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INTRODUCTION

HISTORY OF STUDY

The purpose of this paper is to present an analysis of materials related to India and Indians contained in the social studies texts used in the secondary schools in Ontario. The study originated from a widespread feeling in Toronto's East Indian community that secondary school curricula in social studies present a distorted picture of India. This, it is believed, affects the manner in which Toronto's East Indian population is seen and treated (Mukherjee, 1977, in his proposal for funding of the project, p. 1).

As the proposal for the study outlines, the intention of the study, then, "will be to locate the important myths, stereotypes, and misconceptions -- social, political, economic and cultural -- that prevent the users of these textbooks from getting an objective and unprejudiced view of India and Indians" (ibid.).

The paper will be divided into four parts:

I. Introduction
II. The "Perspective": Your Bias is Showing
III. Reality: A Critical Appraisal of the "Perspective"
IV. Concluding Remarks

Section I will outline the history of the study, the materials analyzed and the methodology. Section II, called the "Perspective", will present the view of India and Indians contained in the textbooks analyzed. This will be done almost exclusively by stringing together quotations taken directly
from the texts. In Section III, the "Perspective" will be critically appraised, again using as much material from the texts themselves as possible, adding, however, the author's own views. This section is intended to correct the biased views contained in the "Perspective", and is thus labelled "Reality". Section IV ties all the loose ends together.

**METHOD OF ANALYSIS**

There are basically two approaches to content analysis: the quantitative approach and what might be called the qualitative approach.

We have shied away from the quantitative approach for two main reasons. First of all, we do not have, in a project lasting only fourteen weeks, the time or the human resources to develop a quantitative methodology appropriate to the study in terms of analysing evaluative words, evaluative assertions, etc. as, for example, done by McDiarmid and Pratt (1971). Nor can we, for the same reason, undertake the meticulous job of identifying every reference to India in the texts that would be required in such a rigorous study. Secondly, even if these could be done, it would still not entirely serve the purpose of this study. Our purpose is not merely to see if the view of India and Indians is biased and prejudiced -- and a quick survey indicated that it indeed was -- and identify it, but also to counteract it while delineating a more realistic view of the country. Thus it did not matter whether a particular characterization occurred in the texts only once, it may be damaging enough to warrant a correction.

If we have thus avoided the quantitative approach, we would like to characterize our approach as being both objective and subjective at the same time. It is "objective"
in the sense that the "Perspective" in Part II has been arrived at, not on the basis of any preconceived notions in the authors' heads (a subjective view), but on the basis of the "object" of analysis itself, namely the texts (objective). In other words, the "Perspective" is in the "nature of things" as far as the texts go. It is the "reality" as seen by the textbooks, and not a "reality" imposed upon them by us. To that extent, then, it is objective.

But it is also "subjective" in that we have ordered the quotations in such a way as to develop a coherent "Perspective" (see Outline of "Perspective"). That is to say, once we had, on the basis of our reading, an idea of the picture of India and Indians contained in the texts, we sought to present this picture to the reader in a coherent manner. The quotations used for this purpose came from different texts and different pages of the same text, and we pieced them together. To this extent the "Perspective" can be said to be "subjective". However, as will be seen in the 'Outline the "Perspective"' and 'The "Perspective" Explored', all efforts were made to keep ourselves in the background as much as possible, and let the quotations from the textbooks speak for themselves.

Section III is more subjective than objective. Here again we have tried to use quotations from the texts themselves to counteract the "Perspective". However, often we had to come out in the open and make available to the reader our personal knowledge of the country as well as of developmental issues in order to show why the view, or aspects thereof, contained in the "Perspective" are not acceptable.

The textbooks analyzed here are those recommended in
Circular 14 and 14A for use in the secondary schools of Ontario. First of all, we went through the circular and made a note of areas under which likely materials for our enquiry may be contained. We identified four such areas: Geography, History, Home Economics and Man in Society. Our researchers (Glen Hastings and Ahmad Saidullah) examined every book under each of these areas for material on India. Twenty-five books were found to contain such references. The researchers then made notes by hand of those relevant materials that were short enough to be copied, adding their own comments on the materials. Lengthy portions, on the other hand, were xeroxed.

On an examination of the 25 texts, it was found that there was "substantial" reference to India in only 14 texts. In others, there was either passing reference, or reference was made to India only as an example, or in unconnected pages. There were two which had a little over one page each, but one of these was a talk given by Jawahar Lal Nehru, India's first Prime Minister, on the day of the country's independence while the other was an interview with an Indian professor living in Toronto. Neither of these had any bearing on this study. The materials on which the present study is based, then, came from the 14 textbooks listed in the Appendix. Of these, 11 were in History, and 1 each in Man in Society, Geography and Home Economics.

At the next step, the basic material was read by three of us, separately. We identified the materials that, in our opinion, were erroneous, objectionable or whatever, and commented upon them. The materials thus identified were then transferred to 3 x 5 cards. In the final step, the present authors tried to make sense of the mass of material and decided upon the materials for analysis.
THE "PERSPECTIVE": YOUR BIAS IS SHOWING

OUTLINE OF THE "PERSPECTIVE"

If a student were to study the sections pertaining to India contained in these texts, this is the picture he is likely to get:

There was backward and archaic India. Luckily for her, the benevolent and modernized British colonizers came along. Having taken major strides in ameliorating the condition of Indians over a period of some 200 years -- mind you, they even built railways -- and followed a farsighted policy of gradually preparing Indians to take control of their own destiny, the British granted India full independence. But, alas, what problems India has! To begin with, there is the spectre of Hinduism everywhere: there are the various castes, and there are the sacred cows that roam all over India at will, consuming or destroying the food available for men. But, then, men themselves are a problem. There are just too many of them in India. And most of them illiterate as well. They don't eat beef or pork either. Hinduism just doesn't allow Indians to be otherwise.

Buddhism, an offshoot of Hinduism, looks enlightened. But it's not very helpful either. And the tragedy of it all is that there are tested out solutions to the kinds of problems India faces, but she, in her stupidity, is unwilling to embrace them. We all know, from our own history (i.e. of Europe and North America) that development is coterminous with industrialization, literacy, population control,
this way. So "the British conquerers introduced into the system a series of changes, political, social and economic", and these changes "effectively undermined" the situation (ibid.: 72-3). As part of the changes, English language was introduced, and "the English language itself became the first unifying language of the country" which enabled the Indians to "communicate easily" (ibid.: 73-4).

Of course, "Britain must play the role of benevolent despot preparing the subcontinent for its eventual liberation" (Spencer:301). And, in fact, "...In the years thereafter, the British were to...become the protector of the rest of the Indian rulers " (Ricker (1): 44). Further, "The British...expanded educational opportunities" (ibid.: 54). "British justice replaced the often savage whim of the local rulers ". Indeed, "British...taxes were not unfair or merciless" (ibid.).

"Whatever the evils of imperialism, British rule in India had brought greater peace and order, and prosperity to the land than it had ever known" (ibid.).

Land reforms, irrigation and drainage, roads and railways, the introduction of new crops such as tea and improved techniques for traditional ones like cotton increased the prosperity of the country and improved the life of the peasant (ibid.).

Especially after the British government took over the administration of the country from the East India Company in 1858, enormous material progress was made in India. Thousands of miles of railways were built; textile manufacturing flourished; universities, hospitals and sea-ports were established. India achieved one of the highest literacy rates in Asia (Earl: 335).
Further,

It could be argued, with some justification, that Western influence had brought material and spiritual progress to many backward communities where tribal wars and savage rituals had been suppressed, and sanitation and education introduced (Trueman et al.: 658).

In subsequent decades industrial progress and more extensive education schooled thousands of Indians to accept Western notions of political rights (Spencer: 301).

And finally, "India has absorbed many ideas from the west, ideas of freedom, equality, science and technology" (Walsh: 72). This is not surprising, since, as early as over 2000 years ago, "in far off India, a Greek general tried a brilliant experiment in civilized living" (Trueman: 152).

THE FAR-SIGHTED POLICIES OF THE BRITISH BRING INDIA INDEPENDENCE

"Western influence started a ferment in India" (Walsh: 72). "An educated middle class emerged and with it rose feelings of patriotism" (Earl: 335). "For over half a century the British had systematically trained young Indians for responsible administrative positions" (Spencer: 421). In fact, "It was in British schools and universities that Indians were to absorb the ideas of liberty, nationalism and democracy". Further, "western ideas became the weapons in the wars of words and acts for freedom" (Ricker (1): 54).

"In no country was this development [i.e. the nationalist movement] more pronounced than in India" (Trueman et al.: 659). "This was partly due to the deliberate British policy, which followed a far-sighted program of gradually conceding an increasing measure of self-government in India" (ibid.).
The best product of the emerging middle class was Mahatma Gandhi. Though "Not a brilliant student, he... mastered enough law to pass his barrister's examination [in London]" (Ricker (1): 69). Wanting to become an English gentleman, he "bought a top hat, striped trousers and a cane with a silver knob....All his attempts to imitate the English failed. Gandhi was, and remained, an Indian" (ibid.). And then he turned against the British. His "great" contribution was to adopt the 'non-violent' approach to the alleviation of his country's problems" (Trueman et al.: 660). However,

it is only fair to point out that the success of his principle... was at least partly due to the [British] government's reluctance to adopt a policy of coercion. Less humane methods adopted by other colonial Powers led to tragic developments in Indo-China, Indonesia and Africa (ibid.).

In fact, "the real difficulty in granting independence was not so much British reluctance to give up India as mounting tension between Hindus and Moslems in the country" (Trueman et al.: 664). This "Indian problem was rendered almost insoluble by racial and religious complications" (ibid.: 659). "The British government tried repeatedly to come to terms with India's leaders, but their efforts seemed only to harden the Hindu-Moslem schism" (Spencer: 422-23). Consequently, "Lord Louis Mountbatten decided that Partition was the only solution" (Trueman et al.: 664). And thus emerged a "new India" (Walsh: 72).

The nature of British policy was such that "although completely independent", India still retained links with the British Commonwealth -- "a striking tribute to British policy" (Trueman et al.: 665). Further, the India Act of 1935 was "in general, so well drafted that it became the basis of the Indian Constitution after the achievement of Independence"
BUT WHAT A PROBLEMATIC COUNTRY INDIA IS!
PROBLEMS GALORE!

Despite the far-sighted and enlightened policies of the British, India finds itself beset with "massive" (Stanford: 233), "insuperable" (Spencer: 425) and "grave" (Trueman et al.: 665) problems. There is, first of all, the "pressing population problem" (Walsh: 78). "Crowded India's" (Cottingham (1): 25) population "is increasing at the rate of about twelve million each year", and this is "perhaps India's greatest problem" (Walsh: 79). It is increasing at an "extremely rapid rate... creating one of the most urgent problems in the world" (Lloyd: 351).

There are other problems related to this population problem. For example, "the primary cause of the dislocation of the Indian economy has always been the intolerable pressure of a huge population on available agriculture" (Trueman et al.: 666). "Apart from the question of food, the large increase in population means that the country's ability to build up a national reserve of funds for the investment which is necessary for greater production is greatly reduced" (Walsh: 79). And, "one of the most difficult problems is to provide education for India's huge population" (Snell: 387).

There is in India a "dependence on agriculture" (Stanford: 113) and, one of the "grave problems" that confronted Nehru in 1947 was this "subsistence agriculture" (Trueman et al.: 665). Further, "agricultural methods were so inefficient" that "agricultural backwardness was a major obstacle to industrialization" (Ricker (2): 20). Thus, a "main domestic problem" for India is "the improvement of
There are, then, the "problems of industrialization" (Snell: 387). Measures such as mechanization are "impossible" (Lloyd: 352) because another of the "grave problems" that faced Nehru was the presence of "relatively little industry" (Trueman et al.: 665).

There is then the "land problem" (Snell: 386). "India's main domestic problem is the redistribution of land..." (ibid.).

Not only is India crowded, but a "grave problem" is that "two-thirds of the population...were illiterate" (Trueman et al.: 713). Another "grave problem" is their "grinding poverty" (Lloyd: 352) and "malnutrition" (Trueman et al.: 665).

An additional problem is the lack of money "to build up a national reserve of funds for the investment" (Walsh: 79). "Improved farming techniques...the use of better seeds, chemical fertilizers and crop sprays, all cost money..." (Lloyd: 353). And "money for education is no more plentiful than for industry and agriculture" (Snell: 387).

To top it all, there is the problem of Hinduism. Take, for example, the caste system. It is "thought by many to remain the greatest obstacle to India's economic progress" (Lloyd: 353). "Contact with members of other castes can pollute, so that staffing a factory, workshop or cafeteria may be complex" (ibid.). Then there are the Hindu food habits. It is "the vegetarian diet that has allowed rural Asians to become so numerous" (Stanford: 47) in the first place.

Since all food contains a part of the Universal Spirit, Brahman, it must be prepared and conserved with proper reverence. The women who prepare the
meal, as well as any who partake of it must first purify themselves by means of ritual bathing of the entire body and often by putting on clean clothes (Jenner: 26, citing from Lowenberg et al.: 147-49).

Associated with the food habit and Hinduism is the "cattle problem" (Lloyd: 354). "India has about 200 million cattle, most of them useless". Not only that, "they all consume food" and are "wasteful users of land" (ibid.). By another count, there were, in 1956, "159 million cattle, one-fifth of all the cattle in the world" (Jenner: 26). Many of them are "unproductive" and "even more serious ... they were either consuming or destroying food needed by the people (ibid.). In fact, "every conceivable means is used... to protect the cattle from harm and slaughter. The Indian government in 1965 supported sixty-two special farms for old, infirm and unproductive cattle" (ibid.).

India's problems do not end there. "The gulf between Indian and Western standards [of living] was startling" and constituted a "grave problem" at independence (Trueman et al.: 665). Indeed, even "Medical science can cause problems" (Lloyd: 352). It has "curbed diseases" (ibid.: 353) and "the death rate continues to decline as better medical facilities spread into the remoter areas". All this can only "tend to increase the already high birth rate" (ibid.: 353).

Finally, even the issue of independence was a problem: "Tragically, the Indian problem [of independence] was rendered almost insoluble by racial and religious complications" (Trueman et al.: 660). What Gandhi did was to attempt to alleviate "his country's problems" (ibid.), but "The orderly progress of Britain's experiment in Indian popular rule was threatened" by the emergence of this "important Indian leader... Gandhi" (Spencer: 303).
HINDUISM THE WORST OFFENDER

"What bearing do you think", asks (Cottingham (2): 29) of the student about the Bhagvad Gita, a Hindu treatise dating from about 1000 B.C., "the teachings have upon [the problems] of India? Elsewhere ((1): 18), he suggests to the students to "Read an article about India today and try to decide whether or not the teachings of the Gita help you to understand her problems".

The suggested link between Hinduism and India's "problems" seems obvious enough: "nowhere else in the world have people been so occupied with religion" (Cruickshank: 45). In fact, "Religion has always played an important and vital role in Indian life" (Snell: 359). "Hinduism...is the religion of India" (Earl: 112). Even the "nationalist movement was predominantly a movement of... the Hindus" (Walsh: 75). And Mahatma Gandhi was a "great Hindu leader" (Trueman (1): 659).

Naturally, therefore, when the Muslim leaders "Awakened to the challenge of Hindu domination" (Spencer: 302), "The old India...split into a Moslem Pakistan and a Hindu Indian dominion" (Earl: 336). "Today, Hinduism is the most important faith among the Indian people..." (Cruickshank: 45), and it is thus Hinduism which is the root cause of India's problems! "The Hindu tradition", for example, "would appear to indicate a predisposition against any form of contraception" (Stanford: 217). "Hinduism is related to the caste system which divides people irreversibly into various social status depending on birth" (Jenner: 25-6). "Thomas reports that no devout Hindu will pass a cow without touching it and then touching his own head" (ibid.). Even Nehru's and others' policy of non-alignment in foreign relations is "re-inforced by the Hindu belief that no political system, or philosophy,
has a monopoly of virtue, and that ultimately all systems of government represent only means to a common end" (Trueman et al.: 666).

Any wonder that India's problems cannot be solved, when you also consider the "amoral behaviour of the Hindu pantheon?" (Stanford: 217). And, can you imagine "the possible outcome of a cow eradication program in a predominantly Hindu area?" (Jenner: 26). What about the "effect of Hindu food taboos [on] world hunger" (ibid.) itself? Consider, for example, the injunction in the Gita "to cease from eating all flesh" (Cottingham (2): 27). Indeed, "it is the vegetarian diet that has allowed rural Asians to become so numerous" (Stanford: 49) in the first place. "Do you think it would be easy to develop a democratic society among people who believed in Verse 47 [of the Gita] ?" (Cottingham (1): 7).

While Hinduism is the worst offender, Islam makes its contribution to the problems as well. What might be the possible consequences of hard work in the fields when the fast of Ramadan occurs during the summer with temperatures reaching 100 degrees or higher, when not even a sip of water is allowed? The truly devout do not swallow their spittle. (Jenner: 25).

Further, "inasmuch as pork is taboo for Moslems and beef for those of the Hindu faith", what could be "some possible difficulties of designing agricultural policy for countries with large numbers of both Moslems and Hindus in the population?" (ibid.).

WE, IN THE WEST, HAVE THE SOLUTIONS

India has problems, and "it is not easy for a large population, living near the subsistence level, to accumulate the financial resources needed". Nevertheless, Indians must
transform their "archaic systems into modern economies" (Trueman et al.: 711).

The reasons for the poverty of underdeveloped countries were...obvious...Large and rapidly expanding population, primitive agricultural techniques...widespread illiteracy...ancient customs and superstitions...general resistance to change...the price of manufactured goods rising faster than that of exported primary products and thus less money for investment in industrial growth (Ricker (2): 19-20).

"The one positive step the 'poor nations' can take themselves to raise their standard of living is to limit the natural increase of their populations" (Trueman et al.: 712). Such "voluntary limitation" is the "only alternative" (ibid.: 666), because "India has too little food for her population. Failure to control population must inevitably result in the famines which have traditionally reduced excess population" (Walsh: 79).

"India cannot very well increase her industrial and agricultural output or improve her health standards unless she can provide education for her people" (Snell: 387).

Improved farming techniques, industrial development, education, all cost money. Outside help is needed for this "since Indian herself does not have sufficient capital for the task" (Snell: 387). Without such outside assistance it is improbable that any progress can be made (Ricker (2): 21).

Indeed, there scarcely is an area in which outside help is not needed. For example, as recently as in "1965, the fighting in Kashmir was ended by strenuous efforts on the part of the United Nations" (Spencer: 424).
"Although the Indian government has done much planning" for dealing with India's problems, "a great deal of Western help continues to be needed" (Snell et al.: 387). "Large-scale capital aid from abroad" is needed to "offset local poverty and lack of capital" (Stanford: 312). And "great strides" have been made "towards the reduction of disease, and the improvement of public health generally in the underdeveloped lands" only "with the assistance of the more advanced nations" (Trueman et al.: 712) including the Communist West (Snell et al.: 37-8). "The United States has given much money", and "Canada has provided a power dam, locomotives, and a nuclear reactor through the Colombo Plan". And now "Russia has given India a steel mill" (Snell et al.: 387).

"Much of this great humanitarian work has been carried out by the World Health Organization in cooperation with the U.N." (Trueman et al.: 712). "The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations is working hard to increase India's agricultural production by the adoption of more progressive methods" (Snell et al.: 387), and as you can see from the picture of "the faces of India's poor", the "homeless street people of New Delhi wait for the dawn distribution of meals by the U.N.'s Food and Agricultural Organization" (Walsh: 77). "Much valuable work towards the objective [of the provision of teachers to raise standards of literacy and thus create efficient administrators] has been performed by Universities Services Organization" (Trueman et al.: 713).

And how about answering this question? Mention some movements and organizations in the world today through which people in the west attempt to give help to the less fortunate, both in their own countries and elsewhere (Cottingham: 10-11, q. 4).
THE ENLIGHTENED NATIONAL GOVERNMENT VS. THE BACKWARD PEOPLE

Foreign aid we give, but "the most difficult aspect of foreign aid is to determine the form it should take. Simply making large sums of money available, as loans or outright gifts, is not a satisfactory answer" (Trueman et al.: 711). "There is...the danger that foreign capital will be diverted into the pockets of unscrupulous officials" (ibid.). When that happens "the well-meaning efforts of wealthier nations can be identified with the preservation of corrupt and inefficient governments" (ibid.). Worse, they are not even grateful.

The U.S., in particular, has learned that it is not easy to play the role of a "rich uncle" in the world -- and that gratitude is not to be expected for well-intentioned but misdirected schemes of assistance (ibid.).

"Despite massive aid from the rich nations" (Ricker (2): 19), "the gulf between Indian and Western living standards was startling: the average income of an Indian was estimated to be about 1/32 of that of an American" (Trueman et al.: 665). In fact, the PCN's are all alike! Take Dahomey for example. "To deal with the various problems of its 2,300,000 citizens, the government had an annual budget of $32,000,000 -- about one sixth of what the city of New York spent each year to run its fire department" (Ricker (2):21)!

The government, however, is enlightened when compared to the people.

Land reform introduced by government abolished the zamindari system introduced by the British. New methods of farming have been encouraged. The government has invested in dams and irrigation schemes...India has embarked on a series of Five-Year Plans... A start has been made towards universal education (Walsh: 79).

It was said that giving foreign aid is not easy because it
falls into the hands of unscrupulous officials. That is only one side of the story. The other aspect is that "many of the 'poor' nations are so backward and illiterate that they do not know how best to utilize such resources" (Trueman et al.: 711). The government, for example, "launched a new programme to modernize agriculture" (Ricker (2): 20), but "many [peasants] are not aware how essential it is to introduce new methods" (Snell et al.: 386).

The Indian Ministry of Food and Agriculture has done much to develop improved strains of wheat and rice, and to make available to farmers, but progress is slow (Lloyd: 352).

Even the FAO is working "very hard" to increase India's agricultural production "by the adoption of more progressive methods, but the peasants' attachment to the old ways slows down the rate of technical change" (Snell et al.: 357).

As another example, the Indian government is taking "far-sighted steps" to explore the possibility of "voluntary limitation of population" (Trueman et al.: 666). Indeed, "The list of improvements and innovations is endless -- but the pressure of expanding population on available resources continually mounts" (ibid.: 712-13). And "progress towards a better life, which is the government's policy, is held back" (Walsh: 79).

This situation is aggravated by the conservative attitudes generated in people living at or near the subsistence level, which inhibit the risk-taking necessary to economic development (Walsh: 127).

And then, of course, there are the "backward social practices" (Spencer: 425).

As a final example:
The government has tried to undermine belief in pollution "contact with members of [certain] castes", and to outlaw caste. However, caste is thought by many to remain the greatest obstacle to Indian economic progress (Lloyd: 353).

As we well know, there are "no quick and easy answers" to problems such as faced by India. They "require education -- not merely literacy". They require "intensified campaigns of education and programmes...to change the customs and prejudices of centuries" (Trueman et al.: 712). But, alas "the enquiring, experimental mind anxious to try out new ideas" that is so "familiar to us in the West [is] strange to Indians" (Lloyd: 353)!

So, alas, the "outlook for India is not good" (ibid.: 354).
REALITY: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF THE "PERSPECTIVE"

In the previous section (from "IN THE BEGINNING WAS BACKWARD INDIA" through "THE ENLIGHTENED NATIONAL GOVERNMENT VS. THE BACKWARD PEASANTS") we have sought to identify the perspective of India and Indians contained in the texts, as outlined in the "Perspective". In this section, we would like to take each of the above mentioned sections and present some evidence to show that the picture of India and Indians portrayed in them is erroneous, unbalanced and prejudicial. As previously, we shall attempt, as far as possible, to do this through the textbook material itself. But we shall abandon this practice in the final two sections, and draw upon our own knowledge of developmental issues, as well as of India and other post-colonial nations in general. The outcome of the exercise is not expected to be a comprehensive picture of India -- this is the task of the next section -- but rather to raise doubts in the minds of the reader as to the validity and fairness of the materials contained in the textbooks. However, one should not expect this section to be an in-depth treatment of the material. Rather, it must be treated as some random thoughts bearing upon issues arising from the "Perspective".

INDIA, A COUNTRY WITH A PROUD HISTORY, WEAKNESSES AND STRENGTHS

India, we agree, is poor, if by that we mean that the amount of money many people can afford to spend on their basic necessities is little, and that some of them also forego certain necessities such as a place of permanent residence, and sufficient and sufficiently nourishing food. It is
also poor because the country is "underdeveloped" (Trueman et al.; Ricker). That is, the resources of the country have not been tapped well, or sufficiently enough to meet the needs of the society. And, perhaps, India is everything else as well that the textbooks claim.

However, it also has its strengths. It has a proud history dating back 2,500 to 4,000 years, a great tradition in philosophy, religion, medicine, logic, astronomy, linguistics, and so on.

As the textbook writers recognize, for example, during the Mohenjodaro-Harappa civilization (2500 B.C.), there were "even drainage systems which ran into brick-lined street sewers" (Trueman: 32). Since "rouge, lipstick, tweezers, and ear-piercing implements" have been found, "Apparently the ladies of the Indus valley were at a sufficiently advanced stage of civilization to spend considerable time over their make up" (ibid.: 32). In fact, "There is a strong possibility that this early Indian civilization contributed to the cultural traditions which Europe inherited through Mesopotamia" (Snell et al.: 358). India has a rich living culture as well, rich in dance, drama, music, techniques of moral and psychological development (e.g. meditation, yoga), a variety of peoples, religions, languages, and so on. She is also rich in natural resources, and it has given the world not only Mahatma Gandhi and Nehru, but also scientists such as Har Govind Khorana, C. V. Raman (both Nobel Prize winners), Ramanujan, Meghnad Saha and Birbal Sahni as well.

The point then is that while India is a country with its strengths and weaknesses, the image that emerges from the textbooks is a negatively stereotypical one. India, in other words, according to the textbook writers, has no inherent
strength. This, surely, is a biased view of any country

THE GREEDY, UNJUST AND RUTHLESS BRITISH

Contact, as Mal nowski points out, is one mechanism of social change. To that extent certain changes could have understandably come about in India as a result of contact with the West, just as changes came about in Europe through contact with India in earlier times (Snell et al.: 358, 361). But to describe India as a backward country which was "saved" by the British is, to say the least, grossly misleading. Let us analyze the statements used to characterize India.

To begin with, even to include statements to the effect that India was a "country of villages" (Walsh) containing "many nations and many peoples" (Snell) is to suggest that there was something "wrong" with India not being a nation-state as European countries had come to be by the time of her colonization. As we all know, the European countries themselves were once at such a stage of socio-political integration. In fact it is even wrong to say that India was never a united national state. It indeed was, at least in part, under Alexander the Great, in the Maurya and Gupta periods (all in the 4th century) and under the Mughals (15th century).

There was no question of India being in a state of "anarchy" (Walsh) as is suggested by the characterization of India as a "country of villages" (Walsh). At the fall of the Mughal Empire (circa 16th century), the local rulers simply asserted their traditional authority. There was indeed law and order in their own domains, although there may not have been a centralized form of law and order.
The British, no doubt, brought the entire country under one rule, even though they ruled parts of the country only indirectly through the local overlords. But that is not to say that however advantageous the arrangement may have been for the colonizer, it was beneficial from the point of view of India. In fact, "Western influence disrupted traditional ways of thinking and living" (Walsh: 72). As an example:

An important break...was made in the matter of land revenue. The...zamindars were made landlords with property rights. The revenue fixed by them was fixed permanently, and they were free to extract as much as they wished from the tenants (Walsh: 73; underlines added).

The changes were important in two aspects: "for the first time, land was owned, and could be bought and sold; and land revenue was to be paid in money" (ibid.). Further, "the number of landless peasants" also increased.

As another example, subsistence farming was replaced by cash crops, and the beneficiaries were the colonizer: "The cultivation of opium was stimulated by the growing demand from China, a demand stimulated by British traders, who made immense profits" (ibid.).

The system of education is another case in point: "Under British rule...education was reserved for the few... Moreover, the kind of education introduced by the British was literary rather than scientific and technical" (ibid.: 79).

Although the view is widely held, it is really questionable whether English is really a "unifying language" (Walsh) in India. It may unite the middle and upper class Indians, but hardly the average Indian. Further, it is doubtful whether "enabling the upper and middle class Indians to communicate
easily" (Walsh) has brought the North and the South, or the twenty linguistic provinces, closer to each other. Indeed, it has done little in terms of broadening the knowledge base of Indian society. What the use of English has done, however, is to "underdevelop" (Frank, 1966) the native languages. That is to say, the more English comes to be used in the country, the less the native languages grow, develop and expand (see Sugunasiri, in progress, for the fuller argument).

Finally, the claim that India made "enormous material and spiritual progress" (Earl; Trueman et al.) under colonialism needs examination.

It is true that the British built rail lines (Earl) in India and that they serve Indians well today. But it certainly was not through love of Indians that railways were first built. It was rather to exploit the country more efficiently. And it must not be forgotten either that the railway lines were built by the sweat of Indian workers, many of whom died in the process. "Textile manufacturing" (Earl) was not new to India either. If anything, Indian textile was superior to European textile. What the British did was to develop the textile industry on a larger scale resulting in the displacement of the small manufacturer and the local weaver on one hand and the growth of big textile industrialists (like the Tatas and the Birlas) on the other.

Education, including higher learning, was not new to India. Nor were universities. Nalanda and Taxila were two ancient universities of international repute and reportedly had enrolments of up to 40,000 students. In addition there were the "forest universities". The universities set up during the colonial period produced not scientists and technicians but primarily those versed in the arts and humanities (Walsh).
An increasing Westernized class, graduate unemployment, and rising youth dissension can all be said to be the outcome of the system of education offered by the universities modelled along Western lines.

Similarly, the establishment of hospitals was not new in India either. Ashoka, the Buddhist emperor, had built many. The opening of Western hospitals should not further blind us to the fact that a highly developed form of native medicine, Ayurveda — literally, the science of life — had been in existence in India for centuries. Ayurveda, before it came into disrepute under the colonial onslaught, included surgery as well. The medical treatise, Charaka Samhita, written by Susruta, dates from the 2nd century. If the setting up of Western hospitals added a further therapeutic dimension to the Indian medical scene, it, however, brought with it serious problems as well. The one that comes to mind immediately is the shift from preventive care to curative care — a hallmark of Western medicine. A second is the overcrowding of hospitals as the dependency on Western medicine increased. A third is the undermining of the knowledge base of the community in community health as people began to hand over the responsibility for curative care to the "professionals".

As for science and technology (Walsh), India gave the world the modern-day numerals, and the decimal system. It produced the Taj Mahal, and converted stainless steel before this was ever done in the West. This is not to mention the level of science and technology which surely would have been necessary to develop a civilization like that of Harappa and Mohenjodaro with its wide roads, extensive sewage systems and high walls.

Thus, if material progress was made under the British, it
added many problems without necessarily providing any solutions. As for "spiritual progress", one is really at a loss to understand what is meant by this, and how such progress was indeed achieved, unless by it is meant the introduction of Christianity and the often forced proselitization of Indians. Buddhist, Hindu, Islamic, Jaini and Sikh teachers, for example, had proposed paths to spiritual advancement which are certainly no less sophisticated than those advocated by Christianity. The effects of meditation and yoga practices are well known in the West. Professor Goleman's analysis of the steps leading to the highest forms of jhanic states is only one of the studies in the West of the spiritual development as taught under Buddhism. Schopenhauer was another who recognized this strength of Buddhism.

As for freedom and equality, the "Charter for Free Enquiry" (see Sugunasiri, in progress, Chapter 2) in Buddhism is unparalleled in the history of human thought. It calls upon everyone to "come and see", and accept nothing on the authority of the Buddha himself. As for equality, again, Buddhism declares in no uncertain terms that

Not by birth does one become a Brahmin or Vasala
By deed alone does one become one (Dhammapada).

Men and women hold equal status in the teachings of the Buddha, with women being allowed into the clergy in Buddha's lifetime itself.

The point, then, is not that certain colonial policies and practices have not turned out to be useful to independent India, but rather (a) that they were not the outcome of deliberate policy arising out of altruistic considerations, and (b) that India would not have been crawling in shame had
it not been for the British. The perspective contained in the texts, however, is one of the benevolent British bestowing favours upon a helpless India.

THE BRITISH HAD TO BE FORCED OUT!

In the above characterization, the British are given credit for both the rise of patriotism and the eventual granting of independence. The logic seems to run something like this:

India got independence due to the rise of patriotism.
Partiotism rose as a result of the rise of the middle class.
The middle class rose as a result of Western education.
Western education rose as a result of the British occupation.
Thus, India eventually got independence thanks to the British occupation.

But what is lacking in this chain of argument is how India came to yearn for independence in the first place. Had not the West occupied India, there was no question of "independence". That basic issue is completely ignored in the textbooks. Did the Indians invite the British over? Or did they come over in greed?

Let us now take the "far-sighted policy" of "gradually conceding" self-rule. In reality, what we find is a colonial policy where concessions "have been conferred by imperial authorities in the expectation that alien rule would thereby prove more acceptable to the natives" (Trueman et al.: 658). As is evident from the same author, what we find is a policy of cunning, deceit and treachery by no means based on the
"Western ideals" of justice and fair play. For example,

Recognizing India's valuable contribution to the Allied cause in the First World War, the British government promised her ultimate self-government. However, a full generation passed before the promise was fulfilled (ibid.: 661).

In fact, when the Government of India Act of 1935 granting "responsible government" to the provinces of "British India" was finally passed, "Over ninety articles in the Act reserved 'discretionary powers' for the Viceroy". He also retained control over such crucial areas as "defence, external affairs, ecclesiastical matters and sensitive frontier areas" (ibid.: 664). Even this Act was a response "to the demand for reform" (ibid.: 661). In 1942, the British realized the "necessity of conciliating Indian nationalists" only when the "Japanese had arrived in Burma", and were threatening India. Britain was afraid that the nationalists would support the Japanese. While the change of government in England from Conservative to Labour had a role to play in it, the eventual granting of independence was indeed a coup-de-grâce, a successful way out, for the British out of the morass they had themselves created and got into. It was cheaper, and honorable, for the natives to kill each other than for the British to do so! And further, independence came only after producing a middle class of "black skin and white masks" (Fanon, 1952), "more British than the British", who could be trusted with the continued exploitation.

It is true that the British concessions to India were gradual, but as can be seen from the above, that was hardly the outcome of "far-sighted British policy". Gandhi, Nehru and others had to go to jail on many occasions to earn it, as did, for example, the more than 90,000 arrested in the
famous Salt March of 1930. This is not to mention the thousands of people killed, for example, in the "Great Calcutta Killing" (Trueman et al.: 664). Such measures can hardly be reflective of the British government's "reluctance to adopt a policy of coercion" (Trueman et al.).

Mounting tension there certainly was between the Hindus and the Muslims just prior to independence. But suffice it to say that prior to the British occupation, the Hindus, the Muslims, the Jainis, the Indo-Aryan speakers of the North and the Dravidian speakers of the South, the many thousand jatis (tribes) -- all lived at peace with each other for over two and a half millenia. As everywhere else the colonists went, religious and racial tensions were, at least in part, engineered by the colonists by means of their divide and rule policy.

Finally, the retention after independence of links with the Commonwealth as being "a tribute to British policy": Thanks to colonial policies, the Indian economy had come to rely on a few exports in the form of raw materials. Since no technology had been developed in India during the colonial period, India (like every other country subjected to colonialism) had to rely on manufactured imports for its food, textiles, and other basic amenities. Plainly, the Indian economy was controlled in London. And it made economic and political sense to keep the controllers on your side! Further, the middle class which had emerged had developed a life-style which could only be satisfied through constant contact with the ex-master. And it was this middle class which made up the civil service on whose advice the politicians came to rely heavily, particularly in the early years of independence. Naturally, they made use of their close relationship with the government to press to retain the links for
their own benefit as well.

These two factors, then, were to a great degree responsible for India's continuing ties with the Commonwealth. There was a lot to lose by withdrawing, and perhaps not much to lose by being in. It was thus a matter of "kissing the arm that cannot be severed", to use a saying from Sri Lanka, rather than a tribute to British policy. Although India achieved political independence, there was no economic or cultural independence. So India in fact was not "completely independent" to act otherwise.

Whether or not the India Act of 1935 served as a basis for the post-independent India's constitution is an empirical question. But even if it were the case, it must be noted that there was an Indian input to it. Even if the Act was written exclusively by the British, the reasons for adopting parts of it in the constitution of independent India may not necessarily lie in the contextual or technical excellence of the Act. If indeed a colonial Act serves as a basis for a post-colonial constitution, it must surely reflect the colonial mentality of the constitution drafters. (See the reference to the Westernized middle class above). It also reflects the fact that the Indian legal professionals, who drafted the constitution, were trained in the very same British tradition which the colonial drafters were trained in. Assuming still that the post-independence constitution was based on the 1935 Act, and is technically excellent, how much does it reflect the aspirations of a free people? Does it allow for societal growth? Did not several post-independence leaders indeed find it to be inimical to societal growth? And as such, did they not have to amend the constitution repeatedly? These are but a few reservations that come to one's mind.
Some of India's "problems", according to the textbook writers, are overpopulation, poverty, malnutrition, food habits, land redistribution, subsistence agriculture, agricultural methods, lack of industry (and mechanization), lack of money, illiteracy, caste, cattle and so on (see "PROBLEMS GALORE!" for authors). Assuming for a moment that India could be characterized in such terms, why indeed need they be viewed as "problems"? And for whom are they problematic? And, again, how accurate is this picture?

Let us begin with population. There are undoubtedly lots of people in India, but that is not to say that in relation to the land available India is "crowded" (Cottingham). In fact, in terms of density of population, India occupies the sixteenth position in the world. It is, of course, true that a few cities such as Bombay and Calcutta have dense populations (that is, the proportion of people per unit of land is high). However, the number of these cities is small and, moreover, the rural areas are much less densely populated than urban areas. India, it should be remembered, has more villages than cities. In light of these considerations, it seems misleading to portray India as a country with a seething mass of people. It might be pointed out also that the growth rate of India's population is much less than that of many other countries, including some Western countries.

There certainly is poverty in India, but what are the causes? It is not simply that India has a low Gross National Product (GNP) and most certainly not that its peasantry is "backward". More realistically, India's "poverty" reflects an inequitable distribution of the national wealth in a country where this wealth is in the hands of a few. In pre-
colonial India, too, there were great inequities, but these inequities were made worse by the colonizers when they patronized the princely state rulers and engineered the rise of the middle class. It is this middle class which continues to rob the country of its wealth through its behavioural patterns and misgovernment.

An important aspect of poverty, related to the above, is that not all Indians are poor. There is a sizeable middle class which is hardly poor by any standards, and an awfully rich few who are rich, again, by any standards.

A final aspect of poverty that the textbook writers have ignored is the distinction between traditional rural poverty and the new poverty of the urban slums. The latter is indeed the creation of the colonial enterprise, and it is a worse kind of poverty. While the rural poor have at least extended family and friends to fall back upon, at least for psychological comfort, the urban poor, having been uprooted from the soil, have no one to fall back on.

There is malnutrition, too, in India, but again, not every Indian has a pot belly as is often depicted. If by malnutrition is not meant that Indians do not suffer from what is referred to in developmental literature as "conspicuous consumption", or in ordinary language as gluttony, of the Western society, or the rich in general (witness, for example, the problem of obesity in Canada), then a large percentage of Indians can be said to be satisfactorily fed — from the point of view of the body's needs. The sinews and the muscles of the Indian may not bulge, and the average weight and height of the average Indian may not be comparable to that of North Americans. That is not to say, however, that he suffers from malnutrition. We may never be able
to establish the extent of malnutrition in India statistically, but to depict the whole country as suffering from malnutrition is not to recognize reality.

By the "problems of food habits" is presumably meant that Indians don't eat meat. It is, therefore, suggested that they lack proteins (Lloyd: 351), and it allows them to become "so numerous and dense" (Stanford: 49). As well, it contributes to the "cattle problem".

First of all, it must be pointed out that not all Indians are vegetarians. There are, for example, vast numbers of Christians and Muslims in India who do eat meat. Then, even among Hindus, there is a substantial body of people who are non-vegetarians. Secondly, "Monsoon Asia is a land of cereals...rice....barley and millet in India" (Lloyd: 351). Indians, as do all rural people, use plenty of protein-rich lentils, green vegetables, as well as dairy products. Thus, what the traditional diet is deficient in are carbohydrates rather than proteins. And meat does not make up for that deficiency. The major food problem, thus, is not related to vegetarianism, but to the fact that there is no adequate machinery to distribute the available food well and at prices which the masses can afford. As Stanford (p. 49) says, an agriculture,

in which crops are consumed directly by human beings can support several times more people than a mixed crop-animal type in which much of the crop output is fed to animals, whose products subsequently are consumed by humans.

If this has traditionally sustained large numbers of people and contributed indirectly towards today's massive population, it is unfortunate. But Indians can certainly be commended for developing such a food production policy, because it
recognized the importance of providing for large families which were, in turn, required to work on the land. A meat-eating policy might have brought catastrophe much earlier, particularly in view of the fact that meat production is extremely cost-intensive and wasteful. Reportedly, it takes twenty times non-meat protein to produce one unit of meat protein.

The habit of "not eating meat" takes us directly to the "cattle problem", simply because every cow not killed adds to the total cattle population. However, the solution of eating meat, as suggested in the textbooks, not only reflects a lack of understanding of Hindu culture and a callous disregard for human values and ecological factors, but also a conscious or unconscious disregard of the way in which meat producing industry operates. Beef is not produced by killing milk cows. Rather, beef cattle are specially produced for this purpose. If this is the case in North America, why is it considered strange that Indians do not kill their cows?

India, to reiterate a point that is repeatedly made, is primarily an agricultural country and the cattle are an integral part of the country's traditional rural economy. It helps plough the land, pulls the carts (Lloyd: 354) which are a vital part of the transportation system, serves as a "power engine" in extracting mustard oil by pulling a long "handle" extending from a huge stone grinder, provides milk and milk-based food products, works as an important source of fuel and fertilizer as well as building material for wattle houses, and serves as a lawn mower. Finally, it fills the role of a household pet, provides piggy-back rides for the more daring youngsters and entertainment to the entire village by its participation in such games as ox-cart races. In a country where petroleum products are in short supply, motor
vehicles are expensive to use. Besides, roads, especially in villages, are unpaved and waterways usable for transporta­tion are scattered. Consequently, the bullock cart serves as an efficient and inexpensive mode of transportation. Indeed, bullock carts in India transport as much cargo as the wide network of railways does. Repairs are few and can be done by the average peasant and there is no need to wait for spare parts to arrive from the city! It may well be that there are few cows which give "as much as 3 pints of milk a day" (Lloyd: 354). Even so, cow's milk is still one of the most nutritious foods and one for which the peasant does not have to depend on the hazards of weather-change. The dried dung is used as fuel (Lloyd: 354), and most villages now have "gobar gas" plants that use cow dung to produce cooking gas. Despite claims to the contrary (e.g. Lloyd: 354), dung also serves as fertilizer. Cattle serve as "lawn mowers" in that they graze on grassland, and, in so doing, they also reservice the land for vegetation with their dung. Many peasants consider the family's cattle as pets, and even have names for them. The man in the family, in particular, has a very close relationship with its cattle, often addressing the oxen as his "sons".

Such is the functionality of cattle in rural India, and here perhaps lies the historical basis of the "sacredness" of the cow. Now to suggest that they be killed for human consumption, or because they are "unproductive" (Jenner: 26) is, to say the least, rather immoral and heartless. How many Canadians would dare suggest that they kill all their pet cats and dogs and budgies for meat? Despite claims to the contrary (Lloyd: 354), cattle do not eat food available for humans, and feeding cattle does not take away money from something else, because, in India cattle feed on grass and fodder, and
not on pet foods bought in stores. By contrast, how much money that could buy food for millions of children around the world is today used up in buying pet foods in North America?

Jenner (p. 26) "complains" that the "Indian government in 1965 supported sixty-two special farms for old, infirm, and unproductive cattle". What it indeed shows is the humanness of the Indian. It reflects an attitude of kindness and unselfishness. The cattle may have outlived its social and economic usefulness, but that does not mean that man must be ungrateful, any more than that a society should be so to its senior citizens. As Balins et al. (1971:355) observe in one of the textbooks not here analyzed, "How many North Americans would be willing to consume their pet dogs, cats and horses?" It may be remarked that the attitude implied here against "unproductive" cattle reminds one of the global corporations' attitude towards "unproductive" labour: "you working stiffs hang around...until we get [a more sophisticated] piece of gear" (Barnet and Muller, 1974: 69).

The question of getting rid of cattle is not merely a moral issue either. It forebodes economic ruin of a village subsistence economy which has cattle at the centre. "Pigs, chickens and goats" are no alternative to cattle, as Lloyd (351) suggests.

The viewpoint expressed here is not intended to suggest that if the presence of large numbers of cattle lead to some development problems, the whole question should not be looked at from a fresh angle. It is like any other issue facing India, and must be seen as such.
HINDUISM REVISITED

The view of India that emerges from the textbooks is that it is a deeply religious land, made up of Hindus almost exclusively, and as a result, Hinduism is at the root of all of India's "problems". The emphasis on Hinduism is so much that as many as 10 of the 14 books analyzed here have made reference to it.

While it is true that a majority of Indians are Hindus, it is not at all accurate to portray India as a Hinduland. It is the country with the largest number of Muslims in the world, higher even than in Pakistan or Bangla Desh. Then there are Sikhs, Jains, Christians, Buddhists, Zoroastrians and Jews as well. And the list is by no means inclusive. It is for this reason that India is more accurately described as a "multireligious" country. Even the portrayal of Gandhi as a "Hindu leader" (Trueman et al.: 659) is misleading. While he was personally a Hindu, what he sought and fought for was a multireligious India. He is a Hindu leader only to the extent that Trudeau is a Catholic leader or Carter a Baptist leader.

Cruickshank's statement that "nowhere else in the world have people been so preoccupied with religion" (p. 45) as in India is one that can be made in relation to many other countries. Thus, if it could be made of India, it could equally truly be made of such other developed countries as the U.K., the U.S.A and Canada. Indeed, to our knowledge, none of the mass circulation newspapers in India has a whole section devoted to religion, a phenomenon we are acquainted with in Toronto itself. The point then is that while Hinduism plays an important part in the lives of its adherents, it is no more and no less influential than the role of any other
religion in the lives of any other people.

Therefore, to point the finger at Hinduism for all of India's present day ills is hardly justified. It is, of course, true that Hinduism teaches that people are born into different castes. But that is not to say that once born, a person is stuck there "irreversibly" (Jaffer: 26). In contemporary India considerable mobility exists in the economic sphere. For example, Kamraj, a former national chairman of the Congress Party, was an "untouchable", and so was Dr. Ambedkar, a leading figure in India's independence movement and one of the architects of the constitution of free India. Jagjivan Ram, an important member of the present central ministry, is another example.

The presence of different religions also serves as outlets for those who want to reverse their birth-positions. Thus, for example, many south Indians have become Buddhists or Christians. All this, however, is not to say that caste is not a strong factor in India but simply to point out that caste is not as rigid an institution as it is portrayed. Traditionally yes. But not so today.

According to Lloyd (353), caste creates a problem in running factories because people of different castes will not eat or work together. But this seems to be a strange claim to make about a country where there are more than enough people to draw from. If it indeed is a problem, a simple solution would perhaps be to have everybody, from the lowest paid worker to the manager, from the same caste!

Will there then be a happy family of workers who will all eat and work together? This would hardly be the case.
In this case, as elsewhere, class divisions far outweigh the caste divisions -- except where they don't compound each other. For example, it is quite possible for an "untouchable" with political or economic power to become so "acceptable" as to be able to enter into matrimonial alliance with a "high caste" family. Similarly, Dr. Ambedkar is well received by the establishment because he was able to go through the educational mill and thus prove his ability to act in a manner "befitting" (in the eyes of the establishment, if not of Dr. Ambedkar himself) the upper classes. The refusal to eat with one's inferiors thus stems not only from caste consciousness but class consciousness as well. And this is true of any vertically stratified society. It is hardly likely that a Canadian corporate head will eat with his janitor.

A related point is that to blame or not to blame Hinduism for this or that problem appears very much to be based on the writer's whim than fact. This is the only way we can interpret the fact that while one writer sees in Hinduism "a disposition against any form of contraception" (Stanford: 217), another considers birth control "not repugnant" to Hinduism. What is even more significant is that the former writer later concludes that "Hinduism presents no sharply defined doctrinal obstacle on parenthood" (Stanford: 219).

The point that emerges, then, is that made by Stanford himself in relation to fertility and birth control when he says: "both the natural and unintended religious and social restrictions" on such matters "have been reduced during the past generation..." (219). And, as Lloyd (353) observes, the government has taken measures, though not yet with full success, to de-castize Indian society.
Two other comments need to be made on material related to Hinduism. One is that none of the writers seems to have a thorough grasp of it, often mixing it up with Buddhism (and vice versa). The second is that, perhaps due to the first factor, these writers have hand-picked certain aspects of it (e.g. caste, food habits and cattle) and, also, only a few textual references from ancient books, leaving the students with the impression that that is all there is to Hinduism.

The following two examples from Earl establish the first point.

A. "The objective of the Hindu believer is Nirvana" (112).
   
   Comment: Nirvana is the objective not in Hinduism but in Buddhism. The highest goal in Hinduism is moksha, "release", or the union of Atman (self) with Brahman (the supreme).

B. "Brahmans are priests, and their importance springs from the fact that they are supposed to be able to perceive God much more vividly than ordinary people. This suggests that there are really two forms of Hinduism: the religion of those who understand, and the religion of those who do not..." (112).

Comment: This statement can only be true to the extent that Christianity, for example, or any other religion (except Buddhism), for that matter, can be characterized as being made up of two varieties. For surely, the priestly class holds its position only by virtue of the claim that it communicates with God, and, therefore,
speaks for the Almighty. We, of course, know that such a characterization is untrue. Just as there are no two forms of Christianity (the reference here is not to the different "churches" but to the same church), there are no two forms of Hinduism. There are, of course, the theological and the practical variations as there are in Christianity or any other religion.

Finally, the handpicking of tenets and material: Cottingham (1): 7-8 has a chapter on Hinduism, but all he includes there are 13 verses of the Bhagvad Gita, dated around 500 B.C., which is itself only a part of the epic called the Mahabharata, which has 100,000 verses. And 13 verses are supposed to give a complete picture of Hinduism! In another book, the same author (2): 27-8 includes the same 13 verses under the heading "Origins of Castes in India"! Here he has one more selection -- half a page of textual material from "The Code of Manu", written between "500 and 300 B.C."!

By what stretch of imagination such scanty material can be expected to give an accurate picture of Hinduism or the caste system, particularly to an uninitiated student, we do not know. To make matters worse, the student is expected to answer questions like: "Do you think it would be easy to develop a democratic society among people who believed in verse 47?" The relevant verse is as follows: "There is more natural happiness in doing one's own Law without excellence than in doing another's Law well. In doing the work assigned by Nature one gets no stain". This verse could just as well have appeared in a text of any theistic religion -- even Christianity. Yet, "democracies" have developed in
Christian countries.

As with Cottingham, Jenner (25-8) too includes 12 lines from "The Code of Manu" and a one and one-half page description from another western text in her chapter on Hinduism! Not to be outdone by Cottingham, as it were, she has a question like this:

Inasmuch as pork is taboo for Moslems and beef for those of the Hindu faith, suggest some possible difficulties of developing agricultural policy for countries with large numbers of both Moslems and Hindus in the population (emphasis added).

The direction of the answer is already implied in the question. What the student is asked to suggest are "difficulties", not advantages and disadvantages.

Another question reads as follows: "Identify specific foods from the Code of Manu that are taboo for the Hindu faith. Comment on the possible effect of food taboos as related to world hunger". Assuming that the connection between Indians' eating habits and world hunger is clear, in no textbook is raised a parallel question that asks to "comment on the possible effect of the eating habits of Canadians or North Americans on world hunger".

The question that needs to be asked, then, is how valid a quotation from a 2,500 year old text is to the present day Indian scene. Answer: as valid as the Bible is to modern Canada.
WESTERN AID AND SOLUTIONS: HOW HELPFUL?

The West is West and the East is East
Ane never the twain shall met.

What is implied in these two lines seems to be true even today, even at a time when there is so much traffic between the East and the West. The truth lies here not in its literal sense; rather, what it tells us is to remember that differences do exist between the two.

"Nobody would deny that", the cynic is sure to say. But yet, in matters of development, we seem to ignore just that. This, at least, is what appears from the textbooks. The 'solutions' that the West has come up with for its own problems are recommended lock, stock and barrel for the Post-Colonial Nations as well.

Take population control for example. Unlimited population growth can create problems for PCNs. But population control a la West can, and does, create problems of its own. It is not the fact that control itself is bad. It is the unintended outcome that matters. Whereas the easy availability of birth control devices can cause strains on the moral and social fibres of a traditional society, a no less serious problem is that given the relations of economic power between the developed nations and the PCNs, as well as within PCNs, these measures are used in a discriminatory manner. They harm the interests of those whose very existence depends on the number of working hands in the family. The resistance to the Western solution of population control on the part of Indians, then, may not necessarily stem from any religious considerations but from an intuitive conviction that the 'solution' has its own problems.

'Foreign aid' is another Western 'solution' suggested in the textbooks. While pumping foreign aid in PCNs is seen to be necessary for development, it is not clearly pointed out that aid funds are
really loans for which a country had to pay sometimes for generations, as in the case of the Mahweli River Project in Sri Lanka. That aid usually had strings attached to it. The money was to be used for:

(a) projects identified and approved by the donor;

(b) to buy equipment and spare parts from the donor country, and so on;

(c) the country was to allow the maintenance of an embassy of the donor country, the expenses for the maintenance of which must come from the interest, repayment, etc. due on the 'aid' and

(d) allow business investments that would have the right to take out of a country large amounts of profits in the form of foreign exchange, and so on.

Thus, in fact 'aid' to poor countries turned out to be aid to rich countries. The former served as dumping ground for excess produce as well as keeping prices in the donor country high (or, as is claimed, to keep prices 'stable'), and a market place for the products of the donor country. These too provided for employment and a stable economy for the donor country. Among other benefits to the donor country was giving the academics a good place to spend their sabbaticals! The recipient country also served as a cheap source of raw material which then served to maximize profits in the aid giver's country. Even more serious results of foreign aid were:

(a) the tight grip that the West had over PCNs;

(b) what Freire (1970) calls "internal invasion" that went with technology, equipment, advice etc. from the West; and

(c) an expectancy for foreign goods and the undermining of self-reliance.
Another Western 'panacea' for development as contained in the textbooks, is industrialization, a 'solution' which emerged from the impact of the industrial revolution first in England and France and then later in the rest of Europe and North America.

Nehru, India's first Prime Minister, was sold on the idea of industrialization and India's first Five Year Plan laid heavy emphasis on industrialization. It took a famine and death to many in the early fifties to make Nehru recognize that India, as a country of which 90% of the people lived off the land, needed to emphasize an agricultural revolution before or rather than an 'industrial revolution'.

Industrialization, it needs hardly be argued, has a place in development, but it is important to recognize that industrialization need not be what may be called 'conspicuous industrialization' -- i.e. big scale industrialization. Such industrialization needs an endless supply of raw material (which may have to be imported and for which there may be no foreign exchange available), trained technicians (who will have to be trained abroad, and will more likely than not remain overseas), administrative methods that would enable the slick functioning of the industrial structure (methods that will have to be developed afresh) and so on. Many PCNs do not have these conditions readily available. Conspicuous industrialization, even when successful, contributes heavily to unemployment, among others, as, for example, when a centrally located hand tool factory throws hundreds of thousands of local smiths out of work. Further, such tools are bound to be more expensive as well, reflecting the overhead charges (and not unlikely, if privately run, the margin of profit as well). Urbanization, or the exodus to the industrialized cities, is an associated problem of industrialization.
Mechanization is an essential ingredient of industrialization. Here again, what has been often overlooked is the distinction made by Ananda Coomaraswamy, the Lankan scholar, between mechanization that extends man's hand and mechanization that replaces man. The 'carpet loom' is a tool that assists the craftsman by allowing him to hold the warp threads at a stretch to the pile to be woven round them by the craftsman's fingers, while the 'power loom' serves as a destroyer of culture.

The tendency towards mechanization does not stop at the factory gate. There is much pressure for mechanization of farming -- to improve its 'efficiency'. The tractor comes to be thus introduced, replacing the many thousands of hands that might otherwise be kept busy. The tractor may even do harm to the land, in that it might dig up too much soil.

Idle hands cannot unfortunately remain idle all the time. Robbed of socially useful work, they turn into socially destructive ones.

Mechanization of farming also leads to the demand for pesticides -- for 'efficiency' again -- which now have been found to do as much harm to the soil structure as to the pests. Changes in farming methods lead to other social problems as well. For example, the experimentation usually begins with 'progressive farmers', and this gives them the advantage over others. This then further confounds the social inequities that already exist in society.

Two other Western 'panaceas' for development have been education and literacy. However, the Western model of education that many PCNs have been made to accept (the foreign 'expert' advice, overseas training, educating the local
planners in the Western system, etc.) have created enough problems of educated unemployment, brain drain, a 'revolution of rising expectations' (Lerner, 1963), 'cultural imperialism' (Carnoy, 1974), and so on. Programs of literacy haven't succeeded all that much either as Galbraith has commented as well. Soon it was discovered by all concerned that literacy must mean more than just being able to read -- it must be functional. But even functional literacy alone does not lead to development when the reading material -- often copied from the West -- is not developmental. Literacy programs have so far been found to 'work' only when linked to an ideological component -- as in the Chinese 'each one-teach one' experiment, and in Freire's (1970) conscientization approach, where a learner's socio-political awareness is raised through words -- and eventual readings, and result in praxis, or developmental action. But the traditional Western view of literacy has found such a 'political approach' to be anathema to its 'liberalism'.

We could discuss several other issues relating to development but what has been discussed so far is sufficient, we believe, to make the point we wish to make. The purpose of this discussion is not to show that there is no contribution that the West can make to PCNs, or that PCNs cannot learn from the experience of the West. It is simply to emphasize a few points that seem to be often overlooked. The first is that just because a certain 'solution' worked for the West does not necessarily mean that it will also work elsewhere. Such 'solutions' emerged in the West over a long period of time, after a long period of political stability and sociocultural integration and different conditions. There were fewer mouths to drain the resources, and plentiful resources. Most importantly, the Western solutions emerged within a Judeo-Christian tradition. Almost none of these conditions prevail, in their totality at least, in any of the PCNs.
The point, thus, is that such solutions must be related to the culture base of the countries if at all they are to be adapted. And it may very well be the case that they cannot even be adapted.

**INDIAN MASSES ARE NO FOOLS!**

The tendency to depict the Indian masses, like the masses in every other PCN society, as unenlightened souls, and the national governments as saviours of the souls reflects the very arrogance of Western man in relation to the non-Western man. The sympathy in the texts towards the (Indian) government is understandable. Governments in PCNs are run by bureaucrats who have either been trained during the colonial period itself, or gone through the school mill of the Western type, or been trained overseas in Western institutions. The Westerners can 'tune into' such people, and there is a human tendency to like those whom you know, personally or as a class (i.e. psychologically) than those whom you don't know. And the Western development expert hardly gets to know the peasant. And, through sheer ignorance alone, it is easy to stereotype the peasant. The fact that they behave differently, then, serves as a self-fulfilling prophecy. Whatever, or whoever, is different must be inferior. The conscience then demands reasons for such a belief. The religion and culture readily come to mind. Because Indian peasants don't behave the way the Westerner behaves, and the Indian peasant's religious beliefs are different from that of the Westerner, the 'inferiority' must be in the culture and religion. And since the peasants also refuse to change as easily as the government bureaucrat does, the blame for the non-application of Western solutions, or their failure, fall on the peasant. But what is ignored is that the major reasons for the failures are the likely inapplicability of the solutions.
to the Indian scene, and the ivory-tower planning of the government where the people have no say at any stage, save in the implementation.

The Indian peasant may not be 'aggressive', or 'bold', or 'innovative', or 'active' in comparison to the members of the Indian middle class or Western man. If so we must look for the reasons in the historical factors and the environment, and not within their psyche, as the textbooks seem to suggest. We are all "actors-in-intercommunication" as Freire (p. 123) puts it, or individuals-in-community (Sugunasiri: in progress, Chapter 3).
CONCLUDING REMARKS

Prejudice or stereotyping, is of two kinds: negative and positive (see Allport, 1958: 6-10 for a discussion). The overall view of India and Indians that emerges from the analysis of the textbooks in this study is one of negative prejudice. This is in striking contrast to the view of Western man, which is one of positive prejudice. McDiarmid and Pratt (ibid.: 25) have observed that while prejudice still manifests itself in textbooks, "it is more subtle" because "it has become less respectable." However, what we find in these textbooks, as seen from the "Perspective" is an open and blatant expression of prejudice, both negative and positive.

This statement might not be acceptable to the textbook writers, and the "Perspective" that has emerged in the study might not be one that any of the original authors individually would want to claim as their own view of India and Indians. In fact, it is even likely that they would themselves each reject the "Perspective" as having nothing to do with them, and as being bigoted. What must be said, however, is that the "Perspective" reflects the collective mind of the textbook writers. In other words, if the authors were to come together and each were to lay out before others his or her particular views of an aspect of India and Indians the overall view that a perceptive outside listener would get is what the "Perspective" represents. Thus, although we do not hold any individual writers responsible for the entirety of the "Perspective" -- although some can be held
more responsible than others -- we must indeed hold them collectively responsible for the negatively prejudicial image of India and Indians and the positively prejudicial view of Western man.

Consider, for example, the words and phrases used to characterize India and Indians on the one hand and the West on the other:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIA AND INDIANS</th>
<th>WEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>archaic</td>
<td>advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attached to old ways</td>
<td>anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backward</td>
<td>brilliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>civilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inefficient</td>
<td>efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overpopulated</td>
<td>enquiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primitive</td>
<td>far-sighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superstitious</td>
<td>humane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underdeveloped</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ungrateful</td>
<td>rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unscrupulous</td>
<td>well-meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This partial list of words or expressions picked at random (by going through "The 'Perspective' Explored") amply illustrates that the authors share their views of India and the West. This conclusion can hardly be avoided when we find different authors using different, and sometimes even the same qualifiers with negative connotations to characterize the former, and qualifiers with positive connotations to characterize the latter. The word "problem" is a case in point. Almost nothing in India is not a "problem" for the writers! (see "Problems Galore!").

If the "Perspective" represents the collective views of the writers, as we have claimed, it needs hardly be surprising.
They are all members of the same (Canadian/Western) society, and share a common (Judeo-Christian) cultural base and a common world view. And, despite claims to the contrary, it is, as it emerges from the textbooks used in Ontario, a 'caste'-based world we live in. Based on the present study, as well as two other studies (McDiarmid and Pratt, ibid.; and Egan et al., 1976), we can develop this 'model' of the Canadian caste system (as of 1977*). In developing this model, we shall fall upon the categories of caste as found in classical Hinduism. This is aptly suitable here since caste in India is treated by 10 out of 14 books analyzed here.

There are, in the Hindu caste system, two broad types: the touchables and the untouchables, or 'persons' and 'non-persons'. The 'touchables' are all born of the various parts of the body of the first mythological man, Purusha, while 'the untouchables' are not. The 'touchables' are themselves a hierarchy, and are made of four levels:

- **Brahmins:** the priests, wise men, etc. (born of Purusha's head)
- **Kshatriyas:** the warriors and the rulers (born of Purusha's shoulders)
- **Vaishyas:** the traders and merchants (born of Purusha's middle part)
- **Shudras:** the artisans and other manual workers (born of Purusha's lower part)

This explanation will help us understand the following model of the Canadian caste-system.

* The details of the model, particularly at the lower levels, may change in a few years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International, touchables</th>
<th>International, untouchables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Brahmans and Kshatriyas</td>
<td>Non-white, non-South Asian (White)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian touchables</td>
<td>Canadian untouchables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asians or &quot;Pakis&quot;</td>
<td>All Post-Colonial Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchables: men</td>
<td>Touchables: men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untouchables: women</td>
<td>Untouchables: women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglosaxon, Protestant, primarily English-speaking</td>
<td>Non-Anglosaxon, primarily Catholic, and/or primarily French-speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>Other (e.g., European immigrants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchables: men</td>
<td>Blacks, Native, Oriental, Other, Christian, Moslem, Indian, Japanese, Non-South Asian, others, Asian immigrant groups: e.g., Arabs, Latin Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untouchables: women</td>
<td>Untouchables: women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchables: Christianized Latin American countries, with major white populations</td>
<td>Touchables: middle &amp; upper classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untouchables: Non-Christian, or less Christ., countries of Asia, Africa &amp; Middle East with major yellow, brown or black population</td>
<td>Untouchables: middle &amp; upper classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untouchables: masses</td>
<td>Untouchables: masses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Going from left to right, and top to bottom of the model: in this caste system are, from the Canadian viewpoint, two basic categories -- those who live in Canada (or the touchables) and those people who live in the PCNs (or the untouchables).

Within the touchable category is a further binary division into Canadian touchables and Canadian untouchables. Of these, the former is made up of two categories: the combined 'Brahmins and Kshatriyas' and the combined 'Vaishyas and Shudras'. The 'whites', in general, make up the 'Brahmin and Kshatriya' category, while the non-white, non-South Asian population make up the 'Vaishya and Shudra' category. The South Asians, that is people from Bangla Desh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka or, more inclusively, the Pakis (i.e. everyone of South Asian origins regardless of the place of residence prior to immigrating to Canada) constitute the untouchable category.

Each of these three categories are further subdivided. The initial division here is sex-based. As the study by Egan et al (ibid.) suggests, women are, in the eyes of the authors of Canadian textbooks, the majority of whom are (what do you expect?) men (ibid.: 57), definitely inferior to men. Thus, men are the touchables within each of the earlier three sub-divisions and women are the untouchables (except their bodies). While the white women are inferior to white men, there are different castes within each category occupying a hierarchical order, the position being determined on the basis of race, religion and the language spoken. At the top of this hierarchy are the English-speaking Anglosaxon Protestants. Next come the primarily Catholic, French Canadians. Next in line are the Jews (McDiarmid and Pratt: 43, table 6). At the lowest level in the white
hierarchy are the 'other', mainly the European immigrants, who, in McDiarmid and Pratt's study receive 3 "favourable" and 4 "very favourable" scores. This then completes the 'white hierarchy'.

The Canadian 'Vaishyas and Sudras' also have the sex hierarchy as in the 'Brahmin and Kshatriyas' category: the men are superior to women. In this category are four other sub-categories, perhaps along a horizontal rather than a vertical axis. There are the Blacks, the Native Indians, the Orientals and the "other non-South Asians", such as immigrants from Arab and Latin American countries. Thus, in the McDiarmid and Pratt study, Muslims occupied the lowest rank among those who received "positive treatment" (p. 43) and they received no "very unfavourable" or "favourable" scores. They received only a combined "favourable" and "very favourable" score of 4. As contrasted with them, the Blacks got 8 "favourable" and "very favourable" scores, and Indians a total of 5. Although the relative positions of Muslims, Blacks and Native Indians thus differ, the treatment of these groups at the hands of the Canadian Brahmins and Kshatriyas, as we know from experience, does not seem to allow a hierarchial order among them. Among the Blacks, however, the Christian Blacks may be more favoured than the Muslim Black. There is a fourth subdivision, perhaps a latecomer to the midst of Vaishyas and Sudras. After having gone through a rough period, particularly in the Western parts of Canada, and having lived here long, the Orientals appear to be gaining greater acceptance in the Canadian society. The Japanese, with their increasing modernization back home, are perhaps held in higher esteem than the Chinese, and other Orientals, such as Koreans, Vietnamese, Filipinos, etc.
Now we come to the Canadian untouchables. They are the brown-coloured, non-Christians from South Asia, or generally anyone who looks brown, whose hair is not curly and speaks a variety of English. These are the "Pakis" -- whether they come from Pakistan or not. Again, within this category is the sex-based hierarchy: the men are superior.

This, then, is the caste system in relation to those who live in Canada. While such a 'rigid' caste-system prevails, with very little upward mobility for the touchable Vaishya-Sudra category and the untouchable South Asians, they are all 'touchables' when compared to those who live in PCNs -- the countries of Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East. At this international level, PCNs are the untouchables.

There is a binary division within this 'international untouchable' category as well. Latin America, with a primarily white (or white-Indian) and Christian population is the 'touchable' here, while the non-white and non-Christian or less Christianized countries of Africa, Asia and the Middle East constitute the 'untouchables'. For example, Brazil, which is industrialized and South America in general, are progressing (Lloyd: 356) while "backward" India is lagging.

Finally, we come to the last touchable-untouchable division. As the present study bears evidence, the government is considered enlightened in India and the masses as really hindering progress and are backward.

The model of the Canadian and international caste system outlined here is not research-based; it is experiential. It must thus be considered as highly tentative and must be
tested out empirically. However, it is the model that emerges from an analysis of the textbooks themselves, and shows the hierarchial nature of Canadian society, as also analyzed by Pratt.

Having given a lengthy treatment of the Canadian caste system, we can now go back to our textbook writers to see to what extent our claim that the "Perspective" indeed represents their collective outlook can be backed up. In order to do this, let us compare the "Perspective" with the model of the 'Canadian caste system'.

In the "Perspective", the West emerges as benevolent, far-sighted, enlightened and progressive while India is backward and problematic. In other words, the image of the West is positive and that of India is negative. If we now compared this to the international caste system in relation to Canada, we find a perfect match. At the top of the hierarchy are the Christian or Jewish white Brahmins and Kshatriyas who, at the international level, reflect the make-up of the Western and industrialized nations. If we considered the Canadian caste system alone, we find that not only are the whites occupying the highest point in the hierarchy, but the South Asians, of whom Indians are a part, hold the lowest position.

While in the "Perspective" India is backward by comparison, the government (made up of the middle class) is enlightened and far-sighted, while the peasants are, by contrast, backward and problematic. If we compared this to the caste system within Canada, the white population holds economic, political and cultural power is predominantly "devoted" and "zealous" (re: Christians), "great", "faithful", and "wise" (re: Jews) while the Vaishyas and Shudras are
predominantly "infidels" and "fanatical" (re: Muslims), "primitive", "fierce" and "superstitious" (re: Negroes) and "savage", "fierce" and "hostile" (re: Indians) (McDiarmid and Pratt: 41).

The point, then, is that the negative stereotyping of India, and Indian masses in particular, and the positive stereotyping of the British and the West are two views that emerge in the same process of thinking. It reflects a certain cultural pattern which the textbook writers share and have inherited from the rest of the society. As D.R. Taft observed (in "Historical Textbooks and Truth", Proceedings of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland) as far back as 1926:

Textbook writers will write the books that publishers will accept; publishers will accept the books that school boards will adopt. School boards will adopt the books that organized public opinion will demand.

It is then clear that the "Perspective" is indeed representative of the collective thinking of the textbook writers.

While we can thus understand the particular view(s) contained in the textbooks, the eventual responsibility must lie with the writers themselves. Their double standard stems from the fact that the textbook writers haven't gone deep enough in making their bold pronouncements. While, for example, they have put the entire blame for India's poverty on the "backwardness" of the Indians, and characterized India as "underdeveloped", they haven't bothered to use the same term in the well-known sense supported by Frank. As forcefully argued by Frank, and a host of others after him, the "underdevelopment" of PCNs (India among them) follows the overdevelopment of the Western nations, not precedes the advent of the Western powers, as the textbooks would have it.
Much of Western prosperity today is the result of 500 years of exploitation of these lands by the West in terms of cheap resources, cheap labour, and so on. This ruthless ability to exploit may have been instilled in Western man by the Protestant Ethic which Weber (1958) links to the rise of capitalism, and the machinery and equipment may have come from the Industrial Revolution. But there is no question that the raw material was 'provided' by the lands we have called PCNs, and that the money invested in capital development came from the enormous profits made out of the exploitation. In other words, what Frank suggests is that the underdevelopment of PCNs took place in the same process as the overdevelopment of the Western countries. Thus, if India is poor, as indeed it is, one must look for its causes and solutions, not merely in the 'backwardness' of Indians but in the international economic, political and cultural orders as well.

The complaint against the textbook writers, then, is that not enough care has been taken to present to the student a realistic and balanced view of India and Indians. Had this been so, India would have emerged, through the pages of the textbooks, as a country which not only has a proud history dating back 4,000 years ago (as acknowledged), but also as a country which had its own weaknesses and divisions, but strengths as well, and changing at its own pace, following its own cultural patterns. Under the impact of several centuries of Western colonialism, certain aspects of Indian society, related to the colonial enterprise, underwent drastic change, while certain others went untouched. The outcome was that the "cultural invasion" (Freire) that ensued served to heighten the existing weaknesses and compound the divisions (particularly with the rise of a Westernized middle class) without necessarily adding much
meaningful (from the Indians' point of view) strengths. It is a continuation of this historical process that is reflected in Indian society today. And only India herself can come up with solutions suitable for her own problems. Others can help only to the extent that they understand this. It is such a balanced view that we hope has emerged from our own discussion in the section entitled "Reality".

We find the particular view of Indians (and Westerners) that emerges in the textbooks analyzed to be totally unacceptable. Negative prejudice, negative stereotyping and negative feelings towards individuals or groups of people are supposed to stem from ignorance. This may well be true. But what we are faced with here is a situation where such attitudes of mind emerge from 'knowledge', or rather mis-knowledge. The result is that the racism of those not associated with the school system is compounded by the racism of those in school. Allport (pp.14-5) talks of five degrees of "acting out prejudice": antilocution (talking with like-minded friends), avoidance, discrimination, physical attack and extermination. Any wonder that we have, in Toronto and Vancouver, reached the fourth level?

The hidden curriculum of the textbooks that fans racism has a devastating effect as well on the Indian and other students of South Asian origins. They themselves come to believe in their 'natural' inferiority, and this hardly contributes to their self-worth. The effect of such attitudes on their educational performance, and the strains placed on the educational system are only too well-known.

In conclusion, then, the present study has confirmed the general findings of McDiarmid and Pratt(p. 25), upon a survey of textbook analysis studies that history books (or social
studies books in general) are "major repositories of evaluative references to minorities", and that the "main sins of omission ... are the failure to note the positive contributions and qualities,... and (their) persecution". The main "sins of commission" are "... the unscholarly reproduction of stereotypes and the casual use of emotive or pejorative terms...". The study also specifically confirms the original premise that led to the present study, namely the "widespread feeling in Toronto's East Indian community that secondary school curricula in social studies present a distorted picture of India". The view is not merely distorted, but patronizing as well, and loud and clear. It seems to be saying, "Smarten up, Indians, and go Western".
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