

Chapter 6

Nehru: India and Israel

I myself sometime feel amazed to see the individuals, ideas, issues, historical events and what not discussed in this manifesto. But it all happened as I proceeded. Wherever the logic and the pursuit of truth led me, I did not hesitate although every time ahead lay a spell of very hard labour.

To understand the ultimate separation between Pundit Nehru and Congress on the one side and Sikhs, Akali Dal and Master Tara Singh on the other, both components of the issue have to be understood i.e. Pundit Nehru's mind and Master Tara Singh's mind. In dealing with Sikhs, I believe, it matters what conclusions Pundit had drawn, if he had drawn, to correct and fine-tune his understanding of history from the behaviour of Jinnah and his All India Muslim League with which the Indian National Congress had to deal for more than 40 years. I wanted to understand his mind by knowing what fundamentals he believed in. In pursuit of this my mind went to the Middle East. How Nehru understood the creation of Israel? Because for me as I have been able to understand and formulate my views, Zionists and Israel is a test case for humanity to understand building or undermining civilisation. What was his position on Zionism and Israel? In both the cases of the partition of India and the partition of Palestine, British Empire was the prime mover.

It will help to understand Punjab's case under him if we can know whether Nehru was anywhere original, specific, path-breaking, discoverer etc. or he worked within what was by default available to him in ideas and practices.

The overall conclusion is that Pundit Nehru was not the man of crisis. At a crucial moment he and those who worked under him were not or perhaps never ready when any crisis came. If things are going well, fine, if they go wrong, he does not know what to do. I feel his lack of anticipatory instincts. He was not clear-headed like a commander who knows before the battle what is what and who is who and would come out victorious.

He was temperamentally a 'good guy' and well-intentioned person, but he failed to educate himself about the cleverness of criminals apparently looking civilized in spite of his life-long dealing with the British and local criminals in India. I believe retaining

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

Mountbatten as Governor-General was not in the interest of India. If Mountbatten is to be believed Nehru and his colleagues were not ready for the outcome in 1947 of what they had demanded or accepted themselves in spite of the fact that nothing had happened instantaneously.

And then, hardly a year before, Muslim League had held a 'rehearsal' for 1947 naming it Direct Action Day. In dealing with Sikhs and Akali Dal, he got disconnected from them. He became the opposite party for them. It is totally unacceptable from any point of view. This all seems unbelievable. Perhaps it is due to the stature Nehru had attained due to the freedom movement. Therefore to say he did not realize the gravity of the situation becomes difficult. Is it meaningful in any way that Pundit Nehru died in 1964, Pakistan sent its men into Kashmir in 1965 resulting in the war and Punjabi Suba came into being in 1966? In short actions and non-actions of Pundit Nehru damaged Punjab, Punjabi and Punjabiya. And the process has never stopped.

The Criteria

But what are the criteria to judge Nehru's understanding and policy about Zionism and Israel? I am in difficulty here. But Mahatma Gandhi rescues me. And I am so grateful to him. It is '*Satyagraha*'. And remaining within its border lines, I ventured to make my views about Zionism and Israel. It was, I believe, due to this state of mind that before I wrote the manifesto *Al-Manshoor* (January 2009) of my party, it became clear to me that I must have a position on Israel. I felt it was my moral obligation if I had the aspirations to lead the peoples of Pakistan in the right direction that my position on Israel (or on any other issue) should be civilizational, not sectarian. That my position on Israel should stand on its own to be truthful today, tomorrow and the day after like Mahatma Gandhi's position on partition of India, for example. That necessitated understanding the issue in its entirety. The result was my book '*Why Israel will not get Recognition?*' (January 2008, 202 pages) which I declared to be a part of *Al-Manshoor*.

The chapter 1 of this book '*The Question of Political Power*' begins with two quotes of Theodor Herzl and Adolf Hitler. Below I reproduce these two quotes, next 3 paragraphs and the last one paragraph of the book to briefly but fundamentally acquaint you with my understanding of the issues involved:

We should there [in Palestine] form a portion of a rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization [the Christian world] as opposed to barbarism [the Muslim world]. We should as a neutral State remain in contact with all Europe, which would have to guarantee our existence. ... It is true that the Jewish State is conceived as a peculiarly modern structure on unspecified territory. But a State is formed, not by pieces of land, but rather by a number of men united under sovereign rule. ... Everything must be systematically settled beforehand. I merely indicate this scheme: our keenest thinkers will combine in elaborating it. ... Every valuable invention, which exists now, or lies in the future, must be used. By these means a country can be occupied and a State founded in a manner as yet unknown to history, and with possibilities of success such as never occurred before. ... Universal brotherhood is not even a beautiful dream. Antagonism is essential to man's greatest efforts. But the Jews, once settled in their own State, would probably have no more enemies. As for those who remain behind, since prosperity enfeebles and causes them to diminish, they would soon disappear altogether. I think the Jews will always have sufficient enemies, such as every nation has. But once fixed in their own land, it will no longer be possible for them to scatter all over the world. The diaspora cannot be reborn, unless the civilization of the whole earth should collapse; ... The world will be freed by our liberty, enriched by our wealth, magnified by our greatness. And whatever we attempt there to accomplish for our own welfare, will react powerfully and beneficially for the good of humanity." – Theodor Herzl [in "The Jewish State": 1896]

"[The Jews] have not the slightest intention of building up a Jewish State in Palestine so as to live in it. What they are really aiming at is to establish a central organization for their international swindling and cheating. As a sovereign State, this cannot be controlled by any of the other States. Therefore it can serve as a refuge for swindlers who have been found out and at the same time a high school for the training of other swindlers." - Adolf Hitler [in Mein Kampf: 1924]

*

Next three paras from my book:

What comes to our minds, I mean what the peoples anywhere in the world would understand by the words 'country', 'state' or 'nation', applies equally to Israel as it applies to Pakistan, India, Iran or Nepal for example. Apparently, this is just a normal statement and there seems to be nothing wrong about it. But the fact of the matter is that unlike Pakistan, India, Iran or Nepal, Israel is an exception. Israel is not a country. Israel is not a state. Similarly the Jews of Israel do not comprise a nation in the sense that Pakistanis, Indians, Iranians or Nepalese own their nationhood.

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

Then what is Israel? Like some big cities' underworlds - groups involved in crime having legal businesses for cover - Israel is, in fact, World's underworld. Other nations and countries deal with the State of Israel as they do with other states. They do not know that in reality it is not a state. Israel's statehood is a façade. It is a showpiece for the unaware world. Its so-called statehood is like the cover of a legal business of an underworld. Behind this cover of legality operates this World's underworld – Israelis-Zionists.

How Jews-Zionists-Israelis were transformed into the World's underworld? The answer to this question can be found in another question: How an individual becomes a criminal while his brother or friend becomes civilized? We have both types of crops of human beings on this earth. On broader level, the equivalent of an individual criminal or a group of criminals who attack individuals or families is an ideological and political movement or a party, which is assembled for a narrow and selfish goal, which can only be realized at the cost of a larger society. And if there are all indications that such a 'goal' of the group is also non-feasible not only in the long run, but also in its very essence, then all those associated with such a project must be 'mad'. And what about the *guru* of such a group? It is better we leave it unsaid. I am talking about Zionists and Theodor Herzl. How could Jews think of occupying Muslim land and then prevail there permanently? It could have been only an interim enterprise, nothing else.

*

And the last paragraph of my book:

Therefore creating an environment of deeper faith in the ultimate success of our cause must continue. That necessitates our renewed faith in humanity and therefore in the Christian world in particular that one day we all will be able to stand together in a massive way to solve the Zionism/Israel problem. The present status-quo cannot stand in front of our un-ending thrusts. Our principled stand, right approach and right and concerted efforts will ultimately tilt the balance in favour of truth and civilization. And therefore I repeat again that being victims, we, the Muslim world, have to work more and harder than others. As time is on our side, even waiting is a part of our fight.

*

Further, I wrote a document (# 32) for my party named 'The Two Minorities: The Jews/Zionists and the Urdu Party: Their empowerment created problems of world proportions'. It is dated 28-1-2012. By Urdu Party I mean Hindustanis/Urdu-Speakers

who came from India. In Pakistan people understood them coming from U.P. and C.P.; Delhi and Lucknow etc. Here is a part of this document:

***The Two Minorities: The Jews/Zionists and the Urdu Party:
Their empowerment created problems of world proportions***

In the inaugural session of the All-India Muslim League (Dacca, December 30, 1906) a fifty-eight member Provisional Committee was formed with two Joint Secretaries, namely, Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk and Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk. The Muslim majority areas/provinces which were later to constitute Pakistan had 14 members, while 44 members belonged to Muslim minority areas/provinces. U.P. alone which was a Muslim minority province had 22 members. The both Nawabs (Joint Secretaries) hailed from U.P. Of the future Pakistan areas 3 members hailed from Eastern Bengal, 1 from Sylhet, 7 from Punjab, 2 from Frontier Province and 1 from Sindh. It is interesting to note that the sole member from Sindh (Hyderabad) was Mr. A.M. Dehlavi. And Hakim Ajmal Khan from Delhi was one of the 7 members representing Punjab province as at that time Delhi was part of the Punjab. Who can claim to or represent whom practically, is a question of time and circumstances!

Descendents of Muslim ruling classes and other Muslims who had come to India from outside or converted to Islam from the local population and belonging to Muslim minority provinces – by now Urdu-Speakers - had no collective name which could distinguish them from the Muslims of the Muslim majority provinces who were by and large converts from the local population. They were now to claim the political leadership of Muslim masses who were in majority in their provinces originally belonged to India and had converted to Islam at various stages and under different circumstances. For Punjab, for example, the nameless U.P. Muslims and even their brethren from other minority provinces were ‘*Hindustanis*’. They did not belong to any other Muslim people or community of India. For example, they were not Punjabis, they were not Sindhis, Kashmiris, Bengalis, Baluch or Pakhtuns. If some of them had Afghan background, in no way they belonged to Pathan or Pakhtun society or culture of North-West Frontier Province or Tribal Areas. Therefore, for others also, like Punjab, they were ‘*Hindustanis*’. This minority not belonging to any majority in any province/state/area of India was able to hide behind an Islamic cover which they orchestrated vehemently and become unrecognizable for the Muslim masses of India. Obviously they indulged in religious deception. Then there was British imperialism

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

like a caring father to encourage, guide, help and protect them at every step. When the British got old and withdrew, Americans stepped in.

On 29 November, 1947 the partition plan of Palestine of the United Nations, through Resolution 181, was approved by 33 to 13 votes, with 10 abstentions. All 33 countries which voted 'Yes' were Christian countries. The 13 countries that voted 'No' were: Afghanistan, Cuba, Egypt, Greece, India, Iran, Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey and Yemen. At that time all independent Muslim countries (9) voted against the creation of Israel. Unfortunately there was no one to appreciate that India went along with Muslim countries and voted 'No'. China abstained. Today there are more than 40 Muslim countries which are members of the United Nations. As you can see, out of the present population-wise top 15 Muslim countries - **Indonesia**, Pakistan, **Bangladesh**, Egypt, Iran, Turkey, **Sudan**, **Iraq**, Afghanistan, **Malaysia**, Saudi Arabia, **Uzbekistan**, Yemen, Syria, and **Kazakhstan** - 7 were not independent and therefore not members of the United Nations when Israel was created.

The empowerment of these two minorities Jews/Zionists and Hindustanis/Urdu-speakers was made possible by British imperialism. To start with, both these empowerments were illegitimate because by these acts Palestinian Arabs lost their homeland and Indian Muslims who were majorities in their own provinces – Bengal, Punjab, Sindh, N.W.F.P., and Baluchistan were denied enfranchisement. And the Muslims of Jammu and Kashmir and those who remained in India were put in a perennial dilemma of loyalty to either their country India or wishing well for Pakistan because they been made contradictory by the ideology the Urdu-speaking had assembled and developed under the permanent protection provided by the British. And as history moved forward, the problem got worsened showing thereby the potential of evil-doing in their ideology. The present stand-offs between Christian and Muslim civilizations and between India and Pakistan have their geneses in these empowerments.

*

My views about our own Partition are spread throughout this manifesto. And I have given my views and beliefs briefly about the partition of Palestine and the creation of Israel. Now we can look into what was going on or what was not going on in Pundit Nehru's mind about Zionism, Israel, recognition of Israel etc.

To be familiar about recognition of China by others should enlighten us when we deal with Israel's recognition or non-recognition by India. Peoples Republic of China was

Nehru: India and Israel

founded on 1 October 1949. USSR recognized it on 3 October 1949 and India on 1 January 1950. My question is, why there was delay of three months? It may have significance in the later developments between China and India during the life of Pundit Nehru and after.

China got its seat in the UN on 25 October 1971. The United States and China established Liaison Offices in Beijing and Washington in 1973. The US recognized China in 1979 and on January 1, 1979, the United States and the PRC commenced normal diplomatic relations. Saudi Arabia recognized China on 21 July 1990 and Israel on 24 January 1992.

And Israel came into being 14 May 1948. India again voted against Israel becoming U.N. member, which it became on May 11 1949. India officially recognized the State of Israel on 17 September 1950.

*

The Evidence

Mahatma Gandhi's position on the issue was quite clear, "My sympathies are with all the Jews....I came to learn much of their age long persecutions. But my sympathy does not blind me to the requirements of justice. The cry for the national home for the Jews does not make much appeal for me. The sanction for it is sought in the Bible....Why should they not like other peoples of the earth make that country their home where they earn their livelihood? Palestine belongs to the Arabs in the same sense that England belongs to the English or France to the French." This was further amplified by Jawaharlal Nehru, India's first Prime Minister. With his anti-imperialist and anti-colonial focus, he wrote the 'Zionist movement was the child of British imperialism' and in his famous Glimpses of World History, he observed 'the story of Palestine ever since has been one of conflict between Arabs and Jews, with the British Government siding with one or the other as occasion demanded, but generally supporting the Jews'. [1]

[1] Rajendra Abhyankar: The Evolution and Future of India-Israel Relations: Research Paper No. 6: March 2012 <http://www.tau.ac.il/humanities/abraham/india-israel.pdf>

*

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

In 1947 Zionist leaders asked Albert Einstein to work a miracle and persuade a sceptical India to support the birth of a Jewish state. ... Einstein's four-page letter of June 13 1947 to Nehru focused on moral and historical arguments. He opened with praise for India's constituent assembly, which had just abolished untouchability. ... On November 29 India voted with the Muslim states against partition. (The Zionists won: the vote was 33 for and 13 against, with 10 states - including the UK - abstaining.) Nehru greatly admired Einstein, as a humanist and scientist. The two men met, I believe for the only time, on November 5, 1949, in Einstein's rooms in Princeton. It was Nehru's only "private" meeting during his trip to the United States. [2]

[2] Professor Morris's latest book, *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem Revisited*, is published by Cambridge UP. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/feb/16/israel.india>

*

P. R. Kumaraswamy in his book 'India's Israel Policy' writes:

With regard to Israel, however, there are a number of additional reasons. As discussed elsewhere, domestic public opinion, especially of the Muslims, played a considerable role. The second reason has to be found in the Arab factor. India was afraid that any hasty move would antagonize the Arabs and jeopardize its larger interests in the Middle East. The issue of recognizing Israel figured in India's deliberations with the Arab countries. Following his meeting with Prime Minister Nehru in Washington in October 1949, Elath [Israeli ambassador in Washington - mam] cabled: "He [Nehru] recently discussed Israel with Arab and Muslim envoys [in] New Delhi, emphasizing necessity [of] reconciliation [with] realities and preparing them for our inevitable recognition by India." According to another senior Israeli diplomat, the Iraqi delegation "brought strong pressure [on] the chief delegate [of] India to activate against Indian recognition [of] Israel."

Nehru's biographer Gopal admits the Arab influence on India's approach toward Israel. According to him, "on the question of Israel's admission to the United Nations, his [Nehru's] first reaction was to abstain. *Later*, as part of the policy of co-operation with the Islamic States, he ordered the Indian delegation to vote against." Less than two weeks after recognizing Israel, Nehru frankly admitted the Arab factor and informed the chief ministers, "We would have done this [recognition of Israel] long ago, because Israel is a fact. We refrained because of *our desire not to offend the sentiments of our friends in the Arab countries.*" Similarly, its ambassador in Cairo also attributed the delay to Arab pressures. Speaking to the Egyptian media soon after

Nehru: India and Israel

recognition, he remarked: "For some time now announcements were being made that India did intend to recognize Israel and that it was only a question of time. India's intentions were made known well in advance to the Arab diplomats in New Delhi and to the governments in the Middle East through Cairo. Some of these governments requested India to postpone her decision but India felt that any further postponement would not serve any useful purpose."

*

It means that before October 1949, about less than one and half year after coming into being of Israel, Nehru "**discussed Israel with Arab and Muslim envoys [in] New Delhi, emphasizing necessity [of] reconciliation [with] realities and preparing them for our inevitable recognition by India.**" And "**we would have done this [recognition of Israel] long ago**", was said sometime in September, 1950. For Nehru, it seems, immediate recognition of Israel was no problem had there been no fear of offence to Arab or Muslim sentiment.

What the West did became reality and wise people accept reality. And therefore Nehru was wise and a statesman. How to argue against it. And who are the audience? This is the burden of history. From Nehru to this day, India has failed to stand on its own feet. Perhaps Modi has completed the circle. It seems Modi has 'discovered' that Israel was India's lost brother during a 'riot' in some '*mela*' long ago. Thank God, they have met now! Look at the consensus in India, be it the West, China or Pakistan! Look at how comfortable they are with English language!

*

P. R. Kumaraswamy in his 17-page Report 'The Friendship with Israel: India Squares the Circle' (2009) writes:

Mahatma Gandhi's November 1939 statement stating that 'Palestine belongs to the Arabs in the same sense that England belongs to the English and France to the French' was the right answer to the idea of a Jewish national home in Palestine as propounded by the Balfour Declaration of 1917.

On 15 May 1947, the General Assembly established the 11 member "United Nations Special Committee on Palestine" (UNSCOP). Eight countries i.e. Australia, Canada,

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

Czechoslovakia, Guatemala, Netherlands, Peru, Sweden, and Uruguay - all Christian countries - advocated partition as the solution; “whereas supported by Iran and the then Yugoslavia, Nehru’s India proposed a federal solution to the Palestine problem.” On 29 November 1949 the UN endorsed the partitioning of Palestine by a majority vote (of all above-mentioned Christian countries – mam). India and Iran voted against, while Yugoslavia abstained. “The Suez crisis and Israeli aggression against Egypt, in blatant collaboration with the imperial powers, infuriated Nehru. In late 1956 he explicitly ruled out normalisation. Since then, ‘time is not ripe’ became the standard Indian stand regarding normalisation with Israel. ... Thus, for over four decades, the hallmark of India’s Israel policy was non-relations. Israel had to settle for a consulate that Nehru allowed to function in Mumbai since 1953.”

“In April 1955 Nehru reluctantly endorsed Israel’s exclusion from the Bandung Afro-Asian conference, thereby institutionalizing Israel’s exclusion from the emerging bloc of Non-Aligned Movement. As time went by, India joined the rest of the Third World countries in adopting an anti-Israel policy that reached its crescendo in November 1975 when New Delhi voted in favour of the notorious UN General Assembly resolution that depicted Zionism as racism.” [3]

[3] <https://www.mei.nus.edu.sg/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/MEI-Insights-004.pdf>

*

The author has termed above the resolution ‘notorious’ which means generally known and talked of; *especially*: widely and unfavourably known, indicating perhaps his being with the ‘civilized world’ as the West calls itself. Obviously, this resolution is known unfavourably in the West. There is no right and truthful reason in the world for any Indian to be pro-Zionism, hence pro-Israel. Perhaps this is due to their experience with Muslims.

By becoming member of UNSCOP, India gave legitimacy to the British project of Israel which was almost at the end stage. It seems Nehru was not in the frame of mind to understand that Israel was a Christian project led by the British, the same British against whom his father and he himself were the star fighters of the Indian National Congress. The reasonable explanation seems to be that Nehru was overawed by the intellectual supremacy of the British and the West. It means he lacked the capacity to understand the world order of the time, its historical background and future

possibilities. But this is contrary to the impression which apparently one gets from his writings. Then perhaps the explanation is that he was a fickle-minded person lacking commitment and resolve India needed at that time. That he needed a Suez crisis to explicitly rule out normalization with Israel leads to such an explanation.

For any honest and well-intentioned person in politics, as I wrote in *Al-Manshoor*, "What else is the path except *Satyagraha* – our 'holding onto truth'? But for that – to hold onto 'truth' -- it has to be discovered, perhaps more often again and again, as it does not always lie ready made on the shelf." Nehru could not do this. He could not mould events, instead he got pushed by events. Obviously this must have damaged India which, obviously, would remain unknown. But I do understand that what I am saying is perhaps asking too much from an individual. Therefore understanding but not agreeing many times with what Nehru did, we move forward.

*

Jacob Abadi writes in 'Israel's Quest for Recognition and Acceptance in Asia: Garrison State Diplomacy':

In the spring of 1950, the All-India Hindu Mahasabha Party passed a resolution demanding **immediate** recognition of Israel. The Arab response was immediate and furious. ... Consequently, an adviser in the Indian Embassy in Hungary informed the Israeli Foreign Ministry that the Indian government wanted to recognize Israel but was compelled to delay the recognition out of consideration for the Arab states.

In a letter to Nehru, Israel's Minister in Brussels complained that India's refusal to recognize Israel was unjustified. Nehru's excuse was that his government intended to recognize Israel but the lack of trained diplomatic personnel stood in the way.

Nehru explained that India must be extremely careful not to antagonize its 30 million Muslims and that it must deal with the issue with great caution.

In his letter to Frances Gunther*, he argued that India did not wish to recognize Israel immediately because it had been claiming all along that the Jews were collaborating with the British in an attempt to dominate the downtrodden peoples of the Third World. He said that the Indian government had changed its views on this matter but did not wish to be regarded as opportunist and fickle by suddenly changing its attitude toward the Jewish state. Shortly afterwards, however, he stated that the recognition of Israel could not be delayed indefinitely.

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

In 1950, India voted in favour of the internationalization of Jerusalem.

When Egypt interfered with Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal in September 1950, and the Security Council passed a resolution calling upon Egypt to desist from such actions, India abstained.

The Israeli Consul in Bombay complained in 1953 that Indian officials did not receive him cordially.

In 1954, officials in the Israeli Foreign Ministry had noted with satisfaction that India, along with Burma and Ceylon, pressed for Israel's participation in the Bandung Conference.

That the Arabs interpreted Nehru's attitude as an expression of friendship toward them was in large measure due to his extraordinary ability to play the 'Israeli card' in order to earn their support. Pannikar had once admitted that India used Israel whenever it wished 'to beat the Arabs'. This astute diplomat added that Israel could not expect full diplomatic relations with India unless the Arabs decided to support the US-Pakistani camp and thereby antagonize India.

Nehru's attempt to demonstrate neutrality in the Arab-Israeli dispute manifested itself clearly at the Bandung Conference. When referring to the Zionist movement he used the term 'aggression' but at the same time he said, we ought to take into consideration the background of what happened in Palestine."

While Krishna Menon was attacking Israel at the United Nations the official statements from New Delhi were that the two countries were on good terms."

The bilateral relations suffered a major setback as a result of the Suez affair. What made Israel's invasion of Egyptian territory so unpopular in India was the fact that the action was carried out in collaboration with Great Britain and France.

Some Indian officials argued that Sinai campaign had interrupted the normalization between the Jewish and the Arab states and thereby adversely affected the Indo-Israeli rapprochement. According to Menon, 'One had the feeling before Suez that some dialogue could have begun. The attack and the invasion of Sinai, the partnership in Imperialist war, killed it. The Suez Affair and the Israeli invasion of the Sinai Peninsula caused concern in India largely due to the pressure exerted by the Muslims in Pakistan. Consequently, New Delhi was pushed further into the Arab fold. As Menon said, 'we are in a difficult position because of Pakistan and our anti-imperialist views. Pakistan does nothing but she makes anti-Israeli speeches ... We have got Pakistan on our borders and we cannot go and create more enemies than we have at the present moment.

The fact that the Indian government did not establish full diplomatic relations in the early days of the Arab-Israeli conflict made it increasingly difficult to exchange diplomatic envoys without antagonizing the Arabs. Nehru continued to exercise great caution in an attempt to portray a façade of neutrality. On one occasion he said, 'After careful thought, we feel that while recognizing Israel as an entity, we need not at this stage exchange diplomatic personnel.' As far as Israel was concerned the message was clear: India was hopelessly pro-Arab and therefore would reject all attempts of rapprochement.

When Nasser visited India in the spring of 1960, Nehru praised Egypt's 'gallant resistance' against the invasion by Great Britain and France but did not mention Israel.

During the Indo-Chinese conflict in the autumn of 1962, Golda Meir gave her approval to the sale of small ammunitions to India. However, seeking to avoid a conflict with Pakistan, she was reported to have refused to sell arms to India during the Indo-Pakistani conflict of 1965. Journalists had later argued that the deliveries of 81-mm and 120-mm mortars and howitzers artillery pieces continued to reach India during the conflict with Pakistan. During the Six Day War, India reciprocated providing Israel with badly needed spare parts for the Israeli Mystere and Ouragan fighter aircraft and the AMX-13 tanks. Officials in New Delhi were not oblivious to the fact that Israel was compelled to deny the sales due to fear of Pakistani hostility. By the same token, Israeli Foreign Ministry officials were aware of India's difficulties and the negative impact that overt relations with Israel could have had on New Delhi's ties with the Arabs. (This paragraph belongs to the above author or not, I do not remember – mam)

*

*Frances (Fineman) Gunther, journalist and writer, was born in 1897 in New York, the younger of two children of Sonia (Paul) and Dennis Fineman, both Russian Jews. Gunther attended Barnard College, with a year (1919 1920) at Radcliffe, and was graduated in 1921. She began psychoanalysis in New York in 1923, continuing in Vienna and other places where she lived over the next four decades. During the 1920s, she went to the Soviet Union, and studied Russian theatre. Married in 1927, the Gunthers lived in Europe (London, Paris, Rome, Vienna) from 1925 to 1936. As foreign correspondent for the *London News Chronicle*, Frances Gunther covered the establishment of a fascist regime in Austria in 1934. In 1937 1938, the Gunthers travelled in the Middle East and Asia, meeting Chaim Weizmann, Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, the Chiang Kai sheks, and T.V. Soong; this trip resulted in a continuing friendship between Frances Gunther and Nehru. Frances and John Gunther were divorced in 1944, but maintained some contact. During World War II, Frances Gunther wrote articles and made speeches critical of British imperialism and

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

advocating independence for India. Among other organizations, she spoke before the Washington Press Club, the Quaker Institute of International Relations, and the Post War Council in New York. Her speeches were collected in a book, *Revolution in India* (1944).

In 1943 1944 she attended the Graduate School of International Relations at Yale to learn more about foreign policy. As a result, she began a study, never completed, entitled "Empire: Notes for a Study of the Theory and Practice of Empires." In 1948 1949 she attended lectures by Karen Horney and others at the New School in New York City, and herself spoke, on "Psychoanalysis and the News World," before the Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis. In 1960 1961 she returned to New York from Israel to take courses on religion, linguistics, and sociology at Columbia University.

Increasingly conscious of her Jewishness and resentful of its suppression, in late 1949 she joined other Zionists in settling the newly established state of Israel. She took Hebrew lessons and, inspired by Martin Buber and other provocative thinkers whom she met there, began a long range study of Arab Israeli relations. Her interest in the connections between religion and politics culminated in an unpublished work entitled "A Study of Theo Politics."

Her travels continued; in 1950 she visited India as guest of the Nehru family, and the following year met John Gunther in Egypt on his "Inside Africa" trip. She was living in Jerusalem at the time of her death in 1964.

Thousands of handwritten notes, which she generally labelled "dream notes" or "diary notes," reveal her thoughtfulness and insight. In addition, the papers contain considerable documentation about family relationships mother and son, wife and husband, sister and brother and Frances Fineman Gunther's intimate relationship with Nehru. [4]

[4] [<http://oasis.lib.harvard.edu/oasis/deliver/~sch00609>]

*

I have quoted in the above piece so much that apparently it may look unnecessary. But it is deliberate. Presently (October 2017), I am revising this manifesto. Things have further crystallised about Pundit Nehru in my mind. Therefore the above long quotation. Presently I feel about Pundit Nehru as an anglicised Indian leader overawed by the intellectual superiority of the West. I feel distressed. If this is true about Nehru, think of India as a whole. Collectively, this state of mind of Indian leadership, I tend

to believe, was no place for a passion to play front and change the world. But for that, commitment to principles which a leader discovers to follow is required. Can I say that India became 'independent' to the extent Indian leadership was capable of? Whatever the West had 'manufactured' and put in place, independent India started playing within and with those things as if the only thing required in the world was that the British leave India. Imagine Nehru was not uncomfortable with Zionism? And how could 'Hindu Nationalists' be not ahead of him? The picture is complete. What the West proposed, India did not dispose.

I am very conscious of the roles of 'Muslims of India', Jinnah, his Muslim League and later of Pakistan in this making of Hindu and later Indian mind. This makes it look more intractable for the region and the world. But go deeper and you will find, in reality it is not so. If leadership does not emerge, how even an easily doable task can be accomplished? And think about how in any people a right leadership can emerge? We have no answer to this question. Humanity must find this answer.

*

Sankar Ghose writes in 'Jawaharlal Nehru, A Biography':

On the question of inviting Israel to the Bandung conference (From 18 April 1955 for a week) Nehru was in two minds. He knew that Israel had come to stay, but on the question of recognizing her he hesitated because of the possible adverse reaction amongst Indian Muslims, Indonesia and the Arabs generally. But in 1948 when Egypt's Farouk voted against India on the Hyderabad issue in the United Nation, he thought that the time had come to tell some of the Arab countries that India could not support them always, irrespective of what they did. So though Nehru asked the Indian delegation to vote against Israel's admission in the United Nations (May 11 1949), in 1950 he recognized Israel.

The birth of the state of Israel in May (14) 1948 had synchronized with the outbreak of Arab-Israeli hostilities as a result of which Israel had seized 77 per cent of Palestinian territory as against 55 per cent allocated to it by the U.N. resolution and it also expelled about 800,000 Palestinians from their homes. So when India recognized Israel, an official statement made it clear that this did not mean that India endorsed the Israeli position regarding its boundaries.

In March 1952 Nehru told Israel that India had no objection to the exchange of diplomatic representatives, but that the same would have to wait till after the elections. Later, however, Nehru indefinitely deferred this decision because of opposition from Azad and fear of adverse Muslim reaction. For the Bandung Conference, though

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

Krishna Menon was in favour of inviting Israel with some explanation to the Arab states, Nehru was against that, even though he confided that this was illogical and was done only because of Arab sentiment.

*

The U-Turn of the Hindu Nationalists

Perhaps within a decade the stalwarts of Hindu Nationalism who seemed to be enthusiastic lovers of Hitler were asking for the creation and then recognition of Israel. Taken together, Nehru, his Congress party and Hindu Nationalists, the intellectual poverty of India becomes manifest. I have mentioned it to complete the picture. It is painful for me to criticize men who faithfully devoted their whole lives for their country and people with a passion. For me there is a lesson. The emergence of right political leadership anywhere in the world is just luck of a people. Then the best can miss what later comes out to be the most crucial.

Accordingly, in 1947 India's Representative to the UN stated that the British wanted the establishment of a Jewish State for political and strategic reasons in total disregard of the principle of self-determination. On the other hand, the Government was strongly criticised by V.D. (Veer) Savarkar, the spokesman for the Hindu Mahasabha, which propagated a Hindu majoritarian view in Indian polity, who wrote that "it is... to be regretted that the delegation which represented our Hindusthani Government in the UNO should have voted against the creation of the Jewish State. [5]

[5] [Rajendra Abhyankar: The Evolution and Future of India-Israel Relations: Research Paper No. 6: March 2012 <http://www.tau.ac.il/humanities/abraham/india-israel.pdf>]

The BJP has a very interesting history --- officially formed in 1980, its history can be traced much further back to the pre-1947 era when Hindu nationalists not only demanded an independent India, but one completely dominated by Hindus. The current BJP is the successor of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh (BJS) party, which itself was the political arm of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh, a group that espoused openly militant Hindu activism and the suppression of minorities in India. The RSS was founded in 1925 by Keshav Baliram Hedgewar, a doctor from the central Indian town of Nagpur in Maharashtra, who agitated for both independence from the British crown and the strict segregation of Hindus and Muslims. What may surprise many in the West is that some of the most prominent figures of RSS deeply admired Fascism and Nazism, the two totalitarian movements that swept through Europe at the time. As

such, RSS was outlawed by the British (and was even periodically banned by the Indian government after independence). Indeed, Naturam Godse, the man who assassinated Gandhi in 1948, was himself a former RSS member who felt that the Mahatma made too many generous concessions to the Muslims. In the decades prior to that momentous event, senior RSS members had direct links to both Benito Mussolini in Italy and Adolf Hitler in Germany. Part of the RSS' fascination with these totalitarian regimes was their shared opposition to the British Empire -- however, it went far beyond that. The RSS (as well as multitudes of other Hindu nationalists) admired the way Mussolini and Hitler reorganized their respective nations so quickly from the wreckage of war to build a powerful economy and military under the banner of patriotism and nationalism. . . . Perhaps there was no greater admirer of Hitler and Mussolini in India than Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, another leading member of RSS. . . . Indeed, many Hindu nationalists also derided Gandhi for opposing Nazism and fascism. In 1939, a spokesman for the Hindu Mahasabha (Hindu Party) intimately connected Germany with Indian culture and people. . . . Another senior RSS member, Madhav Sadashiv Golwalkar, also praised Nazism and believed the ideology should be applied to India. [6]

[6] [Palash Ghosh: Hindu Nationalist's Historical Links to Nazism and Fascism: 03/06/2012 <http://www.ibtimes.com/hindu-nationalists-historical-links-nazism-fascism-214222>]

*

Concluding this chapter, it must not be forgotten that what led me to this discussion was the situation of Punjabi language. Apparently Pundit Nehru had nothing to do with this. But things are complicated. What can trigger a Punjabi youth whether Hindu, Muslim or Sikh to look back at the world, the sub-continent and the Punjab is needed. There are innumerable signposts in history which need to be connected in a certain way that a picture of the future emerges which humanity can recognise and long for.

Let Punjabi youth understand that humanity always needed leadership, humanity now needs leadership and humanity will always continue to need leadership. And both actions and non-actions of any leader matter. But the fundamental is to which principle a leader sticks with his soul in it and whether that principle is historically valid or not.

Let Punjabi youth go into deep and life-long thinking process and make many pictures for the future. We have been absent from history. When we were present we were reacting to a given situation. But the present time is to design the future, collect paraphernalia and start construction. Who is there to prevent. Believe me and I see the

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

inside of history, there is nobody. There is nobody to prevent the enthroning of our queen – the Punjabi language with its beautiful Gurmukhi script. ■