

essentially OECD texts he appropriated. There was this meeting in Deauville on the management of technology on both sides of the Atlantic. I was involved. Out of this was decided to establish an International Institute for the Management of Technology. It was established in Milan in 1971, with Olivier Giscard d'Estaing, the brother [an executive of IBM-France—ed.], Aurelio Peccei, Umberto Colombo, top Germans, Britons, and Dutch. But it never worked. It failed and it disappeared. We could not get the European industries to be integrated. Perhaps the concept was wrong—why separate “technology” from management in general? There was already the INSEAD [Institut Supérieur Européen d'Administration des Affaires, located in Fontainebleau, France, near the former NATO headquarters—ed.]; then, King also helped a lot to establish the EIRMA, the European Industrial Research Management Association, which I always call Irma La Douce. There was Peccei and [Trilateral Commission member Humberto] Colombo and King and Casimir the Dutchman—the 100 top high-technology firms in the world linked together through that institute, which trains managers.

For the last 20 years we've had these fantastic people, King, Peccei—what can we do when they disappear? Before the Club of Rome, in NATO, there had been the report of the three wise men, Lester Pearson, Gaetano Martino, and Halvard Lange [the foreign ministers of Canada, Italy, and Norway, respectively, who were commissioned by the North Atlantic Council in 1956 to write a report on “non-military cooperation in NATO.” They wrote that the nation-state “is inadequate for progress or even survival in the nuclear age.”—ed.] on non-military cooperation within NATO. Then later, a study sponsored by the (NATO) Science Committee, funded by the Ford Foundation, the Armand report, and then the Kilian report. It called for the establishment of a European MIT. . . . It almost came up! Pierre Aigrain [a physicist who served in various high research administrative posts under French President Charles de Gaulle—ed.] was instrumental in that—he was carrying very strict instructions from le general—[De Gaulle]—to kill it.

Murawiec: What other institutions do you work with?

Hemily: There is the European Science Foundation, [Lord] Brian Flowers was its first president. We work closely with them, on this informal basis of a network. We could have more useful links with OECD, officially, if it were not for this “neutrality” thing.

But at staff level, the interaction is total. One of our staffers here with NATO is the man who originally set up the FAST program [Forecasting and Assessing Science and Technology] at the European Community. He was a graduate of SPRU [Science Political Research Unit, Sussex University, Tavistock Institute—ed.], and stayed some while with IIASA. . . . It's all the same network.

Book Review

The crimes of Lord Mountbatten

by Uma Zykofsky

Mountbatten and the Partition of India

by *Dominique Lapierre and Larry Collins*

Vikas Publishing House Pvt.

New Delhi, 1982, rupees 401

The British Crown has always cosmeticized its imperialist design as an effort to uplift impoverished and backward peoples. This myth has been cultivated most energetically by the British East India Company and its kept historians in regard to India, the jewel of the far-flung British Empire from the 18th century until 1947.

The idea that British imperialism is a cheerful acceptance of “the white man's burden” was forcibly imported to the colonies, by means of the re-education of the indigenous elites. While India's poor “natives” were victimized by British Malthusian looting and taxation policies, the subcontinent's leadership was taken to Great Britain and anglicized. At Oxford and Cambridge Universities, they were taught to believe that before the British set foot in India, their native land was steeped in bestiality and irrationalism.

Of course, the British were lying. The true history of the Indian subcontinent includes a great contribution to world civilization, stretching with unbroken continuity over 5,000 years. Sanskrit, the world's oldest language, was a product of this rich history and culture. Throughout their rule of India, the British conspired to destroy this culture as a living tradition, going so far as to hide crucial historical and archaeological data from the Indians, to better press their case that the country was savage, uncultured, and in need of colonial rule.

India's leaders in the fight for independence—notably Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, and Maulana Kalam Azad—considered the rediscovery of India's history central to their freedom struggle. Only upon the base of India's millennia-old traditions and philosophical wealth could a new nation-building effort be carried out in the post-World War II period, they believed. A foremost figure in his effort was Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the anti-British philologist, historian, and lawyer who began the project to revive and re-energize India through a writing of its actual history.

India has been free of British rule for 35 years, but the Crown's attack on its history continues. Dominique Lapierre and Larry Collins's *Mountbatten and the Partition of India*, a sequel to their 1976 bestseller *Freedom at Midnight*, is a prime example of the British method of censorship, distortion, and slander in historiography. Lapierre and Collins are known to American readers as the authors of the recent thriller *The Fifth Horseman*, a fictionalized British intelligence scenario for nuclear terrorism involving Libya's Muammar Qaddafi. In *Mountbatten* they mix a lot of British intelligence-inspired fiction with a few facts and purport to tell the story of how Britain gave independence to India.

The story that neither this book nor *Freedom at Midnight* tells is how Mountbatten, Britain's last Viceroy in India and the man responsible for the transition of power in 1947, carried out a decades-old British Colonial Office plan to subdivide the subcontinent on communal and religious lines with the establishment of Muslim Pakistan and a Hindu India, and created the conditions for instability and bloodshed in the region for many years after Britain relinquished her precious colony.

A racist in his own words

Both *Freedom at Midnight* and *Mountbatten* are heavily based on interviews with the late Lord Mountbatten, the cousin of Queen Elizabeth, the mentor of her husband Prince Philip, and a longtime adviser to the House of Windsor. Mountbatten is portrayed as "the greatest statesman of the 20th century"; next to him India's national leaders appear as midgets.

When *Freedom at Midnight* first hit the bookstores in 1976, it was promptly banned in both India and Pakistan. The governments' grounds were that the book was a gross distortion of history which incorporated viciously slanderous portrayals of all the subcontinent's freedom leaders. *Mountbatten and the Partition of India* is represented by its authors as a response to this bitter criticism. In addition to the interviews in which the Viceroy speaks for himself, the book contains an appendix of selected documents released by the British India Office on the discussions preceding the partition.

The collection is worth reading. The authors let Mountbatten speak for himself to a surprising and revealing extent, and he lets slip some notable views of, in particular, the subcontinent's national leaders. M. A. Jinnah, the founder of Pakistan, was in Mountbatten's words a "bastard" and a "lunatic." Of his dealings with Mahatma Gandhi and Sardar Patel the Viceroy reports: "I used tactics like getting Gandhi to fast and kicking Patel to sign." Gandhi, he adds at a later point, was like a "bird happily chirping on the sidelines."

Of Jawaharlal Nehru, India's first Prime Minister and the builder of that nation's now-considerable scientific and industrial capabilities out of the ruin left

behind by the British, Mountbatten speaks at length and with a transparent racist condescension: "He [Nehru] used to get difficult to contain and I used to say 'You're not helping yourself. You're not helping me. You're not improving your image.'"

"'I can't bear it. I must speak out!' [Nehru would answer.] 'I said 'I know. . . . You're letting off steam and I understand why. But if you're going to be Prime Minister without me—while I'm there I can do it—if one day you're going to run this place on your own, you've got to control yourself.'"

"The funny thing was that on this he always came and cried on my shoulder. He wanted someone to go back to. *I had a sort of funny feeling that Nehru actually required my presence in order to be able to function, and after Gandhi it was me.* He used to go back to Gandhi, and Gandhi was less and less use to him in the end, and then he [Gandhi] was assassinated" [emphasis Mountbatten's].

It is widely believed in India that the British assassinated Mahatma Gandhi because he was the one leader of the independence movement unshaken in his view that India should not be partitioned. It is in this light that one should read this last statement.

The making of British neo-colonial policy

Mountbatten and the Partition of India is also recommended reading for those seeking a sharper understanding of the strategic considerations shaping the British Crown's colonial policy, up to its present-day dealings with the Commonwealth nations and the developing sector. The circumstances leading to the partition of India and the creation of an independent Pakistan illustrate graphically that even during a period of ostensible retreat, British colonial policy makers were carrying out plans to maintain control over the region in the post-war period. The references to their machinations in Collins and Lapierre's book are few and slight, but sufficient to give the reader a picture of the evil schemes the British oligarchy has devised over the centuries to subdue the subcontinent.

Lord Mountbatten himself was among the elite of British policy makers who knew that the "sun was setting" on British India. Since the late 19th century, the communal weapon had been freely wielded to maintain British control in the region. Now it was Mountbatten's assignment to exploit the conditions created by this divide-and-conquer tactic to ensure that if India was to win freedom, that freedom would be granted largely on British terms.

The groundwork for Mountbatten's operation had been under way since at least as early 1905, when the British India Office devised the partition of Bengal to set Hindus against Muslims, and began the process of creating a separatist consciousness between Indians of

different religious backgrounds. Through careful manipulation of this emerging nationalism, the British inspired and promoted the creation of the Muslim League in 1906.

In his memoirs, Viceroy Mountbatten never once mentions the role of Sir Reginald Coupland, who in 1941 prepared the thorough profiles of Indian Hindu and Muslim leaders and communities from which the British Foreign Office worked to prepare the final partition plan. Coupland described his intentions as follows: "The partition threatens to throw India back to the condition it was in after the breakup of the Moghul Empire, to make it another Balkans. This would negate the development of democracy in India. Partition would also prevent a free India from taking its due place in the world as a great Asiatic power, for it would mean disruption into several states ranking from Egypt to Siam. . . . It would convert the whole subcontinent into a complex of quasi-national sovereignties, walled off from one another, by political and economic frontiers. India in fact would be balkanized and instead of being a peaceful and stable element in the new international structure, it might well become like the Balkans in the past, a breeding ground for world war."

Mountbatten arrived in India in March 1947 to put Coupland's mandate into effect. He chose Lord Ismay as his chief of staff for the India operation. It was Ismay who produced the final document on the administrative consequences of partition and the transfer of power, and who carried the working drafts of "Plan Balkan" back and forth from Mountbatten in New Delhi and London's Foreign Office. Lord Ismay's role in the partition operation dispels the popular myth that Mountbatten fought for independence on behalf of India and against the hardline Tory colonialism of Sir Winston Churchill, who was well-known to have referred to Mahatma Gandhi as "a half-naked fakir." Lord Ismay was Churchill's protégé, and in 1940-46 served as Churchill's top commander and confidante.

Mountbatten met separately with Hindu and Muslim leaders to work out the partition plan. The coming into being of Pakistan and India was carried out at the cost of millions of lives. Ten million Hindus and Muslims, ordered to migrate from their homes to territories now declared appropriate for their religious group, were displaced. This most massive migration in human history resulted in such atrocities as the deaths by starvation and disease of entire trainloads of immigrants, and the piling up of the corpses of those who could not be transported at railroad stations.

This policy of partition and genocide was fundamentally the same as that the British carried out in the Middle East during the same post-war period. The creation of a permanent condition of tension between Arabs and Jews in that region was also designed, as

Coupland intended for India, to be a potential trigger for international conflict.

In fact, the men who carried out the partition of India remained on the subcontinent post Independence to carry on with the profiling and manipulation that they hoped would lead to the further balkanization of the region. Among these were Sir Olaf Caroe, who played the Muslim side of the British partition game, and Charles Lamb, who collaborated with Mountbatten on the Hindu side of the deception.

The Commonwealth link

Mountbatten's post-Independence role in bringing India into the newly created British Commonwealth of Nations is revealing on two counts. On the more obvious level, it brings to mind the great degree to which the British still dominate their former colonial dominions, politically as well as economically and financially. When one considers that Mountbatten forged the Commonwealth with the full collaboration of Winston Churchill, who was during the same period launched the anti-Soviet Cold War, the less obvious point is made: it has been the British Crown's complete post-war grip on both East-West and North-South relations that has repeatedly poisoned the waters for a post-colonial new world economic order.

There is a strong tendency among Commonwealth members to dismiss the Commonwealth's power, but reading Mountbatten's memoirs makes one aware of just how central the British considered this new organization to their post-war strategy. Mountbatten treats the continued link to Britain as a favor done for India, in his typical condescending fashion, but also reveals the depth of the Crown's desire to maintain its grip on the subcontinent: "I had a feeling that if the Indians went out on a limb, without the advantage of the British connection, they would probably not be able to carry on. . . . We had people who could help them in their universities, in their police, everywhere, the connection simply couldn't just be cut. . . ." It might be suggested that India was blackmailed into joining the Commonwealth, considering the depth of anglophile operations-in-place which Mountbatten has described.

Finally, it is worth noting that Lapierre and Collins studiously avoid a discussion of the Viceroy's morality outside the political arena. This is another among numerous efforts since Mountbatten's death to protect him from charges that he was a homosexual, who prided himself on using his wife's extramarital affairs for political ends. But the subject of morality need not be broached in this sphere to be efficiently addressed. The horrible deaths of the millions of Indians butchered and rendered homeless by the partition policy say all there is to say about the morality of Mountbatten and the British imperial ruling structure.