DIALOGUE

QUARTERLY

DIALOGUE

QUARTERLY

ASTHA BHARATI

DELHI

The views expressed by the contributors do not necessarily represent the view-point of the journal.

Contents

Editorial Perspective

Positive Developments in Indian Politics

The most important factor in the landslide victory of Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) in the recent parliamentary elections was the electors' belief that Narendra Modi shall develop the country; he is capable of delivery and good governance, as he has done in Gujarat. The situation during the last phase of the Manmohan Singh regime left the people worried. The growth rate of the country has fallen due to corruption, excessive regulation and inadequate infrastructure, for which Congress was held responsible. There is no price control. Law making and policy initiative was practically handed over to the National Advisory Council, an extra-constitutional authority. The constitutional posts, such as that of the Prime Minister, stood devalued. People believed in what Sanjay Baru wrote about the PM in his book. Administrative, Police, Legal and other reforms are overdue. The country needed a fresh initiatives in many fields, such as policy initiatives and its implementations. The relations with many countries, especially the neighbours, needed a fresh look. The country was worried due to accumulation of problems. The electors thought Modi to be capable of overcoming the same, and hence the landslide victory for the BJP under Narendra Modi's leadership.

The people developed faith that election results shall usher in a new dawn in the country. The BJP has emerged as the first party, other than the Congress, to get clear electoral mandate after independence. The Janata Party, which won the parliamentary election in 1977, in reality, was not a political party, but a loose formation of different political groups. It had Congressmen, Socialists, Jansanghis, etc., who started quarrelling as soon as the Government was formed, and thereby, brought an end to the whole affair. In this election, the Congress Party has had the worst performance after the independence. The Left disappeared in its main bastion in West Bengal; it is almost reduced to

non-entity in the country as a whole. People, by their clear verdict wanted that there should be no horse-trading and back-door driving; they acted in the election accordingly. In the 16th Parliament, there will be none to represent Mayawati's Bahujan Samaj Party, Karunanidhi's DMK and Farooq Abdullah's National Conference. Newly formed AAP won just 4 seats in Punjab, and none in Delhi and elsewhere. Even IT czars, Nandan Nilekani and V. Balakrishnan, have lost in the electoral battle. The electorate, in this election, has vetoed against the politics of vote bank and that of the caste politics. The political destabilizers, the so-called 'third front', have been thoroughly marginalized; Nitish Kumar's JD (U) won only two seats. In the present electoral scenario, as the people wanted, there is no scope of horse-trading and back-seat driving. In the 16th Lok Sabha, there are 22 Muslims and 61women; Ruling BJP has no Muslim MP. Majority of Muslims voted against the Muslim BJP candidate in Bhagalpur.

The abysmal failure of Congress, its worst performance after independence, was due to the factors mentioned above. Unfortunately, the Congress is not changing even now. Otherwise, they were to have the grace to spare the last ignominy for Manmohan Singh, the outgoing Prime Minister. Unfortunately, he was made to move the resolution at the party meeting imploring the noble madam and her son not to quit. As he said, they had not an iota of responsibility for the inglorious party performance; it was his abject failure as prime minister and of the government he presided over. In Congress, the family and their sycophantic henchmen shall continue to resist change in its political culture. The recent Parliamentary election has, undoubtedly, stamped the seal of maturity on the Indian electorate. This election has many firsts to its credit. Due to absolute majority, Narendra Modi is not to be constrained by coalition allies or coalition *dharma*, The three regional parties – Jayalalita's AIADMK with 37 MPs, Mamata Banerjee's Trinamul Congress with 34 MPs and Navin Patanayak's BJD with 20 MPs – have performed well in the last election. But, due to absolute majority, Narendra Modi is in a comfortable position to deal with them. Unlike Vajpayee, he has no compulsion to go out of the way to deal with erratic and temperamental Mamata Banerjee. The same may be said about Jayalalita, who happens to be mercurial, reclusive, confiding in none, self-obsessed, very status-conscious, very articulate and good administrator and a loner.

The people have developed great expectations from Shri Modi; rather there is explosion of expectations from him, as usually happens in India. This puts a compulsion on him to act fast within a given time frame. Narendra Modi, as is expected, is not expected to bow to the pressure and political considerations. Given the absolute majority, there is every likelihood that he may not be subjected to such pressures; he is not to be constrained by coalition allies or coalition *dharma,*. There is every possibility that a non-deserving person may not be appointed due to inter- or intra-party pressures. Moreover, he is capable of smoothening bureaucratic road blocks and excessive regulations. Therefore, he may go for speedy policy making and effective implementation of the same. The minimum one expects from him is that he will crush corruption; bring back black money; go for infrastructural development, rather than distribution of laptops; prioritize economic empowerment, rather than distribution of doles. The immediate tasks before him may include solving the problems of illegal migration, insurgency and ethnicity related problems in the North-East, Naxal problem and the economic and unemployment related problems. He knows, and may handle corporate houses well. The problems related to very low intellectual level of the majority of our elite, aculturization, plugging social fault lines, restoration of values in the society is only possible through change in education.

Now, as the euphoria of landslide victory is over, the new prime minister is already active in bringing positive changes and our hope lies therein.

Globalization, Modernization and the National Identity

In India and the so-called developing world, globalization, Westernization, Europeanization and modernization conveys the same phenomenon; these terms have almost become synonymous and are indiscriminately used. The quantum of loss of culture and tradition, often, determines the degree of modernization of an Indian. The number of culture and tradition illiterates is rapidly increasing in India; one often finds such Indians, who proudly declare that their children do not know their mother tongues. Needless to say, the loss of identity makes the so-called modern Indians proud. Thus, in today's India, the degree of modernization is directly proportional to the distance between the individual and his roots –his culture, tradition, language, etc. Obviously, there is something basically wrong. The intellectual irresponsibility is at work.

As Indian elite have a colonized mind; they learn to look at their country and people through Euro-American eyes; they have failed to

show appreciation for India's intellectual and creative contributions. There is no change in the system of education after independence. It continues to be colonial.

The discovery of India, especially Sanskrit and its literature, was acclaimed by the West with cries of ecstasy; the enthusiasm for its culture was widespread. Amaury de Riencourt in his book *The Soul of India* says that philosophers like Schelling, Fichte, Hegel, Schopenhauer, and Schleiermacher, poets such as Goethe Schillar, Novalis, Tieck and Brentano, Historians like Herder and Schlegel, all acclaimed the discovery of Indian culture with cries of ecstasy: 'India, the home of universal religion, the cradle of the noblest human race, of all literature, of all philosophies and metaphysics.' He further adds that 'this enthusiasm was not confined to Germany. The entire Romantic Movement in the West put Indian culture on a lofty pedestal which the preceding Classical Movement had reserved for Greece and Rome.' Tolstoy, although a latecomer, was also deeply influenced by the Indian religious thought. J.G. Herder found morality of Indians "pure and simple" and their Gods as "great and beautiful"; He saw India as "lost paradise" of all religions and philosophies. Voltaire saw India as home of all the religions; he looked upon India with respect and admiration. F. Nork, Lillie and Rosicrucians propagated Indian origin of Christianity. Will Durant, Toynbee, Thoreau, Huxley, etc., assessed India and its contributions highly. But all this came against the British colonial interests and the conversion agenda of the church. As Europe, controlling the empires, had to assert its military, commercial, religious and philosophical superiority, and the Europeans had the usual superiority complex of the conquerors, it was difficult for them to countenance the view exalting a conquered people. The soldier-scholars of the colonial-missionary forces came out with the myths to counter Indo-centrism and establish Euro-centrism. They invented "Indo-European roots" in place of Sanskrit roots. William Jones, on the other hand, offered hypothesis of *third unknown source* for both India and Europe.

Hegel justified the historical necessity of European colonialism and praised the British as missionaries of civilization. The missionaries were already on the warpath; Hegel led the attack on Oriental Renaissance from the philosophical front. He saw Europe moving towards an "absolute idea" beyond reach of other countries; he excluded the Orient from history of philosophy. The high-winded language of intellectuality used by Hegel, was, however, termed "confused, empty verbiage" by Schopenhauer. Max Mueller and others were employed by the British to misinterpret sacred Indian texts. But even Max Muller condemned Mill's *History of British India*.

According to Marx, India is not a nation; he combines Macaulay, Mill and Bishop Heber in most uninhibited form, and regards British conquest as a blessing for India. In Marxist writings, the subordination of non-European cultures to Europe touched new heights. It is strange that the great civilization of China is not mentioned even once in *Selected Works of Marx and Engels*. Although, India and China controlled two-thirds of the world economy for centuries, for Marx, these countries had undeveloped mode of production. Obviously, Marx, like Hegel, was a soldier-scholar of the colonial forces, and Marxism represented old Western imperialism under new slogans, which represents sustained attack on deeper India.

Ironically, our scholars have shown no appreciation of India's intellectual and creative contribution. They, especially the Marxists and misguided liberals among them, continue to replicate the colonial scholarship even today. For them, Western Euro-American culture is global culture, as if Europe and America only constitute the globe. Logically, as globe includes all the nations of the world, and therefore, global culture should be the mosaic of all the cultures of the world and never that of a particular region, say Europe, or a country, like USA. But for our intellectuals, this does not make any difference.

Western social scientists placed their society on the apex of human social evolution; according to the frame of social development drawn by them; every society of the world is supposed to follow the West in that frame of social development. E. Husserl sees European culture comprehending and cancelling all other cultures. He says: 'Europeanization of all foreign parts of the world' is the destiny of the world. Such exorbitant claims of the Western scholars is blindly accepted by our intellectuals. They forget the fact that Europe, even upto the end of the 18th century, remained barbaric; it failed to resolve even the geo-centric-helio-centric cosmological knot and scientists like Copernicus and Galileo had to suffer immensely. It needs mention that when Galileo supported Copernicanism (that the planets orbited the sun), Aristotelian professors of Europe were annoyed and got united against him seeking to persuade the Catholic Church to ban Copernicanism. The scientists' struggle for rectification of the Biblical chronology was not less painful. Needless to say that these problems were resolved in India atleast a millennium earlier. Thus, the West's claim of precedence of its social development is baseless.

Gunnar Myrdal, in his *Asian Drama*, repeatedly draws the erroneous inference that modernization of the traditional countries is not possible until they bring a change in their social institutions, beliefs and values keeping the need of their economic development in view. None among our prominent social scientists, except Professor S.C. Dube, pointed out that the conclusion drawn by Myrdal was erroneous and impractical.

The confusion among our West influenced intellectuals, is that they fail to appreciate the fundamental cultural differences between the West and India, and even Asia, before accepting its superiority. On the other hand, the masses believe in and instinctively follow their ancient culture and traditions, leaving pro-West or "modernist" elite, influential but isolated, at the top. Among others, the most fundamental differences are that the Indian culture and tradition emphasizes duty (*dharma*) over the Western modernist priorities and individual rights; place society over individual, consensus and harmony over competition and conflict – a visiting card of modernity and Western culture. These vital differences are causing serious division in the Indian cultural scene, with pro-West elite on top and a huge mass imbued in our culture and tradition inhabiting rest of the country. It is the linguistic domination of English language, downgrading the Indian languages, and consequent cultural thought processes, which has caused the greatest damage. In the name of modernity it has created a small but influential upper social crust, influenced by Western values and language. In the name of diversionary slogans around democracy, secularism, progress, human rights, modernity, equality etc. it looks down upon or underestimates its own glorious history and tradition, which are universal, better and time-tested, than the modernity and its values.

This basic value-based conflict is at the root of prevalent social and cultural confusion and tension. The negatives of the process of globalisation are sought to be glossed over under the penumbra of growth and modernity (in fact all three are inter-linked). Basically it posits the fundamental question: can we not achieve economic growth and prosperity without the loss of our cultural traditions? Should our intellectuals mix two unrelated issues of global trade and aculturation? In reality, globalisation, growth and modernisation have not necessarily to be at the cost of our traditions and identity, as Japan, China and S. Korea have demonstrated. Evidently, our West influenced and privileged elite is incapable of raising the level and depth of the debate over the issue as their thinking process is neither free from Western biases nor have they moral courage to confront their own cultural/traditional

dilemmas with integrity or honesty. Fortunately, at the political level this issue has been joined with the installation of BJP govt. led by Narendra Modi after 2014 elections. Narendra Modi is development/ growth enthusiast and he won this election on development plank. At the same time he and his party, at the socio-cultural level, have strong belief in Indian culture and traditions. Now, the time will hopefully, provide the answer – if growth and development are possible without losing our traditional roots; even as the modernity and traditional beliefs remain incompatible?

This also raises the oft repeated valid question: what is Indian culture and tradition and what are its markers, in today's multicultural and multilingual India? Culturally, we believe there is basic continuity despite religious diversity introduced with the advent of Islam and Christianity – both of Semitic and outside origin. Their main impact has been social distancing, and artificially induced comunalisation. Islamic conversions over centuries in the mainland and missionary and proselytisational activities particularly among tribals and in the NE, has created a large pool of population who are adherents of religions of foreign origin which is in conflict with the indigenous religious traditions. India has long been a multi-religious/belief country. But despite differences and at times conflicts, the coexistence was not an insoluble problem because of common origin, indigenous roots and similar basic traditions of duty, harmony and tolerance. The Semitic religions, with their notions of superiority and stated mission of converting all to their beliefs, by propaganda, inducements and even force, came in direct conflict with the traditions of tolerance and coexistence. Yet by and large, the overwhelming majority, including the Muslims and Christians, in rural environs and smaller towns, live together, peacefully, and in a life-style of the past-tradition. It is only the politics of communalism which from time to time creates the conflict situation and violence. Yet the old tradition, even among the Muslim and Christian tribal converts, prevails despite efforts to wean them away. This is the reassuring and enduring part of the scenario irrespective of apprehensions of foreign influences, interventions and this partition.

Here, it needs mention that our intellectuals accept the opinions of the Western scholars without critically examining them. Another problem with them is that they often mix-up unrelated issue and draw wrong conclusions. As for example, any discourse on Naxalism, often drifts and focus shifts towards the problems of development and governance, as if Naxalites are fighting for development and good governance. The

discourse on globalization rarely focuses on trade and economic issues. Our intellectuals often forget that India was always a globalized country. It remained the richest country of the world due to its vast trade links. When Chinese envoy, Chang Chien, visited Central Asia in 128 B.C., he was astonished to find Indian traders trading in Chinese good there. The problems, such as the hedonistic consumerism, widening gaps between rich and the poor, loss of identity, acculturation, increasing incidents of violence against women, rampant corruption, deviant social behaviour in the society, etc., have nothing to do with opening of the economy. These problems have cropped up due to the collapse of value system, to be tackled by bringing change in our system of education.

– B.B. Kumar

Hara-kiri in Assam Congress

D. N. Bezboruah*

The verb *roil* means to make a liquid turbid by disturbing the sediment. A roiler is one who does this. Lately, we have had a fair number of our lawmakers of the ruling political party in Assam doing just this. They have stirred what had become the sediment of an inactive political party so that the liquid itself has become turbid. But as we all know, when someone does this, the sediment settles down again after a while so that we are back to square one. This is precisely what seems to have happened to the congress in Assam. The interesting part is that we have more roilers than rulers in the State Congress today.

There is really nothing to be very surprised at the recent political developments in Assam involving the Congress. This is just the kind of thing that is destined to happen in a situation where the Congress keeps pretending that it is a democratic party even when it has long had family rule that has made it obligatory for the party in the States to toe the line of the high command at all times rather than being able to elect leaders on their own. In India, the Congress high command has always sent a representative to 'assist' in the selection of the leader of the legislature party wherever the Congress has secured a majority. There has never been a question of the legislators of the State being allowed to *elect* their own leader.

Dissidence within the Congress government of Assam has been there for about a couple of years though Chief Minister Tarun Gogoi initially managed to pacify the dissidents led by Education and Health Minister Himanta Biswa Sarma. What should be evident by now is that all the initiatives taken so far by Tarun Gogoi to quell dissidence have

---

* The writer is the founding editor of the *Sentinel,* Guwahati and a former president of the Editors Guild of India.

been attempts at papering over the disaffection rather than finding lasting solutions to problems. Perhaps his problems started when he sailed into his third term with the assembly elections of 2011. His hat-trick did him more harm than good. Since then, Chief Minister Tarun Gogoi has been a different person. He has been far more arrogant than ever. He has also got into the habit of making puerile and irresponsible public statements that one would tend to associate more with a dictator rather than an elected representative in a democracy. Besides, he has grown more and more obsessed with rituals rather than with the business of ensuring efficient governance. He has created several new awards that could have waited for better days.

Despite severe criticism of the earlier AGP regime, his own government has been unable to pay salaries of all government employees by the first day of every month. The law-and-order situation has plummeted to unprecedented depths during his time. The chronic power shortage (about which the government has done nothing in the last 13 years) has gone against the ruling party in a big way. The completion of development projects with funds provided by the Centre has come to an almost complete halt during the last few years, and the State government has not been able to account for it. All said and done, there has been systematic loot of public money with the State government doing precious little to stop such loot. By failing to stop such loot and punish the wrongdoers, the State government has actually been responsible for two major aberrations of governance. Firstly, it has sent out the tacit message that it will wink at this systematic loot of the exchequer, and secondly, it has destroyed the work culture within the government by tolerating corruption. Tarun Gogoi's government has been totally incapable of controlling prices of essential commodities in the State. Unemployment and alcoholism among the youth have assumed noticeable dimension. No wonder, at the recent Lok Sabha elections the Congress was able to win only three of the 14 seats from Assam against the 2009 tally of seven seats, while the BJP was able to increase its tally of three seats in 2009 to seven seats this time. What is significant is that some of the Lok Sabha seats of the tea growing areas that had always been the preserve of the Congress went to the BJP this time. The Lok Sabha seats of Jorhat, Dibrugarh, Lakhimpur and Tezpur were all won by the BJP. No wonder the BJP is launching 'Mission 84'—a plan to win 84 of the 126 Assembly seats in the elections of 2016. This may be quite a tall order, especially considering the rapid growth of the All India United Democratic Front (AIUDF) that is neither an all-India

party yet nor loses much sleep over upholding democratic principles if one were to take note of the dynastic obsessions of party chief Badruddin Ajmal.

The foregoing is not to suggest that the dissidents were seeking a change in the leadership of the Congress legislature party in order to undo the aberrations of the party. Far from any such noble intentions, most of the dissidents were concerned about their failure to become ministers. The fact that some of them worked against Congress candidates in the Lok Sabha elections.

During the last few weeks, the dissidents have come out in the open to oppose the leadership of Tarun Gogoi. They openly demanded a change in the leadership of the Congress legislature party, with Himanta Biswa Sarma stating that he was unwilling to work under Tarun Gogoi. Meanwhile, Tarun Gogoi had taken responsibility for the dismal performance of the Congress in the Lok Sabha elections and tendered his resignation to the party president Sonia Gandhi, as he had promised to do if the party did not win the promised number of seats. Sonia Gandhi refused to accept his resignation. The outcome of this decision was that there were several trips to New Delhi of the Tarun Gogoi loyalists and the dissidents seeking his ouster. Tarun Gogoi had made it clear to the high command that if he had to continue as Chief Minister of the State, he would have to have a free hand in the governance of the State. However, it was clear that Gogoi too had managed to read the writings on the wall: that his government had failed the people on several counts. He issued a directive to Chief Secretary to constitute a committee to monitor the progress of the different development projects in the State government. He also exhorted Power Minister Pradyut Bordoloi to initiate measures to deal with the power crisis in the State. All these initiatives should have come years ago instead of being taken up only at a time when the new Narendra Modi government was about to ask inconvenient questions about what happened to the Central development funds given to Assam.

However, the strength of the dissidents had grown over the weeks. Today, out of the 78 of the Congress MLAs in the 126-member Assembly, about 45 are with the dissident group. And it is doubtful if reconciliation is at all possible now between Tarun Gogoi and the dissidents led by Himanta Biswa Sarma. Sarma has said too many things against Gogoi in the open for reconciliation to be possible. There are a few formulas being mooted for reconciliation. One is that all ministers of the Tarun Gogoi Cabinet should resign and a new

Cabinet should be formed with an equal number of ministers from among the Gogoi loyalists and the dissidents. Another was that all ministers who have served for over ten years should resign and make room for others. This formula would automatically include Tarun Gogoi as well, but the Centre was adamant that he should continue as Chief Minister.

What is interesting is that the roar of the dissidents should have been silenced a few days ago by just one signal from the Congress high command that Tarun Gogoi will not be removed. However, things appear to have changed a bit in the last few days. On June 3, when Tarun Gogoi went to meet Sonia Gandhi with the new list of ministers, she refused to see him. This had never happened before. Even Gogoi's meeting with Rahul Gandhi lasted only about ten minutes, and there are indications that Rahul Gandhi gave him a time-frame of one week in which to settle differences with the dissidents or face a trial of strength within the party. It is quite possible that Sonia Gandhi has accepted the views of the AICC and does not regard Tarun Gogoi as irreplaceable any longer. Be that as it may, the fissures in the party have weakened the party further in the eyes of the electorate, and the benefit of this might well be reaped by the BJP and the AIUDF in the Assembly elections of 2016.

The NE Theatre of the Absurd

Pradip Phanjoubam*

Writing of Manipur and the Northeast, especially by those of us who belong here and, therefore, fit in the category of what psychoanalysts have come to refer to as the subject in analyst position, has never been easy. We run into many self inhibiting hurdles, and among these is the forbidding shame of telling life experiences which we are aware others will find difficult to not only understand or empathize, but believe.

---

*Editor, Imphal Free Press, Imphal, Manipur.

Indeed, so many of what have become ordinary and routine life experiences for those living in this remote region would sound incredible, incredulous and outlandish to the outside world. Ours is a world in which the extraordinary have become ordinary, lawlessness has become the law, the incredible has become the everyday reality, the unbelievable have become the commonplace…

In these days when it is difficult to convince people elsewhere that works remain undone because of slow internet, or bad telephone lines, or perennial unscheduled and extended power cuts, who would have a sympathetic ear to outlandish stories of gas cylinders not only costing in excess of Rs. 1000, but also people standing in tediously winding daily queues to buy them; or for tales of highway blockades that last for months; of routine paralyzing bandhs called by unheard of sundry organizations; of the fears of unwarranted combing operations by security forces; of ordinary salaried government officers becoming multi-millionaires amidst an expanding sea of impoverished masses; of academics whose only sense of achievement is the next promotion and pay raise.

Why wouldn't reports of annual droughts in a place which receives some of the highest rainfall in the world sound astounding to someone who has not lived in the region? How are we expected to tell stories of fake encounters that continue unrestrained despite stern strictures by the country's highest court, grenade gifts by so called freedom fighters to intimidate ordinary people, the permanent state of exception to democratic norms so blatantly represented by the continued promulgation of black laws such as the Armed Forces Special Powers Act (AFSPA), without sounding like exaggerations or over reactions?

I distinguish the difficulties faced by the subject analyst from those of the objective observer, precisely because, however, incredible these stories are, therefore, however untellable they seem, the subject analyst has no choice but to believe them, for they are indeed his own reality too. His problem, as Dori Laub in "Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History" says, is that of the witness rather than the observer. Unlike in the case of the objective observer, memory comes in the way of his analyses. He can and does communicate freely with others who have shared his experiences, but often finds himself at a loss to figure out how he can credibly communicate these experiences to the outside world.

Writing of a similar inhibition but in the context of the Holocaust, Saul Friedlander observes, because memories are so widely different

and sometimes incredible, another kind of gap in representation often results because of silence of survivors. Within the same survivor community these memories will circulate freely as their shared experience will ensure they do not appear incredulous. But it is in the dissemination of these stories outside the community where the inhibition occurs. 'The silence did not exist within the survivor community. It was maintained in relation to the outside world and was often imposed by shame, the shame of telling a story that must appear unbelievable and was, in any case entirely out of tune with surrounding society,' Friedlander notes.

This probably explains why there are so few from the Northeast writing their own histories of trauma they are so familiar with. In most cases, it is the objective observers from outside the region who are left to take on this task. While the role of the objective observer is indispensible in its own ways, for they have the advantage of wider panoramic perspectives of unfolding events which often evade those caught up in these same events, to leave everything to be explained from this vantage alone would amount to leaving a huge vacuum in any effort to understand the region holistically. It is therefore essential for analysts in the subject position to come to the fore.

This however is by no means as easy as it sounds, given the trends in history writing in academics and equally relevantly, in reportage of history making events in journalism. It would be pertinent to remember here, journalism often is described as the first draft of history as much as it has also been described as literature in a hurry. On a more serious and empathetic note, good reflective journalistic writing has also been called 'a nation talking to itself'.

The emphasis in history writing and journalism is for the analyst to detach himself from unfolding events and dispassionately observe. This already and automatically marginalises the analyst in subject position.

The difficulties then, as noted earlier, are largely a matter of what are now well known inhibitions of writing trauma, including not the least the incredible nature of the skewed reality of regions immersed in endemic trauma situations. The tendency in these places has always been for the abnormal to become normal, and in the same breath, the normal to become abnormal. The Northeast without doubt would qualify to be such a region.

In a rather cynical way, this turning of everyday logic on its head is captured in many popular local adages in Manipur and elsewhere. In reference to the government employment market in Manipur for instance,

it is now a very common and indeed universally internalized wisdom that to be honest and sincere in the discharge of official duty is to ask to be a self-exile. That in a world which has become steeped in corruption and bribery, it would be career suicide to think of swimming against this tide.

In other words, insanity has become the new sanity, and to insist on being sane would now amount to insanity. A bizarre analogy of this I can think of from school chemistry practical classes is the experiment in which hydrogen is demonstrated as combustible in an atmosphere of oxygen, but when the situation is reversed and the hydrogen is made the atmosphere inside a glass jar, it is no longer hydrogen which remains combustible but oxygen which bursts into flames inside the hydrogen-filled jar.

The challenge is clear. Difficult though it is, the Northeast must shoulder the task of telling its own stories to the world, not always to contradict, but also to complement what the world has already told and knows of it. They must tell these stories as they have experienced and understood faithfully, however incredulous these may sound to the rest of the world. But the challenge does not end there. The Northeast must find the language to tell these stories in ways they can be understood by the world.

In contemplating these matters, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, the 1982 literature Nobel laureate, who died recently, and whose obituaries filled the pages of newspapers the world over for weeks, comes to mind. The literary giant found a way of telling the incredible experience of another beleaguered region of the world, his native Latin America, in ways the world outside of the region not only understood, but also stood up in gratitude that another creative vantage has become available to them.

What appeared as exaggeration to the rest of the world, Marquez convinced them all that this was the reality of his world. Much like the Northeast, this is also a world where the abnormal is often the normal and the normal likewise has become the abnormal. In this narrative style which the world today knows as "magic realism", a corpse can still be acutely aware of its self dignity, as in "The Third Resignation", watching with horror to see if any of his relatives who come to mourn him held up a handkerchief to her nose to confirm his suspicion that his body was beginning to putrefy. Or at night, as he lays in state inside a coffin, wishing his mother would leave the lights on and not leave the room too soon lest rats climbed into the coffin and began nibbling at his toes. In the corpse's sense of helpless entrapment and impotence, in his lack of empowerment to determine the shape of events that had a

bearing on his state of being, in his abject inability to resist events that went against his will, there is something of every oppressed society's own despair.

In Marquez's world of magic realism, joint patriarchs and matriarchs in extended joint families live to see as many as five generations of progenies, as in "One Hundred Years of Solitude"; or dead birds can drop ceaselessly from the sky like torrential rain as in "The Incredible and Sad Tale of Innocent Erendira and Her Heartless Grandmother." Marquez exaggerates consciously and with a flourish too, but in doing so, he conjures up in his own inimitable way, a picture of how in circumstances of prolonged oppressed existence, the line dividing the normal and the abnormal can become blurred and easily confused.

This state of utter confusion of values and perceptions is nothing new to the Northeast, therefore, the appeal of Marquez's and other Latin American writers' "magic realism" applies to this world as well. The myriad explanations for the recent macabre massacre in Bodoland in Assam, many of them contradicting each other; the various bitter, grand and now increasingly grandiose struggles for sovereignty in the region making strange bedfellows with struggles for tribal status under the Indian constitution; existing tribal populations till recently resenting others calling themselves non-tribals, yet when the latter decide they too want to be tribals, suddenly turning around to oppose the move; a lady fasting for 13 years over a draconian law; entire populations rising violently against the use of military in civil policing under undemocratic acts such as the AFSPA, yet the same populations voting the political party which unambiguously supports the AFSPA back to power repeatedly...

These pictures are surreal. They are also just a few samples of the ingredients of the incredible, incredulous, fantastic, absurd, unbelievable world the Northeast has become today. Surely these stories cannot be told with justice in standard narratives with the familiar Aristotelian beginnings middles and ends. Sadly, the Northeast still awaits such a tribe of creative and committed story tellers, capable of finding new vocabularies and idioms to make the fantastically impossible, comprehensible to the rest of the world.

In Manipur's absurd theatre, something else is happening. Democracy has become a façade behind which a plutocracy is germinating. This portends extreme danger for the society in the near and far future. This is not unique to Manipur though, for many see the whole of India and indeed the entire Capitalist world, coming to be ruled by plutocrats. The enlightened aversion of this changing order of political power, is what has made Arvind Kejriwal's Aam Aadmi Party (AAP), an exploding phenomenon today, as many analysts have so incisively observed in recent times.

In plutocracy, State power not only comes to concentrate in the hands of a few of the wealthiest directly or by proxy but also becomes a monopoly in their and their progenies' hands.

In Manipur and most other Northeastern states, the evolving plutocracy is even more grotesque. The wealthy, with the exception of a few, became wealthy not by industry or enterprise, but by brazen and institutionalized official corruption. These emergent plutocrats have no commitments to the society at all, and are interested only in fleecing the system with no thought ever of giving anything back to it. Their way of ensuring their monopoly of power is to reduce everything to purchasable commodities; beginning from education, to jobs, to their and their children's privileged positions in society. A democratic answer to this question, capable of reversing the system's gears, to return it to meritocracy and equitable justice, rather than allow it to slip further into the abyss of plutocracy and corruption, is surely another urgent revolution Manipur awaits.

Polycentrism as the Core of Inter-Asian Dialogue

Lokesh Chandra

The twentieth century was wrapped in gold plundered from a thousand flowers. It was consumerism at its height. It clothed the mind with physicality. This century seeks inner steppes, immense and pristine. We have to work out a journey to the innermost substances of Being. Peoples of Asia have to enshrine their visions and values in ever-creating, all-irradiating forms. We have to avoid to avoid the tragedy of becoming non-descript and monocentric beings, deprived of roots. The poetry of our deeps has to be the presence of the perennial in the present and the ferment of a "Living We" of our futures. No hatred events or blood-stained spikes of dogmas. Roman Rolland, the great French writer had said: 'Teach us to understand all things. Asia, teach us your knowledge of life. And learn of us action, achievement.' This is possible only when distinctive spirits are respected. Asian nations have to make the journey together with many nations, sharing and at the same time varying. Substantive voices have to come from our own beyond and withins, our own forms and movements, our own dreams and spaces. The ruptures of our roots have to live in the kinetics of tomorrows, close to fire without kissing its flames.

The twentieth century is done, but its 'global universal' is a depersonalizing hegemony, wherein 'Creative Consistence' and 'Autonomy of Cultures' are victims. A new morphology of cultural reciprocity, a heartwork of variations, has to be resurrected. The multiple

---

* Professor (Dr.) Lokesh Chandra, Chairman, International Academy of Indian Culture, New Delhi, is an Internationally renowned scholar. He was nominated member of the Parliament (Rajya Sabha) twice. He has written extensively on India's cultural relations with the countries of North, Central, East and South-East Asia.

dream-spaces of life and joy are being ripped by the hegemony of globalism and dialogue.

The concepts of globalization and dialogue are contemporary softening up of the triumphalist term of the nineteenth and early twentieth century when thinkers like Max Weber spoke of the uniqueness and universal importance of the special 'Western' culture and civilization. They saw their direction if development, as of universal importance and validity, and as a chain of factors that led to cultural events in the West. The plurality of cultures was an idealized presentation of the non-European ways and institutions as a critical counter image, as backward stages of Western development. Plurality was neither owned nor honoured, but merely provided a clarity to the formulation of European culture as the only "regular and scientific" progress. All foreign cultures were backward as they lacked the socio-historical roots of a dynamic force to bring forth science and technology. Western thinkers posit their cultural value systems as special in that they enabled Western rationality to lead to a creative understanding of the world. Achievements, destructions and crises were the threefold dynamics of change. Crisis were not regressions, but catalytic forces. The traditional non-Western social structures and values have been derogated and brought down so that non-Western thinkers are compelled to channel their ideas in the Western mould. The lack of perceptible human purpose and the threatening ecological crisis introduces a fleeting era of Western self-doubt. It the Western Faustian man his eternal striving the carcinogen? 'There is a cancer in this world; and it is a man' complain the ecologists. Yet the West cannot accept a diminution of its values, which are the driving forces of its civilization.

Prof. Kaneko Masaru, in his book *Anti-globalism* is outspoken: 'This greedy, survival-of-the-fittest capitalism really what we want…. We must not forget issues like Japanese tradition and cultural identity.' The fall of communism was a victory for human rights, and the demise of globalism will be a victory for Values. Globalization provides confrontation and hereby new opportunities to assess our traditions. In the words of Emmanuel Todd of Paris, traditions are the heart of a culture. Family system stubbornly resists globalization and thus helps cultures preserve their individuality. Prof. Yamazaki Masakazu of the University of East Asia's Graduate School has pointed out that **"values common to all humanity are an illusion"**.

Civilization has swept Japan after the Meiji Restoration of 1868 with the slogan "Civilization and Enlightenment". After the Second

World War, 'civilization' was replaced by 'culture' and the phrase "culture nation" (*bunka kokka*) emerged as a national slogan. The "Huntington shock" has led to a further realization that culture wield power. Asian cultures are aesthetic contemplation, an appreciation of beauty and charm, nobility and fervour. The concept of culture as power has made the Japanese reflect on self-awareness, and to nurture the "speech for our roots." Their perception is: 'we should accept what we are, namely, a distinctly minor civilization that operates best on a scale commensurate with its own physical size'.

As silence gives new voices to historic symbols, the Japanese have noted the importance of 'linguistic sovereigty'. Dr. Takashina Shuji, Director General of the National Museum of Western Art, writes: 'Preserving it is absolutely essential not only to safeguard the Japanese language but also to contribute to the world through the Japanese language and Japanese culture'. The famed novelist Natsume Sosek taught his students that the correct Japanese translation for "I love you" is *Tsuki ga tottemo aoi naa* "the moon is so blue tonight". This emotional expression has to work with the Japanese cultural framework.

Prof. Kawakastu Heita of the Waseda University says: 'Culture emerged from our involvement with the land. The word *culture* comes from a word meaning to till the soil', which was eventually applied to cultivation of the spirit … We are suffering from … a cultural crisis… We have to return to the land again.

A new self-awareness is emerging. All the varied cultures cannot be measured by a single yeardstick. "Heavyweight" cultures have to acknowledge the existence of "lightweight" cultures that possess a mysterious charm, refinement and unique flavour of belonging. It is the difference between a "House" and a "home", an expression of inner identity, alive within, the cultural flowering of a dwelling. The West seeks to submerge non-European identities into an industrial civilization, that exaggerates the value of human rationality, and repudiates the transcendental which can give life meaning. As humans are not completely comfortable with modern industrial consumerism, the clash becomes internalized and spiritual. It is easy to be nihilistic and pronounce tradition and religion, symbols and significance, history and national identity as dead. To deny them is to deny ourselves. Human society is a system of symbols. Symbolic meaning holds away in the realm of life. It preserves continuity and unity. Mass culture is being projected as a counterpoint to break up the dignity of higher symbols and their vitality of spontaneous development. Artistic genres, traditional rituals and conventions, that is Forms, are suffering from ignorance and contempt. Form us the very foundation and main stay of culture. Today there is a 'crisis of Form', whereby contemporary society demonstrates spiritual and cultural shallowness.

Secularization and cultural denigration undermines the institutions of Asian nations. The stronger this drive become, the greater is peoples' identification with their own culture. Prof. Kawakastu speaks of 'an encounter between a Japan of beauty and a West of strength … Beauty is not always something that wilts before might.' The Meiji government let this spirit and virtue fall by the wayside in its headlong dash to build a wealthy state and strong army, with disastrous results. In his policy speech on 7 August 1998 Prime Minister Obuchi Keizo spoke of *fukoku yutoku* 'a country of wealth and virtue'. Prof. Nakanishi Terumasa elaborates the Japanese sense of values, along with accomplishing economic vitality, under three national goals "freedom and vitality, revival of history and tradition, and independence". Mr. Nishibe Susumu has been forthright in his comments: 'The spread of "globalism" is nothing more or less than the "Americanization of the world"… let us make the twentyfirst century the century of de-Americanization.

We will have to move away from glorifying consumerism, sex and violence through the omnipresent and omnipotent electronic media. The West cannot stain the mind of humanity. The sky looks blue but does not leave its stains on the wings of a bird. To avoid tensions and reprisals, clashes and crushings, the disinherited of the earth will have to be respected and owned. The roots of humanity as a whole, and of the West in particular, must go deep down into the universal and infinite. The Upanishadic seers having become men-in-the-universe, were inspired by the mighty living cathedrals of nature, and felt that the same serene depths of the mind pulsate in every living being, and called upon to strive for a profound reverence for life:

> *Everything has sprung from immortal life*
> *And is vibrating with life.*
> *Life is immense.*

Technosphere has to be an auxiliary of the biosphere. It has not to intrude into the functions of the biosphere, with all its *sukha* and *duhkha*, its happiness and gloom. High-tech will have to be harmonized with the needs of life. Life includes human life, animal life, and stationary life (plants). Flora, fauna and humanity have to co-exist. Spiritualization of the image of the future in its creativity through pure science and

applied technology provides a new structure for the continuing process of human development. In a world, where science has become cannibalistic and humanity has become edible, will technology devour the significance of human existence? As the Isha-Upanishad says: 'You should therefore only take what is really necessary for yourself, which is set aside for you. Should not take anything else, because you know to whom it belongs'. The world will have to be "the land of duty, not the land of enjoyment" (Mahatma Gandhi).

The real fulfillment of the human spirit is the values of the inner life to mitigate the acid rain of unbridled pursuit of material wealth. The mad cow disease, for instance, has been a warning. Continued industrial exploitation will invite massive retaliation by nature. Man is to give up the illusion of being the supreme creation, whose mission is a struggle against the forces of nature. He is to be a gentle disciple of life, for the stiff and unbending is the disciple of death. He is to celebrate the green plants that are tender and filled with sap. As Lao-tze wisely put it:

> *A man is born gentle and meak.*
> *At his death he is hard and stiff.*

Dialogue was between teachers and their disciples, and the neophyte occupied a position of submission to the teacher. In the nineteenth century when Western countries were dominant, both politically and economically, dialogue involved Christians and non-Christians. Dialogue is seldom between equal partners. The new emphasis on dialogue is a subtler and more insidious form of missionary apologetics. Dialogue has become a prerogative of Western thought. To quote Prof. Wilhelm Halbfass of the University of Pennsylvania: 'The medium, the framework of any "dialogue" seems to be irreducibly Western one… the global openness of modernity is still a parochially Western, European horizon'. Further on he says: 'The meeting and "Dialogue" of the cultures and religions of this world coincides with their trivialization'. Where will this trivialization lead to? Prof. Halbfass is again blunt: 'The Europeanization of the earth continues to be inescapable and irreversible'.

We have to re-define dialogue as the emergence of a catalyst that breaks through its territorial, civilizational, and cultural entrapments. Its has to free us to function in a universal ambience. It is the opening up of constantly emerging "illusions" that go on

fading out so that the future lives in cultural autonomy, and scientific freedom.

Some Asian Paradigms

1. The European theory of cultures and civilizations is a structuring of a mind that has seen phenomenal advances during the last millennium. The Western mind is seeking room to move meaningfully in a pluralistic universe, while it is rooted in the meaning and being of its own thinking and understanding. It has to seek a revaluation or trans-valuation of its *bodhicitta* in the rich structures of consciousness of Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Taoism, Confucianism, Shintoism, and nature-religions.

2. A uni-dimensional norm of humanity is against the deep reality of existence. We have to discover freedom to acknowledge variousness. All the centuries, climates, land, languages can not be articulated according to a single symbol system. The new science is bringing in indeterminism, plural logical systems, quarks without substance, irrational numbers, and so on. They compel us to a polycentric world, to a new sensibility of multicentric consciousness. The new paradigms will have to be many-splendored, with a liveliness of sharing. Values do not exist in a vacuum. They have a history of centuries, exegeses of hundreds of minds the faith of millions, and now the dreadful power of technology. So concepts like 'cultural commonality' and 'universalism' are counter-productive rather than creative. Asians have to accept and respect differences, the beauty of many forms, the eternality of various values. We have to mesh the many in the harmony of divergence rather than in that of convergence.

3. Universalistic hegemony, 'standards of life', promiscuity, the glorification of violence, the denial of roots in an unprincipalled universalism, the destruction of nature and the mad race for consumerism, have to be replaced. For normalization of life, for the renewal of our inner space, and to avoid deracination in multipolar societies, we need to give up unnecessary acquisitions, to inculcate a vision of values as the supreme quest of life, to bring about a world wherein the state of Being overrides the plenty of possessions. This has to be a 'Century of Life' that will preserve the inside against the outside. 'Creative Coexistence' and 'Autonomy of will' have to become the

absorption of the human mind and action. 'Spiritual ideals of reciprocity' have to shape the heart work of culture.

4. From a focus on politics and economics to an emphasis on civilization and culture.

5. The ability to unite the people culturally will be as important as political military and economic might.

6. A new paradigm of glocalism, to bring together globalism and localism.

7. Confucianism teaches that we are not born human *but become* human.

8. People are part of nature, not its rulers. In former times Japanese farmers used to plant three beans in one hole: one to be eaten by the insects in the ground, another by birds in the sky, and the last sprouts to be eaten by the people.

9. Mr. Kawacho Takashi of the Mainichi Shimbun points our the core Asian values as: 'restraint of individual desires and ambitions, harmony with nature, and concert between the group and individual'. Freedom and fairness have to go together.

10. The vocabulary of post-structuralism, with words prefixed by inter (internet, interactive, intersexuality) is a paradigm shift to relationality. The Chinese ideogram *ren* 仁 combines the elements for 亻 "person" and 二 'tow'. It focused on the individual and his surrounds acting in unison.

11. Re-valorization of the distinguishing features of Asian cultures which are neither fixed nor absolute. In the domestic architectures of Japan and Korea, the interior and exterior are separated by a single thin sheet of paper. The shoji or 'paper homes' are to welcome the sounds and breezes, the lovely chirping of birds and inspects. It is an open culture as contradistinguished from West's culture of walls. It encourages openness.

12. The wave of modernization is being replaced in Japan by a new but opposite wave of *dastu-O nyu-A* "get away from Europe (*O*) and unite Asia (*A*)".

13. Respect for the cultures, civilizations and religions of each other, and no interference or conversions by a subtle psychological agenda should be the value of our century.

14. 'True universality' can only be rich diversity, with no single meaning. The various lines, the many realities will be lived in everyone's deepest feelings. Religions, in the plural, will be global in the sense that they will be rooted in human consciousness as the vision and faith of fellow beings, whatsoever their demographic numbers. Universality of culture and civilization, rather than a universal culture and civilization, will seek civil behaviour in the affirmation of diversity. Such a culture and civilization will be multiple and their centre will be everywhere.

15. Love of one's land is to value the rights of humans to be sculptors of themselves. Some mysterious flow of energy and resolve invests territory. The territorial imperative is a genetically determined form of behaviour, as amply attested by the biological sciences.

16. Love of history. Millenia of time are the subtle and profound 'living space' of men History is the deeper ground of our existence.

17. Sacredness of all life, and the divinity of nature. Awakened awareness, no ideology but ideas, so that tiny pebbles gathered on the shoreline of life become fine like pearls. When we carry these pebbles back home to our hearts, intertwined with them will be the Sea of Consciousness in our sleeves.

18. Human values of divergence are the deepest core of the humanum. We will have to inhabit the spiritual universe as a continuing relationship between 'inside' and 'outside'. There is no 'inside' without an 'outside'. It has to be a continuing realization in the dream-space if human. Without diminution of religious autonomies, we will have to own the 'other'. Alterity or otherness will be integral to humanity. No universal mission as a management of the world, but the acceptance of pluralism as well as respect for multiplicity. We have to pass from de facto plurality to pluralism. It has to be an authentic human plenitude of various strands, held together by mutual respect.

Prof. Lee O-young, a former minister of Culture and Sports of the Republic of Korea, says: 'At length we will hear, wafting in from the once-forgotten Asian steppe, a song that transcends the spiritual, emotional discord.'

Modernity and Tradition

Samdhong Rinpoche*

I wish to confess to my friends who have a misconception that I am a very knowledgeable person, that it is not true. Whatever I say is probably based forty percent on knowledge and the rest is information. Anything claimed on the basis of information is not true knowledge. My friend Pawanji differentiates between 'knowing' and 'believing/ assuming'. It is a fundamental differentiation. We know very little. Mostly it is what we believe in, and yet we claim that we are logical and not superstitious.

I have lived the first twelve years of my life as an independent citizen of an independent country. I have experienced what is independence and sovereignty of a nation. When we came to India in 1959 as refugees, we were told by many that China was able to occupy our country (Tibet) as we were backward, uneducated, and underdeveloped and had failed to modernise ourselves. Listening to all this, for some time, we also started feeling that perhaps we were at fault. At the same time, this also raised two questions in our mind. Firstly, if we were uneducated then all these profound scriptures we have studied till then was futile. Secondly, Tibet since ancient times had economically and militarily mighty countries like China, Russia, Mongolia and India as its neigbour; and though Tibet lacked their economic and military prowess, yet we were self-reliant and no one lacked food and shelter. China always had an eye on Tibet. From time to time it troubled us, had agreements and treaties with us, but there was never any talk of merging Tibet with China. There was a time

_____

* Prof. Samdhong Rinpoche, former Director, Central Institute for Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, former President, Association of Indian Universities, and former Prime Minister of the Tibetan Government in Exile in India, is an eminent scholar and thinker. This is English translations of the Hindi version of his discourses on cultural and tradition, kindly made available to us on our request, English translation was done by Shri J.N. Roy - Editor.

when the mighty British Empire defeated us militarily, but it never occupied us but entered into a treaty, respecting our sovereignty. But with the advent of Mao Tse Tung regime in China, occupation of Tibet acquired a high priority. The question is why so now, in the twentieth century, when we had been living as equals with our powerful neighbours from the eighth to the twentieth century?

After coming to India, I read the autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi. I gathered some new insights from this; especially, how to use non-violence in political struggle. Besides, we also learnt about the distinction between tradition and modernity. This also helped us to understand that the alleged lack of development and education were not responsible for our slavery, as we had been living in this condition since the eighth century. Even the transition of China from monarchy, to the so-called democracy, to the current communist regime, must be driven by some fundamental factor. And this factor appeared to be the thinking of the modern civilisation and the processes unleashed by it. We also understood that if Tibet had become educated and modern earlier then, perhaps Britain would have occupied us; or may be China itself. Because in such a case we would already have had systems in place, suitable to them. As we were not modern, Britain must have found ruling us inconvenient, that's why they left us to our devices.

When I read *Hind-Swaraj* of Mahatma Gandhi for the first time about 20-25 years ago, I could not understand it. Although I did not feel that Gandhiji was conveying incorrect things, yet I could not comprehended as to why Gandhiji was rejecting the modern civilization in its entirety. At that time I held different views. While I believed that the western civilization was not beneficial for us, yet there was a feeling that we could introduce some elements of modernity in our civilization and this could be beneficial for us. That is why I could not understand Gandhiji's strong and vociferous opposition to it. After that I had opportunity to visit and study many (so-called) developed countries of the world. I also had direct interface with very backward countries, called the third world. After seeing and evaluating both the worlds, I reached to the conclusion that Gandhiji was right.

Modernity brought major changes in the world, wittingly or unwittingly and directly or indirectly. We also had long spells of violence and war. We did not understand the root causes behind these. People could not understand the flaws of modernity till Mahatma Gandhi exposed them. Even before Gandhiji, there were others also, who rejected modernity; but their rejections were based on cultural or spiritual

grounds. They could not comprehend the threat and challenge of modernity to the very life force or lifestyle of entire humanity. Only Gandhji understood the true nature of modernity. He identified it as an existential threat to the entire humanity and living beings. But very few fully understood the apprehensions of Gandhiji.

Even many well-known scholars, who have written extensively on Gandhiji, have been found expressing that *Hind Swaraj* should not be taken literally. These scholars believe that *Hind Swaraj* was written under special circumstances, with special objectives for a particular audience. Hence, *Hind Swaraj*, should be understood in a certain context. Even some of his close associates considered it irrelevant. Gandhiji tried over 105 years ago to bring out this truth, but perhaps it could not be understood due to the simplicity of his expressions.

One would recall that Gandhiji in *Hind Swaraj* had asserted that the modern civilisation is so devious that it can neither be easily defined nor fully described. And what was difficult for Gandhiji will not be easy for us. I also have difficulty in relating to or enter into fruitful dialogue with modern people; because I live in the seventh century civilization and think and articulate in the same vein. That is why I find it difficult to communicate and have a dialogue freely. At the same time this does not mean that I have a closed mind; that any fact, argument or example if logical and true is not acceptable to me. Even Buddha had averred that a fact should not be accepted merely because Buddha had said so, but on the merit and understanding of the fact itself. Even then dissimilarity of views makes a dialogue/discussion difficult. Even then, in order to enhance my own understanding, I have attempted differentiation between modernity and tradition in the following six contexts.

Society vs Individual: In tradition, society was considered more important than an individual. In tradition the accepted principle is that if required, in the interest of society, an individual should be willing to make sacrifices. In modern civilizational norms, the individual has prime importance. In this world view, society is expected to suffer, if necessary, to protect the rights of individual. For a modern person, several layers of "my interest" and "our interest" are given importance – ranging from the self to the nation. If you look from the nation's perspective, my nation is always right in any matter and my rivals are always wrong. Our current notion of patriotism considers our nation more righteous than other nations. This evaluation is not based on any just norms. If two nations go to war, who is at fault is of no concern;

the other nation is always the guilty party. Whatever the issue, Pakistan will always blame India, and India, Pakistan. This trend is noticeable at various levels of intercourse embracing the family, the society, the town, the district and the states. If two brothers in a family have dispute, they emphasize only their individual interests and never think of making a sacrifice for each other. Personal individual interests always overrides and come before the interests of the collective.

Duty vs Rights: In tradition, the emphasis is on duty and not on right. In today's world the priorities have reversed. Everybody talks about rights, not duties. The United Nations has also proclaimed a Charter of Human Rights. There is no declaration of Human Duties. There is no mention of it at any level including the society, laws and the legislations. Even in Constitutions, while there are exclusive chapters on fundamental rights, there are no chapters on fundamental duties, and if at all, only a brief passing reference. Even in the Indian Constitution it was added later and did not exist in the original one. This betrays a failure to understand a basic proposition that if everyone is observing one's duties sincerely, the question of violation of anybody's rights simply does not arise. Therefore, there is a fundamental difference between tradition and modernity in determining the priority between duty and rights.

Mind vs Body: Above mentioned two differences are at the level of society. But this difference between mind and body is visible both at the level of society and an individual, a fact which Gandhiji considers significant. At the individual level the difference exists between the mind and the body. While modernity accords greater importance to the physical conveniences, the traditional civilizations gives priority to mental peace and purity of thought. It is in the nature of living beings to crave for happiness and alleviation of suffering. No one seeks suffering; everybody wants happiness. A human being is considered superior because he is endowed with the faculty of judiciousness. It is this attribute which distinguishes him from other beings – birds and animals. But then what is the nature of the distinction? Like human beings other beings also want, happiness and not suffering; but they cannot comprehend what are the means to happiness and what are the causes of suffering? Like human beings they do not know how to attain happiness or alleviate sorrow or suffering by using reasoning or discretion. However, when (modern) human being attempts to get over the suffering, he starts considering physical inconveniences as the main cause of suffering. In modern society people mostly do not realise that

lack of mental peace and equanimity could also be the source or cause of suffering. The modern civilization emphasises on physical conveniences and pleasures and it ignores the role of mental process in attaining happiness–as tradition does.

Natural vs Artificial: Tradition teaches a person to live simply and in accordance with his or her nature. When a person leads a simple life then one is not in conflict but in harmony with others and nature. Modernity has habituated a person to lead an artificial life. His life-style does not reflect his real nature but preference is given to appearance – pretence in various forms like hair-style, attire etc. This artificiality is noticeable in his physical appearance, articulation and thinking – which a scholar has described as a disconnect between "being (*sthiti*) and the manifested (*gati*)". If the being (*sthiti*) and the manifested (*gati*) are in conformity or alignment, there is no place for artificiality or pretence. Behaving as your natural self is simplicity and pretending to be something else is artificiality – a manifestation of modernity.

An artificial person claims to be logical in his thinking but is also at the same time superstitious and does not understand the real meaning of being logical. In tradition there are three levels of logic, viz., the fact, the reason and the manifestation. In modern logic only the reason (*hetu*) is given prominence. The Western civilization functions on the basis of partially developed logic/science of reason, which in fact is not contemporary and is based on assumption. In traditional thinking, along with reason the fact and the manifestation, also get equal importance.

Diversity vs Uniformity: If we look further we find that modernity stresses uniformity. Modernity does not easily countenance diversity in various fields like language, culture, dress etc. Globalisation attempts to promote uniform living pattern in the world over. A child going to school has to wear the same kind of dress, socks, shoes and even hair cut. This ignores the individuality and unique personality traits. This is described as "uniformalisation". This formulation suppresses the basic nature of an individual and his personal uniqueness in the effort to make everyone behave and live in a similar manner. Approximately, 700 crore people inhabit this planet and no two persons are similar in all respects. Even twins who look similar are easily identifiable as individuals. Do we not learn from this that these 700 crore people have their separate personalities and they cannot be forced to become similar in behaviour and living. Such an effort is not natural; but artificial.

Harmony vs Competition: Analysed thoughtfully one finds that the modern thinking promotes comparison, competition and conflict. In contrast, tradition, mutual cooperation and harmony are given priority. Modern civilisation is rooted in conflict and it is natural law that conflict can never lead to a positive outcome. Two stones placed side by side can form a wall, even a house, but if they keep colliding with each other, these would either shatter or diminish. This is the fundamental difference in the vision of the modern and traditional civilizations.

Let us look back a little. Science and industrialisation developed about 250 years ago in the Western countries. This ushered in a new phenomenon of surplus production of commodities than needed or required by people. Earlier people manually produced what they really needed. In modern times, arose the issue of consumption of surplus production, in which capital had been deployed. Research revealed that the 'greed' inherent in human nature could be easily exploited for the purpose, by promoting the cult of "comparison and competition". To achieve this, it became necessary that a person should not understand the real value of things, but get into the habit of always looking at it on the basis of comparison. This habit was to be inculcated through various mediums like education, media, social engineering etc. The idea was to shift the basis of 'Comparision' from the inner self to market manufactured external one. Comparison automatically leads to feeling of competition. If I have one pair of shoes, why my neighbour has ten pairs? I am no less than him, therefore, I should also have them. A mindset of comparison and competition was introduced in social discourses. In the process, the phenomenon of production gave birth to the curse of capitalism, which in turn led to exploitation of the farmers and labour. This unabashed exploitation engendered hatred against capitalists. This in turn led to the birth of Marxism or socialism. If there was no capitalism, there would have been no Marxism.

Advent of Marxism was not a result of any research or invention, but of reaction. A search for reality leads one to the truth. If any such inquiry is impelled by jealousy or reaction; then it will only yield erroneous outcomes. Marx's worldview was based on dialectics and conflict, which according to him, produced something new. Thus, for Marx everything is neutral or inert. According to Marx, a seed in itself is inert. But when soil, water and fertilizer are introduced then the ensuing process of dialectic or conflict ensures destruction of the original seed and this gives birth to a new shoot. He encapsulated this in expression "thesis, antithesis and synthesis". Later he described it as

'class conflict'. His concept of class conflict seems endless, even when Marxism has collapsed and capitalism has triumphed.

Marx erred; the sprouting of the seed in a sapling is the outcome not of 'dialectic' or 'conflict', but cooperation and harmony. The shoot emerging out of a seed is the harmonious coordination of air, water, sun, fertilizer etc. This is the traditional world view. All Indian philosophical and religious systems would consider it an outcome of harmony, not conflict. Cooperation and harmony always lead to positive results.

In my view these are the six basic distinctions between modernity and tradition. This is my belief and it is not necessary that everyone should agree with this. I am presenting only how I look at these things. In a way it will be appropriate to say that there is nothing new in modernity. Most of the societies had pre-existing systems, beliefs and priorities which, modernity has tried to turn on its head and alter. What was natural in human behaviour was altered and presented as something new and defined as modernity.

Prof. A.K. Saran, in his book *The Traditional Thought* has very concisely brought out the characteristics of modernity. In the introduction of the book he writes: 'Novelty, Self-grounding and Violence are synonymous with Modernity.' Modernity seeks novelty in everything – in clothes, speech, behavior or anything that we use. It should not only look new and be very different from others, but this novelty should trace its origin only in modernity and not in tradition or nature. Thus, this novelty should be a standalone phenomenon unconnected with any existing process or reality. Because novelty feels threatened by any connection with any source or foundation as it contests its very basis of being or existence as entirely new, unconnected with the past. Therefore, it has to stand on its own which is "Self-grounding" i.e., it does not need any connection or support from any tradition or reality for its existence. A plant needs a combination of inputs and environment to grow, flower and perish. But in modernity its various attributes seem to be born out of nowhere (in sky or atmosphere) and exists on their own. In order to achieve and sustain these two attributes, violence becomes central. This may take the form of violence or exploitation, directly or indirectly. This is what the reality of modernity is.

Education, politics and religion did not have any significant role in the advent of modernity. Partially science and more significantly industrialization have played main roles. It has empowered man to produce commodities far in excess of what is required and his capacity.

For example, a pair of shoes was produced by a person in one day but today the same person with the help of machines is able to produce ten pairs in an hour. In order to ensure the consumption of these excess pairs, efforts were made to tap and enhance the instinct of greed in human beings. Artificially the feelings of fear and hope were aroused. One can notice in any market place captions like "Rebate/Sale only for today". Thus feeling of both greed and fear are aroused simultaneously over availability and one is induced to buy it. One can easily observe the deep research in human psychology behind it to leverage the human greed for maximum exploitation.

It is possible that in early days of modern science, the search for truth behind external objects and phenomena were driven by objectivity and altruism. But today the final outcome of all the researches are predetermined. This does not mean that the modern scientists have not done their work guided by truth and dedication. But what is being done now is driven by the motto of "profit" and this pervades in almost all the fields. In education the oft asked question is whether it will lead to a job. Today we pre-decide that after education we will seek a job and not entrepreneurship or self-employment. Now the targets are fixed. All efforts now culminate in the question, the volume of "profit or gain".

Today the challenges of the modernity pose existential threat to mankind and earth itself, if not tackled adequately and immediately. The first major challenge is of violence. Its most visible forms are war and terrorism. Then there is the systemic or system generated violence. We are neither able to see it or understand it, but its scope and spread are frightening. The present situation is such that we have no will to resist violence, unless it directly affects us. This kind of violence is market driven which necessitates perpetuation of war or its possibility. We have seen Vietnam, Afghanistan and Iraq wars. Wars, these days, have no cause and are not concerned with victory or defeat. Even popular agitations are turning violent. There is market/business behind all this and we are unable to see this pervasive/reality of violence. There is a book titled: *When Corporates Rule the World*, which describes what will be the situation when corporates run the world? Today 10-12 families are running this world. All these so-called governments, administrations and political parties are puppets being manipulated by them. These realities are not my imagination but are based on credible research. Republic, democracy, equality and justice have become meaningless clichés. The whole world today is not functioning on the

basis of democracy, but on the basis of group/party for whom the group/party interest come before the national or public interest. And these entities are manipulated by the market forces.

In brief the entire world today is being governed by the market forces which are described as consumeristic system. In this system there is no place for values, except profit and money. I cannot forget a sentence written by a teacher in an Australian newspaper: "never mind human rights; money matters." It's true that today human rights have no importance, only dollar. It does not matter even if ten people lose their lives as long as you are earning some money selling bullets. The biggest industrialists today are those producing weapons of mass destruction. It is they who influence the outcome of elections; those who win with their help are duty bound to help in expansion of the arms market. Constant possibilities of war and terrorism are essential ingredients to keep the weapons market vibrant and expanding. I clearly remember that Vietnam War which lasted for 18-19 years could have ended quickly in victory, defeat or surrender. But it was purposely kept going on as victory or defeat was not the objective, war was. Similarly, possibilities of war are kept alive in Afghanistan, Iran, Syria, Ukraine etc. Terrorism is also now always available to keep the arms bazaar flourishing, even if it means a few thousands or lakhs get killed. It is not considered bad. Life has no value as long as weapons are being sold and market for it is being created. Maintaining this reality also means suppressing those who think positively and talk of values and human rights. They should be convinced that they are all helpless and things are bound to continue like this and it is better to compromise with the obtaining reality. There is also an irresponsible thinking, which is symbolic of modern thinking, that its okay even if the earth is destroyed as long as it does not happen in our life time.

The second challenge is that of ENVIRONMENT: The modern life- style, production methods and thirst for development have brought environment to the brink. Thinkers, researchers and environmentalists forecast dire straits for the earth in the next twenty years.

When we discuss about all this, lot of things seem amiss. But later we forget about all these. There is a Tibetan story about a person who became friends with a ghost: The ghost asked him as how he could help. The person asked the ghost to just forewarn him of his death. The ghost agreed and one day informed him that in a certain village a person of his age had died. The person acknowledged the information without much interest. After some time the ghost informed him that in a

particular village a person older than him has died. The person again did not show much interest. After some time the ghost again informed him of a death of a person younger than him, in a particular village. The person got irritated and chided the ghost that he had requested forewarning about his death, then why was he dishing out irrelevant information to him. One day the ghost informed him that he was going to die the next day. The person got angry and said he had asked him to give him prior information and he was warning him only a day before. The ghost said that he had been hinting about it for some time but you could not comprehend it. That is what is happening to us. The devastating floods in Uttarakhand are a matter of concern for them and mere news for us. Same about Tsunami. We keep quiet considering all these as mere information and do not wake up to ask why all this is happening?

The third challenge is that of RELIGION: Religion which ought to provide deliverance to mankind does not exist today. Speaking of Buddhism, I can assert that it has declined considerably. Meanwhile institutions set-up in the name of religion have divided mankind. These exploit the sensibilities and sentiments of human beings. Today religion has become a source of divisiveness and violence.

The fourth challenge is that of ECONOMIC DISPARITIES: Today the issue of economic disparities has acquired a psychological dimension. Even if a person rises out of poverty, he is unable to shed the mindset of poverty. Because the market/bazaar has a vested interest in keeping the divide between the rich and the poor alive so that one keeps trying to copy or catch-up with one better off than him and in the process keep the business going. Market has created a situation where a human being has been reduced to being an instrument of consumption. Now we do not "use" but we "consume" as a key to success. This psychology of economic disparity today pervades even societies and nations, endangering humanity itself. And all this is result of an organized scheme, to prove which one requires evidence and proof. However, those who are experts in crime are also experts in erasing evidence or foot prints. But we can assert so on the basis of inferences. It is said that 12-13 families, who have huge resources are running this world. They leverage their resources in a manner that it keeps multiplying. They are very powerful and it is averred that any regime or government which tries to free itself from their clutches cannot remain safe. Therefore, to retain power it is prudent to follow the dictates of those powerful entities.

It is difficult to offer concrete proof but if examined closely the truth can be inferred. If one follows the recent wars in Vietnam, Iraq,

Afghanistan etc., it appears that there was more keenness to prolong the war rather than achieve any stated objective. Like World War II, these could have been ended in a day. Prolonging the war seemed to sustain the armament industry. They seemed least worried. Nearer home in India one has to understand as from where the terrorists are getting arms and resources. In Tibetan struggle many suggest that we fight and they would help. But we understand their real objective. They are not interested in freedom of Tibet but in prolonging the Sino-Tibet conflict to the benefit of arms bazaar. Most of the political leaders understand this danger of globalization but irony is that they are unable to speak up or resist. Thus, one has to conclude that there are forces more powerful than them, who are running the affairs of the world.

However, the question remains that are all these well planned and coordinated or are they also the automatic by-products and outcome of the very foundations of modernization? After closely examining, I see both these elements in the development process. People's mind or thinking accords with existing system or establishment. This is the basic tenet of human nature and that is why people of similar nature bond together easily. To keep this illusion going and not allowing one to think differently is an essential part of a planned scheme. This can be seen in the developments, in the field of education, science and technology, which are taking place in accordance with these plans. New discoveries and inventions are taking place at the behest of governments or corporates. There are very few inventions/discoveries which are truly beneficial for the society or mankind. Corporates invest in pre-targeted researches only and discontinue those which do not fulfil their objectives.

Meanwhile, the votaries of modernity have generated a number of attractive slogans. Such as democracy, secularism and even peace. These constitute part of our education as well. However the discussions around them appear artificial and hollow and there is contradiction between the prescription and the practice or reality. These slogans even have the consent of people. I do not know why people give their consent to these slogans as these have nothing to do with obtaining reality.

In order to face the challenge of modernity, for the last few years we are engaged in understanding the traditions and their relevance now. Particularly in respect of education system there have been many research projects. The outcomes reflect divisions at the international level and particularly in India. There is a need to understand the education system in India before the arrival of the British Empire. The traditional system produced a number of profound scholars. This education system was neither government sponsored or dependent nor fully people supported. It was only "Guru" or teacher centric. Students voluntarily went to a person who had acquired capability to be called "Guru" and lived up to the age of 25 years with him to acquire education. This education was not compulsory and no one gave grants. One earned and learned simultaneously in guru's ashram. There was illiteracy among people and there was no legislation like "Right to Education", yet the system produced an array of learned scholars who authored *shastras* and produced great literature and philosophy of great scholarship. After the advent of the British system, we need to see if we have produced even one scholar of that calibre. If one takes an over view of education since the intervention of the British system of education in diverse fields of philosophy, art, craft, etc., it will be clear whether education has prospered or declined.

We rightly curse Macaulay, who finished the *swaraj* of language. With destruction of language we also lost the freedom of imagination and resolve. It feels strange that now we think and express in colonial language and also feel proud of it. I travel a lot and resent and even feel humiliated being welcomed by airline hostesses in foreign language. At times I get into argument over this. This happens only in India and not in airlines of Germany, Italy, Switzerland etc. They do not speak in English unless spoken to in English. Recently I called for airlines schedule of Lufthansa and received one in German. I was inconvenienced but liked their attitude of not responding in foreign language unless a specific request was made. In a recent felicitation function for me in Italy, the address of the Mayor of the city was delayed by half-an-hour due to late arrival of the interpreter. Even as he commenced his speech the Mayor many times corrected the interpreter. He knew English but preferred to address in his own language. In India we feel elated even if we are able to speak two sentences of English, underscoring the fact that though we became politically free sixty-five years back but have voluntarily accepted the mental and linguistic slavery.

I feel that the linguistic slavery is more harmful than the political slavery. Change of language leads to changes in thinking, change in the categories through which we perceive and think, which in turn ensures destruction of one's culture. The easiest method to destroy a nation's culture is to deprive it of its language. This method had been used in ancient times and is now being used by the imperialist powers.

We cannot achieve freedom or *swaraj* unless we can naturally articulate and think in our own language. Without it our thought process and whole life style will be artificial and not natural. You will wonder why I am talking about language when we are supposed to be discussing about modernity, culture and education system. I consider it essential to talk about language to answer the question as to currently why are we struggling to discover our tradition? The tradition ought to be a natural part of our lifestyle and as it is not so, we are organising workshops, researches and debates in its search. The search underscores that either we have lost it or abandoned it. All this has happened because we lost our language and consequently our thinking, culture and traditions – an inter linked process. That is why we should be necessarily talking about language.

A Tibetan or an Indian can never become a complete Englishman unless he is born of British parents. One can speak English and adopt their attire and mannerisms, but all this will remain artificial and not natural. Aurobindo Ghosh is a living example of this. His parents in order to make him complete Englishman, from childhood educated him in English. Two British governesses looked after him and not a word of Bengali reached his ears. He was sent to England at the age of 7 and remained there till the age of 24, to keep him away from Bengali language and culture: Yet when he returned he remained an Indian and not hundred per cent British. After his return, he learnt Sanskrit and studied his culture and traditions and lived his life as a great savant and left behind an impressive philosophical legacy. Therefore even after great effort one can only be a poor imitation lacking the natural self.

Simplicity and spontaneity in nature is home of *swaraj*. We lost *swaraj* by enslaving our language. As my friend Pawanji has said that presently there are two streams of educational system viz., the modern and traditional. Both the streams have ardent supporters and detractors: The supporters of traditional education system are in great minority and are considered backward, lost and worthy of pity. Efforts are also made to make them join the mainstream. Yet there are a few who have survived this effort and India still has some people who are leading their lives in the traditional way. We should be proud of them. Yet, there are also supporters of tradition who find attraction in the glitter of modernity.

We had organized two meetings on this issue and for five days lively discussions took place. It was attended by many pro-tradition institutions and individuals. Most of the participants emphasized that

our traditions can co-exist with modernity as we are no more backward and are equal to the modernity in all respects. They felt that there is no conflict between tradition and modernity. It appeared that many assume that traditional symbols like attire and *Tilak* etc., constitute tradition. Their thinking apparently has been influenced by modernity. A good number of traditionalist think like this. Due to this it has become difficult in search of tradition to trust even those who observe external manifestations of tradition. One comes across very few, who despite not speaking in English or adopting western attire, have not been influenced in their thinking by modernity and have thus lost their freedom and *swaraj* – and have no problem with modernity. I am not critisising individuals. I am judging myself also as to how far neutral can we remain or get influenced by modernity. This is a constant struggle which those living a traditional life face in their daily lives. For some it is not a struggle but coordination (compromise/adjustment) and everything is fine.

At a national conference of Sarvodaya leaders at Patna, few seniors asserted that since we have to live in this environment, some compromises will have to be made. In today's world they felt one cannot live on one's own terms. Now question arises that if one has deep respect and faith in one's principles and traditions, yet has to make compromises to survive, then, what is the compulsion to live? And what is the meaning of living with such compulsions? These questions were asked but there were no satisfactory answers. We have given undue importance to survival in our thought process, hence the need to make compromises. In the circumstances it is pertinent to examine whether there is any need or relevance of tradition, if not, then we should have the courage to say that we do not accept traditions. If we do not have this courage then it will neither be honest nor truthful conduct to pretend being supporter of tradition. It is much better to get out of this pretension which will make life more natural and less artificial as the thinking and practice would coincide.

The influence of modern civilisation and education on our minds is such that we judge all our actions on the touchstone of success and failure. Failure leads to despondency and demoralization. Here Gita's innovation is pertinent: 'Work is your duty and result/outcome is not in your hands'. I want to say that if one is too "result" oriented then a good result will increase his vitality and failure would demoralize him: This attachment with results and the consequent greed, hope, fear and despondency detract from our efforts in performance of duties. The

modern civilisation emphasises rights and downplays the role of duties and similarly the physical over the mind. In today's environment and society even the best efforts are unlikely to succeed as long as these are tied to results and rewards. If one concentrates only on performing one's duties, regardless of the results; he will be rewarded with a spirit of selfless vitality.

It will take long to describe how I see the present situation, but briefly would like to recall that the Western civilization which Gandhiji in *Hind Swaraj* had rejected a hundred years ago seems to have acquired deep influence over a large number of people. Today, forget about anyone opposing that civilisation, people feel ashamed to be not associated with it, lest they are called backward. People now wish to walk either ahead of everyone or at least alongside. Barring some saints and seers, even people linked with religious institutions are engaged in trying to modernize themselves. They are doing so to claim that their religion is also modern and not backward.

Western Challenges and India's Response: A Hindu View

P. Parameswaran*

Two powerful concepts have been, of late, invading the world-mind as it were: 'Globalisation' and 'New Millennium'. Both are western concepts, having tremendous potential not only to influence the thinking of the non-western world but also to undermine the cultural, social and economic independence in these regions. Globalisation is not a totally new idea, at least for India; but in its present form, it is vastly different from its older counterparts. India always had the vision of the whole world as essentially one. The expression *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* was India's contribution to world culture. 'Millennium' is a totally western idea; Biblical in its origin. What is to be taken special note of is that both Globalisation and Millennium are intrinsically interconnected, though not apparently. Therefore, their impact is cumulative and has to be dealt with as such.

Globalisation as understood at present is a concept that emerged powerfully since the last decade of the twentieth century when economic liberalisation and technological explosion began to catch the imagination of the developing world. It is basically economic and technological, but the cultural and ethical dimensions follow closely and inevitably. Their institutional support comes from powerful organizations like WTO, World Bank, IMF and a number of other institutions revolving round the UN, particularly the USA. Virtually these are controlled by and work in the interest of the Western world and the USA, the lone superpower after the collapse of the Soviet Union and its allies. They are the most powerful instruments of coercion in the present-day set-

*   P. Parameswaran, Director, Bharatheeya Vichara Kendram (A Centre of Studies for National Reconstruction), Samaskrithi Bhawan, G.P.O. Lane, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala-695001.

up, although many times the coercive aspect is cleverly concealed. Both Globalisation and the New Millennium have converged at this moment of history when humanity entered the twenty-first century. That being the case, this is the appropriate time to assess the likely impact of these on our cultural and social life, so that necessary correctives could be effected in time.

The term globalisation has been with us for the last two decades and more, in the context of economic liberalisation and technological explosion spearheaded by the rapid advance in information technology. It has exerted tremendous fascination both positive and negative. The central fact of globalisation is that the modern western world has swept the rest of the world into its economic, technological, and less straightforwardly, cultural orbit; and the societies affected by this process have resisted, accused, joined in with enthusiasm, and often all three in varying combinations. The truth is that the countries of the 'North' have imposed, on the rest of the world, ideals of material prosperity and standards of economic rationality that have proved inescapable. Even though globalisation has become a household word (*Oxford History of the Twentieth Century*) all over the world, it is amazing how little attention has been paid to the motive of globalisation. One did not have to look far to see that the motive in improvising globalisation was not one of charity. Unlike in the colonial context, not even the alibi of the 'white man's burden' was invoked as an apology for globalisation. Valson Thampu writes in *Vedanta Kesari* special issue on globalisation (December 1999). 'Globalisation is a model of western origin, most suited to the culture, economic models and technological resources native to that part of the world … Its agenda is set by the west; and the rest of the world, true to style, is being squeezed into its mould.'

'(Globalisation) is a total worldview, with its cultural and political accompaniments. No economic or technological model is ever culturally neutral. So we should expect that the western culture would arrive on the wings of globalisation, as is indeed happening at the present time… The speed with which an alien culture is spreading, especially in respect of its superfluous and cheap aspects, in our society should be a matter of concern for all right-minded people… The real concern is that the superficial seductions of the western culture, its false freedoms and fantasies, its consumerism and concupiscence, are being lapped up.

'On the political front, the more macabre faces of globalisation are beginning to surface … (It) is moving along the line of Pax Romana, wherein imperial Rome policed the peace of the known world. The impression cannot be helped at the present time that many of the military interventions in recent times were meant to consolidate the image of the US as the Global Super-Cop. It is relevant to remember here that the peace of Rome was secured at the cost of the sovereignty of the non-Roman societies. We should not be too naïve to assume that we can belong to the global order as envisaged today without surrendering a part of our sovereignty to the ringleaders of the global show.

'On the social front, globalisation confronts the non-western societies with serious problems. What has taken the western world several decades to get used to is being imposed on the rest of the world almost overnight. This very pace, and the element of coercion it necessitates, is unhealthy. Radical social changes breed anxiety and social trauma, and there is hardly any provision or thought in the present context to ease the tensions thereof. The foremost problem in this context is that of aggravating social inequalities. The divide between the rich and the poor is escalating by the hour… This is a serious matter, when viewed against the reality that cost of living has spiked all over the world on account of globalisation. Too many people will have too little to live on. The resentment, bitterness and sense of betrayal resulting from this could be so great that it could create an explosive social scenario, punctuated by crime and violence of an unprecedented scale.'

The dark and negative aspect of globalisation has been engaging the attention of the thinking people all over the world. People are realizing that globalisation is nothing but the second phase of colonialism imposed upon the developing world by the western countries which were forced to terminate the earlier one by massive freedom struggle. Like the first one, this also has its staunch supporters and powerful advocates within the colonized countries, say Valson Thampu: 'In all these, the western strategy has all along been the successful cooption of the elite of the non-western society into their agenda, so that they become the most enthusiastic liaison officers for the western projects in their respective societies.' In fact, the multinational corporations and their supporters all over the world have formed into a privileged class to exploit the rest of the world and enforce their domination at the cost of the weaker sections everywhere. This is the grim scenario that confronts us.

Unless those people and countries who are at the receiving end come together and fight with determination, the 'new colonialism' will prove more disastrous than the earlier one. Fortunately, there is evidence of the realization of the need for such joint action as was proved in the

WTO meet at Seattle, where the US and their allies could not have their way and push through policies which they wanted due to stiff resistance from the developing countries. Similar resistance was visible at Doha meeting of WTO. There is no doubt that globalisation has come to stay and it cannot be wished away. The need of the hour is for the affected countries to gear themselves up to meet the challenge effectively at the various levels. India has a vital role to play in this regard, because she occupies a strategic position as the largest democracy in the world with a vibrant culture and glorious heritage. How should India go about doing this task? One of the leading thinkers of Hindu Culture, Shri Vamadeva Shastri, lays down the following perspective:

'If we look at the main areas of global advancement in science, technology and business, we see successful Hindus in all these areas, who have not had to give up their religion in order to advance in the world. Hindu communities in the USA and UK are among the most affluent and well-educated. Clearly there is no inherent contradiction between Hinduism and scientific and technological advancement. The global communications age is more favourable for Hindu ideas than the previous colonial and industrial eras.

'The richness of Hindu culture and all its pervasive spirituality give it an appeal that few culture can match, provided it is presented fairly in the media, which is seldom the case.

'There has been little organized Hindu response to globalisation. Hinduism tends to be other-worldly and not to react quickly to temporal changes. Hinduism also is not very organized socially or intellectually to tackle such an issue in a major way. Some Hindus think they need not make any response to globalisation other than to continue their spiritual practices. However, when they see their own children adopting a western commercial culture or changing to a hostile western religious belief, they have a rude awakening.'

"Another part is the Hindu response to global business. One effort, going back to Mahatma Gandhi, is to try to protect the villages of India from global business and promote a *swadeshi* movement. Another effort is to promote technological developments but to try and avoid western commercial culture as in the slogan 'Computer chips, yes, potato chips, no'. Perhaps the real question is what the Hindu response to globalism should be? Certainly Hinduism has a lot to offer to the global age in terms of planetary wisdom and earth traditions. It carries the old pagan and indigenous religions of the world. It holds the world's largest, oldest and perhaps best maintained mystical tradition. Yet it also has a futuristic vision with its view of consciousness as the supreme reality; and interfaces well with the modern sciences.

A new globally minded yet spiritually based Hindu intelligentsia is perhaps the need of the hour to deal with this challenge. One of the great debacles of modern India is that the Marxists captured the intellectual highground of the country and turned them into mouthpieces for anti-Hindu attitudes. This is particularly true in Bengal, once the intellectual heartland of the country. This trend is slowly changing in India today.

The intellectuals of India seldom study the great modern teachers of India, even those who wrote in good english and addressed all modern concerns, like Swami Vivekananda or Sri Aurobindo. They would like to view all of Hinduism like some of the vagaries of *Manu Samhita*, a medieval Hindu law book that few Hindu read today, much less follow. Changing this class of society is a key to bringing Hinduism into the of coming millennium.

Perhaps the main conclusion of this article is that there should be a better Hindu response to globalisation. Different Hindu groups should work out their response in a typical pluralistic Hindu manner. They need not all agree with one another either. They can tackle the matter from different angles. But action of some sort, wherever one can start, is necessary.

'New Millennium'

Millennium, like globalisation, is a western concept. It is Biblical in its origin. The sense it carries is more than that of a period of thousand years. According to the *World Book Encyclopedia*, 'it is usually used to refer to the period mentioned in the New Testament Book of Revelation as the time when holiness will prevail throughout the world. Some people have interpreted the word to suggest that Christ will reign on earth either before or after the one thousand year period. It is also regarded as the long period of time between Christ's first coming and his second coming.' Statement of the Pope, the highest authority of Christianity at Delhi on the occasion of the Synod of Asian Bishops: 'The first millennium saw the introduction of Christianity in Europe, the second millennium in America and Africa; and the third millennium', he said, 'would be the occasion for planting the cross across Asia.' It causes disquiet and impression that the period beginning from 2000 AD will be utilized by the Church for spreading Christianity in Asia. The Pope has also pointed out the strategic importance that he attaches

to India in this historic campaign. It is in the light of these expressions that we have to view the significance of the 'New Millennium'.

Millennium is a pregnant concept capable of introducing a world of alien ideas and subverting our native world of ideas. It introduces a new way of looking at time and history, which is basically Christian. It is calculated backwards and forwards with the supposed birthday of Christ as the mid-point, which is presumptive.

The Hindu concept of *Yugabda* is entirely scientific because it is based on proven astronomical calculations. According to the *Yugabda* calendar, the present year (five thousand one hundred and one) is the first year of the second century of the sixth millennium of the *Kaliyuga*. The exact beginning of the present *Kaliyuga* was at 2 a.m. 27 minutes 30 second 3102 BC. So the *Yugabda* is entirely scientific because it is based on proven astronomical calculations. According to the *Yugbada* calendar is one based on a close observation and scientific study of the movements of the celestial bodies, which can be (and has already been) testified by any one who knows the science of astronomy. It is not based on any controversial birthdate of any individual.

Once we accept the Christian calendar and its by-product, the concept of millennium, we are actually abolishing from our mind the far more superior and scientific chronology that we have inherited. All our history and tradition, culture and philosophy are intimately interwined with our concept of time, which is one of *Yugas*, *Manvantaras* and *Kalpas*. It is cyclic in its nature. The Christian calendar is linear and limited. It has a beginning and an end. The Hindu concept of time is cyclical, without beginning or end, revolving in endless cycles. Modern science comes much closer to the Hindu view of time.

The fear expressed here is not just hypothetical. Wherever Christianity has spread, and along with it, western imperialism reigned supreme, the older calendar and chronology along with their religious and cultural traditions have become extinct. To cite just one example, the Mayans of America who had a wonderful calendar which Toynbee calls 'marvelously exact, though formidably complex.'

By and large, India had accepted the *Yugabda* calendar, from the very ancient times. That was, so to say, our national calendar. But that was not the only calendar we had in India. There were quite a number of them, about twenty of them have been listed in the book *The Indian Calendar* by Robert Seawell and Sankara Balakrishna Dixit, some accepted at the all-India level and some at the regional or provincial levels. But *Yugabda* was the Hindu national calendar.

Like globalisation, the concept of millennium also is hegemonistic and destructive of all diversities of cultural life. Cultural diversity is as important as bio-diversity. We have to be extremely vigilant to preserve the various aspects of our rich culture, including its chronology and calendar, from being destroyed by the invasion of alien cultural influences.

Alien Paradigms

Globalisation and the new millennium represent a new paradigm based on an entirely different view and vision of life, from ours. The millennium projects the Christian worldview on one hand and reinforces the objectives of globalisation on the other. (see item 8 of the *UN's Mallennium Development Goals* (2000).

One major impact of the western model of development in the East is in the sphere of management. At first it was taken for granted that management is essentially a western science and that the East has only to sit at their feet and learn. But gradually, as the western management style began to show its weaknesses, the East, especially Japan, came out with a different model, based on her culture and tradition. Of late, there is a growing interest in the same in India. Researches have delved deep into Indian philosophy and brought out principles of management which are not only indigenous, but also holistic. Concepts of *Dharma*, *Yoga*, Holism, etc., are now being considered basic to successful management, holding the all-round development of man in society as the ultimate object. Similarly, *Yoga, Ayurveda*, etc., have also gained a new impetus in responses to the western challenge.

It is time that we stood up and told the world that we had our millennia – six of them in this *Kaliyuga* itself. It is hoped that Indians will take pains to develop the possibilities inherent in *Yugabda* Calendar and present the world with a truly scientific alternative to what pass as the only authentic and international method of calculating.

Conclusion

Whether we like it or not, whether we accept it or not, the concept of globalisation and a new millennium has been so much in the air and people everywhere are under the spell of its attraction. The reason is obvious. The commanding thought currents of the present era have been generated in the West. The western media is irresistible; hence, instead of trying to shut our eyes, which is anyway futile, we have to

adopt a twofold approach to the entire mission. One is to project our concept before the world as effectively as we can. Secondly, we have also to realistically assess the situation and turn it to our advantage as best we can. To put it briefly, we have to strengthen ourselves to grapple with the situation and optimize its advantages.

It we can conceive of the expectation of a new millennium as the expectation of a new dawn, the question arises as to how we have to get ready to welcome this great event. Vedas are full of mantras singing the glory of dawn. It is a joyous event, pregnant with possibilities. But, then, everything depends upon how we prepare ourselves. This ideas has been well drilled into the Hindu psyche even at the most popular level. The day begins with *bhoomi-pooja*. The Hindu looks upon the earth as the *adi-shakti*, the consort of Vishnu. So, the first response of the Hindu to the dawn of the day is to offer prayer at the feet of Mother Earth and beg her to forgive him for placing his feet on the body of the earth. The entire concept is inspiring and enthralling. All the modern concepts of ecology and environmentalism are here in a nutshell, elevated to divine heights.

If we can welcome the new millennium with the attitude of the earth as the Divine Mother many of our ecological and economic problems would be solved. The attitude of exploitation will give place to the attitude of adoration. This will be the only remedy to the environmental disaster that we are facing as a result of the Western view of life shaped by the Semitic approach to Nature. If we can change it and adopt the Hindu view, that would indeed be the right way of ushering in the new millennium for our endangered planet.

But that is only symbolic. The change of outlook must be reflected in all aspects of life. The concept of *yajna* and *dharma* as elaborated in the *Gita* should inspire and inform all our economic and social thinking and action. God and man should respect and replenish eash other as the *Gita* says. All activities should be performed in the spirit of *Yajna*, offering to the Divine, one's self-interest must merge with the interest of all – *loka-sangraha*. The concept of the world as one family – *Vasundhaiva Kutumbakam* – is the greatest and noblest. It is qualitatively and radically different from the western concept of the global market. Hence, what is called for us is a total and radical change in man's attitude as envisaged by the Hindu view of life. If the new millennium is to be different from the earlier ones, it can only be on the basis of such a philosophy of life.

Colonisation, Globalisation and Nationalism

J. K. Bajaj*

Globalisation: A Brief History

Globalisation is a product of the so-called age of European enlightenment. As soon as the Europeans came across the sail, the compass and the gun-powder, they put the three together on ships and boats and embarked upon voyages of discovery and conquest. The nature and intent of these voyages may be inferred from the proclamation made by King Henry VII of England in 1480, at the very beginning of this age, granting to one John Cabot and his sons, 'and to the heirs and deputies of them, full and free authority, faculty and power to sail to all parts, regions and coasts of the eastern, western and northern sea, ...to find, discover and investigate whatsoever islands, countries, regions or provinces of heathens and infidels, in whatsoever part of the world placed, which before this time were unknown to all Christians'. The proclamation further granted them the licence 'to conquer, occupy and possess ...towns, castles, cities, islands and main-lands so discovered' on the only condition that they will in turn give the king 'the fifth part of the whole capital gained' through such voyages.

These voyages undertaken by mercenary entrepreneurs on the authority of the kings and queens of Europe, and also the later 'enlightened' democracies of both Europe and America, soon led to large scale commerce across the seas in not only commodities of various kinds but also in men, women and children, especially from the African continent. Such trade continued from the early sixteenth to well into the nineteenth century. It is estimated that not less than ten million

* Dr. J. K. Bajaj, Centre for Policy Studies; policy.cpsindia@gmail.com, www.cpsindia.org

Africans were abducted from their homes, transported across the seas and traded as slaves for nearly three centuries.

This global hunt for lands, men and commodities was the first phase of what nowadays is euphemistically called 'globalisation'. The discovery of steam power in the early eighteenth century, and the resulting technological and industrial revolution, gave further impetus to this global enterprise. That revolution equipped the European powers with the military means to extend their influence to other more advanced regions of the world, than Africa and America of that time. The industrial revolution also created a need for further extension of coercive global commerce to supply the industries with raw materials and to find consuming markets for the industrial products.

The age of enlightenment and discovery thus led directly to the age of worldwide colonisation, which lasted nearly for five centuries; that age began to come to a close after the two World Wars fought between the industrial-colonial powers. After the Second World War, a mechanism other than direct colonisation was required to continue without disrupting the unequal international trade of capital, raw materials and finished products. The Bretton-Woods arrangement was thus worked out by the industrial powers in 1944, immediately after the War ended. Though the main emphasis of Bretton-Woods was on establishing a worldwide monetary order, the spirit animating the arrangement was to ensure unhindered access of the industrial powers to all nations' markets and materials. The General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) aimed at a general reduction of tariffs and trade barriers, which came into effect in 1948, was an integral part of the Bretton-Woods arrangements.

In 1995, GATT was replaced by the World Trade Organisation (WTO), a much more formal, intrusive and encompassing arrangement designed to tie all countries of the world into binding commitments to liberalise international trade, lower tariffs and remove all 'non-tariff barriers' to trade across national boundaries. The WTO even obliges the participating nations to make quantitative commitments on the minimum amount of imports they would allow in different sectors of their economies. The establishment of WTO is taken as the beginning of a new phase of globalisation. Today, for most purposes, globalisation has come to mean the phenomenal expansion of global trade in commodities and capital that has happened since the 1990s. This period has also witnessed the commodification of ideas and inventions through the various arrangements enforced through the WTO for the protection of so-called Intellectual Property Rights (IPR).

Nature of Globalisation

Globalisation is said to be about free movement of capital, commodities, ideas, inventions, and also of people and labour. But as is obvious from the brief history of globalisation given above, it is also about something more than merely free trade. There has been movement of products and ideas across the world since the beginning of human civilisation. There has also been movement of people—traders, scholars, and even slaves—before the modern European times. But the global commerce of the earlier ages differed from the Colonisation and Globalisation of the relatively recent times in several significant aspects.

The first aspect that distinguishes modern globalisation from the ancient international commerce in commodities and ideas is the sheer quantum of movement. People in earlier times exchanged products of high art and craft; they exchanged high ideas of philosophy and science; great scholars and savants travelled across the continents; people of extraordinary skill and competence were also probably exchanged as slaves; and, great conquering armies sometimes marched across the continents. But the movement was miniscule compared to what has happened in the age of globalisation. Earlier, different people lived by and large on the product of their own lands and their own craft. Their lives were structured largely around the ideas and institutions evolved within their own civilisation area; though, first Christianity and later Islam did make a great effort to globally spread their ideas about religion. That perhaps should be seen as an earlier form of successful globalisation; that effort at religious globalisation has, in fact, continued along with the new commercial globalisation.

The other major aspect that distinguishes modern globalisation from the ancient international commerce is the element of coercion that seems to be embedded in the former. The European expansion that began from the early sixteenth century onwards and forms the first and founding phase of globalisation was based unabashedly in the power of the gun. After World War II, global trade seems to be based in multi-lateral arrangements that the nations of the world are supposed to have entered into voluntarily. But the element of economic coercion is almost always present in these arrangements, and the threat of more robust military measures remains just below the surface. Anyone who has participated in the trade negotiations of WTO would vouch for the fact that the negotiating ability of any nation is determined largely by the economic and military muscle that it brings to the table. Crippling economic sanctions and military blockades are routinely enforced on

nations that attempt to adamantly keep out of the global international order.

The third major aspect of modern globalisation is its insistence on transcending national boundaries. Globalisation in the modern sense means that the national borders must be kept open for not only the entry of foreign commodities but also foreign ideas and institutions. National measures to limit the flow of particular commodities, ideas and institutions are frowned upon and stupendous efforts are made to break down such national resistance. The WTO has a phrase for these attempts at preserving national distinction; these are called 'non-tariff barriers' to free trade and breaking down such barriers is part of the mandate of WTO.

Early Modern Globalisation: Experience of India, China and Japan

These aspects of coercion and breaking down of national barriers have always been part of the process of globalisation. In the early phase of globalisation, or what may be called proto-globalisation, America and Africa were indeed devastated through brute force. But the more advanced and powerful nations of Asia were also subdued through coercive methods. Let us look at three vignettes of the early globalisation in three of the larger civilisational regions of Asia — India, China and Japan.

Sir Thomas Roe, an ambassador of King James I of England, visited the court of Mughal Emperor, Jahangir in 1615 with the objective of seeking protection for the East India Company's 'factory' at Surat; factory in those days meant a fortified and armed trading post. Roe succeeded in his mission through diplomacy and charm. That provided the British with an excuse for their presence on Indian soil. Over the next about a hundred years, the allegedly trading interests of the Company obliged it to militarily intervene in the polity of different parts of India and in due course acquire control over the whole of the country.

In 1793, around the time the East India Company had acquired a near stranglehold over India, a British mission headed by Lord George Macartney visited Emperor Qianlong of China to seek trading concessions. The Emperor was not as easily impressed as Jahangir. Replying to the letter of King George III that the Macartney Mission carried, he wrote: 'Our celestial Empire possesses (all things in prolific abundance and lacks) no product within its borders. There is therefore

no need to import the manufactures of outside barbarians in exchange of our own produce…' The British were of course not put off by this rebuke. They insisted on their right to trade freely, including the right to freely sell opium brought from plantations that the Company had established in India. Within 50 years, the British managed to enforce this right through the First Opium War of 1838-42, and the subsequent treaty of Nanking. The right was further expanded through the Second Opium War of 1856-60 fought jointly by the English and the French. At the end of the War, China was opened for free trade by the Europeans; they obtained the so-called "concessions"— foreign enclaves within the Chinese territory but outside Chinese authority and sovereignty; foreign diplomats were allowed into the Imperial Court; and, European traders and missionaries got the right to travel to all parts of China and freely offer their wares to the Chinese. It is no wonder that the 'unequal treaties' that obliged the Chinese to grant such 'trading rights' are resented by the Chinese to this day.

The Macartney Mission to China was also instructed to visit Japan and seek the opening of trading opportunities there. The Sub-Mission that Macartney sent for the purpose, however, failed. The task of opening up Japan for western free trade was left to the Americans. Commodore Perry of the United States Navy forced his way into the Tokyo Bay in July 1853 and delivered a letter from President Millard Fillmore on gun-point, threatening to return after a year to receive the reply. The Japanese considered the threat posed by the 'Black Ships', took into account the harm inflicted by the West on India and China, and chose to accept the demands made by the US President. When Commodore Perry returned the next year, with a bigger armada, they signed the Convention of Kanagawa. Thus Japan was forced to open its coasts for trade. Before that, it had kept its borders closed for 200 years. After an unpleasant initial contact with the European traders and missionaries, Tokugawa Japan, from early seventeenth century onwards, had followed a policy of strict exclusion, leaving only the port of Nagasaki partially open for foreign contacts. The mission of Commodore Perry led to the abandonment of that policy and the Meiji Restoration. India, China and Japan were thus exposed to that early globalisation at different times, and they reacted to the threat and the phenomenon of globalisation in different ways.

Europeans did not face much resistance from the national State in India. India, perhaps, did not have a 'national' State at that time. The Mughals were indeed an imperial power ruling over a large part of

India. But, the rulers traced their descent to foreign invaders, and represented a culture and religion that was not native to India. Therefore, Jahangir would have probably seen nothing unusual in granting a foothold on Indian soil to European adventurers. One could not have expected the Mughal rulers of Delhi to react in the manner of the Chinese Emperor or the Japanese King.

In any case, it did not take Thomas Roe much effort to persuade Jahangir to formally grant the concessions he coveted. More than a hundred years before him, the Samudari Raja (Zamorin) of Calicut had similarly indulged the Portuguese and readily allowed them trading concessions. But soon the Portuguese came in conflict with the native people and the Raja himself, leading to much bloodshed and the creation of several Portuguese enclaves, including that of Goa, on the western coast of India. As is well known, Indians in those enclaves had to suffer unspeakable atrocities and deprivations.

The concession that the English obtained from Jahangir was also of little avail to them in practice. To assert the formal right that they had obtained from the monarch of Delhi, they had to engage in long-drawn- out fighting with the people and the local authorities in every part of India. It is true that the English ultimately came to rule over the whole of India. But it is important to remember that it took them nearly two centuries to come to that position. Everywhere, they were opposed by the people, their militias, their kings and warriors and also by the more centrally organised Marathas, who were at that very time in the process of establishing their rule over large tracts of India. The British, like the Islamic invaders before them, had to fight for every inch of Indian territory; they could claim to have acquired India only after the final defeat of the Marathas in the early nineteenth century. And, in less than 50 years after that, the people of India mounted a challenge to their authority in the valorously fought First War of Independence of 1857.

The lack of resistance at the level of the national State thus did not mean lack of military response to the entry of the foreigners; in this the Indian response was not different from the others. But what probably distinguished the Indian response was the intellectual surrender that followed the military defeat. Especially after the failure of the War of 1857, the Indian elite came to grant that the European civilisation was superior to our own civilisation, and that India would have to adopt not only western technology, but also western ideas, western dress, western institutions and even western language. The Swadeshi Movement of

early twentieth century and the much larger and longer struggle for Independence waged under Gandhiji did try to disabuse India of the notion of civilisational superiority of the West and restore confidence in India and her ways. Notwithstanding those great efforts, the Indian elite to this day retain their fascination for western products, western ideas, western ways of life and, most important of all, for the English language.

The response of the Imperial Chinese State to the Western intrusion was much more muscular. But the Chinese State also could not face up to the superior destructive power of western technology for too long and was forced to make concessions. Life of the Chinese in and near the coastal enclaves that the Europeans established was indeed as miserable as that of Indians under the colonial rule. But the Chinese elite never accepted the notion of civilisational superiority of the West. And the people of China, with their much talked about xenophobia, did not allow the West to penetrate too far into the Chinese society.

The reaction of the Japanese was perhaps the strongest. Having seen the devastation wrought by Europe in India and China, the Japanese State decided not to put up military resistance. It correctly apprehended that the new technology of the West gave it superior military power. Therefore, Japan resolved to quickly learn the military technologies of the West, but at the same time it also resolved to tenaciously preserve the Japanese civilisation, Japanese ways and Japanese language. The Japanese applied themselves to the task so assiduously that within seven years of the visit of Commodore Perry, a Japanese-built western-style steam-warship set sail for the United States. By the end of the nineteenth century, the Japanese had become so adept at western military technologies that in 1905 they were able to defeat Russia, a considerable imperial power, in a war that involved both naval and land engagements. But while adopting and further developing western military and industrial technologies, the Japanese retained a robust sense of the distinct Japanese identity and Japanese ways. Yes to western technology, no to western sociology, was a persistent theme that ran through the Japanese State and Japanese society of that period.

The Supposed Benefits of Colonisation and Globalisation

It is important to remember this early phase of globalisation and the way different countries and especially the three great powers of Asia reacted to it, because globalisation of today is more or less a continuation of that phase of forcible western domination of the world mainly through

colonisations. The West, of course, does not see the events in that perspective. The West believes that free trade across the world and permeability of national boundaries is for the good of all nations and for humanity in general. It has been an axiom of western economic thinking, since at least the time of Adam Smith, that trade in itself is a productive activity that adds to the wealth of nations. It is believed that free international trade ensures optimal utilisation of capital, raw materials, labour and technology everywhere in the world and thus leads to economic prosperity of not only individual nations but of humanity in general. There is perhaps some truth in this, which we shall discuss shortly. But, it should be remembered that even during the phase of western control and colonisation, the West believed that diverse nations of the world were being subdued, and sometimes devastated, for their own good and for the good of humanity. They believed and said that they were not exploiting the world, but merely performing the onerous duty of civilising it and making it ready for economic prosperity; they were merely carrying the 'Whiteman's Burden' that God had imposed upon them. Marx famously said that the British by forcibly destroying India and her civilisation were merely being the handmaidens of history; they were helping India progress to a higher historical stage. Many educated Indians even today believe that notwithstanding the great indignities and privations that the British rule imposed upon India, their coming to India was a blessing. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh was in fact giving words to the feelings of many elite Indians, when in a lecture at Oxford University in July 2005 he recounted the many benefactions that the British Raj had bestowed upon India.

There is, however, no reason to believe that India, and other subjugated nations of the world, would not have acquired on their own whatever valuable lessons and techniques were there to be learnt from the resurgent European civilisation. In any case, loss of national freedom is too high a price to pay for any benefactions that a conquering nation may bestow. In this context, it is good to recall what Thomas Munro, Governor of Madras from 1820 to 1827, wrote about the pathetic state of a subjugated nation. In his minute of 31.12.1824, Munroe writes:

'…It is an old observation that he who loses his liberty loses half his virtue. This is true of nations as well as of individuals. …The enslaved nation loses the privileges of a nation as the slave does those of a freeman; it loses the privilege of taxing itself, of making its own laws, of having any share in their administration, or in the general government of the country. British India has none of these privileges: it has not even that of being ruled by a despot of its own; for to a nation which has lost its liberty, it is still a privilege to have its own countryman and not a foreigner as its ruler. …It is not the arbitrary power of a national sovereign, but subjugation to a foreign one, that destroys national character and extinguishes national spirit. When people cease to have a national character to maintain, they lose the mainspring of whatever is laudable both in public and in private life, and the private sinks with the public character. …'

The supposed benefits of colonisation, or proto-globalisation, thus came with a high cost. This is also true of the benefits that are supposed to have accrued to the nations of the world through the latest phase of globalisation that began from the early 1990s. It is said that the great expansion of international trade that has occurred in this phase of technology driven globalisation has led to rising of national gross domestic products and increased prosperity for all. This is, of course, true to an extent. But the costs have also been high, especially for countries that do not yet have sufficient economic and military clout in the world.

Let us take the example of India. India joined the globalisation bandwagon and began liberalising imports and exports in the early 1990s. Consequently, exports from India rose from just about 18.5 billion dollars in 1990-91 to about 310 billion dollars in 2011-12. But in the same period, imports rose from about 28 to nearly 500 billion dollars. The trade deficit thus rose from about 9 billion dollars to nearly 190 billion dollars, which formed nearly 10 percent of the GDP. This deficit was funded partly by flows of invisibles, which included foreign remittances, mainly from Indians abroad, and earnings from services, etc. Invisible flows in 1990-91 were a negative 0.3 billion dollars; in 2011-12, these had expanded to a positive 112 billion dollars. But this still left a current account deficit of 78 billion dollars compared to less than 10 billion dollars in 1990-91. This deficit was funded largely by borrowings from abroad and foreign capital inflows; there still remained a gap of about 13 billion dollars which represented a corresponding drawdown of reserves.

This extraordinary expansion of imports and exports indeed led to a substantial increase in economic activity as reflected in the increasing GDP. But, the widening current account deficit, funded through foreign investments and borrowings, also meant that Indian assets and the means of production within India came more and more under foreign control.

And to that extent, we lost the freedom to run our economy freely and independently according to our own preferences and initiatives.

Meeting the Challenge of Globalisation

This, however, should not be taken as a call to withdraw from the processes of globalisation and close our borders. Nations today do not have that option. Nations could not choose to keep out of the proto-Globalisation of the colonial times; and, they cannot choose to keep out of the Globalisation of today. The issue is not to oppose or support Globalisation, but to maximise national good within the globalising world of today. For this, it is important to remember that Globalisation of today has its roots in the proto-Globalisation, or Colonisation, of the earlier times. Like its predecessor, Globalisation is meant to obliterate national distinctions and national boundaries and reduce the whole world to a single unit. The effort earlier was to bring the world within a single Empire; today it is said to be aimed at bringing the world into a single Market. But the effort is also to make the Market incrementally acquire the attributes of an Empire; the World Trade Organisation indeed has all the airs of being the future World Government.

The challenge of Globalisation then is to build national economies and preserve national sovereignties, while participating in the unavoidable processes of global trade. Fortunately, the world today is not quite as innocent of the ways of the West and not as ignorant of their essentially military technologies as it was in the middle of the last millennium when the West started the game of globalising the world. Western technologies are no more the preserve of the West. Several nations today have shown that these technologies can be learnt and used as effectively as the West has done in the past. The technological advantage is now largely neutralised. Therefore, it is possible for nations to play the game of globalisation to maximise their national advantage, as many previously colonised nations have done in the recent past. This, however, requires a strong national will. India unfortunately has so far not displayed that kind of national resolve; and, in spite of her great potential and a strong base of scientific and technological research, India has not yet shown the kind of dogged determination to develop western-style technologies to serve her national purpose. But India seems to be quickly moving in that direction.

Ingredients of an Indian Response

Every nation in the present day world has to evolve its own strategies to harness global trade in the task of nation-building and to turn the threats and dangers of globalisation into opportunities for national resurgence. This requires a detailed assessment of the available resources and skills and of the strengths and weaknesses in different sectors of national economy. But for any such strategy to succeed, India shall certainly have to pay attention to the following:

Inculcating a Deep Sense of Nationalism

To effectively participate in the processes of globalisation, it is important that the nation as a whole is imbued with a sense of national pride. Such a sense of self-confident and assertive nationalism is even more urgently required in the higher bureaucracy and technocracy that is tasked to negotiate in the world trade bodies on behalf of India. For this to happen, we shall have to change the ambience of the whole of our education system. But meanwhile it would be necessary to recast the training programmes of higher bureaucracy in a way that our officers acquire a sense of national pride and national commitment and begin to entertain a healthy sense of scepticism about the claims of scientific and economic rationality and higher civilisational morality advanced on behalf of the western nations.

Strengthening of the Primary Economy of Agriculture

This is the first requirement for effective participation in global economy. A nation that does not produce an abundance of food for its population is unlikely to be able to participate in the global trade on its own terms. Adam Smith mentions in his Wealth of Nations that until there is sufficiency of food in an economy, other goods do not even begin to acquire economic value. He gives the example of Congo of his time where, according to him, any amount of gold could be bought for the price of a loaf of bread. It is therefore not surprising that the non-Western nations that have gained greatly through participation in the globalisation of the last 20 years are the ones that had spent the previous decade or two in substantially enhancing their production of foodgrains. China in the early seventies produced almost the same amount of foodgrains per capita as India did then; during the following two decades per capita production of foodgrains in China multiplied by a factor of more than 3, while it has remained almost unchanged in India till now.

Similarly, the Vietnamese spent the first couple of decades after the war in expanding the production of rice; that has put the country in a much better position to advantageously take part in the processes of globalisation.

Economists in India have convinced themselves, and have managed to convince much of the political leadership, that India is self-sufficient in the production of foodgrains and that the challenge of agriculture today is to help the cultivators diversify to crops other than foodgrains. But annual production of foodgrains in India is just around 200 kg per capita and the availability is considerably below that. In all reasonable analysis, this is considered famine diet. This level of availability of foodgrains is certain to leave a large proportion of the men and animals hungry. It is, therefore, no wonder that India appears near the top in the various international indices that measure the prevalence of hunger in different countries of the world. In the sixties and seventies, there were many countries with production per capita as low as that of India; most of such countries, in Asia, Africa and Latin America, seem to have moved on since then. The efforts that India has made in agriculture in this period have barely sufficed to keep per capita availability at the level of the seventies and eighties.

The challenge before India is to quickly raise per capita production of foodgrains to at least double the present level and to devise means of ensuring that the food reaches the hungry and consumption rises substantially. A hungry India can hardly participate as an equal partner in the business of global trade. It would in fact be worthwhile to ensure that free, or nearly free, cooked food is available everywhere for anyone in need. Tamilnadu has tried this experiment in Chennai and several other cities, through a large number of Public Kitchens that serve clean, nutritious food at affordable prices; this seems to have paid both political and social dividends. Expansion of such Public Kitchens to make them ubiquitous across the country can quickly solve the problem of hunger and food security; and also offer a way of using the money we spent on food subsidy in a much more effective and targeted manner.

The increased demand of foodgrains generated by such a nationwide programme would also create the necessary economic impetus for increasing the production of foodgrains. Quick and substantial increase in the production of foodgrains shall increase overall economic activity in the rural areas of the country and substantially raise the level of employment there. This shall not only make Indian economy much more balanced and strong, but shall also give the country the necessary self-confidence to participate assertively in the global trade.

Strengthening Manufacturing

Manufacturing is at the core of industrial societies. There is no way a nation can participate profitably in global trade without having a strong manufacturing base at home. Unfortunately, this essential economic activity has been greatly neglected in India. We lag behind the world in the essential engineering technologies of making new materials and of moulding, forging and fabricating materials. Our engineers, even those from the elite institutions like the IITs, hardly get any hands-on training in these basic engineering skills. We end up importing almost all engineering materials and machine tools, and we hardly make any machines. Garment makers and leather goods manufacturers have to import almost all machines and much of the materials used for making wares that are fit for export, our nuclear and missiles establishments have to import many of the crucial materials and components, and our armies and police forces have to import almost all of even their small weapons.

To get out of this situation, we shall have to place a new emphasis on manufacturing. Our engineering institutes shall have to be redesigned to ensure that they produce engineers and not merely technical managers. It may be difficult to change the mindset of the high institutes of engineering and technology that have already gone in a certain direction; the IITs seem to have moved so far away from the basic engineering that nowadays many of those institutions offer their graduates a degree in management along with the engineering degree. In this situation, we may have to think of opening polytechnics of a high level across the country and privilege polytechnic training over engineering education.

We shall have to rediscover the importance of science and engineering. During the two or three decades of globalisation, the nation seems to have lost all interest in these fields of knowledge. The best of the science institutions in the country today fail to get students to pursue higher science education and research, while the brightest and the best are making a beeline for the various institutions of management and the rest are being absorbed in the scientifically and technologically barren fields of computer applications. Colonisation and globalisation arose out of the imbalance of scientific and technological competence among nations. We seem to be once again positioning ourselves on the losing end of this imbalance.

We need to re-energise our institutions of science, technology and engineering, have many more of them and have to reorient these towards hardcore research, invention and development. But we also have to

make an effort to make the modern materials and modern engineering skills available to the ordinary mechanics and machinists of the country. For this purpose, we shall have to probably think of engineering extension programmes in the manner of agricultural extension programmes that the agricultural universities have been conducting with some success. Such engineering extension programmes are urgently needed in many regions of the country where there has been a tradition of high engineering and particular communities have acquired special skills of this kind. With some help and some formal acquaintance with the modern materials and techniques, certain regions and communities of Punjab and Tamilnadu, for example, may soon begin making machines and gadgets that can compete with the best in the world.

Restoring the Balance Between Agriculture, Manufacturing and Services

India, after Independence, has privileged the tertiary sector of the economy over agriculture and manufacturing. But nations are not built on services alone. The long neglect of agriculture and manufacture has to be reversed if India is to participate profitably in the globalisation processes of today. In this context, it is encouraging that Shri Narendra Modi, the prime-ministerial candidate of a major national party, has promised in several of his election speeches across the country that he would ensure that agriculture, manufacture and service sectors of the economy contribute equally to the gross domestic product of India. That is the direction in which Indian economy needs to move, especially in this age of globalisation; Mr. Modi must be held to his word if he does become the prime minister.

Emphasis on High Value, High Technology, but Low Volume Products

For effectively participating in the global trade, it is important that we export high value and high technology products rather than merely raw ore. One of our senior engineer colleagues, who also happened to be a committed volunteer and for some time an all-India officer of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh, had made an interesting effort to encourage a number of young engineers to set-up enterprises to make high-value, high-technology, but low volume, products which can be exported to niche markets of the world. He insisted that for such enterprises to succeed, the product must be researched and developed from scratch by the prospective entrepreneur himself and that all the machines required for the enterprise must be fabricated in-house, with local materials and local skills. He was able to convince many young Indians abroad to return to India to set-up such enterprises. Many of them have succeeded in developing enterprises that export extremely high-value, high-technology and often critical products; and, they have more or less captive niche markets for these products. If we could multiply such experiments a thousand fold, we would be an engineering power of the world in no time. But such multiplication requires support and facilitation by the State.

Handholding of Manufacturing Enterprises by the State

Globalisation, as we have seen, is war by others, mainly economic, means. Participation in this global contention through trade requires the forging of an alliance between the national State and the national entrepreneurs. Countries that seem to be winning this new kind of war are the ones that have successfully forged such an alliance.

I remember having visited Shivakasi, the Indian hub of fireworks manufacturing, about 20 years ago, when India was just about beginning to liberalise import and export of various products. At that time, the nearly uneducated manufactures of Shivakasi had sent a deputation to China to visit and understand their future competitor in the business of fireworks. And they were baffled to see the extent to which the Chinese State went to help the Chinese manufacturers. They described how the State there had simplified the process of setting up an enterprise; how the State scouted for and procured raw materials at the cheapest price possible from across the world and made these available to the entrepreneurs; how the State organised and facilitated visits of potential buyers from across the world; how the State ran courses on pyrotechnics in the major universities of China, and so on. The Indian State shall have to organise and undertake similar handholding and facilitation of Indian entrepreneurs, at least in selected industries, if India is to gain from the modern phase of globalisation.

Nationalism and Technological Competence Hold the Key

The above are, of course, only a few examples of what needs to be done. These examples are only suggestive of the kind of new thinking, new intellectual and educational ambience and new determination that India would have to display in the face of pressures of globalisation.

Bemoaning the inequities and horrors of global trade is not going to be of much avail. In these matters, nations have little choice. Most nations had to suffer the much greater horrors and inequities of colonisation, which marked the earlier phase of globalisation, and ultimately had to devise their own ways of overcoming that imposition. In this new phase of globalisation also, we have to find ways to overcome. Remembering the antecedents of globalisation as we have done in this article, shall help in putting the process in perspective and evolving an appropriate national response. That response, as we have suggested, shall require effectively learning the new technologies and imaginatively using these to beat the odds and perhaps win the war of global trade, while at the same time consciously trying to preserve our national identity, national character and national ways. Ultimately, assertive and enlightened nationalism is the only response to globalisation.

Globalism and Nationalism: From Ibn Khaldun to Aurobindo

N. S. Rajaram*

Globalization is not new. But failure to develop a national identity after Independence has left the Indian youth confused and vulnerable to the negative aspects of foreign influence more than assimilation of the positives. In India this is seen in the persistence of mental colonization long after colonial rule has ended.

Introduction: Ibn Khaldun on Mental Colonization

An extraordinary thing happened recently. Sixty-five members of the Indian Parliament wrote a letter to the U.S. President Barrack Obama urging him not to grant U.S. visa to Narendra Modi. The idea was that such an act would so discredit Modi that he would not get elected. It is unlikely to work that way, but it only shows that these supposed 'lawmakers' think that a global power can get results in India that they as Indians cannot. What next? Suppose Modi does become the prime minister (this article was written before the elections). Will the same people beg President Obama to send an army to remove Modi and replace him with someone else? Is this part of the mental condition brought on by globalization or is it residual colonial thinking coming to the surface? To understand the difference, if any, we need to look to history, to a previous era of transition between two globalizations.

---
* Dr. N.S. Rajaram is a mathematical scientist who has written extensively on history and philosophy of science and application of the scientific methods to history. He lives in Bangalore, India and Boston, USA.

Ibn Khaldun

Ibn Khaldun (1332 – 1406), author of the encyclopedic work *Muquddimah* is not widely known in India even among scholars. He was the greatest philosopher of history and sociology produced by Islam and among the greatest anywhere. In fact, according to Arnold Toynbee, 'He has no equal in any country at any time.' Toynbee went on to describe *Muquddimah* as a 'philosophy of history which is undoubtedly the greatest work of its kind that has ever yet been created by any mind in any time or place.' Toynbee was not alone. The British philosopher Robert Flint wrote of Ibn Khaldun: '...as a theorist of history he had no equal in any age or country… Plato, Aristotle, and Augustine were not his peers, and all others were unworthy of being even mentioned along with him.'

Khaldun was born in what is now Tunisia but his ancestors had settled in Andalusia as the part of Spain under Arab (Muslim) rule was known. Though the greater part of Spain had been under Islamic rule known as the Caliphate of Cordoba (Spanish Caliphate) for over five centuries, Khaldun's ancestors were forced to return to Tunisia after the fall of Seville to the Christians in 1248. This was the beginning of the end of Islamic rule in Spain. Khaldun was witness to the Christian *Reconquista* making steady progress against Islamic power and influence. Above all he was witness to the changes in Islamic culture that saw several formerly Islamic people coming under Christian-Spanish influence. It marked the next phase of globalization that spread from Europe to the Americas all the way across to the Philippines.

From this vantage position he gave the following penetrating insight into the behavior of colonized people, especially the Muslims who came under the Catholic Spanish rule. The passage is excerpted from: *Is Western Civilization Universal?* By Maryam Jameelah (Crescent Publishing Company, Delhi).

'The vanquished always seek to imitate the victors in their dress, insignia, beliefs and other customs and usages. This is because men are always inclined to attribute perfection to those who have defeated and subjugated them. Men do this either because the reverence they feel for their conquerors makes them see perfection in them or because they refuse to admit that their defeat could have been brought about by ordinary causes and hence they suppose it is due to the perfection of the conquerors'.

'Should this belief persist long, it will change into a profound conviction *and will lead to the adoption of all the tenets of the victors and the imitation of all their characteristics.* This imitation may come about either consciously or unconsciously or because of a mistaken belief that the victory of the conquerors was due not to their superior solidarity and strength but due to the inferiority of the customs and beliefs of the conquered. Hence arises the further belief that such an imitation will remove the cause of defeat.

'In fact, every country which has powerful conquering neighbours tends, to a large extent, to imitate those neighbours as we see among the Spanish Muslims today in respect to their Christian neighbours. For today, the Spanish Muslims are imitating the Christians in their dress and ornaments and indeed in many of their customs and institutions even to the extent of having statues and pictures on the walls of their houses and shops. *And in this*, *the careful observer will mark a sign of inferiority.'*

It is pity that in India Ibn Khaldun is not studied even by historians. Most haven't even heard of him as I found in my discussions with several historians. This is partly due to political correctness: Khaldun objectively discusses the expulsion of Islam from Spain, which Indian historians for political reasons are afraid of mentioning. It goes against the propaganda of synthetic culture— how Islam, seemingly always victorious, combined with existing cultures. (It is similarly politically incorrect to mention the destruction of the Abbasid Caliphate by the Mongols in the sack of Baghdad in 1258.)

The sack of Baghdad and the end of the relatively enlightened and open Abbasid Caliphate ended the Islamic civilization. What followed was a Turkic dominated military State with Islam turning inwards and

becoming a typical medieval military State dominated by religious beliefs, superstition and dogma. It was this unenlightened brand of Muslim invaders that happened to dominate India during the Delhi Sultanate. The distinguished Indian Islamic historian Irfan Habib attributes lack of progress in Medieval India and its backwardness for centuries to this fact: it was the illiterate Turkic military class and not the enlightened scholars of the Arab-Persian Abbasids that dominated North India for six centuries.

Globalizations

Ibn Khaldun's observations and the aftermath have a message for our own time: globalization never occurs in a vacuum. Also, it is never a level playing field; there is always a dominant power that sets the trend and frames the rules, consciously or implicitly. Until about two centuries ago globalization was also accompanied by a sense of religious superiority that was consciously asserted, and used to justify inequalities. (This was especially so during the Islamic globalization period.) Today, it is mainly secular with economic power and technology ruling the roost. Khaldun lived at a time of transition from one global age to another— from Islamic to Christian European. Islam had dominated the then known world from Spain to India. But he was witness to the expulsion of Islam from Europe and the Christian nations beginning to dominate Islam leading eventually to the discovery of the New World.

What made this possible was the superior naval power of Christian countries leading to exploration and domination of the sea. This was set in motion by Prince Henry the Navigator (1394 – 1460) followed by the great age of exploration and colonization by Portugal and Spain, followed by England, France and the Dutch. While the Islamic expansion was mainly land based, the next phase of globalization by European powers—both Christian and secular (British and French)—relied on naval superiority. Beginning in the 16th century, the scientific revolution and the industrial revolution that followed in the 18th century ensured European superiority in most fields. This was aided by the shattering blows given to the land-based Islamic world by the Mongols, culminating in the destruction of the Caliphate in 1258 and the weakening of the Ottoman and Persian empires in the 17th and 18th centuries.

While the period from Columbus to the rise of competing powers England, France and the Dutch may be called the period of European domination, we see two distinct phases or genres— religious and secular. Columbus claimed the New World for Spain in the name of God and

Christ, while the Dutch, British and the French made no such claims. This is not to say that English and French churches were indifferent to opportunities in the newly colonized lands, but only they did not enjoy unlimited powers that the Catholic church did in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies. Henry VIII in England and Louis XIV (and Napoleon later) ensured that the power of the church remained subordinate to them.

This is reflected in the history of the countries they colonized. Former British colonies like America (including Canada), Australia and India later became democracies with a secular State, at least in principle. Former Spanish and Catholic colonies on the other hand, from Mexico to Chile going all the way to the Philippines, are still struggling to come out of despotic military and dictatorial rule often supported by the Catholic church. This is not to say the churches played no role in the secular colonizing movements of Britain and France: they certainly did but were subordinate to political authority, especially after over-active missionaries provoked Indian soldiers to rebel, almost putting an end to the British rule in 1857.

New Globalization: Khaldun's Observation

In the past thousand years or so India has faced—or endured—three distinct phases of globalization. The first beginning about 1000 AD was Islamic; the next, some six centuries later was European. The present is the post-European colonial secular but dominated by the United States. In each one of these, there is always a native class that benefits by its closeness and emerges as a privileged class. This seeks to set the trends and fashion and consciously or unconsciously serves as the role model for the youth.

During the Islamic, especially the Mogul rule, it was an Islamized State but a substantial Hindu aristocracy of traders, courtiers, artists and administrators were part of the ruling class usually at the second rung, though not always so. Even the rigidly Islamic Aurangazeb appointed Hindus like Raja Jai Singh to high positions simply because his talents and loyalty were indispensible. It was the same with Tipu Sultan and Dewan Purnaiah. The rulers, for all their preference for co-religionists, simply could not do without the services of capable professionals and had to bend the rules. The same is true of some of their policies and acts: religious zealots they may have been but expediencies of politics and governance forced them to make compromises. It would be a serious error to see in it any enlightenment, except in rare instances like Akbar and Ibrahim II (of Bijapur).

It is particularly interesting to look at this class as it made the transition from Mogul to the British phase. The sepoys and the munshis of major and minor Mogul courts moved on to serve the East India Company and the British Government later will look partisan unless some of these names are also mentioned. As a consequence, out of both necessity and circumstance, they became carriers of colonial values as superior and a belief that native traditions are inferior. This was exactly what Ibn Khaldun observed among the Spanish Muslims of his time. Only it was doubly so in the case of these sepoys and ministers who had to adjust to a rapid change of masters— from Mogul to British.

Nehru, and Mahatma Gandhi to some extent, unconsciously institutionalized this process into the Government and the Indian State when the British left. Unlike Sri Aurobindo and his contemporaries half century earlier, Gandhi and Nehru paid little attention to building a national consciousness based on history and culture. Lacking confidence in themselves, they asked Mountbatten to continue as the Governor General. As the letter to President Obama clearly shows, the umbilical cord to foreign masters remains at least in the minds of these surrogate souls. Ibn Khaldun has been proved right with a vengeance.

India of Nehru's Vision: A State without National Roots

Where Naipaul looks at people, Sunil Khilnani studies societies and institutions that contribute to making India a democracy. Naturally, he looks at leaders also, giving a prominent place to India's first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. As he sees it, Nehru's vision of the Indian nation was synonymous with Indian democracy: To Nehru, nation building meant building India as a democratic State. In his words, 'Nehru's idea of India sought to coordinate within the form of a modern state… democracy, religious tolerance, economic development and cultural pluralism.' This was accompanied by a disdain for its historical heritage.

A question to be asked is why has democracy taken such deep roots in India? Even during the Emergency imposed by Mrs. Indira Gandhi, people were prepared to oppose it and go to jail. Mr. Khilnani rightly dismisses the romantic notion that India had democratic institutions in ancient times and the experience was nothing new. He does recognize that a power sharing hierarchy was part of society in the institution of caste. As far back as 1949, Dr. D.V. Gudappa pointed out that the system must have served some function for it to survive for thousands of years. As sociologist

M.N. Srinivas pointed out caste is always changing— it is not today what it was in 1949. This was pointed out also by the medieval historian K.S. Lal in his work *The Growth of Scheduled Tribes and Castes in Medieval India.*

For India's economic development Nehru followed the Soviet model of centralized planning. Mr. Khilnani suggests that it owed less to Soviet Russia than to Europe. If so, Harold Laski of the London School of Economics was a major influence. According to the U.S. Ambassador John Kenneth Galbraith 'the center of Nehru's thinking was Laski' and 'India is the country most influenced by Laski's ideas'. It is mainly due to his influence that the LSE (London School of Economics) has a semi-mythological status in India. He was a revered figure to Indian students at the LSE. The most influential of Laski's Indian students was V.K. Krishna Menon.

India was not the only country influenced by Laski. He attracted a large number of students from the third world countries who went home to apply his ideas to their newly independent countries often leading to political instability and economic ruin. While there is no denying Laski's influence, Nehru's admiration for the Soviet Union is a matter of record. In his *Soviet Union, Some Random Sketches* (1926) Nehru wrote: 'Russia interests us because… conditions there have not been, and are not even now, very dissimilar to conditions in India… Much depends on the prejudices and preconceived notions… [but] no one can deny the fascination of this strange Eurasian country of the hammer and the sickle, where workers and peasants sit on the thrones of the mighty and upset the best laid schemes of mice and men.'

Curiously, Nehru's admiration extended even to the notorious Moscow prison with the beautiful name— the Lubyanka. 'It can be said without a shadow of a doubt,' Nehru wrote, 'that to be in a Russian prison is far more preferable than [*sic*] to be a worker in an Indian factory. The mere fact that there are prisons like the ones we saw is in itself something for the Soviet Government to be proud of.' For a man who could admire Soviet prisons it was not hard to admire and adopt the Soviet system of planning.

Consequences: Primacy of Economics

It is interesting that population groups who grow up under the patronage of colonial rulers rarely produce leaders, much less rulers. If they did, they would not be asking the head of a foreign government to save

them from being their ruled by one of their own. They value comfort and privileges far too much to risk losing them in a bid for power. As Maxmilien de Robespierre, a leading figure of the French Revolution observed:

'If they are Caesars or Cromwells, they seize power for themselves. If they are spineless courtiers, uninterested in doing good yet dangerous when they seek to do harm, they go back to lay their power at their master's feet, and help him to resume arbitrary power *on condition they become his chief servants.'*

This is the main effect of colonization— be it religious or political. In the purely economic globalization that we find ourselves in today, we do find leaders in the economic field— entrepreneurs, captains of industry and the like who attain enormous power and influence. This is the main difference: *leaders of today's globalization are business leaders rather than politicians.* Often they hold the fate of politicians in their hands.

A recent news item naming Pepsico chief Indira Nooyi ahead of Sonia Gandhi among the ten most powerful women in the world brings into focus the influence and meaning of globalization and where the world may be headed. The two women share similarities as well as differences. Smt. Nooyi is an Indian who has risen to the highest level of an American multinational giant through the dint of her own talent and hard work. Italian born Smt. Gandhi on the other hand is a woman that luck and an elite still in the grip of a colonial inferiority complex have placed at the head of a great and ancient nation. It illustrates the changing face of the globe as nothing else could.

To compound the paradox, placing Smt. Nooyi ahead of Smt. Gandhi suggests that multinationals are more powerful than nation States. As a corollary, are we on the way to seeing business leaders replacing politicians as world leaders? Businessmen like Bill Gates of Microsoft command as much media attention as most world leaders. Even in India, we see Narayana Murthy of Infosys and Azim Premji of Wipro commanding a great deal more respect than most politicians. There has even been talk of making Mr. Narayana Murthy the President. It is unlikely that any retired politician (even if such a thing exists) will ever be invited to head a major business.

This suggests that unlike during the era of Euro-colonialism, when a few powerful countries carved out empires across the globe, it is the multinationals and their search for economic expansion that is driving globalization in our time. The British East India Company before it became transformed into British India can serve as a useful but not infallible guide.

Globalization, which is the latest manifestation of imperialism, is not a new phenomenon. What is new about the current version is its decentralized form. Unlike the East India Company 200 years ago, or the Roman Empire 2000 years ago, there is no central authority like a king or Caesar—or his counselors—that controls it. We may see America as the latest master in the globalization game, but that is an oversimplification. Just as European colonialism had many masters, globalization also has many players. The United States today, though the world's sole superpower—as Britain was in the 19th century—is still only the first among equals.

Ultimately globalization is an economic order more than a political institution. Politics, science, technology and even culture are subordinate to economics. The Davos Economic Summit is far more influential than any political summit. Nothing highlights the change from politics to economics more than the shift in importance from political summits to economic summits.

Cultural and Moral Vulgarization

Since the West, especially America is seen as the leader in the globalization process, it is natural that its mores and manners are copied by its followers, the phenomenon that Ibn Khaldun noted among the Spanish Muslims seven centuries ago. (The same is true of the Pakistani elite— they follow India, but copy the lifestyle of their American masters.) This they do indiscriminately: It is rare for the Indian elite (as opposed to scientists and professionals) to bring anything constructive or beneficial like culture. They simply copy trends and fashions like feminism, human rights and the like. This can lead to degradation and even moral corruption as for example in the treatment of women. This is worth taking a look at.

One cannot fail to notice the dramatic increase in crimes against women in the past decade. This is particularly virulent in urban areas. But this was not always so. Indian children have always been brought up to treat women with respect, but this has suffered serious erosion among the urban males of the present generation, the generation that has grown up under the shadow of globalization, beginning roughly with the software boom twenty years ago. (The phenomenon is related to economic globalization, not software or any other science or technology. The latter are value neutral.)

The usual media spokespersons, representing various feminist, human rights and other groups who pride themselves as Indian copies of Western models blame it on the supposedly 'traditional' Indian (read Hindu) male disregard for the female. This is not tenable, for these crimes are being committed not by young men from traditional households, but the newly affluent families culture-education deficient youth. In addition, these crimes have not yet reached such alarming proportions in the rural areas, though thanks to TV, villages too have begun to see such crimes.

We would like to offer an alternative, not by any means authoritative explanation. The same globalization that has put money in the hands of people of formerly limited means, has given them also the feeling that they can become more 'civilized' by imbibing the values peddled by TV programs and media ads that use women in often degrading ways. The TV in India, the advertisements in particular, degrades the status of women. They copy and make more vulgar ideas and themes found in American TV as little more than sex objects. I see TV ads in India that would be unacceptable in the U.S.

This is something worth noting: Indian media and activists also borrow practices from the West but vulgarize them by giving them a perverse sexual turn which may not exist in the original. An example is Valentine's Day which is an expression of one's love for fellow humans, especially family, friends and colleagues. In the U.S., it is usually limited to giving a card or a small gift to parents, grandparents, friends—*and by schoolchildren to teachers*. There is no sexual implication, let alone an orgy of drinking and reveling; this is mainly an Indian innovation. In America it is more like the *raakhi* (or *raksha bandhan*) than anything else.

This point has been missed by feminists and human rightists claiming to speak for Indian women and their 'freedom'. Instead of guiding them, these feminist leaders have misled young Indian women into believing unrestrained conduct is a sign of progress and a means of achieving equality with their counterparts in the West. (It may or may not be, but can it be without consequences in India?) In addition to equating license with freedom, they are demanding that society respect and safeguard them. The 'rave parties' that one sees reported are products of this thinking.

Another example is the use of female dancers in Mumbai bars. It is of course a livelihood, but it also sends a wrong message to impressionable young minds. Feminists and other social activists must find a solution. It is a social problem, not a law enforcement problem. (It is curious that the same people denounced the *deva-dasi* system as immoral and exploitative of women. Many *deva-dasis* played a major role in preserving arts like music and classical dance. It is curious that Christian missionaries who took the lead in denouncing the *deva-dasis* and temples seem to be tongue tied when it comes to bar dancers. What value do they add to society other than money?)

Indian women have earned their respect over centuries and millennia through their character and dignified behavior and as sustainers of the family and society. But this blind imitation of Western practices in perverted form has undermined this matchless achievement of Indian women. The survival of Indian society and culture owes a deep debt of gratitude to its women who kept them alive during the worst days of its domination. This legacy earned over millennia is being undermined by senseless and indiscriminate copying in the name of 'freedom' and 'progress'.

It does not free women; on the other hand it locks them into prisons, worse cages in which they are seen only as sexual objects. The result is there to see— a dramatic increase in the crimes against women. The victims are not the privileged followers of the West or their 'leaders' but innocent, helpless women who are struggling to make a living. Their lives are becoming unsupportable in the quest of a few privileged people to enjoy unlimited license demanding full protection from society's institutions.

Nehruvian Vision: Nation without Nationalism

It is nothing less than a tragedy that after a promising beginning with the Swadeshi Movement in opposition to the Partition of Bengal, the national movement lost firm direction and fell victim to some confusion. Gandhi's failures, especially his Khilafat catastrophe and his support of Pakistan during the 1948 war over Kashmir and Nehru's West influenced vision for the nation. Lest its impacts. But the basic point is neither Nehru nor Gandhi paid much attention in defining a national identity rooted in its history and culture. As far as Nehru was concerned the nation was a political and economic unit— both built on institutions borrowed from the West. It was a hollow entity that left it vulnerable to globalizing influences.

For India's economic development Nehru followed the Soviet model of centralized planning. Nehru's admiration for the Soviet Union as mentioned earlier, knew no bounds.

'Denationalized Children'— and its Antidote

Globalization is here to stay for the foreseeable future. It cannot be wished away. Nor can we close ourselves from Western influences as Japan did for

several centuries. The global media and businesses are pervasive for such a solution to be feasible even if it is desirable. We must study the consequences and protect against it. Nearly a century ago Dr. Ananda Coomaraswamy blamed Western education when he wrote:

'It is hard to realize how completely the continuity of Indian life has been severed. A single generation of English education suffices to break the threads of tradition and to create a non-descript and superficial being deprived of all roots— a sort of intellectual pariah who does not belong to the East or the West, the past or the future… Of all Indian problems the educational is the most difficult.'

This strikes one as excessively pessimistic. After all, many thinkers at the highest level came to be revitalized by exposure to Western thought, especially modern science. Among these was Swami Vivekananda who more than a century ago exhorted Indian youth to learn from the West but not blindly imitate them:

'How can foreigners, who understand very little of our manners and customs, or our religion and philosophy, write faithful and unbiased histories of India? Naturally many false notions and wrong inferences have found their way into them. Nevertheless they have shown us how to proceed making researches into our ancient history. Now it is for us to *strike out an independent path of historical research* for ourselves, to study the Vedas and Puranas and the ancient annals (*Itihasas*) of India, … you never cease to labour until you have revived the glorious past of India in the consciousness of the people. That will be the true national education, and with its advancement, a true national spirit will be awakened.'

In short, learn from every source but don't copy blindly. Use what you learn to strengthen your identity but don't lose your identity. After all Sri Aurobindo was practically raised as an Englishman, but there was no greater prophet of Indian civilization and nationalism. The situation we see today with the Indian elite was more accurately described by Fosco Maraini when he observed how the rise of American influence after World War II had affected the Asian youth. As far as India is concerned, it may be paraphrased as:

'Americanized Indians with the exceptions of a few examples of intellectual distinction who would shine anywhere, are incredibly crude, vulgar, ignorant and presumptuous. They have thrown their own civilization overboard and all they have taken over from the new is a superficial indifference to everything, an arrogance that they mistake for cordiality, a shameless obsession with money.'

Maraini wrote more than fifty years ago, but how accurately it reflects the present generation that mistakes vulgarity for culture! The

Portuguese colony of Goa sank into such a state, thanks to four centuries of alien domination. The renowned Goanese freedom fighter, the late Evagrio Jorge used the term 'denationalized children' to describe fellow Goans who had come to worship Portuguese imperialists who oppressed their own ancestors. To continue with Jorge: 'These are our brothers [and sisters] who do not merit any other name than the one somebody described with great propriety: 'denationalized children.' … They do not deserve any other name as they were disowned by their own parents. They, who taking advantage of the ignorance of their countrymen, incite them to adore the enemies of their ancestors, the enemies of their faith and honour.'

It is not hard to see that a land populated by such denationalized souls is a fertile ground for exploitation by alien interests. This is what happened in Bengal, leading to its capture by the East India Company under Robert Clive. Any student of history of the colonial period is bound to be struck by the readiness with which native rulers and officials were willing to handover the vital assets of the State to foreign agents for small favours. This is what happened in Bengal in the eighteenth century when the enfeebled Moghul Emperor handed over the *diwani* or the tax collection authority to the East India Company. Flush with the tax money, Clive was in a position to bribe Mir Jaffer to surrender the State itself to the British. (Was Clive all that different from the present multinationals bribing their way into huge contracts and influence).

Bengal was not an isolated case. Other 'Nawabis' like Arcot were also ruled by feckless men who were alternately willing to deal with the British and the French for favours and protection. This eventually led to Arcot falling into British hands with Mohammed Ali as its titular chief. At the time of Independence the Nizam of Hyderabad was prepared to treat with Islamic countries like Iran and even Pakistan to be free of Indian rule.

The assault on national symbols as it happened during the Portuguese and Mogul rules, can produce such denationalized souls. They don't have to be a majority, but sufficient in number to form a critical mass to control a few national institutions— as is nearly the case today. Globalization has made defining and instilling of a national identity all the more necessary and urgent. Is this feasible in today's world? That is for the next generation to decide. Where Ibn Khaldun diagnosed the illness, Sri Aurobindo might have found an antidote in cultural nationalism.

Globalisation: Country and Nation

Pawan Kr. Gupta*

There is a beautiful story called "Fidelity" by writer – farmer Wendell Berry from the US. It brilliantly brings out the distinction between patriotism and nationalism – *desh bhakti* or *desh prem* and *rashtra bhakti.* The story is about how nationalism is at the cost of patriotism and how nation State has ruined the more relaxed village life and family life. The difference is important. The very idea of a nation or *rashtra* is intrinsically linked with the constitution. *Desh* or country is about love, ethics, *dharma*, responsibility, relationship and respect for its people, nature, traditions, locality. The idea of *desh* is real, grounded and rooted while the idea of a nation is notional, symbolic in nature. The difference is somewhat like the difference between real, intrinsic wealth and currency.

India or Bharat as a country (*desh*) has thrived during worst of times but the idea of a nation - an imposed idea – is prone to change. India before 1947 as a *desh* and now, remains the same but the idea of India as a nation has changed. Tibet *desh* still thrives in the hearts of Tibetans living all over the world and even among others whether Tibet as a nation exists or not. Tibet *desh* will survive as long as the great Tibetan tradition of Nalanda survives. Bangla Desh had no national identity till 1971 but the same cannot be said if one perceives it from the *deshaj* lens. America in the hearts of native Americans is very different from the US of A.

The idea of *desh* is connected intimately with *samaaj* (society) and locality. *Desh prem* thrives if the *samaaj* is strong, prosperous and self-reliant. A *samaaj* which has the freedom to make choices, decisions and functions in a way that all members feel a part of the community,

can lead a relaxed and tension free life, a functioning society, based on a spirit of cooperation rather than competition, supports the spirit of *desh bhakti*. Diversity supports such a society and in turn diversity thrives in it. This kind of diversity discourages competition and comparisons. Differences here are on a horizontal plane like the difference between Bengali and Marathi, not vertical as between English and other Indian languages. Uniformity has no place in such a society. In uniformity things are prone to comparison and tend to get hierarchical.

Nature thrives on diversity and abhors uniformity. Traditional *samaaj* thrives on similar principles. This *samaaj* is inter-dependent and therefore coexistence and mutual respect are in-built in its structure. The relationship of the individual with other members and groups within the community is complex and the principle of inter-dependence works at several levels. No man or no group is an island here. Modern nation State breaks this web of inter-dependence within the community by making every individual reliant on the State instead, in all areas of life – be it food, water, education, livelihood. So we can see the educated clamoring to be employed (by the State or private enterprise) instead of demanding creation of opportunities for self-employment.

Modernity and the idea of *desh* do not go together. Modernity supports the idea of a modern nation and national identity but goes against the notion of *desh* and *deshaj* identity (identity derived from the family, the *kula*, *jati* or village). The modern nation State cannot afford to have strong and self-reliant *samaaj*. Strong, self-reliant, relaxed, functioning and autonomous communities can pose serious threat to a modern State. Hence the modern State promotes individualism. Rising individualism, personal ambitions, the yearning for a personal identity, competition and comparisons all weaken the *samaaj*. This tendency alters the relationship, instead of being inter-dependent within the community the individual now becomes completely dependent on an alien system controlled by the State. In the *samaaj* the relationship between the individual and others is mutual and two-way while the relationship between the State and individual is only one way. Hence the individual is pushed into demanding and seeking 'rights'.

It is true that at times individuals can also be a threat to the State but the process is slower, and exceptional. The time required by an individual to effectively challenge the State is far longer. The individual will need time to mobilize people and the mobilization is around a particular issue. A strong and vibrant *samaaj* on the other hand can

---

*   Pawan K Gupta, Society for Integrated Development of Himalayas (SIDH), Landor Cantt, Mussoorie-248179; pawansidh@gmail.com

respond much quicker and far more effectively. A strong *samaaj* has the potential to keep the State in check, maintain the balance of power.

It is quite obvious that globalisation is promoting uniformity in every area – lifestyle, food, planning, policies in all areas, education, items and pattern of consumption etc. and most of all economic policies. The instrument for this is the modern nation State. Ironically uniformity and comparison and competition go hand in hand, as the aspirations become common. In traditional societies greed was kept in check, was discouraged. Acceptance and celebration of diversity in all areas also helped to keep comparison and competition in check. Display of wealth was considered vulgar. But modernity and globalisation encourages spending, display and flaunting of wealth. Useless consumption and mindless growth is encouraged to keep the economy going. The paradigm has shifted from need based consumption to desire based consumption. It is no surprise therefore that the idea of a modern State is eulogized to encourage perceived threat (of war) and thus promote the business of arms.

Need based production is now history. Now for 'progress' and 'development' it is important to *create* needs, to hone on to greed, create desires and then through various different means (media, advertisements etc.) turn the desires into felt need. Education whether technical, management or social sciences is busy in creation of 'human resources' to serve the State and the market while talking all the time of individual freedom, free choice, and rights. Educated people coming out of schools, colleges and universities are trained to serve as a cog in this huge machinery called modern nation State a hand maiden of the larger corporate world. They create and maintain the illusion of individual freedom and progress while victimizing the individual. The irony being that the victim becomes a willing advocate of this exploitative system represented by modern nation State. Modern education creates and promotes this illusion.

Swaraj and freedom are two entirely different ideas but the two have been perhaps deliberately confused. The idea of *swaraj* where the individual and the community are more or less in control of all their needs – physical, material and non material is very different from the way freedom is understood. Freedom is mostly understood as freedom 'to do as one likes', no restriction from others and no restriction from society. Freedom is completely alienated from ethics or *dharma.* Only constitution of modern State can rein this kind of freedom. But *swaraj*

is reined in by one's own understanding of ethics and *dharma* and by norms of a strong and vibrant community. If *desh* is in alignment with ethics and *dharma*, then nation State is in alignment with the Constitution. This difference was understood by Mahatma Gandhi very clearly. His *Hind Swaraj* comes from the idea of *desh* not *rashtra*. While pleading his case in the Champaran Court he pleads guilty to begin with. After admitting that he has broken the law, he pleads his case by placing his arguments outside the confines of the law and locating them within the space of *dharma* and ethics. He makes a sharp distinction between the two. Today none of our well meaning activists understand this distinction between the modern State and/or the Constitution and *desh* and/ or *dharma*.

The same difference lies between *itihaas* and history and between truth and fact. History is linear, purportedly based on facts while *itihaas* in non-linear, not bothered so much about facts as about truth. Truth is about eternal principles, about tradition, while facts are both time and space specific, they are temporal. But the confusion prevails just as between *desh* and *rashtra.*

Last 100 years or so the idea of nation State has taken strong roots and this modern State is a hand maiden of modernity. Globalisation is its new *avatar*. The idea is to control communities by breaking them, by promoting uniformity, standardization and individualism. This fans greed and competition, taking away the peace which everyone craves for, but remains a distant dream. Tensed, lonely and dependent individuals are easier to control and manipulate. Mindless growth and development is ruining the universe and creating large-scale problems in every area for which we seem to have no *samaadhaan* (solution), temporary relief measures may be. The only way out is to revisit our traditions, to look at them, try and understand them by removing the chaff from the grain and see if the underlying principles have anything in them from which we can learn.

One Earth and Many Worlds

Udayan Vajpeyi*

1. After independence, in spite of a very fine Constitution and the presence of leaders like Gandhi, India took a sudden turn towards accepting model of socialism as understood by the Soviets. Thus from being a country which suffered from British colonial policies it became some kind of socialist country. Great chess player Gary Kasparov once said: India is a communist country with only all its disadvantages and no advantages. That was right. We lost the chance to gain economic, political and many other momentums that we should have as we progressed away from colonialism. Such was the allure of this model that we, in a way of saying, got all of our private entrepreneur and other initiatives subdued for almost four decades after independence. Our intellectual enterprise was almost bought over by Soviet ideological charms. Everybody seemed to be analyzing Indian situation in the so-called light of Marxist ideological position which coincidently, was always already loaded with the colonial understanding of this civilization. Thus we moved from one image of India which was very calculatedly projected by the colonial masters to the other image of India which ironically was the same as the previous one but this time it was in the new garb of a leftist discourse. This was an image of a secluded India as if this civilization has lived for centuries in total isolation. It was a false image at all possible levels but was construed as such and projected zealously as a true one. It is this false image of this country which is more or less internalized by most of the Indians. If today there is lots of hue and cry against the globalization, particularly by the left and so-called intelligentsia, the reason lies in trying to somehow protect the false understanding of the past of India. Left is on the verge of losing

_____

*   Shri Udayan Vajpeyi is a thinkar-writer and editor of academic Hindi journal *Samaas*.

that image of India which it developed and practiced for so long for its own benefit. Unfortunately the other images of this country were obstructed by the ruling left elite and thus were not allowed to enter the public domain and thus even those intellectuals who may have had different point of views than the left ironically accepted similar images of India.

2.   In his excellent book on ancient world, *The Shape of Ancient Thought,* Thomas McEvilley writes:

> The records of caravan routes are like the philological stemmata of history, the trails of oral discourse moving through communities, of texts copied from texts, with accretions, scribal errors, and incorporated glosses and scholia. What they reveal is the not the structure of the parallel straight lines –one labeled "Greece", another "Persia", another "India"—but a tangled web in which an element in one culture often leads to elements in others.

> In the reliefs of the *torans*, gates of Great Buddhist Stupa of Sanchi, one can very easily find number of Greek figures in their typical shoes and attires roaming around the market place of old city of Vidisha. They are not presented as foreigners but as casual visitors of the market place, something very similar to the Afgan vendors who, till few years back, used to come to sell *Heeng*, (Asaphoetida) in many small towns of even central India.

I spent around fifteen years talking to a unique historian of our times, Dharampal. He once told me about a book of Gavin Menzies, *1421: The Year China Discovered America*. This book gives details of the voyage of a fifteenth century Chinese admiral called Zheng He to many countries including India (Calicut), Africa (Malindi, Sofala etc.), Cape Verde Islands and finally to America. Admiral Zheng He was heading a fleet of ships comprising not less than three hundred ships, each one of which at that time was far bigger than the biggest European ships manufactured in the port city of Venice. The purpose of this fleet was trade and also the establishment of the Chinese supremacy in the world. It was this fleet which for the first time in the history found the way from Asia and Europe to the new world, Americas. By the way according to Gavin Menzies, it was not Columbus who searched Americas but was Zheng He –the admiral of Ming dynasty's Emperor, Zhu Di– who prepared the first map of the voyage from China to America. It was with the help of this map that Columbus 72 years later travelled to America.

Dharampal also once told me that till middle of the eighteenth century more than seventy per cent of world trade was conducted by Chinese and Indians. There might be some exaggeration in this figure

but one thing is very clear that in the trading, Europe was very low in the table. There are many other data pertaining to this fact, some are still to be brought to the fore of the intellectual common sense of the modern mind. But in any case, it is not difficult to establish that even before Europe became a world power, there were some other functional world orders in place which also created a web of relationships between many countries including India.

I often try to imagine as to what was the world like before the firm establishment of Euro-centric world order. How were we, the Indians defined and how were we related to the world. One thing is sure: we were never segregated from the remaining world.

3. I am not a student of History nor am a scholar of any kind. I am only a writer who thinks about his civilization. What I am going to write is a proposition for the reader to think about. It is not a theory of any kind posited as a form of truth. If at all I have any relation to truth, it is that of search. In literature, truth is something which is always about to make its appearance but never actually reveals itself. We, the writers, are weavers of veils of truth and nothing more (and also nothing less) than that.

4. India was always a globalized country. Let me qualify. There was no period in our history when we were not connected to the world at large. This relationship was not only of trade but also of the knowledge and culture at large. Both travelled hand in hand also. For example the theory of space which emerges out of the great Italian Renaissance painters called linear perspective where space was organized for the first time on the painted walls (of churches) in a absolutely novel way where the foreground was separated from the background which in turn would merge with the horizon, the so-called vanishing point, had as its basis in number theory of mathematics which had, supposedly, travelled to Italy through the silk route from India. It is said that Leonardo Da Vinci, one of the pioneers of Renaissance had a link with an Arab tradesman who used to bring things to Italy from Indian and Chinese traders.

Not only India but many other countries in the world were properly globalized. They were part of a certain world order or orders. I am sure that before the advent of Eurocentric world order, there were more than one world orders in place. World was interconnected in multiple ways. Eurocentric world order was not the first world system in the history of humanity. In fact, it was established by destroying multiple world orders which, to my mind, were in place before the hegemony of Europe was forced on the globe. The world before that was not a homogenized 'global village' but rather was 'global mosaic of many different villages'.

5. Rammanohar Lohia in his booklet, *Sagun aur Nirgun* writes very interestingly about the difference between these two key words of *Bhakti* tradition, *sagun* and *nirgun*. He says that there are many abstract concepts which in themselves have no value of their own like, he gives example, equality. Such abstract concepts have to be filled with the material of life. He says, for example, that till one gives actual functional meaning to the abstract concept of equality in the political domain, it cannot be put to any use whatsoever. He suggests that for him equality means that the difference between the earnings of any person in a society cannot be more than ten times the earnings of the lowest paid functionary of that society. This way each of the *nirgun* concepts needs to be made *sagun* by our own endeavour and experience. Globalization also is one such concept. We will see later what meaning post-eurocentric world order has contributed in it and what was its *sagun* form before it.

6. The other day I was listening to a concert of a Malawi folk singer, Kaluram who sings poetry of most enigmatic *Bhakti* poet, Kabeer. He comes from a very old tradition of Kabeer–singing in Malawa. I was struck by one beautiful line of Malawi version of Kabeer, where he praises Goddess Parvati for creating every human being differently. He sings, in other words, of the extensive multiplicity of the human kind.

In northern Namibia lives a tribe called Himba. There is a very curious custom in that tribe. Whenever a Himba girl feels very deeply about becoming a mother, she goes to a tree and sits in its shadow. She remains seated under the tree till she starts listening to a song of her 'as yet unborn child'. Once that happens she leaves the tree and goes and finds a husband for herself and teaches him this song of her 'as yet unborn child'. They make love singing this song. When the girl becomes pregnant, she teaches this song to the old women and midwives of the village. When the child is being born they sing this song as a welcome address to this new born baby. When the child grows, the entire village is taught this song so that whenever he/she falls or is injured villagers sing this song to remind him/her of his/her *almost* existential identity. Even when as a grown up adult if he/she commits some crime, the village-folks surround him/her and sing this song. Himbas believe that whenever anyone is reminded of his/her unique identity, he/she is able to get rid of his/her unwarranted activities. At the time of death of a person the villagers stand around him/her and sing his/her unique song and bid farewell to the dying.

One can go on enumerating many such instances in the so-called pre-modern, rather pagan, world where the uniqueness of every individual is recognized and is made *sagun* in different ways.

7. Ravindra Sharma of Adilabad (a profound practising sociologist) talks about the practice of design in Indian villages. He says that for different families, the artisans used to design differently even within the same village. Thus each family would have slightly different doors to their houses or borders of their *saries*. Industrial design turned the tables: it created homogenous designs for not only one village, or one State or one country but for the entire world. Thus meaning of the design completely changed with modern Industrial revolution. Now the entire world was recognized as being composed of identical human beings which, somehow, is an absurd definition and practice of democracy. I have no doubt, that the source of American individualism or for that matter the source of modern individualism lies in this kind of designing where everyone is seen and is taken as and is made to look and behave and 'be' like everyone else whatever the claims of modernity might be.

8. Navjyoti Singh, a major thinker of Indian tradition and modernity posits, in a long conversation with me (published in Samaas 9), a theory that India was always an industrial country. Here of course, the *sagun* meaning of industry is different from what it is taken to be universal these days. He bases his exertion on the fact that India always had a very big number of artisans. (According to one estimate even today the number of artisans far exceeds the number of farmers in India) They were, any time, more than the farmers in this country. If we stay on this position for a while we will have to argue as to why then, was India called an agricultural country. I think this happened only after the Industrial revolution in Europe headed by Great Britain. In order to belittle the local industries and artisans of India, our country was redesigned as an agricultural country so that the homogenous industrial products of Great Britain could gain access to Indian lives and thus could replace the products of Indian industries as inferior by the products of European Industries.

Thus European scholarship through history writing, sociology, anthropology etc., walking hand in hand with European powers, created a new image of India which was well suited to it. Our scholarship has not been able to correct it even after sixty years of independence.

9. For around five decades after independence, India was nearer the Soviet circle which was trying to create yet another homogenous world order. (Who does not know that we were 'non-aligned' only for the namesake?) But one should be very clear that so called Soviet world order was even more brutal than the Western one because it used to force its selfish dictums on the members on its circle. It was totalitarian in the final analysis. It was posed as alternative to the modern world order but was in fact its crude and distorted replica which gave not even small breathing space for multiplicities of cultures which modernity had in spite of its homogenizing tendencies.

10. Modern world order is homogenizing as far as its industries and designing are concerned. But it is pagan and thus supportive of pluralism to a great extent as far as its arts and literatures are concerned. These are the two forces that are pulling the modern global order in diametrically opposite directions.* On one hand, Europe and America have tried to mediate each and every relationship of world countries, one way or the other and thus homogenize them. On the other hand their literatures and philosophies have tried to reinvent many ancient traditions of thinking and creation all over the world. This, to my mind, is form of new world order. It is different from the older world orders because there the central force was that of recognition of the uniqueness of cultures, of civilizations, of communities and of individuals. Here such recognition only remains a theoretical possibility embedded in its literatures and arts and philosophical thinking.

It is rightly said to a great extent, that today the globalization is another form of Westernization of the world but to say that it is the first time that world is getting globalized is incorrect. The *sagun* meaning of global has changed drastically but this also means that it can be rechanged back to suit not only the homogenizing industries and designs but to the demands of the cultures which recognize and allow the performance and unfoldings of the uniquenesses.

11. Civilizations like India should strive to develop various relationships with different countries based on the discreet recognition of the multiplicity of the cultures and thus should attempt to set an example for the alternate globalization. This would mean that we need to endlessly redefine terms like 'development', 'industrialization', 'modernization' etc. in relation to our cultures and peoples and should try to resist imposition of their concepts from Europe and American markets on us.

12. We need to recreate what Mexican poet and thinker Octavio Paz once said: One Earth with many worlds!

*No such tension existed in most of the communists countries because in those countries this tension, which was the hallmark of modern world order, was undone by forcing literature, arts and philosophical discourses to homogenizing processes. Enforcement of Socialist Realism on all artistic and literary creations was one such technology. That is why I called it a crude version of modern world order.

Globalisation: India Has No Identity Except in Swaraj

Rajiv Vora*

Brief: In the definition of civilization, Gandhiji calls a civilization, "civilization" which lays the path of knowing oneself. The path, thus, of seeking self-knowledge being and must be unique for each individual, group, community and nation according to their Law of Being– swadharma. From the path that one follows, one derives one's identity in society.

These identities are one's locus of self-worth, self-hood, and self-honour. Identity is thus the real locus of one's power (satta) in society. (Power here means one's ability to perform his given task, 'duty' — as this word is used in the definition of civilization – through his untainted, unclouded sovereign intellectual, spiritual emotional and other attributes of his mind and heart.) What in modern parlance we know as 'identity' is a means, has an instrumental meaning within the realm of seeking self-knowledge.

According to the functions one fulfils in relation to various levels and units of society, he is member of or related with, one assumes more than one identity we often call roles though they are duties and responsibilities. Our problem arises from incompatibility, even direct conflict among various roles, duties, multiple identities of an individual. One's duty to one's fellow being, to one's neighbour and to one's compatriot is in conflict with one's citizenship duty to the State. to put it simply, one partakes of the exploitation of the poor and weak and of nature by being beneficiary of the State policy of modern development.

* Rajiv Vora, Chairman of Swaraj Peeth Trust, and founder member of Global Gandhian Movement for Swaraj. A close associates of Jaiprakash Narayan during democratic movement of seventies. Former Editor of Gandhi Marg of Gandhi Peace Foundation.

Dislocation of one's identity from its authentic mother-realm as a result of repression and destruction of tradition has caused total loss of power, disorganization and disorientation of our society and the nation. All identities are set into a conflict mode.

By giving us back our lost vision of swaraj, by redefining freedom, Gandhiji re-injected in a demoralised, despirited, half-dead and fully defeated India an unheard of spirit of revolt, self-cleansing and national regeneration. He gave us its image and laid its path for us to build further upon it. But the very civilizational Indian ideal, swaraj, that gives India and Indians their transcendent Identity was given a go-bye. Gandhi was reduced into an icon of non-violence by delinking his non-violence from the very purpose of it — swaraj. Through working out the meaning of swaraj, could India and every Indian attain their identity as a nation; as communities in a nation; and as individuals in communities?

We discuss here some of the predicaments and factors that have undermined our national swaraj consciousness and caused total loss of the power of identity, if not identity itself; though as a nation and as a society we can hardly claim a unique identity for us while on the path of modernization on the Western pattern. In fact from Gandhian perspective, being a copy cat of the West, we could hardly be called a nation — courtesy the protagonists of Western modernity and antagonists of the idea and vision of Hind Swaraj.

Freedom – Justice Incompatibility:

Challenge to our times comes from modern (Western as it is often called) civilization's innate incompatibility between two of human being's innate quests; namely, freedom on the one hand, and justice on the other. It is in its nature to destroy one in the pursuit of the other because of its very idea of freedom. Modern civilization has reinvented the meaning of freedom, based on its understanding of man and society, such that in optimization of freedom, justice is compulsorily minimised.

Out of the human quest for justice was born socialism as an internal corrective of Western civilization. In the search for equality and justice socialist experiment annihilated freedom. The experiment failed. Freedom of Western idea and justice are set apart as incompatible. Mahatma Gandhi knew this innate defect of modern civilization. He had noted as early as in 1917 that having statutorily removed slavery from their own land, now they were out to enslave the weaker races of the world.

The challenge before the world is that of developing a symbiotic relationship between these two innate and undying human quests. In the pursuit of one the other must be fulfilled in order to attain all-round, universal state of peace. In other words, there should be such a pursuit, in the pursuance of which both should be achieved in direct proportion to striving for that pursuit. Gandhi therefore re-defines in *Hind Swaraj* and through his entire life, thought and action, what is freedom in terms of *swaraj* as a principle of social organization, of ordering human life, its affairs and all its institutions, wherein the very nature of freedom sought by the people, and justice is achieved.

People talk of capitalism and of socialism as if these two and their variants were the only paths for human destiny. It is time to unhinge our minds from such domination of our views on philosophy of life and system of governance. This indoctrination has not only lead humanity to a self-destructive path, but it goes against the grain of human intelligence and reason. We must therefore cultivate the philosophy of *swaraj,* common to many a nations, cultures and civilizations with different words and categories.

I will try in this article to discuss some of the predicaments that have inhibited the discourse on *swaraj.*

Two fundamental positions:

I will proceed from two fundamental positions:

One, globalization essentially, in its ultimate analysis, as opposed to localization, is an ever growing encroachment upon people's sovereignty, freedom and resources, through an apparent process of creating a global class of consumers having similar idea of human needs. At the foundation of it is the idea of man, man's destiny, his identity, his self as defined by the Western civilization in terms of materialist vision of life and an understanding of man-society and man-nature relationship – an inverted relationship of fear, subjugation and lustful exploitation. Thus man, is on the trajectory of knowing everything around him and his world but himself, armed with the scientific spirit and secularization of human intellect and reason. Here, it is fundamentally different from, in fact opposed to Indian civilization, the traditional Indian man and his society.

In the face-off between the Western modernity and traditional India, the definition of civilisation Gandhiji gives in *Hind Swaraj*[1] ends with '...so doing we *know ourselves*' (italics added). He raises the fundamental question about man's primordial identity and the path of realising it,

with which is related the question of freedom, release from bondage(s) — the 'golden chains that bind the soul' in Gandhi's words. Thus the sentence preceding '..we know ourselves' is 'To observe morality is to attain mastery over our mind and our passion and so doing we know ourselves'. Further pointing out to the fundamental difference, the contrast, between 'independence' and 'swaraj' he wrote: 'The word Swaraj is a sacred word, a Vedic word, meaning Self-rule and Self-restraint and not freedom from all restraint which 'independence often means'. What we learn from his definition of civilisation and his contrasting of 'independence' with 'swaraj' is that the journey to self-knowledge, knowing oneself, does not carry the baggage of unrestrained self-indulgence like the journey of the modern man.

Let us revert to the definition of civilization Gandhiji has given. *'Civilization is that mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty. Performance of duty and observance of morality are convertible terms. To observe morality is to attain mastery over our mind and our passion. So doing we know ourselves'.* In this definition, Gandhiji formulates the theoretical and philosophical foundation of a moral society and a moral man, both of whom cannot survive without each other. Man's identity, in harmony with his innate quest and his innate universal nature, could only be realised through the path of self-knowledge. Gandhiji very clearly stipulates that duty cannot be performed without being moral; morality cannot be observed without self-restraint; and, self-restraint – or self-rule in the sense of rule over the self — is a condition for self-knowledge. What is created out of duties so performed is called civilisation, a super, universal realm of good conduct. As Prof A K Saran, one of the greatest Indian minds of our times, notes 'Hinduism's starting point is neither God nor Creation. It is the simple but inexhaustible question: Who Am I?'[2] He notes '... the whole social order depends upon the question of self-knowledge.' Only when one asks "Who Am I ?" can one see the rationale of the traditional scheme of duties and responsibilities: otherwise one either acts under sheer brute force of compulsion hence not as man, or acts drifting along the course of conflicting interests and desires"[3]

Modern civilization has neither the appetite for nor any idea of self-knowledge. That is the reason Gandhiji dismissed the question about what he thought about Western civilization by responding: 'It is a good idea'. A civilization is a 'civilization' according to Gandhiji because it seeks self-knowledge, it began its journey by asking this simple looking question 'Who Am I?' and perfects the path of duty, moral conduct and self-restraint. There is an Upanishadic story of the young man who goes to a *Rishi* to seek knowledge. The *Guru* gave him five cows and asked him to return when out of the five they become five thousand. The student returns after many years of wandering in the jungles. The *Rishi* asks him 'who are you Shwetketu?' Shwetketu replies '*aham bramhasmi*' – *'I am the brahma.'* He had become one with everything around him – the trees, the rivers, the birds, the animals....' Members of our farming communities, tribal people can be seen talking to their bullocks, cows and trees. They have a relationship of oneness not of lust-full otherness. This awareness of one-ness with the entire creation is what ordinary 'illiterate' Indian peasant calls knowledge. True learning to them is self-knowledge. I was doing a four-day *Hind Swaraj* discourse in a tribal jungle area of Jamui district in Bihar. As I was discussing in the very introductory session what is the meaning of *'Swa'* – Self- in *swaraj,* a Dalit lady in the front row facing me looked very anxious, her face visibly brightened. I asked her if she wanted to say something. And, she said: 'what you said about rule over one's own self and one-ness with others, is what exactly what I have learnt in my *Guru mantra.* I am not supposed to give my guru mantra to anyone, but I will tell you. I understand you very well.'

We are buffeted between the modernist and the traditional trajectories of search for self-identity for a rational choice between the two. In Swaraj Peeth's recent Hind Swaraj Conclave in Lonawala, June 2013, Ven Prof. Samdhong Rinpoche, who has given inspiring impetus to re-visiting of Hind Swaraj as none in past four generations, posed to the participants a simple looking hard question: 'How many of us reject modernity in total?', preceded by a similar poser: 'is a life of compromise with moral principles worth living?' This reminds us of Gandhiji comparing modern civilization with plague – from which one should save one self at any cost. A compromised India means a compromised identity – which is no identity at all.

Do You See Your Self-Image in New India?

I have, in the course of *swaraj* dialogues and talks asked a question to many an audiences in villages, towns including the entire gathering of students and staff of I P College, PGDAV College in Delhi on the occasion of their Annual Days; and to a group of colleges and University teachers attending a course at the Staff Training College of Jamia Millia Islamia in Delhi recently. The question is 'Do you see your self-image in the new India that has and is coming up around us?' One can perhaps

believe peasant communities replying in 'No'. But, the young men and women from well to do sections and university teachers too, though stunned at the implication of the question, said 'No'. Not one person in so many meetings, camps and functions has replied in affirmation. Something is seriously wrong; and we avoid looking at it, identifying it, facing it – in spite of the fact that not before long the last the first – every Indian saw his/her image in India that was taking shape under Mahatma Gandhi's leadership, on the path he walked – with the blue print of it in the form of *Hind Swaraj*.

Thus, let me state one of the central problems of our national life as many of us probably see it, the question that stares in our eyes: Do we as a nation have an ideal in which the last and the first see his/her image equally? Is there such a national ideal therefore for which the last and the first are striving actively and equally and in the pursuance of which the conflicts of social and cultural identities and interests are resolved beginning from the last in the social-economic-political ladder, and unity is established ? What is that ideal, national vision that inspires all, – the richest, the powerful and the poorest and the powerless, the first and the last alike so that they stand in harmony with each other in relation to their identities? Why the nation State should be the altar at which all identities must merge into one? In essence, is there an ideal in striving for which theory and practice (e.g. the modernist theory of equality, universal brotherhood, justice, human rights, ecological living etc.), knowledge and life form a unity? Conquered by the West, we have lost that ideal and that vision. India as a nation is a blinded nation, moreover since the vision of *swaraj* went out of political, social and intellectual discourse.[4] We lost the sense of identity in pursuit of what Prof. Ashish Nandy calls: 'bludgeoning the identities of all the communities into Indian Nation State'[5] created as an Indian Service Centre of Modern Western Civilisation or modernity.

My second position is that loss of familiarity and memory of the actual meaning; politicized usage of more than one corrupted meanings of the term, *swaraj*, that defines the identity of Indian civilization is one singular success of the Western civilization to ensure defeat of a struggling traditional Indian society and its masses to whom freedom has not reached. What has reached to them is loss of self-hood, self-worth and self-identity as the consequences of 'Independence' which Gandhi said is 'freedom from all restraints' — for the powerful and the mighty, That term, the receding of which into unconscious from Indian national consciousness is the cause of our visionless-ness, is the term *swaraj*.

At the core of Swaraj lies seeking of self-knowledge as the purpose of both religious and spiritual life. It is relevant to point out here that religion and spirituality, though not the same, they are co-extensive with all the domains of life, viz. economic, political, social, and cultural. Religion and society not being separate, Indian society organized its life such that non-violence was largely a structural attribute. We know it as the principle of '*swadeshi.*' Therefore Gandhi says in the introduction of *Hind Swaraj* that Indian civilization is soundest at its core. Banishment of this Indian ideal, the very term that defines India's perennial quest for attaining that identity, should be central to any discourse on identity. Problems of violent insurgencies and conflicts are product of the growing sense of loss of identity among various communities of Indian people. Without a discourse on *swaraj* the resolution is impossible, except with the means of greater violence and repression or a balance of power between communities, which, as a rule, is mediated by political parties to serve their partisan selfish interests at the cost of social harmony and national unity among its various groups and communities. Based on these two positions I discuss here what we have done to *swaraj* both as a term and as an ideal, and to what consequences.

Rediscovering Gandhi on Swaraj:

We need to identify a self-inflicted Gandhan predicament; and, re-discover Gandhi in relation to that predicament, which calls for firstly, distinguishing between the two Gandhis – the invented or the politically modified and politically comfortable and acceptable one; and, the real one — the politically uncomfortable, inconvenient, silenced and rejected Gandhi. And, finally, if we wish our deliverance, we must with single minded commitment grasp the authentic, the politically inconvenient, wholesome Gandhi, who in fact is the demand of the modern times to get out of the mess modernity has landed the human and ecological world into. Do we realise that we talk only of Gandhi of non-violence? We hardly talk of Gandhi of *swaraj*. Do we realise similarly that Gandhi of non-violence has currently, great value; but Gandhi of *Swaraj*? – Very doubtful!

Unless what we may call a Gandhian predicament is first recognized and then resolved, it remains a block upon which our understanding of Gandhi has been made to stumble. This predicament I would call 'non-violence vs *swaraj*' It is about the Gandhian discourse which has been predominantly non-violence-centric and not *swaraj*-centric.

Non-violence vs Swaraj:

As Gandhi had to write 'Independence *vs* Swaraj' in 1927, in order to remind the leaders in no uncertain terms of *swaraj* as the Indian ideal and not independence from the British rule in his response to the 'Independence of India' Resolution passed by the Indian National Congress as the goal of the national struggle for India's liberation; today he would have perhaps written 'Non-violence *vs* Swaraj' similarly in order not to undermine non-violence, but to underline the fact that on the path of *swaraj* lies the solution of all our ills and not in non-violence severed from *swaraj* consciousness and *swaraj* as the goal, howsoever unattainable it is like the Euclid's Point. People in power, uncomfortable and averse to reconstruction of India on the line of *Hind Swaraj*, resolved to make him into an icon of non-violence and not of a paradigmatic shift in global vision and thinking, the objective need of the modern world.

The reason being the post Gandhi discourse on Gandhi which is infested with two very vital disconnects. One, a disconnect between non-violence from its defining term *swaraj*, with reference to which and on the anvil of which he determined all his actions. The disconnect in our discourse on Gandhi is so pronounced that even there is no right dictionary meaning in English language, though the word *swaraj* is incorporated in the English language. To the contrary, the latest edition of Oxford English Dictionary gives a totally false and subversive meaning by weaving it with independence. It says: 'Self-government or independence for India.' Except for Prof. Samdhong Rinpoche and Prof. Anthony Parel there is no serious effort at defining the term and the concept. There are many scholars of repute who have considered the term, but mostly in its political nuances of political self-governance.

The second is the disconnect between non-violence and *satyagraha*. This disconnect has worked two ways: While the ruling classes exhort the masses to be non-violent without resorting to *satyagraha*; the sundry *satyagrahas* so-called that we witness these days are disconnected from the spirit and discipline of non-violence. The discourse on non-violence without being enlightened by the vision of *swaraj* thus reflects in vital disconnections causing corruption of the concept, methods of non-violence, and circumscription of Gandhi's totality. Above all, all this, in absence of a dominant discourse on *swaraj*, the very term and its meaning is accumulating layers of dust and garbage of half-baked, self-styled Gandhism. These days any seemingly, superficially good work is immediately labelled as Gandhian work! Whether such deed has in it the image, the seed or the germ plasm of *swaraj* is of no use.

The consequences of replacing the identity of national struggle as that of struggle for *swaraj* by non-violent struggle, identifying it not by its ideal and purpose but by its means and methods, is that the Indian national consciousness today is neither Indian nor national. Devoid of *swaraj* awareness any discourse on non-violence is no guarantee for a just and moral order. This is the reason that *swaraj* is absent from national political language and from national discourse, for what the English educated classes wanted was independence and not *swaraj* as defined by Mahatma in *Hind Swaraj*.

Swaraj as Super Categorical Term:

When Mahatma Gandhi charted the course of attainment of *swaraj* as explained in *Hind Swaraj* – the vision that gave common Indian his identity, what happened had never happened in the human history. Because it was his journey on the path he laid down in *Hind Swaraj*, that his non-violence yielded what non-violence, though as old as the hills as Gandhi himself says, had never yielded. Gandhi became what he is today not because of non-violence *per se*, but because of his non-violence as means of *swaraj*. For Mahatma Gandhi non-violence was not the ultimate category in his scheme of things in terms of which he weighed everything else. Its place is that of a means for the end called *swaraj*. In order for a correct conception he clarified: 'it is non-violence which is in truth, and not vice a versa.' It is Gandhi of *swaraj*, of *Hind Swaraj*, that is the real Gandhi, while that of the non-violence minus *swaraj* is the invented one, politically modified convenient Gandhi.

By relegating the ideal and vision of *swaraj* we as a nation have fallen to false conceptualization of man, society and State. And that has landed us into insurmountability of problems like the ones we are in, where every conception of systemic correctives only compounds the severity of the wrong it is supposed to be correcting. Problem is about what type of society and human being we want? What type of awareness, national consciousness and striving we want that should maximise justice, freedom and morality?

Indian civilization had discourse on non-violence, where non-violence was and still is, described as the ultimate Law of Being, or as the highest righteous duty, *dharma.* Discourse on non-violence developed

into a profound philosophy and a theory of life which moulded a way of life; and, as a concept coextensive with all the departments of life it shaped a civilization. Thus, *dharma* has no separate domain of its own. It is co-extensive with society. Man-in-society and man-in-dharma are not two separate phenomena, not two separate existences. Thus, as Prof. Anthony Parel puts it: 'Swaraj is a state of an individual as well as the state of the State.'

Till Indian society was in itself, in the state of its self-hood, non-violence and *swaraj* need not require to be stated separately. It defined civilizational consciousness and path of a nation, shaped our thoughts about right and wrong, just and unjust. But, then how come, in spite of such deep development of the philosophy of non-violence that shaped a nation's mindset, a violent 'civilization' succeeded in pervading all the departments of our life, viz. economic, political, social, intellectual/educational/aesthetic? As a result non-violence got replaced and dethroned. It became a term subsidiary to the term peace; and peace as absence of direct violence. Non-violence thus is conceived as instrumental to what is called 'development'. Hence all the non-violent initiatives including Gandhi's own and other movements that challenge modern development were and are dubbed retrograde and wherever they succeeded at a given time, were in the long run, undone.

We often say Gandhi rediscovered non-violence. What is being said sounds very simple, but what he did was not. And, perhaps we have yet to understand it so that we don't fall prey to, though consciously, undoing of what he did to leverage our national consciousness for developing our understanding and shaping our actions appropriate to the unknown, unthinkable and unimaginable that the intervention of modern civilization did. What is most outstanding is another re-discovery; that of a term of reference for non-violence, which was a means to the goal that the re-discovered term, *swaraj,* defined for Indian struggle for self-rule based on self-hood and self-worth. The power of the term *swaraj* was such that in the national struggle the power of *satyagraha* was always in direct proportion to the awakening of the national *swaraj* consciousness. It was to be a journey of re-discovery of the Indian self. That external freedom can not be and has no meaning without the struggle for inner freedom, self-cleansing and self-regeneration, touched the Indian soul. Re-discovery of the term *swaraj* was reinstatement of the term in our thoughts as determinant of the forms non-violence must take with respect to the newer forms of epistemological, cultural, structural and spiritual violence modern civilization threw up and promoted as progress, development and enlightenment**.**

There is a problem with the term 'spiritual violence' as it may be a wrong usage. What I mean is extinguishing the inner light by transforming self-image, destroying one's self-esteem and identity so that he is incapable of envisioning and of judgement. When Gandhiji says that non-violence is as old as the hills and that he has not done anything new, we can not afford to overlook what new indeed he did.

Non-violence, which, to the educated classes of radicalized Indians had to be and was in fact, serving the goal of 'independence' as one of the forms of 'freedom'; was relocated by Mahatma Gandhi as a means for *swaraj*, as the final destination of all human freedoms and as the final, supreme category in our vision for understanding all our private and corporate actions and their consequences.

His rejection of Westminster model of democracy is based on his insight that this democracy as a final state of a nation is thoroughly inadequate in terms of providing an understanding of central human quests, such as freedom and justice. Our experience is an accumulated evidence of the act that progress of democracy over the past six decades has seen growth in inequality, exploitation of the weak, in justice, so on and so forth. Realizing the meaning of democracy is no guarantee for realizing all round morality and justice. Its working fails miserably in providing answer to these contradictions, much less it is capable of providing an understanding of all these and such other phenomena. And this is the highest common national goal, a vision, an ideal!

A nation, which does not have an ideal, a super categorical term, within the meaning of which the meaning of all the phenomena could be understood, has no way but to allow itself to disintegrating or a forced integration through totalitarianizing the State.

Swaraj as defined in *Hind Swaraj* is what Prof. Daya Krishna calls[6] in a different though similar reference the 'Final term in our thought in terms of which we would want to understand everything'. It is the term in the realm of which meanings of all the phenomena could be understood. In the language of mathematics we can call *swaraj* a primitive notion, a term which is not defined in terms of a previously defined concept, but is one upon which other concepts may be defined. It is an abstraction, a concept that is a super-categorical term for all subordinate concept, that define the state of an individual, society and the State; and, connect and define all concepts related with private and corporate economic, political, cultural and spiritual fields and categories of life.

In the Reverse:

Had *swaraj* been the category in our vision in terms of which we would understand nation building and every action that identifies us as individual and as society, we would have been different, exemplifying moral striving. We become, as Buddha said: What we think ourselves to be. Our people would have been driven by the spirit of cooperation rather than by this violent spirit of competition that has precipitated mini-wars at every level of our society and engulfed all its units including family. Our people would have sought peace in justice rather than development so called which has not created even an illusion of peace. The structure of our polity would not have been so extremely pyramid like where the structure itself, intrinsically, denies accountability. Mahatma Gandhi had suggested a new accountable structure with which he aimed to replace the present one. Governance would have first committed itself to the fulfilment of the basic needs of the masses rather than hijacking the system and recourses to fulfil the exponentially increasing wants of the few. Policy would have been guided by the aspirations of the last, in line with the spirit of 'Unto this Last' rather than of the upper and powerful crust of the society. Above all, those who till the land and feed the nation would not have gone hungry, turned destitute and forced to commit suicide. Industry would have fulfilled the needs of the agriculture first rather than turning the industrial economy into modern day cannibal, devouring everything that the peasantry has. Education would have not torn the taught from the soil of his/her birth, would not have created a generation of culturally uprooted citizens, looking down upon their own people as backward and worth nothing. In place of the political process based on parties which divide the society on each of its fault lines of religion, ethnicity, caste and creed, we would have had a polity that would unite and harmonize these diversities of a multi-cultural civilization. In short, we, Indians would have had a functioning society and would not have turned into a society-less nation with only the Nation State as the sole super institution of power, whereby independence has worked as freedom to the powerful and the unrestrained. Had we thought of ourselves to be in the state of striving *swaraj* or were in the state of striving for *swaraj*, we would have been walking on that path, trying our best to realise that ideal; and as Gandhiji puts it, '..in our progress towards that goal we would ever see more and more enchanting scenery', in place of the ugliest sceneries we are forced to see and suffer day in and day out on the path of our present journey on a trajectory opposite to that of *swaraj*.

References

1. M.K Gandhi, *Hind Swaraj,* Chapter xiii, p. 53. Navjeevan Publishing House, Ahmedabad; 1938;
2. A K Saran, *Hinduism In Contemporary India,* p. 16; Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies Sarnath, Varanasi; 2007
3. Ibid. P 47
4. I can say this with a sense of authenticity because of my 45 years of close association with almost all Gandhian leaders post-1948 and have been part of the Gandhian movement, have edited *Gandhi Marg* (Hindi; Gandhi Peace Foundation) and been in responsible positions; known all major national Gandhian Institutions closely. *Hind Swaraj* was never a text for any debate, much less consideration, until we at Swaraj Peeth made it a matter of campaign under the guidance of Prof. Samdhong Rinpoche, sometime in late 1990s.
5. Ashish Nandy, *Regimes of Narcissism, Regimes of Despair;* Oxford University Press, New Delhi; 2013
6. Dya Krishna.

Globalization: the Context of Education

J.S. Rajput*

Some fifty years ago the technocrats of those times organized an exhibition in the world fair of New York dedicating it to 'Man's achievements on a shrinking globe in an expanding universe'. Celebrated science fiction writer Isaac Asimov visited this exhibition. Highly excited, he wrote an article about how the world would be 50 years on; in 2014. He wrote[1]: 'Communication will become sight-sound and you will see as you will hear the person you telephone. The screen (of the phone) can be used not only to see the people you call but also for studying documents and photographs and reading passages from the books.' In the age of smart phones, Skype's, and e-books, it all looks so prophetic! He could foresee all of these! Asimov, who passed away in 1992, had made several other predictions in most of which he was just on the mark. Change, they say, is the only constant thing. People observe the change, its impact and also realize how they themselves contribute to the change. Change, its pace, magnitude and enormity as also the consequent challenges, has never before been as daunting as at this stage. Today, all of the human beings are 'neighbours'. Huge distances stand reduced to minutes, connectivity within seconds could be universally accessible to anyone. Information, knowledge sources and assistance are just a click away. The glare and glitz of life has been globalized, the fruits of which have up-scaled millions and thrown billions backwards. For some, the 'World is Flat'. For most of the populace, it is a hot and crowded world.

There was another visionary who, in his own unique way, visualized the future implications from within the frame of the 'last man in the line'! He wrote[2]: 'If I preach against the modern artificial life of sensual enjoyment, and ask men and women to go back to the simple life epitomized in the *Charkha*, I do so because I know that without an intelligent return to simplicity, there is no escape from our descent to a state lower than brutality'. Gandhi was not alone amongst those who were worried the way the world was shaping up after the extended and expanded presence of science, technology and now, the communication technology. It is worthwhile to recall Arnold Toynbee who, after surveying the story of modern materialistic civilization, observed[3]: 'It is already becoming clear that a chapter which had a Western beginning will have to have an Indian ending if it is not to end in the self-destruction of the human race… At this supremely dangerous moment in human history, the only way of salvation for mankind is the Indian way – Emperor Asoka's and Mahatma Gandhi's principle of non-violence and Sri Ramakrishna's testimony to the harmony of religions. Here we have an attitude and spirit that can make it possible for the human race to grow together into a single family – and, in the Atomic age this is the only alternative to destroying ourselves.' As modernization and globalization have engulfed the willing and unwilling alike, the need for a critical review has become urgently relevant and necessary. For the first time, informed human beings are worried even on the very survival of the planet Earth if the present trends leading to the breakdown of the sensitive link of man and nature are persisted further without application of mind and ignoring the basic tenet that natures' resources are to be shared by one and all alike and replenished wherever possible and necessary. Globalization is no longer merely an economic phenomenon but it impacts every sector of human endeavour like social, cultural, linguistic concerns and, the very concept of national identity.

From the Global Discourse: The Positives and Negatives

The turn of the millennium gave rise to a vey exhaustive 2K-global debate. In 2005, some of the positives of globalization were summarized by Cheng:[4]

1. Global sharing of knowledge, skills and intellectual assets that are necessary to multiple developments of individuals, local communities and international communities;
2. Mutual support and benefits to produce energy for various developments of countries, communities, individuals in different parts of the world;

* Professor J.S. Rajput is the former Chairperson of the National Council for Teacher Education, NCTE 1994-99 and the former Director of the NCERT 1999-2004.

3. Creating values and enhancing efficiency and productivity through the above global sharing and mutual supports to serving local needs and human development;

4. Promoting international understanding, collaboration, harmony and acceptance of cultural diversity across various countries and regions; and

5. Facilitating multi-way communications and multi-cultural appreciations among various groups, countries and regions.

It would be clear from the above and other similar formulations that globalization would create a new world in which, theoretically, the key elements of international interactions, national policy formulations and executions would centre on 'sharing experience, knowledge and the know-how'. It would be too naïve to presume that globalization would result in altruistic support from developed countries and they would share resources with the developing countries they are eyeing as markets without that fine print of 'terms and conditions apply'! In the knowledge driven world, education, job creation and the local and traditional skills will come under stress. In India, the World Bank assistance in the field of elementary education 1990-91 onwards brought with it greater international interaction, foreign visits of Indian bureaucrats and academics, training programmes, innumerable appraisal missions, and in the process neglect of the local and traditional expertise. Even the content and processes of education were quietly impacted to 'conform to international standards'! Educated class in India, as also in other countries that extricated themselves from the colonial yoke has always remained too eager to embrace the Western culture, tradition and the system of governance and education. This segment has indeed made a very substantial contribution in accepting the imperatives of the globalization without serious and indepth analysis of what is locally/regionally available, how the indigenous could be relevant and whether the 'ideology of progress' being borrowed from elsewhere would really meet the national requirements'? It was known to all sensitive citizens everywhere that the former political colonization could now be extended to social, cultural, and economic spheres! In several ways these apprehensions have proved correct. Over a decade ago, the negatives of globalization as studied and published from various sources were visualized[5] as:

1. Increasing the technological gaps and digital divides between advanced countries and less developed countries, that are hindering equal opportunities for global sharing;

2. Creating more apparently legitimate opportunities for a few advanced countries to economically and politically colonize other countries globally;

3. Exploiting local resources and destroying indigenous cultures of less advanced countries to benefit a few advanced countries;

4. Increasing inequalities and conflicts between areas and cultures; and

5. Promoting the dominant cultures and values of some advanced areas and accelerating cultural transplantation from advanced areas to less developed areas.

It is proper education and the individual prepared through the process could actually understand and properly perceive the negatives of the much-hyped global village and only they could prepare appropriate responses to secure national interests. Even this alone may not be sufficient unless the education systems accept at the policy level that 'education in every country must be rooted to its culture and committed to progress'. It has serious implications that could impact practically every sector of human endeavour and activity. Several newly emerged nations opted for an easy option and borrowed systems, plans, programmes, practices and formulations from outside and soon realized the enormity of the folly committed. No nation could neglect the local knowledge and also the systems of creation, generation, dissemination and utilization of this knowledge. The significance of the traditional and indigenous knowledge base is now globally recognized and efforts are on to preserve it in its specific locations. Needless to say, not all of it could be relevant in the current context. The essence and utility have to be accepted and outdated discarded. Take the example of the systems of indigenous health care like *Ayurveda, Unani, Siddha* and others that could have easily extended health care facilities up to the last man in the remotest corner of the country. This gap in health care and health education shall widen further as the magnitude of globalization expands itself. Nearly fifty per cent of the children in India suffer from malnutrition. There is no indication in policies and programmes that it would be corrected in the next five to six years. It has serious implications for education and also for the growth of the cognitive capital of India.

Canvas that Confronts Education

The first visible signs of globalization appeared in the 'markets' of not-yet-developed nations. Immaculate planning and serious research indicated to the colonizers of the past that though they may have lost on retaining the political hegemony, there are alternative strategies to seek social, economic and cultural dominance over the countries struggling to reshape their future after having suffered alien rule and unbridled exploitation and extortion of their resources for hundreds of years. If handled wisely, these countries could open up enormous centres of economic gains and more importantly dominance**!**

For a developing country like India, technological revolution and its hand-maiden globalisation present both a challenge and an opportunity. Opportunity is to be part of the process (in which we already are); and challenge is to do so, and reap its benefits without diluting or losing our distinct cultural identity and essential Indianness. The Western market driven pressures to ensure all-round uniformity, to the extent of imposing their language and cultural traits can be resisted successfully only if we devise a purposeful educational system from lower to higher levels. Delay and lack of purpose and clarity are driving the impatient job poll-seeking youth in laps of 'education shops' who dish out 'value minus' products to man call centres.

On a serious note, the population of those below 15-16 years has grown up substantially. India, they say, must reap the benefits of the 'golden period of demographic dividend'! India is the nation of the young and ageing societies; particularly the developed countries are keen to offer job opportunities to the young, educated and skilled Indians. The only hitch is: Are we ready to prepare competent, professionally equipped and mentally alert young manpower? The conditions in our schools and universities are certainly not very encouraging and the downward slide in the quality appears unstoppable. India could take advantage of networking with well-reputed international institutions and upgrade its own institutions. It would also require close networking with industry and corporate houses. The communication systems are now universally available to institutions, if not to individuals in difficult situations. In fact the culture 'industry' has been monopolized by certain affluent nations and the same is being imposed on other cultures by those who believe in 'one language, one attire, one menu card, and one culture and uniform social norms and practices'. Some even are busy to ensure one religion for all! It is indeed dreadful to think of a world bereft of the diversities that make this planet a beautiful and colorful place to lead a fulsome life! The fact, and the trend, however remains that languages are vanishing, scripts are being lost, around the globe you could get the food items popularized by the West everywhere, could hear the music and songs of those who, again, could utilize the universal communication systems more effectively than others. The erosion of cultural, linguistic and social distinctiveness that has already taken place is a great loss to humanity, creativity and innovative traits and above all the identity, its cultural heritage and the pride therein! Who would like children not to know the language of their forefathers? With around thirty per cent of schools now in private hands, the craze for english medium schools is on a sharp rise. Here again the decline of the credibility of the public school system plays a significant role. When focus shifts merely to earn more in life, such practices gain prominence and also predominance. In India the craze for english medium education very clearly exposes the malady that is injurious to the generations ahead. Disconnecting the child from learning through his mother tongue in initial years is injurious to him and also to the nation. One of the essential principles of learning is to ensure a continuity of the home environment to school environment. This is just not possible when a three year child is put in a play school' and is made to learn an alien language from day one in an environment that creates apprehensions and even fear.

Responding to the pressures of job market, number of private schools pretending to impart English medium education are burgeoning in the hinterland and at district levels. A sample of figures of 4 backward districts will suffice:

Districts that have Added the Most Schools

District	2008	2012	Rise
Ghazipur (UP)	2, 684	4,585	71%
Murshidabad (WB)	3,942	6,588	67%
Darjeeling (WB)	912	1,522	67%
Gulbarga (Karnataka)	2,003	3,151	57%

These figures in brief encapsulate the fact of steep decline of government run schools at grass-roots levels, the enormity of the challenge and gross inadequacy of the government response. It also stokes the debate like outsourcing the education like healthcare, to the private sector. In a poor country like India, government the cannot

recede from either, and play in the hands of mercenaries and market forces. It is a challenge of aspirations fuelled by globalisation forces. Therefore, the challenge before education is to prepare young children on the principles of 'learning to live together'! The logic given is simple: It is global village in which everyone is the neighbour of everyone else. So, you must learn to respect otherness in all of its shades and colours! How could those unable to live together as a community or as a cohesive society achieve the objective of making their children learn to live together? Education is the only key that could open up alternative solutions, based on diversity and respect for the local and indigenous. Internalisation of human values has to be an integral part of every educational activity.

Learning Essentials

The canvas before education opens its various dimensions in response to a simple query: Why everyone is keen to get education? Answer: A new world order is in the process of taking shape. Every individual deserves to be empowered and enabled to discover his talent to full extent. Everyone must be supported to realize his creativity at its best as that alone could be the backbone of the progress and development which is the essential aim of all the policies, programmes and implementation strategies in every alert and responsive system of governance. The limitations that illiteracy, ignorance and low quality education imposes on the process of growth and progress have been witnessed by practically every developing country, though to varying extents. When the competition is tough, quality of products and output is the key to remain relevant. The nurturance of the growing up of every future citizen just cannot be taken lightly. It is the quality of education and level of acquisition of skills which, upgraded and enhanced through integration of human values and emphasis on character building, would guide the content and process of education in the globalized world. The basic premise of comprehensive education would still be defined by that eternal 3X3 matrix:

Head, Hand and Heart
Self, Society and Nature
Body, Mind and Spirit

Once education systems, right from planning to school level implementation, take care of these aspects and their interrelationship,

education so imparted would truly become an instrument of development. The expected outcomes could be simply put as:[6] Properly planned educational inputs contribute to the increase in the Gross National Products, cultural richness, build positive attitude towards technology and increase efficiency and effectiveness of the governance. To come up to the expectations of the people and the new emerging global society, the qualitative improvement in education must reflect a change in pedagogical dimensions and lay emphasis on the following[7]:

1. A shift from methods that emphasize passive learning to those that foster the active interest and ability of children to learn on their own;
2. A shift from memorization to development of children's capacity for critical thinking;
3. A shift from traditional academic to practically relevant curriculum; and;
4. A shift from imparting information to imparting life values such as independent thinking, self-reliance and individual initiative that are essential for success in any field of endeavour.

In the globalized world, the localized initiatives have to be equally strong and prioritized as the local acquaintance and appreciations developed by local elements of the curriculum would be pre-requisite to become a responsible, capable, active, creative and healthy member of the family and society. Flexibility, dynamism, and readiness to accept innovations have to become hallmarks of the process of curriculum renewal and the assessment of its utility in the labour market.

The Report of the International Commission on Education for the twenty-first century, also known as Delors Report after its Chairperson, identifies four pillars of education[8]: Learning to live together; Learning to know; Learning to do; Learning to be! The Delors Report further stresses the essential purpose of education and learning: None of the talents which are hidden like buried treasure in every person must be left untapped. Globalization promises to present a flat world to one and all. In this fast changing scenario[9], the first, and most important, ability you can develop in a flat world is the ability to "learn how to learn" – to constantly absorb, and teach yourself, new ways of doing old things or new ways of doing new things. Those familiar with the Indian tradition of learning, knowledge creation and its dissemination for the welfare of one and all would immediately recall the presence of the 'idea' all along: *Yavadjivait Adhiyate viprah:* The wise continue their search for

knowledge till the very end! The tragedy is that Indian education system itself is not realizing the universality of the basic premise of the Indian thought: *Vasudhaiv Kutumbakam*: But the world is one family! It requires creation of the spirit of belonging to the nation, community and developing a sense of pride in being the inheritor of great tradition that values humanity the most. India with its great ancient tradition and a highly evolved culture could just not become another nation that excels in copying the West. Those who understand India are aware of the global trends and new techniques and are open to new ideas could sit together and attempt a model of education that could be seen as sprouted from the soil of India but which aims at the welfare of everyone around the globe. This just cannot be the prerogative of those who are not willing to change with the times and would like to adhere to the tradition without realizing the dynamic nature of the process of education which remains relevant only when it traverses the times like a pious stream that always offers only the fresh and freshness. In simple terms: Can India devise an education system with potential to restore 'the global faith in the Indian nation? It is a daunting challenge.

Not by ICT Alone

If one confines attention only to the advances in science and technology and more particularly to ICT impact, it could present a very rosy picture. No doubt, these advances could have been appropriately used to find global solutions to certain basic issues that have confronted human beings for long and are still present in magnitude before nations and the global community. Billions sleep hungry, deprived of food, shelter and health care. A peaceful world just cannot be created if social justice, equity, religious co-existence, mutual respect for other cultures and otherness in different aspects, remain mostly only on paper and are not put to practice for 'all'! All this would take shape only when top priority in the entire process of education at every stage, is given to inculcation of values; moral, ethical, humanistic and democratic. The system needs to orient every young person to imbibe the sense of belongingness to the nation, be proud of its culture, traditions and the eternal knowledge-quest. In the process, learners have to be acquainted with the commonality of eternal human values in all religions, cultures and civilizations[10]. Only a true national citizen could become an effective international citizen. Only the one who adores his mother could adore all the mothers of the world and hence, every human being.

Action Points

1. India needs manpower at the highest level and at the middle level, apart from serious acquisition of vocational skills at the stage of compulsory education which now must effectively extend up to 16 years of age if not 18. To that end we should not hesitate to develop area specific and community relevant models of education instead of insisting on a centralized curricula as has been the case in the past**.**

2. Investments in education upscale the nation on all fronts. Delay and inadequacy of resource inputs causes irreparable damage to the quality of education and, consequently, in preparing the right kind of manpower in every sector of human activity. To compete in a global society and avail the opportunities that are opening up internationally, India needs to ensure that the dignity of its government school systems is restored on war-footing. Indian schools need 1.2 million additional school teachers. There is no visible and serious effort to get these vacant slots filled even in the next couple of years! How could there be an effective implementation of curriculum policies? How could teachers in position find time to focus on personality development, value inculcation or making them understand the national and international contexts?

3. The situation in higher education is indeed alarming. The regulatory mechanisms, developed to ensure dynamism and quality, have failed miserably. If it were not so, how could 80 per cent of professional graduates and 90 per cent of the general graduates are not found fit in the job market. The situation is very complex and the private initiatives have mostly brought in commercialization. Most of them are not worried about the quality of output? Professional institutions must be run professionally and the quality of products monitored regularly by independent agencies.

4. Indian education system must open up to new areas like petroleum, energy, defence equipment, medical equipments, nuclear technologies and others. India requires preparing manpower for outside world which is keenly observing India's 'golden period of demographic dividend'.

5. The content and process of education has to be redefined regularly. Emphasis on the cultural content, heritage, natural

resources, and respect for diversity including religious diversity must be given adequate priority in schools and institutions. They must understand the role that India could play in the globalized world as well as the necessary caution and precautions in dealing with the players of globalizations.

6. India needs to prepare special plans to identify talent, nurture it in schools and universities and give them opportunities to carry out the process of knowledge creation in an environment that gives autonomy, provides opportunity to experiment with ideas and enter in a dialogue and debate with the best minds with confidence and self-assurance.

7. Public participation in school education, particularly in managing the government schools, remains only on paper. It has to be energized and activated. Involvement of stakeholders in educational institutions is a critical element in improving education. The process of transforming India to acquire its respectful place in the comity of the nations must begin in the primary schools of India and it must begin early.

References

1. *The Week*, May 4, 2004; page 18. Kochi, India
2. *Young India*, July 21, 1921
3. *Essential Unity of All Religions*, N.A. Palkhiwala, Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai Third Edition, 2003
4. *New Paradigm for Re-engineering Education*; Yin Cheong Cheng; Springer; 2005
5. Ibid; page 74
6. *Education :Vision 2020*, paper by J.S. Rajput, in the edited volume *India Vision 2020*; Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, 2004
7. Ibid; p 83
8. *Learning: the Treasure Within*, UNESCO, 1996
9. *The World is Flat*, Thomas L. Friedman, Penguin Books, 20026
10. *Human Values and Education,* J.S. Rajput; D.K. Publishers, New Delhi, 2006

Globalisation and National Identity: Limited Options?

Shankar Sharan*

The issues of modernity, globalisation or national identity are hardly new. Depending on the context it can be located in European debates even two centuries ago. In our country too it can easily be seen a hundred years ago in the writings of Sri Aurobindo, Tagore, Gandhi and many others. The point, however, is that under similar terms the contents of the dialogue and discussions undergo a great change with a passage of time. Sometimes even a fundamental change takes place, even though the term remains the same. For instance, the issues and concerns discussed under 'modernity' six decades ago can no longer be found in the debates today. Therefore, it would be a fruitful exercise if our current concerns are outlined about modernisation, globalisation and national identity.

In 1987–1988 a debate was on the pages of a national newspaper of our country between its scholar-editor Girilal Jain and scholar-politician Dr Karan Singh. Jain had concerns of security, unity, stability and orderly growth of the country. It was then a normal worry of an Indian intellectual, in which Jain also added that 'our nationalism is weak'. This sentiment was too much for Dr Karan Singh who saw in it an attitude towards fascism. In his rejoinder Dr Singh presented the notion of universalism as opposed to narrow nationalism. He argued that nationalism is already antiquated and that we should rather welcome globalism. In his support he also mentioned contemporary Indian philosophers Swami Vivekananda and Sri Aurobindo.

---
* Dr. Shankar Sharan is Assistant Professor, Department of Education in Social Sciences, NCERT, New Delhi-110 016.

It is true that in economic relations as well as in cultural, educational matters a rapid process of globalisation has been going on. The new media of twitter, facebook, internet and satellite television have connected the entire world in a way unconceivable even at the time the debate took place between Girilal Jain and Dr Karan Singh. It is not only the easy connectivity today of every person to every person in the world that is making globalisation a reality. Even ordinary teaching and learning is also becoming so. A good mathematics teacher living in a small town in India now has worldwide pupils via internet, giving them regular teaching and earning money too. Likewise academic journals, newspapers and TV channels from all over the world are available to every person living in any corner of the world.

Such a global connectivity in communication, business and education is naturally affecting cultural sphere too. The food habits of American, European societies, the Hollywood films, American TV serials are becoming popular all over the world. Cooked food, packaged readymade snacks and drinks of all kinds are reaching even rural markets of India. Almost the same snacks the Americans eat and drink which now an average semi-urban kid in our country wants and gets. English is the most preferred language of education and all kinds of information is also spreading throughout India as in so many other countries. Now the Supreme Court of India has ruled that education of a child in his/her mother tongue is no longer a right, and the government cannot force any school to impart education in children's mother tongue. In fact, many educationists discard the very notion of mother tongue, calling it the 'first language' instead. The practical meaning of such happenings is a *de facto* recognition of English as the favoured medium of education in our country.

While all these fast developments are leading us to still remains a matter of varied speculation, but it certainly indicates a march towards globalisation. It confirms the observation of the great Hindi poet-thinker Sachchidanand Vatsyayan (*Ajneya*). In one of his last interviews, in 1984, he had observed that the traditional distinct entity of common people of a country is being obliterated for ever ('*lok mit raha hai*'). Indeed, a kind of more or less unvarying people, with American-universal goods, attitudes and habits are increasing all over the world. Local goods, be it toys, clothes or entertainment, are being replaced by a universal kind of fare. The same toys, dress and eatables could be increasingly found in any corner of the world.

The movement at this rate towards one direction only, to English education and American pop culture indicates the truth in the poet's observation. It is a real danger that in a generation or two the folk-songs (*lok geet*) of our rich rural India may become a thing of the past. The giant roller of globalisation is moving on and damaging languages and cultures, slowly but undeniably. The irony is that it is no longer done through any coercion but with eager will of large number of youth, the world over to be a part of global culture. Whether such a trend will remain the same is a matter to be seen.

Meanwhile, today even semi-urban village girls in our country are acquiring attitudes of a free urban girl, sometimes in total disregard of her means, situation and abilities, or with little discipline in life, whether it is related to personal habits like eating, sleeping, waking- up or helping in household works. They like to be independent, free 'like boys', trying to get some urban job, marrying at will, living separately with nuclear family, even divorcing or not marrying at all, disliking family obligations if it hinders consumerist pleasures, etc. All these new trends are catching up, irrespective of whether it is good or bad for the individual or society. It is growing amongst us as a given reality. Individualism and consumerism are becoming the main guide of our individual lives. This is clearly related to the increasing globalisation of economy, education and pop culture.

It is true that societies here and there, especially the Muslim ones, are resisting the process, but the trend is nonetheless on the move. If threat of severe physical punishment from Islamic religious authorities is removed, it is doubtful how far the Muslim societies could resist the globalising influence of American consumerism, thereby weakening their rigid medieval practices within and without. As frequent news from foremost Muslim countries from time to time suggest, the same cravings of consumerist life – free, uninhibited and individualistic – are felt among many Muslim youths too. That they cannot show it openly is also because of the fear of punishment, but the presence of the desire indicates that the situation may not remain the same for long. Something like the situation of Soviet and East European societies three decades ago may be the case of some important Muslim countries today. Any major breakthrough against the institutional authority of Islamic clergy (*ulema*) might unleash some similar process towards freedom which happened with the advent of Gorbachevian *glasnost*.

In fact, the quarrel of the Muslim world with the USA is not only at the geo-political level. There is a parallel current of cultural-

ideological fight as well. The complaints of 'corrupting influence' of America over the Muslims are also a long standing issue. Therefore, in a way the anger of the Muslim world against the United States is also an example of dislike of modernising, globalising pressure coming from the American culture.

It is a very interesting subject for political scientists too. There is a paradox about the whole scenario of modernization. After the Second World War, crumbling of colonialism and in the wake of large number of newly independent nations, the modernization theory in political science was in vogue. The modernization theorists argued that the newly freed countries would try to emulate the political and economic ethos of the Western world. That they would aspire to become 'modern' as the West was, to catch up with their former masters. At that time many American political scientists such as Edward Shils, Lucian Pye, Gabriel Almond, David Apter and W W Rostow were enthusiastic about it. They believed that former colonies would see in their freedom a great opportunity to raise their living standards with creating similar democratic political systems as were in the West.

Those scholars understood that aspiration for progress and modernity would tend to move towards Western kind of economic development, inclusive education, urbanization, transforming of old kinship groups, secularization, and developing democratic political institutions. They considered it all as part of the package. That economic development in the newly independent nations would help better education, which in turn would lead to change in values and promoting modern democratic politics.

But Samuel P. Huntington, the famous Harvard professor, published his *Political Order in Changing Societies (*1968) with an alternative visualization. He frontally challenged those assumptions of the modernization theorists. Huntington argued that political decay was also a possible scenario in some countries. He observed the experiences of some newly independent countries showing social and political disorder. Besides, he maintained that the seemingly good things of modernity have also some negative aspects. Especially so, if social mobilization outpaced the development of suitable socio-political institutions. In such a situation, frustration may also result among some sections of people. They would find themselves unable to participate equally in the political system of their country. That might lead to what Huntington called 'praetorianism'. It might take shape in political insurgencies, military coups or disorganized governments. Therefore, Huntington

argued that economic development and democratic development were not likely to go hand in hand in many countries in the process of modernization. The events of some South Asian, African and Latin American countries testified Huntington's observations. Communist dictatorships, military dictatorships and hereditary monarchical strong rules established themselves in many countries. The goal of progress and development remained in such countries, but in rejection of Western democratic political model. The communists believed in their own version of 'peoples democracy' and 'internationalism'.

It is interesting to note that till 1960s, the Muslim countries and their views were nowhere in the reckoning in the political science discussions. But with discovery of large deposits of oil, the oil-rich countries started to combine their strength to bargain with and pressurize the Western countries. The oil-rich Arab countries were largely non-democratic, so their political actions were not exposed to various mechanisms of democratic control by the electorates, internal democratic rivalries, etc. The Western powers, being democratic, were vulnerable on the score of popular criticism and accountability. Therefore, they could not match the pressure of Arab countries as a group. The presence of a powerful Soviet block, anti-West in its general ideology, at the United Nations also made their options limited. In such a scenario, beginning with early 1970s, the oil-rich Muslim countries emerged as a major power block in international politics. Thence, gradually the Islamic theories, sensitivities and demands came to be noted, and respected as a rule, in political and international discussions. Since the Iranian revolution (1979) led by Ayatollah Khomeini, the phenomena of Islamic radicalism, militancy and terrorism gradually occupied a significant place in political discourse. In competition with Iran, the Sunni Saudi Arabia also started spreading its version of orthodox Islam, lest the entire Muslim world see Iran as their leading model. These efforts of the Shia and Sunni powers, on the whole, presented Islam in international politics as a significant entity which could not be ignored.

The vocal representatives of Muslims in non-Muslim countries, especially from the Indian sub-continent, also joined their voices to that of the powerful Muslim countries. For instance, on the issue of Salman Rushdi, the Indian Muslims took the lead even before powerful Muslim countries. Such phenomenon presented its own version of Islamic internationalism in world politics. This internationalism was also as eager to spread it in the world on the strength of petro-dollars and militancy as was the erstwhile communism. Similarly, like Soviet

communism, it also challenged the Western model of democracy, development and culture.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union (1991) the Western world began celebrating its universal democratic model as the only one. Francis Fukuyama, another Harvard professor, wrote his famous *End of History* essay postulating as much. But the celebration was short-lived. The fast rise of Islamic militancy world over posed a new and stiff challenge within a decade.

Samuel Huntington captured the mood with his seminal book *Clash of Civilizations* (1996), which was an elaboration of his earlier lecture on the subject. From the Soviet collapse as well as from the developing scenario in Arab and Asia, Huntington underlined the durability of cultural values. He was the first among the recent political scientists to observe the primacy of religion as a shaper of national political development and international relations too. It was interesting to note, as Huntington did, that the Western globalization have not seriously undermined this primacy. The attractive consumerist fare only created a thin veneer of cosmopolitanism. Muslim masses did not accept it as the model of prosperity to emulate at the cost of their religion. The United States did not attract them as universalizing democratic model. Rather, they took it as an aggression of a modernized Christianity over Islam. Huntington's theory was discussed worldwide, which was again a testimony that his observations had many valid insights.

The terrorist attack on the twin towers of New York (2001) dramatically proved Huntington's theory to be realistic. The primacy of the USA was threatened by the attacks. It was an openly declared, direct assertion of multinational Islamic internationalist forces, showing a will to impose it on the world. Since then the USA and some of its allies fought it ruthlessly in Afghanistan, Pakistan and also in different ways in other countries, including their own.

Thus we have reached today at the stage where both the forces are fighting each other. The force of American/western values, its universal consumerist culture, English media and individualist moves are being resisted by Islamic societies in the name of saving their religion, Islam, which has equally universalistic ideas about so many things. It is true, as indicated earlier, that the latter force is weak in reason but the fight is on.

Meanwhile, countries like India or Japan are not in focus as to the civilisational conflict with the West. The liberal ethos of Hinduism and Buddhism is also a reason that the feeling of resistance does not usually take any radical or violent form. Hence the progressive march of American consumerist culture seems little hindered in these countries. However, it does not mean that the spread of this culture and the resultant anomalies are not a matter of concern for a large number of thinking people in our country. It is obvious that the ever growing influence of English in education, business and polity might kill the Indian languages and connected culture. Culture resides in language. Losing language is another name of losing culture. That is exactly what is happening gradually even in rural areas of the country. Countries like Japan, China, South Korea have understood this conncection and while embracing development, technology etc. they have stoutly preserved their distinct linguistic cultural identity.

Therefore, with all talk of economic progress and technical advancement in India, the issues of language and culture are sidelined. But they are not non-existent. They do exist, in many forms including resistance to proselyting thrust of the semitic religions like Christianity and Islam. Spread of Islamic terrorism in India is a direct result of this resistance and global influence of radical Islam. It only underscores the national security concerens due to globalising factors including terrorism, drugs and arms smuggling. Religious considerations have become an integral part of the globalising thrusts in some countries though protagonists claim it to be a secular phenomenon rooted only in economic and technological domains.

Therefore, threats to Indian culture, though not in prominence at the moment, is bound to surface in a radical form, if not addressed in good time. Various concerned voices are being heard about the gamut of problems associated with the all-engulfing consumerism and erosion of culture. The issue of Indian identity is dormant but not dead yet. Saving our languages, through a renewed emphasis on going back to them, including Sanskrit, is being resisted by the influential and western-ised elite, under the rubric of threat to secular character of the country. It is short-sighted, self-serving and damaging to the oldest surviving religion and culture in the world. They do not realize that it is not Hinduism vs. Islam and Christianity a secular regalements, but, Indianism vs. western influences in the garb of globalisation.

For the moment, the point is that the traditional India still has the will to fight for its identity and thwart all-engulfing consumerist globalisation and other aggressions. The recent political rise of Narendra Modi, who till two years back was an untouchable and persona–non-grata in mainstream political discourse of the country, has a non-political

message also. Our liberal-secularist world is as myopic as the radical Hindu, Muslim and Christian fringes. We mistake and accord them recognition as overall representatives of these faiths. Indian ethos is above all this. Will Durant got its right and so should we the modern Indians. Will Durant wrote: 'Perhaps in return for conquest, arrogance, and spoliation, India will teach us the tolerance and gentleness of the mature mind, the quiet content of the unacquisite soul, the calm of the understanding spirit and a unifying, pacifying love for all being. Only such a philosophic outlook is compatible with being able to go on and on since the time immemorial and all times to come'. It is this universal spirit which will save us from the cultural onslaught of globalisation. It is not a Hindu, Muslim, Christian or a secular issue. It is about India and its soul.

References and further readings:

Sri Aurobindo, *The Ideal of Human Unity* (Pondicherry: SriAurobindo Ashram, 1999). (First in 1919)

Will Durant, *The Story Of Civilization: Part I, Our Oriental Heritage,* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1964)

Samuel Huntington, *Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New Delhi: Penguin, 2000)

Koenraad Elst, "Hindu survival: What is to be done", in Elst, *The Argumentative Hindu* (New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 2012)

Ram Swarup, *Hinduism and Monotheistic Religions* (New Delhi, Voice of India, 2009)

David Frawley, *Universal Hinduism* (New Delhi, Voice of India, 2010)

Ajneya (Sachchidanand Vatsyayan), *Truculent Clay, Preparing the Ground* (New Delhi: Rupa, 2011)

Rabindranath Tagore, *Personality: Lectures delivered in America* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1948)

Globalization and National Security Concerns

D C Pathak*

It is not adequately appreciated that there was an unprecedented transformation of the world in the beginning of the Nineties in terms of both geopolitics and economy with the result that strategic analysts are still struggling to assess the long-range impact of what certainly was a sudden transition to the age of 'globalization'. Interestingly, the year 1991 will go down in history as the common cut-off point for this two prong leap to a new world order. Following the success of the anti-Soviet armed campaign in Afghanistan, the politburo of the Communist Party of Soviet Union (CPSU) met for the last time in April that year to discard 'Democratic Centrism' and confirm the end of International Communism and the demise of the USSR as a super power. The advent of a unipolar world order in which the US would become the prime driver of international relations marking the arrival of a new globalized geopolitics, happened at a time when the success of the IT revolution was already throwing open the world to a hitherto unknown economic globalization. This revolution announced itself in 1991 when for the first time the US investments in industrial sector were overtaken by the funding of Information Technology.

The IT revolution opened up the gateway to the powerful globalization of economy by ushering in the 'Age of Information' that would be known for instant connectivity, borderless markets, and the knowledge-based competition. It changed the rules of business in the world of industry, trade and finance and made it possible for a smaller but 'smarter' competitor to get past the bigger rival that had stronger money power. And this competition could arise from any part of the

* Shri D.C. Pathak IPS (Rted.) is former Director of Intelligence Bureau and Chairman Joint Intelligence Committee of Government of India.

globe. The new age mandated that you had to be well-informed if you wanted to succeed in any professional or business field. The importance of having the right information at the right time – an essential paradigm for ensuring national security, was now the new 'mantra' for success in the market place too. The rise of China in the global economy is an obvious example of how to use knowledge, technology and time as the new age resources for pushing ahead against competition. State controls are proving increasingly ineffective in shielding domestic weaknesses whether they relate to politics or economy. The 'Arab Spring' of Egypt and the demonstration of public resentment in India over the 'growth story' failing to deliver, signal this phenomenon.

An upshot of this globalization was that it forced a certain degree of transparency on the political and economic moves of all countries, big or small. The phenomenal, though not surprising, rise of social media has been significantly responsible for this welcome trend. Social media is now a powerful instrument, especially in the hands of the young and a handy tool for political mobilization as the recently concluded general election in India demonstrated so well. It is a medium for democratization too. Unfortunately the debate on social media in India has been focused either on its misuse or on the alleged intentions of the government to impose curbs on it in violation of fundamental rights. The debate is clearly overdone by the commentators on both sides. Being in cyber space is like being on a public platform and the user has to take responsibility for violating the law that prohibits abuse of this public space for spreading communal discord, slander or pornography. On the other hand, it should be presumed that it is only a minority of users who would willfully misuse the medium for this purpose. The cyber space in fact poses a far greater threat to security than it does to privacy – even as the misuse of private data for commercial purposes by unscrupulous entities has certainly become an emerging flip side of globalization.

Reverting to the question of national security concerns that globalization is already rising for the community of nations in today's world, these deserve to be carefully identified and seriously examined. A number of them are now in evidence and some others are seen on the horizon.

First, a phenomenon that is still not fully explained by the experts on geopolitics is the stark reality that the post-Cold War era has thrown up scores of theaters of cross border terrorism, insurgencies and proxy wars across all continents – not in the mode of frontal 'wars' but more in the nature of covert armed offensives. At the height of the cold war

the tense divide between the two super powers had provided the deterrence for any country precipitating a conflict without fearing being on the wrong side of one of the two Big Brothers. With this veil of control lifted on the termination of the cold war the distant US could not be expected to jump into the limited combat of the neighbours every time. The result is there is a violent assertion of national and sub-national identities particularly where these were unduly restrained by the super powers. It is not surprising that the path of insurgency or proxy war was adopted: It offered deniability as the offensive was covert and also proved to be cost-effective. In India the ethnicity based insurgencies of the North-East had been there for decades but post-Cold War the threat of their receiving a foreign input increased manifold.

Second, a major threat to India's security– cross border terrorism– is strangely tagged timewise to the advent of 'globalization' on the termination of the cold war. It is interesting that Afghanistan once described as the 'geographical pivot of history' lived up to this reputation by becoming the territory that would first cause the demise of one super power–the USSR– ushering in the post-Cold War era and then follow it up by hosting the forces that would create the run up to 9/11 and confront the lone super power, the US with the threat of a new kind of 'global terror'. India's new security concerns got linked both to the success of the anti-Soviet armed campaign in Afghanistan as well as the 'war on terror' that followed 9/11. The fight against the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan was conducted on the war cry of Jehad and guided by the CIA-ISI combine that gave it an operational back up. Its success, for which Pakistan was given a near total credit by the Americans, prompted Pak ISI to plan a replication of the Afghan Jehad in Kashmir by diverting the Mujahideen to this new theatre. This is how a new proxy war was started against India in which cross border terrorism would be stepped up not only through the LoC in J&K but also extended to other parts of this country by infiltrating militants through the porous Indo-Nepal and Indo-Bangladesh borders. Its aim was to cause internal instability and economic damage and this was reflected in the selection of targets ranging from places of worship to the instruments of economy like the Railways, Airports and leading Hotels.

The globalization brought about by the IT revolution was a great asset for the world economy and the law abiding people but it was like any gift of science & technology available to the malcontents of the society anywhere, in equal measure. The masterminds of terrorism have used it as a force multiplier in training, funding and operationally tasking

the militants. This was made evident in 26/11 the biggest terrorist assault on India organized from across our borders. Pakistan has successfully followed up on it by stepping up its effort to raise modules of local elements by using Indian Mujahideen and its affiliates to carry out faith-based indoctrination. Our internal security management tried to cope with this hostile activity of Pak ISI but perhaps not effectively enough– partly because of the communally tinted responses coming in from sections of our own political leadership to the arrests of IM members.

The threat of cross border terrorism has been compounded by the inept handling by our policy makers of the role of India in the decade-long 'war on terror'. It may be recalled that Pakistan was the first of the only three countries – the others being the UAE and Saudi Arabia, to give recognition to the Talban rule in Afghanistan established in 1996 at the end of a few years of internal turmoil that was witnessed there, following the withdrawal of a defeated Soviet army. It is Benazir Bhutto the then Prime Minister of Pakistan who had consciously dispatched the Taliban to Afghanistan to bring the situation under control in that country and provide a helpful regime there. If the US would not have been compelled to intervene in Afghanistan subsequently, Pakistan would have had no difficulty in having a relationship of collaboration with Taliban and pursuing with added vigor the proxy war it had launched against India on the pattern of Afghan Jehad, as mentioned earlier. However, the ascendency of Taliban also marked the beginning of a growing collaboration of the rulers with Al Qaeda headed by Osama bin Laden in which the Taliban regime hosted the top leadership of Al Qaeda and worked for a common strategy to convert Afghanistan into a land of radical Islam. In the process Taliban started baring its fangs against the US-led West.

Not many scholars and analysts cared to examine the antecedents of Islamic radicals represented by the Taliban-Al Qaeda combine. For reasons that are historical, political and ideological, radical Islam is primarily antagonistic to the West and its cultural value system. Radical Islam is the product of the armed resistance that was led by the leading Ulema in the name of Jehad to oust the Western 'encroachment' on Islamic land, in the middle of the nineteenth century. This was witnessed across Algeria, Arabia and India – the Indian chapter being described by some historians as the 'Wahabi movement' since it was launched by the followers of Abdul Wahab of Saudi Arabia. It was crushed by the British and the protagonists of the failed Jehad established the well known seminary at Saharanpur called Darul Uloom Deoband. After

Independence the seminary settled down to promoting learning of Islam and took the ideological position that the Muslim minority in India could coexist with others under a secular dispensation. In Pakistan the network of Deobandi madrasas – the Taliban were to be drawn into the political domain as mentioned earlier and used by Pakistan to acquire a hold in Afghanistan. Inevitably because of their historical and ideological roots they were to emerge as the focal point of anti-West sentiments and lay the run up to 9/11 that in turn precipitated the 'war on terror'. On the Indian side Darul Uloom Deoband did not involve itself in politics but retained its anti-West stance all through this period.

When India got on board with the US-led world coalition against the 'Global Terror'– and we did so even ahead of Pakistan which would need some political coercion from America to join in, it was because as a democratic nation India could not approve of violence emerging out of any form of religion-based extremism. However, it soon became clear that Pakistan was recognized as the front line ally of US in the 'war on terror' and being rewarded with enormous funding as well as political support in lieu of the Pak army's promise of fighting the radicals led by the Taliban-Al Qaeda axis on its own soil and help in Afghanistani. It was in this setting that Pakistan felt encouraged to step up its proxy war against India to force a solution of its liking on Kashmir. This proxy war was quite outside of the conflict zone of 'war on terror' and was conducted with the help of India-specific groups of Islamic militants led by Lashkar-e-Toiba and Hizbul Mujahideen, who were mentored by the ISI and let loose on India without causing any prejudice to the American interest in the 'war on terror'. The US not only expressed sympathy for Pakistan on the issue of Kashmir but later started upholding the Pak denial of any hand in the terrorist attacks on India. The US did this even in respect of 26/11 the biggest assault on India organized from within Pakistan – all because of its dependence on Pak army for fighting what had been reduced by Gen Kiyani to an out sourced American war against Islamic radicals and help in Afghanistan.

An evaluation of the threat of cross border terrorism will not be complete without a critical examination of the response of the UPA government to the Pak mischief that was kept up through the period of 'war on terror'. Although both India and Pakistan were on board with the US led world coalition against global terror, we clearly failed to get the Americans to endorse our concerns on the Pak sponsored cross border terrorism. Dr Manmohan Singh in fact made India's Pak policy a sub-set of his treatment of US. This is what caused the blatant distortion

of our security policy at Havana where India granted 'shared victimhood' to Pakistan in respect of terrorism knowing fully well that the hostility towards US and Pakistan came from the Islamic radicals led by Al Qaeda- Taliban combine, whereas cross border terrorism against India was perpetrated by the militants of Lashkar-e-Toiba and Hizbul Mujahideen, who were sustained and mentored by the Pak army. In our keenness to remain aligned with the US stand in the 'war on terror – which was one of acknowledging the risk that the Pak army was taking in combating the radicals–we gave Pakistan a permanent plea of deniability that it used successfully even on 26/11. John Kerry who was then the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate visited Mumbai only to give a clean chit to the Pak army. The US went along with the view that the Mumbai attack was the doing of non- state actors and Dr Manmohan Singh lost no time in falling in line with this spurious argument. The new regime that has taken over the reins in India will hopefully restore a foreign policy that is meant to safeguard our national security interests with greater force of conviction.

The third facet of globalization impacting our national security concerns is linked to the doctrine famously pronounced by Warren Christopher, President Bill Clinton's Secretary of State as far back as in 1993, that 'national security is inseparable from economic security'. Globalization has affected international relations, created a new interface between sovereignty and economic cooperation, and made economic growth a mark of success in handling global competition. The decline of India's growth story is of course attributable to corruption and mis-governance but it has somewhere also brought out the fact that those managing Indian economy in these recent years could only give theoretical constructs on global economy and did not connect with the state of development that existed on the ground in India. They could not evolve an Indian model of development within the globalised economy. India has lost precious time in this. One hopes that effective and clean governance and a nationally oriented economic policy will restore the growth story, under the new dispensation.

Fourthly, globalization riding on the success of IT revolution has created a new domain of national security for all countries. It has thrown up the new concept of combat – the 'asymmetric warfare' – in which an attack on the information systems of the enemy in the strategic sectors can prove as deadly as the conventional war. In China the Peoples Liberation Army (PLA) that controls armament research became actively engaged in developing an e-bomb when the US under Reagan was working on the Nuclear Missile Defense (NMD). The cyber security

issues are now an integral part of national security concerns everywhere. India has woken up to the threat of cyber warfare and finally announced the National Cyber Security Policy (NCSP) – a little late in the day though – to address concerns on the increasing evidence of its known adversaries planning cyber attacks on our strategic sectors. Several conferences have been organized by industry associations and think tanks in Delhi and elsewhere in recent weeks to professionally discuss issues of privacy, national security, international cooperation, legal deterrence against willful breaches and public-private partnership for maintaining universal integrity of the cyber domain. Some of these require a close examination.

The matter has acquired urgency after the revelations by Edward Snowden, the American whistle blower, that extensive global monitoring of phone calls and e-mails was being covertly done by the National Security agency of US and that illicit collaboration of service providers was being secured to get unauthorized access to information from across the world. Now the very definition of espionage is that it is 'unauthorized access to protected information'. The American NSA's activity can be presumed to include operations designed to lay hands on the State secrets of other countries and siphon off data in violation of privacy for various purposes including commercial gain. The value of raw data on citizens for business as well as for possible espionage was highlighted in the media reports recently on the opposition raised on security grounds to the contentious move of the Election Commission of India to go in for a Google-based record keeping of the details of all voters.

It is well known that the security of sensitive information is ensured through the so-called 'security classification' that provides varying degree of protection to information through the use of tags, like Top Secret, Secret, and Confidential. A concern has now arisen that the Access Control mechanisms put in place for protecting information could be externally breached by a hostile country that had the wherewithal to compel a service provider housed on its territory, to collaborate in the process. The fallout of Edward Snowden case embraces the vital point about the exercise of sovereignty in the name of national security, for launching covert operations against other countries. On the other hand the easy use of a 'webcrawler' by Snowden to do what he did, illustrates the heightened importance of a constant research on the counter measures against the 'insider threat'.

Going beyond the option of using the best available instruments of security like the fire walls, anti-virus tools, log in controls, application layer controls and encryption, guarantee of both privacy

and security can only be enhanced by international protocols and agreements accepted by all countries to prevent espionage and sabotage directed against cyber assets. There is no significant progress in this direction for reasons that are not far to seek. International cooperation can come about only if the partners have a shared perception of the common adversary. The Russian distrust of Budapest Convention arose from the clause that an authorized external agency looking into a cyber security breach, to make enquiries with Russian citizens on their country's soil, without prior permission of the Russian government. Russia had no problem with joint action against the international crime syndicates.

It is a matter of satisfaction that the NCSP announced by the Government of India in July last year, highlights 'timely information sharing for pro-active, preventive and protective actions' and seeks 'to set up Centers of Excellence in areas of strategic importance from the point of view of security of cyber space'. It favours effective private- public partnerships and collaborative engagements in technology for enhancing the cyber security. There is need to speed up implementation of these ideas under the watchful supervision of national security experts.

Finally, India has major threats to internal security from the ethnicity- based insurgencies of the North-East and an ideologically provoked Maoist movement heavily laced by lumpish elements, spread across thousands of kilometers of tribal and forest belt in the soft belly of India. These problems had their origin and aggravation rooted in indigenous factors but they always had the potential of inviting external inputs from India's adversaries. In the age of globalization it has become far easier for the latter to aid and instigate these insurgencies and movements, indirectly. Our internal and external Intelligence agencies have to step up their vigilance against a possible influx of arms and funds into the hands of these militants.

In short, the geopolitical change brought about by the termination of the cold war and the advent of globalization has created a paradigm shift in international political and economic relations and set off new challenges to national security as well as new opportunities of cooperation for growth.

Globalization

Dipanjan Roy Chaudhury*

Globalization is the process of international integration arising from the interchange of world views, products, ideas, and other aspects of culture.Advances in transportation and telecommunications infrastructure, including the rise of the telegraph and its posterity the Internet, are major factors in globalization, generating further interdependence of economic and cultural activities. Though scholars place the origins of globalization in modern times, others trace its history long before the European age of discovery and voyages to the New World. Some even trace the origins to the third millennium BCE. The term globalization has been increasingly used since the mid-1980s and especially since the mid-1990s.

Humans have interacted over long distances for thousands of years. The overland Silk Road that connected Asia, and Europe is a good example of the transformative power of translocal exchange that existed in the "Old World". Philosophy, religion, language, the arts, and other aspects of culture spread and mixed as nations exchanged products and ideas. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Europeans made important discoveries in their exploration of the oceans, including the start of transatlantic travel to the "New World" of the Americas. Global movement of people, goods, and ideas expanded significantly in the following centuries. Early in the nineteenth century, the development of new forms of transportation (such as the steamship and railroads) and telecommunications that "compressed" time and space allowed for increasingly rapid rates of global interchange. In the twentieth century, road vehicles, intermodal transport, and airlines made transportation even faster. The advent of electronic communications,

*Shri Dipanjan Roy Chaudhury is a New Delhi based journalist.

most notably mobile phones and the Internet, connected billions of people in new ways by the year 2010.

The term *globalization* is derived from the word *globalize*, which refers to the emergence of an international network of social and economic systems. One of the earliest known usages of the term as a noun was in a 1930 publication entitled, *Towards New Education*, where it denoted a holistic view of human experience in education. A related term, *corporate giants*, was coined by Charles Taze Russell in 1897 to refer to the largely national trusts and other large enterprises of the time. By the 1960s, both terms began to be used as synonyms by economists and other social scientists. Economist, Theodore Levitt is widely credited with coining the term in an article entitled *Globalization of Markets*, which appeared in the May-June 1983 issue of Harvard Business Review. However, the term 'globalization' was in use well before (at least as early as 1944) and had been used by other scholars as early as 1981. Levitt can be credited with popularizing the term and bringing it into the mainstream business lexicon in the later half of the 1980s. Since its inception, the concept of globalization has inspired competing definitions and interpretations, with antecedents dating back to the great movements of trade and empire across Asia and the Indian Ocean from the fifteenth century onwards. Due to the complexity of the concept, research projects, articles, and discussions often remain focused on a single aspect of globalization.

Roland Robertson, Professor of sociology at University of Aberdeen, an early writer in the field, defined globalization in 1992 as: "...the compression of the world and the intensification of the consciousness of the world as a whole."

Sociologists Martin Albrow and Elizabeth King define globalization as: "...all those processes by which the peoples of the world are incorporated into a single world society."

In *The Consequences of Modernity*, Anthony Giddens uses the following definition: "Globalization can thus be defined as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa."

In *Global Transformations* David Held, et al., study the definition of globalization:

Although in its simplistic sense, globalization refers to the widening, deepening and speeding up of global interconnection, such a definition begs further elaboration. ... Globalization can be located on a continuum with the local, national and regional. At one end of the continuum lie social and economic relations and networks which are organized on a local and/or national basis; at the other end lie social and economic relations and networks which crystallize on the wider scale of regional and global interactions. Globalization can refer to those spatial-temporal processes of change which underpin a transformation in the organization of human affairs by linking together and expanding human activity across regions and continents. Without reference to such expansive spatial connections, there can be no clear or coherent formulation of this term. ... A satisfactory definition of globalization must capture each of these elements: extensity (stretching), intensity, velocity and impact. Swedish journalist Thomas Larsson, in his book *The Race to the Top:*

The Real Story of Globalization, states that globalization: "is the process of world shrinkage, of distances getting shorter, things moving closer. It pertains to the increasing ease with which somebody on one side of the world can interact, to mutual benefit, with somebody on the other side of the world." The journalist Thomas L. Friedman popularized the term "flat world", arguing that globalized trade, outsourcing, supply-chaining, and political forces had permanently changed the world, for better and worse. He asserted that the pace of globalization was quickening and that its impact on business organization and practice would continue to grow.

Economist, Takis Fotopoulos defined "economic globalization" as the opening and deregulation of commodity, capital and labour markets that led toward present neo-liberal globalization. He used "political globalization" to refer to the emergence of a transnational elite and a phasing out of the nation-state. "Cultural globalization", he used to reference the worldwide homogenization of culture. Other of his usages included "ideological globalization", "technological globalization" and "social globalization".

Manfred Steger, professor of Global Studies and research leader in the Global Cities Institute at RMIT University, identifies four main empirical dimensions of globalization: economic, political, cultural, and ecological, with a fifth dimension – the ideological – cutting across the other four. The ideological dimension, according to Steger, is filled with a range of norms, claims, beliefs, and narratives about the phenomenon itself.

In 2000, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) identified four basic aspects of globalisation: trade and transactions, capital and investment movements, migration and movement of people and the dissemination of knowledge. With regards to trade and transactions, developing countries increased their share of world trade, from 19 per cent in 1971 to 29 per cent in 1999. However, there is great variation among the major regions. For instance, the newly industrialized economies (NIEs) of Asia prospered, while African countries as a whole performed poorly. The makeup of a country's exports is an important indicator for success. Manufactured goods exports soared, dominated by developed countries and NIEs. Commodity exports, such as food and raw materials were often produced by developing countries: commodities' share of total exports declined over the period.

Following from this, capital and investment movements can be highlighted as another basic aspect of globalization. Private capital flows to developing countries soared during the 1990s, replacing "aid" or "development assistance" which fell significantly after the early 1980s. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) became the most important category. Both portfolio investment and bank credit rose but they have been more volatile, falling sharply in the wake of the financial crisis of the late 1990s. The migration and movement of people can also be highlighted as a prominent feature of the globalization process. In the period between 1965–90, the proportion of the labour forces migrating approximately doubled. Most migration occurred between developing countries and Least Developed Countries (LDCs).

Paul James, Director of the United Nations Global Compact Cities Programme, argues that four different forms of globalization can also be distinguished that complement and cut across the solely empirical dimensions. According to James, the oldest dominant form of globalization is embodied globalization, the movement of people. A second form is agency-extended globalization, the circulation of agents of different institutions, organizations, and polities, including imperial agents. Object-extended globalization, a third form, is the movement of commodities and other objects of exchange. The transmission of ideas, images, knowledge and information across world-space he calls disembodied globalization, maintaining that it is currently the dominant form of globalization. James holds that this series of distinctions allows for an understanding of how, today, the most embodied forms of globalization, such as the movement of refugees and migrants are increasingly restricted, while the most disembodied forms such as the circulation of financial instruments and codes are the most deregulated.

During the nineteenth century, globalization approached its modern form as a result of the industrial revolution. Industrialization allowed standardized production of household items using economies of scale while rapid population growth created sustained demand for commodities. Globalization in this period was decisively shaped by nineteenth-century imperialism. In the nineteenth century, steamships reduced the cost of international transport significantly and railroads made inland transport cheaper. The transport revolution occurred sometime between 1820 and 1850. More nations embraced international trade. Globalization in this period was decisively shaped by nineteenth-century imperialism such as in Africa and Asia. The invention of shipping containers in 1956 helped advance the globalization of commerce.

After the Second World War, work by politicians led to the Bretton Woods (1944) conference, an agreement by major governments to lay down the framework for international monetary policy, commerce and finance, and the founding of several international institutions intended to facilitate economic growth multiple rounds of trade opening simplified and lowered trade barriers. Initially, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), led to a series of agreements to remove trade restrictions. GATT's successor was the World Trade Organization (WTO), which created an institution to manage the trading system. Exports nearly doubled from 8.5 per cent of total gross world product in 1970 to 16.2 per cent in 2001. The approach of using global agreements to advance trade stumbled with the failure of the Doha round of trade-negotiation. Many countries then shifted to bilateral or smaller multilateral agreements, such as the 2011 South Korea–United States Free Trade Agreement.

Since the 1970s, aviation has become increasingly affordable to middle classes in developed countries. Open skies policies and low-cost carriers have helped to bring competition to the market. In the 1990s, the growth of low cost communication networks cut the cost of communicating between different countries. More work can be performed using a computer without regard to location. This included accounting, software development, and engineering design.

In the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, the connectedness of the world's economies and cultures grew rapidly. This slowed down from the 1910s onward due to the World Wars and the Cold War but has picked up again since neoliberal policies began in the 1980s and Perestroika and the Chinese economic reforms of Deng

Xiaoping opened the old Eastern Bloc to western capitalism. In the early 2000s, much of the industrialized world entered into the Great Recession, which may have slowed the process, at least temporarily.

Trade and globalization have evolved tremendously today. Globalized society offers a complex web of forces and factors that bring people, cultures, markets, beliefs and practices into increasingly greater proximity to one another. International business arrangements have led to the formation of multinational enterprises (MNE), companies that have a worldwide approach to markets and production or one with operations in more than one country. An MNE may also be called a multinational corporation (MNC) or transnational company (TNC). Well known MNCs include fast food companies such as McDonald's and Yum Brands, vehicle manufacturers such as General Motors, Ford Motor Company and Toyota, consumer electronics companies like Samsung, LG and Sony, and energy companies such as ExxonMobil, Shell and BP. Most of the largest corporations operate in multiple national markets.

Businesses generally argue that survival in the new global marketplace requires companies to source goods, services, labour and materials overseas to continuously upgrade their products and technology in order to survive increased competition. According to a recent McKinsey Global Institute report, flows of goods, services, and finance reached $26 trillion in 2012, or 36 per cent of global GDP, 1.5 times the level in 1990.

International trade is the exchange of capital, goods, and services across international borders or territories. In most countries, such trade represents a significant share of gross domestic product (GDP). Industrialization, advanced transportation, multinational corporations, offshoring and outsourcing all have a major impact on world trade. The growth of international trade is a fundamental component of globalization.

An absolute trade advantage exists when countries can produce a commodity with less cost per unit produced than could its trading partner. By the same reasoning, it should import commodities in which it has an absolute disadvantage. While there are possible gains from trade with absolute advantage, comparative advantage – that is, the ability to offer goods and services at a lower marginal and opportunity cost – extends the range of possible mutually beneficial exchanges. In a globalized business environment, companies argue that the comparative advantages offered by international trade have become essential to remaining competitive.

Globalization has made tourism a popular global leisure activity. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that up to 500,000 people are in flight at any one time As a result of the late-2000s recession, international travel demand suffered a strong slowdown from the second half of 2008 through the end of 2009. After a 5 per cent increase in the first half of 2008, growth in international tourist arrivals moved into negative territory in the second half of 2008, and ended up only 2 per cent for the year, compared to a 7 per cent increase in 2007. This negative trend intensified during 2009, exacerbated in some countries due to the outbreak of the H1N1 influenza virus, resulting in a worldwide decline of 4.2 per cent in 2009 to 880 million international tourists arrivals, and a 5.7 per cent decline in international tourism receipts. One notable exception to more free travel is travel from the United States to bordering countries Canada and Mexico, which had been semi-open borders. Now, by US law, travel to these countries requires a passport.

In 2010, international tourism reached US$919B, growing 6.5 per cent over 2009, corresponding to an increase in real terms of 4.7 per cent. In 2010, there were over 940 million international tourist arrivals worldwide

Economic globalization is the increasing economic interdependence of national economies across the world through a rapid increase in cross-border movement of goods, service, technology and capital. Whereas the globalization of business is centered around the diminution of international trade regulations as well as tariffs, taxes, and other impediments that suppresses global trade, economic globalization is the process of increasing economic integration between countries, leading to the emergence of a global marketplace or a single world market. Depending on the paradigm, economic globalization can be viewed as either a positive or a negative phenomenon. Economic globalization comprises the globalization of production, markets, competition, technology, and corporations and industries. Current globalization trends can be largely accounted for by developed economies integrating with less developed economies by means of foreign direct investment, the reduction of trade barriers as well as other economic reforms and, in many cases, immigration.

Forty-four nations attended the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944, with a purpose of stabilizing world currencies and establishing credit for international trade in the post World War II era. While the international economic order envisioned by the conference gave way to

the neo-liberal economic order prevalent today, the conference established many of the organizations essential to advancement towards a close-knit global economy and global financial system, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Trade Organization.

As an example, Chinese economic reform began to open China to globalization in the 1980s. Scholars find that China has attained a degree of openness that is unprecedented among large and populous nations, with competition from foreign goods in almost every sector of the economy. Foreign investment helped to greatly increase product quality and knowledge and standards, especially in heavy industry. China's experience supports the assertion that globalization greatly increases wealth for poor countries. As of 2005–2007, the Port of Shanghai holds the title as the World's busiest port.

As another example, economic liberalization in India and ongoing economic reforms began in 1991. As of 2009, about 300 million people – equivalent to the entire population of the United States – have escaped extreme poverty. In India, business process outsourcing has been described as the "primary engine of the country's development over the next few decades, contributing broadly to GDP growth, employment growth, and poverty alleviation".

However there are many downsides of globalisation. Despite claimed enhancement of trading activities and businesses, the globalisation has also caused notable increase in inequalities both in inter-state and intra-state terms. The gap between few such and large number poor has gone up. It as mainly caused by the a symmetrical trade relationship between the developed and backward countries, unleashing exploitative trends. While much has been written of the economic advantages of Internet-enabled commerce, there is also evidence that some aspects of the internet such as maps and location-aware services may serve to reinforce economic inequality and the digital divide. Electronic commerce may be partly responsible for consolidation and the decline of mom-and-pop, brick and mortar businesses resulting in increases in income inequality. Cultural globalization has increased cross-cultural contacts but may be accompanied by a decrease in the uniqueness of once-isolated communities. For example, sushi is available in Germany as well as Japan but Euro-Disney outdraws the city of Paris, potentially reducing demand for "authentic" French pastry. Globalization's contribution to the alienation of individuals from their traditions may be modest compared to the impact of modernity

itself, as alleged by existentialists such as Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus. Globalization has expanded recreational opportunities by spreading pop culture, particularly via the Internet and satellite television.

Religious movements were among the earliest cultural elements to globalize, being spread by force, migration, evangelists, imperialists and traders. Christianity and Islam, have by their proselytizing zeal influenced endemic cultures in places far from their origins. This has besides generating tensions, conflicts and war (Bosnia, Sudan, Iraq etc.) and causing disappearance of local cultures.

In general, globalization may ultimately reduce the importance of nation states. Supranational institutions such as the European Union, the WTO, the G8 or the International Criminal Court replace or extend national functions to facilitate international agreement. Some observers attribute the relative decline in US power to globalization, particularly due to the country's high trade deficit. This led to a global power shift towards Asian states, particularly China, which unleashed market forces and achieved tremendous growth rates. As of 2011, the Chinese economy was on track to overtake the United States by 2025.

Increasingly, Non-Governmental Organizations influence public policy across national boundaries, including humanitarian aid and developmental efforts. Philanthropic organizations with global missions are also coming to the forefront of humanitarian efforts; charities such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Accion International, the Acumen Fund (now Acumen) and the Echoing Green have combined the business model with philanthropy, giving rise to business organizations such as the Global Philanthropy Group and new associations of philanthropists such as the Global Philanthropy Forum. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation projects include a current multi-billion dollar commitment to funding immunizations in some of the world's more impoverished but rapidly growing countries and hundreds of millions of dollars in the next few years to programmes aimed at encouraging saving by the world's poor. The Hudson Institute estimates total private philanthropic flows to developing countries at US$59 billion in 2010.

As a response to globalization, some countries have embraced isolationist policies e.g. North Korea and Myanmar. For example, the North Korean government makes it very difficult for foreigners to enter the country and strictly monitors their activities when they do. Aid workers are subject to considerable scrutiny and

excluded from places and regions the government does not wish them to enter. Citizens cannot freely leave the country

Both a product of globalization as well as a catalyst, the Internet connects computer users around the world. From 2000 to 2009, the number of Internet users globally rose from 394 million to 1.858 billion. By 2010, 22 per cent of the world's population had access to computers with 1 billion Google searches every day, 300 million Internet users reading blogs, and 2 billion videos viewed daily on YouTube. According to research firm IDC, the size of total worldwide e-commerce, when global business-to-business and -consumer transactions are added together, will equate to US$16 trillion in 2013. IDate, another research firm, estimates the global market for digital products and services atUS$4.4 trillion in 2013. A report by Oxford Economics adds those two together to estimate the total size of the digital economy at $20.4 trillion, equivalent to roughly 13.8 per cent of global sales.

Many countries have some form of guest worker programme with policies similar to those found in the U.S. that permit U.S. employers to sponsor non-U.S. citizens as labourers for approximately three years, to be deported afterwards if they have not yet obtained a green card. As of 2009, over 1,000,000 guest workers reside in the US; the largest programme, the H-1B visa, has 650,000 workers in the U.S. and the second-largest, the L-1 visa, has 350,000. Many other United States visas exist for guest workers as well, including the H-2A visa, which allows farmers to bring in an unlimited number of agricultural guest workers. The United States ran a Mexican guest-worker programme in the period 1942–1964, known as the Bracero Programme.

Migration of educated and skilled workers is called brain drain. For example, the U.S. welcomes many nurses to come work in the country. The brain drain from Europe to the United States means that some 400,000 European science and technology graduates now live in the U.S. and most have no intention to return to Europe. Nearly 14 million immigrants came to the United States from 2000 to 2010.

Immigrants to the United States and their children founded more than 40 per cent of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies. They founded seven of the ten most valuable brands in the world.

Reverse brain drain is the movement of human capital from a more developed country to a less developed country. It is considered a logical outcome of a calculated strategy where migrants accumulate savings and develop skills overseas that can be used in their home country.

Reverse brain drain can occur when scientists, engineers, or other intellectual elites migrate to a less developed country to learn in its universities, perform research, or gain working experience in areas where education and employment opportunities are limited in their home country. These professionals then return to their home country after several years of experience to start a related business, teach in a university, or work for a multi-national in their home country.

A remittance is a transfer of money by a foreign worker to his or her home country. Remittances are playing an increasingly large role in the economies of many countries, contributing to economic growth and to the livelihoods of less prosperous people (though generally not the poorest of the poor). According to World Bank estimates, remittances totalled US$414 billion in 2009, of which US$316 billion went to developing countries that involved 192 million migrant workers. For some individual recipient countries, remittances can be as high as a third of their GDP. As remittance receivers often have a higher propensity to own a bank account, remittances promote access to financial services for the sender and recipient, an essential aspect of leveraging remittances to promote economic development. The top recipients in terms of the share of remittances in GDP included many smaller economies such as Tajikistan (45 per cent), Moldova (38 per cent), and Honduras (25 per cent).

The IOM found more than 200 million migrants around the world in 2008, including illegal immigration. Remittance flows to developing countries reached US$328 billion in 2008 and new projections on remittance flows to developing countries show they are expected to reach US$515 billion in 2015.

The Dharma of the Expert

Ramasubramanian*

The advent and domination of modern technology today extends from our daily domestic use all the way to national defense and international communications.

However, whenever the questions are posed about the modern technology such as the Nuclear Power Plant in Koodankulam or the introduction of Genetically Modified Crops, we find that even the best among us don't have a framework or approach that is clear and easy to understand. Questions such as: What is the limit to the usage of modern technology? How do we measure its benefits as against its harms? And more importantly, when to reject modern technology? are not always eliciting a clear response from intellectuals, leaders and even scientists and technocrats. We find that they are unable to balance their professional interest against the common interest for humanity.

If there is a question as to whether the healthy and peaceful life of our people is important or having an advanced technology based on nuclear power plant is important? Most of us will find it easy to choose the former. Similarly, if the question is: Do we need a technology, such as genetically modified crops which cannot guarantee its long-term health or environmental impact for short-term gains? We would obviously choose to reject the technology.

Such simple questions on issues of public welfare seems to elude the 'experts' whom the government often listens to in taking important technology issue based decisions. "Public Ignorance", "Un-Scientific Approach", "Fear Mindset", "Unnecessary Fear", etc., are the kind of

_____

* Ramasubramanian, Chief Consultant, Samanvaya, Consulting, Chennai (ram.samanvaya@gmail.com). This article is a translation by the author from an earlier article written for the THAALANMAI Tamil magazine. www.samanvaya.com

terms often adopted by those who are aware of the technology, the 'experts' too refer to people like us who are unaware of these technologies. Then do we submit the genuine concerns of the 99per cent of people like us to the 'expert' knowledge of the 1 per cent of them? Majority of our people are often happy to adopt such a venture; 'after all they are so well educated', 'they should know better', 'isin't it scientifically valid?' And several other questions are often posed within our societies and communities to accept the verdict of the 1 per cent or even less of 'expert' knowledge against our own common sense.

How do we, as a society, decide on issues that may have long-term disastrous impact? What is our responsibility towards the future generations? Should we not be even concerned about the future welfare or are we to be limited in our concern with current challenges? Can we limit our responsibility to our own personal life, aggrandizement of wealth, asset creation and eventual demise as someone who couldn't think beyond their immediate personal life? Is that all? – These could be some of the thoughts in the minds of those who are seeking and thinking beyond their own personal lives and care for the society.

Some of us may be inclined to look at the past to see how our ancestors made decisions on common welfare of humanity beyond their times. To analyse and understand the different approaches they adopted towards such human conflicts. After all we are not the first ones to face such a situation.

In our culture, every vocation has been guided by *dharma* of that particular vocation in its social engagement. To feed everyone and ensure no one goes without food is the *dharma* of the farmer; to ensure no one falls sick in society is the *dharma* of the traditional doctor; to elevate human mind through aesthetics is the *dharma* of the artist; to not merely produce clothing, but in the process also determine some social customs was the *dharma* of the weaver; to create wealth for the entire community was the *dharma* of the trader; to sustain the beauty of the language was the *dharma* of the poet; to maintain peace, order and sense of security was the *dharma* of the king and to maintain an higher aspiration and bearing in society was the *dharma* of the religious leaders. Thus, practitioner of every vocation had a *dharma* or a social contract that guided their engagement with the larger society. It is an amazing society that could draw a code of conduct and behaviour to so many vocations and sustain the society for a long period of time.

What would be the *dharma* for the 'experts' of modern technology today? What are the guidelines by which they determine whether to recommend a nuclear power plant or a genetically modified crop?

'That which is felt as being truth and for the benefit of all by a mind that is uncluttered is called *dharma*' defines an old scripture. So, '... can we see the truth of the claims behind the nuclear technology? Is it really the only solution that can provide the required electricity that is for the benefit of humanity? Can the technology and its consequent electricity provide human beings true happiness and contentment? These can be some of the questions on nuclear energy. Similarly, "is the pest management best solved through such an expensive technology? Don't we have cheaper and simpler ways of controlling the same pests? Whom does the real benefits of the GM technology serve?" may be some of the questions on the genetically modified crops.

When an expert says that the radioactivity from a nuclear power plant is within the permissible limits for human beings, the question arises as to what are the other radio waves that are impacting our lives on a daily basis? What if some of us are less healthy than others and fall ill even by lesser doses of the waves? Similarly, when experts state that the GM crops are 'substantially equivalent' to that of naturally grown crops and they are more or less similar, we see that the experts are resorting to a newer language to explain the inadequacies of the technology which cannot state the truth in simple language because the truth may be contrary to the sense of security they want to communicate.

We know from history that experts denied that smoking causes cancer for several decades before conceding that it does. What was public knowledge and concern that took the experts several decades of studies to arrive at and to state a simple truth. The Bhopal emission victims even today have not found justice; the experts who pronounced the factory safe have had it easy, while the victims and their families have suffered beyond generation.

In an era where our lives are often dictated and dominated by so many products of technology that we use and we are driven by these expert opinions, it is important that the Dharma of the Expert is defined, articulated and practiced. One does not find any such practice among experts; there doesn't seem to be a compelling reason for the 'experts' to adhere to any code or *dharma* today. Unfortunately, our society has elevated such 'experts' and 'scientists/technocrats' to a demi-god status. It indicates the status of the society today that it can elevate persons with low code of conduct or ethics to a high status in society.

Many of us pride our children being educated at higher levels of technical or scientific education without providing the required ethical code of conduct that could differentiate them from being a better practitioner of a vocation against a harmful practitioner of the vocation. We will have to stop the culture that celebrates, 'my son/daughter will be a good engineer or doctor' and starts to celebrate 'my son/daughter will be a good ethical practitioner of his/her vocation'. Unless we do such celebrations, we can at the best bemoan the lack of ethics and at worse become its victims in the coming times. It is time that we choose either being passive consumers of the 'expert' knowledge pervading our lives in a million ways each day or place an active demand of ethical behaviour in the experts; we start to understand and demand the *dharma* of the expert.

The Palestine Situation: Genesis and Issues

H.N. Das*

The mind-boggling politico-military situation in Israel and Palestine struck me as inscrutable when I toured the region during November 10-21, 2012, which almost coincided with the Gaza rocket-war that raged between November 14 and 21, 2012. The war caused much human tragedy and loss of property. A total of 174 were killed in the Gaza wing of Palestine and 5 in Israel. Gaza city was devastated. Many buildings in south Israel were affected. I saw some of the action as well as the damage. The Gaza war did not exactly occur as a sudden eruption of anger. Nor was it the culmination of a series of previous events although it cannot be looked at in isolation. In my view it is one among a series of similar events since 1948. I am afraid that the circumstances are such that probably, and unfortunately, other similar events will follow in the future. Without a close understanding of the incredible chronology of events in this strategically located region, called Canaan in ancient times, it is difficult to fully comprehend the Palestinian imbroglio. This impelled me to delve deep into the historical, geographical, demographic, social, religious and political developments during the past five thousand years as a backdrop to the present day situation.

I may begin by mentioning that ancient Canaan roughly corresponded to the present day countries of Israel, Jordan and Palestine taken together. It is the same region as Roman Judea (63BCE-324AD) and the British Mandate area (1917-48). To the east and adjacent to Canaan, in the nearby valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrutis rivers, several civilizations flourished five thousand years ago. These included the civilizations of Sumer, Assyria, Babylon, Akkadia and others. This

---

*Shri H.N. Das, IAS (Retd.) was Chief Secretary, Assam, (1990-95).

area is now known as Mesopotemia. It contains the Ziggurat which is "an ancient Mesopotemian temple tower consisting of a lofty pyramidal structure built in successive stages with outside staircases and a shrine at the top".

The arrival of a man named Abraham from the city of Urs near the Ziggurat to Canaan around 1800 BCE is considered as one of the most crucial events of human history. Abraham is credited to have united and consolidated the tribes, wandering in the desert, into one single race of Jews or Hebrews who happened to be the followers of the first ever monotheistic religion of Judaism. According to Jewish tradition Abraham attempted to sacrifice his son, Isaac, at the Temple Mount of Jerusalem. But Isaac was providentially saved. Isaac's son, Jacob, had twelve sons. The name Israel was first given to Jacob after he successfully wrestled with the angel of God. Thereafter, the twelve sons of Jacob became the ancestors of 'the twelve tribes of Israel or children of Israel'. According to the Jewish sacred scripture, Torah, 'God promised the land (of Israel) to the three Patriarchs of the Jewish people.' They were Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

At the site of the attempted sacrifice at Temple Mount, King Solomon (967-937 BCE) built the oldest Jewish temple on a plot of land which had been purchased by his father David (1060-967 BCE) from Aravna the Jebusite. David, incidentally, was the greatest of the Jewish kings. This temple was built over the Ark of the Covenant, worshipped as the most sacred relic by the Jews. This temple was once destroyed by the Babylonian invaders under the leadership of King Nebuchhadrezzar II (630-562 BCE) in 586 BCE. It was rebuilt by the Jews returning from Babylon after exile during the sixth century BCE and was renovated by King Herod (74-4 BCE) who also expanded the complex. The Romans destroyed the second temple in 70 AD. But the Wailing Wall in the West remained to become the rallying point for Jews from all over the world. Since then it has achieved the distinction of religious, historical and national significance for the Jews. Jerusalem and Israel passed through Israeli, Persian, Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, Moslem, Crusader, Mameluke, Ottoman and British Mandate before the new democratic republic of Israel was formed in 1948. There is a long history of wars and conflicts which affected the lives of the people who inhabited this region during the past five thousand years.

Next to the growth of Judaism, the most important event in this region was the emergence of Christianity. Virgin Mary, who was a Jew, conceived Jesus Christ before her marriage to another Jew, Joseph, in

the oldest synagogue in Nazareth. During her confinement Archangel Gabriel visited her and intimated her about the imminent arrival of Jesus. The Christians also consider Abraham to be their ancestor. The Old Testament is common to both the Jews and the Christians.

The Muslims believe that the Quran was revealed to Hazarat Muhammad by the same Archangel Gabriel. They also believe that Abraham, through his illegitimate son Ishmael, is their ancestor. Ishmael or Ismail had been banished to the desert along with his mother Hagar. Moreover, the Quran mentions Abraham or Ibrahim, Isaac and Jacob, beside Jesus Christ, as prophets. They preceded Hazarat Muhammad whom Muslims consider to be the last prophet.

All these three religions follow the Ten Commandments. This had been given to Moses, another Jewish Patriarch, in the Sinai desert in the thirteenth century BCE. whom Muslims also consider to be a prophet. All three religions consider Jerusalem as their sacred city. In the small area called the Temple Mount the Jews have the Wailing Wall. In the same area the Christians have the Chruch of the Holy Sepulchre over the spot where Jesus was crucified, buried and had his resurrection. The Muslims have their EI Aqsa Mosque at Temple Mount beside the *Qubbet es Sakha* on the spot from where Hazarat Muhammed is believed to have ascended to Heaven to meet Allah. He rode a wheat coloured steed named *El Burak* . He went up with the help of Archangel Gabriel. Even inspite of all that is common to them, however, the adherents of these three monotheistic religions have been bitterly fighting each other during the past. In fact, continuous wars and conflicts have disturbed the peace in this region called the Holy Land.[1] Probably no other region in the world has suffered so much. All this happened due to religious bigotry. People of the three groups–Jews, Christians and Muslims have been all along obsessed with religion. Even in the modern times they have not been able to free themselves from this obsession.

During this entire period one word, 'Diaspora', achieved great significance in Jewish history. It means 'scattering' and refers to the massive migration of Jews out of their homeland—*Eretz Israel* or the land of Israel. This happened "as a result of either voluntary resettlement or deportation". The word has come to be used "as a phrase to explain the state of being, or of mind, of all Jews who do not live in Israel". These expatriate Jews have maintained their distinct identity based on "a combination of non-essentialist-primordial factors" including "common ancestry, biological connections, a common historical language, collective historical memories". What is surprising is that the

Diaspora Jews "do not regard their existence in their host countries as exilic".[2]

The Jews had gone out to Egypt, in the second millennium BCE, practically driven away by famine in Canaan. In Egypt, however, they got entrapped into slavery. After suffering for four generations they escaped the bondage and returned back to Canaan. This return, called the great 'Exodus', took place around 1290 BCE under the leadership of Moses who happened to be a great-great grandson of Jacob. It has been described as "the decisive event or watershed in Israel's history. Even to-day Jews understand themselves in the light of the Exodus". The importance of the Exodus is reflected by the observance of the *Passover* which "makes every believing Jew a participant in the event which delivered their ancestors from bondage and established a special relationship between themselves and the One True God".[3] The first Diaspora, however, occurred when some Jews went over to Babylon in the sixth century BCE.

Visiting Israel, I could sense the intensity of feeling of the Jews towards religious matters everywhere. It was evident even in the hotels, in the offices and in the business establishments. But the *bar mitzvah* ceremonies that I saw in the Wailing Wall convinced me that the Jews were somewhat different and more dedicated, more bigoted, to their religion. At *bar mitzvah* thirteen year old boys are initiated into religion. After this ceremony "a boy becomes a man".

The real mass migration of Jews to different countries took place only in the first century AD after their second temple in Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans in 70 AD in retaliation of the great Jew revolt of 66-70 AD. It is then that the concept of Diaspora assumed prominence. Since then the Jews "lived throughout Europe, Africa and Asia Minor under severe discrimination, and disabilities". During the next few centuries the Jews had their national loyalities to the particular country where they lived. This, however, did not save them from persecution at the hands of the Christians. They were made to live isolated in ghettos in many cities where they were subjected to atrocities under 'programs' carried out by or at the instance of the Governments. They were the ones who suffered badly during the Inquision. They were castigated for practicing usury and hence looked down upon. Shakespeare's character Shylock is an example of such popular prejudice. It is unfortunate that "despite their economic contribution to their host countries, most Jewish communities experienced limited tolerance and were regularly expelled by hostile governments and

monarchs". [2] But the Jews of all countries remained united in religion and in language. In fact, during most of the first and the second millenniums of the Christian era "the Yiddish language evolved in central Europe from German and Hebrew elements and Jewish philosophy developed as did Cabala (mysticism)". [3]

The majority of Jews have always lived outside Israel. Out of a total of 14.5 million Jews worldwide only 6 millions now live in Israel. The rest, 8.5 millions, live outside and form the Diaspora. The biggest tragedy to the racial existence of the Jews came when during the Second World War "Nazi anti-semitism resulted in the holocaust, the murder of six million Jews", mostly burnt alive in the gas chambers, under the direction of Germany's Adolf Hitler [3&4]. The memories of the events and the personalities of this greatest human tragedy are very faithfully and vividly displayed in the Holocaust Museum *(Yad Vachem)* of Jerusalem which is dedicated to "rememberence, documentation, research and education". I was awestruck during a daylong visit to this Museum.

Some Jews came back and settled down in Palestine after they were expelled from Spain in 1492. They were followed by similar small numbers in the next few centuries. But the Jews got enthused to return to Israel in large numbers when a clarion call was given to do so by the first Zionist Congress held in Basle, Switzerland in 1897. Then the Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917 "announced that British Policy favoured the establishment of a national home in Palestine for the Jewish people". Arthur James Balfour was then the British Foreign Secretary. This Balfour Declaration has been "accounted the greatest success of Zionism".[1]

After the First World War (1914-1917) and the collapse of the Ottoman Empire (1372-1922) a large number of Jews migrated to Israel. In course of time they swamped the Arabs, dispossessed the Arabs of their land and slowly became a majority in this region. Meanwhile, in the process of apportioning the territories of the moribund Ottoman Empire the international community put the region, then known as Palestine, under a British Mandate in 1917. But wars and conflicts, uprisings and controversies kept this region always under tension. During the British Mandate (1917-1948) there was simmering discontent with surreptitious immigration of Jews from all over the world and revolts by the Arabs.

The present series of conflicts began soon after the United Nations passed a resolution on November 29, 1947 to end the British Mandate and to partition the region into two independent countries. The western part was given to the Jews. They named it Israel which declared independence on May 14, 1948. The eastern part, given to the Arabs, was included in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. The present day Palestine emerged later through a historical process since the 1967 war. In that war Israel convincingly defeated the Arabs; snatched Golan Heights from Syria; East Jerusalem and West Bank from Jordan; and Sinai and Gaza from Egypt. In pursuance of the Camp David Accord, mediated by USA in 1978, Israel returned Sinai to Egypt. Israel then unilaterally decided to absorb Golan Heights and East Jerusalem within its fold. But it agreed to West Bank and Gaza joining together to form Palestine. However, without waiting for Israel's final approval the charismatic Arab leader Yesser Arafat of Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) declared independence of Palestine on November 15, 1988.[5]

The Palestine Authority was created in 1990. In November, 2012 it was given "observer status" by the United Nations General Assembly. Earlier by the Oslo Accord of 1993 the Palestinian National Authority had been given the right to govern in West Bank and Gaza. However, Israel has kept Palestine under leash by retaining matters relating to security with it while allowing the Palestine Authority (now State) to run the local administration. Moreover, Israel has implanted, during the past six decades, about 300 'settlements' in West Bank (of the Jordan river) for accommodating the Jews who have migrated to their 'homeland' and also to secretly oversee the Arabs. According to one estimate there are more than half a million Jews who live in these settlements. In the West Bank they number over 300,000, in East Jerusalem 250,000 and in Golan Heights over 18,000. [2] All these settlements were established on land earlier occupied by Arabs after systematically evicting them. During my visit to Israel and Palestine I saw some of the 'settlements' while traversing the entire West Bank on a 170 kms drive from Nazareth to Jerusalem. I also saw such settlements in other areas as well.

I was really surprised to find that Palestine is yet to achieve full statehood. It has no currency of its own. It has to use the Israeli shakel and depend upon revenue grants from Israel. After the Gaza war Israel stayed payment of an amount of 460 million shakel (about US$ 115 millions) which should have been given to Palestine in order to meet revenue expenditure. What is more humiliating is that for security

reasons the Palestinians need 'Work Permits' to enter and earn in Israel. Moreover, for security reasons, only married persons above the age of 40 are allowed to obtain such permits. There are huge boundary walls with small gates and check points through which Palestinians must pass while coming to Israel. Quite frequently, Israeli military and para-military personnel carry out raids at random and arrest Arabs. The recent documentary film, "the Gatekeepers", directed by Dror Moreh, vividly portrays some of the Israeli atrocities on the Arabs. From the beginning, that is, from the formation of Israel, the Jews have been carrying on 'ethnic cleansing' and literally driving away millions of Arabs. The bitterness created between the Jews and the Arabs manifested itself in two *intefadas* (or uprisings), several wars and other conflicts. I am afraid that due to these historical events the bitterness between the Jews and the Arabs will be difficult to erase for generations to come.

In November, 2012, Gaza started the war after Israeli spies killed their rocket expert and army commander Ahmed Jaberi when he came out of his underground bunker one day. However, as has been already mentioned, the war hurt Gaza more than it did Israel. Even the Prime Minister's office in Gaza city was completely destroyed. The Prime Minister, Ismail Haniyeh, escaped personal injury only because he lives and works in an underground bunker. A very large number of people in Gaza live and work from underground bunkers and shelters. There are myriads of tunnels through which trade and smuggling activities are carried out between Gaza and Egypt.

The Gaza war has once again proved the superior fire-power of Israel. Israel could have thrashed Gaza further had not the international community intervened. Why then the Palestinians of Gaza started the war? To quote Alistair Lyon, by fighting the war Gaza's ruling political party, Hamas, has brought "a sense of pride and dignity" to the Palestinians.[6] Therefore, Hamas celebrated 'victory' on December 8, 2012. The previous day their exiled leader, Khaled Meshael, staged a triumphant return to Gaza for the first time after 1975 on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of Hamas. King Abdullah of Jordan also paid a surprise visit to West Bank in a show of Arab *bonhomie*. Earlier, the Egyptian Prime Minister had visited Gaza on a similar mission.[7] Ruminating over what I had seen in a tense Israel and what I had read long ago about its history I fully agreed with Lyon's analysis. I also remembered the excellent chronicle of the 1948-1967 events recorded by Dominique Lappiere and Larry Collins in their 1972 best-seller *O Jerusalem*! which I had read a second time recently along with

Lappiere's 2007 Preface in the revised edition.[8] This remarkable book vividly describes the personal involvements and tragedies of the important leaders of all the parties concerned.

At this stage I must introduce some geographical and demographic information which are relevant for appreciating the issues and the problems. Out of Israel's 2012 population of 7,900,600 as many as 5,955,200 are Jews (75.3 percent) and 1,627,900 (20.6 percent) are Arabs. The majority of Arabs are Muslims (16.0 percent). Only a small number follow Christianity (2.1 percent). In addition, there are about 2,500,000 Arabs in West Bank in an area of 5,879 sq. kms. Then there are 1,600,000 Arabs in 363 sq. kms of Gaza, which incidentally is one of the most congested areas in the world.

The small population of Jews of Israel have been able to boldly withstand all onslaughts by the enormous populations of the much bigger Arab countries. Outside this region hundreds of millions of Arabs and other Muslims of Asia and Africa support the Palestinian Arabs in their struggle against Israel. Some countries such as Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Iraq have directly intervened and fought against Israel. Others have assisted with money and soldiers on crucial occasions. Even then the Jews won every time. This is one of the greatest mysteries of the twentieth century. Complete dedication to their religion and race, strict discipline, superior weapons and unstinted and substantial financial contributions of the rich Diaspora Jews from all over the world, and particularly from the USA, made this possible. The way the Jews organize and run the important State agencies such as Haganah, Irgun, Mossad and others is a sufficient indicator of their efficiency and discipline.[5] Philanthropy has also played an important role. All over Israel I could see the different development projects taken up with donations from Jews living abroad. The Diaspora Jews have done very well in many countries. Each such family, including the Rockefellers, who happened to be the richest in the world for many decades, made munificent contributions towards such development projects in Israel. *O Jerusalem* has described how arms were bought by the Israeli army with money contributed by rich Diaspora Jews during the 1948 and the 1967 wars. [8]

My tours in different interior parts of Israel helped me to understand the issues and problems better. Visiting Golan Heights in the far north, in the vicinity of Mt. Harmon, I saw the Syrian-Israeli border separated by two parallel lines of fences. In between, there is a buffer zone where United Nations have a big camp from where the international peace

keeping forces operate. There is a sprawling irrigated corn field on the Israeli side belonging to the local Kibbutz which is a commune run on co-operative lines. But the residential and utility buildings have been shifted behind a tall mountain in order to safeguard life and property from the direct line of Syrian gunshot and mortar attacks. Golan Heights has been absorbed by Israel because it is strategically important and the Arab population there are considered to be less troublesome. There are four Druze villages whose inhabitants distance themselves from the Muslims and fully support the Israeli Government.

Another area similarly absorbed by Israel is East Jerusalem. Israel has built a beautiful new capital in Jerusalem with the impressive Knesset (Parliament) building and other Government quarters. But most countries, including India, consider this to be illegal. These countries still retain their embassies in Tel Aviv, the previous capital. This is because Jerusalem had been recommended as an international city by a UN Report on the basis of which the impugned UN resolution to partition the British Mandate area had been passed in November, 1947.

Israel has an ambivalent attitude towards West Bank. They want the land but not the huge and poor Arab Muslim population. During my travel through West Bank I saw the prosperous Jewish 'settlements' side by side with the poor Arab Muslim villages and the primitive Bedouin tribal camps on both sides of the international standard highway built and maintained by Israel. A number of Kibbutz run the Jewish 'settlements' with irrigated corn fields; palm, banana, mango and other trees; and or ganges, olives and lemons in green houses. They have well built commodious bungalows with solar electricity panels and drums on the roofs. They have gardens with multi-coloured flower plants, shrubs and bougainvillea. In comparison the Arab villages look unkempt with half-burnt garbage strewn everywhere and children playing in the sands. The Bedouins live in make-shift tents. They move from place to place in a cycle of 4/5 years. I had lunch in one of the colourful Bedouin camps. As in the case of the Israeli-Syrian border, in the West Bank-Jordan border also two parallel lines of fences run with a buffer zone in between. On West Bank side, the fence is electronically activated so that any movement is immediately known in the Israeli central control room. The buffer zone is totally mined and anyone entering it risks instant death. It may be mentioned in passing that Israel has normalized relations with Jordan, but not with Palestine. The Jewish 'settlements' are maintained in West Bank of Palestine as a manifestation of Israel's domination over that country.[9]

It is when I visited Bethlehem in West Bank that the tension became more apparent. I sensed the tension in the taxi stand, the markets and even the Churchyards. Bethlehem is the birth place of Jesus Christ. The city and its environs are now separated from Israel not by fences but by a 6 metre tall reinforced concrete wall which runs menacingly for miles. The entry and the exit points on each side are through check-posts guarded by heavily armed security personnel. Everyone has to walk through long iron-girder passage-ways at the end of which X-ray machines are installed for body and baggage checks.

The city of Bethlehem presents a unique population-mosaic. The old city has an Arab Muslim majority. There are three big refugee camps with more than 50,000 Arabs who had been evicted by the Jews from their homes 64 years ago. They have given up all hope of rehabilitation. An ancient Biblical Shepherd village called *Betsahur* nestle in the hills with a Jewish population of more than 20,000 who have been living there since the Biblical times. All these three areas are poor. The Arabs resent the Jewish police who raid Arab homes quite frequently. The Arabs also resent the Jewish 'settlement' in another part of Bethlehem where the Israeli Government have built big bungalows for about 60,000 prosperous Jews. I could sense the tension while talking to people, mostly Arabs, in shops, restaurants and streets. Communal feeling is so high that in Bethlehem the Jew Guide had to be replaced by an Arab Christian.

I could not enter Gaza because of the rocket-war. But on my return trip from Eilat, a port town on the Gulf of Aqaba abutting on the Red Sea, about 500 kms south of Jerusalem, I saw the military preparations with tanks and heavy artillery all along the Israeli-Egyptian border in the Sinai desert, where Al-Qaida and other fundamentalists have proliferated after the fall of the former Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak in the Arab Spring of 2010-12. On the way to Tel Aviv the driver suddenly stopped the vehicle to show two Iranian built *Fajr* and *Kassam* rockets from Gaza aimed at the Israeli port city of Ashdod. These were intercepted mid-air by the Israeli Iron Dome system. Earlier, while travelling from Jerusalem to Eilat plenty of reservists, recalled for duty, came to notice on the roads. They were journeying to their camps. One got up into the vehicle I was riding near the Dead Sea. He got dropped at Timna in the Negev desert near the ancient copper mines of King Solomon. I saw tension in Jerusalem also where mounted police and Army detachments appeared immediately after the rocket-war started. One evening I saw a demonstration by about 200 people

near the Israeli Prime Minister's residence. These demonstrators appeared to be much more disciplined compared to those in our country.

In Nazareth, where Jesus Christ spent 30 years of his early life, the population pattern is similar to that of Bethlehem. Here also tension is high mainly because the Arab Muslim majority resent Israeli dominance. The more recent cause of unhappiness stems from the Muslims' inability to build a mosque in a plot of vacant land, which the Muslims own, since the land is situated in front of the Chruch of Annunciation. The Christians objected to it. Even the Pope of Rome personally intervened. I have seen the tension in the other towns and cities of Israel. I have talked to a large cross section of people. The Arabs specially are very talkative. They give vent to their feelings in words and limb movements like Indians. During lunch in a Nazareth restaurant one very polite and suave Arab Muslim young man suddenly became angry and replied sharply when I asked him about the situation in Israel. He said that there was no Israel. The entire area belonged to Palestine. In his opinion the Jews should be pushed back into the sea. That is the depth of Muslim hatred against the Jews. The Jews reciprocate in the same measure.

In my understanding, the main issue is that of ownership of land. The Jews came back after 2000 years to re-claim their 'homeland' nearly 4000 years after "God had made a sacred covenant" with the Jew Patriarchs, as mentioned earlier. The Jews believe that Jehovah (God) told Abraham "that his were the chosen people, the people whom God had adopted" and that "during the time of Moses, in around 1200 BCE, the Jewish people escaped from slavery in Egypt to their promised land, Canaan, later to become Palestine".[4] This is the same region where the Arab Muslims had established themselves during the past 1500 years by defending their land through the Crusades and other warfares and conflicts. The surprising thing is that in the twentieth century the Jews could dispossess and displace millions of Arabs from their homes and hearths on the basis of such an imagined 'covenant' of a 'promised land'. More than a million of such Arabs are even now living in refugee camps for the past 64 years in different countries including Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Egypt and rump Palestine. They have become permanent in these camps and have given up all hope of rehabilitation. Meanwhile, as has been already stated, the Jews have also forcibly occupied Arab lands to implant 'settlements' for their brethren coming from different countries. The Arabs have all along objected to such 'settlements' and demanded their removal. The Jews have refused to oblige. This has led to numerous conflicts and

wars. To quote Roberts 'victims for centuries, the Jews in their turn are now seen by Arabs as persecutors'[1] Moreover, there are similarities between the situation in Israel and Palestine on the one hand and in Sikkim, Tripura and Assam (particularly in the BTAD areas) on the other in regard to demographic changes leading to shift of political power.

Observing the present situation, I could not help feeling that poverty and unemployment among the Arabs are two of the major hurdles in achieving peace. As in the case of Assam, in Palestine also the poor and the unemployed youths provide the reservoir for recruitment by the extremist outfits. They recruit the youth, even children. In the Gaza wing, for example, 40 percent of the population is under the age of 14. They have no gainful employment in sight nor any vision for a better future. These children constantly live with death, destruction, war and chaos. They can be easily lured for insurgent activities.

Meanwhile, the rise of Islamist fundamentalism in the countries of the Middle East and Africa, particularly after the Arab Spring of 2010-12, has emboldened the Islamist politico-terrorist outfits of both West Bank and Gaza wings of Palestine. Hamas, for example, was established in 1988 with two 'core' objectives: to re-organise "Palestine society in accordance with the Koranic Sharia law and the Sunna" and the "eradication of the state of Israel". Hamas views Israel "as a Zionist entity– a foreign occupier of Islamic lands". Incidentally, Hamas is an acronym meaning "Islamic Resistance Movement". Hamas now rules in Gaza. As has been already mentioned, there is no geographical linkage or continuity between West Bank and Gaza. The political unity and cohesion of Palestine has also been lost after Hamas took over in Gaza in 2007.

The political party which rules in West Bank, called Fatah, officially "acknowledges Israel's existence" and believes in non-violent methods. However, it is totally opposed to Israeli dominance over Palestine. The President of Palestine, Mahmoud Abbas, belongs to the Fatah party. He lives and works in Ramallah in West Bank. The Prime Minister of Palestine, Ismail Haniya, belongs to the Hamas party. He lives and works in Gaza. But in West Bank there is another Prime Minister named Salam Fayyad. I may mention that there are other extremist organizations active in Palestine such as the Islamic Jihad and the various Salafist groups who have more extremist agenda than Fatah or Hamas.

Looking at the economic situation I find that the Jews have transformed Israel during the past 64 years. Israel now has a per capita

income of US$ 31,985 against USA's US$ 43,017 and India's only US$ 3,468. Israel's Human Development Index is very high being 0.936 against 0.956 of USA and only 0.612 of India. In education, in scientific research and in health care Israel is far ahead of most advanced countries. Israel is a member of OECD, the rich man's club, which admit only prosperous countries of the world as its members. Many Jews have won the Nobel Prize in many different countries including 10 in Israel itself. The Jews can count many scientists including, of course, Albert Einstein as their kin. Similar is the case with artists, painters, musicians and litterateurs. It has been well said that the main reasons for the achievements are the 'Jews' determination to continue to survive and overcome actual and perceived difficulties in their host-lands, their painful memories of historical deprivation and persecution, family and communal support and encouragement, a strong emphasis on education within their families and communities (education being a precondition for economic progress), and existence of Jewish communal and international networks and systems of communications".[2] The Jews do not want to lose their economic advantage by including the poor Arabs in their country. Nor do they want the Arabs to tilt the political and demographic balance in Israel by such inclusion. That is why the Jews want Palestine continue to remain as a separate country but under the hegemony of Israel. How can the Arabs countenance this?

In the present crisis the Jews seem to pin their hopes on two options. The first option is "to restore deterrence, significantly reduce arms-smuggling into Gaza and achieve a cease fire that postpones as long as possible the inevitable next round of violence".[10] They realize, however, that this option will not bring permanent peace. The second option is to oust Hamas and bring in the other political party– Fatah to power in the whole of Palestine because Fatah officially "acknowledges Israel's existence" and believes in non-violent methods. I noticed considerable differences of approach towards national issues between Hamas and Fatah. I also felt that since they function in different and distinct wings of Palestine it is easy for the Jews to drive a wedge between the two.

The Jews have another difficulty. To my Indian eyes this ancient race seems to be riddled with a worse caste system than the Hindus. Decades ago, reading the all time best-seller, *The Source*, by James A Michener, I became aware about the existence of this caste system. According to Michener the position is so bad that "between Ashkenazi and Sephardim there was little social contact and few marriages, that good places in the medical schools went always to the Ashkenazi, that business, law and newspapering, cabinet positions all were reserved for the other group". [11] I may mention that Ashkenazis came from Central Europe and Sephardims came from Portugal, Spain and North Africa. The Falasha came from Ethiopia. When the Jews started migrating into the British Mandate area in the early twentieth century, the white-skinned and rich ones came from Europe and America. The black skinned and poor ones came from Africa and the Middle East. They never mixed and remained separate. There were about 7,000 Jews in Mizoram. All of them were not allowed to enter Israel in the beginning. Only in 2012 they got settled in Israel. But they have to live in conflict-ridden areas in the borders. The white Ashkenazi Jews rule Israel. The position has not changed for centuries. In the cities, particularly in the metropolitan city of Tel Aviv, the blacks live in separate streets and houses. If even some white Jews are looked down upon the Arabs cannot expect any better treatment at the hands of the Ashkenazi Jews. Therefore, looking closely at the social scenario I felt that it would be too much to expect that there would be any reconciliation in the near future between the Jews and the Arabs. The caste system and the superiority complex of the Ashkenazi will stand as a stumbling block in the path of unity and peace.

I noticed an editorial in an Israeli newspaper which concluded as follows: "Unfortunately, it is too much to expect that Gaza's Hamas Government will redirect its efforts and energies from terrorizing Israelis to bettering the lives of the 1.6 million people living under its leadership" [10] To my mind this statement succinctly sums up the attitude of all Jews towards the Arabs. I wonder what will the answer of the Jew intelligentsia be if I asked the question: Why the Israeli Government is not doing anything for the advancement of the Arabs? And, why instead they are doing everything possible to see that the Arabs remain poor?

Political developments since the Gaza War have significant indications for the future of the Israel-Palestine region. In the Gaza Strip of Palestine, for example, the ruling extremist political party-Hamas-got a morale boost by showing that it could smuggle in hundreds of Iranian made *Fajir* and *Kassam* rockets and use them against Israel in spite of strict Israeli air and naval blockades and ground surveillance.

In the other wing of Palestine– West Bank– the Palestine Authority President and Fatah Party leader Mahmoud Abbas succeeded in getting

the United Nations' approval to "Observer State Status" to his country by a thumping majority of votes in the General Assembly. As has been already mentioned India was one of the countries which sponsored the proposal. Huge crowds in the Palestinian capital city of Ramallah celebrated their victory. These developments appear to have sinister portents for the future of the Middle East. The Arabs will now follow up their 'victory' with political and military actions. It is the military action which might lead to another conflagration and the consequent misery to the people. The Israelis will not keep quiet but will try to strengthen their military control over West Bank and their economic blockade of Gaza. What is more dangerous is that neither Israel nor Palestine has an agenda for ending the conflict and achieving peace. Their respective objectives are such that it is difficult to identify common grounds and to suggest a way out of the imbroglio.

One silver lining, however, has been the result of the January, 2013 General Elections in Israel, when the centrist Yesh Atid Party, under the charismatic leadership of the former television-presenter Yair Lapid, won 19 seats out of 120 in the Knesset, sufficient to influence policies now that the Yesh Atid party has joined the coalition government. This party is demanding that "the stalled peace talks with the Palestinians must resume". They are also opposed to the construction of more settlements particularly in the El stretch of West Bank and East Jerusalem. In January, 2013 a panel of the United Nations Human Rights Council has declared this type of settlements as illegal. The Yesh Atid party is also demanding that all Israelis must be treated as equal and the exemption from serving with the armed forces, given to Orthodox Jews, must be withdrawn. This will give a jolt to the caste discrimination now practiced in Israel. When President Barack Obama of USA visited Ramallah on March 21, 2013 he averred that his country was "deeply committed" to the creation of an "independent, sovereign State of Palestine". He further elaborated that "put simply, Palestinians deserve a State of their own". This he said in a Press conference with the Palestine President Mahmood Abbas. This is another good sign. The international community's earlier perception was that the USA always supported Israel as evidenced recently by its vote against Palestine in the UN General Assembly. All these and the conciliatory policies espoused by Fatah should enable the United Nations to make an approach towards a solution to this vexed problem.

Notes and References:

The references on the history of the Middle East are prolific. But I have mainly consulted the following:-

1. Roberts, J.M, *History of the World*, Helicon, Oxford, 1992.
2. Internet.
3. *The Guinness Book of Answers*, Guinness Publishing Co., Enfield, UK, 1989.
4. Kate Santon and Liz McKay, Edited, *Atlas of World History*, Parragon, Bath, U.K. 2011.
5. About PLO and the other insurgent outfits of Israel and Palestine the following books were found helpful:
   * Neil C. Livingstone and David Halevy, I*nside the PLO*, William Morrow & Co. Inc., New York, 1990.
   * Victor Ostrovsky and Claire Hoy, *By Way of Deception*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1990.
   * Yosi Melman, *The Master Terrorist*. This is the story of Abu Nidal aka Sabri al-Banna, Avon Books, New York, 1986.
6. *The Jordan Times*, November 21, 2012, Amman. Alistair Lyon is the political analyst of this daily English Newspaper.
7. Indian Media Reports.
8. Dominique Lapierre and Larry Collins, *O Jerusalem*, Reprint of Revised Edition, Vikash Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., Noida, 2012.
9. Media reports and numerous political brochures published in Israel, Jordan and Palestine.
10. Editorial in the *Jerusalem Post* dated November 21, 2012.
11. James A. Michener, *The Source*, Fawcertt Books, New York, 1965.

India: The Discourse on Integration, Related Issues and Challenges

B.B. Kumar*

Our discourse on 'National Integration' in post-Independence India, and the related issues and challenges, is often shrouded in confusion and haziness. Myths and misinterpretations of our history, culture and religion abound even after independence. This is precisely because of the multiple lack syndromes of our scholarship, which continues to be basically colonial and Marxist; it dogmatically resists change in old perceptions. This is because the British believed, as Churchil once said, that 'The empires of the future are the empires of the mind.'[1] Macaulay planned the battle of mind, at least a century earlier, than the above statement of Churchil.

Macaulay, in his address to British Parliament on 2 February, 1835, revealed the Indian opulence and high morals. He said: 'I have traveled across the length and breadth of India and have not seen one person who is a beggar, who is a thief. Such wealth I have seen in this country, such high moral values.'

Then he proposes to break Spiritual and Cultural Backbone of the country and says: 'People of such calibre, that I never think we would ever conquer this country, unless we break the very backbone of this nation, which is her spiritual and cultural heritage, and, therefore, I propose that we replace her old and ancient education system, her culture, for if the Indians think that all that is foreign and English is good and greater than their own, they will lose their self esteem, their native culture and they will become what we want them, a truly dominated nation.'[2]

He further said: 'We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern—

—————————————
*Editor, *Dialogue* (English) and *Chintan-Srijan* (Hindi).

a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and intellect.'

Accordingly, the planned distortions and myth-making was initiated; the colonial education through English medium was initiated by the British government of India, which continues even today. Distorted version of Indian history was prepared and taught. Max Mueller's remarks about the Mill's *History of British India*, recommended for study for the candidates of Indian Civil Service, shall be an eye-opener. He writes:

'The book which I consider most mischievous, nay, which I hold most responsible for some of the greatest misfortunes that had happened to India, is Mill's *History of British India*, even with the antidote against its poison, which is supplied by Professor Wilson's notes.'[3]

While even a colonial, like Macaulay, saw both positives and negatives in India, there were many, such as Miss Mayo, author of *Mother India*, and Charles Grant, a missionary, who saw only the negatives. For Grant, India was backward, depraved, wretched and amoral, as it was Hindu and not Christian. The Missionaries in India wanted complete liberty to denigrate Hinduism and convert India to Christianity. Grant writes: 'In the worst parts of Europe, there are no doubt a great number of men who are sincere, upright and conscientious. In Bengal, a man of real veracity and integrity is a great phenomenon; one conscientious in whole of his conduct, is to be feared, is an unknown character … Power entrusted to a native of Hindoostan seldom fails to be exercised tyrannically, or perverted to the purpose of injustice. Official or ministerial employment of all sorts, in all gradations is generally used as means of peculation… The distribution of justice… has generally become a traffic in venality; the best cause being obliged to pay for success and worst having the opportunity of purchasing it … Such is the power of money, that no crime is more frequent, hardly any less thought of, than perjury… The apathy, with which a Hindu views all persons and interests unconnected with himself, is such as excites the indignations of Europeans. Patriotism is absolutely unknown in Hindoostan.'[4]

The paper attempts to expose such empty statements; it tries to clear myths, which is necessary to remove our confusion, which is essential for national integration.

The British were a microscopic minority in India. For that, they needed: (i) Indian intermediaries to help them in governing this vast country; they introduced colonial system of education to produce them;

(ii) they needed to weaken this country by dividing it socially; followed the policy of 'divide and rule'; they divided Hindus and Muslims, Aryans and Dravidians, Hills and plains, British India and Princely States, and promoted similar divisions.

The British summoned European and Indian Scholarship in Service of the Empire. They churned out myths, misinterpreted and denigrated our history, culture, religion and traditions. Indology, anthropology and other social sciences in India, basically, developed as colonial disciplines. Even Indian history was given colonial orientation. The Indians with colonial education, Indian Marxists and the missionaries were the willing partners in this nefarious game. It needs mention that Marx praised British colonialism. The net result was that the Indians lost self-image. They started viewing themselves, their nation, their society with borrowed eyes/ borrowed vision. In this perspective it is essential to know about the realities of British colonialism to enable Indians to guard themselves from emotional divide and consequent disintegration of the society and the nation. By this kind of knowledge input, the change in fossilized colonial system shall become easier.

Fossilized Colonial System

In this country, the education system, judiciary, everything was adopted without trying to put the Indian originality into it. The leftovers of the colonial period, education system, judiciary, system of policing in India, colonial system of administration, etc. tenaciously persists. The colonial myths persist. The latest discoveries say that Aryan Aggression Theory is a myth. It is still taught in the schools and colleges. We are creating clones in this country who have lost roots. The outdated pattern of westernized education produces brightests students, but without much grounding in our own culture. Our intellectuals go on parroting the negatives discovered or fabricated by the British, forget to talk about positive developments. When the British came, Dalits were not poverty-stricken. They could proudly say, 'we make shoes, we are also the soldiers. They forget the fact that crores of Hindus mingle everyday in factories, mines, trains, trams, schools, colleges, market places, offices, etc. without enquiring about their castes and yet talk about untouchability.

The sponsored studies on Indian scriptures were undertaken with the sole motive of the conversion of Hindus to Christianity. Keeping in view of the colonial interest, the Indian history was distorted; it was given Euro- and Middle-east centric orientation, and it was attempted to credit others for its intellectual achievements. The Indians were labelled as barbaric invaders; their history became mythology.[5] Apart from the bias against India, the poor quality of European scholarship also was responsible for the harm. The severe criticism of Professor Goldstucker of the massive Sanskrit –German Dictionary of St. Petersberg, written by Rudolf Roth and Otto Bothlingk, enraged A. Weber to use abusive language against Goldstucker. This forced Goldstucker to reluctantly expose the conspiracy of Bothlingk, Roth, Weber and Kuhn, thus:

'It will, of course, be my duty to show, at the earliest opportunity, that Dr. Bothlingk is incapable of understanding even easy rules of Panini, much less those of Katyayana and still less capable of making use of them in the understanding of classical texts. The errors in the department of his dictionary are so numerous … that it will fill every serious Sanskritist with dismay, when he calculates the mischevious influence which they must exercise on the study of Sanskrit philology.'

He further remarked: 'Questions which, in my mind, ought to be decided with very utmost circumspection, and which could not be decided without very laborious research have been trifled within his Worterbuch in the most unwarranted manner.'[6]

Compelled by the unjustified attack on the Vedic tradition, he criticized the mischevious propagandists camouflaged as critical scholars: 'When I see that most distinguished and the most learned Hindu scholars and divines – the most valuable and some times the only source of all our knowledge about ancient India are scorned in theory, mutilated in print, and as a consequence, set aside in the interpretation of Vaidika texts; …When a clique of Sanskritists of this description vapours about giving us the sense of the Vedas as it existed at the commencement of Hindu antiquity; — when I consider that this method of studying Sanskrit philology is pursued by those whose words apparently derive weight and influence from the professional positions they hold; … then I hold that it would be want of courage and a dereliction of duty, if I did not make a stand against these Saturnalia of Sanskrit philology.'[7]

Here, it needs mention that the knowledge of Western Sanskrit scholars was not as perfect as is usually believed. In many cases, the Indian *pandits*, who helped the Westerners, themselves lacked proper knowledge of the language.[8] The saddest part of the story is that certain avarious Sanskrit scholars of Indian origin did not lag behind in the nefarious act of distortion of Indian history and culture.[9]

India, during colonial period, lived under immense physical and psychological pressure. The country, as will be discussed in this paper, was thoroughly robbed and pauperized; illiteracy increased many times after the arrival of the British. Traditional education system was destroyed.[10] The colonial education produced a disproportionately influential class, who blindly believed in what the British said about their country and society; they continue to do so even today. They define their country and society in western categories; conceive it in western parameters. The Western academic studies of India either discover or create new fault-lines; they intensify the existing ones. Our intellectuals blindly follow the Western academics and continue to act as their partners in India deconstruction brigade.

India: The Colonial Perception of Divided Entity

India, according to British colonial scholars, was an imaginary State, a British colonial administrative construct, a geographic entity, or at best, a Nation in making. Prior to 1857 AD, the British colonial emphasis was on (i) expansion and consolidation of their empire in India, and (ii) conversion of Indians to Christianity. After 1857, the policy of 'divide and rule' was followed with greater vigour. The colonial perception to depict India as a divided and confused entity consisting of diverse castes, tribes, races, languages, dialects, regions, religions, sects, cultures, rituals, food habits, dresses, etc., and the British empire as the only uniting factor was advanced by Alfred Lyall, a British colonial functionary. Accordingly, studies were sponsored to highlight our differences; monographs on castes and tribes, District Gazetteers, Census Studies, Linguistic and Ethnographic Surveys, etc., were commissioned; Lyall played important role in the implementation of the same. These studies promoted racist and isolationist theories, core-fringe conflict, myth of mainstream, etc.[11] The Census of India played active role in promoting caste-tribe divide and Hindu and tribal religion divide, ignoring overall cultural, religious and ethnic continuum in Indian society.[12] Fully conscious of the fact that imperialism thrived on divisions, the policy-planners sponsored scholarship with colonial inspirations, which sowed differences wherever non-existent; created myths; it ignored fundamental unity, laid overemphasis on accidental differences. The functional distinctions became more important, rather than the fundamental ones. Obviously, deeper ideation was essential to bring the desired positive change, which this country lacks even after sixty-seven years of independence. Needless to say that the colonial image of India countered its self-image.

India: The Self-image

Contrary to what the colonial scholarship depicted, India was a well-defined geographical and political unit since the remotest past. The term *Bharatavarsha* was used in both wider and narrower sense in our classical literature. In wider sense, as depicted in the *Puranas*, it was Greater India stretching from the Central Asia through India proper to South-East Asia, including the Indian Ocean Islands.[13] India proper, however, was often called Kumara dvipa/Kumari dvipa or Bharatakhanda, or simply, Bharata.[14] The part of India east of Brahmaputra River, according to Vayu Purana, was called Indradvipa.[15] Kalidas describes India with Himalaya in the north, and with girdle of hills and mountains, and sea all around. All the foreign scholars or travellers, whether Herodotus, Megasthenese, Pliny, Fa-Hian, Hiuen Tsang, Al-Baruni or Ibn-Batuta or others, were equally conscious of the political India and its geographical spread, and thus confirmed its self-image. Hiuen Tsang was under no illusion that he was visiting a part of India when he visited Kamarupa on the invitation of Bhaskaravarman, who was called the 'ruler of Eastern India' in the contemporary history of China.[16] The civilization of Chinese Turkistan up to tenth century A.D., as P.C. Bagchi writes: 'was also mainly derived from India and Iran. This is why this region was called "Indo-European oases" by some scholars. The late Sir Aurel Stein, that indefatigable explorer of Central Asia region, preferred the name Ser-India which the ancient Greeks had used. The use of this name has greatest justification for the simple reason that both China and India played a dominant role in shaping the civilization of that area.'[17] Herodotus seems to speak of all that area as a part of India.[18] Again, South-East Asia was labelled as 'Greater India' by the European scholars. Obviously, in the past, the political boundaries of India Afghanistan, Nepal and Khotan of Xinjiang remained part of India during Ashoka's reign and even for centuries after that. Obviously, the political boundary of India extended far beyond its present day political boundary of the country. In terms of the chronological antiquity, India is an ancient nation. There is no dark age in Indian history; the recent archaeological excavations push back its history at least up to 7500 BCE.[19]

The political power operation was allowed in India at different levels. There were regional, and even sub-regional, power centres. At the grass-roots level, the villages were running their own affairs. However, all such arrangements, and the diffusion of power, did not obliterate the overall vision of India. This vision is expressed in the 'Sutra of the Golden Light':

"When the eighty-four thousand States are contented with their territories, they will not attack one another or raise mutual strife. When all these kings think of their mutual welfare and feel mutual affection and joy, contented in their own dominions, India will be prosperous, well-fed, pleasant and populous. The earth will be fertile, and the months and the seasons and the years will all occur at the proper time …. And all living beings will be rich with all manners of riches and corn, very prosperous but not covetous."[20]

In India, while there was diffusion of power at the village level, as stated above, at the higher level, the political power was concentrated in the hands of the *Chakravarti* or *Sarvabhauma* monarchs, who used to perform *Ashvamedh* or *Rajasuya yajnas* and thereby got recognized as the all-India rulers, or even the rulers of the known world (*Sarvabhauma*).

Forces/Networks at Work to Disintegrate India

Presently, three global networks with well-established operating bases inside India are actively working to undermine the integrity of India, which are: (i) Islamic radicalism having linkages with Pakistan; (ii) Maoist/Marxist radicalism, and (iii) Dravidian and Dalit identity separatism being fostered by the West in the name of human rights. These networks are using all the materials – colonial theories, myths, propaganda materials, etc. – the colonial period even today to create faultiness and cleavage to break the society and eventually to disintegrate the nation.[21]

Marxist Support to the Forces/Networks of Disintegration

Marxist support to all kinds of secessionist forces is a well-known phenomenon. Communist Party of India supported the creation of Pakistan; it accepted the rights of the nationalities to secede. The secessionist movement in Manipur was initiated by Irabot Singh, who was a communist. NSCN (National Socialist Council of Nagaland) and ULFA (United Liberation Front of Assam) believe in Marxism. The Naxalites support the secession of Kashmir, Nagaland, etc. Many more such cases may be cited. The fact is that Marx, himself was the greatest supporter of the British rule in India. He wrote:

'The question, therefore, is not whether England had a right to conquer India, but whether we are to prefer India conquered by the Turk, by the Persian, by the Russian, to the India conquered by the Briton.

England has to fulfil a double mission in India – one destructive, the other regenerating – the annihilation of old Asiatic society, and laying of the material foundations of Western society in Asia'[22]

Marx wanted Christianity to replace Hinduism; he criticized British for not facilitating the same. He was stupid enough and thoroughly ignorant about Hinduism to believe that famous Jagannath Temple was mainly a centre of murder and prostitution. He wrote: 'did they (the British), who combated the French revolution under the pretext of defending "our holy religion", not forbid at the same time, Christianity to be propagated in India, and did they not, in order to make money out of the pilgrims streaming to the temples in Orissa and Bengal, take up the trade in the murder and prostitution perpetrated in the temple of Juggernaut?'[23]

Marx, contrary to the fact that India and China remained the richest country of the world, as discussed below, foolishly believed the Asiatic mode of production to be primitive. Anyway, the fact remains that the Marxists in India exert disproportionate influence in academia, media and public life, and are pillar of strength for the destabilizing elements in India.

Weaknesses in Countering Disintegrating Forces/Networks

The greatest hurdle and the weakness in countering the forces of disintegration in India lies in the fact that there is hardly any attempt to defeat them on an intellectual ideational plane, which is essential for defeating any ideology.[24] The discourse on the problems often goes out of track. As for example, while discussing Naxalism, people often start talking about non-delivery and non-governance, as if Naxalites are fighting for development and governance. The Indian scholarship is politicized, and at the same time, co-opted by the Euro-American Academia.

Colonial Myths and the Realities

As we know, many of our national problems stem from the uncritical acceptance of the colonial myths. The root cause of the secessionism in the North-East is the myth of isolation, myth of hegemony, mainstream and core-fringe conflict, and the racist interpretation of the society. The root cause of the ethnic conflict is the uncritical acceptance of so-called Aryan Aggression (now Aryan Migration) Theory, which is disproved on scientific ground.[25] Colonial exploitation, rather than the

internal factors, as discussed below, were responsible for the pauperization, illiteracy and lack of education in India. There was no dark age in Indian history; we had older civilization than the middle-east or Europe. British assumption of 'white man's burden' and their morality claim while running the affairs of British India was absolutely baseless, which the succeeding paragraphs will reveal.

World's Richest Country When the British Arrived

India, when the British appeared on the scene, was the richest country of the world; it was also a highly educated country. India was the wealthiest country of the world even during the end of the Mughal rule. As Will Durant rightly asserts 'it was the wealth of eighteenth century India which attracted the commercial pirates of England and France.'[26]

Sunderland also informs us about the wealth of India:

'This wealth was created by the Hindus' vast and varied industries. Nearly every kind of manufacture or product known to the civilized world—nearly every kind of creation of man's brain and hand, existing anywhere, and prized either for its utility or beauty—had long, long been produced in India. India was a far greater industrial and manufacturing nation than any in Europe or than any other in Asia. Her textile goods—the fine products of her looms in cotton, wool, linen and silk—were famous over the civilized world; so were her exquisite jewelry and her precious stones cut in every lovely form; so were her pottery, porcelains, ceramics of every kind, quality, colour and beautiful shape; so were her fine works in metal—iron, steel, silver and gold. She had great architecture—equal to beauty to any in the world. She had great engineering works. She had great merchants, great businessmen, great bankers and financiers. Not only was she the greatest ship-building nation, but she had great commerce and trade by land and sea which extended to all known civilized countries. Such was the India which the British found when they came.'[27]

Even Robert Clive, who defeated the Nawab of Bengal at Plassey, who accepted huge bribes/ "presents"/tributes from the rulers, said thus about the riches of the country. He said: 'When I think of the *marvelous riches* of that country, and the comparatively small part which I took away, I am astonished at my own moderation.'[28]

Angus Maddison, in his *The World Economy – A Millennial Perspective*, has worked out the share of India, China and other countries of world during the last two thousand years. According to the same, the share of India, China and Western Europe in the world economy was 32.9 per cent, 26.2 per cent and 10.8 per cent respectively in 0 CE. During 1000 CE, the figures for these countries/regions were 28.9 per cent, 22.7 per cent and 8.7 per cent respectively. The position of India slipped to second position in 1500 CE with India (24.5 per cent) and China (25 per cent). During 1700 CE, however, India regained its first position with world GDP share of 24.4 per cent. The economy of Western Europe (22.5 per cent), China (22.3per cent), UK (2.9 per cent), Africa (6.6 per cent) and US (0.1 per cent) followed. After that the position of India sharply declined. During 1950 CE, hardly a couple of years after the British left India was among the poorest countries of the world with world GDP share of 4.2 per cent. The GDP share of the US, Western Europe, UK, China and Africa during that year was 27.3 per cent, 26.3 per cent, 6.5 per cent, 4.5 per cent and 3.6 per cent respectively.[29]

Strength of the Economy

The strength of the Indian economy was due to healthy combination of the agriculture and industry. The Indian handicrafts maintained millions of skilled artisans. The trade and industries generated wealth. The British systematically destroyed them, and naturally, its economy.

Destruction of Indian Economy

Destruction of Indian economy started just after the assumption of *Diwani* of Bengal by East India Company. It started with the plunder, receipt of huge bribes by Clive and his men. The Indian trade and industry was systematically destroyed with tariffs and control; agriculture and land by excessive taxation. Land taxes were increased many fold breaking the backbone of agriculture; so that two-third of the population of the provinces under Company fled.[30] This happened soon after the assumption of *Diwani* of Bengal by the East India Company.

The destruction of the economy was further caused due to the huge drain of resources from India to Britain in various ways, such as the excessive exports in comparison of the imports. The British employees in India remitted their earnings to England. British maintained an army in India at the cost of this pauperized country and thereby further starved it. The British Indian Army, maintained by Indian taxes, not only fought fratricidal war to enslave this country, but also for the

expansion and protection of the empire elsewhere. Even the development oriented expenditure in India, such as for railway construction, as mentioned elsewhere, did not serve the economy of this country.

Destruction of Indian Trade and Industry

The plunder, which Clive started, continued even after he left. And what happened to the richest province of India after the British control? Macaulay writes: 'During the five years which followed the departure of Clive from Bengal, the misgovernment of the British was carried to such a point as seemed incompatible with the existence of the society … The servants of the company… forced the natives to buy dear and to sell cheap… Enormous fortunes were thus rapidly accumulated at Calcutta, while thirty millions of human beings were reduced to the extremity of wretchedness."[31]

The situation was not better elsewhere. The same story of mal-administration, extreme exploitation and utter pauperization was repeated wherever the British control was extended in India. James Mill, writing about Oudh and Karnatak under British rule, was of the opinion that 'two of the noblest provinces of India, were, by misgovernment, plunged into a state of wretchedness with which … hardly any part of the earth has anything to compare.'[32]

The situation remained always deplorable. A report of an investigating committee of the House of Commons, in as early as 1804, said: 'It must give pain to an Englishman to think that since the accession of the Company the condition of the people of India has been worse than before.'[33] 'Under no Government whatever, Hindu or Mohammedan, professing to be actuated by law, was any system so suppressive of the prosperity of the people at large as that which has marked our administration.'[34]

The fact exposed by a British administrator in Bengal to the House of Commons in 1857 was even more damaging: 'The fundamental principle of the English has been to make the whole Indian nation subservient in every possible way, to the interests and benefits of themselves. They have been taxed to the utmost limit; every successive province, as it has fallen into our possession, has been made a field for higher exaction; and it has always been our boast how greatly we have raised the revenue above that which the native rulers were able to extort. The Indians have been excluded from every honour, dignity or office which the lowest Englishman could be prevailed upon to accept.'[35]

Policy to Convert India into Purely Agricultural Country

Will Durant has observed that the English in India objected to the competition of their domestic industry with that of India and 'resolved that India should be reduced to a purely agricultural country, and be forced in consequence to become a vast market for British machine-made goods. The Directors of the East India Company gave orders that the production of raw silk should be encouraged and the manufacture of silk fabrics discouraged; that silk-winders should be compelled to work in Company's factories, and be prohibited under severe penalties, from working outside.[36] The British Parliament discussed ways and means of replacing Indian by British industries. The export of Indian textiles into free trade England was discouraged by placing a tariff of 70-80 per cent, whereas English textiles was imported and sold in India almost duty-free. To further kill the Indian textile industry, an excise tax was levied on Indian textile goods.[37]

R.C. Dutt cites the opinion of a British historian highlighting the injustice: 'It is a melancholy instance of the wrong done to India by the country on which she has become dependent. Had India been independent, she would have retaliated, would have imposed prohibitive duties on British goods, and would thus have preserved her own productive industry from annihilation. This act of self-defense was not permitted to her; she was at the mercy of the stranger. The British goods were forced upon her without paying any duty, and the foreign manufacturer employed the arm of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have contended on equal terms.'[38]

Martin Montgomery sums up the situation thus: 'We have done everything possible to impoverish still further the miserable beings subject to the cruel selfishness of English commerce. Under the pressure of free trade, England has compelled the Hindus to receive the products of the steam-looms of Lancashire, Yorkshire, Glasgow, etc., at merely nominal duties; while the hand wrought manufactures of Bengal and Behar, beautiful in fabric and durable in wear, have heavy and almost prohibitive duties imposed on their importation into England.'[39]

To avoid further competition, mineral wealth of India was not explored. British monopolized sea trade also. Indians were neither permitted to build ships, which used to provide employment to thousands in the past[40], nor to organize a merchant marine of their own.[41] As the development of the country was forcibly arrested, India became rural hinterland of industrial England.[42] Kuhn observed: 'India was transformed

into purely agricultural country, and her people lived perpetually on the verge of starvation' under the British rule.[43] The end result was devastating, as Will Durant Observes: 'The vast population which might have been comfortably supported by a combination of tillage and industry, became too great for the arid soil; and India was reduced to such penury that today nothing is left of her men, her women and her children but empty stomachs and fleshless bones.'[44]

Destruction of Community-maintained Indigenous Education

The British, during the early period of their rule conducted surveys in the Madras and Bombay presidencies to ascertain the state of indigenous education. Madras Report by the Governor, Sir Thomas Munro, was very extensive. *Survey of Indigenous Education in the Province of Bombay* was equally extensive. *A Report on the State of Education in Bengal* was an unofficial report by W. Adam, published in three parts during 1835, 1836 and 1838. Punjab came late under British rule in 1849. A Report by G.W. Leitner, the Principal of the Government College, Lahore, and sometime the Director of Public Instruction, Punjab, was published under the title *History of the Indigenous education in the Punjab since Annexation and in 1882*. Eminent Gandhian scholar, Dharmapal, basing on these surveys and reports and the data collected from British and Indian archives, wrote *The Beautiful Tree: Indigenous Indian Education in the Eighteenth Century*. These studies bring out realities of the status of education in India during British Raj.[45]

According to these studies, education was widespread in India. Practically every village in India had one or more school when the British arrived on the scene. According to Adam's reports, there were then atleast one lakh schools in Bihar and Bengal, whereas the number of villages at that time was 150784. On an average, these States had one school for every 63 students. As the study indicated, even very poor families also used to send their children to the schools. According to Governor Munro, there was possibility of at least one school in every village in the Madras Presidency. He estimated that one third of the children of the presidency were receiving education, out of which one fourth were really attending the schools. Girls used to get education mostly at home. According to G.L. Prendergast, a senior officer of the Bombay Presidency, even a small village of the presidency during 1820 had a school and bigger villages had more than one. Leitner mentions that almost every village of Punjab had a school when the British occupation took place in the State in 1850[46]

The situation drastically changed after the arrival of the British. According to an expert, when they came, there was, throughout India, a system of communal schools, managed by the village communities. The agents of the East India Company destroyed these village communities, and took no steps to replace the schools; even today, after a century of effort to restore them, they stand at only 66 per cent of their number a hundred year ago.[47] All the efforts resulted into establishment of 162,015 primary schools, whereas the number of villages, at that time, stood at 730,000.[48] Only 4 per cent of the children (7 per cent of the boys and 1.5 per cent of the girls) received education.[49] The tuition fee charged by such Government established schools loomed large to a family always hovering on the edge of starvation.[50] The bills, introduced by Gokhale in 1911 and Patel in 1916 for compulsory primary education in India, were defeated by the British and Government-appointed members.[51] The teachers were poorly paid. Upto the year 1921, the pay for primary school teachers in the Madras Presidency was only $24-36 a year. The expenditure of the British India Government on education was only eight cents per head per year,[52] whereas it spent eighty-three cents per head per year on army.[53] Even major part of that meagre sum, total of which was less than one-half the educational expenditure in New York State,[54] was spent on English medium secondary schools and universities, where, according to an American scholar, history, literature, customs and morals taught were English, and young Hindus, after striving amid poverty to prepare themselves for college, found that they had merely let themselves in for a ruthless process that aimed to de-nationalize and de-Indianize them, and turn them into imitative Englishmen.[55] Overall situation was so pathetic that the British India's increase in appropriation for the fratricidal army during quarter of a century, between 1882 to 1907, was 21.5 times more ($43,000,000) than that on education ($2,000,000[56]). The result was that this country lapsed into illiteracy and ignorance. The illiteracy increased to 93 per cent during the colonial rule of a century and half in India during 1920s.[57]

The facts, mentioned above, clearly expose the myth that the British brought with them education and enlightenment in India. The educational surveys and Dharmapal's study countered the myth, created by colonial scholars and missionaries, and propagated by Marxists that the Brahmins/*Dwijas* monopolizing education. These studies reveal that education in India was widespread; all sections of the society, including so-called Dalits, were benefited by the same as students and teachers.

In Madras Presidency, less than 25 per cent students attending traditional elementary and advanced institutions of learning were Brahmins, (the percentage in today's Tamil Nadu was still less); 48.8 per cent were Shudras and 15.7 per cent belonged to still lower castes, including untouchables. The percentage of Brahmin teachers was only 11 per cent in Bihar and Bengal, and that of Brahmin students was less than 25 per cent. Adam's Report disproved the Christian Missionary claim about the education of the Hindu lower castes. As his report shows, thirteen missionary schools of Burdwan had only one Chandal, three Dom and not even one Mochi student; the traditional schools had sixty, fifty-eight and sixteen students respectively of these communities.[58]

Myth of British Morality

The British and a large number of Indians products of colonial education often talk about the British morality in running the Indian affairs. Some unique cases of the bankruptcy of the British morality are cited below:

(i) Purchasing India from Indian cost: The British government took over the captured and plundered Indian territories as a Crown Colony by paying the East India Company handsomely. The purchase price was added to the public debt of India, to be redeemed, principal and interest (originally at 10.5 per cent) out of the taxes collected from the Indian people.[59]

(ii) Enslaving India at the Cost of Indian Blood and Resources (Taxes): India was not only forced to pay for the Army used for fighting fratricidal war in this country and enslaving her, but also for fighting Colonial Wars for the benefit of the British in Burma/Myanmar, Afghanistan, Africa, France, etc.; British fought one hundred eleven wars in India during nineteenth century alone, 'using for most part Indian troops' at Indian costs and blood to enslave India.[60] for which; the English congratulated themselves on conquering India without spending a cent.[61] India paid $45 crores for the 'wars fought for England outside of India with Indian troops' during the nineteenth century. India contributed $50 crores to the war chest of the Allies, $70 in subscription to the War loans, eight lakh soldiers, four lakh labourers to defend the British Empire outside of India during the First World War. This army of fratricide consumed 64 per cent of the total revenue of India in 1922. The empire, which was starving ten million Indians to death every year, was using its army at its cost to fight fratricidal war in Burma and to defend the empire on the fields of Flanders. No other army in the world consumed so large proportion of the public revenue.[62]

The same story was repeated during the Second World War. The drain became more acute after the creation of "Royal Indian Navy" with the intention of using it anywhere for the interest of the empire. During 1857, the British charged India with the cost not only of transporting them, maintaining them in India, and bringing them back home, but with their maintenance in Great Britain for six months before they sailed.[63]

(iii) The British introduced bonded labour and *beggar* in India[64]

(iv) Railways, irrigation projects and deforested agricultural lands only promoted British interests due to over-taxation. As traders interst was supreme, the greatest revenue from Indian Railways during pre-independence period was not from the transportation of goods, as in America, but from the third class passengers. While the companies gathered the gains, the losses were paid by the tax-payers.[65] While, it was hoped that the railways would solve the problem by enabling the rapid transport of food from unaffected to effected regions; the fact that the worst famines have come since the building of the railways proves the cause has not been the lack of transportation, not the failure of the monsoon rains (though this, of course, is the occasion), nor even over-population (which is a contributory factor); behind all these as the fundamental source of the terrible famines in India, lies such merciless exploitation, such unbalanced exportation of goods, and such brutal collection of high taxes in the very midst of famine, (48) that the starving peasants can not pay what is asked for the food that the railways bring them. American Charity has often paid for the relief of the famine in India while the Government was collecting taxes from the dying.[66]

(v) The Huge Drain on India Through Trade, Services and the Tributes: India suffered due to excessive surplus of exports over imports, which during the days of company, used to be even ten times and later on, it was found to be in the ratio of 3:1. The most striking part was that the British created a shameless myth that India, which was almost starved and made naked by their immoral plunder and mismanagement, imported gold and silver with the excess money. Another explanation provided in 1853 was that the difference was the tribute which Britain received from this country. A document privately addressed by the British Government in India to the British Parliament revealed other remittances to that country. It said: 'Great Britain, in addition to the tribute which she makes India pay her through the customs, derives benefits from the savings of the services of the three presidencies (the provinces of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay) being

spent in England instead of in India; and in addition to these savings, which probably amount to $500,000,000, she derives benefit from the fortunes realized by the European mercantile community, which are all remitted to England.'[67]

The fortunes, dividends and profits made in India were remitted to England. Not only every rupee of profit made by an Englishman was lost forever to India, but also the salaries and pensions earned in this country by them. There were about 7500 pensioners in England drawing $17,500,000 in pensions from the Indian revenue in the late 1930s. An Englishman serving in India was required to put 24 years of service, reduced by four years of furloughs, and then he was given generous pension for life. The officials usually sent their families or children to live in England with the funds derived from this country.[68] They mostly consumed goods purchased from abroad, except for perishable food items.[69] Two factors, related to employment of the officials by the British, which adversely effected Indian economy, need special mention. These were: (i) comparatively very high salary of the employees, especially the European ones; and (ii) employment of the British/ Europeans on the higher posts with higher salaries and perks, even when Indians of comparable or even higher abilities were available for the same. In reality, Indians were not employed on higher posts and were comparatively paid far less. This added to the drain of resources further from India to the England.

(vi) Contrary to the General Perception, Traditional Indian Rulers Used to Live Simple Life: They used to spend less on them. The situation changed after British take over. The case of the Maharana of Mewar is cited in this paper. The topmost officer of Tipu Sultan, the governor of Chitradurga, was getting only a hundred rupees per month. A labourer at that time was getting Rs. four a month. The English District Collector and the member of the Governor's Council started getting Rs.1500 and Rs.6000 to Rs.8000 respectively soon after that. On the other hand the wages of the labourers and the craftsmen fell to one-third or at best half in 1850 in comparison to that in 1760 in Karnataka.[70] This story was repeated throughout the country.

(vii) Industrial Revolution with the Stolen Fund of India: Edmund Burke, as early as in 1783, predicted that the annual drain of Indian resources to England without equivalent return would eventually destroy India.[71] As computed by Brooks Adam, the drain of India's wealth to England within fifty-seven years, between Plassey to Waterloo, was 2.5 to five billion dollars.[72] and it was this stolen wealth from India

supplied England with free capital for the development of mechanical inventions, and so made possible the Industrial Revolution.[73] As estimated by Dutt in 1901, one half of the net revenue of India flowed annually out of the country, never to return.[74]

(viii) India Became Land of Famines, Diseases and Death After the British Occupation: Ruthless exploitation and drain of resources converted India into the land of famines, diseases and death. R.C. Dutt says: 'So great an economic drain out of the resources of the land, would impoverish the most prosperous countries on earth; it has reduced India to a land of famines more frequent, more widespread and more fatal, than any known before in the history of India, or of the world.'[75] It needs mention that one-third of the Bengal's population died due to famine during 1769-71, soon after the establishment of the British rule. Francois Goutier observes: 'the greatest famine that happened in India was under the British rule. In 1947, there had been starvation. According to British statistics one million Indians died of famine during 1800-1825, 4 million Indians died between 1825-1850, 5 million between 1850 and 1875 and 15 million between 1875 and 1900. … 10 percent Indians died during the British rule.'[76] According to R.C. Dutt, 'there has never been a single year when the food supply of the country was insufficient for the people,'[77] and yet millions died of starvation. In this connection, the observation of Will Durant points to the naked reality:

(ix) High Death Rates after the British Rule: Death rate in India was shockingly very high during British rule. Half of the children born in Bengal used to die before attaining the age of eight. The infant mortality rate in Bombay in 1921 was as high as 666 per thousand. One-half of the death rates were preventable, according to a medical expert.[78] A Conscientious Englishman, H.M. Hyndman revealed the reality: 'Even as we look on, India is becoming feebler and feebler. The very life blood of the great multitude under our rule is slowly, yet ever faster ebbing away.'[79]

To sum up, it may be relevant to quote Sir Wilfred Seawen Blunt:

'India's famines have been severer and more frequent, its agricultural poverty has deepened, its rural population has more hopelessly in debt, their despair more desperate. The system of constantly enhancing the land values (i.e. raising the valuation and assessment) has not been altered. The salt tax…still robs the very poor. What was bad twenty-five years ago is worse now. At any rate there is the same drain of India's food to alien mouths. Endemic famines and endemic plagues are facts no official statistics can explain away. Though myself a good

Conservative…I own to being shocked at the bondage in which the Indian people are held;…and I have come to the conclusion that if we go on developing the country at the present rate, the inhabitants, sooner or later, will have to resort to cannibalism, for there will be nothing for them to eat.'[80]

(x) Social Evils: The British were responsible for many social evils in India such as drinking and opium eating. India was a sober nation, well-known for the temperance of its people. Warren Hastings said: 'The temperance of the people is demonstrated in the simplicity of their food and their total abstinence from spirituous liquors and other substances of intoxication.' The East India Company opened saloons for the sale of rum just after the establishment of the very first trading posts. It made handsome profits from the same; the revenue earned from the source during 1922 was thrice the appropriation for schools and colleges. The British introduced opium cultivation also in this country.[81]

(xi) Crushing the Spirit of India, Defeatism and Self-denial: The British, apart from political subjugation, destruction of Indian economy and indigenous system of education, did all other things also which resulted into 'pitiful crushing of the Hindu spirit, a stifling of its pride and growth, a stunting of genius that once flourished in every city of the land.'[82] As stated, they worked with the fundamental principle to make the whole Indian nation subservient. Their actual policy in India has been one of political exclusion and social scorn and they gave shape to that policy in real practice. In reality, the English rule, even during the last two decades, 'with all its modest improvements' was destroying Hindu civilization and the Hindu people.[83] The British succeeded in cultivating deep sense of mental defeat, self-pity and inferiority among the Indians.[84] This led to India's self-denial, which persists even today after more than six decades of Independence.[85]

The positive findings about our society by Dharmapal and even many western scholars are taboo for our intellectuals. England is still a model for them, as it was for Rammohan Rai, and others like him, who were ignorant about the realities of British society. Dharmapal, in his scholarly works, has brought out the facts that democracy and liberality of the British society upto early nineteenth century was a myth. As Francois Gautier has cited a case of Indians unduly blaming this country outside: Indians go outside and say that 'in my country people are persecuted, there is no freedom.' What do you mean by freedom? I've found India the most secure place with my camera, my pads and all.

Never was I marked. I had been in very dangerous places in India. I got no problems. As a journalist I can go anywhere, at any time. But in China you can not move so freely. A foreign journalist there needs a government permission informing about the topic. You should appreciate India. Of course there are problems. There are problems because of democracy, freedom. Separatism is here in India."[86]

The British colonials have left; but India is yet to get rid of the impact of colonialism. In reality, the system created by the British has fossilized; it has paralyzed our mental faculty to such an extent that we have lost the capacity to bring change.

References

1. Malhotra, Rajiv and Aravindan Neelakandan; *Breaking India: Western Interventions in Dravidian and Dalit Faultlines*, Bhopal (2011); quoted on p. 297.
2. Macaulay's address to British Parliament on February 2, 1835.
3. Max Muller, *India: What can it teach us?* p. 28.
4. Quoted in *Transcending Conflict: Indian and Eastern way,* GFCH (India), New Delhi; p. 347.
5. Varma, Kailash Chandra, "Some western Indologists and Indian Civilization" in *India's Contribution to World Thought and Culture*, by Lokesh Chandra et. al. (Ed.); Madrass (1970), pp. 165-180.
6. Ibid, pp. 169-70.
7. Ibid, p. 170.
8. Sharma, Raghunandan Prasad, *Distortions in Indian History*, New Delhi (2004), pp. 51-54.
9. Ibid, p. 14.
10. See Dharamapal, *The Beautiful Tree*, SIDH, Mussoorie; Reprint (2007)
11. Kumar, B.B.; *India: Caste, Culture and Traditions*, Delhi (2009), pp. 2-3.
12. Kumar, B.B.; *The Tribal Societies of India*; pp. 1-26.
13. *Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India*, ed. S. Majumdar Sastri; Appendix I, pp.751-54.
14. *Varaha Purana; Vamana Purana*, XIII.59; *Cultural Heritage of India*, Vol. VI, p. 15.
15. Ali, S.M.; *The Geography of the Puranas*, 1966, pp. 128-30.
16. Vasu, Nagendra Nath, *The Social History of Kamarupa*, Vol. I, p. 163; H.K. Barpujari (Ed.), *The Comprehensive History of Assam*, Vol. I, p. 119.
17. P.C. Bagchi, *India and Central Asia*, pp. 13-14; p. 6.
18. Ibid, p. 6.

19. B.R. Mani, *No Dark Age in Indian History: Archaeological Evidence*, Dialogue, Vol.15, No. 1; pp. 40-46; K.N. Dikshit and B.R. Mani, *The Origin of Indian Civilization buried under the sands of 'Lost River Saraswati'*, Dialogue, Vol. 15, No. 1; pp. 47-59.

20. Quoted; Encounter, December 1966, p. 40.

21. Malhotra, Rajiv, *Breaking India ...*; the book documents the third factor in detail.

22. Karl Marx, "The Future Results of the British Rule in India", in Marx and Engels, *The First Indian War of Independence*, 1857-1859; Moscow (1988), 6th printing; p. 30.

23. Ibid, p. 26.

24. Ram Swarup, *Hinduism and Monotheistic Religions*, Voice of India, New Delhi (2009), p. 227.

25. Dialogue, Vol. 15, No. 1; Papers of Navaratna S. Rajaram, Saroj Bala and Premendra Priyadarshi throw enough light on the subject.

26. Will Durant,*The Case for India*, p. 6.

27. J.T. Sunderland, *India in Bondage*, p.367; quoted by Will Durant, p.6. Sunderland's book was banned in British India due to obvious reason.

28. Macaulay, *Critical and Historical Essays*, vol. I, p. 504.

29. Maddison, Angus, The World Economy – A Millennial Perspective, Overseas Press (India) Limited, New Delhi (2003); quoted by Professor P. Kanagasabapathi, "Bharatiya Economic Model", Dialogue, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 41-42.

30. R.C. Dutt, *History of India under Early British Rule,* p.61.

31. Macaulay, T.B., *Critical and Historical Essays,* vol. 1, p. 529.

32. Macaulay, op. cit., p. 528.

33. Quoted by Will Durant, *The Case for India,* p.110; Lajpat Rai, *Unhappy India*, p. 311.

34. Lajpat Rai, p. 333; Will Durant, p.11. According to a statement of Lt. Col. Briggs in 1857.

35. R.C. Dutt, p. 373.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid, p. 256; Will Durant, p. 24.

38. Durant p. 24; Dutt, pp. 45, 256-57, viii-ix.

39. Ibid, p. 283.

40. Quoted in Dutt, p.290; from Martin Montgomery, Eastern India.

41. Durant, p. 26; quoted from J.T. Sunderland, India in Bondage, p. 365.

42. Lajpat Rai, p. 462; Durant p. 17.

43. Durant, p.25.

44. Will Durant, p. 25; quoted, Kohn, H, *History of the Nationalism of the East*, New York (1929) p. 101.

45. Durant, p. 25.

46. Dialogue, 9:2; October-December 2007; p.14.

47. Dharmapal, pp. 29-30.

48. Will Durant, p. 31; quoted Lajpat Rai, pp. 24-25.

49. Durant, p. 31; referred Moon, p. 308; Sunderland, p. 259.

50. Ibid, p. 31; referred in *Indian Year Book*, p. 398.

51. Ibid, p. 31.

52. Lajpat Rai, p.69.115.

53. Ibid, p. 55.

54. Durand, p. 32; referred Sunderland, p. 283.

55. Ibid, p. 32; referred Moon, p. 308.

56. Ibid, p. 32.

57. Ibid, p. 32; referred Sunderland, p.259.

58. Lajpat Rai, p. 42.118)

59. Dialogue 9:2; p. 14.

60. Will Durant, p. 9.

61. Ibid, p. 10; quoted Sunderland, p. 135.

62. Will Durant, p. 10-11; referred Lajpat Rai, p. 343.).

63. Ibid.

64. Ibid, p. 17; Lajpat Rai, p. 346.

65. Dharmapal, *Bharat ka Swadharma* (Hindi), Allahabad, 1998: p. 53.

66. Durant, pp. 26, 135; Lajpat Rai, pp. 344-347, 382, R.C. Dutt, p. xiii, Moon, p. 291

67. Ibid, pp. 36-37.

68. Ibid, pp. 27-28

69. Ibid, p. 29.

70. Ibid, p. 29; quoted Mahatma Gandhi.

71. Dharmapal, p. 52.

72. R.C. Dutt, p. 49.

73. Adam, pp. 259-65; Sunderland, p. 386; quoted by Durant, p. 29.

74. Adams, pp. 313f.; reference Durant, p. 29.

75. R.C. Dutt, p. p. xiii.104).

76. Ibid, p. 420.

77. *Quest*, Guwahati, 2008, p. 19.

78. R.C. Dutt, *Economic History of India under early British Rule*, p. 7.

79. Sunderland, p140; Zimand, p. 179; refered by Durant, p. 37-38.

80. Lajpat Rai, p.350; cited by Durant, p. 39.

81. Durant, p. 30; referred Sunderland, p. 316; Lajpat Rai, p. 357.

82. Ibid, p.33.

83. Durant, p. 21.

84. Durant, pp.12,18.

85. Dharmapal, pp.11-17.

86. Francois Gautier, *India's Self Denial*, in *Quest*, Vol. I, January 2008, pp. 15- 28.

Contribution of Agha Shahid Ali to English Ghazal

Syed Ahmad Raza Abidi*

Abstract

Agha Shahid Ali was a noted writer of English ghazals, a Persian form that utilizes repetition, rhyme and couplets. As editor of *Ravishing Disunities: Real Ghazals in English* (2000), he described the long history of fascination of Western writers with ghazals, as well as offering a succinct theoretical reading of the form itself. Agha Shahid Ali is a prime example of a diasporic writer who has "an ethnoglobal vision", namely, a vision that is rooted in the nurturing rhythms of his own indigenous, ethnic traditions and one that also has wider, even global resonance, for humanity as a whole. Shahid brings the local, indigenous tradition of Urdu poetry, via the ghazal, in conversation with a global audience through the very power of his linguistic talents, and through his creative and cultural translations that make one culture alive to a different one. An important point about Shahid's poetry is that it drew as much upon English poetic traditions as it did on Urdu literary forms. This needs to be stressed because Shahid's influences were as varied as James Merrill on the one hand and, on the other, Faiz Ahmed Faiz, whose work he has translated with great diligence. Indeed, it can be said that no other Indian poet writing in English came close to attempting what was Shahid's great achievement—the elaboration of a poetic voice that was representative of the Subcontinent's own mixed history.

---

* Dr. Syed Ahmad Raza Abidi is Assistant Professor of English in G.S.S. Mahavidyalaya, Allahabad. He has obtained his D.Phil. from University of Allahabad. His more than sixty Research Papers/Book Reviews/Interviews have been published in different journals, magazines and anthologies of repute. He is also a creative writer. He writes poems, short stories, articles and columns in English, Urdu and Hindi besides reviewing films for dailies and magazines.

Agha Shahid Ali (1949- 2001) was born in India in a Kashmiri family of Shiite Muslims. He is perhaps Kashmir's most famous poet in the Western world, having lived in Amherst, Massachusetts (USA), where he sadly died at the young age of 52. Though a Kashmiri Muslim, Ali is best known in the U.S. and identified himself as an American poet writing in English. Instead of succumbing to the status of refugee, he became the cultural ambassador of his country. Agha Shahid Ali's poetry is a sincere attempt to make this culture available to the world. Agha Shahid Ali used the ghazal form in English. Ali's experiments with form included his own mastery of canzone, a form which requires extreme repetitions, his use of the ghazal form in English (at times even using lines by American poets and developing them into ghazals) and his ability to persuade many American poets to write ghazals. Through these endeavours, Agha Shahid Ali not only introduced an entirely new idiom in English poetry but also exploited poetic form as a site where the "in-between" space, the hyphenated identity, could be posited. The recipient of numerous fellowships and awards and a finalist for the National Book Award, he taught at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, Princeton College and in the MFA program at Warren Wilson College. At the time of his death in 2001, Ali was noted as a poet uniquely able to blend multiple ethnic influences and ideas in both traditional forms and elegant free-verse. His poetry reflects his Hindu, Muslim, and Western heritages.

In Persian, "ghazal" literally means "talking to/of the beloved. In one of his couplets Agha Shahid Ali explains the meaning of his name: 'They ask me to tell them what Shahid means' Listen: it means "The Beloved" in Persian, 'witness' in 'Arabic' (*Call me Ishmael Tonight* 25). This overlap of the two meanings must have drawn this "Beloved Witness" to the ghazal form. Agha Shahid Ali wrote many ghazals in English which were later put together in the volume titled *Call Me Ishmael Tonight*. The thematic concerns of these ghazals are no different than the thematic concerns in the rest of his poetry, namely, love, longing, loss, separation and searching for home, for lost relationships, for life, for identity, and even for death. However, what stands out in these ghazals is the completely new idiom of poetry drawn from Indo-Persian tradition, which Ali introduces into English poetry. The texture of his language is rooted in eastern poetic traditions more so than it is in English. Some of the themes (*mazmûns*) in his ghazals are very close to the themes used in Urdu and Persian poetry. For example, the theme of "dust" in the following: "I am mere dust. The desert hides

itself in me. Against me the ocean has reclined from the start" (*Call Me Ishmael Tonight:A Book of Ghazals* 42). This couplet is reminiscent of Ghalib's famous verse: "*Hôtâ hai nihân gard mçn cehrâ merç hôtç / Ghistâ hai jabîn khâk pe dariyâ merç âgç*" (The desert hides itself in dust in my presence / The waves break their heads before me).

Many problems are involved with the production of ghazals in English. They have to do with the level of lexicon, syntax, semantics and the cultural context. Since the ghazal form strives for maximum precision, their elaboration comes to depend on vocabulary taken from the lexicon of language which is pregnant with cultural context and does not need any elaboration. Thus Urdu words such as *sâqî* (tavern keeper), *sharâb* (wine), *mai* (wine), *maikhâna* (wine-cellar) etc., come from the same semantic domain, but given the value of their occurrence they can be used symbolically in multiple contexts to invoke multiple meanings such as divine blessing, beloved's favours, preacher, metaphysical experience, and so on. The lack of such a tradition of diction in English handicaps the poet as he cannot depend on the reader's participation in his metaphorical usages. Similarly, cultural contexts metaphorically represented by this lexicon also facilitate the precision which the form is known for. Thus ghazal poets in Urdu have used lexical nodes such as *pyâs* (thirst), *dar-badarî* (nomadism), *maqtal* (battleground), *qaidkhâna* (prison), *hijrat* (migrancy), etc.

Few examples from *The Country Without A Post Office*, where Shahid has tried to follow the rule of Urdu ghazal:

> *'Where are you now? Who lies beneath your spell tonight*
> *before you agonize him in farewell tonight?'*
>
> *'Has God's vintage loneliness turned to vinegar?*
> *He's poured rust into the sacred well tonight.'*
>
> *'And I, Shahid, only am escaped to tell thee—*
> *God sobs in my arms, call me Ishmael tonight.' (40)*

Besides writing ghazals himself, Agha Shahid Ali also translated ghazals by masters such as Mirza Ghalib, Ahmad Faraz and Faiz Ahmed Faiz. In his introduction to *Ravishing Disunities*, Ali explains that it is not possible to stick to formal ghazal restrictions in translations because "it would be impossible to sustain a convincing *qafia*—given the *radif*—when translating couplet after couplet" (*Ravishing Disunities:Real*

Ghazals in English 11). In translations, the constraints of language force the poet to introduce lexical nodes that are not there in the original in order to make the poem work in the target language. He must invert the order of lines to create some semblance of rhymes, etc. The casualties in all this are the suspense/resolution schema, which the two-line ghazals have. Shahid also translated a ghazal of Ghalib in *Rooms Are Never Finished*:

> *Not all, only a few –*
> *disguised as tulips, as roses—*
> *return from ashes.*
> *What possibilities*
> *has the earth forever*
> *Covered, what faces? (45)*
>
> *yûn hî gar rôtâ rahá Ghâlib to ay ahl-e jahân*
> *dçkhnâ in bastiyôn kô tum ke vîrân hô gaîn*
>
> *(If Ghalib continues to shed tears like this, O fellow beings*
> *Watch out your dwellings, they will soon become deserted)*
>
> *World, should Ghalib keep weeping you will see a flood*
> *drown your terraced cities, your marble palaces.*
> *(Call Me Ishmael Tonight:A Book of Ghazals 52)*

Here the translator uses lexical items such as flood, drowning, and marble palaces, etc. that are not explicitly mentioned in the original Urdu *sher*, thus restricting the scope for interpretations. Again Ahmad Faraz's lines:

> *kis kis kô batâçngç judâî kâ sabab ham*
> *tû mujh sç khafâ hai tô zamânç kç liyç â*
>
> *(Who all will I explain the reasons for separation*
> *You may be angry with me, come back for the world's sake)*
>
> *Not for mine but for the world's sake come back.*
> *They ask why you left? To whom all must I explain?*
> *(Call Me Ishmael Tonight:A Book of Ghazals 48)*

Here the sequence of lines has been reversed, again impacting the suspense/resolution schema. However, if these translations are read as independent pieces, no one can deny their poetic worth and beauty.

This perhaps explains why Ali himself does not use the word "translation". He only says "after Ghalib," "after Ahmad Faraz," and so on.

With the passage of time Shahid's poetry was more influenced by that of Faiz. Therefore, he wrote: "Homage to Faiz Ahmed Faiz" in *The Half-Inch Himalayas*, followed by the *Rebel's Silhouette: Translation of verses*, a book of translation of Faiz's selected ghazals. In "Homage to Faiz Ahmed Faiz", Shahid invokes Faiz:

> *When you permitted my hands to turn to stone,*
> *as must happen to a translator's hands.*
>
> *I thought of you writing Zindan-Nama*
> *on prison walls, on cigarette packages,*
> *on torn envelopes.(The Half-Inch Himalayas 32)*

The last line of Faiz Ahmed Faiz's poem "Tanhai", which Shahid translated and named it as "Solitude", is, "ab yahan koi nahin, koi nahin aayega", which is to be read after translation, as, "no one, now no one will ever return.", finds expression in Shahid's "Homage to Faiz Ahmed Faiz".

> *Bolt your doors, sad heart! Put out*
> *the candles, break all cups of wine.*
> *No one,*
> *now no one will ever return.*

(*The Rebel's Silhouette: Translation of verses by Faiz Ahmed Faiz* 4)

The knowledge of two different cultures, that has made it possible for Shahid to experiment with poetry. However, for the convenience of readers, who are not so familiar with Urdu script, Urdu part is given in English script:

> *Tanhai*
> *Phir koi aaya dil-e-zaar! Nahin koi nahin*
> *Raahvar hoga, kahin aur chala jayega*
> *Dhal chuki raat, bikharne laga taaron ka ghubaar*
> *Ladkhadane lagey aewanon mein khwabeedah*
> *chiragh*
> *So gayi raaste tak tak ke har ek rahguzaar*
> *Ajnabi khaak ne dhundla diye qadmon ke suraagh*
> *Gul karo shamein, badha do mai o meena o*
> *aayagh*

> *Apne be khwab kiwadon ko muqaffal kar lo*
> *Ab yahan koi nahin, koi nahin aayega.*
> (*The Rebel's Silhouette: Translation of verses by Faiz Ahmed Faiz* 8)

The translated version, which was named as *Solitude*, is as follows:

> *Someone, finally, is here! No, unhappy heart, no one-*
> *just a passerby on his way.*
> *The night has surrendered*
> *to clouds of scattered stars.*
> *The lamps in the halls waver.*
> *Having listened with longing for steps,*
> *the roads too are asleep.*
> *A strange dust has buried every footprint.*
> *Blow out the lamps, break the glasses, erase*
> *all memory of wine. Heart,*
> *bolt forever your sleepless doors,*
> *tell every dream that knocks to go away.*
> *No one, now no one will ever return.*

(*The Rebel's Silhouette: Translation of verses by Faiz Ahmed Faiz 9*)

The book *The Rebel's Silhouette: Translation of verses by Faiz Ahmed Faiz* is an outstanding gift by Agha Shahid Ali to all literature lovers. In the Preface to *The Rebel's Silhouette*, Shahid writes:

Faiz Ahmed Faiz, of course, is a very popular poet in the Indian Subcontinent, lionized by the literary elite as well as the masses. To have to introduce him is frustrating because he should already be familiar to poets and poetasters all over the world; a non Subcontinental audience, however, may begin to understand his stature as a poet and a public figure by imagining a combination of Pablo Neruda, Nazim Hikmet, Octavio Paz, and the Palestinian, Mahmoud Darwish. (*The Rebel's Silhouette: Translation of verses by Faiz Ahmed Faiz* 3)

About the purity of the translation Shahid says,

I have undertaken my translation in the hope that something may be borne across to English readers. This book is not for purists, because at times I have had no choice but to adjust, especially in the ghazals, the letter of Faiz's work—a letter to which I have an emotional, even a sentimental attachment, but only in the original Urdu. If my translations manage to convey some of Faiz's magic and a fraction of the complexity that resulted from his political and cultural background, I would

consider myself as having managed to pay a modest tribute to his immense humanity. (*The Rebel's Silhouette: Translation of verses by Faiz Ahmed Faiz* 3)

Shahid's translations of one of the most prominent masters of the ghazal, namely, Faiz Ahmed Faiz (1911-1984), from Urdu into English, as well as Shahid's own uses of the ghazal in his English language poems, and his editing a volume of ghazals entitled *Ravishing Disunities: Real Ghazals in English* by over a hundred Western poets, are prominent literary achievements. Shahid's voice echoes Faiz's political-poetic voice, and in writing about Faiz (in "Homage to Faiz Ahmed Faiz") who, most of the times lived in exile; Shahid recalled and relived his own exile. Nearly ten years after this text of Faiz's translations, Shahid published an edited volume, *Ravishing Disunities: Real Ghazals in English* (2000) that could be described as Shahid's experiment with cultural translation. This volume, described by Edward Hirsch as 'a gift to American Poetry' includes ghazals by poets such as Diane Ackerman, Paul Muldoon, Keki Daruwalla, Michael Collier, G.S. Sharat Chandra, Paul Jenkins, and Reginald Gibbons among the 109 contributors, the majority of whom are Euro-American poets. Since they work originally in the English language, there is no linguistic translation, although Shahid selected and collected these 'real ghazals in English' as the subtitle indicates.He has also written of book, *T.S. Eliot as Editor* which was published in the year 1986.

Work Cited

Ali, Agha Shahid . *In Memory of Begum Akhtar*. Calcutta: A W W Pub., 1979. Print.

—-. *The Half-Inch Himalayas*. Middletown: Wesleyan U P,1987. Print.

—-. *A Nostalgist's Map of America*. New York: Norton, 1991. Print.

—.*Call Me Ishmael Tonight*: *The Final Collections*. New Delhi: Permanent Black & Ravi Dayal Pub., 2004. Print.

—. *Rooms Are Never Finished: The Final Collections*.Delhi: Permanent Black & Ravi Dayal Pub., 2004.Print.

—.   ed. 2000. Introduction to *Ravishing Disunities: Real Ghazals in English*. Hanover, NH and London: University Press of New England.Print.

—. *Live Like the Banyan Tree*: *Images of the Indian American Experience*. Ed.& auth. Lila Prasad. The historical society of PA, 2006. Print.

—. *Bone Sculpture*. Calcutta: A W W Pub., 1972. 11. Print.

—. "Death Credentials". *Indraprastha* magazine. New Delhi: U P, 1971. 16. Print.

Brian Keith, Axel. "The Diasporic Imaginary." *Public Culture* 14.2 .2002,Print.

Ghosh, Amitav. "'The Ghat of The Only World': Agha Shahid Ali in Brooklyn". *Man's World*. New Delhi:Permanent Black and Ravi Dayal Pub,2002 Print.

Kabir, Ananya Jahanara. *Territory of Desire: Representing the Valley of Kashmir*. Minneapolis:

University of Minnesota Press, 2009. Print.

Katrak, Ketu H. "Cultural Translation' and Agha Shahid Ali's Uses of The Ghazal Form". *Catamaran: South Asian American Writing*. N.p, Fall 2003. Print

Majumdar, Keya. "Nation as Image, Imagination of the alien: A Glimpse into Agha Shahid Ali's Book, *The Country Without a Post Office*". *Kavya Bharti: Special issue: Poetry of the Indian Diaspora-I*. Madurai: American College, 2004. Print

Merrill, Christopher. *Rattapallax 7* Magazine. N.p.: Rattapallax P, n.d. Print.

Nayeem, Hamida. "Shola-e-ishq Siyah Posh Hua Tere Baad". *Sensor*, Sunday Supplement of *Greater Kashmir*. Ed. Ahsanul Haq. N.p.:n.p., Feb.2002. Print.

Needham, Lawrence. 'The Sorrow of a Broken Time': Agha Shahid Ali and the Poetry of Loss and Recovery". *Reworlding, The Literature of the Indian Diaspora*; Ed. Emmanuel S. Nelson. G P, Number 42, n.d. Print.

Radhakrishnan, R. *Between Identity and Location: The Cultural Politics*.New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2007.Print.

Russell, Ralph "Ghalib: A Self Portrait", *Ghalib The Poet and His Age*. Ed. Ralph Russell. Delhi: Oxford U P; 1997. Print.

Shanta Acharya. "The Contribution of Poets from India to American Poetry Today". *Kavya Bharti: Special issue Poetry of the Indian Diaspora-I*. Madurai: American College, 2004. Print.

FORM IV
(See Rule 8)

1. Place of Publication : Delhi

2. Periodicity of Publication : Quarterly

3. Printer's Name : Rajesh Bhargava
   (Whether citizen of India? : Yes, Indian
   Address : 27/201, East End Apartments,
   Mayur Vihar Phase-I Extension,
   Delhi-110 096.

4. Publisher's Name : Rajesh Bhargava
   (Whether citizen of India? : Yes, Indian
   Address : 27/201, East End Apartments,
   Mayur Vihar Phase-I Extension,
   Delhi-110 096.

5. Editor's Name : B.B. Kumar
   (Whether citizen of India? : Yes, Indian
   Address : 27/201, East End Apartments,
   Mayur Vihar Phase-I Extension,
   Delhi-110 096.

6. Name and address of : Astha Bharati,
   Individuals who own the 27/201, East End Apartments,
   Newspaper and partners Mayur Vihar Phase-I Extension,
   or shareholders holding Delhi-110 096.
   Total capital

I, Rajesh Bhargava, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

June 18, 2014 (Sd) Rajesh Bhargava
(Signature of Publisher)