appears that it was simply ignored by the parties concerned. Gopal writes as if the role of a go-between is a mark of supreme achievement on the part of a Prime Minister. If this role was the greatest achievement of Nehru, he should have become the Secretary-General of the United Nations and not the Prime Minister of India.

Nehru sermonized on peace to the great powers, and this annoyed both the power blocks. Gopal quotes the following remarks of Christopher Isherwood as a compliment to Nehru :

Nehru "was like a tremendous nanny, talking to Khrushchev and Kennedy as if they were naughty nephews, hoping they wouldn't get into a war."

One wonders whether this is a compliment or ridicule.

Chou En-lai once openly said that he had not seen a more arrogant statesman than Nehru. In the Bandung conference Nehru behaved as a host and introduced everybody to everybody, thus annoying the real hosts. Gopal quotes a letter from Chou En-lai to Nehru which is as follows:

"Your Excellency has more knowledge about the world and Asia than I have. I am not being modest. Your Excellency has participated much more in international affairs than I have. We have been shut up in our own country dealing with our own human problems."

Both Nehru and Gopal regard this as a certificate. Obviously Nehru and his admirers have no capacity to recognize sarcasm.

Nehru once visited China and after coming back was complaining, "Mao Tse-tung treated me like one of his ministers". This remark betrays Nehru's illusions about himself. Nehru was a Prime Minister and not the President of India. So the head of China would and should treat him as a minister and not as a President, or better still like a messiah as Nehru thought he was.

There are many other assessments which are in line with mine. Malcolm Muggeridge described Nehru as "conceited and second-rate". Hugh Gaitskell said:

"Nehru is a very arrogant man. He really thinks everybody wants to listen to him. He does not behave in a democratic way. He is aloof and unfriendly" (Gopal).

Bhutto hit the nail on the head when he said, "the myths and images of Nehru were greater than himself."

Gopal also reports how Nehru felt elated by the reception he was given in the US. He did not have the common sense to realize that this reception was to the Prime Minister of India and not any tribute to his personal greatness. He was therefore peeved when he saw that Liaquat Ali Khan, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, received as warm a reception as he did. He failed to see that for the US the Prime Minister of India is no greater than the Prime Minister of Pakistan. He writes to Vijayalaxmi:

"I must say the Americans are very naive or singularly lacking in

intelligence. They go through the identical routine whether it is Nehru or the Shah of Iran or Liaquat Ali..."

The above letter also is an example of how Nehru was in the habit of commenting on other people's intelligence, though his own speeches and behaviour did not create a very favourable impression about his own intelligence.

The description of Nehru as a world-leader was however never heard after the Chinese invasion. But claims are still made that Nehru "saved the world" from an atomic holocaust. What is the evidence for the strange belief that but for Nehru the world would have been swallowed by a nuclear conflagration?

Let us see how, in spite of Nehru, the world came to the brink of a nuclear war and how it was saved. In 1962 Nehru was cut to size by the Chinese and was piteously searching for protectors. The USA came to his rescue not because it thought much of Nehru but because India was attacked by a communist country and the USA had regarded it as her mission to save the world from communism. Nehru was in no position to prevail on the USA to desist from a nuclear offensive; he was a supplicant himself and not a spiritual mentor of the USA. Bertrand Russell presumed to advise the American President but was roundly told that his pacifism be better addressed to the USSR. The USSR, though inferior to the USA in nuclear might, had the power to strike back in kind and though in case of a nuclear war Russia could have been annihilated, America though unannihilated would have cursed its survival; so terrible would have been the effect of a Russian counter-attack.

It is obvious that if Russia had no nuclear weapons America would have dropped the atom-bomb on Russia. It did not do so before Russia acquired the bomb because it was not in any way threatened by the might of Russia. The example of Japan is handy. If Japan had even one nuclear weapon, the USA would have thought twice before wreaking the conflagrations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Nobody was befooled by Nehru's posture of peace and the boast that India can make the atom-bomb but does not make it because it is wedded to peace. It is only the English-educated class in India that took

this posture seriously. The world knows that India could not make even a motor-car without the help of the West, let alone the atom-bomb. The USA took adequate care to see that India did not make a bomb by misusing the atomic facilities provided by it.

The claim of Nehruites that Nehru prevented an atomic holocaust is like the claim of a person who walks with his hands raised and takes the credit for preventing the heavens from falling.

The Self-styled Expert

Nehru regarded himself an expert in foreign affairs and looked with contempt upon other Indian politicians, at least in matters of foreign policy. He took the Ministry of External Affairs under his special charge when the practice in other countries is for the Prime Minister to take up Home. For him Home was of no consequence; all that mattered was external affairs. The only reason for Nehru's regarding himself an expert in external affairs is that he was educated in Britain from the age of 14 and frequently went on a trip to Europe. The details of what he did there never appeared in newspapers.

Nehru reports in his *'Discovery of India'* how he refused to see Mussolini even when he was invited by the Duce. It is difficult to see how this is something to brag about. It is pure and simple discourtesy. It cannot be said that this was in line with Gandhi's policy of reassuring the British that the Congress is not a revolutionary organization seeking help from the enemies of Britain, because Mussolini was the avowed enemy of communism, not of the British. In fact he had hoped for the sympathies of Britain in his anti-communism.

Nehru is not known to be in contact with any other head of state or any politician capable of influencing the power-equations in his country. It is strange that he persuaded himself that he understood foreign affairs better than any other Indian politician. The rulers of Indian states could have beaten him in frequency of foreign visits, but none of them carried the impression that they were experts in foreign affairs.

The reason for Nehru's refusing to see Mussolini was that Mussolini was "Fascist". This is the foulest abuse in the communist lexicon. Nehru's

foreign policy becomes an open book when we note that he was a non-card-holding communist. His ideas on international relations were carbon copies of communist rags. Apart from rushing to Europe at the slightest pretext the resolutions he brought before the Congress in its annual sessions reflect the communist preoccupations of his mind. The resolutions were all concerned with support to the Soviet Union against those whom the Soviet Union considered its enemies. General Franco in Spain rebelled against the Spanish government. It was thought that the Spanish government had the blessings of the Soviet Union and General Franco those of Hitler and Mussolini. This was enough for Nehru to want the Congress to declare its support to the Spanish government against Franco and send wheat to feed the starving Spaniards. The Chinese regime was fighting against the Japanese; Japan in the dictionary of the communists was a "Fascist" country; so Nehru thought he must support the Chinese against it. Later when Gandhi proposed a movement against the British in 1942 Nehru opposed it in the Working Committee on the ground that such a movement would not be in the interest of Russia, a country in alliance with Britain at that time.

Immediately after Independence Nehru started his non-alignment movement. Just as by 'secularism' the ordinary English-knowing person means a non-religious outlook, by non-alignment he means not siding either with America or with Russia in international politics. But Nehru had a special brand of English. Just as by 'secularism' he meant Hindu-baiting, by non-alignment he meant supporting the Soviet Union. When Girilal Jain asserted in one of his articles in *'The Times of India'* that non-alignment does not mean pro-Sovietism, many communists wrote letters to the editor and showered quotation after quotation from Nehru's speeches clearly stating that non-alignment did mean aligning with the Soviet Union. When a resolution condemning colonialism was being considered, Sir John Kotelavala of Sri Lanka raised the issue of Soviet dominance of eastern Europe. Nehru was annoyed and sharply reacted to this.

The Indian representatives always voted for the Soviet cause in the United Nations. In what way this prevented a Russo-American conflict is known to the admirers of Nehru alone.

About the only exception to this voting pattern of the Indian representative was the vote for sending a United Nations' force for protecting South Korea from the North Korean invasion. But this was due to the fact that the USSR representative remained absent from this meeting because Russia had unwisely decided to boycott it. By remaining present Russia could have vetoed the move to send a United Nations' force against the communist aggression. Nehru though a communist by persuasion was not a member of the communist party, and his enthusiasm for communism was not backed by inside knowledge. He therefore did not think that the North Korean invasion of South Korea was sponsored by the Soviet Union and China. He thought it to be a spontaneous act on the part of North Korea.

Pro-Sovietism

Many people defend Nehru's pro-Sovietism by saying that this was not a one-sided affair, the Soviet Union in turn helped India by vetoing a UN resolution against India at the time of the Goa action and later helped India in the 1971 war against Pakistan.

It is true that India could not have counted on any other country to side with India at that time. But who created this situation? Nehru had antagonized Britain and France over the Suez and the USA by sermonizing to it on peace. The USA which brought pressure on Britain to concede independence to India and Britain herself which responded to that pressure could have been persuaded to pressurize Portugal.

It did not speak for any tactfulness on Nehru's part to send the Indian Army openly to Goa. Most countries solve such problems by helping insurrectionary elements within the regions held by hostile powers.

Pakistan sent raiders to Kashmir, then its army personnel without uniform, and now it is sending extremists. India lodged a complaint against Pakistan's unofficial interference in Kashmir, but Pakistan needed no veto by any permanent member to prevent a UN action against it. Now it is saying openly that it lends "moral support" to the Kashmir "freedom fighters". It is even interfering in Afghanistan and feeling no international pressure against its meddling. So it is the open military action in Goa that

speaks for the poor political manoeuvring of Nehru. His need for the Soviet veto was an outcome of this poor manoeuvring.

Apart from poor manoeuvring the Goa action betrayed two ugly features of Nehruism. Nehru involved the country in the Goa military action. Because Menon's election was threatened, he regarded Menon's defeat as his own defeat and therefore needed to do something dramatic for winning the election. Thus no patriotic motives prompted the Goa action; the objective was just one Lok Sabha seat.

Even an uglier feature than this is revealed by Menon in his two articles on the Goa action in *'The Times of India'*. Nehru wanted the Goa action for winning the Bombay election but he was also afraid that military action would tarnish his image as a messiah of peace. He therefore rang up the Portuguese informing them of the date of the army action. When the Indian soldiers approached Goa they saw that the Portuguese had prior knowledge of the date and they were prepared, giving the Indians no advantage of surprise. The attack was therefore postponed. But on the second date also the same thing happened. Menon then guessed that it was Nehru who was informing the Portuguese and for the third time he marched the armies into Goa without informing Nehru.

The motive of Nehru in thus committing an offence which if committed by a soldier would invite court-martial and even by a civilian should attract punishment for treason, was that he expected the Portuguese and the world to think that he was an apostle of peace and it is only bad men like Menon who involved him in war. Nehru thus did not care whether his actions cost the lives of jawans. Further it throws light on his poor sense in judging the effect of his actions on others.

The other act of Nehru which can be described as treason is secret acquiescence in the Chinese occupation of Aksai Chin. The Parliament did not know about it nor did the Cabinet. When news appeared in foreign newspapers that China is building a road in Aksai Chin, N. G. Gore raised a question in Parliament as to how China can build a road in our territory. Nehru thereupon tried to make light of his secret understanding with the Chinese, by saying "not a blade of grass grows there" and Parliament must not make a fuss over nothing.

The 1971 war did appear to highlight Russian help to India. But we have not noted very obvious features of this war and derived proper lessons from it. The 1971 war was the aftermath of the Tashkent accord brought about by Russia. In this accord Lal Bahadur Shastri was forced to withdraw Indian troops from Hajipir and other portions of Kashmir illegally occupied by Pakistan and liberated by Shastri on the eve of the 1965 war. This clearly showed that Russia did not recognize Kashmir as an integral part of India. Russia stuck to this stand in the 1971 war, ordered a cease-fire immediately after the surrender of Dhaka and did not allow India even to take back Chamb, an area in Kashmir seized by Pakistan in that very war. On the contrary, immediately after the surrender of Dhaka, Russia started wooing Pakistan for signing a treaty on the lines of the Russo-Indian treaty. This effort on the part of Russia exposed the whole purpose of Russia in helping India in the war: It was to drive a wedge in the Pak-American alliance by convincing Pakistan that in spite of the American alliance it had to suffer defeat at the hands of its sworn enemy and its real interest lay in striking an alliance with Russia. If Pakistan had yielded to the entreaties of Russia, the USA would have reconsidered Pakistan's membership of the SEATO alliance. The Russian game to wean away Pakistan from the military alliance with America was the main objective of Russia in acting against Pakistan in the Bangladesh war.

It was clear that the Tashkent pact had the blessings of the USA. The USA and Britain were both sympathetic to the cause of Bangladesh. So, as far as the liberation of Bangladesh is concerned, the USA had given a free hand to Russia. But the USA would surely not have brooked any attempt to destroy West Pakistan. This was very well understood by Russia. Many well-educated Indians believe that Russia was on the side of India and America was on the side of Pakistan in this war and therefore it was a real achievement on the part of India to have defeated Pakistan. But America did not render any help to Pakistan in this war. The ship it sent to Bangladesh waters was meant to take away the entrapped Pakistan soldiers. The soldiers however never reached the shore to take advantage of the rescue ship.

It should not be very difficult for us to realize that the USA was not on the side of Pakistan to the extent that Russia was on India's side.

Pakistan's submarine *Gazi* sank in the sea because Pakistan did not have the latest sea-maps as we did on Russia's lending. The USA could surely have given Pakistan the advantage of American intelligence. There is no evidence that it did so.

It was obvious that Russian help to India was within the limits allowed by the USA. The 1971 war is therefore no evidence of success of Nehru's policy in befriending Russia.

The 1965 war leaves no doubt that Russia did not treat India as its ally. Neither Russia nor America helped either Pakistan or India in this war. Russia undertook to mediate between India and Pakistan after the cease-fire with the consent of America. If Pakistan had any misconceptions about Russia's being a friend of India, it would never have accepted Russian mediation. The tremendous pressure brought on Lal Bahadur Shastri by Russia for vacating the areas of Occupied Kashmir makes it clear to the densest mind that Russia treated India and Pakistan on par. The 1965 war took place immediately after Nehru's death and reflects what influence Nehru had on Russia.

When it is contended that Nehru's policy secured Russian support on Kashmir because Khrushchev declared that Kashmir is Indian territory, it is forgotten that when the Maharaja had acceded to India nobody in the world had doubted India's title to Kashmir. It is as a result of Mountbatten's pressure that the Maharaja acceded to India. The Maharaja was vacillating because Nehru lost no opportunity to revile the Maharaja and was wary about the treatment he would get from India after accession. But in the absence of accession Mountbatten who was then the Governor-General of India ruled out any military assistance to Kashmir.

Pakistan never questioned the right of the Maharaja to accede to India. If anybody questioned India's title to Kashmir, it was Nehru. So it lies ill in the mouth of his supporters to claim that he secured Russia's recognition to the accession of Kashmir.

6. THE ULCERIZATION OF KASHMIR

Let us recount the events. After August 1947, Gandhi visited Kashmir and saw the Maharaja. It was reported that Gandhi sounded the Maharaja about accession. Later, Pakistan sent raiders to Kashmir. They captured Baramulla and were threatening Srinagar, the fall of which was a question of days. The Maharaja had earlier warned Pakistan that he would seek the help of "neighbouring states" if Pakistan persisted in harassing Kashmir. In accordance with this warning the Maharaja sent his Dewan, Meher Chand Mahajan, to Delhi for help.

Mahajan saw Nehru and informed that the situation in Kashmir was very serious. If Srinagar fell Kashmir would be irretrievable, it would be plunged in blood-bath and outrages. The Indian Army should therefore be sent immediately.

Nehru was very cold. He said there was no urgency; even if Srinagar is taken, it could be retaken. Mahajan replied that Kashmir could not wait even if Nehru could, that the Maharaja had given him plenipotentiary powers to accede to Pakistan; Jinnah was fortunately in Delhi at the moment, he would go to him and sign the Instrument of Accession.

After delivering this ultimatum Mahajan walked out.

The moment Mahajan left, Sheikh Abdullah who was in the adjoining room listening to the conversation, came in with panic writ large on his face and urged Nehru to call back Mahajan at once. So Mahajan who had not walked away very far was called back. Nehru then told Mahajan that the decision to send the army to Kashmir was a very serious one and he would like to consult Sardar Patel.

Patel was then called. He agreed with Mahajan. Thereupon Nehru said that he would like to consult Gandhi as well. Accordingly both Nehru and Patel went to Gandhi. Gandhi said unhesitatingly that Kashmir must be saved at once. (M. C. Mahajan: *'Looking Back'*).

Around this time Nehru declared in a speech that a UN vote should

be held on Kashmir. This was the headline I read in the *'Oxford Mail'* at that time. It should be noted that it was not Pakistan which suggested such a vote; nor did anybody else in the whole world suggest it. It was Nehru alone who was responsible for this.

Nehru's view that Kashmir is not an integral part of India but only a disputed territory is clearly reflected in his reference to the United Nations. The reference was not made under Chapter 7 on "acts of aggression" but under Article 35 entitled "pacific solution of disputes". The UN agenda refers to the case as India/Pakistan problem and not as India's complaint against Pakistani aggression. The Indian reference also made a commitment for holding plebiscite in Kashmir which even Pakistan had not demanded. Thus it is Nehru who was making demands on behalf of Pakistan.

The Indian Army cleared Srinagar of the raiders, and captured Baramulla. By this time winter set in. India's communications with Kashmir were snowlocked, unlike those of Pakistan. The Indian army had to suspend operations.

Pakistan on the contrary was not compelled to halt operations due to snowy conditions. Even so there was nothing to be panicky about. It was a question of waiting for 2/3 months and the Indian Army could have easily cleared Kashmir of the Pakistani raiders and even the Pakistani army personnel in the garb of raiders. But Nehru decided to refer the Kashmir question to the UN. He later admitted that Gandhi was against such a reference.

Gopalaswami Ayyangar opened India's case. He said the matter was simple. Kashmir had acceded to India and Pakistan had unofficially attacked it; the UN should ask Pakistan to keep off Kashmir.

Sir Zafrullah replied on behalf of Pakistan by quoting from Nehru's speeches. He brought to the notice of the UN that no less a person than the Prime Minister of India had said that a genocide of Muslims was going on in India. India had forcefully occupied Junagadh which had acceded to Pakistan. The Hindu majority of India is like the Nazis of Germany preying upon the Jews. It is preying upon the poor Muslims. Pakistan is sympathetic to their cause. The raiders have not been sent

by Pakistan. But Pakistan is sympathetic to their cause and does not wish to go out of its way to prevent their entry into Kashmir.

Extensive quotations from Nehru's speeches damaged India completely in the eyes of the world body. Far from condemning Pakistan the UN passed resolutions urging India to honour its suggestion of holding a plebiscite in Kashmir.

Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, on return, expressed his desire to resign in the light of this deplorable performance. But Patel is reported to have told him that it was a pity that he had no power to ask for the resignation of the only person responsible for this debacle, that there was no question of Gopaldaswami's resigning, he had done his best under the circumstances.

Ever since, the world has regarded India as the guilty party in the Kashmir dispute.

Nehru's Calculations

If there are any who feel that Nehru must have realised his mistake in making India the guilty party, they are in gross error. They have no understanding of Nehru's psychology. Nehru cared little whether India was seen in a bad light; what mattered was that he projected an image of himself as a saint, a world leader not guided by petty considerations of patriotism. This is clear from the subsequent actions of Nehru. He got the notorious Article 370 passed. According to this Article Kashmir has a special status, not enjoyed by any other state in India. The citizens of Kashmir are automatically the citizens of India but the citizens of India are not and cannot become the citizens of Kashmir. Even a Kashmiri woman marrying a non-Kashmiri Indian loses her citizenship rights in Kashmir. Indian laws are not applicable to Kashmir unless they are endorsed by the Kashmir legislature. India has only responsibilities in Kashmir, no rights. It has fought one major war over Kashmir and is facing a perpetual terrorist menace. It has spilt blood and wealth for the defence of Kashmir but Kashmir has given it only ignominy. By sealing Kashmir from India Nehru ensured that it would fall off from the mother country like an organ which is tied so tightly that it does not partake of the blood circulation of the rest of the body.

Nehru surely foresaw this as everyone else but he imagined

something more not imagined by ordinary mortals, viz., that this sacrifice of India's interest would earn for him the gratefulness of Muslim nations outside the Indian subcontinent, and pave the way for his world leadership. This calculation was the only driving force in Nehru's policies.

There are perhaps some admirers of Nehru who feel that Nehru did succeed in his objective but one will not find a single soul in the Muslim countries who regards Nehru as anything more than a Hindu Prime Minister of a Hindu country, suffering military defeats and political humiliation.

There are people who, though they are not admirers of Nehru, would not like to attribute unpatriotic motives to him. They attribute Nehru's Kashmir policy to his inherent bent for fairness which made him feel that it was not right to force the Kashmiris against their will to remain in India. As Muslims they would surely prefer Pakistan to India and denying them an opportunity to express their choice is against the principle of self-determination.

If Nehru has to be credited with fair-mindedness in trying to make a gift of Kashmir, one can legitimately ask, where did this fair-mindedness vanish in colluding with the Chinese in the rape of Tibet? Did the Tibetans want to be part of China? Was there any chance of China's winning if there were a plebiscite in Tibet?

Apart from Nehru's doings the principle of self-determination for Kashmir deserves to be discussed on its own merits. If the Kashmiris are to be allowed to decide whether to join India or Pakistan, why should Kashmir be regarded as one unit? The people in Jammu and Ladakh will surely not want to join Pakistan. The plebiscite should therefore be held in the Kashmir Valley only.

Again, why should the choice be confined to India and Pakistan alone? The Ladakhis being Buddhists may want to join China. The Kashmiris including the people in the Valley would certainly have their first preference for independence.

Again, why should the plebiscite be a once-and-for-all affair? Like

five-yearly elections, why not have five-yearly plebiscites? After all the people of Bangladesh repented their choice of Pakistan in less than twenty-five years. The people of Sindh similarly are raising the slogan 'Jeeye Sindh' and are wanting to secede from Pakistan. Why not a plebiscite in Sindh also?

The above points show the absurdity of the notion of self-determination if it is carried to its logical conclusion.

M. C. Chagla, the noted jurist, summed up the logical and legal position when he said that self-determination is applicable to countries and not parts of countries. Before talking of self-determination for Kashmir it will have to be decided whether Kashmir is a country or a part of a country. It was never known as a country. Historically it has been a part of India throughout known history. It was never part of Pakistan because Pakistan never existed before 1947. Sometimes Kashmir may have been ruled by kings who were not under the suzerainty of a contemporary major Indian power. But even then it was culturally or by nationhood a part of India.

According to the Pakistan ideology, Islam is the determining factor of nationhood, and wherever Muslims live, they form a nation and cannot be a part of a non-Muslim country. If this ideology is accepted, the 12 crores of Muslims living in India are a separate nation and the sovereignty of the Indian government does not extend to them. Nobody in the world can accept this ideology without digging a grave of his own nationhood because Muslims live in all the countries. That Islam constitutes nationhood is thus a doctrine which sounds the deathknell of whatever nations exist in the world. This is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the doctrine of self-determination applied to Kashmir.

To resume the story:

After the snow in Kashmir melted Indian communications to Kashmir were restored and the Indian Army started its offensive against the raiders. There is no reason why this offensive could not have succeeded in clearing Kashmir of the raiders. But by this time the UN ordered a cease-fire. As was expected, Nehru did not ask who was to implement the cease-fire on the other side, since Pakistan said that the

raiders were not under its command. Pakistan accepted the cease-fire, so did Nehru. The army circles unanimously hold that if only Nehru had delayed the cease-fire by a day or so, which was easily possible, the whole of Kashmir could have been cleared of the raiders. It is naively believed that Nehru wanted Kashmir to be cleared of raiders. He fondly expected that the Muslim world would thank him for allowing Pakistan to retain a portion of Kashmir. Another motive in stopping the Indian Army's victorious march towards Pak-occupied Kashmir was that Sheikh Abdullah had little clout among the people in those areas and they could have been a hurdle in keeping him an unchallenged "Prime Minister" of Kashmir if any election were held to decide the issue (Ajit Bhattacharjee in '*Indian Express*' dated 19-7-1999). Thus Sheikh Abdullah's interests were more important for Nehru than those of the country.

That Nehru was quite willing to hand over Kashmir to Pakistan on a platter, like Tibet to the Chinese, is openly stated even by Gopal. He reports that Nehru had decided to hand over Kashmir to Pakistan when Mahammad Ali, the Pakistan Prime Minister, came to India. What prevented this was Pakistan's joining the American alliance. In other words Pakistan was denied Kashmir by Nehru not for serving India's interests but for serving the interests of international communism.

Nehru had planned to make another Kashmir of the Hyderabad state also. This has been reported by Narahar Kurundakar, a resident of Marathvada, forming part of the then Nizam's dominions. The report has been reproduced by Chandrashekhar Madkholkar in the '*Tarun Bharat*' of Nagpur. According to this report Nehru, in collaboration with Yawar Jang, the Dewan of Hyderabad, worked out an arrangement whereby the Nizam was to enjoy autonomy similar to that of Kashmir under Article 370. It should be noted that in Kashmir the autonomy is exercised by an elected government, but in Hyderabad it was the Nizam who would have exercised the autonomous powers. This proposal for an ulcerous growth right in the belly of the country was prevented by the Nizam who rejected the arrangement because he wanted more than autonomy; he wanted nothing short of sovereignty. If Sardar Patel had not taken things into his own hands, Hyderabad would have developed as a sovereign state becoming as strong as Pakistan with international alliances. If this had

materialized one wonders whether India would today have existed as a free country at all.

Nehru's Israel Policy

Nehru's Islamic "secularism" dictated his policy towards Israel. The Arabs did not want Israel because it was formed by evicting them from areas which they had occupied for two thousand years. Because the majority of the Arabs are Muslims, the Indian Muslims were expected by Nehru to oppose Israel and to side with the Arabs. So, according to Nehruism it follows that the Government of India must also oppose Israel and side with the Arabs. But around this time Farukh's Egypt, an Arab country, assailed India's action in Hyderabad because the Nizam was a Muslim. This did not make any difference to Nehru because in his thinking the Muslim nations of the world had a right to be anti-Hindu. He therefore continued to withhold recognition of Israel and exchange embassies. India did not recognize Israel even when the Soviet Union, the USA and even some Arab countries had recognized it. He even opposed an invitation to Israel for an Afro-Asian conference until the Arab nations agreed to extend such an invitation. Even when India was in the grave peril of the Chinese aggression, Nehru declined to take weapons from Israel because Nasser opposed the deal! It is a fact as clear as daylight that all the Islamic countries are sympathetic to Pakistan and against India in its disputes with Pakistan. Pakistan's military build-up is receiving massive help from the Islamic countries. In these circumstances Israel can render substantial help to India because it has to encounter the same forces for its preservation as India has to. Israel, though small, is an advanced country and has tremendous influence with the United States. All this could have been put to India's service. But India's service was the last thing Nehru wanted. For him what counted was that Islam is more international than Judaism, it claims far larger numbers, and Nehru's dream of world leadership ill fitted with the policy of preferring Israel to the Muslim nations.

Nehru's Israel policy gave a very dangerous message to the Indian Muslims, viz., that their primary loyalties are to the Arabs and international Islam and only secondarily to their mother country.

Many Nehru admirers write as if Nehru and by implication India

was recognized as the leader of the non-aligned movement. This was by no means the case. Chou En-lai and not Nehru was the central figure at the Bandung conference; Gopal admits that he overshadowed the Indian Prime Minister. Later at the time of the Bangladesh war all the non-aligned nations condemned India, showing that far from their recognition of India as a leader, they cared little for India.

As to what the Americans thought of him we might quote the '*New York Times*' editorial of 24-6-1955:

"Nehru said as he took off from Moscow that he was leaving a part of his heart behind. We might be forgiven for thinking that he also left a part of his commonsense behind."

7. WEAKENING INDIA'S DEFENCES

A rudra's *'Memoirs'* reveal that in 1947 the three heads of the defence forces produced a Defence Paper on threats to Indian security and took it to Nehru. Nehru exploded and said, "Rubbish, total rubbish. We don't need a Defence Plan. Our policy is non-violence. We therefore see no military threats. Scrap the army. The police are good enough to meet our security-risks." (*'Organiser'*, 13-6-1999).

Some apologists for Nehru say that the army really failed in clearing Kashmir and Nehru only made a virtue of necessity by accepting the cease-fire. Recently Kuldip Nayyar has come out with the apology that it is the military generals and *not* Nehru who was responsible for the military debacle in 1962. In their opinion it is in no way the duty of a Prime Minister to take stock of possible threats and build up the country's defences; this is the duty of the generals! It is hard to believe that these apologists of Nehru would dare to spell out so clearly the share of the duties of the Prime Minister and the generals. They are not unlikely to know that the generals can only advise the government about their requirements after they are told what job they have to do. Did Nehru ever define the shape of things to come and the roles the generals would be called upon to play? If the generals had failed in their duty to be vigilant on the basis of military intelligence and warn the government in time, it was for Nehru to take action against them. This was by no means the case. "On at least six occasions in the first six months of 1962, the Army Headquarters brought to the notice of the government the low levels of stocks of ammunition and all types of necessary equipment; but on the assumption that there would be no major campaign in the near future, the government persisted in the political decision not to purchase large quantities of military requirements abroad." (Gopal)

In fact I have positive knowledge that the generals had *not* failed in their duty even earlier. I attended the meeting held for inaugurating the Defence Science Laboratory. Nehru was the principal actor in this ceremony, the then Defence Minister Krishna Menon and the Chief of

Army Staff General Thimayya were present. General Thimayya delivered the opening speech and said that there is no such thing as military preparedness for all eventualities. No country has the resources for being prepared for all eventualities. The politicians have to tell us against whom the Armed Forces have to be prepared and provide the data about the military strength of the likely enemies. The Armed Forces can then decide the lines on which they have to prepare.

It is quite obvious that General Thimayya was hinting at the possible threat from China and demanding that the Armed Forces should prepare against it.

Defence Minister Menon then got up and said:

"The general's remarks remind me of a story. I once asked my teacher, Sir, I go for long walks in the nearby forest. I am afraid some day a tiger will confront me. What should I do if a tiger confronts me? The teacher replied: 'You need not do anything. Just give a smart salute and the tiger will do the rest'."

The message which Menon wanted to convey by narrating this anecdote is obvious. The possibility of China's confronting us is as remote as the possibility of a tiger's confronting us in the "forest" near our school, and in case the possibility does become an actuality there is nothing that India can do about it but to surrender.

All this took place in the presence of Nehru. It was therefore naive on the part of General Thorat to suppose that the plan he gave for defence against China to Menon never reached Nehru and Nehru was not in the know of Menon's doings if any. The fact is, those who criticise Menon know full well that by Menon they mean Nehru, but they have no courage to say so, so they satisfy themselves by using Menon to vent their wrath. Abusing Menon involves no risk.

Nehru himself made it clear several times that Menon only implemented his policies and those who criticised Menon were in fact criticising him, and also openly charged that the move to oust Menon was a move to oust him; if Menon can be ousted in spite of his full patronage, he himself can be ousted. When the talk of ousting Menon assumed

decisive proportions in 1962, Nehru dared the Congress to sack him if it wanted to sack Menon. Mahavir Tyagi thereupon picked up courage to say that if Menon cannot go without dragging Nehru along with him, the sack of Nehru will also have to be considered. It was in the face of this showdown that Nehru agreed to sacrifice Menon. It is the unilateral cease-fire ordered by the Chinese that saved Nehru.

The US Stance

In fact, saving Nehru was one of the purposes of the cease-fire. If Nehru were sacked the new Prime Minister would surely have signed an anti-communist alliance with the USA and reopened all issues including the occupation of Tibet. The USA was in an aggressive mood in those days and would have made full use of India against China. China saw the danger of this eventuality, and saved itself by saving Nehru by ordering the cease-fire.

China wanted to give advance hint to Nehru that they were going to cease fire very soon lest Nehru join the American alliance. My surmise is that they used Nanporia the then editor of *'The Times of India'* to convey this hint. Nanporia made a forecast in the columns of *'The Times of India'* that the Chinese would cease fire soon. There is no evidence that Nanporia was such a great fortune-teller that he could foretell so accurately the Chinese manoeuvres.

America was so much concerned about Chinese intentions that it prompted Ayub Khan to propose a joint defence to Nehru. Nehru thereupon asked, "Defence against whom?" and made a laughing-stock of himself. He had declared as early as 1957 in Parliament that "there was not the remotest chance of India having any kind of military conflict with China."

If Nehru had agreed to this joint defence, America would have built up India's might even without India's joining the same pact as Pakistan. Even before Nehru declined the offer of joint defence and protested to Eisenhower for giving military aid to Pakistan, Eisenhower offered military aid to India. Nehru did not pursue the matter and ask him clarifications of what America expects in return. He rejected the offer out

of hand. Eisenhower knew full well that Nehru would not join any anti-communist alliance. So his condition could not have been that Nehru should enter into a military alliance against Russia. It is obvious that this offer was in line with the suggestion for joint defence. Even if India had not joined Pakistan in an anti-China alliance, if it could have been strengthened by American arms, China could not have easily invaded India as it did. This would have served the American purpose of containing Chinese communism. But for Nehru any help from America against a communist country smacked of "fascist" behaviour. He preferred to let India be humiliated in 1962 by China and preserve his image as an anti-fascist. One cannot help saying that Nehru was almost working for the humiliation of India. Circumstances were so favourable that the humiliation could have been easily avoided.

8. HOW NEHRU INVOLVED INDIA IN THE CHINA WAR

The seeds of this humiliation were sown when Tibet was handed over to China by Nehru on a platter. Apologists for Nehru say that there was no alternative to the surrender of Tibet; that refusal to do so would have invited a showdown with China and this was the last thing India was prepared for. There is not a grain of truth in this. Nobody in the world, not even Russia, wanted China in Tibet. China occupied Aksai Chin in Kashmir claiming it as part of Tibet, built a road to Pakistan and thus like the US gained the capacity to use Pakistan territory as a springboard against Russia.

Henderson, the US ambassador, clearly hinted that the state department would gladly help if asked. (Gopal)

When China's letter declaring its resolve to "liberate" Tibet from Indian "imperialism" was received and Nehru was in favour of meekly succumbing to it, Sardar Patel tendered the following advice:

"Very soon the Chinese will disown all the stipulations which Tibet has entered into with us in the past. The undefined state of the frontier and the existence on our side of a population with its affinities to Tibetans or Chinese have all the elements of potential trouble between China and ourselves."

Nehru ignored the advice. He was so sure that China had no evil designs that as late as 1958 he allowed a Chinese military mission to tour India's major defence establishments. (M. J. Akbar: *'Nehru: The Making of India'*)

The whole world regarded China's occupation of Tibet as an act of aggression. The Dalai Lama wanted *status quo* in Tibet, i.e., the presence of the Indian army and all the privileges in Tibet which the British government in Delhi had enjoyed. The Independence of India Act passed by the British Parliament regarded India as the successor government with all the privileges inherited from the British Government of India excepting those which were specifically granted to Pakistan. Nehru could

very easily have said that Tibet is not China and that Tibetans are not Chinese, that they did not want India to get out and even if they did so that is no reason why they should allow the Chinese to occupy their country. The legal rights of China in Tibet are irrelevant. On 'legal' grounds India's freedom struggle itself was unjustifiable because the British were the lawful rulers of India. India supports the principle of self-determination and it is for the Tibetans and *not* the Chinese to decide who should rule them.

The whole world would have endorsed this stand not only morally but also militarily. America was eager to contain communism and it is doubtful whether even Russia would have opposed a UN action against China for the defence of Tibet. Nehru's helplessness is an empty excuse.

It is a sad commentary on Nehru's philosophy that he thought of a plebiscite in deciding Kashmir's accession when nobody ever doubted that Kashmir was an integral part of India, but was very eager to hand over Tibet in spite of the protests of Tibetans themselves represented by the Dalai Lama. Nehru's loyalty to communism outweighed his loyalty to his own country.

The Dalai Lama was reluctant to go back to Tibet after its occupation by China. But Nehru persuaded him to go back and even assured him that he would not be ill treated by the Chinese. He could never understand that in the eyes of the Chinese as well as the rest of the world his so-called "charisma" and "world leadership" existed only in his delusions and those of some among the Indian intelligentsia. When the Dalai Lama complained of ill treatment Nehru declared his intention to visit Tibet to sort things out. On hearing of his intention to visit Tibet the Chinese government curtly declared that it had not permitted Nehru to visit Tibet and did not recognize his title to sort things out in Chinese territory. Thereupon Nehru satisfied himself by visiting Sikkim instead of Tibet.

Indo-Tibetan Border

It has to be noted in this connection that the border between India and Tibet was fixed by the British government in India and the representative of Tibet. The Viceroy had invited the Chinese also to participate in

the boundary demarcation talks. But the Chinese said that they would boycott the talks if Tibet presumed to sit along with the Chinese; Tibet is part of China and it cannot have any separate say in fixing the boundary which is Sino-Indian boundary and *not* Indo-Tibetan boundary. Thereupon the Viceroy went ahead with the boundary talks with the Tibetans and finalized the boundary. This shows that the Viceroy had not accepted Chinese sovereignty over Tibet and did not regard China's consent essential for fixing the Indo-Tibetan boundary. Nehru did not realize the elementary fact that by conceding that Tibet was part of China he had himself questioned the legality of the Indo-Tibetan border. He naively went on swearing with the boundary accepted by the British. In fact China is wholly right in maintaining that it has never accepted the Indo-Tibetan border which Nehru was harping upon. G. S. Bajpeyi and K. P. S. Menon advised Nehru that India should not withdraw her garrisons from Gyantse and Yatung without securing Chinese acceptance of the British-recognized boundaries of India and Tibet. But Nehru was in a hurry to make a gift of Tibet to China in the hope that he would acquire a prominent place in the history of international communism by favouring a communist nation. He pooh-poohed the advice of Bajpeyi, K. P. S. Menon and others in the External Affairs Ministry by saying that "no major challenge to these frontiers is likely in the near future."

But as usual, Nehru's naivety was exposed and the major challenge to the Tibetan border came soon. Since the border itself was in dispute there was friction between the Chinese and Indian border-posts. Nehru thought of his "forward policy" to wriggle out of the situation. The "forward policy" means that we stealthily push our posts forward. It is a fact that the Indian posts were ahead in 1962 as compared to those in 1959. This led to local skirmishes, the news of which leaked out to the Indian people. They were naturally outraged and demanded stern action on the part of Nehru. Pressed by this, Nehru ordered military action against the Chinese.

In September 1962 Corps Commander Umrao Singh of the North East Frontier Agency - now Arunachal Pradesh - received the notorious command of Nehru to "throw out the Chinese". Umrao Singh pleaded that the equipment at his disposal was meagre for such a task and he should

be given six months' time for preparation in addition to the speedy delivery of the necessary equipment. Nehru did not heed this and replaced Umrao Singh by his favourite B. M. Kaul.

This is only one example of how Nehru had emphatic opinions on matters about which he knew nothing. He once said in Parliament, "I wonder how much Prof. Ranga knows about war." N. G. Ranga replied, "As much as the Prime Minister does." On this Nehru issued to himself a certificate, "Then you know a good deal." The basis of this self-opinion came to light when he gave a harangue in Parliament saying that Chengiz Khan was the greatest General known to history. Apparently any history reader can claim to be an expert in war.

It should be noted that before the Nehru-sponsored "throw out the Chinese" action, the Chinese had not attacked; they were only intruding on the border, the legality of which was thrown in doubt by Nehru's acknowledging Tibet as Chinese territory. The Nehru-ordered attack on a division scale provided the Chinese the excuse to pose theirs as a defensive action. Maxwell, the well-known journalist, wrote a book '*India's China War*' accusing India of starting the war.

Nehru's Complacency

Nehru ignored the Chinese threat in the belief that the Chinese leaders did not mean business, that Chinese army was on the border just to deter India from attacking Tibet, and an attack on the Chinese outpost would not be treated by the Chinese as an attack on the Chinese army. All this speaks very poorly of the intelligence of Nehru.

It is shocking to see that he had no idea of the strength of the Chinese. He declared that he had issued orders to "throw out" the Chinese as if they were a handful of men with guns trespassing on his Teen Murti place, and proceeded on his usual foreign tour. The army took action against the small Chinese pickets who according to Nehru had intruded into Indian territory. It is undeniable that the army, like their boss Nehru, did not see that the Chinese must have been backed by a substantial force and that that force must be very near the pickets. If they did not know this by sheer common sense, military intelligence should have warned them

that a powerful Chinese force was near and ready to strike. But it did not do so; on the contrary Lt.-Gen. Sen reported that the strength of the Chinese force at the border was in the neighbourhood of 600, when in fact it was 10,000 ('Tarun Bharat', 13-6-1999). This force could not have come to the borders of India overnight; the Chinese in division strength were already on the Indian border.

We deployed our best division, the fourth division, which is all we had to contend with the Chinese. Our best division was smashed by the Chinese with one blow; it could not even retreat and regroup, its very striking power was knocked out, the survivors were either captured or ran to more interior places within the country. The whole equipment fell into the hands of the Chinese.

The Debacle

The government never came out with full facts about the debacle. Gen. B.M. Kaul and Brig. J.P. Dalvi have written accounts of it; but these accounts are mostly designed to defend the writers and the army. This does not mean that the accounts have no historical value. The government instituted an inquiry called the Henderson Brooks inquiry. The report of this inquiry was never published. No action was taken against the guilty as a result of the inquiry. The most important thing is that the inquiry was at the bureaucratic level and by its very nature could not have thrown light on the doings of the main culprit, viz., Nehru.

Recently Col. Machad and Col. Halloor have revealed that 20,000 jawans died in that fateful week; they had ammunition sufficient for 50 rounds only and it ran out in half an hour. ('Tarun Bharat', 13-6-1999)

It was given out that the Chinese fought with automatic weapons whereas the Indians fought with outmoded 303, in which each shot has to be loaded separately. It was also said that the Chinese used the Maratha technique of *ghola*, i.e., encircling the enemy by flanking movements, remaining at a safe distance from him. It is reported that Brig. Hussian Singh, a brave officer in the Indian army, advised against the policy of retreat, since encircling the enemy by remaining at a considerable distance from him exposes the invading force to the danger of having its retreat

cut off. The Indian army did not try to cut off the retreat of the Chinese. It did not even manage its own orderly retreat. Orderly retreat is the minimum that one expects from the army even if it is confronted by an overwhelmingly superior force.

I have given above the substance of what appeared in the press and other published accounts. It is obvious that there was criminal neglect of our defences. The armed forces were not to blame for this as is clear from General Thimayya's suggestion that we must prepare against the Chinese. This was pooh-poohed by Nehru and Menon. "The army did not have even blankets," the complaint went. Menon had declared in Parliament that the defence factories were idle because they had already produced the needed defence equipment, they therefore produced goods of civilian use like coffee-percolating machines. Morarji Desai the then Finance Minister said that he sanctioned money for the coffee percolating machines in the belief that 'C. P. M.' was a missile! The Nehru government cannot escape the sole responsibility for the debacle.

1962 witnessed the all-round degradation of our defence, poor morale, poor tactics, poor equipment. This was the state of the army which had fought a world war just 17 years ago and was found equal to any other army in the world. If this was not the doing of the Prime Minister who had the whole and sole power in these 17 years, who else should be held responsible for it?

The degradation of morale was the most painful. Convent education became the rule of the day under Nehruism. The essence of this education is to instil shame about their own nationality in the minds of the young. "Aping the Englishman from holding the dinner knife to speech mannerisms and music is the end-all and be-all of life." The cultural education in the army, both formal and the one imbibed in mess life, is on the same lines. It was customary to use the abuse "*kalu*", i.e., "blacky", parroting the English, the parrots forgetting that they were "blackies" themselves.

It might be said that this army culture was not an innovation by Nehru. It was there in the British days also. Why then did it not affect the army in their times? The answer is obvious. In the British days the high officer ranks were entirely British. The highest Indian officer

K. M. Cariappa was only a colonel. The morale of the army was maintained by the British command as well as by the knowledge that the world's best resources were available to the army through the British empire.

Nehru's farewell to the people of Tejpur made it clear that he had no intention to make a stand anywhere. The fourth division was our best division and with its rout the whole defence collapsed. There was no army on the border of Pakistan to prevent any Pakistani invasion which was prevented only by America's saying "No".

Skewed Priorities

In this hour of grave peril for the country Nehru was more interested in his international image than in the defence of the country. When every soldier was needed for the defence of the country, Nehru sent more troops than any other country to execute a United Nations mission in Congo, and said shamelessly that "even urgent requirements at home should not upset the plans of the United Nations or come in the way of our international commitments" (Nehru's reply in the Lok Sabha).

Nehru deluded himself by supposing that he knew a good deal about war as well as strategy. It is due to his order that the Air Force could not be used against the Chinese. Our ground forces were exposed to the enemy fire without air-cover. Nehru said that if we use the Air Force against the Chinese they would bombard our cities. He did not have the common sense to understand that the first priority of an invading army is to defeat the home army and not to waste precious petrol and bombs for killing civilians living thousands of miles away.

Some people blame Nehru for not resigning after the debacle. But this is barking up the wrong tree. It was for the M P s to throw out Nehru. If the majority was still with him we have to blame the pusillanimity of the majority, not the person who had every right to stay on if he commanded the majority. People get the government they deserve, it is no use blaming the rulers.

Maxwell asked the Chinese leaders why they undertook an attack on India on a division scale when they could have easily pushed back the

Indians without such a massive attack. The reply he received is best summed up by Felix Bandarnaike's report at Delhi. According to this report the Chinese wanted to prove that "China is one head taller than what India imagined herself to be". Liu Xiaqi said that "the chief purpose of their military campaign has been to demolish India's arrogance and delusions of grandeur". Chou En-lai's description of Nehru as the most arrogant leader he had ever seen makes obvious that "arrogance and delusions of grandeur" are references to Nehru's poses.

Though Nehru was not sacked after the debacle, the balloon of his greatness was punctured and he was shattered. Some say he died because of this shock but the doctors do not agree with this. Gopal's biography of Nehru gives the cause of his death authentically. In fact Nehru had begun to realize that his pose of world leadership did not deceive anyone excepting the English-educated Indians. His utterances on the occasion of the Chinese invasion are a confession leaving no doubt. He said: "We were living in an imaginary world of our own making." He was wrong in roping in others by using the word "we". He was the sole maker of the "imaginary world". After the Chinese invasion it is doubtful whether any sensible person took the talk of Nehru's world leadership seriously.

In spite of this Nehru was still cashing in on the gullibility of the Indian people. In a speech at Amritsar in 1963 he said: "The Chinese invasion of India has done more harm to China than to India"! Though he thus added insult to the injury he caused to the country, he was not hooted out for this shameless utterance. Mir Jaffar could as well have said that the battle of Plassey did more harm to the British than to the Nabab rulers of Bengal and Bajirao II could as well have boasted that the treaty of Vasai by which he signed away Maratha sovereignty was a feather in his cap and taint on the British power.

Nepal is another example of the perverse nature of Nehru's foreign policy. There was a rebellion in Nepal against the Ranas, the hereditary Prime Ministers of Nepal. This rebellion was said to have restored real power to the titular king. The Ranas crushed the rebellion and the king took refuge in India. Nehru told the Ranas that India cannot recognize the Rana regime unless it democratized Nepal. Reports also appeared in the press that this was not a mere suggestion; the Indian army actually made moves into Nepal. The Ranas had to agree and set up democratic institutions in Nepal.

This disturbed the stability in Nepal. It threw up the communists. The results were in no way in the interests of India. Nepal began to look to China as its protector. Nehru did not realize that China can dig up history to claim that China had suzerainty over Nepal as well and transform Nepal into another Tibet.

It has to be noted that Nepal had once wanted to accede to India. Nehru's policy made a foe of a friend.

It should be noted further that Nehru did not bother if democracy was scuttled in Pakistan and Tibet. It is only in Hindu Nepal that he thought it fit to interfere on the excuse of concern for democracy! Hindu-baiting was the key-note of Nehru policies. He missed no opportunity to revile the Maharaja of Kashmir but never said a word against the Nizam.

Another example is that of the Kalat in Baluchistan. This Muslim state wanted to accede to India. If the accession had been accepted it would have been a vindication of the principle that India is a successor government to the British; it has not been partitioned into Hindu and Muslim areas; the Pakistan areas have seceded from it, the rest is India whether Hindu or Muslim, and thus the Kalat state is part of India. But Nehru was incapable of thinking of Hindus and Muslims as one nation.

Nehru's perception of Indian nationhood as a dustbin of invading tribes was at the root of his anti-national outlook on all issues and his defence policy was no exception to this. If as he said the Mughals were national rulers, the Pakistanis can hardly be described as aliens. Culturally and historically they were part and parcel of this country. Again for a man who is a non-card-holding communist an invasion by China is no foreign invasion; it is 'liberation'. Why should then Nehru be serious in taking steps against the Pakistani and Chinese aggressions? The only hitch in Nehru's thinking was that he himself was ruling India and therefore any invasion of India could not have but affected him personally. Torn between these two pulls, Nehru was very half-hearted about India's defence.

He was more concerned about Pakistan, not because he regarded Pakistan as a foreign country but because it was allied with the "capitalist" camp. This was some reason for resisting Pakistan apart from the threat to his personal position. He therefore satisfied himself by buying some ill-assorted arms from Western countries and Russia. He did not think that more preparation was necessary because of his dogma that in the twentieth century no country would attack another country; if it does there would be a world war; we shall be on the side of some one and our military needs will be looked after by our ally.

When the Chinese belied his calculations and attacked in spite of their living in the "twentieth century", not like a "fascist" and a "reactionary" country but a "progressive" communist country, Nehru came out with the foulest abuse in his repertory. "They belong to the 18th century", he said. Thus Nehru had the centuries while the Chinese had the territory.

The Chinese attack came in 1962. Nehru saved himself by sacrificing Menon and was made to accept Yashwantrao Chavan as Defence Minister. It was supposed that Chavan would work for military preparedness. When therefore Lal Bahadur Shastri took the decision to attack Pakistan in 1965, it was thought that three years of military preparation

under Chavan was so massive that we could walk into Pakistan with impunity. It is obvious that the Chief of Army Staff was of this opinion, otherwise he would not have advised an invasion of Pakistan.

But the 1965 war made the shocking revelation that not only our political leaders but also our military commanders were naive with regard to war. Our attack on Lahore failed ignominiously; we tried to compensate for it by trying to take Sialkot, but there too no success attended our arms. On the contrary Pakistan itself launched an attack on India in the Khemkaran sector. The target of that attack was Delhi itself.

Fortunately the attack failed and Delhi was saved, but Pakistan remained in occupation of some Indian territory in the Khemkaran sector. Later, after cease-fire, Pakistan intruded into some areas of Rajasthan and could not be dislodged from there by the Indian force sent from Ahmedabad. The Pakistani force took the Indian commander and some jawans as prisoners. The net result of the Indian attack on Lahore and the Pakistani counter-attack in the Khemkaran sector was that India occupied some areas in the Lahore sector and Pakistan occupied some areas in the Khemkaran sector.

At this stage a stalemate was reached. Pakistan could not dislodge India from the Lahore sector nor could India dislodge Pakistan from the Khemkaran sector.

In this war our jawans had to face Pakistan's Bonn-made cobra missile while we had nothing to counter it with thanks to Nehru's refusal in 1958 to approve the proposal of L. N. Mishra, Minister of State for Defence, to acquire a missile for the Indian Army. ('*Organiser*', May 3, 1969).

After about two weeks of fighting the Indian press started saying that Pakistan's ammunition had run out. It is known from usually reliable sources that India was in no better position, the Indian ammunition was also at rock bottom. This forced a cease-fire, though the official cease-fire came a week later.

The cease-fire was first accepted by India and later by Pakistan. In this Pakistan hoped to grab some areas in the Rajasthan sector not guarded by the Indian army.

This is the bald picture of the 1965 war which is regarded as an example of Indian military prowess in some circles. In fact this is a pitiable example of the utter lack of judgement in our intelligentsia which cannot even properly assess what appeared in newspapers and was easily deluded by the propaganda that the Indian army could easily have occupied Lahore but desisted from doing so because the occupation of Lahore would have thrown the responsibility of feeding the Lahorians on us and this was more than what we could afford. A greater proof of the gullibility of the Indian intelligentsia is that many of them believe the propaganda that the occupation of Lahore would have involved street fighting and destruction of the buildings of Lahore. This was repugnant to India since Lahore was after all a part of India only a few decades ago and the destruction of Lahore buildings would have meant we are destroying our own buildings. Lest anybody takes this as a joke he should read Girilal Jain's articles on the 1965 war in '*The Times of India*.'

The 1965 war was a clear proof of the extent to which Nehru weakened the defences of India. When Nehru assumed office India was the greatest military power in Asia. Pakistan had only eight tanks and no Air Force and India could have walked into Pakistan at will. After 17 years of Nehru rule China could annihilate the Indian defence in a week and make a laughing-stock of it.

PART II
THE FALL-OUT OF
THE NEHRU FIEFDOM

Nehru weakened the defence of India, not only in the realm of equipment but also in respect of morale and political culture. In a democracy it is expected that the Armed Forces should not take sides in the disputes of political parties; they should back whichever government is duly elected. But Nehru in the heart of his hearts not only spurned the Constitution, but also was averse to a democracy based on adult franchise. He had contempt for the Indian masses which he openly expressed in a letter to Krishna Menon. (Gopal). He was also toying with the idea of indirect democracy. The larger the electorate the more difficult it is to manipulate it. Nehru's objective was to perpetuate dynastic rule. He inducted Indira Gandhi into politics by an undisguised suggestion in the Working Committee. When a member timidly protested saying that Indira Gandhi was not keeping well Nehru snubbed him.

The Kamaraj plan to oust stalwarts like Morarji Desai and S. K. Patil from the cabinet was mainly intended to pave the way for Indira Gandhi. Shastri was brought in to look after Nehru's work when Nehru was ill. But this was merely a cover. Nehru clearly saw that in view of his health, he could not count on many days in power and wanted Indira Gandhi to take over in his lifetime. But he wanted it to appear as a spontaneous development and not something engineered by him. Shastri was expected to help in this play-acting. Veiled suggestions were made to him that he should say that the work was beyond him and it should be allotted to Indira. Shastri pretended to be naive but went on saying that he could handle any task with Nehru's blessings. Nehru then gradually stopped sending files to him to make his leading questions more explicit. If Nehru had lived longer Shastri would surely have been sacked. But Nehru died sooner than he expected and when Shastri was in the saddle. The whole Congress thought that Shastri was Nehru's successor appointed by Nehru himself. This was the main reason why the Congress supported him for donning Nehru's mantle.

There was another reason for Nehru and later the Congress to

support Shastri for Prime Ministership. Shastri both in appearance and behaviour appeared meek and submissive. Nehru expected him to quake in managing the Prime Minister's job. The Congress "syndicate" also thought that it could keep power in its hands by making Shastri Prime Minister. A strong and self-willed man like Morarji Desai would not be amenable to taming by the syndicate.

Nehru thus being temperamentally given to personal and dynastic rule wanted the Armed Forces to have loyalty to him and his family. How this tendency worked havoc with the political culture and morale of the Armed Forces has been narrated by Brig. M. M. Sharma in his book. (Review in the *Hitavada*)

In order to make the Armed Forces a tool in the hands of the Nehru family it was necessary to fill the top-ranking posts in the army by officers who were loyal to the Nehru family. Nehru's policy of weakening the army and meddling with it ignorantly has lowered the prestige of the army in the eyes of the young. "A career in the commissioned ranks of the Armed Forces was the first choice of Indian youth in 1947. It is now the eighth choice according to a survey carried out by the service headquarters." This is a sad state of affairs, since the Armed Forces need manpower on a colossal scale and the unpopularity of military service among the youth would make the Armed Forces suffer in both quality and quantity. Nehru interfered with the military command. This led to increasing litigation by military officers to seek redress. Another measure of the discontent caused by this interference is that sometimes the number of officers seeking premature retirement has reached 40%.

Till 1953 the Armed Forces used the system of Queen's regulation. According to this system the civil authorities seldom interfered with promotions. But in 1953 the government decided to make the Defence Minister an active participant in decisions about promotions.

It is obvious that the Defence Minister can have only political reasons for his decisions on promotions; about the military merit of the officers he has hardly any reason to differ with the military command. This resulted in introducing political leanings in the Armed Forces, a highly undesirable development in a democratic country.

Lateral induction of army officers in the Ministry of Defence practised by all countries was stopped by Nehru in 1959. India has a professional army with no national military service with the result that our young men by and large are completely ignorant of war. Just imagine the Defence Ministry manned entirely by civilians who have not even read books on war, in complete command of one of the largest armies in the world!

Nehru's Anglophilism resulted in another shameful phenomenon which is becoming pressing now. The British raised an army of 25 lakhs in the Second World War when the population of India was half of what it is now. They never complained that the army is short of either officers or jawans. But now with double the population, the army is complaining that it is not only short of officers but also is finding it difficult to get enough jawans. The reason is that the British thought that they could manage even with illiterate recruits, but our Anglicized army now wants even jawans to have some knowledge of English. This is a tall order in a country where the majority is illiterate.

The incapacities inflicted on India by Nehruism remind one of Tukaram's verse wherein he narrates how a military officer put in charge of defending a caravan with a strong contingent to assist him allowed the caravan to be looted by brigands, and justified his incompetence by saying that he could not fight against the brigands because they were a neat group of four whereas he was having a crowd of 20, his knees were chained to the saddle and his hands busy in managing the reins, when he left the reins his hands were tied to the sword and the shield!

12.

BALKANIZATION

Just as weakening of India's defence was one of the "achievements" of Nehru, Balkanization was another. At this remark some readers will at once jump to the subject of linguistic distribution of states. I must make it clear at once that linguistic re-organisation of states is necessary and would have been beneficial if it had been made according to its original conception. It is wrong to suppose that Nehru was responsible for the linguistic states. On the contrary he tried his level best to sabotage linguistic re-organisation and it is because of his opposition that linguistic distribution has taken a form making its utility questionable.

Nagaland

The specifically Nehru policies of Balkanization had their most harmful effects in Assam. Nagaland was established as a separate state though it had a population of 400,000 and a revenue of only half a million rupees. Assam has further been Balkanized into nearly half a dozen tiny states. Nehru aided and abetted the separatist forces in these states. The states are so tiny that the separatist tendencies in them could easily have been curbed by a mixture of firmness and tact.

But Nehru's firmness and tact, if any, were reserved for serving the anti-national forces. Nagaland is the most deplorable example. The separatist movement in Nagaland was fostered by the missionaries and it is largely the converted Nagas who rose against the country. At the advent of Independence there were only 200 Christians in Nagaland as pointed out by Shastri, a prominent Assam politician. Now it is said that Nagaland is mainly a Christian state. The Christian population in Assam in 1951 was 4,87,331. It shot up to 7,64,553 as a result of 10 years of Nehru rule ('Organiser', May 31, 1969). There was an outcry against the missionaries. The Madhya Pradesh Chief Minister Ravi Shankar Shukla appointed a commission under Justice Niyogi to inquire into the activities of the missionaries. The commission submitted its report and it is there for all to see.

Nehru came down heavily on Ravi Shankar Shukla and Justice Niyogi. The ouster of Ravi Shankar Shukla from politics was mainly due to his patriotic work in exposing the missionaries. Nehru gave the missionaries a free hand. Father Verrier Elwin, an English missionary, was his adviser about Nagaland. Nehru did not see it fit to take advice from prominent Nagas themselves, among whom Hindu Nagas like Rani Gaidouli would have been immensely useful. He in fact did not regard the Nagas as Hindus, being under the influence of the missionaries who spread the canard that the Nagas are animists and not Hindus. Animists are those who attribute a soul to natural objects and phenomena. In this sense the animists, far from being non-Hindus, are emphasizing a distinctive feature of Hinduism, viz., pantheism. The worship of the cow and the pipal are the outcome of pantheism. But Nehru was not interested in truth; he was interested in promoting everything that is anti-Hindu. This is obvious from his tendency to decry all attempts to bring the tribals in the mainstream of Indian nationhood by saying that the tribals should not be "drowned in the sea of Indian humanity" (Gopal). At the same time he saw nothing wrong in their conversion to Christianity.

That the missionaries are not merely religious workers but subverters of nationhood was as clear as daylight to those who have the interest of the country at heart. It did seem that in the Naga areas missionaries were involved in fostering anti-national sentiments. A letter had been circulated to pastors requesting them to celebrate 5th April as Naga independence day in their churches and chapels. Phizo, the Naga leader who was wanted for murder, had contacts with the missionary Scott. Nehru permitted him to visit Nagaland. Besides the missionaries, the Nagas had contacts with East Pakistan also.

Nehru disallowed the army to use stern measures against the Nagas and declared that the army is unable to curb the Naga yearning for "independence" which was itself a creature of missionary tutelage. Nehru's panegyrist Gopal very lightly reports that the army was not equal to the task of subduing the Naga rebellion, without mentioning that it was not allowed to do so by Nehru. The army was expressly ordered *not* to use machine-guns and planes against the Nagas. Nehru wrote to the Governor of Assam:

"People fighting in the Naga areas for what they considered their freedom could not be treated on par with ordinary criminals in the settled parts of India and would be pardoned, with only serious cases being referred to the Naga council" (not to military courts or even to criminal courts where those who had the misfortune of being Hindus under Nehru rule, were tried).

In other words any section of people living in India which according to Nehru was non-Hindu, is free to declare itself independent of the country and claim immunity from the law. There is no evidence of the Nagas' ever being regarded as non-Hindus and *ipso facto* outside our nationhood, nor did the Nagas themselves ever claim a separate national status. This claim was specifically a missionary coinage and Nehru was very eager to accept it because through the missionaries he hoped to enhance his international image. That this would aggravate secessionist tendencies elsewhere was no concern of his. Movements like that for Khalistan were encouraged by such actions of Nehru.

The Nehru apologists cite Nehru's attitude to the DMK movement in Tamil Nadu, in order to show that he was a champion of national unity. Nehru "made it clear, in the face of loose talk about secession, that he was prepared even for a war to put down any effort at separation" (Gopal). "How then can Nehru be charged of siding with the secessionists?" it is asked.

The answer is that the DMK-plank was not that they are not Hindus and therefore they are entitled to special treatment. They swore by Tamil nationalism which has its roots in India at least for 2000 years. Encouragement to DMK separatism was therefore not an encouragement to an anti-Hindu movement but in a way a strengthening of a form of Hindu Rashtra though separate as a state. The DMK was not for anglicization and Christianity like the Nagas, they were for a thoroughly indigenous nationhood.

The Naga rebellion does not fall in this category; it was anti-Hindu. Theirs was therefore a legitimate freedom movement according to Nehru. The Khalistan movement in his eyes had the same legitimacy because the Khalistanis deny that they are Hindus.

Nehru hated the Hindus. His contempt for the Hindus was aggravated by the adoration which the Hindus heaped on him. It was like the adoration of the master by a slave. A slave seldom inspires anything but contempt in the mind of his master by his adoration.

Nehru announced a general amnesty to the Nagas for all acts against the state and ruled out military operations. A large number of regular battalions were withdrawn. Nehru brazenly boasted that he was "not aware of any instance in any country where a government acted with such friendliness to win over an insurrectionary group." Yes, certainly, because no other country is ruled by a man who regards the country's interests expendable for his imagined international image. Gopal has to admit that "the spectacle of soldiers standing by while the initiative passed to about 150 armed Nagas, created a general impression of weakness." It is not generally known that the Nagas are exempt from income-tax even if they are roiling in wealth. In Nehru's India treason became a pass for entry into the chamber of state favours.

Goa Liberation

When Goa was liberated, there was a demand for its merger with neighbouring Maharashtra. There is a party called Maharashtravadi Gomantak in Goa. It won several elections in Goa. Since the party stands for merger with Maharashtra it should be assumed that its victory in elections was indicative of popular support for the merger of Goa in Maharashtra. The Goanese used Marathi in education, Konkani was used only at home. The Encyclopedia Britannica says that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi. But though for Nehru this Encyclopedia was a gospel on many other points he differed with it on this point. He further said that Goa was a bastion of Portuguese culture and it should remain separate from Maharashtra lest that culture be swallowed by Marathi culture. He actively worked so that the Western and Christian culture swallows the Naga culture, but did not want the Goans to return to their parent culture from which the Portuguese had alienated them by force and fraud. For Nehru Hyderabad had Mughal culture; Goa had Portuguese culture; Pondicherry had French culture and the rest of India had English culture; and as to Hindu culture, "What creature is called by that name?"

This culture business was based on religion in Goa. It was largely the Christian population of Goa that insisted on not being Marathi. It is they who were the claimants of Portuguese culture. But it is doubtful whether they were very insistent on this. It is reported that after the Goa police action many of them started reviving their Hindu ancestry. Henry Satyanatha became plain Satyanatha. But it was Nehru's consistent policy to foment separatism. His refusal to recognize Goa as Marathi encouraged the Goan Christians in their separatism. The Nehruist Congress actually canvassed against merger with Maharashtra. The result was that the Portuguese culture could muster a majority in the referendum held on the issue of merger and Goa was alienated from Maharashtra and its parent culture. It was encouraged to keep aloof from the mainstream of Indian nationhood.

Telangana

Nehru's tendency to encourage treason by being soft was seen not only in his dealings with the secessionists like the Nagas but also with those who rose against the government itself to dethrone it by revolution with the aid of foreign powers. Being a communist at heart he saw nothing wrong in communists' trying to overthrow his "capitalist" government by acting as agents of Stalin. This is clear from his treatment of the Telangana rebellion. This was a communist rebellion, the most dangerous form of which was seen in the Telangana area of Andhra. Travancore-Cochin, Tripura, Manipur, Malabar, Andhra, parts of West Bengal, Bihar, Eastern Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra were also affected. In Hyderabad, the communists were in league with the *razakars* and fought the Indian army. The communists said that "Sardar Patel's army" went to Hyderabad "to perpetuate the Nizam and the bourgeois feudal rule of the Congress government from the rising tide of the forces of democratic revolution."

These communists had planned an all-India uprising by bringing about a railway strike. Nehru himself was condemned as a "Fascist" (the phrase he often used in connection with the RSS and the like) plotting against the working class at the behest of the "Anglo-American capital". It is only when Nehru's policies were seen to be pro-communist that

Palme Dutt advised the withdrawal of the uprising after three years of headache to the whole country.

It is instructive to see Nehru's reaction to this movement. He said that action would have to be taken against persons subverting law and order but this should be in accordance with normal legal procedures. It was not reported in the press how many of the rebels were hanged as a result of "normal legal procedures". It was reported on the other hand that Nehru used his position to get the death sentences against many of the Telangana rebels commuted (Gopal). At that time Rajagopalachari was Governor-General and he proposed that the Russians who were found to be in league with the communist rebels should be expelled from India. Nehru vehemently opposed this.

In dealing with insurrections the British never treated the rebels as individuals and wait for punishing anybody until evidence was found against that particular individual. Being a party to the rebellion was enough to invite the extreme penalties of the law. Hundreds of Hurs were hanged from tree-tops in the Hur rebellion in Sindh, under martial law and not under "normal legal procedures".

Traitors Nurtured

As a result of such policies, terrorist outfits like the Naxalites, the PWG in Assam, the numerous *senas* in Bihar, the Khalistanis like Bhindranvale in Punjab, multiplied in the country and the Nehruist governments went on encouraging them by not only not punishing, but even "rehabilitating" them after surrender. Not only were traitors not punished, on the contrary the Indian Army personnel were sent to life imprisonment for being "harsh on the extremists, who poor fellows take to extremism because of their hard economic conditions." Thus rebellion against the government became an easy way to earn one's livelihood in India.

The main reason for this softness was that the Telangana rebels were the co-ideologues of Nehru. If Nehru were not himself the Prime Minister, he would have supported the Telangana rising against his own elected government, because elections in a capitalist country, according to com-

munism, are a capitalist device to retain its power and not a reflection of the will of the people. He therefore wrote to the Chief Ministers of states not to take action against the communist rebels, and sang the praises of civil liberty. His love for civil liberties had vanished when he banned the RSS on trumped-up charges and ruined many a household. He complained, "We are getting very unpopular in other countries and our reputation now is that of a police state suppressing individual freedom." (By this he meant the freedom of communists to betray their own country). There is not a jot of evidence that any country excepting perhaps the Soviet Union disliked the action against the communists.

Bidhan Chandra Roy, the Chief Minister of Bengal, ignored Nehru's advice and banned the communist party. Nehru condemned this as a practice befitting a police state.

Nehru's softness towards Indian communists was dictated by his desire to please their Russian and Chinese masters, not by any desire to serve this country's interests. The same indifference to the interests of the country was seen in his dealings with the African countries. He clamoured against the racialism practised against the Africans by the British. Lord Swinton, the British Commonwealth Secretary, took exception to this as interference in the British domestic affairs. Indians who were living in Africa will testify that the racial discrimination practised by the Africans against the Indians is far worse than that practised by the white. The white, however bad, did not expel the Indians from their dominions; the Indians were allowed to carry on their vocations, they were only restricted to certain localities; the white practised a form of untouchability on the Indians. But the Africans just threw out the Indians when they came to power. The Indians employed by the British had to flee to Britain where alone their continued livelihood was possible. Nehru never raised his voice against this racialism of the black. On the contrary Nehru and his likes condemn the Indians for "exploiting" the black population. Exploitation, in their terminology, means successfully competing with the locals in trade. Instead of admiring the Indian community for prospering in trade wherever it went, these "progressives" justify the ill treatment of the Indians by blaming it on their success in business. Nehru never took up the cause of overseas Indians because taking up the cause of Indians is parochialism, not internationalism befitting a 'world leader' like him.

13.

"A BAR PER THOUSAND"

We have seen how Nehru sabotaged the Directive Principles of the Constitution enjoining the government to give a common code to all the citizens. He made fun of another directive principle, viz., the one about prohibition. He ridiculed the prohibition laws as "virtue promoting". "Such virtue promoting laws should not be passed in haste," he enjoined. He could not openly criticise the Constitution but it was in his power to sabotage it. So "go slow" instead of "don't". "Go slow" with regard to any legislation is understandable if the people are not prepared for it. But the prohibition movement was part of the freedom movement since the days of Tilak; prohibition was introduced by Congress governments as far back as 1937. Some parties tried to make an issue of it in elections but did not get any response from the electorate. Recent events in Tamil Nadu and Andhra have shown that prohibition is very popular among women and governments can fall by going slow in prohibition. So the conclusion is inescapable that Nehru advised "go slow" in prohibition because in the heart of his hearts he approved of drinking. M. O. Mathai assures us that Nehru did not drink. This only means that he was not an *habitual* drinker. But that he was by no means a teetotaler can be gauged by what is reported in the Rao couple's '1000 Days'. The report goes: Nehru was enjoying a drink and criticising Gandhi for his outmoded view on prohibition, when Gandhi was sitting on the floor below. This is in keeping with Nehru's mode of thinking. He hardly cared for scientifically ascertained facts. If drinking was fashionable in the West it could not be bad. In "independent" India drinking has acquired a prestige which it never had before. Some people may thank Nehru for this. It is therefore necessary to point out a few facts. It is very often said that if drinking is so bad the West should have perished by now, but far from perishing, it is the model of civilization.

What exactly do these apologists for alcohol mean by 'perishing'? It is true that every one who sips a peg does not become an alcoholic, nor does he become incapable of earning his livelihood. But the incidence of this is very high. There are eight million alcoholics in America. This comes

to about 4 per cent. Alcoholics are people who cannot do anything except drink, they have to be maintained at state expense. One million deaths a year are attributed directly to alcohol in Russia. Crime and abstention from work have reached menacing proportions. This is what prompted Gorbachev to introduce prohibition.

It is supposed in "high" society that alcohol is less harmful than hemp, marijuana and hashish. '*Abnormal Psychology*' by Coleman nails this lie. Compared to alcohol, these drugs are almost harmless and an expert committee appointed by the Government of India recommended their legalization.

Nehru's complacent attitude towards alcohol gave a fillip to the drink habit in an unprecedented manner. The Chief Minister of Maharashtra, Vasantarao Naik, declared that he wanted to open a bar for every thousand of the population; of course he added that he wanted to do this in the interest of prohibition. In ancient days when a goat was sacrificed *mantras* were chanted about the great luck of the goat in being chosen as an offering. Medical opinion as well as the experience of Western countries and the USA goes to show that alcohol is pure evil. The opponents of prohibition therefore very often say that prohibition leads to bootlegging and that it is the propagation of cheap liquor which is harmful; it is better therefore to let genuine liquor prevail. Several commissions of inquiry have shown, as noted by P. Kodanda Rao in his articles on prohibition in the '*Hitavada*', that there is more bootlegging in wet than in dry areas. But since the advocacy of alcohol is not based on reason, one cannot expect that it should take note of hard facts.

It is very often said that prohibition leads to loss of revenue. But the crucial question is whether alcohol is harmful or not. If it is harmful, earning money from alcohol would mean that the government is making money at the cost of social health. This cannot be justified even on economic grounds. A society of patients cannot be expected to be prosperous. If earning money from liquor tax is justifiable, why should traders be punished for making money by selling harmful adulterated food?

14.

POPULARIZATION OF BEEF

The third Directive Principle undermined by Nehru is concerned with cow protection. Nehruism succeeded in creating an impression that cow protection is a contemptible superstition. Nehru used to be peeved at the very mention of cow protection. He once slapped and physically threw out a *sadhu* who had come to plead for it.

It is said that cow protection could be an economic drag on society; maintaining old and useless cattle costs money, which the country can ill afford.

Like all "progressive" views of Nehruism, the notion that those who eat beef are ridding the society of useless cattle is itself a superstition. Old and useless cattle are useless even for food. Those who have a taste for beef want to eat even tender and healthy cattle such as calves. Once a "progressive" correspondent wrote a letter to '*The Times of India*' gleefully describing the slaughter of calves and the deliciousness of their flesh. I can only say that such glee is evidence of complete lack of culture and civilized sensibility. Animals have pains and pleasures like ourselves; they have as much right to live as human beings. Killing them just for food betrays a lack of moral sense. Societies which recognize the animals' right to live and refrain from killing them except in self-defence are, as compared to carnivorous societies, on a higher ethical plane.

Many educated Indians have developed an apologetic attitude about cow worship and even about vegetarianism. Even Savarkar had expressed criticism of cow worship as a superstition.

In a sense all worship can be condemned as superstitious because the feeling of reverence is subjective like the appreciation of beauty. One who does not feel reverence for X cannot be convinced by merely objective arguments that X is worthy of worship. Love and reverence cannot be created by argument. Can a traitor be made to love his country by mere argument?

The only point that can be argued is whether reverence for the cow contributes to social well-being or ill-being. It then becomes obvious that

reverence for the cow can lead to better care of the milch animals and this will contribute to the wealth of the society. Maintaining useless cattle does involve some expenditure but cows never become entirely useless; even their urine and excreta are useful. The useless period in a cow's life can be set off against the useful period and on balance the bargain is not unprofitable.

The economic argument is not only against cow-slaughter; it is wholly against non-vegetarianism itself. Recently this has been amply shown by Maneka Gandhi. For producing one unit of non-vegetarian food, 16 units of vegetarian food have to be spent. Thus vegetarianism would ease the food problem 16 times.

I have heard a strange argument for non-vegetarianism in the army messes. I was told that slaughtering animals for food is an economic necessity because but for the non-vegetarians the animals would multiply so fast that human beings would not get even vegetarian food.

I fail to see whether this argument is the outcome of ignorance or dishonesty. It seems to be based on complete ignorance of the existence of animal husbandry. Just as natural food like fruits, roots and wild grain is not sufficient for our requirements, and agriculture is a must if we are not to starve, animals naturally born are grossly insufficient for the requirements of non-vegetarians, and animal husbandry has to be resorted to for multiplying their numbers and quality. This is a business more costly than agriculture.

The notion that vegetarian food is incomplete and some necessary amino-acids and proteins can only be found in non-vegetarian food has been adequately answered by Dr. Sukhatme. He has shown that the so-called essential 75 nutrients can be obtained from vegetarian food if it is taken in sufficient quantity. This quantity contains roughage which is also essential for the digestive process because food without sufficient roughage is constipative and difficult for digestion.

The lie that vegetarian food is deficient in necessary nutrients can be nailed by the fact that no nutrition expert is able to detect whether a man is a vegetarian or not by thoroughly examining him by all the available medical methods if food particles are not sticking in his mouth or undigested food is not present in his stomach.

15.

THE CRUSADE AGAINST INDIAN LANGUAGES

So far we have only considered the Directive Principles of the Constitution sabotaged by Nehru. Another major crime of his against the Constitution was the sabotaging of the language clauses of the Constitution which were not merely directive but mandatory and date-bound. The Constitution had enjoined that Hindi in the Nagari script with predominantly Sanskrit vocabulary shall be the language of the Union Government and that the Government should bring about this change with complete elimination of English within 15 years, i.e., by 1965. Nehru succeeded in sabotaging this clause so completely that many well-educated Indians today do not even know that there is such a clause in the Constitution. In spite of the clear injunction in the Constitution, occasionally the courts have ruled that the Union Government has no constitutional authority to insist that those who seek employment in the Union Government must have knowledge of Hindi, nor even to insist that they should learn Hindi after joining service. The government on the other hand has full authority to insist that those who do not know English will not be allowed anywhere near the portals of government and profane its lofty stature. The reason given is that "imposition" of Hindi amounts to discrimination, since it is the language of only a section of Indians. English on the other hand is not the language of any section of Indians. Those who argue thus also argue that English is an Indian language since it is the language of Anglo-Indians. Heads I win, tails you lose! The argument that the use of Hindi amounts to discrimination can be used against *swaraj* itself and was effectively so used by Jinnah. That independence of India would be the independence of Hindus and the dependence of Muslims on them was the purport of his argument. In India, even if you keep out Hindi, the Hindi belt has a majority and therefore the rule of the Indian Parliament is the rule of the Hindi belt over the non-Hindi belt. The best way therefore is to call back the British in order to end "discrimination"!

That arguments against Hindi are arguments against independence

itself is realized by the English enthusiasts but in the heart of their hearts they are averse to independence itself.

It is very often said that Nehru only yielded to the pressure of the South Indians, in not implementing the language clauses of the Constitution.

In fact the boot is on the other leg. Maulana Azad and Nehru themselves instigated the South Indians against Hindi. Umpteen speeches of Nehru can be cited to show that he missed no opportunity to ridicule Hindi and the *Hindi danda* wielded by the Hindi "chauvinists". Nehru's apologists should point out a single speech of Nehru where he pleaded for the use of Hindi and the Indian languages. It should be remembered that the term "imposition" of Hindi emanated from Nehru, not from the South Indians. "Language ultimately grows from the people, it is seldom that it can be imposed," he said as early as September 1949. This utterance is a standing proof of either hypocrisy or complete ignorance of history. Nobody is in any doubt that English would never have been used in India as a medium either of education or of administration if India had not been conquered by the British. One of the demands of the revolutionaries of 1857 was that English should not be imposed on the Indians. The currency of Persian and later of Urdu in India is due to the Turko-Mughal occupations. Nehru held that Urdu had a special place in Hyderabad simply because it was ruled by the Nizam. He was himself all along using state power to exterminate the Indian languages and to perpetuate English.

Nehru's assurances that English would not be eliminated without the consent of South Indians was never strongly demanded by the South Indians.

Rajaji started his fulminations against Hindi *after* Nehru and not *vice versa*. It should be remembered that Rajaji sent opponents of Hindi to prison when he was Chief Minister of Madras. No doubt there was an anti-Hindi movement in Tamil Nadu even in the days of Gandhi, but it is also a fact that it did not command respect of the people at large. Tamilians in large numbers appeared for the Hindi examinations instituted by the Rashtra Bhasha Pracharini Sabha. Even now Hindi films are said to run more than Tamil films in Tamil Nadu. Immediately after his release

from prison in 1945 Gandhi undertook a tour of Tamil Nadu, addressed huge meetings in Hindi and criticised the "lure for English" without mincing words. There were no demonstrations against him. At the advent of independence Sardar Patel openly warned the Tamilians in Hindi right in Tamil Nadu, in a meeting, that they would not get government jobs at the Centre if they did not learn Hindi. The Tamilians did not protest.

Tirade Against Hindi

Nehru's concern for the preservation of English was manifest right from the initial meetings of the Constituent Assembly. "He controlled the enthusiasm for Hindi and secured the retention of English as one of the official languages at least up to 1965." (Gopal)

Later Nehru gave up all reticence in expressing his desire to promote English and in the 1961 session of the Congress he got a resolution passed directing the Government to undertake more extensive teaching of English and retaining English as medium of instruction in higher education, which includes high school education, since regional languages as media will foster regionalism. Nehru should have driven the last nail in the coffin of the ideals fostered by the freedom movement by declaring that since any rule by any section of Indians would be a sectional and not an all-India rule, the English should be invited to rule this country in order to promote "national integration." It speaks for the utter lack of the sense of criticism among the English-educated that they do not see any contradiction in using the word national in connection with English.

When Nehru started his tirade against Hindi it was widely asserted that the Constituent Assembly accepted Hindi only by a casting vote of the President. If Nehru had really wanted to make Hindi the language of the Union Government he would have promptly squashed these calumnies. In fact circumstantial evidence goes to show that Nehru himself had planted these calumnies. The fact is, not only was Hindi not accepted only by a casting vote of the President, it was adopted unanimously. There was no other proposal before the Constituent Assembly.

It was widely believed that Rajaji had started the canard. When 'Organiser' made this charge, Rajaji promptly denied it in a letter to

'Organiser'. One does expect that Rajaji himself being a member of the Constituent Assembly should have squashed the rumour earlier but since he had openly taken a stand against Hindi, one does not expect him to strike blows for the supporters of Hindi. But if Nehru's anti-Hindi stance was the result of the realities of the situation and not a part of his deliberate plan to sabotage the Constitution, one does expect that the minimum he should have done is to set the record straight by denying baseless charges. When Nehru allowed these charges to rule the roost it is too much to expect that he should have pleaded the cause of Hindi before its opponents.

The feeling against Hindi was certainly not so strong as the feeling against Muslims in the early days of independence immediately after Partition and its holocaust. In the teeth of this widespread hatred of Muslims Nehru pleaded for them day in and day out. But one cannot point out a single speech where Nehru thus reasoned against the opponents of Hindi.

There is a widespread impression that Nehru was against Hindi because he wanted "simple" and "current" Hindi whereas the "Hindi enthusiasts" concocted a highly Sanskritized and "artificial" jargon and wanted to "impose" it on the country.

Roman Hindustani

It is no secret that the "simple" and "current" Hindi of Nehru was Roman Hindustani used in the army for the training of the jawans. This is really a concocted language with a liberal sprinkling of English and Urdu words written in the Roman script. It is unlikely that Nehru did not know that Sanskritized Hindi was not concocted by the Hindi "chauvinists" at the time of making the Constitution. That was the language used by Hindi newspapers and other periodicals and writers like Premchand when they wrote in Hindi and not in Urdu. It is again not likely that Nehru did not know that all the languages of India including the South Indian ones use 30 to 40 per cent Sanskrit words. Still he pretended that Sanskritized Hindi was a curio and Roman Hindustani was the common language of the people.

It is wrong to suppose that the language advocated by Nehru was

Urdu and he had special love for that language. Urdu came handy to him for beating Hindi with and instigating the Muslims against it. He wanted to oust Urdu no less than Hindi and make India safe for English. This became obvious soon after the Hyderabad police action when the Government of India issued an order to abolish Urdu medium in the Osmania University and the Hyderabad administration and introduced English. For this again there was no demand from the people of Hyderabad. With this glaring instance nobody should harbour the notion that Nehru was a champion of Urdu.

Before the Constituent Assembly took the clear decision that Hindi in Nagari script with predominantly Sanskrit vocabulary should be the language of the Union Government, there was some discussion about "Hindustani" with both the Nagari and the Arabic scripts to be made the common language. But with Partition, one of the causes of which was Urdu nationalism, the nation was in no mood to brook Urdu and the decision had a smooth passage.

Dr. Raghuvira who had a great share in getting the Constituent Assembly round to this forthright decision charged that soon after the Constituent Assembly decision, Maulana Azad said to him in the presence of Nehru:

"You have got the measure passed but we dare you to get it implemented."

Subsequent actions of Nehru show that the decision to sabotage the language clauses of the Constitution was taken at the very time the clauses were passed.

In 1950 I went to Delhi to take up my job in the Central Government. My son was of school-going age. I got him admitted to the Nutan Marathi School. When I mentioned this to my colleagues they all looked at me with contempt and said:

"That school is meant for riff-raff."

I asked them:

"And where do lofty people like you send your children?"

Pat came the reply:

"To the convents of course."

I asked them whether sending children to convents would not make them suffer when the Constitution has enjoined that English shall be removed altogether from the Centre in 15 years and the linguistic provinces will remove it from the provinces.

They all pitied my gullibility and said:

"The Constitution is not meant to be implemented."

It was clear from this conversation that not only was the decision to sabotage the Constitution taken right in the beginning but also that clear hints to this effect were passed on even up to officers of my level.

I had a taste of it very soon. When my son started his primary education in a Marathi medium school I found that he could not even count in Marathi and did not understand me when I used Marathi numerals in mentioning dates etc. I made inquiries and was told that there were orders that in vernacular medium schools only English numerals should be used. It was said that the Constitution enjoins this. In fact the Constitution enjoins only the English mode of writing numerals, *not* the English words for numerals. The conspiracy to cut out all our roots was thus under way.

When just before Nehru's death the Constitution was amended to say that English would continue to be used as an "associate" language, it was openly declared on the radio that the decision to do so was taken long back.

This should leave no one in doubt that the Constitution was left unimplemented not because of any genuine difficulties; it was deliberately sabotaged in a planned way.

I remember Nehru's addressing the Indians in Britain in the India House in 1948. At that time he rebuked the receptionist for speaking in English. He himself spoke in what he called Hindi for five minutes and soon switched on to English. This was almost immediately after independence. The bulk of the Congress was pro-Hindi and as the later election

of Tandon as President of the Congress against Nehru's wishes showed, it was not possible for him to defy the Congress ideology, openly. His pro-English stance became more open and more virulent after Sardar Patel's death, when he succeeded in turning out Tandon and placing his own nominee as President of the Congress. Tandon was especially known for his advocacy of Hindi.

If Hindi had been made compulsory for the UPSC examination, the way would have been cleared for honouring the mandate of the Constitution. But Nehru would have nothing of this. He turned down the proposal of the President that Hindi should be introduced as the medium for the Central Civil Service examinations. (Gopal)

Teaching Hindi to those who were already in service was dropped for no reason. The best place for introducing Hindi at once was the Armed Forces. The jawans, at the time of recruitment, are mostly illiterate. But they have to be trained in some language. The jawans are recruited at a very young age and are retired before they are on the wrong side of 40. Use of English for their education is therefore out of the question. The British however did not want to teach them Hindi because if the jawans had studied Hindi they would have read Hindi literature and unwittingly imbibed nationalism. This was dangerous for the security of the British rule in India. So the British hit upon an ingenious plan. They coined a new language called Roman Hindustani, a language with copious Persian and English words in Hindi grammar and written in the Roman script. This language was sufficient for the not very intellectual training of the jawans. As there is no literature in this language there was no danger of the jawans' reading anything other than training-manuals. With this the isolation of the jawans from the rest of the population was secured. What the British started for the protection of the British rule, Nehru continued for the protection of the English language in India. The jawans come from all over India. If all of them had shared a common language, viz., Hindi, the demand for its use in the Central Government would have become irresistible. Nehru squashed this possibility by retaining Roman Hindustani in the Armed Forces and occasionally recommended its extension to other fields. Nehru was very enthusiastic about the Roman script. He once issued a family invitation in "Roman Hindustani." When Gandhi received it he

expressed his disapproval in strong terms. Nehru thereafter refrained from expressing his preference for the Roman script.

Just as there are Indians who would love to see the Indian languages banished from all dealings among the educated including those at home, there are some who want to banish all Indian scripts and replace them by the Roman.

The opinion of Subhash Chandra Bose is very often cited to assert that the advocacy of the Roman script is not confined to the so-called anti-national people; that it was shared by a die-hard nationalist like Subhash Chandra Bose. Subhash Chandra Bose advocated the Roman script and used it in the Indian National Army. It is not known what justification he gave for this but it is easy to see that it was meant as a political compromise. The Muslims may accept Hindustani as being indistinguishable from Urdu, but the Nagari script is very much associated with "Sanskritized Hindi." They therefore may not accept it. The South Indians also, it is supposed, may have their reservations about Hindi if it is written in the Roman script.

Is Nagari Script a Hurdle?

Apart from the above considerations, which are by no means convincing, there is no case for the use of Roman. Its defects have been pointed out by no less a person than George Bernard Shaw who gave away his entire fortune in a will for devising a suitable script for the English language. There was a bill in the British Parliament for improving English spelling. The main hurdle against better orthography for English is that its literature is so vast that even a fraction of it cannot be transcribed and if the new script is used all over, the existing literature of English will be unreadable to the future generations.

The same hurdle is also there in changing the script of the Indian language. Their literature though not as vast as that of English is sufficiently vast to make transcription an insurmountable task.

It should be noted that most supporters of the Roman script advocate it precisely because they want to cut off Indians from their traditional literature. The advocacy of the Roman script does not stem from

a desire to give a better script to the Indian languages but from their hatred for them and the intention of exterminating them from all the activities of the educated. It is not possible to say this openly. The objective is sought to be achieved by making the Indians illiterate in their own script so that they cannot read their literature. The next step can then be taken, viz., abandoning the use of Indian languages altogether.

It is no accident that the strongest advocates of the Roman script are the Christian missionaries.

All these motives were present in Nehru. The fact that there is not one sensible argument based on fact in favour of Roman, makes the search for anti-national motives in the minds of its advocates obligatory for explaining their absurd advocacy.

It is very often said that the Roman script is more efficient for printing and typing. I asked a person who advanced this claim to me whether he has seen a Hindi typewriter, when he began acting piano playing in describing Hindi typing. As expected he said "no". I then showed him my Hindi typewriter which was the same machine with the same number of keys as the English typewriter. I further showed him that typing the same word in the Nagari requires fewer strokes than in the Roman. The Education ministry had conducted some experiments on the comparative efficiency of Hindi and English typing and circulated the results indicating the above conclusion.

This objective reasoning of mine had no effect on my friend and he went on pleading that Roman was essential for "bringing us in line with the civilized countries." The cat was thus out of the bag.

The superstition that Nagari script is less efficient than the Roman for typing persists even among professional typists. One of them said to me that the typing speed statistics for Roman and Nagari are overwhelmingly in favour of Roman. I pointed out to him that this is so because the Nagari typists type both Roman and Nagari whereas the Roman typists type Roman alone. The efficiency of a biscriptural typist cannot be compared with that of one who concentrates on one script. Secondly the statistics for Roman is based on world figures whereas the one for Nagari

is confined to the few typists who type in Nagari in India alone. It is obvious that the maximum of the world will be higher than the maximum of one country.

The example of China is nowadays cited in advocating the Roman script. It is asserted that China has adopted the Roman script. This is a downright lie. China is using the Roman script as an aid to teaching pronunciation of Chinese writing. It is still using the traditional script for its language.

One fact about the Chinese script is worth noting. The Chinese script is not merely Chinese, it is used in Korea and Japan as well. It is said to be very difficult as nearly 3000 symbols have to be mastered for writing it. But it is forgotten that these 3000 are not letter symbols but ideas or the nearest analogue to our words. They are not phonetic symbols but symbolic pictures just like the sign for square root or 'equal to' in mathematics. The mathematical signs can be read by everybody in his own language. Will Durant reports that the same text is read by the Chinese in Chinese, the Japanese in Japanese and the Koreans in Korean. If therefore the Chinese script with 3000 symbols is taught in our schools, the whole literature of China, Japan and Korea will be available to those who learn it, in their own language without translation.

There is therefore no objective consideration for the adoption of the Roman script. Its advocacy is either based on utter ignorance or the tendency to ape the West or more sinisterly the desire to cut us off from our traditional literature. That the last motive operated in Nehru is clear from his subsequent actions.

It might be urged that Nehru never openly advocated the Roman script, but then he never openly advocated convent education or the extermination of Indian languages. It is only the naive or hypocrites who would believe that the rapid spread of the above movement was a natural development without a plan behind it.

Secondly Chagla and Humayun Kabir, both ministers of Nehru, openly advocated the use of the Roman in Parliament. Kabir advanced a strange argument. He said that the defeat of Japan in the Second World

War was due to the script superiority of the English-speaking nations. It is hard to believe that he believed this nonsense.

Shrimali who was Education Minister under Nehru interpreted the Constitution as ordering the use of English in Arithmetic for all. He enthusiastically declared that he wanted to Indianize the media of instruction in the universities during his regime. He was sacked within days of this declaration and replaced by Chagla. Immediately after taking charge Chagla began wailing that we shall be orphans without English and our languages should be written in the Roman script. Here was an Education Minister who was openly preaching against the Constitution, but Nehru did not sack him; he had sacked his predecessor for declaring his intention to implement the constitutional objective of Indianization in languages. The result is that English words for numbers have come into common use and even the shop-keepers have forgotten that Indian languages have their own words for numbers. What a sad commentary on a country which gave the world, the place-value system of numbers. We have even to borrow terms for numbers from those who borrowed the number system from us, i.e., the Arabs!

Like numbers we have to borrow our initials from the Roman. The telephone directories refuse to write your initials in your script even when expressly requested to do so. It is assumed that our script is really Roman and those who want to write their initials in their own script are "chauvinists" and "obscurantists."

The Hidden Agenda

Soon after the promulgation of the Constitution, articles began to appear in the press against Hindi and for English, feigning ignorance that the Constitution had already ruled against English and for Hindi. The question was regarded as open. The Education Minister Maulana Azad bewailed the fall in standards of English and started a special institute for English in Hyderabad. In official meetings he openly decried the use of Sanskrit terminology in defiance of the injunction of the Constitution in its favour. Nehru in one of his speeches said that Hindi brings backwardness, as is shown by the fact that U.P. is one of the most backward states in India. He always spoke of the *Hindi Danda*. There is not a single

speech in which he urged the adoption of Hindi. This was in contrast to Gandhi and Patel.

In the early days of independence orders were passed that the officers should learn Hindi, otherwise their leave privileges would be withdrawn. This order was cancelled.

Similar considerations are relevant with regard to Nehru's attitude to Sanskrit. It is as clear as daylight that the status of Sanskrit declined after independence. It was made impossible for science students to go in for Sanskrit. It was ruled that the marks in Sanskrit ought not to be taken into account in deciding the order of merit. Whenever a scheme for the propagation of Sanskrit is put up, the government writes directing that a parallel scheme for the propagation of Arabic and Persian be put up! Sanskrit was abolished in many schools on the excuse that there were not enough students for Sanskrit. It would take much persuasion to believe that this happened without Nehru's sponsorship.

The ugliest feature of Nehru's Sanskrit policy was seen in the way the government defended its policy towards Sanskrit in the Supreme Court. It argued that if it is regarded incumbent on the government to promote Sanskrit, it should be equally incumbent on it to promote the African tribal languages. This policy was obviously a continuation of the Nehru policy and surely not conceived by Narasimha Rao the then Prime Minister. It fits in with Nehru's philosophy that India is a conglomeration of invaders and the Sanskrit speaking "Aryans" were no less invaders than the British and the Mughals. Nehru alone among the Congress leaders preached this philosophy and subsequent Congress and semi-Congress governments toed it.

V.V. Mirashi, a famous Sanskrit scholar, said to me, when I alleged that Nehru was anti-Sanskrit, that this charge was unfounded since Nehru has spoken glowingly about Sanskrit in his *'Discovery of India.'* I replied that politicians have to be judged by their actions and not by their words. Politicians sing hallelujas even to the person whom they are plotting to hang.

The results of Nehru's campaign against Sanskrit were immediately seen. In the British days Sanskrit was almost compulsory up to

matriculation and Sanskrit quotations were quite frequent in the conversation of the educated. Now if anybody quotes Sanskrit he is asked which language he is speaking. The Indian language periodicals ask their writers to eschew Sanskrit quotations, since nobody on their staff knows enough Sanskrit to correct them in proof. The *keertankars* used to sing Sanskrit verses sonorously and explain them in an interesting way, with the result that the common man who heard the *keertans* had enough grounding in Sanskrit to appreciate simple Sanskrit quotations. Now many *keertankars* too have boycotted Sanskrit. Nehru's bid to deculturize India has borne fruit.

Similar is the case of the ridicule of Hindi. Many think that Nehru was only ridiculing the "difficult" Hindi and pleading for "simple" Hindi in advocating the use of Urdu and English words. He insisted that the AIR news bulletins should be in the form in which they were delivered in the British days, i.e., in Urdu and *not* in Hindi. When he sent such an order to the AIR the AIR introduced Urdu bulletins in addition to the Hindi. When Nehru protested, the AIR authorities explained that a common bulletin of his conception would amount to the type of bulletin issued in the British days, i.e., straightforward Urdu bulletins, and the Hindi bulletins would have to be dropped altogether.

The poor AIR authorities did not realize that this was *exactly* what Nehru wanted! The motive of his advocacy of Urdu was not simplifying Hindi, so that it spreads more rapidly; it was to sabotage the speed. It will be accusing Nehru of subnormal intelligence to suppose that, even after an association with the Congress movement and the national language for about a quarter century as well as numerous arguments with scholars like Dr. Raghuvira, he did not know that all Indian languages use 30 to 40 per cent downright Sanskrit words and depend upon Sanskrit word-formation for coining new words. Urdu is described as "a literary form of Western Hindi" by Grierson. In other words Urdu is not a spoken language at all. In all provinces the dialects used by the common people whether Hindu or Muslim contain mainly Sanskrit vocabulary. Even a villager in U.P. has '*manokamana*' and not '*khawaish*'. The adoption of Hindi with predominantly Sanskrit vocabulary would have led to the rapid spread of Hindi and by now Hindi would have become the common language of the whole

of India. A language used by a nation of 100 crores with a long history of civilization would have soon spread even outside India. The way Hindi spread to Burma during the British rule shows that by now Hindi would have become a major language of Asia. The wide use of Sanskrit vocabulary in South East Asia lends credence to this conjecture.

This is exactly what Nehru wanted to prevent. As a communist he was wedded to the belief that India is not a nation, it is multinational and therefore it cannot have a common language. He conveniently forgot that even multinational Russia makes Russian compulsory. But then according to the communists no nation other than Russia has a right either to be national or multinational, it must exist as a subnation of the Soviet fatherland.

Again it must not be forgotten that Nehru was not a simple communist but an Anglo-Communist. The India of Nehru's conception did not envisage a country having a common language.

Nehru continuously instigated the South Indians by bewailing that Hindi would provoke the Muslims against Hindi. By posing that the language of Muslims is Urdu, he even instructed the Chief Ministers to send to him quarterly reports of official recruitment to give special weightage to minority communities (Muslims). He also drew the attention of the Home Minister to Urdu being edged out in Delhi where it once enjoyed a proud and famous place. He instructed the officials to favour the regional language in those areas where its use was prevalent and elsewhere grant it the privilege of a minority language.

The Home Minister G. B. Pant had no enthusiasm for promoting Urdu and warned Nehru that that would encourage Muslim separatism and cleavage. Nehru clearly said on this that he was prepared to face common injustice.

Linguistic Provinces

The advocacy of Hindi as a common language created a misconception in some quarters, as aimed at dominance of Hindi language in all fields. This was not the objective of those national leaders who initiated the Hindi movement. In the beginning even Gandhi could not speak Hindi

himself, his mother tongue being Gujarati. But he realized that if he wanted to propagate his ideas throughout India neither Gujarati nor Sanskrit would be helpful. Gandhi took up the cause of Hindi more enthusiastically and never dreamt of replacing Gujarati by Hindi in Gujarat. He envisaged that in independent India, Hindi would be used for official purposes at the Centre, not within the provinces themselves. The provinces were to use their own languages for provincial purposes. In fact during the freedom movement linguistic provinces had posed the greatest threat to English in India.

It is strange that some Hindi enthusiasts, forgetting the consensus at the time of the Constitution-making in this regard, saw a threat to Hindi in the formation of the linguistic provinces.

Nehru, for a considerable time, feigned ignorance of the national consensus on linguistic provinces and went on singing the praise of English. The English advocates were by now thoroughly steeped in this Nehru propaganda. They forgot or showed that they did that linguistic provinces was one of the objectives of the freedom movement. Some of them even forgot that the Constitution had adopted Hindi as the language of the Union Government. I have actually met highly educated colleagues who condemned the "Hindi chauvinists" for demanding the use of Hindi at the Centre. When I told them that this demand is not a new brainwave of the Hindi "chauvinists" but a date-bound injunction of the Constitution, they pooh-poohed me as a chauvinist living in a world of imagination.

Nehru was against the formation of linguistic provinces from the very beginning. There was demand that the formation of linguistic provinces should be included as a feature of the Constitution. Nehru opposed this. He suggested the formation of a committee to go into the question afresh and made an utterly false statement that "the Congress was not committed to the linguistic provinces." The Nehru Committee suggested that "in view of the unsettled conditions in the country, the consideration of the linguistic provinces might be postponed for ten years." Accepting the report the Constituent Assembly merely provided, in Article 3 of the Constitution, for the creation of such provinces some time in the

future. "Nehru directed the Working Committee and the Parliamentary Party of the Congress not to press for an early action on this." (Gopal).

Seeing that the dream of Linguistic Andhra Pradesh which he saw in the days of the freedom movement was being blown up, Potti Sriramulu went on a hunger-strike to press the demand and lost his life. A linguistic Andhra Pradesh was therefore conceded at the time. The Englishvallas began clamouring that Sriramulu's fast unleashed the troubles of the linguistic provinces. They forgot that linguistic provinces was not the brain-child of Sriramulu; it was a national decision reached at the time of Gandhi himself. Nehru's lifework consisted of undoing all the national decisions, and linguistic provinces was only one of his victims.

Rajiv Gandhi bewailed the linguistic provinces as one of the mistakes of Nehru. He forgot that Nehru did all that was in his power to prevent the formation of the linguistic provinces. The troubles arose out of Nehru's efforts to swim against the current liberated by the freedom movement.

Nehru's attempts to prevent the formation of linguistic provinces failed. He was eventually compelled to form them. In fact Nehru never formed linguistic provinces. The provinces that were formed were the result of Nehru's attempt to resist the formation of linguistic provinces after Sriramulu's fast.

Other provinces began their clamour. So Nehru, instead of forming the linguistic provinces on the basis of already known linguistic boundaries, appointed the States' Reorganization Commission and said that language should not be the only basis for the reorganization of the provinces. These other considerations, not being based on any objective or clear grounds, opened the Pandora's box of endless cavils in drawing the boundaries of the states. The most advertised quarrel was about Bombay. It was said that Bombay was developed by Gujarati businessmen and therefore it does not belong to Maharashtra alone. If one follows this logic Calcutta should belong to Marvaris. It was further insinuated that if Bombay is made the capital of Maharashtra the Gujaratis would suffer.

Fomenting Conflicts

Thus the occasion of the reorganization of the provinces was used for fomenting inter-provincial quarrels just to ensure the safety of English at the centre. The demand for a separate Vidarbha was encouraged and when Maharashtra was formed Nehru shed tears for the lot that would befall the poor Vidarbhis, thus instigating the people of Vidarbha against United Maharashtra. The demand for separate Vidarbha mainly emanated from the non-Marathi population settled in Vidarbha. They were instigated by insinuating that the demand for linguistic provinces springs from linguistic chauvinism. It is somewhat like the demand for Pakistan, a bid to dismember the country. The opponents of the linguistic provinces gave themselves airs of all-India nationalism whereas in fact theirs was nothing but Anglophilism.

In drawing the boundaries of the states it was natural to expect that the village should be treated as the unit so that the boundaries drawn would result in the minimum of linguistic heterogeneity in the provinces. But Nehru did not want this, because the greater the heterogeneity in the provinces the easier it would be to instigate the linguistic minorities against the language of the province. The problem of Belgaum was created for nothing by treating the districts as units. At one time the Kannadigas had almost agreed to abide by the verdict of the Mahajan Commission even if it had recommended the inclusion of Belgaum in Maharashtra with minor border adjustments. But Mahajan, like Nehru, wanted to keep the quarrel alive in the interest of English, and gave a long sermon against the idea of linguistic provinces and recommended *status quo* in Belgaum. The sermon against linguistic provinces was completely uncalled for; the desirability of linguistic provinces was not one of his terms of reference. That he wandered into this irrelevant diatribe betrayed his motive in giving such a perverse verdict.

The unjust drawing of boundaries resulted in riots. Any fool could have known the cause. But Nehru saw in the riots an opportunity to sabotage linguistic provinces. Instead of setting right the wrong done by non-linguistic borders Nehru came out with a bill to scuttle the move for linguistic provinces altogether. The bill sought to perpetuate the existing multilingual provinces. This created an uproar not only among

the people at large but also within the Congress Party itself. Kamaraj, the Tamil Nadu leader, told Nehru that there should be no going back on linguistic provinces. The bill was therefore shelved.

C. D. Deshmukh the then Finance Minister resigned in protest against Nehru's policy on Bombay. It was wrongly thought that he supported the formation of linguistic provinces and of United Maharashtra including Mumbai. This impression was soon dispelled by Deshmukh himself declaring that he favoured the formation of Bilingual Bombay province with Mumbai as its capital. Nehru seized on the idea and formed Bilingual Bombay.

This created more resentment in Gujarat than in Maharashtra because the Gujaratis were in a minority in the new province, and at least a section of them felt that in the effort to save Mumbai from going to Maharashtra they had joined the whole of Gujarat to Maharashtra in addition to Mumbai. Politicians were not wanting to say to the Maharashtrians that they should now stop demanding United Maharashtra, since they can now dominate the whole of Gujarat instead of the Gujaratis who were living in Bombay. This is a measure of the extent to which the nationally agreed objective of maximum linguistic autonomy was perverted by the English lobby into a desire to dominate other linguistic groups.

Widespread demonstrations were held in Gujarat against the Bilingual Bombay. Nehru held a public meeting in Ahmedabad to assuage the feelings of the Gujaratis. He was greeted with black flags. He thundered to the people asking them to get out of India and settle in some other country with black flag as their country's emblem. The fact to note is how Nehru was deliberately maligning the demand for linguistic provinces as a demand for the dismemberment of the country. The movements which really wanted to dismember India, like the Nagas, had the blessings of Nehru. He never asked the Nagas to get out of India, on the contrary he conceded their demand for secession by exempting them from the central law of income-tax since they were claiming to be independent of India. But he shamelessly asked the Gujaratis who gave Gandhi and Patel to India to quit the country because

they were only demanding the implementation of a nationally agreed decision.

The movement for the formation of Samyukta Maharashtra led to the formation of the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti. It fought parliamentary elections on that issue and defeated some 22 Congress candidates. The defeat of the Congress on this single issue was an unmistakable indication of popular aspirations. Nehru had soon to concede Samyukta Maharashtra with Mumbai as capital.

The provinces thus formed were not the linguistic provinces of the nationalists' dream but what remained of it after Nehru's determined attempts to sabotage the nation's decision. It is not the inclusion of small pockets of linguistic areas in the wrong province that mattered so much as the strangling of the very purpose for which linguistic provinces were to be formed, viz., the use of the provincial languages for all purposes in the provinces. 40 years after the formation of Samyukta Maharashtra, poet Kusumagraja bewailed that Marathi was in wilderness even after the formation of Samyukta Maharashtra. Sharad Pawar, the then Chief Minister of Maharashtra who was present, made it clear before the walls of the poet died out in the hall, that he had no intention of saving Marathi from its wilderness and giving her what Kusumagraja considered her rightful throne.

Thus linguistic provinces without the use of provincial languages in education and administration was a futile exercise. The provinces may have remained as they were if the use of Indian languages was not the issue involved. Nehru really succeeded in keeping the Indian languages out and keeping their place safe for English.

In spite of Nehru, periodicals came out in Indian languages and a good deal of literature was also produced. Nehru wanted to stop all this and to reduce the Indian languages to the level of unwritten tribal dialects, heard only in the huts of the illiterate. But it was not possible to spell out this objective openly. Nehru therefore thought out a plan. He started his concern for "enriching" Indian languages. "Enriching" meant a copious use of English words. He issued a directive to the All India Radio suggesting this way to "enrich" the Indian languages and using them on the AIR.

The AIR authorities protested against this, so Nehru appointed a committee under the chairmanship of B. V. Varerkar the famous Marathi writer. The committee unanimously ruled against this "enrichment" and wanted the AIR to continue using the type of language it was using. Nehru threw the recommendation in the wastepaper basket and made the AIR follow his "enrichment" programme. This is how the tendency to use eight English words in a sentence of ten words became fashionable. This type of language is now common in telecasts, broadcasts and even periodicals and books. State awards were given to books written in such a language. Such a language cannot be understood by those who have not studied English and therefore the next step of dropping it altogether and openly switching over to English can be taken.

Going to Fundamentals

The above narrative of how Nehru sabotaged the language clauses of the Constitution and even tried to exterminate the Indian languages may evoke admiration for Nehru rather than dislike in some quarters because they want the perpetuation of English in India and do not see any advantage in switching over to Indian languages. The late P. Kodanda Rao was a consistent upholder of this view even in the days of Gandhi when his species was rare. Now in the Nehru era it has become predominant. It is therefore necessary to discuss the place of language in a nation's development.

Kodanda Rao asserted that nobody is born with a language and therefore if English is more useful than the Indian languages it should be retained.

I asked Kodanda Rao whether he can apply the same yardstick to English rule as he applies to the English language. If after objective consideration it cannot be held that the British occupation was in any way less beneficial than the Maratha Confederacy which it replaced, would he be prepared to condemn our freedom movement itself as a mere emotional upsurge without any rational justification? Can it be proved by objective considerations that independence is always preferable to dependence? Preferability is a question of values and we must consider what values are involved in saying that good government is no substitute for self-

government. The very word self-government makes a distinction between self and alien. If the distinction 'foreign language' and 'native language' is unsustainable, how can the distinction 'foreign rule' and 'native rule' be sustained?

Kodanda Rao's plea that nobody is born with a language and therefore there is no such thing as a foreign language is true for an individual. If an individual hears English only right from his birth his language will be English. The fact that his parents were not English will have no relevance in determining his language. But this is not applicable to a whole country because all or even a substantial majority of people in a country cannot be transferred to England so that they hear only English right from their birth, nor can we teach English to so many people that their children in India come in contact with English only. The conventvallas have already tried to adopt English in this way but theirs has remained a microscopic minority.

It has been seen that even when a majority of people switch over to English by abandoning their language English itself gets so changed that no Englishman can follow it nor can the speakers of such English follow the language of the English. The Pidgin African English is a well-known example of this.

An example of African English furnished by John Gunther in his *'Inside Africa'* is given below:

"Den de Lawd dun come back for earth an he go call Hadam. But Hadam he no be for seat. He go fear de lawd an done go for bush, one time. Again de lawd call: "Hadam!" An Hadam he say with small voice: "Yessah, Lawd." An de Lawd He say "Close me Hadam, close me". An Hadam he close the Lawd."

The theme of the above passage is Biblical and therefore from the words Lawd and Hadam and the familiar story of Adam something can be made out of the above passage. But if this were not the theme I wonder whether anything could have been made out of it.

If in the effort to adopt the language of the English, English itself gets so changed that it is not useful for reading English books or for

communicating with the English-speaking countries, what have we gained in giving up our languages?

The likes of Kodanda Rao must realize that language cannot be transplanted. In fact this is the test whether a language is a foreign language for a people or not. If it can grow independently in a country without getting so changed that it becomes incomprehensible to its original speakers, it cannot be regarded as foreign.

With this test English is hundred per cent foreign to India because our English will not cease to be incomprehensible to Englishmen, unless we keep in constant touch with English as it is used in England. It cannot grow independently on Indian soil.

Those who say that if we abandon English we shall relapse into backwardness have been amply answered by the fact that Nehru's India which tried to adopt English as its own is the most backward country in the world and countries like Sri Lanka which have switched over to their own languages have made considerable progress in all fields.

It is forgotten that science is the easiest field for any language, for by its very nature it is independent of any natural language. It is in the field of literature that translation is difficult if not impossible. Newton is the same in all the languages but Shakespeare cannot be. Even languages spoken by a few lakhs, not only in Europe but also in the erstwhile Soviet Union, are being used as media for science education. The Japanese and the Chinese have never experienced any difficulty in using their languages for science. Even Thailand uses Thai and is taking scientific vocabulary from Sanskrit. The notion that Indian languages cannot be used for science is a sad commentary on the thinking-capacity of the English-educated.

Can English Become the Common Language?

Now about the common language. Is it not necessary that there should be one language which is understood from Kashmir to Kanyakumari? If people from different provinces of India require interpreters for understanding each other, will it not cause hesitation to regard them as members of the same nation?

If a common language is necessary, English can surely not foot the bill. Even with Herculean efforts of Nehru to exterminate the Indian languages and make India English-speaking, hardly two out of hundred crores can use that language. Hindi, on the other hand, in spite of the fact that rulers so far have been antagonistic to it, has spread sufficiently to give us hope that the objective of every Indian being able to use that language is practicable.

If Hindi becomes the common language of 100 crores of Indians, it will easily spread outside India too. Chinese does not have the capacity to spread easily outside India, but Hindi spread to Burma even during the British rule as is evidenced by the accounts of Sharat Chattopadhyaya. Hindi films are seen in West and South East Asia. A language of 100 crores will not be ignored by the world and the non-Indian world will also study Hindi on a larger scale. If our language thus spreads outside India, will it not add to our influence?

As to international contact the English enthusiasts have been bluffing the nation into believing that English is the only international language. In fact the UN has recognized five international languages and it would recognize Hindi also. Atal Bihari Vajpayee addressed the UN in Hindi. It is high time that we give up the practice of studying only one foreign language, viz., English; we must study all of them. Our curriculum and administration should be so designed that those who study a non-English foreign language are not required to study English in addition. English must not only be removed from administration and from education as a medium, but also as the only foreign language studied.

If education and administration are carried on in the mother-tongue with complete Indianization of vocabulary, it will remove the deep-rooted feeling that original work in science and ruling the country are the privileges of foreign invaders and that Hindus are born to be slaves.

The phenomenon of irradiation can operate or is operating in our country through our language policies. Irradiation is generalization of behaviour which is restricted to a narrow field in the beginning. Experiments have shown that a nerve impulse tends to spread to other neurons as it passes through the central nervous system. After experiencing intense

cold on touching ice, the sight of ice can cause the sensation of cold, though physiologically sight has no power to convey that sensation.

The second form of irradiation is exemplified by the conditioned reflex to a limited cutaneous area which tends to be elicited by the stimulation of other neighbouring areas. If a child is habituated to smiling when its toe is stimulated, it may begin to smile when, not its toe, but its leg is stimulated.

In the third form, if the intensity of the stimulus to which the response of a particular motor area is conditioned, is increased, the response does not remain confined to that area but spreads to other areas. If the pupils are conditioned to raising their hand when the teacher mentions their name, they may raise not one but both their hands if, instead of speaking, the teacher shouts.

This shows that the attitudes inspiring our choice of English will not remain confined to English but will spread to other spheres. Thus a nation which feels no shame in discarding its own languages and adopting the conqueror's language when no objective considerations justify such a choice, may soon cease to feel shame in adopting corrupt practices, in not keeping its vows, in not respecting the sanctity of relations and so on. As McDougall has said, the self-regarding sentiment is the basis of all sense for values. When that is lost there is nothing to stop man's all-round moral collapse.

Can any one honestly say that "all-round moral collapse" is an incorrect description of Nehruist India?

If India is to make all-round progress it must shed all the hangovers of slavery; it must wipe out all the traces of British occupation to such an extent that nobody living in India should be able to know, without reading history, that the British ever occupied India.

16. ONE PARTY AND ONE DICTATOR

Nehru was a communist by ideology and wanted at heart the rule of one party and one dictator. In the Indian context this meant the only party that has a right to rule is the Congress and the only person that has a right to lead that party is Nehru.

But during his very lifetime the communist party in Kerala defeated the Congress in elections and formed the government. Nehru was immensely perturbed and started machinations for dismissing the government. A charge was levelled that the communist government in Kerala was being guided by the Russian leaders. The Russian leaders took affront and denied any such interference in Kerala. The government was further charged of having insulted the President of India. This had no basis; in fact Nehru himself had publicly used unbecoming language against President Rajendra Prasad while denying him a third term. The communist government wanted to curb the autonomy of Christian institutions guaranteed by our "secular" Constitution and introduced a bill. Nehru objected to this and referred the bill to the Supreme Court. The bill was revised according to the suggestions of the Supreme Court. The communists had made a commitment during elections to nationalize the plantations owned by foreigners. Nehru firmly objected to the implementation of this commitment. He hinted that the days of the communist government were numbered. Namboodiripad, the Kerala communist leader, said at the time, "The communist party lends its support wholeheartedly to Nehru's efforts towards promoting socialism, but Nehru does not want our support and is behaving as if the Congress is the nation." He described this as "a policy of division" and could lead to "national disruption."

Poor Namboodiripad did not realize that "national disruption" is exactly what Nehru wanted and he did not want any power centre in India not subservient to him even if it is based on popular vote within the Constitution of India. On the basis of reports sent by the Kerala Congress workers he said that the Kerala communists were indulging in murders and the state government was giving preferential treatment to the communists,

as if the Congress governments throughout India were not giving preferential treatment to Congressmen.

The Kerala Governor, who it is needless to say owed his position to the Congress, reported that the state administration was trying to assist the communist trade-union organization to improve its position as against those supported by the Congress.

Nehru then came out with his novel idea of democracy by saying that democracy is "deeper than voting or a political form of government." In other words democracy is synonymous with keeping Nehru and his dynasty in power. Gopal says that the Congress in Kerala was secretly advised (obviously by Nehru) to demand mid-term elections even though the government had not lost its majority. A Vimochan Samara Samiti, i.e., a Liberation War Council was then formed and a widespread agitation against the government was launched.

Very exaggerated reports of the massiveness of this agitation appeared in the press, but Namboodiripad described it as a movement of Catholics and Nairs. It should be noted that the Kerala communist party is mainly supported by Hindus and the Congress by the Catholics and some Nairs. It is because of this that even Savarkar came out in support of the communist government of Kerala on this occasion. As was the foregone conclusion, the communist government was dismissed as a result of this agitation. In the mid-term poll the Congress obtained a majority and Nehru's wish that no non-Nehru government should exist anywhere in India was fulfilled.

Subsequent governments have followed this policy and have been dismissing the non-Congress governments for faked reasons even when they enjoyed the confidence of the house.

17.

PLAYING THE CASTES ONE AGAINST ANOTHER

After playing the Muslims against the Hindus and one linguistic group against the other, Nehru, like the British, played one caste against the other. Nehru drafted the objectives resolution of the Constituent Assembly which like the British talks of "minorities", "tribals" and the "backward". Thus Nehru was basically against the principle of democracy that "everyone is to count for one and nobody for more than one."

The Constitution enjoins that reservations for the scheduled castes in government jobs should be discontinued after ten years. It should be noted that Dr. Ambedkar was in favour of this provision. Government jobs would not improve the lot of the scheduled castes in general; they would benefit only a few individuals. Such reservations would promote a vested interest in backwardness; more and more castes would claim to be backward. Besides, instead of mitigating the evils of the caste system it would aggravate them by intensifying caste-consciousness. After all the British started reservations not because they were mightily interested in the welfare of the scheduled castes, but in order to pursue their policy of divide and rule and creating as many warring groups among Indians as possible. The myth that the Brahmins are an advanced caste was perpetuated by non-Brahmin movements in provinces where the Brahmins were dominant in government service because they were advanced in education. But even in these provinces the Brahmins were not the most prosperous caste. That section of the Brahmins which pursued their traditional profession of priesthood was neither economically nor educationally advanced. In other provinces the predominance of Brahmins in government service and education was not seen. Even the Mandal Commission has recognized this fact and included some sections of the Brahmins among the backward as deserving the benefits of reservation.

The Constitution expressly prohibits reservations on the basis of caste. When therefore the Tamil Nadu government took some anti-Brahmin decisions, the courts overruled them as unconstitutional.

Nehru, instead of welcoming this decision, proposed to amend the Constitution to allow discrimination "in favour of the weaker sections". This opened the Pandora's box and we had to witness the holocausts of Mandal.

That reservations are necessary to bring the backward castes in line with the forward is an argument which lacks substance. In the days before reservation for the backward the Gonds took pride in calling themselves Kshatriyas, now they want to be classified as a backward tribe. Instead of forgetting caste, reservations have made it obligatory to carry the label of caste on one's forehead and accentuated caste conflicts. Though the scheduled castes were treated unjustly in the past, the upper caste "armies" attacking the scheduled caste *en masse* and massacring them was unknown in the bad old days. Now such events have become common, thanks to Nehruism.

Nehru's caste policies were more vigorously pursued by his Nehruist successors. In doing this, universally accepted canons of law were flouted. There are laws on the statute book to the following effect:

(1) Caste abuses by a non-scheduled caste member hurled against a scheduled caste member are culpable but a scheduled caste member can abuse a non-scheduled caste member for his caste with impunity.

(2) The burden of proof in such cases will not lie on the scheduled caste but on the 'upper' caste.

(3) The following are offences only when committed by the non-scheduled caste against the scheduled caste:

- I Compelling to eat foul stuff.
- II Throwing dirty and foul things in the vicinity of or on the person.
- III Disrobing and parading a person.
- IV Misappropriating land belonging to the scheduled caste.
- V Inflicting forced labour.
- VI Molesting scheduled caste women.

The above laws imply that the scheduled castes have a right to

molest a non-scheduled caste woman, to disrobe and parade a non-scheduled caste person and to misappropriate his land. I wonder whether any other country has such perverse laws.

The effect of these laws was that they were used for personal vendetta. This gave rise to widespread resentment and riots against the scheduled castes. The riots in Marathvada and the massacres in Bihar were largely due to these laws. When the laws are unjust people take the law into their own hands.

The motive of the post-Nehru politicians in passing such laws was to corner the block votes of the scheduled castes. But Nehru had no such motive. He was never likely to have lost any election. His motive was therefore the same as that of the British, viz., to disrupt Hindu society which he hated and facilitate its conversion to Islam or Christianity.

18.

NEHRU AND SOCIAL REFORM

Just as Nehru's caste policies were an imitation of the British, his ideas of social reform consisted of "bringing our society in line with the West." He introduced the harsh penal provision of 7 years' rigorous imprisonment for bigamy because there is a Christian superstition that bigamy is as heinous an offence as murder. In fact it is nothing of the kind.

We shall now see whether this Nehru "reform" has benefited the women in any way. There was a case of a highly educated woman working in my office who filed a suit against her husband for bigamy. The plea her husband took in the court was that he is not only not married to the woman who is called his second wife by the complainant, he is not even married to the complainant herself. He is living with both of them without marriage!

The court acquitted him.

The woman in the above case could not prove her marriage because it was not registered. But according to the traditional Hindu law even Gandharva marriage, where the couple marry in secret without any witnesses, is accepted as legal. *Janashruti*, that is the *vox populi*, is accepted as evidence. If the couple have been introducing themselves as husband and wife, Hindu law accepts them to be so and no other evidence is required.

Like the law against polygamy, the law against child marriage also has many perverse features.

The Nehruvian prejudice, unlike the stand of the earlier reformers, against child marriage, is completely against the facts of biology. The sex-drive is strongest between 14 and 30 years of age. Not only the sex-drive, but also all the capacities of head and heart are at their peak during this period and some sign of aging begins to appear right at thirty. So prohibition of marriage before the age of 18 amounts to prohibiting it just when it is most needed.

Another important point is that having all the children one wants before one is 30, reduces the age-difference between the children and the parents and thus minimize the generation gap. The children can also be settled before one retires.

Like the law against polygamy, the law against child marriage also discriminates between Hindus and non-Hindus, indicating that the welfare of non-Hindu women is no concern of the government.

The TV shouts day in and day out that a girl below 18 cannot safely bear children. No factual evidence is given for this excepting a statement made without any data that the womb does not grow to its full size before 18. In the same breath it is said that the womb is functionally mature by 18. But functional maturity is all that matters. Like the womb, the height also does not reach its peak before 18. Will this justify prohibiting the under-eighteens from participating in adult sports?

It is sometimes said that prohibition of marriage before 18 will help control population. This again is an absurd expectation because a woman can deliver up to the age of 45 on the average. Thus 27 years of marriage without family planning provides sufficient time for the woman to give birth to more than 10 children if the length of the marital period during the fertile years is regarded as vital for controlling population.

Thus though Nehru sang hymns to science, his whole mentality was anti-scientific and science for him was equivalent to Western superstitions.

The above account shows that Nehru differed with all other political leaders not only on the details of *swaraj* but also on the whole philosophy of *swaraj*. This was made clear when he was very easily persuaded by Mountbatten and Attlee to remain in the British Empire, euphemistically called the Commonwealth. He thought nothing of turning 180 degrees from the resolution of *Poorna swaraj* which he himself had moved less than two decades ago. He moved a resolution in the Constituent Assembly rescinding its earlier resolution of India being an Independent Sovereign Republic by dropping the word independent and recognizing the British Crown as head of the Commonwealth as a symbol of free association. Dr. Malan had suggested in a Commonwealth conference that the Crown would not exercise any constitutional functions in virtue of being the head.

But it should be remembered that the Indian Constitution does not say so and the British have no written Constitution, it has only British conventions. So there is nothing in law to support the claim that India is an independent country; its independence depends on British conventions. Nothing could be more damaging for Indian self-respect.

One has to reach the painful conclusion that Nehru, like the communists, was against Indian independence. The communists want to substitute Soviet or Chinese occupation for independence whereas Nehru wanted to substitute that of the Nehru dynasty emotionally and culturally identifying itself with the Daily Worker section of Englishmen.

PART III

A DIAGNOSIS OF THE NEHRU PHENOMENON

The reader may wonder how it is possible that the most popular Prime Minister of India was also the one whose actions without exception resulted in colossal damage to the interests of the country in all fields. Is it possible, unless the man was deliberately plotting evil ? Since this could not be so, there must be something entirely wrong in the assessment, or the assessment must be motivated by malice against Nehru.

I must answer this charge first. What motive could I have had in deliberately maligning Nehru ? He has done me no personal harm, in fact I was a beneficiary of Nehru's policy of encouragement to science by giving fat jobs to foreign-trained scientists. I belong to this category and it is doubtful whether under any other Prime Minister I would have had a secure job with satisfactory emoluments in a field of research. In fact the English-educated class was the only beneficiary of Nehru's policies. Under the British, this class was groaning under large-scale unemployment. In a family of three brothers, hardly one could find employment, the other two lived on him.

In the Nehru era a large sector of employment for the English-educated which was closed before was opened. This was the officer-ranks in the forces which require officers by the thousands. Besides this the bureaucracy expanded in geometrical progression under Nehru. So the intelligentsia had a good day. This is one reason why this class feels surprised when someone says that under Nehru the country turned the wheel of progress backward. Since the intelligentsia makes public opinion, there was no medium to expose the national danger posed by Nehru and Nehruism.

Though the lowest classes had a bad deal under Nehru, it must be remembered that they too improved their lot under Nehru as compared to what it was under the British. Nehru's performance is dismal when compared to that of almost all other countries, but it was better than that of the British and proved that *swaraj*, however bad, will be better than foreign rule. The President, on the eve of the Republic Day of 1999, said that life-expectation has doubled and literacy has jumped from 18 per cent under the British to 52 per cent. So even the lowest classes had no reason to dislike Nehru because they had no knowledge that they had a ruler who was the worst possible among his contemporaries.

he Hindutva group represented by the Hindu Mahasabha and the RSS did criticise Nehru but this group was anti-Gandhi also and assumed that Nehru was carrying on Gandhi's policies which were anathema to them. Even this group took it for granted that Nehru was working wonders in the economic field. Since this was the touchstone of progress in the modern world, any criticism of Nehru was bound to sound hollow.

Nehru took full advantage of the fact that the Hindutva lobby was anti-Gandhi and had not contributed substantially to the freedom movement under the auspices of their official organizations. Nehru derived maximum advantage from the murder of Gandhi by a man who belonged to the Hindutva ideology. It is doubtful whether Godse was a member of the RSS. He was surely a member of the Hindu Mahasabha and a devotee of Savarkar. There was widespread resentment against Gandhi's last fast among all hues of Indians, not only among the Hindutva lobby. Godse's resentment had nothing specifically to do with the RSS. The court found no evidence that there was any political conspiracy for murdering Gandhi hatched by any political organization; the conspiracy if any was confined to Godse and his friends.

In spite of this, Nehru squarely blamed the RSS for the murder of Gandhi and banned the organization. Even those Indians who resented Gandhi's fast forgot their resentment immediately after the murder and the image of Gandhi "the father of the nation" dominated their emotions. There were therefore no voices against the banning of the RSS. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan sent a letter to Nehru protesting against the ban on RSS, but his letter was ignored and he too soon began to utter unkind words against the organization.

Nehru thus came out as a champion of nationalism against the very group which criticised him for anti-nationalism.

Another leader who persistently criticised Nehru was Ram Manohar

Lohia. He was a good orator. I have listened to his speeches for hours. Lohia even moved a no-confidence motion against Nehru in the Lok Sabha. I read the text of his speech. I am sorry to say that there was hardly anything in Lohia's anti-Nehru harangues which analyzed all Nehru's deeds as Prime Minister. One of his points was that Nehru spent 20,000 rupees per day from the national exchequer on himself. It is difficult to understand how Lohia arrived at this sum. One of his charges was that new airports were built just for the sake of Nehru in places where none were necessary. He has not given the details of these places. It is doubtful whether a single person who was pro-Nehru became anti-Nehru on listening to Lohia's speeches.

22.

IN THE ROLE OF A RULER

Another factor which favoured Nehru was that he was the first Prime Minister of independent India. No Indian leader before him including Gandhi was seen by the people in the role of an all-India ruler. The gullible even said that Nehru is greater than other national rulers who flourished before him because they ruled over only a small portion of India whereas Nehru was ruling over the whole of India. With this criterion not only Nehru but also Charansingh, Chandrashekhar and Narasimha Rao are greater than Shivaji. With five decades passing with the emergence of new men greater than Shivaji, in a time sometimes shorter than five years, India has now no dearth of great men !

Nehru's image was bolstered up in the beginning by the achievements of Sardar Patel. The integration of the Indian states with the ruthless action in Junagadh and Hyderabad were the solid achievements of Sardar Patel. He also brought Pakistan to its knees on the issue of the Hindu refugees from East Pakistan by amassing troops on its border. Since all this happened when Nehru was Prime Minister, Nehru got the credit for all these achievements. It is an open secret that Sardar Patel had to reckon with the opposition of Nehru in doing all this, but for saying this the opponents of Nehru have to produce evidence which concerns happenings behind the curtain. The people go by the obvious and are not impressed by long-winded arguments.

The waves of Hindu refugees which the newly independent India had to cope with were ably managed by Sardar Patel and the refugees were settled in a reasonable time, unlike in Pakistan where they are not yet finding their feet. The credit for this also went to Nehru even within the very group which suffered most from Muslim atrocities and which could have hated Nehru for his pro-Muslim policies. Even this group was thus softened towards him.

Another factor which tilted the balance in favour of Nehru was his much advertised Five Year Plans. Big dams like Bhakra-Nangal silenced

the critics of Nehru; so did the huge science laboratories established by him. It is only a decade after Nehru's demise that the real worth of Nehru's Five Year Plans and his services to science were exposed.

Thus there is a clear explanation why Nehru remained popular in spite of his many anti-national deeds.

It should be clear from the foregoing pages that much of what Nehru did as Prime Minister has harmed the nation.

PART IV

FACETS OF NEHRU'S PERSONALITY

One might ask, "Can it happen that everything a man does is harmful to the nation unless there is some underlying cause in the man's personality leading to this eventuality?" There is no basis to suppose that there was any such anti-national feature in Nehru's personality which could explain this anti-national behaviour. This one argument has the power to silence the estimate of Nehru's doings in the foregoing pages. It is therefore necessary to analyze Nehru's personality to seek an explanation of his persistent anti-national behaviour.

There were several facets to Nehru's personality. However much one may try to denigrate him, some good qualities in him are undeniable. The foremost was that he was a fairly good writer. I have read all his books and it is undeniable that one can read through them effortlessly. His language is easy-flowing and he had a poetic streak. Some of his epigrams are of considerable value. The one I like most is: "If there is a God it will be necessary not to worship Him." Only a man with literary powers out of the ordinary can write a line like this.

But Nehru's writings themselves throw light on his limitations. All his books are of the nature of historical narratives. There is nothing original in them. The most remarkable quality is the easy-flowing and mostly chaste English, mostly because the use of the terms "secular", "communal" etc. was altogether at variance with standard English as we know it from the dictionaries. Recognizing Muslim laws because they are based on scriptures, and giving special privileges to certain religions because they are in a minority were according to him "secular" practices. If this is secular one wonders what is anti-secular. He used the word "communal" as an antithesis of "secular". In fact the word has no such meaning. As pointed out by no less an authority than Sarojini Naidu, "communal" is what is held in common. None of the meanings of the word "communal" given in the dictionary justifies Nehru's categorization of the RSS as "communal".

One might think that the use of the word "secular" by Nehru to designate something which is exactly the opposite was deliberate like the use of the term "democracy" by the communists to describe Stalin's dictatorship. This might be so but the use of the word "communal" does not brook any such explanation. Nehru had no sense for accuracy. It should be remembered that the communists used the word "democracy" because democracy is a popular ideal and it is difficult to push dictatorship openly as something in itself desirable. It had to be couched with the cover of the word "democracy". In fact most people are reluctant to call themselves secular because they want to be religious and secularism denies the validity of religion in the most important field of social life, viz., law and administration. The Constitution-makers were therefore reluctant to introduce the word "secular" in the Constitution. If the Constitution was really secular it could not possibly make freedom to practise and propagate religion a fundamental right.

In spite of the fact that the Constitution did not declare itself secular, Nehru went on proclaiming that India is a secular state. He ignored the fact that if India is a secular state the fundamental right to practise and propagate religion has to go. He was not bothered by the correct meaning of the word "secular" and was not concerned with establishing a state which does not recognize any scripture whether Hindu or non-Hindu as a basis for laws and administration. Nehru's only purpose in declaring India to be a secular state was to declare that India is *not* a Hindu state. Hence, after Nehru's frequent use of the term, it has come to mean 'non-Hindu'. So the "secular" front against the BJP today includes the Muslim League as the secularist of all secular forces.

My first contact with Nehru was as a member of the crowd which had gathered to listen to his speech. Some time in 1935 Nehru's speech was advertised with fanfare. Talk was current in those days that Nehru's family is so rich that their clothes were sent to Paris for washing. It was said that Motilal Nehru, his father, charged fees equivalent to his son's weight in gold. The tale was passing from mouth to mouth that Motilal Nehru ordered his Scotch whisky straight from Scotland and even when in jail, the governor of UP sent his own bottle of whisky to him. So the masses admired prohibitionist Gandhi for his teetotaling and at the same time admired his disciples for consuming costly alcohol. It was said that Jawaharlal gave up all this life of luxury and joined Gandhi, wearing coarse khaddar which pricked his skin which was said to be bathed before in a tub of alcohol.

These tales will make it clear why Ram Manohar Lohia's diatribes against Nehru's spending Rs.20,000 per day did not turn a single one among his audience against Nehru. A man who used to bathe in alcohol and get his clothes washed in Paris must spend Rs.20,000 per day; he is no commoner like Lohia but a prince-charming.

Nehru came late for the meeting; we were eagerly waiting for him. I twice decided to leave but was prevented by the announcement that Nehru was just arriving. Nehru came, his coming was announced by the cry "*Nehru ki jai*". (He did not seem to have earned a popular title like Mahatma and Lokmanya.) People were thronging to touch his feet but he was mercilessly kicking them with booted feet. This did not seem to have caused any resentment. I regard this scene as symbolic of Nehru's career as Prime Minister which consisted of kicking Hindus and the Hindus' licking his boots.

On the dais somebody asked for his autograph and handed over his pen. The pen would not write, so Nehru slapped the autograph hunter. The latter was stunned, but descended the dais smiling and caressing his cheek as if it bore a Royal favour.

Nehru started speaking.

Among all the tales about Nehru's greatness, his being a great orator did not figure. He was surely a handsome man, but he was certainly no speaker. He was supposed to address us in Hindi, but the language he spoke was surely *not* Hindi. I had heard Hindi speeches before specially in my sojourns to Madhya Pradesh where many of my relatives were living. What Nehru spoke was certainly not that language. I understood every word of the Madhya Pradesh speakers but about 40% of Nehru's speech was hardly comprehensible. I was later told that the language he spoke was Urdu and not Hindi.

Later I discovered that language was not the only cause of non-comprehension. The speech itself was a product of a brain which was incapable of clear and consistent thinking. Nehru was jumping from topic to topic without any apparent connection. This rambling was so pronounced that it was difficult to figure out what Nehru was speaking about. Most of his speech consisted of frequent references to what was happening in Europe and China.

I do not wish to suggest that this is a verbatim report of one particular lecture. Though typical, none of the sentences reported below are fastened on to Nehru. Some of the gems are worth quoting.

"Catastrophic happenings are taking place in the world (i.e., in Europe). Fascism is threatening everything we cherish. People here are bothered about villages being washed away by floods. Why should they not build their villages on hill-tops? Here China is engulfed by reactionary forces and is attacked by fascist Japan. What are we doing about it? People complain about paucity of grain. If grain is scarce why should they not eat bananas?" So on and so on.

The above gives a fair idea of the nature of his speeches and behaviour. Occasionally there were some disturbances in the corners of the meetings. When these took place Nehru would utter abuses like *kamina*, pull up his sleeves and try to rush at trouble-makers. He was held

by many admirers and prevented from entering into the fray. (Sita Ram Goel: *'Why I am a Hindu'*).

Fluency was conspicuous by its absence in Nehru's speeches. Frequently sentences would be left incomplete. If one were to judge his intelligence from his speeches, the estimate would not be very flattering.

Intelligence is of 120 types, according to Guilford. These are not necessarily interconnected. The number of correlations possible are $(120 \times 119)/2$. Out of these 38% have been shown to be zero. The rest also can be shown to be so if we go on purifying the tests so that each test gives an independent estimate uncorrelated with other tests.

Out of the 120 types of intelligence, very few are connected with the ability to write historical narratives in any interesting way. This was the only forte Nehru displayed in his life. It cannot even be said that he had linguistic ability of a high order. He knew no other language excepting English. He flaunted his love for Urdu but his speeches and writings do not betray any knowledge of Urdu literature. One cannot make too much of his mastery of English when one remembers that he was educated in English right in England from the high school standard. At home also English was spoken. So it would be evidence of low intelligence if he had not acquired mastery of English to the level he did. If one were to estimate I.Q. from linguistic ability, Narasimha Rao will have to be regarded far more intelligent than Nehru, being fluent in half a dozen languages. Writing creative literature is a surer evidence of intelligence than writing "*Glimpses of World History*", "*An Autobiography*" and "*Discovery of India*".

Taking stock of Nehru's family, one cannot help remarking that low I.Q. was a trait running in the Nehru family. Motilal Nehru failed in his B.A. and became a lawyer by passing the *munsif* examination. Vijayalaxmi Pandit could not obtain any degree. Indira Gandhi could not pass any public examination. Jawaharlal was the only graduate in the Nehru family but he too by no means was known as a brilliant student.

Some people say that academic performance is not a criterion of intelligence. This is belied by the fact that intelligence tests have a substantial correlation with academic performance. This correlation like all correlations in Psychology is very far from perfect but that only means

that academic ability is not identical with intelligence. Intelligence is only one factor in academic performance. The other obvious factor is industry. Legible and fast handwriting enabling the student to transfer on paper what he knows, in the prescribed time, though a minor factor in ability, is a major factor in success in examinations.

It is often pointed out that Lokmanya Tilak failed twice in his M.A. and never made it, but nobody dare say that his intelligence was not of a high order.

Tilak's case should be further scrutinized. Tilak passed B.A. in the first division and Mathematics was his main subject. No psychologist would concede that a student who does B.A. Mathematics with credit does not have the basic ability to pass M.A. Mathematics. Tilak's failure in M.A. must therefore be explained by causes other than lack of basic ability.

One obvious cause was his not being able to devote whole time to his studies. After B.A. Tilak was spending some time in earning his livelihood. He was not a whole-time student.

Another reason can be found in Tilak's head-strong temperament which led him to pursue an idea doggedly once he had taken it up and to lose all sense of proportion. This was displayed in Mathematics since his early days. When a problem was found very difficult he would neglect all other studies and be lost in finding its solution. His other fellow students would just note down the solution after he found it and rejoice at the idea that they have done full justice to other subjects besides reaping the fruits of Tilak's labour and scoring over him not only in other subjects but even in Mathematics.

This trait of Tilak was seen in the way he pursued the insignificant Tai Maharaja case, fighting right up to the Privy Council, just for vindicating the cause of the son adopted by his deceased friend, though his wife did not want the boy and disowned the adoption after the death of her husband. The energy, money and time spent in this case could have been utilized for more fruitful causes.

Tilak similarly must have spent disproportionate time on those topics which engrossed him and neglected other parts of the course. This

is my reading of Tilak's failure. It is a pity that the biographer N.C. Kelkar who was close to Tilak has not tried to explain Tilak's failure and has brushed aside the subject after reporting his failure.

Some people ask me whether Gandhi also should be regarded as a man of low I.Q. on the basis of his average academic performance. I would answer this question with an emphatic NO, for the following reasons:

I do not find statements like (1) "People should eat bananas if they are unable to get grain" and (2) "Villages should be laid on hill-tops lest they are washed away by floods", in any of Gandhi's speeches and writings.

I once discussed matters with Gandhi and found him to be a cogent speaker like a lawyer. Gandhi had full grasp of reality and did not delude himself that his success in the Satyagraha movement was due to his miraculous spiritual powers. He knew that the British would let him die if he undertook a fast unto death and therefore himself limited his fast to 21 days. Every political decision of Gandhi was based on sound reasons and in my opinion it was the best that could have been done under the circumstances.

Nehru had no grasp of reality as is clear from the fact that he regarded himself as a leader of the world. "I am more than a Prime Minister of India", he once told Parliament. Gandhi had no such illusions though his influence was far greater. Nehru admitted at the time of the Chinese invasion that he was "living in an imaginary world of [his] own making". He had seriously believed that the Chinese would not attack India.

When he was the leader of the non-alignment movement, he regarded China as only its camp follower. The Chinese had signed the *Panchasheel* agreement which Nehru thought was a great international achievement. He did not realize the simple fact that no nation would ever say that it does not want peace. Even Hitler justified his wars as wars of defence against the enemy who attacked Germany "for the second time".

Nehru's illusions could have been described as symptoms of schizophrenia (which is not related to low intelligence) if they had continued unabated after the Chinese invasion. But since he realized that they were illusions they have to be attributed to defective intelligence.

A question arises as to whether a lover's illusion that a particular girl loves him, when in fact she holds him in contempt, is a mark of defective intelligence. The answer depends on how far the lover got a chance to associate with the girl and draw appropriate conclusions from her behaviour. If he had very meagre contact with her and his was love at a distance, his illusions cannot be attributed to defective intelligence.

Blinding passion coupled with insufficient knowledge is an adequate explanation of the delusion. But Nehru's ideas about laying villages on hill-tops and eating bananas to combat grain shortage cannot be attributed to any blinding passion or insufficient knowledge. He may not have known the comparative economics of bananas and rice and therefore this particular utterance can be of a piece with that of Marie Antoinette's famous solution of eating cakes for combating bread-shortage. But imagining that village-people are like the rich who live on hill-stations cannot be referred to any cause other than low intelligence.

Gandhi's average academic record is not coupled with such errors of judgement. He was in the habit of clothing his ideas in spiritual terms and this made them unacceptable to the rational. "Untouchability causes earthquakes in Bihar", Machines should not be used because "work is worship", "Non-violence should be practised against the British because violence is always a sin" are some of his pronouncements which are ridiculous on the face. But every one of them enshrines a principle which has solid rational justification. "Untouchability causes earthquakes in Bihar" emphasizes that untouchability is as bad as earthquakes. "Work is worship" emphasizes the principle that in a country like India which is short of capital and rich in population, economic plans should be labour-intensive and not capital-intensive. The insistence on non-violence in the freedom movement underscores the obvious fact that under the British, India was in no position to use violence against the British and such violence would have been ruthlessly suppressed sounding the death-knell of the freedom movement.

Another evidence of Gandhi's intelligence was his mastery of several languages. It is well known that Gandhi knew several Indian languages and tried to speak to people of different provinces in their own language. It can very well be appreciated that simultaneous mastery over several languages does draw upon a high degree of general intelligence. Even a man of low intelligence can obtain mastery over English by deciding not to use any other language but English, whether he is in his bed, kitchen or bathroom. This is what the conventvallas do and what Nehru largely did except for the compulsion of speaking in "Hindustani" to the masses. There is no evidence that he ever read Hindi newspapers;

if he did his notion that Sanskritized Hindi was invented by the "chauvinists" in the AIR after independence was not honest but a deliberate false propaganda. Similarly it is doubtful whether he read a single Hindi book like a novel by Premchand from cover to cover. Some Urdu-knowers assure me that the language he spoke was not the type of language which a man accustomed to reading Urdu would speak.

In short Nehru was ignorant of any language other than English. One can hardly expect such a man to be in tune with the intellectual and emotional world of his fellow countrymen.

A word must be said about the philosophy which Nehru adopted. It is said that no adolescent in the 1920s escaped the influence of Marx and whoever did not grow out of that influence by the 1940s had not grown out of his adolescence by then.

This epigram is applicable to Nehru. His writings and speeches do not indicate that he had read '*Das Kapital*' of Marx and other important writings excepting the Communist Manifesto, nor was he aware of what economists think of Marx's labour theory of value, and historians of his interpretation of history, nor philosophers of his Dialectical Materialism. In short Nehru's communism was an ill-informed adolescent enthusiasm. This as another indication of Nehru's mediocre intelligence.

Mediocre academic performance as a family trait, misjudgement of oneself as a world leader, no evidence of logical thinking, these are sufficient grounds for supposing that Nehru did not have sufficient intelligence for discharging the duties of a Prime Minister.

29.

NEPOTISM

Nehru was different from all other Congress leaders in most respects. One such point of difference was the trait of nepotism. Mahatma Gandhi did not try to pass on his leadership of India to his sons. Sardar Patel did not try to make Manibehn Patel, his daughter, the Congress President or to bring her to political prominence in any other way. Dr. Rajendra Prasad is also not known to have helped his kith and kin to attain prominence in politics.

On the contrary nepotism was a trend running in the Nehru family. Motilal Nehru persuaded Gandhi to make Jawaharlal the President of the Congress. Nehru in turn, when he became Prime Minister, appointed Vijayalaxmi Pandit ambassador to Russia. Vijayalaxmi's performance in Russia was so poor as to prove that beyond being Nehru's sister she had no other qualification for the job. Stalin did not see her even once. She presented her papers in English. The Russian authorities objected by saying that it is customary to present diplomatic papers in the national language. Vijayalaxmi thereupon presented them in Hindi. But her Hindi was the Nehruist Hindi, not the Hindi of the Constitution. It referred to the President of India as *sabhapati*. Russian experts in Hindi pointed out that *sabhapati* means chairman and not the head of a state. The President of India is called *Rashtrapati* in the Constitution. Thereupon the papers were changed with the sorry spectacle of the Russians teaching the Indian ambassador her own language. (Dhulekar, Congress M.P. from Jhansi).

While travelling in Europe I heard a widespread complaint against Vijayalaxmi. She was alleged to be in the habit of lifting lakhs of rupees worth of goods from shops without paying for them. The bills were then sent to Nehru for payment and no doubt they were debited to the accounts of the Government of India.

General Kaul's elevation was due to the fact that he was a 'Kaul'. Nehru's Kashmiri surname was Kaul; the family was called Nehru because their ancestors were in charge of a *nahar*, i.e., canal.

Brig. Sharma in his recent book has charged Pt. Nehru of lying in Parliament by saying that "The COAS has put up three names for promotion to the rank of a Lt.-General. The second in the list had not commanded a division but Maj.-Gen. Kaul had and was better suited for the promotion." This statement according to Brig. Sharma was contrary to the facts known to Nehru.

Gen. Kaul's performance later proved that like Vijayalaxmi he owed his position to kinship with Nehru and not to merit.

The fact that all Nehru's favourites were unconcerned with the interests of the country and two of the five were even charged with treason reminds one of the well-known adage "Man is known by the company he keeps."

Nehru's weakness for Teja is explained by some as weakness for the charms of Mrs. Teja. Nehru had a weakness for women. Some may not regard this trait as a defect in personality but a mark of manliness, if kept within bounds. But this proviso was absent in the case of Nehru. Towards the close of 1949 he came to address the convocation ceremony of the Nagpur University. After his address he was taken to the airport in an open car from which he greeted the crowd. There was a good-looking girl in the crowd. Nehru went on looking at her turning his back till she could no longer be seen. I am an eye-witness to this incident.

Menon was a brilliant man and came in contact with Nehru in his student days. Since Nehru himself was conscious that he was average in academic performance, Menon may have made an impression on him. Nehru's weakness for Mathai and Sheikh Abdullah has no obvious explanation. Both Mathai and the Sheikh were anti-Hindu and *ipso facto* anti-national. It is persistently seen that Nehru had a weakness for anti-Hinduism.

Nehru's anti-Hinduism must not be mistaken for the anti-Hinduism of atheists and reformers like Dayananda, Agarkar and Savarkar. The atheists do not substitute other religions for Hinduism as objects of their respect; they have as much contempt for the theism of other religions as that of Hinduism. Savarkar and Agarkar were social reformers; their

hatred was directed towards the suicidal evils in Hindu society. This hatred stemmed from their love of the Hindu society which they wanted to be cured of the weaknesses which spelled its downfall. Dayananda, Savarkar and Agarkar hated the enemies of Hindus like the medieval invaders and the missionaries. Their blood boiled at the thought of the deliberate and wanton desecration of Hindu holy places by these invaders, though they themselves did not necessarily regard these places as holy. Their resentment of the invaders stemmed from the fact that their fellow countrymen had deep emotions about these places and they respected the emotions of their countrymen.

Nehru on the other hand had contempt towards the Hindus and rejoiced at their discomfiture at the hands of the invaders. He regarded the invaders as national rulers and the spots reminding us of the devastation they wrought were regarded by him as places which Hindus should respect, just as the Roman rulers expected the slaves to flaunt the ring which they put round their necks as mark of their slavery, or in the jails the prisoners are expected to wash their chains and keep them spotlessly clean like ornaments.

30. ANGLO-COMMUNIST TROJAN HORSE IN THE FREEDOM MOVEMENT

A part from inborn inadequacies like those of low intelligence, Nehru's upbringing explains many others. The atmosphere in his house was Anglicized and Persianized. Mostly English was used at home. The invitations for Nehru's marriage and even his thread ceremony were in Urdu. I was shocked to note this because the thread ceremony as well as the marriage is regarded as an auspicious rite and the use of languages like Urdu and English which are linked with shameful events in our history introduces a discordant note of inauspiciousness in them. Later under Nehru's tutelage English is continuously being used for all purposes and those who have been nurtured in the Nehru era do not realize that English and Urdu have the capacity of nipping all sense of nationalism in the bud. Nehru pretended to believe that Urdu is the spoken language of a vast majority of Indians and never abandoned this dogma even when facts were repeatedly brought to his notice.

Nehru was educated at Harrow and Cambridge. During his stay in England he came under the influence of communism, but joining the communist movement in the British days was a dangerous proposition. Nehru, in spite of the oft-repeated claim that he was an idealist, was far from being so. He scrupulously kept aloof from the communist movement and never became a card-holding member of the communist party. He similarly kept Savarkar and other Indian revolutionaries (who were active in England during Nehru's student days) at not only the arm's but perhaps a mile's length.

Nehru chose to join the Congress and tried to convert it into a communist fellow travelling organization. In this he failed during Gandhi's lifetime, but translated his cherished dream into actuality after the death of Gandhi and Sardar Patel.

Nehru was thus English by culture, and communist by ideology: an Anglo-Communist Trojan horse in the freedom movement.

Some people ask me, "How is it possible for anybody to hate his

own country and try to harm it ?" They will get the answer if they study the communist ideology. The sum and substance of this ideology is that Hindus, i.e., 85 per cent of the people of this country even now, and people who constituted the bulk of the country since time immemorial, deserve to be wiped out and the invaders from Alexander to Clive and Warren Hastings were engaged in this noble task and are therefore worthy of worship. There are thousands of people wedded to this ideology. If this ideology is not anti-national, I fail to see what is anti-national. The communist ideology was precisely the ideology of Nehru.

With the glasses of communism on his eyes Nehru made himself thoroughly incapable of understanding events either in India or elsewhere. He always translated them into events in Europe.

The fact that Nehru used his power to falsify history to malign Hindus shows that he was well aware that the history as it exists does not warrant a ghost of justification to his comparison of the Hindus with the Nazis and the Muslims with the Jews. Nehru's Hindu-baiting therefore cannot be excused on the basis of ignorance and innocence.

31.

HINDU-BAITING

I have tried to understand the case of Hitler against the Jews and have read Hitler's *Mein Kaemph*. What I read is more similar to Jyotiba Phule's case against the Brahmins based on fanciful history and missionary propaganda. Max Muller's imagination which gave birth to the mythical people called the Aryans, a distinct race who have the prerogative of all virtue and other excellence, was accepted by Hitler and he added to it another race thoroughly vile and crafty, viz., that of the Jews who did tremendous harm to the Aryans. Copying Marx, for whom all history was a struggle of the classes in which the labour class was destined to emerge victorious in the end by the decree of Dialectical Materialism, Hitler depicts the whole history of mankind as a struggle between the Aryans and the Jews in which the Aryans are destined to win by the decrees of Woton. Anybody can see that there is nothing similar in this to the Hindu-Muslim cleavage. The cleavage here is based on undeniable facts of history which Nehru tried to conceal in concoctions by hiring "historians" like Tarachand.

The Hindu-Muslim conflict is not racial. The Hindus can become Muslims and *vice versa*. It is not possible for the Jews to become Aryans. So there is no redemption for the Jews; they are condemned for ever to Aryan "justice".

Nehru had another trait which came in the way of his understanding Hindu history. This was a thorough contempt for the Hindus. This contempt was the outcome of his exotic upbringing. Islam is international, Hinduism is not. Islam carried its flag right into the heart of Europe for several centuries. Hinduism has no such 'glorious' record to boast of. The European writers have always looked upon the Hindus as servile and the record going back through several centuries justified this attitude. Nehru imbibed it in the absence of any emotional attachment to Hindu heritage. If therefore the Muslims persecuted the Hindus, there is nothing to feel sorry about it. That is what the Hindus deserve.

Why then was Nehru attracted to Gandhi ?

As an adolescent Nehru was in search of an ideology as in that age nobody is satisfied with a matter-of-fact planning of one's personal career merely for material gain. This need for an ideology was satisfied by communism. Nehru lived in an age when no young man escaped communist influence. Gandhi was not far removed in time from the Russian revolution and the socialist ideology. But his own personality was so strong that everything that influenced him did not itself escape being influenced by him in turn. He was brought up in a Hindu home, but the Hinduism of Gandhi was more Gandhian than orthodox.

Nehru did not have such a strong personality; there was nothing original about him. He was attracted to Gandhi's movement because the freedom struggle of India, being a struggle against Britain, a capitalist country, was regarded even in communist circles as a part of the movement against capitalism. The communist party did not regard Gandhi's movement anti-capitalist and asked its followers to oppose it, but communism nevertheless advocated a revolution against the British.

Nehru did not toe this line because he was thoroughly practical where his personal interests were involved. Further, he was an aristocrat by nature; ideology for him was one of the plumes of a stylish aristocratic life, not a dedication. Joining any revolution amounts to writing off one's life. Nehru did not live for an ideology; he wanted an ideology to make his life grand. The British government was harsh on the communists. Joining any communist revolution in the British days would have been a road to the gallows or at least to hard labour for life as in the case of Dange.

Gandhi's movement was comparatively safer. The British were convinced that Gandhi would not take to violence; on the contrary his movement was regarded by them as a safety valve against a violent

upsurge like that of 1857. Hume's idea in founding the Indian National Congress was to provide such a safety valve. The Congress leaders were therefore treated leniently and got comfort in jails.

Nehru decided to have the best of both the worlds by joining Gandhi and hoped to convert Gandhi himself to communism. He has reported in his autobiography how he preached the virtues of communism to Gandhi at length and has regretted that Gandhi's ears were open but his mind was closed. Gandhi was downright practical and was not interested in the mythologies of communism. Its main appeal was the claim that it is the champion of the poor and Gandhi saw no reason why anybody should need the label of communism and the leadership of Stalin for championing the cause of the poor. Nehru contented himself by presenting pro-communist resolutions on foreign policy to the Congress and others let them be passed and did not think it worth while to waste time on debating them, since the resolutions were operationally completely irrelevant in the given condition of the Congress when it was not in the government; and the British government which was in the saddle did not need the advice of the Congress for conducting its foreign policy.

Another example of Nehru's practical sense where threat to his own position was involved was his *volte-face* about the Indian National Army of Subhash Chandra Bose. He said in a meeting in Bihar : "Subhash has joined the Fascists and is thus on a wrong path. If he steps into India along with the fascist forces of Japan, I will fight against him". On hearing this the audience hooted him out with one voice. He then realized that it was not safe to take Subhash Chandra Bose head on. He therefore ate his words and subsequently donned his Barrister's gown for defending the INA soldiers who were being tried by the British in the Red Fort. It was obvious that Nehru had no particular role to play in the defence. The defence was in the hands of the experienced lawyer Bhulabhai Desai and Nehru's legal acumen if any never showed up in this trial. But the news that Nehru was defending the INA heroes served its purpose by indicating that Nehru was on the right side of the masses.

Nehru was true to the grain of the Hindu communists. Communists throughout the world have the same hue but the Hindu communists have a special shade not shared by others. This is utter contempt for everything in their heritage, i.e., Hindu heritage. I have met Muslim communists, the chief among them was Nurul Hasan who was my fellow-student at Oxford. Far from having any contempt for Islam and Islamic culture, he had great pride in the Muslim conquest of India. His friends and admirers told me that he claimed to belong to a clan directly related to the Prophet and his forefathers were not Hindus, unlike those of other Indian Muslims. His physical features however were quite like those of any other Indian Muslim. He defended Aurangzeb, condemned Shivaji and whenever he met the citizens of the Muslim republics of the USSR, as he said he did, he prevailed on them to shed Russian influence and return to the pristine purity of Islam, by which he meant the Turko-Arabic culture. He ridiculed Darwin and his doctrine of evolution as it is against the tenets of Islam.

Now take the Chinese communists. The Chinese communists belied the expectations of the Hindu communists. A Hindu communist friend of mine once took a bet that the Chinese quarrel with the Soviet Union is stage-managed to hoodwink the Americans; no communist will think of challenging the leadership of Stalin and the Soviet Union. The Chinese communists broke with the Russian because the Soviet Union was not helping them to make their own atom bomb. The Chinese not only made their own bomb without the help of the Soviet Union and in spite of the determined opposition of the American camp but also made their country developed in most fields. They also swore by the history of China and claimed every territory over which China had a sway in history however remote. I am sure the Hindu communists in power would never have done any of these things. They would have substituted Soviet imperialism for the British and made India a colony of the USSR. In fact Nehru rule was a fair replica of what Communist India would have been, excepting for democracy and the fact that in the economic and foreign policy matters, Nehru's India continued to be a colony of Britain and not of the USSR.

Hindu communists revile everything Hindu. While writing Indian history they try to make out that whatever little this country has for which some good words can be said is wholly due to the invaders, first the Aryans, then the Greeks, Shakas and Kushanas; it is wrong to say that the Gupta age was the golden age in the history of India; the Guptas were Hindus and could not and did not usher in a golden age: that privilege belongs to the invaders. Later this grand work was undertaken by the Turks and Mughals. Shivaji and his hordes were mere looters and did nothing but wrong. The British though doomed by Dialectical Materialism to lose in the end have to be thanked for ushering in capitalism in feudal India and thus carrying it a stage further in the pinnacles of history. About 1857 the communist attitude is ambivalent, because their mentor and preceptor Karl Marx described it as a war of independence, but most communists and fellow-travellers have not read this piece by Marx and they continue to revile 1857 as a struggle of Rajas and Maharajas trying to resurrect feudalism and block the wheels of progress.

Nehru enjoined these views on history writers by issuing such guidelines. I wonder whether the Chinese communists thus glorify the invaders of China.

In assessing the RSS movement during the British period we are wrongly viewing it in the light of later history. Nobody during the British rule thought that the British would transfer power in a peaceful way through the method of elections. Everybody thought that the British would leave only if they are defeated by some foreign power and in the vacuum left there is bound to be a Hindu-Muslim conflict for the mastery of India. The Muslims would not be satisfied by having a piece of India but would want the whole country since they were constantly thinking of reviving the days of the Mughals. Under such circumstances it is suicidal to leave the Hindus unorganized and an easy prey to Muslim overlordship. The RSS was preparing against this eventuality. That this eventuality did not in fact arise does not render the RSS movement ill advised or harmful, any more than carrying a gun while wading through a lion-infested forest can be regarded as ill advised simply because no lion did in fact confront the explorer.

It should be noted that Gandhi who is often accused of appeasement of Muslims never fulminated against the RSS in the Nehru fashion. He even addressed an RSS rally and only asked whether the scheduled castes are admitted to the RSS since the RSS wants to consolidate all

Hindus. He even chatted with some scheduled caste followers of RSS to satisfy himself that they were well treated in the organization. Sardar Patel warned Nehru that in dealing with the RSS he should not forget that he was dealing with patriots and not with criminals. Nehru's RSS-phobia was not shared by anyone in the Congress; it was a peculiarly communist trait.

Nehru's attitude can be explained by another trait of his, viz., internationalism. In order to remain in the eyes of the West, concern for the Muslims is more handy than concern for Hindus. It should be remembered that Nehru's speeches do not indicate any concern for the scheduled castes. The explanation is clear: the scheduled castes have no champions outside India.

This "internationalist" attitude of Nehru was at the back of his lauding the British occupation as the fourth chapter of our civilization.

This attitude of Nehru must be distinguished from Justice Ranade's in describing the British conquest of India as a "divine dispensation". Ranade in thus describing the conquest is not gloating over the lot of this country but expressing his anguish. This is clear from his Herculean efforts to found the discipline of Indian Economics which exposes the expropriatory nature of the "dispensation". Nehru and the communists, on the other hand, gloated over the plight of the Hindus as well deserved. It will take much persuasion not to declare such an attitude as a form of treason.

Hindu-baiting *a la* Hindu communists guided most of Nehru's policies.

A direct outcome of Hindu-baiting and alien education was Nehru's mania for world leadership. His autobiography sold well in foreign countries. This was an unfortunate development for the shaping of Nehru's personality. He convinced himself that he was not merely a leader of India, he was destined to be a world leader. Thenceforward his policies were guided to secure a world image for himself and the interests of this country were treated as expendable capital for securing this aim.

Gandhi was not altogether immune from this tendency. It is one of the principles of Psychology that what you say as propaganda knowing full well that it is a lie, takes hold of you as a truth. A lie meant for foreign consumption becomes a self-addictive drug.

Gandhi preached *ahimsa* as a religion out of practical necessity. But this constant teaching took hold of his mind as a gospel of which he considered himself to be a prophet. His admirers included men like Einstein. Foreigners flocked to Sevagram and became his disciples. It would have taken superhuman capacity for self-examination not to lose head over this phenomenal success. Gandhi displayed it to a large extent but sometimes had tantrums for playing a world role.

His last fast was one such tantrum. Jinnah debunked his claim to be a leader of Muslims as well as Hindus. This debunking was publicized throughout the world, since it took place as part of the historic event of transfer of power. Gandhi therefore wanted to do something dramatic to impress the world that he was not merely a Hindu leader, he was a world figure and regarded both Pakistan and India as his creatures. He therefore undertook the last fast for forcing the Government of India to release Rs.55 crore to Pakistan and not to withhold the sum for bringing pressure.

It should be remembered that there was a Congress government at the Centre which took the decision to withhold Rs.55 crores from Pakistan. Gandhi was the undisputed leader of the Congress and he could easily have used his influence to get the government decision changed. But such a course could have defeated the very purpose of dramatizing and advertising the fact that it is Gandhi, the world leader, who had come to the succour of Pakistan. The event would have been forgotten like many routine decisions of the Congress. Hence the drama of the fast.

Thus Gandhi was not altogether averse to playing to the international gallery *a la* Nehru. But here again a careful analysis of the Rs.55 crore affair shows the basic distinction between Gandhi and Nehru.

Gandhi chose an issue for the fast which could help in dramatizing his international concerns without too much harm for India. Nehru showed little concern for the interests of this country in playing to the international gallery. His agreeing to cease-fire in Kashmir before liberating the whole of it, promising plebiscite without anybody asking for it, and damaging India's case in Kashmir by the blatant propaganda that genocide of Muslims was going on in India, the surrender of Tibet to China, though at that time the whole world including Russia could have opposed the rape of Tibet if only India had stood against it, communicating the date of India's entry into Goa to the Portuguese authorities and thus endangering the lives of jawans, encouragement to Pakistani infiltrators to enter India, legalizing the *Shariat* in India in blatant violation of the Constitution, encouraging the conversion of Hindus in Nagaland, aiding and abetting the Naga rebellion - these were raven acts of treason perpetrated just to play to the international gallery. What was just an occasional aberration in Gandhi was a second nature in Nehru.

35.

NEHRU AND WOMEN

A good deal has been circulated about Nehru and Lady Mountbatten. There is a tendency among Indians to treat this as a feather in the cap of Nehru and the country. Rusi Modi is said to have seen the duo in a compromising position. There is a French book on the subject.

There is no doubt that sexual morality is becoming loose in the West. The Diana affair has shown that the disease has spread to the royal family as well.

On the contrary there is a book on Mountbatten reviewed by the fortnightly '*Sadhana*' under the name '*The Viceroy Out of the Ordinary*' which quotes a letter by the then Prime Minister of Britain, which includes the sentence "Mrs. Mountbatten can take care of them all." This book also contains a reference to Jinnah as the only incorruptible Indian politician who becomes deaf when anything not concerned with Pakistan is spoken. So single-minded in purpose was Jinnah.

These references show that whatever Lady Mountbatten felt about Nehru cannot be described as love; it was in keeping with modern sexual trends in the West where flirtation is not looked down upon and no husband expects his wife to have refrained from touching another male.

Lady Mountbatten's flirtations with Nehru, if Rusi Modi is to be believed, has another facet. She influenced Nehru's political decisions. This shows that the flirtations were not unmotivated; she was making a fool of Nehru for political gains.

The certificate to Jinnah as the only incorruptible politician casts a reflection on Gandhi. This is painful, but it has to be remembered that Gandhi with his experiments in celibacy no longer remained normal in sex matters and was prone to being influenced by feminine charms. But he cannot be charged of taking political decisions under the influence of the likes of Lady Mountbatten. On the contrary there is reason to believe that Nehru's decision to stay in the British Empire and to refer the Kashmir dispute to the United Nations were taken under the influence of Lady Mountbatten. It is well known that these were Mountbatten's

ideas and the possibility that Nehru could have been influenced by Mountbatten even without the intervention of Lady Mountbatten cannot be ruled out. But it is anybody's guess that Lady Mountbatten made Nehru totally amenable to Mountbatten. Gopal in his panegyric has clearly stated, "Nehru, in the sphere of administration, recruited the services of Mountbatten even though he was a constitutional head."

I do not regard the relations between Nehru and Lady Mountbatten in any way complimentary either to Nehru or to the country. A man who does not honour the sanctity of marriage-vows is not likely to honour the sanctity of his oath to defend the Constitution.

Mathai has reported Nehru's illicit relations with Sharada Mata. He also alleges that the duo had a child. This has been denied by Indira Gandhi and the person concerned. But Mathai seems to have had no motive in making such an allegation. Moreover he writes in a strain as if he is paying a compliment to Nehru with overtones of a poet writing about Radha and Krishna.

36.

NEHRU AND CORRUPTION

Along with women, wealth is traditionally spoken of as a corrupting influence. Though a writer like me whose sources are limited to published material cannot make any sure statements about women as a source of corruption in Nehru's life, fairly reliable statements can be made about Nehru's undependability in the nation's financial affairs. He used his influence to cover up Menon's "jeep scandal" in spite of the recommendation of the accounts officers that the deal should be inquired into. An 8 crore rupees worth of contract was given to a firm whose total assets were not in the region of Rs. 8 crore. The delivery of the jeeps was not satisfactory and the government suffered a huge loss. The matter came before Parliament but Nehru put his foot down by saying that the only thing scandalous about the deal was the use of the word scandal. If Nehru was so sure, why did he not allow the law to take its own course so that the critics of Menon could have been exposed as unscrupulous men hungry for character-assassination ?

The second case directly concerns Nehru. Nehru used to say that he derived "considerable" income from his books. Violating the laws of the country he also opened a foreign account. When Morarji Desai revealed this in Parliament, Nehru explained that he found it necessary to open such an account because he used to get a considerable amount of money from foreign countries for his books. What an explanation ! Does this mean that all those traders who earn money by exporting can open accounts in foreign countries without seeking government permission ?

Now about the source of the money itself. Ram Manohar Lohia used to say that even authors like Shaw never earned as much money from their writings as Nehru, in spite of the fact that their plays were staged and filmed. The sale of Nehru's books in English-speaking countries was certainly not comparable to those of Somerset Maugham or P. G. Wodehouse.

Wherefrom did the money come ? Mathai again has explained that these sums were paid by the USSR. The sums continued to be paid, even

after Nehru's death, to Indira Gandhi; and this is how she explained her income of Rs.120,000/- per year when she had no public office and source of income after her defeat in 1977.

It is well known that the USSR did not recognize any copyright laws. It is not known to have paid any money to any other author. It is hard to believe that the USSR had so many readers wanting to read Nehru in English so that Nehru's books could sell in such large numbers. It is therefore obvious that if Mathai's statement is true Russia was making gratis payments to Nehru under the garb of royalties on his books.

There is no reason to allege that Mathai has concocted this story. The whole temper of his book is to sing the praise of Nehru. Some communist friends ask, "What is wrong if Nehru accepted donations from the Soviet Union when there are umpteen donees receiving American largesse in India?"

It should be noted that these umpteen donees are institutions and not individuals and the process of receiving these donations is open to public scrutiny. The institutions which receive help from America are known to be institutions for public good. It should further be noted that sums received by Nehru, though large when regarded as an income of an individual, are peanuts when regarded as donations for any national undertaking. The painful conclusion is that the sums paid to Nehru were a favour for serving Soviet interests.

A still more shocking fact that came to light during the tenure of the Janata government is about the treasure of the Indian National Army of Subhash Chandra Bose. Shri Damle, I.C.S., wrote to Morarji Desai the Janata Prime Minister stating the following:

Japan, in appreciation of the stand of the Indian judge in the war-crimes trial, wanted to return the assets of Subhash Chandra Bose's Azad Hind Government to its rightful successor, the Government of India. The bank-balances were transferred on paper but there was jewellery which could not be so transferred. So the Japanese government requested Nehru to send some responsible officer to take delivery of the same in person. Nehru deputed Damle and personally instructed him to hand over the jewellery box to him personally. Nehru did not give him any receipt.

Damle was in a soup. There were several places where he had signed that he had received the box and many documents to show that he was commissioned to take the delivery. On the contrary there was nothing with him to prove that he had handed it over to Nehru and did not misappropriate it himself. The government therefore had to inquire into the matter and trace the box.

Morarji ordered an inquiry. The box was found in the national museum, but it contained no valuables, it contained only broken buttons !

Just as Nehru-worshippers abuse Menon, they would doubtless abuse Damle and Morarji as liars.

The above account shows that Nehru did not have the qualities associated with integrity. Whatever patriotism he was capable of was killed by Anglo-Communist influence; he was a man of average intelligence (the average of graduates and not of the country at large), he had no special abilities excepting writing good English narrating events in an interesting way. This ability is of little consequence in the Prime Minister's job; his easy success went to his head and the dreams of world-leadership destroyed all desire to serve his own country; instead he used his position to treat the interests of this country as expendable capital for attaining an international position for himself.

This syndrome grew in Nehru gradually. The considerable circulation of his autobiography in foreign countries was the beginning. But Nehru was shrewd enough to realize that he could retain his leadership only with the blessings of Gandhi. After Gandhi, there were only two men who could have eclipsed him: Subhash Chandra Bose and Sardar Patel. Bose attained martyrdom in his Herculean effort to free the country, at an early age. Sardar Patel grew in stature after he became Home Minister with his attainments in the integration of states. By the time his merits as compared to Nehru's failings were noticed, he died. Nehru was thus left without a challenger. Continual good turns at the hands of fortune confirmed Nehru in his belief that he was a man of destiny. The feeling lasted till the Chinese delivered a rude shock. One cannot blame Nehru if he thought that just as he became the uncrowned king of India, just by receiving a cane-stroke at the hands of the British police, spending some time in comfortable conditions in British jails and stuttering a few speeches, he could also become the leader of the world by delivering a few sermons on peace occasionally. Anybody who wants to blame Nehru should try to put himself in his position and say with a clear conscience that such easy success will not go to his head.

EPILOGUE

NEHRUISM SANS NEHRU

Many have asked me, "Why talk ill about the dead?" I would not have bothered to write about Nehru if Nehruism had died with him. In fact I was hoping that Nehruism would die with Nehru as no sensible person believes in it and is likely to act on it. The basis of my belief was that no other Congress leader held the views which Nehru held.

But in my life there were many disappointments, and one of the most serious among them was that independence of India proved to be a virulent form of subjugation under Nehru; and this state of affairs did not come to an end with Nehru; instead it continued with renewed vigour.

It is for this reason that I have captioned this book '*The Nemesis of Nehru-worship*', and not simply 'Nehru' or 'Nehruism'.

I am thus obliged to show how Nehruism continued to grow strong after Nehru. For this it is necessary to briefly discuss post-Nehru history of India.

Shastri took over the Prime Ministership from Nehru. I have already shown that there is no reason to believe that he would have chalked out a path different from that of Nehru if he had lived.

Some readers might feel that my description of Nehru's secularism as Hindu-baiting is a form of exaggeration. I must therefore expand this point to show that my charge is a verbatim truth and not a fabrication. In the freedom movement we blamed the British for creating divisions in the country by their policies of reservation for the Muslims. Nehru brazenly adopted the British policy by getting a resolution passed in the 1961 session of the Congress that the government should endeavour to recruit Muslims in larger numbers in the services. Nobody asked him whether this does not amount to denying the whole *raison d'être* of the freedom movement.

Later Nehru's daughter carried further the task begun by her father. For the facts stated I am indebted to Vijay Kumar Malhotra's three articles entitled 'Is it a crime to be a Hindu?' published in important newspapers in January 1991. The articles refer to what happened in Indira Gandhi's regime. But Indira Gandhi's regime was only an extension of the Nehru regime and therefore what follows should not be regarded as irrelevant in evaluating Nehru.

It is well known that the Arya Samaj and the Ramakrishna Ashram had to declare themselves as non-Hindu organizations because calling themselves Hindu amounted to suicide. According to the state government education codes, no recognized school or college can impart religious instruction in its institution. The buildings of the school or college cannot be made available for the function of any institution. The admissions of the students and the appointments of teachers and other staff are made in accordance with the direction and rules and under the supervision of the Education Department. But these codes and directives are not made applicable to "minority" institutions. The latter can prescribe any sort of religious curriculum in their institutions, and can make available their grounds and buildings for use to any institutions. They can admit any one with less number of marks and there is no interference in the selection of lecturers and professors by the Education Department or by the University.

The admissions in the colleges in Delhi are conducted by Delhi University and even the managing committees of the colleges do not have the power to admit one single student on their own. But the rules of the University which are applicable to DAV College, Sanatan Dharma College, Ramjas College and Hindu College, for instance, are not applicable to St. Stephen's, Jesus and Mary, Khalsa and Zakir Hussain Colleges. Even with less number of marks, Muslim, Sikh and Christian students get admission whereas even after securing more marks Hindu boys and girls cannot.

The managing committee of Queen Mary's School gave an advertisement for the post of Principal. It was stated in the advertisement that the candidate must be a Catholic Christian. On a complaint that such an advertisement was contrary to the Constitution, the Education Department made a suggestion to the managing committee of the school that they could appoint anyone as Principal but they should not expressly mention the condition with regard to religion in the advertisement.

The managing committee did not accept this suggestion and approached the courts. The Education Department argued in the court that almost all the students in the school are Hindu. How then can these schools be called Christian schools? The courts waived aside this argument and held that under the Constitution the schools run by minorities are regarded as minority institutions even if the students belong to the majority community, and minority institutions are autonomous and beyond the purview of the government.

Dr. V.K.R.V. Rao was for some time the Education Minister of India. He enthusiastically made an announcement that during his tenure he would like to see a Muslim as Vice-Chancellor of Varanasi Hindu University and a Hindu as Vice-Chancellor of Aligarh Muslim University. An agitation was launched at Aligarh Muslim University to assert that the Aligarh University was meant only for Muslims and for the protection of the Muslim religion. Aligarh University is a minority institution and "secularism" does not apply to it. Dr. Rao pleaded with the Muslim delegation that the Aligarh University was run entirely on government grants and government grants cannot be spent for one particular religion only. The Supreme Court also endorsed this stand. But the government

passed a special legislation to ensure that Muslim and Christian institutions could be run entirely on government grants.

The entire education in Jammu and Kashmir is free and is financed by the Government of India. The government spends about Rs. two lakhs in producing one doctor in five years.

Another feature of education in Kashmir is that all Muslims are declared as backward so that even the reserved seats for the backward can be given to Muslims. All the Hindus are supposed to be advanced and hence they cannot get any seat reserved for the backward. The Hindu can get in only when all the seats reserved for the backward are filled by Muslims. The Muslims have to compete with the Hindus only for the open seats.

The Kashmiri Hindus thus find it difficult to get admission in Kashmir unless their marks are very high. Those getting marks below the high standard cannot get admission in states like Delhi where students from other states are admitted only when their states do not have the types of colleges required.

Another "secular" programme of the government consisted of opening institutions for the candidates from "minority" communities for preparing them for the competitive examinations without charging any fees. The Hindus of course are debarred from these institutions (*vide* Prime Minister's directive dated 11.5.1983).

Not only in the competitive examinations for the services; the above directive asks the state governments to ensure that "minorities" are admitted in large numbers to technical institutions.

In 1984-85 the government started special polytechnics for "minorities" in Delhi, Aligarh, Lucknow, Moradabad, Ajmer, Goa, Bhopal, Ranchi and Kichkaria. In these institutions Muslim and Christian students can be admitted even if their marks are very low. It is understood that 50 "minority" students are taken every year compulsorily in each technical college, as a result of these special facilities to the "minorities". In answer to a parliament question the government informed that special training for minorities has been introduced in 21 colleges and Rs.30 lakhs were paid

for this. Attempts are being made to introduce them in all the universities. "Minorities" get free training even if they may be rolling in money and in ability far inferior. The Hindus even if they are living from hand to mouth and have greater ability are debarred from receiving technical education.

In 1983 the Prime Minister issued a directive to all the ministers to see that Muslims are recruited in large numbers to all services, especially the police.

There is a Minority Commission. In addition, there are minority cells in the Home and Education Ministries.

The Reserve Bank of India has issued directives that applications for loans from members of the minority community should receive preference over similar applications from Hindus. In sanctioning loans to the Hindus, mortgage must be insisted on, but not in sanctioning loans to the Muslims and Christians.

Instructions have been issued to banks that they must prefer minority communities in appointments, and that the selection committees must contain members of these communities.

Forty districts in the country have been labelled as districts in which "minorities" predominate. Some of these districts do not contain more than 40% "minorities". Special banks have been established in these districts for the benefit of "minorities" with "minority" staff. Besides these banks, other banks also have been asked to have minority cells.

THE EMERGENCY-FAME INDIRA GANDHI

Nobody expected Indira Gandhi to deviate from Nehruism. Many of the harmful features of Nehruism were aggravated during her regime. I have discussed this under the preceding section.

But there is one important event that occurred during Indira Gandhi's tenure which seemed to mark out her regime as more hopeful than that of her father. This was the 1971 war with Pakistan. In this war the Pakistan army was defeated on the eastern front and this victory caused euphoria throughout the country. It had made an impression on me also and I for some time thought that Nehru's daughter would bring better days to this country. I also thought that my assessment of Indira Gandhi as an ordinary woman without any ability to write home about must be revised. This assessment was based on Indira Gandhi's poor academic performance and the fact that before she assumed Prime Ministership nobody who came in contact with her ever thought that she was a woman of ability. I wonder whether any ability present can be so completely hidden even in a favourable environment.

It should be remembered that the main reason why she was chosen for the office of Prime Minister is that the Congress bosses thought that being a woman of no ability she would remain under their control.

But Kamaraj who had played the main role in making her Prime Minister soon found that he had bet on the wrong horse when Indira Gandhi bypassed him on the currency devaluation issue. Many regarded this as a sign of Indira Gandhi's independence of judgement and loyalty to principles, but in fact it was a simple case of replacing Kamaraj by some other adviser, in the case of devaluation the foreign powers, not a case of independence of judgement.

Many regard Indira Gandhi's success against the Congress "syndicate" as a sign of political genius. Nothing succeeds like success and the successful man is credited good qualities and the failures are supposed to be good for nothing. The fact is, Indira Gandhi's success against the

"syndicate" does not speak of her political genius, but of her being the daughter of Nehru and the fact that the people identified the Congress with her and did not regard it as an institution having half a century of creditable history. Some people seem to recognize only individuals and not institutions. Indira Gandhi's success in elections was not due to her skill but due to this fact, just as the throngs that are attracted to the deity of Tirupati cannot be explained by any divine qualities which the idol there has and are not shared by any other idol anywhere else.

In fact it was clear that Indira Gandhi had incurred the displeasure of the entire Congress, where she had no majority. This was evidence that she had no political skill worth the name.

Bangladesh War

But the 1971 war was a different affair. This war showed that there is realization that on our own we could not obtain a decisive victory over Pakistan. The help of Russia was secured. A possible Chinese intervention was prevented by a clear Russian warning. The Chinese would have to face Russian might if they did not keep aloof from the Indo-Pak conflict. Unlike in 1965 a clear victory was gained over Pakistan, and the whole war ended with Bhutto the Prime Minister of Pakistan beating his breast.

But more than these diplomatic factors was the *causis belli*. The war was fought because Pakistan was throwing out Hindus. A clear understanding was given to Pakistan that the Hindus of Pakistan must stay in Pakistan safely and honourably, otherwise India would intervene.

None of these factors fits in with Nehruism. In the 1971 war I thought that Indira Gandhi behaved like Sardar Patel and not like her father, not only with regard to philosophy but also in diplomatic skill. I therefore thought that my judgement of her abilities and patriotism was grossly unfair and mistaken.

But events soon occurred showing that my earlier assessment was the correct one and I was rash in believing that Indira was a Prime Minister of my prescription. Immediately after the surrender of the Pakistan army in Eastern Pakistan, Russia ordered a cease-fire not only on the Eastern Front but also on the Western. In fact unlike on the Eastern our arms were

not gaining decisive success on the Western Front. On the contrary Pakistan had seized the area of Chamb in Kashmir and even some areas in the Punjab near Ferozpur. Gen. Candeth, the officer commanding this area, was eager not only to recapture the areas seized by Pakistan but also to liberate the whole of Kashmir and was pinning hopes on the successful closure of the Eastern Front which was expected to add to the Indian strength on the Western Front. But he was ordered on telephone to cease fire. When he did not do so he was court-martialled ('Organiser', 1-8-99). This shows that the army high command was not aware of the policy to leave the job of defeating Pakistan unfinished. It seems even Indira Gandhi did not know that this was the USSR intention because it was reported that in the beginning when the Soviet diplomats did not participate in the Simla talks the talks were not progressing, but when the Russian diplomats entered the scene, the talks were concluded speedily.

The Simla accord was far from being an accord between a victorious India and a Pakistan brought to its knees. Pakistan was not even made to accept that Kashmir was an integral part of India; on the contrary it was clearly accepted as a disputed territory, the dispute to be settled by mutual talks without a third party intervention. The ever complacent English-educated class attributed this to the large-heartedness of the Indian rulers who treat the beaten enemy with respect.

Later Indira Gandhi dashed my elation over her attitude to refugees when she declared immediately after her thumping success in the 1980 election that the uproar over the Bangladeshi infiltrators was uncalled for and it did not matter if they kept on coming. I wondered whether the woman who fought a war over refugees was the same woman who now did not mind even infiltrators.

Soon after the cease-fire the USSR made an offer to Pakistan that they should sign the same treaty with them which India had signed.

Later the Soviet leaders visited India. When their visit was in progress Morarji Desai made a charge that they had come to persuade Indira Gandhi to fight another war with Pakistan with full-fledged Soviet help. After victory, the USSR would allow India to keep the Sindh and Punjab parts of Pakistan and USSR would keep the North-West Frontier

Province and Baluchistan. He reported that such an offer was made to him when he visited the Soviet Union as India's Prime Minister, but he rejected it, saying that he did not want to destroy Pakistan.

It is this revelation by Morarji Desai that earned him the Pakistani honour of '*Nishan-e-Pakistan*'.

For Whose Benefit?

These events made me revise my favourable estimate of Indira Gandhi. I began to see that the 1971 war was not fought on the initiative of Indira Gandhi where she cleverly used the Soviet rulers for India's benefit. On the contrary the Soviet leaders were in an aggressive mood when their occupation of Afghanistan was tolerated by America. They wanted to repeat the adventure in Pakistan with India as the cat's paw. Morarji Desai did not allow himself to be so used.

The 1971 war was the first act of the whole drama of the later intended destruction of Pakistan. In 1971 Russia wanted to demonstrate to Pakistan that the alliance with America would not save them from India if USSR is not on their side. They should therefore sign an offensive and defensive alliance with it.

If Pakistan had signed such an alliance, it would have made the Pak-America alliance meaningless, because it was designed to be an anti-communist alliance. If Pakistan had fallen in the Soviet line it would have been completely weaned away from American friendship.

It is because Pakistan foiled the Soviet intentions in 1971 that they seem to have planned the destruction of Pakistan in 1977.

This leaves no doubt that the 1971 war was the Soviets' war and Indira Gandhi was just a pawn in the Soviets' designs.

Some people say that if Indira had been in Morarji's place she would have accepted the Soviet offer and solved the Pakistan problem for ever; that Morarji proved himself to be a lesser statesman in rejecting the Soviet offer. Those who think on similar lines blame Indira for withdrawing our armies from Bangladesh. Apart from the fact that their belief (that withdrawing or not withdrawing armies from Bangladesh depended on the

sweet will of Indira) is extremely naive, their grasp of the Muslim problem is also poor. In fact Indira also is reported to have justified the withdrawal of armies from Bangladesh by saying that she had enough of Muslims in India and adding to their number did not reflect any wisdom. The Muslim problem is not a problem of adding all the erstwhile Muslim areas of India by force. It is a question of absorbing the Muslims in Indian nationhood. The Indian Muslims instead of being absorbed in Indian nationhood are behaving as Pakistani nationals in captivity in India. Nehruism has developed among Muslims a vested interest in separatism. Even though 1/8th of the population, they can veto any programme of the government. Doubling their population by adding the Pakistani Muslims to them would mean that the country would for ever have to function in the chains of Islamic fundamentalism. The plea for the advisability of accepting the Soviet proposal further assumes that America and China would have just looked on when Pakistan was being destroyed. America and the Western world in general as well as China are pledged to the preservation of Pakistan.

The case of Bangladesh was different. There was a movement for the establishment of Bangladesh in Eastern Pakistan itself and there was great sympathy for this movement in Britain. America goes by the judgement of Britain where Hindustan is concerned.

Now to return to the topic of Indira's supposed political ability, the Emergency must be discussed. We have seen that Indira's success in elections can in no way be attributed to her political wisdom. On the contrary her political failures were clearly due to her incompetence. The Emergency is a fair example. After having won the Bangladesh war, her position in politics had become unassailable. Indira did not realize this and was seized by panic at the Allahabad High Court judgement and declared the Emergency. The Emergency created countrywide hatred against her. She thought that she could retain her leadership only if she remained Prime Minister; out of office she would be a nobody. Nehru thought on the same lines. What a contrast with Gandhi who never thought that the plumes of office were necessary for retaining his leadership. As long as elections could be won in her name Indira would have remained the leader, whether she held office or not.

Another trait of Indira Gandhi which was obvious to anybody was that she exercised her judgement only in deciding who should be her adviser; after exercising this judgement she would leave everything to the chosen adviser.

Another maxim on which Indira acted was that the adviser must be repeatedly changed so that she did not become dependent on one particular person. From Dinesh Singh to Rajiv Gandhi she changed many advisers. At the time of the Emergency Sanjay Gandhi was her adviser and would have remained so but for his death.

Brazenness

Indira Gandhi practised nepotism, particularly dynastyism, much more brazenly than Nehru. The traits of Sanjay Gandhi were well known. True to the Nehru tradition he showed no evidence of intelligence in his career. He proudly said that he read nothing but comics. He was convicted on a criminal offence by a sessions court for 11 months' imprisonment from which he could be saved only after Indira became Prime Minister. His actions were thoughtless and they alienated both Hindu and Muslim voters from her. By making Sanjay her adviser and successor Indira betrayed poor judgement of persons as well as little concern for the welfare of the country. The 1977 election showed that Sanjay was a liability even for the personal interests of Indira.

This very poor judgement brought about Indira's death and the subsequent holocaust. She was advised to replace the Sikh guards after the Golden Temple imbroglio. But she refused, reportedly on the "noble" ground that she did not want to show distrust of the Sikhs. Many praise this attitude as a sign of bravery and high principles and liken it to Gandhi's refusal to accept search of the persons who came to attend his meetings. Gandhi's murder could have been prevented if such searches were allowed.

Shivaji is quoted in this connection because the 12 trusted guards he took with him when he went to meet Afzal Khan included more than one Muslim.

The two examples given for justifying and even eulogizing Indira's refusal to replace the Sikh guards merit independent examination. Shivaji's

action is justified by the results. The Muslim guards lived up to his trust and this showed that Shivaji's judgement of persons was sound. In the case of Indira the result showed that she was grossly mistaken.

In the case of Gandhi it was not a question of judgement of individuals because he insisted that none should be searched. After Madanlal's bomb, Gandhi surely did not think that nobody among his audience would think of murdering him. But Gandhi's insistence on not searching anyone at his prayer meetings was a piece of his fondness for martyrdom like Christ with whom he liked himself to be compared. The act was not in any way praiseworthy and worth emulating. Gandhi may not have cared for death but his actions were not the concern of himself alone. He was the leader of a big country and his murder brought avoidable suffering on the country. He may be excused for not minding the assassin's bullet but he had no right to involve the country in riots and bloodshed. The welfare of the country was not his personal concern.

Indira cannot even be credited for courage like Gandhi. Gandhi was sufficiently aware of the peril he was inviting. But Indira was complacent. When the assassin pointed his gun at her she is reported to have asked "What are you doing?" This shows that she had not at all expected that her guard would shoot her down. Her easy and unmerited success before had made her completely complacent.

Brig. Sharma reports that Gen. Sinha was superseded in preference to Gen. Vaidya and made COAS because Gen. Sinha advised against an open military action in the Golden Temple and opined that flushing out the extremists from the temple by other means was possible.

This can only be a surmise of Brig. Sharma because such reasons are not expected to be mentioned in writing. The other means suggested by Gen. Sinha may have been non-military police action which could have been executed quietly. These could not have appealed to Indira Gandhi who always wanted something dramatic and she thought that the extremists in the temple could be killed or arrested without any damage to the temple and she could have this as a feather in her cap like the Bangladesh war. There is no reason why such an action could not have been possible since when the extremists entered the temple again in Rajiv Gandhi's time they

were flushed out without any damage to the temple. But Gen. Vaidya and Gen. Sunderji who was directly in command of the operations obviously had no idea of the strength, both numerical as well as armed, of the extremists and the action involved huge manpower losses to the Indian army and colossal damage to the temple. This speaks very poorly of the intelligence the army has. The sorry state of affairs in this field which came to light in the 1962 debacle was seen to remain unimproved in 1983. The murder of Indira Gandhi could have been avoided if the army had proper information about the strength of the extremists.

In short there is nothing in Indira's long spell of Prime Ministership to which the country should look back in pride and be thankful for.

The Nagarvala Episode

It is wrongly said that Indira brought corruption in politics. It has already been shown that her father was the source of corruption. He violated the country's laws by opening a foreign account, accepting unearned money from the Soviet Union and a shady role in the disappearance of the treasure of the Indian National Army.

Thus though Indira cannot be charged of being the harbinger of corruption, the scale on which it occurred in her regime was unprecedented. The Nagarvala episode is an all-time high in this field.

What happened is that the cashier of the Imperial Bank was arrested for handing over Rs. sixty lakhs to Nagarvala because he thought that Indira Gandhi rang him up and ordered that the money should be given to a man of Nagarvala's description at a particular spot. The cashier after handing over the money went to Indira's residence and inquired whether everything was according to plan with regard to the sixty lakhs. When Indira pleaded complete ignorance, the cashier was panicky and reported the matter to the police. Nagarvala was then arrested by the police and his trial was finished in record 24 hours and he was sentenced. Shortly Nagarwala died under suspicious circumstances.

The only explanation is that this was not the first time that the cashier withdrew money in this fashion. The money was not in any account because it was not legally obtained. The cashier was taken into confidence

to keep this money in the bank without an account of it and to give it whenever asked. When Indira was out of power and the cashier was changed, the money would not be available. But that does not matter because in any case the money did not belong to those who were using it.

The circumstantial evidence points to Indira. This affair was never probed by the police because the only government which could have probed it collapsed and no subsequent government had any interest in investigating it. Thus Indira's involvement is only the most convincing hypothesis and not a proven fact. But this is enough to show that Indira also had an image as the fountainhead of corruption.

41. RAJIV GANDHI'S SRI LANKA FIASCO

After the murder of Indira Gandhi, anti-Sikh riots broke out in Delhi. It is reported that about 3,000 Sikhs were butchered in these riots. A more distressing fact is that the riots were not spontaneous but were encouraged by some people in authority. Rajiv Gandhi refused to inquire into the riots by saying that "such an inquiry will not be in the interests of the Sikhs", implying that it would come out with the finding that the Sikhs deserved their fate. He also said that when a mighty tree falls the earth is bound to shake. This utterance is inane because no tree is so mighty that its fall will shake the earth. On the contrary trees are uprooted when the earth shakes.

One may excuse the poor power of expression which Rajiv had, unlike his grandfather. His meaning is quite clear. He was hinting that the murder of his mother was such a great tragedy that the massacre of a few Sikhs was not a matter to worry about in that background. A strange attitude towards a section of our people; and also one betokening poor political judgement about the effects of such an utterance.

Rajiv was confronted with the Punjab and Assam unrest right at the beginning of his office. He proposed to solve these by signing a pact with Longoval the Punjab leader and the Assamese leaders. He was praised sky-high for this act of statesmanship. But the results showed their naïveté. That an accord with Longoval and the Assamese leaders would mitigate the insurrectionary conditions in Punjab and Assam assumed that Longoval and the Assam leaders were controlling the insurrectionists. If this were so they should have been caught and hanged. It does not require more than a horse-sense to see that the problem of insurrection is not solved by talks. Longoval was soon murdered with the Punjab problem being left where it was. The same story was repeated in Assam. Rajiv Gandhi's tenure, like that of his mother, was bereft of anything that benefited the country. On the contrary, like that of his mother and grandfather, every major action of his caused damage to the country.

The interference in Sri Lanka damaged the reputation of the army and the Indian government. The Indian army was asked to get out of Sri Lanka because it would not do the job of crushing the Tamil rebels though it was specifically called for. It is surprising that Rajiv Gandhi should have accepted such an assignment. The Tamil rebels were obviously aided by some government, as without such aid they could not have been so strong as to cross swords with an established government. This aiding government could not be any other than the Government of India. It was involved by connivance if not by initiative. So Rajiv Gandhi's acceptance of the assignment to crush the Tamil rebels meant the right-hand's accepting the assignment to chop off the left. After accepting the assignment, the army was not allowed to function in its own way; it is reported to have been instructed not to capture Pirabhakaran, the leader of the Tamil Tigers. The casualties suffered by the Indian army were considerable as can be seen from reports of those who returned from the scene of action, though the government has not given any account of the cost of the whole endeavour in men and material. This cost again was without any gain as the army returned without accomplishing anything. Thus Rajiv Gandhi's only objective, like that of his grandfather, seemed to be to seize the chance of playing an international role.

Rajiv Gandhi's action in the Sha Bano case was a deplorable example of lack of uprightness. Before the Sha Bano case all the political parties had agreed that they would not treat the common code issue as political and try to get Muslim votes. Rajiv Gandhi had agreed to this. But no sooner did the ink on this agreement dry than he used his massive majority to nullify the court judgement in the Sha Bano case. The judgement was that even a Muslim husband owes responsibility towards his divorced wife and must ensure her maintenance. Rajiv Gandhi got a bill passed amending the law to the effect that the law on the basis of which the court gave this ruling will not be applicable to Muslims. Thus Rajiv Gandhi was true to the Nehru tradition and bestowed a sanctity on the *Shariat* which it never enjoyed during the British rule, and helped to seal the fate of attempts to bring the Muslims in the mainstream of India's nationhood.

Rajiv Gandhi was called 'Mr. Clean' before he entered politics

because he had kept himself aloof from politics unlike Sanjay Gandhi. But like his mother he too got himself embroiled in shady deals. He was accused of corrupt dealings in the Bofors case wherein guns were bought for monetary consideration. A similar charge was made in the submarine deals. It is not known whether the submarine deal is being inquired into, but the Bofors deal has caught headlines and nobody will be blamed if he believes that there is a *prima facie* case against Rajiv Gandhi. A final word on this can of course be said only after the investigations are complete.

Rajiv Gandhi continued Nehru's work of weakening India's defences. General Candeth who was officer-commanding the Western Front in the 1971 war has revealed to the journalists in discussing the infiltrators' attack in the Kargil sector in May 1999, that India had a photo reconnaissance squadron which could photograph enemy movement from a height of 50,000 feet, but it was prohibited from taking photographs in the Pakistan area. In 1987 Pakistan was preparing to attack in the Siachen sector in Brigade strength. When the Indian commander got wind of this he requested permission to reconnaissance the enemy plans. Rajiv Gandhi refused the permission. The Air Force then thought out a strategy. Our reconnaissance aircraft pretended to be stranded and landed in Pakistan by informing the Pakistani authorities that they were stranded. Pakistan allowed them and the aircraft completed their mission of reconnaissance. This enabled the Indian forces to win in Siachen. This is just in line with the umpteen examples how this country had to save itself from the Nehrus before it could save itself from the enemy.

After Rajiv Gandhi's first term he failed to get a majority and declined to form the government. V. P. Singh of the Janata Dal then formed the government with outside support from the BJP. V.P. Singh was not connected with the Nehru family. He was initially close to Rajiv Gandhi but Rajiv Gandhi shifted him from the Finance Ministry to the Defence. This annoyed V. P. Singh and he dug out the Bofors deal wherein Rajiv Gandhi was alleged to have helped some people to obtain a substantial commission. This may be one of the reasons why Rajiv Gandhi failed to get a majority.

V. P. Singh's policies were on all fours with those of Nehru. He was "secular". This he proved by arresting Lal Krishna Advani when he brought out the *rathayatra* for the Ramjanmabhumi. Arun Shourie has reported that V. P. Singh had asserted that there is no mosque on the Ramjanmabhumi site and therefore the problem was non-existent, i.e., a creation of Nehruism. Arun Shourie was sacked by '*The Indian Express*' for saying this. There was no likelihood at that time that Lal Krishna Advani's *rathayatra* would create any law and order problem. The problem could have been handled by regulating the entry to the Ramjanmabhumi. But V. P. Singh wanted to impress the Muslims by doing something drastic. And what could be more drastic in the eyes of the "secularists" than arresting the President of the BJP ?

V. P. Singh went one ahead of Nehru in practising another tenet of Nehruism, i.e., minorityism, breaking up the nation into small factions based on caste and religion. He resurrected the Mandal Commission Report which had been kept in cold storage even by Indira Gandhi. This report renders almost all jobs in the country a preserve of small castes on the plea that this will bring the backward castes forward. This resulted in self-immolations and other kinds of unrest.

A word must be said about reservations. Nobody in his senses can believe that the British started the policy of reservation for the good of

the backward classes and castes. In the first place castes contain crores of members even if they are small, and giving government jobs to a few score of them cannot uplift the caste excepting the family members of the person who gets the job. After he gets the job he tends to pose that he is not a member of the backward caste but is advanced, would like to marry in what he considers to be the 'upper' classes and castes and keep aloof from his fellow castemen. Secondly the fact that insistence on castes brings jobs, tends to perpetuate caste because those who get the advantage of reservation develop a vested interest in being backward and those who are denied jobs because they belong to a particular caste tend to hate those castes which were responsible for this denial. This was exactly the purpose of the British in pursuing the reservation policy. Nehru opened the doors for this policy because he wanted to disrupt the Hindu society which he hated. Later politicians found this to be a way of cornering block votes of particular castes.

V. P. Singh opened the Mandal box for cornering the votes of the scheduled and the backward and also tried to grab the block Muslim votes so far monopolized by the Congress. He gave Rs.50 lakhs to the Shahi Imam for the upkeep of the Jama Masjid and announced a closed holiday for the birthday of the Prophet by fanfare. There was thus a competition for obtaining Muslim votes.

V. P. Singh's Mandir policy was quite in keeping with that of Nehru. He had clearly told Arun Shourie that there is no Masjid at the Babari site and yet he never said this in public to persuade the Muslims to accommodate the feelings of the Hindus. He gave his blessings to the arrest of Advani, in spite of the fact that he owed his Prime Ministership to the support of the BJP. The BJP therefore voted him out and Rajiv Gandhi supported Chandrashekhar for Prime Ministership. He pulled him down in a few months by complaining that a policeman had been sent to keep watch on him on the orders of Chandrashekhar.

43. THE DO-NOTHING NARASIMHA RAO

After Rajiv Gandhi's murder the Congress Party, true to its tradition of Nehru-worship, requested Sonia Gandhi to accept the office of Prime Minister. But Sonia Gandhi declined and P. V. Narasimha Rao was elected as the leader of the Congress Parliamentary Party to become Prime Minister. Narasimha Rao was the most intelligent of the Prime Ministers so far. He is fluent in several languages both Indian and foreign and is also an author. His speeches, unlike those of any Nehru descendant, are well reasoned and marked by ease of expression not usual in persons who have knowledge of several languages. He has a background of persecution by the Nizam of Hyderabad. He was one of the students who were expelled by the Osmania University for singing "Vande Mataram". He was given admission by the Nagpur University along with other "Vande Mataram" students. He had thus a thoroughly Indian background unlike that of the Nehrus and was expected to deviate from the anti-nationalism of the Nehrus.

But nothing of the kind happened. In the beginning he was reported to be soft towards the BJP. At that time if the BJP had adopted the stand adopted by the Congress with regard to the Vajpayee government, Narasimha Rao could have been toppled long ago. But he was saved by the BJP's not wanting to throw the country into chaos by making it governmentless. Merely toppling Narasimha Rao would not have put the BJP in power nor could such an act have endeared the BJP to the electorate. But Narasimha Rao repaid this by dismissing the BJP governments in UP, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh later on.

Narasimha Rao's tenure was marked by corruption and other Nehruist policies. In fact he proved to be more Nehruist than the Nehrus. Narasimha Rao has been charged in court of bribing the Jharkhand Mukti Morcha for casting their vote against the no-confidence motion brought against him. His questionable involvement with Chandraswami and the charge of forgery in the conspiracy to involve V.P. Singh in corruption were all discussed in court and in some of them he escaped by mere technicali-

ties of law. Some of the cases are still going on and it will not be proper to discuss them here.

Narasimha Rao, like the Nehrus, could be easily browbeaten by the West in all matters. He cancelled the tests of Agni when the Americans frowned. He, like the Nehruist governments, agreed to curtail defence expenditure for getting a few morsels of Western charity.

Narasimha Rao's deviation in the economic field from Nehruism in taking the path to privatization was the result of international pressure and no evidence of independent thinking.

But the surest test of Nehruism which Narasimha Rao passes with credit came on the Ramjanmabhumi issue. Nehru was virulently against restoring the temples destroyed by the invaders and wanted the Hindus to treat the kicks delivered by them as badges of honour. When Somnath was restored Nehru tried to prevent President Rajendra Prasad from attending the inauguration ceremony and disown the part of the government in the restoration which he regarded as shameful.

It is an undisputed fact of history that Babar destroyed the Ram temple at Ayodhya and built a mosque on its debris. This was never questioned by the British nor by anyone else till the Nehruists started falsifying history. The site of the Ramjanmabhumi mosque was in the possession of a Shiya Muslim; and the leader of the RSS Ramjanmabhumi movement, Shri Moropant Pingle, assured me that the owner was prepared to sell the site. But the Congress, instead of trying to persuade the Muslims, persistently instigated them. The UP government wanted to build a wall around the site without touching the so-called 'mosque' where reportedly no *namaz* has been performed since 1936. The Muslims could have been persuaded to allow the construction of the wall since Rajiv Gandhi had allowed the *bhumipujan* of the place for such a construction. Narasimha Rao adopted a do-nothing posture, without taking any responsibility for any decision, and throwing it on the courts. Finally Narasimha Rao's policies came to mean that the Ramjanmabhumi agitators should not be allowed to do anything whatsoever. Simultaneously the dismissal of the UP government was also contemplated. The concerned activists got wind of this and were put in the "Now or never" mood. Narasimha Rao had

allowed lakhs of people to assemble at the Ramjanmabhumi and then wanted them to return without doing anything. At the same time he or any other leader democratically elected could not have perpetrated another Jallianwalabagh to prevent the demolition of the Babari structure. Mulayam Singh's example is not relevant. Mulayam Singh did indeed perpetrate a Jallianwalabagh at Ramjanmabhumi, but he had to pay dearly for it politically. He was wiped out in the next election. Besides, Mulayam Singh's ambitions are limited to U.P. and he hopes to come to power by the block votes of Muslims in U.P.

The ambitions of the Congress are not limited to U.P.; it wants to continue to rule over the whole country as it did for almost 50 years. This, it cannot do by relying on Muslim votes alone.

After the demolition of the Babari structure Narasimha Rao tried to make political capital out of it by beating his breast publicly on the T.V. bewailing the "shameful act". He must have known that this sort of breast-beating is a sure way of instigating the Muslims who would run riot and then he could blame the BJP for the riots and secure Hindu votes because nobody wants riots. The Congress policy of fomenting Muslim-Hindu conflicts had started right in the days of Nehru, but Narasimha Rao's action at this time made the *modus operandi* of this policy so clear that none but the inane could fail to see through it. In Maharashtra, for example, the Muslims ran riot after the Babari demolition. The police controlled the riot by firing. The "secular" Congress government thereupon paid compensation to those who were hit by the police bullets, instead of punishing them for participation in the riot. In Nagpur the Muslims assembled in numbers to attack the Ramamandir. The police commissioner Inamdar was stoned and his helmet was battered; so heavy was the volley of stones. But instead of bringing the guilty to book the government transferred Inamdar, giving a message to Muslims that running riot and demolishing Hindu temples is their birth-right.

44.

THE "SECULARIST" BILGE

A word must be said here about the Ramjanmabhumi and similar issues. Lakhs of people visit places like the Ramjanmabhumi and the Krishnajanmabhumi every year. They are told that the places were destroyed by Babar and Aurangzeb and that the Muslims of the day are not prepared to undo the wrong. Can one expect that these lakhs will go away without harbouring hatred towards the Muslims ? Such places are spread all over the country and they are a standing reminder to the Hindus of their humiliation. Is it a wrong conclusion to draw that those who do not think that this state of affairs must be remedied want to perpetuate the Muslim-Hindu cleavage ?

The "secularist" answer to this is that the guides at such places should be prevented from telling these facts to the visiting public ! But in a democratic set-up the fact that the guides are prevented from narrating the history as they know it cannot remain secret and the public will believe the fact of the demolition all the more strongly. The Nehruist solution is that history as it is taught in schools itself must be changed so that even the guides do not know the ugly facts. Such complete suppression of history is not possible in a democracy and has not been possible even in totalitarian states like Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. People cannot be prevented from reading history written in the pre-Nehru era and those written by internationally famous writers like Will Durant. You cannot fool all people for all time and lies can never be a solution to the abiding problems of any society.

Some people urge that the Hindus should be persuaded not to hate the contemporary Muslims for the wrongs perpetrated by their co-religionists centuries ago. This would be a strong argument if the contemporary Muslims were ashamed of the acts of Babar and Aurangzeb. Is there a significant movement among the Muslims which owns that the acts of Babar and Aurangzeb are something to be ashamed of ? The "secularists" preach day in and day out that the demolition of the Babari

structure was a shameful act. They keep silent over the fact that the Babari structure itself was raised by demolishing a temple.

When pressed about the demolition of the temple the "secularist" historians justify it by giving fanciful reasons such as that the temple was harbouring criminals, etc. They will however not concede the right to the Indian Government to demolish a mosque if it harbours criminals. Those who do all this are wanting to perpetuate the Muslim-Hindu legacy of hate.

This is clear from the fact that the "secularist" propaganda has resulted in widening the rift between the Hindus and the Muslims. There are Muslims who may be believing the "secularist" propaganda. For such Muslims the Hindus who spread "false" stories against their past co-religionists deserve nothing but hate. The fundamentalist Muslims do not believe the "secularist" propaganda because they take pride in the demolition of temples. Such Muslims hate the "secularist" Hindus as much as they hate the "communal" Hindus because they are depriving the Muslim heroes of their glory by preaching that they have never demolished the temples. The remaining class which does not believe the "secularists" but also does not regard demolition of temples as a pious act are rendered unable to persuade their co-religionists to atone for the acts of the likes of Babar and Aurangzeb by handing over the sites of their demolished temples to Hindus.

The "secularists", by their actions, are passing a slur on the Muslims by supposing that no Muslim or at any rate no sizable number of them will ever agree to hand over the sites of these temples to the Hindus even if they are shown evidence that on these sites stood the temples of Hindus. Even the chairman of the Babari committee, Shahabuddin, said that he is not only prepared to hand over the site of the Babari structure to the Hindus if it is proved that a mosque was built there by demolishing a Hindu temple but also that he will perform *karseva* to build a temple there. No "secularist" has ever said this. This shows that they are not interested in solving the Hindu-Muslim problem; they want to aggravate it in order to disrupt this nation. This was also Nehru's subconscious thinking. As to the other Congress "secularists", they find instigation of Muslims a profitable way for cornering Muslim votes in elections.

45.

HOPE OR DESPAIR ?

After the term of Narasimha Rao was over, no party could get an absolute majority though the BJP got more seats than any other party. This saw Nehruism in its rabid form when all the parties vowed to keep the BJP out of power and came together with this purely negative objective. BJP rule for them was a greater calamity than instability and possible anarchy.

There are now grave signs of a more sinister comeback of Nehruism. In the 1997 election the Congress was not hoping even to cross two figures of Loksabha seats. They therefore approached Sonia Gandhi, the widow of Rajiv Gandhi, with an SOS. Sonia Gandhi agreed and drew considerable crowds in her election meetings. Sonia Gandhi cannot speak even one or two sentences and reads out her speeches. She has as yet shown no evidence of any kind of ability. Yet the Congress did better than it expected in this election. Its number of seats was reduced a bit but it was far above the dismal forecast of two digits. The desertions from the Congress ranks stopped after Sonia Gandhi assumed its leadership. In the polls for Delhi, Mizoram, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan the Congress under Sonia Gandhi performed well. The phenomenal rise in prices is given as a reason for the BJP debacle. The BJP debacle may be explained by the rise in prices but the rout of the non-BJP and the non-Congress parties cannot. The parties which had eaten into the Congress vote-bank found that the Congress is regaining them. This means that there was a positive swing in favour of Nehruism.

There seemed no doubt that if an election were held at that time the Congress may have got even a majority and Sonia would have formed the government. Those who do not realize the enormity of this development should ponder over the following facts.

Sonia Gandhi is an Italian and has no knowledge of any Indian language. The Hindi she knows is barely enough to get along with servants and to read out Hindi speeches written by others probably in the Roman

script. She is not likely to have read a single book in any Indian language. She has no knowledge of the Hindu society, its ways of thinking and feeling and its history in which these are rooted. Besides she does not have an iota of the scientific culture of Europe from where she comes; she is a devout Catholic and influenced Rajiv Gandhi to give up Hinduism for all practical and emotional purposes. Rajiv Gandhi is reported to have declared himself a Christian in order to get his children admitted to a Christian school in a foreign country. She was responsible for driving away Dharendra Brahmachari for the sole reason that he was preaching Hinduism in his Yoga talks on the T.V. For the "secular" this point is irrelevant; but for the welfare of a nation where 80 per cent are Hindus and the Christian and Muslim population has been carved out of the Hindu population by the invaders in order to dismember the nation, this point is vitally important. If Nehru, in spite of his Hindu descent and some knowledge of the Hindu society, had so much contempt for the Hindus, one can very well apprehend a come-back of Christian foreign rule if Sonia comes to power. Even now the Congressmen are complaining that she is showing marked favour to Christians.

Questionable Loyalty

Some people cite the example of Mrs. Annie Besant and her love for India in advocating Sonia. But Mrs. Besant had turned to Hinduism after a deep study and her love for India had a firm base. Sonia has no such dimension to her personality.

Apart from questionable loyalty to the country Sonia is a very mediocre lady with no particular ability to talk about. Comparing her with Mrs. Besant is like comparing a grass-shoot with the banyan tree. Sonia has no understanding of Indian politics and is afraid of meeting the press. No doubt, if she wins elections she might develop confidence and the Indians may begin to see non-existing abilities in her as in the case of Indira Gandhi. But she is likely to prove a greater disaster than Indira Gandhi because of the reasons cited above. If Nehruism assumes power again in the Sonia form, there seems to be no hope of the revival of this country.

Soon after Sonia assumed the leadership of the Congress, cries of atrocities on Christians began to be raised mainly by English newspapers.

It is not likely that this is accidental. It should be noted that the Indian language papers published in places where these atrocities are supposed to have taken place give a version of these incidents which show that the hullabaloo raised by the English papers amounts to making a mountain out of a mole-hill. In Gujarat it is the Christians who are said to be on the offensive by the Gujarati papers. In Orissa the Chief Minister who belongs to the Congress has stated on the floor of the house that it is the Christians who attacked first. The English newspapers and the media like the T.V. and the radio have virtually blacked out this news. In the reported case of rape of nuns the medical examination did not corroborate the rape story, and in Madhya Pradesh where there was a Congress government the nuns were reported to be no virgins and to be long in league with the alleged rapists. The news of 'atrocities' on Christians first appeared in an American newspaper. It is obvious that the Christian countries do not want a BJP government in India because it is likely to put a stop to Christian proselytizing activity. The second reason is that the Christian countries have long realized that the Congress under Nehru ceased to be a nationalist organization and the Nehru government was actively helping their proselytizing activities. Further, excepting for toeing the Soviet line in international affairs, the Nehru government and the subsequent governments were very pliable. The BJP government being wedded to nationalism is expected to be not so pliable. So the propped-up propaganda of atrocities on Christians may have been a coinage of the foreign press itself or of the Indian missionary organizations in league with the foreign press. The reason why the missionaries are raising a hue and cry is that the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and similar organizations have given up the former suicidal Hindu stand that people can only go out of Hinduism, nobody can ever come into it. Though these organizations are not comparable to the missionary organizations in resources, they are likely to grow and have posed a real threat to the activities of the missionaries. They will therefore try every means including their international influence to topple the BJP government and install the Congress under Sonia at the Centre.

Strangely there is a class of Hindus who do not see anything wrong in the whole of India's ceasing to be Hindu and becoming Christian or Muslim. I wonder how many Englishmen in England which is a Christian

country, or even in America which is a secular country, would say that they would not mind if the whole of their country turns Hindu. I am sure those who say so will be a microscopic minority. The missionaries are not allowed in China. China is a communist country and does not mind if its traditional religion is wiped out by communism. Still they do not want the country to turn Christian. The very first act in Japan's resurgence was to expel the missionaries. I am sure that if the Hare Krishna movement assumes a scale such that it begins to change the demographic composition of America or Britain, it will be put down by an iron hand. It has already been banned in Russia. It is therefore a measure of the utter intellectual bankruptcy of the "secular" Indians which makes them blind to the dangers of Christian proselytization. They must ask themselves if India would have been partitioned if a large number of Hindus had not been converted to Islam, and whether the Kashmir problem would have arisen if Kashmir had remained Hindu.

It has been shown so far that all the governments which succeeded Nehru excepting the Morarji Desai government swore by Nehruism and continued to cause damage to this country and cannot claim a single act which in any way benefited it. The Morarji government did something to undo the damage, such as treating the whole country as one economic zone and deviating from the Nehruist policy of Balkanizing the country, bringing to light the corruption under Nehru and Indira, bringing a bill to curb conversions, etc. But this government lasted only for 27 months in spite of the massive majority which the voters gave it. This was one of the major tragedies after independence since it created an impression that only the Nehrus can give stability to this country and Indira was voted to power again with a clear majority.

Now the BJP government under Vajpayee has been in the saddle for a couple of years. The government is not a pure BJP government but a coalition of different parties with a hangover of Nehruism tending to believe that the BJP agenda will not be in the interests of the country. They are even opposing measures like repealing Article 370.

Vajpayee sometimes praises Nehru; he says that the English language has come to stay. He allowed the Pope's visit when even the Christian rulers of Sri Lanka did not want him, not to speak of China. The

Pope, enjoying the hospitality of this country, openly declared his intention to wipe out Hinduism. Vajpayee should try to declare that he intends to wipe out Christianity from America if and when he visits it and see what happens to him. He has raised the quota for the Haj pilgrims, though there is no inclination to give financial aid to Hindu pilgrims to visit Manasarovar.

The Hope

But it seems I was not mistaken in thinking that the RSS and BJP ideology is the only hope of this country. In spite of numerous difficulties, the Vajpayee government has done better work in two years than all the Nehruist governments in the past. It has asserted India's right to defend itself with all the weapons possible and dared the United States to do its worst. It has resisted the effects of the American sanctions; it has solved the Cauvery water dispute which the Congress could not solve in the last 50 years. It has obtained a new military friend in France by entering into a defence agreement with it. It has obtained substantial funds from non-resident Indians. It has ably defeated the Pakistani aggression in the Kargil sector and for the first time attained diplomatic success against Pakistan and isolated it in the world community. Nehruism had left the country friendless.

The BJP/Shivsena government in Maharashtra has passed the Marriage and Adoption Bills to be applicable to Muslims as well as Hindus and demonstrated that the passing of the bill did not result in any Muslim backlash. The excuse of Nehru in scuttling the common-code-directive, that the directive would cause a Muslim explosion if implemented, was an instigation to Muslims and bowing down to Muslim intransigence. The Maharashtra government further started the process of expelling the infiltrators. This exposed the credentials of the Nehruists who, instead of helping in this task, attacked the police who were carrying the infiltrators to the borders. There was not a single Hindu-Muslim riot in the BJP regime proving that Hindu-Muslim cleavage was largely a creation of Nehruism.

AN AFTERWORD

Nehruvian Legacy in Defence and Foreign Affairs

by

N. S. Rajaram

Background

It can be stated without fear of contradiction that the nation's defence is the highest responsibility of any government. A careful examination of the record of the past fifty years shows beyond dispute that national defence and the closely related area of foreign affairs were the areas of the greatest failure of Nehru and the Congress. No less seriously, while his (and his successors') other failures may be corrected - and are being corrected - his failures in foreign policy have left India with problems that will haunt India for many years to come. They have led to two nearly intractable problems: in Kashmir and the border with China. His Kashmir policy has resulted in a large number of Kashmiris' becoming refugees in their own country, while his China-Tibet policy has made India the only country of its size in the world without recognized borders with its giant neighbour.

The point I would like to emphasize in all this is that both these problems are Nehru's creation. Pakistan did not create the Kashmir problem; Nehru did. It was not Pakistan but Nehru that took Kashmir to the United Nations. What I want to highlight in this Afterword is that the same is true of the border problem with China : it was not China that created the problem but Nehru with his squalid betrayal of Tibet while getting nothing in return. Against all logic, Nehru abandoned Tibet to China placing India at a considerable strategic disadvantage. His other mistakes like those in economic policy and education may be corrected, but India will need extraordinary leadership - and extraordinary luck - to recover from his strategic blunders.

Nehru's foolhardy behaviour with regard to Tibet and China reinforces Dr. Waradpande's observation that "Nehru's loyalty to Communism outweighed his loyalty to his own country." And Sita Ram Goel has

noted that Nehru removed his Communist blinders only when confronted with Islam, which to him stood above Communism.

Nehru's blunder in Kashmir is well known. What I propose to do in this article is describe the chain of events - and blunders leading to India's border problem with China, with the help of material that has very recently come to light.

Korea and Tibet

In the year 1950, two momentous events shook Asia and the world. One was the Chinese invasion of Tibet, and the other, Chinese intervention in the Korean War. The first was near, on India's borders; the other, far away in the Korean Peninsula where India had little at stake. By all canons of logic, India should have devoted utmost attention to the urgent situation in Tibet, and let interested parties like China and the US sort it out in Korea. But Jawaharlal Nehru, India's Prime Minister, did exactly the opposite. He treated the Tibetan crisis in a reckless fashion, while getting heavily involved in Korea. India today is paying for this misplacement of priorities by being the only country of its size in the world without an official boundary with its giant neighbour.

On the surface the roots of the Kashmir problem and the border problem with China appear different, but on closer examination, they are found to be similar. In Kashmir, Nehru ignored the advice of his field commanders, General K. S. Thimayya and General L. P. Sen, and referred the case to the United Nations on Mountbatten's advice. In the case of Tibet also, Nehru chose to be guided by V. K. Krishna Menon and K. M. Panikkar - both known Communist sympathizers - while disregarding the advice of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. India gave up treaty rights and interests that she had inherited from the British, allowing China a free hand in Tibet. Simultaneously, Nehru became preoccupied with Korea in an effort to project himself as a mediator between the Communist world and the West - sacrificing national interest at home for the sake of international glory abroad. This is the picture that emerges from some fresh evidence that has come to light, especially from Tibetan sources and British archives.

Part of the difficulty in unravelling the scene is lack of access to

records relating to the period. Nehru's heirs continue to exercise dictatorial control over these vital documents, including those in the National Archives ! Strangely, many of the same records are available at the India Office in London. And thereby hangs a tale. When India became independent, H. E. Richardson, British representative in Lhasa, was asked by the Indian Government to continue as Indian representative. And Richardson sent copies of all his correspondence with his new bosses in Delhi to his former superiors in London. This was an act of questionable loyalty, but fortunate for historians. In his remarkable new book *'The Fate of Tibet'* (Har-Anand, New Delhi), the eminent French scholar Claude Arpi has made extensive use of them in addition to hard-to-obtain Tibetan records.

To return to Tibet: At the time of the Chinese invasion in 1950, Indo-Tibetan relationships had been governed by the Simla Agreement of 1914. According to this agreement, 'Outer Tibet', corresponding to present-day Tibet, was to be entirely autonomous. China would not interfere in this region, and would not also convert it into a Chinese province. (Forty years later, China violated both.) Another important decision was the demarcation of what is known as the McMahon Line, as the boundary between India and Tibet. It is of crucial importance to note that the Chinese representative was not invited for the negotiations leading to it. The decision was reached entirely between the Tibetan representative Lonchen Shatra and Sir Henry McMahon. This means that all parties recognized that Tibet had full authority to negotiate its boundary with India. As late as 1954, if not later, China also was willing to settle for this demarcation had Nehru shown more interest in the border problem than in his *Panchasheel*. Disputes between China and Tibet were confined to the eastern and northern regions that made up what was known as 'Inner Tibet'.

India at the time maintained missions in Lhasa and Gyantse. Because of the centuries-long close cultural relations between India and Tibet as well as the unsettled condition of China, Tibet's transactions with the outside world were conducted mainly through India. Well into 1950, the Indian Government regarded Tibet as a free country. China also had a mission in Lhasa, but on July 8, 1949, following the defeat of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government in the civil war, the Tibetan Govern-

ment asked the Chinese to leave, telling them they would discuss the status of the Chinese mission with the new government.

These Chinese officials, being appointed by the Nationalist Government, wanted to come through India. The Indian Government (of Nehru) expressed its delicate position, but did not question the authority of the Tibetans to expel them. Nehru wrote to Lhasa: "The Tibetan Government are the best judges of their own interests but to us it would seem unwise on their part to take any steps which, in effect, mean the forced discontinuance of the Chinese mission in Lhasa." At the same time, the Indian Government was ready to help Lhasa with its security concerns. This clearly shows that the Indian Government regarded the 'Tibetan Government' as an independent entity in no way subordinate to China.

The Chinese announced their invasion of Tibet on 25th October 1950. According to them, it was to 'free Tibet from imperialist forces', and consolidate its border with India. Nehru announced that he and the Indian Government were "extremely perplexed and disappointed with the Chinese Government's action....." Nehru also complained that he had been "led to believe by the Chinese Foreign Office that the Chinese would settle the future of Tibet in a peaceful manner by direct negotiation with the representatives of Tibet...."

Nehru was not being truthful. In September 1949, more than a year before the Chinese invasion, he himself had written: "Chinese communists are likely to invade Tibet."

The point to note is that Nehru, by sending mixed signals and showing more interest in Korea than in Tibet, had encouraged the Chinese to invade Tibet. The Chinese had made no secret of their desire to invade Tibet. The day after the Chinese invasion, the British newspaper *'The Daily Telegraph'* aptly summed up the situation as follows:

"The Indian Government had 'invited' China to open military operation on Tibet by her attitude.... From the very beginning of the year and at frequent intervals the liberation of Tibet had been proclaimed over the radio as a task of the Chinese Communist Government... The Indian Government made it equally clear that it had no desire to intervene

militarily. This was a clear invitation to the Communists to proceed and the only reason for surprise is that they left it so late in the year."

While the Chinese were moving troops into Tibet, there was little concern in Indian official circles. Panikkar, the Indian Ambassador in Beijing, went so far as to pretend that there was 'lack of confirmation' of the presence of Chinese troops in Tibet and that to protest against the Chinese invasion of Tibet would be an "interference to India's efforts on behalf of China in the UN". So Panikkar was more interested in protecting Chinese interests in the UN than Indian interests in Tibet ! Amazingly Nehru concurred with his Ambassador. He wrote, "Our primary consideration is maintenance of world peace.... Recent developments in Korea have not strengthened China's position, which will be further weakened by any aggressive action [by India] in Tibet." So Nehru was ready to sacrifice India's security interests in Tibet so as not to weaken China's case in the UN!

Malignant Influences

It was a great tragedy for India that the two greatest influences on Nehru at this crucial juncture in history were Krishna Menon and K. M. Panikkar, both Communists. Panikkar, while nominally serving as Indian Ambassador in China, became practically a spokesman for Chinese interests in Tibet. Sardar Patel remarked that Panikkar "has been at great pains to find an explanation or justification for Chinese policy and actions." While Nehru was proclaiming his *'Hindi-Chini Bhai-Bhai'* to the world, Patel observed: "Even though we regard ourselves as friends of China, the Chinese do not regard us as friends."

Patel did not stop there. He wrote a celebrated letter to Nehru in which he expressed deep concern over developments in Tibet, raising several important points. In particular, he noted that a free and friendly Tibet was vital for India's security, and everything including military measures should be considered to ensure it. He made two telling points: (1) A reconsideration of retrenchment plans for the army (following World War II) in light of the new threats posed by China's aggressive designs in Tibet. (2) A long-term assessment of defence needs to assure adequate supplies of arms, ammunition, armour and communication equipment.

On November 9, 1950, two days after he wrote the letter to Nehru, he announced in Delhi: "In Kali Yuga, we shall return *ahimsa* for *ahimsa*. If anybody resorts to force against us, we shall meet it with force."

Patel, unlike Nehru, clearly understood the ground rules of international affairs including timely and effective use of force. He recognized that in 1950, China was in a vulnerable position, fully committed in Korea and by no means secure in its hold over the mainland. For months General MacArthur had been urging President Truman to 'unleash Chiang Kai-shek' lying in wait in Formosa (Taiwan) with full American support. China had not yet acquired the atom bomb, which was more than ten years in the future. India had little to lose and everything to gain in presenting a determined show of force when China was struggling to consolidate its hold. In addition, India had international support, with world opinion strongly against Chinese aggression in Tibet. The world in fact was looking to India to take the lead. The highly influential publication, *'The Economist'* of London, echoed the Western viewpoint when it wrote:

"Having maintained complete independence of China since 1912, Tibet has a strong claim to be regarded as an independent state. But it is for India to take a lead in this matter. If India decides to support independence of Tibet as a buffer-state between itself and China, Britain and USA will do well to extend formal diplomatic recognition to it."

But this was not to be. Nehru ignored Patel's letter as well as international support and gave up this golden opportunity to turn Tibet into a friendly buffer-state. With such a principled stand, India would also have acquired the status of a great power while Pakistan would have disappeared from the radar screen of world attention.

Much has been made of Nehru's blunder in Kashmir, but it pales in comparison with his blindness in Tibet. As a result of this monumental failure of vision - and nerve - on Nehru's part, India soon came to be treated as a third rate power, acquiring 'parity' with Pakistan.

Two months later Patel was also dead. And for the next nearly half century, India's fate was left to the whims and caprices of small men and women of no vision. It demonstrated the truth of Edmund Burke's observation: "Little minds and a great empire go ill together."

As if the betrayal of Tibet were not enough, Nehru soon began another march of folly called the *Panchasheel*.

India Sponsors China

Strange as it may seem, as Tibet was crumbling before the Chinese advance, bringing the great power to the borders of India, Nehru's main preoccupation was getting China admitted to the United Nations as a permanent member of the Security Council. This was foolhardy to say the least, for China was then engaged in a war against the United Nations forces in Korea! Nehru's ambition was to project himself as an intermediary between the socialist world - meaning China and the Soviet Union - and the West. In the process he wanted to be seen as the principal figure in the Non-aligned world. To achieve this he sacrificed India's national interest in Tibet.

A question that naturally arises is whether India was in a position to influence China in 1950 to stop or at least slow down its advance. There can be no definitive answer, but the point to note is that China in 1950 was not in as strong a position militarily, domestically or internationally, as it was to be a decade later. China entered Tibet, crossing the Yangtse River, on October 7, 1950, the same day on which she entered the Korean War. In addition there was always the danger that the United States may 'unleash Chiang Kai-shek' (General MacArthur's phrase) and threaten Mao's position on the mainland itself. India had nothing to lose and everything to gain by taking a firm stand against Chinese intervention in Tibet, citing historic treaties between India and Tibet.

But Nehru did exactly the opposite. He refused to protest against the Chinese advance in Tibet because that would prove an 'embarrassment' for the Chinese at a difficult time. Further, at a time when the legitimacy of Communist China was being questioned by most countries, Nehru, influenced by Panikkar, not only recognized Communist China, but even went out of his way to try to make it a permanent member of the UN Security Council in place of Nationalist China. In the process, he gave up India's diplomatic rights in Lhasa. This was an ignoble beginning that led eventually to the catastrophe of 1962.

India gained nothing from this except hostility from the West. Nehru ignored the most fundamental principle of all foreign policy - there are no permanent friends, only permanent interests. Even more than India's later friendship with the Soviet Union, it was the betrayal of Tibet and the sponsorship of Mao's China that soured India's relationship with the West. Acharya Kripalani declared in the Parliament: "Soon, this nation [China] that was struggling for its own freedom, strangled the freedom of a neighbouring nation [Tibet], in whose freedom we are intimately connected." And the great historian K. D. Sethna, a pupil of Sri Aurobindo, wrote:

"In recognizing Red China the Indian Government has committed a mistake whose gravity beggars description. We have made a New Year's gesture, which would rank as one of the stupidest in our history if its stupidity were not surpassed by its perniciousness."

This was to prove an understatement.

Panchasheel deceived Indian public

The *Panchasheel*, which was the principal 'policy' of Nehru towards China from the betrayal of Tibet to the expulsion of Dalai Lama in 1959, is generally regarded as a blunder by Nehru whose good faith was exploited by the Chinese who 'stabbed him in the back'. This is not quite correct, for Nehru was himself guilty of both policy blunders and deception. Nehru (and Krishna Menon) knew about the Chinese incursions in Ladakh and Aksai Chin but kept it secret for years to keep the illusion of *Panchasheel* alive.

To understand this, it is necessary to appreciate the situation at the time. In the years following the Korean War, what China wanted most was a stable border with India. As previously observed, China was not as strong then as it was to become a decade later, and the Indian Army had an outstanding reputation following its brilliant record in the Second World War, Kashmir and Korea. With this in view, the Chinese Premier Zhou En-lai visited India several times to fix the boundary between the two countries. In short, the Chinese proposal amounted to the following: they were prepared to accept the McMahon Line as the boundary in the east

- with possibly some minor adjustments and a new name - and then negotiate the unmarked boundary in the west between Ladakh and Tibet. In effect, what Zhou En-lai proposed was a phased settlement, beginning with the eastern boundary.

But Nehru would have none of it; he wanted the whole thing settled at once in accordance with his *Panchasheel*! The highly practical Zhou En-lai found this impossible. And on each visit, the Chinese Premier in search of a boundary settlement, unfailingly got an earful of sermons on *Panchasheel* from Nehru. He interpreted this as intransigence on Nehru's part. (It is worth keeping in mind that many Asian leaders at the time saw the highly westernized Nehru as an Anglo-American agent and Indian independence - obtained peacefully - as a sham).

Again it is important to keep in focus the purpose of Zhou En-lai's visits to India: stable borders with India - not lessons in *Panchasheel* from Nehru. China had in fact settled its boundary with Myanmar (Burma) roughly along the McMahon Line. Contrary to what the Indian public was told, the border between Ladakh (in the Princely State of Kashmir) and Tibet was never clearly demarcated. In fact, as late as 1960, the Indian Government sent survey teams to Ladakh to map the boundary and prepare maps. But Nehru kept on misleading the people that there was a clearly defined boundary which the Chinese were refusing to accept.

Public Misled

This being the situation - with no recognized border - what was needed was a creative approach based on mutual give-and-take. There were several practical issues on which negotiations could have been conducted. China needed Aksai Chin because they had plans to construct an access road from Tibet to Xinjiang province (Sinkiang) in the west. So Aksai Chin was of far greater strategic significance to China than to India. (It may be argued that it is a strategic liability for India - being expensive to maintain and hard to supply.) Had Nehru recognized this he might have proposed a solution like asking for Mount Kailash and Manasarovar in exchange for Aksai Chin. Alternatively, the Chinese could have free passage through Aksai Chin in exchange for similar passage for Indians to Kailash and Manasarovar. Strategically and culturally, these are of

much greater significance to India than Aksai Chin. In fact, in 1849, Maharaja Gulab Singh of Kashmir had sent an expeditionary force under General Zorawar Singh to acquire them, only to be defeated by the weather.

The issue is not whether such an exchange was possible, but no negotiations were even proposed. Nehru simply wasn't interested in the boundary issue. Instead, Nehru kept misleading the Indian public by claiming that the entire border was beyond dispute and China was creating the whole problem. This was pure demagoguery, which only wasted valuable time. The early fifties were the right time to settle the border, for China was not then militarily as strong as it became a decade later. The upshot of all this was that China ignored India - and Nehru's *Panchasheel* - and went ahead with its plan to build the road through Aksai Chin. India again got nothing in return.

This was not the only deception. What the Indian public does not seem to know is that Nehru and Krishna Menon had been fully informed about the Chinese encroachment in Aksai Chin - years before it became public. Most Indians learnt of the Chinese encroachment in 1959, when the Dalai Lama was forced to come to India. General Thimayya had brought Chinese activities in Aksai Chin to the notice of Nehru and Menon several years before that. Mr. Arpi produces evidence showing that in 1955, an English mountaineer by name Sydney Wignall was deputed by Thimayya to verify reports that the Chinese were building a road through Aksai Chin. He was captured by the Chinese but released and made his way back to India after incredible difficulties, surviving several snowstorms. Now Thimayya had proof of Chinese incursion.

When the Army presented this to Nehru and Krishna Menon, Menon blew up. In Nehru's presence, he told the senior officer making the presentation that he was "lapping up CIA agent provocateur propaganda." I can confirm that Wignall was not Thimayya's only source. Shortly after the Chinese attack in 1962, General Thimayya, in a talk in Bangalore, mentioned that he had deputed a young officer of the Madras Sappers (MEG) to Aksai Chin to investigate reports of Chinese intrusion. The officer was captured by the Chinese who were there in strength, but released after he signed a few papers. I had occasion to see Thimayya the

next day and discuss it in more detail. On neither occasion did Thimayya say anything about Wignall's report but confirmed that he had informed the Government about the Chinese occupation of Aksai Chin several years before it was made public.

So the following facts relating to the Indo-Chinese border negotiations are inescapable. Even after the betrayal of Tibet, Nehru ignored repeated efforts by the Chinese to settle the border in phases beginning with the eastern boundary. The years that should have been devoted to demarcating the boundary between the two giants were squandered on the meaningless exercise of *Panchasheel*, which had no purpose beyond glorifying Nehru as a pacific sage. During these ten years, China became a great military power, while India's own armed forces deteriorated due to neglect and mismanagement by Nehru's favourite Krishna Menon. Also, during the same period, he kept the people of India in the dark about Chinese activities in Ladakh and Aksai Chin though he and Menon had been kept fully informed by the Army. This again was because he wanted to keep alive the illusion of friendship that he wanted to project as the fruit of his brainchild *Panchasheel*.

Dynastic Folly Continues

This sad string of failures holds an important lesson in history. The Congress has always been a party held together by a personality - first the Mahatma, later Nehru, and now Sonia Gandhi. It is inevitable therefore that force of personality rather than concern for national interest should have influenced major decisions even at crucial points in history. This was so in Kashmir, in Tibet, over the border dispute with China, the Simla Agreement, and more recently, the misadventure in Sri Lanka. It is India's misfortune that this personality-dominated entity should have controlled the fate of the nation for the better part of half a century since Independence. The question for the future is - will history repeat itself or have the people of India learnt their lesson? The Congress apparently has not. This is clear from its behaviour preceding the brief war with Pakistan over Kargil, when Sonia Gandhi tried to take over the Government in a coup under false pretences.

It is unnecessary to go into the details of this sordid episode, but

a basic question needs to be asked. There are complaints all around that Sonia Gandhi is destroying the Congress Party because of her inexperience and her style of functioning. But the same Congressmen were willing to bring down the Government and install her as Prime Minister - just when Pakistani soldiers were infiltrating across the LOC in Kashmir. The question is - what would have been the fate of Kashmir and India, had the coup attempt succeeded, with the immature Sonia Gandhi in the place of Vajpayee as Prime Minister, with the likes of Jayalalitha and Subramanian Swamy in control? It does not take much intelligence to see that Kashmir would have been lost, giving Sonia Gandhi an excellent excuse to declare Emergency leading to another spell of dynastic dictatorship. This would bring back European rule with a vengeance.

This is what India escaped in April 1999 - no thanks to the Congress Party. Nehru may no longer be on the scene but his legacy of sacrificing national interest for personal gain - or what the author has called 'war on India's nationhood' - continues unabated. By no stretch of the imagination can the dynasty or its party be called nationalistic. Dr. Waradpande has done the nation a service by showing both Nehru and his party in their true colours.



A

Abdullah, Sheikh	3, 24, 31, 42, 47, 137-9
Advani, L. K.	176
Africa, Indians in	78
Agarkar	139-40
Agni	179
Ahimsa	26, 149, 194
AIR	95, 101-2, 135
Akbar	13-4
Akbar, M. J.	54
Aksai Chin	39, 54, 196-9
Alexander	141
Ali, Fakhruddin	30-1
Ali, Liaquat	30, 34-5
Ali, Mohammad	47
Aligarh Mus. Univ.	161
Ambedkar, B. R.	22, 109
Andhra Pradesh	98
'Animism'	73
Antoinette	134
Appeasement	22-6
Arabic	94
Arpi, Claude	191-9
Arudra	50
Arya Samaj	160
Ashoka	13
Assam	30-1, 72-3, 173
Attlee	113
Aurangzeb	15-6, 146, 181, 183
Ayyangar, Gopalaswami	43-4
Azad, Maulana	87, 93, 136

B

Babar	15-6, 181-3
'Backward' castes	29, 109-11, 176-7
Bajirao	61
Bajpayee, G. S.	56
Balkanization	72-8, 186
Bandaranaike, F.	61
Bandung conf.	49
Bangladesh	2, 30, 40, 164-8
Banks and minorities	163
Beef	81
Bengali	20
Besant, Annie	184

Bhagiratha	13
Bhakra-Nangal	10, 121
Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan	21-2
Bhattacharjee, Ajit	47
Bhindranvale	77
Bhutto, Z. A.	23, 34, 165
BJP	126, 176-8, 180, 183, 185-7
Bofors case	175
Bokare, M. G.	7
Bose, Subhash Chandra	13, 90, 145, 154, 156
Brahmachari, Dharendra	184
Britain	38, 54
Brooks, H.	58
Buddha, Buddhism	13, 15
Burke, Edmund	194

C

Candeth	166, 175
Cariappa, K. M.	59
Caste	10, 29, 109-11, 176-7
Cauvery	187
Chagla, M. C.	46, 92-3
Chandrashekhar	121, 177
Chandraswami	178
Chattopadhyaya, Sharat	105
Chawan, Y. B.	63-4
Chengiz Khan	57
China, Chinese	9, 10, 19, 34, 39, 45, 51-7, 60-2, 91-2, 128, 133, 150, 156, 165, 186, 189-99
Christianity	72-3, 91, 111, 184-6
Churchill	33
Civil code, common	18, 22, 26, 174
Clive	141
Coleman	80
Commonwealth	113
'Communalism'	24
Communism and communists	33, 36-8, 53, 55-6, 62-3, 76-8, 96, 107-8, 114, 126, 135, 141-8, 156, 167, 186, 189-90, 193
Congress — and Muslims	18, 160; — and Partition 28; — and foreign policy 37, 145, 189-200; — and prohibition 79-80; — and language policy 83-96; — and linguistic provinces 97-101; — dictatorship 107-8,

INDEX

168, 200; — leaders 138, 144-5, 159; — founding 145; — and RSS 148; — 'syndicate' 164-5; — and Indira Gandhi 164-72; — and Muslim votes 180; — 'secularism' 182; — and missionaries 184-6; — defence policy 189-200; — personality-dominated 199
 Constitution — 20-1, 22, 29; — Art. 370, 2, 3, 24, 44, 47, 186; — undermined by Nehru 2, 83-6; — a Hindu document 13-4; and language 83, 87-8; — and linguistic provinces 97; — and reservation 109; — and independence 114; — and secularism 126; — and *Shariat* 150; — and Nehru 152
 Convents 9, 59, 87-8, 134
 Conversions 19
 Corruption 153-5
 Cow protection 81-2
 'CPM' missile 59

D

Dalai Lama 54-5, 198
 Dalvi, Brig. J.P. 58
 Dalwai, Hamid 19
 Damle 154-5
 DAV college 161
 Dandi march 13
 Dayananda 139-40
 Defence Science Lab 50
 Defence Science Org. 5-6
 Desai, Bhulabhai 145
 Desai, Morarji 59, 153-5, 166-7, 186
 Deshmukh, C. D. 100
 Dhulekar 138
 Diana 151
 Dictatorship 107-8, 168, 200
 Durant, Will 16, 181

E

Education and minorityism 160-3
 Einstein 149
 Eisenhower 52
 Elwin, Verrier 73
 Emergency 168, 200
 English as national lan. 83-105
 En-lai, Chou 34, 61, 196-7

F

'Fascism' 53, 76, 145
 Five Year Plans 8, 11, 121-2

Franco 37
 Fundamentalism 2, 17, 23, 32, 168, 182

G

Gadgil, N.V. 15
 Gaidouli 73
 Gaitskell, Hugh 34
 Gandhi, Indira 3-4, 24, 31, 69, 130, 152, 154, 160, 164-75, 184
 Gandhi, Mahatma — contrasted with Nehru 3, 8, 18, 23-7, 29, 31, 79, 132-3, 149-50, 168; — Dandi march 13; — and Hindi 85, 97; — murder 119; —'s intelligence 132; —'s realism 133-4; — and languages 134; —'s campaigns 144-5; — and RSS 147-8; — and Jinnah 151; — and sex 151; —'s martyrdom 170; —'s dominance 199
 Gandhi, Maneka 82
 Gandhi, Rajiv 4, 98, 169, 173-8, 183-4
 Gandhi, Sanjay 169, 175
 Gandhi, Sonia 178, 183-5, 199-200
 Ganga 13
 Garibaldi 26
 Ghola 58
 Gita 13
 Goa 38-9, 75-6
 Godse 119
 Goel, Sita Ram 129, 189
 Gonds 100
 Gopal, S. 10, 20, 21, 23, 29, 33, 34, 47, 50, 54, 61, 69, 73, 74, 75, 77, 85, 89, 108, 137, 152
 Gore, N. G. 39
 Govind Singh, Guru 13, 14
 Grierson 95
 Gujarati 96
 Gunther, John 103

H

Halloor 58
 Hare Krishna 186
 Hasan, Nurul 146
 Hastings, Warren 141
 Hatta 33
 Henderson 54
 Hindi as national lan. 18, 20, 83-106
 'Hindi danda' 84, 93
 Hindu-baiting 2, 10, 13-32, 160-3
 Hindu Code 22
 Hindu College 161

Hindu College 161
 Hindus and Islam 19
 'Hindu growth rate' 8
 Hindu Maha Sabha 22, 119
 Hindu-Muslim Cleavage 15-6, 19-20, 23-4, 142, 146-7, 181, 186-7
 Hindu Rashtra 13-4, 74
 Hindutva group 119
 Hitler 133, 143
 Hume 145
 Hussain, Zakir 29
 Hyderabad 47, 76, 87, 93, 178

I

Import 11-2
 Inamdar 180
 Independence of India Act 54
 India — under Nehru rule 2; — contrasted with Pakistan 2, 5, 7, 20; — in science 2; — in defence 2, 5-6; —'s Muslim problem 2; — contrasted with Bangladesh 2, 7; — contrasted with Sri Lanka 2, 7; — and information technology 5; — and poverty 7; — contrasted with China 10
 India Office 191
 Indians in Africa 78
 Indian National Army 90, 145, 154, 171
 Indo-Pak war 1965, 63-65; — 1971, 166-8
 Industrialization 7
 Infiltrators 29, 166
 Information technology 5
 Instigation 23-6
 Integration, national 24, 27-9, 85
 Intelligence 130-2
 Irradiation 105-6
 Irrigation 11
 Islam 14, 19-20, 25, 111, 142, 146, 186
 Isherwood 33
 Israel 48

J

Jain, Girilal 37, 65
 Jama Masjid 177
 Jamsaheb 14
 Japan 35, 92, 128, 154, 186
 Jayalalitha 200
 Jeep scandal 153
 Jesus 25
 Jesus and Mary College 161

Jharkhand Mukti Morcha 178
 Jinnah 18, 31, 149, 151
 Joshi, Sharat 9

K

Kabir, Humayun 31, 92
 Kai-shek, Chiang 191-2, 194-5
 Kalat 62
 Kamaraj 99, 164
 Kanishka 13
 Kashmir 24, 38, 41-9, 150-1, 162, 165-6, 186, 189-90, 199-200
 Kashmiri 22
 Kaul, B. M. 57-8, 138-9
 Keertankars 95
 Kelkar, N. C. 132
 Kennedy 33
 Khalistan 74, 77
 Khalsa College 161
 Khan, Abdul Gaffar 31
 Khan, Ayub 23, 31, 52
 Khan, Chengiz 57
 Khrushchev, N. 33, 41
 Kodanda Rao, P. 80, 102-4
 Konkani 75
 Korea 38, 92, 190-3, 196
 Korean lan. 92
 Kotelavala 37
 Krishna 13, 14, 22
 Krishnajanmabhumi 14-5, 181
 Krupalani, J. B. 196
 Kshatriyas 110
 Kulkarni, S. P. 7
 Kurundakar, N. 47
 Kusumagraja 101

L

Language — problem 83-106;
 — 'enrichment' 101-2
 Laxmibai 13
 Liberalization 4
 Linguistic provinces 97-101
 Literacy 118
 Lohia, R. M. 119-20, 127, 153
 Longoval 173

M

MacArthur 194-5
 Machad 58
 Madanlal 170

- Madhok, Balraj 18
 Madhokkar, C. 47
 Mahabalipuram 13
 Mahajan, M. C. 42; — commission 99
 Mahalanobis, P. C. 10
 Maharashtra 26, 98-101
 Maharashtra Gomantak Party 75
 Mahavira 13
 Malan 113
 Malhotra, V. K. 160
 Mandal comm. 109-10, 176
 Mao Tse-tung 33-4, 196
 Marathi 75-6
 Marriage law 112-3
 Marx, Karl 135, 143, 147
 Mathai, M. O. 79, 136-7, 152-4
 Maugham, Somerset 153
 Max-Muller 143
 Maxwell 57, 60
 McDougall 106
 McMahon line 191, 197
Mein Kaemph 143
 Menon, K. P. S. 56
 Menon, Krishna 39, 50-1, 59, 63, 69, 136, 139, 153, 155, 190, 196-9
 Minorities Com. 163
 Minorityism 28-30, 160, 176-7
 'Minority districts' 163
 Mirashi, V. V. 94
 Mir Jaffar 61
 Mishra, L. N. 64
 Missionaries 72-3, 91, 111, 184-6
 Modi, Rusi 151
 Mohenjo-daro 13
 Mountbatten 41, 113, 151-2
 'Mr. Clean' 174
 Muggeridge, Malcolm 34
 Munshi, K. M. 15
 Munshi, Lilavati 22
 Muslim-Hindu cleavage 2, 15-6; — fundamentalism 2, 17, 23, 32, 168, 182; — League 17-8, 126
 Muslims—and secularists 17;
 —and Nehru 18; — and Congress 160
 Mussolini 36-7
- N**
 Nagaland 2, 72-4, 150
 Nagari script 22, 83, 90-2
 Nagarvala 171-2
- Naidu, Sarojini 125
 Naik, Vasantrao 80
 Nalanda 13
 Nambodiripad 107-8
 Nanporia 52
 Nataraja 13
 Nationhood and Islam 46
 Navanagar 14
 Nayyar, Kuldip 50
 Nehru, Jawaharlal
 —'s war on India's nationhood 1-4; —'s China policy 2, 51-2; —'s Tibet policy 2, 54-7, 189-99; —'s Kashmir policy 2, 24, 43-7; —'s Naga policy 2; —and terrorism 2; —'s leadership 3; —contrasted with Gandhi 3, 8, 18, 23-7, 29, 31, 79, 132-3, 149-59, 168; —'s dynastic rule 3; —'s science policy 5-6; —'s planning 7-12; —growth rate 8; —and English language 11, 71, 83-106; —'s import policy 11-2; —'s Anglophilism 11, 71; —'s 'secularism' 13-32, 125-6, 160-3; —and Somnath 14; —and Muslims 18; —and Pakistan 20; —instigating Muslims 23-6; —'s delusion as 'world leader' 33-41, 45, 55, 133, 148, 156; —and foreign affairs 36; —and Mussolini 36-7; —'s pro-Sovietism 37-8, 146-8; —and Israel 48; —and defence 50-3; —and China war 54-61; —'s intelligence 57, 130-2; and Nepal 62; —fiefdom 67-114; —and missionaries 72-4; —and Balkanization 72-8; —and secessionists 76; —and racism 78; —and Directive Principles 79; —and prohibition 79-80; —and cow protection 81-2; —'s language crusade 83-96; —'s Hindi 88, 128; —and Sanskrit 94; —and linguistic provinces 96-101; —'s Anglocommunism 96, 140-2, 156; —'s dictatorship 107-8; —topples government 107-8; —and caste 109; —and social reform 112-4; —and *swaraj* 113, 118; —phenomenon analysed 115-22; —and the English-educated 117; —and RSS 119, 147-8; —as ruler 121; —'s personality 123-56; —as writer 125, 148, 153-4; —as speaker 127-9; —'s knowledge of communism 135; —'s judgement of persons 136-7; —and G. B. Shaw 137; —'s nepotism 138-9; —'s anti-Hinduism 139; —'s pragmatism 144-5; —and INA 145; —'s 'internationalism' 148, 156; —and women 151-2; —and corruption 153-5; —'s legacy in defence and foreign affairs 189-200

- Nehru, Motilal 127, 130, 138
 Nehruism—*sans* Nehru 157-87; —and Indira Gandhi 160; —, negativist 183
 Nepal 62
 Newton 104
 Nizam 47, 84, 178
- O**
 Orissa sculptures 13
 Ostler, Dutta and Abhijit Sen 7
- P**
 Pakistan 2, 5, 9, 11, 15, 18, 20, 21, 23, 29, 30-1, 34, 38, 40-6, 52, 54, 63-5, 149-51, 166-8, 175, 187, 189-90; —war 1965, 63-5; —war 1971, 164-8
Panchasheel 133, 135, 191, 195-9
 Panikkar, K. M. 190, 193, 195
 Pant, G. B. 96
 Pantheism 73
 Partition 2, 5, 18, 27-8, 86-7, 186
 Patel, Manibehn 138
 Patel, Vallabhbhai 14, 23, 26-9, 42, 44, 47, 76, 85, 88-9, 121, 136, 138, 148, 156, 165, 190, 193-4
 Pawar, Sharad 101
 Persian 84, 89, 94
 Phizo 73
 Phule, Jyotiba 143
 Pirabhakaran 174
 Planning 7-12
 Plassey 61
 Plebiscite 45-6, 55
Poorna swaraj 113
 Pope 186-7
 Population 9-10
 Portugal 38
 Poverty 7-12
 Prasad, Rajendra 15, 27, 29, 107, 179
 Premchand 86
 Prohibition 79-80
 Prophet 21, 25, 177
 Punjab accord 173
- Q**
 Queen Mary's School 161
 Queen's regulation 70
- R**
 Radhakrishnan, S. 119
- Raghuvira 87, 95
 Rajagopalachari, C. 84-5
 Rama 13-4
 Ramjanmabhumi 14-17, 176, 179-81
 Ramakrishna Ashram 160
 Ramjas College 161
 Ranas of Nepal 62
 Ranade 148
 Ranga, Prof. N.G. 57
 Rao, P. V. Narasimha 4, 10, 94, 121, 130, 178-80, 183
 Rao, V. K. R. V. 161
 Rashtra Bhasha Pracharini Sabha 84
 Ravana 13
 Razakars 76
 Reform, social 112-4
 Refugees 29, 166
 Reservation 109, 160, 176-7
 Reserve Bank of India 163
 Richardson 191
 'Roman Hindustani' 86, 89
 Roy, Bidhan Chandra 28, 78
 RSS 19, 76, 119, 125, 147-8, 179, 187
 Russell, Bertrand 35
 Russia—and Nehru govt. 154, 185; —and India 37, 40, 48, 165-8; —and Bangla war 165-8
 Russian lan. 96
- S**
 Samyukta Maharashtra 26
 Sanatana Dharma College 161
 Sanskrit 20, 22, 83, 93-5, 104
 Sastri, Lal Bahadur 3, 12, 40-1, 63, 69-70, 159
Sati 29
 Satyagraha 133
 Savarkar, V. D. 81, 108, 119, 139-49
 Saxena, Mohan Lal 28
 Scheduled castes 29, 109-11, 176-7
 Science under Nehru 5-6
 Scott 73
 'Secularism'—Hindu-baiting 13-32; —and Somnath 14; —and Ramjanmabhumi 15-17; —and Krishnanjanmabhumi 15-17; —and history 16, 181-2; —and Muslims 17, 180; —and language policy 20; —and Constitution 126; —under Nehru 160-3
 Sen, L. P. 58, 190

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| Sha Bano case | 174 | Telangana | 76 |
| Shah of Iran | 35 | Terrorism | 2, 44 |
| Shahabuddin | 17, 182 | Thai lan. | 104 |
| Shahi Imam | 177 | Thimayya, Gen. K. S. | 51, 59, 190, 198-9 |
| Shahir | 33 | Thorat, Gen. | 51 |
| Shakespeare | 104 | Tibet | 2, 45, 47, 54-7, 150, 189-99 |
| Sharada Mata | 137, 152 | Tilak, B. G. | 131 |
| Shariat | 23, 150, 174 | Tipu Sultan | 13 |
| Sharma, Brig. | 70, 139, 170 | Tripura | 31 |
| Shatra, Lonchen | 191 | Tukaram | 71 |
| Shaw, G. B. | 90, 137, 153 | Turko-Mughal invasions | 13-4, 19-20, 26, 29, 84, 146, 184 |
| Shenoy, B. R. | 10 | Two-nation theory | 18, 20 |
| Shivaji | 13-4, 19, 26, 121, 146, 169-70 | Tyagi, Mahavir | 52 |
| Shourie, Arun | 176-7 | | |
| Shrimali | 93 | U | |
| Shukla, Ravi Shankar | 72-3 | United Nations | 38, 42-3, 46, 55, 60, 105, 151, 189, 195 |
| Simla accord | 166, 191, 199 | U Nu | 33 |
| Singh, Charan | 121 | Urdu | 20, 22, 84, 86-7, 95, 130, 140 |
| Singh, Dinesh | 169 | USA | 11-2, 35-6, 40-1, 52-3, 146, 167, 187, 190, 194 |
| Singh, Guru Govind | 13, 14 | | |
| Singh, Hussian | 58 | V | |
| Singh, Mulayam | 30-1, 181 | Vaidya, Gen. | 171 |
| Singh, Umrao | 56-7 | Vaidya, V. M. | 7 |
| Singh, V. P. | 4, 176-8 | Vajpayee, A. B. | 105, 178, 186-7, 200 |
| Sinha, Gen. | 170 | Varanasi Hindu Univ. | 161 |
| Social reform | 112-4 | Varekar, B. V. | 102 |
| Somnath | 14, 179 | Vedic hermitage | 13 |
| Soviet Union | 37-8, 40, 48, 146-7, 153-4, 165-8, 185 | Vegetarianism | 81-2 |
| Sri Lanka | 2, 3, 9-10, 173-4, 186, 199 | Vijayalaxmi Pandit | 34, 130, 138-9 |
| Sirramulu | 98 | Vikramaditya | 13 |
| St. Stephen's | 161 | Vishwa Hindu Parishad | 185 |
| Stalin | 145 | W | |
| States Reorganisation Com. | 98 | Washington, George | 26 |
| Sukarno | 33 | Wignall, Sydney | 198-9 |
| Swami, Subramanian | 200 | Wodehouse, P. G. | 153 |
| Swaraj | 83, 113, 118 | X | |
| Swinton | 78 | Xiaoqi, Linu | 61 |
| Sukhatme | 82 | Y | |
| Sunderji, Gen. | 171 | Yawar Jung | 47 |
| 'Syndicate' | 70, 164-5 | Z | |
| T | | Zaffrullah | 43 |
| 'Tamil Tigers' | 174 | Zakir Hussain College | 161 |
| Tandon, P. D. | 89 | | |
| Tarachand | 143 | | |
| Tashkent | 40 | | |
| Teja, Mrs. Teja | 137, 139 | | |