Chapter 4 : The Eagle and the Dove

Churchill and Nehru as Writers

This Chapter is divided into two sections. The present chapter evaluates Churchill and Nehru as writer as also simultaneously probes into the process of colonial mentality and how decolonization takes place.

Section One evaluates Nehru and Churchill as writers and with special reference to history writing by Churchill.

Section Two is a pivot of the study. It exposes Churchill's attitude to India which establishes him as power oriented conqueror. This Section presents Nehru's views on India and shows the process of decolonization as revealed in Nehru's writing. This section points out broad base of Nehru's self-Representation in postcolonial terms.

The Art of History Writing and Churchill

The method of treating history as a species of literature was the method employed by Thucydides, and Livy, and the ancient classic writers generally. This method prevailed down through the Middle Ages to the close of the eighteenth century. The literary method was than superseded by the scientific method, the author of which was George Niebuhr (Born in 1776 and died in 1831). He is known as the founder of the Modern Scientific School of History. It is true that Niebuher and his followers have created a new era in historical writing where mere guesswork is supplanted by evidence. But one cannot disregard the artistic side of history.

German followers of Niebuher are found uniformaly dull and wearisome, it lacked life, colour, movement. In contrast with the unpolished style of German historians is the attention paid by the French to literary form and finish. French writers are conceded to be the unrivaled masters of modern prose; partly because of their language, and partly on account of the artistic instinct. Of the representative historians of France, William Francis Guizot deserve special mention, as being the best known and most widely appreciated historian outside his own country (1787-1874). His chief historical work are a *History of Civilization in Europe*
and a *History of Civilization in France*. Guizot treated history as social science. He was the first to present a complete analysis of the divers elements which compose the social body. Besides Guizot, two other French writers Jules Michelet (1798-1874) and Joseph Ernest Penan (1823-1892) need to be mentioned. Like Guizot, Michelet was a politic writer. His chief historical work is a *History of France*, upon which he spent forty years.

**English Historians**

Although English literature is rich, varied and excellent but very few names are found in historical writing. The first English writer of prominence is Bede justly called the Father of English history. His *Ecclesiastical History*, composed in the early part of the eighth century, is in reality a political history of England down to that date, for it comprises all that is known of early English history, whether ecclesiastical or political. A noteworthy feature of Bede’s history is the amount of research which it represents. The Latin style of Bede is correct, plain and clear but not remarkable for any quality. But the first English historian who deserves to be ranked as a stylist is Edward Hyde, better known as the Earl of Clarendon (1608-1674). A university graduate and a member of the long Parliament, Clarendon took part in the English Civil war, which he afterward made the subject of his history. The fine analysis of character and its dramatic presentation are not the least among the gifts of Clarendon. His prose is distinctively modern in tone and phrase as contrasted with the involved, lumbering style which Milton, Bacon and Raleigh employed in their historical writing. The next stylist after Clarendon in the order of time, is David Hume, the Scotch Philosopher, essayist and historian. The History of England, written by Hume, beginning with the invasion of Julius Ceasar extends to the reign of James I. There is a certain exquisite ease and vivacity about Hume’s narrative which has never been surpassed.

**Lord Macaulay**

The best known stylist in English history is Lord Macaulay, whose work, like that of Clarendon, is fragmentary. Whatever be the correct estimate of his work, Macaulay had a rather peculiar view of what a history should be. In one of his critical essays he defines a perfect history as a compound of poetry and philosophy, impressing general rules on the
mind by a vivid representation of particular characters and incidents. Elsewhere he defines
the perfect historian as one in whose work the character and spirit of an age are exhibited in
miniature. The magnificence of his style won him instant popularity. Macaulay’s theory of
what a history should be is far better than his performance.

Edward Gibbon

By far the greatest name in English historical literature is that of Edward Gibbon (1737-
1794). His The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire is undoubtedly one of
the greatest monuments of industry and genius. Guizon calls him the most accurate of
European historians. The style of Gibbon is remarkably pompous, elaborate and dignified.

Henry Hallan

A modern English historian who illustrates the method of writing history on institutional
rather than national lines, is Henry Hallam (died in 1859). His work is eminently judicial. In the
list we can add Henry Buckle (1921-1862), William Hickling Prescott (1796-1859), George
Bancroft (1800-1891), Francis Parkman (1823-1893), John Fiske (1842-1910).

Churchill

Churchill was a prolific writer throughout his life and many of his works were historical.
His better known works include: Marlborough: His Life and Time, The World Crisis (a history
of World War I), The Second World War which earned him the Nobel Prize in literature. A
History of the English-speaking Peoples was equally noteworthy.

Churchill’s View of History

Churchill was an exponent of the view that the British and American people had a
unique greatness and destiny and that all British history should be seen as progress towards
fulfilling that destiny. This belief inspired his political career as well as his historical writing.

Although Churchill was an excellent writer, to some critics he was not a trained historian.
The major influences on his historical thought, and his prose style, were Clarendon’s history of
the English Civil War, Gibbon’s Decline and Fall and Macaulay’s History of England. He had
a limited interest in social or economic history, and he saw history as essentially political and military, driven primarily by great men rather than by economic forces or social change, which is at odds with the views of many trained historians. But neither approach has been accepted as invariably superior. What is important about his work is that it provides an abundance of well written testimony by one of the major participants in the history of the 20th century. As with all witnesses, in reading this testimony it is important to consider the biases and personal interests from which no person is immune.

**Three categories of Churchill’s historical works: Family History**

Churchill’s historical works fall into three categories. The first is works of family history, the biographies of his father, *Lord Randolph Churchill* (two volumes, 1906), and of his great ancestor, *Marlborough: His Life and Times* (four volumes, 1933-38). These are still regarded as fine biographies, but are marred by Churchill’s desire to present his subjects in the best possible light. He made only limited use of the available source materials, and in the case of his father suppressed much material from family archives that reflected badly on Lord Randolph. The Marlborough biography shows to the full Churchill’s great talent for military history.

**Autobiography**

The second category is Churchill’s autobiographical works, including his early journalistic compilations *The Story of the Malakand Field Force* (1898), *The River War* (1899), London to Ladysmith via Pretoria (1900) and Ian Hamilton’s March (1900). These latter two were issued in a re-edited form as *My Early Life* (1930). All of these books are colourful and entertaining, and contain some valuable information about Britain’s imperial wars in India, Sudan and South Africa contain elements of self-promotion, since Churchill was a candidate for Parliament in 1900.

**Narrative History**

Churchill’s reputation as writer, however, rests on the third category, his three massive multi-volume works of narrative history. These are his histories of the First World War – *The World Crisis* (six volumes, 1923-31), and of *The Second World War* (six volumes, 1948-53), and his *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples* (four volumes, 1956-58, much of which had
been written as journalism in the 1930s). These are among the longest works of history ever published (*The Second World War* runs to more than two million words), and earned him the Nobel Prize in Literature.

Churchill’s histories of the two world wars are, of course, far from being conventional historical works, since the author was a central participant in both stories and took full advantage of that fact in writing his books. Both are in a sense therefore memoirs as well as histories, but Churchill was careful to broaden their scope to include events in which he played no part – the war between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, for example. Inevitably, however, Churchill placed Britain, and therefore himself, at the centre of his narrative. Arthur Balfour described *The World Crisis* as “Winston’s brilliant autobiography, disguised as a history of the universe.” In any case he had far fewer documentary sources for matters not involving Britain.

**Access to documents**

As a Cabinet minister for part of the First World War and as Prime Minister for nearly all of the Second, Churchill had unique access to official documents, military plans, official secrets and correspondence between world leaders. After the First War, when there were few rules governing these documents, Churchill simply took many of them with him when he left office, and used them freely in his books—as did other wartime ministers such as David Lloyd George. Following the First World War, stricter rules were put in place regarding Cabinet documents.

*The World Crisis* began as a response to Lord Esher’s attack on his memoirs, but it soon broadened out into a general multi-volume history. The volumes are a mix of military history, written with Churchill’s usual narrative flair, diplomatic and political history, portraits of other political and military figures, and personal memoir, written in a colorful manner.

When he resumed office in 1939, Churchill fully intended to write a history of the war then beginning. He said several times: “I will leave judgments on this matter to history—but I will be one of the historians.” To circumvent the rules against the use of official documents, he took the precaution throughout the war of having a weekly summary of correspondence, minutes, memoranda and other documents printed in galleys and headed “Prime Minister’s personal
minutes.” As well, Churchill actually wrote or dictated a number of letters and memoranda with the specific intention of placing his views on the record for later use as a historian.

**Controversy**

This all became a source of great controversy when *The Second World War* began appearing in 1948. Churchill was not an academic historian, he was a politician, and was in fact Leader of the Opposition, still attending to return to office. By what right, it was asked, did he have access to Cabinet, military and diplomatic records which were denied to other historians?

What was unknown at the time was the fact that Churchill had done a deal with Clement Attlee’s Labour government which came to office in 1945. Recognising Churchill’s enormous prestige, Attlee agreed to allow him (or rather his research assistants) free access to all documents, provided that (a) no official secrets were revealed (b) the documents were not used for party political purposes and (c) the typescript was vetted by the Cabinet Secretary, Sir Norman Brook. Brook took a close interest in the books and rewrote some sections himself to ensure that nothing was said which might harm British interests or embarrass the government. Churchill’s history thus became a semi-official one.

**Deficiencies**

Churchill’s privileged access to documents and his unrivalled personal knowledge gave him an advantage over all other historians of the Second World War for many years. The books had enormous sales in both British and the United States and made Churchill a rich man for the first time. It was not until after his death and the opening of the archives that some of the deficiencies of his work became apparent.

Some of these were inherent in the difficult position Churchill occupied as a former Prime Minister and a serving politician. He could not reveal military secrets, such as the work of the codebreakers at Bletchley Park, or the planning of the atomic bomb. He could not discuss wartime disputes with figures such as Dwight D. Eisenhower, Charles de Gaulle or Josip Broz Tito, since they were still world leaders at the time he was writing. He could not discuss Cabinet disputes with Labour leaders such as Attlee, on whose goodwill the project depended. He could
not reflect on the deficiencies (in his view) of generals such as Archibald Wavell or Claude Auchinleck, for fear they might sue him (some indeed threatened to do so).

Other deficiencies were of Churchill’s own making. Although he mentioned the fighting on the Eastern Front, he had little real interest in it and no access to Soviet or German documents, so his account is a collage of secondary sources, largely written by his assistants. The same is true to some extent of the war in the Pacific, except for episodes such as the fall of Singapore in which he was involved. His account is based heavily on his own documents, so it focuses on his own role.

**Shortcoming of his history**

David Reynolds one of Churchill’s best known critic, thoroughly exposes Churchill’s revision of history. According to him, his narrative occasionally bogs down in minute critiques that merely confirm what any sentient reader already knows: that memoires are inevitably self-serving. Since it was contemporary history, Churchill had to be careful not to offend any block, more understandably, he had to cover up some wartime secrets. It is for this reason Churchill had to bend and sometimes break the historical record.

*About his plan and method of writing history, David Reynolds notes,*

“At the end of the Second World War Churchill was hailed as the savior of his country and more widely as the savior of freedom and democracy. He basked in the applause, but long and painful experience of the vicissitudes of politics had taught him that memories were short and reputation a highly perishable commodity. The lesson was reinforced by his defeat in the general election of July 1945, but as his wife predicted, it turned out to be a blessing in disguise. Opposition set him free to fight a battle that would ensure his place in history for decades to come: the battle of the war memoirs. He embarked on a six-volume history of the Second World War to which he brought all the energy and vision, and the aggressive political skills, of his war leadership. It was a literary campaign which ended with a decisive victory for Churchill over his most deadly opponents, old age and the clock. Exhaustive research has enabled David Reynolds to reconstruct the story in a compelling narrative abounding with fresh insights and evidence.
According to Reynolds, it is a portrait of its author and his multifarious character. During the Second World War Churchill was a patriotic public servant who drive himself to the brink of exhaustion in pursuit of victory. This was the role in which he wished to be remembered by posterity, but there were earthier aspects of his personality on which Reynolds is very illuminating. The Churchill of his pages was also a buccaneering entrepreneur with an appetite for enormous sums of money, a literary predator who exploited and appropriated other people’s work, and a historical manipulator who suppressed or adapted the evidence to suit his political purposes. In the hands of Churchill’s detractors this would doubtless add up to a telling indictment of a myth-making hypocrite. What Reynolds gives us is a rounded and realistic picture of a great man with the defects of his qualities.

Churchill was a law-abiding citizen who operated within the rules, but the rules were frequently bent in his favour, and at his request. His use of government documents was a case in point. When he returned to office as First Lord of the Admiralty in September 1939 he ordered that his minutes and telegrams should be printed at regular intervals, an arrangement that continued throughout his war premiership it was suspected with good reason in Whitehall that he intended to make use of the documents when he came to write his memoirs after the war. But were they his to dispose of? The Cabinet Secretary, Sir Edward Bridges, wanted to enforce a rule adopted in 1934 whereby ministers on leaving office were required to leave behind them all official papers. His deputy, Norman Brook, warned that Churchill would never accept this, and the War Cabinet agreed in May 1945 that ministers could take away documents they had written themselves and would be free to publish them provided they had the approval of the government of the day.

Churchill, therefore, left office with a complete wartime set of key documents which served as the backbone of his memoirs.

To assist him in writing the book Churchill gathered together a team of researchers, who became known as “the Syndicate.” The principal members were William Deakin, an Oxford historian, General Pownall, who had been Mountbatten’s Chief of Staff in Burma, and Commodore Allen, a senior naval officer. Surprisingly, perhaps, the drafts and memoranda they prepared, together with materials supplied by Brook, Ismay and others, have been preserved in
abundance in the Churchill papers. Having gone through the materials with a fine toothcomb Reynolds is able to show that Churchill’s advisers and assistants wrote many parts of the book. The tone, structure and overall interpretation were unmistakeably Churchillian and so too were many of the set pieces and personal recollections, but it would have come as a great surprise to readers at the time to learn that the passages on the emergence of Hitler, the evacuation from Dunkirk, the rise of Japan, the Dieppe raid, the war in Burma, and numerous other topics, had been written by others. Furthermore the ghost writers soon acquired the habit of writing in the first person singular and imitating Churchill’s style. Seven pages on the tensions between Churchill and Cripps over the machinery of defence polity in the autumn of 1942 were actually the work of Norman Brook. “My long experience in these matters,” Brook made Churchill say, “had taught me that a Minister of Deence must work with and through responsible advisers.”

In retrospect Churchill’s method of organizing and leading a collective project looks perfectly sensible, and Reynolds argues that it does not diminish his standing as an author. But the impact of the book has always owed a great deal to Churchill’s apparent mastery of military history, and the illusion of a literary genius composing every word. Though the book still ranks as one of Churchill’s most remarkable achievements, Reynolds’s analysis deals another blow to the Churchill myth of the forties and fifties.

“History will not say that the Right Honourable gentleman is wrong in this matter,” is wrong in this matter,” Churchill is alleged to have said after an argument with Baldwin in the House of Commons. “I know it will, for I shall write the history.” He did indeed write the history and more to the point he got his version in first. With Roosevelt dead and Stalin keeping his secrets, he was the only one of the allied war leaders in a position to give an authoritative account of the “Grand Alliance.” On the British side his only possible competitors were Eden, who lagged behind in the race, and Alanbrooke, who was spurred into action too late to halt the mighty juggernaut in its tracks. Churchill stamped his interpretation of the Second World War on the minds of a generation and even now British historians find it hard to know exactly what to make of the Churchill version. Reynolds has given us, for the first time, the technical and intellectual resources we need for a detached historical assessment.
Reynolds takes us through *The Second World War* volume by volume, explaining the circumstances in which each was written, the ways in which Churchill interpreted and manipulated the evidence, and his motives for doing so. We see the war Churchill waged, in parallel with the war as he reconstructed it, and the war as historians understand it today, Churchill, of course, was driven by a desire to vindicate himself before history. “He was trying,” Reynolds writes, “to shift perceptions of himself from the man of words to the man of deeds.” One of the most interesting of his discoveries is the extent to which Churchill was plagued by doubts that surfaced in early drafts but were subsequently deleted. The first of his volumes, *The Gathering Storm*, gave a highly distorted and partisan account of the 1930s which reflected the prevalence of the “guilty men” thesis. Churchill’s bitterness at his exclusion from office, and the failure of Baldwin and Chamberlain’s biographers to mount a robust defence of their subjects. In one of the early drafts, however, Churchill admitted his “incredible neglect” of the tank in the 1930s. “In my conscience I reproach myself for having allowed my concentration upon the Air and the Navy to have absorbed all my thought.” In the first draft of his account of the Norway campaign of April 1940 he wrote: “It was a marvel – I really do not know how – I survived and maintained my position in public esteem while all the blame was thrown on poor Mr. Chamberlain.” Also revealing are the wartime documents Churchill omitted from the record, though the reasons why are sometimes a puzzle. Why, for example, did he exclude his minute about the bombing of Auschwitz? And was it from a sense of guilt, or mere political expediency, that he gave so little space to the strategic bombing offensive, and deleted references to “terror bombing”? In Command of History is a work as nuanced and complex as the test it analyses, but lucid and fascinating throughout. Nothing in the book conveys the complexities better than Reynolds’s analysis of the Anglo-American dimensions, on which he writes with exceptional authority. Churchill was a fervent believer in the concept of the “special relationship” and his book was intended to demonstrate the need for closer Anglo-American co-operation in the post-war world. But Anglo-American relations had been troubled by a number of contentious issues including American hostility to the British Empire. Churchill was also under attack in the United States from writers who claimed that he had been opposed to a cross-channel invasion and had fought hard to delay or prevent the opening of a Second Front. He was trying, therefore, to defend himself against his American critics, but he also had a case to make against Roosevelt,
Truman and Eisenhower. Writing as the Cold War intensified, he sought to show that he had been more tar-sighted about the Soviet threat than American policy-makers, whom he blamed for allowing the Red Army to enter Berlin, Prague and Vienna before the British and the Americans. But Churchill could not afford to offend Truman, who remained President until 1952, or his successor, Eisenhower, it was a measure of Churchill’s skill and in the handling of so much dynamite that he managed in The Second World War to assert his own claims while maintaining cordial relations with the Washington Establishment – and marketing the book in the United States. He could only achieve this, however, by practicing some economy with the truth. In particular his claims to have been a consistent supporter of a cross-Channel invasion were misleading. In October 1944, we learn, Churchill and the Chiefs of Staff came close to abandoning operation Overlord. Churchill even set out a dream-like scenario for a British strategy independent of the Americans.

It is hard not to feel some sympathy for Churchill as Reynolds, with his mastery of the sources and the historiography, deconstructs chapter after chapter with a rigorous audit of the great man’s errors, omissions and spin-doctoring techniques. I had the impression at times that Churchill was always manipulating the evidence or getting it wrong Reynolds, for example, comments that Churchill paid little attention to the eastern front, neglecting the crucial role played by the Red Army in the achievement of victory. But Churchill’s main theme, following the thread of his minutes and telegrams, was the British war effort. His mistake was to expand what were essentially his war memoirs into a history of the war as a whole and to do so in a half-hearted fashion in which the eastern front - like America’s war in the Pacific – was dealt with in perfunctory fashion.

Reynolds does acknowledge that The Second World War possessed substance as well as spin, but he could perhaps have given the substance greater emphasis. Churchill’s book was Anglocentric, egocentric, and artfully constructed. Nevertheless his six volumes, published at intervals between 1948 and 1954, represented a quantum leap in historical knowledge. There was much selection and editing of the documents, but Churchill also published in complete and original form a wealth of primary source materials that would otherwise never have been available to historians until the 1970s. If Churchill commanded history, it was partly because of this
extraordinary bold act which ran clean contrary to Whitehall traditions of secrecy, and opened up his record to critical scrutiny. Churchill has often been accused of publishing his minutes and telegrams without publishing the replies. Here Reynolds does come to his aid by pointing out that Attlee discouraged Churchill from publishing documents written by other officials, especially the Chiefs of Staff.

“These six volumes,” wrote J. H. Plumb in 1969, “require the most careful assessment, and one not yet made: soon, however, the scholars must get to work, and what a task they will have!” In spite of Plumb’s injunction, Churchill the writer and historian has been comparatively neglected, while Churchill the statesman has been intensively researched and debated. David Reynolds has redressed the balance in a work of superb scholarship which has now received the recognition it deserves with the award of the Wolfson Prize.”

Reference:


Churchill as Historian

David Reynolds rightly observes that “Churchill’s life was politics. His career as an MP ran, virtually unbroken, from 1900 to 1904 …… almost the first two-thirds of the twentieth century. But although Churchill lived for politics, he lived by writing.

*(Churchill’s writing of History: Appeasement, Autobiography and “The Gathering Story” David Reynolds)

At one end of the spectrum were scores of newspaper columns assessing contemporary events and politicians, at the other extreme are large books such as the biographies of his father (1906) and of his martial ancestor, the first duke of Marlborough (1933-8), and his History of the English-speaking peoples (1956-8). Somewhere in between are autobiographical vignettes such as The Malakand Field Force (1898) and My Early Life (1930) and his most remembered two sets of war memoirs and six separate volumes on World War I (1923-31) and its aftermath, six more on World War II and its origins (1948-
‘History will judge us kindly’, Churchill told Roosevelt and Stalin at the Tehran Conference in 1943; men asked how he could be so sure, he responded characteristically. ‘Because I shall write the history’. And so he did, in the six massive volumes of The Second World War. He was a prolific and very well-paid historian and Journalist. Churchill was certainly right – history did treat him kindly.

Churchill had played multiple, often overlapping roles as warrior, statesman, politicians and historian. As Britain’s prime minister from 1940 to 1945, he courageously led his nation and the world away from appeasement, into wars and on to triumph over the Axis dictators.

His monumental and authoritative volumes, despite Churchill’s many shortcomings, leads his critic Reynolds to conclude “In death, as in life, Winston Churchill continues to glow. He remains In Command of history” (David Reynolds In Command of History, Random House, 2005).

Literary Traits:

Reading William Manchester’s or Martin Gilbert’s extensive biographies of Churchill indicates his idiosyncratic and unique production of research and writing. He used to leave research of original sources to his devoted staff. He was a great synthesizer of information.

‘Power’ Element:

Churchill Scholar David Reynolds notes : he’s writing ‘a book about personal biography and public memory”. Churchill’s double role making history and writing it sounds too heavy to bear. What impelled him to write the history of the 20th century’ is this: Churchill wrote a letter to Stalin in 1944 saying “I agree that we had better leave the past to history, but remember if I live long enough I many be one of the historians.” (quoted by David Reynolds in In Command of History : Churchill Fighting and Writing the Second World War)

In his history, he was forced to omit the Ultra Secret and was inclined to overlook the war in Russia and the Far East. In Reynolds words : “he overindulged in counterfactual speculation”. “Sometimes he got his facts wrong; sometimes he altered his text for his own purposes, such as his desire to return to power….” (David Reynolds in In Command of History).
True, in every event he was there at the center of events. It seems that “the aim is not historical accuracy, but rather to enhance the own political and military reputations and to their leadership. Churchill’s ability to use classified documents that would not be available to historians for many years to come, is impressive. “But equally interesting are the many documents that were available but not used because they would have cost the author in an unfavourable light”*

*(Gilberto Villahermosa, Reviewing David Reynolds’s assessment of Churchill)

To some critics Churchill’s pattern is to writes about himself or his ancestors constantly mixing it with his histories of America or England. Clearly, Churchill had a selective memory in favour of his own role. He sounds a second-tier historian and a first rate story-teller. His power ridden ambition, no doubt, led him to be the centre of the event. His boundless energy impresses but throughout his six volumes on the Second World War it gives the impression of Churchill single handedly managing the war. Churchill would involve himself in extreme detail much to the annoyance of those being probed.

J. H. Plumb observed that Churchill’s historical work could be divided into two categories: ‘formal, professional’ histories and those dealing with contemporary events in which he himself was involved’. Yet there is a sense in which, for Churchill, all history was autobiography. For Nehru the situation was different. In describing contemporary event, Churchill’s self promotion, self projection comes up. His outstanding work Gathering Storm (the first volume of the six), is the most significant work of the century. The first volume of the memoires detailing the growing Nazi menace, shows how remarkably prescient he was. He foresaw the futility of British involvement in the Spanish Civil War. Here he shows how he took a tough stand against German expansionism and India’s independence. It is this stark attitude showing his real self.

Criticizing Churchill’s Style

It is said that he was a great synthesizer of information and a gifted writer who knew how to turn a phrase. It gives the impression that histories and memoirs written by politicians are not to be totally trusted as their aim is not historical accuracy but rather to enhance their own political and military reputations and to vindicate their leadership. How far this is true for
Churchill and where do Churchill stand in the scale of values which governs ethics is a matter of analysis for the historians. But the emergence of personality is noteworthy.

**Churchill’s Personality**

Churchill was more than the sum of his occupations. Soldier, writer, politician and statesman. Many of the Churchill leadership traits were grown and developed whilst working in these fields. It is also true to say many of his leadership traits are products of his complex personality. He was emotional, brave, romantic, intuitive, hard working, hedonistic, nationalistic determined, witty and risk-taking with a strong sense of his own destiny.

A man of great integrity, Churchill was 65 years old when he first became Prime Minister. Winston Churchill was one of the giants of the twentieth century. As Britain's Prime Minister from 1940 to 1945, he courageously led his nation and the world away from appeasement, into war, and on to triumph over the Axis dictators. His classic six-volume account of those years, The Second World War shaped our perceptions of the conflict and secured Churchill’s place as its most important chronicler.

**Churchill : The Writer**

A famous war correspondent in 1900, the highest paid journalist in the world by the late 1920s Churchill was a prolific writer of books, writing a novel, two biographies, three volumes of memoirs. His prose is of an outstanding literary quality which belongs unquestionably in the Canon of English literature of twentieth century. Churchill's literary career began with campaign reports: The Story of the Malakand Field Force (1988) and The River War (1900) on account of the campaign in the Sudan and the Battle of Omdurman.

Long praised as a master of the spoken word, he was as accomplished in the literary field as in public life. Readers and reviewers alike praised Churchill's writing for his powerful style, his ability to express his thoughts with clarity, and to make his subject alive and entertaining no matter, how complex or dry the material.

His works received varying reviews, some examples are given below:

1. **World Crisis,**

World Crisis was churchill's magnificent attempt to capture history of the war from the viewpoint of one who had a direct influence on its transactions. In this five volume
work, Churchill praised the new fresh, idealistic spirit of American republic that poured itself out on the war weary allies. His language was too extravagant. The professional historian would debate whether this work indeed was history. Yet it was so popular that it was revised and republished in 1931.

The fall of the conservatives allowed Churchill to write in ever increasing volume. During the next ten years he published a six volume work on his ancestors, Marlborough, which received many very good reviews.

Much of the narrative is military history on which he was an authority. His accounts of military operations are marvels of clear exposition. For all his undisguised admiration for his subject, Churchill is, in general fair in distributing praise and blame and has produced a historical contribution as well as an enduring piece of literature. It is a careful, accurate biography.

Churchill also continued his discussion of World War I with a book on the eastern front, entitled The Unknown War, one of the first and best histories of this area of the war. Truly, it required courage and energy to carry through 50 vast and dismal an undertaking. It was a sort epilogue to his brilliant and monumental The World Crisis. One can accept his promise that the war was exclusively a matter of dynasties, cabinets and opposing G. H. Qs.

As World War II loomed on the horizon Churchill began to publish works on the contemporary world. The first 1937, Great Contemporaries, contains the personal reflection of Churchill on twenty one eminent men of his time. The book led P.W. Wilson of the New York Times to say it was a "....book to agree and disagree with pleasure." Churchill's summaries were purely personal but notable for clear style, sense of humour and rhetoric.

The final two works in this period were While England Slept, a compilation of Churchill's speeches on the rearming of Germany. Step by step was compilation of letters written by Churchill fortnightly on foreign policy and defence.

Alldritt praise the works that appeared before the 1940s for their "prose marked by Wit, subtle human insight, pace, drama and a poetic richness and allusiveness."

(Keith Alldritt, Churchill The Writer : His Life as a Man of Letters Hutchinson, London: 1992)

Alldritt considers The River War his second book, a classic of historical writing discerning in it "some of the qualities of epic." One must acknowledge the very obvious limitations of the novel Savrola which Churchill himself disparaged. The complicated char-
acter of the eponymous hero of the book who concerns the author far more than the other characters and the philosophical ruminations makes the work difficult.

Following his precocious early years as a writer, his great biographies of Lord Randolph Churchill and of Malborough, his early volumes of The World Crisis are praiseworthy.

Churchill's special abilities with words is often best seen in the smaller, more modest prose forms in his essays and portraits. In portraits we find his delicately insinuating humour, his fine ironies and his generous understanding.

His dominant qualities were courage and imagination. Less obvious to the public, but no less important, was his powerful, original, and fertile intellect. He had intense loyalty, marked magnanimity and generosity, and an affectionate nature with a puckish humor. Oratory, in which he ultimately became a master, he learned the hard way, but he was a natural wit. The artistic side of his temperament was displayed in his writings and oratorical style, as well as in his paintings.

He was a combination of soldier, writer, artist, and statesman. He was not so good as a mere party politician. Like Julius Caesar, he stands out not only as a great man of action, but as a writer of it too. He had genius; as a man he was charming, gay, ebullient, endearing. As for personal defects, such a man was bound to be a great egoist; if that is a defect. So strong a personality was apt to be overbearing. He was something of a gambler, always too willing to take risks.

In his earlier career, people thought him of unbalanced judgement partly from the very excess of his energies and gifts. That is the worst that can be said of him. With no other great man is the familiar legend more true to the facts. We know all there is to know about him; there was no disguise.

His father, Lord Randolph Churchill, was a younger son of the 7th duke of Marlborough. His mother was Jennie Jerome; and as her mother, Clara Hall, was one-quarter Iroquois, Sir Winston had an Indian strain in him. Lord Randolph, a brilliant Conservative leader who had been chancellor of the exchequer in his 30's, died when only 46, after ruining his career. His son wrote that one could not grow up in that household without realizing that there had been a disaster in the background. It was an early spur to him to try to make up for his gifted father's failure, not only in politics and in writing, but on the turf. Young Winston, though the grandson of a duke, had to make his own way in the world,
earning his living by his tongue and his pen. In this he had the comradeship of his mother, who was always courageous and undaunted.

In 1888 he entered Harrow, but he never got into the upper school because, always self-willed, he would not study classics. He concentrated on his own language, willingly writing English essays, and he afterwards claimed that this was much more profitable to him.

**War Treatment**

Critics have often remarked on Churchill's old fashioned foundness of war. However, his treatment of war is factual and dispassionate. Unlike the trench poets, especially Wilfred Owen who appeals to our senses and feeling by showing us all the terrible visual and palpable detail of war, Churchill remains dry but there is no uncritical celebration of war. Though he regrets at the disappearance of nobility from modern mechanized warfare. This is a prominent theme in *Thoughts and Adventures* (1932).

A gift which captivated even his opponents was his keen sense of satire and humour. He employed it as an art of government for if ever he was in a tight corner in Parliament, he would make the House laugh, and laughter disarms opposition. His wit could be sharp as a repier; it could also strike home by an unusual turn of phrase, an unexpected adjective, a masterly use of anticlimax. For example his statement.

"I am easily satisfied with the very best." or 
"History will be kind to me for I intend to write it." and  
"Eating my own words has never given me indigestion."

and his humour was quite unique:

"I think I can save the British Empire from anything – except the British."

Again,  
"I like things to happen; and if they don't happen, I like to make them happen."

His understanding of humour was philosophical, he used to say:

"A joke is a very serious thing."  
or   
"You cannot deal with the most serious things in the world unless you also understand the most amusing."

He has very apt, unusual way to describe people. He says about Field Marshal
Montagomery" Indomitable in retreat; invincible in advance; insufferable in victory". Of Sir Stafford Cripps. (British labour politician) he says: "He has all the virtues I dislike, and none of the vices I admire."

On his school years his remark is quite witty:

"Headmasters have powers at their disposal with which Prime Minister have never yet been invested."

Equally impressive was his satire. In his speech at Kinnaird Hall Dundee, Scotland on 14th May 1908 he commented "The Times is speechless, and takes three columns to express its speechlessness." Again, his aversion for socialism was known, in his speech in the House of Commons in 1945, he said,

"The inherent vice of capitalism is the unequal sharing of blessings.
The inherent virtue of socialism is the equal sharing of miseries."

Self humour shows transparency. Churchill's self humour was of high level. In 1947, in the House of Commons he said,

"When I am abroad I always make it a rule never to criticize or attack the Government of my country. I make up for lost time when I am at home."

Words come easily and take proper place to suit the occasion. On receiving the London Times Literary Award in 1949, he aptly remarked:

"Broadly speaking, short words are best, and the old words, when short, are best of all."

A life time warrior, he wisely condemned war saying:

"War is mainly a catalogue of blunders."

Criticised for his love of strong drink, he characteristically replied,

"I have taken more out of alchohole than alchohole has taken out of me."


On his 75th birthday he happily quoted in the N.Y.Times Magazine on November 1, 1964 (P.40):

I am ready to meet my Maker. Whether my Maker is prepared for the great ordeal of meeting me is another matter."

Llyod George, according to Churchill "could almost talk a bird out of a tree."

Churchill, for his part, actually could do so – and quite frequently did.
His writings gives us impression that he was essentially a romantic, and although he only once wrote a poem – as a boy of 15, – he was a poet by heart. Describing the scene in 1940 (II World War Preparation) he wrote of "a white glow, overpowering, sublime, which ran through our (England) island from end to end" is poetic expression and all those famous 1940 speeches show unquenchable fire that burned within him, of a bright flame that gave a blaze to his eloquence. His love for poetry is noteworthy. "Westward look the land is bright" was a line of Arthur Hugelough's poem he used to quote and during his visit to America, Churchill quoted in full the poem about the old lady draped in the Union flag who told the confederate troops to "shoot if you must at this old grey head, but spare your country's flag."

Churchill's biographers have never overlooked his books, finding in them a source as indispensable as it is irresistible. Churchill's deeds have eclipsed the shelf full of books he wrote, which most biographers treat simply as a lucrative diversion from politics. It is interesting to recount the career of a professional writer which lasted some sixty years and which predated and fascilitated his other career in politics. No doubt, the two careers stand in a creative dialectical relationship with each other. His speeches deserve to be treated as a separate subject.

Churchill's self education in India and his enthusiasm for earlier writers from Gibbon to Defoe served as models for his prose.

*World Crisis* was Churchill's magnificent attempt to capture history of the war from the view point of one who had a direct influence on its transactions.

Rejoining his regiment, he was sent to serve in India. Here, besides his addiction to polo, he went on seriously with his education, which in his case was very much self-education. His mother sent out to him boxes of books, and Churchill absorbed the whole of Gibbon and Macaulay, and much of Darwin. The influence of the historians is to be observed all through his writings and in his way of looking at things. The influence of Darwin is not less observable in his philosophy of life: that all life is a struggle, the chances of survival favor the fittest, chance is a great element in the game, the game is to be played with courage, and every moment is to be enjoyed to the full. This philosophy served him well throughout his long life. In 1897 he served in the Indian army in the Malakand expedition against the restless tribesmen of the North-West Frontier, and the next year appeared his first book, *The Story of the Malakand.*
"What shall I do with all my books?" Winston Churchill asks in his essay 'Painting as a Pastime'. His answer: "Read them. But if you cannot read them, at any rate handle them and, as it were, fondle them. Peer into them. Let them fall open where they will. Read on from the first sentence that arrests the eye. Then turn to another. Make a voyage of discovery, taking soundings of uncharted seas. Set them back on their shelves with your own hands. Arrange them on your own plan, so that if you do not know what is in them, you at least know where they are. If they cannot be your friends, let them at any rate be your acquaintances. If they cannot enter the circle of your life, do not deny them at least a nod of recognition."

This is very good advice when applied to Churchill's own books. It is certainly a mistake to read too many of them at once – or too soon in life. "The first impression is the one that counts," wrote Churchill, "and if it is a slight one, it may be all that can be hoped for. A later and second perusal may recoil from a surface already hardened by premature contact. Young people should be careful in their reading, as old people in eating their food. They should not eat too much. They should chew it well."

At his death in 1965, Winston Churchill had produced forty books (filling over sixty volumes).

Winston's feel for the language was soon matched by a love of history, the second course in which he quickly excelled.

As a writer, Churchill was a war correspondent, novelist, biographer, historian, reviewer, essayist and the contributor of innumerable topical articles on a wide range of subjects to newspapers and magazines throughout the world. How much did he write? In 1974, the Collected Works of Sir Winston Churchill was published by the Library of Imperial History, London, to mark the centenary of his birth, November 30, 1874. The set was issued as a limited edition of 3000, and contains all 50 of Churchill's published titles, arranged in 34 volumes, plus an additional 4 volumes of his essays a total of 5 feet of books.

Much of what Churchill wrote, including some of his most important works- Marlborough, His Life and Times; The Second World War; A History of the English-Speaking Peoples- were written to keep creditors at bay. They are now considered to be some of the best histories written on their respective subject matter. The Churchill Story is one of high adventure, bitter defeats, and the inner strength of the towering Englishman whose watchword was: Never give in, Never, never, never, never give in."

He retained the grand manner in oratory, too. Sir Isaiah Berlin has maintained that the way in which Churchill spoke to the British people in the summer of 1940, was such that 'they
conceived a new idea of themselves.... they went forward into battle transformed by his words ... He created a heroic mood ... so hypnotic was the force of his words, so strong his faith, that by sheer intensity of his eloquence he bound his spell upon them..." (Isaiah Berlin, Mr. Churchill in 1940.)

He was not only great synthesizer of information, but a gifted writer who knew how to turn a phrase.

Between 1948 and 1954, Churchill had the freedom to write as he lost the 1945 general election. During his "Second Wilderness Years," he turned to the Pen as had before to redeem his reputation.

***

**Nehru : The Man of Letters**

His aesthetic sense

His vast-reading & Western Education

Mahatma Gandhi's Influence

His Major Works

(I)  *Glimpses of World History* (1936)

(II)  *An Autobiography* (1936)

(III)  *The Discovery of India* (1946)

(IV)  *A Bunch of Old Letters* (1958)

(V)  *Nehru's Speeches*

(VI)  *The Will and Testament*

Commonwealth Countries share many things, one of them is expression in literature. From imitation and immaturity to creative experimentation and conscious maturity. Nehru's writing is a part of the literary renaissance, he is attempting the re-assertion of the national genius successfully. His writing reflects the emergence of a new literature that is confident and rooted in the national tradition. It is dynamic and modern and rooted to the soil at a time. Nehru proved that one can fly high even if firmly rooted in the soil. Whether they write in English or indigenous language, their self-expression remains original, free and creative. The impact of English literature is no more obstacle but provides an impetus and an inspiration.
Nehru's Literary Background

His entire body of writing reacts to the discourse of colonization either directly or by discussing various problems arising out of it. Two major influences on his writing are: first his Western Education and secondly Gandhi's philosophy which is not always acceptable to him yet the same compelled him to find new path and think freshly.

Nehru's literary sensibility owes much to his vast reading of English literature, European thinkers and Mahatma Gandhi's life long influence. Here he is not politician or activist but introspective humanist.

It is to his years (about ten years) in prison that we owe his three main books, Auto-biography, Glimpses of World History (1939) and Discovery of India (1946).

His prison life in a way, compelled him to pent-up emotions of years. Nehru managed to adjust to prison. He wrote to his daughter:

"here all is different; everything is quiet
and I sit for long intervals, ... one gets
used to everything in time ... And rest is
good for the body; and quiet is good for
the mind; it makes one think."*

*(Letter of 1 January 1933, in Glimpses of World History P.475).

This loneliness and quiet made him think and his inner gift worked, a writer in him came out. Thus prison provided leisure for contemplation and writing. He read voraciously and pondered with a fresh mind the problems which had long troubled him. In Michael Brecher's words:

"It was another 'Voyage of Discovery'
part of his endless quest for knowledge.
From it emerged the last of his triology,

The Discovery of India."*

*(Nehru – a Political Biography, p.147)

Writers like Bankimchandra Chatterji, Tagore, and Aurobindo laid stress on India's distinctiveness because it seemed threatened by absorption into a universalized Europe. But they were also internationalist who know and respected Europe and warned for inter-cultural understanding. Their defenders and detractors lay stress on their essentialism, but they themselves went beyond it, contesting the validity of Eurocentrism without promoting
an equally imperfect Indocentrism. Following the same tradition Nehru combined western genres with local content. His is a poetic expression in prose.

He refers to Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of Roman Empire*, Dante's *Divine Comedy*. Not that he is lured by glitter of Europe but as a most refined man, he appreciates its grandeur. He captures good things from Europe as well as Asia. Of course, the antiquity of Asian empires impresses him, but he treats all empires East or West, impartially. Surprisingly, Chengiz Khan has been described as "the greatest military genius and leader in history. In all his historical assessment the centre of interest is "what is the final essence or message of all these at last?" He is not a historian to record names and dates. His writing is rather personal search of the deep significance of the event.

His status as high ranked statesman was so prominent that his talent as writer was given less attention. He deserves worthy recognition as a man of letters for his literacy merit. He was inspired by the spirit of English literature.

K.T.Narasimha Char places him in the true tradition of Edmund Burke, John Morley and Augustine Birrell whom A.G.Gardiner calls "double firsts" for having achieved distinction both in the fields of politics and letters.*

(*p.194 in *Profile of Jawaharlal Nehru*)

He was very fond of books and was a voracious reader. He had deep interest in scientific advancement as he obtained his master's degree in natural science at Cambridge and he was equally fond of poetry.

A journalist par excellence he had been not a little responsible for building up a strong and independent press during the years of India's struggle for freedom. He often contributed articles to newspapers and journals both in India and abroad on important political topics. In 1938 "The National Harold" was started under his guidance.

There is an aesthetic background to Jawaharlal Nehru's life, a love of beauty and art, a feeling for nature, he revelled in the Himalayan Valleys in ecstatic delight, enrapturing the majesty of Himalayan peaks. Though a statesman and politician, it was his belief that the art of nation gives a greater insight into the soul of its people, the transient activities of its masses. He wrote:

"Can you imagine any good life which does not have an artistic and an aesthetic element in it, and a moral element in it?"

*(Independence and After, Page 401)*
The Discovery of India reveals his acquaintance with world literature from ancient times until the day. He refers to Tolstoy, Ruskin, Freud, Marx, Rolland, Yeats, Virginia Woolf and appreciates their literary genius. The Ajanta Frescoes took him back into "some distant dream-like and yet very real world."*

*(The Discovery of India, Page 244).

He was equally impressed by the magnificent cathedrals of Europe. He was in favour of developing a sense of artistry and love for beauty and not to tolerate ugliness in one's life. Like a mature artist he was convinced that:

"A touch of artistry does not cost money or costs little, it really needs some imagination and some love of beauty..."*

*(Speeches [1953-57] Page 244)

To his artistic tendency, there was Mahatma Gandhi's influence which brought serenity and inner strength. The most appealing part of his Autobiography is his coming into contact with Mahatma Gandhi. The picture of Mahatma that emerges from its pages is a masterpiece of world-painting:

"This little man of poor physique had something of steel in him, something rock-like which did not yield to physical powers, however great they might be. And in spite of his unimpressive features, his loin-cloth and bare body, there was a royalty and kingliness in him which compelled a willing obeisance from others. Consciously and deliberately meek and humble, yet he was full of power and authority..."

Further, he observes:

"The (his) language was always simple and to the point and seldom was an unnecessary word used. It was the utter sincerity of the man and his personality that gripped; he gave the impression of tremendous inner reserve of power."* *(Autobiography, Jawaharlal Nehru, Page 129-130)
Jawaharlal also compares his father to Mahatma Gandhi, he observes the contrast and notes that the Mahatma's capacity to win over was such that his father forsaked his princely life and plunge into the fight for India's freedom.

The Autobiography contains the profile of many of India's leaders in the freedom struggle – Motilal Nehru, Madanmohan Malviya, C.R.Das, Tilak, Abdul Gafar Khan, Dr.M.A.Ansari, Rajgopalchari and Rajendra Prasad.

Poetic Vision of History : (Glimpses of World History, 1934)

His is a poetic vision of history, that is why the title "glimpses" suggest moment of illumination and for Jawaharlal illumination means hope for better tomorrow for all. The letter form allows him to slip narrow structure of documenting events. This explains why Nehru treats the Gupta Empire of India for being 'wonderful renaissance of art and literature' while the Roman Empire is treated with scant courtesy. Throughout his history writing, his concern for the underdog becomes his distinguished quality. He follows Louis Blanc, a philosophic historian in this matter. He avoids religious view of history and believes in Herodotus's view of downfall:

"Success; then, as a consequence of success,
arrogance and injustice and then downfall."

In this regard, he can be compared with H.G.Wells, though Wells is often impersonal. Thus Literature and History are inseparable in him. It is not narrow or one-sided but depiction of highly sensitive imagination. During his fifth term in prison, Nehru began a series of letters to his daughter, later published as Glimpses of World History. In this context Michael Brecher notes that :

"Nehru is not a trained historian, but his feel for the flow of human history and his capacity to weave together a wide range of knowledge in a meaningful pattern give to this book qualities of a high order."

(Nehru – a Political Biography, Michael Brecher OUP 1961 pp.89–90)

His genuine interest in the struggle and aspirations of humanity led him to reread history and the reward he expected from the task was to shape man's future. Here and there he refers to Chinese civilization with admiration because of their antiquity and high culture and their vitality to survive in spite of centuries of poverty and suffering unlike most histo-
rians, he praises Chengiz Khan for being tolerant and respected learning though illiterate himself. Thus, in some ways he explodes an established myth. Similarly, the British were not all enemy. He does not jump to hasty conclusion. His positive attitude proves him "Light of Asia". His reaction to British tyranny in India is:

The tyranny of the British, we say? Whose tyranny it is, after all? Who profits by it? Not the whole British race, for millions of them are themselves unhappy and oppressed. It is a system, a machine that crushed millions... The fault is ours that we quarrel among ourselves."

He is thus more interested in the impact of events than in cataloguing them. Being a lover of humanity, Nehru's interest in the history of nations was noteworthy. He was particularly curious how civilizations were formed and developed. Started as a series of letters to his daughter Indira, the work turned into an encyclopaedic work revealing information in a fascinating manner. In a very simple but interesting style, he tells the story of various peoples who have inhabited the earth, tracing their origins and developments and turns our attention to the causes that led to their downfall.

Here also are pen pictures of Socrates and Sankaracharya, Leonardo da Vinci and Lenin, Chengiz Khan and Napolean; Buddha and Christ, Garibaldi and Mizzini, Lincoln and of course his mentor Mahatma Gandhi among others, who have made history and have left their footprints on the sands of time. One may not agree with the truth of conclusions but his treatment remains charming and fresh.

In a way this work is Asia-centered, a reaction against Europe and colonial mentality. At the very outset, Nehru disarmingly confesses:

"I do not claim to be a historian. Indeed of the faults that these letters contain there is no end."

Yet, readers do find it "better history and better English."*

(*Srinivas Iyengar in *Indian Writing in English*, P.299)

As a cure for the creeping paralysis of isolation in Jail, he wrote a series of letters to his daughter Indira when she was a child often giving a brief account of the "early days of the world" in simple language. As Indira grew from a child to a firl, the letters also has to acquire wider scope.
In *Glimpses of World History* he is consistently unfair to the British. The book is noteworthy from the point of scholarly research. C.D.Narasimhaiah compares him with some other noted historians such as Louis Blanc whom he resembles, Herder, Spengler and Toyanbee who are philosophical like him. True, there are repetitions and at times it sounds dull and conventional generalization make it over-simple yet he manages with ease and admits both sides of the coin while drawing great figures of the past. Whatever he narrates there is a tone of intimacy and avoids dogmatism.

The term *Glimpses* itself is poetic. Nehru clearly warns his daughter that these letters are "not meant to give you history, but to awaken your curiosity." This is a rare sense of history combined with literary sensibility and an understanding of civilization. He was trying to remove dark curtain to search sparkling scenes of living people and their aspirations.

**An Autobiography (1936)**

By the time his Autobiography published he was one of the senior leaders. In the words of C.D.Narasimhaiah "years after, Nehru, the politician and Prime Minister is forgotten the world will remember him as a man of letters."* (*Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Statesman as Writer* Pencraft International, Delhi : 2001. p.75)

C.D.Narasimhaiah gives credit to An *Autobiography* for "there is neither mock-modesty nor over statement both of which are disastrous in a writer of autobiography. He is frank, confessing that he is neither a saint nor monster to remain unaffected by so much lover and fame he received. But as he says what saved him was his habit of introspection. His characteristic candour is visible certainly, his literary gifts are visible in his first major literary work - his *Autobiography*.

*Autobiography* is actually tells more about the pageant of his people's struggle for emancipation from alien rule than his personal life. It seems his object is to set out the salient aspects of the freedom movement in India against the backdrop of the social and political conditions in the country charged by Mahatma Gandhi’s leadership.

One expects details of wealth, luxury, worldly prospects, aristocratic family life in his *Autobiography*. But it is not there, instead one finds anxiety about future of India, self-criticism and worry to solve problems that constrain progress. For him India is his love but there are certain things which he dislikes, so also about England, he respects some aspects but cannot tolerate colonial mentality. For both the nation he finds self contradiction and *Autobiography* is sincerely reveals this dilemma.
In the earlier chapters he tells the readers about his education in England the English people and their ways of life and confesses that he owes much to England though he was fighting against the British rule in India. It is unevenly written but it is honest and alive. There are characteristic touches of truism and anti-climax. There is not much humour.

The *Autobiography* owes as much to Harrow, Cambridge and Inner Temple as to India. On one hand he is haunted and shamed by poverty of India, of perjury and intrigue compared to the outlook he developed in England on the other hand his sense of dignity does not allow colonial rule and react against England. In *Autobiography* we find a torn spirit of its writer.

Often autobiographies are known for its open and obsessive confessions. Nehru's work is example of purity. Nowhere he is unclean or sensual. His aesthetic sense has purity and displays truthfulness. It also records the evils of communalism, untouchability, poverty as also there are comments on the record of British rule in India, the attitude of the Indian Liberals and the Round Table Conference among other topics.

He tells us in his *Autobiography* that after he came back from Cambridge and joined Gandhi's national movement he travelled India and his conception of India underwent a change:

"A new picture of India seemed to rise before me, naked, starving, crushed and utterly miserable. And their faith in us ... embraced me and filled me with a new responsibility that frightened me".

Amrita Sher Gil, the renowned painter wrote on reading *Autobiography*:

"As a rule I dislike biographies and autobiographies. They ring so false. But I think I like yours ... You are capable of saying: 'when I saw the sea for the first time, when others would say 'when the sea saw me for the first time'!"

His modesty was notable. In *Autobiography* one finds ungenerous remark on V.S.Srinivas Sastri and other intolerant references here and there, but the total impression is that of great saga of a nation.
Srinivas Iyengar says "the testament of a whole generation. Personal history fused with national history."

(*Indian Writing in English. p.303)

Aldous Huxley welcomed his Autobiography by saying:
"For those who would understand contemporary India it is an indispensable book.

Edward Thompson observed:
"It is written with modesty and power, and expresses a character of outstanding nobility. It is the mirror of a man trying all things impartially, 'starving to save his own soul and his comrade's homeward way.'"

(*Nehru Abhinandan Granth" p.6)

Tagore praised him as:
"I have just finished reading your great book ... leads us to the person who is greater than his deeds and truer than his surroundings."

(*Nehru Abhinandan Granth, p.6)

**The Discovery of India (1946)**

This book shows Nehru's inevitable quest for India. One may call it A Tale of Tomorrow. Nehru had been engaged for nearly three decades in freedom movement and the processed possessed him so much that he felt strong unity with India, her past, her future, her weakness, her strength, her identity and the result is his The Discovery of India. He is constantly looking for her vitality and his major concern is how does she fit into the modern world of science and technology. It is not the politician Nehru talking of India, but visionary Nehru thinking of India, her natural beauty, her architecture, sculptures, epics, her mountains and rivers all attracts him. India's diversity and continuity makes him spell bound. It strengthens his self-confidence which helps to save himself from self-pity. His main concern is how to renew ourselves to march forward in spite of all obstacles.
Ten years after the Autobiography came out in 1946 The Discovery of India was written in Ahmednagar Prison Camp. It supplements his autobiography in many ways as it reveals his depth of knowledge and as K.T.Narsimha Char says "a rich and radiant tapestry of thought". Here, he loves India and her ancient heritage passionately, on the other hand he cannot bear the thought of his country men still being in the clutch of superstitions and orthodoxy. Though away with religious ritual, he praises the eternal truths of Hinduism which is summed up in the Upanishads:

"Lead me from the unreal to the real!
Lead me from darkness to light!
Lead me from death to immortality!"

Through his writing one must know India the way Nehru did. India for him, is "a lady with a past" who 'clings to her children', with 'her sphinx-like smile'.

The Discovery of India shows Nehru type of patriotism, – his fascination with what makes India a nation, its cultural and historical antecedents and mainly the secret of the continuity of the Indian heritage from the time of the Indus Valley Civilization to the privations of British rule. He is impressed by her diversity as also her willingness to absorb various religions and ethnicities. His evocative depiction of India's past helps him to establish identity of India as nation, her antiquity should form her present and show the way for better future. His 'discovery' of India is her strength of continuity and diversity.

The work sincerely tries to forge the links of the racial memory and by unfolding the layers of the past, he gains strength to the future. This is his discovery – how this civilization, in spite of contradictions and diversities sustained and continued. The clashes of races, calamities, the fall of empires, the liquidation of dynasties, how it maintained its existence.

The Discovery of India presents a masterly analysis of the facts and circumstances that for ages have kept India serene and sustaining. He knew strong and weak points of his country and his people. The beauty of the work lies in its naturalness and deep conviction.

Further it seems his contact with nature was his preoccupation in prison. The Discovery of India reveals his acquaintance with beauty of nature especially the majesty of the Himalayas or the mingling of the three oceans near Kanya Kumari. It shows the intellectual in Jawaharlal he merges as a thinker. The book contains critical estimate of India's great
personalities drawn with a few strokes of his pen. His aesthetic component is pronounced here. It is his world-view that makes the book literary piece. He writes:

"The stream of life goes on in spite of famine and war, full of its inherent contradictions, and finding sustenance even in those contradictions and the disasters that follow in their train ... and out of the heavy trials of seeming defeat the spirit emerges with new strength and wider vision. The weak in spirit yield and are eliminated but others carry the torch forward and hand it to the standard bearers of tomorrow."


His attractive individual style and the fusion of emotion and argument, self examination and curiosity rings sincere. Here he is no more a leader of national stature but speaks as man with understanding and sympathy. The only criterion applicable is his peoples' love for him.

Srinivas Iyengar praises to Nehru's writing as:

"The history of Jawaharlal Nehru's writings and speeches merges with his life, and his life likewise merge with the life of the nation the history of India."

(*Indian Writing in English, p.295*)

Here his tone is more nationalistic.

Letters and Other Writings:

*A Bunch of Old Letters* (1958) is a loving bag of letters written to and written by Nehru. The celebrities who wrote to him are Stalverts of the century, Gandhi, Tagore, Sarojini, Jay Prakash Narayan, Pant, Vallabhbhai Patel, Subhaschandra Bose, Kripiani and from abroad Bernard Shaw, Harold Laski, Sir Stafford Cripps, Edward Thompson, Madame Chiang Kaishek, and many more from all the countries of the world.

The correspondence between Gandhi and Nehru revealing their differences and yet their trust and respect for each other. The tone is bound to be personal and graceful. There is no bitterness, though ideas and opinion differ. His use of English language is best here.
In addition to letters Nehru wrote lengthy pamphlets or treatises like Soviet Russia, India and the World, China, Spain and the War and other. They are largely political and informative type of work. The Unity of India consists of a selection of Nehru's thought between the eventful years of his life i.e. 1935 and 1942. In all these writing he is full of human compassion. It includes Nehru's article 'Rashtrapathi' written under the pseudonym of 'Chankya' for the 'Modern Review'. Here he criticises himself.

Other Writings

He had already written India and the World, The Unity of India, Soviet Russia and Eighteen Months in India, some of them partly written in prison. He also wrote many letters as we find in A Bunch of Old Letters (1958).

The next major work consisting his writings between 1937 and 1940 is The Unity of India. These are Nehru's articles published in newspapers and journals not only in India but also in America and England about Indian political scene.

Nehru's Speeches

Probably no other statesman in last century had made so many speeches as he had made in India and abroad on all subjects. On different occasions. On many occasions his speech rises to heights of literary beauty and often his speech has magnificence natural to great orators. There is the all sufficing simplicity and sensitiveness of the humanist. His public speeches were more like personal talks and he maintained friendly tone throughout. It is his unique trait that he was more intimate and friendly with larger crowds than in a small committee, so also his writing reflect the same tone.

About Nehru's speeches Watter Crocker notes:

"Naturally, I heard him make many speeches; scores and scores of speeches, both in and out of parliament. The range of his speeches most of which were unprepared, and most of them without a note, must be without parallel – on political matters in a huge variety, and also on technology, science, art, morals, history, welfare, and a host of good causes."

(*Nehru – a Contemporary Estimate, p.21)
He was able to deliver speech without written note for half an hour in English and translating it in Hindi immediately. His speeches were part of his political action and aspiration. It should not be treated as oratory but 'face to face talk with his people.'

His address to the Indian Constituent Assembly at midnight on August 14, 1947, on the attainment of Independence by his nation is a masterpiece.

"Long years ago we made a tryst with destiny, and now the time comes when we shall redeem our pledge, not wholly or in full measure but very substantially. At the stroke of the midnight hours, when the world sleeps, India will awake to life and freedom. A moment comes, which comes but rarely in history when we step out from the old to the new, when one age ends, and when the soul of a nation long suppressed, finds utterance."...*

*(Independence and After, p.3)*

His Radio Broadcast on 30th January 1948 soon after his revered master Mahatma Gandhi's assassination was like flow from the pained heart.

"The Light has gone out of our lives and there is darkness everywhere...
The light has gone out, I said and yet I am wrong. For the light that shone in this country was no ordinary light. The light that has illumined this country for these many years, will illumine this country for many more years, and a thousand years later, that light will be seen in this country and the world will see it and it will give solace to innumerable hearts. For the light represented something more, .... it represented the living, the eternal truth...
His Will and Testament written in 1954 which was released to the nation upon his death in 1964, is full of love for India and his poetic mind speaks through the symbol of the Ganga, as symbol of India's age-long culture and civilization,

"ever-changing, ever-flowing, and yet ever the same Ganga ... And though I have discarded much of past tradition and custom, and am anxious that India should rid herself of all shackles that bind and constrain her and divide her people, ... I do not wish to cut myself off from the past completely."

On this feeling of Jawaharlal Nehru, Shashi Tharoor comments aptly:

"In death, as in life Jawaharlal would become India."

*(Nehru The Invention of India, p.218)*

The very notion of Indianness is his quest as a writer: He is constantly searching.

Literary Style : One of his biographers, K.T.Narasimha Char, Compares him with an ace journalist A.G.Gardiner. What delightful pen-pictures he draws of men and mountains, nature and children, animals, flowers and though he was a lonely man but not unsocial one. There is something graceful sincere and fresh feeling about his style that reflects his cultured mind and human side. In the Nehrus generally there is individualistic energetic strain and they are never restful. Dr.S.Radhakrishnan has appreciated his versatility "He knows a good deal about a good many things." He is never loud but there is a flame-like quality in him. His intellectual endowment is also noteworthy. The first quality that strikes the reader of his books is his broad mindedness, an intense desire to universal friendship. Nehru as a man and as a writer is imbued with a historical perspective of events and people involved in India's struggle for freedom. Moreover there is no bitterness against its alien rulers. As a writer his loyalty to his ideals stands steadfast. Be it personal detail in Autobiography or history in Glimpses of World or quest of identity in The Discovery of India, one could not miss the element of poetry in his character which won him abounding love from his countrymen.

Nehru's writing about India and India's problems is forceful and vocal but in describing personal pain and loss, he is simple, short and having direct appeal : for example on Kamala's death, Nehru wrote :
"that fair body and that lovely face, 
which used to smile so often and so 
well, were reduced to ashes."*

*(*The Discovery of India. p.38)*

He cabled the dedication for his autobiography : "To Kamala who is no more"

The Discovery of India and Glimpses of the World are two monumental books painting a vivid impression of Jawaharlal Nehru's mind and of his vision of the world.

For some critics his work lacks consistency and sometimes he is in a hurry to say many things. He has been charged of not being compact or concise as he lets himself flow freely giving expression to his thoughts and feelings, eager to explain his ideals and aspiration – all about two of his favourite themes i.e. world peace and a picture of the India of his dreams.

His poetic quality is expressed in this short skillful sentence:

"And then Gandhi came"

"And" is loaded world with a deep sense of relief. Its power is felt immediately. At times he quotes from a less known Elizabathan poet to support his emotional stress.

Both Nehru and Churchill offer an impressive example of writer whose fame and place as men of letters have earned the right to a place in any anthology of good prose by masters of the English language. In Nehru literature lost a great writer to politics. The difference between the two is sharp, as writer Churchill records power, victory, conquest, Nehru questions the power created and victory won over.

He aptly quotes from Hopkins and Eliot, as also from the Upanishads, Aurobindo and Tagore. His essays 'Escape' and 'Monsoon comes to Bombay' collected in Unity of India (by V.K.Krishna Menon) were written as a playful literary indulgence. For example :

"so whispered the wind softly
and cunningly...."

His love for India and his concern is visible:

"Again we are standing on the threshold of great happenings.
Again our pulses quicken and
our toes are a quiver, and the
old call comes to our ears."*

*(Nehru : An Anthology, p.44)

His speech in the Constituent Assembly on 14 August 1947 is of a poetic appeal rather politician's address:

"To the people of India, whose representatives we are, we make an appeal to join us with faith and confidence in this great adventure. This is no time for petty and destructive criticism, no time for ill will or blaming others. We have to build the noble mansion of free India where all her children may dwell"*

*(Nehru : An Anthology, p.77)

His sensitivity is expressed when he describes his life in prison:

"One misses many things in prison, but perhaps most of all one misses the sound of women's voice and children's laughter."*

*(An Autobiography, [1936], pp.49)

To describe Indian Peoples' struggle for freedom, his words are sparking:

"Already the world is witness to the sacrifice and suffering of our people at the altar of freedom, to the wonderful courage of our women, and to the indomitable spirit of our brave peasantry.... they have willingly set aside their material pleasures and belongings, and written a stirring and shining chapter in India's long history."*

*(Extract from the Prison Diary with letters)
He was aware of the maxim "pen is mightier than sword".

What strange and mysterious things are words! The spoken word is powerful enough but even more so is the written word, for it has more of permanence....*

*(From : Nehru An Anthology, p.199)*

Nehru admits:

"I am no judge or critic of poetry.... but I love poetry and some of these little poems have appeded to me greatly."*

*(Jawaharlal in Foreword to Prison Days and Other Poems. S.H.Vatsyayan [1946])*

From the prison he quoted Edgar Allan Poe's lines to his wife Kamala as "they seemed to represent my feeling". The poem runs as below:

Thow Wast all that to me, love.
For which my soul dip pine –
A green isle in the sea, love,
A fountain and a shrine,
All wreathed with fairy fruits and flowers,
And all the flowers were mine..."

He quotes English poets when feels lonely in prison : for example,

"What can one do any way in prison? At least one can read William Blake:" and he quotes:

"Never seek to tell thy love,
Love that never told can be;
For one gentle wind does move silently invisibly".

His vast reading is impressive. Though soft romanticism was always there in his temperament, his ideas about the role of writers are realistic. He writes:
"In my opinion a writer should not be a more Utopian; for unless he has something fundamental in his mind, and his writing has connection with reality, with actual life, his work cannot prove enduring.....
A progressive writer should present his ideals in such a way that his work would create among the people the aspirations and the desired favour and enthusiasm to reach those ideals."*

*(A speech at a Conference of Progressive Writers, Allahabad. 14 November 1937)

As history writer he puts his own theory into practice on an Address to the Indian Historical Records Commission, in 1948, he said:

"It is only then that we can really clothe the dry bones of history with life, flesh and blood... And I suppose the only way really to read, write or understand history is to evoke in the mind a picture of a living society functioning, thinking and having all the virtues and failings which the human being has possessed, and gradually changing whether in the direction of progress or in some other."

**Nehru's Affinities with Nature**

In *Letters from a Father to His Daughter*, he tells his daughter to begin her education with the story of the earth and to understand this to go to 'the great Book of Nature itself' He writes :

Imagine how fascinating it is!
Every little stone that you see lying in the road or in the mountain side may be a little page in a nature's book and may be able to tell you something if only you know how to read it."
He recognizes nature's soothing capacity and finds it inspiring: for example:

"The moon ever a companion to me in prison, has grown more friendly with closer acquaintance, a reminder of the loveliness of this world, of the waving and waning of life, of light following darkness, of death and resurrection following each other in interminable succession."

In his Will and Testament the Ganga river figures prominently. Also, in *Autobiography*, a whole chapter is there to describe animals and insects. When he describes nature. For example:

"The clouds would throw out their arms to embrace a mountain – top, or creep down stealthily like children at play. I watched this everchanging spectacle, and sometimes the sheer loveliness of it was overpowering and I felt almost faint. As I gazed at it, it seemed to me dream – like and unreal, like the hopes and desires that fill us and so seldom find fulfilment. It was like the face of the beloved that one sees in a dream and that fades away on awakening."*

*('National Harold* [24-31 July 1940])

He was generous to praise his seniors and coworkers. On the occasion of unveiling the portrait of Bal Gangadhar Tilak in Parliament, he gave him just praise in the most artistic way:

"To be a single person blazing the trial, not knowing who follow, not knowing what would happen – that requires supreme courage which only the greatest
of people possess...*

*(Speeches [1953-57], p.488)

Again, of Sarojini Naidu who gave up poetry for politics at the call of Mahatma Gandhi, he observes:

She infused artistry and poetry into our national struggle. Just as Father of the Nation had infused moral grandeur and greatness to the struggle, Sarojini Naidu gave it artistry and poetry and that indomitable spirit which not only faced disaster and catastrophe, but faced them with a light heart and with a song on her lips, ...."*

*(Independence and After. p.399)

In a letter to George Bernard Shaw in 1948 he wrote:

"...like many of my generation, we have grown up in company with your writings and books. I suppose a part of myself, such as I am today, has been moulded by that reading..."

Similarly his tribute to Lady Mountbatten on her leaving India, Nehru, a sensitive writer expressed his feelings in the following way:

"The Gods or some good fairy gave you beauty and high intelligence, and grace and charm and vitality, great gifts, and she who possessed them is a great lady wherever she goes."

*(Independence and After. p.370)

"In gaining Nehru for the nationalistic cause" said a great Indian to me, "we lost what would have been one of the greatest scholars India ever produced."

*(Quoted by John Haynes Holmes in "My Gandhi", page 144)
His prison reading included Bertrand Russell, Spengler, Bukharin, Maurois, Rolland and Llyod George's speeches and sonnets of Shakespeare. He praised the Indian epics, the *Ramayan* and the *Mahabharat* as works of literature, not as sacred texts.

After analysing Nehru as a writer, the study concentrates on Nehru's assessment as post colonial writer in the next chapter.

Section II

**Churchill on India**

Churchill's biographers have observed his magnanimity, his pursuit of social justice and Churchill's own statement:

"I hate nobody except Hitler –
and that is professional"

is often quoted. Yet it is unfotunate that Chuchill had a blind spot about India. There are several occasions where his bias and negative stand is apparent.

He was never halfhearted in his pursuit of social justice and improvement in the general standard of living "There was", he argued, no virtue at all leveling down, but the miracle of science should be used to provide a bountiful supply of Victorians*1 and Churchill had the idealism of both the liberals and Victorians. But not for India.

The present study analytically discusses Churchill's attitude towards India. Churchill's mind having racial superiority, the Raj ego, colonialism, and typical imperial effect reflect his bias attitude forming the "power" ego, as against Nehru's ever fresh sensitive and sympathetic view of brotherhood that reminds us of his rich ancient heritage.

As Foucauldin theory*2 suggests, it is the narrative that weilds the power of history, and the memoirs are Churchill's narrative, so far Churchill's impression of India is concerned, he is to be held accountable.

*Europe Unite* (1950) is a collection of Churchill's speeches between 1917-1948. The book embodies moving address to the Congress of Europe at the Hague in 1948 and other topics. It contains the escalating violence in Palestine, up and down relations with America and the Soviets, conscription, nationalization, the grim economy and above all Britain's precipitale post war decline.

But nothing more typefies the last than India, for which Churchill has often been excoriated as a die-hard imperialist, determined to preserve the Raj.
In the following pages the researcher has attempted to present factual evidence to diagnose Churchill's attitude.

First and Last Exception
(Churchill's Sympathetic Attitude)

Ramchandra Guha wrote in The Hindu:

"Winston Churchill's first and last statements about India were notably sympathetic to nationalist sentiments. But his record in-between was 'truly dreadful'."

In April 1919, a group of soldiers led by a man named Dyer fired at a crowd of unarmed Indians at the Jallianwala Bagh in Amritsar. Speaking in the House of Commons, Winston Churchill described this as:

"However we may dwell upon the Difficulties of General Dyer during the Amritsar riots, upon the anxious and critical situation in the Punjab, upon the danger to Europeans throughout that province, ..... one tremendous fact stands out – I mean the slaughter of nearly 400 persons and the wounding of probably three to four times as many, at the Jallan Wallah Bagh on 13th April. This is an episode which appears to be without precedent or parallel in the modern history of the British Empire .... Let me marshal the facts. The crowd was unarmed, except with bludgeous. It was not attacking anybody or anything. It was holding a seditious meeting. When fire had been opened upon it to disperse it, it tried to run away. Pinned up in a narrow place considerably Smaller than Trafalgar Square, with hardly any exists, and packed together so that one bullet would drive through three or four bodies, the people ran madly this way and the other. When the fire was directed upon the centre, they ran to the sides. The fire was then directed to the sides. Many throw themselves down on the ground, and the fire was then directed on the ground. This was continued for 8 to 10 minutes... If the road had not been so narrow, the machine guns and the armoured cars would have joined in. Finally, when the ammunation had
reached the point that only enough remained to allow for the safe return of the troops, and after 379 persons had been killed, and when most certainly 1200 or more had been wounded, the troops, at whom not even a stone had been thrown, swung round and marched away ..... we have to make it absolutely clearly .... that this is not the British way of doing business... our reign in India or anywhere else, has never stood on the basis of physical force alone, and it would be fatal to the British Empire, if we were to try to base ourselves only upon it.:

(Speech in the House of Commons, July 8, 1920 "Amritsar" at the time Churchill was serving as Secretary of State for War under Prime Minister David Lloyd George.)

He described it strongly : as "a monstrous event", "a great slaughter or massacre upon a particular crowd of people, with the intention of terrorising not merely, the rest of the crowd, but the whole district or country." This was most likely his first public utterance on Indian affairs. His last such utterances date to the mid 1950s when he and Jawaharlal Nehru were both Prime Ministers of independent nations. Now, Churchill expressed much admiration for Nehru as a man who "conquered two great human infirmities : fear and hate. In one fanciful moment, he even saw his fellow Harovian as the "Light of Asia", who was shaping the destiny of hundreds of millions of Indians and playing an "outstanding part in world affairs". This is first and last expression about India which are compliments but between these two the study focuses on what was said or written by Churchill.

Two Phases

Churchill's tirades against India and its peoples is found in two phases. The first phase ran between 1929 and 1932, when the Gandhian movement for freedom was going strong. The second one in 1940 and after when he wrote reminiscences of his military and unjustly expressed his opinion on Indian army.

Churchill in India

In early October,1896 he was transferred to Bombay, British India. He was considered one of the best polo players in his regiment and led his team to many prestigious tournament victories.
In 1897, while preparing for a leave in England, he heard that three brigades of the British Army were going to fight against a Pashtun tribe in the North West Frontier of India and he asked his superior officer if he could join the fight. He fought under the command of General Jeffery, who was the commander of the second brigade operating in Malakand, in the Frontier region of British India. Jeffery sent him with fifteen scouts to explore the Mamund Valley; while on reconnaissance, they encountered an enemy tribe, dismounted from their houses and opened fire. After an hour of shooting, their reinforcements, the 35th Sikhs arrived, and the fire gradually ceased and the brigade and the Sikhs marched on. Hundreds of tribesmen then ambushed them and opened fire, forcing them to retreat. As they were retreating four men were carrying an injured officer but the fierceness of the fight forced them to leave him behind. The man who was left behind was slashed to death before Churchill's eyes; afterwards he wrote of the killer, "I forgot everything else at this moment except a desire to kill this man. However the Sikhs' numbers were being depleted so the next commanding officer told Churchill to get the rest of the men and boys to safety. Before he left he asked for a note so he would not be charged with desertion. He received the note, quickly signed, and headed up the hill and alerted the other brigade, whereupon they then engaged the army. The fighting in the region dragged on for another two weeks before the dead could be recovered. He wrote in his journal: "Whether it was worth it I cannot tell," An account of the Siege of Malakand was published in December 1900 as The Story of the Malakand Field Force. He received 600 Pound for his account.

A year after Indian Independence Churchill's curious complex about India was still highly evident. It was a complex which he developed when stationed in Bangalore, as a subaltern in the Queen's Hussars, from 1896-1899. Throughout his time in India, he had been more concerned with the prestige this position offered (horses and Polo Playing being the outward trapping of health) and the possibility that it would lead to a political career, than what he could learn from India, or the Indian Army, itself. His refusal to learn Hindi, which he believed a quite unnecessary as all natives here speak English perfectly and I cannot see any good in wasting my time acquiring a dialect which I shall never use. This shows that he could not enter very fully into the thoughts and feelings of the Indian troops which he encount red. But this does not stop Churchill from presuming that "there was no doubt they liked having a white officer among them. Men fighting --- they watched him carefully to see how things were going, if you grinned, they grinned. So I grinned"**. As year after he had arrived in India, Churchill was warned about catching Indian fever as it was
very difficult to get rid of. The fear never left him*, Churchill never recovered and India would always be his 'blind spot'. When it came to writing his memoirs, Churchill's almost obsessive sentiment about India often affected his opinion on the Indian Army too.

About India he was obliged to give way by the sheer strength of the opposition. Churchill was in opposition to the Government of India Bill in the 1930s when he did his utmost to destroy Mr. Baldwin's liberal move in the direction of giving India increased self government. Clearly, Churchill had a blind spot about India.

In conversation to Leo Amery, Secretary of State for India, the following quotation is widely cited as written in "a letter to Leo Amery":

"I hate Indians. They are a beastly people with a beastly religion"*10.

Phase I

The Emperial Churchill Against India's Independence

In 1930, the Labour Party began negotiation with India for Home Rule. When the Conservatives supported Labour. On this issue, Churchill resigned from the Shadow Cabinet of Stanley Baldwin because this decision was not compatible with his concept of the British Empire. In his attack on the Labour Position in India, Churchill was the leader of malcontents in the Conservative Party. His role with the group, while it kept his name in the paper through the 1930s hurt his influence in the party, and the nation.

In 1933, Churchill finally lost in his bid to lead the Conservatives against the India bill, and this defeat was the subject of an editorial in The New York Times contrasting Churchill's duplicity with Baldwin's steadfastness.

In October 1929, when the Viceroy (Lord Irwin) suggested Dominion Status for India, Churchill called the idea –

"not only fantastic but criminally mischievous in its effects"*11

As an ambitious politician currently out of power, Churchill thought it necessary to marshal "the sober and resolute forces of the British Empire" against the granting of self-government to India. Over the next two years, Churchill delivered dozens of speeches where he worked up, in most unsober form, the forces hostile to the winning of political independence by people with brown (or black) skins. As the historian Sarvapalli Gopal writes, in these speeches Churchill "stressed not only the glory but also the necessity of empire". The glory was to India, as in his view, without the Raj there would be little peace and less prosperity. And the necessity was to England, for if the Raj ended, then "that spells the
doom of Lancashire”. Churchill seriously feared an economic recession if access to Indian markets and goods was denied.

Speaking at the Albert Hall in 1931, he claimed that "to abandon India to the rule of the brahmins (who in his view dominated the congress party) would be an act of Cruel and wicked negligence". If the British left, "India will fall back quite rapidly through the centuries into the barbarism and privations of the Middle Ages".*12

Stanley Baldwin became Prime Minister again in 1935. Churchill did not seek nor received a Cabinet Post or Ministry in Baldwin's government. The state of the British Empire now dominated House of Commons debate and the press headlines. The "Crown jewel" of the Empire was India. Baldwin and his Viceroy in India, Lord Halifax, had worked out a settlement to give India its political freedom, in response to mounting protests and riots led by Nehru and Gandhi.

From the back benches, Churchill roared his opposition. India, he said: "India was not a political but geographical term". There were "fifty different Indias" and only Britain could hold the balance between them.*13 He predicted that as many as a million people might be killed in religious conflict between the Hindus and Moslems". In his attack against the government bill, Churchill charged:

"Democracy is the argument the government uses, but aristocracy would be the result – and India run by Brahmin born elites like Nehru & Gandhi, whose caste treatment of the 'untouchables' the lower classes, is brutal in their harshness".*14

But there was more to Churchill's opposition than concern for "the untouchables". In Churchill's mind, losing India was the first step in dismantling the Empire. Britain without an empire to Churchill, was like Samson shorn of his locks; The Empire was the source of Britain's strength as a world power. With hindsight, Churchill's prewar opposition to Indian independence can be characterised as reactionary. In fairness, though, he truly believed that a people with no tradition or history of civil liberties would experience corruption and strife if exposed to democracy prematurely.

* * *

Churchill's View on Gandhi

Churchill opposed Mohandas Gandhji's peaceful disobedience revolt and the Indian Independence movement in the 1930s, arguing that the Round Table Conference "was a frightful prospect". Later reports indicate that Churchill favoured letting Gandhi die if he went on a hunger strike. During the first half of the 1930s, Churchill was outspoken in his
opposition to granting Dominion status to India. He was a founder of the India Defence League, a group dedicated to the preservation of British power in India. Churchill brooked no moderation. "The truth is", he declared in 1930, "that Gandhi-ism and everything it stands for will have to be grappled with and crushed.\textsuperscript{15}\textsuperscript{15} In his speeches and press articles in this period he forecast widespread unemployment in Britain and civil strife in India should independence be granted. The Viceroy Lord Irwin, who had been appointed by the prior Conservative Government, engaged in the Round Table Conference in early 1931 and then announced the Government's policy that India should be granted Dominion Status. In this the Government was supported by the Liberal Party and, officially at least, by the Conservative Party. Churchill denounced the Round Table Conference.

At a meeting of the West Essex Conservative Association specially convened so Churchill could explain his position he said, "It is alarming and also nauseating to see Mr. Gandhi, a seditious Middle Temple lawyer, now posing as a fakir of a type well-known in the East, striding half-naked up the steps of the Vice-regal palace...to parley on equal terms with the representative of the King-Emperor." He called the Indian National Congress leaders "Brahmins who mouth and patter principles of Western political system.\textsuperscript{16}\textsuperscript{16}

He used to say "that old humbug Gandhi and his hunger strike." Indeed, his prediction of violent religious conflict came true after a Labour government finally granted India its freedom in 1947. "In time, of course, India proved Churchill wrong; although cultural and religious unrest continues, the country remains the world's largest democracy. But in 1935 Churchill's fervent opposition won the day. The government bill to grant India autonomy was defeated."\textsuperscript{17}\textsuperscript{17}

Churchill permanently broke with Stanley Baldwin over Indian independence and never again held any office while Baldwin was prime minister. Some historians see his basic attitude to India as being set out in his book \textit{My Early Life} (1930). Another source of controversy about Churchill's attitude towards Indian affairs arises over what some historians term the Indian 'nationalist approach' to the Bengal famine of 1943, which has sought to place significant blame on Churchill's wartime government for the excessive mortality of up to three million people. While some commentators point to the disruption of the traditional marketing system and maladministration at the provincial level. Arthur Herman, author of \textit{Churchill and Gandhi}, contends, "The real cause was the fall of Burma to the Japanese, which cut off India's main supply of rice imports when domestic sources fell short ... [though] it is true that Churchill opposed diverting food supplies and transports
from other theatres to India to cover the shortfall; this was wartime.\textsuperscript{18} In response to an urgent request by the Secretary of State for India, Leo Amery, and Viceroy of India, Wavell, to release food stocks for India, Churchill responded with a telegram to Wavell asking, if food was so scarce, "why Gandhi hadn't died yet."\textsuperscript{19} In July 1940, newly in office, he welcomed reports of the emerging conflict between the Muslim League and the Indian Congress, hoping "it would be bitter and bloody."

It seems that the passion which ruled Churchill's mind was colonizer's superiority and racism. Guha notes, "through the late 1930s, Churchill thought and spoke little about India. But then in 1940 he became Prime Minister and had to confront the question as to what would happen to Indians after the Allies had won a war ostensibly fought to preserve freedom. As the diaries of his Secretary of State for India, Leo Amery, makes clear, Churchill was implacably opposed to all proposals for Indian self-rule.

In 1944, Amery wrote that "I am by no means sure whether on this subject of India, he (Churchill) is really quite sane ...\textsuperscript{20}"

Guha appends the comment of Lord Wavell, who as Viceroy of India between 1943 and 1945, concluded in his diary, that the British Prime Minister (Churchill) "has a curious complex about India and is always loth to hear good of it and apt to believe the worst.\textsuperscript{21}"

\textbf{Phase II}

\textbf{Indian Army Portrayal by Churchill (Churchill on India)}

It is old adage that history is always about power. But, as, Alun Mauslow, writes, if the 'past exists for us only as it is written up by historians' what then happens if that historian is less than scrupulous?\textsuperscript{22} The same applies to Winston Churchill's portrayal of the Indian Army's contribution to the Second World War as found in his six volume opus \textit{The Second World War}. This chapter will offer reasons as to why Churchill almost totally ignored the Indian Army; reasons that go beyond the overly simple explanation of Churchill's inherent racism. (Unless otherwise stated the term Indian Army is used in this chapter to refer to Indian Army Units which were part of the British & Commonwealth force). It seems the advent of Indian independence was so painful an experience for Churchill that it tainted his portrayal of the Indian Army when the time came to compose his historical narrative. The present study examines to what extent, his narrative influence subsequent official histories
and why did Churchill pay such little attention to the history of the Indian Army's achievement in the Second World War.

Although aptly described by A.J.Balfour "Churchill's autobiography disguised as world history"*23, Churchill learnt how history could be manipulated and serve as a platform for both self-vindication and self-justification*24. Having secured imperical Britain's discomfiting retreat from India, Mountbatten returned to England in 1948. Attending a party thrown by Anthony Eden in his honour, he encountered Churchill, Churchill approached him, pointed to him and declared: "What you did in India was like whipping your riding crop across my face!*25"

A year after Indian independence Churchill's curious complex about India was still highly evident*26. It was a complex which he had developed when stationed in Bangalore, as a subaltern in the Queen's Hussars, from 1896-1899. Churchill probably spent a total of twelve months in India as his four year posting was interpersed with various sorties as a war correspondent in the Sudan and then South Africa and with several trips back to London. As it has been noted earlier, throughout his time in India, he had been more concerned with the prestige this position offered (horses and polo playing were his favourite activities), and the possibility that it would lead to a political career, than what he could learn about India, or the Indian Army, itself. He refused to learn Hindi, which he believed it "quite unnecessary as all natives here speak English perfectly and I cannot see any good in wasting my time acquiring a dialect which I shall never use." This means he was not in a mood to familiarise fully into the 'thoughts and feelings' of the Indian troops which he encountered. But this did not stop Churchill from presuming that, "there was no doubt they liked having a white officer among them when fighting ... they watched him carefully to see how things were going, if you grinned, they grinned. So I grinned industriously"*28. A year after he had arrived in India, Churchill was warned about catching Indian fever as it was 'very difficult to get rid of*29. When it came to writing his memories, Churchill's almost obsessive sentiments about India often affected his opinion on the Indian Army, and vice versa.

**Ancestral Prejudice:**

Churchill briefly acknowledged the presence of the Indian Army in the trenches of Northern France, during the First World War, when he wrote that, "the steadfast Indian Corps in the cruel winter of 1914 held the line by Armentieres."*30 In reality, Indian troops had served with distinction in the trenches of Northern France as well as Mesopotamia*31.
and each of the major theatres of the First World War*. Churchill's low opinion of the Indian troops had been reinforced by his parents who, in turn, had been influenced by their elders who had experienced the Mutiny of 1857*. His own experiences in India had done little to reverse this, and the Singapore Mutiny of 1915 did nothing to dispel Churchill's already low opinion of the Indian Army*. Yet he never looked at the reverse; that the overwhelming majority of the 80,000 Indian Soldiers who saw action in France, Mesopotamia, Palestine or Africa had fought valiantly alongside their British Officers and counterparts and had remained loyal to the King.* It seems his imperial feeling was stronger than his sense of historical fact.

It seems Churchill is led away by racism.

**Racism & Churchill**

Oxford Dictionary defines racism as 'prejudice, discrimination, or antagonism directed against someone of a different race based on the belief that one's own race is superior.

Churchill seems to believe that race is the primary determinant of human traits and capacities and that racial differences produce an inherent superiority. As Hitler's declaration of his belief in a "master-race" was an indication of the inherent racism of the Nazi so also Churchill believed that there is a casual link between inherited physical traits and traits of personality, intellect, morality and other cultural behavioural features and that the British are innately superior to natives (Indians).

It is clear that Racism was at his heart when he reviewed Indian Sepoys. In fact, the idea of RACE was inverted to magnify the differences between people of European Origin and those of Asians. By viewing Asians as lesser human beings, the English justified colonial rule and Churchill wanted to maintain this system of exploration while at the same time portraying the British Empire as a bastion and champion of human freedom.

The next mention Churchill made of the Indian Army is telling. As he reminisced about his return to the Admiralty in 1939, Churchill included a copy of a memo he submitted to Prime Minister Chamberlain in which he recommended that the "only way in which our force in France can be rapidly expanded is by bringing the professional troops from India, and using them as the Cadre upon which the Territorials and conscripts will form"*. What Churchill alluded to, was that the British Officers of the Indian Army and not the Indian Officers were the professional soldiers. In one sentence he had cast aspersions about the nature, ability and professionalism of the small numbers of Indian officers that existed, let
alone Indian soldiers. Further, Churchill writes that 'in principle, 60,000 Territorials should
be sent to India to maintain internal security and complete their training.' This means in
Churchill's opinion India was good enough to be a training ground for troops from Britain,
yet Indian troops themselves were only capable of maintaining internal security. This point
clearly illustrate how Churchill only referred to the Indian Army, and to the Indian troops
themselves, when and if it served his own purpose. He tenaciously refused to alter his late
nineteenth century view of the Indian Army during the war, but by including it in his mem-
oirs it proved that it was a view he maintained long after the fact.

In fact Churchill's opinion of India influenced his opinion of the Indian Army and
his opinion had neither softened nor moderated ever.

Throughout the first two volumes of his memoirs, Churchill intimated that Indian
troops, like their 'native' African counterparts, were not to be trusted, ill-disciplined, inef-
ficient and not as professional as their British counterparts. Churchill discarded the status
of Indian troops to no more than relief soldiers when he wrote that 'a ceaseless stream of
Indian units' should be sent to Palestine and Egypt because 'India is doing nothing worth
speaking of at the present time. Churchill viewed them as inferior to both the Australian
and New Zealand soldiers who he thought were, in turn, below the standard of the British
troops. He also wrote that 'native' troops were to be mixed together so that 'one lot can be
used to keep the other in discipline.'

Churchill's depiction of the Indian troops varied to meet the needs of his narrative.
Of course, General Archibald Wavell did not share Churchill's views on Indian troops. In
November 1942, Wavell encouraged Churchill to consider 'sending a special message to
armed forces in India command' as this token of his appreciation would 'greatly hearten
them'. The belief in the superiority of the British soldiers over the Indian soldiers proved
itself to be outmoded and mistaken: "gone were the days when it had been supposed that
the example of British troops was needed to fire Indians to valour.'

In short, when it came to composing his memoirs, Churchill was still overly emotional
when it came to the subject of India. It was proved at the time of Quit India movement,
and the horror of the devastating Bengal famine from 1943 onwards.

It was in the fourth volume of memoirs that Churchill made the noticeable distinc-
tion between the British and the Indian Army Unit. Until then, Churchill had described the
Indian Army as the 'British Indian Army'. Using what Raymond Callahan described as a
'clumsy locution.' Churchill's use of the term 'British-Indian Army' spoke volumes about
what he thought of the Indian Army (even if his writing did not)*41. For Churchill, the Indian Army was essentially British, albeit including Indian soldiers. This was, perhaps, general perception of the British Army Officers about Indian Army.

Churchill had been humiliated by the relative ease with which Japanese troops had invaded and occupied Burma. But even more humiliating for Churchill was the fact that victory over the Japanese was won by the Indian Army, an army that Churchill had always regarded as inept, disloyal and nothing more than an armed Frankenstein's monster*42. Churchill was reinforcing his notion that all the Indian Army needed was 'a white officer among them when fighting'*43.

Again, as work on the fifth volume of his memoirs progressed, he wrote a note which stated that he would not spare more than 3,000 words ... on the struggle in Burma*44. This self-imposed word limit enabled Churchill to gloss over the significant contribution made by the Indian Army to the war in Burma. The brief chapter in which Churchill portrayed the campaigns for the reconquest of Burma, 'Burma and Beyond', is located towards the end of the fifth volume, 'Closing the Ring'. At this stage of the reconquest of Burma, March to May 1944, some of the fiercest battles against the Japanese were being fought. The aim of the Japanese offensive, U GO was to destroy the British and Indian forces around Kohima and Imphal, advance up the Dimapur pass, and forge ahead across to India. Churchill allocated less than two pages to his descriptions of the battles for Imphal and Kohima. He mentioned the 5th and 7th Indian Divisions and how they were flown into Imphal and Dimapur respectively.

Churchill also mistook, according to the Burma Star Association's battle histories, the units of the 2nd Indian Division for units of the 2nd British Division*45. The Eighth Army received several mentions, as did Alexander, Wavell and the American troops. But no mention was made of the Armies fighting in Burma, let alone specific mentions of Indian or African troops. Churchill maintained this silence in his memoirs*46. It may be surmised that Churchill did not include the troops in Burma because they were a constant source of humiliation for him. After all, they had, to use Slim's phrase, turned defeat into victory with very little help compared to the other theatres of war and, above all, it had been the Indian Army which had been in the majority.

To include them by name, to remember the forgotten, would mean Churchill would have had to revise his opinion of Indian troops. In fact, any post war discussion of Burma would not only include the virtues of the Indian Army, virtues which Churchill could not
accept, but also it would reveal how Burma had been the 'tale of the rejection of one strategic plan after another's due to the divergent and opposed American and British purposes'.

Prasad succinctly encapsulated the American and British perspectives on Burma:

"One seeking to utilise India for the object of keeping China in the war and hitting Japan directly therefrom, the other keen to get back their old empire in South-East Asia."

When the pivotal contribution that the Indian Army had made resurfaced in the chronology of his tale, it became one more issue that Churchill gladly glossed over. No doubt the advent of Indian, as well as Burmese, independence contributed to Churchill's childish shunning of the Indian Army's achievements, but Burma had exposed a mass of raw nerves for Churchill. The Indian Army had proved itself to be a formidable lighting unit. An army which quickly adapted to unfamiliar terrain and an army that learnt from its mistakes and became adept at improvisation. Whilst Churchill's ignominious dismissal of the Indian Army, and especially their role in the reconquest of Burma, was blatant throughout his memoirs. It may not be wholly fair to blame subsequent official histories for a similar lapse.

Quasi-Historian: It is not enough to cite his dismissal by way of his imperialistic, racial assumptions. After all, he changed his mind regarding the Japanese soldier, from non-threatening throughout 1939 and 1940 to a vicious, brutal and dedicated professional soldier by 1943, yet he did not change his mind regarding the Indian soldier.

It seems compiling and editing his memoirs was a world in which he wanted to remain at centre stage. As the 1950s dawned, his reputation and status was enhanced by his portrayal of his history of the Second World War. Churchill once said to a young research assistant of his,

"give me the facts .... and I will twist them the way I want to suit my argument"

This illustrates the little respect he thought history as a discipline was due. One can say that Churchill's narrative of the contribution made by the Indian Army to the Allied victory of the Second World War is not going to be an example of responsible history. We can have the factual, accurate record in *The Tiger Strikes. The Story of Indian Troops in North Africa And East Africa*. The Indian Tiger had struck, it had killed, and it had triumphed. The wartime history was there for Churchill to include, and expand upon. For various reasons, he
chose not to. The reason being long history of colonization. The following pages will examine how Churchill's attitude was formed as natural offshoot of colonialism.
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Power Oriented Conquerer

The researcher studies how does Churchill's literary texts, explicitly or allegorically represent various aspects of colonial oppression. It explores what does his text reveal about the problematics of post-colonial identity, including the relationship between personal and cultural identity and such issues as double consciousness. The study examines the issue of power and culture and how these elements work in relation to colonial hegemony.

Colonial Discourse

There has been an outstanding burst of scholarship on colonial studies in the last two decades – crossing the disciplinary boundaries of literature, anthropology and history. This ensures that this past is not forgotten. The colonial past is also invoked to teach a lesson about the present, serving to reveal the hypocrisy of Europe's claims to provide model for democratic politics and a rational approach to understanding and changing the world, by connecting these very idea to the history of imperialism.

Colonial discourse on the one hand, refers to the language employed by representatives of the great colonial powers in establishing authority over vast regions of Asia, Africa, the South Pacific and Latin America during the period of imperial expansion that reached its height at the end of the 19th century.

On the other hand, post colonial scholars treats that particular type of discourse as "a pace within language that exists both as a series of historical instances and as a series of rhetorical functions" that trope the colonized space in Specific ways in order to demonstrate the colonizer's control and power over it. Colonial discourse constructs subjects in order to dominate. Colonial exploitation had created a new imperative for the colonial lords.

Historical writing requires a combination of attention to structural considerations along with the finding and assessing of facts. A writer of history must answer a variety of questions in his or her writing. These questions are not limited solely to what happened; they include why and how. The writer must also address the background of the event, the principals involved, significant dates and the influence of the event upon future developments. Moreover, objectivity is an essential aspect of historical writing. However, there are, two nearly unavoidable limits to historical objectivity: documentation and diversity of the writer's personal experiences.
Churchill as historian missed reading Anoquetil Duperron’s translation of Avesta (at Surat) and the Upanishads (in Paris), William Jones’ works on India, Charles Wilkins’ Institute of Manu and Bhagwat Gita, Napolean's Descriptio de L'Egypt and Friedrich Schelegel's learning of Sanskrit in Paris all had a close association with the oriental renaissance in Europe.

He could have studied India in the light of Indian history, how India was a land of riches and from time to time varied invaders came to this land to plunder and to loot its riches and in return tried to affirm their own culture and religion. Churchill's English imagination simply cannot accommodate an antiquity of India. None can deny thousands of years old structures of culture, religion and the rest about India.

**English Attitude Towards India**

India's awareness of its history and culture was manipulated in the hands of colonial ideologues. Domastic and external views of India were shaped by authors whose attitudes towards all things Indian were shaped either by subconscious prejudice or worse by barely concealed racism. For instance, Victorian Writer and important art critic of his time, John Ruskin, dismissed all Indian art with ill-concealed contempt:

"...the Indian will not draw a form of nature but an amalgamation of monstrous objects".

While actually several writings of pre-colonial Europeans appreciated India and her rich civilization. But in case of Churchill, it could no longer be truthfully acknowledged that India had a rich civilization of its own – that its philosophical and scientific contribution may have influenced European scholars or helped in shaping the European renaissance.

Churchill as historian did not notice the significance of the **Vedas** as also the date of the **Vedas**, the Aryan invasion theory, the Aryan Dravidian divide, spiritually as essence of India which could have proved introductory mark of India. He is subservient to the political system that supported him. Not only his personal bias narrowed his view, he also reduced the enlightenment of Europe. His examination of fact is not only defective but at times lacking in historical reliability. His colonial colouring to the presentation gives us a narrative-strategy that is not rationally defensible.

Any critical historian would not have let this so unnoticed. This misrepresents India as was his own position as historian. His approach is unjustifiable on historical or anthropological grounds. Writers like Bankim Chandra Chatterji, Rabindranath Tagor and
Aurobindo could have helped him to revise his view but his vast reading did not include the prominent writers of the country his government had been ruling for more than 150 years. This tendency to explain non-English culture in terms of English culture is a conscious attempt to establish English superiority in racism or cultural charvinism.

With this view of English superiority in respect to social standards, he seems to have judged India. Noted historian like Churchill should have unearthed ancient history of India – one of the world's oldest, dating back to 3000 Bc.

Missing the historical heritage of India, Churchill could have known India personally at the time of his stay in India. His refusal to learn Hindi never allowed him to enter into the thoughts and feelings of Indian people. But he never tuned himself with India. He never had intimate contact with Indian people.

In view of above facts, his remarks on India calls for deep analysis as what and how he formed his opinion on India. Generally, he was never halfhearted in his pursuit of social justice and improvement in the general standard of living. But not for India. His famous quote "I hate nobody except Hitler – and that is professional" seems halftruth.

Churchill's depiction of India is a style of thought based upon ontological and epistemological distinction made between the orient and the occident. It seems Churchill shows a hierarchical system of belief that places the "West" on top. To support colonial superiority others had to be made inferior. His remarks create a strongly negative stereatpe of orient people.

The limitations imposed by centuries of misunderstanding made Churchill victim of the arbitrary divisions of the world created by Europeans.

His attitude towards India is exactly what Edward Said says; "represented by the West and in the West in a specific manner".

Throughout history, humans have formed groups of various kinds around criteria that are used to distinguish 'us' from 'them'. Colonialism is a point in this case.

Post-colonial criticism also questions the role of the western literary canon and western history as dominant forms of knowledge making. The terms 'first world', 'second world', and 'third world' nations are critiqued by post-colonial critics because they reinforce the dominant positions of western cultures populating first world status. This critique includes the literary canon and histories written from the perspective of first world cultures.

Understanding colonialism is central to understanding Churchill's attitude to India. One finds a sound component of power-centric colonial prejudice in the formation of his
bias. His ignorance and sense of superiority pushed him to oppose freedom to India. He did hold low opinion about Indian people and their leaders and debased not only brave and dedicated Indian army but also criticize Indian religion. His equally derogatory remark about Mahatma Gandhi and his hunger strike, his refusal to see the factual proof and his intensional desire to avoid looking into ancient history of India proves colonizer's attitude. Colonial exploitation was an old story of evil, greed and lust penetrated upon a weaker people. There is no coherence or logic to justify his opinion. Enframing of "otherness" is clearly visible.

In fact this is the narrative of dominance – power. His belief is retrogressing because of the inability to grow beyond the colonial mentality.

**Power Politics of Representation:**

"They cannot represent themselves, they must be represented".

– Edward Said

In Britain, imperial expansion was then generally held to be in the interests of employment, markets, civilization, security and future greatness. The Queen's Diamond Jubilee celebration in 1897 was turned into a great imperial pagent. Empire sentiment and euphoria reached their Zenith in the years 1898-99, when Conord was writing his anticolonial and anti imperial *Heart of Darkness*.

The question is to what extent Churchill was lead by colonial bias? His opinion did not change for long (upto 1947). By 1940 he had been 40 years in Parliament and held every major portfolio in the Government except the Foreign Office. He had suffered in the hard school of failure and disappointment. But on India, he remained unchanged.

Churchill believes in power politics of representation in Edward Said's concept "they cannot represent themselves, they must be represented." Indians becomes not a representing subject in its own right but a subject represented by the West. It is clear that in the colonies one could see the truth about Western mind stripped bare.
"Ideological" Position:

Following Antonio Gramsci’s theory colonialism maintained control not just through violence and political and economic coercion but also through ideology. Colonialism developed a hegemonic culture, which propagated its own value and norm so that they became the "common sense" values of all.

Colonized people identified their own good with the good of the colonizers and helped to maintain the status quo rather than revolting. This was false ideology. Churchill believed in the British Empire as it was during nearly his whole life.

How to legitimise his intransigent thoughts on India, though he was always a strong supporter of Home Rule for Ireland? His hope was that the colonies would remain tied to the mother country by history and the golden link of the crown.

Mistakenly, to Churchill and to most of his generation in Britain, it seemed that the British had, to the lasting benefit of the local inhabitants, provided not only great material benefits in roads, railways, telecommunications, schools and hospitals, but has imposed law and order in lands where greed, tyranny, injustice and tribal warfare had formerly reigned supreme. In Churchill's opinion natives were represented as communal and fanatics. And hence European presence was necessary to curb communal intolerance.

Churchill depends on the concept of what Bhabha describes "fixity" means that travellers of different class appropriate similar rhetorical strategies to describe the colonized. As a skilled prose writer, as a historian and a statesman of reputation, one expects different version of India from Churchill, but he seems to borrow from a ready database of tropes and aesthetic devices. It connotes rigidity and degeneracy and daemonic repetition. To him, all Indians and for that matter, all colonized are almost the same but not white.

This concept of superiority that haunts colonial discourse is a disclosure of the ultimate aim of this type of discourse; it does not simply aim at establishing a radical opposition between colonizer and colonized, but also emphasises how natives were willingly submitted from a conviction that the English were more wise, more just and more anxious to improve native's condition than any other rulers they could possibly have.

In Churchill, we find 'West's misrepresentation of the orient developed from the Euro-centric perspective from which the former colonial powers saw themselves.
Paradoxical Attitude

On one hand colonizer wants to civilize its "others", on the other hand they fix them into perpetual otherness so that they can be ruled. Whether this is historical ambiguity or diplomatic, the fact remains that colonial power mechanism forced colonized to think low of themselves - as corrupt, superstitious, lacking in self-discipline, xenophobic and therefore unable to govern themselves. As Edward Said observes the West has always been relatively wary of self-reflectivity or cricismism. This may apply to Churchill, too.

In addition, the orient has helped to define the West as its contrasting image, idea, personality and experience. It concludes that the White is efficient, honest, capable and messian for the native. Actually colonialism regarded the inhabitants of the colonies merely as means of production rather than as human beings, and expressed a hope that "civilization" might follow in the footstep of farced labour.

Here it may be appropriate to quote Karl Marx who also noted that –
"the profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilisation lies unveiled before our eyes... in the colonies, where it goes naked."*

(*K. Marx, 'The Future results of British Rule in India', on Colonialism {Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1968} 88.)

Jean Paul Sartre reached a similar conclusion when he wrote that 'the strip-tease of our humanism' took place in the tropics, and 'in the colonies the the truth stood naked.'*


Literary Context

Similarly in Conards' Heart of Darkness, like Nostromo, shows that the 'civilizing' mission of European imperialism was nothing more than barbarism.

Connecting Conrad and Jane Austen, for instance, with this enterprise, Edward Said holds them capable of depicting native people as "marginally visible" and "People without history". It is in the very omission of the salient fact of imperialism that much English literature from Jane Eyre, Vanity Fair and Great Expectations to Raymond Williams's "culture and Society" assumes its character. A poem written by Kudyard Kipling, represents what sort of view most of Britain had towards their colonies at that time.
Kipling wrote in 1899, actually about the U.S. Conquest of the Spanish colonies, among them the Phillipines.

The White Man's Burden
Take up the White Man's burden –
Send forth the best ye breed –
Go bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives' need;
To wait in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild
Your new-caught, Sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half-child.

The poem clearly looks down on any other culture than the Western one. In other words, it was the white-civilized and superior European's obligation to save the uncivilized native population in colonies. But there is the following quotes criticizing colonialism.

The conquest of the
earth, which mostly means
the taking it away from
those who have a different
complexion or slightly
flatter noses than ourselves,
is not a pretty thing when
you look into it too
much."

Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness*

The literature of the British Empire falls into two different camps that reflected the different opinion of the time. One camp thought that it was the Empire's obligation to expand its borders to improve the quality of life in the world. Churchill did not show much interest in this, too.

Sir John R. Colville, (On March 24, 1985). On the occasion of honorary degree bestowed on him at Westminster College, spoke on "The Personality of Sir Winston Churchill". He said:

"High among Churchill's virtues, I rate
magnanimity. He was the very reverse of
vindictive. Like a pugilist, he enjoyed the fight, but however hard the punches, when all was over, he thought no ill of his opponent and wanted to shake hands"....

... Allied to his magnanimity towards opponents, and especially towards the Vanquished, were the twin virtues of humanity and compassion."

We find in this analysis, the strong ties that orientalism has with power and colonialism. The underlying assumption of subjection and dominance rest on the reduction of Indian People as primitive illogical and corrupt.

Colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content by a kind of perverted logic but turns to the past of the oppressed people and distorts it. Churchill's attitude proves "misrecognition" of India and its peoples. It is this relationship between power and culture that inspired Edward Said in Orientalism. Orientalism endows 'things with changeless,"Oriental" properties... and confirms them in a distant and irreducible specificity transcending the bounds of reason. The ambivalence of the "West" towards the "Orient" is old. The orient's 'rich cultures', 'superior civilizations' and 'ancient wisdom' have inspired many 'Westerners'. Yet the orient's 'monstrous mysteries' and absurd religions have threatened the "West". Churchill is no exception. The 'Will to dominate' is the final impression. As he famously described.

"India is not a country or a nation: it is rather a continent inhabited by many nations... it is a geographical abstraction.... such unity of sentiment as exists in India arises entirely through the centralized British Government"*

*(R.Landworth, Churchill's Wit, P. 133).

Here we can see how power as culturally and symbolically created and constantly re-legitimised through an interplay of agency and structure.

The opinion and words used by Churchill suggest much more detailed colonial analysis of power relations rooted in colonialism. But the process of decolonization was already
initiated and Churchill with his 'imposed power' was soon to see 'Power Within' and how this invisible power was going to empower a nation.

Nehru's Concept of India

Major part of Nehru's writings are comprised of India and Indians. Her past, her present her future and her progress, what makes her and what are the obstacles concern him the most.

In 1959 he delivered Azad Memorial Lecture titled India Today and Tomorrow.

"What is India? That is a question which has come back again and again to my mind. The early beginnings of our history filled me with wonder. It was the past of a virile and vigorous race with a questing spirit and an urge for free inquiry ... accepting life and its joys and burdens, it was ever searching for the ultimate and the universal. It build up a magnificent language, Sanskrit... its arts and architectures ... It produced the Upanishads, the Gita and the Buddha ...
I have often wondered, if our race forgot the Buddha, the Upanishads and the great epics, what then will it be like!"*

(*Nehru An Anthology Ed. S. Gopal. P.225-6)

The more he tried to understand India, the more he appreciated it. He studied her ups and downs, tide and ebb, and realized that in the tumult and confusion India stood facing both ways, forward to the future and backwards to the past. For him, the real challenge was how can India resolve her conflict and evolve a structure for living which can fulfill India's material needs and, at the same time, sustain her mind and spirit. Repeatedly Nehru, emphasised to change the thinking and activities of hundreds millions of people, and to do this democratically by their consent.

It is surprising that a very lonely man who was, till he was thirty or more, a misfit in Indian life who often had in his country, "an exile's feelings" – "out of place everywhere, at
home nowhere" – became the most shining symbol of his country dearer to his people. He was in search of India which had always existed but had been long suppressed. He never claimed "creating" India or Indians but certainly the India that was born in 1947 must reassert her identity.

As a historian, as a son of the soil and as a prominent promoter of independent India Nehru was conscious to define the concept of India. As an anti-colonial, anti-imperial person, Nehru rejected British concept of India. His desire to define India was natural.

"We do not look to England as a mother country. We are a mother country ourselves and the vigorous progeny of our mind have been scattered over Asia for two thousand years or more and yet look to India as a mother country".*

(* A Letter to Eleanor Rathbon, 9 November 1941, Nehru : An Anthology Ed.S.Gopal, P.57)

He knew the emotional and psychological aspect of the Indian problem. That is why he says:

...with sympathy for a long – suffering people who have long endured frustration and repression...

... so much has been said and done that has hurt the Indian people and scares remain..."

(Nehru An Anthology, P.63. A Letter to Sir Stafford Cripps, 1946)

Nehru wrote in 1921 how taking on the Vice Presidency of the Kisan Sabha (Farmers' Council) and lending voice to their grievances, he began to show some of the emotional identification with Indians of mixing with them, of living in their mud huts. Such feeling marked the beginning of the Harrovian and Cambridgian Nehru’s rediscovery of India and of his own Indianness.

Brecker describes how the controversy between no-changers and prochangers marks Nehru's entree into the inner politics of the party. In March 1922 while facing his second political trial when he was sentenced to twenty one month's imprisonment, he established a genuine rapport with simple folk whom he would meet en masse.

With his lively sense of history, Nehru redefines the concept of India. Who symbolises India and why that was his quest. According to Nehru, Tagore and Gandhi each in his
different way, was a symbol of India, they were typical of India representing India's cultural
tradition, also both of them were of the world of tomorrow. In fact, Nehru became synony-
mous to many. So, Abid Hussain pays tribute to Nehru's concept of India in this way:

"The dynamic secular spirit of India was
reflected even in the mystic mind of
Tagore and the prophetic mind of Gandhi,
but it manifested itself almost in its pure
form in Jawaharlal Nehru."*

*(The Way of Gandhi and Nehru, Asia Publishing House, Bombay: 1959, p.90)*

All over the world for more than two decades, "India was Nehru" nad Vice Versa. But Nehru studied deep and finally he captured the finest spirit of Eternal India. During freedom struggle, Nehru felt:

"In India today we are making history,
and you and I are fortunate to see the
happening before our eyes... How shall
we bear ourselves in this great movement?"

He was eager to recreate the rich heritage of his country, her art, philosophy, nature, history and people. He praises the Ganga, the Himalayas, rivers and Ghats. For him the Ganga is a "symbol and a memory of the past of India, running into the present and flowing on the great ocean of the future".*

*(A post-script to An Autobiography (1936) 1941)..

What fascinates him about India is:

"India is a curious mixture of an amazing
diversity and an abiding unity." or "The
curious thing about India is the persistence
of the old and the new at the same time; all
the centuries seem to be represented in the India of today."
*(Foreword to *India, the Country and its Traditions* by Jean Fillozat (1962) from Nehru An Anthology Ed. S. Gopal, P.238–241).

He wanted India to be not only free but open, too. Diversity was India's identity, yet Unity continued to weave cultural tapestry of India. His address at the Aligarh Muslim University on 24th January 1948 he said:

"I am proud of India, not only because of her ancient magnificent heritage but also because of her remarkable capacity to add to it by keeping the doors and windows of her mind and spirit open to fresh and invigorating winds from distant lands."

Thus he appreciated India's two fold strength to absorb the new element and to maintain her own heritage. Thus synthesis was his keyword. His broadmindedness and secularism is visible. He was conscious to maintain the same. In 1954, he sent a circular to the Presidents of Pradesh Congress as following:

We have always to remember that our great country exhibits a wonderful variety not only in physical features and geography, and climate but also in human beings, their languages, customs backgrounds and urges. We have to keep this broad picture in view and not seek to impose something on one part of the country which may not suit it."


Nehru realized what made India great, it was her broad mindedness. India accepted that "truth is many sided and of infinite variety/"

*(Nehru: Bharat Jyoti 2 May 1949)
He said:

"India encourages the pursuit of truth
and of moral values."*

*(Ibid)*

The Nehrus never learnt Sanskrit. The outstanding prose writer in English, Nehru wrote in National Harold on 13th February in 1949;

If I was asked what is the greatest

 treasure that India possesses and

 what is her finest heritage, I would answer

 unhesitatingly it is the Sanskrit language

 and literature and all that it contains."

This was Indian culture he discovered. But he has his own frame of India which he
dreamt and worked to realise it. Based on equality and secularism his concept of India was utopian.

"We think of India and talk about her and

 also sing Vande Mataram and raise slogans

 like Bharat Mata ki Jai, and yet I wonder

 here many of us have really thought what

 exactly that conception is ... I have had

 a vague glimpse of what India is. I felt

 India's diversity was tremendous, and yet

 behind it lay an equally tremendous unity."*


As a Socialist, as a democrat and as a radical leader he wanted India to be free from her old shackles. Nehru never wanted India to lose her uniqueness and individuality and became merely a copy of the industrialized west.

"Let us be clear about our national

 objective, her aim at a strong free

 and democratic India where every

 citizen has an equal place and full

 opportunity of growth..."*

He is convinced that "What made India great was her broad mindedness". Like Tagore he wishes not to be imprisoned in narrow cage, his historical study convinced him that India advanced in when India had her mind open to the outside world and declined when she wanted to close it up. His favourite word is dynamism and of course, word static to be refused. He constantly analyses India. For example:

"Often I ask myself: What is India? What is the essence of India? What are the forces that have of gone to make India and how are they related to the major dominating influences of the world in the past and in the present"*

*(From Foreword to Samskriti Ke Char Adhyaya by Ramdhari Sinh. "Dinkar" [1955])

Ramchandra Guha, the leading contemporary historian writes:

It was Jawaharlal Nehru who pointed out that India was home to all that is truly disgusting as well as truly hoere in the human condition"*


His one ambition was to be able to bring the people of India to the level of those of England and America but without importing their false standard of life, and to make his countrymen feel a sense of dignity and pride in ancient ideals that have helped India to withstand the tornado of time. Unity and discipline – these have been the twin pillars of his one-man educational compaign to ease India's transition to a modern, progressive society.

He discarded so called branded "Spirituality" as Indian identity. In 1961 he was persuaded to open certain premises of noted spiritual mission in Calcutta and inaugurate a conference on spiritual life. On seeing the grandiose, he burst with Nehrusquie headstong reaction:

"I have always avoided using the word spirituality because of the existence of much bogus spirituality. India is a hungry nation. To talk of spirituality to hungry
men does not mean anything... It is no
good running away from the daily
problems of life in the name of spirituality."
I am out of place in this gathering –"

New India, scientific India was his dream, in the development of India's technologi-cal, nuclear and satellite programme he saw India. He called dams and factories 'The new Temples' of India.

However, he was convinced that –
"India must break with much of her
past and not allow it to dominate
the present".

His India was modern, scientific broadminded and dynamic.
"We must and cannot think of this
or that party, of this community or
religious group or another, of right or
left, consolidations. The hour calls
for national consolidation in the great
cause of Indian and world freedom."*

His India was secular, tolerant and plural. He never forget the common man in his
"ideal" India. He knew poverty was India's major problem. In 1936 he issued a message to
the Nation;
"....when we consider the problem of
India, we find that essentially it is the
problem of removing poverty and
unemployment...."*

Nehru always consider India as more than the sum of its contradictitious. He always
feminized India. He writes in *The Discovery of India:*

India is a country held together by
strong but invisible threads ... She
is a myth and an idea, a dream and
a vision and yet very real and present and pervasive."

He was true Indian. Rajmohan Gandhi in his *The Good Boatman* argues that the reason Gandhi choose Nehru as his successor was that he was a genuinely India – or all India figure ... The fact that he was not at all provincial ... all trust him that was crucial in his helping build and nurture a unifying and inclusive idea of India."


Nehru was intensely prince of his country in spite of his pronounced internationalism. He was proud of India's ancient civilization and culture that has withstood the ravages of time down the centuries. His patriotism peeps out in page after page of his two masterpieces, the Autobiography and *The Discovery of India* as well as in his other books and numerous speeches.

He knew how the widest tolerance of belief and custom was practised and every variety acknowledged and even encouraged. This was a vision of India for him. What Nehru, most liked about India was its plurality and what impressed him most about India was – her unity in diversity, he writes:

"...Though outwardly there was diversity and infinite variety among our people; everywhere there was that tremendous impress of oneness..."

In 1921, Nehru initiated himself in "knowing India". Thirty five years later he said:

"Yes, I have changed. The emphasis on ethical and spiritual solutions is not unconscious ... the human mind is hungry for something deeper in terms of moral and spiritual development, without which all the material advance may not be worthwhile... The old Hindu idea that there is a divine essence in the world, that every individual possesses something of it and can develop it appeals to me."*

(*Karanjia: *The Mind of Mr.Nehru*, p.48)
In an article in 1953 Nirad Chaudhari considered Nehru 'the indispensable link between the governing middle-classes and the sovereign people' of India, as well as 'the bond between India and the world' –

Shashi Tharoor acknowledges the same in this way:

"Nehru defined Indian national through the power of his ideas, in many ways like Thomas Jefferson in the United States"...

(Nehru: *The Invention of India*, p.227)

To reply an American interviewer; Nehru's words were:

"Thy legacy to India? Hopefully, it is 400 million people capable of governing themselves. This was Nehru's love for India."

Tharoor aptly concludes:

"In death, as in life, Jawahar would become India"

*(Nehru *The Invention of India*, P.218).

During his years as Prime Minister his name became one with the name of his country.

Nehru – the Significance of Self-representation and the Process of Decolonization

**Preface**

History is transparent not because it makes the past comprehensible, but instead it reveals patterns of exploitation or domination. Both Nehru and Churchill were strong individualists never scared to express their own beliefs. But both had different source of such attitude.

Nehru was led by nationalism. While Churchill drawn by imperialism and colonialism. Nehru's writing shows how the "other" is represented falsely and Churchill's writing echoes "they cannot speak they are to be spoken"

The meaning and implications of the word "colonialism" and of the closely connected terms "empire" and "imperialism" have undergone a profound transformation in
recent decades. Until the end of the nineteenth century the words "empire" and "imperialism" were generally used in a laudatory and not a pejorative sense. Colonialism is the emotional issue of the decade. The previous chapter discussed the peripheral representation of India by Churchill in his writings and speeches.

The colonizer requires colonized subjects
to be like them and works to dismiss them,
"it requires them, impossibly, to be "almost
the same but not white"

– Homi Bhabha, p.79.

Paradox and contradictions as a feature of colonial discourse:
The 'black' is both savage and yet the most obedient and dignified of servants (the bearer of food); he is mystical, primitive, simple minded and yet the most wordly and accomplished liar and manipulator of social forces.

For restoration of order and security
The colonizing imagination takes for granted that the land and its resources belong to those who are best able to exploit them according to the value of a Western Commercial System. This concept of superiority that haunts colonial discourse is visible in Churchill's attitude to India.

The discursive trope of debasement
Themes of debasement are heavily employed by colonial discourse. The targeted space is assigned qualities of dishonesty, suspicion, superstition, lack of self-discipline, corruption, xenophobia, tribalism, and inability to govern itself.

Churchill's position in colonial discourse is an "apparatus of power" that turns on the recognition and disavowal of racial differences. Churchill's knowledge of colonised is also stereotyped.

The Play of Difference
The White mute disavows the black, while the black disavows his own race to identity with the positivity of whiteness. The colonised population is both cause and effect of the system and, as such, imprisoned in the vicious circle of interpretation.

Western Idea of India
Said argues that the West has stereotyped the East since antiquity.

Nehru in Discovery of India tries to free from a perspective that takes Europe as the norm from which the "exotic", "inscrutable" orient deviates.
Churchill depict it as an irrational, weak, feminised "other" contrasted with the rational, strong, masculine west. Nehru knew how deeply the history of colonies before European subjection was entwined with overseas conquests. They consider "non-European" to static backwardness.

**Colonial Discourse**

To analyse the attitude of Nehru and Churchill theory of colonial discourse is very important. Though colonial empires had already lost their international legitimacy and ceased to be viable forms of political organization, yet a colonial project situated between 1492 and the 1970s has arisen and there has been an outstanding blast of scholarship on colonial studies. Frederick Cooper answers this:

"Part of the impetus behind the recent research and writing colonial situation has been to ensure that this past is not forgotten. But the colonial past is also invoked to teach a lesson about the present, serving to reveal the hypocracy of Europe's claims to provide models of democratic politics, efficient economic systems, and a rational approach to understanding and changing the world, by connecting these very ideas to the history of imperialism."

*(Colonialism in Question : Theory Knowledge, History, p.16)*

**The Rhetorical Features of Colonial Discourse:-**

Colonizing Aesthetics Writing on colonialism in the last three decades has had a double and positive impact in regard to established verties: calling into question a narrative of progress radiating from Europe that ignored how deeply the history of colonies before European subjection was entwined with overseas conquest, and rejecting the consignment of "non-European to static backwardness. Therefore, the colonial text has been seen by scholars as an important factor in the formation of metropolitan societies, and thus has been called into analysis. The historical study of colonial discourse, on the onehand, refers to this latter as "the language employed by representatives of the great colonial powers in establishing authority over vast regions of Africa, Asia, the South Pacific, and Latin
America during the period of imperial expansion that reached its height at the end of the
nineteenth century”. On the other hand, post colonial scholars define that particular type of
discourse as "a space within language that exists both as a series of historical instances and
as a series of rhetorical functions” that trope the colonized space in specific ways in order
to demonstrate the colonizer's control and power over it. In English Writing and India,
1600-1920: Colonizing Aesthetics, Pramod K. Nayar writes "if discourse, in Hayden White's
(1978:2) terms, "constitutes the objects that it pretends only to describe realistically and to
analyze objectively", colonial discourse constructs subjects in order to dominate”", "Colo-
nial discourse", Nayar goes on "is not simply a set of linguistic devices. On the contrary,
these devices "actually do much of the crucially important work of colonialism" (Greenblatt
1993:xvi)". Colonial discourse relies on aesthetic devices in order to describe and assert a
degree of narrative control over the colonized landscape "Aesthetics", Nayar writes, "help
not only to describe the landscape, but also discursively "prepare" it for colonial projects
and intervention. Aesthetics was thus a crucial anterior moment in the rhetoric of colonial
space-it narrated, and it colonized."

In brief, colonial discourse is an "apparatus of power" that turns on the recognition
and disavowal of racial – cultural – historical differences. It also attempted to explain the
ways and means adopted by the Occident (Churchill, in this case) to understand and repre-
sent the orient (in this case India).

Since Churchill's attitude is Euro-centric and his belief in imperialism is visible at
every page of his writing, the study needs to define imperialism and Euro-centrism. Essentially,
Indian human agency is displaced by the negemonic account. The Indians were treated as
interchangeable, nameless parts of a malleable and stagnant society that must be moulded
into the image of modernity to facilitate nationalism.

**European Imperialism (A Historical Overview)**

Imperialism is the domination of one country's political, economic or cultural life
by another. The overseas empires began to form in the fifteenth century. Developments in
ship-building and navigation, which allowed sailors to travel across the open seas with
much greater success, coupled with advances in mathematics, astronomy, cartography and
printing, all of which allowed better knowledge to be more widely spread, gave Europe the
potential to extend over the world. A number of reasons pushed European countries to seek colonies overseas. Each of the European nations felt a competitiveness to own more colonies than their rivals. Fueled by Europe's feeling of superiority, economic and racial, it was felt that they had the right to take over the nations that were weaker than them to further their powers. Thus, Europeans soon endeavoured to conquer many countries. Latin America and the sea-ports of Africa and Asia were some of the first areas to be colonized by Europe. England was the leading European colonial power, and it established most of its overseas empires early. French was second, holding South-east Asia and North Africa.

**Eurocentrism** is the practice of viewing the world from a European perspective. The term Eurocentrism was coined during the period of decolonisation in the late 20th century.

The Eurocentrism prevalent in International affairs in the 19th century had its historical roots in European colonialism and imperialism from the Early Modern period (16th to 18th centuries). Many international standards (such as the worldwide spread of the Common Era and Latin alphabet, or the Prime Meridian) have their roots in this period.

Eurocentrism often seeks to define Europe as a distinct entity, regardless of theological roots. Even though Christian philosophy, Writing, and other fundamentals of European culture have been significantly influenced from Asia Minor and the Near East, a eurocentric worldview often seeks to show the superiority of Western customs to analogous developments in other, often earlier cultures.

The term *Eurocentrism* was coined relatively late, during the decolonisation period following World War II, based on an earlier adjective *Europe-centric* which came into use in the early 20th century. The term appears in precisely this form in the writings of the right-wing German writer Kari Haushofer during the 1920s. For instance, in Haushofer's 'Geo-Politics of the Pacific Space' (*Geopolitik des pazifischen Ozeans*), Haushofer contrasts this pacific space in terms of global politics to the 'European' and 'Europe-centric' (*europa-zentrisch*).

The term *Eurocentrism* appears in the 1970s, through the Marxist writings of Samir Amin as part of a global, core-periphery or dependency model of capitalist development.

Early Eurocentrism can be traced to the European Renaissance, during which the revival of learning based on classical sources were focused on the ancient Greek and Roman civilizations, due to their being a significant source of contemporary European civilization.
The effects of these assumptions of European superiority increased during the period of European imperialism, which started slowly in the 15th century, accelerated by the Scientific Revolution, the Commercial Revolution and the rise of colonial empires in the "Great Divergence" of the Early Modern period, and reached its zenith in the 18th to 19th century with the Industrial Revolution and a Second European colonization wave.

**Power, Hegemony, and Literature**

Post-colonial criticism also questions the role of the western literary canon and western history as dominant forms of knowledge making. The terms "first-world", "second-world", "third-world" and "fourth-world" nations are critiqued by post-colonial critics because they reinforce the dominant positions of western cultures populating first world status. This critique includes the literary canon and histories written from the perspective of first-world cultures. So, for example, a post-colonial critic might question the works included in "the canon" because the canon does not contain works by authors outside western culture.

Moreover, the authors included in the canon often reinforce colonial hegemonic ideology, such as Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. Western critics might consider *Heart of Darkness* an effective critique of colonial behavior. But post-colonial theorists and authors might disagree with this perspective."... as Chinua Achebe observes, the novel's condemnation of European is based on a definition of Africans as savages: beneath their veneer of civilization, the Europeans are, the novel tells us, as barbaric as the Africans. And indeed, Achebe notes the novel portrays Africans as a pre-historic mass of frenzied, howling incomprehensible barbarians.." (Tyson 374-375).

**Early anticolonialism:**

One of the first critics of colonialism was Bartolome de las Casas, who described destruction brought by European colonists in America. Even in the 19th century, anti-colonial movements had developed claims about national traditions and values that were set against those of Europe. In some cases, as with China, where local ideology was even more exclusionist than the Eurocentric one, Westernisation did not overwhelm long-established Chinese attitudes to its own cultural centrality, although some would state this idea itself is a rather desperate attempt to cast Europe in a good light by comparison (Chine never attacked a large percentage of the population of the world).

In Central America and South America a merger of immigrant and native histories was constructed. Nationalist movements appropriated the history of native civilizations
such as the Mayans and Incas, to construct models of cultural identity that claimed a fusion between immigrant and native identity.

At the same time, the intellectual traditions of Eastern cultures were becoming more widely known in the West, mediated by figures such as Rabindranath Tagore. By the early 20th century some historians such as Arnold J. Toynbee were attempting to construct multi-focal models of world civilizations.

**Decolonization**

Since the end of World War II, the former worldwise dominance of European culture has waned drastically (decolonisation). The change has been most drastic in the USA, triggered by the 1950s to 1960s civil rights movement and perpetuated by the political correctness of the 1970s to 1980s. Today, Eurocentrism remains a topic in the U.S. "culture wars", notably when juxtaposed to Afrocentrism, but its prominence is limited compared to topics of religion or social issues.

**Eurocentrism in Literature**

Much of the cultural work of building and sustaining Eurocentrism was done in popular genres of literature, especially literature for young adults (for example Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*) and adventure literature in general. Popular novelists like Edgar Rice Burroughs supported the political and military builders of Western empires by presenting idealized (and often exaggeratedly masculine) Western heroes who conquered "savage' peoples in the remaining 'dark spaces' of the globe.

**White Supremacy**

To be distinguished from (conscious or unconscious) Eurocentrism as the tendency to explain non-European cultures in terms of European culture are positive claims of European superiority in racism or cultural chauvinism.

Such ideas are at the origin of the some of the racial segregation in colonies and former colonies. Eurocentrism is present in current times when considering the usage of dualistic models of comparison. Dualisms of the past such as "civilized/barbaric or advanced/ backward" worked to organize people "through reference to the racial superiority of Europeans".
Churchill's concept of India is the suitable model of what Edward Said refers to in his book *Orientalism* (1978). In his book Said argued that Western conceptions of identity, culture, and civilization have historically been built on the projection of images of the non-West, and specifically of images of the so-called 'orient'. These images could be negative and derogatory, or positive and romantic. In either case, the identity of the West has been defined by reference to the meanings ascribed to what is presumed to be different from the West, its non-Western 'other'.

Churchill never developed close personal contact with India or her people, nor did he study history, art, or literature of India, yet he formed opinion which was derogatory and one sided. Conquest occurred through violence, and over-exploitation and oppression necessitate continued violence; Colonialism denies human rights to human beings whom it has subdued by violence and keeps them by force in a state of misery and ignorance that Mark would rightly call a subhuman condition.

Racism is ingrained in actions, institutions and in the nature of the colonialist methods of production and exchange.

**Subhumanity of colonized**

The colonizer's conservatism and his racism is visible. It was not the situation which allowed the colonizer to rule colony but system. There are neither good or bad colonist. There are colonists. There was "a kind of historical necessity by which colonial pressure created anti-colonial resistance the colonizer, having established that the colonized is a "hopeless weakling", thereby comes to the concept of a "protectorate".

The colonized means little to the colonizer. The colonized is not this, is not that. It is of a stunning negation. For the colonizer, the colonized is nobody. It is the rough and ready man who saw the conquered and colonized as the ultimate other. The colonizer is one taking simply a voyage towards an easier life. That follows a fascinating account of the components of that easy life of the time – servants, climate, automatic qualification for superior status over the multitude. This is what Edward W. Said has defined as –

"How you supply the forces of world-wide accumulation and rule with a self-confirming ideological motor".

In fact by doing it he dehumanizes himself. The natives are "atomized". Colonialism creates the patriotism of the colonized. Kept at the level of a beast by an oppressive system, the natives are given no rights. But here, a people's misfortune will become its courage. In
colonialist mythology, the colonized is a litany of faults and inadequacies. He is unbelievably lazy at the same time this authorizes his low wages. This has to be rejected. Nehru's writing shows this reenerised spirit. The colonizer justified his situation by asserting that the colonizers brought enlightenment, technical as well as religious, to the indigenous people living in the heart of darkness. On the colonizer's scale there was a tradeoff balance, a straight deal that could ignore morality. We can see this forced deal in its psychological impact on both sides.

Nowhere one can find issues of representation, identity and power more relevant than in the writings of Churchill and Nehru. Churchill's views on Indian proves exercise of power over colonized cultures.

The peripheral representation of India, or the misrepresentation of India in Churchill's writing shows that Churchill like the typical West was of the view that the subject races did not have it in them to know what was good for them. The ways and means adopted by Churchill clearly indicates the demarcation between European and non-European was just a part of power game. His depiction of Indians emerges as the fantasy projection of an autonomous will to power.

Churchill is a part of manifest Orientalism i.e. what Europeans always find what they want and expected and there is hardly any encounter with the 'real' India. The idea that colonial discourses are entirely the product of colonizers are applicable here. His knowledge of India is formed prior to and in the absence of the actual contact.

As Said claimed that Orientalist representations were really self-generating projections of western paranoia and desire, and were not based on any detailed knowledge of different cultures or societies. Churchill in this aspect, has reproduced the stored ideas and fixed image of Indians which have been produced over centuries. It is essentially a case of misrepresentation. Thus it is true that the Orient was created by the west for its material interest; the West did not have the will or the motivation to see the orient at par with the occident.

When we come to Kipling, Conard, Arthur Conan Doyle, R.L.Stevenson, E.M. Forster, and George Orwell the empire is a crucial setting. The irony is Churchill, a renowned historian and part of empire treated Indian as people without history, he did not take note of its rich ancient heritage, people on whom empire depended but whose reality had not historically or culturally taken note of.
In his attitude the sustained possession of colony is important, but its people are unacceptable human beings, colony is a place where disgraced young sons are to be sent off, shabby older relatives go there to try their luck or enterprising travellers go there to collect exotica. The colonial territories were realms of possibility.

We do find allusions to the facts of empire, everywhere in nineteenth and early twentieth century British literature. These allusions constitute what Edward Said has called a structure of attitude and reference.

In *Mansfield Park*, references to Sir Thomas Bertram's overseas possession are shown which gives him wealth and fixes his social status at home and abroad. This ordination comes as colonial possession to establish his social order.

In many other Dickens' novels businessmen have connections with the empire. Domby and Qilp are two noteworthy examples.

**Post Colonialism**

As a critical literary theory, Post-colonialism deals with the literatures produced in countries that once were colonies of the European colonial imperial powers. This study focuses on national identity in this context.

"The term post-colonialism – according to a too-rigid etymology – is frequently misunderstood as a temporal concept, meaning the time after colonialism has ceased, or the time following the politically determined Independence Day on which a country breaks away from its governance by another state. Not a naive teleological sequence, which supersedes colonialism, post-colonialism is, rather, an engagement with, and contestation of colonialism's discourses, power structures, and social hierarchies ... A theory of post-colonialism must, then, respond to more than the merely chronological construction of post-independence, and to more than just the discursive experience of imperialism."


Post-colonialism (also post-colonial studies, and post-colonial theory) is an academic discipline that comprises method of intellectual discourse that present analyses of, and responses to, the cultural legacies of colonialism and of imperialism, which draw from different post-modern schools of thought, such as critical theory. Postcolonialism is a form of contemporary history that questions challenges and reinvents the way we have viewed
and are viewing other cultures. It is an interdisciplinary field which draws on the contrib-
utes to a range of discipline across the humanities and social sciences. Postcolonial studies
examines the relations of power under colonialism and neocolonialism through the lens of
representation. Post-colonial theory – as epistemology, ethics and politics – addresses the
matter of postcolonial identity and their interactions in the development of a post-colonial
national identity; of how a colonized people's knowledge was used against them, in service
of the coloniser's interests; and of how knowledge about the world is generated under specific
socio-economic relations, between the powerful and powerless. The present chapter analyses
Nehru's work from this view point.

Definition
Post-colonialism is an intellectual direction (sometimes also called an "era" or the "post-
colonial theory") that exists since around the middle of the 20th century. It developed from
and mainly refers to the time after colonialism. The post-colonial direction was created as
colonial countries became independent. Nowadays, aspects of post-colonialism can be found
not only in sciences concerning history, literature and politics, but also in approach to cul-
ture and identity of both the countries that were colonised and the former colonial powers.
However, post-colonialism can take the colonial time as well as the time after colonialism
into consideration.

Development
The term "decolonisation" seems to be of particular importance while talking about
post-colonialism. In this case it means an intellectual process that persistently transfers the
independence of former-colonial countries into people's minds. The basic idea of this pro-
cess is the deconstruction of old-fashioned perceptions and attitudes of power and oppres-
sion that were adopted during the time of colonialism.

First attempts to put this long-term policy of "decolonising the minds" into practice
could be regarded in the Indian population after India became independent from the British
Empire in 1947.

However, post-colonialism has increasingly become an object of scientific exami-
nation since 1950 when Western intellectuals began to get interested in the "Third World
Countries". Post-colonialism is one of the most concerned and rapidly expanding field of
literary and cultural theory at the turn of the century. In 1995, the initiators and also the
most vocal expounders of postcolonial theorists are Edward W. Said, Gayatri C. Spivak, and Homi K. Bhabha have been called the "Holy Trinity" by Robert J.C. Young, Professor of English and critical theory at Oxford University. These three critics, with largely independent approaches to the postcolonial heritage, have all been intending to deconstruct the classical canon of the western modernity, and to reconstruct the subjectivity of the subaltern and the "minorities" with the aspiration to help the latter to find their own voices, and to have the "right to narrate".

Colonial narrative and its concomitant ideology were mediated by and facilitated through aesthetics which provided the Western traveller in travel narratives with the vocabulary to describe varied phenomena and events. People, architecture, religions, beliefs, processions and gatherings, marketplaces, literature and history—all these and more could be captured within images that drew upon the age's dominant aesthetic conventions and vocabulary. An important feature of colonial discourse, according to Bhabha, is its dependence on the concept of "fixity" in the ideological construction of otherness. What Bhabha means by "fixity" is that travellers of different class or social backgrounds appropriate similar rhetorical strategies to describe the colonized. They all seem to borrow from a ready database of tropes and aesthetic devices. Part of the explanation of such a commonality of devices might be attributed to a common readership and review system. Instructions were issued to travelers—on what to see, what to record, and how to record them. So fixity, as the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of representation: it connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repetition. Another feature that epitomizes colonial discourse, as far as Bhabha is concerned, is ambivalence, one of the most discursive and psychical strategies of discriminatory power—whether racist or sexist, peripheral or metropolitan. For Bhabha, colonialism is haunted by an ambivalence arising from the colonized mimicry of the colonizer. Mimicry, Bhabha notes, is not merely a "narcissistic identification" on the part of the colonized; rather, it menaces colonialism through a "double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse disrupts its authority". Colonialism thus both requires successfully colonized subjects and works to dismiss them; it requires them, impossibly, to be "almost the same but not White". Intimate relationships between colonizer and colonized are thus necessary for the success of the colonial enterprise, and yet the intimacy of the relationship must be continually disavowed. In other terms, the ambivalence of colonial authority repeatedly turns from mimicry—a difference
that is almost nothing but not quite - to menace - a difference that is almost total but not quite. And in that other scene of colonial power, where history turns to farce and presence to "a part" can be seen the twin figures of "narcissism" and paranoia that repeat, furiously, uncontrollably. It is the force of ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency: ensures its repeatability.

Edward Said's reference to India is also important.

**Representation of India in the Taxonomical Scheme of Edward Said**

Edward Said devoted much less attention to British rule in India, by far the lengthiest and most successful example of European hegemony in the Orient. He makes his first reference to India on pages 11 and 14 of his book Orientalism where he says that an Englishman took interest in India to colonize it. The West believed that it belonged to a power and hence had shown a definite interest in the Orient. He gives a list of Victorian writers like John Stuart Mill, Arnold, Carlyle, Newman, Macaulay, Ruskin, George Eliot, Dickens, etc. and asserts that they had definite views on race and imperialism, which can be seen in their writings.

Said further talks about the two Orientalists, Balfour and Cromer, who dealt with the Orient (Egypt) in general and India in particular and used glorious terms to express the relationship between the Orient and the Occident. The Oriental was defined as "Irrational, depraved and different and the European as rational, virtuous, mature, normal...(p.40). Both Balfour and Cromer were of the view that the subject races did not have it in them to know what was good for them. Edward Said quotes Cromer from the 34th chapter of his Modern Egypt and says that Cromer puts down a sort of personal canon of Orientalist wisdom. He says, "Oriental cannot walk on either a road or pavement ... Orientals, are inveterate liars ... are lethargic and suspicious ... oppose the clarity, directness, and nobility of the Anglo-Saxon race" (pp.38-39). Said accuses Cromer for considering the Anglo-Saxon race superior to the Orient and for tagging the Orient.

This demarcation between European and non-European was just a part of power game. To the Occident "the Oriental was an Oriental...that could be written without even an appeal to European logic or symmetry of mind" (p.39). Said examines that the knowledge of subject-races made their management profitable and easy. Said carries forth his reference to India on p.75 where he states that after the Portugal invasion of India in the 16th century, England ruled over it commercially and politically, and India itself never provided
any threat to its invaders as the native authority could not stand united, thus, allowing itself
to be treated by European haughtiness of manner.

Anquetil Duperron's translation of Avesta (at Surat) and the Upanishad (in Paris),
William Jones' works on India. Charles Wilkins' Institute of Manu and Bhagwat Gita,
Napoleon's Descriptio de L' Egypt and Friedrich Schlegel's learning of Sanskrit in Paris
all had a close association with the Oriental renaissance in Europe.

Edward Said in his book also talks about William Jones' interest in India, William
Jones was already master of Arabic and his ambition was to know India better than any
other European ever knew it and thus he made a list of topics that he were to study during
his stay in India. Jones' curiosity for the laws of Hindus, geography of Hindustan, govern-
nance in Bengal Arithmetic and Geometry, and Mixed sciences of the Asiaticks, Medicine,
Chemistry, Surgery and Anatomy of the Indians, natural Productions of India, Poetry, Rheto-
ric and Morality of Asia, Music of Eastern Nations, Trade, Manufacture, Agriculture and
Commerce of India (p.78) paved a way for sustained governance of the British rule in
India. Said maintains that Sanskrit language, Indian religion and history did not procure the
status of scientific knowledge until after Jones' efforts in the late 18th century. Said exam-
ines Jones' interest in India and his open throated praise for Sanskrit language "that (it) is
more perfect than Greek and more copious than the Latin" (p.79) had a dual purpose to play
firstly to rule and to learn and then to compare the Orient with the Occident. Said also gives
an account on how Charles Wilkins, a company official was assisted by William Jones to
first master Sanskrit and then to translate the Institutes of Manu (Wilkins incidentally, was
the first translator of Bhagwat Gita, 1785).

About the Indian religion, the Orientalists had different views, which are discussed
in short by Said in his Orientalism. In the 19th century Europe stood for the loss of that
origin, innocence, purity as a result of machanization, industrialization and scientific ad-
advancement. Europe had the dream of regaining the genealogical essence through its
understanding of the Oriental past. Friedrich Schlegel and Novelis said, "It was Indian cul-
ture and religion that could defeat the materialism and mechanism of Occidental culture"
(p.115). But to some of the German Romantics, Indian religion was essentially an Oriental
version of Germano-Christian Pantheism" (p.67).

Indian religion is the most antiquated religion and the West's thoughtless categoriz-
ing of Indian religion seems to be just a part of their Orientalistic strategy. Some Orientalists
explained oriental religion and culture in terms of mysticism and exoticism. Islam and
Oriental religion, including Hinduism, were projected as exotic items devoid of rationality (p.317) and as full of metaphysics and mystic elements (p.268). Joseph Conrad's *Heart of the Darkness*, Rudyard Kippling's *Kim*, and the traveling account of Lane, Durton, Chateaubriand, and other establish Europe's search for exoticism and mysticism in the East, Said also focuses on Schlegel's enthusiasm for India and then his ensuing abherrence from it. The Orient that was merited for its pantheism, its spirituality, its stability, its longevity, its primitivity, and so forth and in whcih Schelling saw a preparation of the way for Judeo-Christian monotheism; Abraham was pretfigured in Brahma; such regards for Oriental polytheism was followed by a counter response. "The Orient suddenly appeared lamentably underhumanized, antidemocratic, backward, barbage, and so forth...the Orient was under-valued" (p.150).

Every European colonizing power directed its first efforts toward India, and the bitterest struggles for the glittering prize were fought on the battlefields of Europe and India alike. The success of Britain in defeating her continental rivals, as well as the nature rulers of India, and the consolidation of her domination in India paved the way for her subsequent world supremacy. The plunder of India was a main source of the primitive accumulation of capital which made possible the English industrial revolution.

British imperialism in the epoch of declining world capitalism, has become the most powerful reactionary force in India, buttressing in turn all other forms of reaction. Nevertheless the day of reckoning cannot be long postponed. The solution of the terrible problems of the toiling millions of India demand the overthrow and elimination of British imperialism, which was the foremost task of the coming Indian revolution – non-violently.

**Precolonial Discourses**

If the European idea of the Orient is a European invention, the Orient itself is not. Even Said is obliged to "acknowledge it tacitly". Long before Vasco de Gama landed in Calicut in 1498, the peoples of South Asia created modes of self and world-representation that owe nothing to European notions. (It is necessary to mention this obvious fact, since reductive orientalists who push theory to extremes are sometimes inclined to forget it.) Many of these systems of discourse are preserved in texts or methods of practice or both. One example (among hundreds) is the Shaiva Siddhanta school of early mediaeval India, whose rituals are still performed in South India. Texts like the Kamikagama (?seventh century CE) present a systematic and coherent view of the Divine, the world, and the human
being; other texts detail practices that "not only sought to bring the agent personally into relation with God and to transform his or her condition, but they also collectively engendered the relations of community, authority, and hierarchy within human society." Far from being influenced by Western discourse, such precolonial societies were obvious of it. "There is", as intellectual historian Wilhelm Halbfass writes, "no sign of active theoretical interest, no attempt to respond to the foreign challenge, to enter into a 'dialogue' - up to the period around 1800."

**Three Styles of Colonial Orientalism**

1. **Patronizing/Patronized Orientalism.** European visitors to India between 1500 and 1750 published their observations in travel narratives, missionary polemic, etc., but serious European oriental scholarship may be said to begin towards the end of the eighteenth century. Two landmarks are the formation of the Asiatic Society of Calcutta in 1784 and the publication of Charles Wilkins's translation of the *Bhagavad Gita* the following year. The preface to this volume by Governor-General Warren Hastings contains a passage that is archetypally "Orientalist" in the Saidian sense: "Every accumulation of knowledge, and especially such as is obtained by social communication with people over whom we exercise a dominion founded on the right of conquest, is useful to the state." But Hastings also demonstrates a real, though patronizing appreciation of Hindu culture. He notes, for instance, that the Brahmins' "collective studies have led them to the discovery of new tracks and combinations of sentiment, totally different from the doctrines with which the learned of other nations are acquainted: doctrines, which ... may be equally founded in truth with the most simple of our own." In a similar vein, the iconic orientalist William Jones writes in the preface to his translation of the *Manu Smriti* that this code is "revered, as the word of the Most High, by nations of great importance to the political and commercial interests of Europe", who ask only protection, justice, religious tolerance and "the benefit of those laws, which they have been taught to believe sacred, and which alone they can possibly comprehend." With British rule established, patronizing Europeans taught their language to patronized Indians, some of whom made important contributions to English-language scholarship, Rammohun Roy (1772-1834), who produced a number of translations and expositions of Sanskrit texts, notes in the introduction to one that he had undertaken the work "to prove to my European friends, that the superstitious practices which deform the Hindoo religion have nothing to do with the pure spirit of its dictates!"
2. Romantic Orientalism. British orientalism during the colonial period was obviously connected, if not invariably complicit, with British imperialism. Germany had nothing to do with imperialism in India, yet Germany took the lead in Sanskrit studies in the nineteenth century, a fact that impels Trautmann to ask: "How does Said's thesis help us to understand" this? One of the first German Sanskritists was Friedrich von Schlegel, whose *Uber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier* (1808) is glorification of the religion and philosophy of the "most cultivated and wisest people of antiquity". The work of Schlegel and other orientalists helped in the development of German Romanticism, of which Indophilia was a major strand. Writers like Geothe and Schopenhauer were influenced by Sanskrit literature, and published positive assessments that helped offset the largely negative British view. Indian scholars were delighted to reproduce such European praise. *Hindu Superiority* by Har Bilas Sarda (1906) is a catalogue of out-of-context encomiums by writers from Strabo to Pierre Loti, to which Sarda adds his own obiter dicta, e.g., "The *Vedas* are universally admitted to be not only by far the most important work in the Sanskrit language but the greatest work in all literature."

3. Nationalist Orientalism. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, educated Indians began turning from the imitative Anglophilia of the previous generation to a renewed interest in their own traditions. Around the same time the national movement got off to a slow start. In this climate a nationalist style of orientalism took root. Sister Nivedita (Margaret E. Noble, 1867-1911), a disciple of Swami Vivekananda (1863-1902), gives an explicitly nationalistic turn to her writings on India. "The land of the *Vedas* and of Jnana-Yoga has no right to sink into the role of mere critic or imitator of European Letters," she writes in *Aggressive Hinduism*. "The Indianising of India, the organising of our national thought, the laying out of our line of march, all this is to be done by us, not by others on our behalf." Nivedita's friend Aurobindo Ghose insists even more firmly on the necessity of judging Indian culture by Indian standards.

Three Styles of Postcolonial Orientalism

4. Critical Orientalism. Nationalist scholarship was prominent during the years of the freedom movement (1905-1947) and the first two decades after the achievement of independence. During the fifties and sixties, historians trained in Western methods and working within Western theoretical frameworks, began to produce empirical studies of all periods of India's past. More recently, critical scholarship has turned its attention to historio-
graphical issues. Romila Thapar for example investigates how "both the colonial experience and nationalism of recent centuries influenced the study, particularly of the early period of [Indian] history" in *her Interpreting Early India*. Nehru belongs to this category.

5. **Reductive Orientalism.** As we have seen, Saidian interpretations of orientalism and the Orient are themselves orientalist discourses. As Ludden puts it, they inhabit "a place inside the history of orientalism." Saidian treatments of Indian history and culture began to appear within a decade of the publication of *Orientalism*. One of the first was Ronald Inden's *Imagining India* (1990). His stated aim is to "make possible studies of 'ancient' India that would restore the agency that those [Eurocentric] histories have stripped from its people and institutions." But by insisting that European orientalists constructed Hinduism, the caste system, and so forth, he tends instead to deny Indian agency and give a new lease on life to Eurocentrism. Churchill may easily fall in this line.

6. **Reactionary Orientalism.** In recent years a loose grouping of scholars, many with degrees in scientific disciplines but without training in historiography, have sought to restore India to its ancient glory by rewriting its history. This revisionism is necessary because, "as a consequence of a century and a half of European colonialism, and repeated extremely violent onslaughts [by Muslims and Christians] going back nearly a thousand years, Indian history and tradition have [p.176>] undergone grievous distortions and misinterpretations." This critique is directed against nineteenth-century European orientalists as well as contemporary writers who "assumed that the fashionable theories of the age in which they were brought up - theories like Marxism - represented universal laws of human history."

Thus the principle inspiration for postcolonial theory, however, lies in the work of Palestinian-American literary critic, Said. As earlier mentioned in his extraordinarily influential book, *Orientalism*, Said employees a Foucauldian notion of discourse as a means not simply of representing, but also of controlling and disciplining the "other" than lies outside of the West. At the same time, this discourse helps to constitute and create the West by way of the boundaries and contrasts supplied by Orientalist discourse. The issue for Said is not the accuracy, or lack thereof, of these Western representations of the Orient, but, rather, the function of these representations in the West in helping produce and sustain imperialism and colonialism, and in the reiteration and recirculation of these representations in the East itself. This politics of representation lies at the heart of Said's project. Glossing Marx's line in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Banaparte*, that since "they cannot represent them-
selves, they must be represented," Said holds that the Orient becomes not a representing subject in its own right, but a subject represented by the West (1978; 21). Representation thus becomes an arena both for the dissemination of colonial control as well as for indigenous resistance to these Western discourses and representations.

Bhabha's work further elaborates on these issues raised by both Fanon and Said and explores the ways in which strategies such as mimicry and hybridity can often function as moments of resistance for subaltern subjects inhabiting the peripheries of Western culture and Western discourse (1994). Spivak's writings have also been central to the development of postcolonial theory. Her insightful and influential article "Can the Subaltern Speak?" has provoked enormous amounts of critical attention. Arguing not only that the exclusion of subaltern speech and representation happens within Western discourse, Spivak also asserts the impossibility of any such subaltern speech occurring and being heard within the confines and constraints imposed, created and maintained by Western discourse (1988).

These questions of representation are central to the study of postcolonial literature. In Homi Bhabha's (1994) work, the emphasis is upon colonial subject-formation as an inherently ambivalent process of emulation, mimicry, and subversive trickery, giving rise to forms of hybrid subjectivities.

Is it, in Bhabha's word hybridity? as colonizer and colonized negotiate their cultural difference and create a culture that is a hybrid, which is the revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity" of both colonizer and colonized (Lc 112) so, in the sense their negotiation is dialectic that still remains ambivalent. But here, the process of creating the hybrid culture does not destroy the colonized nor the colonizer for a "better" culture; the process is not Hegelian, which resolves the two in some grand cultural synthesis.

**A Unique Perspective on Empire**

Seminal post-colonial writers such as Nigerian author Chinua Achebe and Kenyan author Ngugi wa Thiong'o have written a number of stories recounting the suffering of colonized people. For example, in *Things Fall Apart*, Achebe details the strife and devastation that occurred when British colonists began moving inland from the Nigerian coast.

Rather than glorifying the exploratory nature of European colonists as they expanded their sphere of influence, Achebe narrates the destructive events that led to the death and enslavement of thousands of Nigerians when the British imposed their Imperial govern-
ment. In turn, Achebe points out the negative effects (and shifting ideas of identity and culture) caused by the imposition of western religion and economics on Nigerians during colonial rule. The present study follows this guideline. Nehru's viewpoint has been justified through this perspective.

The time is right to concentrate on what attitude of these two stalwart leaders have in common and where and how they differ and what divides them and keep cultural legacy alive by creating a lasting impression.

**Literature from the Post-colonial Era**

With the end of World War II the British Empire was broken, the Jewels from its imperial crown were gaining independence one country at a time. (Greenblatt, 1832). This was the most dramatic geographic shift of English literature in history. The work of these writers hybridized their local traditions with their experience of their time in the British Empire (Greenblatt, 1832). Some examples of these post-colonial writers are: Wole Soyinka, Nadine Gordimer, Derek Walcott, V.S. Naipul, and J.M. Coetzee, all of which were winners of the Nobel Prize. Post colonial literature dealt with many issues; some common themes would be: The Empire's effects on a colony's way of life, how one who was educated in the British Tradition related to his previous generation or other experiences that resulted from the empire's influence. Thus once again it reminds that Post colonial literature is a body of literary writings that reacts to the discourse of colonization. Post-colonial Indian writers challenge the silence of orientalism and the power issue of the West through various speaking voices of narratives representative of Indian life. For example, Arundhati Roy as speaking abjection in *The God of Small Things*, Salman Rushdie's narrative method of magic realism allows "Speaking Trauma" through his character Saleem, Bapsi Sidhwa, Khushwant Singh and Rohinton Mistry "Speak History" as their novels carry the eight of conveying 'history of partition and emergency. In *Such a Long Journey*, Mistry usses an anthrozoological theme in portraying issues of power over innocence.

Recognizing the choices and negotiations of immigrant life through the coming of the word (dis) assimilation, Jampa Lahiri's writings are analyzed in terms of "Speaking Voice" of (dis) assimilation for Indian immigrants in the United States, while Zadie Smith's *White Teeth* speaks (dis) assimilation as a voice multiple ethnicites negotiating immigrant life in the United Kingdom. These writers show the power of Indian Writers in challenging the silence of orientalism through narrative.
The anticolonial leaders were educated in the schools of the colonial powers. In twentieth century Western imperialism was about to fade, its sun was now setting. Nehru's viewpoint is to free the factors helping produce and sustain imperialism and colonialism, and in the reiteration of these representations in the East itself. Nehru decolonizes the politics of representation which lies at the heart of Said's project.

*Nehru's Discovery of India*

Consciously attempts to rise above the colonial paradigms, to free all scholarship concerning its development and its relationship to the world from the biased formulations and distortations of colonial influenced authors. Not only this, Nehru studies the West and other Civilizations with dispassionate objectivity - eschewing both craven and uncritical admiration.

Nehru break the particular kind of myth produced by European thought about India. Nehru as a writer realises that colonialism consisted of more than economic exploitation and political subordination. It also involves the exercise of cultural power over subordinated populations. Colonial power denigrates the traditions of non western culture and establishes the superiority of particular version of Western Culture.

If the colonial rulers understand culture to be an instrument of domination, then regaining control over the means of collective self-definition is required. Nehru's literary work provides strategy in this regard. One good example of the analysis of this relationship between culture domination and resistance, is James account of the history of cricket in the Carribbean. In *Beyond a Boundry* (James C.L.R., 1963, *Beyond a Boundry*. London: Hutchinson). The Cricket field is refigured as an arena in which relation of racial superiority are asserted and subverted during colonialism.

Shimona Kanwar finds Orientalism-in-reverse in the works of M.K.Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru. She describes their nationalism as Orientalism-in-reverse.

Nationalism gives voice to its muted subjects. By nationalism as Orientalism what she means is a pride in cultural achievements, nationalists did not stop outside the Indian past that is, they accept the orientalist formulations of a glorious Indian past and its subsequent decline. Shimona Kanwar studies M.K.Gandhi’s *Hind Swaraj* and Nehru's *Discovery of India* to prove her views. According to her both the text defend the invasion of 'inner' spirituality from 'outer' sphere and signified spiritualism as the core of the Indian tradition. In her words "the nationalist constructed a hiatus between the "inheriar" spiritualism that
the East represented and the "exterior" materialism that the West stood for." It is true, to retain the pride in culture, Nehru as the nationalist (following M.K.Gandhi) asserted spiritualism as an antidote to Western "outer" materialism. But Nehru was more than the nationalist, (in fact both M.K.Gandhi and Nehru) his interest was not limited to the dichotomy of the East and West to continue and both never wished to articulate a distinctive identity structured on the colonial differences. Both were larger than the colonial frame. This study analyses in detail Nehru's image in this reference later.

Nehru was primarily a nationalist in the sense as he transformed the object of knowledge – India – from passive to active. Ludden agrees Gandhi and Nehru "used Orientalism against imperialism" in positioning non-violence and tolerance as the strength of Indian culture.*

* Ludden, David "Orientalist Empiricism : Transformation of colonial knowledge". in Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament : Perspectives on South Asia. Eds. Breckenridge and Veer 250-278)

Both these nationalists were a product of Western education. They had voraciously read Western (European) literature and had grasped some of the Western thoughts in their anticolonial discourse. Their first and foremost problem was to determine their "self identity and for that they reflected upon the orientalist essences of the ancient origin of Indian culture. It was a prerequisite for national unity against alien invasions. Revival of the past was essential. In a letter to Eleanor Rathbone, in 1941 (Nov. 9) Nehru wrote :

"India is not a land colonized by the British people, gradually learning from the mother country how to step forward, and thus developing into a dominion. We do not look to England as a mother country. We are a mother country ourselves and the vigorous progeny of our mind have been scattered over Asia for two thousand years or more and yet look to India as a mother country."*


This was his anticolonial stand. The West conceived the Indian culture in its own paradigms and subsequently contrasted it with Western prototype. Examining Nehru's The
*Discovery of India*, it is clear he wants to "find his roots", being an Indian he wants to 'discover' that very India. In order to understand Indian culture, he revisits the past. Without effacing the colonial discourse of an "eternal and glorious" Indian past. In the words of Shimona Kanwar the term 'discovery'

"gradually transformed from geographical lexicon to a cultural metaphor of identity".

Nationalism is a resistance in Homi Bhabha's anticolonial approach. The puzzle of the staying power of Indian civilization and the difference between Indian and Western society had to be solved. Nehru regard the uniqueness of India in the continuity of its culture. But he is not orientalist who will find everything about India either 'glorious' or 'dull', neither he is the nationalist who would be proud of everything Indian. He finds quite many things objectionable, for example certain customs such as the Sati, the status of women, caste system, poverty, superstition are to be removed. The romanticized notion of the ancient autonomous Indian village went together well with colonial ideology that delegitimized an Indian nation on the grounds of its disunity. Nehru has clear picture of the wretched condition of Indian villages. He does not degrade them but cares for them. He rejects the Western binary ontologies. Nehru scientifically analyses their limitations, problems and also suggests change to improve their lot. He has faith in their potential. He says:

"For my part, I wish to say that, in spite of everything, have a firm faith in India's future"*

*(p.206, Nehru – An Anthology)*

Again,

"What is India? That is a question which has come back again and again to my mind...

We have all these ages represented in us and ... we have the growth of nuclear science and atomic energy in India, and we also have the cowdung age."

His nationalist discourse does not emerge necessarily from the mythical and religious connotations of India's past. For him diversity of India and continuity of Indian culture is the real Identity. He sees no need to compare India with the West but defines India in her own language.
Nehru writes:

"I felt India's diversity was tremendous, and yet behind it lay an equally tremendous unity".

or

"India's strength has been twofold; her own innate culture which flowered through the ages, and her capacity to draw from other sources and thus add to her own. She (India) was far too strong to be submerged by outside streams, and she was too wise to isolate herself from them, and so there is a continuing synthesis in India's real history and the many political changes which have taken place have had little effect on the growth of this variegated and yet essentially unified culture."*

*(An Address at the Aligarh Muslim University, 24th January 1948 from Jawaharlal Nehru – an anthology Ed. Sarvapalli Gopal, OUP)*

To Nehru, Indian culture and tradition is not invented by colonialism. It had been there before colonizer came. He thus provokes people into action. This was his anti-colonialism. This was central to his nationalism and communal consciousness. The use of a pure past was required to literate Indians from the awe of British culture. But past is not all. Nehru, the dreamer and visionary looks at the future.

Past to future, the journey was to lead him from subjugation to freedom. Perhaps from Gandhi, he realised that in order to build up one's grounding one has to connect himself to his roots; one has to encounter all challenges, he realized about India that it has an antiquity that European imagination simply cannot accommodate.

Nehru is trying to dig out how India was capable of inventing itself for centuries before, during and after British presence. which means imagining the essential elements of Indian society and culture his was the most sophisticated attempts to arrive at an Indian way of looking at India history, but he builds on foundations that were laid a hundred years ago. It mseeems he was preoccupied with what India is going to do with its self determination. Would she strike out her own original path or forever stumble in the wake of Europe?
One thing that distinguishes his attempt as the nationalist was to create "an alternative language of discourse" or "different modernity". Nehru gave new positive twist to orientalism. Nehru is free from both the extremes. To him India is neither glorious, romantic age old ancient wisdom, nor wrapped in monstrous mystery. Nehru's style of nationalism is critical so also his orientalism. One may call Nehru a British trained Indian Nationalist. As a critical orientalist he stresses the objectivity of knowledge.

David Kopf says British orientalists impressed Nehru but he used orientalist knowledge to build up a new India. His key words for India are diversity and continuity. Nehru writes

"The curious thing about India is the persistence of the old and the now at the same time; all the centuries seem to be represented in the India of today. There does seem to be any obvious conflict between them. They coexist, though, undoubtedly the past and its methods are giving place to the new."

(*Forward to India, the Country and Its Traditions by Jean Filliozat [1962]).

In this way Nehru gave voice to those who had been silenced by the dominant ideology. Nehru proved it wrong that nativism cannot be an effective answer to Western hegemony.

In the book Orientalism (1978), Edward Said lucidly described how European scholars who studied what the West called "The Orient" disregarded the intellectual and cultural perspectives of the Asian whom the Europeans studied. His firm faith in India has been expressed in this way:

"...But India is not a mere geographical entity. It is something much more and deeper. It is an idea which has influenced the people who have lived here and who have come here from other countries and found a home here since the beginnings of civilization. That idea may have had the germs of both good and bad in it; but whatever it was, it was a thing of power or
else it could not have survived, not only in a changing world but in a changing India.*

*(A postscript to Autobiography (1936)

His was the answer to the ways in which Churchill unjustified Indians – i.e. cultural representation of the colonized country as a perpetual inferior people. His focus on national identity is broad based. It starts from relieving India from colonial shackles and reaches at the point where India is the leader of peace and brotherhood resolving conflicts through the principle of Panchsheet.

Orientalism’s myths have become central to identity politics in the postcolonial world, while nationalism, in turn, has become the great abstraction able to subsume previously autonomous projects. The concept of nation provided voice and shape to certain Universal goals, such as the emancipation from colonial shackles and limits, and self-determination. Nehru is a nationalist in this sense.

**Post Colonial – Orientalism**

As a field of critical inquiry, post-colonialism has its intellectual origins in the writings of a number of intellectuals who help to analyse the period of intense anti-colonial struggles against formal European territorial and cultural control, mainly in Asia and Africa. Nehru's writing stands high in this regard.

As Franz Fanon, the writer of two classics, *The Wretched of the Earth* (1967) and *Black Skin, White Mask* (1991) suggested that nationalist ideologies were an essential element of anti-rational struggle, Nehru too, is in search of nationalist ideology. The study critically looks into how Nehru give value to the displaced identity truth and authenticity. His purpose was to account for and to combat the residual effects (social, political and cultural) of colonialism upon the cultures of the peoples who had been ruled and exploited by the Mother Country.*

*(Fischer Tine 2011. S Lead, Quayson, 2002)*

Nehru faces the dilemmas inherent to developing a national identity after decolonization; the ways in which writers articulate and celebrate that identity, often reclaimed from the colonizer, whilst maintaining connections with the colonial Mother Country.

The clear link between a generation of anti-colonial writers and the emergence of postcolonialism in the late 1970s is shared concern with the conditions for the decolonization of the mind. Nehru's *Discovery of India* seeks to share the same concern. His concern with modes of reasoning thinking and evaluating Indian identity, comes as a reply to Churchill’s
colonial mentality. His attempt to recover the lost glory of Indian civilization. He tries to
invocate 'authentic' tradition and a binary opposition between modernity and tradition that
leads him to fuse them.

Personal memories created in him a great sensitivity for human degradation and a
sense of moral responsibility. Ironically, Nehru's writing was inspired by British education
and British literature. It is true, much of the Indian mind actually took place outside the
formal classrooms and through the sale of British literature to the English-educated Indian
who developed a varacious appetite for the British novel and British writings on a host of
popular subjects. In a speech before the Edinburgh Philosophical Society in 1846, Thomas
Babington (1800-1859), shortly to become Baron Macaulay, offered a toast:

"To the literature of Britain ... which has
exercised un influence wider than that of
our commerce and mightier than that of
our arms... before the light of which
impious and cruel superstitions are fast
taking flight on the Banks of the Ganges!"

However, Macaulay's strategen could not yield greater dividends on the contrary,
the effect of training in European learning gave an entirely new turn to the native mind. It
is interested to note how the connections among the "heart and margins" of the colonial
empire are demonstrated by analyses of the ways in which "relations, practices, and repre-
sentations" of the pasts are "reproduced or transformed", of how knowledge of the world is
generated and controlled.*

*(Sharp J. Chapter 6, "Can the Subattorn Speak?" *Geographies of Postcolonialism*. SAGE
Publication)

Nehru rejects their self ascribed intellectual and cultural superiority. He reject all
that which allowed the west to name, describe and define and thereby control, non-Euro-
pean peoples, places and things; an attitude of absolute cultural superiority forged and
facilitated by colonial imperialism, by his intellectual changing the inherent assumptions
... (and the) material and discursive legacies of colonialism.
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