

# POLITICAL DIARY

**Deendayal Upadhyaya**

**Suruchi Prakashan**

Keshav Kunj, New Delhi-110055

## Contents

---

Foreword	1
Biographical Sketch	6
<b>State of the Economy</b>	
Fourth Plan Disappoints	11
Some Problems of Economic Growth (Interview)	13
On Morarji's Budget for 1963-64	18
Government of India's Gold Policy	26
Third Five Year Plan X-rayed	33
State Trading in Food-Grains	36
On PL 480 Agreements	40
Public versus Private Sector	45
Co-operative Farming—An Eassay in confusion	47
<b>Indo-Pak Relations</b>	
India, Pakistan and the United States	52
United States' Military Aid to Pakistan	58
Can We Afford to Compromise on Kashmir ?	62

## **External Affairs**

Some Impressions of the West	69
Foreign Policy and Defence	74
Of Congo, and Berubari	81
India and the Queen	86
Some Thoughts on the Commonwealth	89
India, Nepal and Democracy	93

## **Language**

Why Sanskritised Hindi	96
Swabhasha and Subhasha	102

## **The Menace of China**

Lessons of the Chinese Attack	108
Menon Must Go	112
Should We Opt for Alignment ?	116
Let Government Trust People	123
Chinese Aggression and GOI	126
'By An Inch or a Mile'	130
The Chinese Threat and the CPI	135
India's Stake in Tibet's Freedom	137

## **Parliamentary Democracy**

Some Thoughts on Election Law	142
-------------------------------	-----

Code of Conduct for Parties	148
Congress and Democracy	151
Democracy and Political Parties	155
Legislative Wing versus Party Wing	159
Who is a Suitable Candidate ?	163
Candidate, Party and Ideology, All Count	167
Changers and No-changers	171

## **Miscellaneous**

Of Bharatiya Jana Sangh's Sessions	175
Swatantra-Jana Sangh Merger	179
Kashmir, Jana Sangh and Swatantra	181
Holding the Price Line	183
About the Kamaraj Plan	185
Punjab and Punjabi	188
Madhya Pradesh Tribals	192
Ford Foundation and Cow Slaughter	195
Growing Dependence on State	199

## Foreword

**Dr. Sampurnanand**  
**CHANCELLOR**

**KASHI VIDYAPITH**  
**VARANASI-2**

Shri Nanaji Deshmukh and some other friends have expressed the desire that I should contribute a few introductory remarks to this collection of papers most, if not all, of which have appeared on previous occasions in the diary columns of the 'Organiser' of Delhi. I have readily agreed. Shri Deendayal Upadhyaya was one of the great leaders of the Jana Sangh and I have been during the whole of my political career a member of the Congress. In these circumstances, it might sound surprising to some people that such a request should have been made and accepted. I can realise this but as a matter of fact, this is only a simple expression of that great virtue of tolerance which we all must learn to practise if democracy is to take roots in our country. No one can claim a monopoly of the Truth, to know all the various facets, some seemingly opposed to one another, from which Truth may be approached. In a true democracy every one should have the fullest right as well as the duty of giving expression, within certain well known limitations, to the Truth as he understands it and see to it that everyone else gets the same freedom as he himself. It is only by honestly putting together the various

bits gathered by each one of us that we can make something like an asymptotic approach to the Truth. This should be the attitude of every one who engages in the process of thinking and exchange of thoughts with others for the sake of arriving at knowledge which will help us best to serve humanity. Those who are interested only in gaining victories over others can be of no help in the service of democracy. After all as the ancient saints say — वादे वादे जायते तत्त्वबोधः . We want तत्त्वबोध . If we engage in discussion let us hope we will do so because we are animated by तत्त्व-जिज्ञासा not by विजिगीषा — a desire for victory over the other party.

These papers, one sees, may roughly be put into three groups. The First is chiefly devoted to political polemics, mainly newspaper polemics at that. The contents of these articles have no importance in themselves. In a way, they were meant only for the occasion when they were written. They are alive with the spirit of thrust and counter thrust which is the characteristic of political battles particularly those conducted in the field of electioneering. They can serve one useful purpose at a later date also. This is, as I take the justification for their inclusion in this volume. They will supply to the reader of a later age some of the psychological glow, that touch of excitement, which animated those who took part in those old battles. Without something of the psychological material an account of the events of those days might appear to be very dull reading.

There is the second class of papers closely allied to the first but longer, going deeper and supplying more food to thought. Such material would be invaluable for anyone who, say after a decade or so, wants to go into the history of those

days. He will get from articles like these not only material for understanding what happened and why it happened, he would be able to form an idea on why certain individuals and slogans were able to capture the popular imagination. What part reason played in the statements issued by various parties? In short, this supplies that absolutely necessary fill-in material without which no history of the recent Past could be a well connected and comprehensive narrative. After all, all of us according to our lights have had a hand in shaping this recent past. We have played our parts, howsoever humble, in making it what it was and in evolving out of it that Present in which we live. It is this recent Past, the Past that was born after the achievement of independence which is going to be our stepping stone into that future, of which we all dream in our different ways. It is necessary that we, particularly now when some of the dust and heat has settled down, soberly try to understand that Past. By misunderstanding it, by yielding the place of reason to sentiment we may mould the future into something that may turn out thoroughly undesirable. It is, therefore, necessary that we should give the fullest opportunity to any one who has anything to say on the subject, the fullest opportunity to every idea to come before the public for free and open discussion. It is for this reason that I felt that I shall be failing in my duty if I did not respond to the request to help secure the fullest publicity to the thoughts of the late Shri Deendayal Upadhyaya and it has to be remembered they are not just anybody's thought. These words clothe the ideas of one of the most notable political leaders of our time, a man devoted to the highest good of his country, of a person of unimpeachable character, a leader whose weighty words swayed thousands of educated men. If we do not agree with him let us treat them with the respect



they deserve and ponder over the implications. Those elections and other events of temporary importance are over; the country remains, the country in whose name all those activities were undertaken. We have still to work for the country deriving what light we may from the world of the old fighters as they sank to the ground sword in hand. It does not matter to what party these men belonged, who fought clean, there was no malice in the hearts. They recognised the gentleman in one another and in any case if at any moment one of them yielded temporarily to any human weakness, let us remember the words in which Ramchandra Ji admonished Vibhishana : मरणात्तु निर्वेराणि .

There is also I must point out the third class among those papers, unfortunately much too few in numbers. This class of papers goes much beyond the present time even though they were dictated by circumstances which arose in a temporary set up. I wonder if Upadhyaya Ji himself realised this or had the time to realise it. I can refer for example only to one. The paper which bears under the caption "YOUR VOTE" it is addressed to the present set of voters. But incidentally it touches upon subjects which constitute some of the most important problems of political science. It is on a proper understanding of these problems that depends the scientific ordering of society. Some of the greatest writers on political theory not only of the present day but of ancient times like Bhishma for example have referred to them so in recent times have men like Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Bhagwan Das. Who is qualified to vote and who is qualified to get a vote are important questions. The very phrase "Get a Vote" is significant and carries a world of implications. I trust that some of the admirers of Upadhyaya Ji will take up this

question and seek to probe the deeper implications of this paper.

I do not think these papers need any further introduction from me. They will soon be before the public and I am glad I have been associated even though to a very minor extent in this process.

—Sampurnanand

**So young, so fair,  
Good without effort,  
Great without a foe...**

—Byron

Some, it has been said, are born great, some achieve greatness and some have greatness thrust upon them. Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya belonged to the second category. Starting with the advantages of neither birth, wealth nor rank, he yet rose to the front rank of Indian Politics. Many important leaders fade away after death. Deendayalji belonged to the class of the truly great who only rise higher after their death.

Deendayal was born on Sept. 25, 1916 (Vikram Samvat 1973 (Chaitra) Shalivahan Shake 1838, Bhadrapad-Ashwin, Krishna 13, Somavar) in the village of Dhankia on Jaipur-Ajmer Rail line, where his maternal grandfather, Shri Chunnilal Shukla, was working as station master. His own father, Shri Bhagwati Prasad, belonged to village Farrah (Nagla Chandrabhan) in district Mathura. He was the station master of Jalesar Road station near Mathura. His paternal grandfather, Pandit Hariram, was a well known astrologer. When he died there was a Hartal in Agra and Mathura.

Bhagwati Prasad passed away when Deendayal was less than three years old. With his mother he went and stayed with his maternal grandfather. But before he was eight, he lost his mother too. Deendayal was thereafter brought up by his

maternal uncle, Shri Radha Raman Shukla, who was a railway guard on the Frontier Mail.

Deendayal was an outstanding child. He was all brains and nerves. He did his matric from Kalyan High School, Sikar, standing first class first in the Ajmer Board examinations. He was awarded a gold medal each by the Board and the school. Two years later he stood first class first in the Intermediate examination from Birla College, Pilani. Again he got two gold medals, one from the Board and the other from the college. He did his B.A. with Mathematics from S.D. College, Kanpur in first class. Panditji joined St. John College in Agra to do his M.A. in Maths but left it midway and went to Allahabad where he did L.T. During all his college career he was the recipient of a monthly scholarship.

When the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh came to U.P. in 1937, Deendayal was one of the first few to join it. And he stayed on to make the RSS a mighty force in that biggest State of the Union.

As soon as he had completed his studies, he decided not to take any job. He decided, instead, to devote his life to the RSS work of national awakening and national consolidation. Beginning as a district Pracharak in Lakhimpur, U.P. in 1942, he rose within five years to be Joint Provincial Pracharak, next only to Bhaurao Deoras. He continued on this position till 1951 when his services were lent to Bharatiya Jana Sangh founded in that same year. He became U.P. State BJS Secretary.

The following year, at the Kanpur session of the Jana Sangh, Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerji appointed him General

Secretary, Bharatiya Jana Sangh. Dr. Mookerji was so impressed with his organising ability that he said after the Kanpur session that if only he had two Deendayals he could transform the political face of India.

Unfortunately Dr. Mookerji died soon after, and the responsibility of transforming the political face of India fell on Deendayal himself. He achieved this quietly with a distinction that startled the country as results of 1967 elections came in. He described it as the Second Revolution—the first one being the Independence of India. Jana Sangh emerged a Number Two Party in the country. It was clear that its emergence as the First Party was only a matter of a few years.

Though he rose to be a great leader, Deendayal washed his clothes with his own hands. He was so simple in his habits that his banyans would go to shreds before he agreed to replace them. He did not shout about *swadeshi* but he would never buy *videshi*.

As editor of Panchajanya (Weekly) and *Swadesh* (daily) in Lucknow he not only edited the papers, he would compose the matter, tend the machine and even act binder and despatcher, whenever necessary! On one occasion, in the late forties he wrote out his 'Chandragupta Maurya'—a novelette about that hero—in Hindi at one stretch of 16 hours. Later he wrote a biography of Shankaracharya, also in Hindi. Later still he translated RSS founder Dr. Hedgewar's definitive biography from Marathi into Hindi.

Though very ordinary in appearance, he was extraordinary in everything else—in the sweep of his ideas, in the utter sincerity of his words, in the tireless persistence of his

work and in the sheer purity of his life.

Deendayal was General Secretary of the Jana Sangh soon after its inception till a few months before he died. Presidents came and went but the General Secretary remained. He built up the party—worker by worker, state by state. As Shri Vajpayee put it, he was not an M.P. himself, but he had made all the Jana Sangh M.Ps. And yet nobody ever heard him speak of himself or his efforts. The word 'I' seemed to be taboo with him. As Shri Yagyadutt put it, his life was a sacred *triveni* in which *tamas* was as non-existent as Sarasvati at the *Sangam* while *rajas* and *satva* were deep and wide as Yumuna and Ganga.

In 1963, Panditji was invited to visit the U.S.A. But the thoughtless Reserve Bank would not issue him 'P' form! It was at Nehruji's personal intervention that he got the form. He took this opportunity to visit U.K., West Germany and East Africa also. He made a great impression on the Indian communities in London, Nairobi and elsewhere.

Panditji's principal subject in college had been Mathematics. And his first love had been Sanskrit. But as soon as he entered public life he realised the importance of Economics. He studied the subject till he had understood it better than any economic theoretician. He read the various plans with more attention than perhaps any other politician or economist. His most original contribution to Indian economic thought was Integral Humanism: the relating of the four *purusharthas*—*dharma*, *artha*, *kama*, *moksha*—to the socio-economic problems of today.

Only a few weeks before he was done to death on Feb.

11, 1968, in circumstances still shrouded in mystery, Deen-dayalji presided over the historic Calicut session of the Jana Sangh. Commenting on the great session, the Mathrubhoomi—the biggest paper of India—wrote that for three days it looked as if the Ganga had changed its course and begun to flow through Kerala. Jana Sangh had arrived in the South with a big bang. It was in this great hour that he was murdered—like Swami Dayanand Saraswati, Swami Shradhanand and Mahatma Gandhi before him.

Home Minister Chavan saluted him as an "Ideal Indian", Balasaheb Deoras, RSS General Secretary, described him as "an ideal swayamsevak" and compared him to Dr. Hedgewar, Nath Pai placed him in the nationalist tradition of Gandhi, Tilak, and Bose, Hiren Mookerji called him an 'Ajatashatru' (one without an enemy) and Acharya Kripalani saw in him "a man of Godly qualities". Like Dadhichi, he had given his very bones in the service of his country. Such was Deen-dayal. The country will miss him long—and remember him for ever!

## Fourth Plan Disappoints

The note on the Fourth plan prepared by the planning Commission has not been published in full yet. But from what has appeared in the press, it seems that the Commission continues to hold on to the priorities and strategy of the earlier plans in spite of the fact that these have miserably failed. The need for a change has been recognised, but it is not reflected in the sectoral allocation. The following are some of its undesirable features.

The megalomania of planning-in-a-big-way continues unabated. The rate of growth during the Third Plan is not likely to exceed 3% per annum. But the Fourth Plan is conceived on the assumption of a rate of growth of 6.5% per annum. It is better to be realistic than bombastic.

The allocation between the public and the private sectors is on a doctrinaire basis and does not take into consideration the past achievements, present capacities and future potentialities of the two sectors. The public sector needs consolidation. Achievement in financial terms during the Third Plan period in the Public sector is not likely to be more than Rs. 6,500 crores. The allocation of Rs. 15,600 crores to the public sector, therefore, is well beyond its capacities.

Agriculture still continues to be relegated to back position. As against 14% in the Third Plan, only 13.8% has been allocated for the development of agriculture in the Fourth



Plan, while the allocation for industries and minerals has gone up from 20% to 25%. The allocation for small scale industries has been reduced from 4% to 3%. All this is not likely to solve the unemployment problem or stabilise prices.

While the full picture as to resources is not available, it is suggested that there should be additional taxation of Rs. 2500 crores. The saturation point with regard to taxation has already been reached—and passed. Except for increased revenues accruing from greater economic activity, there is no scope for any additions to the tax-structure. The Fourth Plan is likely to kill the hen that lays the golden eggs.

The Planning Commission, in formulating this Note, has not given due regard to the views publicly expressed by the Prime Minister (Shri Shastri) in respect of planning and priorities. The Commission seems to be so much obsessed with its earlier thinking that it cannot think anew. It is desirable that the structure of the Commission be changed and people who can take empirical decisions, and formulate a plan in consonance with the ideas of the Prime Minister, be entrusted with this task.

(October 26, 1964)

## Problems of Economic Growth

(An Interview—By The Editor, ORGANISER)

**Q:** Are you satisfied with the rate of our economic development?

**A:** I am not.

**Q:** What's wrong, and where, you think?

**A:** I think our development should be less capital-intensive and more labour-intensive. I also think that it should be less import-oriented.

**Q:** Could you give some Concrete examples?

**A:** Certainly. Let's take our dams. We have imported expensive machinery to build them. I think we should have used more labour to build them. I find that the Mysorean engineers, with their good experience on local projects, who worked on the Chambal Project did that. I wish the same had been done on our other dams.

I also think that we should have attended more to smaller dam projects. There would have been less expense, higher utilisation rate, and of course quicker and larger returns.

**Q:** Any other example?

**A:** Yes. I think we are building too many buildings. And



we are building them all with cement. Why could we not use bricks, locally made? That would not only have reduced the pressure on railways to transport heavy cement, but also encouraged local, decentralised brick-kiln industry.

We are building shipyards, to build ships, to carry our trade. Perhaps it would be cheaper for us at this stage to buy ships. We are locking up our scarce capital resources. Our investment should be so directed as to yield a quick turn-over. I think Government is not attending to small industry as well as it should.

Q: Any examples?

A: Our light engineering industry has done very well. They are exporting electric motors, pumps etc. But they find it difficult to get all the steel quota they want.

Only too often, licences go to 'political businessmen' and not to actual users.

A serious consequence of our lop-sided development is that necessities are in short supply, and so prices of consumer goods are continuously rising.

Q: Don't you think that people on the whole live better now than before?

A: It varies from class to class. The landless labourer is worse off. So is the entire salariat—the fixed-income section of society. The middle peasant is no worse than before. The big peasant is a big gainer. The factory worker does better in the big city than in the small town. The businessman is doing better. So are the senior lawyers, doctors, etc. But you will see, that leaves a majority of people worse off than before. Formerly the

clerk and the teacher was a small saheb. Today he is only white-clothed, that's all. He has no savings, no status.

Q: If that is so, why don't they agitate?

A: The Central Government Employees' strike three years back was an expression of their deep discontent. They spend so much time in office, and so much time going to and from office, that they have little time or energy left for agitations. Maybe, also, agitation is not socially very respectable with the white-collar class.

Q: Does not the salariat look better than before?

A: Well, appearances have changed. Consumption standards have changed. A monthly visit to a picture house has become a must. But their kids get no milk to drink. Don't forget prices have increased five-fold since 1939, but a clerk's starting pay has gone up from Rs. 40 then to only Rs. 105 now. In Kerala, Mysore etc., graduates start on Rs. 70 P.M.

Q: Maybe there are more working wives now.

A: Not very many, not in most parts of the country.

Q: Now, food prices are high. How is it that the farmer still is not encouraged to produce much more than before?

A: The farmer is producing more than before. And the price he gets is not high; it is just fair. His necessities are also costing him more.

Q: Food prices are by far the biggest single factor in the price level. It is the high price of food that is pushing up all other prices, and crushing the salariat. The more you give the farmer, the more you pinch the clerk.

A: There is a way out of this. Government should subsidise food articles for those earning, say, less than Rs. 200 P.M. Government could easily find the money for this by checking its expenditure on administration, which is consuming 20% of all Government revenues. This mushroom growth of Government offices must be cut.

Q: Do you think every body is doing best for the national economy? Is there not too much inertia in the country?

A: It is very much there.

Q: Do you think the idea of simplicity and renunciation is responsible for it? Should we not renounce this renouncing idea (*tyaga*) itself?

A: That sounds interesting. But I think our society has certain ideals. Making money is not considered a good thing by itself. The best way to energise our society is to hitch men's minds to a great national goal. The reunion of India and Pakistan could be one. Clearing India of Chinese aggression could be another.

Q: What do you think of socialism as an inspiring goal?

A: I am afraid socialism means half a dozen different things to different men. It is obvious it has not inspired anybody. When socialism means 'nationalisation', and nationalisation—as that of foodgrains trade in Rajasthan—means giving licences for it to selected favourites, it is hardly any wonder that nobody is inspired by it.

Q: Any other concrete suggestion for accelerating the rate of development?

A: The present rate of income tax and corporation tax is so high that the taxes are very much evaded. The result is

a huge amount of black money which disturbs the economy by its speculative activity. I wish Government accepted the whole scheme of Kaldor's suggestions and brought taxation down to a maximum of 45%.

Also a tax on incomes as low as Rs. 250 P.M. is unnecessary. It should commence on incomes double that amount. This would free Income Tax Officers from much work which yields little income.

Also I would suggest that after cutting the nominal tax rate, Government accept all income declarations as true. Those found guilty of tax evasion in sample investigations may be dealt with ruthlessly. I guess a system like that would bring the exchequer more revenue than the present system where every tax-payer is treated as a thug.

(April 13, 1964)

## Morarji's 1963 Budget

In the present Emergency everybody expected a defence-oriented budget. The Finance Minister has come up to these expectations in so far as he has increased the defence outlay considerably. This is welcome. However, efforts should be made so that this amount is properly utilised and the defences of the country fully secured. As for security reasons the defence budget is not presented to Parliament in greater detail, it would be advisable if the Defence Council, or the Defence sub-committee, gives greater attention to this question.

We agree with the view that defence and development go together. If the latter is sacrificed, defence in the long run will be weakened. But it is wrong to assume that the Third Plan is really a plan of development that can form the basis of strong defence. There is need for a basic reorientation of the plan and policies of the Government. The present budget does not take an integrated view of the country's economy geared to fighting a war.

The country's economy had been under a severe strain due to the policies of the Government. Now when additional burdens, due to war, have been imposed, there is imperative need of remedial measures. The Government has failed to take any such measure.

Let us analyse the current year's budget. Last year when

the Finance Minister presented his budget, he proposed to cover the revenue gap of Rs. 60 crores by additional taxes of like amount, thus leaving a small surplus of Rs. 72 lacs. Despite greater yield from the new taxes, there has been a revenue deficit of Rs. 22.06 crores according to revised estimates. Taking both the revenue and capital budgets the Government intended to resort to deficit financing only to the tune of Rs. 150 crores. Now the Finance Minister places this figure at Rs. 240 crores. He has tried to justify this lapse in the name of national emergency, and the consequential increase in defence expenditure.

But this is a wrong impression that he intends to create. Due to aggression by Communist China our defence expenditure increased from the budget figure of Rs. 343.47 crores to Rs. 451.81 crores (revised) under Revenue and from Rs. 32.63 crores to Rs. 52.75 crores under the Capital budget. Thus there is a total increase of Rs. 128.46 crores. If we look at the revenues of the Government they also show an increase of Rs. 120 crores, from the budgeted figures of Rs. 1380.93 crores to the revised estimate of Rs. 1500.25 crores. Thus if the Government would have cared to keep down unvoted expenditure in other departments, there was no reason why there should have been such a high deficit. Moreover, the people responding to the call of the nation have contributed Rs. 123.93 crores under various funds raised after the declaration of emergency.

Evidently the people have borne the additional burden. If there is any lapse, it is on the part of the Government. But for their extravagance the current year's budget would have been a surplus budget. Had they effected economies as sug-

gested by the Public Accounts Committee, they would have certainly saved something to meet future expenses.

One of the reasons for this added expenditure is grant of ad hoc loans to some seven State Governments to improve their ways and means position. Increasing resources are being made available to the States from the Centre. The Third Finance Commission had increased their share in the central takes and grants. Besides, the Centre too had been giving lavish grants each year. While during the Second Plan period only Rs. 2867.92 crores were transferred from the Centre to the States, an equal amount has already been their share since the third plan started. This year's budget puts this figure as high as Rs. 1008.72 crores. Revised estimates for this year have been placed at Rs. 982.44 crores. The total revenue and capital budgets of the States for 1962-63 amount to Rs. 1700.61 crores. Evidently they get more than 60 percent of their resources from the Centre. This state of affairs needs to be amended. Either the States should be asked to raise more resources or told to cut their coat according to the cloth.

There is also need for reorganising the division of the different taxes between the Centre and the States. The present position will make the States lean more and more on the Centre and thus make them irresponsible. As for the States that have continued to overdraw on the reserve, there is need for taking appropriate constitutional measures. An advice by the Finance Minister or an expression of hope will not suffice. The President should take action under Article 360 and declare a state of Financial Emergency in those States.

As for the next year's budget the Finance Minister has tried to spread his net as wide and as deep as possible without

caring for the effect on the people and the economy. The people may be patriotic enough to bear the unbearable burdens, but surely the economy cannot respond in an organic manner. The Finance Minister knows the principles when he said: "I had emphasised that in a planned economy taxation policy serves not only the objective of raising resources for the Exchequer but it is also an instrument of economic policy to achieve the wider objective of promoting the rate of growth of the economy and of correcting imbalances between different sectors of it." But his budget proposals completely ignore this view point. The Finance Minister has proposed taxes to the tune of Rs. 296.50 crores besides the Compulsory Deposit scheme under which he hopes to get about Rs. 70 crores. Thus there will be an added burden of Rs. 366.50 crores. The States are also proposing various tax measures, which are likely to go up to Rs. 135 crores. How much burden the local bodies will impose is difficult to assess. By and large it can be said that the people this year will have to pay more than Rs. 500 crores in addition to what they have been paying so long. And all this burden is being imposed in the name of defence. But the fact is that not more than Rs. 400 crores are likely to be spent additionally on the defence services.

The Present taxes hit all classes of people and hit them at vulnerable points. The excise and the customs duties will surely have an inflationary impact. Prices which have all along been showing an upward trend, were somehow kept under control in the wake of the Emergency. Credit for it will go to the people—the consumers, the producers and the traders. But now they cannot neutralise the effects of these new levies. The consumption pattern in India is mostly



demand-inelastic. There is a limit beyond which people cannot tighten their belts. It is estimated that the family budget will rise by about 25 to 30 percent as a result of the latest levies. That is too much.

The direct taxes will hurt both the middle class and the investors. War demands a wider industrial base. But the Finance Minister has not taken into account the needs of the private sector. At a time when equities are stumbling these proposals will prove fatal. The super profit tax is economically unsound like the gold and prohibition policies.

Despite all these unprecedented burdens on the people the Finance Minister has failed to balance the overall budgetary position. The capital budget shows a deficit of Rs. 151 crores which is sought to be met by expansion of treasury bills. The third plan had put a limit on deficit financing. But the way in which the Finance Minister is going he would soon cross it. All this will mean price rise and consequent demand for increased wages leading to rise in cost structure. The Finance Minister has granted certain concessions to export items. There might be some justification for subsidising export industries. But price differential at home and abroad, if allowed to persist long, will lead to corruption and an economic structure based on uneconomic foundations. The Government should modify its policies to stabilise prices.

The Government has done nothing to effect economies in administration. The Community Development and Social Welfare programmes, which have proved a complete flop, are maintained. So far as the administration is concerned there is an increase in expenditure. As against the actuals of Rs.

98.40 crores in 1961-62 under salaries and allowances, the budget puts it at Rs. 121.15 crores, an increase of Rs. 23 crores. The PAC had suggested an economy of Rs. 60 to 100 crores per annum. But we find the Government running in the opposite direction. The administration is getting top heavy.

In 1961-62 the pay of officers was Rs. 17.21 crores and that of the establishment Rs. 56.10 crores. They have increased to Rs. 23.18 crores and Rs. 65.70 crores respectively. The pay of officers has thus increased from 17.4 percent of the total salary bill to 19.1 within the last two years. There is also no appreciable fall in the amount of privy purses in spite of the fact that 80 percent of the rulers are reported to have accepted a voluntary cut of 10 percent.

The budget lacks economics and ignores economies. It seems that the Finance Minister has not cared to formulate his new proposals in the light of the Economic Survey presented along with the budget papers. The Survey forthrightly admits that the people had risen to the occasion in meeting the challenge posed by the Chinese aggression. It says: "The immediate task of economic policy, in the wake of the Emergency was to permit defence mobilisation at as quick a pace as possible without upsetting the general balance of the economy, and by all available evidence, this proximate objective has been achieved with the help of the spontaneous cooperation of the people." The immediate objective having been achieved, the long term needs have to be met on the basis of policies, well thought out and coordinated. But the Finance Minister has brought forth ill-conceived measures. The Survey cautions and says: "The general



feeling of uncertainty has prevailed and it has had an inhibiting effect on the floatation of new issues...but it is quite clear that the performance of the economy in the coming months would depend to a significant extent on the confidence of the private investors and in their ability to raise the funds necessary for the expansion of essential business." The Finance Minister has further shaken this confidence.

Not only new entrants have been scared, but there is the likelihood of unfavourable effects on existing industries. The new customs duties are sought to restrict imports. But as the Survey says:-

"With the progressive tightening of import restrictions a stage has already been reached when any further increase in the degree of restrictions would impair seriously the chances not only of higher production but of higher exports as well."

The compulsory deposit scheme is an innovation likely to affect small savings and small men. It is inequitable and imposes burdens on the agriculturists which the States had discreetly avoided. The gold policy has already made rural credit a problem. If the Government now compulsorily takes away 50 percent of land revenue as deposits, it will only leave less with the agriculturists as capital. It must affect agricultural production. Moreover, there are no uniform rates of land revenue in the various States, or even in different regions of the same State. How does the Government propose to meet this difficulty? A flat rate is definitely inequitable.

So far as salaried employees are concerned those getting less than Rs. 1500 per annum have been exempted. Why not so in the case of agriculturists? There are crores, whose in-

come is less than Rs. 1500. Why should they be treated differently from their counterparts living in the cities?

The Finance Minister should give second thoughts to all his proposals and before asking the people to tighten their belts, see that the Government too tightens its belt which is so loose that the Government has lost both grace and efficiency.

(March 11, 1963)

## GOI'S Gold Policy

It is now more than a month that the Gold Control Order has been in operation. The last date for declaring non-ornament gold possessions above the exempted limit of 50 grams for an adult and 20 grams for a minor has been extended till Feb.28. Evidently the declarations to-date do not seem to have come up to the Policy-makers' expectations.

The Period for subscribing to the Gold Bonds issue has also been extended. There too, the response has been deplorably poor. According to a press release, total subscriptions to those bonds came to about Rs. 3 crores only. Despite the fact that trading in the yellow metal, ready or forward, is not allowed, its prices now quoted nominally have not registered any fall.

On Feb.12, Gold Diamond in the Delhi Bullion market was rated Rs. 108 (nom) per 10 gms. On January 8, the day before the enforcement of the Gold Control Order, it ruled at Rs. 107.75. Except for the first two or three days after the Gold Control Order, the new gold policy does not seem to have made any impact on gold prices.

The dealers who, in November last year, had grown panicky about the future of the metal due to the Finance Minister's hinting at Governmental measures to bring down prices, this time behaved normally. Either they have strengthened their nerves to the shocks of Governmental

steps or the new policy has belied their expectations of severity and effectiveness.

In November there was an all-round offering of hoarded gold, and even distress sales with the result that prices slumped to a low level of Rs. 84.50 per 10 grams compared to the all-time high record of Rs. 129.50 per 10 grams touched last year. It was a big crash and the Government felt encouraged and confident that it could bring down gold prices to the international level. However, panicky conditions soon gave way to a confident note, and prices rose. Except for the normal marginal fluctuations, in spite of threats of strict Government measures by the Union Finance Minister, and the Reserve Bank's continued directions against advances on gold prices, during this period of recovery gold went as high as Rs. 119 per 10 gms. Far from coming down to the international level, the price-curve has been rising upwards.

The objectives of Government's gold policy do not seem to have been realised so far. Shri Morarji Bhai in his radio broadcast on January 9, 1963 when the Gold Control Order was promulgated has said: "The most fundamental aim of a gold policy in our circumstances must be a determined attempt to reduce the demand for gold progressively not only for the duration of the Emergency but on an enduring basis". As such it might not be correct to draw any conclusions on the basis of the trends of the last one month alone. However, this behaviour of the market cannot be ignored in any analysis of the gold policy.

The Emergency due to communist China's aggression was surely the most appropriate time for executing a gold policy aimed at unloading of the precious metal. But it took

time for the whole scheme. Gold Bonds were issued on Nov. 5, 1962 while the Gold Control Order came two months later on Jan. 9, 1963. In the meanwhile the psychological pressure of the Emergency was considerably relieved due to the ceasefire and the subsequent attitude of the Government. With the acceptance of the Colombo proposals, the Nation seems to have been lulled into a sense of complacency. The net result is that the intensity on the patriotic appeal has been greatly reduced.

However, the Government is depending on powers given to it under emergency legislation, not only in the execution of the policy but even in its formulation. The people's response to the NDF both in money and gold has been encouraging. But, such an impassioned approach cannot be assumed in the formulation of an economic policy with long-term objectives. The Government seems to have ignored economic factors in enunciating the present policy.

Besides, it is handicapped by lack of precise data in respect of gold holdings in the country. On the basis of returns to be submitted under the Gold Control Order, it may be possible to reach a reasonably correct estimate about the quantity and distribution of the total non-ornament gold. So far only rough estimates have been made and they vary from a figure of about Rs. 600 crores to Rs. 6100 crores. However, the Reserve Bank's estimate places it at about Rs. 1850 crores at the international price. But most of it must be in the form of ornaments.

Keeping in view the economic development of the country there is no justification for investment in gold. It is non-productive, and for the last decade it has been exerting

a great deal of pressure on our meagre foreign exchange resources. Investment in gold adds neither to individual nor to national income. It does not also provide capital for additional employment. If people therefore, instead of purchasing gold, invest their savings in any productive enterprise, they will be doubly rewarded. It will not only bring them interest and/or profits but will also generate a process of development leading to greater propensity to save and invest.

But why do people have a hunger for gold? There are both social and economic reasons. In India while social compulsions are on the wane, the economic causes, despite changed conditions, have only led to a greater demand for gold. These are due mainly to Government's acts of omission and commission. Gold smuggling on a large scale is considered to have started since 1952-53 and has been continuously on the increase. The economic factors responsible for it should be understood and rectified.

The first and the greatest factor in pushing up demand for gold is inflation. If the Government fails to stabilise prices and the value of its currency, there is bound to be a tendency to invest in real specie.

Secondly, there is also lack of banking and credit facilities, especially in the rural areas. In the villages people have no other means of preserving their savings except through their conversion into gold ornaments. There are no banking institutions where they can invest, and none will lend them any money without security. Naturally if they have gold they can pawn and get money when in need. According to the rural credit survey, the part played by Cooperatives and Land Mortgage Banks is still negligible. Considering the

vast needs for credit of the agriculturists.

As for the landless labourer and the artisan, there are hardly any credit facilities. He must fall back upon his past savings turned into gold or silver ornaments, in times of distress. The tale of the urban middle classes is not much different, despite post-office savings and other banks. The present gold rules will definitely hit these classes hard, unless a widespread network of credit institutions with cooperatives, chit funds etc. is simultaneously spread.

Government's industrial and trade policies are also responsible for pushing up the demand for gold. There are no investment facilities commensurate with the savings of these classes. For all these years private issues have been over-subscribed. Evidently there were funds seeking avenues, which the Governments' obsession with the socialism had choked. Talks of nationalism further scared away these funds. Naturally they ran after gold, contraband or otherwise.

Government's taxation laws, and corruption, so widespread in services, have also contributed to this great demand for gold. Both, with officials in certain positions and the business and trading community, there is "black money" which could not become white and therefore was turned into "yellow." If the Government wants its policy to succeed it has to remedy these causes along with the enforcement of measures envisaged under the Gold Control Rules.

Unless the Government's economic policies leading to the present mess are basically revised and reformulated, the Chairman of the Gold Control Board Shri Kotak, like King Canute, will fail to stop the golden waves of the economic

ocean. The Gold Policy of Shri Morarji Bhai, though laudable in its objectives, will meet the same fate as the prohibition policy. It will drive the normal trade channels underground, resulting in a loss to the exchequer, and generation of additional illegal money with the officials, a rise in the price of gold due to black market and so a greater inducement for smugglers. Boot-legging and smuggling in gold will be a natural outcome of such an uncoordinated step.

In its multifarious ramifications, the Gold Policy also affects goldsmiths. Under the present rules, they are the worst sufferers. Since the promulgation of the Gold Control Order they have been rendered unemployed. The Government in the first place did not take into consideration this human aspect, and in the second seems to be so callous as to completely turn a deaf ear to all their representations.

Goldsmiths have suffered because of the prohibition of manufacturing ornaments with a greater purity than 14 carats. Large number of these people working in villages and towns just cannot make ornaments of this sub-standard quality of hardened gold. They lack the necessary training and instruments. Moreover, there are no refining facilities available in the villages, which is a necessary process for manufacturing ornaments of adulterated gold. Technological unemployment apart, it will lead to concentration of gold manufacturing business in the hands of a few capitalists in the cities, and result in the death of some of the finest skills for which India is famous and which even earns us valuable foreign exchange.

Whether the 14-carat rule will result in a reduction of demand for gold is still debatable. While authorities assert



that it will, the workers plead that it will not. Surely a 14-carat gold ornament will be cheaper. But that may lead to an expansion of the market and thus nationally, in the aggregate, more gold is likely to be consumed. Thus, it may serve other social purposes at the cost of the economic objectives, to achieve which the present gold policy has been formulated. A complete ban on manufacture of pure gold ornaments in the country may also lead to smuggling of such ornaments.

If economic measures fail, it is doubtful that executive measures will succeed in checking smuggling. As there is no ban on keeping ornaments of pure gold, and as they do not have to be declared, it will not be easy to detect a smuggled one, once it reaches the customer. Thus, depriving our own artisans, we will only provide work to goldsmiths in Pakistan and other middle eastern countries.

With the best of intentions, a policy, if not well conceived in all its aspects, will fail. More than a month's experience, views expressed by different sections of society and by experts, and representations made by various interests, should all be utilised to perfect this policy. When there is unanimity with regard to objectives, it will be deplorable if we fail to evolve an effective policy in the implementation of which all can cooperate, and instead let those objectives be defeated by an 'I alone am right' attitude or the fad of any one individual or group.

(February 18, 1963)

## The Third Plan X-Rayed

The Third Five Year Plan was presented to the Lok Sabha on Monday August 7, when it reopened for its Monsoon session. The broad features of the Plan are not different from what the draft had earlier discussed. Some of the programmes have been spelled out in greater detail, but in matters such as employment and price policy which had been specifically deferred to the final plan, the planners have failed to give any clear indication. The objectives, priorities and strategy are not in any way different from the Second Plan except that self-sufficiency in food grains and increase in agricultural production have been added to the list. If there is anything that the planners seem to have learnt from the difficulties of the Second Plan period, it is a greater realisation of the importance of agriculture in the economic development of the country. However, as we shall see later, it is regrettable that the programme under the plan have not followed the objectives and priorities in this regard.

The Physical programmes that have been included in the Plan are estimated to cost more than Rs. 8,000 crores in the public sector and Rs. 4,100 crores in the private sector. However, the financial resources estimated for the present have been placed at Rs. 7,500 crores for the public sector. Thus there is a gap of Rs. 500 crores between the physical and the financial aspects of the Plan, and if allowance is made of underestimates as is usual with regard to most of the projects, the gap may still widen. Just before the elections, political



expediency might have necessitated the inclusion of many a scheme which may ultimately be dropped. This, however, raises false expectations, the non-fulfilment of which will only create a sense of frustration in the people.

The figure of Rs. 7,500 crores includes only that part of expenditure which is proposed to be met by the Centre and the States. Besides, the local bodies in Municipalities, Corporations, Village Panchayats and District Councils which have been recently created under what is superciliously called decentralization of power, are also expected to raise their own resources to finance local plans or to supplement matching grants. To this must also be added expenditure as development services and institutions established upto the end of the Second Plan, estimated at about Rs. 3,000 crores for the five-year period. Thus, the people will be required to find out more than Rs. 11,000 crores to meet the expenditure on public sector plan projects, in addition to the current expenditure of the governments which too has been rising at a very fast pace. After providing for the needs of the government the people will also be required to tap the various resources to fulfil the private sector part of the plan fixed at Rs. 4,100 crores. After deducting Rs. 2,200 crores which is the estimate of foreign capital imports, the net burden to be shouldered by the people will be Rs. 12,900 crores towards the cost of the plan.

Outlays in the First and the Second Plans were Rs. 3,760 crores and Rs. 7,700 crores respectively. Out of this outlay the private sector contributed Rs. 4,900 crores over the ten years period. The public sector expended Rs. 6,560 crores during the period of the two plans. From Rs. 6,560 crores in

ten years to Rs. 12,000 crores in five years is a big leap and if looking at the heavy defence and other commitments of the nation, thinking people raise some genuine doubts about our capacity to bear these burdens or apprehend serious dislocation of our economic stability, they should be heeded to, rather than dismissed as an unambitious lot.

The only argument that the planners have been putting forward is that the Plan is too small compared to the vast needs of the people. But they conveniently forget this argument when they fix the priorities or propose sectoral plans. By laying greater stress on basic and heavy industries to the utter neglect of consumer industries, by arguing for export promotion even by depriving the consumer at home of his legitimate needs and by imposing taxes to restrict consumption, the planners look to something other than the vast needs of the people. The long term needs of development and the short term needs of satisfying the expectations of the people for a better standard of living have to be balanced. The planning technique that we have adopted and which is patterned after the Russian model, has failed to strike this balance. The Third Plan will only intensify the stresses and strains that the economy has been experiencing all these years.

(August 21, 1961)

## State Trading in Foodgrains

The last meeting of the National Development Council on April 17 could not come to a decision on the means to be adopted to stabilise prices during the Third Plan period. The Planning Commission, in keeping with its earlier stand and its doctrinaire approach, suggested extension of state trading in foodgrains, ultimately leading to controls, rationing and procurement. The Union Food Minister, Shri S.K. Patil, who since his assumption of office, has been opposed to State Trading in foodgrains, disagreed with the Planners. The differences were so sharp that there was a deadlock and the Prime Minister suggested a small sub-committee to go into the question and resolve it.

It is more than two years that the National Development Council all at once decided to take up the foodgrains trade. That this decision was taken in haste, without carefully considering all aspects of the question, is borne out by the fact that the States which tried to implement the decision faced a number of difficulties and that since then there has been a gradual retracing of steps. It is also no secret now that like the present Food Minister, his predecessor also differed with the National Development Council and the Planning Commission in this matter. A vacillating policy in respect of such an important matter has done incalculable harm to the economy of the country. As it is, neither has the State taken upon itself the responsibility of feeding the people at a reasonable cost, nor has it left the people to adjust themselves

to changing economic circumstances. In a free economy wages and prices come to some sort of adjustment in an imperceptible way and after some initial hardship the people's lot is in general normalised. In a controlled economy the Government takes measures to maintain a price-line according to its economic objectives. But in the present circumstances we have the disadvantages of both, and benefits of neither.

On Saturday the 9th instant, foodgrain dealers of the country met in a convention which was inaugurated by Shri C. Rajagopalachari. Being an ardent follower of free economy, he could not but line up with the traders in opposing the Government's move for the monopolisation of the foodgrains trade. Even Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan who, as a socialist, should be inclined to support the Government, felt that extension of the socialistic principles to this field may not be desirable. He said: "The traders have been in the field for generations and are specialists in the line. The Government cannot do it with the same skill and efficiency as they can, and the matter does not admit of any controversy or ideological bickering."

We must agree with the Sarvodaya leader that ideological considerations should not be imported into this basic question of feeding the people. Unfortunately, most people both in the Government and outside, have not looked at it dispassionately and pragmatically. It will ill serve socialism if the Government fails to satisfy the basic needs of the people even when it has taken the entire trade in its own hands. Also, we cannot allow the prices of essential commodities to rise higher and higher. Higher prices lead to

higher wage demands. And thus, the proverbial price-wage spiral goes on rising. All our economic plans will fail if the price line is not stabilised.

The planners advocate a policy of controls in the name of stabilising prices. But the real motive seems to be to get profits out of state trading to augment revenues for the plans. As revealed by Shri M.H. Hashem Premji, President of the All India Foodgrains Dealers Association, the Government wants to get as much as Rs. 170 to Rs. 270 crores, out of the profits of the foodgrains trade. If that be the intention, the real purpose of keeping prices in check will be defeated. The constitutional position also with regard to food has complicated the matter. The States and the Centre both come into the picture to some extent. None of them is prepared to bear the entire responsibility. For the present the working of Government policy, has only created deep inter-State jealousies. One State is not prepared to share the woes of the other. A surplus State considers foodgrains a lucrative trade and is not prepared to bring down prices. The Madhya Pradesh Government is reported to have purchased wheat at Rs. 13-14 per maund. It made the same available to the Centre at Rs. 19 per maund. And the Centre resold it to the State Government at Rs. 22 per maund. The consumer could get it only at Rs. 24 per maund. Thus, state trading has only added to the price increase. Individual States cannot be dissuaded from these acts. The only course is to set up a Central Corporation or some such statutory body which should take upon itself the entire responsibility of purchasing and selling foodgrains. The States should not come in between. That alone will bring about uniform prices throughout the country.

It must also be borne in mind that the Government, instead of taking over the entire trade, should enter into the field partially as a big trader. It should build up buffer stocks either by importing foodgrains from surplus countries or by purchasing within the country in surplus areas, or at the time of falling prices. It should come out in the market as a seller at the time of rising prices or in areas of acute shortage. Any other arrangement would only result in black market and bureaucratic inefficiency.

It should also be remembered that unless we increase food production at home, any changes or innovations in the distributive arrangement would be of no use. It is regrettable that the Food and Agriculture ministries have everywhere and at all times paid more attention to distribution rather than production of food. Even procurement from abroad cannot be continued for long. Shri S.K. Patil's present proposal of importing 12 million tons of food at a cost of Rs.700 crores will hardly bring down prices for long, unless we are prepared to spend as much amount—in addition to what has been presently estimated to be allocated—on raising bigger food crops at home.

Under the circumstances the Government, even if it decides, cannot take over the entire foodgrains trade. The middle course alone is possible. They can only scare away the trading community by their ill-considered announcements. Actually, there is hardly any difference between the views of the Union Food Minister and the practice of most of the Governments. It would be better if theoretical discussions are not allowed to create a state of uncertainty in this important matter.

(April 25, 1960)



## On PL 480 Agreements

At a time when shortage of food has been the headache of both the people and the Government, the general reaction in the country to the conclusion of an agreement under US Public Law 480 for a wheat loan of Rs. 607 crores cannot but be of gratefulness towards the benefactor. Shri S.K. Patil can legitimately feel proud for having been able to secure timely assistance—and that too on an unprecedented scale.

That United States attaches an unusual importance to this agreement is apparent from the fact that President Eisenhower himself, contrary to protocol, personally signed the agreement on behalf of the US Government while on behalf of the Government of India there was present neither the Head of the State nor that of the Government but simply the Minister for Food and Agriculture, Shri S.K. Patil. When in the changed circumstances due to the Chinese aggression in Ladakh and NEFA, people are gradually waiving their antipathy towards America, this act of the US Government must be considered as a great stroke of diplomacy to win friends in India. It was, therefore, not surprising when the US Ambassador in India Mr. Ellsworth Bunker repeated a number of times the Indian Ambassador at Washington Shri Chagla's observation, that 'Indo-US relations have reached an all time high.' The US Ambassador has not made it a secret that the decision of his Government has been motivated by political consideration also. He feels that "the Public Law 480 supplies from the US would help India strengthen its internal

economy, stabilize its political life and boost its upward progress."

It would, however, be wrong to infer that the agreement is simply an act of charity or of diplomacy—and that it is not going to benefit the US economically. In fact the Public Law 480 was enacted in 1954 by the US Congress with the principal objective of promoting economic stability of American agriculture and to expand international trade in agricultural commodities. Until December 31, 1959 agricultural commodities worth \$ 4156 million (Rs. 1978 crores) at export market value had been sold to 38 countries. It should therefore be clearly understood that the agreement serves the economic interests of both the countries, and as such, whatever political significance interested parties may try to attach to it, we should look at it realistically and objectively. If it has served our needs at a critical juncture, it has also secured a market for the US surplus agricultural commodities for the coming years.

The present agreement is the fifth in the series of agreements under P.L. 480 signed by India. The first agreement was signed on 19th August, 1956, and this fifth on May 4, 1960. While the first four agreements were for supply of agricultural commodities totalling Rs. 460 crores, the fifth one covers commodities worth Rs. 607 crores. It is in respect of 16 million metric tons of wheat and one million metric tons of rice. The US Government will finance purchase and ocean transportation cost of wheat and rice bought under the terms of this agreement. One fourth of the agreed amount will be made available this year i.e., after September 30, when shipments will commence. The rest will be made avail-



able according to the rate and manner of shipment agreed to by the two Governments after January 1, 1961. The US Government has also agreed to give to the Government of India Rs. 512 crores out of the sale proceeds of these commodities. Half of this amount will be treated as grants and the other half as loan at 4 percent interest. The remaining Rs. 95 crores also will be spent in India by the US Embassy for financing its routine expenditure.

The agreement is entered into not merely to meet current consumption but to build a reserve of four million metric tons of wheat and one million metric tons rice. It is hoped that this buffer stock will help the Government in controlling prices. Shri S.K. Patil, since his assumption of office as Food and Agriculture Minister, has been trying to build these reserves. The agreement will help him implement his policies. If food prices are brought down it is felt that inflation will be checked and the country's economy may be brought on an even keel.

While we do not want to minimise the usefulness to India's economy of the large imports of food under this agreement we would like the Government to follow a policy of caution and vigilance. Food is no doubt an important factor and constitutes the main item of the family budget of an average Indian. But in our country more than seventy percent of the population depend on agricultural food and other agricultural commodities as the principal means of acquiring purchasing power. If the Government policy of stock piling leads to a sharp decline in agricultural prices the country will not be better off. Will it not mean supporting the US farmer at the cost of India's peasantry? There is an added reason for

such apprehensions because in addition to the import of wheat and rice under this agreement, India has committed herself to the purchase of 14,680,000 bushels of wheat from the world market. This condition has been forced upon us to satisfy Canada and Australia who feared that their market for wheat will shrink as a result of the Indo-US agreement. But this condition is wholly unjust inasmuch as it stipulates purchase by India far in excess of her normal requirements from abroad. This would lead to a fall in Indian agricultural prices.

It will not be wholly correct to say that a fall in food prices will lead to a general decline in the price level. Though food shortage has accentuated the price problem, the causes of the rise in prices are to be analysed in terms of the fiscal, monetary and industrial policies of Government. It is possible that there may be a fall in the prices of agricultural commodities while the prices of manufactured goods may continue to rise.

The question of disbursement of U.S. Public Law funds in the country is also important. Apart from political implications, its economic value is also doubtful. There is already a controversy between Shri Shenoy and other economists whether utilization of such funds adds to inflation or not. One thing is definite that these funds give to a foreign government a great power of patronage. The Cooley amendment requires that 25 percent of these funds should be loaned in the private sector to "American firms or their subsidiaries operating in the host countries or indigenous firms having an affiliation with an American firm", or to such indigenous firms as are facilitating the disposal of American agricultural products. Thus, the agreement not only secures a market for the

American farm products, it also ensures a vantage position for the American industrialists wishing to come to this country. It would be unwise to shut our eyes to the long-range effects of these proposals.

While these imports may help us tide our present difficulties, the real solution of the problem lies in maximising agricultural production in the country. That we have not done sufficiently in this direction needs no saying. The present agreement is an eloquent testimony of the Government's failure on this front. With the passage of time we have become increasingly dependent on foreign sources. We fear that due to availability of food in plenty in the present the (Central and State) Governments may become complacent in their efforts to rise production locally. The US Ambassador feels that America is following this policy only to let the struggling people of the democratic world to realise that "there can be both freedom and food." But what we want is 'our freedom and our food'. That is possible only if we revive our old slogan of "Freedom from foreign food". Dependence on foreign sources will impoverish and entangle us. We will, therefore, offer our bouquets to Shri Patil not now on his return, but when he succeeds in raising food production in the country and shows to the world that he was the last Food Minister of free India to go round the world with a begging bowl.

(May 16, 1960)

## Public versus Private Sector

The Manufacture of a truck may not be a great event in itself, but when the Prime Minister inaugurates such a function it assumes an importance to the press and the people. The press has accordingly discharged its obligations by faithfully reporting the Jabalpur function. It has been considered a first-class front-page news. But the people really fail to see a *Shakti* of the 'Shaktiman'. The man in the street does not understand why the Prime Minister should take all the trouble of going to Jabalpur just to press a button so that a three-ton truck may roll off the assembly line. And not only the Prime Minister, but many other V.I.P.s, have been able to find time to attend the function. The Defence Minister Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, the Steel, Mines and Fuel Minister Sardar Swaran Singh, the Chief Minister of the Province Dr. Kailash Nath Katju, were also present. The Chief of the Army Staff, the Chief of the Air Staff, the Deputy Chief of the Naval Staff and the G.O.C. in C. South Command, represented the armed forces. Where such high dignitaries of the state come together it would be considered uncourteous for a host of officials not to dance attendance upon them. It would be an interesting piece of research to find out how much was drawn by way of T.A. by the V.I.P.s and not-so-very I.P.s collected for the ceremony. Very probably the figure would far exceed the cost of the blessed truck.

The whole thing may be big news for the press but the people wonder if the occasion demanded all this fanfare and expenditure. Is it for the first time that a truck is being

manufactured in the country? Is there something special about this particular truck? So far as information goes, the use of the word 'manufacture' is somewhat misleading in the present case. It is simply building of a wooden body on an imported chassis and engine. And if that is so, the Prime Minister should not have spoken in such challenging terms. Surely it was no occasion to compare the achievements of the private and the public sectors. It seems that the Defence Minister wanted to avail of the opportunity only to meet the criticism that had been levelled against him in Parliament. The P.M. thought it fit to oblige his friend. But at a time when all-round economy is the need of the hour, we cannot justify such wasteful expenditure.

With regard to controversies about the public sector and the private sector, the Prime Minister said that he wanted both of them to flourish and that it was good that there should be some element of competition between them which would profit both of them.

Pandit Nehru's remarks are significant. But does he really believe in what he said? So far, the public sector has not allowed competition. Wherever the Government enters it acquires a monopoly, not through efficiency or through the play of economic forces but through legislative provisions. It is because of this monopoly, and the consequent displacement of individual enterprise, that people dislike the public sector. Monopoly breeds inefficiency, scarcity, corruption and other vices. If Pandit Nehru believes in this principle of some element of competition, let him allow private enterprise in a number of fields which, either for strategic or other similar reasons, need not be reserved for State action. It will surely do good to both of them.

(June 29, 1959)

## Cooperative Farms—An Essay in Confusion!

The A.I.C.C. meet at New Delhi has not thrown any new light on the Congress programme of cooperative farming. The Congress President (Shrimati Gandhi) herself admitted it when she is reported to have angrily shouted: "I don't want this general discussion. It leads nowhere. I have hardly heard anything new today...I hope the A.I.C.C. will come down to brass tacks." The 'brass tacks'—that sounds well. But when you come down to brass tacks, you have no alternative but to give up the whole programme. For after all, cooperation as an ideal is not questioned. But it can be realised only within certain limits. And farming, which is an organic process, severely limits the usefulness of cooperatives as they are understood today. It is a different thing when people are joined in family ties that transcend economic and material relationship.

A family represents the ideal 'from every man according to his capacity and to every man according to his need'. Tradition has helped to inculcate this feeling amongst the members. The 'karta' of a family does not depend upon the votes of the members. No training classes have been, and need be, organised to train him how best to discharge his responsibilities. He does it instinctively, following the ways his forefathers had followed. But in a cooperative we are faced with the crucial problem of how to distribute the



produce. When people with all sorts of lands and with no lands and those with varying rights in land are joined together, it is practically impossible to divide the produce equitably. It may be done equally but that will not be equitably. Dr. Sushila Nayyar posed this question and demanded that the A.I.C.C. should clarify the issue. Well, this is coming to 'brass tacks'. Will the Congress President take up the job?

The question of leadership is already there. Leaders could hardly be trained in a training class. But there, too, the people are not coming forward. A.I.C.C. members can talk of thousands, but only six or seven names have been received by the office for the proposed training camp; and that too when even non-Congressmen were allowed to join it. Surely, the programme will not be implemented on a voluntary basis or even by social workers, but by officials. The Congress President saw it when she said that the main responsibility in this direction rested with the Government.

Shri Subramaniam said that a sense of collective responsibility had to be developed amongst the peasants, and that needed leadership. In some measure this leadership can come from the former landlords and landowning classes. But the atmosphere in the villages has been so vitiated that even they would not be able to enthuse the people. Shri Bimal Chandra Sinha saw some danger in their joining the cooperatives. They may have a dominant voice in the whole area, he said. Congress wants a new leadership. Wherefrom will it come? It will not grow out of the villages. It will be imposed from above.

Shri P. Govinda Menon from Kerala complained that the

Communist Government there was controlling the cooperative societies. "The stark reality in Kerala", he said, "is that cooperative societies started by Congressmen are not registered. As soon as Congressmen or non-Communists apply for registration of cooperative societies, the Minister concerned or the party boss will get their own people to make an application and the Registrar will accept the latter. This is one of the communist techniques to see that the movement remains a wing of the Communists. The second technique is to supersede societies of non-communists. Thirdly, the Registrar has been given powers to direct executive committees of societies to enrol members sponsored by himself. Communists get in through this way." What the Communists are doing in Kerala, Congress is doing elsewhere. Co-operativising is only another name of officialisation. How is it different from the collectives?

Though the Prime Minister spoke as an ordinary delegate, yet his views have received wide publicity. He has spoken so often on the subject and always with the vigour of a missionary that he has made contradictory statements about the shape of these cooperatives. Even in this speech he has said that they need not wait for three years to implement the programme of cooperative farming. Yet at another place he has said that he would not mind if not even a single cooperative was formed until proper leaders were trained. Evidently he knows that proper leaders are not available. How can he then insist on the formation of such cooperatives here and now? He has also made confusing statements about the right of the peasant to quit the cooperatives. At one place he is reported to have said that a peasant opting for cooperative



farming could not be allowed to keep going in and out. At another, he says that since cooperative farming was essentially voluntary some procedure could perhaps be worked out to allow persons "to go out on the best possible terms". He has also tried to draw a distinction between scientific and mechanised agriculture. But he should not forget that agriculture on large tracts, whatever the tenure be, tends onwards mechanisation in the name of scientific methods of production. Science and machine are associated. If we want to resist mechanisation we should forego the temptation of pooling lands together. That in India invariably results in mechanisation.

Pandit Nehru has complained that the opponents of cooperative farming do not propose any alternative. The difficulty is that he is so much obsessed with his fanciful ideas that he fails to see the alternative. That is so not only in this case. In other matters of policy also he sees only one course and that is his own. Cultivation on the basis of peasant proprietorship is there. It has given maximum results in Japan and other countries. Poland reverted to it after an unsuccessful experiment with cooperative farms. If instead of relying on the views of psychopants, he thinks coolly of the other side of the picture he will realize the truth. He and the Congress President are trying to minimise the opposition and the possible and real difficulties. They fancy that the peasantry has everywhere responded most favourably to the programme. Pandit Nehru has spoken with warmth. But his substance does not make out a case for cooperative farming. Dr. Mahtab felt about the Congress leaders that 'many of them are still confused about the programme they are asking

the people to implement'. Yes, there is confusion and it persists from top to bottom. Let Congress leaders first think out the scheme in all its details and ramifications and then tell the people about it in clear and unequivocal terms. That will do more good than the many-mouthed eloquence we are being treated to these days.

(May 18, 1959)

## India, Pakistan & the United States

The people of America have sympathy with India against Communist China's aggression. But they have a lurking suspicion that we might not be willing to combat China properly. There are a number of causes for this suspicion. Our past policy which was definitely and unabashedly pro-China and our present soft-peddalling of the aggressor are, to a great extent, responsible for this feeling. It is hard for them to understand our continuance of diplomatic relations with a country which we accuse of aggression. They do not appreciate our stand with regard to the Colombo proposals. In fact our China Policy is an enigma to them. It is incoherent and inconsistent. It is not a policy which a nation that feels aggrieved, sees further threats, and intends to retrieve the position, should follow. It has weakened our case.

The Government of India's policy, coupled with American intelligence that Communist China is not likely to renew her attack in the near future, has had some dampening effect on the warmth with which that country rushed to our help in October-November 1962. The question of military aid to India is now looked upon more in the background of long-term strategy than of immediate build-up against an imminent danger. Under the circumstances they do not see any harm in obliging Pakistan by conceding its demand for not arming India.

East-West detente and the Sino-Soviet schism have also

contributed to this policy. There was a feeling visible in the States that the bi-polar world was no longer there. USA seemed to have gained much in her self-confidence due to Soviet Russia's stepback in Cuba. Having gained a point, they were not prepared to risk another bet. A thaw in the cold war fulfils their wish and strategy. In its present mood America certainly wants to win India but it decidedly does not want India to align itself with the USA to the discomfiture of Soviet Russia. It looks strange, but it is substantially correct that the West no more feels sore about India's policy of non-alignment. To some extent it suits them. I met people in the U.S. who made no secret of this feeling.

The Western world is naturally pleased with the growth of rift in the communist bloc. It is generally admitted that in the ultimate analysis, if it comes to an armed conflict between the communist and non-communist world, intra-bloc differences would not matter. But that ultimate is now a remote possibility and can be pushed still further remote by appropriate policy decisions. As communist China has challenged Kremlin's claim of being the sole guide of the communist world, she has come to be looked at from a different point of view. If they cannot openly pat China on the back, they would definitely like to avert anything that might mean a stab in the back, when her face is turned towards Soviet Russia. Some even go to the length of propping up Communist China lest she stagger and fall again at the feet of Russia. That explains why KMT was not allowed to strike at the mainland when Communist China was engaged on the Western front, why U.K. decided to supply airplanes to China after her blatant aggression against India, and lastly why France has recognised and established diplomatic relations

with Communist China even by betraying her erstwhile friend Chiang Kai-Shek.

This also provides some plausible explanation for USA tolerating Pakistan's hobnobbing with Communist China. So far as the people of America are concerned, they are angry at Pakistan's antics. Pakistan was armed to the teeth only to checkmate communist expansionism. But at a time when India, a non-communist country, fell victim to the designs of a communist power, Pakistan not only remained a passive onlooker but regarded India's adversity as her opportunity. Not a few people remarked that Pakistan was stupid, ungrateful and untrustworthy.

But this feeling is not shared by the administration. The State department continues to regard Pakistan as an ally, does not feel perturbed at Pakistan's pourparlers with, and its surrender of territory to, China.

Washington's policy-makers want India to follow a tough line with communist China, but at the same time to be soft with Pakistan. On the other hand, they can allow Pakistan to be soft with China and tough with India. There is an apparent contradiction, but it suits them fine.

So far as China is concerned, the Western powers are now playing the part that India played all these years. The only difference is that India acted in a simple—almost simpleton—manner. India's China policy had the blessings of one of the senior partners of the Western bloc. On most matters India followed, or was joined, by U.K. However we overplayed our part, and therefore suffered. Now that relations between India and China are strained, Pakistan has been

picked up to play the part. With Pakistan the West has an added advantage—in that she would always take her cue from them. India followed on occasions an independent line and at times caused annoyance and embarrassment.

Both the people and the Government of the U.S. are keen on Indo-Pak amity. But they have failed to understand, much less appreciate, India's view-point. Not only the common man, but even highly educated persons like university professors show colossal ignorance about the facts of Indian life. There is a widespread impression that the partition of India had been on a Hindu-Muslim basis and that there are no Muslims in India. While talking to a dean of foreign students in a university I enquired if he found any difficulty in accommodating students coming from different countries. He replied that Arab students would not like to live with the Jews from Israel. When I further asked him if there was any such case with students coming from India and Pakistan, he replied in the negative and wondered why in the existing state of strained relations between the two countries, Indian and Pakistani students continue to live in a spirit of friendship.

I tried to explain the whole thing by telling him that the partition had been effected on an artificial basis and that we had been one through-out history, and just a political line could not divide the people. I told him further that if somebody came to him, he could hardly recognise whether he was an Indian or a Pakistani. "Why, it is so easy", he said, "I can find out their nationality from their names". "How can you do so"? I queried. "Well, it is simple, if he has Muslim name he must be a Pakistani, otherwise an Indian". I was

shocked to hear of this simple rule-of-the-thumb method. I requested him just to give me the list of Indian students in the university. He ordered the list to be supplied. There were about a dozen Muslim students. I asked him if the list was correct, for some "Pakistani names" seemed to have been included in that list. He vouchsafed for the accuracy of the list. Then I showed him those Muslim names and asked if he knew that they were Muslims and that nevertheless they figured in the Indian list. He admitted that they were Muslim names, but could not explain why they were there. He looked puzzled and perplexed. It was only when I told him that there was nothing wrong in Muslim names being included in the list because there were about 45 million Muslims still living in India, that he felt reassured about the correctness of his official list. It was a revelation to him.

Even those who were not as ignorant as this learned dean would always view Indoa-Pak problems in terms of Hindus and Muslims. A New York Times columnist would not write India without the appellation Hindu. It would always be 'Hindu India' and 'Muslim Pakistan', especially when writing about Kashmir. I asked one of the members of its editorial staff regarding this practice and whether he knew that India was a secular State and that 45 million Muslims lived there. "Yes, we know that there are Muslims in India", he said, "but what of that? You are as unmistakably a Hindu country as Pakistan is Muslim".

I was reminded of the fact that the Indian National Congress always persisted in refusing to be a Hindu organisation and challenged the claim of the Muslim League to be the sole representative of the Muslims. To support its assertion it went

even to the absurd length of ignoring legitimate Hindu interests in its appeasement of Muslims. But the Britishers always considered the Congress as a 'Hindu' organisation and the Muslim League a 'Muslim' one. The old History continues to repeat itself. Whatever India might do to show that it is not Hindu, the world will not believe it. Howsoever un-Islamic Pakistan might be, the world will always take it to be a representative State of The Muslims. There were many who did not know that Shri Chagla, who had been India's Ambassador in America, was a Muslim, and when told so, they were incredulous. And those who knew it were not prepared to admit that India on that account was not Hindu.

When I discussed this subject with another professor, he told me— and, I think, rightly— that there was nothing wrong in allowing Muslims to live in India and also choosing from them capable persons for different jobs. "If foreign nationals could be employed for particular posts what was the harm in appointing your own citizens", he asked. But he added: "Whom did Chagla represent if not Hindu India?" He went on: "By keeping Lord Mountbatten as your Governor General for some time India did not become a country of Englishmen as well." I told him that the analogy was not correct. Muslims in India were not exogenous. "I admit," he said, "but till India and Pakistan are not reunited, they will continue to be Hindu and Muslim countries." I was happy that I could meet one who did not rule out Akhand Bharat. It is surprising that Congress leaders, when they oppose Akhand Bharat, fail to see this glaring inconsistency in their stand. Partition and secularism go ill together.

(March 30, 1964)



## U.S. Military Aid to Pakistan

It is difficult to say whether Pak President General Ayub Khan has been successful in his mission to the U.S. or not. It is evident, however, that the bitter hostility which Pakistan has been harbouring against India right since its inception continues unabated. One objective of Ayub Khan's trip to the United States was to pour slanderous venom on India, and this he has done to his heart's content. The joint communique issued by President Kennedy and General Ayub after their talks provides a measure of the impact this campaign of slander has been able to make on the Government and the people of the United States. Obviously, Ayub Khan wishes to use its ties with the U.S. as a lever to make U.S. inimical to India. It appears that President Kennedy has not proved obliging in this regard. Vis-a-vis the Kashmir issue too, Kennedy has expressed hope of an early peaceful solution. Apparently, in the present circumstances, the US cannot approve of Pakistan making Kashmir an excuse for some adventurist expedition against India.

Two different interpretations are being put on the reference to military aid contained in the Joint communique. "Extension" of aid can mean just continuation in point of time, and it can also mean actual expansion in volume. If it is the first thing that is intended, it simply means that the US-Pak pact would continue. If, however, the communique involves increased military aid to Pakistan, India certainly has cause for concern. In America, General Ayub has tried to make out

that at present there is a gross imbalance of power between India and Pakistan, and unless Pakistan's military strength is brought at least on par with, if not augmented to a level above, India's strength, Pakistan's life should always be in jeopardy. That a Government which has consistently kept up a jihad hysteria against India, and which maintains a veritable army of fifth columnists here, and through them has been assiduously striving to undermine India's security and peace, should thus howl about its own existence being in danger, is indicative of the fact that the rulers of Pakistan are not just anti-Indian, they are crooked too.

If India really wished to efface Pakistan's entity, there have been not a few occasions since 1947 when it could have easily done so. But India's rulers have, on each of these occasions, ridden rough-shod over indignant public opinion, and have even been making concessions after concessions to appease Pakistan. If even then Pakistan is actually afraid about its existence, it must be its own sins that are making it so panicky.

In an attempt to exploit the anti-communist feelings of the US people, the Pak President has been telling them a very small segment of the Indian armies has been posted on the Chinese borders. There may be truth in what he says, but can the General ignore the fact that Pakistan's own conduct has been responsible for this? We do want to checkmate China's aggression, but not by shutting our eyes to Pakistan's designs. If Pakistan's intentions had been peaceful, India could well have afforded to concentrate its entire energy in order to combat China. But, as it is, we have to fight on two fronts.

In fact, by entering into a military pact with Pakistan,

the United States have only weakened India's hands in her fight against the Reds. If today, the volume of military aid to Pakistan is stepped up, the inevitable result would be that India would be compelled to devote greater attention to the Pak border. U.S. will have to decide what it desires—whether it wishes to keep non-aligned, independent India free from peril from the Pak side and able to pull its full weight against the Red menace, or whether it wants to have its attention split on several fronts. Who is going to prove more useful for the 'Free world', Pakistan with its military dictatorship founded on the ruins of democracy, or democratic India? Today, India's troops are distributed on two major fronts, while Pakistan's forces are all massed along the Indian or Afghan borders. Where, and how, is Pakistan fighting the Communists?

Truth is, the law under which US has conferred military aid to Pakistan, has as its objective the containment of the Communist powers. It is only this objective that sanctions such assistance. Hitherto such a stipulation has not been fully cared for in case of Pakistan, and if the measure of military assistance is further increased by US, it would be going counter to its own law.

Indian national sentiment was deeply hurt by the Pak-US Military Pact and as a result a sharp estrangement set in Indo-US relations. In course of time, and as the US Government evinced growing appreciation of India's policy of non-alignment, there has been a relaxation of strains between these two peoples. If America repeats its earlier blunder, there would surely be a fresh spurt of anti-US feeling. Communists here would not fail to exploit such a situation to the ad-

vantage of China and Russia. The Reds have already been reaping political harvests out of India's relations with the communist countries. The Prime Minister is thinking of going to Russia while on way to the US. If U.S. desire that the growth of communists should be effectively checkmated in India, then it needs to understand India's national sentiment. Pakistan is capable of suppressing its self-respect to become a camp-follower of another country, but proud, self-respecting India can never do that. So while battling against communism, the United States will have to respect India's independence and national self-respect.

(July 24, 1961)

## Can We Afford to Compromise on Kashmir?

The Prime Minister is going to Pakistan on 19th of this month. The avowed object of this visit, according to his statement in the Lok Sabha, is to sign the Canal Waters Treaty. But it does not take five long days to initial a document. Obviously, the time is to be utilized for discussing other problems pending between India and Pakistan. However, no definite agenda has been fixed. One can understand the desirability of not insisting on an agenda specially when there are basic differences between the viewpoints of the two States on most of the issues. But the indefinite and general nature of the talks has given rise to wide speculation about their purpose and about the topics to be discussed. While New Delhi is reticent, Karachi is quite vocal. News items based on reliable sources emanating from Karachi and Rawalpindi have made it known to the world that possibly the two leaders would discuss Kashmir. As the press in Pakistan is controlled, we can take these reports to be nothing but official handouts. From these reports it appears that the scope of the talks is very wide and includes all sorts of topics from Indo-Pak trade to joint defence.

In spite of the fact that all the pending and possible issues may be discussed, there is no likelihood of any package deal. Neither the Government of India, nor that of Pakistan, is in a position to sell such a deal to their people. Both have

their commitments at home and abroad and it would need a basic reversal of policies if a question such as joint defence is even to be considered. Under the circumstances it does not seem to be desirable or wise to open all the questions—only to find that there exists a wide divergence of viewpoints.

Such a thing will only arrest the improvement in the relations between the two States that has been visible of late. Unless the President desires to exploit the visit for propaganda purposes to show to the world that India is not responsive, by putting all sorts of unthinkable and unacceptable proposals, the talks should be confined to only such matters on which there is little difference. As relations improve, the proper atmosphere for dealing with even ticklish questions would be created.

Of particular concern at the present moment is the question of Kashmir. This is reported to have been included in the undeclared agenda for the talks. Pakistan, unless it has the good sense of vacating aggression, knows full well that the problem cannot easily be solved. Even then it has been included only because it wants mischief. Pakistan's game all these years has been to continue to create a state of uncertainty about the future of Kashmir, and that sustains the anti-national and pro-pakistan elements in Kashmir.

So far as India is concerned, the only question to be discussed with Pakistan in respect of Kashmir is when and how it intends to withdraw from that part of Indian territory. The question of accession has been long ago and finally settled. We cannot reopen it. If Pakistan wants to question the right of the Maharaja to sign the Instrument of Accession or of the Constituent Assembly of J. & K. State to ratify it, we



can as well question the right of Pakistan as a separate entity. Pakistan was created under the India Independence Act. The same Act put an end to the paramountcy of the then British Government and left the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir like any other prince—sovereign in his own right to decide the future of the State. As for the people, the Constituent Assembly of the State was surely of a more representative character than all the junta of politicians who divided the country, or rule that part of it now known as Pakistan. If Pakistan wants to put the hands of the clock back, let us go to June 3, 1947 and not to October 26, 1947.

It is necessary that the Prime Minister should refuse to discuss the question of accession of Kashmir and make a categorical declaration in this behalf. His silence is proving harmful. He is unwittingly playing into the hands of Pakistan. This is giving a new lease of life to the Plebiscite Front and other communal elements in the State. While on the one hand Pakistan is widely publicising the inclusion of Kashmir in the agenda, Shekh Abdullah and Beg on the other hand have been utilising to the fullest extent possible the opportunity afforded to them in the course of their trial, to make political statements instilling a new hope in their followers. It is unfortunate that the Indian press which is so niggardly in giving space to the expression of nationalist sentiments with regard to Kashmir, has been displaying the views of these anti-national elements with an eye on unusual publicity. The whole thing is intriguing.

Views have also been expressed that by accepting a de-facto partition of the State along the ceasefire line a solution of the problem is possible. Whether Pakistan will accept such

a solution, there is no indication. Prime Minister Nehru had once made such a proposal, but it was summarily rejected by Pakistan. Even now it is only the people and press on our side who have been going out of their way to propose such a solution. Most of them belong to that group which is eager for some sort of a joint defence pact with Pakistan, and therefore willing to pay any price to secure it. Such an undue anxiety on our part is evidence neither of statesmanship nor of nationalism.

The argument of these people is that the chances of regaining the one-third of Kashmir beyond the ceasefire line are very remote and that, therefore, it is better to give a legal status to an already existing fact rather than keep alive the myth of our sovereignty in that area, and thus leave a problem pending. They also feel that in view of the mounting threat of Chinese aggression we should disentangle ourselves from the Pakistani mesh. Once the issue is settled with Pakistan they hope that normalcy would also return to the rest of the State. These people do not take into consideration national sentiments but claim to speak as hard headed realists, dismissing with contempt all expressions of national feeling and self-respect as mere sentimentality. While we feel that a realist should be able to differentiate between sentiment and sentimentalism and should realise the great potent power of the former in building a people, we would for the present consider the proposal in a more mundane manner and see what dangerous implications the proposal has.

If the cease-fire line is recognised as the de-facto boundary between India and Pakistan, what reaction is it likely to create on the people of the State? As there will be a fun-



damental surrender of our sovereign rights, and an abridgement of scope of the Instrument of Accession, this will give a fillip to the Pakistani elements in the State. They will definitely create disturbances in the State to achieve their objective of merging larger tracts with Pakistan. It is widely known that the communists also have some hold on the people of the valley. The Democratic National Conference is nothing but a wing of the CPI in the State. Once the certainty about the relationship of the State with India is disturbed these and other people will try to fish in the troubled waters. There is no guarantee that they will not work for the Chinese who have already crossed the frontier. This course will thus defeat the very purpose of those who want to surrender a part of Kashmir to Pakistan in order that India should face the Chinese more effectively.

Mere reports that the Kashmir question is being reopened have created problems for the Bakshi Government. It must be said to the credit of Shri Ghulam Mohammed Bakshi that he has withstood all attempts at undermining his loyalty to India and has so far acted as a true nationalist. But if, instead of strengthening his hands, as also consolidating nationalist forces in the State, New Delhi continues to follow a policy of keeping the Kashmir question hanging in the air, there can be uncertainties also in places where we had so far found nothing but certainty. Communal and regional considerations have already begun to determine the policy of the Bakshi Government. Instead of relying on the nationalist elements in and outside the State he seems to be trying to woo the communal forces of the Valley. Nothing but failure can be his lot in this. But the policy of the Government will by then have created a lot of mischief with regard to that State

and caused untold suffering to the people of Jammu.

The question of Chinese aggression has also to be considered against the background of the policy of inaction of the Government of India. Pandit Nehru is determined not to take any military action against China to get the aggression vacated. The issue already seems to have been frozen. China will continue to stay put in Ladakh, as Pakistan does in Kashmir. A time will come when some people will counsel de-jure recognition of the de-facto occupation. Thus it will mean our losing both sides. Heads we lose to Pakistan, and tails to China. This policy of surrender will also encourage further aggression against India.

We have also to take into account the increasing activities of Muslim communal elements in the country. They are becoming more and more aggressive. Their activities in the recent Assam riots are well known. The day is not far off when we will find that demands by these people are put forward and Pakistan will inspire and back them as it has been doing in the case of Kashmir. Appeasement will only whet the appetite of Pakistan, and of all those who have been dreaming of an Islamistan in Hindusthan.

It is, therefore, necessary that the Prime Minister should not talk about Kashmir so far as its accession is concerned. Let him insist on getting the aggression vacated. Due to some reports and the activities of some people, there have been apprehensions in the minds of people about the possible outcome of the talks. We demand a categorical assurance from the Prime Minister that he would not in any way agree to any infringement of the sovereign rights of Bharat in Kashmir. In this connection attention must be drawn to the Canal

Waters Treaty which is reported to contain a clause with regard to the Mangla Dam in Pak-occupied Kashmir. The Prime Minister should not sign this treaty unless this cause is deleted. If he accepts Pakistan's right to construct a dam in that area, our earlier protest in this regard will have no meaning. It will mean a virtual abdication of our claim on that part of Bharat's lawful territory.

People should also be watchful. At a time when the Government is out to offer lands in *Bhoodan*, they alone are the protectors of the unity and integrity of the country. Let us very clearly tell the Government that no betrayal of the nation's trust shall be tolerated. Be it Berubari or Kashmir, Aksai Chin or Barahoti, the Government has to protect and preserve, and not to pawn and part with, national territory.  
(September 12, 1960)

## Some Impressions of the West

It is about a month that I have returned home from my trip to USA, UK, Germany and East Africa. During this one month wherever I have gone, searching queries have been made about my experiences abroad, and also about the attitude of these countries towards India. As it has become somewhat a fashion to pen your views and impressions after such a tour, there have been persistent complaints from a number of friends and colleagues about the delay. I owe to them an apology, and an explanation.

Besides my preoccupation with other organisational work, a feeling of hesitancy is also responsible for this delay. Life in the Western countries is notoriously fast and, to crown it, I had at my disposal less than nine weeks to cover four major countries. If, I could have started a little earlier, it would have given me an extra three weeks period at least, either to cover a few more countries or places, or to have the whole thing arranged in a less hurried way. However, there are in India too many hurdles—official, regulatory and red-tape—that an intending visitor to foreign countries has to cross. Unexpectedly—or, perhaps, I should have expected it—it took more time and thus upset the earlier schedule, with the result that the whole thing had to be cramped into a limited period of time.

In addition to the programmes arranged by the hosts in different countries, there were not a few engagements fixed

by Indian friends at various places. Consequently, programmes followed one another in such a fast sequence that it became difficult to fix particular attention to any one of them. Moreover, their nature was so varied that like an unedited cinematograph, the sequence produced somewhat of a transient impression. As such, those who expect from me some authoritative statement or a thorough analysis of the situation, should feel disappointed. My aversion to detailed descriptions will only add to their disappointment. So, this has been the cause of my hesitation. I would therefore urge upon the readers to regard any views expressed here as casual observations of one who had an opportunity to get only a general and a very hurried view of things.

In all these countries, I found a great fund of goodwill for India. Even where they differ with us, there is a desire to appreciate our point of view. It is unfortunate that there still exists in the common man not only colossal ignorance about India but also a distorted picture of India given to them by Miss Mayo and her tribe. Pictures of the snake-charmer, the Yogi with long beard and matted hair and the Banjara belle have been so widely published that most people do not know that all these represent only some of the uncommon features of Indian life.

In USA there have also been political prejudices caused by both, Shri V.K. Krishna Menon and Mr. John Foster Dulles. Political predilections have given a penchant to the press and, through it, to the people and it is only recently, after the massive aggression by Communist China across the Himalayan borders, and Pakistan's hobnobbing with that country, that some people have begun to look at India's case

a little more objectively.

Our publicity too is poor. We can realise the difficulties of our men incharge of publicity, but on this very account, greater efforts should be made to propagate our views. Pakistan being a military ally of USA, it definitely has an advantage over us; but we could have easily made good this deficiency because logic and truth have all along been on our side. Moreover, despite our not joining any military pact, there had been a feeling of genuine friendship and regard for the people of USA. If this feeling could have been properly harnessed, the misunderstandings that have harmed our case would not have been there.

In spite of the fact that it means an extra dollar of tax to the American citizen, there is general recognition of the need, and desire, to help India and all other under-developed countries. There is also sympathy for us in our problems and they would like to render all possible assistance to enable us overcome them. This is a widespread feeling and the cuts in foreign aid, made from time to time by the Congress, do not exactly reflect the people's views. It might be a coincidence but I did not meet a single individual who did not express disapproval of this policy of the Congress.

There is also a desire in some quarters to take something in return from India. One American Professor admitted that if USA could help India develop her material resources, India in turn could teach the people of USA how to soothe their nerves and lead a peaceful life. Definitely there is much that is complementary in the life of the two countries and if proper steps are taken in this regard, it will not only be of mutual help and benefit, but also bring about a synthesis in

the two life patterns, so very necessary for the evolution of an affluent and contented humanity.

It could be easily seen and felt that USA is conscious of its world position and consequent obligations. Most of its policy decisions are based on some obvious economic, military or political advantage; but these are not the basic sentiments that sustain the people in their continued support for these decisions. There has definitely been a revolution, especially after the Second World War, in the mental attitude of the American people. Some people can have apprehensions that under the impact of such an overpowering sentiment, Government might assume some sort of a supercilious attitude towards other nations—as the Britishers did in the name of their assumed responsibility, the 'white man's burden'. I, however, feel that due to changed circumstances, and differences of character and tradition and also because of USA's vast potential for progress at home, there is no possibility of any repetition of the history of the Anglo-Saxon race.

People who have been subjected to a long spell of colonial rule, naturally would not like to take chances. But it is always necessary and desirable to build up the relationship between any two nations on a sounder basis, by understanding and appreciating the fountainhead of their national resurgence rather than on the basis of expedient measures. More than the material prosperity and affluence of USA, it is this resurgent feeling that seems to have given a purpose to all their activities. Their desire to help the victims of national calamity in Cuba, or to supply wheat to USSR and other East European countries, could be traced to this senti-

ment. Even unreserved aid to India in her hour of peril had the sanction of this one dominant desire of the people. If this sentiment finds proper and useful avenues for expression, it will be a great asset to other nations and it will in its turn help further develop the personality of USA.

(December 30, 1963)



## Foreign Policy and Defence

The tenth annual session of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh, held last month at Bhopal, provided an opportunity to the delegates for a reappraisal and reorientation, if necessary, of the party's policies and programmes in the light of the Chinese aggression. It was primarily with this end in view that the earlier decision to hold a mass session at Indore was changed. Enormity in number makes it difficult to deliberate seriously on issues. The number of delegates here, about thirteen hundred, was more than expected. Yet it was well within manageable limits. Moreover, the delegates displayed a unique awareness of the situation, and conscious of their responsibility responded in a most constructive manner. It was because of their positive and coöperative approach that all aspects of the policies could be fully discussed and yet almost all the resolutions adopted unanimously. Technicalities, which according to some legal luminaries, law makers and interpreters matter much, were not allowed to throttle discussion. A political meet of this nature needs a free and frank exchange of views, so that the workers feel convinced and in turn convince the people throughout the country. Discussion in the Subjects Committee served this purpose to a great extent. The Madhya Pradesh Jana Sangh and its General Secretary Shri Kusha Bhau Thakre particularly need to be congratulated for their wise decision to change the venue to Bhopal. The Legislative Assembly Rest Houses, away from the din of the city and presenting a beautiful panorama, were

most suited to the purpose.

To the Bharatiya Jana Sangh the Chinese aggression did not come as a sudden surprise. We were conscious of the dragon's designs and had all along been warning Government and the country of the imminent danger. While framing its policies and programmes, the Jana Sangh had considered the eventuality, and therefore, the resolutions passed at Bhopal, do not indicate any break from the past policies. There was mainly a reassessment and restatement of the Jana Sangh's stand. If there was anything new, it was only a spelling out in greater detail the programme of the party with particular reference to the present situation. Recommendation to the Government to attempt manufacture of the A-Bomb, (Shri Ramchandra Bade's amendment) needs to be particularly recorded, because at its Varanasi Session the Bharatiya Pratinidhi Sabha had turned down such a suggestion. The wider issues that weighed with it then seem to have lost their significance with the yellow peril at our gates.

The proceedings and resolutions have been fairly well reported by the press. However, with regard to foreign policy, conflicting reports have appeared and on that basis some leader-writers have tried to read in them the existence of divergent and contradictory views in the Jana Sangh. As a democratic organisation Jana Sangh does not demand strict conformism and that too at the formative stages of a policy-resolution, but with regard to the party's foreign policy it can be said definitely that the so-called differences are only apparent, not real. The differences appear because of varying emphasis on criticism of the Government's present policy. If a particular occasion does not demand a positive re-enuncia-

tion of the party's foreign policy, people often hasten to draw some inferences—which unfortunately in the present case have not always been correct—on the basis of certain criticisms. It would be better if Jana Sangh's views in this respect are judged on the basis of its resolution adopted unanimously both by the Working Committee and the Subjects Committee. Despite conflicting reports in the newspapers—and these reports had appeared when the resolution was still being discussed by the Subjects Committee—there was no confusion as far as the delegates were concerned. No one proposed any amendment with regard to the supposedly controversial alignment and non-alignment issue.

Since the Chinese aggression no issue has been debated more than the country's foreign policy. Even the Defence policy has lagged behind. This debate has sprung firstly from the misconceived notion that defence primarily depends on the country's foreign policy, and secondly due to a desire on the part of certain interested parties to take advantage of the present crisis to switch over our preferences. There are some people who look at this vital issue more from a negative angle. Some confusion has also arisen because we have tried to define the vast expanse of our external relations by one word viz. either non-alignment, or alignment. We forget that these words represent a particular concept in a particular context. Let us not commit the fallacy of generalisation. It must also be realised that in a dynamic situation, it hardly serves to be pegged to static ideas. Moreover, a foreign policy like any other policy cannot become a creed. It has to be adopted to suit changing situations.

Bharatiya Jana Sangh believes that the foreign policy of

a country should be framed with the sole objective of securing the enlightened self-interests of the nation. It has to be realistic and should take into account the mundane nature of the world. As Jana Sangh had always given top priority to the defence of the country, it feels that the foreign policy must also be formulated to subserve this end. Jana Sangh, however, knows that no country—certainly not India—can be defended simply by clever manipulations of foreign policy.

Those who regard that aggression against a country always implies failure of its foreign policy seem to place too much reliance on it. They are committing the same mistake which the Government of India did by neglecting defence build-up because of the Panchsheel treaty with Communist China. If the Government was living in a world of unreality, its critics on this score also seem to share the same misconceived notion.

The following quotation from an article on the Defence of the Empire by Lord Chatfield, Admiral of the Fleet during the Second World War, will help in rectifying the imbalance:

"There is a tendency to overstate the connexion between foreign policy and defence. After the First Great War many were led to imagine that, because the peace treaties appeared to settle the foreign policy of the world for a long time ahead, we could consequently neglect our defences and our national and imperial organisation for war. But however satisfactory the state of the world may appear, we must always remain strong enough. Decisions on foreign policy may arise at any moment and require immediate decisions: decisions regarding

defence cannot be made suddenly, because it takes a long time to change your strength. Defence plans, therefore, must be laid well in advance."

If we did not adequately prepare for the defence of the country it was no fault of the foreign policy. That very foreign policy did not prevent us from taking massive military aid from friendly countries when we felt the need. And if today the present policy is changed and still the Government continues to neglect the military build-up of the country, can any one assure that there would be no aggression, or if there is one, it would be successfully repelled? Foreign policy cannot supplant defence policy; it can only supplement it.

The controversial issue of non-alignment should also be considered. There are people who are making a fetish about the word, as if that is the peg round which the whole super-structure of foreign policy revolves. Nothing like that. Non-alignment has significance only in the context of two power blocs. But in the course of the last decade many new forces have sprung, and new alignments have been forged. It is true that in the absence of powerful pivots, like the USA and the USSR, these new associations have not assumed significant proportions, but their dimensions cannot be denied. The Afro-Asian bloc is one such association in which the aligned and the non-aligned are all included.

Communist China is also a new aggressive force threatening the peace of Asia and the world. It will not be statesmanship to look at this new menace from the old angle. In that case a war with China will be a world war with the two blocs pitted against each other. Will that be to our ad-

vantage or of benefit to the world? It will mean ushering in a world war on our soil. Even if we are prepared for such a calamity, the initiative both for war and peace in that case will pass on to U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., and if some Chamberlain decides to enact another Munich, what shall we do but watch helplessly like poor Czechoslovakia?

It is, therefore, necessary to keep the two blocs away, so far as this conflict is concerned. Let us forge a new alignment—the word 'alignment' because of a particular meaning attached to it may be avoided, and we may call it a new 'alliance' or 'association'. We can invite in this new relationship and joint endeavour all countries, aligned or non-aligned. Shri N.G. Ranga, the Swatantra Party leader, has been reported to have said that even Soviet Russia can be invited to join us as an ally. Evidently this cannot be possible if we stick to the old alignment. So far as that is concerned, our policy will continue to be of non-alignment. But in this new association we shall definitely be aligned with the western world because they have indicated their willingness to help us, with some of the non-aligned countries especially of Asia that can be made to realise the danger of expansionist China and even some of the Communist countries if they disapprove of the Chinese policy of aggression. If the Democratic West and Communist Russia could join to defeat Nazi Germany, we cannot dismiss simply as wishful thinking the idea of the above alliance. Thus, there would be new allies and new neutrals. Even if the Communist countries remain neutral that will be a gain to us. The Jana Sangh has demanded some effort in this direction. The Prime Minister also has stated that in the context of China's aggression, there was no question of non-alignment. Steps have to be taken



to see this approach materialise.

The situation demands a complete change in the Government's China policy. Jana Sangh has been demanding in this regard that:-

- (i) Diplomatic relations with China be severed;
- (ii) Recognition of China's suzerainty over Tibet be withdrawn; and
- (iii) Dalai Lama's Government be recognised as the emigre Government of Tibet and all assistance be provided for the liberation of Tibet.

Implementation is an integral part of any policy. A foreign policy that is not properly presented and executed will fail even if it is correctly formulated. It is here that our lapse have been gravest. Our spokesmen abroad gave our policy a pro-Soviet bias. Similarly, we have not been able to present our case both against China and Pakistan. Jana Sangh feels that if our diplomatic apparatus is adequately geared up, we shall surely get results without in any way changing the basic policies.

(February 4, 1963)

## Of Congo, and Berubari

About one hundred Members of Parliament, mostly belonging to the Congress party, have issued an appeal to the United Nations and to the parliaments of the world, to secure the immediate release of the Congolese Premier, Mr. Lumumba. They have further asked parliamentarians of other countries to use their influence with their Governments "to prevent the Congo situation deteriorating any further, to enable the rightful Parliament of Congo to function, to bring about the immediate disbandment of the armed groups led by Colonel Mobutu, the expulsion from Congo of all Belgian personnel and put an end to the Belgian and other foreign interference in the Congo". And exactly when these members were issuing this appeal, the Berubari People's Delegation was submitting a memorandum to them to save 12,000 people of Berubari from being "consigned to the tender mercies of a foreign power and subject them to unending misery and persecution at the hands of a theocratic state".

We do not know if the members of Parliament have any but humanitarian grounds for appealing to secure the release of Mr. Lumumba, but the people of Berubari can definitely claim greater justification for coming to the members of Parliament with a petition not to throw them to the wolves. The Parliaments of the world cannot but exert some sort of moral influence in the matter, but the parliament of India can take definite, concrete and completely effective steps to see that the petitioners get justice. But there is little hope that these



members of Parliament will wake up to their responsibilities. They have more sympathy for Mr. Lumumba than for the people of Berubari. Their hearts bleed when Col. Mobutu's soldiers misbehave, but they can look on disinterestedly if Indian citizens are subjected to all sorts of ignominious treatment at the hands of Pakistanis, by being transferred to that State. What a disgraceful contrast!

In spite of the fact that the whole country has vehemently opposed the transfer of Berubari, Pandit Nehru is determined to carry out his plan. He does not mind the constitutional limitations. The Constitution can be amended to give validity to his unconstitutional acts. It is understood that comments in the foreign press have made him doubly determined to implement his pledge. So the policy of our Government is not determined by anybody in the country, but by leader-writers in foreign countries. Sovereignty does not vest in the people but in Manchester's *GUARDIAN* and the American *TIME*. This over-susceptibility to foreign influences only betrays a state of mental slavery which persists even after the attainment of freedom.

Mr. Justice Sinha of the Calcutta High Court in his judgement on the petition filed by Nirmal Bose against the Union of India and others, observed: "It seems to me unthinkable that the Constitution contemplates that a citizen should wake up one morning and find that he and all that he possessed have been bodily handed over to a foreign power without his knowledge and consent". But the unthinkable is going to happen in India under the benign Congress Government.

The manner in which the amendment has been brought

also shows that Government has not the courage to face the people. What has happened in West Bengal and the disgraceful manner in which Dr.B.C. Roy has changed sides only shows that Congressmen can go to any length without any compunction. The prorogation of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly—only to deprive the members of a chance to move a resolution to go to the Supreme Court—only shows that the Government's case is very weak. They are not prepared to face yet another verdict of the highest tribunal in the land.

The West Bengal Legislative Assembly having unanimously returned the Constitution Amendment Bill with the remarks that it was "unconstitutional", the West Bengal Government is honour bound to move the Supreme Court without any further resolution in this respect by the Assembly. If it fails to do so, it will amount to a disregard of the Assembly.

The Union Government had earlier indicated that the Bill might not come in the current session. But after the refusal of Pakistan to modify the Nehru-Noon agreement in respect of Berubari they have all at once decided to introduce the Bill in the current session of Parliament. Those who had hoped for a change in the attitude of Pakistan, must stand corrected. Instead of helping Pandit Nehru in his present discomfiture, Pakistan has been trying to put him in a still worse position. Recent utterances of President Ayub in this regard have a devilish tinge about them. He is sarcastic and wants to gloat over the embarrassment of the Prime Minister Nehru. Like the Shakespearean Jew he insists on having his pound of flesh. It is necessary that he should be taught a similar

lesson.

A treaty which contravenes the provisions of the constitution of a country has no validity in international law. Even the Amendment of the Constitution cannot have retrospective effect. The Prime Minister in fact should have told the Pak President that he was helpless in the matter. That would have raised his prestige as a democratic leader and an upholder of the constitutional form of Government in the eyes of the world more than his attempt to subvert the spirit of the Constitution by amending its letter. The matter should end there. If on that account Pakistan abrogates the treaty, we have nothing to lose.

Even if the Prime Minister insists on an amendment, the matter is so important and delicate that there should be a free vote on the Bill. Earlier, such a vote was allowed on the language question. This issue is more important than the language one. But the Congress party has already issued a whip. If Congress Members of Parliament, instead of falling a victim to a false sense of prestige and loyalty, disregard the whip and vote according to the dictates of their own conscience, they will raise themselves much higher in the esteem of the people. The prestige of India lies in preserving its integrity and not in disintegrating it bit by bit. By voting against the Bill they will show to the world that the people and their representatives love every inch of their motherland so very dearly. That will be a demonstration of our nationalism. That one act will keep the invading armies at bay and foil the evil designs of all enemies of the nation. If, on the other hand, members vote for the Bill they will forfeit the right of representing a free, democratic and sovereign people.

Let the will of the people rather than that of an individual prevail. Voting on this Bill will show whether the future of India is safe in the hands of a Parliament with Congressmen in such a brute majority. The integrity of every honourable member is at stake. It is to be seen if they deserve that appellation.

## India, and the Queen

New Delhi has had occasion to welcome foreign Heads of State a number of times by now. Queen Elizabeth II is not the first such dignity. U.S. President Mr. Eisenhower and USSR Chiefs Marshal Bulganin and Mr. Voroshilov have also been here during their respective terms of office. The receptions accorded to them were on a grand scale. The ovation for the Queen has been made a still grander affair. If this had been actuated by a simple desire always to improve on past performance, there could hardly have been any objection. It would have even been appreciated. It cannot be forgotten that Elizabeth II is not only a Head of State, she is also a Queen. However simplicity-prefering she may be described and held to be, she is accustomed to greater splendour than other Heads of State, particularly those of Republics. The fact that she is a lady makes the expectation for greater grandeur in receptions somewhat natural. But the Government of India's conduct towards the Queen seems to have been determined by some other considerations besides.

Queen Elizabeth is not only the Queen of England, but is the Head of the Commonwealth as well. India is a member of the Commonwealth. The reception to the Queen, therefore, has had to befit her position. The pertinent question is: what exactly are the relations between India and Great Britain as members of the Commonwealth? It is on the basis of this question that it would be possible to adjudge what would be the bounds of such a "befitting welcome".

No exact definition is available of the Commonwealth. Constitutionally, it is a hazy notion. Prior to India's becoming a republic and accepting the membership of the Commonwealth, this notion was interpreted by the Balfour declaration of 1926 thus: "They (members of the Commonwealth) are autonomous nations within the British Empire, equal in prestige, independent of each other in the matter of internal matters and foreign relations, though bound together in a common allegiance to the British Crown and freely associated with each other as members of the British Commonwealth."

When the Congress adopted its pledge of complete Independence on the banks of the Ravi this idea was unacceptable to it. It was an association not of equality but of subservience. No doubt, today's Commonwealth is different from that one. In the above declaration, "autonomous" has been replaced by "independent", the words "British" and "allegiance" have been omitted, and the British Crown has been accepted Head of the Commonwealth but only as symbol of the "equal association" of its members.

Dr. Radhakrishnan has described the Commonwealth to mean "independence and informal association", as a partnership of ideals and not of dependency, of aims and not of loyalties, as joint deliberation which might subscribe to decisions which would bring about a better understanding of problems, but would not limit the independence of the members.

But the Queen's visit, and particularly the protocol observed by the Government on this occasion, has compelled us to reconsider whether the new relation is fundamentally

different from the former.

On the occasion of the Republic Day Parade, the Queen drove jointly in State with the Rashtrapati. Atop the Rashtrapati Bhavan the Queen's flag has been fluttering along with the President's Flag. Is the Head of the Commonwealth superior, or even equal to our Rashtrapati, so far as we are concerned?

Let there be as many and as grand receptions accorded to the Queen as any one may will, but co-participation of the Queen along with the Rashtrapati in the ceremonials of our Republic Day is surely a downgrading of our Republican and independent status. There can be numerous ways of manifesting our respect and affection for the Queen. But for that purpose, we can never concede to her the place that belongs only to the First Citizen of our Independent Republic. If we do so, then our relationship with the Commonwealth is not of equality but subordination. Such a status is repugnant to our sovereignty. It will have to be changed.

(February 6, 1961)

## Some Thoughts on the Commonwealth

The Commonwealth Prime Ministers, including the President of Pakistan, met, discussed and dispersed. They did not decide anything for it is not in the nature of the Commonwealth to take decisions. The communique issued at the end of the conference describes the Commonwealth as "an association of independent sovereign states each responsible for its own policies". They could, therefore, hardly take a decision which would be binding on all or any of the members. What is then the purpose of the Commonwealth? If they have no common bonds of association, or have no obligations to any set of generally agreed principles, the millions of people inhabiting these countries will not feel inspired to continue the tie which has only memories of the unpleasant and dismal past and no sentiments and aspirations for a bright and noble future.

The Queen of England has been recognised as "the symbol of free association of its independent member nations and, as such, the head of the Commonwealth". But to most of the members of the Commonwealth there is no sentimental attachment to the Queen. They even regard monarchy, whatever its form, as something retrograde, and have, therefore, adopted republican forms of constitutional Government. If inspite of past memories and present beliefs they have accepted the Queen as the head of the Commonwealth, the association must serve some useful and ennobling purpose.



When the Commonwealth of nations was first formed, it was felt that all the member countries had faith in parliamentary democracy and that their continued association would bring out many other common points. But during the last twelve years this hope has not been realised. Pakistan bade good-bye to democracy, and adopted a military dictatorship. The Commonwealth took no note of that: Pakistan continues to be a member of the Commonwealth. At the recent conference she was represented by her President, the head of the State, while all others were represented by their Prime Ministers. Even in economic matters Pakistan had refused to fall in line with other member countries. When all other Commonwealth countries devalued their currencies to meet the crisis of falling sterling reserves, Pakistan refused to follow suit.

The Commonwealth has not been able to give to its citizens even an equality of status in all the member countries. Nationally, citizens of a Commonwealth country are not treated aliens in another member country, but in fact, and often in law, there exists differential treatment for citizens of different countries. In Pakistan, citizens of India are not treated on par with citizens of other Commonwealth countries. British citizens everywhere still enjoy privileges which are denied to citizens of other countries.

Apartheid is too glaring an example of racial discrimination to need any mention. By refusing to discuss this question formally Commonwealth members have disappointed those who had been hoping for a really "free association" of men and nations in the Commonwealth. They have shown that the Commonwealth does not represent an ideal but only a pur-

poseless get-together of people who, by force of habit, do not want to get out of the hypnotic effects of the British monarch.

The communique clothes the Commonwealth with some sort of an ideal when it says that: "The primary objective of all is world peace and security. It is their declared purpose to do everything in their power to achieve that objective, and to continue to co-operate to that end with all the peace-loving nations of the world". All this sounds good, but is nothing more than platitudinous. What concrete steps has the Commonwealth so far taken to maintain world peace and security? It has taken no action to end aggression of one member country against another, nor to ward off invasion by a non-member power against a member nation. Pakistan continues to be an aggressor in Kashmir. The Commonwealth countries have not used even moral pressure to ask it to withdraw. The question of Chinese aggression has not been discussed at the Conference. True, India's Prime Minister did not raise it there. But do not member countries have a moral obligation to see that another country does not come to harm? An offer of unasked help might be construed as an infringement of our sovereignty. But they could have surely condemned China for her aggression. It should not be necessary for India to go as suppliant to ask her friends to declare China an aggressor in Ladakh. And it cannot be construed that her silence on the issue has been at the behest of India's Prime Minister.

Economic questions also were discussed at the conference but even on matters which concerned all of them, no clear-cut policy decisions were taken. The European Common Market will adversely affect the export trade of all the

Commonwealth countries. But except for expressing concern and hoping that the European countries would conform to The GATT principles, they could not chalk out any plan of concerted action to meet the problem. As for aiding the development of underdeveloped member countries of Asia and Africa, the responsibility has been shirked and passed on to the officials and the Commonwealth Economic Consultative Committee. All that they have agreed to is to exchange specialised skills and experience. And that would only mean employing some more British engineers and technicians in the Commonwealth countries.

Unless the Commonwealth can devise ways and means of tackling practical problems and real issues in an effective manner, it will not become a useful medium of international cooperation. The Commonwealth has to demonstrate that it has something more—and real—to offer than the various agencies of the U.N.O. If it cannot, it will be simply a window-dressing for the British empire—to delude the people of Britain and of the various newly independent countries. It will be nothing more than a myth—a myth at the cost of the national prestige of countries who have fought for, and acquired, their freedom. The Commonwealth has a past: we all want to forget it. But that can only be done when this “free association of independent sovereign nations” can fashion a future for itself.

(May 23, 1960)

## India, Nepal & Democracy

On December 15, the King of Nepal dissolved Parliament and assumed full powers. The Prime Minister, B.P. Koirala, and other ministers were arrested the same day. Later on, most other political leaders also have been detained and a ban has been imposed on all political activity in the State. The communists are reported to have gone underground, while the police is out to search them.

The action by the king was so well planned that the news came as a surprise to almost all inside and outside the State. The Indian Ambassador in Nepal was out of Kathmandu on a ‘Shikar’ with General Thimayya. The Commander-in-Chief of the Nepalese Army, who had earlier planned to accompany them for ‘Shikar’, cancelled his appointment at the last moment. But the Indian Ambassador did not, or could not, scent anything fishy about it. True to our tradition of an open and talkative foreign policy, it was none of his concern to be prying into other people’s business. Other ambassadors were in no better position either. If they had any information about the whole thing, at least their foreign ministers, and they themselves, have discreetly been silent about it. They prefer to be dubbed as ignoramuses rather than boast of the most uncommon, but commonly-claimed, quality of prescience in the matter.

The arrest of people of all shades of opinion, a blanket ban on all political activity, and a total lack of fore-

knowledge of the events to any foreign power have all put a cloak of mystery around the King's action. Except for what has been doled out in official pronouncements, nothing is known about the possible motives that led the king to take such a drastic step. That no foreign hand is involved can be definitely said. It is too early to say if the King's action was intended to foil any attempts at intervention by foreign powers. However, if the Koirala Government had been working at the instigation of any other agency, there would have been some reactions and adverse comments, after the dismissal and arrest of the ministry, in those circles. The reactions of communists or even of other groups in the State, are also very subdued. Either they are terror-stricken or they do not feel particularly hunted and hounded. All share the same fate and none is specially more sore about the situation.

Suppression of all political parties has, however, created a feeling outside the State that it is not the question of failings or serious lapses on the part of one individual or a group that has promoted the King to take recourse to such an emergent measure but a desire on his part to put an end to the democratic form of Government in the country. Prime Minister Nehru expressed this feeling when he talked about a setback to democracy in Nepal. However, we should not forget that it was the King who got the constitution framed and prepared the stage for ushering in an elected Government. If he has at this stage decided to take such an unusual step, it must definitely be attributed to something grave, rather than to an impulsive desire for establishing an absolute monarchy. We cannot also forget that by now there have been more than half a dozen Prime Ministers in Nepal and almost all the important personalities of the State have held that office by

turn. It is not easy to spot out another Prime Minister, after the dismissal of Shri B.P. Koirala, who might also have the confidence of Parliament. In these circumstances the King was perhaps not left with any other alternative.

The first reaction of anybody who loves democracy will be that of regret for all that has happened. But it is neither possible at this stage, nor politic, to fix responsibility for this regrettable step. It is difficult to say whether the King took this step to establish his personal sway or to discharge his responsibility to the people and the State. So far as Bharat is concerned we have very close ties with Nepal. And we are not bound with personalities, or with particular forms of government. It is for the people of Nepal to take decision in this respect. We can continue to be friendly with all Governments of Nepal so long as they continue to reciprocate that friendship.

Utterances of the Prime Minister in the Rajya Sabha during the course of the foreign affairs debate have not been very happy. Why should we try to underwrite the policies and actions of the Koirala Government? After all, it is not on any ideological and programmatic basis that we formulate our relationship with other countries. We have friendly relations with democracies as well as dictatorships. We did not mind abrogation of the constitution in Pakistan or the military coups in Egypt and Burma. How can a Government which is planning to demonstrate the country's allegiance to a monarch on Republic Day, dislike monarchical action on "ideological" grounds? We have the best of wishes for Nepal, and the King of Nepal should continue to receive the greatest consideration and regard from the people and Government of India.

(December 26, 1960)



## Why Sanskritised Hindi

The debate in the Lok Sabha on the Official Language Commission's Report revealed near unanimity on the ultimate objective of adopting one indigenous language for official purposes of the Union and inter-state communication. That Hindi, as accepted by the Constitution, alone can be such a language was also not questioned by any one. The plea that English is as much Indian as any other language like Urdu and Sanskrit, was put forward by none except Shri Surendra Mahanti of the Ganatantra Parishad. His argument is contrary to the stand taken by the former President of the Ganatantra Parishad and the Parishad nominee in the Parliamentary Commission, the late Shri P.C. Bhanj Deo, who has appended a note of dissent to the report. It seems that Shri Mahanti expressed his personal views.

But when we come to the means through which, and the pace at which, this ultimate objective is to be attained, there is a wide variance of views. This is not unnatural. Such differences about details, are bound to be there. However, if we have a desire to realize the objective, variety of ways and means will only enrich and unfold the manifold aspects of the common achievement. But it is necessary that we engage ourselves in this task without prejudice or confusion. It is true that, of late, some kind of fear has grown in some of the non-Hindi speaking people that if Hindi comes in, their chances of recruitment to the all-India Services etc. would be less. I think the Prime Minister's assurances in this respect should

set at rest all such fears and anxieties. In fact, so far as recruitment to all-India services is concerned, knowledge of Hindi should at no time be considered necessary. But **after** recruitment, arrangements should be made to impart to the employees a working knowledge of Hindi. Competitive examinations should be held through the media of regional languages. Difficulties of moderation can be overcome.

If once this anxiety about future recruitment is removed there is no opposition to the introduction of Hindi. The pace and the method of its introduction will be more a question of practical working than that of policy or principle. It was this practical consideration which made the Constituent Assembly prescribe a fifteen year time-limit instead of an immediate switch-over. Even after the date-line, if there are any special difficulties, the Parliament has been empowered to continue the use of English for certain purposes. The so called Hindi enthusiasts have never demanded deletion of these provisions. If ever they raised voice it was against the Union Education Ministry, which, under the guidance of late Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, was trying to by-pass these constitutional provisions. The Constitution has definitely made it obligatory for the Union Government to make Hindi a fit medium of official business. A great deal of work has been done, and it continues to be done by different scholars and State Governments in preparing a new terminology. Their work needed coordination. Because of lack of coordination, different words are being used in different Hindi states for the same English word. There are two Nagari scripts used in Bombay and U.P. All this leads to confusion. It may make Hindi unintelligible even to the Hindi-knowing people.



Obviously, we cannot ask these states to halt their progress in the switch-over from English to Hindi. Of course, this difficulty is not faced by non-Hindi states. In all these, there is just one state for one regional language. There is no need therefore of coordinating the activities of one, two or more states. But so far as the Hindi states are concerned, coordination is imperative. Moreover, Hindi being an All-India Language, it has also to take into account the vocabulary of other regional languages. That is possible only if we have a Central committee to lay down common terms for all the Indian languages. We have waited all these years for this simple thing. The Centre could have easily done it. The Commission also has recommended it. But we do not know if the Government will implement the recommendation.

There is a lot of confusion, and the Prime Minister seems to be the most confused man in this regard. He feels that new technical terms should not be prepared or coined, but that these should evolve. He said so during his speech in the Lok Sabha. "This business of some kind of slot machine turning out Hindi words and translations was an artificial, unrealistic, fantastic, absurd and laughable approach. By adopting such an approach all one would do was to confine oneself to a steel-frame and recite some '*slokas*' and do nothing else". His tirade is evidently against Sanskrit language and scholars. He does not want Sanskrit. If we leave out Sanskrit, what will be the common basis of the new terminology for all regional languages? The terms in use are English. If we continue them there is no question of replacement. It will simply mean replacing a few pronouns and verbs, as the Moghuls did while evolving Urdu out of Persian. Persianised

Hindi could not serve the purpose. Anglicised Hindi will not serve it either. The half-educated city people may talk in that language, but it cannot be used for official or literary work.

It is true that a number of foreign words have completely become part of our own languages. Nobody wants to ban their use. But they can be used only in common conversation or even in works of light literature. For legal and scientific treatises we must have a scientifically based terminology. We may use the word 'judge' but we can't use 'judiciary', 'judicial', 'judgement', 'judgeship', 'judicature', 'judicious', 'adjudge', 'adjudicate', 'prejudge', 'prejudice', 'justice', 'justiciable', 'justiciary', 'justify', 'justification', 'justificatory', 'justifiability', 'justificative', 'juri', 'juror', 'jurisdiction', 'juridical', 'jurist', 'jurisprudence'— all allied terms derived from the same root. If you want to use Hindi for official purposes, for legislative and executive business, you will have to use all the above terms in dealing with the judiciary. 'Judge' may be a word commonly understood but if we use all these words in Hindi, it will hardly make sense to anybody. It is no fault of Dr. Raghuwira to have given words derived from the same Sanskrit root for all such allied concepts. One may disagree with some words but anybody who has some conception of a terminology will not question his basis. The Prime Minister in deriding him has only exposed his own ignorance of the subject.

The Prime Minister has also said that new words should not be coined but should evolve from the common people. It is true that the new words are always thrown into circulation by the common people and Hindi, as any other living language, has them in abundance. But most of them will hardly

serve the end that Hindi is intended to serve. Will Pandit Nehru like the 'Governor' to be called a 'Lat Sahab' and the President to be addressed as 'Bara Lat' instead of the chaste 'Rajyapal' and 'Rashtrapati'? Words like 'Lok Sabha' and 'Rajya Sabha' which have become quite familiar now were not evolved but were coined by the slot machine formula ridiculed by Pandit Nehru. To begin with, their names sounded novel and unfamiliar, but already they have become familiar, as though we have always had them! There are scores of such words which even Pandit Nehru uses, which are taken not from the common man but from Dr. Raghuvira and other scholars.

There is also some confusion about simplicity of language. Nobody denies that language should be simple. But what is the criterion of simplicity? It should be understood by the greatest number of people. If that be our objective the new Hindi should be Sanskritised. It cannot be 'Hindustani' as advocated by Gandhiji. In fact, Gandhiji adopted Hindustani not because of its simplicity but only to appease Muslims by creating an artificial language composed of Hindi plus Urdu. But that Hindustani is not spoken or understood anywhere. Pandit Nehru's Hindi is not understood south of the Vindhyas and Maulana Azad's Hindustani was not understood even in Uttar Pradesh. Those who had their schooling in Urdu will always find Hindi, with a Sanskrit base, difficult, but it will be easier to all other people in the country. Last Year Pandit Nehru was irritated at the word 'kritrim nabhomandal' for planetarium. But he could not suggest an easier word. His persian equivalent would have been even more difficult.

The other day the Allahabad High Court also complained of difficult Hindi used in a judgement by a judicial magistrate. As an example of this difficult Hindi, the phrase *Anya purushon ke viruddh arop hai* was quoted. In place of this Hindi, the magistrates were writing so far: *Digar ashkhas ke khilaf ilzam hai* and the judges of the High Court could understand it. If we take a poll throughout the country, or even in Uttar Pradesh, those understanding the "difficult Hindi" will be more numerous. If Hindi is to develop as an all-India language it cannot be Persianised. Those who stand for imposing upon the non-Hindi people a language which is totally foreign to them and advocate a hybrid Hindustani have done more harm to Hindi than the so-called Hindi enthusiasts, because for the non-Hindi people every word of this language has to be learnt, and that too without an associated similar word in their own language. But that is not the case with chaste Sanskritised Hindi.

(September 14, 1959)

## Swabhasha and Subhasha

Protagonists of English in India may be fighting a losing battle, but they have surely succeeded in creating a lot of confusion about the linguistic needs of the country. Though there may be hardly any, except Shri C. Rajagopalachari, who support Frank Anthony's contention that English is as much an Indian language as any other, the number of those who would like to retain English is not inconsiderable. Of these, some are motivated by their antipathy for Hindi. They would prefer any language in place of Hindi. They offer all sorts of specious arguments and keep playing upon the sentiments of the non-Hindi speaking people. They try to show to their people that their own language will not survive if English is displaced.

Fact is that the fight against English is not a fight of Hindiwallahs. It is indeed the common cause of all Indian regional languages. If the Britishers followed the policy of *divide et impera* to strengthen their rule, the supporters of English are doing the same thing to perpetuate this foreign tongue. If English goes, its place will not be taken by Hindi alone but jointly by Hindi and the regional languages. If English remains, no language in India can prosper. Was it Hindi that displaced Tamil, and Bengali, and other languages from their respective areas? Nobody conceives that legislative and administrative work in Kerala will be transacted through Hindi instead of Malayalam. But Malayalam cannot come unless English is dislodged.

It is true that Hindi will replace English at the all-India level. That place could have been given to any other Indian language, but for obvious reasons, Hindi was considered to be the fitting medium for use as lingua franca. In fact it occupied that place much before the Constitution was passed. If Sanskrit served as the language of communication of the learned and the elite it was Hindi that served that purpose for the common man. The Sadhus of the mediaeval period used it freely and frequently. We find a number of Hindi compositions by them in spite of the fact that their mother tongue was not Hindi.

Hindi has also been a natural vehicle for inter-communication during our long struggle for freedom. Bhushan composed his lyrics of Chhatrapati Shivaji in Hindi. Guru Govind Singh exhorted his followers in Hindi. The plot to overthrow the Britishers in 1857 was hatched through Hindi. Swami Dayanand's animated call to the nation was through the medium of Hindi. Gandhiji adopted it as the fitting vehicle of enthusing the people to rise in a peaceful rebellion against the Britishers. Language had played as much part in our fight for freedom as it did in Ireland.

If the Constitution described Hindi as the Official Language of the Union in place of the usual expression in vogue i.e. the national language, it was only to remove misapprehensions about other regional languages as also to show that they were equally national. Nationalism is a qualitative concept and is not quantitative. This may be difficult of comprehension to those bred on the idea of territorial nationalism. Such people cannot also understand how national unity can be preserved without imposing any dull uniformity in linguistics.



tic and other matters. However, the constitutional expression has misled people to feel that it does not reflect upon one's sense of nationalism if one opposes Hindi and pleads for English. To them official purposes are mundane matters. They can be transacted through any language and it does not matter if English continues to be used. This has resulted in a lukewarm attitude towards the language question. Compromises effected for practical considerations have also mellowed the enthusiasm for the changeover. It should be remembered that if English is to go, it will be to satisfy our sense of national self-respect. It is, therefore, no use to perorate on the qualities and advantage of English. We could not have kept the English rule, whatever might have been its advantage! The thirst for *swarajya* (self-rule) cannot be quenched by *surajya* (good rule) was our common reply to the pro-British elements during the earlier days of our freedom struggle. Today also the need for a *swabhasha* cannot be fulfilled by a *subhasha*.

Frank Anthony's argument comes up again. Is English our own language? He feels it is. Firstly, due to its use for the last hundred and fifty years it has become part and parcel of our national self. Leaders of the country in every walk of life have been trying to realise ideals given to them through English. Our thinking is done in English. Our Judgements about values are derived from English. Frank Anthony's reading of the situation is correct. But it does not make English an Indian language.

If our national life is being planned and guided by ideals born out of English, it is a sign of our mental slavery. Sooner we get rid of it the better it is. We cannot realise our national

self by professing and promoting these ideals. We may simply ape the Westerners, but can never be our own selves by following their ways and methods. We cannot breathe the life-giving free air of our own cultural renaissance as long as English continues. Even at the risk of losing access to modern scientific knowledge, we should free ourselves from the clutches of this foreign tongue. Our contribution through our own languages will be much more valuable to us and the world than what we can give by imitating the West through English.

Frank Anthony also maintains that English should find a place in the Constitution because it is the language of a minority i.e. the Anglo-Indians. If Shri Anthony feels as a national he should cease to think in terms of minorities and majorities. After all, this dichotomy has a restricted purpose in parliamentary democracy. We cannot extend it to plague our entire national life. If we do so there will be a number of minorities as we go on changing our basis of classification with the result that everybody will belong to some minority or the other. There can be religious minorities, linguistic minorities, political minorities, racial minorities, occupational minorities and so on. Secondly, if the Anglo-Indian community has been speaking English, it is to be given up if they want to be one with the people they live amidst. In fact their language of accommodation is Hindi or Hindustani as they call it. If they speak English, it is because of their education that they generally get in convents. That way even non-Anglo-Indian children studying there begin to speak English. It is only a denationalising influence of these schools. Instead of asking them to give up the practice and be in tune with the times we cannot impose upon the whole people a lan-



guage which is not their own. It should also be noted that the Anglo-Indian community came into being due to special circumstances. They enjoyed all the privileges during the British rule. Some of these were guaranteed, at the instance of the quitting British masters, for ten years by the Constitution. Shri Frank Anthony should have prepared his community to live as common people before the expiry of these ten years. It does not behove him to initiate an anti-national move and thus degrade the whole community. As for his calling English the mother tongue of the community. As for his calling English the mother tongue of the community, I would only refer him to the definition of an Anglo-Indian\* given in the Constitution and leave him hoist, so to say, with his own petard.

The resolution moved by Shri Anthony proposes to include English as one of the languages enumerated in the Eighth Schedule. His supporters say that the proposal does not imply any change in the constitutional provisions regarding Hindi and other languages. This is an argument only to dupe the people. If English can be allowed to enter the list of Indian languages through an amendment of the Eighth Schedule, this will some day become an added argument to retain English as the only official language of the Union and the States. It should also be noted that though some English words that are in vogue may be retained, English cannot serve like other Indian languages as the basis of development of Hindi. English words cannot be assimilated into Hindi without interfering with its genius. It is one thing to continue

\* Art. 366 defines an Anglo-Indian as "a person whose father or any of whose other male progenitors in the male line is or was of European descent but who is domiciled within the territory of India and is or was born within such territory of parents habitually resident therein and not established there for temporary purposes only."

to use the word 'cycle' in Hindi. But we cannot use 'cyclist', 'cyclic', 'encyclic', 'cyclostyle' etc. In fact when we come to find out suitable terms for technical and legal subjects, we have to fall back upon Sanskrit. We cannot retain English terms because they come not alone, but with their whole family.

(May 11, 1959)

## **Lessons of the Chinese Attack: Have We Learnt Them?**

The Defence Minister, while withholding from Parliament and the people the report of the enquiry into our military debacles last year in NEFA and Ladakh, has made a statement purporting to present the broad findings of the enquiry. The purpose of the inquiry, according to the statement, was not to hunt witches but to learn lessons. As such, instead of pinpointing responsibility, the report seems to have only made vague generalisations. Such observations of a sweeping nature, while protecting a few, indict all. It may have a discouraging effect on the dutiful, while the negligent goes unpunished. The latter is not likely to learn any lesson, particularly if he is unrepentant. We hope that no attempt would be made to shield the guilty.

The report, in so far as it has been revealed in the statement of the Defence Minister, does not say anything which was not said earlier. The difficulties of terrain, shortage of equipment, deficiency in numbers, suddenness of attack etc. were, according to official spokesmen so far, the reasons for our reverses. But the people had suspected something more, and the enquiry has revealed lack of prescience at the highest levels. The report has also accused the higher military authorities of interference in the operational functions at lower and local levels. All this, according to the statement, was a departure from the established code and procedure.

The enquiry definitely indicts the policy-makers for their failure to give a proper direction to the military. The statement says: "Even the largest and the best-equipped of armies needs to be given proper guidance and major directives by the Government, whose instrument it is". Evidently, it is the Government, and not the military, that is at fault. The Government and the Defence Ministry headed at that time by Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, ruled out any war with Communist China. Consequently, the military was unprepared for the task. It is no surprise that while trying to make the best of a bad situation, they met with reverses initially. But before they could rally their resources and reverse the march, the dishonourable unilateral cease-fire was accepted. Thus, the Government is responsible for the continuing stigma that sticks to our defence forces.

In this respect there is no sign that the Government has learnt any lessons from past experience. Has the military been given clear directions in regard to war with Communist China? The Prime Minister's utterances are vague, and cloud the issue. Far from wresting initiative from the enemy and taking steps to regain the territory, the Prime Minister is as doubtful in September 1963 as he was in September 1962 about Chinese designs. In the Rajya Sabha debate on foreign affairs, he continued to harp on peaceful methods of settling 'border differences' with Communist China. The Government of India still sticks to the Colombo proposals and is even prepared for 'arbitration by a person or a group of persons'. All this is not military thinking and cannot psychologically and physically prepare the country and the armed forces to meet the Chinese menace.

Even the statement by the Defence Minister betrays this policy indecision of the Government. While clearing the famous Fourth Division of the bad name it got in November last, the Defence Minister expressed the hope that "the famous Fourth Division will live to win many more battles, if there is any future aggression against our country". Thus, the hope for redemption lies not in any positive action on our part but in case the Chinese choose to commit further aggression.

All this amounts to overlooking the sad and humiliating happenings of the last year. There does not seem to be any desire on the part of the Government to regain our lost territories and lost honour. It is a major step-down from the position that they took in November last. It is the same position that the Government took under the evil influence of the ex-Defence Minister. Unless it is changed, the defence policy of the Government will not be purposeful. It will not inspire the people. Shri Y.B. Chavan, while assuming charge of the Defence Ministry, had invoked traditions of the land. Let him live up to them.

It is surprising that the Prime Minister has two standards for dealing with China and Pakistan. He rightly takes note of Pakistan's growing perfidy and says: "It is clear that in the existing circumstances, that is, while Pakistan is tying up more and more with China, there can be no hope of a satisfactory settlement with Pakistan". He further feels that the whole outlook of Pakistan must change before a satisfactory agreement could be arrived at.

In this matter Pakistan's guilt is as much as China's. If Pakistan, out of animus for India, is hobnobbing with China,

China too is, in its turn, aligning with Pakistan. Evidently, China's attitude also should change, before we can think of coming to any settlement with her. Should not the Prime Minister, therefore rule out any talks with China as he has done with Pakistan? That alone will be honourable and realistic.

(September 9, 1963)

## Menon Must Go

At his monthly press conference, the Prime Minister had once again to defend the Defence Minister for having made statements prejudicial to the defence and security of the country. Shri V.K. Krishna Menon is reported to have said that India's defence forces, though strong, were inadequate to meet the Chinese threats. On yet another occasion he remarked that the Government could not cede Indian territory either to Pakistan or to China without first amending the Constitution. The Prime Minister has not seen anything objectionable in these statements. He was of the opinion that by referring to the inadequacy of our defence forces the Defence Minister might only be urging the people to increase our strength.

With regard to the second observation, the Prime Minister's reply was ominously vague. He said: "Nobody can do it, no government can do it, without these processes. Ultimately it is a question between two nations, It is a question, if you like, of relative strength in the long run."

It is one thing to urge people to add to the country's strength and it is quite another to say that our military might is inadequate to face the danger of Chinese aggression. Such a statement can only result in subverting the morale of people and the army. No Defence Minister could honourably give expression to such views even if it were true. In the case of our own country, we know on the basis of facts—and of

statements earlier made by the Prime Minister and the Union Home Minister—that it is not the inadequacy of our military might but the pacifist policy of the Government that has been keeping our armed personnel in check. If they are allowed to march ahead, there can be no doubt that in spite of the difficulties of terrain and cold weather, they would push the Chinese beyond the border as easily as they pushed Pakistanis out of Kashmir beyond the ceasefire line. But when the Defence Minister made this statement he definitely wanted to give a hint to the Chinese—as he had done when he committed the Government of India to not using physical force in driving the Chinese out of Ladakh.

With regard to the second statement about the power of the Government to cede territory to China or to Pakistan too, the Prime Minister's reply is ominous. The Prime Minister has not categorically said that there was no question of ceding any territory to these countries. On the contrary he has only repeated in other words what the Defence Minister has said. Everybody knows that the Government cannot transfer portions of Indian territory. If there was anybody who was ignorant of this restriction on the powers of the Government by the Constitution, it was the Prime Minister himself. But for his ignorance he would not have agreed to the transfer of Berubari and other parts of the country to Pakistan under the Nehru-Noon agreement. It needed a judgement of the Supreme Court to remind him that in this matter he was not all-powerful. But when he says that no Government could do so without these processes, he seems to be thinking of some such transfer. And further when he talks about the relative strength of the two countries he definitely wants to give an impression to the people that such



a transfer was nothing but inevitable. One could have some excuse for referring to transfer of parts to Pakistan for it has been subject matter of a reference to the Supreme court. But why should China be referred to in this context? Was there any question of transferring any areas to China? The Prime Minister should have categorically refuted the statement of the Defence Minister. But he did not.

The Defence Minister has often been making statements—to which people have taken exception—which the Prime Minister had either to defend or to circumvent. One cannot say that Menon makes these statements inadvertently. He is reputed for his command of the English language. He cannot be accused of making statements without thinking. The only conclusion that we can draw is that he does so purposefully and with a set plan. It is difficult to say whether he speaks out what the Prime Minister already thinks, or does so only to bind the Prime Minister to a certain course of action. Whatever the reason be, there have been instances when he has created a precarious position for the Government. His utterances only strengthen the belief that instead of safeguarding the interests of the country he is only subverting them.

People have been long demanding that the Defence Minister be relieved of his responsibilities. Earlier, the Prime Minister also had given an impression that the people's wishes in this regard would be fulfilled in course of time. There was also a report that the Defence Ministry would be bifurcated into two and Shri V.K. Krishna Menon might be put in charge of Defence Production. The Prime Minister has now said that there was no basis for such a report. It means that the Defence Minister will continue to occupy his present portfolio. The Prime Minister's continued disregard of the

people's feelings in this matter is unfortunate. It seems that he is waiting for a more forceful expression of the people's feelings. If a Prime Minister could be made to resign in Japan—and a whole ministry in Kerala—it would not be difficult for the people to force an unwanted minister out of office. If they have not taken to agitational methods it is only because the matter is delicate in view of the aggression on our northern border. But it may be that the very needs of meeting such an aggression may force them to take resort to agitation to get rid of the Defence Minister who, because of his alleged communist leanings, is hardly suited to give a lead to the country, and the Army, in checking communist China's expansionist and aggressive designs. Let not the Prime Minister try the people's patience in this vital matter.

(July 4, 1960)

## Should We Opt for Alignment?

Communist China's aggressively expansionist policy has not only created problems of national defence for the countries of South Asia, but has also vitiated the atmosphere created in the international world by the joint efforts of the Soviet and the Western blocs. While Russia and America are painfully and scrupulously trying to make the summit a success, their allies China and France are following a policy that might make any summit meaningless.

While we recognise the usefulness of the summit conference—it should go quite some way in easing the tensions created by cold war manoeuvres—we do not feel very optimistic about the real benefits of any international conference aimed at securing an enduring world peace. It must be noted that the present political map of the world is neither in keeping with the principles of the U.N. charter, nor is truly representative of the human population. There are vast numbers of people who have been denied the fundamental freedom of developing according to their own genius. There are governments who claim to represent civilized people, but are treading in the footsteps of Timur and Chengiz Khan. Equality between man and man is nowhere to be seen and in some countries it is an offence to talk about it. How can the democratic conscience of the Western world tolerate apartheid? But colonialism, racial segregation, exploitation and tyrannic rule continue and the leaders of the world try to calm the qualms of their conscience by solemn declarations of

abiding peace and a prosperous world.

All this creates no impression on the suppressed, down-trodden and enslaved humanity. They are not bound by decisions of any summit conference unless it leads to the realisation of their aspirations. If the summit means that the people of Africa should cease to strive for their independence and that the free world should legalize the misdeeds of Russia in Hungary and other countries, of France in Algeria, of Britain in Kenya and of China in Tibet, it will be no more than a conspiracy against the human race and an agreement among bandit nations which can hardly be respected by the aggrieved nations.

Bharatiya Jana Sangh has, therefore, in its resolution on international situation drawn attention to this aspect of the summit meet. The emergence of free nations in Africa is in keeping with this aim and, therefore, Jana Sangh has extended its cordial greetings to them. Jana Sangh has demanded that steps should be taken to make the UNO an effective instrument for preserving world peace and for securing to the enslaved nations status of equality and freedom. Unless all the nations of the world are truly represented in it, the UNO can hardly claim to bear that appellation. The UN Charter needs revision. But fear has been expressed that any attempt to revise it may lead to the disintegration of the UNO. Well it may. But it will be no use allowing the UNO to repeat the history of the League of Nations. The test of statesmanship of the leaders of world powers lies in successfully revising the Charter. It may not be impossible if Eisenhower realises that what Lincoln fought for was liberty of man not only in USA but in the whole

world, if Macmillan can show that he no longer represents the diehard conservatives of the Kipling age but an enlightened race which, of its own free will, could grant independence in a constitutional manner to a number of nations in succession, and if Khrushchev can establish that the sympathies of the communist world for slave and suffering peoples is not a political ruse to win such people to its side but an expression of the true nature of communism and therefore nations within its fold are also entitled to the same independent and honourable treatment. If that is done, there will be no case for nuclear or other weapons of destruction, and real disarmament will ensure.

Coming to our own problems, we are faced with a grim situation and much confusion about our foreign policy. India has claimed to follow a policy of non-alignment. The Prime Minister does not like to call it a policy of neutrality, for he is not prepared to be a mere spectator of the world drama. It is true that today we cannot think in terms of isolation. We are very much in the midst of a turmoil, and when we are affected by the major developments of the world it will hardly be wise not to try to shape them to our best advantage. But in a world which is so sharply divided into two irreconcilable blocs, it requires a man of very high calibre to implement what the P.M. has termed a policy of dynamic neutrality. Granting that it is always easier to criticise than to work out a policy, it is accepted universally that we have not succeeded in our attempts. There is a feeling that one reason for this is that we chose a wrong man as spokesman of our foreign policy. I do not underrate the qualities of Shri V.K. Krishna Menon. At one time he might have been very useful to the country, and after the passing of Sir Girija Shankar

Bajpai, might have assisted the Prime Minister with his vast, first-hand and intimate knowledge of international affairs. Unfortunately today he has ceased to be a non-controversial figure, as is needed to work out a policy of non-alignment. His communist leanings are no secret. His temperamental weakness is recognised even by the Prime Minister. It is, therefore, in the interest of the country's international foreign policy to see that he dissociates himself from the Government of India and the Foreign Affairs Department.

We have decided to follow a policy of non-alignment. But in his anxiety to justify this policy the Prime Minister has often tried to give it a philosophical basis. We Indians have somewhat a weakness for philosophy, and so are susceptible to such polemics. The result has been a kind of sentimental support to Nehru's foreign policy and not a realisation of our responsibilities on the acceptance of that policy. And at a time when we are faced with a number of international problems, the antagonists of non-alignment can easily exploit national feelings to win the people to their camp. It is therefore necessary that we correctly propound our foreign policies and explain the reasons for adopting it.

Bharatiya Jana Sangh has always believed that a country's foreign policy is formed on the basis of its enlightened self-interest. It is always a policy and not a principle, and therefore it can be changed if the interests of the country so demand it. If we have followed a policy of non-alignment, it is because our interests could be best served by it. It is a different matter that those who practised it could not secure the maximum benefit to the country. Even today when our borders are threatened, we feel that a policy of



non-alignment can best safeguard our interests. Alignment would complicate matters. Of course, when we talk of non-alignment it is presumed that we can, on our own strength, and on the basis of a general improvement in the international situation, defend our interests. There are people who feel diffident on this point. They are afraid of the powers that are ranged against us. These powers are Pakistan and China. They belong to two different blocs. How are we going to meet the challenge of both by joining any one bloc? And possibly we cannot go on changing our membership of these blocs from time to time, as the danger from the one or the other increases. Today both have aggressed into our territory. While China has crossed into India from the Ladakh border, Pakistan continues to illegally occupy one third of Jammu-Kashmir. Legally we are at war with Pakistan, and with China we have averted a *de jure* war by a *de facto* surrender of our sovereignty and rightful claims in Ladakh. When aggressive acts of China were not known, and cries of Jihad were a daily feature of Pakistan, there were people in this country who advocated our joining the Soviet bloc. Now when Chinese aggression is in the headlines, people demand rushing to America for help. They are swayed more by newspaper headlines and sporadic acts rather than by a realisation of the all time danger from these two neighbours. Let us think of measures for a lasting defence. Non-alignment cannot be abandoned in this complicated situation.

It must, however, be realised that non-alignment cannot succeed if it continues to be based on fear of displeasing the one or the other. In that case non-alignment would mean appeasement of one or the other. In the present case it has been appeasement of both in succession. We surrendered our

rights in Tibet to China and tolerated her occupation of our territory, only to meet the danger from Pakistan. Now we are appeasing Pakistan, so that we may deal effectively with China. But in fact we have been able to deal effectively with neither. Instead, they have in turn exploited our difficulties to secure the best possible terms for themselves. The Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954 and the present Indo-Pak border agreement are examples in point. Non-alignment, to be useful, requires a bold policy which, in turn, needs strength and conviction. Only a strong and self-reliant India can preserve, protect and promote her interests. All steps should be taken towards this end.

When we talk of non-alignment as a policy we need not bring in ideological considerations. This policy has nothing to do with our opposition to communism or love of democracy. It is true that on an ideological basis, viewed only superficially, there is much in common between India and the Western world. But it should be remembered that these democratic countries do not formulate their foreign policy on any ideological basis. They care for democracy only in their own countries. As for others, they only care that their own interests should be served best. It is for this reason that they have supported dictatorial and tottering regimes in a number of countries. Even their opposition to communism has little to do with their foreign policy. For example, Yugoslavia, an openly communist country, has always received support from them.

The P.M. was right when he said that we have to fight communism in our country. But that should not make us oblivious to the dangers posed by international communism



in our own country. We can maintain our non-aligned position without allowing international communism to make a dent in our national life. Col. Nasser has followed this policy. The P.M.'s attitude towards communists in this country has unnecessarily projected foreign policy into home affairs.

(February 22, 1960)

## **Let Government Trust the People**

The Prime Minister has once again bypassed Parliament in defining India's attitude towards the Chinese proposals on demilitarisation and negotiations. Mr. Chou En-Lai's letter was received on November 7, and its reply was handed over to the Chinese Ambassador in New Delhi on November 16, the day on which the Parliament met. If the reply could be delayed—because the Prime Minister had a number of engagements earlier and also because of his decision to observe his birthday in Dehradun, away from the people—it could have been deferred for a few days more till the people's representatives had had an opportunity to apprise the Government of their views.

It needs no saying that in spite of some recent changes, there has been a wide gap between the nation's sentiments and the Government's policy on this issue. No democratic Government can afford to ignore the people, more so on an issue which requires an all-out effort and complete national unity. But the Government has been persistently refusing to follow the people. Instead the Government is keen to confront Parliament with a fait accompli.

It is this attitude that has been the cause of growing discontent in the people. Not only the opposition but even the Congress Parliamentary Party has resented this policy, and rightly. The Congress members have not spared the Government and have been openly criticising its weak-kneed

and unrealistic China policy. There has been a still fiercer attack on the policy-makers in the private meetings of the party. On the opening day, the party had one of its stormiest meetings ever. Even Pandit Nehru could not silence the critics. The discussions were not open to the press and an oath of secrecy was administered to all members present not to divulge what transpired at the meeting, especially the contents of the Prime Minister's speech. The Prime Minister is believed to have threatened resignation if his stand was not endorsed. He is reported to have already expressed this view in a T.V. interview with an American correspondent. He felt, "It would be good for me and for the country if I left the office of Prime Minister."

For the present I do not want to discuss the pros and cons of the Prime Minister's possible or rumoured retirement at this critical juncture. But we can ignore or minimise only at our own peril the growing estrangement between the leadership and the people on this important question. One can always argue the correctness or otherwise of a policy. It is not the debate that will win the battles, but the devotion and determination of the people that will withstand all the trials and turmoils of the grim situation ahead. If the so-called correct policy of the Government weakens the national will, or undermines its morale, it is better to take a "false" step. In the ultimate analysis the people are always right, and they must win. Let us not, in our false sense of superiority and wisdom, despise and disparage the people.

If the Government turns to the people for guidance in the formulation of the Chinese policy, it can not only meet the situation successfully but can also utilize the opportunity

to forge national unity which, for the last ten years, has shown signs of weakening. That nations live in war and die in peace may have been said of Europe, but it has a universal application. It is true that we in India have always relied more on the positive contents of culture and *dharma* to give to the people a sense of common nationality and a purposeful life. But of late, with the increase of foreign ideas and ideals, that underlying unity hardly finds expression in a visible and commonly understood form. The political scene has predominantly become regional, factional and personal. At a time of crisis, these base sentiments can easily be overcome. But it is surprising that in spite of calls for national unity by the Prime Minister, Congressmen are busy more with their group wrangles than with the national issues. To them the Chinese invasion is of no importance. Instead of driving the Chinese out, they are more anxious to rout their opponents at the party polls. This is mainly due to the fact that they have no sense of participation in the policy-making of Government. If they endorse the policies of the Government it is more out of helplessness, and for strategic reasons, than out of conviction or belief in the soundness of these policies. It is necessary that this mental inertia is removed and the whole nation is activated. That at once will lead us to victory. It does not need much effort or huge plans to achieve it. Only the Government and the Prime Minister should learn to take the people in confidence and not ignore the institutional arrangements and procedures of a democracy.

(November 23, 1959)

## Chinese Aggression and the GOI

The Prime Minister's last letter to the Chinese Premier, though it left much to be desired, was an improvement on the previous communications. Its tone was firm and the arguments in most cases sound and based on geographical facts, historical records, treaties and conventions. For the first time the Chinese were told in unreserved terms that negotiations about the border could not be held so long as they continued to illegally occupy Longju and other Indian outposts in NEFA and Eastern Ladakh. Lack of precision about the language, and of details about the other points where the Chinese have intruded, could have been avoided if some more pains and care had been taken in the drafting. However, omission of a demand to vacate aggression from the Aksai-Chin area—where the Chinese have built a road—seems to have been deliberate. One is led to the conclusion that the Government of India does not want to press its claims in that area. And that is intriguing.

All the good effect of this letter has been neutralized by the recent declaration of the Prime Minister that India would not use force to oust the Chinese from Indian territory so far occupied. Pandit Nehru feels that it would be irresponsible on the part of India to act 'militarily' when a political solution of the problems was being sought. If responsibility is synonymous with inaction and surrender, Pandit Nehru is perfectly justified. But using force to push back aggressive intruders is behaving responsibly and not irresponsibly. The

Chinese did not occupy the outpost by mistake. They actually overpowered our sentries there and captured the outpost. If Pandit Nehru is not prepared to take it back by our own efforts, his warning to the Chinese that any further aggression will be resisted will have no meaning. His words have lost all meaning by his renunciation of force to defend where an offense has already been committed. The argument that use of force may lead to war is a standing argument in support of all surrenders and submissions. If tomorrow China commits further aggression, will Shri Nehru, according to his warning, use the military might of India to meet the challenge? Well, then, that may lead to war. And will that not be acting in an 'irresponsible' way—one that hardly befits a 'mature' and 'big' country like India?

Pandit Nehru has used the words 'political' and 'military' settlements as if the two are mutually exclusive terms. At times military moves help a political settlement. If it were a judicial settlement the matter would have been different. We have not lodged a complaint in a judicial court, in which case any action on our part would have been improper, the matter being sub judice. We seem to be applying national laws in dealing with international problems. When we deployed our military along the northern borders, we knew that it will have a salutary effect on Chinese adventurism. Recapturing of Longju would demonstrate that we really mean to defend our borders. One does not understand what after all prompted the Prime Minister to make this declaration. In fact, in this matter Shri V.K. Krishna Menon stole a march over the Prime Minister. He had made this declaration in America even before the Prime Minister disclosed his mind at the Press Conference. Was this Shri Menon's

deliberate plan to water down the firm tone of the Prime Minister? Why did he, with indecent haste, go out of his way to commit India not to use force to regain her lost territories? The Prime Minister had to echo the words of his Defence Minister, who wants to defend the country without coming into contact with foreign invading forces. Who decides the Government of India's policy? The Prime Minister or V.K. Menon? In this regard Shri Menon has only served to undermine our China Policy and by his speech has assured China that inspite of the strong protest lodged by India, she should not be afraid of it.

We want a 'peaceful' settlement of the border dispute which evidently has a reference to major adjustments. But so far as minor adjustments are concerned, China would not feel inclined for any settlement for she has already occupied areas which, if scientific demarcation of borders is carried on, she may be required to vacate. Why should she desire to lose what she has already taken possession of, especially when she knows that she will not be dispossessed of them by any force? So far as we are concerned, we have already given over Tamoden which, according to Pandit Nehru, was on the other side of the Mac Mahon Line. Thus China is not going to gain anything by coming to a negotiated settlement, and she is not losing anything by refusing to negotiate. She has our friendship and support. We plead her case in the UNO. We have, by our continued betrayal of the Tibetan cause, almost toed the China line. In our internal affairs, we continue to allow full freedom to pro-Chinese and anti-Indian forces. These forces refuse to recognise the Mac Mahon Line or call China an aggressor. In the name of Sino-Indian friendship, they plead for the sacrifice of our legitimate na-

tional interests and for the surrender even of large chunks of our territory, to confuse the people, create chaotic conditions and undermine national solidarity. Under the circumstances, what is there which would impel the communist government of China to come to some peaceful settlement of the issue and vacate aggression? She may not commit further violations of our borders in the immediate future. She may bide her time and choose some appropriate moment to strike.

The Prime Minister has said that "considerable time might be necessary to solve the border dispute between India and China." Naturally during all this time the tension will continue and our military will have to actively watch and protect our borders. This continued tension will definitely harm the cause of peace. Deployment of military all along the northern borders will mean heavy recurrent expenditure. An early solution is very much in our interest. We cannot afford to put off the issue for some future date. Obviously, that is possible only if we can put some pressure on China and dislodge her from illegally occupied positions. Protest notes and speeches did not make Portugal quit Goa, nor Pakistan, Tokergram. To me it seems that the Government of India has, under protest, reconciled itself to the fact of Chinese occupation of our territory. These formal protests may help some future government to reclaim these areas. So far as the present Government is concerned, these areas should, for all practical purposes, be written off the map of India. The Prime Minister's impassioned speeches and high sounding words are meant only to bemuse the people and help them forget the loss.

(October 19, 1959)



## 'By an Inch or a Mile'

As usual the Prime Minister has exhibited his temperamental weakness in dealing with the issue of Chinese aggression. When first he announced that the defence of the North East Frontier borders had been handed over to military control and that India will defend every inch of her territory, high hopes were raised. People felt that Government was conscious of their duty and that the integrity and honour of the country can be considered safe in their hands. Later utterances of the Prime Minister however have belied all these hopes. In his monthly press conference, and in the debate in the two Houses of Parliament, he gave public expression to his views and the Government's policy in regard to this question. On these occasions, he gradually retreated his steps. Though he has used beautiful phrases and interspersed his statements with bold remarks to be utilised by the press for banner head-lines, his speeches on the whole make pathetic reading. The qualifying clauses appended to each one of his bold statements render all these ineffective and of no practical value.

In the Rajya Sabha, the Prime Minister said that status quo ante aggression must be maintained before any talks on the border issue could be held. But in the Lok Sabha he clearly said that the Government of India would not take any step, except appealing to the Chinese Government, to regain possession of lost territories. Evidently the status quo before the Chinese aggression is not going to be restored. While on the one hand the P.M. had been declaring that India was firm on her stand, on the other he counselled forbearance in the Lok Sabha, saying that there were limits to firmness also. Of course, there are limits to every thing; but,

unfortunately the Prime Minister's limits are set at starting points. Nobody, has suggested a full scale war with China. But should we not use some force only to force the few intruders back? Communists have described these aggressive intrusions as minor incidents. Well, if the Government of India also indulges in some such minor incident only as a retaliatory and restorative measure, it should not cause anxiety to any one. Illegal occupation of miles of Indian territory has not shaken China's faith in the very lofty and laudable principles of Panch Sheel. How can it mean any deviation on our part from this ideal, if we just push the uninvited Chinese friends to the other side of the Himalayas? It will not, and cannot, mean war. If Panch Sheel is to be preserved it should not be allowed to go astray from the Mac Mahon line. Panch Sheel punctilio demands that lapses on our friends' part must be corrected.

Instead of taking this practical step, Pandit Nehru has made all sorts of suggestions to resolve the 'dispute' which, in fact, did not exist before the advance of the Chinese army personnel into Indian territory. He has even gone to the length of accepting arbitration. It may be recalled that Pandit Nehru had earlier turned down proposals of arbitration in inter-national disputes. The interests and honour of the country demand a solution not of the border dispute-which does not exist, so far as we are concerned, but to the problem of border violations by China.

However, it seems that the Prime Minister is not very particular about the territorial integrity of the country. When he says that it does not matter whether a mile remains with us or goes to China, he betrays a lack of proper and patriotic grasp of the concept of territorial integrity. Integrity is not measured or preserved by degrees. "Off the path is off the path, by an inch or a mile" is a Shavian expression which emphasises that in cases of faith and fidelity, even an inch matters. When Pandit Nehru says that he is prepared to adjust the boundary for a few miles but not for large chunks of lands

shown in the Chinese maps, he, in fact, advances a very weak argument. One who cannot protect even a mile how will he protect hundreds of miles? Take care of the pence and the pounds will take care of themselves—is an old saying. It has some lesson for the Prime Minister. If he talks so lightly about our territory, how can he expect the brave fighters for the defence of the country to sacrifice their lives to protect the sacred soil of Bharat from being defiled by trespassers? And we know that when it comes to fighting, one has to fight not only for miles, but for every bit of territory. Inch by inch you gain or lose. During the last war, Russians gave a grain fight to the Germans in every room, storey and building of Stalingrad. For months, the fight went on and yet the Germans could not capture the city. That needs an outlook completely different from what is inspired by such utterances by the P.M., "A few miles of territory this side or that does not mean anything either to India or to China". So far as China is concerned it has shown that it means a lot to her. Why else would she occupy areas that our Prime Minister calls "barren and uninhabitable, where not a blade of grass grows"?

There has been aggression at three points, namely Longju in the NEFA, Bara Hoti in U.P. and Ladakh in Kashmir. The Prime Minister has so far pin-pointed attention only to one. With regard to Ladakh he has practically surrendered that area to China. Though the aggression had taken place two years ago, the Prime Minister has taken no practical steps to meet the challenge! In his recent statements also he has not shown any desire to pursue the matter. He always starts negotiations after conceding more than half the demand of the other side. Being thus handicapped, India is always a loser. If every act of border violation to be followed by negotiations means some loss to us, we shall in the course of a few years, lose, by peaceful means, not yards or a mile or two, but large chunks of territory to expansionist neighbours. Let there be some

limit to these "peaceful settlements" which cost us as dearly as lost wars.

The change in Pandit Nehru's attitude, though characteristic of his weak and timid nature, is directly due to a hardening of the Chinese attitude. We saw it in the case of Tibet also. When Tibet was overrun by Chinese troops, Pandit Nehru condemned their action. His first and nobler reaction found expression. But when the Chinese adopted a stiff attitude he forsook Dalai Lama, so to say, in mid-stream. And now he has taken exception even to Dalai Lama's attempts to refer the matter to the U.N.O. In our own border case also, Pandit Nehru being awfully afraid of conflict, has climbed down as the Chinese attitude has grown rigid.

Having achieved initial success, the Chinese have, under the guidance of USSR, also passed resolution for peaceful settlement of the border issues. But they have not only accused India of occupying Chinese territory but have demanded her withdrawal from these areas. Unfortunately, nobody in this country knows which areas exactly the Chinese mean. Evidently the communist Government of China will try to strike a bargain on the basis of its own claims.

The resolution of the Central Congress at Peking also demands cessation of the so-called anti-China agitation by right wing parties in India. If voicing our concern at the aggressive designs and acts of China is regarded as agitation against China, the whole of India, except the communists, is partaking in it. China should be told—if she does not know it already—that India is a democratic, non-communist country. People here have a right to react and Government is expected to follow the lead given by the people, contrary to the practice in China where the 'people's Government' leads the people. The Peking Government has thus termed the whole country, except communists, as "rightist". Those who pride themselves as leftists and fall a prey to the communist moves of exploit-

ing them under the name of leftist unity, have thus been left in the lurch. The price of leftism seems to be unfaithfulness to one's own country.

Incidentally, Comrade Dange in his speech in the Lok Sabha forestalled the China Central Congress resolution in its entire approach and content. But is it 'incidentally'? We knew the Chinese view-point even before they passed that resolution.

(September 21, 1959)

## Chinese Threat and the C.P.I.

The Prime Minister's recent enunciation of policy with regard to developments in Tibet is most disappointing. It has belied all expectations and ill serves the cause of Tibet's freedom and India's interests. Simply by giving asylum to Dalai Lama and a horde of refugees, we can neither secure Tibet's independence nor satisfy the sentiments of the people in India. There is need for adopting a bolder policy in this regard. Dalai Lama should be allowed to direct and guide his people in their struggle against the Chinese imperialists.

The Communist Party of India is trying to exploit the natural sentiments of the people of Bharat for peace and friendship with China. If our betrayal of the Tibetan people's cause and justification of the aggression by Communist China be the price for Sino-Indian friendship, it is not worth the sacrifice. In fact, a free Tibet is a *sine qua non* for a lasting peace in Asia and friendship between China and India. An atmosphere conducive to mutual trust and goodwill can hardly exist when China has already created serious suspicions in our minds, due to her mischievous cartography. A strong policy by India will not only help Tibetans to regain their lost independence but will put a check on the aggressive designs of China. Those who demand a submissive attitude by India, stand not for respectable relations between two equals but the ultimate enslavement of India by the Communist world.

The developments in Tibet and the policy followed in that regard by the Communist Party of India have once again exposed the un-Indian character of this party. Whatever the economic and

political systems of Tibet be, no outsider has any right to forcefully change them. If communists in India, echoing Peking, can justify Chinese aggression in Tibet on grounds of the allegedly reactionary character of Dalai Lama's Government, they might, as well, welcome such an aggression in India if they feel that the Government here continues to be "reactionary". It is nothing but base treachery. It is the duty of every patriotic Indian to see that they are not allowed to develop a potential that may some day seriously undermine India's freedom and security.

(May 25, 1959)

## **India's Stake in Tibet's Freedom**

Now that the Dalai-Lama has reached Mussouri and has been comfortably lodged in the Birla Niwas, the dramatic and sensational part of the episode, beginning with his escape from the clutches of the Chinese Communist Army, and his request for an asylum in India, has ended. The people gave him a warm ovation wherever he went on his way to Mussouri. He has been deeply touched by this spontaneous and enthusiastic manifestation of the great love and reverence that the people of Bharat have for the Tibetan leader. Some people may interpret this public enthusiasm as owing to the spiritual and religious hue of the Indian soul and to the saffron robes of the visitor. This aspect of the matter can neither be ignored nor minimised. But it is essentially our concern for the peaceful Tibetan people, and our deep resentment at the way the Communists have behaved, that the people have such intense feelings. It may also be that there is the growing realisation of the potential danger to our own safety and security that has led people to throng in thousands around the man whose sufferings are intimately connected with our own. It is, therefore, natural that the people eagerly look forward to future steps on the part of the Dalai Lama and the Government of India.

The Prime Minister, even before he has met the Dalai Lama, has given an idea of the way he wants him to behave. Replying to a question in the Rajya Sabha, he said that the Dalai Lama would be free to carry on his religious activities. The Prime Minister maintained that "it was the ordinary right of any country to limit the activities of foreigners who create difficulties with other countries". Nobody will like to, or can in fact, question our right to impose



restrictions we deem necessary. But the main question is : what is necessary for us ?

India is confronted with a very delicate situation in the matter. China is a friendly country. We have been friends in the past, and would like to continue so in the future. Besides the cultural traditions of the two countries, the need of preserving world peace also demands it. The Prime Minister argues that in addition to USA and USSR, China and India, which are developing fast with vast resources and vaster numbers, 'would largely shape the destinies of the world and peace in Asia in particular' in years to come. He, therefore, feels that this aim would be largely achieved if there existed a tradition of friendship between the two Asian countries.

To establish this tradition he has at times gone out of his way to please and placate China. At a time when the newly formed Communist Government of China was friendless and isolated, Pandit Nehru came forward to recognise and recommend to the world a Government which most people felt was nothing more than a band of foreign agents who organised themselves into the Communist Party of China, and ultimately, through a number of tactical moves, aided by the peculiar circumstances of the Sino-Japanese war, and the corrupt and inefficient administration of Chiang Kai-shek, successfully usurped power in the name of the people. Though a number of Western powers were antagonised, yet the representatives of India in the U.N.O., and in various other world organisations, were allowed to persist, in season and out of season, in demanding a seat for communist China. All this was done on altruistic grounds to support the good case of a friendly neighbour.

But Tibet presented a case where altruism could be practised only at India's cost. Pandit Nehru, who is not reputed for following a foreign policy fashioned to further the nation's enlightened self-interests, too readily succumbed to the fanciful theory of Chinese suzerainty over Tibet, when the new fangled principles of Panch-

Sheel were fanfared to the world. China agreed to preserve Tibet's autonomy perhaps only to provide some excuse to Pandit Nehru to calm his conscience at the abject surrender of a noble cause to appease the monstrous dragon. But a Government wedded to totalitarian methods, could not long keep up the facade. Tibet's autonomy was automatically atomised when the Chinese introduced their so-called "reforms" in all walks of life. How could an intensely religious and spiritual people co-exist with an utterly materialistic people with foreign modes and mores? Far from the ecological aspect of a people's organic development, the Chinese could not even maintain an autonomous administration in Tibet. Offices and departments were all manned by the Chinese, and vast tracts were acquired to settle the surplus Chinese population by the introduction of cooperative farming. Under these circumstances a clash was inevitable.

What should the Government of India do? It is a moot question. Pandit Nehru's recent statements show that he is satisfied with giving an asylum to the Dalai Lama. As a religious head, he may continue to function. But will that be sufficient to achieve the objective? Is it true that the Dalai Lama, by his mere presence on the Indian soil, will serve as a focal point for the Tibetan guerillas who, it is considered, will continue to be active inspite of the military might of the aggressor, due to the peculiar terrain of the country? It will mean a little headache to Peking, but that will not go to secure autonomy, let alone independence, to the Tibetan people.

India has a stake in the matter. Tibet's autonomy is vital to us. If we cannot secure it, not only our integrity and independence will be threatened, but it may become well nigh impossible for us to continue a policy of non-alignment. So far as China's intentions are concerned, they are well known. Already she has committed what is known as "catographic aggression". Now Chou En-Lai is reported to have come forward with a suggestion that undefined

boundaries between China and other Asian countries should be settled by peaceful negotiations. Obviously she does not recognise the Mac Mahon Line, which forms the boundary line between India and Tibet. The seeds of discord between the two countries have been sown and at any time the People's Government of China may direct its 'liberating' hordes to ransack Indian villages. Pandit Nehru has admitted that the Chinese have already occupied a few strategic Indian villages in the district of Almora. Pandit Nehru has so far taken no action.

Besides India, China has her greedy eyes on Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. Nepal, as an independent state, is responsible for her own defence. Communist China's activities in Tibet have posed a serious question to her rulers about Nepal's future defences. Whatever significance we may attach to the news published in the Pak paper 'Dawn' the King of Nepal is reported to have sought assurances from Pandit Nehru of active help in case of Communist aggression, failing which Nepal would consider the desirability of joining SEATO, to increase her defence potential. What has Pandit Nehru to say in this regard? Due to his opposition to military pacts on fundamental grounds, he may not agree to give any categorical assurance to Nepal. If he does agree, he will have to consider ways and means of increasing our defence potential, which is already too low and inadequate even to meet the aggressive designs of Pakistan.

If Nepal goes to the American bloc, it will greatly influence India's foreign policy. In fact it needs some reorientation. Pandit Nehru may not like to do anything that may displease communist China, but her attitude will depend not on what Panditji does but on what suits her. A booklet published by the UAR Information Department aptly writes : Nehru and Nasser led the Bandung movement many years ago. Then Communist newspapers were praising Nehru as a man of peace. Now Moscow imagines that he has lost his utility.....

"Thus the idea of planting a Communist base in India has emerged and local communists are being provided with money to spread propaganda against Nehru".

Because of this scheme Peking does not seem to be so particular in avoiding points of conflict with India. In spite of the fact that Pandit Nehru has adopted a very lukewarm attitude on the Tibetan issue, Peking continues to accuse India of complicity in the matter. Dalai Lama's statement, according to Chinese News Agency, is said to have been prepared by some Indian official of the External Affairs Ministry. They have not withdrawn the allegation that Kalimpong is the seat of the rebellion. Even a veiled threat of raising the issue of Kashmir and Nagaland has been held out by the Chinese. This shows that China is out for trouble. Pandit Nehru's wishes will not avert it.

A strong and definite stand on the issue of Tibetan autonomy alone can set China right. Such a stand is necessary to preserve friendship between the two countries. Friendship must be based on trust and respect, equality and mutual benefit, and not on fear and misunderstanding arising out of a hesitation to look differences in the eye and seek an open reconciliation.

The Dalai Lama, therefore, should have all the facilities to direct his people in their fight for independence. The people of India wish it. The interests of India demand it. If Pandit Nehru fails to follow this policy, he will cut himself asunder from the current of the national feelings and sentiment in this regard. It is admitted that this policy will mean certain risks. But we have to bear them. If we hesitate we may have to take greater risks in future, involving fundamental changes in our policies.

(April 27, 1959)

## Some Thoughts on Election Law

In its report on the Third General Elections the Election Commission has made a number of recommendations for amending the election law of the country. The Government has already accepted the recommendation suggesting abolition of Election Tribunals. If there is any election petition, it should be presented to the High Court of the State and should be tried by a permanent judge. This proposal might reduce the time that is now taken for the disposal of the petition, but will increase the expenses of both the petitioner and the defendant. Considering the heavy work and arrears in the disposal of cases in the High Courts, it is doubtful also if the petitions would be decided earlier.

The Government has yet to consider other recommendations. In making these recommendations the Commission is guided by two basic considerations—to make elections cheaper and fairer, and secondly to reduce the number of parties so as to ultimately evolve a two-party system. So far as the first objective is concerned, there can be no two opinions. The second purpose, however, is not to be achieved through any manipulation of election law. Let the elections truly represent the people. If the electorate votes more parties than two it is better to adapt the parliamentary system to such a multi-party polity rather than to distort election results by Procrustean ways.

The suggestion about increasing the security deposit of candidates from Rs. 500 to Rs. 1500 in the case of elections to the Lok Sabha, and from Rs. 250 to Rs. 750 for a Legislative Assembly candidate, has been made in order to reduce the number of contesting candidates. This is not fair. It amounts to scaring poorer people

out of elections. The number of candidates cannot be reduced by these artificial means. With the consolidation of political parties this number will automatically come down. Even now where any of the non-Congress parties has emerged stronger, there are fewer multi-cornered contests.

Some proposals have been made with a view to reduce election expenses. The total period for the election campaign is to be reduced to fifteen days. This can certainly lead to some reduction in expenditure. It is also proposed that the number of motor vehicles to be used by a candidate should be limited to three in an Assembly constituency and six in a parliamentary constituency. Such a blanket provision may create difficulties in areas where adequate transport facilities are non-existent. In sparsely populated areas too this ban might impede proper approach. Further, in the case of people with means, who already own vehicles, it might be difficult to enforce this provision.

There is a proposal to prohibit processions, demonstrations and display of large-sized streamers and banners. The use of peripatetic loudspeakers on highway is also sought to be banned. These proposals will reduce expenditure and also bring sobriety to electioneering. This can be accepted.

It is also suggested that the use of conveyance for transporting voters be made a cognizable offence. I do not think this is likely to make any difference in the situation. This is a widely prevalent corrupt practice. The reform suggested will lead to pinpricks or harassment by police officers, but police force will not be adequate to enforce this provision. Instead, the number of polling stations should be increased so that no polling centre is more than a mile from any village. The idea of mobile polling stations can also be considered.

Besides some of the amendments on the basis of these suggestions, it is necessary that some satisfactory method is adopted for



the allotment of symbols to different political parties. The Election Commission has been making changes in this respect from time to time. The present position is far from satisfactory. Barring the Congress which is recognised throughout the country, except in Goa, every other party feels handicapped. The method needs to be changed.

According to the present procedure, parties have been recognised on a state basis. No party is recognised on an all India basis. A party which had secured four percent of the valid votes cast in the 1962 Elections in a State has been recognised in that state. In calculating the percentage, votes of those candidates who forfeited their security deposits have not been counted. A symbol is reserved for the party only if it happens to be a recognised party. If it is not a recognised party, its candidates are to be treated as independent candidates and will be allotted a symbol out of a list of the free symbols, which do not include the symbol of the party. Thus, party-symbols are restricted to States where those parties are recognised. There will be no 'deepa' symbol in Madras or Mysore and no 'pair of bullocks' in Goa!

This is altogether a new system. It is different from that in vogue in the preceding three general elections. It has not only deprived political parties of their symbols but has created other difficulties as well.

In some of the by-elections in the States in which Jana Sangh is not a recognised party, its candidates could not get the 'deepa' symbol. This fact was exploited by other candidates. They propagated that those candidates were not Jana Sangh candidates. Had they been BJS candidates, they would have got the Jana Sangh symbol 'deepa'—so they propagated. As Jana Sangh had fought all the three general elections with this symbol it is widely known even in areas where it could not get enough electoral support. Depriving Jana Sangh, or for that matter any other party, of its particular sym-

bol amounts to an undoing of the groundwork that it has done during the last general elections.

Reservation of symbols on the basis of the results of the last election does not take into consideration changes that have taken place due to the activities of the party in the course of the last four years. So far as the Communists, PSP, SP and Swatantra Parties are concerned there have been all sorts of mergers and divisions. The Commission has taken note of these and has been from time to time revising the list of reserved symbols for these parties. It is true that the Bharatiya Jana Sangh has not undergone any such change, but it has greatly extended and strengthened its organisation in States where it could not get recognition last time. Before the Third General Elections, the Commission had taken note of the changed situation and duly provided for the Swatantra Party which was then a newcomer. If this increase in work, and the number of candidates that the Jana Sangh intends to set up during the next general elections are taken into consideration, Jana Sangh would easily get recognition in several more States.

Similar claims can be put forward by other parties. It might thus entail constant revision of the list of reserved symbols. To avoid this difficulty we would suggest that the system adopted for the Third General Elections be continued. Besides reservation of the symbols, a recognised party also gets free copies of the voters' list. So far as the second privilege is concerned, it could be limited to only those parties that are recognised. But the reservation of the symbol should be related to the plans of the party in the ensuing elections rather than to its performance at the last elections. The older system was satisfactory and did not discriminate against any party. The Commission in its report on the Third General Elections in India, Volume I, writes on page 30 :

"According to the former rules governing the allotment of reserved and free symbols, a symbol reserved for a party only in



one or two States was not available in any other State for any candidate even as a free symbol. Some of the recognised parties which claimed to function also in a number of other States in which they were not recognised objected to this restriction on the ground that they would be greatly handicapped in these States by not having their symbol for electioneering purposes. This appeared to be a legitimate grievance, and the Commission felt it was desirable that the party symbol should be made available to its candidates also in these other States provided the Commission felt it was desirable that the party would be setting up a sizable number of candidates."

It is surprising that the Commission reverted to rules which are even more regressive than those against which it felt that the grievances of the parties were legitimate.

In order to remove the grievances of the parties, the Commission had included party symbols in the list of free symbols and had notified following rules for the allotment of these symbols :

1. If the party sets up a candidate in the constituency (whether parliamentary or assembly) he should be allotted the party symbol in preference to all other candidates.
2. If the party sets up a candidate in a parliamentary constituency, the symbol should not be allotted to any candidate in any of the assembly constituencies comprised within that parliamentary constituency unless that candidate also belonged to the same party.
3. If the party sets up a candidate in an assembly constituency, the symbol should not be allotted to any candidate in the parliamentary constituency unless that candidate also belonged to the same party.

The procedure was prescribed to ensure allotment of the party symbol to the candidates of the party on the one hand and on the other to keep these symbols free for independent candidates where no party candidate was set up. However, according to the report of

the Commission, "Quite a few independent candidates did not like any party symbol being allotted to them. Evidently no useful purpose was served by including the party symbols in the list of free symbols. It is, therefore, necessary that a simple procedure be adopted with regard to the party symbols and that they should be reserved symbols throughout the country.

Presently there are only seven parties, viz. Indian National Congress, Communist Party of India (Right) and Communist Party (Marxist), Praja Socialist Party, Swatantra Party, Samyukta Socialist Party and Bharatiya Jana Sangh, which can claim an all India character. Their symbols should be reserved in all the States. So far as other parties are concerned they are confined to particular States. If, however, any one of them claims a sizable number of candidates in any other State the Commission can make appropriate provisions.

(April 10, 1966)

## Code of Conduct for Parties

To meet the long felt need of evolving a code of conduct for the political parties in India a number of conferences have so far been arranged. Some tentative decisions have been taken at these meetings. From the reports of deliberations it appears that the scope and nature of the code yet remains to be defined. There is no obligation, except the moral, to adhere to the various decisions being taken. However, if the people are properly educated, they can definitely exert an influence on the political parties and thus help minimise chances of deliberate violations of the code.

On Congress rests the main responsibility of setting an example before the people and other political parties, because it is not only the oldest but the largest party today and happens to be in power. Unfortunately, the political conduct of Congressmen in recent times is not at all worthy of emulation. Parties formed out of defection from the Congress also suffer from the same malaise especially because those who leave Congress seldom do so on ideological grounds. It is, therefore, necessary for the non-Congress parties to make a conscious effort to build up a code which will be healthy, and lead to better organisation of political democracy in the country. They may be required to undo much that Congress and Congressmen have done. Some of the decisions taken at these meetings are intended to benefit only the Congress and its members, for example, about not giving a ticket to one who had been refused a ticket by one party, or confining one's attacks to policy matters alone, eschewing references to personal and private lapses. However, it is worthwhile to oblige the Congress in these matters because, if it is thereby enabled to set its own house in order, the

outcome will have a wholesome effect on the general political health of the nation as well.

From petitions to mass *satyagrahas*, from *dharnas* to coercive fasts—all these have become the order of the day. Often, there is talk even of a plebiscite or a referendum. Some people, especially the communists, do not rule out even violent methods.

There is need also of evolving a code of behaviour by the political parties with regard to the means that they would follow for influencing the decisions of the Government. Our political and public life today is an extension of the freedom struggle. Therefore, people generally consider it legitimate to take recourse to all those means which we employed against the alien rulers. The administration too has not shown any remarkable change in its outlook towards the people agitating for redressal of their grievances. Governments readily and unhesitatingly deploy all the forces at their command to crush any agitation that the people may launch. And it is only after their failure to subdue the people, that Government thinks of listening to their demands. Thus every agitation leads to a situation where the Government's position is compromised. There being a party-Government, party-interests also come up and thus even in cases when the people get their demands accepted by the Government, it is without grace. A trail of bitterness is left behind. Thus, to the people the Government growingly becomes symbolised as a satan, to be dreaded. The rift between the two is widening. This is not a happy situation.

Let the Government and all the political parties which believe in democracy come to an agreed code in regard to the expression of the people's views about particular issues. The Government should become more responsive to resolutions and petitions. It does little credit to the democratic sense of Government when it throws more than two crores of signatures demanding a ban on cow-slaughter into the waste paper basket, but yields to a *satyagraha* on the same

issue. Whatever the Prime Minister might say, there is a general feeling that the creation of the Andhra Pradesh was the direct result of the fast of Potti Shri Ramulu and the acts of widespread sabotage and violence that followed in the wake of his death. This feeling has to be removed. The Prime Minister seems to be doing so now by adopting a stiff attitude towards the fasting Akali leader. If Master Tara Singh dies, it will be at a very great cost that the Government would be eradicating this feeling of the people. Let something positive be done, so that occasions for such fasts or Satyagrahas may not arise. Let us all decide what issues can be agitated for in between the two elections.

Only minor issues should be pressed on the Government and the major ones should be left to the verdict of the people during a general poll. It would be undemocratic to insist on a major change in Government policy by any other means except a change of Government in an election.

(September 4, 1961)

## Congress and Democracy

We have adopted a parliamentary form of democracy. Under the Constitution two general elections have been held and the third one is in the offing. But merely the creation of a Parliament and/or the fact of its being an elected body do not mean the existence of a parliamentary democracy. These are but the outward forms, which lose all significance if the inner attitude needed for the successful working of democracy is lacking in those who offer themselves as candidates and are chosen as their representatives. It is true that the electorate in the country, the largest in the world, evinced keen interest and took enthusiastic part in the elections. The whole thing was peaceful too. But that should not mean that democracy is safe in India. It only shows that the people are basically democratic and peace-loving.

But even more than the people, it is the faith of those who enjoy power, and those who intend to capture power, that will smoothen the progress of democracy in the country and fashion the present institutions into effective instruments of translating the people's will. We are prone to take it for granted that such a faith exists. But the assumption may not be correct and it would be better if the political situation is properly assessed and analysed so that we are not caught unawares. We must not fail to take proper remedial measures for the preservation and protection of our democratic rights.

The interregnum between the ushering in of independence and the promulgation of the Constitution may be left out as an extraordinary period when problems arising out of partition, transfer of power and integration of the States required special measures. But



the manner in which the party in power has behaved thereafter needs examination and one is constrained to observe that they have not given any demonstrable proof of their faith in democracy. On the contrary, events point in the opposite direction.

That a parliamentarian of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherji's stature should have died in detention in mysterious circumstances, and that the whole matter should have gone unenquired, was a glaring instance which created grave apprehensions about the future of parliamentary democracy in the country. The parliamentary system is government by discussion, and those in authority must always be prepared to consider and concede the opponent's point. Dr. Mookherji with his ardent faith in this system repeatedly pleaded for a meeting with the Prime Minister to discuss the issues arising out of the Praja Parishad's satyagraha. But the Prime Minister refused to meet and discuss the Kashmir question with one who was virtually the leader of the Opposition. The ignorant may be silenced with the plea that the action of the Prime Minister was supported by the majority in the Parliament, but it has to be remembered that in a parliamentary system the majority party only forms the government. The country is ruled not by the Government but by the Parliament. It is in this way that the Opposition too contributes to the successful discharge of responsibilities by the Parliament. But for this fact, there would be hardly any distinction between treason and opposition.

It is said that when once a visiting sovereign of a West Asian country was introduced to the Leader of the Opposition in the British Parliament and was told that he was paid from the treasury, the visitor was intrigued. He could not understand how a man who opposed the Government could be maintained by the Public Exchequer. "We would prefer to shoot such a man", he exclaimed. But His Majesty's Government in UK has a His Majesty's Opposition also. The Government does not merely tolerate the Opposition, it

trusts it. In India, it would seem, the party in power would tolerate the Opposition only so long as it is not a threat to its power. It does not trust it.

Democracy requires a high order of non-attachment (*nirasakti*) with power. Like Lord Rama, the politician in democracy should always be prepared to accept power if called upon, and also to relinquish it without feeling in the least the great loss it might involve. Like a sportsman he should fight for a victory but be prepared for a defeat. If he cannot take defeat with good grace and congratulate his opponent, he is not a democrat. It is in this spirit that Churchill could hand over power to Attlee and Attlee to Eden. But what do we witness in India?

Here, of course, a situation has not yet arisen when overall power is transferred from the hands of Congress to any other party as a result of the people's verdict. However, in some provinces the Congress Ministries have been ousted, and the Congress has suffered defeat in some of the prestigious bye-elections. Reactions shown by the Congress leaders—and by the Prime Minister—have not been very happy. Thus, the manner in which they have behaved after the defeat of the Congress candidates in the New Delhi Lok Sabha and Kamala Nagar (Delhi) Corporation bye-elections clearly shows that they have lost their balance and the real undemocratic attitude of their minds has revealed itself. This talk of banning Jana Sangh under one plea or another shows what regard the Congress leaders have for democracy and fundamental rights. It is true that such a ban is not possible because it will worsen the position of Congress and so its chances of success, but that such an idea should occur to them is itself a heresy in democracy. What is the difference between General Ayub banning all political parties and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru allowing parties only of his choice to exist? In a democracy this choice lies with the people, not with the rulers. If rulers begin to exercise this power, there will be dictatorship and not democracy.



Everybody can pose to be a democrat so long as he is supported by the people, but it requires deep faith to continue to be so even when you are defeated. The Congressman is a faithful Congressman if he gets the Congress ticket or is otherwise accommodated in this vast enterprise of sharing power. But in case he is refused the party ticket, his loyalty and admiration for the great (!) organisation evaporates within a second. The Congress leaders can bow before the people's verdict, if it is in their favour. But the moment people change their verdict, there are a host of invectives reserved for them and their chosen representatives and all measures are considered fair to compel the people to bow to the Congress. They do not want a people's Government but a people faithfully following, and every time voting, for a Congress Government.

In their present mood Congressmen pose a great danger to democracy. There is hardly any exception. Even Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who had all along been considered a democrat cannot escape the charge. In fact, it is his utterances, his thinking, that have set the Congress moving in that undemocratic direction. It is necessary that all lovers of democracy give serious thought to this problem and act effectively and decisively before the emergence of a Castro in India.

(July 10, 1961)

## Democracy and Political Parties

By and large people in India desire a democratic way of life. But of late, due to the failure, or suppression, of democratic Governments in a number of Asian countries, many people in India have become apprehensive about the future of democracy in this country. The deteriorating economic and political conditions have also made people doubtful about the efficacy of democracy to face the critical situation successfully. While there are many who only 'pine for what is not' and thoughtlessly wish for alternative forms of Government, there are others who with their firm faith in democracy consider the prevalent democratic structure in India only a base imitation of the outward forms of the British parliamentary democracy. They want that the constitutional and political set-up should be differently constituted if the goal of true democracy is to be achieved.

The question of forms and formalities may be important but there are certain essentials which have to be guaranteed before any democratic system can hope to succeed. Vice President Dr. Radhakrishnan has rightly drawn attention to these essential prerequisites in the speech he delivered while performing the opening ceremony of the new Orissa Legislature building. Disciplined parties and devoted and patriotic leadership he said, were the *sine qua non* of a successful parliamentary democracy in any country. He also considered a free press, an independent judiciary, and a clean and efficient administration necessary for making democracy a success.

However, since in a democratic government ultimate power rests with the elected representatives, they count more than any-

thing else. For unless the people are determined and prepared for an open rebellion, the press, the judiciary, and the administration, can be by dubious ways coerced to conform to the wishes of the party in power. Directly and indirectly the press can be gagged, the judiciary weakened by amending legislation to nullify judicial pronouncements, and the administration corrupted by the corrupt leaders at the top. The first thing, therefore, is to turn our attention to the political parties if we want to mend our affairs.

There is much to be desired so far as the political parties in India are concerned. The worst offender in this case is the ruling party, but the conduct of many others is no better. The political parties are today organised not on any ideological basis but on personal or group basis. Dr. Radhakrishnan in this regard says: "Politics is after all a means to an end; it devises arrangements by which social and economic justice is secured for all. No democracy will be worth the name if it confines its activities only to enabling the elected representatives to squabble for power and jockey for positions and leaves the purposes of the state to be fulfilled by fits and starts." Today politics has ceased to be a means. It has become an end in itself. We have today people who are engaged in power politics rather than aim at political power with a view to achieving certain social and national objectives. It is because of this that the different political parties, instead of organising the people and creating order out of disorder, are only adding to the prevailing chaos. Their sole aim is to add to their numbers without caring for the views of those who come to them.

Let the different political parties try to evolve a philosophy for themselves. Let them not be mere conglomerations of persons joined together for some selfish ends. It should be something different from a commercial undertaking or a joint stock company. It is also necessary that the philosophy of the party is not kept confined to the pages of the party manifesto. Members should understand it and devote themselves to translating it into action.

But every and any ideology will not make a party a fit vehicle for ushering in a democratic era. The ideology must not go counter to the spirit and ideals of democracy itself. In fact, in many a country democracy has suffered much at the hands of those who have used democracy only to subvert it. The communists have an ideology and claim to follow democratic means—only to ultimately put an end to democracy. "Democracy", to quote Dr. Radhakrishnan again, "has for its basic principle the dignity and freedom of the individual. The free spirit of man is responsible for all progress in human history. Any system which tends to destroy the individual is undemocratic. The techniques of democratic way of life are discussion, persuasion, compromise, give and take." Therefore, any ideology which is rigid and does not believe in human dignity and freedom will not suit a democratic set-up. Such parties should either adapt their ideologies to democratic conditions, or stop paying lip service to democracy.

The question of discipline in the ranks of a party is important not only to keep the party in perfect health but also because of its bearing on the conduct of the people in general. A Government is primarily an instrument of conservation and protection and not of destruction, or change. To inculcate a reverence for law in the people demands that the parties who aspire to be guardians of law should themselves set an example in this direction. The essence of democracy is a spirit of, and capacity for, self-governance. If the parties cannot govern themselves how can they hope to create in the community a desire for self-governance? While on the one hand it is essential for the community to guarantee and protect individual freedom it is desirable, on the other hand, for the individual to willingly submit to the general will. The greater this submission, the lesser will be the coercive power of the State. In a party, whose affairs are regulated not by any state law but by the decisions voluntarily accepted by the party units, one can set an example of how best individual freedom and social responsibility can

be balanced. It is, therefore, necessary for the parties to prescribe a code of conduct for their members and to strictly follow it.

It is but natural in a democracy that there should be more than one party. These parties should follow some sort of *panch-sheel*, if they want to develop healthy conventions. Defections from a party on ideological grounds can be justified. But the parties should not encourage defections on other grounds. In a situation when no party emerges in an absolute majority, or the margin is very narrow, power-hungry politicians are likely to use unfair means to win over support from other parties. It is necessary that we evolve and adopt conventions somewhat different from the two-party parliamentary system of Great Britain. That alone will give to the country a stable government and also keep the parties from becoming an arena of unscrupulous politicians.

There are many such matters that need consideration. Will the parties that have faith in democracy realize their responsibility? Let them not, in their anxiety and hurry to capture power, destroy the very foundations on which they stand.

(February 27, 1961)

## Legislative Wing versus Party Wing

Dr. Sampurnanand, Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, has announced his decision to resign his office and also to retire from public life. This comes as a sequel to a long period of group wranglings between the ministerialists and the dissidents or the State Congressites. He has been advised by Pandit Nehru to leave the office for that might pave the way for unity in the Congress ranks. But Pandit Nehru's diagnosis of the disease, and the remedy suggested, are, as usual, not correct. On the morning of November 29, when the election of the new leader was scheduled to take place, Shri C.B. Gupta, in spite of wide publicity having been given to the fact that his name had been sponsored by Pandit Nehru, could not get unanimous support of the legislators. Some feel that if on an express communication from the Centre the election had not been postponed, he would not have carried the day. It remains to be seen whether the Congress High Command imposes its nominee on the legislators or they are left free to elect their own leader.

Though, as usual, the struggle is more of a personal nature, yet principles have been dragged into the arena by each group to disguise their base lust for power. While Shri Sampurnanand and his supporters held that the legislative wing should be free, and responsible only to the Legislature and the people, the dissidents insist that the party outside the Legislature should control those in office. This is an old controversy and it may be difficult to make any rigid demarcation of the spheres of the two.

The two are not mutually exclusive and as things have proceeded, the government and the party are getting more and more



identified. In the present case there is an element of self-contradiction in the stands of both Dr. Sampurnanand and Shri C.B. Gupta. When party elections were being held, Dr. Sampurnanand had announced that if his group suffered a defeat it would amount to a vote of no-confidence in his ministry and that he would resign. Obviously, he wanted a vote of confidence not from the Legislature but from his party. He had subordinated the legislative wing to the party wing. If the ministerialists had won the State Congress elections, they could have eaten the cake and had it too. They would have controlled both, and therefore no sacrifice or quitting of office was involved in propounding the high philosophy of the supremacy of the party. But the calculations went wrong. The State Congress was captured by the dissidents. It has therefore become necessary to ardently espouse the cause of the legislative wing as the representatives of the electorate and not of a section of the people. Having conceded to the party the first say in the matter, they should obey it.

When Shri C.B. Gupta maintains that the party should guide and control the legislative wing, he assigns to the party the role of king-maker. This role may not in practice be played by the present Congress anywhere, but it was definitely played in the earlier days, and very effectively too. The ministries were made and unmade by the Congress High Command. But the situation has since undergone a great change. The Congress no longer has any power to control the Government. The question of the relative position of the two wings was long resolved when Acharya Kripalani resigned his Presidentship of the Congress in protest against the Nehru Government and when Rajarshi Purushottam Das Tandon was forced to relinquish the same. The Congress no more controls the Government, rather, it is the Government that controls the Congress. There is no Congress Government, but only a Government Congress. The Congress President always plays a second fiddle to the Prime Minister.

But what is true at the all India level may not always be true at the State level. Here Shri C.B. Gupta wants the ministry to follow the State Congress. However, the cat was out of the bag when Shri Gupta himself came forward as a candidate for Chief Ministership. Evidently he is no longer satisfied with the role of a king-maker, but himself wants to become king. Having failed to enter through the front door, he wants to get into that office through the back door. This is certainly not the way to resolve the crisis; it would only deepen it. The U.P. example may be followed in other States also. The ministry and the Congress are manned by rival groups in most States. It is one thing to make the legislative wing subservient to the party, and quite another to make the party-leader the leader of the Legislature. If this is done, there will be party-dictatorship in the country.

The question of the relative importance of the two wings is a practical one, and cannot be solved by any doctrinaire approach. Theoretically, in a democracy, the people's wishes are supreme and their representatives should not be subjected to any control except that of their own conscience, the public opinion and the Constitution. But, in practice, in a party form of democracy, it is on the basis of the party-support that a candidate is elected. More often the people support a party, rather than party-individuals. The individual too, of his own free will, accepts the discipline of the party. He cannot, therefore, bring in the name of the people only when he finds it inconvenient to follow the dictates of the party. Especially in a system where there is no provision for recall, the party alone can regulate the behaviour of the legislator after his election. The people are helpless—till the next elections.

However, it is necessary for a party to have grass roots—if it wants to exercise its authority in people's interests. In the present case the people are nowhere in the picture. In fact they are made to suffer because of the faction fighting of those who claim to repre-



sent the people. The Prime Minister, while speaking at Bhopal a fortnight back, had, in his mood of despair and disgust, advised dissolution of the Congress. If the crisis cannot be resolved, the party must be dissolved—was his dictum. But any step with that defeatist approach, and in a mood of despondency, will not help the country. In fact Congressmen are not going to sign a decree of dissolution, but the way they are behaving, they are paving the way for decline and decay. Let those who have faith in democracy realize their responsibility and, instead of allowing the vacuum to be filled by worthless people, come forward to discharge their obligations to the people.

(December 5, 1960)

## Your Vote (1)

### Who Is a Suitable Candidate?

The programme for the next General Elections, as announced early by the Election Commission, has been confirmed by the Government. Whatever the astrologers might predict, the people and the political parties have to be serious and business-like in preparing to meet this great democratic challenge. Parties have finalised their list of candidates. While some of the older parties, notably the Congress, experienced much difficulty in seeking an agreeable formula to satisfy the conflicting claims of factions and communal groups, the newer parties have had to make hectic efforts to find out 'suitable' candidates, to contest the elections on their symbol. A 'suitable' candidate is a term which is better understood than defined. However, for a correct appraisal of the political health of the country and the parties, it would be desirable to discuss some of the salient qualities of such a candidate.

A suitable candidate to a man of commonsense should be one who can represent the party's views in the legislature, who has been nursing his constituency and can claim to air the feelings of its people. As an individual he should be devoted to the people and as a member of the party he seeks to represent, he should be disciplined and dedicated to its cause. If he has any other qualifications they may add to his stature, but they cannot be substituted for these basic ingredients of suitability.

But in India hardly any political party worries about these things. Their only consideration is that he should be able to win. Like race-goers they have no love for a particular horse. They will bet on one which has brighter chances of winning. But they forget

that in politics their association with the winner does not end after the play. They have to carry the burden all through and it is through his medium that the party will be required to act in the legislatures and in the constituency.

Most of the political parties today have no grass-roots. The Congress which one day was a mass party in real terms has now ceased to have any hold on the masses. The newer parties have yet to work hard to endear themselves to the masses. Under these circumstances appeals other than those of the party have to be made. It is for this reason that the ex-rulers are being wooed by every party. Even ministers have hesitated to appose if any member of the ruling family is in the fray. And if they choose to go with the Congress, all other opposition candidates consider their chances of victory bleak.

Even granting that the ex-rulers have the citizen's right to participate in the elections, it must be admitted that the present state of affairs is not happy. The situation cannot be mended by ex-rulers but by the people and by the various political parties. The ex-princely order must definitely be encouraged to take part in politics, but a ticket in the elections should not go to them by birth but by merit. People should also realise that a vote is not an instrument of expressing gratefulness to any candidate but a mandate to carry out their wishes.

Caste and communal considerations also play a great part in the selection of candidates. Congress is the worst sinner in this respect, but other parties also cannot escape the odium. This also is due to lack of a sound and solid organisation. It is no use abusing casteism. Those who do so indirectly help it. Everybody in India belongs to some caste or community. By accusing the other party of indulging in casteism or communalism, you throw an indirect hint and make an unconscious and subtle appeal to these sentiments in the rest of the society. Experience of the last elections shows that candidates who tried to arouse caste feeling invited the antagonism and the united opposition of the rest, and thus lost badly. But still that consideration weighs heavily with political parties. If other

basic qualifications are there, I would not mind to what caste the candidate belongs. He cannot be a casteless human being - at least not in India. But if the situation develops to such an extent that even Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia had to forego his candidature only because he did not belong to the caste that numerically predominated in the constituency (this happened in a U.P. bye-election, sometime back), it betokens a serious malady. The way out is to strengthen the party organisation, rather than accentuate appeal to caste considerations as the socialist doctor is trying to do by his promise of reserving sixty per cent seats for backward castes and classes.

Financial viability is another big factor that influences the choice of candidates. A number of people are given tickets for no other qualifications than their capacity to spend money. These people come in the field at election time and then hibernate for five years in the crowded bustees of Calcutta and Bombay. They do not come to the people to solicit their votes but to purchase them. They do not apply or qualify for the party ticket but purchase it. For them no price is too high. All that they want is to grease their way to the Parliament. For them it is a business deal. The parties, including the Congress, are so tight of finances that they are only too willing to oblige these aspirants for power and fame. The Congress has been reported to have struck a deal with some of the industrialists in Calcutta to give them some Parliamentary seats if they promise to foot the election bill of the Assembly candidates. The Swatantra Party is commonly charged as being a party of Dalal Street. The financial stringency with the parties is so great that the Ganatantra Parishad has, just on that account, decided to merge with the Swatantra Party.

All these are factors that are likely to give a wrong direction to the politics of the country. If steps are not taken to mend them, powerful lobbies will emerge in the country's legislatures and political decisions will hardly be taken in an objective manner taking into consideration only the welfare of the people and fur-

therance of national interests. The parties that want to develop into major parties should be careful not to sacrifice principles for quick gains. People too have a duty, and if they exercise their franchise in a judicious and intelligent manner, they can also correct the distorted viewpoint of the political parties.

- The voter should not complain; he should command. He should not desire; he must demand. He should not grumble and grudge; but should assess and assert. The voter should see that he votes for a principle and not for a party, that he votes for a party and not for a personality, that he votes for a person and not for the purse.
- Let him consider the cause and not the caste; go with the worthy rather than with the winner. Choose the right man and see that the man you choose wins; that will be your victory. If you simply go as a camp follower of the man who has created an impression that he will win, you have already lost, whatever the result of the election be.
- Vote is a matter of conscience. Do not sell it. Do not destroy it. When you vote take a momentous decision, please do not take it just on the spur of the moment.
- Vote is an individual right to be exercised socially. It symbolises your freedom; use it freely. If you are a democrat do not be dictated by anybody but your conscience. Political parties that stand for the people also stand on the strength of the people. If the people want that nobody should bend them the people should lend them their strength. It is the people who are the architects of political parties, and through them of their political destiny.

Let them succeed in the great test they are faced with.

(December 4, 1961)

## Your Vote (2)

### Candidate, Party and Ideology All Count

Now that all the double member constituencies have been bifurcated, you have only one vote each for the Lok Sabha and the Vidhan Sabha. You have to select one out of the so many in the field. It is a single act, through which you cannot satisfy competing claims and conflicting preferences. The ultimate decision depends on a careful and correct assessment of a number of factors. The candidate, the party, and its ideology—all have to be considered. A bad candidate cannot claim a premium just because the party he belongs to is good. An evil is an evil and, like the proverbial ill-wind, cannot blow good to any one any where. The party High Command in giving a ticket to such a man might have acted on a partisan basis or, with the best of intentions, it might have committed an error of judgment. It is the duty of a responsible electorate to rectify such a mistake.

There was a time when people would vote for a lamp-post just because it bore the Congress symbol. In the first general elections such stalwarts as Acharya Narendra Deva and Acharya Kripalani were defeated by Congress nominees who bore no comparison with them. The lamp-post era is over. But there is the likelihood of the pendulum swinging to the other extreme. A gentleman recently remarked that he would prefer to vote for a milestone but not for a Congress candidate. Whether you choose the 'lamp-post' because of your faith in the Congress, or the 'milestone' because of your intense disgust with the Congress, you are equally wrong. It denotes a diseased and perverse state of mind.



The Congress President is reported to have said not long back that the worst in the Congress was better than the best in the Opposition. It reminded me of Maulana Shaukat Ali who said that the lowest amongst the Muslims was, to him, better than even Mahatma Gandhi. Nobody can endorse these sentiments. The voter who votes out of reaction belongs to the same category. He allows his judgment to be clouded by morbid reaction.

Do not choose either the 'milestone' or the 'lamp-post'. They cannot represent you. If they are in the House it will be a reflection on your capacity to discern and decide. So elect your own representative.

You want a good man. But a good man in a bad party will not prove effective. The most valiant will not succeed with a broken or blunt weapon. The example of Rajarshi Purushottam Das Tandan is enough to illustrate my point.

But which is a good party? Evidently the one that is not simply a collection of individuals but is a body corporate with a distinctive purposeful existence different from its desire to capture power. Political power should be a means rather than an end to the members of such a party. There should be devotion to a cause in the rank and file of the party. Devotion leads to dedication and discipline. Discipline does not mean simply outward conformity to certain do's and don'ts. The more you impose discipline from above the less is the internal strength of a party. Discipline is to a party what Dharma is to a society.

If there is a devotion and discipline, there will not be any groups and factions in the party. When party interests are subordinated to self-interest, factionalism begins. It is a social manifestation of an egoistic and perverse mind. A faction-ridden party becomes ineffective and loses all capacity for doing good.

The third quality of a good party is that it should be wedded to certain ideals and all its policies should be framed with a view to

realising these ideals. It is true that the very practical act of administration cannot be fitted into a set of formulae framed on a theoretical analysis of situation. But expediency and opportunism should not pass for realism. Realism is a virtue of the idealist, the principled man, the missionary; it is not a characteristic of the man with an easy conscience, the opportunist and the apostate. Political parties and leaders by their behaviour determine the values of political life. They set the norms. Naturally their policies should in no case violate these norms of public behaviour. Democracy is not simply elections. It requires a well organised people, well built parties and well established conventions of political behaviour.

A good party with a set of good candidates must also have a good, realistic programme. It is after all the programme that will require to be implemented. Good people with a bad programme or an impracticable programme will not help alleviate the sufferings of the people. On the contrary they will create more difficulties.

These three things have to be considered in an integrated manner. It may be difficult to get an ideal in every respect. But an optimum combination of the three can be found out. Well intentioned people, guided by altruistic motives, and disciplined, can to a great extent make up the deficiency of a programme if it is not based on principles that are wholly unacceptable. If the party is moving in the wrong direction, no amount of goodness and efficiency will improve matters. The direction having been decided, the pace can be speeded up only by correct and efficient handling of matters.

So far as candidates are concerned it is not possible to discuss individual cases. The voter knows them better. Coming to parties, it is true that most of the political parties in India do not conform to the definition of a party. The Congress is the biggest and the largest party, but it has no binding force except power. It has more do's and don'ts than any other party, but its members have no sense of discipline, no urge willingly to submit. In an artificial manner,



however, it has so far maintained enough discipline. But there are signs that this forced discipline will no longer remain effective.

It is needless to refer to groupism in the Congress. The two bullocks invariably symbolise the two groups at every level. That even at the centre, decision with regard to the deputy leader of the party could not be taken betokens a serious malady.

There are parties which have been formed by ex-Congressmen and which depend mainly on recruitment from Congress ranks. They constitute the bulk of disgruntled and dissatisfied elements. For them questions of discipline do not arise.

The Communist party is definitely a party. But for its ideology, it would have been quite ineffective one. With its extra-territorial character, however, a party so well organised becomes all the more dangerous to the nation. It can not be loved and supported. It has to be exposed and liquidated.

As for Jana Sangh, all that I would like to say is that we have been trying to evolve into a well-knit, disciplined and devoted party. At times we have been criticized for following this course. This has not been liked by those who wanted to develop the Jana Sangh into some sort of haphazard organisation on the PSP pattern. But Jana Sangh has been firm and whatever apparent losses it might have incurred in the short run on this account, on the whole it has maintained the health of the organisation and endeared itself all the more to the people. Firmness and righteousness pay more dividends than trying to rope in all sorts of opportunist elements.

(December 11, 1961)

## Your Vote (3)

### Changers and No-changers

Election alliances develop a sense of negativism in the people. It is not proper. They invariably involve a compromise of principles, and to some extent help the opportunist elements in the country. They should be avoided. Democracy imposes certain limitations with regard to the ultimate realisation of all political activity i.e. to capture power. It discards the use of the bullet but everything cannot be considered fair in the battle of the ballot.

It is also wrong to think that a united front of all the parties is necessary to defeat the Congress. An analysis of the last elections' poll does not lead to this conclusion. In straight contests with the Congress, except in a few notable cases where public sentiment was raised to a high pitch, the non-Congress candidates have been losers on the whole. What we need is not a united front of all the opposition parties but the solid work of one single party to defeat the Congress. If the Congress can win on the basis of a minority vote other parties also can win. In the last elections the Communists defeated the Congress in Kerala without forging any united front.

There may be a need of polarisation and reduction in the number of parties. But polarisation requires a nucleus. So far no party can claim to occupy that position. On an ideological basis the Jana Sangh and the Communists provide the nucleus round which the nationalists and the extra-territorialists have to gather. Organisationally that right is still not conceded by many parties on both sides. The people alone by throwing their weight on the side of

such parties as can serve the basis of a principal organisation of the people can help this process of polarisation. Let them, therefore, not dissipate their energies and votes.

Before dealing with the Election Manifestoes of the various political parties, it will be useful if their ideological basis is analysed in general terms. That alone would enable us to read between the lines and correctly appraise the programmes and promises outlined in the manifestoes. The same words and phrases used by different parties may not mean the same thing. To the common man a zero simply denotes nothingness, but not so to the mathematician. The missing links can also be found out on the basis of the past performance and doctrinaire outlook of the parties, for the election manifestoes of most of the parties miserably lack details.

In the West the political parties are generally termed as 'rightist' or 'leftist'. In India also this terminology is growingly being used to denote the characteristics and aims of different political parties. But this categorisation does not give a correct idea of the politics of India. We say this not only because there are parties here which represent multifarious hues between the extreme right and the extreme left, but because many programmes of these parties defy any classification on this orthodox basis.

The Congress may be termed a leftist party in so far as it stands for a socialist pattern of economy, but the support it extends to and derives from the vested interests lends it a conservative colour. The Jana Sangh may be called rightist because it does not believe in doctrinaire socialism but its programme and cadre definitely make it more radical than some of the so-called radical parties of the country.

If we discard this Western terminology, the political parties in India can be classified on the basis of their source of inspiration. Most of the parties seek to fashion India's politics on some foreign

pattern. Their ideological basis is provided by Western political thinking. The Congress, the Communists, the P.S.P., the Socialists and the Swatantra, all fall in this category.

Whatever differences there be among these parties, they all seek to project foreign politics into the Indian scene. They refuse to think originally or take into consideration the basic thought-values of our nation. The utmost that some of these parties concede is an intergration of Western ideals and Bharatiya culture. They want a Western political picture in the Indian background. In analysing the political situation in India, they readily and unquestioningly accept results of foreign analysts. The communists stand for unadulterated Marxism as developed in Russia.

The Congress, the PSP, and the Socialists are all torn asunder between national loyalties and socialist ideals. They cannot afford to disregard democracy and want somehow to combine the twin philosophies of democracy and socialism. The Swatantra Party is opposed to socialism. It, however, does not know that there can be any better alternative to socialism except the discredited capitalism.

On the other hand there are parties which derive their inspiration from the eternal values of Bharatiya culture and life, and are not prepared blindly to accept Western ways and ideals. The Jana Sangh and the Ram Rajya Parishad fall into this category. Of these two, the Ram Rajya Parishad represents the more orthodox type and is opposed to all sorts of social and economic reforms. The Jana Sangh follows the reformist tradition of Dayanand and Tilak, not only in the social field but also attempts to extend it to economic issues.

Thus we have another classification viz. the 'changers' and the 'no-changers'. The RRP and the Swatantra are no-changers. They would even like to reverse the order of change that has taken place during the last fourteen years. To them institutional arrangements existing today or during the British rule are something to be

preserved. They attach sanctity to them. RRP considers them as part and parcel of Hinduism, while the Swatantraites would justify their existence on grounds of a liberal tradition tending towards conservatism.

Other parties are not satisfied with the existing state of affairs. They felt it disirable that economic and other institutions must change for they neither represent the ideal nor continue to have the vitality that they initially possessed. The socialists desire change in the direction set by their ideological savants in the West. The Jana Sangh wants to do so in a direction to be determined by the principles and goals set for human endeavour by our forefathers. Thus if you want to maintain the status quo, vote for the Swatantra; if you want change imitating the West, choose any of the Socialists; if you want to reform and modernise your national life, in conformity with its age old ideals, back Jana Sangh.

(December 11, 1961)

## Of Jana Sangh Sessions

The twelfth annual session of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh is being held at Vijayawada on January 23 and 24. Wherever I have gone I have found great enthusiasm for this session among Jana Sangh workers and the people alike. It may be noted that there has not been a single session of the party till now, attendance at which did not exceed the expectations of the organisers. One should not feel surprised if the same thing is repeated this time. The organisers would be well to make some stand-by arrangements so that the sudden rush may not create difficulties.

Jana Sangh is a growing party. The people have great hopes from it. Our workers are conscious of their responsibility. Naturally, therefore, at present time of deepening all round crisis in our national life, those who realise their obligations and are not thrown into a depressed mood of cynicism and inertia would be eager to attend the confrence where they could compare notes, discuss the situtation and decide their future course of action. While in our day-to-day working we are engaged mainly with local matters, with solving the little difficulties of the people, which, of course, are not of minor significance, it is only when people from the four corners of the country congregate that things can be viewed from a national persepctive. Here the local and the national view points fuse into one, and there develops an integrated outlook. It is this outlook that is very much lacking in the country today. We have people who are either totally oblivious of the wider world or they want the heavens to move around in an orbit with they themselves as the foci. Then there are people who always think of the big, and the abstract. Like the proverbial astronomer, their eyes are always fixed on the stras above, and they forget to look at the ditch



right in front of them. If such people meet their doom in the sordid pits of life, one should not feel surprised or pained. We have to avoid both these extremes.

That this session is being held in the South is an added cause for the delegates' interest. We had one annual session at Bangalore. But that was more a business session. Not that business is not transacted at other sessions, but a session where the usual forms of propaganda and publicity are not much attended to or desired is generally termed a business session. From that angle the Vijayawada session can be said to have been planned in a big way.

I was in Andhra at the time of the session of the All India Congress Committee. The whole government machinery was geared to making the session a big show. Yet, I am told, they could not take out a procession when the Congress President arrived there. A gentleman, after his return from the Guntur session, said: "We have seen the demonstration of Raj Shakti, now at Vijayawada in the Jana Sangh session, We shall see the manifestation of Jana Shakti."

This will be an assemblage of people and not a get-together of leaders. Naturally, there will be no lavish arrangements for lodging and boarding. There will be no ostentation in the whole layout and, surely, there would not be that awe inspiring distance between the speakers and the audience, the leaders and the people. But there should be more order, more discipline and more of serious discussion. We cannot afford the luxury of big sessions and then dispose off vital questions like the manufacture of the nuclear weapons in a casual and sentimental manner.

There is a widespread impression that Jana Sangh has no foothold in the South. It is true that there are areas in the South where we reached late and where because of some peculiar problems, Jana Sangh has not yet become a force to reckon with. But this is not true for the whole of the South. We have to dispel

this wrong impression of the people. I hope that this session will be able to achieve this purpose. Let people know that the Jana Sangh is an all-India body, that its programme has a national appeal and that its work has developed and is developing grass roots throughout the country.

The draft of the Jana Sangh's 'principles and Policy' is also going to be discussed and adopted at the session of the Bharatiya Pratinidhi Sabha on January 25 and 26. The draft was first circulated at the time of the Gwalior meeting of the Sabha. At that time it was decided that it should be thrown open for public debate. Workers at different levels were required to study and discuss its draft, and forward to the Central Office their views and suggestions. Because of the important nature of the document, views of the people unconnected with the party, but who are leaders of thought and research and have deep faith and interest in Bharatiya Sanskriti, were also sought. The document was well received and views of a considerable section could be had. We are thankful to them all in assisting us to improve the original.

The draft, along with all the views received, was considered by a sub-committee of the Working Committee. The Working Committee too considered and adopted it in its meeting at Patna on Dec. 4, 5 and 6. In its ultimate stage, it is to be placed before the Bharatiya Pratinidhi Sabha for approval and adoption.

During the discussion stage, it is but natural that conflicting, critical and apparently contradictory views are expressed by different members of the organisation. It only shows that we are mentally alert and serious about our resolutions and manifestoes. I remember that an important office bearer of an all-India party once said that their organisation has on record resolutions and manifestoes professing right from completely socialist to free enterprise policies. If we agree to merge our party with theirs, he added, it will not be difficult for his party to adopt any programme.



Well, Jana Sangh members do not take things that lightly. We are in politics not for loaves of office but for a cause. I am, therefore, extremely happy that our members seriously considered the draft and had the courage to say what they felt. The future of an organisation, constituted thus, is bright. Democracy is safe in their hands. Free thinking is assured full scope.

Some papers, particularly of the left, have tried to see dissensions in Jana Sangh ranks on this basis. It is their wishful thinking. Those who are accustomed to methods of brainwashing, and with whom everything except strict conformism is heresy, cannot understand the ways of free minds.

However, we have to be wary lest the Goebellian lies of the left press create any influence on our unconscious minds. We have read the old tale of "Trayanam Dhurtanam" - the three thieves who made the poor Brahmin feel that he was carrying a dog and not a goat. The Vijayawada session will prove a great disappointment to these enemies of the country's solidarity, freedom and democracy. It will reassure the people that the Jana Sangh with its ranks consolidated as ever, will soon emerge as a fitting instrument for the realisation of their dreams.

(January 11, 1965)

## Swatantra-BJS Merger

THE twelfth annual conference of the Punjab Pradesh Jana Sangh was held at Chandigarh on December 26 and 27. The number of delegates who attended the meet, the nature of their deliberations and the manner in which they conducted the various programmes of the conference all made the session a remarkable one.

The presence of some opposition leaders was notable. The United Front of non-communist opposition parties in Punjab has inculcated a sense of fellow-feeling and tolerance among the leadership and, therefore, they do not consider it undesirable to go to meetings organised by other political parties. It may be surprising to many to learn that the Chairman of the Reception Committee at this session was Shri Chiranjivalal, an eminent advocate and leader of the Swatantra Party. And in his speech at the open session, he did not rest content simply by offering a formal welcome, but addressed the audience for more than an hour and surveyed the entire gamut of political events in India and the world. Dr. Baldev Prakash's presidential speech in comparison seemed just an epilogue to the welcome address. Perhaps, this brevity was a concession to the audience who had earlier become restive and wanted a recompense. If the doctor could not have felt the pulse, who else would have?

Sardar Basanta Singh, General Secretary of the Swatantra Party, who spoke at the seminar on planning, dwelt on the need of the coming together of the two parties and hoped that there would soon be unity between the two parties. His remarks were applauded. That the two parties should come together is a general wish. But wishing is not willing.

When recently I was leaving on my trip to the U.S.A. a small party was organised at the Constitution Club, New Delhi, and on

that occasion, the Chariman of the meeting expressed a similar wish. Shri N.G. Ranga, President of the Swatantra Party, referred in his speech to the Chairman's observations and said that it had become a fashion to talk about unity. He added that so long as the causes that differentiated the view points and policies of the two parties existed, unity was not possible. What Shri Ranga said has a great deal of substance. We know that the Swatantra Party was formed in spite of the existence of the Jana Sangh. In the first meeting which, of course, was called for a different purpose, but where the 21-point draft programme of the Swatantra Party was circulated and a proposal to organise such a party was adopted, Shri V. Rajagopalachari and Shri M.A. Venkatarao, at that time Presidents of the Provincial units of Jana Sangha in Madras and Mysore respectively, pleaded with the gathering that there was no need to organise another party because a party that substantially answered to their needs already existed and that they were all welcome to join and strengthen it. However, other leaders present there thought that they must build a home of their own. And that they did.

Since then, the party has developed a characteristic personality of its own. Evidently unity between the two parties can come about now only if the leaders of the Swatantra Party first discuss and decide among themselves if the causes that prompted them to organise separately were valid and still exist. If the answer is in the affirmative, then the reply to all proposals for unity must necessarily be in the negative. But if there exist no valid grounds for separate existence there is a way to unity if we will. I earnestly request Sardar Basanta Singh and all others of his way of thinking—and there are many in the party—that the appropriate forum to address in this regard is not the Jana sangh session, but their own leadership.

(January 4, 1965)

## Kashmir, Jana Sangh and Swatantra

Shri T.T. Krishnamachari, while asserting in London that the whole of Jammu and Kashmir State legally belonged to India, has expressed the Government's desire to talk to Pakistan on the Kashmir issue. So long as Pakistan is not prepared to accept our legal title to the State, there is no common ground for talks between India and Pakistan on this question. From time to time the Government of India has succumbed to international pressures and talked to Pakistan on Kashmir. This has only led to confusion with regard to our basic stand and has encouraged forces that are conspiring for a further vivisection of India. It has also hampered development of the State. Once and for all, the Government of India should declare that it would not talk Kashmir to anyone who refuses to accept the finality and irrevocability of the Instrument of Accession. It is also necessary that Article 370 of the Constitution be abrogated so that the State may attain an equal status within the Indian Union, and citizens of India living in Kashmir be assured all the guarantees and privileges of our Constitution. This will put an end to all speculation and kite-flying about the future of the State.

There are people in the country who are advocating various solutions of the problem involving even secession of the State from India. In the interest of India's unity and integrity, it has become imperative that this sort of propaganda placing Kashmir under the U.N. is dangerous. We do not want to turn this beautiful valley and a strategic region of ours into a hotbed of international conflicts. Kashmir, under no circumstances, can be allowed to become another Congo or Laos.

Shri M.R. Masani, General Secretary of the Swatantra party, is

reported to have said recently at Hyderabad that his party would have no truck with Jana Sangh unless it changed its policy on Pakistan and Kashmir. We are very much thankful to Shri Masani for revealing his mind so clearly. It has relieved us of a commitment with regard to electoral adjustments which had become considerably embarrassing to us ever since the Swatantra Party leaders had taken up their present position in respect of Kashmir and Pakistan. In fact, we were given to understand earlier that the views expressed by Shri Rajagopalachari and Shri Masani, were their personal views and the party did not subscribe to them. On the contrary, a majority of members in the party were believed to hold the same views as Jana Sangh on these issues. It now appears that this majority has been hustled into acceptance of the policy enunciated by Rajaji and Masani. Under the circumstances it is natural that Jana Sangh cannot align itself with forces that stand for an ignoble surrender of Indian territory to an aggressor.

People ask which is the greater danger, Pakistan or China. It is like asking which is worse Plague or T.B. There is however, one difference. China is stronger than India; India is believed to be stronger than Pakistan. And there is also the fact that if China attacks India the West would rush to our aid; but if Pakistan were to attack us, there would be no body to help us.

(July 20, 1964)

## Holding the Price Line

There has been a constant rise in the price line during the last decade. Of late, it has reached such a crucial level, that unless effective measures are adopted, it would lead to dangerous consequences both economically and politically. It is unfortunate that the Government are still fiddling. They are confused and vacillating. Their utterances show neither a correct appraisal of the situation nor a proper analysis of the causes of the present malaise nor even a determination to set things right.

The situation demands both long and short term measures to mend matters. The price rise is mainly due to shortfall in production and a fall in the value of the rupee due to credit creation by the Government to meet its growing unproductive expenditure. Not only has the Fourth Plan to be differently conceived but the Third Plan also should be reoriented to remedy these defects. Government expenditure should be drastically cut down and all unessential schemes postponed. The priorities of the plan should be changed and immediate efforts must be made to increase supply of consumer goods both through larger internal production, as well as through imports.

Government should give up the idea of nationalising and monopolising trade in foodgrains. Instead it should enter the market partially, as a large-scale trader. It should also establish its agency for procurement and distribution of foodgrains throughout the country. Even if it could manage ten per cent of the total trade, it would give the administration strategic advantage to regulate trade practices and prices. The Government should enter into for-

ward trading contracts direct with the farmers. All help to them thus would be linked with production.

For employees of the Government and the organised private sector, fair price shops subsidised by the employer should be opened. This course is better than that of increasing the dearness allowance which has an inflationary impact and which thus neutralizes any addition to emoluments.

While the present situation has to be tackled on a war footing, Government should take particular care that it is not exploited by anti-social elements or by parties determined to create chaos to further their nefarious ends. Looting of grain-shops should under no circumstances be tolerated. All-party committees should be formed in each district and at higher levels so that the problem could be dealt with in a non-partisan manner.

(July 20, 1964)

## About the Kamaraj Plan

Pandit Nehru's axe, sharpened by the Kamaraj Plan of renunciation—it should be termed a Yatiraj Plan if it really has that great virtue—has fallen, in the first instance, upon half a dozen Union Cabinet Ministers and an equal number of Chief Ministers of the States. This cantrip has been performed to cure the cankerous Congress of its ills of corruption and lust for power.

The step is claimed to be revolutionary. No doubt, it is sensational. But sensationalism is not revolution, nor is revolution necessarily progress. How will the exit of these trusted twelve, or these damned dozen—depending upon how you look at them—oxygenate the collapsing Congress? If they are of sterling worth, and good administrators, the Government will be so much the poorer by their going out. And the country, at this critical hour, can hardly afford such a luxury. But if they have been relieved because they were considered to be burdensome, what good will they do to the decadent Congress? Diseased blood, if transfused, can only disperse disaster to the donee.

Pandit Nehru was given supreme power by the AICC to pick and choose the heroes to be Victoria-crossed—or is it Ashoka-Chakra-ed. He has been pleased to submit the first list. It is anybody's guess if the selection has been objective. The surprise that some of them have felt at having been included in the list, shows that they never meant their resignation letters to be taken literally. Evidently, they are not going to take up their new assignments with the missionary zeal expected of them, to put new life and vigour into the septuagenarian Congress. They have become victims of a confidence trick.



Only the ignoramus or the gullible can believe that the maladies of the Congress Government can be cured by the exit of a few who were simply executors of a policy conceived and formulated by their leader. Ministers have come and gone; but things have not improved. It is common knowledge that except for the Prime Minister, other ministers hardly matter. The Kashmir bungle, the Nehru-Liaquat Pact, the Nehru-Noon Pact, the Panchasheel treaty, the Five Year Plans, the socialist-pattern objectives, and the VOA deal—all these show that there had never been a joint responsibility of the Cabinet. Today, even after the Kamaraj Plan, the Five-Year Plans, and their architect and god-father, remain. The personal predominance of the Prime Minister remains. The policies that have plagued the people remain. On the contrary, as visualised by Shri N.V. Gadgil, all this will vest the Prime Minister with more powers. In fact, the Kamaraj plan was formulated with that end in view. It was meant to restore to Pandit Nehru whatever he might lose of his halo due to the non-confidence motion in the Lok Sabha. But like all other plans of the Congress this plan will also fail.

As early as in 1947, Acharya Kripalani, the then President of the Congress wanted the Congress Government to be subservient to the Congress organisation. But Pandit Nehru did not agree. Gandhiji could not force it. And Acharyaji had to resign. Even so, if instead of vesting the Prime Minister with powers to choose who should resign, the AICC had entrusted this task to the Congress President, the situation might have been different. Obviously the AICC has no faith—or dare not express it—in its President. And when the AICC has no personality of its own beyond being a rubber-stamp, or cannot take free decisions, its resolutions have no meaning.

We have our doubts, but still we wish all success to the Prime Minister and his Congress colleagues in their attempt to improve matters. But we would like to warn the people lest they should fall

into complacency and relax their vigilance. Addicts are hard nuts to crack. And it is wise to be vigilant and armed rather than repentant and reviling.

(September 2, 1963)

## Punjab and Punjabi

The Punjab Special Language Bill has been passed by the State Legislature. It replaces an ordinance earlier promulgated on the subject. In so far as it seeks to introduce Hindi and Punjabi in place of Urdu and English as languages of administration upto the district level, it is a welcome step. But it will hardly satisfy anybody in the Punjab, as it deprives both Hindi and Punjabi of their legitimate place in the province. It is more an act of appeasement rather than of establishing a direct link between the Government and the people through their tongue, which is so very essential in a democratic set up. As such, it ignores realities and introduces an element of arbitrariness in the provisions for the use of official languages.

One thing that must be borne in mind by any one looking at the Punjab problem is that for various reasons this province does not present a language-region pattern that has developed elsewhere in the country. It is, therefore, not possible to apply the same yardstick for solving the language problem of this area as has been done in Maharashtra or Andhra. The State as a whole is not only not unilingual but it is also not possible to carve out well-defined unilingual areas on any basis whatsoever. The Sachar and the Regional Formulas sought to demarcate Hindi and Punjabi regions and the Akali Dal is agitating for a Punjabi Suba. All these have little relevance to language. They are all attempts to divide the State on communal lines.

Linguism, communalism and separatism have got so mixed up in the Punjab that it has become difficult for the people to see things in an objective manner. Punjab has come to be associated

with the Sikhs and the Punjabi Suba with a Sikh State. The way in which the Akali Dal has carried on an agitation both for recognition of the Punjabi language and for the Punjabi Suba have only confirmed doubts about the real intentions of the sponsors.

The language problem can be seen in its right perspective if it is dissociated from the demand of a Punjabi Suba. It has to be made clear that the present truncated Punjab shall not be further divided. Any division of it will leave the units non-viable and instead of solving the communal problem will further aggravate it. On economic, social, political, administrative and even linguistic grounds, it is not possible to reduce the present size of the Punjab. The Punjab remaining as it is, has to use the two languages prevalent in the State in such a manner that in addition to providing the people an intelligible and easy means of communication with the administration it also leads to their emotional integration. So long as Punjabi and Hindi are continued to be used on communal or regional basis these objectives will not be attained.

It is wrong to call Punjabi the language of the Sikhs. The non-Sikhs not only speak it but there are a number of them who have literary contributions to their credit. If the Akalis had not used the language as an instrument of their separatist designs, more and more non-Sikhs would have come forward to enrich their mother tongue. It must, however, be recognised that there are vast numbers, who even though they speak Punjabi, use or want to use Hindi for all purposes for which a language is meant. Their present attitude towards Hindi Punjabi might become hardened due to Akali politics, but it is definitely not a reactionary one in its origin. Even the Sikh Gurus were masters of Brajbhasa, the then dominant dialect of Hindi; and if Swami Dayanand used Hindi to propagate his message to the people of the Punjab, he did so because it was widely understood. In fact in the Punjab both Hindi and Punjabi are developing side by side. It must be admitted that

Punjabi did not develop into a full-fledged language with a literature at a time when all other regional languages grew. Its development has been delayed but for that matter it should not suffer. There are always some stresses and strains experienced by a developing language as by a developing economy. The protagonists of Punjabi should realize this and instead of creating obstacles in its way by associating it with political ends or religious movements they should leave it free to be espoused by as many people as possible.

The question of script is also a bit baffling. There is no sense in opposing Gurumukhi. Whatever its origin it is today widely used by the Punjabi-speaking people. But there are many who demand the use of Nagari script also. Why should it not be accepted? This would help the cause of Punjabi. There are apprehensions that if Nagari is used for Punjabi, the language will not be able to obtain its distinctive character. The fears are unfounded. Marathi has Nagari script and yet it is a distinct language. Whatever the Government does, I feel that the writers and publishers will growingly make use of Nagari for writing Punjabi, because books published in Nagari will definitely find a wider market. As Hindi is the national language, everybody would be learning it. So Nagari script will be known to all. Advocates of Gurumukhi alone only want to limit the field of Punjabi.

As such Bharatiya Jana Sangh has always been of the view that the Punjab should be recognised a bilingual province for all purposes. Both Hindi and Punjabi should be used throughout the state and at all levels. Arrangements should be made to impart instruction in both of them. Opposition to any one of them at any stage will only widen the gap and may ultimately lead to the bifurcation of the state with dire consequences to all. There are political forces in the State advocating extremist views and preaching a policy of exclusiveness. Whether they are for Punjabi or for Hindi, they ignore realities and want to change the existing complexion by force.

Let the citizens have the freedom to use both the languages. Punjabi has come to stay and nobody can displace it. By neglecting it some people may only leave it to be used by sectional interests. Thus, instead of growing into a fit medium of expression of the national self, it will only be misused by sectional interests for their narrow ends. It is the sacred duty of all Punjabis to free their mother tongue from the clutches of the Communists and the Communalists. Hindi too cannot be dislodged from the Punjab. So long as the Guru Granth Sahib continues to be recited in the Gurudwaras, the Ramayana and the Sukhsagar in the temples and the Satyarth Prakash in the Arya Samaj mandirs, Hindi will occupy a place of pride in the lives of the people of Punjab. The solution of the Punjab problem needs a truly nationalist and objective mind. It is a matter of great satisfaction that an unattached and intensely patriotic personality like that of Shri M.S. Golwalkar also has endorsed the views of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh expressed as early as in 1953. He has advised the Punjabis to own their mother tongue and the Sikhs to own their nationality i.e. Hinduism. The Jana Sangh feels its stand vindicated.

When Shri Golwalkar frankly gave expression to his views, the extremist elements were perturbed. Those who had been thinking in terms of an anti-Hindi or anti-Punjabi approach to the problem could not have liked this integrated approach. However the saner elements have appreciated his stand. Unfortunately, in the Punjab for the last few years the extremists have appropriated to themselves a representative character because the moderates and the nationalists did not assert themselves. The Pradesh Working Committee of the Punjab Jana Sangh also met at Karnal on November 20, and having discussed the whole situation has reiterated its earlier stand.

(November 28, 1960)



## Madhya Pradesh Tribals

When Shri Giriraj Kishore Kapoor, President, Madhya Pradesh Jana Sangh, devoted full four pages of his eighteen page address to the annual conference of the party at Itarsi, to detailing the grievances of the Vanavasis--wrongly termed as Adivasis--of the province, some people felt that it was disproportionate. But on reading Shri Bade's pamphlet on the issue I felt that the problem was so acute that a separate conference could have been held to go into its manifold aspects. Out of the five hundred and odd delegates who attended the conference, the Vanavasis comprised about twenty percent. The Bharatiya Jana Sangh is fast penetrating into these jungle recesses and the Vanavasis have found in Jana Sangh workers ardent sympathisers of their cause. They do not go there to 'lead', but to work shoulder to shoulder for the amelioration of their conditions.

The fast changing laws, the unrealistic programmes under the plans, and the callous attitude of the administration are the main causes of the various problems with which these people are faced. Government wants to grow more forests, wants to preserve wild life, but it completely neglects the human beings living there. For ages they have been leading a simple but happy life depending on the forest produce for their income. In addition they also tilled large areas by rotation. In return for allotment of forest lands for agricultural purposes, they bore the responsibility of afforestation. In fact they discharged both the duties. This was known as Tongya system and was in vogue since times immemorial. But the present Government, under the advice of foreign experts, has abolished that system and declared all the forests as "Reserve forests", thus making it

illegal and punishable for anybody without a proper order to touch even a blade of grass in these areas. With one stroke of the pen three lakh people in Madhya Pradesh alone have been deprived of their means of livelihood. No compensation was paid to them, and no arrangements for their resettlement were made. The order extended not only to the forest areas, but also to vast tracts of land, which had been under the plough for more than a generation, and where there existed no sign of a forest. The simple reason was that these villages were recorded as forest villages and not revenue villages. The Government never bothered to see that the difference was more on paper than in fact. The result was that thousand of tillers were ejected. If some of them continue to till, it is due to the connivance of the employees of the Forest Department. We do not know whether it is human kindness or human weakness--so common in these days of graft--that is responsible for the delay in the implementation of the Government plans.

There are no industries and with the introduction of mechanised transport and felling and sawing equipment, even the demand for manual labour in forests is decreasing. The contractors employ them on paltry wages and feel gratified that they have been doing a good turn to them by providing some work when they had none. The Constitution might have abolished *begar*--forced labour--but not the forest department. Officials feel it a duty to keep up the tradition of *begar*, even when the corresponding privileges attaching to that system are no more there. The people are simple and their wants few, but their resources have become even fewer. When during my last tour to Nimad I was told that there were only exceptions amongst the Vanavasis who could afford two square meals a day, I could not believe it. But the pale faces of those sitting around me bore convincing testimony to the fact.

"Zamin Do" is not a slogan with them. It is the cry for self-existence of a dying people. The Constitution has given special repre-



sentation to the Scheduled Tribes. There are special funds allocated for their welfare. But the lion's share goes to the converts to Christianity for they have institutionalised their life and the Government equates them with the tribals. The real sufferers go unattended and uncared for. The Australians hunted the indigenous people out into the jungles. The present Madhya Pradesh Government is hunting the Vanavasis out of the jungles.

It is a matter of great satisfaction that the Vanavasis are getting organised under the banner of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh. Thakar Bapa and the Adimjati Seva Sangh had once done some good work amidst them. But with the advent of freedom, the A.S. Sangh did not prove better than organisations attached to the Congress. Selfless and missionary workers are therefore turning to the Bharatiya Jana Sangh for the fulfilment of their mission. The Vanavasis had organised a number of morchas, and also offered satyagraha, by tilling the deforested forest lands. The Government is following a policy of repression. It was feared that these people, so expert in archery, might find it difficult to follow the path of a peaceful satyagraha. But it goes to the credit of the organisers that these people have been behaving in a most peaceful manner. They are following the way of Prahlad. And if the Government continues to act like Hiranyakashyapu, a Narasimha is sure to come out of the woods. Let the Government instead of making a show of the folk dances of these people, see that they lead a human existence. They do not want modern amenities. In fact modernism is driving them out of existence. Let them only live in peace.

The Itarsi session was a landmark in the history of the Jana Sangh in the province. If the programmes that the conference adopted materialise, I can confidently say that in the next election Jana Sangh would emerge as a powerful force well positioned to influence the future set-up of the province.

(November 21, 1960)

## Ford Foundation and Cow Slaughter

In spite of strong criticism and demonstrable failures, the Government continues to draw on foreign sources for advice and guidance even in matters where hardly any new knowledge can be added to our already existing fund. Whenever a problem arises, the Government invariably sends a delegation to some foreign countries, or invites foreign experts to report and recommend. Whatever the individual merits of these recommendations, it is definite that they fail to take a co-ordinated view of things. It is generally said about experts that they not only undervalue, but completely neglect subjects other than their own. And if they happen to be foreigners they do not even know the people whom they advise. If their report concerns some technical matter, there may not be much difficulty in implementation. But if the subject is such as requires the personal attention of a vast number of people, they will definitely fail in their assignment because of their lack of an intimate knowledge of local mores. The report of the Ford Foundation team on agricultural production in India suffers from this very deficiency.

We do not intend here to examine the full report of the team but will deal only with their recommendations regarding the cattle problem of India. The team has advised the progressive reduction of cattle in the country. To this end, in addition to total slaughter of useless (?) cattle, they have suggested the following measures:--

(a) A tax on cattle: a graduated tax schedule for animals with some suitable exemptions, with a view to bring cattle numbers in balance with food supplies by making the maintenance of such animals a financial burden on their owners;

(b) compulsory confinement of all bulls kept for natural service;

(c) mandatory castration of all young bulls not required for breeding;

(d) compulsory sterilization of surplus cows and heifers;

(e) the advisability of enacting a law prohibiting open grazing should be investigated: compulsion to keep animals within the farm premises would help to control cattle numbers.

These recommendations definitely ignore the socio-economic importance of the cow in India. Though the team has recognised that there is a strong sentiment for the cow in India which Westerners cannot realize, yet it has gone out of its way to advise--on the authority of some Westernised, and therefore (should we say?) denationalised Indians, whom it has extensively quoted--in favour of slaughter of cows. Mr. Maurice Zinkin rightly commented in this regard when he wrote in his *Development For Free Asia*: "If a Hindu believes that killing cows is a sin so profound that it will cause him to be reborn in the next life as an animal, it is irrelevant to point out, as the economist so often does, that a cow which is too old for milking eats but gives no return; the argument is as much a waste of time as telling an English Suburban housewife that she should have her dog put down because the meat he eats worsens Britain's balance of payments".

In spite of this strong sentiment, the economists, especially those who have not studied the economic aspect of Hindu sociology, have again and again dared to recommend cow-slaughter. Their recommendations, being unrealistic, lose all force, and it is a sheer waste of money and energy to get such experts to probe our problems.

It is not mere sentiment that makes the Hindu so very much attached to the cow. The cow also happens to be the archstone of India's economy. Foreign visitors, or our people visiting foreign lands, conveniently forget this fact. But we in India know that but for the cow our agriculture would be nowhere. For the last hundred

and more years slaughter of cattle has been going on virtually unhindered and unregulated by law. If the cow has so long survived the butcher's knife it is because of its economic importance. And those who demand a complete ban on cow slaughter also do so on economic grounds. The deterioration and decrease of our cattle wealth has ruined the country's economy. If we want to rebuild it, we can do so only by reconstructing the base. Plans for agricultural development have no meaning if they cannot restore to the cow and the bullock the pivotal position they had all along held.

The team has appreciated the position of our bullocks. It writes: "India's bullocks have gained world-wide recognition for their power, speed and endurance. Improved draught breeds of cattle will continue to be the mainstay of farming operations". But it passes one's comprehension when it continues further: "Yet pressure on the land is so great that serious study of alternative sources of farm power should be undertaken. The suitability of small tractors to meet the power needs of different types and sizes of farms, should be investigated, both with respect to tillage needs and practices and operating costs".

In fact the cat is out of the bag when this recommendation is made. It is the American industry trying to find a market for its products. Tractors cannot be used in India so long as the bullocks continue to hold the field. They must, therefore, be liquidated, so that the Indian farmer is left with no other alternative but machines. It does remind you of the Britishers who cut off the hands of our weavers to keep the weaving mills of Manchester and Lancashire going. Cattle population is useless because it hinders the growth of American industry in India.

The team bases its arguments on the theory that there is competition between man and cattle for the produce of the land. They advise the slaughter of cattle to save man. We will not go here into the question as to whether there does exist any such competition.

One thing we must say is that the competition theory of creation does not find favour with Bharatiya sociologists. We hold that cooperation, rather than competition, is the law of creation. Civilisation consists in establishing that cooperation if, due to some defects, there is some disorder. If there is competition between the cattle and the human population in the country, the need is to eliminate it by making the two complementary, and not by killing one or the other. We think that it is always better and easier to improve matters by following nature, rather than by flouting it.

(November 30, 1959)

## Growing Dependence on the State

President Dr. Rajendra Prasad, speaking at Hyderabad, deprecated that the people should look to the Government for everything. He felt that the people should be self-reliant and need not depend upon the Government for the fulfilment of their objectives. In this connection he commended a decentralised system in which one can retain one's individuality. He also urged upon social workers to continue their efforts and give up the feeling--largely developed after independence--that their task is done.

Every thinking man, who has some idea of the Bharatiya way of life, will agree with what the President has said. Government, according to the Hindu concept, has very limited functions. Apart from the fact that politics have been assigned only a part of one of the four purusharthas that a man has been ordained to pursue, most functions of government and administration are supposed to be carried out at the local level. Centralization was aimed more in the emotional sphere than in the practical fields of administration. While there was an inherent sense of unity, national and cultural, it manifested itself in diverse ways according to local conditions. This not only made people self-reliant but afforded an opportunity to all regional and other groups--nay, to every individual--for fuller development. Hinduism, therefore, presents a picture so abundant in detail and so varied in its delineation that, to a superficial observer, it may appear bereft of coherence and unity. The modern world recognizes unity only in its drab mechanical aspect. Uniformity has been assumed to be the essential characteristic of unity. In a living organism the inner unity seldom manifests itself in uniform ways. A machine can repeat the same action any number of times, and in any place. But a human being is not capable of acting in this mechanical manner.



If today there is an over-dependence on government it is due to a number of causes and the most important of these can be traced to the Congress movement for independence. When we were ruled by an alien government, we developed a habit of making government responsible for all our ills. The national leaders and the village demagogues alike asked the people to throw off the foreign yoke if they wanted to get rid of their troubles. While the Britishers, through various methods of subtle propaganda, tried to impress upon the people that they enjoyed a most benevolent, just and kind government, the nationalists always painted it as the devil's own government. Expectations of the people were raised high even before independence. They were told to ask all that they needed from Government. If Gandhiji and other leaders took to some voluntary service it was likened by some to establishing a parallel Government. National schools and colleges were established when the non-cooperation movement was launched. This was done not because of any belief on the part of the national leadership about freedom of educational institutions from Government control. It was only by way of boycotting Government schools and colleges. Local Courts were also established not because the Congress felt that most of the disputes should be amicably settled by the people locally in keeping with their local customs and conventions, but only to paralyse the British administration. Those who offered dharna at toddy shops felt compelled to do so for want of their own Government which could enforce prohibition by law. It was natural, therefore, that when our own Government came, social workers should consider their task as done, and depend upon the Government to do the rest.

All this might be explained and justified on grounds of tactics. When our sole aim was to achieve independence, every means to create an urge for freedom in the people was justified. But there was the need of reorientation in approach as soon as we got independence. Government should have told the people its limitations

in principle and in practice. But it did not. On the contrary by adopting the ideal of a welfare state, and later of a socialist state, it made the people all the more dependent upon the Government. Scathing criticism of voluntary, private, old and existing institutions also turned the people away from them. If these institutions are undesirable and unserviceable, new institutions should be established. The Government swearing as it does by socialism, cannot share responsibility with the people. It is only as and when the Government fails that people are brought into the picture as scape-goats.

There is also one more cause that has led to this sorry state of affairs. There is a general feeling that we cannot do without big projects and consequent centralisation. "However, the world is running towards centralisation", it is said, "and we cannot escape its impact". It is this feeling of helplessness--if not the lack of faith and fervour--that has rung the death-knell of all our decentralized institutions in the political, economic and social spheres. If we cannot escape the impact of the modern world, and cannot find out new ways on our own, better suited to modern conditions, we go down with the rest of the world. But the fact is that the impact of the world is not as forceful and as unavoidable as we imagine it to be. We can still hold to our own and pave the way for others to follow.

But this calls for a total reorientation of our outlook towards life, towards policies and towards planning. We should admit their limitations. It is therefore necessary that Government should be persuaded--and the President should use his influence in this regard if he really wants the people to be self-reliant-- to give up their socialist fads and stop their inroads into what is, in principle, and in practice, legitimately and conventionally the people's sphere.

(August 4, 1959)