

July 1992

Editorial

## SIKH RELIGION-THE DOUBLE EDGED SWORD

Ours is a critique of T.N. Madan's paper "The Double Edged Sword : Fundamentalism and the Sikh Religious Tradition', read in 1988 at Chicago, and included in a book, 'Fundamentalisms Observed', edited by N.E. Marty and R.S. Appleby, for the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, published by the University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London. Ordinarily we are reluctant to write on current issues. But Madan's paper contains such misinformation about the Sikh Religion and the Punjab problem, that we feel obliged to give an authentic version of the matter.

The author deals with the growth of Sikh religion, and seeks to stress that the present problems in the Punjab are the result of Sikh fundamentalism. It is sad that a scholar who does not belong to the discipline of Religious Studies, has tried to pontify about the basics of Sikhism and its institutions. It is sadder still that being ignorant of developments leading to the present Punjab problem, he has made dogmatic assertions about them that are unrelated to the realities. Accordingly, we shall discuss four aspects of his paper, namely, (i) The Sikh Religion, (ii) The Punjab Problem, (iii) Indian Secularism, and (iv) Secularism-Its Problems, and finally draw our conclusion.

### 1. SIKH RELIGION

Madan makes two assumptions :

(a) that Guru Nanak's religion is a system of 'inferiority' and a part of the Sant Tradition or the Bhakti Movement of Hinduism, and,

(b) that Guru Hargobind's and Guru Gobind Singh's system of miri piri, is different from the religion of Guru Nanak, or the bani in the Adi Granth. He has, however, given no evidence whatsoever to support them. We shall, therefore, start with an examination of these two related statements.

Madan seems to be unaware of the basic classification of religions into categories of (i) Whole-life systems, and (ii) Dichotomous systems. While Judaism, Islam and Sikhism are whole-life, all Indian system; except Sikhism are dichotomous. These two categories have also been described as life-affirming and life-negating. Madan could not be unaware of Schweitzer's and Weber's calling Indian systems life-negating

(a) Sikhism Examined: Lets us examine Guru Nanak's system in this context. No one in the history of religion, has made a greater departure from one's tradition than did Guru Nanak. Since dichotomous system are life-denying, they have certain very conspicuous common features. For them life is either a suffering, an entanglement, *mithya* or *maya* (illusion). As such, asceticism, monasticism, withdrawal and *Sanyasa*, are their essential features. Further, celibacy and the downgrading of woman are natural corollaries. The methodology is Yogic, ritualistic, or purely meditational; consequently, Ahimsa or pacificism is a necessary ingredient, and individual Moksha (salvation) is the goal of life. Even from a brief examination, we shall find that Buddhism, Jainism, Nathism, Vedanta and the Bhakti systems belong to the life-negating category, because

they own all the features mentioned above. In addition, Vaishnavism and Nathism with which Sikhism is sought to be connected, accept caste and pollution as essential features. A Ramanuja, the chief representative and exponent of Vaishnavism, would throw the entire food, if someone, while it were being prepared or eaten, cast an eye on it. A Nath would not go for begging to the house of a Muslim or a low caste. Lowest castes are not accepted as Nath. Every Nath takes three vows of celibacy, Ahimsa and not doing any work or business in life. Shankra calls woman 'a gate-way to hell'. Neither Ramanuja nor Shankradeva, a great liberal Vaishnava saint, would recruit a woman as a Vaishnava, since she is considered sin-born.' Shankradeva writes : "of all the terrible aspirations of the world, woman's is the ugliest. A slight side glance others captivates even the hearts of celebrated sages. Her sight destroys prayers, penance and meditation, knowing this, the wise keep away from the company of woman. Vaishnavism recommends celibacy, withdrawal and Ahimsa. Dichotomy and withdrawal in Yoga and Jainism are well known. According to Digambra Jains a woman cannot reach Kaivalya until she is born as a male." Among Buddhists, Bhikshuhood, or virtual monasticism and withdrawal are the normal modes of the spiritual path. The woman Bhikshu has a lower status than the male Bhikshu who would not rescue a drowning woman, even if she were his mother.

Schomer considers Bhagat Kabir a mesogynist, as he calls woman 'a pit of hell', 'refuse of the world', 'a black cobra' ; etc. She Finds "a strong ascetic streak in his Bani". " Bhagat Kabir is a confirmed pacifist or votary of Ahimsa. Similarly, Bhagat Nam Dev tells us that "it is impossible that the pursuit of God can be coupled with a life of Samsara". "If it had been possible for him to see God while carrying on the duties of a householder, the great Suka would not have gone to the forest to seek God".

Another essential feature of life-negating systems is that they do not create a society or Panth. They are all for individual salvation of a few, the religious elite. Since withdrawal from life is a necessary ingredient for seeking God, social ethics is never the concern of the seeker. Shankradeva was not bothered about making any social change; his concern was only with affording religious fellowship, "He saw his vocation only in establishing religious freedom and fellowship, rather than social overhaul. The trouble about improvement of social conditions, perhaps, seemed to him as little profitable. Maitra, an authority on Hindu ethics, while discussing the moral concept of the ideal life in the Hindu systems, concludes that it is "the conception of the ideal as a negation, or atleast as a transcendence of the empirical life proper, and that the state is thus a supermoral spiritual ideal, rather than a strictly moral idea." It is a transcendental state of deliverance from all struggles of life. Similarly, Gaudapada-the original author of Vedanta writes, "The manifold universe does not exist as a form of reality, nor does it exist of itself." "Having attained to non-duality, one should behave in this world like an insensitive object." The various essential features of the Hindu systems mentioned above, are logically and closely linked, as also are their ethical concepts.

It is in the above context that Guru Nanak brought about a complete reversal in the socio-religious life and values in the Indian religious tradition. He made an inalienable combination between the spiritual life and the empirical life of man, and emphatically broke the earlier dichotomy. Against life-negation and withdrawal from life, he recommended life-affirmation and complete social participation. Against monasticism and asceticism, he accepted a householder's life and full social responsibility. Against celibacy and considering woman as 'sin-born', he gave religious sanctity to married life

and equality to woman, which till today no other religion has granted. Against the rigidity of the varanashram dharma and the institution of caste and pollution, he from the very first day of his mission, accepted and practised social equality and brotherhood of man. Against the world being mithya and a suffering, he found it to be real, beautiful and the realm for the spiritual growth of man. Against tapas, ritualism and meditation alone, he prescribed the primacy of work and activity, emphasizing that one's religious assessment was based on moral deeds in this world. Against the ideal of personal salvation or moksha, he prescribed the goal of carrying out the Altruistic Will of God in the world. The contrast of approach to life is evident from the following hymns of Guru Nanak and of Sankra.

Guru Nanak: "The sun and moon, O Lord, are Thy lamps; the firmament Thy salver; the orbs of the stars the pearls encased in it... The perfume of the sandal is Thine incense; Thy wind Thy fan; all the forests are Thy flowers, O Lord of light. What a wonderful worship is this; O God, my mind is fascinated with Thy lotus feet, as the bumble bee with the flower; night and day I thirst for them. Give the water of Thy favour to the sarang (bird) Nanak, so that my heart may dwell in Thy Name."

Sankra : "I am not the doer, how can there be either bondage or release for me ? I am neither male, nor female, nor sexless. I am the peaceful one, whose form is self-effulgent, powerful radiance. I am neither a child, nor a young man, nor an ancient; nor am I of any caste. I do not belong to one of the four life-stages. I am the Blessed Peaceful One, who is the only cause of the origin and the dissolution of the world."

While Guru Nanak is bewitched by the beauty of His creation, and sees in the panorama of nature a lovely scene of the worshipful adoration of the Lord, Sankra in his hymn, rejects the reality of the world and treats himself as the sole Reality. Zimmer feels that "such holy megalomania goes past the bounds of sense. With Sankra, the grandeur of the supreme human experience becomes intellectualised, and reveals its inhuman sterility."

Consequently, instead of a salvation system for a few individuals, Guru Nanak, from the very beginning, started organising sangat (a society) or panth. On the one hand, he meticulously enumerated all the faults in the social, administrative and political systems of his times, and, on the other hand, he laid down an ethical system and duties that could fulfil the religious objectives and goals he had in view. An important fact is that, since a rigid tradition of 3000 years of dichotomy could not be demolished, and a new and motivated society created, in a decade or two, it is he who created a system of succession, and advised his successors actively to organise and lead a Panth.

It is logical for every religious system, from Moses down to Guru Nanak, to follow the spiritual experience of the Founder and his concept of God or Reality. In fact, the entire religious ethics of Guru Nanak, or for that matter, of any Prophet, is based on his concept of God. The Guru Granth says, "Friends ask me what is the mark of the Lord, He is all Love; the rest He is ineffable." Guru Nanak calls God "Ocean of virtues and values", His God being Loving and Altruistic the world in which He expresses His attributes, automatically becomes real. The goal of life is to follow the Altruistic Will of God, and the assessment of man is based on his virtuous deeds. God is intimately interested in the spiritual growth of man. Consequently, it is Guru Nanak who says, "If

you want to play the game of love, enter my lane with your head on thy palm" and "Truth is higher than every thing; higher still is truthful living."

Further, there are four clear responsibilities of the spiritual man, which are specifically prescribed by Guru Nanak. First is the duty of maintaining equality between man and man, and man and woman. His call that there is 'No Hindu nor any Mussalman', and his taking a Muslim Marasi (a low caste in the Brahminical system) as his first life companion, was a major blow to the hierarchical caste ideology. Caste ideology and immobility of caste duties governed the entire empirical life in Hinduism. An allied step he took was the creation of the institution of Langar, (community kitchen), involving help to the poor and equality of status for one and all. The second responsibility which he prescribed was that of work, involving production and the sustenance of life. He wrote "The person incapable of earning his living gets his ears split, and becomes a mendicant. He calls himself a guru or a saint. Look not upto him and touch not his feet. He knows the true path who earns his living and shares his earnings with others." He further emphasizes the religious necessity and responsibility of equitable distribution of wealth, saying, "God's bounty belongs to all but in the world it is maldistributed" and, 'riches cannot be gathered without sin, but do not keep company after death. He, thus, condemned exploitation and accumulation of wealth, and demonstrated his censure of it, by acceptance of the invitation of Bhai Lalo, a poor carpenter, and rejecting that of Malik Bhago, the wealthy local chief. The most significant responsibility, which is often missed by casual scholars, is that of confrontation with the unjust and the oppressors. This responsibility logically follows from his description of God, whom he calls the "True Emperor", the 'Protector', the 'Shelter of the Shelterless', the 'Helper of the helpless', and what is very significant, the 'Destroyer of the Evil', 'the Destroyer of the Demonical', and 'the Slayer of the Inimical."

In this context, two aspects of the Bani of Guru Nanak, are very important. First, he is critical of the failure of the rulers to secure justice, fairness and safety for their subjects, and to resist and repel the invaders whose butchery and tyranny he condemns. He goes to the extent of ridiculing religious persons who were depending upon Mantras to make the invading hordes blind or invoking the protection of the Devis and Devitas against the enemy. He criticised corruption at all levels of the administration and social life. The second fact is his complaint to God for allowing the weak to be oppressed by the strong and the consequent failure of the Master to protect his flock. This Bani of Guru Nanak is not idle rhetoric, but it lays down an emphatic direction as to what is necessary and virtuous for the religious man to do and the targets for which his Panth has always to struggle to achieve. It is in this background, that Guru Nanak directed the futility of some earlier ethical injunctions saying that people did not know what was sin and what was not sin, and if there was any piety involved in avoiding meat-eating. He wrote : Men discriminate not and quarrel over meat-eating. They do not know what is flesh or non-flesh and what is sin or non-sin". This being his stand regarding Ahimsa, he explained that there was life in every grain of food man ate. The obvious inference is that since he envisages his society to confront and resist injustice and oppression, and since injustice and oppression are greatest by the rulers, the State or the invaders, it is he who clearly removes the hurdle of Ahimsa in the life and development of his society that could possibly arise in its pursuing or fulfilling its responsibilities of resisting or removing social injustice.

In short, students of the Bani of Guru Granth and of Guru Nanak, know that ideologically what the later nine Gurus did, was nothing beyond implementing the thesis laid down by Guru Nanak. It will not be possible for us to discuss in detail the close and logical development of Guru Nanak's mission by each subsequent Guru, but a few salient steps of continuity are briefly indicated. As stated above, and, as a comparison of Guru Nanak's thesis with other whole-life religions will show, the religio-empirical development of Guru Nanak's system was inevitably to lead to the organisation of the Khalsa or the society of committed Sikhs, by the Tenth Master. Guru Nanak's choice of his successor, to the exclusion of his own son who was of an ascetic bent of mind, clearly stresses the essential implications of his miri-piri system that combined the spiritual and the empirical lives of man. The second and the third Gurus emphasized the separate characters of the mission and the Sikh Society, and specifically excluded recluses from the Sikh fold. The Third Guru created for religious and secular purposes as many centres of religious administration, as the number of provinces in the Moghal Empire of the day. The work of the first four Gurus was specifically two- fold. First, it was to motivate the Sikhs with new ideas of religion, values and social morality, that were at complete variance with the tradition in the country that had existed during the earlier 3000 years. The task was so colossal, and the conditioning of the people in new values had to be so radical, that it took about a hundred years for the Gurus to make the society not only to accept the new way of life, but also to live it, and be prepared to sacrifice their all for the new ideals.

The revolutionary character of Guru Nanak's system was so great that the Naths were perplexed, and accused the Guru of trying to distort the religious values of the Indian tradition by being a house-holder. The same surprise was expressed by Sant Ram Das of Maharashtra, when he questioned Guru Hargobind as to how he, who was successor to the seat of Guru Nanak, was wearing arms and riding a horse. The reply of the Guru was clear and cryptic, "Guru Nanak had given up mammon, but not the world", and that his sword was for the protection of the weak, and destruction of the tyrant. In fact, he conveyed that he was, as God's instrument, doing the same thing as the role of God in the destruction of the evildoers Guru Nanak had described in his hymns. The second step the first three successors took, was to create Centres of worship, organisation and assemblage. The Fourth Guru's creation of the Darbar Sahib at Amritsar, and also the town for normal trade and secular activities, which ultimately became the capital of the Sikh Society, is a significant landmark in the above direction. The role of the Fifth Guru is extremely important. In his time not only the religious Centre of Amritsar was finalised, but also a similar religious Centre and town were established at Tarn Taran. But the more important facts are three. Sikhs had grown into a distinct socio-political society with important secular wings. The Guru started the system of Daswandh, which was an alter- native system of revenue, used both for religious and secular purposes of the community. In addition, the Guru and the Sikhs took to trade in the import of horses, which was normally a business conducted by members of the martial classes. The proof of the Sikhs having developed into a religio-political organisation, is evident from the fact that, while the emperors of the day are normally not worried about quietist saints or societies, the Sikh Society clearly aroused the suspicions of the Moghal Administration, as is evident from the autobiography of the Emperor Jehangir. He not only took notice of this political development and ordered the execution of the Fifth Guru, so as to stop the

growth of the Sikh society, but also considered the event to be important enough to be recorded in his autobiography. No wonder, in his detailed assessment of the socio-political growth of the Sikhs, historian H.R. Gupta records that the Fifth Guru had created a 'State within a State'. Evidently, it was this development which the Emperor, like any vigilant ruler wanted to stop. The second step the Fifth Guru took was to finalise the Scripture of the Panth, thereby categorically announcing that the Sikhs had an entirely new religion, or thesis, embodied in the Scripture, being unrelated to any other religious system, its scripture or doctrines. The third step the Fifth Guru took, was intimately connected with his first two measures of proclaiming the independent character of the Sikh religion and organising its development as a socio-religious body. This step had three aspects. The Guru was called and treated as a Sacha Patshah (True Emperor), meaning thereby that he was the head both of the secular and the religious wings of life. It is essential to know that Bhai Gurdas calls Guru Nanak also Sacha Patshah, indicating thereby that the Guru was the instrument of God in both the spiritual and the secular realms. The second aspect was that Guru Arjun, as also perceived by the Emperor, had financially assisted and supported a rebel to the throne. This was bound to raise the ire of the Emperor, involving confrontation with The Empire and leading to Guru's martyrdom. It was a very important religious and political event to give a lead to the Sikh society and to motivate and prepare it for the new tasks ahead. In the religious history of India it is the first case of martyrdom involving confrontation between a prophet and the Emperor of the day. The third step the Guru took, logically following from the other measures he had adopted, was training his son in the art of arms and hunting, and giving the direction to him that he should raise an army. Otherwise, it is impossible to conceive that at the age of eleven the Sixth Master, on the very first day of his Guruship, and to the surprise of chief Gursikhs like Bhai Budha and Bhai Gurdas, should insist on wearing two swords and using a soldier's attire.

The necessity of this step was ideologically so clear to the Guru, that he employed mercenaries to train his men in the art of soldiery. Further, he not only fought battles with the Imperial forces, and constructed a fort at Amritsar, called Lohgarh, but formally symbolised the Miri Piri system of Guru Nanak by the constructions of Akal Takhat and the raising of the flags of Miri and Piri close to Harmandir Sahib. They were not two institutions. But, following the logic of the system, these represented their essential combination in the Sikh religion.

Hereafter the maintenance of an army by the Gurus became a regular feature of the Sikh Society. So much so, that despite knowing of the martyrdom of the Fifth Guru, who had supported the rebel Khusro, the Seventh Guru approached rebel Dara and offered him military assistance for his claim to the throne. Another extremely important fact is the reply of the Ninth Master to Aurangzeb. It was reported to the Emperor that the Guru was organising a new and independent nation which could be a political force against him. The Emperor conveyed it to the Guru that if he desisted from his political activities, he would be favoured with official grants for his religious preaching and prayers. The Guru declined the offer, and continued with both kinds of activities, which he naturally considered essential for his mission. To outsiders the hymns of the Ninth Master would seem to be very quietist in their import. These they are not. For, the martyrdom of the Guru was clearly connected with his support for the cause of the Kashmiris suffering oppression and religious persecution, as represented by Pandit Kirpa

Ram. The Tenth Guru's confrontation with the Empire and his invitation to the hill Princes to join him in his crusade are clear enough. He created the Khalsa, specifically contemplated as the epitomic and final step in the development of the Panth.

Here two facts are worth mentioning. The Fifth Guru, even after he had compiled the Scripture, continued the succession, which lasted through Five Gurus for another over a hundred years. Had it been merely the compiling of a Scripture and the proclamation of a new religious system, unconnected with its empirical targets and responsibilities, the question of continuing the succession would not have arisen the other hand, in those hundred years the main work organised was a Panth alive to its secular responsibilities. Significantly, even in the times of the Sixth Guru, when the Moghal soldiers approached the Guru for the return of the falcon, he replied that there was no question of giving it back, because their objective was even to snatch from them the throne." The second fact is that the Tenth Master created the Panth, got Amrit from the Five Piyaras, and closed the succession even while all his four sons were alive. It is also important that the mission of Banda and the Sikhs, with message of the Guru to the Sikhs in the Punjab to help Banda in his attack against the Governor of Sirhind, was initiated by the Guru himself. This is also evidenced by the letter of Mata Sundri, spouse of the Tenth Master, saying that the Guru's injunction to Banda was to serve the Panth, and that political sovereignty had been bestowed on the Panth by the Guru himself. The Nash doctrine proclaimed by the Tenth Master, also involved a complete break with the earlier religions, cults social beliefs and customs," occupational practices, caste and status institutions, and lineage.

Madan accepts that the Miri Piri system, or what he calls fundamentalism, and the objective of capturing political power, were there in the times of later Gurus, especially during the life of the Tenth Master. But his misunderstanding, as a votary of a dichotomous system, is that he suggests that the system of the first five Gurus was different from that of the religio-secular stand of the later Gurus. It is this fallacy which should be discussed.

(a) We shall examine the issue in two parts. The first is the aspect as to how the Gurus and their contemporaries including their adversaries viewed the system. The second aspect, is as to how Guru Nanak's system is congruous or incongruous with other whole-life systems. We have already stated what Guru Nanak spoke to the Naths, and Guru Hargobind spoke to Sant Ramdas, explaining both the originality and independence of the system and the unity of its thesis. Guru Nanak went to the extent of saying that the Naths did not understand even the elementaries of a spiritual system. The Seventh Guru offered military help to rebel Dara knowing full well of the fate of his grand father for blessing and giving aid to rebel Khusro. Further, there is the Ninth Guru, rejecting the suggestion of the Emperor for giving up his politico-temporal activities, and confining himself to spiritual preachings alone. In addition, the Guru Granth itself records that all the Gurus represented a unity of spirit and ideology. That is why every Guru including the Ninth Master, while writing his Bani, calls himself Nanak, and not by his personal name. This fact is an emphatic assertion of the ideological unity of the Bani in the Guru Granth. Similarly, the Tenth Master clarified it as follows :

"Nanak transformed himself to Angad and spread Dharma in the world. He was called Amardas in the next transformation. A lamp was lighted from the lamp, when the opportune time came for the boon, then the Guru was called Ram Das. He was bestowed

upon the old boon, when Amar Das departed for the heaven. Sri Nanak was recognised in Angad, and Angad in Amar Das. Amar Das was called Ram Das, only the saints knew it, and the fools did not. The people considered them separate ones, but there were a few who recognized them as one and the same. Those who recognised them as one, successfully understood the spiritual phenomenon. Without this recognition, there could be no success in understanding. When Ram Das was merged in the Lord, the Guruship was bestowed on Arjun. When he left for the abode of the Lord, Hargobind was seated on the throne. When Hargobind left for the above of the Lord, Har Rai was seated in his place. Har Krishan (the next Guru) was his son. After him, Teg Bahadur became the Guru.

Let us first see what the Sikhs felt about the unity of their Gurus. We have stated that both the Guru Granth and the Gurus have proclaimed that unity. The Sikhs from the very start, including Bhai Gurdas, call the Guru Sacha Patshah, involving his realm and supremacy both in the spiritual and the temporal worlds. For the Sikhs, for all purposes of reference and authority, the Guru was Nanak. Even in the times of the Tenth Master, it is recorded that "If a wayfarer arrives at midnight, and takes the name of Guru Nanak, he is treated as a friend and a brother, no matter he may be an utter stranger or even a thief or a robber or an evil-doer." The point of significance is that even in the time of the Tenth Master, the sole prophet of reference was no one other than Guru Nanak. Then there is the statement of Bhangoo in reply to the question of Captain Murray, as to who gave legitimacy to the political sovereignty of the Sikhs. He replied that it was given by the Sacha Patshah himself. When asked who was the Sacha Patshah, the answer was prompt that it was Guru Nanak who bestowed empirical sovereignty on the Sikhs. The point of importance is the unity of the whole-life or Miri-Piri system of Guru Nanak, in which the empirical component was an essential part of his spiritual system. Further, there are the seals of Banda Bahadur, Jassa Singh Ahluwalia, and Ranjit Singh in which Guru Nanak has been referred to as the Master of both the worlds, namely, spiritual and the empirical, and the bestower of the Sword to the Sikhs

An allied aspect is the impression the Sikh society gave to its adversaries about its faith and its prophet. Qazi Nur Mohammad who came with Abdali, during his invasions in the eighteenth Century, wrote that the Sikhs were not Hindus and that the new religion which was distinct from Hinduism had been created by Guru Nanak. Further, there are the orders of the Moghal Emperor and Governors in the eighteenth century, which state that 'Nanak Pathis' should be eliminated and that rewards would be given for their destruction. This shows that there was only one entity, namely, the 'Nanak Panthis' or Sikhs, whom the rulers of the day considered to be the opponents worth liquidation. Nowhere is the order confined only to Amritdharis, Singhs, or Khalsas. In fact, these terms are not mentioned in related official records. This clearly shows that making distinction of ideology or faith as between Nanak Panthis, on the one hand, and Sikhs, Khalsa, Amritdharis, and Singhs, on the other hand, is a recent contrivance, unknown to the insiders, outsiders or the adversaries of the Sikhs, before the nineteenth century. The confusion has arisen, because in the nineteenth century during the rule of Ranjit Singh when the Sikh star was ascendant, many fair-weather friends entered the Sikh fold. At that time becoming a Sikh only meant gaining prestige and benefits without any risk of liquidation as in the earlier century, and it is they who reverted to Hinduism after the annexation of Punjab.

That Sikhism is a system of Naam Simran or interiority needs some clarification. A few misguided persons wrongly argue that Naam Simran or meditational practice alone is the point of emphasis in the Guru Granth Sahib. This displays a complete ignorance of the ideology of Guru Granth or Naam. The Gurus have repeatedly defined Naam as the immanent aspect of God, and its attributes are the same as those of God. It is called the 'Ocean of Values and Virtues', and the Force that controls and informs the world. So far as the mere repetition of any word to be used as a Mantra is concerned, the practice is clearly deprecated by the Gurus, when they say "Everyone repeats God's name, but by such repetitions one gets not to God" "One mutters God's Naam, but does evil daily, in this way the heart is not purified." On the other hand, the way to Naam is described thus : "Love, contentment, truth, humility and virtues enable the seed of Naam to sprout." "Good, righteousness, virtues and the giving up of vice are the way to realize the essence of God." "It is by our deeds that we become near or away from God. The difficulty is that whereas the Gurus have repeatedly, both in their hymns and in their lives and deeds, unambiguously emphasized the spirituoempirical combination, the Miri-Piri or the Sant-Sipahi character of their thesis, persons, conditioned by or drawn from dichotomous religions, sometimes, advertently or inadvertently, divide it into two systems, one of the earlier Gurus and the other of the later Gurus. In fact, Sikhs have no two sects nor two systems, as understood or asserted by those who have not studied the Sikh religion in depth or from the original source, the Guru Granth.

(b) Other whole-life systems : Now we shall consider our statement that Sikhism is not like other Indian religions, a dichotomous system, but is a whole-life religion like Judaism and Islam. Moses, as we know, who got the revelation, was both a spiritual and a political leader of the Jews. In the revelation to Moses, as recorded in the Torah, and 'the Exodus' in the Bible, God said, "The people may have a change of heart, when they see war and return to Egypt." "So God led the people roundabout, by way of the wilderness at the Sea of Reeds." Again, it is -recorded, "Joshua overwhelmed the people of Amalek with the sword. It is God in revelation to Moses who speaks that Jews should attack the land of Cannon and occupy it, since God had given it to the Jews, saying, "My angel goes before you and brings you lo the Amarites, the Hittites and Perizzites, the Ganaanites, the Hivites and the Jevusites and I annihilate them....." Further, the Law of Punishment revealed to Moses was "the penalty shall be life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise." As is known to every student of religion, the Torah prescribes the ethical commandments laid down by God for the Jews, and also strict rules for their religious, sacrificial, ritual, and civil life. This religion was followed by the rule of David and Solomon, the wisest and one of the best rulers in the millenium before the Christian era. And surprisingly no one has called the Bible, Moses, or Solomon of the Jews fundamentalists, because their system is Miri-Piri and sanctions the need of war for a righteous cause or the purpose of God, and prescribes conquest by the sword, or punishment of eye for an eye and tooth for tooth. In short, the spiritual commandments revealed to Moses by God and incorporated in the Torah and the Bible, sanction both the use of sword and war, for gaining political power and land, and the wielding of that power for all secular purposes, as was done by David and Solomon. And, whatever subsequent scholars might say, the above is the interpretation of the Torah, accepted and acted upon by the Jews and their prophets for centuries on end. The first seeming deviation was by Jeremiah, who suggested non-

resistance to the attack of the Babylonians in the sixth century B.C.; but he did so, without repudiating the earlier interpretation, saying that God had punished the Jews in the form of the Babylonian attack, because of their non-observance of His commandments. In any case, the cults of Essenes and Kaballists apart, the original interpretation of the Torah is still the Jewish canon in Israel, and Torah forms an integral part of the Bible.

Islam is another whole-life religion; and, as is well-known, prophet Mohammad clearly sanctions the use of sword for a righteous cause and the performance of political functions by the man of religion. Prophet Mohammad, like Moses got the message of God, and was both the spiritual and the political head of Islam. The two functions continued to be combined in the earlier Caliphs as well.

We wonder, if any scholar has ever accused Judaism of having originally introduced fundamentalism, used in a condemnatory sense, as has been done now, or has argued that Islam, as a religion, is fundamentalist.

For outsiders, ignorance of religious classification between whole-life and dichotomous or salvation religions, is understandable; but one's dogmatism in splitting Sikhism (a whole-life religion, as are Judaism and Islam) into quietism of Guru Nanak and fundamentalism of Guru Gobind Singh is, indeed, irrational, incorrect and selective. We have shown above that it was Guru Nanak, who rejected every salient principle of the earlier dichotomous Indian religions, and again it was he, who from the very start organised a society criticising profusely the socio-secular life of the times, and clearly denying the inviolable value of Ahimsa.

It should be evident that all whole-life religions have four fundamental features. First, that in each case the spiritual experience of the Prophet is that God is Love. It is so in Judaism, Islam and Sikhism. God in each case is the True Emperor and the Controller of the cosmos, who has a Will. The second feature is that God in each case is Destroyer of evil doers, and it is Guru Nanak, who clearly defines God in that manner, and as one who uses the sword for destruction of the enemy. The third feature is that God has Attributes which form His clear commandments, described as His virtues of being Protector, Loving, Brother, Father, Helper of the weak, and showering His grace where the weak are helped. His altruistic Will has to be followed by the spiritual seeker. This is the goal of the religious man in Sikhism and all whole-life religions. And, fourth, all whole-life religions create a society, since the virtues the seeker has to practise, are social and societal in their implications. Again, it was Guru Nanak who started the Sikh organisation, and condemned withdrawal and asceticism, when he stated that who would look after the well being and health of the world, if men of religion receded to the isolation of the hills. It is extremely significant that the learned Hillel when asked to explain the 613 commandments of Torah, replied. "What-ever is hateful to you, do not do to your neighbour. That is the entire Torah, the rest is commentary, go and learn it." Similarly, the story of Abu Ben Adam in Islam stresses the same thing by saying that the seeker who loves man, is dearer to God than the one who loves Him. The same principle is emphasized by Guru Nanak, when he says that 'truthful living is the highest', and that life is a game of love'. In short, a whole-life religious system lays down that wherever injustice and oppression are practised, the man of religion cannot remain neutral or unconcerned, its ethos being life-affirming. Use of necessary force for a righteous cause, social or political, becomes logical in a whole-life social system.

It is significant that whereas no earlier religious system in India prescribed, much less took specific measures to practise them, it was Guru Nanak who both emphasized and implemented these four and allied religious doctrines and responsibilities. Historically, Guru Nanak appeared in a land with a dichotomous religious tradition that recommended personal salvation, with hardly any concern for social morality, as concluded by Maitra in his study of Hindu ethics. It is for the reason of this background, that Guru Nanak had to introduce the system of succession. Guru Arjun continued it, even after the compilation of the Scripture, and Guru Gobind Singh, after the creation of the Panth, closed it. It is important that the system of Miri-Piri or Sant-Sipahi, as is the case of Moses and Prophet Mohammad, was actually practised and lived by the Gurus themselves, so that there is no misunderstanding or ambiguity about Guru Nanak's system. As explained by us, so far as the contemporaries of the Gurus and the Sikhs were concerned, there was never any misunderstanding about the unity of Sikhism, its independent identity and theology. It is only the present-day scholars, mostly votaries of dichotomous religions, often politically oriented, who sometimes feel confused and misrepresent its unity of ideology.

It is an important fact of history that Pir Budhu Shah, a Sufi Muslim sacrificed two of his sons, while they were fighting in the army of Guru Gobind Singh." Had the Sufi not been deeply impressed by the spiritual cause the Guru had been fighting for, it is unthinkable that he would have sent practically all his sons and men to fight for the Guru while a Muslim Emperor had been ruling in Delhi. Pir Budhu Shah was not a mercenary, but a pious and respected religious divine above temptation of material or secular gains.

Evidently, Sikhism is a whole-life religion. A radical departure from the earlier religious systems was made by Guru Nanak. No doctrinal addition was made by subsequent Gurus. Only those ignoring the religious history of man, could find dual parts, or a split between the system of Guru Nanak and that of Guru Hargobind and the subsequent Guru. In fact, it is the only religion in India which, instead of seeking personal salvation presents an evolutionary view, involving the spiritual growth of the manmukh or the egoist to that of gurmukh or superman who will play the same role as did the Gurus, being the instruments of God.

## II. THE PUNJAB PROBLEM

While ignorance of Madan, because of the lack of the necessary background of the discipline of religion, is obvious, his blackout of the realities of the Punjab situation, is, indeed, inexplicable. Unfortunately he has, it appears, without studying the problem and facts himself largely relied on the misinformation projected by the media, Mcleod or scholars like Oberoi or his coreligionist. It seems necessary, therefore, to give a brief account of the issues involved in the Punjab Problem.

(a) Background before 1947: It is well known that immediately before 1947 the British were, broadly speaking, dealing with three parties in India, namely, the Congress, representing the majority of Indian opinion, the Muslim League, representing by and large the Muslims of India, and Akali Party, representing the Sikhs. Sikhs being largely located in the old Punjab, both the Congress and the Muslim League tried to woo them, each hoping to retain a major part of the old Punjab with the support of Sikhs. Jinnah had made tempting and specific offers of autonomy and safeguards to the Sikhs. However, the Sikhs chose to throw in their lot with India, depending upon the following assurances of the Congress, Mahatma Gandhi, and Jawahar Lal Nehru.

In 1929 when Shri Jawahar Lal Nehru was the President, a formal resolution was passed by the Indian National Congress at Lahore" that no constitution of India would be finalised, until it was acceptable to the Sikhs. The second assurance was the clear statement of Nehru in 1946 that there was nothing objectionable in the Sikhs having an area demarcated in the North-West of India, where they could enjoy the 'glow of freedom'. It was a significant statement, since it was given in the context of Jinnah's offering to the Sikhs constitutional guarantees in a separate state in the Eastern part of the contemplated Pakistan." Third, there was the statement of Mahatma Gandhi, saying that his words should be accepted and that the Congress would never betray any one, and that if they did, the Sikhs knew how to use their Kirpan (sword). Finally, there was the statement of Nehru in the Constituent Assembly in December, 1946, while proposing a federal system with autonomous states. He moved the executive resolution, which envisaged "The Indian Union as an independent sovereign republic comprising autonomous units with residuary powers, wherein the ideals of social, political and economic democracy, would be guaranteed to all sections of the people, and adequate safeguards would be provided for minorities, backward communities and areas," Nehru described the resolution as a "Declaration, a pledge and an undertaking before the world, a contract of millions of Indians, and therefore, in the nature of an oath which we mean to keep."

An important fact is that the Congress had consistently been making two policy statements, first, that India would be reorganised on a linguistic basis, 'and, second, that the Indian constitution would be Federal in its structure, with states being largely autonomous.

(b) After 1947 : After 1947, to the surprise and dismay of the Sikhs, the Congress completely changed its stand. When the Akalis approached the Home Minister, Sardar Patel, for the creation of a Punjabi Suba, his reply, as described by Prime Minister Charan Singh, was, "I am ready to concede it. But you will have only that much land that falls in your share on grounds of population. So Punjab area will be halved. Now you form 17% of the Army. They will have to be dismissed. Are you prepared for it ?" This opened the eyes of Sikh leaders, but it was too late. In 1949, when the draft constitution was circulated to the State Assemblies, all the Sikh Members of the Punjab Legislative Assembly unanimously rejected it, saying, "It has been the declared policy of the Congress that India is to be a union of autonomous states, and each unit is to develop in its own way, linguistically, culturally and socially. Of course. Defence, Communications and Foreign Affairs must remain the Central Subjects. To change the basic policy now, is to run counter to the oft-repeated creed of the Congress... In the considered opinion of the Akali Dal the residuary powers should be with the states... The list distributing legislative power should be based on the principle that the Centre or the Union Parliament should be limited to Defence, Communication and Foreign Affairs only." But the Centre went ahead and adopted a centralised constitution. In protest the Akali representatives in Constituent Assembly declined to sign it.

Thus started the agitation for an autonomous Punjabi speaking state in which the Sikhs happened to be in a majority. The Centre did constitute a States Reorganisation Commission in 1956 for the purpose of creating linguistic states. It recommended the formation of unilingual provinces in the entire country, except in the North West India, i.e. the Punjab. Following its recommendations, instead of forming a Punjabi speaking

State, the Sikh majority area of Pepsu, was merged in East Punjab to make the Sikhs a minority in a State which was declared bilingual, i.e., both Punjab-speaking and Hindi speaking. The agitation for the Punjabi speaking state continued and hundreds suffered death and more than half a lakh went to prison.

(c) A Sub-State created in Punjab: At the time of the 1965 War, on an assuring gesture from the Prime Minister, the Sikhs suspended their agitation. The Sikh soldiers and the Sikh population of Punjab showed exemplary patriotism and made commendable sacrifices. After the War, the Congress decided that a Punjabi speaking State should be carved out of the then East Punjab. A Parliamentary Committee to report on its formation was constituted. Its recommendation was that a Punjabi speaking state on the basis of the areas demarcated under the Regional Formula of Parliament, should be created. But, unfortunately, both the then Home Minister, and Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the Minister for Information and Broadcasting, were quite perturbed about it, and wanted that no Punjabi speaking state should be constituted. This is clear from the following account given by S. Hukam Singh, then Speaker of the Lok Sabha:

"The Prime Minister was reported to have observed on November 26, 1982, when releasing some books published by the Delhi Gurdwara Committee (HT. Nov. 27), that 'When the Punjabi speaking State was formed the suggestion made by the committee headed by S. Hukam Singh had been accepted.' This was not so. According to her statements in My Truth (p. 117) 'Unfortunately, Mr. Shastri had made S. Hukam Singh, the Speaker of the Lower House, Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee on Punjabi Suba although he was very biased in favour of Punjabi Suba....."

"I went to Mr. Chavan and said, I had heard that S. Hukam Singh was going to give a report in favour of Punjabi Suba, and that he should be stopped....."

"Once the Prime Minister's appointee had declared himself in favour of Punjabi Suba, how could we get out of it."

"Mrs. Gandhi along with Mr. Chavan, could see Mr. Shastri with much difficulty, and when they did, Mr. Shastri just said, he was fully in touch with the situation and we need not bother, (p. 118). "But I was very bothered, and I went around seeing everybody. Of course, once the report came, it was too late to change it."

"Lal Bahadur Shastri continued the policy of Jawahar Lal Nehru and was as dead against the demand of Punjabi Suba, as was Nehru. So, when he was urged upon by Mrs. Gandhi to stop Hukam Singh, he did not waste any time. Mr. Shastri called Mr. Gulzari Lal Nanda, then Home Minister, to his residence, and conveyed to him the concern about the feared report. I was contacted on the telephone. Mr. Shastri disclosed that Mr. Nanda was with him, and had complained that he had suggested my name (Hukam Singh) for the Chairmanship of the parliamentary committee under the mistaken impression, which he had formed during a casual talk with me, that I believed that Punjabi Suba would not be of any advantage to the Sikhs ultimately, but that now I appeared determined to make a report in its favour."

Government's intention :

"I answered that the facts were only partly true. I had told Mr. Nanda that Punjabi Suba would not ultimately be of much advantage to the Sikhs. But I had also added that the issue had by then become one of sentiment and had roused emotions. Therefore it was not possible to argue with, much less to convince, any Sikh about the

advantages or disadvantages of Punjabi Suba. Every Sikh considered the denial as discrimination. I further enquired from Mr. Shastri, whether I had not expressed the same opinion to him and his answer was in the affirmative. I myself offered to confront Mr. Nanda by immediately rushing to Mr. Shastri's residence, but he said there was no need. This disillusioned me. The intention of the Govt. then was to use me against my community, secure an adverse report, and then reject the demand."

"The Govt. has never seen merit in any Sikh demand. The Das Commission in 1948 recommended postponement of reorganisation on the plea, inter alia, that if once begun in the South, it might intensify the demand by Sikhs in the North. The J.V.P. Committee (Jawaharlal, Vallabhbhai Patel and Pattabhi Sitaramayya) when reviewing the Das report gratuitously remarked that no question of rectification of boundaries in the provinces of Northern India should be raised at the present moment, whatever the merit of such a proposal might be."

"And this became the future policy. Nehru stuck to it. Shastri continued the same, and Indira Gandhi has made no departure."

"Every effort was made by Mrs. Gandhi, Mr. Shastri, and Mr. Nanda to stop me from making my report."

"Why the government had been so strongly against the parliamentary committee making a report in favour of Punjabi Suba and why Mrs. Gandhi had felt bothered and ran about seeing everybody to stop Hukam Singh," has been explained by Mrs. Gandhi herself. "The Congress found itself in a dilemma, to concede the Akali demand would mean abandoning a position to which it was firmly committed and letting down its Hindu supporters in the Punjabi Suba (p.117, My Truth)." The government has always been very particular about not "letting down its Hindu supporters." The Congress could not depend upon Sikh voters and out of political considerations could not suffer losing Hindu votes also. Therefore the Congress failed to do justice to the Sikhs."

"The first schedule of the Regional Committee Order 1957 contained Ropar, Morinda and Chandigarh Assembly constituencies in Ambala district in the Punjabi region."

"The subsequent reference to Shah Commission was loaded heavily against Punjab.

Making the 1961 census as the basis and the tehsil as the unit was a deliberate design to punish the Sikhs. The language returns in the 1961 census were on communal lines.

Therefore, the demarcation had to be on a communal rather than on a linguistic basis."

"Consequently merit was again ignored and justice denied. Naturally tensions between the two communities increased. If the Sachar Formula, worked out in 1949 had been accepted, there would not have been any further conflict. If the Regional Formula had been allowed to be implemented, there would not have been any further discontent. And if Punjabi Suba had been demarcated simply on a linguistic basis, and not on false returns in 1961, there would not have been any extremist movement."

It clearly shows that the demand for a linguistic state, a policy which was an old one with the Congress, and which had been implemented in the rest of India, was to be denied in the Punjab, because Sikhs would become a majority there, and come in power under the democratic process.

The Sikhs are known for their love and struggle for freedom. This new policy, the Sikhs feel, is aptly described by Machiavelli's observations, "Those states which have been acquired or accustomed to live at liberty under their own laws, there are three ways of holding them. The first is to despoil them; the second is to go and live there in person; the third is to allow them to live under their own laws, taking tribute of them, and creating within the country a government composed of a few who will keep it friendly to you. Because this government, being created by the Prince, knows that it cannot exist without his friendship and protection, will do all it can to keep them."

Hence forward it would seem that the Central Government has been following the three

pronged policy of despoiling Punjab, ruling it by stooge governments, and imposing the President's rule if and when, by the democratic process, a non-Congress government came into power in the state. The subsequent history of the Punjab has been just a struggle between the Sikhs, historically known for their love of liberty, and the Centre pursuing the above policy. Both Mrs. Indira Gandhi and Shri Nanda were concerned and worried about the proposal for a Punjabi Suba having been accepted by the Congress.

While actually reorganising the old state, the Home Minister passed an Act which virtually scuttled the very idea of a Punjabi speaking state as recommended by the Congress. It made the Constitutional situation worse for the Sikhs." The Punjabi speaking areas and Hindi speaking areas in the old Punjab, had stood clearly demarcated and accepted by all parties and public men under the official formulae called the Sachar Formula of 1949, and the Regional Parliamentary Formula. But, these accepted demarcations were unilaterally annulled and a Commission for making a new demarcation was appointed, giving it the direction to follow the 1961 Census, which had been virtually rejected by the Government, because under communal propaganda Hindus had wrongly reported their mother tongue as Hindi instead of Punjabi.

But the greatest snag of the Reorganisation Act was that Punjab was virtually dwarfed in its political status and competence, and a substate was created instead of a Province having the same constitutional rights as the other states of India. For, no area can be called a political unit or a state, if it is incompetent to develop and exploit its water and hydel power resources which form the very base of all agricultural and industrial growth. Water and hydel power are exclusively state subjects under the Indian Constitution. But, in the Punjab Reorganisation Act, 1966, whereas the entire river waters of Yamuna belonging to the old Punjab were allotted to Haryana, on the basis of its being in the Ganga Basin, the development, control, maintenance and the distribution of the waters and hydel power of purely Punjab rivers, were unconstitutionally kept in Central hands. Even under Articles 162 and 246 of the Indian Constitution it was beyond the legislative and executive jurisdiction of Parliament to legislate about or administer the waters and hydel power of state rivers.

The incongruity and the injustice involved being obvious, the agitation against the unconstitutionality of the Reorganisation Act started. Later, the Centre issued an executive order, directing that recruitment to the Defence services, the largest organisation giving Government employment, should be on the basis of the population of each state. Until about the Fifties merit was the criterion for recruitment to Defence Services, and Sikhs formed 17 to 20% of the Indian Defence Forces. This new policy,

apart from being unconstitutional, was considered to have three adverse effects. First, it would eliminate merit and reduce the eligibility of Sikhs for future recruitment in the Defence Services to 1.5% or less. Since the issue of these orders, it has come down to about 8-9%. Second, a large part of the rural Punjab being traditionally dependent upon employment in the Defence Forces, the new policy could evidently create a major problem of sustenance and employment in the State. Third, it would eliminate the historical role of Punjab as the sword-arm of India. The Akalis chiefly objected that this order of the Centre was violative of Articles 15 and 16 of the Indian Constitution, which provided that there shall be no discrimination in recruitment to public services on the basis of one's place of birth. The order being unconstitutional, the Sikhs wanted that it should be placed before the Constitutional Bench of the Supreme Court for adjudication of its validity.

Similarly, it was found that an Executive order had been issued placing a ban on the wearing of a Kirpan during air travel. The order was considered unconstitutional, since both under the Law and the Indian Constitution there was a clear provision (Article 25) permitting the Sikhs to keep Kirpan, this being their essential religious wear.

Therefore, the agitation against the Centre continued with the major demands being four. For, apart from the three Constitutional demands mentioned above, it was urged that the linguistic demarcation made under the Sachar and the 'Regional Formulae, that had actually been worked and administered for decades on end, should not be disturbed especially when everybody had accepted it and even Members to the Punjabi and Hindi Legislative Committees of the State Assembly had been elected on that basis. Any change or appointment of a Commission was uncalled for, and presumably aimed at disturbing the status quo and keeping the whip hand with the Centre. The truth of this assertion is clear from the fact that, although a quarter century has elapsed since 1966, and many Commissions have been appointed, yet no final demarcation has been made so far. From the very start, the Reorganisation Acts which had reduced Punjab to a sub-state, was attacked on three scores. First, it had kept the control of the waters and hydel power of the Punjab rivers in Central hands. Second, although Shimla, the one time capital of the Punjab, and summer Capital of India, was allotted to Himachal, Chandigarh, the Capital of the Punjab, built over Punjabi speaking areas, was turned into a Union Territory, thereby creating an entirely new precedent. Nowhere else was either the capital of the reorganised state transferred, or the question of territorial compensation for it ever raised. Third, was the change sought to be made in the settled and accepted linguistic demarcation. As a part of the agitation Pheruman, an ex-Congressman, kept a fast unto death and died. Sant Fateh Singh also kept a fast, which was given up on the assurance that a satisfactory solution would be announced by the Prime Minister.

It is for emphasis that the issues relating to the Sikh demands, arising from Reorganisation Act and otherwise, were purely socio-political. The three main issues concerning the water and hydel power, the executive order for recruitment of Defence Forces, and restriction on the wear of kirpan, were entirely constitutional, and the matter of demarcation of Punjabi speaking areas, was a settled territorial issue which was being unnecessarily unsettled. The substance of the Sikh demands, was that the three constitutional issues should be placed for decision before the Constitutional Bench of the Supreme Court, which was the only forum to decide constitutional issues, and that the territorial issue, as already settled and accepted by all, should not be put in the melting

pot. Thus, the entire Punjab problem could be solved in one day without any rational objection from any party since neither a state could question the verdict of the Supreme Court, nor could Haryana object to a demarcation which its representatives and the Centre had accepted and worked for decades on end.

Inexplicably, Madan has made a blackout of the real political issues, and instead of discussing their rationale or otherwise, and that of the Government stand, has raised the camouflage of fundamentalism, which has nothing to do with the problem that had led to the agitation in Punjab. For, as explained above, there could never be a Punjab Problem, if the rational or constitutional course had been followed. It is obvious that the only course for the settlement of the three major constitutional issues has not been followed for the last quarter of the century. And yet there is not a word from Madan by way of explanation or comment in this regard, especially when there is nothing fundamentalist in requesting for a constitutional issue to be referred for decision of the Supreme Court of India.

We shall not go into details of the Akali struggle which was started to pursue the settlement of the four major issues, mentioned above, except briefly to indicate the facts and history of the crucial Punjab water and hydel problem, and how it has been handled in order to prejudice the economic and political interests of Punjab.

(i) Water and Hydel Power Problem : In 1947, the old Punjab had 170 MAF of waters in its rivers. After Partition, the Indian Punjab was left with a little over 32 MAF in Ravi, Beas and Satluj, and about 5.6 MAF as its share in the Jamuna waters. The Punjab immigrants from Pakistan had left behind 22 lakh acres of perennially irrigated lands. Since their settlement was unjustly confined to the East Punjab only, cuts to the extent of 95% on their land holdings were enforced. Against 22 lac acres, they were allotted only 4 lakh acres of perennially irrigated land left by Muslim migrants. The rest of the area allotted to them was barani or unirrigated. Over time, the Punjabis could have been compensated, if allowed the benefit of canal irrigation by harnessing Punjab rivers and irrigating their barani lands. But just the contrary was done.

In 1947, out of the over 10 MAF, 9 MAF of water were being actually utilised in the present Punjab, and 1 MAF in the Ganga Nagar area. Only about 22 MAF were left to the share of East Punjab, part of which was actually being used in Pakistan areas. Since then Pakistan has constructed displacement works, so as to irrigate these area from their own rivers.

As is the dictum of Machiavelli, in Punjab, except for very short periods, there has either been a Congress Ministry or a Congress sponsored Government, that got its directions from Delhi, or the President's Rule. A non-Congress government, even when elected, was readily undone, followed by President's rule. Accordingly, Central decisions regarding the Punjab water and hydel power, have continuously been to the detriment of Punjab, involving the allotment of over 75% of the available 22 MAF of Punjab waters to the non-riparian areas of Rajasthan. Haryana and Delhi.

In 1955 out of the 22 MAF, unilaterally the Central Minister of Irrigation allotted 8 MAF of Punjab waters to the non-riparian and desert areas of Rajasthan. This was done against the clear advice of the Experts of the World Bank. Alloys A. Michael in his book *Indus River A study the Effects of Partition*, concludes as under :

"Viewed realistically the Rajasthan Project in its ultimate form is a dubious one.... The ideal of extending the Rajasthan Canal parallel to the Indo-Pakistan border in

the northern portion of the Thar Desert down to a point about opposite the Sukkur Barrage was a seductive one : 7.9 million acres could be brought under command and 6.7 million of these are potentially cultivable although the project in its present form is limited to supplying water to only 4.5 million acres of which only 3.5 million would be cultivated in a given year. Even then, these lands will receive only 1 cusec (F.N.II) of water for each 250 to 300 acres, an intensity lower than what has prevailed in the Punjab since the British times (1 cusec for 200 acres) and less than one third of what prevails in the US..... Assured by her geographical position and later by the treaty of the full use of the Eastern Rivers, India naturally sought an area to irrigate. Forgotten or overlooked were the fundamental differences between the Punjab, with its convergent streams, tapering doabs and silty soil, and the Thar Desert, hundreds of miles from the Sutlej with its sand and sand dunes. The cumulative irrigation experience in India, Egypt, the US, and the Soviet Union indicates that more food and fibre can be obtained by increasing the water allowance to existing cultivated lands than by spreading water thin over new tracts..... But to introduce it into the Thar Desert is economically unjustifiable. The 8.8 MAF of Beas-Sutlej-Ravi water that are to be diverted from Harike for the Rajasthan canal could be put to much better use in the East Punjab, north and the south of the Sutlej and in eastern margins of Rajasthan served by the Bikaner Canal and Sirhind Feeder. Combined with concentrated application of the limited fertilizers at India's disposal, yields in the established areas could be doubled or trebled at a saving in cost and pain in Rajasthan. The very experience with the Bhakra project itself, which increased water supplies to 3.3 million acres south of the Sutlej demonstrates this, yet even here, out of every 182 run into a canal, 112 are lost by seepage, evaporation and non beneficial transpiration of plants. On the Rajasthan canal, although the lining will reduce seepage in the main canal, to a minimum, evaporation alone might reduce supplies by 50%. And seepage losses in the unlined branch canals, distributaries, minors, sub-minors, water courses, and on the bunded fields themselves will further reduce the share of water that can be used beneficially by plants of economic value.... "

The US Bureau of Reclamation and the author of the "The Indus River" severely criticized India "for undertaking a costly project to irrigate the lands which like all desert lands are highly porous and deficient in organic matter without first carrying out the basic soil surveys and the studies on the land classification. Evidently, the allotment to non-riparian Rajasthan, was considered unproductive and wasteful; and, yet, the Central Government continued with the Project, even though it had been emphasized that use of that water in Punjab would be much more productive and at a far less cost. The Bhakra Project was constructed under which only 11 lakh acres were to be irrigated in Punjab, and the remaining 25 lakh acres were to be irrigated in non-riparian Rajasthan and Haryana. That was the distribution of the waters of Satluj. In 1976, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi gave an award allotting 3.5 MAF each to Haryana and Punjab, 0.2 MAF to Delhi and remaining water was left for Rajasthan.

After the Emergency, an Akali Government was elected in Punjab, it Filed a case in the Supreme Court questioning the vires of Sections 78 to 80 of the Punjab Reorganisation Act, giving control of Punjab waters to the Centre.

Punjab's case throughout has been that, since under item 17 of the State List, irrigation and hydel power are state subjects, and under Articles 162 and 246, the State has the exclusive executive and legislative powers regarding these two subjects, the

Centre could not constitutionally take control or make an enactment in that regard. Hence the invalidity of the Reorganisation Act and all the Central decisions about Punjab rivers. But, in 1980, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi returned to power. She dismissed the Punjab Ministry, got signed an out-of-court agreement among the Congress Chief Minister of Punjab, Rajasthan and Haryana, and the case filed in the Supreme court, withdrawn. The agreement virtually endorsed the award of the Prime Minister given earlier.

There are two other related events, which also suggest that the Centre was very vigilant that the constitutional issue about Rajasthan and Haryana being non-riparian, and the Reorganisation Act being ultra vires, of the Constitution, should never be raised before the Supreme Court. One was the immediate shifting of Chief Justice, S.S. Sandhanwalia, of Punjab and Haryana High Court, as soon as the Chief Justice had constituted a full Bench for hearing the water issue and as a result the transfer to Delhi of private petitions that had questioned the vires of the Punjab Reorganisation Act, thereby virtually frustrating another attempt to obtain a Judicial decision. The second was an extra-judicial agreement of 1984 about hydel power, made by the Punjab Governor with Congress Chief Ministers of Haryana and Rajasthan, eliminating the possibility of the issue concerning hydel power and the vires of the Reorganisation Act being raised in the Supreme Court.

All this suggests that the Centre was conscious and feared that the constitutional verdict of the Supreme Court regarding the Punjab waters, would be against it, and it was very vigilant to ensure that such an eventuality did not occur.

The Riparian Law, Constitutional Rights And Practices

Under the age old International Law and practice it is accepted that where a river lies wholly within the territory of one state, it entirely belongs to the state, and no other state has any rights therein. Thus, according to authorities like Berber, Heffer, Stark, Samisonian and others disputes relating to river waters can only be between riparian states and not between a riparian state and a non-riparian state. In short, river and river waters which flow on land are an essential part of land or territory of a state, which has absolute rights therein. For, territory constitutes an integral attribute of a state. Here it is necessary to indicate that the word state for the purpose of this right includes a state or a province within a country. This riparian principle stands embodied in the Indian Constitution and vide entry 17 of the list to 7th Schedule of the Constitution, Rivers, River Waters and Hydel power have exclusively been kept as state subjects. The entry reads ;

"17- Waters, that is to say, water supplies, irrigation and canals drainage and embankments, water storage and water power subject to the provisions of Entry 56 of List I."

Entry 56 of List I of the 7th Schedule reads;

"56 - Regulation and Development of Interstate rivers and river valleys to the extent to which such regulation and development under the control of the Union, is declared-by the Parliament to be expedient in the public interest."

Further, regarding a river the state has full and exclusive legislative and executive powers under Articles 246(3) and 162 of the Indian Constitution. Entry 56 and Article 262 mentioned above give authority to Parliament to legislate only in regard to interstate rivers and not in regard to water of a state river over which the concerned state alone has full, exclusive and final authority. A river valley is "a tract of land lying

between mountains and hills, generally traversed by a stream or a river or containing a lake usually narrower than vale and lying between steeper slopes." Valley also means "a land drained or watered by a great river." At the 1958 conference of the International Law Association a basin has been defined thus :

"A drainage basin is an area within the territories of two or more states in which all the streams of flowing surface water, both natural and artificial, drain a common water-shed terminating in a common outlet or common outlets to the sea or to a lake or to some inland place from which there is no apparent outlet to a sea.

As such, both under the definition of the basin and the valley, Rajasthan and Haryana lie

beyond the valleys or the basins of the three Punjab rivers, Satlej, Beas and Ravi. In fact, Haryana lies in the Ganga-Yamuna basin, and partly in the Ghagar basin which is clearly distinct from Satlej basin. For, no river or drain from Rajasthan or Haryana has a common ending with the Punjab Rivers. The fundamental principle and rationale underlying the Riparian Law is that since for centuries on end it is the inhabitants around a river or rivulet who suffer loss of land, property, cattle, and human life from the ravages and floods of a stream, they alone are entitled to the benefits or water rights of the concerned stream. Here it is relevant to state that in the 1988 floods, Punjab suffered a loss of scores of lives apart from the loss of property estimated officially at over one billion dollars. It is significant that neither Rajasthan, nor Haryana nor Delhi ever suffered a penny worth of loss from floods in the Punjab rivers.

Existing Judicial Decisions - National and International

(a) On the riparian principle there are clear judicial decisions including the one concerning the Narmada River which passes through the territory of Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Gujrat, but not through Rajasthan. As such, following was the judicial, decision on the petition of Rajasthan for a share of the Narmada Waters :

"(1) Rajasthan being a non-riparian state in regard to Narmada, cannot apply to the Tribunal, because under the Act only a co-riparian state can do so; and (ii) the state of Rajasthan is not entitled to any portion of the waters of Narmada basin on the ground that the state of Rajasthan is not a co-riparian state, or that no portion of its territory is situated in the basin of River Narmada."

On Rajasthan's plea that even though non-riparian, it should get Narmada Water, just as it is getting Punjab waters, though a non-riparian state, the judgement records as follows :

"Utilisation of Ravi and Beas : The apportionment of water was the result of an agreement. It appears from Rajasthan documents Volume VI at page 26 and 30 that Punjab was prepared to satisfy the needs of Rajasthan, provided its own needs as a riparian state were first satisfied."

"Tested in the light of these, we are not able to say that Rajasthan has fulfilled the burden of showing the requirement of opinion necessitatis. Nor is there evidence of a clear and continuous course of conduct with regard to the rights of Rajasthan, as non-riparian state in the rivers of Punjab or Uttar Pradesh."

"(12-A) 1951, When the question of utilisation of waters of Ravi and Beas was under examination, the Punjab Government again claimed a preference, vide their representation dated 16.11.1964, for the waters of these rivers on the ground of their being a riparian state. The superiority of the right of Punjab was not upheld by the

Government of India and in the meeting under the auspices of the Government of India, the water was apportioned..... Rajasthan was allotted 8 MAF out of a total available quantity of 15.85 MAF.

Two important facts are clear from the Narmada Judgement, namely, that Rajasthan

accepts that it is non-riparian vis-a-vis Ravi and Beas, and that the Centre has been allocating Punjab waters to Rajasthan, despite objections from the former and their knowledge of the verdict that non-riparian Rajasthan has no claim to Punjab waters.

(b) On the ground that those who suffer from a stream, are alone entitled to enjoy rights therein, the inhabitants of South California for over a hundred years did not allow water even to the lands and parks of the Federal Government situated in South California itself. It was only in February 1988 that the lower court agreed that the forest lands of the Government in South California should be allowed water, but this permission was made subject to the provision "that state water authorities retain the power to subordinate any new federal claims to the needs of the current water users in the state" It shows that the principle of reciprocity, that benefit should in equity go only to those who suffer, is so strong that even Federal Forest Lands and Parks in that very state remained deprived of the facility for over a century, and when it was allowed, the right was made clearly subject to the interests and needs of the private users. The decision was considered destabilising and unsatisfactory, and the affected private parties were going in an appeal to have it reversed. This shows how strong is the recognition and sanctity of the Riparian Law, and its equitable linkage between the sufferers and the beneficiaries.

We record here the view of former Chief Justice of India S.M. Sikri about the Indus Water treaty : "The fact that the Central Government paid to Pakistan a sum of L 62 millions in order to obtain unrestricted use of all waters of Eastern Rivers, the Sutlej, Ravi and Beas, is irrelevant to the question, namely, what if any, are the rights of Haryana in the Ravi and Beas. It is irrelevant because the effect of the Indus treaty, 1960, was that the sovereign right of erstwhile state of Punjab to control or regulate the use of waters of Ravi and Beas which was a limited right in 1966 in view of the existence of the international servitude (Page 51 of Law of Succession by Counsel) ceased to be limited in 1970. It was the reorganised State of Punjab which had either retained the Sovereign right under the Act or acquired it under the Act."

The physical map of Punjab makes it plain that no stream from Haryana or Rajasthan area either falls into Punjab rivers or flows to the sea at Karachi. Madan has also conveniently omitted the fact recorded in the recent Cambridge history that Prime Minister Desai cryptically rejected the demand of the Chief Minister Rajasthan for Punjab waters by asking him to have a look at the map.

(ii) Water Needs of Punjab: According to experts, the recommended paddy-wheat rotation needs a minimum of 5 acre feet of water per acre. This means a total water requirement of 52.5 MAF for the acres of cultivable area in Punjab. Thus, Punjab can hardly give 3 acre feet of water to its land, even if the entire waters of the three rivers are utilized in the State. With the allotment of about 15 MAF made by the Centre to Punjab, the present position is that canals can irrigate only about 38 lakh acres in the State. Since most of the available Punjab waters have been diverted to non-riparian states, the migrant Punjabis and others have perforce resorted to Tubewell irrigation to make their Barani areas cultivable. At present, the farmers have spent over Rs. 1,200 crores to sink about

8.5 lakh shallow tubewells to irrigate 55 lakh acres of Barani land. Another unfortunate fact is that tubewell irrigation is about 5 to 15 times more expensive than canal irrigation. Besides, the maintaining cost is extremely heavy, since each year the pumping sets have to be lowered because of the receding water table.

On the other hand, the final allotment by the Eradi Tribunal is :

Punjab	: 5 MAF.
Haryana	: 3.83 MAF.
Rajasthan	: 8.6 MAF.
Jammu & Kashmir	: 0.65 MAF
Delhi	: 0.2 MAF

The broad ratio of allotment is the same as that in the Indira Gandhi award of 1976. Among allottees except Punjab, and Jammu and Kashmir, the remaining areas are non-riparian.

In addition, Haryana stands allotted 5.6 MAF of entire Jamuna waters of old Punjab on grounds of its being in the Ganga-Jamuna basin, a principle the application of which has been consistently denied to Punjab despite persistent requests of the State that the issue should be adjudicated upon by the Constitutional Bench of the Supreme Court of India.

(iii) Supreme Court V/s Tribunal : As stated already, Punjab's demand has always been to refer the constitutional issue to the Supreme Court, and not to a Tribunal. For, the real issue was the constitutionality of the Punjab Reorganisation Act, which matter Supreme Court alone could adjudicate upon, and which the Tribunal could not decide, because its jurisdiction related only to cases of inter-state rivers, which Punjab rivers are not. Thus, a Tribunal was not competent to pronounce a judgement about the vires of the Punjab Reorganisation Act or about the waters of a state river. But the Centre consistently sidetracked this constitutional demand, and ultimately after the Bluestar and Woodrose attacks, succeeded in entering into the Rajiv-Longowal Accord involving reference of the water issue to a Tribunal and not to the Supreme Court. The irony of the fact is that the Dharam Yudh Morcha which was started with the prime objective that the SYL Canal, a post-reorganisation scheme, should not be constructed, ended with the Accord under which the Centre was able to secure both its aims, first of having the acceptance of the SYL Canal and that it would be completed within ten months of the accord, and, second, of the water issue not being referred to the Supreme Court, and instead, being placed before a Government Tribunal, even though the Punjab rivers were not inter state, and Section 2 of the Inter-state Water Dispute Act gave jurisdiction to the tribunal only regarding inter-state rivers. But Madan who is anxious to call the Sikhs Fundamentalists for making the demands, remains completely silent about these significant matters, demands, and the issues involved in the so-called Rajiv-Longowal Accord, which evidently was a complete victory for the Centre, and a surrender for the Akalis.

(iv) Dismal Future of Tubewell Irrigation: According to Government estimates, each shallow tubewell irrigates, on an average, about 8 acres of land. As those tubewells also supplement canals for assured irrigation, and assuming that they give only 4 acre feet of water for the paddy wheat rotation, the total draw of water by the 8.5 lakh tubewells comes to over 27 MAF per annum. According to the Punjab Government White Paper, the available ground water each year is only 3 MAF. This means that the annual

overdraw is 24 MAF of ground water. Another system of calculation, accepted by the World Bank, relates to the year 1986-87. According to it, the water actually consumed by the crops matured in that year, came to 37.7 MAF. Excluding the allotment of 15 MAF of canal water and 3 MAF of subsoil water, the yearly overdraw of ground water comes to 19.7 MAF, involving a rapid fall of the water table from 30 to 90 feet during the preceding decades. In many community Blocks the water table has already reached the danger line. Accordingly, the Government has declared majority of the Community Blocks in the State to be incapable of tubewell irrigation. Out of the total 118 Blocks in the State, only 12 are grey, which means that tubewell irrigation is possible only in them. The expert warning is that within the current decade most of the existing tubewells will become non-functional, rendering about 40 lakh acres of present tubewell-irrigated areas barren. An expert concludes, "How long can this state of affairs last ? We must take steps to correct the situation, lest our grand children inherit a land returned to semi-desert condition." Similarly, Dr. W.C. Lowdermilk, in his report to the Economic and Social Development Council of the United Nations, writes, "The present water supplies, both in developed as well as undeveloped areas, are either already insufficient, or will prove to be so, in the foreseeable future, which will mean a severe setback to economic development. The rate of increase in water requirement is greater than increase in population.""

Further, it has been calculated that as soon as the order of the Tribunal is implemented, the existing canal irrigated area will also fall by about 10 lakh acres.

In short, seen in the light of the Machiavelli's dictum of despoliation, the position of the Punjab under present Central decisions becomes quite obvious. The migrants left about 22 lakh acres of perennially irrigated lands in Pakistan, and got only 4 lakh acres of such area in India, with the rest of allotments being of unirrigated lands. The Government, instead of allowing the available 22 MAF of water for canal irrigation on Punjab lands, has diverted, in violation of the Constitution and expert advice, about 75% of it to non-riparian states, leaving Punjab peasants perforce to resort to extremely expensive tubewell irrigation. And, as the reality of the ground water position is, over 40 lakh acres of that land would again become unirrigated within this decade, because of the inevitable fall of the ground water table. Further, whereas Punjab will continue to suffer from year to year a flood loss of life and property worth thousands of crores, the principal beneficiaries of the Punjab river waters and hydel power would be the non-riparian states to the tune of billions of Dollars each year.

Unfortunately, Madan remains quite unconcerned about these relevant and crucial facts of the Punjab Problem. The reader can make his own guess as to why he has been silent about them.

(C) The Agitational Aspect of the Punjab Problem :

We have stated that the talk about religious fundamentalism, or law and order, has been irrelevant, and a camouflage to sidetrack the reality of the socio-economic issues for justice in regard to which the Sikhs had been vocal. For, keeping in view the assurance given before 1947, they found a complete reversal in the Congress stand after Independence, as evidenced by (1) the denial of a federal constitution, as unanimously demanded by the Punjab legislators in 1949, and (2) creation in 1966 of a dwarfed substate, which was deprived of even the power of using and developing its own natural

wealth of water and hydel power, a power which every other state in India enjoyed under the Constitution, etc.

The above being the socio-economic position, it was natural for the Punjab to demand constitutional solutions, and that the settled territorial demarcation should not be disturbed. No one could assert that these demands were not constitutional and legitimate, or that there was anything unreasonable, fundamentalist or separatist about them. Yet, it is a fact of Punjab history that none of those demands have been met or placed before the Supreme Court, nor has the settled demarcation been allowed to remain intact. There could be no Punjab problem, if the constitutional path had been followed by the Centre.

Accordingly one wonders what could be the course open to Punjab, except to take to the path of negotiation and peaceful agitation from 1966 onwards. It is well known that the Dharma Yudh morcha of 1982 was started by the Akalis only when the Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, on the one hand, invited the Akalis to have a talk with her, and on the other hand, before the date of the meeting, got the water agreement concluded among the three Congress Chief Ministers in December 1981, and got the waters case, filed by the Akali Ministry, withdrawn from the Supreme Court. She decided to inaugurate the digging of the disputed SYL Canal, and virtually banged the door of negotiation against the Akalis, leaving them hardly any option but to start the peaceful agitation.

Next is the question of law and order and introduction by the Congress of Bhindranwale in the Punjab politics. Madan concedes this fact. The evident object was to create a schism among the Akalis and break the unanimity of their demand and agitation. At places, Madan, it appears, has resorted to making wrong statements. For example, he states that the group that went to the meeting of the Nirankaris in 1978, was led by Bhindranwala. It is a known fact that he was criticised for not doing so and remaining aloof. Bhindranwala continued to support the Congress and its political candidates, even while he opposed the Nirankaris for their attack on Sikhism. It is also incorrect that Nirankaris have made any additions to Guru Granth; infact, the Nirankaris, on their own admission, are not a Sikh sect, nor do they believe in the Sikh principles or the Guruship of Guru Granth Sahib.

It is that whereas the Congress cannot deny its responsibility for introducing Bhindranwala in Akali politics, the Akalis led by Longowal, continued to be nonviolent throughout in their agitation. Now, a few words about Bhindranwala. There are some incontrovertible facts about him. First, that he never raised any issue other than the four demands and matters that had been initially and principally raised by the Akalis. The second, that the reason for his popularity among the masses was that it appeared to them that Bhindranwala would not let them down regarding their demands concerning river waters, hydel power and recruitment to the Defence services, which for them were crucial for their very living and future, and which, they felt somehow, the other Akali leaders could, out of political expediency, barter away. As the Longowal Accord later showed, this actually happened, after the death of Bhindranwala.

Here three other facts have also to be borne in mind. Madan states that Bhindranwala was a violent character and had been charged twice for murder. He was arrested only once and that after the murders both of the Nirankari Baba and Shri Jagat Narain. After detailed investigations and interrogations, he was declared innocent and the Home Minister made a statement in the Parliament to this effect" This makes it plain that

whatever Madan and the media might say, the Government had nothing against him to rearrest him, or declare him wanted till June 1984. The Akalis repeatedly wanted the names of the so-called militants who had allegedly taken shelter in the Golden Temple. Bhindranwala's name never appeared in any list, nor did the SGPC fail to surrender any wanted person who was known to be in the Temple Complex. And the crucial fact is that no less a person than Rajiv Gandhi stated that Bhindranwala was only a religious leader and not a political person, meaning thereby a virtual clean chit for him. The Administration having the best knowledge of militancy or murders, what is the value or veracity of Madan's statement that Bhindranwala was heading a militant movement and had himself been 'charged twice with complicity in political murders'.

Now, let us examine if Bhindranwala was really such a dangerous character as is made out by Madan. For, it is extremely important fact that in May, 1984 Shri Kuldip Nayyar, the Ex High Commissioner of India to U.K., and Dr. Ravi, at the specific instance of the Centre, approached Bhindranwala for the settlement of the Punjab problem, Both of them have made clear public statements that Bhindranwala was without any hint of separatism, willing for what they considered to be a reasonable compromise, within the ambit of the Indian constitutional structure. In fact, Dr. Ravi's statement says that he was as solicitous and considerate for the interests of India as of the Sikhs.

Dr. Ravi stated that Bhindranwala being convinced of his sincerity told him that whatever settlement he thought to be reasonable would be acceptable to him. He clarified that the settlement should be in the interests both of the Sikhs and the Bharat. He conveyed the substance of his talk to the Centre but there was no response. Similar has been the statement of Kuldip Nayyar who was specifically sent to negotiate and bring about a compromise. As a result, he proposed an acceptable formula and conveyed it to the Prime Minister. He reminded the Home Minister about it on the 24th May, 1984, but there was no Government response even though the initiative for talks had originally been made by a Central Minister.

These statements show that Bhindranwala was a reasonable person far from the being a dangerous militant, a separatist, or a law and order problem. It is, therefore, evident that neither for a solution of the major demands of the Sikhs, which were primarily constitutional, nor for the resolution of the struggle of the Akalis, called the Dharam Yudh morcha there was any necessity or justification of the attack on the Golden Temple on the Gurburb day.

A relevant issue is the presence of arms in the Golden Temple. The important question is how, despite the continuous vigilance of the Administration, these arms could be carried there, and who was responsible for the omission or commission in this regard. The two faces of the (government of India in relation to the LTTE insurgency, are now well-known. Similarly, its dual role regarding violence in Punjab, though alleged, has yet to be revealed. Although many suggestion including that of official complicity have been made, yet no final answer to this question can be given, until the relevant records of the Administration for the decade before 1984, are available to the historian. It is also an important question as to whether the Administration ever envisaged that the step the Government took in deciding upon the army action, could, in the circumstances or history of the case involve a risk to the person or persons of the authorities in Delhi. On the basis of known facts, the general opinion, without passing any judgement as to whether the army attack should have been made, has been that the results it has led to

have, without solving any problems of the Punjab, of law and order, or separatism, been seriously damaging to the country.

The statement that General Shahbeg Singh was dismissed for corruption, is not correct. Actually, General Shahbeg Singh was removed under a special clause in the Army Act, which had never been used earlier. It was invoked in his case only a day before retirement. Under this clause he was not entitled to even a trial. But Shahbeg Singh approached the Court, and he was cleared of the supposed charges against him. Thereafter he sought his reinstatement, and even approached the Government for it, without success.

Whatever be the facts leading to the army action, one thing is singularly unexplained, as to why the day chosen for it was the Martyrdom Day of Guru Arjun, the Founder of the Golden Temple, when normally thousands of pilgrims had to be present. This sadistic choice of time cannot be explained on any rational or administrative grounds, except that the object of the attack could perhaps be to teach the Sikhs a lesson and to break their spirit of resistance. No serious scholar can fail to notice the implications of the choice made.

An equally important fact is the role of the ruling party in allegedly organising the massacre of over ten thousand Sikhs all over India, after the assassination of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. Highly responsible personalities, including the former Chief Justice of India, have issued cogent and credible reports, accusing Congressmen of organising the killings, and the Administration of negligence or participation in the continued commission of large-scale crimes for about three days in the capital. Here it is relevant to state that to treat the minorities as hostages and to retaliate against them, so as to pressurise the majority elsewhere, has been a known policy of some senior Congress leaders. The relevant issue is not so much as to why the perpetrators of the crimes have not been punished so far, but why those took place at all. For, that by itself could explain subsequent reluctance or failure to punish anyone so far. It is well known that following the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi, no Maharastrian was touched, nor was a Tamilian destroyed in Delhi or elsewhere, after Rajiv Gandhi's assassination. A biased scholar may decide to omit these realities of Indian life, but these facts cannot fail to register on a perceptive or Sikh mind.

In conclusion, we find that there has been a continuous silence and omission on the part of the learned author, both about the salient facts of the Punjab Problem, which the Central Government seemed reluctant to solve, and the more important fact as to why, despite all administrative, military and other measures, the issues that arose in 1966, remain unsolved and the situation has become more tangled.

Results of the Sikh World-View :

The burden of Madan's paper is that Sikhism is a split ideology, one of the first Gurus, quite akin to Hinduism, and the second of Fundamentalism, as introduced by the Sixth and the Tenth Master, involving even political objectives. We have stated in the first section of this article that Sikhism is a harmonious and rational whole-life ideology, just as are Judaism and Islam. However, there is a difference as well. Pacifism and withdrawal appeared in the former in the sixth century B.C., and in the latter as Sufism. These have been significantly avoided in Sikhism, because of the doctrines as prescribed in Guru Granth and as lived by the Gurus. Struggle for justice, including that in the socio-political Field has been a religious objective with the Gurus and in the Sikh faith. While

Madan's ignorance about the Sikh ideology and Guru Granth is evident, it is not understood why instead of attributing Fundamentalism to the Tenth Master he does not mention its roots in the Torah, the Bible and the Qoran, because both Judaism and Islam sanction the use of force for political objectives.

So far as Sikhs are concerned, it is because of their religious ideology that they not only suffered extreme persecution in the eighteenth century, but also achieved some unparalleled objectives, first, of stopping, once for all, a thousand year wave of invasion that the Indian socio-political life had been unable to challenge, much less repel. Of this, Gupta, the doyen of Punjab history writes; "We now close the narrative of the Sikhs, who placed themselves at the head of the nation; who showed themselves as the interpreters of the rights of the people; who maintained the struggle between good and evil, between sovereign will of the people and the divine right of kings, and the opposition of liberty to despotism; who avenged the insults, the outrages and the slavery of many generations past; who delivered their mother country from the yoke of the foreign oppressor; who displayed all that was great and noble; who left to the children of this province a heritage unsullied by the presence of any foreign soldier; who won for the Punjab the envied title of 'the land of soldiers'; who alone can boast of having erected a 'bulwark of defence against foreign aggression', the tide of which had run its prosperous course for the preceding eight hundred years; and to whom all other people of Northern India in general, and of the Punjab in particular, owe a deep debt of gratitude."

The second achievement of the Sikh Religious Revolution, has been the raising of the level of the lowest classes and enabling them to stand level with the highest classes in all fields of life." It is the dichotomy in other Indian religions, that has enabled the inequitable system of caste and pollution to survive in Indian society for thousands of years without any serious socio-political or organised protest. The sanction is so strong, that even in modern India, the statue of a Brahmin Chief Minister, unveiled by the Deputy Prime Minister of India, Shri Jagjivan Ram from a Scheduled caste, had to be purified with holy water from the Ganges, because it was considered to have been defiled by the touch of one belonging to a Scheduled caste. For like ideological reasons Indira Gandhi was not allowed entry in a sacred temple in the South.

Madan has attributed fundamentalism to Guru Gobind Singh and also to Banda Bahadur. But, is it not remarkable that, while theologian Niebuhr has, after the Christian experience of two millenia, suggested only now the giving of political power to the down-trodden classes, Banda Bahadur accomplished it two hundred years earlier, by elevating the lowest strata of Indian Society, so that they could stand up with dignity and strength against the upper castes and the elite ? For the first time in history, as Qazi Nur Mohammad wrote, Kalals, Mazhbis, Ramdasias, Ramgarhias and Jats became feared soldiers and leaders whom the ruling elites, both Muslims and Hindus, faced with respect. It is the same whole-life system that made significant achievements in the time of Ranjit Singh, who not only once for all stopped the wave of invasions and tyranny in the North of India, but also gave peace and equality of treatment to all communities. It is significant that it was because of the Sikh ethos, that despite the persecution of Sikhs at the hands of the earlier Moghal Empire, there was never any expression of bitterness against the Muslims or any attempt to convert persons of other communities to Sikhism. Although it was a part of the Sikh tradition, his armies had soldiers from all religions and castes,

which in the Hindu systems were considered pariahs. He never punished anyone with death sentence, not even those who had made murderous attempts on his life.

In the same century Shivaji and Mahrattas made a strict revival of Hindu ideology including the Caste system. As is the Hindu tradition, he kept Brahmin Peshwas as his Ministers. A Hindu King in his administration has to see that all social and civil rights and practices, are strictly in accord with the Caste rules." Accordingly, the appearance of the Scheduled castes like Mahars and Mangs on the streets of Pune, was banned before 9 A.M. and after 3 P.M., because their long shadows defiled the higher castes, especially Brahmins." Shivaji's circular letter enjoined on all members of the society not to make any innovations in Caste practices, but to follow the traditional path prescribed by the Shastras.

Another significant achievement of the Sikh Revolution is reflected in the sacrifices the Sikh community made in the struggle for Indian freedom. Among the 121 hanged, 2646 imprisoned for life, and 1300 killed at the Jallianwala Bagh, 93, 2147 and 799, respectively, were Sikhs. Further, in modern India, a major encroachment on Indian freedom, was made by enforcement of Emergency in 1975 by Indira Gandhi. Whereas no organised protest was made by any section of the Indian community anywhere in India, it was the Sikhs who conducted a morcha (an agitation) from the precincts of the Golden Temple, involving imprisonment of over 40,000 volunteers. This is what Vijayalakshmi Pandit, Jawahar Lal's sister and former Indian Ambassador to U.S.A., stated:

"Punjab which had always been in the forefront of resistance to oppression kept its colour flying during the EMERGENCY also. It was in Punjab and Punjab alone, that a large scale resistance was organised against it. The worst thing that happened during the emergency was that a brave nation was frightened into submission, and no body spoke, except in hushed tones. In Dehra Dun, where I was, I hung my head in shame, and wondered if this was the Bharat for-which we, the freedom fighteres, had suffered. Even those, not actually in prison, were no less in jail. Only in Punjab the Akalis organised a morcha against this. Punjab's lead in such matters should continue."

All this is to emphasize that making sacrifices for the love of freedom or confrontation with injustice in the socio-political field, is a fundamental objective in the Sikh ideology, and for that matter, in any whole-life religion. It would, thus, be a misstatement to call it Fundamentalism. The struggle of the Sikhs for their own rights since 1947 or during the Emergency for the suppression of human rights in the country as a whole, has, thus, been a part of their sanctioned ideology, which is far from being in any sense fundamentalist or anachronist.

### III. INDIAN SECULARISM

Indian Secularism has nothing to do with what is known as Secularism in the West. Let us see the realities and its history. The Indian problem is the problem of the Hindu society. The undisputed scriptures of the Hindus, the Vedas and the Upanishads, give sanction to the Caste ideology. The great Bhagwad Gita, which embodies the philosophy and guide of most Hindus, clearly sanctions castes (varnas) as the creation of the Lord, and prescribes rigid immobility of caste divisions. The religious goal in Hinduism is personal moksha. The Hindu system, except for the Caste norms and duties, prescribes no social duties or general morality. Maitra, as stated already, finds that all Hindu ethics is super-moral. The distinguished framer of the Indian Constitution,

Ambedkar, has made a detailed and close study of the Hindu Scriptures and Shastras. He concludes, first, that among Hindus there is want of both 'public conscience' and 'social conscience'. Its caste rules are supreme, and human loyalties and affinities do not go beyond the sphere of one's family or caste." His second conclusion is, like indications by Weber, that in view of its Scriptures and Shastras, Hinduism cannot be reformed from within," because all proposals of social reforms are found to run counter to Shastric or sanctioned Caste injunctions.

It is in this context that we have to understand the system of Guru Nanak who created a new ideology, guided by a new Scripture, a new ethos and a new culture, which are essentially different from the earlier dichotomous or caste cultures. Acceptance of social responsibilities in all fields, including the socio-political field, is an essential doctrine of Sikhism. Madan makes quite a mistake by saying that Guru Nanak was against the use of a scripture, and only suggested being in tune with the mystic Shabad(word). Guru Nanak emphatically states. "O Lalo, I am saying what the Lord commands me to ". This point has been repeated by him and the other Gurus. In fact, it has been stressed that the real message is conveyed in the Bani which is the Guru, the embodiment of all Amrit. Since the times of Guru Nanak the Sikh society has been following the ethical and cultural pattern prescribed by the Gurus, and lived by them for over two hundred years.

Now let us see what have been the corresponding developments in the Hindu society. After the Islamic invasions, the first important revival was in Maharashtra. We have noted separately that this involved a clear application of the Brahminical ideology in all its aspects. But after the British invasions and the impact of Western culture in the nineteenth century, Raja Rammohan Roy was one of the first to realise that some of the reforms in Hindu Society, which might be necessary in view of the modern concepts, were in conflict with the Hindu tradition. For example, the abolition of Sati, could not find sanction in the Hindu Shastras. Similarly, if the inequities of the caste ideology had to be removed, one could not find sanction for that in the Scriptures. Perhaps, this was his compulsion that in order to incorporate some of the norms of modern culture, he started his system of Brahma Samaj, wherein the member was free to accept ethical principles, even though not in consonance with the Hindu doctrines.

But a major change in direction took place, when Mahatma Gandhi assumed the undisputed leadership of the Congress, and introduced Hindu religious concepts in politics. His justification that he was cooperating with the leaders of the Khilafat Movement because it would help him in the protection of the cow, which was his religion, his insistence on the religious doctrine of ahimsa as a national policy, his raising of the imagery of Ram Rajya as a socio-political ideal, his reluctance to have food in non-Hindu houses," and his clear anxiety to maintain the overall caste framework of the Hindu society, emphasized that hence forward, that society had to look back to its past, scriptures and Shastras. In protest, Mrs. Besant left the Presidentship of the Home Rule League, because it became 'intertwined with religion' Instead Gandhi became its president, Jinnah who had been the President of the Bombay Home Rule League, raised a constitutional objection in a meeting presided over by Gandhi, who overruled his objection. In protest, Jinnah and nineteen others, including Munshi, a noted Congress leader, left the League. Munshi later recorded : "When Gandhiji forced Jinnah and his followers out of the Home Rule League and later the Congress, we all felt with Jinnah

that a movement of unconstitutional nature sponsored by Gandhi..... would inevitably result in wide-spread violence.... To generate coercive power in the masses would only provoke mass conflict between the two communities, as in fact it did. With his keen sense of realities, Jinnah firmly set his face against any dialogue with Gandhiji on this point." "Jinnah, however, warned Gandhiji not to encourage fanaticism of Muslim religious leaders and their followers..... Sri Nivasa Sastri wrote to Sri P.S.S. Aiyar... I fear Khilafat Movement is going to lead us into disaster." Gandhi replied, "I claim that with us both the Khilafat is the central fact, with Maulana Mohammad All, because it is his religion, with me because..... I ensure the safety of the cow, that is my religion, from the Musalman's knife." Gandhi also admitted that Jinnah had told him that he (Gandhi) had ruined politics in India by dragging up a lot of unwholesome elements in Indian life and giving them political importance, that it was a crime to mix up politics and religion the way he had done." In retrospect, Seervai, the most distinguished Constitutional lawyer of India, writes, "The introduction of religion into politics to secure power over the masses in order to arouse their political consciousness, is intelligible; but there was a price to pay, and it was paid in full by the Partition of India."

Here a point needs clarification. Jinnah had objected to the mixing of religion and politics the way Gandhi had done. The real fact was that Gandhi had introduced Hindu ideas in Congress politics. He made the Hindus look back and accept the dichotomous Hindu ideology, which in the empirical field, was quite amoral, if not immoral; because Ram Rajya meant acceptance of the inequities of the sanctioned Caste ideology. For, Lord Rama had removed the head of a Sudra for violating Caste rules." Thus, as in the case of Mahratta Rule, this ideal involved the revival of Hinduism. And it is this looking back only to the Hindu past and the subsequent decisions of Gandhi and the Congress that, as we shall see, increasingly disillusioned the minorities.

Religion's chief role in life is to support and sustain a universal moral tone of society. For Ellwood, the function of religion is "To act as an agency of social control, that is, of the group controlling the life of the individual, or what is believed to be the good of the larger life of the group." "Religion projects the essential values of human personality and of human society into the universe as a whole." But the caste ideology has been incapable of giving any universal or even social values. After discussing the subject, Ambedkar asks the questions, "Does it tell the Hindus to be righteous to the untouchables ? Does it preach to the Hindus to be just and human to them ? ... No Hindu can dare to give an affirmative answer to any of these questions. On the contrary, the wrongs to which the untouchables are subjected by the Hindus, or acts which are sanctioned by the Hindu religion, they are done in the name of Hinduism and are justified in the name of Hinduism... How can the Hindus ask the untouchable to accept Hinduism and stay in Hinduism ? Why should the untouchables adhere to Hinduism which is solely responsible for their degradation ?

The new trend introduced by Mahatma Gandhi, resulted not only in a setback to the Congress ideology, which purported to be national in its outlook, but also made the Muslims and other minorities alienated from the Congress because of their loss of faith, following a wide gap between its professions and its parochial decisions.

The first major disillusionment was Mahatma Gandhi's fast against His Majesty's decision to give reservations to the Untouchables. Ambedkar has clearly stated that in

view of the religious injunctions, the Untouchables have no hope of the redemption of their lot within the Hindu society. He had, therefore, pleaded for reservations at the Round Table Conference. The surprising thing is that Mahatma Gandhi had told him that he would not oppose his proposals." But, at the Conference Gandhi opposed it tooth and nail. All his pleadings at the Conference according to him, were not for Swaraj, but for not giving any reservation to the Untouchables. He records, "Now here is a definite word given by Mr. Gandhi in open conference, namely, that if all others agreed to recognize the claim of untouchables, he would not object, and after having given this word, Mr. Gandhi went about asking the Musalmans not to recognize the claims of the Untouchables, and to bribe them and take back their plighted word. Is this good faith or is this treachery? If this is not treachery, I wonder what else could be called treachery.

Gandhi threatened to go on fast, if the Government gave reservations to the Untouchables; and as the Government decided to sanction reservations for the Untouchables, he went on fast unto death." Presumably, Ambedkar fearing retaliation against the scattered untouchables in the villages, gave up his stand, and the order of reservations was withdrawn.

Niebuhr has clearly stated that Christian love should not only involve the show of social concern for the lower classes, but also essentially involve giving them political power, so that lower classes could themselves look after their interests. In the above case what happened was exactly contrary to the view of the Christian theologian. Under threat of Gandhi's fast political reservations for Untouchables were withdrawn, and they were made to remain subject to the religious sanctions of the Caste ideology and upper castes.

About the help to the Untouchables for their temple entry, Mahatma Gandhi said, "How is it possible that the Antyajias (Untouchables) should have the right to enter all the existing temples? As long as the laws of caste and ashram have the chief place in Hindu religion, to say that every Hindu can enter every temple, is a thing that is not possible" Guruvayur Temple satyagraha for temple entry was launched by a caste Hindu. Gandhi's advice was that Harijans might be allowed entry for a fixed time of the day, when the objectors might not visit the Temple, which could be suitably purified after the visit of the Harijans each day. He stated, "The Harijans' attitude should be this, If there is a person who objects to my presence. I would like to respect his objection, so long as he (the objector) does not deprive me of the right that belongs to me, and so long as I am permitted to have my legitimate share of the days of offering worship side by side with those who have no objection to my presence, I would be satisfied." Regarding temple entry. Sir C.P. Ramaswami Iyer clearly stated, "that the present system of temple worship and its details are based on divine ordinances. The problem can be presumably solved only by process of mutual adjustment." In short, while Mahatma Gandhi was willing to lay down his life, if untouchables were sanctioned political reservations as an independent section of society, he was not willing even to recommend for them temple entry as a matter of right, much less was he willing to keep a fast for them. Dr. Khare, Chief Minister had included an Untouchable in his cabinet, but this was objected to and he resigned. He records, "Mahatma ji took me to task for including a Harijan in my second Cabinet. I retorted by saying that it was a Congress programme of uplift of Harijans for which he fasted unto death, and that I did what I could in furtherance of that programme, when opportunity offered itself, and I think I have done nothing wrong in doing so. Thereupon Mahatma charged me of doing this for my selfish ambition. I

repudiated this charge that my selfish motive is disproved by my resignation." Ambedkar recalls, "That this is true and that Gandhi objected to the Untouchable being included in the Cabinet, is evidenced by the fact that when a new Congress Ministry was formed in the Central Provinces, this Untouchable, who functioned as a Minister for a day, was excluded.... That he was not, shows that Gandhi was opposed to his inclusion on principle."

Ambedkar concludes that Mahatma Gandhi's real consideration was for the maintenance of the caste structure, with Untouchables as a subservient section of it; but he was not for the amelioration of the conditions of the Untouchables in the Hindu Society, which because of its religious injunctions, could hardly take place. Hence Ambedkar's final decision to suggest to the Untouchables to change their religion. It is, however, relevant to state that since then within the Hindu society, the conditions of the Untouchables have not materially changed. Only recently in June 1992, according to reports in the Tribune dated the 18th June 1992, about 14 persons or more were murdered by the higher castes. The whole-sale attack and burning of the locality of the lower castes followed a dispute, because four boys of the lower caste sat on chairs instead of squatting on the ground in the local cinema at Kumher in district Bharatpur, Rajasthan. In fact, incidents of this kind including attacks and elimination of the lower castes of a village are not uncommon. Hence the Congress acceptance of the ideology of looking back to the Hindu past, has alienated the depressed castes and other classes. The strong reaction of the higher castes to the recommendations of the Mandal Commission is an evidence of the existing approach of the Hindu elite to maintain status quo in its social structure.

The second major incident relates to the formation of a Congress Ministry in U.P. in 1937. Before the elections the Congress obtained the cooperation of the Muslims on the understanding that their representatives would be included in the Cabinet, which would be a Coalition Ministry. But the Congress went back on its understanding, when it got a clear majority in the Legislature. Jinnah specifically approached Gandhi for his intervention to ask the Congress to include League representatives in the Ministry. Gandhi's reply was euphemistic rejection, saying, "I wish I could do something. But I am utterly helpless. My faith in the unity is bright as ever, only I see no daylight, but impenetrable darkness, and in such distress cry to God for light." Tendulkar writes that "the 'cry to God for light' was to remain unanswered." "You (Jinnah) ask me whether I have now seen the light. Much to my regret I have to say," 'No'." Both Seervai and Maulana Azad regard it as a wrong and narrow-minded decision of the Congress, which conveyed a clear message to the Muslim community. For, the Muslims became convinced that once the majority community was in power, it would disregard Muslim or minority interests or voice. Maulana Azad records, "The basis of Pakistan is the fear of interference by the Centre in Muslim majority areas as the Hindus will be in a majority in the Centre." The situation in India is such that all attempts to establish a centralised and unitarian government are bound to fail."

The third major step of alienation of the minorities, especially the Muslims, was the backing-out of the Congress, Jawaharlal and others, from the accepted interpretations of the Formula for a Federal India proposed by the Cabinet Mission. Seervai, while analysing the entire history of the Pre-independence days, concludes that the Partition of the country was entirely due to the communal trends in the Congress and its reluctance to share power with the minorities, or give an assurance to the Muslims about due reward

for their interests. It is well known that the day Jawaharlal gave a new interpretation of the Formula of the Mission, Jinnah rejected the Plan and stuck to his Pakistan proposal, since he became convinced that once in power, the Congress would not abide by its commitments.

The last one was the betrayal of the interests of the Frontier Province, Nationalist Muslims and other minorities, including Sikhs. They were all opposed to the division of India. Mahatma Gandhi had clearly stated that Partition would take place over his dead body. The Khudai Khidmatgars and Abdul Ghafar Khan were completely disillusioned, when they found Gandhi supporting the resolution for partition of the country. Frontier Gandhi stated that his enemies would laugh at him, and even his friends would say that so long as the Congress needed the Frontier, they supported the Khudai Khidmatgars; and later they came to terms with the League without even consulting the Frontier and its leader. Abdul Ghafar Khan repeatedly stated that the Frontier would regard it as an act of treachery, if the Congress threw the Khudai Khidmatgars to the wolves, namely, to the rule of the League. Later, when Ghafar Khan was asked his reaction to the Congress Resolution by A.C. Ball' of the Tribune, he replied, "Betrayed".

We have stated above the rationale behind the Sikh struggle since 1947, and the economic, social and political issues of discrimination involved. For decades on end before Independence, the Congress had been consistently proclaiming that the Indian language was Hindustani. Unfortunately, soon after 1947, the fundamental change in its secular stand was made by the Congress, when instead of Hindustani it declared Hindi as the Lingua Franca of the country. Whereas Hindustani symbolised a process of integration, Hindi clearly signified that hence forward the cultural and linguistic roots would be Hindu in character. All the minorities, especially the Muslims and the Sikhs, which, having distinct religious identities, got the message of volte face by the Congress. This naturally alarmed them. This fear, as we shall indicate, has continued to be accentuated, and the first shock to the Sikhs was the Home Minister Patel's statement in reply to Master Tara Singh's discussion mentioned earlier. Neither Andharites, nor Maharashtrians, nor Keralites were ever given such a reply that if they wanted linguistic states, they would have to quit other parts of India. Then there is the report of the States "Re-organisation Commission and the subsequent decisions of the Government that there would be no Punjabi Suba. Not only that. In 1956 it was seen that the only area where the Sikhs were in a majority, was merged in East Punjab to turn them into a minority and

eliminate the chances of their being in a majority in any state, howsoever small, where they could have a status equal to that of other states or regions. The greatest blow was dealt in 1966. It has been indicated how Indira Gandhi and the Home Minister Guizari Lal Nanda were unhappy, and made sure that the proposal for Punjabi Suba that was being recommended, became forever scuttled, and instead, a sub-state was created, without any semblance of autonomy in regard to even the most basic subjects of water and hydel power. That by the allotment of over 75% of river waters to non-riparian states, not only the agricultural, economic and industrial future of Punjab has been jeopardised, but its people also face the dismal future of almost half of its cultivable area becoming unirrigated, unculturable and unproductive. Instead of referring the issue to the Supreme Court for judicial adjudication, the evidently unconstitutional allotments have been made a fait accompli through a tribunal. Everyone is aware of the serious tussel between the

two riparian states, namely, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu, regarding their river rights; and yet never has a Congress Ministry of Punjab, or, for that matter, the Centre considered it necessary to object to this drain of water and power from Punjab to the non-riparian states. And when the Dharam Yudh morcha was started, the Centre found it necessary to make the army attack as a justified measure, to sidetrack the real problem. Could any secular Administration in India or outside, think of justifying an attack on Somnath, Vatican in Rome, or the Temple at Jerusalem ? Even a colonial government held a public enquiry, censured Dyer and removed the Governor, when 1300 persons were killed at the Jallianwala Bagh. But over 3,000 innocent pilgrims are reported to have been killed in the Blue Star attack, and there is not a word of regret or enquiry. Instead the military officers were decorated and rewarded. No one can fail to note the contrast in approach, public conscience, and sense of responsibility in the two cases. Could pogroms be organised in Delhi and other Indian cities against one's own citizens ? Madan has maintained equal silence about the organised attack on Babri Masjid and the fact that it is backed by an Indian Party that is in power, in most states of the Cow-belt. It is also well known that recently 47,000 Muslims have been converted to Hinduism in Rajasthan. Separately, we have slated of the disillusionment of the Parsi Community in relation to the Nariman affair.

One of the first public acts done with blessings of Mahatma Gandhi, was major renovation of Somnath Temple involving even demolition of old graves. Further, cow being sacred to the Hindus, its slaughter has been banned. Not only the acceptance of Hindi in place of Hindustani was a clear step to declare Hindu culture as the national culture, but there have been positive steps to help and promote Hindu religion. Decades back Article 290 A of the Constitution made it mandatory for the Tamil Nadu and Kerala Governments to sanction heavy payments for the maintenance of Hindu Temples. In 1951 in Madras an Act was passed, creating a Government Department and appointing a Minister to administer Hindu endowments. A draft Bill of 1959, later approved, declared Temple employees as Government Servants, and authorised the Revenue Department to collect rent of Temple lands." These facts and realities about the consistent rise of Hindu orthodoxy under the garb of Indian Secularism, that convey alarming messages to the minorities in India, have been completely omitted by the learned scholar.

It needs to be understood that there has been in India, the clear presence of Hindu orthodoxy, since the beginning of the century and its growingly aggressive tendencies. An extremely centralised constitution has been framed, with further periodic centralisations and encroachments on the meagre autonomy of the states. There has not been any time since Partition, when the Congress has exhibited its seriousness to take into consideration the legitimate interests of the minorities. So far as Punjab is concerned, it has been a virtual sub-state with hardly any material autonomy.

The important fact is not Secularism versus Sikh or Muslim Fundamentalism, or that of any other minority, but whether the Secularism of the type embodied in the Indian Constitution, can be sustained in the presence of evident and growing communal trends in the Indian polity and the principal political parties.

#### IV. SECULARISM - ITS PROBLEMS

It appears to us that Secularism, including Indian Secularism, has created problems, which by itself it is unable to solve. First, we shall consider the problems of Secularism as a whole. Secularism, according to its literal meaning, is the belief that the

state, morals, education, etc., should be independent of religion. In short, Secularism not only envisages complete control of the empirical life of man, but also seeks to evolve an ethics that is independent of religion, but makes for cohesion in society. But, in the last about three hundred years, since Secularism has its survey in the empirical life, it has been unable to create an ethics, even for the individual state, much less a universal ethics that should embrace humanity as a whole.

After the Reformation the national state came into being with the Christian Church becoming a wing of the State, Catholicism went on the decline, and lost its overall supremacy in the Western world. Science and the Industrial Revolution, gave major blows to religion, and many a thinking person felt it was really superfluous for the empirical life of man. Until the first quarter of the century, Science generated considerable optimism for the future of man, and his capacity to create his own destiny. The two World Wars, and especially the events following the Second World War, have, apart from shattering many hopes, created serious doubts as to human capacity to live with his neighbours.

Toynbee laments that for the last about three hundred years we have been in the grip of the idea of a national state, involving a rapid narrowing of our vision, affinities and affiliations. He observed; "The secularisation of the Western civilisation in the Seventeenth century, so far from producing a stable way of life, raised the question : what is going the Fill the temporary spiritual vacuum that this deconsecration of Western life has created in Western souls ? Alternative attempt" to fill this vacuum have constituted the unstable spiritual history of the Western world during the last 250 years." "The transfer of allegiance from the Western Christian church to parochial Western Secular state, was given a positive form borrowed from the Graeco-Roman civilisation by the Renaissance." "On this political plane the Renaissance revived the Graeco-Roman worship of parochial states as goddesses. This unavowed worship of parochial state was by far the most prevalent religion in the Western World in AD 1956,""U Toynbee views that Secularisation having replaced great world religions, has led to 'nationalism, communism and individualism,' systems that are "all three equally impersonal and dehumanising.""

In the empirical field the facts of life are too ugly and obvious to ignore. Secularisation in this century created two monsters. Hitler and Stalin, who could sadistically and cynically destroy, 6 millions and 12 millions respectively, of their own peaceful citizens. And, the unfortunate tragedy is that the tribe of mini Stalins is far from being extinct. The drum-beating for them is too loud to permit the faint voices of sanity to be heard. Hiroshima and Nagasaki are stark realities of modern life. Since 1914, apart from the two world wars, we have fought over four dozen hot wars, involving, in this century, the destruction of more human beings than did the rulers of various civilisation in all the earlier wars of man. Despite all talk of disarmament we are spending about a 1000 billion Dollars on armament each year. No wonder, Toynbee strikes a dismal note about secularisation and the doubtful role of our scientific genius.

"After having been undeservedly idolised for a quarter of millenium, as the good genius of mankind, he has now suddenly found himself undeservedly execrated as an evil genius who has released from his bottle a jinn that may perhaps destroy human life from earth. This arbitrary change in the technician's onward fortunes is a severe ordeal, but his loss of popularity has not hit him so hard, as his loss of confidence in himself. Till 1945

he believed without a doubt that the results of his work were wholly beneficial. Since 1945 he has begun to wonder whether his professional success may not have been a social and a moral disaster." He pities that ultimately whether it is an Einstein, an Oppenheimer or a Sakharov, he is obliged to be the instrument, not of God, nor of his conscience, but of the parochial state or the political master about whose ethics the mounting misery in the world is a standing monument.

There is little doubt that Marxian goals for the social salvation of man were unexceptionable. That is why in the first two quarters of the century, these invoked the sympathies of many a thinking person. However, in the general euphoria science and social sciences had created, the warning given by men of religion, that the class struggle contained the seeds of self-destruction and dehumanisation, was ignored. Soviet Russia grew into an unchallengeable giant that had not only kept many states of Eastern Europe as its colonies, but had also reduced its own citizens to be just soulless numbered units of life. While outsiders had not a clear conception of the fast deterioration of internal cohesion in this Leviathan state, Eduard Shevardnadze, the Soviet Foreign Minister, emphasized in 1990 that "Universal ethics should have priority over regional or class interests or morality. Ultimately, as we have witnessed the Soviet Empire, cracked up because of its lack of internal cohesion. The collapse, as critics of Secularism see, was due to the fact that whereas the moral sense and its internal discipline which Christianity had given to the Russian life, had slowly worn out or been deliberately eroded, Communism had simply failed to create an alternative ethics that could sustain the Soviet society or give the individual his moral brakes.

But, while recording what is felt to be the inevitable fall of Communism, as a secular system of production, we do not in any way seek to eulogise the life of unbridled Capitalism and its cut-throat competition. Its problems of ethics are equally chronic, and grave, and for that matter, could prove equally dangerous for the social life of man. It is significant that while the West was seriously collaborating with the Soviets, Soizhenitsyn gave a clear warning that it was making a dangerous mistake, and was virtually betraying the very facet of man that had been giving the Christian West its cohesion and hope.

Similarly, the dismal 'disarray' in the moral life of man was plaintively voiced by Schumacker, when he wrote that nothing was in greater disruption and confusion than the moral life of man." Quite the same was the diagnosis of the report of the Club of Rome, when it wrote :

"Short of world effort, today's already explosive gaps and inequalities, will continue to grow larger. The outcome can only be disaster, whether due to the selfishness of individual communities that continue to act purely in their own interest, or to a power struggle between the developing and the developed nations. The world system is simply not ample enough, nor generous enough to accommodate much longer such egocentric and conflictive behaviour by its inhabitants."

While decades have elapsed since the above warning was categorically given by the authors of Limits of Growth, man's egoism continues to run amuck unabated with the inevitable increase in wide gaps between the rich nations and the poor nations, and the rich of a nation and its poor. We do not believe that our reading is, on the whole wide off the mark. It is undeniable that since 1947 the percentage of Indians living below the poverty line has been steadily mounting to the present about 50%. The increase in population is as rapid as is the increase in glamorous, vulgar and wasteful living of the

rich elite. Nowhere is there any thinking, much less an attempt, to deal with this malady. Evidently, in this context, we seek to emphasize that the problem before the modern man in the West, and more so in India, is the dismal lack of cohesion that Secularism has created in the life of man.

The real issue, we believe, is not Fundamentalism or for that matter, any other ism, but the very loss of moral moorings, which Secularism has created. Alcoholism is a major symptom of the corroding frustration and tension in the soul of the individual. The break-up of the family and the mounting number of unstable children from broken homes, are the inevitable fall-out of this malady. It is not just incidental, but is very significant, that the problem of alcoholism, suggesting deep frustration in the soul, was the greatest in Soviet Russia. This clearly points to an internal vacuum that needs to be filled.

True, Science has given us amazingly efficient tools to accomplish things. But the tragedy is that the ape in man continues to be our ruthless master and operator. And, within a very short period, we have seriously endangered the very health and environment of our planet. It is in this context, that we feel the diagnostic talk of Fundamentalism in Madan's paper appears partly irrelevant.

In this background, we record a significant development. The leaders of North American Churches, came to the conclusion that Secularism was a serious problem. Accordingly, in the World Council of Churches they proposed that Secularism was a common danger that required to be fought and eliminated as a social force, and that Christianity should seek the cooperation of other religions to combat its evil influences. Presumably, they felt that the divorce of religion from politics and the empirical life of man, had made Secularism a dangerous institution that was increasingly eroding the moral sap in the Western life. But, this voice of sanity was drowned in an exhibition of suicidal egoism of European and other Churches, who considered that "Secularisation, not Secularism, is the primary process, it is a process in which some of the values of Christian Faith have been put into a Secular framework, bringing about a powerful force which is destroying all old ideas. Hence Secularisation in an ally, because it will destroy Hinduism, Islam and other forms of what they considered to be superstition. So we should ally ourselves with Secularisation, and see it as the work of God." Later it was stated, "We do not feel that we have anything lacking. And so we are opposed to dialogue, unless it is for the sake of testifying to Jesus Christ." They were emphatically unwilling to talk to other religions on terms of equality with them.

It recalls to us Toynbee's warning, "The historian's point of view is not incompatible with the belief that God has revealed Himself to Man for the purpose of helping Man to gain spiritual salvation that would be unattainable to Man's unaided efforts; but, the historian will be suspicious, a priori, of any presentation of this thesis that goes on to assert that a unique and Final revelation has been given by God to my people in my time on my satellite of my sun in my galaxy. In this self centred application of this thesis that God reveals Himself to His creatures, the historian will espy the Devil's cloven hoof."

It is not our intention at all to raise an accusing finger at anyone. What we seek to stress, is the growing presence of egoism in all walks of modern life, whether social, political, economic or religious, as had been pointed out by the authors of Limits of Growth. The problem, as men of religion believe, is not of any wrong thinking, but of the constitutional make-up of man, which is organically egoistic. Hence castigating

Communism, Fundamentalism or any other system would hardly be a remedy of the problem. A century of human efforts, we find, leaves man equally helpless and unequipped to face problems of social cohesion and ethics. Neither Communism, nor Capitalism has been able to do so. In any case, this problem remains as acute as ever before.

Our difficulty has been twofold. Most of our scientific and intellectual drives have been to gain power over nature, which logically led man not to love his neighbour, but to move for his control and annihilation. Hence the power instinct of man, instead of being checked by any internal discipline, has been fed to an exhibition of brutal strength. Secondly, in order to find the roots of moral values, we start for a search of their base in the animal life. That search gave us the dogma of "survival of the fittest." This answer instead of giving us any moral health, or enlightenment, only gave us a maxim of tautology without any theory of ethics, and, we came to the conclusion that "all morality is a defence mechanism" and "a reaction formation" against the environment of man. In short, our search for the roots of morality in the animal life has virtually been a failure, the difficulty being that while the moral problem is a social one, we could only experiment and probe in the field of life that is lower than human. Obviously, the results have been far from illuminating. On the other hand, the pursuit of power over nature has, in the absence of moral brakes, inevitably led to threatening results, First, to the concentration of unbridled nuclear and fire power in some states, and a serious risk to the environment of the planet; and, second, to Consumerism and Individualism that militate against all social harmony and amity between classes, societies or nations. For, Schweitzer in his survey of the entire fields of Greek and Western thought comes to the dismal conclusion that there is no trace of the ethical in the working of the world or any sound basis for ethics in the world of thought, or any purposive evolution in which our activities can acquire a meaning.

In the above context, the religious men of yore were faced with two questions and answered them. The authors of dichotomous religions have proclaimed that the world and life are a suffering, maya or mithya or illusory. Accordingly they recommended withdrawal from its tangled webs. But the whole-life religions have a positive approach. They suggest not only participation but also total responsibility in all realms of life. Participation raised another problem as to the means or the use of force. Judaism, Islam and Sikhism accept its use, as a last resort, in defence of justice and freedom, and for a righteous cause. Christianity, although a societal religion, because of the Sermon on the Mount, gives a pacifist answer. While it is unnecessary to give the long history of pacifism and other worldiness in Christian Society, we may indicate some landmarks. St. Augustine, had come to believe that "the spread of Christianity would not ensure political and economic improvement. The earthy city of self-will would continue to exist amidst the rise and fall of states and empires." The goal being a heavenly life, slowly monasticism, celibacy and nunneries, gained roots in Christianity, which is otherwise a societal religion. Following the Reformation, the Church accepted the virtual supremacy of the national state. After the rise of Science, Secularism gained almost complete control over the empirical life of man. The twentieth century brought its wars, catastrophies, miseries and disillusionments.

The reaction of the North American Churches, as stated above, was evidently to avoid the dismal hold of Secularism on modern culture. For similar reasons, two other

trends of thought have already appeared in the Christian world. First is the Liberation Theology that accepts the use of force for a righteous cause. Second is the theology of men like Reinhold Niebuhr who says that "because of evil in man and in society, Christian political action called not simply for love but for an attempt to give each group within a society enough power to defend itself against exploitation by other groups, although relations between individuals might be a matter of ethics, relations between groups is a matter of politics."

Another Christian theologian, Jurgen Moltmann, argues that "Jesus identified himself with those who were abandoned, and challenged the status quo. Further, theologian Gutierrez, asserts that salvation means 'to struggle against misery and exploitation' and involves 'all men and the whole man'. Similarly, Father Camilo Torres declared, "The Catholic who is not a revolutionary, is living in mortal sin"." In the same strain, Catholic Archbishop, Holder Camara, claims that, "the violence of the rich against the poor, and the violence of the developed countries against the underdeveloped, is more worthy of condemnation than the revolutionary violence that they create."

Dr. Walsh writes about the existing theological thinking on pacificism in Christianity. "The Question of Jesus' and /or Christianity's pacificism, however, remains hotly debated, as it has been for centuries. In general the "Just-war tradition" has won out with the conviction that there are occasions, when it is legitimate and appropriate for the Christian to take up arms. Peace churches have generally been in the minority e.g. Anabaptists and Mennonites." In the same survey, Walsh concludes that Sikhism's major contribution to the world has been its sense of 'responsibility in the world', 'emphasis on spiritualising what have been viewed as secular spheres of life', and that, in Sikhism, 'salvation is not an otherworldly event, but is directly related to our actual life on earth,' it being "a religion of responsibility, a religion of ethics."

The above shows the problems a societal religion faces, and the answers it gives, when it either withdraws from the empirical life or strictly adheres to the principle of pacificism.

However, the views of whole-life religions are different. After the Babylonian attack in the 6th century B.C., more especially after the Roman attacks in the Christian era, and the Jewish diaspora, both pacificism and withdrawal became accepted Jewish institutions. But, after centuries of travail and persecution, Zionism was regarded as a valid mode of Jewish thought that had the religious backing of the Torah. Persons like Einstein fully supported Zionism that has led to the state of Israel.

So far as Islam is concerned, it has never wavered from its fundamental concepts of combination between the spiritual and the empirical lives of man. Dr. Iqbal's couplet sums up the position :

"Be it the pomp of empires or the show of democracy; If religion is separate from politics, what remains is the rule of Jengiz."

In the case of Sikhism the position has been made extremely explicit. The Gurus do not believe that the earthy City of self will continue to exist amidst the rise and fall of empires. They clearly state that while at the present level of human egoism, clashes and conflicts between societies will continue, they positively recommend, on the one hand, a moral role of responsibility for the religious seekers in all walks of life, and, on the other hand, hold out a distinct hope of evolution of man to a higher level when he will live truthfully'. "God created first Himself, then Haumen (individual entities), third

Maya (Multifarious things and beings), and fourth, the next higher stage of the Gurmukh who lives truthfully." In fact, the recommendation is for a continuous moral effort. It is wrong to say that Guru Nanak recommended only listening to the holy word. In fact, no one emphasizes the importance of 'deed' more than does Guru Nanak who says that man's assessment shall be based on his deeds, "truthful conduct is the highest form of living,' and that one remains near or away from God according as is the character of one's deeds."

The problem Secularism has created, is that having discarded the internal brakes that religion gave to society, it has been unable to devise and instil in man any rational ethics that could create cohesion in a society. The factual position is that despite the warning the authors of Limits of Growth, gave a quarter century back, the gap between the rich and poor of a country, and between the developed and undeveloped countries, has grown at an alarming rate. The present thinking seems to involve "the annihilation of mythology, religion, all value system, all hope." The problem appears to be not of any seeming fundamentalism, but of Secularism, and its inability to create a commitment of the people to a rational ethics, much less to a universal ethics.

**Pacifism and Indian Context :** Here a few words about pacifism, and its ethical base or value. The present century has known for two great pacifists, namely, Bertrand Russell in the field of thought, and Mahatma Gandhi in the field of religious conviction. During the First World War, Russell faced imprisonment; but after the Second World War the same pacifist Russell suggested that in order to avoid the appalling disaster of a Russian Victory, a threat of force or even actual use of force should be employed against the USSR, before it could develop a big stock pile of atom bombs and become a threat to the West. To an outsider, the moral difference between a pacifist Russell, who recommended a strike against Russia, and a Ronald Reagan who called it an 'evil empire', is hardly visible.

Next is the question of Mahatma's combining religion and politics, and his pacifism. Combination between the two was always practised by Mahatma Gandhi. His incongruities in this regard, are too obvious to be ignored. He endorsed the stand of the Akalis, whom Madan calls Fundamentalists, when they freed their gurdwaras from the control of Government patronised Mahants. Yet, he was inexplicably upset, when the Akalis started the Jaitu morcha, although he himself wanted the Akalis to join his political movement against the British, whom the Akalis had confronted at Jaitu. And again, when it suited him, he joined the Khilafat Movement, which was politically extra-territorial. We have noted how he introduced Hindu ideology in the Congress, which was turned to looking back to the Hindu past.

He recommended pacifism to the British, when faced with an impending attack from Hitler's Germany. Seervai, the unparalleled Constitutional lawyer of India, has made a detailed analysis of these facts and events, and come to the conclusion that Mahatma's faith in non-violence was just superficial, far from being serious. He writes, "There is little doubt that Gandhi used non-violence as a political weapon, and was prepared to support or connive at violence to secure political goals. Anyway, it is well known that later he not only promised to promote the war effort, if India were given autonomy, but also blessed the dispatch of Indian Army to Kashmir in 1947. Abul Kalam Azad's views about Indian and Mahatma's pacifism are not very different.

The Mahatma stressed that Pakistan would be created on his dead body, and yet it left Abdul Ghaffar Khan aghast, when Gandhi supported the Congress Resolution

recommending the Partition of India. No wonder, he felt completely betrayed. Again, while he was willing to send armies to Kashmir, he was unwilling to recommend forced entry of Harijans into Hindu temples, saying that God was in all human hearts, and because it offended Hindu religious injunctions. And yet he kept a fast unto death, forcing Ambedkar and the Government to withdraw separate reservation from the Scheduled Castes. His objective was quite narrow in its scope, and in fact, was contrary to Niebuhr's Christian moral principle of giving political power to the downtrodden classes of society. Of his dietary practice he wrote, "For years I have taken nothing but fruit in Mohammadan or Christian households.... In my opinion that interdining and intermarrying are necessary for national growth is a superstition borrowed from the West." Obviously, with the Mahatma his commitment to Hindu orthodoxy and orthopraxy was of over-riding importance; and though a votary of Hindu pacificism, he could neither avoid a combination of religion and politics, nor the use of force, when required for a political purpose.

Madan's Views Examined:

Madan has created his own definition of Fundamentalism, which he employs in a condemnatory sense. Fundamentalism is a known concept, which means belief in the literal truth of the stories in the Bible. Nowhere Fundamentalism implies, either the combination of religious and empirical lives or the use of force for a righteous cause, including political ones. By Madan's definition, the Torah, the Bible, the Guru Granth, and the holy Quran are all Fundamentalist scriptures. The Guru Granth emphasizes that man's religious life has to be in line with the Attributive Will of God, who is called Love, Ocean of virtues, and Destroyer of evil-doers. In a whole-life system the religious man has, therefore, to be compulsively altruistic in every field of life.

Madan also says that a Fundamentalist makes a selective retrieval, picking out of the religious tradition certain elements of high symbolic significance, with a view to organising his coreligionists. Here too, he makes contradictions. Being ignorant of the classification of religions, he wrongly attributes two traditions to Sikhism, one of Guru Nanak, and the other of the Tenth Master. Second, the question of symbolic selection does not arise, when he himself attributes Fundamentalism to Guru Gobind Singh, whose system, he says, has been revived by the Singh Sabha and the Akali Party. He makes such a strained use of verbiage as facts hardly justify. His arbitrary definition appears just a way to condemn a religion which is different from his own, and which all the same he insists on calling a sect of Hinduism. Seemingly, he is unwilling to understand that Sikhism is a whole-life system; nor is he inclined to study its doctrines as embodied in the Guru Granth. Instead he tries to measure it by the principles of his own religion, which is dichotomous and other-worldly, and where correct practice of rituals alone is of the essence, and brings all kinds of benefits in this and the next world.

Often the position of relations between religious life and empirical life is different in a dichotomous system. The Vedas and the Upanishads are the unchallenged scriptures of the Hindus. The Vedas lay down, says Das Gupta, "First a belief that Sacrifice, when performed with perfect accuracy, possesses a secret, mysterious power to bring about or to produce as their effect, whatever we may desire either in this life or hereafter. This being the unalterable religious dictum, and, the caste division, having been prescribed in the Vedas itself, it is impossible for any Hindu, including Mahatma Gandhi, to challenge the prohibitions involved in the Caste system, or the dichotomy

recommended in the Upanishads, although out of expediency, as did the Mahatma, the religious prohibitions and pacificism are often violated. Infact, by Madan's definition, Mahatma Gandhi would be one of the first to be called a Fundamentalist.

Here a deep and meaningful contrast between Sikhism and Hinduism, need be recorded. Despite the efforts of numerous reformers and a century of Western impact, no one has been able to secure the unrestricted entry of even a Prime Minister or Deputy Prime Minister of India in the Hindu temples. Entry of Sudras in them is indeed unthinkable because of the Scriptures, Shastras and "divine ordinances." in contrast it is well known that the objection of a Hinduised Mahant of a Sikh Gurdwara to the entry of a few Sikhs whom they considered low caste, became the root cause of the entire class of Mahants being removed forcibly by the Sikhs from every Sikh Gurdwara in the country, because such a prohibition is grossly violative of the hymns in the Guru Granth. This ethical contrast is extremely revealing of the core of the two systems. It is not merely an ideological or scriptural contrast between the fundamentals of the two religious. It is a cultural contrast in the ethos, the motivations, the conditioning and deep religious responses, which the Gurus, the Sikh martyrs and Sikh history have created in the psyche of even an ordinary Sikh. The ban against entry imposed by the Mahant of the Gurdwara, was found so outrageous, that it provoked the moral indignation of the entire community, since it violated the very basis of the Guru Granth. In the case of Hindus, the bar against temple entry evokes hardly any response, much less indignation, even among the most religious, because it is in consonance with the spiritual injunctions or divine ordinance. Any yet, Hindu scholars like Madan, are fond of paying that Sikhism is a Hindu sect. The scriptural, the ideological, the ethical and the historical contrasts are too glaring to be glossed over even by a casual student of the two systems.

Indian Secularism has, thus, been only a device, which was considered necessary in a multi-religious society. But, since its administration has to be done by the majority, in reality, as has become evident, it has meant virtually both orthodoxy and orthopraxy, involving a serious gap between its profession and practice. In this background of Hinduism, Madan's use of the word, Fundamentalism, for the whole-life Sikh world-view, reminds us of the comments of James Lewis on the Christian criticism of the so-called early pacificism of Guru Nanak and the later militancy of Guru Gobind Singh, "Given the popularity of this state of affairs, it would not be inappropriate to postulate some kind of unconscious repression-projection mechanism at work that might explain the scholar's lack of even-handedness. One does not have to be a psychoanalyst to perceive that the guilt about the gap between one's ideals and one's behaviour can be pushed out of the light of full awareness only to re-emerge as a projection. In lieu of a better explanation of the one-sided treatment of the Sikh religion by Westerners it appears to the present writer that the relevant scholars are uncomfortable with the contradictions between the theory and practice of their own religious traditions, have repressed the problem and have projected the contradiction on to Sikhism, a tradition that apparently (but not actually) contains the same contradiction. Thus their condemnation of Sikh militancy is really a projection of their own (unexpressed, repressed) condemnation of the Christian tradition. The point here is not to criticise Christianity, but rather to once again point out the differential treatment that the Sikh religion has received at the hands of Western scholars. These kinds of evaluative statements would have been less

objectionable, had similar criticism been levelled against other religious traditions as well. "

It is incorrect that it is the conflict of world views that has led to the Bluestar attack. Indian Secularism has never been Secularism of the type understood in the West. Second, in operation, it has many a time been only an expression of Hindu orthodoxy. Third, so far as the combination of religion and politics and the execution of the Sikh Morchas from the precincts of the Golden Temple arc concerned, these were never objected to either by the Mahatma, or, later after Independence, at the time of Punjabi Suba agitation or during the Emergency imposed by Indira Gandhi. And, as to the issues for which the Akali Party, struggled, those were purely socio-political, being the result of uncalled for and unconstitutional, but overt discrimination made by the State against the Sikh community.

At times Madan asserts what suits his argument, howsoever, irrational, it may be. Punjabi language stands recognized as one of the fourteen languages in the Indian Constitution. And, yet, he cannot conceal his bias, when he says that "the argument (about necessary secular basis of language) has not entirely been convincing, although the Sikh holy book is written in Gurmukhi." For him, Punjabi is hardly a language and the demand for a Punjabi-speaking state was not justified, although he is well aware that everywhere else the division of India had been made on the linguistic basis. On the other hand, he has hardly a word of condemnation, when almost the entire Hindu community in Punjab collectively resorts to making false public statements about their mothertongue. Instead of being critical of such public conduct, he appears quite unconcerned except for saying that there is considerable truth in it. Minority positions being what they are the world over, the Sikhs have never denied that a Punjabi Suba will give them a sense of security. But, the studied effort of the Centre to deny it, the Punjabi Hindus' making an exhibition of public misconduct, and, thereafter, the Centre's taking it as the truthful basis of the division of Punjab, could not but alarm the Sikhs about the euphemistic Secularism of the Centre.

It is also incorrect for Madan to say that in 1981 at the Sikh Educational Conference the call for Khalistan was given. In fact, even till June, 1984 there was never any idea of Khalistan in any political group or party, not even in the case of Bhindranwala or the Sikh Students Federation. This is evident from the statements both of Nayyar and Ravi about their talks with Bhindranwala in May, 1984, and the statement of Rajiv Gandhi.

Again, on the one hand, Madan says that the Tenth Master invested the Guru Granth with Guruship. Later, he says that Guruship of Guru Granth is an evolutionary growth. Nor has Madan's statement that the text of the Guru Granth was finalised in 1962, any factual basis. It is a historical fact that in early 18th century, the dispute between the Bandai Khalsa and the Tatt Khalsa was resolved following the hukm (hymn) from the Guru Granth. Similarly, Madan concedes that the entry of some Sikhs (Mazhbis) to the Golden Temple was decided following a hymn from the Guru Granth Sahib. In both the cases it was the meanings of the hymns that prevailed and not the symbols. Hence the incongruity of Madan's statements that Guru Granth is a classic example of supremacy of symbol over substance. We have explained that unlike as in the Vedic religion, where only the meticulous performance of the ritual or repetition of the mystic

mantra is of the essence and supreme, in Sikhism it is only the meaning and content of the hymn followed by deeds which alone are relevant or of any religious value.

This being the context, the problem in India is not of any contradiction between Secularism and Sikhism, or Secularism and Islam, but of implementing Indian Secularism. Madan's misconceptions are two. He ignores the fact that the Indian Secularism and Western Secularism are not synonymous terms. The former is a wishful compromise in a society of religious pluralism. His second misconception is that the danger to it is not from the minorities but from the tradition of the majority and the realities of India's past. Madan's failure appears to be the proclivity of the Indian mind, first, to create a new myth, and, then, naively to insist that it is a historical truth; and, second, to maintain a rigid objective to recreate the traditional past, whenever there is an opportunity of revival or resurgence. We have already mentioned the strict adherence to Brahminism in the Maharata cum-Peshwa rule, in contrast to the rule of Ranjit Singh, which had the background of Sikh ethos. Madan cannot be unaware of the fact that after independence, from the Prime Minister down to every Chief Minister was a Brahmin; and of the shocking knockdown blow to Indian Secularism that was given when, first, Nariman, the undisputed Parsi stalwart of Bombay Congress was unceremoniously excluded and a Hindu was made the Chief Minister" and later when as a national language, Hindustani was given a go-by.

Minority experience of Congress Secularism has been far from happy or reassuring. Although Madan perceives no incongruity, when a whole community resorts to public misstatement, yet his perception remains opaque to the facts that it is the Sikh ideology and the Sikhs, who relieved the groaning Indian sub-continent of a thousand year wave of oppression, and made the largest contribution of blood and suffering for the Independence of India, both in the past and the present. But they and their ideology are called Fundamentalist. Instead the tag of Secularism is placed on hose, some of the greats of whom, including the Father of the Nation, are not willing to share food at a non-Hindu's place, and apart from officially practising religious discrimination, are trying to revive the Hindu past by seeking to build a mandir on the site of a mosque. This insistence on the construction of a temple, continues, even though the Historical Committee of the Government has reported lack of evidence of a temple there in the past. In contrast the Sikh tradition is that not only Ranjit Singh gave liberal grants to Muslim Shrines, but the Sixth Master actually constructed a mosque for Muslims in his area.

It would seem that sometimes personal bias is so strong, that one cannot help giving misinformation, making a blackout of essential happenings and events and construing them in a manner, which facts do not justify.

Faults and Failures of Understanding : Madan's paper is a classic instance of a unidisciplinary approach to a subject which is multi-dimensional, especially when it tends to be dogmatic about doctrines of a religion which has its own ontology, method of study, and history. The author's failure to take into consideration the history of religions, and of Judaic monotheism, a miri-piri. system, vitiates his entire understanding and interpretation of the doctrines and development of Sikhism. To a student of religion it is well-known that in the West, the original tradition of monotheism has been of a whole-life system, and monasticism or pacificism are, in fact, later developments, finally leading to Secularism. Further, that, as it happens, in a creative spiritual experience, Guru Nanak completely departed from the dichotomous Indian religious tradition. His second fault,

although arising from the first, is his insistence on trying to view Sikhism in the light of his own dichotomous tradition, and for that matter, considering miri-piri system to be an aberration. He appears to be unaware that to followers of whole-life system the appearance of pacifism or monasticism in religion, is considered a symptom of decline, which arises, when the system is unable to face the problems of contemporary culture, and resorts to withdrawal. In whole-life systems, this approach is considered escapist betrayal of God. A follower of Judaism or Islam would not even for a moment feel that there is anything abnormal or incongruous in a miri-piri reaction by a man of religion. The contrast between the response of Pir Budhu Shah, to the extent of sacrificing his sons, and that of Hindu Hill Princes, to the call of Guru Gobind Singh, makes the point quite clear.

Third, on the Punjab problem, the author's statements appear even more unfortunate. Because extremely important and known facts of the issues, have simply not been mentioned. For an outsider like McLeod such a blackout could be explained on grounds of ignorance and distance. But, for a person so close to the scene of happenings, important omissions are not easy to explain. For, we do not find any reference to the very serious constitutional and economic implications of the water and hydel power problems, and other related issues that are at the base of a quarter century of struggle in Punjab. We do not understand how a perceptive person can fail to note the contrast of approach as between a Government that censures its General, and holds a public enquiry, when he kills 1300 persons at a banned political meeting at a public place, and a Government that approves, without enquiry, the General who shoots, as reported, thousands of innocent pilgrims, women and children, on a known day of Martyrdom at the Golden Temple, and calls it 'a right action, done at the right time and in the right manner.'

Fourth, it is undeniable that to a scholar of current events, an important aspect of the problem and its related material, remain a closed chapter. For, no scholar can have access to the great volume of Government papers, which contain essential aspects of the picture. In the absence of this important record, views on current events, can at best be of a journalistic or conjectural nature. For this reason we have always been very reluctant to make an academic assessment of current issues. But, as seemingly lop-sided pictures have appeared from the academic platform, we have considered it necessary to correct the assessment to the extent possible.

Fifth, both in regard to political events and ideology, Madan has used only secondary sources, when primary sources are available. Further still, we find, the author has been quite selective in the use of his secondary sources, especially when authoritative writings on Sikh religious doctrines are available. For example, Madan has relied on Kapur, McLeod, Oberoi and Barrier. We wonder if the author is unaware that writings of McLeod and Oberoi, have attracted adverse comments and assessment in the University and academic journals. Dr. King, while writing about the different works of McLeod, remarked :

"Whatever Dr. McLeod intended, many readers will ask his books the wrong questions and get the wrong answers. The books to an uninitiated reader, seem to reiterate the notion that a great amount of Sikh belief appears to be based on uncritical religiosity. The reader seeking the well springs of what Sikhism is, will not be assisted. The only successful opponent to the thousands of years of passing conquerors must have something that 'makes him tick'. Nowhere in these books is there an attempt to tell us

what it is." Dr. McLeod has for long years been a part of the Christian Mission at Batala (India). Similarly, Oberoi's papers have also evoked comments which are by no means complimentary, both about his knowledge of the Sikh religion and his academic credibility, as commented upon by Dhillon in his published paper presented at Los Angeles in 1988 :

"Oberoi while he gives irrelevant details of the miraculous powers attributed to Sakhi Sarvar and lavishly quotes Rose as evidence, seems to have deliberately concealed the above mentioned conclusion drawn by Rose and, instead has made the distortion that Singh Sabha leaders were the first to object to such practices. Such clear misstatements are generally made by partisan propagandists, but never, we believe, by any academician. This indicates either a lack of indepth study or a conscious attempt to suppress facts with a view to misrepresenting Sikhism."

Madan calls Oberoi a careful scholar. Dhillon's observations clearly suggest that in order to draw a wrong inference he went to the extent of making a suppression of known, important and relevant material. Apart from being selective in his secondary sources, he hardly appears to be up-to-date in considering the material which he employs for his assessment. For example, more than three papers commenting on the writings of Oberoi, were read, and later published, at the Seminars, held at long Beach, and at Vancouver in the University of British Columbia. Dr. Noel Q. King, Professor Emeritus, University of Californis, Santa Cruz, read a paper "Fundamentalism, Modernity; Sikhism : A Tertium Quid", in which he discussed Oberoi's views, and drew two emphatic conclusions, namely, first, that Sikhism is not a Fundamentalism in any sense, but is a third path with an identity of its own, and, second, that there is complete unity between the thought of Guru Nanak and that of the later nine Gurus.

It would appear that in the assessment and views of Madan there are evident faults of understanding and in the choice of material and method.

#### V. CONCLUSION

We have endeavoured to explain that the real problem today related to the failure of Secularism to evolve a rational ethics. The whole-life religions have always felt that Secularism alone can neither evolve a viable ethics, nor deliver goods in the empirical field, because in the world of cause and effect, there is no element of freedom or creativity, which can furnish societal cohesion, or be the base of moral life of man. On the other hand, dichotomous religions and Secularism believe that religion should remain aloof from the empirical life. Withdrawal, asceticism, sanyasa and monasticism are the direct consequence of this approach. Like St. Augustine, these religious ideologies virtually leave the earthy city of self-will to stew in its own juice. But whole-life or miripiri religions clearly take up the challenge of evil in life. They stress that evil and injustice, being facts of life, and being more so in the socio-political field, the man of God should not run away from the challenge, but should accept the responsibility of meeting it and removing inequity. For them God being Love, they have to be His instruments in the expression of that Love and in battling with injustice and oppression, wherever it be, and whatever be the cost. Although dichotomous religions are generally pacifists and have a different view, yet we have seen that whether it is a Mahatma Gandhi from Hinduism, or a Niebuhr, a Moltmann, a Cutierrez, a Father Torres, or the Liberation theologians from Christianity, they are coming to the view that Godliness must in practice involve both participation in the socio-political life and the use of

minimum force, if necessary. We, therefore, stress that Sikhism is a whole-life religion, without a split in its ideology and that the concept of there being two ideologies, one of Guru Nanak, pacifist and of interiority, and the other of Guru Gobind Singh, militant and fundamentalist, is just a misconception or misunderstanding of persons, drawn from pacifist or dichotomous religions, because they tend to view other religions through the glasses of their own system. For, by his method and measure the learned scholar brands those who strongly reacted in 1975- 77, against encroachments on the rights of man in the country, following imposition of the Emergency, as Fundamentalists, and those who did not react, as Secularists. Such hasty views, based on selective use of material, and serious omission of fundamentally relevant facts and factors, can hardly help any understanding of events.

The Sikhs, as we have emphasized, represent an entirely new religion with its own world view, ethics and culture. It is the product of the culture of those who as Gupta says, brought freedom and peace to the North West of India from a thousand year wave of invasions. They led Punjab with their sacrifices to a realm of health and justice. It is that ethos, which seriously changed the caste and power structure, and brought the lowest in society to the highest level, and gave them social prestige and power. Again, it is the same culture and ethos that made preponderant sacrifices in sufferings, blood and martyrdoms for the freedom of the country. Again, it is because of the same ethos that, despite its earlier struggle with the Centre, in the 1965 War the Sikh soldiers and the people of rural Punjab made maximum sacrifices. Again, they were the only people, who resisted in an organised manner the inhuman abrogation of all rights of freedom and man in the country as a whole during the long years of the Emergency imposed in 1975.

It is also equally significant that the Green Revolution in Punjab, is the result of the ethos for work, production and sustenance of life, created by the Gurus and the Sikh culture. Every factor that brought about the Green Revolution, was available for adoption and practice by not only other parts of the country, but also by other countries that were deficient in food. It is thus not just an accident or incident that the Green Revolution caught its roots and became a success in the Punjab. This shows modernity but not fundamentalism.

As against this it is significant and relevant to record that Vinobha Bhave the truest non-violent and accepted spiritual heir of Mahatma Gandhi, on the one hand, supported the imposition of the Emergency as a festival for the observance of discipline, and, on the other hand, sought to stake his life by a fast, like his mentor, for the safety of the cow. Hence what the Congress under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi has been pursuing, is the maintenance of the caste structure of the majority community and a desire to look back to the Hindu past, for inspiration and revival. Hence Indian Secularism is either a myth or a camouflage or a political expedient or a mixture of all three, with a view to pursuing a parochial policy Mahatma Gandhi had initiated in the first quarter of the century. That it has since then alienated the minorities and created a loss of faith in the professions of the majority is, as narrated above, a historical fact. It is obvious that increasing power and support to the BJP, involving the presence of over 110 MP's in the Parliament, and their control of four important states in the Cow Belt, is a clear and logical result of the policies pursued and the imagery raised by the Congress in the early twenties.

In the above context, Madan's formulations seem so irrelevant and superficial, when he seeks to prove that the problems in the Punjab are due to Sikh Fundamentalism started by Guru Gobind Singh. The Sikh perceptions, as stated, are entirely different, because they have a faith, that their culture, world view and ethics are entirely different from those of the Hindu society. Otherwise, how can one explain the uncommon facts of the Ten Gurus, a new thesis, a new Scripture, their work and martyrdoms for over 230 years, ending in a Panth ? The Sikhs understand the history of the preceding 45 years, and the Bluestar attack, as a part of the pressures employed by the majority against a minority. The decades long struggle of the Sikhs has to be seen and assessed after taking into account the Sikh perceptions and their Scripture, history and religion. The facts are too serious for anyone to argue or assert lightly that Sikhs have a split ideology, misconstrued by the Tenth Master.

For any perceptive student of Indian history, two facts are undeniable. First is the growing gap between the rich and the poor, which is partly attributed to the lack of moral strength of the Indian elite to have serious consideration for the interests of the poor and the backward castes. The distinguished modern historian, A.C. Banerjee, writes : "There could be no social revolution in India without a frontal attack on the caste system, which crippled human dignity and formed a dyke against spiritual regeneration through direct approach to God. In Hindu society religion and caste have been inseparable for ages." Second, in 1947 it is the parochial policy that led to the division of the country. And yet, after Independence, we got a state wherein the national feeling was fairly strong and cohesive. Today we can hardly deny that the fissiparous tendencies in the country, are becoming increasingly visible. This is a matter of serious concern for any student of Indian society or polity. To us it appears quite a flippant and non-serious approach to brand the Punjab Problem as of Fundamentalist origin, and not to understand and analyse the general trends in the country, that have led us to the present position, nor to suggest measures that could stem the forces of disintegration. It is for this reason, we believe, that N.T. Sehgal suggested the need of a Hindu Liberation Theology. Perceptive thinkers have always felt that the sanctioned inequities of the Caste ideology, have virtually dried up over the centuries, the moral sap of the Indian culture. It is in this context that Guru Nanak pursuant to his revelation, created a whole-life revolutionary religious system. It is unfortunate that the sense of self satisfaction and sophistry, appears too strong to do some introspection. It reminds one of the painful warning given by Swami Dharma Tirtha in 1946 against our delusive smugness :

"Some of the national foibles which have kept us in the tutelage of other nations and cultures for many centuries in the past, are even today the main source of our inefficiency as a nation. If at any time Indian nation cease to live, it will undoubtedly be a case of suicide, and not of murder."

The Club of Rome has published a new report in 1991, the First Global Revolution, describing the situation of the contemporary world as one of terrifying, but also hopeful complexity. Dr. U. King of the University of Bristol, U.K., writes that "While contemporary societies are confused about morals and ethics, and in social, political, and educational chaos, it is essential for humanity to respond to this unique opportunity for global revolution.... We live in a world of extraordinary diversity and pluralism." "The report of the Club of Rome states the need for learning in a new era, and stresses the importance of the spiritual and ethical dimension which religions have

fostered throughout history". The report, King feels, "should be analysed as a momentous call to explore the powers of religion and spirituality in shaping the world. The Club of Rome is not alone in doing this; there are many other voices today which stress the same point."

It is because of a known and felt chaos that, whether it is the Club of Rome, the Churches of North America, the Liberation Theologians, a Niebuhr, a Moltmann, a Father C. Torres, Archbishop H. Camara, a N.T. Sehgal, a Schumacher or a Schervanadze, they plead for a universal ethics that alone can help us in the present moral crisis, and can alleviate the sufferings of our 'individualistic' and 'consumer generation'.

It is, therefore, time that we thought about the current situation in the country and the world, more patiently, more seriously and less self-righteously. Both World Secularism and Indian Secularism are having their problems, which are serious enough. We wonder, if merely attributing them to Fundamentalism or calling the prophet of another religion a Fundamentalist, a condemnatory word in the present political jargon, will be a worthwhile academic solution or an appropriate contribution in any way relieving the current situation. It would seem that at least from the academic world a sounder appraisal of the events is called for. Sikhism has never been exclusive. In tune with its goals, it has always been willing and anxious to cooperate with any ideology or system that has universal goals or ends to achieve.

The need of the times, we believe, is to bring into contact and cooperation all those forces that exist in every field of life to make for universal understanding and effort. The cultural problems today are global and serious. The Cartesian individualism has increasingly divorced us from the basic stream and rhythm of life, which is the source of all values. We owe it to ourselves, the society and the world that we contribute towards social effort and sustenance, instead of to division and decay. In India we need to do some heart searching. Have we in the last about half a century improved for posterity the legacy of India we received from our forefathers ?

#### REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Wilson, H.H., *Religious Sects of Hindus*, p. 19.
2. Briggs, G.W., *Gorakh Nath and Kanphatta Yogis*, pp. 26-27 & 45.
3. *Ibid.* p. 28.
4. Jain N.K., *Sikh Gurus and Indian Spiritual Thought*, p. 168, Punjabi University, Patiala.
5. Jaiswal, Savir, *The Origin and Development of Vaishnavism*, p. 116-118,
6. G.Murthy, H.V.S., *Vaishnavism of Shankradeva and Ramanuja*, p. 232.
7. Zimmer, H., *Philosophies of India*; pp. 222-23.
8. Daljeet Singh, *Sikhism*- Sterling Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1979; p. 95 *Journal of Sikh Studies*, Vol. 7, Feb-Aug. 1980; GND University, Amritsar; p.38.
9. *Ibid.*, *Journal of Sikh Studies*, Vol. 7, Feb-Aug. 1980, GND University Amritsar, p. 38.
10. Juergensmeyer, M. and Barrier, N.G., *Sikh Studies*, Berkley Religious Studies Series, Graduate Theological Union, Berkley, 1979, p. 83.
11. Machve, P., Quoted by Daljeet Singh; *The Sikh Ideology*; Guru Nanak Foundation, New Delhi, 1984, pp. 111-2.
12. Murthy, H.V.S., *Vaishnavism of Shankradeva and Ramanuja*, p. 201-2.
13. Maitra, S.K., *The Ethics of Hindus*, p. 244.
14. Zaehner, R.C., *Mysticism : Sacred and Profane*; p. 155.

15. Macauliffe, M.A., *The Sikh Religion*, Vol. I, p. 239.
16. Zimmer, H., *Philosophies of India*, Delhi, 1909, pp. 462-3.
17. *Guru Granth Sahib*, p. 459.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 1412.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 1245.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 1171.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 417.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 1208, 224, 145, 1028.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 1289.
25. Gupta, H.R., *History of Sikh Owns*, U.C Kapur & Sons, New Delhi, 1973, p. 114.
26. *Tuzak-i-Jahangiri in Hari Ram* (above) Persian, p. 35, p. 101.
27. Gupta, H.R., *op. cit.*, p. 110
28. *Ibid.*, p. 130.
29. Banerjee, A.C., *Journal of Sikh Studies*, Feb., 1976, Guru Nanak Dev University, p. 61.
61. *Haqiqat-i-Banou-Uruj-i-Firqa-i-Sikftan 1783 AD*, Anonymous, pp. 3-6,1 *Sikh Review*, Calcutta, February, 1990, p. 22.
30. Ganda Singh, Ed. *Gur Sobha*, pp. 21 & 32.
31. *Gur Bilas, Chhevin Patshahi*, Language Deptt. Patiala, p. 290.
32. Rattan Singh Bhangoo, *Siri Guru Panth Parkash*, Ed. Jil Singh Sital, S.G.P.C. Amritsar, p. 189.
33. Gupta H.R., *History of Sikh Gurus*, p. 189.
34. *Guru Gobind Singh, Bachittar Natak*.
35. Gupta, H.R, *History of Sikh Gurus*, p. 177.
36. Bhangoo, Rattan Singh; *Siri Guru Panth Parkash*, Ed. Jit Singh Sital, SGPC, Amritsar. p. 41.
37. Kapur Singh, *Prasaraprasna*, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, p. 233, 234.
38. Qazi Nur Mohammad, *Jang Namah*, Ed. by Ganda Singh, Amritsar, 1939, (English translation) pp. 58-59.
39. Gupta H.R., *History of Sikhs*, Vol. II, New Delhi, 1978, p. 39. Latif, S.M., *A History of Punjab*, Calcutta 1991, p. 213.
40. The entire concept of Naam in Sikhism has been detailed in Daljeet Singh's paper published at pages 56-88 of "*Advanced Studies in Sikhism*", edited by J.S. Mann and H.S. Saraon, published by the Sikh Community of North America in 1989.
41. *Guru Granth Sahib*, p. 491.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 1199.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 955.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 418.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
46. *Torah, A new translation of the holy Scripture (First Section)* The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 2nd Ed., 1981; p. 122.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 122.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 130.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 141.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 135.
51. Hertzberg, *A Judaism*, p. 98 Ed.

52. Gupta H.R., History of Sikh Gurus, pp. 175-176.
53. Young India Bombay, March 19, 1937; Rajinder Puri, Rediscovery of India, New Delhi, 1989, p. 122.
54. The Statesman, Calcutta, July 7, 1940.
55. Dhillon G.S., India Commits Suicide, Chandigarh, 1992, p. 14.
56. Young India, Bombay, March, 19, 1931.
57. Duggal D.S., The Truth about th Sikh, Amritsar, p. 21.
58. Azad Abdul Kalam, India Wins Freedom, p. 140.
59. Illustrated Weekly of India, June 10-16, Calcutta. The Man Everyone loves to Hate.
60. Council of Sikh Affairs, The Anguish of Punjab - I. Sikhs Demand Justice, p. 25.
61. Ibid, Dhillon, G.S., Researches in Sikh Religion and History, 1989; p. 114-115.
62. Machiavelli, Niccolo, The Prince, p. 46.
63. For details of the Punjab Problems, and the Punjab River Waters and Hydel Power Dispute see papers by Dr. Kharak Singh & S. Daljeet Singh at pages 136-160 and 196-228, respectively to Fundamental Issues in Sikh Studies.
64. Nichel A.A., The Indus River, p. 191.
65. Kumar, R.N. and Sieberer, George, The Sikh Struggle, p. 200-201.
66. Council of Sikh Affairs, Punjab River Waters Dispule, p. 4.
67. Govt. of India, The Report of the Narmada Waters Disputes Tribunal, Vol. III, New Delhi, 1978, p. 30.
68. Ibid., p. 25-26. Th
69. The Los Angeles Times, Feb., 19,1988, p. 1, 32.
70. Council of Sikh Affairs, Opp. cil. p. 7-8.
71. Grewal, J.S., The New Cambridge History of India, The Sikhs of the Punjab, p. 221.
72. Dhillon, G.S., PAU, Ludhiana, Before the Well Runs Dry; The Tribune, Chandigarh, 15 March, 1990.
73. Council of Sikh Affairs, opp. cit., p. 12.
74. Tully, Mark and Jacob, S., Amritsar, Mrs. Gandhi's Last Battle, pp. 65-66.
75. Ibid., p. 221.
76. Sami-ud-din, Abida, The Punjab Crisis; p. 231, Anguish of Punjab - II, Council of Sikh Affairs, Chandigarh, pp. 11-12. Also Surya, July 1984.
77. Nayyar, Kuldip and Khushwant Singh, Tragedy of Punjab, pp. 85-87.
78. Amarjit Kaur, Arun Shourie, el al, Tragedy of Punjab, pp. 48-49.
79. Azad, M. Abulkalam, opp. cit. 108.
80. Gupta,H.R.History of Sikhs,p.282.
81. Jagjit Singh, The Sikh Revolution; pp. 204-211.
82. Ganda Singh, Banda Singh Bahadur, pp. 241-2. See also Jagjit Singh; The Sikh Revolution, pp. 210-212.
83. Gupta, H.R., History of the Sikhis, Vol. I, pp. 288-290. See also Qazi Nur Mohammad; Jangnamah, pp. 172-175.
84. Osborne, W.G., The Court and Camp of Ranjit Singh, pp. 94-95.
85. Ghurye, G.S., Caste and Race in India, p. 95.
86. Ibid., pp. 11-12.
87. Sardesai, G.S., The New History of Mahrattas, p. 52.
88. Rajinder Puri, Rediscovery of India, opp. cit., p. 121.

89. The Tribune, Chandigarh, March 1977.
90. Ambedkar, B.R., Baba Saheb Ambedkar -Writings and Speeches, Vol. 5, pp. 89-102.
91. Ibid., pp. 89-102.
92. Ambedkar, B.R., Annihilation of Caste, Edited by Mulkraj Anand.
93. Guru Granth Sahib, p. 722.
94. Ibid., p. 982.
95. Seervai, H.M., Constitutional Law of India, p. 8.
96. Baig, MRA., The Muslim Dilemma in India, p. 60.
97. Seervai, H.M. opp. cit., p. 6-7.
98. Ibid., p. 7.
99. Ibid., p. 7.
100. Ibid., p. 6-8.
101. Ibid., p. 8.
102. Ibid., p. 7.
103. Senart, E., Caste in India, p. 100.
104. Ambedkar, B.R., op. cit.. Vol. 5, p. 410.
105. Ibid., p. 409.
106. Ibid., p. 411-2.
107. Ibid., p. 324.
108. Ibid., p. 327.
109. Ibid., p. 340.
110. Ibid., p. 340.
111. Ibid., p. 388.
112. Ibid., p. 388.
113. Ibid., p. 390.
114. Ibid., p. 377.
115. Ibid., p. 377-8.
116. Seervai, H.M., opp. cit.; p. 13-14.
117. Ibid., p. 14.
118. Azad, Abulkalam, India Wins Freedom, p. 144.
119. Ibid., p. 145.
120. Ibid., p. 186.
121. Ibid., p. 193.
122. Illustrated Weekly of India, Calcutta, May 1992.
123. Prafull Goradia, Hindustan Times, June 28, 1992.
124. Toynbee, A., An Historian's Approach to Religion, p 208.
125. Ibid., p. 210.
126. Tim Dowley, Ed., Eerdman's Handbook lo the History of Christianity, Reprint 1987; Eerdman Publishing Company, Michigan, p. 570.
127. Toynbee, A., opp. cit., pp. 233-4.
128. The Tribune, Chandigarh, July 12, 1990.
129. Schumaclier, E.F., A Guide to the Perplexed, p. 112.
130. Club of Rome, Limits of Growth; A Report for the Project "The Predicament of Mankind, Summer 1987, pp. 191-2.
131. Dialogue and Alliance, A Journal of International Religious Foundation, Summer 1987, pp. 94-98.

132. Toynbee, A., opp. cit, p. 132.
133. Schweitzer, A., Civilisation and Ethics, pp. 9-12.
134. Tim Dowley, Eerdman's Handbook to the History of Christianity, opp. cit., p. 5.
135. Ibid., p. 597-8.
136. Ibid., p. 609.
137. Ibid., p. 610.
138. Ibid., p. 610.
139. Walsh, T.G., International Religious Foundation, New York : in the Sikh Courier, London, Autumn 1990, p. 94.
140. Ibid., p. 95.
141. Kewin, Stephen, A Brief History of Time, pp. 177-78.
142. Guru Granth Sahib, p. 113.
143. Russell, Bertrand, Unpopular essays, pp. 53-57.
144. Seervai, H.M., Constitutional Law of India; Supplement to the First Edition, pp. 78.
145. Azad, Abulkalam, India Wins Freedom, p. 133.
146. Seervai, H.M., opp. cit., pp. 143-7.
147. Seervai, H.M. opp. cit., p. 144. Daljeet Singh : The Sikh Ideology; p. 39; Azad: opp. cit.; pp. 108,93,97.
148. Das Gupta, Hindu Mysticism; pp. 17-18.
149. Lewis, James, Advanced Studies in Sikhism, Ed. J.S. Mann & H.S. Saraon; The Sikh Community of North America, Irvine Ca, 1989; Misrepresentation of Sikh Tradition, p. 214.
150. Azad, Abulkalam, India Wins Freedom, pp. 113, 15-16,
151. Gurdev Singh, The Sikh Tradition, Academy of Sikh Religion and Culture, Paliala; p. 49.
152. Mann, J.S. & Saraon, H.S., Advanced Studies in Sikhism; Singh Sabha Movement-A Revival (G.S. Dhillon), 1989, p. 245.
153. Banerjee, A.C. Guru Nanak to Guru Gobind Singh, p. 31.
154. Swami Dharma Tirath; Menace of Hindu Imperialism; pp. 102.
155. King, U; Essay contributed at Moscow Conference in Nov. 1991, published in the Report of the International Theologians Foundation, Vol. 7, 1992.