

SYMMUN '16

March 26-27



BACKGROUND GUIDE- SC

INDIA TOWARDS A FASCIST TILT?

LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Respected Representatives,

At the outset, the Executive Board wishes you Luck. It is our utmost pleasure to invite you all to SYMMUN'16! The reason why this agenda was chosen by the Executive Board was that in the light of the events happening in the past, there may be a possibility that intolerance exists and if it does, what are the solutions? We therefore thought of taking up this crucial issue for discussion. In this Background Guide we have tried our best to include every aspect of the agenda. You all are requested to go through it and research further and come fully prepared. We expect a healthy and a sensible debate considering the seriousness of the issue .Given the nature of the committee, it is imperative that members are extremely solution-oriented in their responses. At the same point of time, it is important to understand that foresightedness is essential. Solutions that do not fit into long-term plans are often solutions that do not work. Therefore, it is important to take a holistic view of the situation and decide for the country, what is best for it in long-term. Brace yourselves up for a committee that will be fast-paced, and will challenge you to think on your feet, again and again.

The Background Guide is split in two parts . The first part is to understand the concept of Fascism and the second part is restricted to the events that have tilted India towards Fascism.

MANDATE OF THE COMMITTEE

Since, this is a stakeholders meet, we expect you to debate every aspect of the issue and come up with a resolution that will be forwarded to the government and which reflects the real mood of the society.

Together, we will protect the unity and integrity of our motherland- that is, Bharat.

Jai Hind

In Case of any query or doubt feel free to contact us .

Harsh Jaitak
(Chairperson)
+91-9810513431

PART – 1

CONCEPT NOTE

Fascism is recognized to have first been officially developed by Benito Mussolini, who came to power in Italy in 1922. To sum up fascism in one word would be to say "anti-liberalism".

Fascism is much more than that however, but understanding fascism is in fact one of the most important elements in understanding the 20th century and our modern world.

In 1932 Mussolini declared that the 20th century would be the "Fascist century" by stating:

"If it is admitted that the nineteenth century has been the century of Socialism, Liberalism and Democracy, it does not follow that the twentieth must also be the century of Liberalism, Socialism and Democracy. Political doctrines pass; peoples

remain. It is to be expected that this century may be that of authority, a century of the "Right," a Fascist century."

Mussolini and his followers believed that this ideology was the best hope for "saving Western Civilization".

What, then, is fascism exactly?

In order to understand fascism it is first important to understand the climate of the early 20th century in which fascism took shape.

Fascism was born out of the ruins of World War I, in which Mussolini served. Fascism was immediately reactionary to its surroundings in Europe, which was dominated by the two established powers of Britain and France. Britain and France were seen as economically dominant but decaying imperial civilizations who were imposing their hegemony on the rest of Europe. At the same time, Russia had recently undergone its Bolshevik Revolution and was supporting Marxist revolutionary activity and ideology throughout Europe. All of the countries in which fascism took root were countries that had significant socialist movements. Fascism was the opposition to those socialist movements. Fascism further recognized the finance capitalism of the United States and Britain as a destructive and corrupting force on "Western Culture" and as a threat to the still developing European countries, such as Italy, Germany and Ireland.

So, this was the environment in which fascism formed; in an environment where the "lesser" countries of Europe felt trapped between the established powers of international capital and the powers of revolutionary Marxism.

Fascism was ultimately born out of, and supported by, conservatism and the belief that Western Civilization had become decadent and self-ruinous.

In 1927 Oswald Spengler, who wrote *Decline of the West*, wrote that the infection the West was suffering came from certain elements. He went on to state: *"I will list them: liberalism, democracy, socialism, free-masonry. The organism of the West has been weakened, debilitated by these ideologies. Well, there is in existence only one movement existing at the present time which has the courage possessing the power of a great nation to be fundamentally, openly, ferociously anti-liberal, anti-democratic, anti-Freemason: Fascism."*

A German article ¹, was published in 1939 which talked extensively about Spengler's *Decline of the West*. The article stated:

The fact that "The Decline of the West" was written, read and believed is clear proof that Germany, and with it Europe, was in deadly danger, heading for destruction. Spengler pinpointed the worldview situation of the declining liberal age.

Mussolini argued that it was ridiculous to base policy simply on the desires of the majority because of his belief in the decline of Western Civilization and the idea that the majority of people had become decadent. In his 1935 essay on fascism, *Fascism: Doctrine and Institutions*, Mussolini wrote: "*Fascism denies, in democracy, the absurd conventional untruth of political equality dressed out in the garb of collective irresponsibility...*"

The development of fascism, and its eventual popular support, was a total rejection of Marxism, which was a growing movement at the time. In fact, Germany was the birthplace of Marxism, as it is where Karl Marx was born and schooled and where his ideologies were first accepted. Germany, at the time of the fascist takeover, had one of the strongest Marxist traditions in the world with a large and organized Marxist labor movement. Fascism ultimately rejected all of the ideas contained in Marxism and took action to break Marxist labor movements.

The principle tenets of Marx² are equality, democracy and atheism/materialism. Marxism champions the pursuit of the equality of race, gender, and economic status. Marxism stated that democracy as it was practiced was not truly representative of all people, it was only representative of establishment interests, and thus Marxism was a call for "true" and total democracy where every citizen was totally equal in their political influence. Marxism, of course, stated that religion was the "opium of the people" and a barrier to solutions for worldly problems, and Marxism, as an atheist ideology, acknowledges nothing supernatural and held that the only things that exist are material; that all of reality is simply the material reality that we see and experience. Additionally, Marxism held that "class struggle" was the driving force of social progress, and that class struggle was the appropriate means by which a just society would be created.

¹ The HYPERLINK "<http://www.calvin.edu/cas/gpa/schul01.htm>" HYPERLINK "<http://www.calvin.edu/cas/gpa/schul01.htm>"Victory of Faith

² HYPERLINK "<http://www.marxists.org/subject/students/index.htm>"i HYPERLINK "<http://www.marxists.org/subject/students/index.htm>"sm

Fascism was based on the fundamental rejection of all of these ideas.

Mussolini states in his 1935 essay on fascism:

Such a conception of life makes Fascism the complete opposite of that doctrine, the base of so-called scientific and Marxian Socialism, the materialist conception of history; according to which the history of human civilization can be explained simply through the conflict of interests among the various social groups and by the change and development in the means and instruments of production. That the changes in the economic field—new discoveries of raw materials, new methods of working them and the inventions of science—have their importance no one can deny; but that these factors are sufficient to explain the history of humanity excluding all others is an absurd delusion. Fascism, now and always, believes in holiness and in heroism; that is to say, in actions influenced by no economic motive, direct or indirect. And if we deny the economic conception of history, according to which men are no more than puppets carried to and fro by the waves of chance, while the real directing forces are quite out of their control, it follows that the existence of an unchangeable and unchanging class-war is also denied—the natural progeny of the economic conception of history. And above all Fascism denies that class-war can be the preponderant force in the transformation of society.

Hitler's 1933 Reichstag speech, considered one of his most important because of its generally positive reception by the international community, also clearly defined the fascist anti-Communist agenda.

"IN NOVEMBER, 1918, Marxist organizations seized the executive power by means of a revolution. The monarchs were dethroned, the authorities of the Reich and of the States removed from office, and thereby a breach of the Constitution was committed. The success of the revolution in a material sense protected the guilty parties from the hands of the law. They sought to justify it morally by asserting that Germany or its Government bore the guilt for the outbreak of the War.

This assertion was deliberately and actually untrue. In consequence, however, these untrue accusations in the interest of our former enemies led to the severest oppression of the entire German nation and to the breach of the assurances given to us in Wilson's fourteen points, and so for Germany, that is to say the working classes of the German people, to a time of infinite misfortune....

The splitting up of the nation into groups with irreconcilable views, systematically brought about by the false doctrines of Marxism, means the destruction of the basis of a possible communal life.... It is only the creation of a real national community, rising above the interests and differences of rank and class, that can permanently remove the source of nourishment of these aberrations of the human mind. The establishment of such a solidarity of views in the German body corporate is all the more important, for it is only thereby that the possibility is provided of maintaining friendly relations with foreign Powers without regard to the tendencies or general principles by which they are dominated, for the elimination of communism in Germany is a purely domestic German affair."

So fascism, as it developed, was reactionary; it was a reaction to the perceived problems of modernism, and the immediate perceived threat of Communism.

Mussolini declared fascism as the ideology of the "ethical State". From Mussolini's 1935 essay:

The foundation of Fascism is the conception of the State, its character, its duty, and its aim. Fascism conceives of the State as an absolute, in comparison with which all individuals or groups are relative, only to be conceived of in their relation to the State. The "Liberal State" is not a directing force, guiding the play and development (both material and spiritual) of a collective body, but merely a force limited to the function of recording results. On the other hand, the Fascist State is itself conscious, and has itself a will and a personality-thus it may be called the "ethical" State....

The individual in the Fascist State is not annulled but rather multiplied, just in the same way that a soldier in a regiment is not diminished but rather increased by the number of his comrades. The Fascist State organizes the nation, but leaves a sufficient margin of liberty to the individual; the latter is deprived of all useless and possibly harmful freedom, but retains what is essential; the deciding power in this question cannot be the individual, but the State alone....

The Fascist State is an embodied will to power and government, the idea of force in action. According to Fascism, government is not so much a thing to be expressed in territorial or military terms as in terms of morality and spirit. It is an empire-that is to

say, a nation which directly or indirectly rules other nations without the need of conquering a single square yard of territory.

That statement says a lot so I will dissect out the finer points.

This starts to get tricky because of modern understandings of what Liberalism is. I don't want to get too far ahead, but I will say that the modern popular concept of "Liberalism" in America is in some ways the concept of fascism, and what was at that time referred to as Liberalism would perhaps be referred to as libertarianism in America today, thus the above statement is seemingly confusing.

Firstly, fascism, as it relates to governance, is an ideology based on the importance of the State. Fascism holds that the institution of the State is itself the most important entity in society, i.e. that the government is more important than individuals.

Secondly, fascism holds that the purpose of the State is not just to uphold rights and document legalities, but that the purpose of the State is to organize society and guide the spiritual and economic development of the nation. Thirdly, the goal of the fascist State is to, essentially, protect people by removing "harmful" freedoms, while preserving "essential" rights. These two concepts are what most people in America identify with so-called "Nanny State Liberalism", although in truth both conservatives and liberals in America support such views.

Additionally, the fascist State embarks on imperialism, not only through the traditional means of colonial territorial control, like that of the British Empire, but through the use of hegemony to directly or indirectly control nations with or without occupation.

This is known as neo-liberalism, but is now often referred to as neo-conservatism, as this practice is supported mostly by the American Right today.

There are two somewhat distinct aspects of fascism, social fascism and economic fascism. Both the economic and social aspects of fascism focused importance on the role of the State.

The fascist concept of the State was as an entity which was to be used to promote the "cultural well being" of civilization; that liberal society existed in chaos because the State had no authority to enforce organization or to actually promote culture or to give people a direction, and that it was the goal of fascism to give people direction in a chaotic world. The desires of the fascist leaders, Mussolini, Franco, and Hitler, to

"improve" society were genuine. These were not people who were simply trying to take power in order to materially benefit themselves. They did materially benefit themselves in the process, but they had an honest desire to transform society and, in their view, make the world a better place.

Economic Fascism

Economic fascism was essentially the predecessor of Keynesian ideology.

Keynes' *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money* was published in 1936 and has today been largely regarded as the foundation of the post-War economy of the United States. However, Keynes' economic ideology is essentially the same thing as economic fascism, and indeed Keynes himself was heavily influenced by fascism, associated with fascist thinkers, and stated that the fascists were perhaps the most well suited to adopting his economic agenda (which is really because they had already developed similar programs).

Keynesianism is an attack on laissez-faire capitalism and proposes solutions to the problems posed by that model.

In relation to the State Keynes said in 1924:

"We must aim at separating those services which are technically social from those which are technically individual. The most important items on the Agenda of the State relate not to those activities which private individuals are already fulfilling, but to those activities which fall outside the sphere of the individual, to those decisions which are made by no one if the State does not make them. The important thing for Government is not to do things which individuals are doing already, and to do them a little better or a little worse, but to do those things which at present are not done at all."

In the German version of the *The General Theory* Keynes wrote:

I confess that much of the following book is illustrated and expounded mainly with reference to the conditions existing in the Anglo-Saxon countries. Nevertheless the theory of output as a whole, which is what the following book purports to provide, is much more easily adapted to the conditions of a totalitarian state than is the production and distribution of a given output produced under conditions of perfect

competition and a large measure of laissez-faire. This is one of the reasons that justifies my calling my theory a general theory. Since it is based on less narrow assumptions than the orthodox theory, it is also more easily adapted to a large order of different circumstances. Although I have thus worked it out having the conditions in the Anglo-Saxon countries in view - where a great deal of laissez-faire still prevails - it yet remains applicable in situations where national leadership is more pronounced.

The essence of Keynesian economic ideology is basically the use of the State to promote economic interests, the idea that the State should promote a middle class through the redistribution of wealth, and the idea of the use of State spending in order to promote employment.

The early laissez-faire economists, such as Adam Smith, believed in the liberal ideology that individuals should be encouraged to take actions that would be beneficial to society. The development of laissez-faire capitalist ideology was based on the premise that when allowing people to pursue their own private interests people would be guided by an "invisible hand" to act in the best interests of society. The foundation of laissez-faire ideology was not the pursuit of self interest for self interest's sake, but rather that through the laissez-faire process social interests would be served. As Smith put it, men would live in a system of natural liberty in which each individual would be free to pursue his own ends but would be guided as if by an invisible hand to serve the interests of others in society as the means to his own self-improvement.

By the turn of the 20th century people in all advanced capitalist societies were reaching the conclusion that Smith's vision of society was simply not being realized and that laissez-faire policy was in fact not serving the interests of society, but rather the interests of a small wealthy elite.

One of the ultimate agendas, and successes, of the fascists was to create a strong and stable middle class. They viewed the problems of Western society to be both "out of control" laissez-faire capitalism and its opposing force, Communism. The fascists correctly understood that Communism was a reaction to the excesses of laissez-faire capitalism. Thus they believed that the solution to the threat of Communism was the mitigation of the problems of laissez-faire capitalism.

This problem was widely recognized in the early 20th century in all Western societies. America and Britain entered the 20th century as the giants of trade and relatively laissez-faire capitalism, but it was recognized even in those countries that laissez-faire capitalism was in fact causing major problems, not only for society, which was growing increasingly fragmented with increasing economic inequality, but also for the dominant capitalists themselves who were becoming more and more interested in protectionism as opposed to free trade.

At this point it would be a good time to define what capitalism really is. Capitalism is basically an economic system in which profits can be made through ownership of property. To expound on that, capitalism is a system in which people privately own the "means of production" and employ others to generate profits for them.

People often get free trade tied up into the idea of capitalism, but free trade and capitalism do not directly have anything to do with each other. You can have capitalism without free trade and you can have free trade without capitalism. In fact, you can argue that under a purely privatized capitalist system free trade could not exist because if everything were privatized then all trade would have to take place along privately owned infrastructure, which of course would mean that tolls or some form of compensation would have to be used to pay for the use of the infrastructure on a per-use basis, meaning that it would not be "free to trade", as all trade would have tolls or user fees tied to it. Free trade, however, was definitely a strong element of the development of laissez-faire capitalism, but as the Marxists pointed out, capitalism ends up creating its own obstacles as it develops.

So in fact free trade can only take place with the existence of at least some publicly owned property, which can be used as the avenue of trade.

Getting back to capitalism, capitalism is a system that revolves around the capitalist. A capitalist is someone who makes money through ownership. A capitalist is one who is an investor or an owner. Support of capitalism is support of a system in which people can "earn" money without actually working, i.e. they can receive profits from the work of others by owning the property which they employ other people to use to provide goods or services.

In many cases the owner of the property, for example a barbershop, also works in the business and provides part of the labor to make the business run and operate

and generate profits. This is typically what we think of when we think of a small business. In other cases owners or investors do not actually provide any of the labor for the business that they own. This is what is traditionally referred to as being a "capitalist", one who owns but does not labor, and this is often what we think of when we think of big business and investors.

What fascism was all about in the economic sense was ultimately the protection and regulation of capitalism, i.e. the preservation of private ownership of the means of production. Fascism sought to use the power of the State to protect and to stabilize the economic system by bringing the major capitalists into a system of cooperation with each other so that economic conflict would be reduced and through their cooperation stability would be, and was, achieved. Fascism opposed laissez-faire capitalism, but nonetheless supported capitalism in a regulated form. The Italian form of fascism was more capitalist in nature, the German form was more socialist in nature. Both supported private ownership of the means of production.

Of the three major ideologies, laissez-faire capitalism, fascism, and Marxist socialism, fascism was the only one which was objectively pro middle class. Fundamentally, laissez-faire capitalism has no goals at all, however it was apparent that laissez-faire resulted in major socio-economic stratification and promoted the interests of a small wealthy elite over everyone else. The goal of Marxist socialism/communism was the complete elimination of class and the role of private capital. The goal of the Marxists was ultimately to eliminate all traditional elements of society and create a new society founded on the principle of equality. Fascism (and Keynesianism), in the economic sense, was the middle ground between these two major competing ideologies.

In 1920 Adolph Hitler outlined 25 points of the NSDAP program (the program of the National Socialist Party). Among the points was:

We demand the creation and maintenance of a healthy middle class, the immediate communalizing of big department stores, and their lease at a cheap rate to small traders, and that the utmost consideration shall be shown to all small traders in the placing of State and municipal orders.

The National Socialist Workers Party, which would eventually become known as the Nazis, was not known as a fascist party at the time, but it would later become

accepted by Mussolini and others as a party whose platform was in line with the objectives of fascism.

The National Socialist platform, like other fascist platforms, called for the promotion of a middle class and for the support of small business through the power of the State.

However, once in power the fascist regimes, especially in Germany, actually supported the wealthy establishment and did not give the middle class the gains that they were hoping for.

Another major goal of fascist policy was to achieve "full employment". This was of critical importance due to the economic depression of post WWI Europe.

Part of the way that the fascists sought to do this was through the use of state spending and corporate regulations. When Mussolini came to power he, *"instituted a program of public works hitherto unrivalled in modern Europe. Bridges, canals and roads were built, hospitals and schools, railway stations and orphanages, swamps were drained and land reclaimed, forests were planted and universities were endowed."* (Hibbert 1965)

Mussolini's policies were revolutionary at the time and they were admired by many people around the world. Through the use of these types of programs, and deficit spending, both Germany and Italy quickly rose up out of the worldwide depression and became some of the most successful countries of the time economically. Unemployment dropped dramatically and social welfare programs were instituted in both Germany and Italy. The fascists were the first to seriously call for and institute forms of social insurance. Again from Hitler's 1920 NSDAP 25 point agenda, point number 15:

We demand the extensive development of insurance for old age.

In order to regulate industry and "promote the interests of society" the fascists merged the State with private industry.

Mussolini himself stated that:

"Fascism should more appropriately be called Corporatism because it is a merger of State and corporate power."

After the war, during the Nuremberg Trials, Hermann Goering stated:

The strange part of it all is that I don't feel like a criminal and that if I had been in the United States or South America or any other place else, I would probably be a leading figure in one of those countries. I am a capitalist and a cultured gentleman.

Fascism is essentially organized capitalism. By organizing capitalism, and tying the interests of corporations to that of the State, Mussolini was able to, in some ways, please the wealthy elite while at the same time pleasing the working classes of Italy. Mussolini promised to restore discipline to the workplace and to back up and support private industry, while at the same time removing some of the autonomy and individual power of private interests.

Elements of Mussolini's fascist system, such as the National Council of Corporations, which was to be comprised of representatives from industry, labor, and state, who worked together to settle labor disputes and guide industry, the Institute for Industrial Reconstruction, and other such state bureaucracies, regulated and administered Italy's economy. Well established big businessmen became highly involved in the state bureaucracy and the Corporate State became a tool for establishment businessmen to serve themselves.

The Italian system also subsidized and regulated agriculture as part of their program for national self sufficiency. Mussolini pushed for autarchy, economic self-sufficiency, which won popular support as a means to make Italians more independent and as a protectionist measure for Italian businesses.

Of course another major reason for self sufficiency was Italy's military aspirations. Mussolini openly stated that fascism was anti-pacifist, and that he intended to rebuild a Roman Empire. Because of this, Italy's economy was geared towards military industry. This was true in Germany as well. Both countries began to promote science, mathematics, and engineering in school as a way to develop better scientists who could be employed to build better weapons and military corporations were given significant support from State funds. The military focus worked best in Germany, which proceeded to produce some of the most advanced technologies in the history of the world at the time, and the most advanced weapons. The military industrial complex acted as a boon to the economy by providing a large number of jobs, which made people happy and further bolstered support for the leaders. By the fact that the State played an important role in the economy, the State saw to it to protect and promote industries which were viewed as vital to State interests.

However, both Italy and Germany ran up huge deficits which ended up severely hurting their economies by mid war.

Throughout World War II, Italy and Germany both suffered major economic hardship and even the citizens had very little food to eat. The concentration camps were beyond horrific, but what is less known is that the German people were barely able to feed themselves as well. On May 2, 1942, three years before the end of the war, Joseph Goebbels wrote in his personal diary:

I received a report about the present position of German agriculture which is anything but encouraging. There is a dearth of seeds, of man power, of gasoline, of horses, of cattle, of good weather- in short of just about everything essential to guarantee sufficient food. It may be necessary next autumn to take in out belts a few more notches.

Social Fascism

Fascism, in the social sense, is ultimately an affirmation of "traditional values". Fascism embodied much of traditional social ideology, such as "machismo", family values, religious faith, patriotism, social structure, honor, and traditional hard work.

Asvero Gravelli, a prominent author on fascism at the time, described fascism in the following way:

Fascism transcends democracy and liberalism; its regenerative action is based on granite foundations: the idea of hierarchy, of the participation of the whole population in the life of the State, social justice in the equitable distribution of rights and duties, the infusion of public life with moral principles, the affirmation of religious values, the prestige of the family, the ethical interpretation of the ideas of order, authority and liberty. In the light of this transcendence Europe will be able to find its way to enter a new phase of History.

Discussing the exact nature of fascist beliefs can be difficult because there is always debate about what the fascist leaders "really" believed and what they just said in order to manipulate the public. In truth there is some disconnect between the "true" beliefs of some fascist leaders and what they espoused in public, but what is actually most important is understanding the public perception of fascism because this is what determined fascist culture and this is what the public at large believed in and

were drawn to. The other thing that is difficult about understanding the personal views of some of the fascist leaders is that it's very hard to separate anti-fascist propaganda from truth.

Fascism first took root as an opposition to Marxism. The core of fascist propaganda and mentality was anti-Marxist. The fascists were in a more general sense opposed to everything that was of the "Left leaning" ideology, which is to say liberalism in general, but what they had the strongest opposition to was Marxism.

The fascists talked a lot about the building of strong moral character, hard work, and family values. Fascism was an ideology of order and obedience where people were expected to fall in line with leadership, and questioning and criticizing were looked at as the qualities of the decadent "liberals".

From a 1943 Nazi pamphlet:

...liberalism taught that all people were equal, that there were no value differences between the races, that external differences (e.g., body type, skin color) were unimportant. Each person, regardless of race, might be a hero or a coward, an idealist or a materialist, creative or useless to society, militarily able, scientifically able, artistically gifted. The environment and education were the important elements that made men good and valuable. If one provided the proper environment and freed people from their chains, the peoples would join together to develop their abilities in a unified humanity, and eternal peace would result. Therefore liberalism demanded equality for all, the same opportunities for everyone, in particular the Jews, equality and freedom in the economic sphere, etc.

We Germans have seen where such doctrines lead. Liberalism tore down the structures that held races and peoples together, releasing the destructive drives. The result was economic chaos that led to millions of unemployed on the one side and the senseless luxury of economic jackals on the other. Liberalism destroyed the people's economic foundations, allowing the triumph of subhumans. They won the leading role in the political parties, the economy, the sciences, arts and press, hollowing out the nation from inside. The equality of all citizens, regardless of race, led to the mixing of Europeans with Jews, Negro, Mongols and so on, resulting in the decay and decline of the Aryan race.

Fascism is an ideology that focuses on the State, and as such the boundaries between Church and State were broken just as the boundaries between Corporation and State were broken. Just as corporations and the State were brought into mutually beneficial relationships so to were the Christian Churches and the State.

Above all, fascism was a movement that gained its support from a growing religious sentiment among the public. It is not so much a case of what certain fascist leaders believed, it was more a case of what it was that the public wanted from their leadership and the ways in which those leaders gave the public what they wanted. What the people wanted was a religious experience and they wanted to feel a close bond between Church and State, and thus the fascist leaders identified with religious feelings in the community and used it to their advantage.

Benito Mussolini was himself not a particularly religious man, but he did cater to the religious beliefs of the public. He embraced the Catholic Church and in fact became a member of the Church. Mussolini stated, *"There is no need to get all tied up with antireligiousness and give Catholics reason for unease. A fight...between Church and State, the State would lose."*

The Catholic tradition was very strong in Italy, but it had come under attack from liberals and Marxists. Mussolini knew that people were unhappy about this and instead embraced the Church as a partner of the State.

In 1929 Mussolini signed the Lateran Treaty with Pope Pius XI. This established Catholicism as the official religion of the State, gave the Pope increased political powers, gave papal sovereignty to Vatican City, ensured that the Catholic religion would be taught in all schools, compensated the Pope with \$90 million for the loss of papal property since 1870, and cemented broad Catholic support for Mussolini.

The issue of religion in Nazi Germany was a bit more complex however. Religion was an important part of the National Socialist movement and, as in Italy, a desire for a religious resurgence fueled support for the Nazi regime, especially early on. However, Hitler preached his own brand of Christian fundamentalism. Some of the other Nazi leaders espoused anti-Christian, but still highly religious, views. Nevertheless it was the strong religiosity of his message that gained Hitler much of his support.

In Hitler's 1920 NSDAP 25 point agenda, point number 24:

We demand freedom for all religious denominations in the State, provided they do not threaten its existence and do not offend the moral feelings of the German race.

The Party, as such, stands for positive Christianity, but does not commit itself to any particular denomination. It combats the Jewish-materialistic spirit within and without us, and is convinced that our nation can achieve permanent health only from within on the basis of the principle: The common interest before self-interest.

Both Italy and Germany had a reasonable degree of religious freedom with the exception of Judaism and the lack religious belief. Atheism was seen as one of the major "evils" of modern society and heavily associated with Marxism, and Judaism of course, was not tolerated in Germany, where the Jewish synagogues were eventually destroyed in 1938. What was ultimately important in Germany was a belief in God, whatever form that belief took, as this 1937 article on education, Educational Principles of the New Germany; What Schools and Parents Need to Know About the Goals of National Socialist Education, states:

Life comes from God and returns to God. All life and all races follow God's ordinances. No people and no race can ignore them. We want the German youth to again recognize the religious nature of life. They must realize that God wants the individual as well as the whole people, and that they lose contact with life when they lose contact with God! God and nation are the two foundations of the life of the individual and the community. We want no shallow and superficial piety, rather a deep faith that God guides the world, that he controls it, and a consciousness of the relationship between God and each individual, and between God and the live of the people and the fatherland. The National Socialist state will promote such a deeply religious educational system. We want parents to support and strengthen this by honesty and by good example.

Early on fascism was seen as a movement that embraced Christianity. In Germany fascists promoted what they called "true Christianity", which was essentially Christian fundamentalism.

In 1999 John Conway of the Association of Contemporary Church Historians discussed the role of Protestantism in the Nazi movement. Here he presents information from another study:

"Richard Steigmann-Gall's contribution, "Apostasy or Religiosity? The Cultural Meanings of the Protestant Vote for Hitler," dealt with the question of who voted for Hitler and investigated the roles that German Protestantism played among the Nazi electorate. Steigmann-Gall identifies what he calls a "Protestant affinity" for Nazi politics leading up to January 1933, when Hitler became chancellor of Germany. Protestantism was the single most important factor in determining who voted for Hitler, he said, and it was not just the institutional affiliation that made the difference. According to Steigmann-Gall, the extent of support for National Socialism correlates directly to the degree of allegiance to Protestantism, rather than, as has been so often suggested, apostasy from it."

In 1933 in a speech in Stuttgart Hitler stated:

"And now Staatspräsident Bolz says that Christianity and the Catholic faith are threatened by us. And to that charge I can answer: In the first place it is Christians and not international atheists who now stand at the head of Germany. I do not merely talk of Christianity, no, I also profess that I will never ally myself with the parties which destroy Christianity. If many wish today to take threatened Christianity under their protection, where, I would ask, was Christianity for them in these fourteen years when they went arm in arm with atheism? No, never and at no time was greater internal damage done to Christianity than in these fourteen years when a party, theoretically Christian, sat with those who denied God in one and the same Government.

I would ask whether the economic policy of this now superseded system was a Christian policy. Was the inflation an undertaking for which Christians could answer, or has the destruction of German life, of the German peasant as well as of the middles classes, been Christian?"

What the Nazis espoused was that Christians who tolerated atheism or Jews were in fact not "true Christians". Hitler's major social charge was that he was going to clean up Germany and rid it of the influences of Marxists, Jews, and atheists, who he claimed were destroying not only German culture, but all of Western culture.

Just to drive this point home I'm going to present several more Nazi quotes.

"There are only two possibilities in Germany; do not imagine that the people will forever go with the middle party, the party of compromises; one day it will turn to

those who have most consistently foretold the coming ruin and have sought to dissociate themselves from it. And that party is either the Left: and then God help us! for it will lead us to complete destruction - to Bolshevism, or else it is a party of the Right which at the last, when the people is in utter despair, when it has lost all its spirit and has no longer any faith in anything, is determined for its part ruthlessly to seize the reins of power - that is the beginning of resistance of which I spoke a few minutes ago." - Adolph Hitler, 1922 Munich Speech

"He said in the last session of the Landtag that his feeling 'as a man and a Christian' prevented him from being an anti-Semite. I SAY: MY FEELING AS A CHRISTIAN POINTS ME TO MY LORD AND SAVIOUR AS A FIGHTER. IT POINTS ME TO THE MAN WHO ONCE IN LONELINESS, SURROUNDED ONLY BY A FEW FOLLOWERS, RECOGNIZED THESE JEWS FOR WHAT THEY WERE AND SUMMONED MEN TO THE FIGHT AGAINST THEM AND WHO, GOD'S TRUTH! WAS GREATEST NOT AS SUFFERER BUT AS FIGHTER. In boundless love as a Christian and as a man I read through the passage which tells us how the Lord at last rose in His might and seized the scourge to drive out of the Temple the brood of vipers and of adders. How terrific was His fight for the world against the Jewish poison. Today, after two thousand years, with deepest emotion I recognize more profoundly than ever before - the fact that it was for this that He had to shed His blood upon the Cross. As a Christian I have no duty to allow myself to be cheated, but I have the duty to be a fighter for truth and justice. And as a man I have the duty to see to it that human society does not suffer the same catastrophic collapse as did the civilization of the ancient world some two thousand years ago - a civilization which was driven to its ruin through this same Jewish people.

Then indeed when Rome collapsed there were endless streams of new German bands flowing into the Empire from the North; but, if Germany collapses today, who is there to come after us? German blood upon this earth is on the way to gradual exhaustion unless we pull ourselves together and make ourselves free!

And if there is anything which could demonstrate that we are acting rightly, it is the distress which daily grows. For as a Christian I have also a duty to my own people. And when I look on my people I see it work and work and toil and labor, and at the end of the week it has only for its wage wretchedness and misery. When I go out in the morning and see these men standing in their queues and look into their pinched

faces, then I believe I would be no Christian, but a very devil, if I felt no pity for them, if I did not, as did our Lord two thousand years ago, turn against those by whom today this poor people is plundered and exploited. "

- Adolph Hitler, 1922 Munich Speech

Christianity was not content with erecting an altar of its own. It had first to destroy the pagan altars. It was only in virtue of this passionate intolerance that an apodictic faith could grow up. And intolerance is an indispensable condition for the growth of such a faith.

- Adolph Hitler, Mein Kampf

The best characterization is provided by the product of this religious education, the Jew himself. His life is only of this world, and his spirit is inwardly as alien to true Christianity as his nature two thousand years previous was to the great founder of the new doctrine. Of course, the latter made no secret of his attitude toward the Jewish people, and when necessary he even took to the whip to drive from the temple of the Lord this adversary of all humanity, who then as always saw in religion nothing but an instrument for his business existence. In return, Christ was nailed to the cross, while our present-day party Christians debase themselves to begging for Jewish votes at elections and later try to arrange political swindles with atheistic Jewish parties-and this against their own nation.

- Adolph Hitler, Mein Kampf

As a matter of fact we succeeded until the autumn of 1923 in keeping our movement away from such controversies. The most devoted Protestant could stand side by side with the most devoted Catholic in our ranks without having his conscience disturbed in the slightest as far as concerned his religious convictions. The bitter struggle which both waged in common against the wrecker of Aryan humanity taught them natural respect and esteem. And it was just in those years that our movement had to engage in a bitter strife with the Centre Party not for religious ends but for national, racial, political and economic ends. The success we then achieved showed that we were right, but it does not speak today in favour of those who thought they knew better.

In recent years things have gone so far that patriotic circles, in god-forsaken blindness of their religious strife, could not recognize the folly of their conduct even from the fact that atheist Marxist newspapers advocated the cause of one religious

denomination or the other, according as it suited Marxist interests, so as to create confusion through slogans and declarations which were often immeasurably stupid, now molesting the one party and again the other, and thus poking the fire to keep the blaze at its highest.

But in the case of a people like the Germans, whose history has so often shown them capable of fighting for phantoms to the point of complete exhaustion, every war-cry is a mortal danger. By these slogans our people have often been drawn away from the real problems of their existence. While we were exhausting our energies in religious wars the others were acquiring their share of the world. And while the patriotic movement is debating with itself whether the ultramontane danger be greater than the Jewish, or vice versa, the Jew is destroying the racial basis of our existence and thereby annihilating our people. As far as regards that kind of 'patriotic' warrior, on behalf of the National Socialist Movement and therefore of the German people I pray with all my heart: "Lord, preserve us from such friends, and then we can easily deal with our enemies."
- Adolph Hitler, Mein Kampf

Though Hitler himself never spoke openly in opposition to Christianity, other Nazi leaders did. Below is a speech from Dr. Robert Ley to party leaders in 1939, which serves as an example of the types of things said by some Nazi leaders in relation to Christianity:

"We must take a broad view of history, and see everything that German culture has accomplished. It is childish of England to want to play our baby-sitter. We cannot allow that. We must see our enemies clearly. Their worldview is Christian and negative. Of course Roosevelt does not imagine himself only a liberator of the Christian world; he knows the Jew is at the root of it all.

If the Jew wants to fight, it is fine with us. We have wanted that fight for a long time. There is no room in the world for the Jews any more. The Jew or us, one of us will have to go. We know that the Jew will lose, that he and his devilish, life-denying and destructive doctrines will be annihilated..."

"Look at our people today, and remember how they were ten or twenty years ago. If that is the measure of whether one believes in God or not, if one faces everything that fate brings, if one faces war or peace calmly, if one faces life calmly and lives it

the same way, then one has God. To have God means to have a fixed point in life, to have God means to have faith. I do not know what the future will bring, since I am only a man, but I am not concerned. English newspapers write: "Germany will gain no advantage from Bohemia and Moravia." One doesn't know which is more astonishing: the Führer's pace or the peace with which 80 million Germans accept what happens. That means we have God: we are calm, we have faith and confidence - just like the priests always say. Yes, the Führer gave confidence to every German, and therefore peace and faith. We have found God.

We have become a people that believes in God. This is what our idea of life and of affirming life has accomplished, becoming the idea of Germany. We will be able to do everything if that grows from its small beginning into a religion, to something holy to the German people...."

"The Church may say its only weapon is peace. There is no institution more bloodthirsty than the Church. No state, no count, no world ruler has spilled anywhere near as much blood as the Church. It says it was all for a higher cause, and that the end justifies the means. No, that was not for the glory of God, who created humanity so that it could live. It was only for the glory of the pope and to satisfy the power lust of the priests."

All of the Nazi leadership and institutions were deeply religious, but some were less traditional in their beliefs. Again, there are two issues to consider, #1 the personal views of Nazi leadership, and #2 the perception of the public. In terms of learning lessons about society and in terms of understanding fascist culture #2 is the more important, however issue #1 will always remain relevant as well.

There have always been questions as to whether Hitler originally just used pro-Christian rhetoric as a propaganda tool, but this does not seem to be the case. It appears more likely that his views did in fact change over time. There are many examples of Hitler's early writings which were written before there was any need for him to try and propagandize to anyone and his views were Christian at that time.

In fact it seems more likely that Dr. Joseph Goebbels, the Nazi Propaganda Minister, and one of Hitler's closest friends, influenced Hitler's views over time. Dr. Goebbels, though himself a believer in God and raised a devout Catholic, was opposed to established religions and saw the power of churches as a possible threat to the Nazi

State. There is also speculation that Joseph Goebbels may have been molested by Catholic priests as a boy. Dr. Goebbels led a major campaign against pedophile priests while in power with the Nazi Party.

Now that the basics of fascism have been outlined, how does anti-Semitism play into all of this?

There is much, much, more to anti-Semitism than first meets the eye. Anti-Semitism is not just hating Jews for the sake of hating Jews, in the anti-Semitic mind there are clearly defined reasons to hate Jews. In order to understand anti-Semitism you first have to know what these reasons are, why these things are hated in the first place, and lastly why they are associated with Jews.

For the most part, Jews were, in their mind, the embodiment of everything that the fascists opposed, and when I say fascists I do not just mean the leaders, I mean the civilian public as well.

I have already outlined what the fascists opposed, they opposed liberalism, democracy, Marxism, secularism, and laissez-faire capitalism. What is most important to note about this is that many people, not just the fascists, shared many elements of these same feelings. These sentiments are in essence the definition of right-wing social ideology.

The roots of anti-Semitism go back to the early days of Christianity, but I will only cover them briefly.

Ironically, Christianity was in its origin a liberal movement within Judaism. Both the Pharisees and the Zealots were Jewish conservatives that were opposed to Roman culture and rule. There were also the Sadducees and Herodians who were Jewish liberals, some of which worked with the Romans and had in fact become respected members of the Roman community.

The Christian movement was in many ways a political movement that opposed corruption within the Jewish community and supported non-violence in opposition to Roman infringement on Jewish sovereignty. Christianity was a liberal movement that opposed the Roman treatment of Jews, the poor, and the oppressed masses. While some Jews integrated into Roman society, others were oppressed by the Romans, and Rome took some Jews into slavery. During a strongly conservative time in Romans society, shortly prior to the adoption of Christianity by Rome, many

religions, including Judaism and Christianity, were outlawed. Christianity was later adopted as the official religion of Rome however.

Once Christianity became the dominant religion of Rome the Christians that came to power in Rome began taking further action against Jews, who they despised as people who were not only responsible for the killing of Jesus, but who had also opposed the Christian movement all along.

Anyone who has participated in a powerful mass movement will be familiar with the special sense of power that comes from being "a part of something bigger". An actual physical sensation is experienced as people feel joined to those around them, almost as if by electricity. A feeling as though together you are all united and you are all in complete harmony. This is an important element of many religions, and it is this feeling that groups such as Christian fundamentalists make heavy use of in their organizations. When you see fundamentalist Christians at a service in large masses, swaying back and fourth with their hands in the air and their eyes closed, they are often experiencing this feeling of social unity. This feeling is produced by chemicals in the brain and can actually become addictive.

The Nazi regime engendered this type of feeling in a large segment of the German nation. This powerful, electric, feeling of social unity and love for Germany, fellow Germans, and the Fuhrer, swept the country under the leadership of Adolph Hitler.

It is this powerful feeling of love and unity that made the atrocities of the Nazi regime possible.

The Jews increasingly became outsiders, because they were never a part of the Nazi Party, and the Nazi Party had become like a national fraternity. Just as people in fraternities often look down on non-members naturally, this same phenomenon took place in Germany. In addition to this natural attitude towards non-Nazis, the Jews were increasingly portrayed as a threat to the unity and community that had been created in Germany. It's important to remember that the major actions against the Jews didn't begin until 5 or more years after the Nazi Party had gained control of the country, and that during that time the focus of the party was not on spreading hate, but on building community and loyalty.

Similar to the way that a lover may commit murder in a crime of passion, or the way that fraternity members may commit violence out of a sense of passion for the group,

Germans turned against the Jews because they were viewed as threats to the unity and strength of the German society that they had grown to love. The Germans had become so attached to their sense of community, and so addicted to the religious sense of purpose and social bonds that they felt as Nazis, they were driven to take any action they believed was necessary to preserve this feeling and to protect this sense of community.

It is impossible to understand the actions of the Germans against minorities, and the loyalty of the Germans to Adolph Hitler, without understanding this real sense of passion and community that had been engendered in the German people. By viewing Nazism primarily as an institution of hate the reality of the movement is missed and it is impossible to understand why it was really so powerful.

THEREFORE FASCISM IS NOTHING BUT A "CONCEPT OF OTHER"

PART-2

FASCISM IN INDIA AND THE EVENTS TRANSPIRED

Today, this very vision, which through the freedom struggle and later came to be accepted by a majority of the Indian people, is facing unprecedented challenges. The assumption of the reins of state power by the BJP and through it the control of the RSS, indeed puts the future of such a vision in jeopardy. In this context it is indeed appropriate that the theme of our lecture today is the rise of communalism and fascism in independent India.

The clash between the visions of India's future as an independent country begins not with the dawn of independence. It in fact dates back to the twenties when the formation of the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh brought into existence a force that sought to convert India into a theocratic Hindu Rashtra. Since then, all through these decades the struggle has been an ongoing one.

The RSS vision of a Hindu Rashtra was articulated in a chilling treatise by its Sarsanghchalak or supreme leader Madhav Sadashiv Golwalkar titled "We or Our Nationhood Defined" written in 1938, first published in 1939 and later in 1947 after independence. There he states in unambiguous terms

"...The conclusion is unquestionably forced upon us that... in Hindusthan exists and must needs exist the ancient Hindu nation and nought else but the Hindu Nation. All those not belonging to the national i.e. Hindu Race, Religion, Culture and Language naturally fall out of the pale of real `National' life."

"We repeat; in Hindusthan, the land of the Hindus, lives and should live the Hindu Nation - satisfying all the five essential requirements of the scientific nation concept of the modern world. Consequently only those movements are truly `National' as aim at re-building, re-vitalizing and emancipating from its present stupor, the Hindu Nation. Those only are nationalist patriots, who, with the aspiration to glorify the Hindu race and nation next to their heart, are prompted into activity and strive to achieve that goal. All others are either traitors and enemies to the National cause, or, to take a charitable view, idiots" (page 43 & 44). And then continues "...we must bear in mind that so far as `nation' is concerned, all those, who fall outside the five-fold limits of that idea, can have no place in the national life, unless they abandon their differences, adopt the religion, culture and language of the nation and completely merge themselves in the National Race. So long, however, as they maintain their racial, religious and cultural differences, they cannot but be only foreigners" (page 45).

And further: "There are only two courses open to the foreign elements, either to merge themselves in the national race and adopt its culture, or to live at its mercy so long as the national race may allow them to do so and to quit the country at the sweet will of the national race. From this standpoint, sanctioned by the experience of shrewd old nations, the foreign races in Hindusthan must either adopt the Hindu culture and language, must learn to respect and hold in reverence Hindu religion, must entertain no idea but those of the glorification of the Hindu race and culture, i.e., of the Hindu nation and must lose their separate existence to merge in the Hindu race, or may stay in the country, wholly subordinated to the Hindu Nation,

claiming nothing, deserving no privileges, far less any preferential treatment - not even citizen's rights. There is at least should be, no other course for them to adopt. We are an old nation; let us deal, as old nations ought to and do deal, with the foreign races, who have chosen to live in our country" (Golwalkar, 1939, pp 47-48).

Notwithstanding all the subterfuge that the leaders of the Saffron Brigade indulge in today to state that this book had been subsequently withdrawn there is no official testimony to it. In fact in a sympathetic account of the RSS, (JA. Curran *Militant Hinduism in Indian Politics -- a study of the RSS*) states "The genuine ideology of the Sangh is based upon principles formulated by its founder Dr. Hegdewar. These principles have been consolidated and amplified by the present leader in a small book called "We Or Our Nationhood Defined" written in 1938. 'We' can be described as the RSS 'bible'. It is the basic primer in the indoctrination of Sangh volunteers." (This was written in 1979)

Golwalkar's abiding influence has been in providing the saffron brigade with an ideological formation not merely in terms of ideas and principles but also in terms of establishing an organisational structure to achieve the aim of a Hindu Rashtra.

Golwalkar was primarily instrumental in establishing the organisational structure of what is now known as the Sangh Parivar. The strategy was clear. The RSS would in the public eye confine itself to "cultural activity" while its affiliates would branch out into the various sections spreading the message of "Hindu Rashtra". These seemingly independent tentacles were welded together by the RSS. This organisational network is today there for all to see.

Golwalkar's important initiative, however, comes in the attempt to organise the Hindu religious leaders in mid-1964 "to discuss ways in which various Hindu sects and tendencies could sink their many differences, work together and establish contacts with Hindus residing abroad. Thus was laid the foundations of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad, and an RSS pracharak, Shivram Shankar Apte, became its first general secretary. The subsequent career of the VHP, today the most formidable of the RSS affiliates, demands a separate study" (Basu, Datta, Sarkar, Sarkar, Sen, "Khaki Shorts: Saffron Flags", p.50).

Another organisational measure taken by him was to utilise this organisational structure of the "family" to create a political front which would be always under the leadership and control of the RSS. In 1951, he sent cadres to help Shyama Prasad Mukherjee to start the Bharatiya Jan Sangh, whose later incarnate is today's BJP. Among those who were sent were Deen Dayal Upadhyay, Atal Behari Vajpayee, L.K. Advani and S.S. Bhandari. (This fact is mentioned in Basu, Datta, Sarkar, Sarkar and Sen, "Khaki Shirts, Saffron Flags", 1993, p.48).

All through the freedom struggle and later this sectarian and communal strand of thinking always contended with the major stream which envisaged a multi-religious, multi-linguistic, multi-cultural, pluralistic independent India. All through the freedom struggle the enemy for the RSS was not the British against whom the Indian people were then in struggle. The hate against the Muslim community was sought to be spread much deeper than against the British precisely because the Indian people could not be rallied for their "Hindu Rashtra" opposing the British. This was so because the anti-British feelings found expression in the growing strength of the united freedom movement that embraced Hindus, Muslims and others.

It is for this precise reason that the RSS never nailed down the British as its enemy during the freedom struggle.

Even sympathetic accounts of the RSS (The Brotherhood of Saffron by Anderson and Damle amongst others) detail the virtual absence of the RSS in the freedom movement and the consequent concessions it gained from the British. Even Nanaji Deshmukh says, "RSS as an organisation did not take part in the National Liberation Movement..."(RSS, A Victim of Slander, page 29). In fact, the Bombay Home Department, during the 1942 Quit India Movement, observed: "the Sangh has scrupulously kept itself within the law, and in particular, has refrained from taking part in the disturbances that broke out in August 1942..." (quoted in Anderson and Damle, 1987, pp.44). This urge to establish a 'Hindu Rashtra', drove the RSS to be a virtual ally of the British. The freedom struggle and the Congress were regarded as a diversion from their objective. The animosity grew particularly after the AICC announced that free India would be a secular, democratic republic (at the Karachi

Congress, 1931). This was seen, and correctly from their point of view, as the very anti-thesis of the RSS conception of a Hindu Rashtra.

Mahatma Gandhi, the tallest of devout and practicing Hindus, was assassinated because he along with the majority of Indian people embraced Secular democracy rejecting the RSS ideology.

Parallel to the emergence and growth of such a retrograde vision were certain developments that provided sustenance to the communal forces. Learning its lessons well from the experiences of the 1857 first war of independence, the British in a bid to consolidate its rule, implemented the infamous 'divide and rule' policy with a vengeance. The British realised that they cannot continue to rule India if they allow Hindus and Muslims to join in a common cause. They could not afford the repetition of a situation where the devout Hindu, Rani Laxmibai of Jhansi hailed the moghul emperor Bahadur Shah Zafar as her monarch! A contemporary British chronicler, Thomas Lowe, documenting the events of 1857, noted, "the infanticide Rajput, the bigohed brahmin, the fanatic mussalman joined together in the cause, cow killer and the cow worshipper, the pig hater and the pig eater revolted together!"

To prevent the recurrence of any such possibility, the British fomented venomous hatred between the Hindus and the Muslims. Administrative measures such as separate electorates etc etc gave a permanent structure to such a divide. In this process, the British were admirably aided by communal forces on both sides. This policy made such inroads into the fabric of Indian society, so inflamed the unity and amity among its people that till date we continue to pay the price. The wounds of partition fester even today, fifty years after independence, on both sides of the divide.

Further, while the majority of the freedom struggle opposed the retrograde vision of an independent India it needs to be noted that there was a trend within the freedom movement itself which permitted such communal feelings to survive. This was so because a revivalist ideology gripped a number of leaders of the freedom movement. Coming from upper caste Hindu background some of these leaders in the struggle against the British drew sustenance from India's past. For a long time leaders of the Hindu Mahasabha were concurrently leaders of the Congress Party. Patel was a

classic example of such reliance on revivalism. Rajni Palme Dutt in "India Today" summed up this tendency most appropriately "So from the existing foul welter and decaying and corrupt metaphysics, from the broken relics of the shattered village system, from the dead remains of court splendours of a vanished civilisation, they sought to fabricate and build up and reconstitute a golden dream of Hindu culture -- a 'purified' Hindu culture -- which they could hold up as an ideal and a guiding light, against the overwhelming flood of British bourgeois culture and ideology, which they saw completely conquering the Indian bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. They sought to hold forward a feeble shield of a reconstructed Hindu ideology which had no longer any natural basis for its existence in actual life conditions. All social and scientific development was condemned by the more extreme devotees of this gospel as the conquerors' culture: every form of antiquated tradition, even abuse, privilege and obscurantism, was treated with respect and veneration." (page 327)

Thus, the communal and revivalist ideology that struck roots during the freedom struggle continued to remain alive in the absence of a sustained ideological struggle against it. It was only the Communist Party of India that saw in this ideological trend the seeds of potential reactionary and retrograde movement that may well hijack and disrupt the gains that the Indian people had made during the freedom struggle and after.

Does the assumption of state power by these sections, albeit through the support of a large number of allies who claim not to subscribe to its communal ideology, constitute the emergence of fascism in India? Further, why is it that after having been decisively rejected during the course of the freedom struggle and later that the communal ideology has managed to rear its head again in a forceful way?

Let us examine the first question. The most authoritative and to date scientific analysis of the nature and emergence of fascism was made by Georgi Dimitrov in his penetrating address to the 7th Communist international in 1935. He defined fascism as the "open terroristic dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialistic elements of finance capital". The capturing of state power by fascism is not an ordinary succession of one bourgeois government by another but

the substitution of one form of the ruling class state by another -- bourgeois parliamentary democracy by an open terroristic dictatorship.

This comes as a response of the ruling classes to the actual crisis that threatens its class domination. This was the case with the German monopoly capital in the period preceding Hitlerite fascism. This threat emerges as a consequence of the crisis generated by the ruling classes own rule both from within its own camp as well as and often simultaneously with the challenge to its class rule by the toiling sections of the working people -- the proletariat.

The situation obtaining in our country today is not similar to the period leading to the emergence of fascism in Germany. The threat of the immediate seizure of power by the proletariat is not on the agenda. Further, the crisis of the bourgeois landlord class rule has not reached a stage where the jettisoning of parliamentary democracy by the ruling classes is on the immediate agenda.

Hence, the assumption of power by the RSS led BJP does not mean the establishment of fascism in its classical sense. It reflects the fact that the crisis of the bourgeois landlord class rule has reached the stage where one section of the ruling classes, the most reactionary section, represented by the BJP and the Saffron Brigade has succeeded in capturing state power.

But this in no way should lead one to underestimate the potential danger of the assumption of power by the communal elements. They represent the forces of religious fundamentalism which is a dangerous negation of all fundamental tenets of our secular, democratic, Republican Constitution. Swami Vivekananda in his famous Chicago address to the world parliament of religions (11th September, 1893) warned " Sectarianism and bigotry and its horrible descendant fanaticism have long possessed this beautiful earth. They have filled the earth with violence, drenched it often with human blood, destroyed civilisation and sent whole nations to despair.....Liberty of thought and action is the only condition of life for growth and well being. Where it does not exist, the man, the race, the nation, must go down."

The rabid intolerance which constitutes the backbone of the Saffron Brigade's ideology thus represents the advance guard of fascism. Though not fascism in the

classical sense, the methods adopted by the Saffron Brigade to achieve its objective of a Hindu Rashtra are fascistic. It thus has the potential of heralding a future fascistic tyranny in India.

Adoption of fascistic methods to consolidate its rule is no novel recourse of the ruling class parties. The Congress did so in West Bengal in the seventies prior to generalising it for the country as a whole during Emergency. While not ushering in fascism, fascistic methods are often used to browbeat opposition particularly the Communists. Over 3000 communists were martyred and lakhs displaced during the semi-fascist terror unleashed by the Congress between 1971-77 in West Bengal.

The Saffron Brigade adopts the fascistic methods of appropriation of popular symbols, create a false consciousness of deprivation amongst the majority community and appeal to extreme jingoism as their methods to advance. Dimitrov had said "Fascism acts in the interests of extreme imperialists but presents itself to the masses in the guise of a wronged nation and appeals to outraged `national' sentiments. In order to present the RSS as such a champion Golwalkar's book creates a false consciousness that the Hindus had been and are deprived while at the same time generates hate against the Muslims (taking cue from Hitler's rabid anti-Semitism) to the effect that they are responsible for such a `deprivation' of the Hindus. This was the purpose of the book.

The present day activities and propaganda of the Saffron Brigade are based precisely on these two points that Golwalkar provided as the ideological input. To achieve its goal of a "Hindu Rashtra" it has perfected the Gobblesian technique (Gobbles was Hitler's propaganda minister) of telling big enough lies frequently enough to make them appear as the truth.

They proceeded to destroy the Babri Masjid propagating an untruth, not proven by any historical record or enquiry, that a temple stood at that very site where the Babri Masjid was erected.

Many other untruths spread by them have been dealt with and exposed elsewhere (Saffron Brigade's Myths and Reality, December 1992 and The BJP Campaign:

Myths & Reality -- Thirteen myths of a thirteen day wonder, 1998; CPI(M) publications).

Such disinformation is systematically spread with an objective: to unite a heterogeneous Hindu community not on the basis of religious commonality but on the basis of hatred against the Muslim community in particular and religious minorities in general.

It must be noted that communalism has nothing to do with religion or religiosity. It is, in fact, a criminal misuse of religion, unscrupulous exploitation of religious sentiments for political purposes.

Its emulation of fascism's methodology does not stop here. Dimitrov had stated: "Fascism acts in the interests of extreme imperialists but it presents itself to the masses in the guise of the champion of an ill-treated nation and appeals to outraged national sentiments"

It is precisely this that the Saffron Brigade has been doing over all these years. In its entire range of policy framework, its interests coincide with that of imperialism whether it be in economic policy or military cooperation. The extreme jingoistic position that it is adopting today in the name of making the nuclear bomb is only aimed at increasing tensions in the subcontinent and South-Asia which can only prove beneficial to imperialist intervention and maneuvering. This jingoism is however sold in the name of protecting 'national security'. The consequent nuclear arms race that this dangerous policy may unleash could well lead to a situation of 'Hindu Bomb v/s the Islamic Bomb'. Such jingoism is eagerly lapped up by islamic fundamentalists across the border. Their aggressive reaction, in turn, will further strengthen the forces of jingoism at home. Hindu communalism and islamic fundamentalism feed and thrive on each other (more on this later). In the process imperialism and its military-industrial complex -- the merchants of death -- will prosper while the Indian people will suffer as developmental funds would be siphoned off. All this in the name of national 'sentiment' and 'security'.

Dimitrov makes two other incisive points. First, while acting in the interests of the most reactionary circles of imperialism, fascist forces "intercept the disappointed

masses who deserted the old bourgeois parties.... by the vehemence of its attacks on the bourgeois government and its irreconcilable attitude to the old bourgeois parties." The entire popular anger against the Congress party is sought to be appropriated by the communal forces. While not taking any measures in the socio-economic sphere that are any different, the Saffron Brigade portrays itself as a party that will deliver to the masses benefits. This diversion of the popular discontent to further its project of establishment of a 'Hindu rashtra' is the methodology that they adopt. Secondly, Dimitrov states : "fascism puts the people at the mercy of the most corrupt and venal elements but comes before them with the demand of an honest and incorruptible government. Speculating on the profound disillusionment of the masses.....fascism adapts its demagogy to the peculiarities of each country, and the mass of petty bourgeois and even a section of the workers reduced to despair by want, unemployment and insecurity of their existence fall victim to the social and chauvinist demagogy of fascism. "

Dimitrov could well be talking about the BJP's current campaign. While seeking to portray itself as a party with a difference, claiming that its *chehara*, *chaal*, *charitra* and *chintan* are distinct from that of other bourgeois parties the BJP has indulged in the crassest form of money laundering and immorality to garner majority whether it be in UP or at the Centre. The most corrupt and venal elements are today collected behind the BJP not to speak of those with criminal records.

The Saffron Brigade today has clearly revealed that the actual conditions of the people and the alleviation of their miseries is not its concern.

The agenda that the Saffron Brigade is posing before the country and the methods that it uses to achieve its objective are nothing but an expression of an Indian variant of a communal party utilising fascistic methodology. Its assumption of power at the Centre today does not constitute the emergence of fascism in the scientific sense but the vigour with which it utilises the fascistic methods reveal its potential of moving towards a fascist takeover with all the grave consequences to the Indian people and its future.

Such adulation of fascism and the naked appreciation of its methods was noted by Golwalkar in his book when he states "to keep up the purity of the race and its

culture, Germany shocked the world by her purging the country of the Semitic race -- the Jews. Race pride at its highest has been manifested here. Germany has also shown how well-nigh impossible it is for races and cultures, having differences going to the root, to be assimilated into one united whole, *a good lesson for us in Hindusthan to learn and profit by.*" (Emphasis added)

Hitler's fascistic Germany is the ideal; instead of race it is religion and instead of the Semitic races it is the Muslims.

Hitler's methods continue to be a source of inspiration for the Saffron Brigade today. Hitler had set up his notorious private army (the Brown Shirts) to bowbeat the opposition and terrorise the society to adopt a course of servile confirmism. On similar lines, the Bajrang Dal, soon after the assumption of power by this BJP led government announced its decision to set up *Balupaasanas* (paying obeisance to strength) kendras in all the 7531 blocks covering all districts in the country (*The Times of India*, April 8, 1998). These centres, we are told, are to train Hindu youth in martial arts in order to give a 'fitting reply' to the 'objectionable' activities of the Christian Missionaries and cultural invaders (read Muslims).

Instead of the Hitler's 'Brown Shirts', we shall have 'Saffron Shirts' as the Saffron Brigade's private army.

Let us now turn to the second question as to how such a vision of Hindu Rashtra so decisively rejected during the freedom struggle was able not only to resurface but mount an offensive against the very foundations of our republican Constitution?

This is so not because of a sudden surge of religiosity among the Indian people. The answer to this question lies in the path of development adopted by the ruling classes since independence and its consequent crisis.

Fully conscious of the risk of summarising and generalising this experience of the last half a century, let us do so due to constraints of both space and time.

In order to capture State power at the time of independence the Indian capitalist class led by the big bourgeoisie compromised with imperialism on the one hand, and feudal landlordism on the other. The consequent bourgeois-landlord ruling class

alliance prevented a thorough going agrarian reform, liberating millions of our countrymen languishing in the backwardness of feudal and semi-feudal exploitation, from taking place. For, such a transformation would have meant attacking the socio-economic base of landlordism, a partner of the ruling class alliance. It is for this simple reason that the land reform legislations adorn the statute books without being implemented except for the CPI(M) led Front ruled states of West Bengal and Kerala.

This limitation has had an all round impact on post-independent India especially in the economic sphere leading to the New Economic Policy of liberalisation. This is dealt elsewhere (Why This new Economic Policy, The Marxist, January-June, 1992). For the purposes of our discussion here it would suffice to note that the absence of a thorough going agrarian reform meant that the vast mass of Indian people were left victims of not only economic backwardness but also of the social consciousness associated with it. A social consciousness dominated by caste and communal sentiments.

Therefore, in a situation where the path of development chosen by the ruling classes created illusions amongst the people without delivering the goods, the popular discontent kept mounting. While the Left and democratic movement sought to channelise this discontent into struggles aimed at achieving a thorough going agrarian revolution, the right reactionary forces sought to channelise this discontent, diverting it away from the true liberation of the people, into channels that advanced its communal project of the establishment of a 'Hindu Rashtra'. In this they were ably assisted by a social consciousness that was susceptible to exploitation of religious sentiments due to its backwardness. Thus the reason for the growth of support to communal forces lies in the concrete conditions of post independent reality rather than in the realm of metaphysical appeal.

Given this, a proper understanding of how to conduct the struggle to safeguard the advances made by the Indian people and lead these towards the goal of their true emancipation becomes important. In this context it must be realised that the main battle lies as to who will channelise the popular discontent growing as a result of the policies of the ruling classes. As we have seen, this communal upsurge is not the

establishment of fascism. It surely is an early warning of its arrival. However, as Dimitrov himself taught us, fascism is able to intercept the mass discontent and channelise it in its favour in the absence of a left communist intervention. The plain truth is that unless the Left intervenes to channelise the discontent into struggles leading to complete the incomplete agrarian revolution, the objective of safeguarding the gains made so far by the Indian people and advancing them cannot be achieved. An uncompromising struggle against the policies of the ruling classes hence is the order of the day. Hence the question of joining hands with the Congress, strategically, to defeat the BJP means to cut the very branch we are sitting on. For, the growth of popular discontent has been mainly due to the Congress policies.

Tactically however, the Indian people, would have to ensure that the communal forces do not consolidate their rule. For this, it is necessary to aggressively expose the inherent contradictions of the present BJP led coalition and seek its removal from holding the reins of state power.

In this task of preventing the consolidation of their rule, the unity of all Left, secular, democratic forces needs to be strengthened urgently. The circumstances for such a possibility will fast arise as the BJP led government continues to pursue the same ruling class policies, especially economic policies. The consequent rising mass discontent cannot be allowed to be diverted by them into communal and jingoist channels. The first few weeks of the present government, which is following the same economic policies imposing newer burdens on the people, has clearly shown that the actual conditions of the people and the alleviation of their miseries are not its concern. That more Indians than the entire population of the USA live below an abysmally low poverty line is no concern to them. That more children in our country, than the whole populations of many countries are forced to earn a livelihood is of no concern; that more Indian than the entire population of Australia *die every year* due to malnutrition is of no concern to them. The Saffron Brigade today is only strengthening the very edifice of exploitation that is heaping miseries on our people.

As a result of such policies, the conditions of the vast majority of working Indians -- a majority of whom are Hindus -- are bound to deteriorate. It is the channelisation of this growing popular discontent strengthening the Left democratic and secular

forces which will serve as the bulwark against the efforts to impose fascist slavery on all of us. A diversion of this discontent into jingoist and communal channels by the Saffron Brigade to achieve its political ambitions of a `Hindu Rashtra' cannot be allowed.

While mobilising the Indian people in this battle, it must be noted that a large number of our brethren belonging to the minorities, especially the Muslim minority, unsettled by growing insecurity in the present conditions may well fall prey to minority fundamentalism. The answer to Hindu communalism can never be given through Muslim fundamentalism. In fact, both are the two sides of the same coin.

It needs to be recalled that two years after Golwalkar's book was published, the Jamaat-e-Islami was founded. On August 26, 1941, under the leadership of Maulana Abul Ala Maududi, the founding conference was held in Pathankot. Maududi is to the Jamaat what Golwalkar is to the RSS. The similarity of their political project and roles is indeed remarkable. Just as Golwalkar rejected everything modern in human civilisation -- liberty, equality, fraternity, secularism, democracy and parliamentary institutions -- as `alien concepts', so did Maududi and the philosophy of Muslim fundamentalism.

Maududi, in a speech at Pathankot in May 1947, when partition was imminent, urged Indians to organise their state and society on the basis of Hindu scriptures and laws, as they would organise Pakistan based on the laws laid down by `Allah'. Replying to certain queries by Justice Mohammed Munir, who was appointed as the single-member Commission to inquire into riots against the Qadianis in Pakistan, Maududi said: "If a Hindu government based on Hindu law came to India and the law of Manu became the law of land as a result of which Muslims were treated (as) untouchables and were not given any share in the government -- not only that, they did not even get the citizenship rights -- I would have no objection" (quoted in Z.A. Nizami, 1975, p.11).

Hindu communalism and Muslim fundamentalism feed on each other. In the process, both spread communal poison deeper, threatening the very fabric of our country's unity and integrity. Both act against the interests of the majority of the people they claim to represent.

That they feed on each other was most terrifyingly revealed in the Coimbatore riots during the 1998 elections. The Muslim fundamentalist challenge to Hindu communalism not only led to barbaric loss of life and property but also directly contributed to the electoral victory of Hindu communalism and its consolidation.

The struggle against fascistic communalism can only be met by the united struggle of all Indians irrespective of their religious affiliations. India today is a secular democratic republic because a majority of Indians -- Hindus, Muslims and others -- rejected the communal vision and politics. It is only under such conditions can the security and interests of the minorities be protected.

It is again only under such conditions that the Indian people can mount the offensive against the ruling class policies. The unity in struggle of the working people -- the working class, the poor peasantry, agricultural labour -- is precisely what communalism seeks to disrupt by sowing seeds of discord. Thus, it acts directly to preserve and intensify the existing exploitative order.

While seeking the maximum possible cooperation from political parties to prevent the consolidation of its rule, it must be realised the fascistic communalism can never be defeated only through maneuvering or political bargaining. Its defeat can be sustained only by isolating it through wide spread mass struggles that mobilises the popular discontent for a fundamental change. A change aimed at replacing the rule of the ruling classes. Fully conscious of the fact that the Saffron Brigade represents the most reactionary expression of the ruling classes, the Left must seek to utilise all contradictions amongst the ruling class parties to isolate the communal forces, without losing sight of the elementary truth that the success of the struggle depends on the depth and intensity of class struggle. There can be no short cuts. It is this that, all of us, interested in safeguarding the gains made by the Indian people so far and seeking to advance it, for the complete liberation of the Indian millions must endeavour to do.

JNU ROW

To understand what nationalism means, let us first understand what a Nation means. Sadly though, this isn't Physics and there is no universally accepted definition of a "Nation". So we will have to do with some level of subjectivity and abstraction over here. Let us start with a simple definition for now. A Nation is a word used to designate larger groups or collectives of people with common characteristics attributed to them—including language, traditions, customs (mores), habits (habitus), and ethnicity. However, if you look at this definition (or a lot of others as well) you will notice that India does not fall into the definition of a Nation. She is diverse in her language, customs, traditions, habits and ethnicities. So are we even justified in classifying India as a nation? Well, yes. Yes, we are. To trace the appropriateness of the statement, let us go back and trace the evolution of the idea of India as a state. Now, the idea of India has existed for a very long time but there was no feeling of Indianness among her inhabitants for most of that duration. Modern day Afghanistan and Pakistan were parts of India while Southern India beyond the river Narmada was offlimits. Such an idea seems ridiculous now. Southern India is an integral part of India while Pakistan clearly is not. So it is clear that the idea of the nation of India has also evolved over the course of history. In addition, people felt loyal to their kingdoms and monarchs, not so much to India. That of course changed with the coming of the British. For the first time, Indians broadened their sense of identity beyond their immediate sociopolitical and geographic environment and felt as if they were a part of something bigger than a Saurashtra or an Awadh. The Indian freedom struggle only pushed it further and Indian consciousness awakened and people began identifying themselves as Indians. Now, you could say that idea of the Indian Nation only came into existence due to the Class Struggle between the Indians and the Colonist Britishers as Marx theorizes . What we do know now is that somehow, defying all conventions and definitions that the Western intellectual sphere gave us, India turned into a Nation, unique in her own right, uncaring of all the World's hesitations and whispered mutterings predicting her imminent failure, and has kept on going 7 decades later. Once we have this, now we turn to address the question, what is Nationalism then? Here, thankfully, there is a more widely agreed upon definition to guide us in our quest. "Nationalism is a shared group feeling in the significance of a geographical and sometimes demographic region seeking independence for its culture and/or ethnicity that holds that group together. This can be expressed as a belief or political ideology that involves an individual identifying

with or becoming attached to one's nation. Nationalism involves national identity, by contrast with the related concept of patriotism, which involves the social conditioning and personal behaviors that support a state's decisions and actions.” Having said that, let us now try to understand what does Nationalism entail. Going by the definition, running the risk of oversimplifying, it is the feeling of love for one's own nation. Now what does that this love entail? Does this mean turning a blind eye to the faults of a nation? Or is it the determined refusal to entertain the idea that nation could ever do anything wrong? We leave the questions as an exercise to the reader. Having said that, let us now come to the idea of “Antinationalism”. Clearly, it represents everything that goes against nationalism. An antinational would be who does not love his or her nation. Would that entail now that the antinational is critical of the country? Then how would you differentiate between an antinational, looking to burn down the country that you love and a critic, who wants to foil the nefarious attempts of the former? We leave the questions unanswered herein because these are the questions that every individual needs to answer for himself or herself. answer that we deem correct would colour us Red or Saffron, put us on the Left or Right side of the fence and brand us as Nationalist or Antinationalist. So instead, we choose to give you the facts and let you decide what you want to believe for yourself in the hopes that you will not pick a side without hearing what the other side has to say for itself. Where there are no correct definitions of the terms, how can there be easy answers to the questions we can't frame?

The fact that Enigma was broken by Alan Turing becomes a misconception when you visit New Delhi's Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU). This University has always been India's Enigma and the country is yet to find its Alan Turing. When the sane people of this country seem to have put the left ideology into trash for good, JNU is still obsessed with the “Laal Salam”(Laal representing their mindset full of blood and Salam for anything that is antiIndia). While the word “comrade” resembles something regressive outdoors, this is a familiar progressive word in the alcazar of Indian Enigma since the foundation of JNU in 1969. The motto of the University was learning and research to achieve better integration with National and International policies. The question to be asked is that what was the real purpose? The real purpose was to give the people of regressive ideology some sort of sops. The leftists were in control of the campus when Communists (out of habit) began opposing the

policies of Smt. Indira Gandhi. They are experts at opposing since that is the only thing they know other than calling their plain lies and mindset as principles. The other thing they can do is protest and that is what they did when Prime Minister visited the campus in 1980 which forced her to leave. Whatever is done horribly wrong all over India by the Communists is given sophisticated justifications in this citadel. These pseudo intellectuals in the university create a false idea of left being progressive and are always in search of some philanthropic activity to justify their existence. These are the representatives of educated middle class elite who are articulate. SFI and AISF of CPI(M) and CPI respectively occupied most of the posts in Student's Union till the emergence of All India Students Association (AISA) which is the student wing of CPI(ML). The supporters of Maoist terrorism gradually became a powerful voice on campus. Just like radical organizations recruit vulnerable youth, the campus turned out to be a recruitment ground for radical ideologies. The only difference was that of replacing Jihad with communism. The campus has seen ideological deviation in the left politics which became very clear after the formation of various social groups based on identity politics like AIBSF (All India Backward Students Forum) which was successful in implementing backward class quota in recruitment of JNU teachers. The ideological aberration is clearly visible from the fact that the fashion of associating with SFI till 1990s has shifted to a fashion of associating with the ideological disaster that is AISA. The biggest problem with AISA is that there is no ideological clarity since it has assimilated various groups (specially the backward Caste and Dalits). The only ideology is the blind hatred for the right and engaging in useless manufactured protests to score political brownie points. They have a set course of action. The major chunk of "nothing to do" comrades start to find a petty issue to pass their 24/7 free time at Jantar Mantar or any other spot they want to have fun at. If they are short of issues, they have a universal issue of "Saffronization" and "RSS" for whom they start making a marketing strategy. If some issue is fortunately found, they start twisting the issue by sophisticated justifications and start spreading lies in form of principles. Half of the comrades have no idea about what is happening but since its a nice way to pass time, they start shouting slogans of "revolution" and "change". They will do activities to invite some action like Lathi Charge and when proper action is taken, they will start playing the victim card. Then, they will try to fool the people around about the action taken and no one knows what exactly has happened as everyone is least interested. The routine

continues and they are happy since they have a nice hang out during university life. There is one thing that this university exclusively teaches the art of skillfully presenting a viewpoint, which consists of an 'Angry Intellectual Youth' image who proved that they are most interested to change the system, presented by a few cliched words like "Capitalism", "Fascism" and "Patriarchal" that present them as "scholarly" and "intellectual". Some of these pseudo intellectuals who were well connected with politicians would later turn out in campus as teachers and their task then changes to mentor students and keep doing what they did as students. The greatest victim of JNU activism was Chandrasekhar who was killed in Bihar by goons of politician-gangster Mohammad Shahabuddin. He failed to understand that fearlessness is a virtue but chestthumping as a tactic is foolhardy against bullets. We lost a precious life of a person who came innocent into the campus but later had to suffer from the venom of "revolution" spewed on him by the AISA. JNU is considered to be one of the best campus in India for post graduation as the stamp of JNU gives them access to many lucrative avenues. Naxals and terrorist sympathizers have often found shelter here. It won't be wrong if JNU is to be labeled the "Den of secessionism" and a "Hub of subversive activities". A genuine "Jholawala" must have a cause or he can't exist. A jhola keeps him prepared for any eventuality as it would contain cigarettes, a 20 day old clipping from The Guardian or any other New Yorker. It also contains a toothbrush since you don't know where the sun will rise the next day and a comb (however, not mandatory). It would also contain a book to be a pretentious reader and a couple of refills (but no pen) to write with. This is what the last left Alcazar is left with.

This is a research guide and your research should not be limited to this . This is the bare minimum required.

FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

- Modi flirting with fas
"http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/headtohead/2015/12/modis-india-

flirting-fascism-151201114124802.html" c HYPERLINK

"http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/headtohead/2015/12/modis-india-flirting-fascism-151201114124802.html"ism

- Neo Fascism In India
- Akshar Magazine