
Nature of Indian Politics after Independence

_____ Kausar Perveen

The partition of India intensified the hostility of Hindu extremist movements against Muslims in general as it nullified the Congress perception of a United India. The result was a strong Hindu reaction after independence resulting in communal riots as well as hard policy against Pakistan. This paper provides some details of the Hindu reaction against the Muslims, Pakistan and Kashmiris.

Amidst the celebration of independence, all over India, on the midnight of 15 August 47, with jubilation and a display of fireworks all around, there were heavy hearts and soul pricking, with feelings of retaliation against Muslims, who had, notwithstanding every possible resistance against, succeeded in carrying out a separate homeland for themselves in the North-West and North-East of India. (1) Incidentally, those who had been prized with, Muslims of East Bengal apart, were the people of Sind, Baluchistan, the Punjab and the Frontier. Their contribution in the struggle for making Pakistan was negligible, and occasionally negative. (2) But those, who had been left out in India, despite their untiring efforts for a dream turning into a reality, were the Muslims of the United Province, Bihar, Bengal and some other areas of the Southern India. The Indian National

Congress, apart from other extremist political groups, considered them, the real culprits in failing their mission of United India. The passion for revenge was born much before 15th August. Noakhali in Bengal was a scene of carnage, slaughter and setting ablaze of residential buildings and shopping centers, in the communal riots, which failed the peace mission of Mahatma Gandhi. (3) The communal frenzy spreading throughout, with the approaching Independence Day, coupled with the mess created by the Viceroy in postponing the Boundary Award of Cyril Radcliffe, received by him on 12 August, on a pretext of a possible strong reaction, thus keeping thousands of people in hundreds of villages in the Punjab and Bengal, to spend 15 August in fear and uncertainty unable to celebrate, because they would not know to which dominion they were going to belong (4) Mountbatten informed the Government in England, "I decided that somehow we must prevent the leaders from knowing the details of the Award until after the 15 August; all our work and the hope of good Indo-British relations on the Day of the Transfer of Power could risk being destroyed if we did not do this."(5)

The reaction of the Award, in Pakistan, has already been noted.(6) Now, Independence allowed police support to the rioters, all over Northern India, in particular in the Punjab, Bengal, Bihar and Assam to kill and plunder the refugee caravan moving toward their destinies across the border.(7) An estimate of 500,000 massacred during riots and refugee movement of 12 million men, women and children, young, old, and infants, with and without their domestic holdings, creeping on foot or bullock carts, was the most dreadful scene around, with occasional carrying of wounded and crippled, leaving behind the dead and the abducted young girls and women by invading armed mobs.(8) Many had lost their parents, husbands, wives, and children on the way, with untold misery of the strain, tension, and illness, apart from assaults of the hostile communal groups.(9)

Jawahar Lal Nehru, the Indian Prime Minister, who (unlike Mahatma Gandhi) remained unmoved on the communal riots, before Partition, (10) was now the most disturbed man. With extreme difficulty, he persuaded his own influential colleagues for assisting him in his mission; he said, "What foreigners reported that had brought India's name into the mud and made him ashamed even to meet the members of the diplomatic corps." (11) The dark clouds of extremism, which overflowed the Indian skies before and after 15 August, could not prevent a beam of light in toleration, forbearance and a new liberalism, at least in the name of country's honour and prestige, before the world. Nehru was the torchbearer of that beacon house to bring or atleast trying to bring the new enlightenment, so eminent to the name of India, renowned internationally for her cultural traditions and Eastern humanitarian values. (12)

"These events taken as a whole", observed Nehru, "have shown a picture of all Muslims, irrespective of their position or standing or residences, being hunted down and killed wherever possible. Every Ambassador's house has been visited by gangs in search of Muslim servants There is a limit to killing and brutality and that limit has been passed during these days in North India. – The future appears to be dark, not so much because 50,000 or 100,000 people have been murdered but because of the mentality that has accompanied this and that perhaps might continue. I quite realize that I am out of tune with this environment and not a fit representative of it. Yet I am entirely convinced that if we surrender to this mentality, then indeed we are doomed as a nation." (13) Writing to Dr. Rajendra Prasad, immediately after the Partition, he stated: "The consequences of each step that we might take are bound to be far reaching. The world is watching us also and the world's opinion counts. But above all we are watching over selves and if we fail in our own estimation, who will rescue us"? (14) Nehru, in fact, was confronted with severe communal feelings within his own Cabinet. Members like Abul Kalam Azad, John Matthai, Ahmed

Kidwai and Amrit Kaur were exposed to more liberalism than Vallabh Bhai Patel, Dr. Rajindra Prasad and the Hindu Mahasabha leader, Shyama Prasad Mookherji. Some of them pleaded a Hindu State in India, which symbolized the Hindu interests of the Hindu majority. (15) Muslims could not be loyal to India and should be dismissed or made a hostage for a guaranteed security of the Hindus in Pakistan. (16) He was against Nehru's desire of employing some Muslims to deal with Muslim refugees in camps. (17) Both, Patel and Rajindra Prasad were followers of Gandhi but untouched in the real sense of the spirit of Gandhi." Rajindra Prasad criticized Nehru on his involving army to protect the lives and property of the Muslims in Delhi. "If the Hindus and Sikh remained unprotected in Pakistan, why should the Muslims be protected in India?" (18)

Hindu extremist behavior was being highlighted by foreign media to the extent that Nehru had to write to his sister Vijay Lakshmy Pandit, Indian Ambassador in the USA that she should not let the U.S. media to print reports on Indian riots. (19) Nehru was greatly concerned about Indian image abroad. His efforts to evolve a saner and a tolerant social structure was the pre-requisite of a democratic society. But many of his colleagues did not see eye to eye with him. Nehru, as such, had become leader of a newly born Liberal group in Indian politics, immediately after the birth of Independent India.

Before 1947, (The Partition of India) Nehru did not belong to the Liberal group of the Indian National Congress. He was not an extremist either. He was unlike his father Motilal Nehru, well known for his moderate ideals in politics. But after the Montford Reforms of 1919, Jawahar Lal Nehru was able to influence his father, which made him to compile a report against Muslim interest. (20) Attitude towards Muslims only evolved as an important factor, but not the real one, in the dividing line between Extremists and Liberals in Indian politics. In fact this division was born with the birth of the Indian National Congress

in 1885, when two simultaneous sessions were held, at Calcutta and Bombay. The Calcutta session was attended only by the Indian mostly Bengalis whereas the Bombay session was attended by quite a few former English civil servants, besides some Muslims. It was presided by a Bengali barrister W.C. Banerjea. (21) Although the following sessions of the Congress remained united and held on the Christmas Day every year, yet, the division of the Congress was marked in the approach of its members: one group prepared to cooperate with the Englishmen and the Government of India, but not the other. (22) This division became more visible after 1892 when the Amendment to the Indian Council Act of 1861, appeared, disillusioning the political aspirations of the Indian National Congress. (23)

The Partition of Bengal in 1905 added fuel to the fire and the Hindu extremists openly condemned the Government of India. At the same time some Indian continued to cooperate with the Government. (24) The Seditious Committee Reports followed by the Rowlett Act, strengthened the Indian extremists, now denied by the Government, the privileges of the Diarchy in the provinces, under the Government of India Act of 1919. (25) And yet, there was a substantial number of the Congressites who participated in provincial elections under the new Constitution, and winning, joined the Provincial Governments, besides ordinary members, nominated by the Governors for the Governor's Council along with many educated Hindu Congressites joining the Imperial Council and members of the Viceroy's Executive Council. (26) Those Congressites, who remained associated with the Government of India, sustained all pressures of agitational politics, which began with Mahatma Gandhi's Non-Cooperation Movement after the Rowlett Act, and continued intermittently till the formation of the Interim Government in 1946. There appeared occasional deadlocks in pursuing the Independence Movement by the Congress with a perception, which was not identical to the perception of the Colonial power. The big gap in perception caused the tyranny of the Jillianwala, (27) though not

repeated ever, yet it boosted up to highest level, the popularity of the Congress at the grassroot level. (28) Gandhiji's Non-Cooperation was withdrawn in 1923 following the Chori Chaura incident, (29) but it was renewed after the publication of the Simon Reports in 1930, which did not meet most of the demands claimed by Congress in the Nehru Report.

The Congress's boycott of the first Round Table Conference and Gandhiji led Non-Cooperation Movement came to an end with Irwin-Gandhi's pact, facilitated by the Liberal Congress members, in the Viceroy Executive Council. (30) The failure of the R.T.C. and the announcement of the Communal Award (1932) again provoked Non-Cooperation Movement which continued till the elections of 1936 under the Government of India Act 1935. (31) The Liberals, as such, mediated between the Congress and the Government in bringing them to the conference table for a mutual understanding and thus, advancing the movement ahead. Their contribution to the Indian politics, in particular, the Freedom Movement of India has not been studied till to date. (32) It is important to note that the person who contributed to the Indian machinations in managing accession of Kashmir to India, i.e. V.P. Menon, was an employee of Vice regal Secretariat and very close to Mountbatten. It was unfortunate, that the role of these Congressite except a few including Menon remained untold in the history of Indian Freedom till today. Even after Independence, the credit of the Movement was enjoyed by Jawahar Lal Nehru and his group, including Vallabh Bhai Patel, having won appreciations over his strong policy as Home Minister, during the Interim Government, particularly for integrating the princely states. (33)

The other factor, which divided the Extremists and the Liberals in the Indian National Congress was not in their main objective, rather, in the approach toward its achievement. The Extremists joined by the militant groups of B.G.Tilak, and the religious-political factions, under Arya Samajist leaders such as

Dayanand, Lajpat Rai and Swami Shardhanand professed total conversion of the Muslims to their original dharma by force, if a choice of voluntary acceptance to Hinduism, remained ineffective. (34) The Liberal's were not intolerant towards Muslims; their political rights were sympathetically considered by them but not to an extent, which could challenge Hindu political domination over the minorities. For examples, the principle of weightage did allure the Congress (Liberal) in the Lucknow Pact, to recognize Muslim Separate Electorates, and their one third representations in services etc., but they withdrew their acceptance, in 1924, of the Lucknow Pact following its implementation after 1921, with the enforcement of Diarchy in the Province. (35)

The ensuing Hindu-Muslim question, remained a burning issue in the Constitutional reforms, and from the 'Parting of the Ways' (1928), till the Muslim League's finally joining the Interim government, (1946) an atmosphere, of mistrust, skepticism, and communal hostility prevailed in a showdown for the successes of their communal objectives. The Indian National Congress was over obsessed with her failure in resisting the Partition of India, as also disillusioned that Jinnah might reject the offer of a crippled Pakistan. (36) Then, the Congress reconciled itself with Pakistan in a hope that she may soon breakdown which could result in its rejoining the Indian Union. (37) Kashmir may be of extreme importance to India for her close vicinity to China, Afghanistan and Russia, more so for her socio-religious and cultural affinity with Buddhist and Hindu traditions in Ladakh and Hindu dominated region of Jammu etc. notwithstanding Muslim majority and their predominant religious culture, (38) little valued politically under Dogra Rule, and the humiliating living conditions of the Muslims due to economic deprivation. Yet the valley was the so called 'Life Line' for the newly born Pakistan, and India had an opportunity to strike and hurt her by nipping Pakistan's throat, by converting a fertile region into a desert. (39)

With this objective, the Indian National Congress and all other political parties whether regional, religious or National, despite their different approaches, in efforts to achieve their goal, were ideologically united. But, the distinction between their approximations branded them Extremist, Liberal and Communalist etc. Referring to the air lifting of Indian forces to Srinagar, Nehru's statement is self-explanatory. He said, "I trust in this defense, we shall give demonstration to all India and to the world, how we can function unitedly and in a non-communal way in Kashmir. In this way, this terrible crisis in Kashmir may well lead to a healing of the deep wounds which India has suffered in recent months." (40) This is not just a statement of an individual, it was an Indian ideal, then, and it sustained in its spirit, in India's domestic and foreign policy in the days to come.

But with the dawn of Independence, the old structure of the Liberals disappeared. Those, who remained in the Viceroy's Executive Council, in fact, lost their offices with the induction of the Interim Government in 1946, with Jawahar Lal Nehru as the Prime Minister. History does not record, the fate of the former Indian members of the Viceroy's Council, with some exceptions, of those who were absorbed in the Indian administration after the Partition. (41) Nehru's liberalism in saving Muslim lives, after Partition and resisting the extremists demand to attack Pakistan in revenge to the exodus of Hindus and Sikhs from the Punjab, was more to save a bad name for India in the International Community than for the love of Indian Muslims. Paul R. Brass rightly observes: "A set of values associated with the idea of a strong centralized state underlay and preceded pre-occupational threats to nation's unity and territorial integration under the manipulative and self-defeating policies of particular leaders sacrificing the interest of the country in favor of their own. Even before Independence, India's national leaders, with the exception of Mahatma Gandhi and his followers and disciples – considered such a state an absolute necessity to make Independent India a great respected country in the world."(42) Associated with this doctrine

was also the belief that "a consolidated nation was essential to provide a foundation for such a state," added Paul Brass. "The idea of turning such a diverse and heterogeneous country as India, into a nation state was tempered during Nehru's lifetime by his pluralist policies and the acceptance in practice of India, as in effect, a multinational state – though the word itself could not be used in a society whose nationality oriented elite would be offended by its implications. For the latter, the unity and territorial integrity of India, as the ultimate value, for whose preservation any and all means will be used, as the world has clearly seen in the Punjab and Kashmir."(43)

The Indian obsession of national unity and her claim to secularism is evident from the status of Indian Muslims and Hindu-Muslim relations. Secularism, in principles demanded a strong central government to protect the minorities. (44) The Muslims – whose very status, "as perpetual and endangered minority, is required to justify the existence of the state. For without the dangers produced from Hindu-Muslim riots, most especially the unending conflict with Pakistan, the ideological justification for such a state would be reduced and demands of decentralization of the Indian polity would acquire a greater force."(45)

The reason behind the variance in the professional and operational values may be or perhaps was the dominant influence of Hindu extremists, which turned Indian politics to militant Hindu Nationalism. (46) The Indian politics initiated militant cult, immediately after Partition, and kept its pressure with sustainable force, with regard to (i) Indian Muslims, (ii) relations with Pakistan and (iii) Kashmir throughout her domestic and foreign policy. (47) The militant Hindu Nationalism grew in a family of Hindu militant organizations including the Bharatiya Janta Party (BJP), the Rashtria Swayamsewak Sang (the RSS, founded in 1925), the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (V.H.P) and the Bajrang Dal (B.D). The manifestoes of these militant political groups, though

common in objective i.e. the Hindutva Swarajia, their approach and methods seem unidentical to one another. The RSS aimed to unite Indians and consolidate them into a Hindu Nation. The B.J.P. aimed at acquisition of power and develop India into a Hindu State. The V.H.P. was the torchbearer of the Ayudhiya Movement, late in 1992, and its members, with heavy hammers in hand, were seen breaking the Babri mosque. The B.D. an armed gang, is responsible for violence during any activity, ostensibly to protect Hindus, in fact to kill Muslims. (48) Thus, under the shadow of secularism, professedly adopted with the Constitution, since 1950, the communalists took to Hindutva as a goal to be attained. "There is no secular counterpart to the R.S.S Shakas, the Van Kalyan Samithis, the Shisha and Saraswati Niketans, the tribal re-conversion movements of the like of Dilip Singh Judes in Chatli's sagarh."(49)

Their communal propoganda and misuse of their social welfare activities in spreading communal feeling, igniting communal fire, when opportunity arises, at their vicious end. (50) Addressing the birth of Jana Sang, Mani Shankar suggests, "it was not till the autumn of 1949, that the trickles assumed the proportion of one way flood from East Pakistan into West Bengal, Assam and Tripura. It was that flood which provided the proximate provocation for the Jana Sang under the leadership of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee. The Jana Sang began as a regional party of the Hindu motherland of West Bengal reaching out to other parts of Hindu motherland, which Hindu militant, Shyama Prasad, picked up through his Private Secretary Atal Bihari Vajpayee. (51) The Indian communal frenzy was excited again when in 1949, in the crisis of Sterling devaluation, India devalued her rupee, but Pakistan refused. India immediately stopped her trade activities with Pakistan. But Mohan Lal Sexana, the Union Minister of Rehabilitation of Jawahar Lal Nehru's Cabinet, ordered sealing all Muslim shops in Delhi because India had broken all economic ties with Pakistan. (52) The Indian Prime Minister, in 1950 faced himself in a critical position when in his

hometown (the U.P), newly elected President of the Indian National Congress, Parshotam Das Tondon, and disallowed teaching of Urdu language in primary schools, unless more than forty students or more demanded it. Jawahar Lal Nehru wrote to Pandit Govind Vallabh Pant.

“The United Province is becoming a foreign land to me. The U.P. Congress Committee, to which I have been associated for 35 years, functions in a manner that amazes me. Its voice is not the voice of the Congress I have known, but something that I have opposed for the greater part of my life.”(53) The new structure of Liberalism had thus come to exist from within the Indian National Congress, which had its effects on other individuals, both, politicians as well as journalists. Nehru really meant when he wrote to the Congress’s new President, Tondon: ‘So long I am Prime Minister, I shall not allow communalism to shape our policy, nor am I prepared to tolerate barbarous and uncivilized behavior. (54) Even the Deputy Prime Minister, Sardar Vallabh Bhai Patel was an extremist and fully supported Hindutva movement. Inspired by him, West Bengal’s Chief Minister B.C. Roy decided that ten Muslims be expelled from W.Bengal against one Hindu, driven out from East Bengal. Nehru did not approve, rather strongly denied such a policy, not caring the eventual resignation of the Chief Minister. (55) But such stray instances, apart, the Hindutva movement was emerging fast within the Indian National Congress and as its impact the Nasik elections for the Congress’s Presidency, in September 1950, rejected a Liberal candidate, Achariya Cirpalani. But, when the extremism of the new President (Tondon) became evident, and strongly opposed by the government, he had no other choice except to resign, and Nehru, in order to identify his own policy of Liberalism, assumed the office of the Presidentship of the Congress. Addressing a public gathering on the 1st anniversary of Gandhi’s assassination, he said, “if any person raises his hand to strike down another on the ground of religion, I shall fight him till the last breath of my life, both as the head of the Government, and from outside.”(56)

Reconstruction of Somnath temple was another important issue that brought to limelight the ideological differences between the two groups of the Congress. Somnath temple existed in Junagarh, a princely state with a majority Hindu population, but a Muslim ruler, who announced the accession of state to Pakistan. It was captured by India in November 1947 through a police action. (57) A mosque also existed near the Somnath temple and one minaret of the Mosque lay in for destruction before the reconstruction of the Somnath temple, was to be inaugurated. Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the Indian President and K.M. Munshi were zealously keen to be present at the ceremony, which could flare up communal tension. Mahatma Gandhi, had earlier opposed this scheme, but his efforts to dissuade them, proved futile. Nehru was also against government involvement in the reconstruction of the temple, as it was a matter of personal faith, and more so, it was an act of reventchism.”(58) K.M. Munshi pleaded that the Union Cabinet had already approved in December, 1947, the reconstruction plan of the temple. But the minutes of the meeting in record did not show any such approval, which infuriated Nehru, stopping all Government funds for the temple, in consequence (59)

The fate of extremist politics in India was finally decided during the Lok Sabha elections of February 1952, which gave the Liberal Congressite a sweeping win (60) and Jan Sang and Hindu Mahasabha could not get more than two seats. (61) This was a tacit recognition of the people to support Nehru and liberalism, atleast for the time being, but quite timely.

The extremists political defeat in the General Elections of 1952 did not mean that they were being ignored ideologically. Their perception of Nationalism which was popular with all the Indian citizens, irrespective of their religious beliefs remained unchanged, and all political parties, including the Indian National Congress, remained alive to its preservation. Even India's secular

posture, adopted with the Indian Constitution from 26 Jan 1950, did not make much difference, practically.

M. S. Golwalker, the R.S.S. Chief in 1940, defining Indian Nationalism, advised the Muslims that "culturally, linguistically, they (Muslims) must adopt the past, and must entertain the aspirations for the future of the Hindu Nation. In short, they must be integrated in the country through animisation assimilated in the (Hindu) Nation wholly The non-Hindu population in Hindustan must either adopt the Hindu culture and language, must learn to respect and hold in reverence Hindu religion, must entertain no idea, but those of the glorification of the Hindu race and culture i.e. they must not only give up their attitude of intolerance and ungratefulness towards this land, and its age long traditions, but must also cultivate the positive attitude of love and devotion instead ---- in one word, they must cease to be foreigners or may stay in the country, wholly, subordinated to the Hindu Nation, claiming nothing, deserving no prestige, not even citizen rights."(63)

It may be incorrect to presume that such a definition of Hindu Nationalism may be a reaction against the Muslims on their call for a separate Muslim homeland (The Lahore Resolution). On the contrary, it finds its legacy from the religio-political movements of the late 19th century i.e. the Tilak and the Arya Smajaist Movements, which professed perception of Indian Nationalism, not dissimilar to the R.S.S. leader. (64) It may not be a mistake to consider that the Indian (Hindu) extremists and Liberals did not have a divided perception on Indian future, with predominant Hindu representation in Legislature, Union and State's governments, services, and socio-cultural activities overshadowed with their religious traditions and outlook. (65)

A.R. Momin, an educationist of Mumbai University, observes on Indian Nationalism, "As the ideology of Hindutva posits an inherent, explicit identity between nationalism and patriotism on

the one hand and Hindu ethos and cultural traditions on the other. A corollary of this view is that Muslims, Christians, Zoroastrians and all other non-Hindu communities are excluded from the ambit of nationalism and patriotism." (66)

V.D. Sarvarkar defined a Hindu as "a person who regards this land From the Indus to the sea, his fatherland (pitrubhumi) as well as his holy land (Puryabhumi)." His argument, however unsound, urges that to Muslims and Christians, India was a father land but not a holy land. Their mythology and god men, ideas and heroes, are not the children of this soil. Consequently, their names and their outlook smack a foreign origin; their love of land is divided."(67) Golwalker's statement, "let the minorities understand that their safety depends in the goodwill of the majority,"(68) is somewhat a blunt statement but it carries the same meaning which the more sophisticated statements, came later from L.K.Advani and Murli Manohar Joshi. The latter used to address Muslims as Muhammadi Hindus and the former as Sikh Hindu, Muslim Hindu and Christian Hindus. (69)

Reaction of the Partition against Pakistan

Indo-Pakistan relations were indeed tense from the very birth of Pakistan, but the heart burning was more pinching on Indian side for obvious reasons. Every Pakistani, though highly delighted for winning the goal, was also sad over Indian mechnation in obtaining accession of Kashmir in Oct 1947, and the ensuing Muslim uprising coupled with the incoming refugees caravan after caravan, all carrying unforgettable stories of the sufferings on way to Pakistan, by the armed assaults, under police support, killing men, women, children, the old aged, and the young, indiscriminately. Pakistan, herself, without sufficient resources, (70) had to meet this challenge to rehabilitate the refugees, and to provide treatment to the coming sick, wounded and most distressed with the loss of their parents, children, husbands and wives, and still more upon the abducted young girls and women by the Sikh/Hindu marauders. (71) Let alone Kashmir, India

grabbed forcefully Junagarh and Manawader, two Princely States on her border, immediately after their Muslim rulers declared accession to Pakistan in December 1947. In September 1948, Indian forces ran over Hyderabad Deccan, crushing the resisting forces of Qasim Rizvi, the head of the State Militia and the volunteers. (72) Hyderabad's Prime Minister, Laiq Ali, had already come to Pakistan, before the Indian military take over. (73) The fall of Hyderabad coincided with the death of Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah on 11 September 1948. (74)

Indian aggressive posture, in use of force, was indeed a matter of concern to Pakistan, more so because Pakistan's forces i.e. the Muslim regiments, offering to serve Pakistan, and scattered in different parts around the subcontinent, waiting to return home were held back under orders of Baldev Singh, the Minister of Defense during the Interim Government. It was only after the establishment of Pakistan that they were allowed to come back and then immediately deployed in the two wings of the country to secure refugee caravans from the marauding armed gangs. (75) Reorganization of Pakistan's army was still in the process of making, when India under pretext of a large scale exodus of Hindu refugees from East Bengal to Assam and West Bengal, concentrated her forces on the West Pakistan borders. Whether or not, it was merely a threat from the Indian side, shall remain debatable amongst the historians of India and Pakistan, nevertheless, India had informed the United Kingdom over her intentions, (76) when, Pakistan sharply responded, and her Prime Minister, Liaqat Ali Khan, addressing a public gathering in Lahore, waved his fist to India, warning that Pakistan was not cowed down by Indian threats. (77) "Nehru's early hopes," observes his biographer, of a quick re-union with Pakistan had not lasted long, and even in January 1948, he had given a public assurance that the Government of India had no desire to re-unite Pakistan with India. (78) Repetition of the same statement by Nehru, six months later, (79) was an apology to another frustration of Indian

ambitions and their long cherished desire and expectation of Pakistan's immediate collapse. (80)

After being declared a secular Republic, India resolved a fresh start with Pakistan, extending a hand of friendship with a No War Pact. Nehru also requested Liaquat Ali Khan for a joint tour of the two Bengals in order to cool down tension caused by non-Muslim exodus from East Bengal. (81) The Congress Parliamentary Party disapproved the idea, before Pakistan's response, and the plan flopped. (82) Differences between Nehru and Patel became evident on the growth of extremist political groups like R.S.S., which the latter deemed important, and Nehru disapproved. (83) Gandhi's assassination had encouraged extremist groups supported by Patel, besides many other members of Nehru's Cabinet, conspiring to oust him Patel being tipped as the next Prime Minister. (84)

The signing of the Liaquat Nehru Pact on the minority issue, was motivated because of the Objective Resolution, moved in Pakistan's Constituent Assembly, which from Nehru's points of view, was meant to install a theocratic government. This move spread some disappointment in the minority community, which began immigration to West Bengal and Assam. After some assurance from Liaquat Ali, Nehru proposed a joint commission of the two Bengals to keep monitoring of equal rights, guaranteed to the minorities. Liaquat Ali rejected the offer, as a joint Commission could be between the two governments, rather than, between two provinces. Nehru, conceded eventually, and the Agreement (Liaquat-Nehru Pact) was signed on 8 April 1950. (87) Nehru seemed to be more concerned on the political rights of the minorities in Pakistan. Having been moved in the Constituent Assembly in 1949, the bill was still in the process of adoption, which appeared threatening for the non-Muslim minority, having resolved to leave Pakistan. On the contrary, the Muslim minority in India was in a constant state of insecurity, and a mass hysteria for killing them, spread among the general population. Nehru,

because of his liberalism towards Indian Muslims and efforts to break the spiral of inhumanity, was himself under threat of assassination, receiving too many abusive letters. In extreme regret, he wrote to Aruna Asif Ali, 'an evil fate seems to pursue us, reducing many of us to the level of brutes. (88) Nehru's keenness to improve better relations with Pakistan, overcame his despondency on extremists irrational behavior. Writing to Sri Prakash, he stated: 'Do not give up hopes about me so easily. I have still enough strength and energy left in me to face many storms, and I have every intention of overcoming and controlling the present storm.'(89) Two of his colleagues in the Cabinet: Shyama Prasad Mookherji and K. C. Neogy, had resigned in protest against Liaquat – Nehru Agreement. Nehru urged upon them to accept the Agreement and work to make it a success, however unsatisfactory to them, the Agreement may be. (90)

The Deputy Prime Minister, Vallabh Bhai Patel, who supported Nehru on the minorities Agreement with Pakistan, was in fact under pressure from the large scale communal riots (91) that broke out in West Bengal. Patel had to step in Gandhi's footprints to cool down angry armed mobs. Earlier, he fully supported a military take over of East Bengal. Khushwant Singh, referring to the communal riots after the Partition, states "I thought we had seen the worst and hoped that one thing that would never happen again was Hindu-Muslim riots."(92) He later laments, "Alas after a lull of a few years, the communal crisis erupted again in different parts of the country. Commission of enquiry have stated in categorical terms that in all Hindu Muslim riots after Independence, over seventy percent of casualties, in term of life and property were Muslim's. I have little faith in the impartiality of our police in quelling communal violence, but I had hoped for better performance from the majority community."(93)

This majority community, unfortunately, was over-onscious of its recently acquired Independence, and with a few exceptions in political leadership as well as the Hindu masses, all of them

were engaged to develop India a Hindu State, not in name, for it may reflect Indian dark face abroad, but camouflaged under Secular India. Jawahar Lal Nehru, seemed in this darkness of communal outlook, the only spark and a beam light of hope, as a Liberal, who came out to care for Muslims, the most suffering minority in India after Partition. Even when most of the extremist ministers of his own cabinet in the Government were all bent upon to revenge and attack Pakistan, Nehru, alone, extended a hand of friendship, a necessity, for whatever motives. But Kashmir was a different question. Nehru, as far as Kashmir was concerned, could not bow down from his position, that, come what may, it shall remain with India and under any situation.

Post – Partition: Impact of Indo – Pakistan Kashmir War

The Kashmir war between India and Pakistan was already in progress on the eve of the partition of India, so much so, that the Dogra Raja, under pressure of the general uprising of the Muslims in the valley, fled with all his belongings to Jammu.’(94) But soon after the declaration of the Radcliffe Award, the Dogra Raja’s accession of the state to India, Indian troops, having landed in Srinagar as on 27 October, for an all out war against the Kashmiri Muslims, whom India stated to be Pakistan’s army in civilian dress. (95) But these Kashmiri Muslims, whether civilian Kashmiris, or tribesmen or the Pakistan army Jawans, had almost reached Srinagar, and if properly equipped, as usually any army is, Kashmir could almost be a solved issue. (96) “The Poonch relief,” observes Lamb, formally declared their Independence from the Maharaja as the State of Azad Kashmir,’ and the volunteers involved in fighting against the Dogra ruler, now named the Azad Kashmir army, which blew up the Mhura Power Station, only 30 miles from Srinagar. (97)

The drama of the valley’s accession to India, and the haste with which it was played on and finalized, is well explained by Lamb, which include participant actors from the Indian politicians including Jawahar Lal Nehru himself, the Dogra Raja with his

Prime Minister, Mahajan, besides the Governor General Mountbatten, and his former aid V. P. Menon. (98) It has already been suggested that it was pre-planned and executed now with extreme care, notwithstanding the risk of moving Indian forces in Kashmir, before the accession papers were properly signed by Mountbatten and later on by the Dogra Raja. (99) The story of the accession, and the forgery involved, is too often repeated by Pakistani and foreign historians. Very briefly some chronological explanation of developments from 15 October should bring us home to the conclusion. On 15 October, M.C. Mahajan, Prime Minister designate of Jammu and Kashmir, (Formerly Hindu member of the Boundary Commission under Radcliffe and a Judge of the Punjab High Court, who was a party in granting Gurdaspur and Batala, the Muslim majority districts, to India, under the Boundary Award) was commissioned to manage Kashmir's accession to India. (100) Taking charge as Prime Minister, he accused Pakistan, (101) having stopped supplies to Kashmir of essential food items. (102) The same day, a Stand Still Agreement was sent to both: India and Pakistan for Kashmir accession to anyone of the States, pending decision. Pakistan accepted the offer whereas India, as per understanding, did not respond. (103) and yet Nehru wrote back to Mahajan that Pakistan was trying to force Kashmir's accession in her favour. (104) On 18 October, Pakistan received a threat from Mahajan that unless an impartial enquiry was instituted to know the causes of the suspension of supplies to Kashmir, he would be obliged to ask for friendly assistance' (obviously from India)(105). Demand of an enquiry was only an excuse for gaining time, as when Liaqat Ali Khan agreed on the Enquiry Commission and asked Mahajan to nominate a person, he did not respond. (106)

India was highly concerned over the insurgency in Kashmir, more so because of the rapidly deteriorating condition of the Raja's forces. The news of the Tribesmen from the North of Pakistan, including Gilgit, which was a part of Jammu and Kashmir, having come to join the Muslims of Kashmir, involved in

the Jihad against the Dogra Raja, was most perturbing to India. Nehru and Patel had different opinion upon India's immediate arms supply to Kashmir. Patel considered it imminent, whereas, Nehru said it was not possible before formal accession of the state to India. Nehru also rejected Mountbatten's proposal for managing a temporary accession of Kashmir. (107) On 26 October, Mountbatten, 'reluctantly' allowed Indian troops to be air borne to Kashmir. The Accession Documents were brought by V.P. Menon and Mahajan, unsigned by the Raja, on the morning of 27th. Mountbatten was again hesitant to sign a blank Accession Form. But, he eventually signed the documents. The Dogra Raja signed the document a day later. (107) India was not yet satisfied with the situation. Nehru, in utter confusion, apprised the British Prime Minister, Lord Attlee, how India was obliged to airborne troops to Kashmir after the tribal invasion from Pakistan. But Attlee was most reluctant to involve England in the Kashmir dispute.

Nevertheless, he advised Nehru for a negotiated settlement of the issue, as sending troops in Kashmir, may not help and was therefore not advisable. (109) Attlee insisted a meeting between Nehru, Liaqat and the Maharaja for a formal settlement of the dispute, as Indian forces in Kashmir could initiate an open war between the two countries. Attlee also wrote a letter to Liaqat Ali Khan, almost on the same lines. (110) Lord Ismay and Field Marshal Auchinleck also insisted upon a peaceful settlement of the dispute, rather than through forces, but both Nehru and Patel rejected. Meanwhile an official statement issued from Karachi about the Indian fraud in Kashmir, infuriated Indian Government. (111) Jinnah-Mountbatten meeting in Lahore on 1st November 47 was fruitless, (112) and the war continued. Mountbatten did not agree with Gandhi, who thought that if England took a hard line, Pakistan may succumb and return to normalcy. On the contrary, Nehru was becoming more and more emotional on Kashmir. 'It was not only future of Kashmir or Pakistan, it was also the future of India, he said". (113) Mountbatten, however, was able to

convince Nehru that he should refer the issue to the U.N.O., that the only alternative left to India was a full scale war against Pakistan. This issue had already been on the agenda of talks between Nehru, Liaquat and Mountbatten on 21 December '47 in Delhi. Mountbatten thought that the letter to the U.N.O. be shown to Liaquat Ali, in good faith. But Nehru declined. (116) The wave of distrust between the two countries had already dawned; in India, apprehensive of, with the gradually leakage of their plan for the Kashmir's accession; and for Pakistan, when Mahajan refused to entertain Pakistan's nominee to negotiate with the Kashmir's Prime Minister. (115)

Another frustration for Pakistan befell, when Douglas Gracy declined Quaid-i-Azam's orders to send troops to Kashmir. The matter being referred to Auchinleck, he rushed to Lahore for a meeting with Pakistan's Governor-General, threatening him to withdraw all British officers, in Pakistan army, in case of an open war between the two countries. (116) And yet the Government in England was showing concern over Kashmir war. She desired a plebiscite in Kashmir, possible only when hostilities could come to an end. A request from the British High Commission in Pakistan alleged Indian influence over Mountbatten which could poison English feelings against Pakistan and in favour of India. It was refuted immediately by London, saying that Indians were accusing them to be pro-Pakistan. (117) But, what England desired was that India and Pakistan, come to an agreement on Kashmir. (118) India, meanwhile rejected England's another proposal for a plebiscite under the auspices of the I.C.J. (International Court of Justice). (119) But Nehru declined that unless the invaders were driven out, it was not possible. He added that the I.C.J. did not possess the necessary machinery for a plebiscite. For this, the Security Council of the UNO had the mechanism ready. (120) India rejected Mountbatten's another proposal to attack West Punjab, a plan, which the Indian Defence Council had already approved on 20 December. According to Mountbatten, the U.N.O. might back up India on the move. (121)

Nehru, too, had a similar feelings, but on different grounds. He thought, that a complaint to the Security Council may include the details of the invaders crossing Pakistan's territory to attack India, might get an approval of the Security Council for sending troops across the International Border to strike at the base of the tribesmen. (122) "On no account would we submit to this barbarity whatever the cost. I am convinced that any surrender on our part to this kind of aggression would lead to continuing aggression elsewhere, and whether we want or not, war would become inevitable between India and Pakistan We have refrained from crossing into Pakistan territory because of our desire to avoid complications leading to open war To surrender to this situation we have brought a complete degradation upon India which I could not possibly tolerate."(123)

Nehru also informed Attlee of India's intentions of a pre-emptive attack on Pakistan, ostensibly in self-defence. (124) Mountbatten did not approve of an attack on Pakistan, also threatening to vacate office of the Governor-Generalship, if Nehru did it."(125) Attlee's reply, too, was disappointing to Nehru, and so that of the Security Council. He said, "I must say that, prepared as I was for untoward happenings, I could not imagine that the Security Council could possibly behave in the trivial and partisan manner in which it functioned. These people are supposed to keep the world in order. It is not surprising that the world is going to pieces. The United States and British have played a dirty role, Britain probably being the chief actor behind the scene. I have expressed my self strongly to Attlee about it and I propose to make it perfectly clear to the British Government what we think about it. The time for soft and meaningful talk has passed."(126)

Attlee had in fact warned India earlier, that "approaching the U.N.O. would place India definitely in the wrong in the eyes of the world, and I can assure you from our experience on International bodies that it will greatly prejudice India's case before the U.N.O". (127) And yet Attlee made manifest his real

concern on the issue, and wrote to the two High Commissions in India and Pakistan, that the Government in England intended to ask Arthur Henderson, who was to visit shortly Burma for Independence celebration, to discuss the possible solution, with the two Prime Ministers in Delhi and Karachi on his way back. He is also asked to invite the two Prime Ministers to visit London for a summit. Henderson was disappointed with his meeting with Nehru on 9 Jan 1948, who refused to proceed to London for a meeting with Liaqat Ali, and any negotiations on Kashmir. (128) Henderson's meeting with Liaqat Ali remained just formal. He made no mention of a visit to London as it was not necessary. (129)

Nehru's annoyance with Great Britain, despite Mountbatten's warnings, was for the simple reason that he just wanted a moral support from England or the U.N.O, if not from the U.S.A., for sending troops to West Punjab to seal the tribesmen to their Northern areas. He did not take notice of Attlee's earlier warning when he stated: "all military history goes to show how difficult it is to deal with tribes of the North West Frontier even when operating from secure military bases." (130) Now, when India launched a complaint against Pakistan in the Security Council, the main objective was to obtain recognition of India's claim that Pakistan be declared an aggressor so that India had a chance to run over West Punjab through her forces. Attlee, perceiving the Indian objectives, advised his Permanent Representative in the Security Council to precipitate Ceasefire Resolution before India, undertook the adventure. (131)

The Security Council discussed the issue initially on 15 Jan 1948, and then on 27 January 1948. The detailed analysis of the issue, shall come in the following chapter, suffice here to note that the S.C. made hectic efforts for a possible compromise on the issue of plebiscite, in order to narrow down the differences. This was besides the U.N. appeal to the two countries, not to aggravates, the already tense situation in the valley. (132)

Nehru was extremely upset on the whole situation. He considered the role played by England and the U.S.A. more harmful to Indian interests. Writing to Mountbatten, he said, "I can only say I am amazed after all that has happened to us. Quite apart from any difference of opinion, one has an uncomfortable feeling that an attempt has been made to lull us into feeling a security when developments were taking place which were considered by us entirely objectionable." (133) Nehru's letter to Stafford Cripps, an old friend, was more pathetic. He said, I feel that the British Policy has not been very happy in Asia, in India and in Kashmir. Why it should have been so is more than I can understand, because I see no benefit to the United Kingdom in adopting this policy toward India. India counts even now and will count a great deal later." (134) Attlee did not like Nehru's tone. In his reply, he was formal in rejecting Indian complaint, which irritated further the Indian Prime Minister. (135) Cripps, too, was formal in reply, "you must be fair Jawahar Lal Nehru, and not take the attitude that any stick will do to beat the British with." (136)

Disappointed with Britain, Nehru resolved to visit the U.S.A., responding to the long awaiting call from President Truman. Perhaps in a personal meeting with the U.S. President, he may be able to convince the U.S. on Indian logic on Kashmir. (137) But before he could embark upon his U.S. venture, U.S. support to Pakistan on Kashmir issue irritated him. No one was in a mood to recognize Pakistan as an aggressor. (138) India, in utter disappointment was rejecting all proposals, whether of a plebiscite, withdrawal of forces, or arbitration and so on. (139) "We want to be friendly with the United States of America and the United Kingdom but neither pressure tactics nor lure of help will make us give up a position which we were convinced was right from every point of view." (140) In a public speech at Ferozepur, he stated, "that his government had rejected the proposals for arbitration which Truman and Attlee had pressed on him and assessed that Indian troops would not be withdrawn from Kashmir unless the people of that state desired it and the

government of India was satisfied that the safety of Kashmir would not be endangered thereby. (141) Nehru had denied arbitration of Admiral Namitz earlier, and, now, once again he took a hard line against General Mecnaughton, whom he accused, appeared to be against India. (142) Nehru suspected some Englishmen serving in Pakistan doing mischief. In particular, he named Foreign Secretary, Earnest Bevin, who moved Pakistan in Arab politics, as a bargain for winning English support on Kashmir. (143) Nehru, disappointed from U.N.O., looked hopefully towards the Common Wealth, which could safeguard interests of India with Great Britain as the mother country. The U.S. administration, too, had some feeling that England encouraged anti U.S. activities in India. (144)

On his visit to the United States of America, Nehru had a stopover in Canada, perhaps for sharing his views with the Canadian Prime Minister, before embarking upon his real mission to the U.S.A. But his talks in Washington with Trueman and identify Atcheson focused on divergent interests. Trueman's effort to square up Nehru on the US policies on China and Korea proved as disappointing as Nehru's explanation on Kashmir. Atcheson reflecting upon Nehru's visits to the U.S. observed later "he was one of the most difficult man with whom I have ever had to deal. (145) Nehru himself, was almost in a disgusted mood. He stated that "the U.S. Government had expected acquiescence from him on issues, and were unwilling to assist India for anything less. (146) India had cooled down her relationships with U.S. after Nehru's visit. He had taken exception of a message from Atchison on plebiscite in Kashmir as on U.S. visit. "I am tired and sick of the attitude that the British and American Governments have taken in this matter." (147) He advised, "It does appear to me that there is a concerted attempt to build up Pakistan and run down India, if I may say so. It surprises me how immature in their political thinking the Americans are". (148) Nehru, a great statesman as he was, having fought against the British for more than forty years or so, was reluctant to recognize that the

International community could not possibly see eye to eye with India on the issue of self determination for a people, who in principle were granted this right under the Act of Partition, notwithstanding, the Valley's geo-strategic position. At the same time it did bring home Nehru to a somewhat moderate outlook towards Indian Muslim minorities and also improve relations with Pakistan. (149) But a warm welcome extended to Pakistan's Prime Minister, in May on his first official visit to the U.S.A. against Nehru's unpleasant memories, were clear indications that Liaquat Ali was being built up as a great Asian leader against Nehru. (150)

Further, Nehru had in hand a weakness of the British Government, and all opportunities to cash it, could be exploited to the maximum to get England's favour for India on Kashmir. The British Commonwealth and its political and economic advantages were more profitable to the mother state i.e. the United Kingdom, rather than to the prospective member states. India, like Canada and Australia was a big Dominion, and England aspired her membership for all her economic potentials, which could give the British Commonwealth an added strength. Mountbatten had frequently advised Nehru to join, the commonwealth irrespective of Nehru's leanings towards socialism. (151) It was difficult for India to offend the Soviet Union, skeptical of the British neo-imperialism in the name of Commonwealth. (152) Poorna Swaraj, a committed member of the Indian National Congress since 1929, (153), and many of the socialist friends of Nehru, like Jay Prakash Narain, were against India's joining the British Commonwealth which to them was lack of confidence in self-reliance. (154) Nehru, on the contrary, thought that such an association for a couple of years, could benefit India in many ways, as she could withdraw from the Commonwealth at pleasure. (155) Disappointed from the UNO, India could take advantage of the Commonwealth for the development of an understanding within the group for safeguarding Indian interests. (156) Mountbatten had also

indicated very clearly that England would withdraw all the British nationals serving in India and Pakistan, if any one of the two dominions remain out of the British Commonwealth. Pakistan had already declared that she would remain within the Commonwealth. The Quaid-i-Azam had told the Viceroy much earlier of his intentions before the Partition. (157) But, the Viceroy had some reservations about Pakistan, though he argued with the Indian leaders opposing Indian membership, how Pakistan could take advantage from her membership of the Commonwealth, in India's absence (158) Mountbatten had a long meeting with Nehru at Simla, agreeing on the recognition of Dominion States for India before June 1948, which meant an automatic membership of the Commonwealth, of course, with a privilege to sever from the organization at pleasure. (159) It was with some difficulty that Mountbatten had to explain to the Indian leaders that England would not be in a position to expel Pakistan from the Commonwealth, in case India withdrew from the Organization. (160)

England well realized India's strong and hostile feelings against Pakistan. If Pakistan's membership to the Commonwealth was ensured, India would not take long enough to fall in. (161) This proved true as per expectations after 15 August 1947. Notwithstanding the Resolution of the Indian National Congress on 16 December 1948, that India would welcome her association with Commonwealth, even after becoming a Republic, though without any link with the British Crown. (162)

The Prime Minister's Conference having begun on 22 April, solely concentrated on the privilege, India demanded, i.e. to remain a member of the Commonwealth, after becoming a Republic. After a heated debate, India did succeed in obtaining approval of the conference on her membership even after she became a Republic. (163) There was no doubt in the mind of other member countries of the Commonwealth that India had an opportunity to black mail England and she succeeded in her

mission. (164) India had a weak point in hand, and she could exploit it at will.

In January 1951, Pakistan proposed to the British Prime Minister that the Kashmir dispute be placed on the agenda of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference. (165) Nehru, initially did not agree, but when most of the Prime Minister's of the member Commonwealth countries did not object, Nehru also accepted some informal talks. (166) Pakistan insisted on plebiscite under the auspices of the U.N.O. Menzies (Australian Prime Minister) professed to raise a Commonwealth force to conduct the plebiscite. But Nehru desired everything to be done under Sh. Abdullah's government, which could not be removed. (167) Pakistan did not accept a possibility of a fair plebiscite under a hostile administration. Neol Baker, England's Permanent Representative at the U.N.O., sent Attlee a draft resolution raised from, originally, the Chinese. The Resolution suggested withdrawal of the tribesmen and Pakistan nationals from the Valley, rehabilitation of law and order in Kashmir, without prejudice to a fair plebiscite and lastly that Plebiscite, administrator to enjoy such authority, which could ensure free verdict of the people. (168) Attlee felt that India would never accept the last two conditions in the Resolution, and that it was not the line that England had given to its representative in the U.N. (169) He had already developed a soft corner for India and for the British Prime Minister it was not easy to by pass the Indian interests. (170)

There were more than one reason from the British point of view, to give India a preference over Pakistan, apart from the geo-physical, and demographic position of the two countries. India was the largest developing economy, which the British had planned much earlier. But they had to leave it before enjoying enough of its fruits. A close cooperation with India could be of greater advantages to England than any other country. Further, Indian population, a majority of which lived below the poverty

line, was more prone to socialism, more so because of Pandit Nehru, the Indian Prime Minister, who himself had been once the torchbearer of Socialism in India. (171) But after Indian Independence, though Nehru continued to profess socialist theories, yet he encouraged capitalist economy to benefit from the US scientific and technological advancement, without offending Russia on India's fidelity to the socialist cause. (172) It was this policy of duplicity, which offended Nehru's friends, like Jay Prakash Narain, to cut off from Nehru and the Indian National Congress. (173) England was greatly concerned that India may not fall completely in Russian lap and hence the British smiling face to India.

On the contrary, Pakistan's point of view on Kashmir was widely recognized in the U.N.O. and by the majority members of the British Commonwealth countries. The recommendations of the UNCIP and the later reports of U.N. mediators and arbitrators, including Owen Dixon, and Graham had upheld Pakistan's point of view supporting plebiscite in the Valley as a whole or in some sectors. (174) To Nehru it was not pleasant, rather, unfair in the sense that no one, not even England, was recognizing Pakistan as an aggressor state, holding Indian view. (175) Taking Dixon's Plan as a victory to Pakistan, Nehru stated that, "Dixon's astonishing formula amounting to converting the Valley and other parts of Kashmir into a kind of half Pakistan even before the plebiscite." (176) It was here that he called it a result of some intrigues of England and some other countries against India, otherwise the Kashmir dispute would have long been settled. (177) Nehru was convinced that the British Prime Minister and Secretary of State for India, and all other officers concerned were convinced that Kashmir being predominantly Muslim, should go to Pakistan. (178) He was convinced that the speeches by the U.S. and British delegations in the UN were delivered by Pakistan's delegation. (179) He threatened that if Pakistan's communal approach prevailed in Kashmir, it would not only be a tragedy for Kashmir, but it would upset the whole scheme of things in India,

and of course in Pakistan. We would enter a phase of trying to exterminate each other. These are the terrible thoughts which come to me, and I find the Americans and British people skating merrily on this very thin ice over the deep ocean and accusing us of intransigence.”(180) Nehru, accordingly, refused to entertain another U.N. mediator Dr. Frank Graham. He would be received with courtesy but beyond that India would not go.”(181)

Nehru’s liberalism for the Indian Muslims, however for the good of India itself, was quite contrary to his policies on Kashmir. There his conduct was alike the other extremists in Indian politics, who had always lived with the ambitions of Indian political and economic domination at any cost. Kashmir, though lacked a physical link with India, against a fairly long border with Pakistan, could easily remain with India under machination, and however unjustified, with force as long as India desired.

Another development, which influenced Indian politics and shook it from within, was Sh. Abdullah’s diplomatic role, first as a Chief Executive and then as the Prime Minister of Kashmir. “The only person who can deliver the goods in Kashmir is Abdullah,” said Nehru. “I have a high opinion of his integrity and his general balance of mind. He may make any number of mistakes in minor matters, but I think he is likely to be right in making major decisions. No satisfactory way can be found in Kashmir except through him...” (182) But gradually Abdullah started troubling India in one way or another. He occasionally discussed plebiscite in his speeches, to the final settlement of the Kashmir dispute and also advocated Independence of Kashmir, (183) seeking assistance from the U.S. and English visitors and the U.N. mediators. (184) Many political extremists including Vallabh Bhai Patel took an exception to his statements, which demanded an explanation. Abdullah himself remained firm, as his thoughts of the final decision still wanting of the Kashmir’s future. Nehru was apologetic: “He is obsessed with the idea of meeting a challenge from Pakistan, and keeping his own people from being influenced

by Pakistan's propaganda. I made it clear to him that his approach should be different." (185) Abdullah did not take notice of repeated warnings from India, and meeting U.S. Ambassador on visit to Srinagar, in April 1949, he stated that England and the USA would support independent Kashmir and should guarantee its freedom. (186) He is said to have proposed to Owen Dixon for meeting bilaterally with Azad Kashmir's leadership for finding out a possible solution. (187) The widening gulf between Nehru and Abdullah had some healing effects with some understanding on the Constitutional relationship between the state and India. Notwithstanding special status, which Kashmir enjoyed, Nehru could not tone down Indian extremist voices which occasionally burst out with assassination calls against Nehru. (188)

Notes and Reference

1. Callard, Keith: (1957) *Pakistan a Political Study*, G. Allen and Unwin, George Allen and Unwin, London. Jawahar Lal Nehru observed on the creation of Pakistan that "it has come into being, rather unnaturally, I think.... This development a throw back but we accepted it in good faith. It is inevitable that India and Pakistan should draw closer to each other or else they will come into conflict." *Servepelli' Gopal: (1980) Jawahar Lal Nehru, An Anthology Oxford University Press, Delhi, p.207*
2. Sind was a province, which passed a resolution in 1938 in favour of separate homeland for the Muslims, before the Lahore Resolution. Later on, G.M.Syed and Ayub Khurro entered into some dispute with Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah creating some impediments, for Sind to back step in the run to the goal of independence.
3. Collins, Larry and Dominique Lapierre : (1975) *Freedom at Midnight*, William Collins Sons & Co., London, p.238.
4. *Ibid*, p.227
5. *Ibid*, p.228. Z. Masani: (1975), *Indira Gandhi*, T.Y. Crowell, New York, London. remarked "The new Nation was born in blood and tears of millions." p.77; V.P. Menon noting *After Month of Partition* mentions Attack on Muslims in East

Punjab, pp.419-21, Muslim Refugee Camps in New Delhi threatened by Hindus, p.429; Nehru and Patel unable to control disturbances, handedover administrative control to Mountbatten p.434; see Transfer of Power in India, Sangam Books, 1957.

6. See Supra Chapter-I.
7. Suhail, Masarrat: (1991) Partition and Anglo-Pakistan Relations 1947-51, Vanguard, Lahore, p.88-99
8. Moore, R.J: (1983) Escape from Empire: The Attlee's Government and the Indian Problems, Oxford University Press, London p.327see also M.J. Akbar, India, The Siege within p.69 and Akbar's: Riots after Riots, Penguinine 1989, pp.39-40; Zareer Masani op.cit., p.78.
9. ibid, F.Tuker: (1950) While Memory Serves Cassel London, p.433.
10. Gandhi visited the disturbed areas during communal riots using his personal influence in cooling down situation under threat of fast until death. See Collin op.cit., p.231-3.
11. Gopal, S: (1979) Jawahar Lal Nehru, ii, Oxford University Press, Delhi, p.16.
12. Bhasham, A.L.: (1954) The Wonders that was India, Grove Press, New York, London, pp.36-40.
13. Gopal, S: Nehru, p.16.
14. The Hindu (Madras) 1st October 1947, Nehru to Dr. Rajendra Prasad 19 September 1947.
15. Gopal, S: Nehru, p.15.
16. Muslim employees of the Government of India, opting to serve India had doubtful credibility. Patel, an extremist leader, too, doubted their loyalty to India. Ibid.
17. Ibid, Stanley Wolpert (2007) Shameful Flight, Oxford University Press, Karachi.
18. Letter of Rajendra Prasad to J.L.Nehru: 17, September 1947; S.Gopal (ed) Selected Works of Jawahar Lal Nehru, Orient Longman, Dated: 1972-1982 vol-iv. See also File No.L/PGS/13/1868 and KS-247-K, M.H.A.

19. Letter of Nehru to Vijay Laxmy Pandit, 19, November 1947, *ibid*, Stanley Wolpert suggest that Vijay Lakshami Pandit had returned to New Delhi before 15 August 47, she was hopeful to become Ambassador of India in U.S.A. again. But she was appointed Indian Ambassador to Moscow. Wolpert suggests it was because of her renewed love affair with Syed Hussain, President of the Committee of India's Freedom in the U.S.A. who had become a widower. Having returned home before Indian Independence, he was residing in Imperial Hotel, where "Hussain and Nan" met as much as possible" See Nehru. *A Tryst with Destiny*, Oxford University Press , Karachi, New York, 1996. p.398, Nehru was unhappy over the affairs. He appointed Syed Hussain Indian Ambassador to Cairo and Nan to Moscow, perhaps to separate the two, *ibid*.
20. Hamid, Abdul: (1967) *Muslim Separatism in India*, Oxford University Press, Lahore, pp.196-99. Moti Lal was Chairman of All Parties Committee, preparing a draft Constitution for India, called Nehru Report.
21. Sitaramaya: (1935) *A History of the Indian National Congress*, *op.cit*, pp.25-29.
22. No foreigner or any Englishman was invited in the Calcutta Session, See Sitaramaya. *op.cit.*, pp.28-29.
23. The Government of India had sought moral support from Indian National Congress in her differences with the Home Government, promising representation in the Legislative Councils to the educated Indian. See A.B. Rudra: (1940) *Viceroy and Governor Generals of India*, Humsphery Milford, Oxford, London, pp.86-7; Sitaramaya, p.28.
24. Lord Sinha was appointed a member of the India Council in England in 1906, see Dodwell: *Cambridge History of India: Vol-VI*, Delhi, 1958, p.231.
25. *Ibid*.
26. Sitaramaya, *History of Congress*, pp.438-39.
27. International Community was memorized by Gandhi' personality. The like of Mahatma Gandhi was never seen before. He was an intriguing character: Lawrence Ziring: *Pakistan at the Cross-current of History*, Vanguard, Lahore, 2004, p.9.

28. Majumdar and Rai Chaudheri: *Advance History of India*, p.984; Cf Lawrence Ziring, Pakistan. p.6.
29. Dodwell: *Cambridge History of India*, Vol-VI, p.6, See Sitaramaya, *History of Congress*. pp 596-99.
30. Hugh Tinker has given names of the Congressiste members of Lord Irwin's Council: (i) Vithal Bhai Patel, (President Imperial Legislative Assembly), Sir Sankarran Nair, and Jayakar. See his *Viceroy's Curzon to Mountbatten*, Oxford University Press, London; Dodwell suggests that Gandhi-Irwin Pact was a result of Liberal's mediation particularly Tej Bahadur Sapru and Jayakar, See *Cambridge History of India*, vol-vi. p.618.
31. Dodwell: *Cambridge History of India*, vol-vi. p.613.
32. Lamb, A. *Kashmir: (1992) A Disputed Legacy*, Oxford University Press, Karachi, p.162.
33. Memon, V.P: (1956) *The Story of the Integration of Indian States*, Orient Longman, Calcutta, p.23.
34. For Shudhi and Sangton Movements. See Abdul Hamid: *Muslim Separatism*. p.157; I.H. Qureshi: *A History of Muslims Community of the Indo-Pak. Subcontinent*. Hague, 1962. pp.278-82. According to A.R.Momin, Muslims living in certain parts of Rajasthan such as Ajmer, Jaisalmer, Bikanir, and Barmer are faced with highly disturbing situation of forcible re-conversion to Hinduism. They have succeeded in reconverting thousands of illiterate Muslims in Rajasthan and Haryana. Ten thousand volunteers, with large financial assistance, were engaged in the re-conversion movement in other areas as Utter Pradesh, besides Rajasthan and Haryana, distributing money, clothes, and household articles with pamphlets glorifying Hindu religion. See A.R. Monim: *The Empowerment of Muslims in India*, Institute of Objective India, New Delhi, 2004, pp.66-67.
35. Aiyer, C.S. Ranga: (1930) *India: Peace or War*, Allen Williams Books, London.
36. Johnson, Campbell: (1954) *A Mission with Mountbatten*, Robert Hale, London, p.32.
37. Nehru's Press Conference 12 November 1948, *National Herald*, 14 November 1948; *Hindustan Times*, 19 January 49.

38. Lamb: *Kashmir A Disputed Legacy*, p.7.
39. *Ibid.* Indians, many if not all, do feel strongly that creation of Pakistan was a mistake, which could still be corrected. See Keith Callard: *Pakistan's Foreign Policy. An Interpretation*, Oxford University Press, London, New York, 1959, p.14.
40. Nehru to Mountbatten, 27 August 1947 quoted by S.Gopal *op.cit.* p.14.
41. Dodwell and Sethi: *Cambridge History of India*, vol-vi, *op.cit.* pp.613, 629.
42. Selig S.Harrison, Paul H. Krishberg, and Dennis Kux (ed) (1999) *India and Pakistan: The 50 years*; Cambridge University Press. see chapter: *India Democratic Progress and Problems* by Paul B. Brass, p.38.
43. *Ibid.* (In the Punjab, the reference stands for the attack in Golden Temple, and Kashmir is on fire for more than sixty years or so).
44. The Minorities in India, apart from the Muslims, were Sikhs, Christians, Buddhist, Parsis, and Herijan. But there is no threat to minorities except Muslims.
45. Brass, Paul R: *India Democratic Problems*, pp: 38-39; Mushir-ul-Hasan in his *Introduction to Will Secular India Survive?* Makes the same observation in an apologetic manner which is evident between the lines. See pp.10-21. Keith Callard's view of unending conflict between India and Pakistan are the demanding equal status, "Pakistan reacts hysterically to any suggestion that India outranks her in prestige or status." Keith Callard, *Pakistan*. p.14.
46. *Ibid.* p.39. See Aijaz Ahmad: *Indian Politics at the Cross Roads*; pp:170-210, and also Zoya Hasan: *Social inequalities. This, Secularism and Minorities in India Democracy* pp:229-39 in Mushirul Hasan(ed) *Will Secular India Survive?* Imprint One Delhi, 2004.
47. The destruction of Babri Mosque in Ayudhiya on 6 December 1992 and an effort to build a temple (Ram Bhomi) over its debris is just one example, besides many others destructions of sacred religions shrines and mosques, not highlighted through media.
- 47-a The R.S.S. according to Katherine Frank was fascist communal group similar to Hilter's brown shirts." See *The*

- life of Indira Gandhi, Houghton, Mifflin Publihers, New York, 2002, p.217.
48. Brass, Paul B.: India Democratic Problem, p.39.
 49. Aiyar, Mani Shankar: (2006) Confession of a Secular Fundamentalist, Penguin, New Delhi, p.127.
 50. Ibid, Many a Communal riots, including the tragedies of Gujarat and Godhra in 2002, were outcome of their activism.
 51. Aiyer, Mani Shankar: Confession of Secular Fandamadlist, p.129.
 52. Ibid, see also V.P. Menon Integration of States. pp.433-35.
 53. Ibid, p.131, letter to Pandit Govind Pant dated 17 April1950, quoted by Mani Shankar.
 54. Letter to Parshotan Das Tandon dated 1st April1950. Tondon, later on resigned from the Presidentship of the Congress because of his differences with Nehru.
 55. Aiyer, Mani Shankar: Confession of Secular Fandamadlist. p.130.
 56. Gopal, S: Nehru.
 57. Aiyer, Mani Shankar: Confession of Secular Fandamadlist, p.133.
 58. Ibid.
 59. Ibid.
 60. ibid, p.135.
 61. Aiyer, Mani Shankar: Confession of Secular Fandamadlist, p.135
 62. Hindustan Times 14, March 1952.
 63. Golwalker, M.S.: (1947) We and Our Nationhood Defined, Bharat Prakashan, Nagpur, pp.55-6.
 64. Hamid, Abdul: Muslim Separatism. pp.29-30.
 65. This was quite evident when the Indian National Congress took over the Provincial governments in 1937; and even today the dominant Indian (Hindu) culture is visible with all its poisonous influence on Indian Society suffering from obstinacy and vicious sexuality, a tradition of Langa – a deity

- of sex in Indian mythology, see MacDonnell: (1917) *Vedic Mythology*, Oxford University Press, London.
66. Momin, A.R: *Empowrment of Muslims*, p.63.
 67. Sarvarkar, V.D: (1989) *Hindutva*, (6th ed), Peoples Publishing House, New Delhi, pp110-113. See also: Pardip Kumar Datta, *Hindutva Ideas of the Past*; and Pralay Kanungo: *The Navigators of Hindu Rashtra*: R.S.S. Parcharaks, in *Assertive Religions Identities, India and Europe* edited by Satish Saberwal and Mushirul Hassain, Manohar Publishers, New Delhi, 2006.
 68. *Times of India*, 18 March 2002.
 69. *Ibid.*
 70. Ziring: *The Long View*. p.46 "Pakistan", observes Ziring, "had virtually nothing from which to construct a Government, let alone the treasury to serve the needs of ever expanding citizenry." P.46.
 71. Collins, Larry: *Freedom at Midnight*, p.270.
 72. Ali, Ch. Muhammad: *Emergence of Pakistan*, (R.S.P.) Lahore, 1983(revised), pp.276-8.
 73. *Ibid*, pp.277, 28.
 74. Connel, John: *Auchinleck*, London, Cassell, 1959, pp.920-22.
 75. Ali, Ch. Muhammad: *Emergence of Pakistan*, p.281; Nehru's Statement before Parliament 23 Feb. 1950 quoted by Gopal, Nehru. p.84; see Mansergh T.P. Vol-XII, p.447.
 76. *Ibid.*
 77. *Hindustan Times*, 19 Jan. 1948.
 78. Nehru's address at a public meeting Madras, *The Hindu* (Madras) 26 July 1948 quoted by S.Gopal, Nehru. p.34.
 79. Gopal, S: Nehru. p.36 Ch. M. Ali quotes from the memories of Lord Ismay, Quaid-i-Azam saying to Ismay, "events of the past three weeks went to prove that they (The Indian) were determined to strangle Pakistan at birth." p.259.
 80. Nehru's note to Cabinet dated 16 January 1950.
 81. Gopal, S: Nehru. p.82

82. Ibid, p.83.
83. Sardar Patel's Correspondence vol.vi, pp.318-20.
84. Patel called himself a secular but he was known a hard liner extremist, who doubted the loyalty of Indian Muslims unless they proved so. He was against Nehru's friendship with Indian Muslims, see Gopal op.cit. p.86.
85. Quoted by Ch. Muhammad Ali, Emergency of Pakistan, p.305.
86. Ibid. p.36.
87. Govt. of Pakistan; Ministry of Foreign Affairs (ed) Riaz Ahmad Syed: Pakistan Treaty Series (1947-1953) Vol-I, Islamabad pp:268-272. Zirring, The Long View, p.53; Kieth Callard holds a different opinion. He considered it an offshoot of Two Nation Theory. Pakistan could not absorb all the Muslim who before partition was running Pakistan movement.
88. Nehru to Aruna Asif Ali, 12 March 1950; S.W.J.N. (2) 14 Part-I, p.102.
89. Nehru to Sri Prakash, 6 April 1950, *ibid*, p.141.
90. Letters to Mookerji and Neogy dated 7 April and 12 April 1950 respectively, S.W.J.N., *ibid*, p.216.
91. Lenger, H.V.R, Bangladesh Swarajya, Madras, Annual Number, quoted by Gopal, p.89.
92. Singh, Khushwant: The End of India, Penguin, New Delhi, 2003, pp.89-90.
93. *Ibid*.
94. Mahajan, M.C: (1963) Looking Back, Leaders Press London, pp.151-3, see also Chapter-I
95. Gopal, S: Nehru, p.20.
96. Lamb, A: Kashmir A Disputed Legacy, pp.134, 136, Indian forces airborne to Srinagar airport on 27 October were 35,000 regular troops. This was besides the Maharaja's State army, paramilitary troops of the Patiala State, sent earlier, alongwith R.S.S. volunteers fully armed against Muslim insurgents.

97. *ibid*, p.135. It is reported that this incident was before Indian troops reaching Srinagar. Khan Abdul Qayyum Khan, suggested in a personal interview that it was after Indian troops landing in Kashmir.
98. *Ibid*, pp.135.
99. See Chapter-I
100. He could well explain to the Maharaja, how Kashmir was linked up with India, delaying the Award, facilitating Kashmir's accession to India, and all military assistance, in case of any insurgency.
101. Pakistan was not created on 13 August. If at all there was some difficulty in supplies, it could be a local problem.
102. Chaudhury, G.W: (1968) *Pakistan's Relations with India (1947-66)*, Pall Mal Press, London, p.100.
103. Indian historians allege that the letter to New Delhi was held in Lahore, reaching Delhi late. S. Gopal notes no sources of this information, which speaks of the forged apology.
104. Nehru to Mahajan dated 21 October 1947 SWJN(2)4: P.272-3.
105. Chaudhury, G.W: *Pakistan's Relations with India*. p.109.
106. Afzal, Rafique: (ed) *Speeches and Statements of Liaqat Ali Khan*: R.S.P. Lahore, Telegram of Liaqat Ali Khan to Mahajan, 18 October 1947, p.129.
107. Hodson, H.V.: (1969) *The Great Divide*, Oxford University Press, London, pp.449-50.
108. Bazaz, Prem Nath: (1954), *History of Struggle for Freedom in Kashmir*, Kashmir Publishing Co; New Delhi, pp.154-8.
109. Letter of Lord Attlee to Nehru, 26 October 1947 L/WS/1/1138 (India Office File and Record), London.
110. Lord Attlee to Liaqat Ali 26 October 1947, *ibid*. File No.L/P & S/13/1868 I.O.L.R.
111. Nehru to Mahajan, 30 October 1947 SWJN (2): p.292-3. File No.L/P & S/13/1868 I.O.L.R.
112. Governor General's Report No.:5, 7, November 1947, (L/PO/1/433).

113. Wingate, R: (1970) Lord Ismay Hutchinson, London. p.174.
114. Gopal, S: Nehru, p.22.
115. Liaqat to Attlee: 29 October 1947, explaining all efforts Pakistan had made to settle the issue. India Office Record, London.
116. Auchinleck to Chief of the Army Staff 28,October 1947 (L/WS/1/1138)
117. Telegram U.K.H.C. (P). 5 November 1947 (L/WS/1/1138) I.O.R., London. See also File No.32(46) 48-P.M. Vol-I, P.M.S.
118. C.R.O. to U.K.H.C. (P) 6 November 1947, *ibid*
119. U.K.H.C (1) to Nehru 22 November, 1947, *ibid*
120. Nehru to Attlee 23 November 1947, *ibid*
121. Nehru reports Mountbatten. The Defence Council did not suggest any attack on West Punjab (Pakistan) see notes: India Papers MSS EUR D.714/84, Kashmir 1947/48 I.O.R.
122. *ibid*.
123. Nehru to Mountbatten, 26 December 47 (L/WS/1/1139)
124. Nehru to Attlee, 29 December 47, *ibid*
125. Johnson, Campbell: Mission with Mountbatten. p.259.
126. Nehru to Vijay Lakshamy, 16 Feb. 1948. SWJN(2) 9: p.218.
127. Attlee to Nehru 29 December 1947 (L/WS/1/1139)
128. Tele. UKHC (I) to CRO, 8 January 1948, *ibid*
129. Tele. UKHC (P) to CRO, 11 January 1948, *ibid*
130. Attlee to Nehru 29 December 1947 (L/WS/1/1139)
131. Telegram British Foreign Office to P.R. in New York 30 December 1947 (L/WS/1/1140). See also Telegram CRO to UKHC(P) and (1), 9 January 1948.
132. Security Council proceeding: 3rd year No:1 to15 pp.121-122; 129;143; see also Meeting No.236, 27 January 1948, S.C.O.R. p.284 and Meeting 237, 29 January 48; SCOR, p.292.

133. Nehru to Mountbatten, 17 April 1948; File No.44/4/48 Pol. & KW, M.H.A.
134. Nehru to Stafford Cripps 17, December 1948. File *ibid*.
135. Attlee to Nehru 28 December 1948, (L/WS/1/1148)
136. Cripps to Nehru, 7 January 1949, *ibid*
137. Nehru to Kristina Menon, 14 May 1949., SWJN(2) vol.8 (1989) p.117. See also File K.S.-55/48 Ministry of States, M.H.A.
138. Nehru to Chief Minister of Provinces, 14 May 1948. *ibid*
139. See Chapter-III
140. Nehru to Attlee, 8 September 1949. File No: L/P&S/13/1900, I.O.L.R. (London)
141. Nehru's Speech at Ferozepure, 17 September 1949, Reported in Times of India 8 September 1949, the same speech repeated in Srinagar on 24 September 1949 reported by Indian Express 25 September 1949.
142. Indian Express, 8 September 1949.
143. Nehru to Krishna Memon, 18 December 1948 SWJN(2),8,p.297. File No.KS/53/48/Ministry of States, M.H.A. (Extracts)
144. U.S. Ambassador in Delhi to State Department, 26 December 1947, see Dr Grady: (1972) U.S. Foreign Relations, 1947, vol.iii, Washington, pp.77-8.
145. D. Atchison: (1969) Present at the Creation, Hamish Hamilton, New York North, p.336.
146. Nehru to Radha Krishna, 6 February 1950. SWJN (2) vol.111 (1992), p.270.
147. Nehru to B.N. Rao, 17 January 1950 SWJN, *ibid* Pt2. p.251.
148. Nehru to Vija Lakhshamy, 10 May 1950 SWJN, *ibid* Pt2.p.148.
149. Pearson, Lester: (1974) Memories, ii, Elsevier Publishing Co; p.115 (Account of Philip Noel Baker's activities in Karachi)
150. Gopal, S: Nehru, p.63.

151. Directive of Attlee to Mountbatten, 18 March 1947: Mansergh(ed) Transfer of Power, vol.ix, p.543.
152. Brecker, Michael: (1968) *India in the World Politics*, Oxford University Press, London, p.19; see also M. Brecker: *India's Decision to remain in Commonwealth*, *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative politics*, March-July 1974, pp.62-70.
153. Attlee to Commonwealth Prime Ministers: 23 May1947: *Transfer of Power vol.x*, p.527.
154. Gopal, S: *Nehru*, p.46.
155. *Ibid.*
156. *Ibid.*
157. Viceroy's Staff Meeting, 28 March 1947 and meeting Liaquat Ali Khan, 10 April 1947,: *T.P. vol.x*, p.28 and 178.
158. Viceroy's Personal Record No:5, 1st May 1947.
159. Mountbatten's meeting with Nehru, Mansergh *T.P.x*, pp.365,366.
160. Viceroy's Personal Record No:8, 5, June 1947.
161. Mansergh(ed). *T.P*, vol.xi, p.266.
162. Archibald Nye to Secretary of State for C.R., 15 June 1949, See also Memoranda: CAB 21/1824, PRO.
163. Inauguration Speech of Attlee, 20 April, *The Guardian*, London, 21 April 1949.
164. Liesching to UKHCs, 5 May 1949; DO75/2209.
165. Gopal, S: *Nehru*, p.113.
166. *Ibid.*
167. *Lok Sabha Debates*, 1951 Column 2697, 2706.
168. See details in Chapter-III
169. Acting Secretary of State to the Embassy in India, 10 April 1951.
170. *Ibid.*
171. Gopal, S: *Nehru*, p.66.
172. *Ibid.*

173. "He is one of the finest men I have known, and it character counts as it does, he counts for a great deal. It seems to me a tragedy that a man like him should be thrust by circumstances into the wilderness. Nehru to G.B. Pant 1st July 1948 quoted by Gopal, S: Nehru, p.67.
174. See Chapter:III
175. Nehru's speech in Lok Sabha 26 June 1952 is revealing: "We have not got a clean slates to write upon. We are limited, inhibited by our commitments to the UNO by this, by that. But never the less the basic fact remains that we have declared that it is the people of Kashmir who must decide if the people of Kashmir does not want it, it will not go there. Let us suppose there was a plebiscite thus And the Kashmir decides." We do not want to be with India. Well, we are committed to it, we would accept it. It might pain us, but we would not send an army against them. A.G. Noorani's (1964) *Kashmir Question*, Mnaktalas Bombay, p.60 quoted by Praveen Swami *Sacred Jihad*, p.47. That was Nehru's duplicity, in which his professional mastery earned Inida a success in Kashmir despite different odds.
176. Nehru to Chief Ministers 1st Nov. 1950. SWJN(2) 14 Pt2 p.342. File No:43(102)/150-PMS (Extracts)
177. Nehru to B.N. Rao, 17 November 1952 *ibid*(4) Pt!, p.124.
178. Nehru's note to the Cabinet, 26 May 1952 cf. S.Gopal *op.cit.*
179. Gopal, S: Nehru, p.114.
180. Nehru to Vijay Lakshamy, 25 June 1951 quoted by Gopal p.115..
181. Gopal, S: Nehru, p.115, Nehru was in a fix because of his commitment to plebiscite in Kashmir, which brought International pressure upon him. In an effort to evade it, he had no other choice but to deny any former commitment. Praveen Swami says that Nehru after 1953 would never again consider what Nehru before 1953 had seemed willing to do," See *India, Pakistan and the Sacred Jihad*, *op.cit.*, p. 47.
182. Nehru to Maharaja of Kashmir, 13 November 1947 SWJN (2) 4:pp.324-25.
183. Mahajan: (1963) *Looking Back*, *op.cit.*, p.162.

184. Warren Austin's interview with Sh. Abdullah, 28 January 1948, Foreign Relations of U.S. 1948 vol: 5, part-I, p.292. Abdullah was not sure whether he held the command over this valley to win the people's support see Praveen Swami, Sacred Jihad, p.15.
185. Nehru to Patel 4 October 1948, Sardar Patel's Correspondence, vol.i, Ahmadabad, 1971, p.252-3.
186. The Daily Statesman, 14 April 1949.
187. Ibid, see Raj Gopal AcHeriya to Nehru, 23rd March 1949, quoted by Gopal, S: Nehru. p.118.
188. Gopal: p.122.