1. Introduction

What is found as subjectivism in Webster’s Third New International Dictionary is a matter for consideration to begin with.

“1. (a) any of the various epistemological theories that limit knowledge to conscious states and elements; (b) any of various theories, doctrines, or view points that attach great or supreme importance to the subjective elements in experience: as (1) Kantianism (2): The doctrine that truth is relative to human nature: protagoreanism.

(2) either of two doctrines in ethics : (a) the supreme good or the end of ethical conduct is the realization of some type of subjective experience or feeling (as pleasure) (b): individual feeling or apprehension is the ultimate criterion of the good and the right.”

Now let us approach such defined ‘subjectivism’ in history writing and its implications.

It is interesting to note that Dr.C.K.Kareem, at the History seminar sponsored by the IOS, Kerala Chapter at Calicut, said that

“Distortion of history, particularly of Indian history is a subject that often comes for lively discussions. Distortion is generally of two types, accidental and intentional. History based on misunderstanding and misconstruing of men and events is accidental while history purposefully
misrepresented, mutilated and misinterpreted is intentional. Both are highly dangerous that go against the principles of truth and objectivity which are the basic tenets of history. Here an attempt has been made to show the mode and method of presenting such history, fully mutilated and fabricated by bringing out its reasons and consequences.  

The long held theory that Aryans came into India from Central Asia is challenged now. New historians with motives stigmatize this theory as a comedy of errors and attempt to prove that Aryans were the original inhabitants of India. For a student of history, however he may be interested in the past, it is immaterial whether Aryans were the inhabitants of this land or settlers. Air, Light, Water and Ether have no visas for entry into different lands. When elements that make life possible on earth have no geographical confines why should man, the finest of the species in creation is upset over a theory which is of no help to his social progress.

It has always happened that historians of the conquering race impose a history of their choice on the land of subjugation.

The Aryans in their literature have immortalized their heroes and dotted Dravidians with Ravan, Vali, Sugriva, Hanuman and the like just to prove that Dravidians were inferiors.

English historians grossly misinterpreted the historical facts. They didn’t write history with concern for objectivism. They stooped down to base means for strengthening their empire, to suit their imperial designs.

Ancient Indian History is known as Hindu History. Medieval Indian History is called as Mogul History but Modern Indian History is painted not as
Christian history but as British history. English historians deliberately distorted the governance of Muslim rulers since they snatched away the power unceremoniously from them. Every reform or scheme the British brought forth was mainly for the purpose of dividing Hindus and Muslims.

English historians' interpretation of Muslim rule, as downright fanaticism is a fallacy of the first order.

Mahmood Ghazni plundered the temple at Somanathapuram. It was not his intention to convert Hindus into Muslims. On the other hand he pillaged the enormous wealth of the temple. Therefore temples were plundered out of greed and not for religious purposes.

The author of *Chachanama* writes

"From one temple 230 *muns* of gold were obtained and 40 jars filled with gold dust. These were weighed and were found to contain 1320 *muns* of gold."*4*

Tippu sultan is painted blacker than he is. He is said to have destroyed temples in Kerala. On the other hand Tippu sultan distributed lands to religious *mutts* and *sathrams* at Kerala. While Christians occupied Spain they eradicated even the very trace of Muslim occupation within the shortest period; Moguls who ruled India for 600 years did not convert Hindus into Muslims as a policy. In Mysore where there was Muslim rule the percentage of Muslims is 11%; while Kerala which had not seen Muslim rule it is 25%.

English historians deliberately misinterpreted *Jizia*. It is not a tax exclusively on Hindus. There were exemptions from this tax for Brahmins,
women, children and specifically widows. Therefore in no part of the world subjectivism has played such a destructive role as it has played in India.

“Modern subjectivism begins with Kant (1724-1804) whose role it was to admit the importance of scientific knowledge while at the same time undermining its foundations. Claiming that Hume had awakened him from his dogmatic slumber..... Kant awakened and descended to the other slope of the dream.”

“The proto-social sciences were magic and ritual. Within them they carried the seeds of economics, sociology, philosophy, and the other social sciences. Economics was the first social science to develop institutionally during the eighteenth century, imitating at best it could the outlook and techniques of physical science. The religious, national, and class struggles, which accompanied the growth of capitalism, led to a new inquiry as to the ultimate purposes of society. The criticism of Lilburne and Winstanley, the Levelers and Diggers, was the earliest to combine theory with practical reform which culminated in the work of Hobbes (1588-1679). It was Sir William Petty, once secretary to Hobbes, who began economic statistics which he summarized in his *Political Arithmetic* (London, 1690). Petty lays down in this book the labour theory of value, which was directed against courtiers, churchmen and landlords who claimed rewards for which they had not worked. As Bernal says - the labour theory of value “..... Fell into disrepute among orthodox economists because it was felt that it might be used in the same way against capitalists.”
Therefore when a theory gains ground there is purposeful subjective base for it. This is common to histories of different disciplines.

If an event is chronologically narrated it is journalistic excellence to the maximum. But history writing is altogether different from journalistic presentation. It is the critical analysis of a past event. Why it occurs, what were the courses behind its occurrence and what was the impact that event made on the segment of humanity is generally history writing.

"Islam exhorts a Muslim to see not only the outward manifestation of the different happenings of human life, but to study the undercurrent of ideals and motives which have shaped those happenings. The historical references and the accounts of the past are given in the Quran not so much to fill in the gaps of our factual knowledge, but to systematize and generalize it and to take lessons from it. The Holy Quran treats of the events of the past not only with a view to reviving them in our memory but to making them meaningful and instructive to us."^7

When 'factual' and 'faithful' journalistic presentation tends to be subjective, critical approach of a past event naturally becomes subjective.

If one proceeds from the premise of R.G.Collingwood^8 among others, one can safely arrive to perceive what is subjectivism.

R.G. Collingwood raising the question what is history says conclusively it is a science of finding things out: and in that sense history is a science when one is ignorant of a matter, event or personality his search dispels darkness from his mind on a specific subject.
Therefore it is an enquiry of an individual and the search into its object and methodology differ from person to person. No individual is the same. There is bound to be at least an iota of difference between individual to individual. Racial, linguistic, religious considerations make one's approach strikingly different from the other. So, subjectivism emanates from the basis of altogether different attitudes and approaches of individuals.

The second question he raises is what is the object of history. His answer is history is the science of res gestae. He attempts to answer questions about human actions done in the past.

Historical events shrouded in the delirium of the past do not open that swiftly to a researcher. However effective tools one has, enquiry into past event necessarily creates subjectivism in the attitude of the scholar, since this enquiry is concerned with the past on which the student does not have personal knowledge or direct experience there is bound to be blurring of the vision.

When R.G.Collingwood answers to the question how does history proceeds he finally says that historical procedure or method consists essentially of interpreting evidence.

There is no hard and fast rule that an evidence when thrashed out should lead a researcher to one and the same conclusion. When Ghazni Mahmood, came to plunder Somanath temple, priests prostrating on the floor by the way of passive resistance were mistaken by the invader as that was one of the ways of Indian welcomes. If witnesses to an event could hold different opinions it is quite natural on a past event men may impose their specific impressions.
He again raises a question what history is for and satisfactorily answers to know what kind of person you are. Men are of different kinds though there is an universal concept of what man is. Therefore when the object differs necessarily the lessons we derive too differ. It is a kind of our eternal battle between innocent bias and ignorant subjectivism.

Therefore when a past event is recreated in the mind of a historian his attitude and approach necessarily get involved. Objective writing is conditionally subjective. There is no middle road of Buddhistic contours but everyone belongs to a block of J.B. Priestly. Narration is no history. Interpretation is history. Then bias is unavoidable. And this prejudice should not expand to a level of blurring facts. This is the minimum expectation from a historian.

In a world of injustice if one makes a claim that he is deliberately impartial it means he is insensitive to what happens around him.

When R.G.Collingwood says “History as it exists today, therefore has come into existence in the last 4000 years in Western Asia and Europe” his bias against the East⁹, is revealed. Equally ancient, the religious and secular literatures available in India and in China are primary sources of History. The excavation of Harappan culture to cite one instance, is enough to prove that ‘Sindu valley’ in its heyday was a cradle of civilization as Sumeria was. ‘Thasyu’ an equivalent word to slave came from Sumeria. In Sumeria ‘oor’ as it is in Tamil refers to village. Either Sumeria must have influenced India or India must have influenced Sumeria. Therefore to say that West Asia and Europe only contributed to the available history of world is nothing short of a sweeping generalization.
East and West are two different diametrically opposite blocks. Aldous Huxley, Arch Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, Mark Twain and Pandit Nehru were some of the few thinkers who speak on the differences between Occident and Orient. In common they suggest that East represents the Heart and West symbolizes the Brain. While the East subjects itself to elements the West always conquers them. Therefore the treatment meted out to East which is a cradle of major religions is a casual fallacy of the worst prejudice.

It is shocking how a discriminating mind could close its doors to the highest peak of human thought in the vedic period. Reference to one volume of Max Mullar would have corrected him.

Again, R.G.Collingwood says that in “Europe alone human life is written genuinely as history wherein China or India or among the natives of America there is no true historic progress, only static or unchanging civilization, in which old forms of life are changed without steady cumulative development which is the peculiarity of historic development.”

This statement shows the bias against the East in unmistakable words. In China when the printing paper was invented, printing press was the subsequent development. Therefore to say China was static, repeating the old forms in a new way is a sententious fallacy.

For example the East and West do not meet any where with one another on the idea of the vital fluid of humans. While the West does not take a serious view of the emission of the vital fluid the East condemns such practices of pleasure-seeking. A knowledge of sex and the various postures of sexual cohabitation are the principal contributions of China and India while the West has not critically analyzed sex habits. It was only the Chinese Sexologist who
insisted upon sex in the early hours of morning. This lesson they derived from birds with enormous physical prowess. Herbal medicine and holistic approach to afflictions and a sense of health were highly developed in China and India as it was nowhere else. It is a pity a great historian as R.C. Collingwood is not appreciating the development of science in this part of the East.

Around 1700 A.D. it was Prophet Mohamed who exhorted his companions to rush to china not because it was a distant land but because of the invention of paper and print. Therefore to say there was no dynamic progress in the civilizations of this area is a falsity of the worst kind.

R.G.Collingwood says that "History on the other hand is objective, by which I mean is not my own personal past that it concerns but with the past in general, the past depersonalized, the past simply as fact". 11

If someone asked about the history behind such and such an occurrence, he may be able to enumerate the reasons. When he justifies his reasoning out subjectivism is born.

In 6th century B.C., Confucius, enlightened the Chinese society. Buddha challenged the scriptural captivity of Hinduism; Socrates in Greece started his spiritual movement of "know thyself" and several prophets of Judeh led several principalities of people to the promised land. Therefore in 6th century B.C. itself there were contributions to history from every part of the earth. To say that except West Asia and Europe all others were static is mutilation of facts.

Had R.G.Collingwood had known Tamils, he would have understood that their 'Magnum Opus' "Tholkappiam", a didactic grammar on life was available
in the same century which was the end product of a higher civilization of an earlier period.

G.R. Elton in his ‘The Practice of History’ says

“Pattern-making cannot be avoided; interpretation from historians is proper and necessary task. To make it possible to understand a historic event or phenomenon is an attempt to put pieces together”\textsuperscript{12}

Therefore, he is of the opinion as pattern-making is unavoidable, subjectivism is inevitable. But a historian can still be objective, when he does not favour an unjust cause in a partisan way. R. Sathyanatha Aiyar’s ‘History of Nayaks of Madura’ is of considerable historic value. Though I do not accuse him any of the biases towards Muslims his belittling of ‘Khan Sahib’ is inexplicable.\textsuperscript{13}

‘The Cultural Heritage of India’ the five volumes brought out by the Ramakrishna Mission is full of subjective elements.

Instead of approaching Manu Samhita critically its writer in a diction of sententious lavishness extolls Manu. The prescription of Manu for a Chandala (of low caste origin) for copulating with a Brahmin woman and the punishable ‘audacity’ of a depressed one to hear ‘scriptures’ and other inhuman practices which are nothing but a criminal slur on the face of Indian society are not condemned adequately.

Instead it is written ‘Keith who is impatient with Nietzsche for ranking Manu above the Bible, yet says that the Manu Smriti ‘is not merely important as a law book’, but ‘it ranks as the expression of a philosophy of life’ and in Manu we have the soul of a great section of a people’. says Brahaspati in his smrti.
Different sashtras strut about only so long as Manu, the teacher of Dharma, artha, and moksha does not appear on the scene".14

1. All the five volumes present vividly the epics and historic literature of the North and not of the south India.

Kambar one of the masterminds of Tamil Literature has not been presented properly.15 Though he adopted the already prevalent story of ‘Ramayana’ he fundamentally altered valmiki’s version in many instances so as to suit the cultural ethos of Tamils. This fundamental fact has been mischievously hidden.

2. Tamils’ ancient grammar and literature Tholkappiyam of 6th century B.C., Thirukural, Sangam literature and the five epics have been back seaters. Except for a generalized article of C. Rajagopalachari on ‘Thirukkural’ the ‘magnum opus’ of Tamils, culture of the south has been relegated to the oblivion.

3. The contribution of Islam and Christianity to the composite culture of India has not been dealt with due attention.

4. Buddhism has been treated with scant respect in the lines of Dr. S. Radhakrishnan and Ananda Kumarasamy with a criminal slur on the pluralistic Indian society. Their view that Buddha had not uttered anything new but only clothed the Upanishadic teachings in a new attire makes one perplexly sad.

‘The Story of Philosophy’ by will Durant is one of the excellently codified and critically analyzed work. In such a work on the lives and opinions of the world’s greatest philosophers East has been totally kept out. But for
Buddha, Confucius, Latze, Adhi Sankara, Ramanuja, Madhava, Thiruvaluvar, Mahavir, Gurunanak and Mahatma Gandhi have no place in the scheme of Will Durant. He conveniently forgets the fact that in 6th century B.C. when Socrates was active, Buddha, Mahavir and Confucius were equally powerful influencing human action with their respective philosophies. Will Durant has treated even Buddha with contempt.16

The same Will Durant writes “Buddhism’s propounder … makes the distortion of the will the entirety of religion and preaches Nirvana as the goal of all personal development. The Hindus were deeper than the thinkers of Europe because their interpretation of the world was internal and intuitive not external and intellectual”.17

While Will Durant lauds Hindus in flowery turns of phrases, why does he forget Hindu and Chinese philosophers is an enigmatic puzzle to a student of history.

Scholar V. Kanagasabai in his ‘The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago’ mentions that since Kovalan was beheaded the Pandya kingdom was cursed by Kannagi with famine, fever and smallpox. Then Verri-vel-Cheliya who held his court at Korrikai believing that those misfortunes were brought on with the curse of Kannagi sacrificed 1000 goldsmiths at her altar and performed festivals in her honour. Then copious rains came and prosperity was at sight.18

V. Kanagasabai though a scholarly person with scant respect to objectivism has written this passage with no evidence what so ever. Why goldsmiths he could have sacrificed 1000 kings instead!

When we explore subjectivism in modern Indian History we have to confine ourselves to the modest limits from 1600 to 2000 AD. Many of the
authors like Romila Thapar, D.D Kosambi, Harihara Rao, Sen Gupta, Vincent Smith and others speak of this specific period only as modern period. Without mincing words one can safely say that British period since the foundation of the East India Company to independence and half a century further constitute modern period.

Moulana Abul Kalam Azad’s ‘India Wins Freedom’ is an objective work of perfection is the common derivation. But Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia succinctly condemns Moulana Abul Kalam Azad’s ‘India Wins Freedom’ as children’s fable since he has exonerated Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and blamed his weakness for Lady Mountbatten for partition. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia discusses at length who were all the principal perpetrators of partition and reprimands each one of the congress followers. This is how opinions differ; what is best for the researcher may not be even good for one of the greatest thinkers Ram Manohar Lohia.19
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