



LOHIA AND PARLIAMENT

This volume profiles the life, work and ideology of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia who dominated the Indian political scene for as many as three and a half decades. A staunch socialist by instinct and conviction, he gave a new direction and dimension to the socialist movement in India keeping in view the ground realities of Indian social, political and economic matrix.

As a freedom-fighter, philosopher, political leader and parliamentarian, he carved out for himself a unique place in the hearts of the people. Assertive and affable, he endeared himself to the masses through his wit, wisdom, dedication and revolutionary ideas. This volume throws light on Dr. Lohia's multifaceted personality. It carries contributions from high dignitaries, senior Parliamentarians and eminent persons and above all, Dr. Lohia's own ideas on various aspects of Indian polity.

This volume should be of interest to laymen, scholars and leaders alike, interested in having a glimpse into the life and ideas of the man who played vital role in modern India's political and social life.

LOHIA AND PARLIAMENT

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI
1991**

First Edition: 1991

© Lok Sabha Secretariat, 1991

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, except for purposes of review, without prior permission, in writing from the Lok Sabha Secretariat

Price: Rs. 200.00

Published Under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Seventh Edition) and Printed by the Manager, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi-110 064

FOREWORD

"Where is the equality, human dignity and social justice if you address the rich and affluent with 'Aap' and a rickshawpuller with 'Tum' because he happens to be poor and belonging to a weaker segment of society. This is what Dr. Rammanohar Lohia hammered into us in his characteristically sharp and acerbic style when I, along with some students, met him for the first time in 1948 in Orissa. At that time, after Gandhiji's death, the Socialists in the Congress had parted company and Lohia had come to Orissa to organise the Socialist Party. This remark, not so easy to swallow, yet so true to life, left an indelible imprint on our young minds and our search for fathoming 'Who after Gandhi' was complete. Here was a man, we felt, who could confess as frankly and informally as Bapu, the bitter truth of life and who could rank next only to him in practising what he said or preached.

Lohia's assessment of the appalling and inhuman conditions of the masses, who were the real masters in a democracy, was based not merely on theory or hearsay, but was the result of his personal contact with the poorest of the poor and the weakest of the weak. The idea that led to the historic 'fifteen annas versus three annas' debate in the Lok Sabha relating to the per capita income of the 60% population living below the poverty line, through which Lohia successfully challenged the statistics of the Government during the first ever No-Confidence Motion against the Nehru Government in 1963, had germinated out of a heart-to-heart talk that he had with a young boy. During his visit to a village, Lohia had seen the boy collecting some fish from a pond. On being asked about his daily earning, the boy informed Lohia that he earned about three or three and a half annas a day. This piece of information led Lohia to deep introspection making him later challenge the official statistics about the per capita income.

Lohia strongly believed that the Gandhian ideals could be the only solution to meet the basic needs of a society, both

(ii)

developing and developed. It was thus that even after independence he wielded the Gandhian weapon of *satyagraha* most effectively to fight every form of injustice against the oppressed and the depressed. Like Gandhi, he gave the highest priority to the removal of rural backwardness. He was, however, not a blind follower of Gandhi and his *Charkha*. He was for an innovative technology that could help in bringing about an all-round development in a developing society.

Lohia was an original thinker of superlative quality and acumen. Being sensitive and inquisitive by nature, he applied his mind to understand the evolving trends in political philosophy and reflected them fully in his writings and speeches. Both as a philosopher and a practical statesman, he attempted to find a way out of the hostility between the individual and the State. He was the first socialist thinker whose ideas were not circumscribed by the western thinking or the political processes in the Soviet Union. To him a nation had to have its own ideology based on its culture, traditions and history. While analysing the political, economic and social philosophy of Lohia, there is often a tendency among the contemporary researchers not to recognise him as an academic system-builder in the tradition of Kant, Hegel and Comte. But one must not forget that his approach to look at ideology as an integrated phenomenon is now being widely accepted the world-over as the only answer to meet the structural weaknesses in both developed and developing economies.

The essence of his philosophy is found in the Seven Revolutions, as he called them. These are: (1) for equality between man and woman; (2) against political, economic and spiritual inequality based on skin colour; (3) against inequality between backward and high groups or castes based on long tradition, and for giving special opportunities to the backward; (4) against foreign enslavement and for freedom and world democratic rule; (5) for economic equality and planned production and against the existence of and attachment for private capital; (6) against unjust encroachments on private life and for democratic methods; (7) against weapons and for *satyagraha*.

(iii)

It is these struggles or Revolutions in which Lohia crystalized his philosophy as well as practical action plan. Since the system which grew during post-independence period widened the gulf between the rich and the poor, he advocated another struggle. The call for 'Total Revolution' given by Jayaprakash Narayan in the late 70s was the same as Lohia's call for Seven Revolutions.

Lohia advocated socialism in the form of a new civilization which in the words of Marx was 'socialist humanism'. He championed the cause of socialism for ensuring social justice and equality. Referring to caste system in India he said, "All those who think that with the removal of poverty through a modern economy, these segregations will automatically disappear, make a big mistake." During his Pachmarhi Presidential address, Lohia had brought in no uncertain terms the irrelevance of capitalism as well as communism for the economic and political reconstructions of the Third World. Lohia, therefore, prodded socialists to organise themselves into a party capable of capturing power in seven years, even while exhorting them to have patience and commitment to carry on the struggle for a century. His views, I am sure, are getting slowly consolidated as the new ideological foundation of the socialist movement throughout the world.

A multi-faceted personality, Dr. Lohia, apart from being a prominent freedom fighter, a revolutionary philosopher, a prolific writer, a self-less social worker, and an outstanding socialist leader, was a parliamentarian par excellence.

When he came to Lok Sabha for the first time in 1963, Lohia tried to raise issues concerning the poor and the weak. He was always very keen and sometimes very impatient to bring home the point that the Lok Sabha—the highest peoples' forum of the country—should not only be an instrument to reflect the urges and aspirations of the people but should be an institution to effectively engineer socio-economic justice to them. Whenever he felt that the Constitution, the law, the rules or the statistics were quoted (or misquoted!) in the highest institution not to help the poor and the weak but for maintaining *status quo* implying continuation of injustice, the rebel in him opposed it and opposed it effectively. It is indeed our misfortune that Lohia had

a very brief term in Parliament. He entered Parliamentary life late and by the time he was trying to reshape it to be an effective apparatus for complete transformation of the face of the country, cruel hands of death snatched him away from us.

Today when we hear about social justice, the relevance of Lohia who spoke about it years before is more than proved. He was a man much ahead of his times. That is why probably sometime before his death he said "People will listen to me. Perhaps, after I am dead. But they will certainly listen to me."

I am glad that the Lok Sabha Secretariat has brought out this book which although limited mostly to his contribution towards parliamentary life will yet provide to the readers a fruitful thought. The book is a token of deep gratitude to him for his outstanding contribution.

I am sure that the book will be found useful and interesting by parliamentarians, lay readers, students of political science and all those in public life.

NEW DELHI
May 1, 1991

RABI RAY

PREFACE

The decision of the Indian Parliamentary Group in early 1990 to celebrate the birth anniversaries of eminent Parliamentarians and its beginning with the birth anniversary of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia is worth reckoning as a significant development in our parliamentary history.

A Monograph on Lohia brought out as part of the celebrations could not, as was widely felt, adequately describe this multifaceted dynamic personality. Consequently, it was decided to amplify it into a book. Hence this Volume.

Divided into four parts, the first part of the book profiles the great leader and theoretician. Articles in part two, contributed by his contemporaries and close associates, are highly analytical, portraying the man as they found him.

An eloquent and forceful speaker, Lohia poured out his heart into his utterances. Nevertheless, the facts and figures often reeled out by him were incontrovertible, bearing a mathematical precision. Excerpts from his select speeches in Parliament and some quotes, in part three of this Volume, indicate how strongly he held on to his convictions.

Though slightly feared for his outspoken nature, he was admired and highly revered by his friends and fellow parliamentarians. Glowing tributes paid to him in both the Houses of Parliament on his tragic demise find their way into the last part of the book. That, if anything the years since he left us have enhanced our respect for him is substantiated by some more tributes from persons of eminence in different fields included in this part. These have been culled out from speeches made at the meeting held last year under the auspices of the Indian Parliamentary Group to celebrate his birth anniversary.

Most of the material in the present Volume is a translated version of the original in Hindi. Every care has been taken to ensure that the originality is not lost in the process. Needless to say, the views expressed in various articles are clearly those of the authors for which the Lok Sabha Secretariat does not take any responsibility.

We must express our gratitude to Honourable Speaker of Lok Sabha, Shri Rabi Ray, for his constant guidance, assistance and encouragement in our task in bringing out this Volume. His inspiring 'Foreword' reflects his closeness to and clear understanding of Lohia and his ideology. We are also grateful to the eminent writers for their articles which have enriched this publication.

This publication dedicated to the memory of Lohia is our humble tribute to his outstanding contributions to our parliamentary and national life. We hope it will be found useful by our young parliamentarians, students of political science, and would also generate interest in 'Lohia Studies'.

Contributors' Who's Who

Articles

Professor Madhu Dandavate
Former Union Minister

Shri George Fernandes
Former Union Minister

Shri P. Upendra
Former Union Minister and Member of Parliament

Shri Laloo Prasad
Chief Minister of Bihar

Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav
Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh

Shri Madhukar Dighe
Governor of Meghalaya

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy
Governor of Arunachal Pradesh

Shri Dhanik Lal Mandal
Governor of Haryana

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
Governor of Manipur

Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy
Governor of Uttar Pradesh

Shri Yagya Dutt Sharma
Governor of Orissa

Shri Upendra Nath Verma
Former Union Minister of State

Shri Murlidhar C. Bhandare
Member of Parliament

Professor Samar Guha
Former Member of Parliament

Shri Madhu Limaye
Former Member of Parliament

Shri Jagdish Prasad Chaturvedi
Eminent Journalist

(viii)

Tributes

Shri Rabi Ray
Speaker, Lok Sabha and Former Union Minister

Shri Hukumdeo Narayan Yadav
Union Minister of Textiles and Food Processing Industries

Dr. (Shrimati) Najma Heptulla
Deputy Chairman, Rajya Sabha

Shri George Fernandes
Former Union Minister

Shri Ram Vilas Paswan
Former Union Minister

Shri Vasant Sathe
Former Union Minister

Shri P. Shiv Shanker
Former Union Minister and Member of Parliament

Dr. G. Vijay Mohan Reddy
Member of Parliament

Dr. Nagen Saikia
Member of Parliament

Shri G. Swaminathan
Member of Parliament

Shri Somnath Chatterjee
Former Member of Parliament

Professor N.G. Ranga
Former Member of Parliament

Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait
Former Member of Parliament

Dr. Ram Sajiwan
Former Member of Parliament

Shri Yadvendra Dutt
Former Member of Parliament

Contents

Foreword

(i)

Preface

(v)

Contributors' Who's Who

(vii)

PART ONE

HIS LIFE

1

DR. RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

A Profile

(3)

PART TWO

ARTICLES

2

LOHIA'S QUEST FOR A NEW DIMENSION

Professor Madhu Dandavate

(17)

3

DR. RAMMANOHAR LOHIA: THE ICONOCLAST

George Fernandes

(22)

4

LOHIA TODAY

P. Upendra

(30)

5

A PROFOUND THINKER—DR. RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

Laloo Prasad

(33)

(ix)

(x)

6

**DR. RAMMANOHAR LOHIA:
A FAR-SIGHTED REVOLUTIONARY**
Mulayam Singh Yadav
(39)

7

LOHIA—AN IMMORTAL PERSONALITY
Madhukar Dighe
(44)

8

DR. RAMMANOHAR LOHIA—THE GREAT SOCIALIST
Surendranath Dwivedy
(51)

9

IMPORTANCE OF COMPASSION IN LOHIA'S PHILOSOPHY
Dhanik Lal Mandal
(54)

10

REMEMBERING DR. RAMMANOHAR LOHIA
Chintamani Panigrahi
(57)

11

DR. RAMMANOHAR LOHIA AND SOCIALISM
B. Satyanarayan Reddy
(60)

12

DR. LOHIA: A TRUE SOCIAL REFORMER
Yagya Dutt Sharma
(69)

13

A MAN WHO NEVER COMPROMISED HIS PRINCIPLES
Upendra Nath Verma
(73)

(xi)

14

DR. RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

Múrlidhar C. Bhandare

(79)

15

THE STORMY SOCIALIST

Professor Samar Guha

(84)

16

**RAMMANOHAR LOHIA:
A MANY-FACETED PERSONALITY**

Madhu Limaye

(91)

17

LOHIA AS DISCIPLE OF NEHRU

Madhu Limaye

(105)

18

DR. RAMMANOHAR LOHIA AS A REVOLUTIONARY

Jagdish Prasad Chaturvedi

(120)

PART THREE

HIS IDEAS

**EXCERPTS FROM SOME SELECT SPEECHES
OF DR. LOHIA IN LOK SABHA**

19

**MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS (1963)**

(137)

20

**MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS (1965)**

(157)

(xii)

21

UPLIFT OF SCHEDULED CASTES AND
SCHEDULED TRIBES

(168)

22

DISTRIBUTION OF NATIONAL INCOME

(171)

23

MOTION REGARDING APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE FOR
RESTRICTION OF MONTHLY EXPENDITURE OF
AN INDIVIDUAL

(179)

24

CORRUPTION

(192)

25

STUDENT UNREST

(203)

26

RICKSHAW PULLING

(208)

27

CRITICISM OF INDIAN HISTORY

(213)

28

BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION

(219)

29

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS)

(233)

30

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS OF MINISTRY OF INFORMATION
AND BROADCASTING

(237)

(xiii)

31

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS OF MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
(243)

32

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS OF MINISTRY OF LAW
(253)

33

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS OF MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL
AFFAIRS
(259)

34

MOTION REGARDING INTERNATIONAL SITUATION
(268)

35

MOTION REGARDING PAKISTANI FORCES ATTACK ON
KUTCH BORDER
(281)

36

DISCUSSION ON RESOLUTION REGARDING CEASEFIRE
OF HOSTILITIES BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN AND
RESOLUTION REGARDING INDIA QUITTING
COMMONWEALTH
(288)

37

DISCUSSION ON ILLEGAL OCCUPATION OF INDIAN
TERRITORY BY CHINA AND PAKISTAN AND STATEMENT
MADE BY THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION REGARDING THE
AREA OF INDIAN TERRITORY
(298)

38

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL
(AMENDMENT OF ARTICLES 124 AND 217)
(306)

(xiv)

39

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL
(OMISSION OF ARTICLE 370)

(310)

40

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL
(AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 352)

(314)

41

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL
(AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 368)

(319)

42

COMPANY (AMENDMENT) BILL

(326)

43

PREVENTIVE DETENTION (CONTINUANCE) BILL

(334)

44

PRESS COUNCIL BILL

(342)

45

PATENTS BILL

(348)

46

RESOLUTION ON PROCLAMATION REGARDING
PRESIDENT'S RULE IN KERALA

(355)

47

MOTION REGARDING FOOD SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY

(368)

48

MOTIONS REGARDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC
UNDERTAKINGS

(380)

(xv)

49

REORGANISATION OF PUNJAB STATE

(388)

50

**REPORT ON MIDTERM APPRAISAL OF THIRD FIVE YEAR
PLAN**

(392)

51

LOHIA SAID

(405)

PART FOUR

TRIBUTES

52

**OBITUARY REFERENCES MADE IN LOK SABHA/RAJYA
SABHA ON THE PASSING AWAY OF DR. LOHIA**

(417)

LOK SABHA

N. Sanjiva Reddy

(417)

Indira Gandhi

(418)

Professor N.G. Ranga

(419)

Atal Bihari Vajpayee

(420)

K. Manoharan

(421)

Yogendra Sharma

(422)

Madhu Limaye

(424)

A.K. Gopalan

(428)

Surendranath Dwivedy
(428)

Frank Anthony
(430)

N.C. Chatterjee
(431)

Prakash Vir Shastri
(431)

Ram Sewak Yadav
(433)

RAJYA SABHA

V.V. Giri
(434)

Jaisukhlal Hathi
(435)

Dahyabhai V. Patel
(435)

K. Damodaran
(436)

Mulka Govinda Reddy
(436)

Sundar Singh Bhandari
(437)

Gaure Murahari
(438)

A.P. Chatterjee
(440)

Ganga Sharan Sinha
(442)

(xvii)

B.D. Khobaragade
(444)

A.D. Mani
(445)

Chitta Basu
(445)

Narindar Singh Brar
(446)

Rajnarain
(447)

EXCERPTS FROM THE SPEECHES DELIVERED AT THE
FUNCTION HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE INDIAN
PARLIAMENTARY GROUP ON 23 MARCH, 1990 ON THE
BIRTH ANNIVERSARY OF DR. LOHIA

53

LOHIA—MY MENTOR AND GURU

Rabi Ray
(459)

54

LOHIA—A SAINT

Hukumdeo Narayan Yadav
(463)

55

A TRIBUTE TO LOHIAJI

Dr. (Shrimati) Najma Heptulla
(465)

56

LOHIA—A MAN WHO PRACTISED WHAT HE PROFESSED

George Fernandes
(467)

57

I HAVE LEARNT FROM DR. LOHIA

Ram Vilas Paswan

(473)

58

LOHIA—THE SOURCE OF INSPIRATION

Vasant Sathe

(476)

59

LOHIA—A SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC REFORMIST

P. Shiv Shanker

(479)

60

LOHIA: A DYNAMIC PERSONALITY

Dr. G. Vijay Mohan Reddy

(481)

61

LOHIA: A CREATIVE THINKER

Dr. Nagen Saikia

(482)

62

LOHIA: A FIGHTER AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

G. Swaminathan

(485)

63

LOHIA—A TRUE PATRIOT

Somnath Chatterjee

(487)

64

LOHIA—A REVOLUTIONARY OF REVOLUTIONARIES

Professor N.G. Ranga

(489)

(xix)

65

LOHIA—A GREAT SON OF INDIA

Ibrahim Sulaiman Sait

(492)

66

LOHIA—A GREAT SOCIALIST THINKER

Dr. Ram Sajiwan

(493)

67

LOHIA: A GREAT MAN

Yadvendra Dutt

(494)

Index

(495)

P A R T O N E

HIS LIFE

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia: A Profile

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, the eminent socialist leader, was born on 23 March, 1910 at Akbarpur in Faizabad district of Uttar Pradesh. His father, Hiralal Lohia, was a businessman. Originally, his ancestors lived at Mirzapur in Uttar Pradesh. The family acquired the surname 'Lohia' for doing business in 'Loha' (hardware) for generations. Rammanohar lost his mother at an early age of two and half years and was, therefore, brought up by his grandmother and aunt.

As a child, Lohia found in his family an atmosphere which was free from caste and communal prejudices. The spirit of strong nationalism was gifted to him by his father, Hiralal, who was an active Congressman and a devotee of Gandhiji. Since his childhood, Lohia was full of sympathies for the needy and as such he always helped the poor and the down-trodden.

His Education

He had his early education at Tandon Pathshala and Visheshwar Nath High School in Akbarpur. He always topped in his class and remained a favourite of his teachers. After his father had shifted from Akbarpur to Bombay, he continued his studies at Marwari School in Bombay and passed the Matriculation examination in the first division in 1925. His Intermediate education took place at Banaras Hindu University. In 1926, he accompanied his father to the Gauhati session of the Indian National Congress when he was just 16 years old. In 1927, he passed the Intermediate examination and went to Calcutta for further studies. Here an incident in his life is worth mentioning. There were two Government Colleges in Calcutta at that time with good reputation. Besides these, there was also a private College, Vidyasagar College, whose teachers

possessed a nationalistic outlook. When the question of taking admission came up, Lohia, as a true nationalist, preferred Vidyasagar College for higher education rather than either of the Government Colleges. In 1929, he passed his B.A. examination. Later, he went to Germany for higher studies. He obtained the Ph.D. degree from Berlin University with 'The Taxation of Salt in India' as the subject of his thesis. It was in Berlin that he studied the works of Marx and Hegel. He left Berlin in 1933 with definite leanings towards socialism. Lohia was also deeply influenced by Gandhiji's ideals, values and methods.

The period when Dr. Lohia was at Banaras Hindu University was the most important phase of his life. Since his younger days, Lohia was an excellent orator. At the University, as a sharp student, he developed a style of his own, a logical one, of delivering speeches and thus attracted the attention of the listeners. The University, known as Kashi Vishvavidyalaya, was famous during those days for producing brilliant youth who could bring honour to the country and sacrifice their all for her sake. Lohia was one of them.

As a Freedom Fighter

Dr. Lohia joined the freedom movement at an early age. His interest in politics gained further momentum owing to the atmosphere he had found at home. In 1934, a historic development took place in the Congress Party, when the Congress Socialist Party (CSP) was formed within the Indian National Congress. Dr. Lohia was instrumental in its formation and was considered one of its pillars. The party, declaring socialism as its objective, stated that Marxism alone could guide the anti-imperialist forces to their destiny and emphasised on democratising the organisational structure of the Congress.

Young Lohia was made the Secretary of the Foreign Affairs Department of the Congress Party in 1936, an office which he held with distinction till August 1938. As Foreign Secretary of the Congress, Lohia was instrumental in laying the foundations of the foreign policy of India. He maintained close contacts with

the freedom movements then going on in other parts of the world and developed close relations with progressive organisations in Asia, Africa and Latin America. As Secretary, he had written a pamphlet "The Foreign Policies of the Indian National Congress and the British Labour Party" which was described as a "Work of outstanding merit" by Pandit Nehru.

Lohia was aware of the problems faced by the overseas Indians and he told the Indian people about their pitiable conditions. He had also drawn the attention of the world towards the suppression of civil liberties in India and other countries. He was arrested for making anti-Government speeches, on 24 May, 1939, his first imprisonment, but was released the next day on bail. He was of the view that the country would not get freedom automatically. He created an awareness among the people by writing articles and pamphlets.

During the Second World War, he supported the view that India should not extend any support to the British and advocated complete non-cooperation. He said that the supply of men and money to the then Government should be refused. When All India Congress Committee passed a resolution in 1939 supporting the Britain in the war effort, Lohia opposed it and wrote an article "Down with Armaments". He was arrested for making anti-war speeches in 1940. Mahatma Gandhi did not like it and reacted very strongly. Deploring the action, Gandhiji said that imprisonment of patriots like Rammanohar Lohia and Jayaprakash would not be tolerated and he would not be a silent witness to this increasing encroachment on popular freedom. The individual civil disobedience campaign launched by Gandhiji in 1940 was designed to assert the people's right to democratic freedom.

Dr. Lohia played a significant role in the 'Quit India Movement' of 1942. He directed the Movement while remaining underground and could not be detected for nearly two years. He also established an underground radio station. He utilised the time by writing booklets and articles full of inspiration like "How to establish an Independent Government?", "I am Free", "Prepare for the Revolution", and "Brave Fighters March

Forward". Another scholarly article "Economics after Marx" was also written by him while he was underground. He, however, was arrested on 20 May, 1944 and kept in prison till 11 April, 1946. Later he worked for the freedom of Goan and Nepalese people also. Dr. Lohia was arrested as many as 25 times for participation in freedom movements of India, Goa and Nepal and civil disobedience movements in free India and in America.

As a Socialist

In 1947, the Congress Socialist Party was transformed into Socialist Party by removing the word Congress from its name at a conference held at Kanpur though it continued to be a part of the Congress. In 1948, the Socialist Party of which Dr. Lohia was a founder, dissociated itself from the Congress. In 1952, the Praja Socialist Party was formed and Dr. Lohia was elected its General Secretary in 1953. After a split in the Praja Socialist Party, the socialists met at Hyderabad in December, 1955 and a new Socialist Party of India was formed under the chairmanship of Dr. Lohia in 1956.

A great socialist, Dr. Lohia believed in the ideology of democratic socialism and always stood for power to the elected representatives of the people through parliamentary means but supported the non-violent direct action against any and every social, economic and political injustice. His creative mind had a great fascination for new ideas and he spurned the *doctrinaire* approach to social, political, economic and ideological problems. A relentless fighter against every form of injustice, he fervently pleaded for social equality and preferential opportunity for the socially oppressed sections of society to enable them to overcome their centuries-old sufferings.

While Dr. Lohia laid great stress on resistance to evil, he knew the importance of constructive activity. He was of the view that politics was inseparable from power. He supported the idea that the state power should be controlled, guided and tamed by people's power. To achieve it, he propounded the

formula of combining jail, spade and vote for achieving a social revolution in the country. He asked the youth to devote "one hour's free and voluntary labour" for national reconstruction.

His main contribution to the Indian polity was the incorporation of the Gandhian ideas in the socialist thought. A firm believer in decentralised economy, Lohia stressed the need of setting up of cottage industries and the small machines with minimum capital investments where maximum manpower may be used.

Lohia was well aware of the fact that people of the country live in villages. He, therefore, became the symbol of the aspirations of the poor peasants, the landless people and agricultural labourers. He initiated Kisan marches and struggles right from 1947. He was one of those great leaders who not only advocated the need for a fundamental re-ordering of our social relations but also provided an ideological basis for this revolutionary transformation. He always stood for the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial revolution. He had deep sympathy for the equalrights movement launched by American Blacks. He symbolically participated in it. In America he was refused entry into a restaurant and was arrested when he insisted on entering it. That he was set free almost immediately with a gracious apology from the American Government is another matter.

As an untiring champion of social equality, he deplored the caste system and the hierarchical order based on birth and considered it the single most important factor for decline of the nation and its repeated subjection to external aggression and foreign rule. He also launched a "destroy caste" movement. He declared that in a traditionally unequal society, equality could not be established by merely providing equal opportunities to all. He said that the backward classes, women, Harijans, adivasis and the backwards among the minorities had to be given special opportunities to bring them up to the level of the advanced.

Dr. Lohia possessed a universal outlook. He subscribed to

the concept of the citizenship of the mind, citizenship of ideals without the restrictiveness of nationality or race. A widely travelled man, Dr. Lohia dreamt of an international order where one could travel around the world without passports or visas. He was for the establishment of a World Parliament and a World Government to which the sovereign national states would voluntarily transfer a part of their sovereignty. He was also elected India's representative to the Conference for World Government in 1949.

Lohia had his own ideas about revolution. He justified revolution in any of the following conditions: (i) A revolt to establish complete equality between men and women; (ii) A revolt against the economic, political and social inequalities based on the colour of skin; (iii) A revolt against the traditional concept of caste based on birth and in favour of special opportunities for the backward; (iv) A revolt for overthrow of foreign rule, for freedom and for the establishment of a democratic government; (v) A revolt against the inequalities in accumulation of capital, for economic equality and planned increase in production; (vi) A revolt against interference in the private life of citizens and in favour of a democratic system of Government; and (vii) A revolt against conventional and nuclear weapons and for recognition of *satyagraha* as a legitimate weapon.

As Leader of Masses

Lohia's greatness was his simplicity and intense love for his fellow countrymen. He had shown equal concern for pain and pleasure. In him, there was an ideal combination of piety, love, modesty, anger and suffering. He was a relentless revolutionary and an exponent of dynamic political and economic thoughts. He was a leader of the masses and always talked in their language. He was a stormy petrel not only in the Lok Sabha where he fulminated on the floor of the House against the policies of the then Government but also in the larger and more extensive field of national life for over thirty years.

As a true nationalist, he disapproved the way in which the

young men and women of the country were copying the western way of life. He was fully devoted to the Indian civilization. He wanted that Hindi should flourish as our national language along with other Indian languages and English must go from India. He described fondness for English as a 'sinful life' .

Like Gandhiji, Lohia had also shown his disobedience to oppressive and cruel laws and rules. For him the very existence of such laws and rules was unbearable. Dr. Lohia personally was against the partition of India. He was whole-heartedly devoted to the Hindu-Muslim unity and after India achieved freedom and was partitioned he worked tirelessly and fearlessly to maintain the unity and communal harmony in various parts of the country.

As a Writer

Lohia was a prolific writer. His ideas were original and always created awareness among the masses. During the freedom movement he showed the way of freedom to the people through his writings and left an ever-lasting imprint of his thoughts on their minds. Among his publications a few were: *India on China; Struggle for Civil Liberties; Indians Outside India; Congress and War; Rebels Must Advance; Mystery of Sir Stafford Cripps; Third Camp in World Affairs; Himalayan Policy For India; Aspects of Socialist Policy; Fragments of a World Mind; Wheel of History; Will to Power and other Writings; Guilty Men of India's Partition; Marx, Gandhi and Socialism; India, China and Northern Frontiers; The Caste System; Language; Note and Comments; Interval During Politics; Foreign Policy; Valmiki aur Vashishtha; Kranti Ke 'Liye Sangathan; Hindu Aur Musalman; Nirasha Ke Kartavya; Krantikaran; Sarkari, Mathi Aur Kujat Gandhivadi; Ram, Krishna aur Shiva; Samaivadi Andolan Ka Itihas; Dharma Par Ek Drishti; Sapta Krantiyan.* He was also the Chairman of the Editorial Board of 'Mankind' and 'Jan'.

As an Exponent of new Theories

As an original thinker, he formulated the theories of: Twin origins of Capitalism and Imperialism; Small Unit Machine;

Equal irrelevance; The Third Camp; Immediacy; Oscillation; between Class and Caste; Efficiency, total or maximum; Physical and Cultural approximation of mankind; Permanent Civil Disobedience; Co-existence with Approximation; Autonomous relationship of general and economic aims or spirit and matter; Inverse relationship of Internal Rebellion and External Invasion; Preferential opportunity for Backward Groups in place of equal opportunities and Seven Revolutions.

As a Parliamentarian

Dr. Lohia was elected to the Third Lok Sabha in 1963 in a bye-election from Farrukhabad constituency in Uttar Pradesh. He took oath as a member on 13 August, 1963. On the first day when Lohia came to Lok Sabha, it appeared that a new life had come to the House. Every body in the House stood up and welcomed him when he entered the Chamber. Indeed with his entry, the House felt honoured. He was also given a civic reception at the Ramlila Ground in Delhi on his maiden entry in the Lok Sabha. He was again elected in March, 1967 to the Fourth Lok Sabha from kannauj constituency in Uttar Pradesh.*

A dedicated Parliamentarian, Lohia took keen interest in the business of the House. He used to come fully prepared for parliamentary debates and discussions. His speeches in the Lok Sabha gave new turns and twists to the Indian polity and provided real food for thought. Whether it was the policy of Non-alignment or the issue of corruption in the country, he always took the Government of the day to task. He pointed out the weaknesses of the Government policies through his speeches in the House. Whether it was the Prime Minister or any other Minister he spared none. Whenever he found any irregularity or any injustice being done, he was ever vigilant to raise the issue.

His arguments in what has come to be known as the 'Three

*His election to the Fourth Lok Sabha was set aside after his death, vide Allahabad High Court Judgement, dated 14.5.1969 based on its order of 31.1.1969 for a general rescrutiny and recount of valid votes. As Lohia had died on 12.10.1967 there could be only a nominal contest in this case from his side.

annas versus fifteen annas' debate were an eye-opener for the people of the country. Lohia asserted that the then Government's view that average income of a person in the country was fifteen annas was misleading and false. He proved by facts and figures that between 16 to 18 crore people were surviving on a daily earning of three and a half annas or four annas. Getting inspiration from him 'Janvani Day' was observed under his leadership in Delhi on 13 March, 1964.

It was indeed very sad that Lohia had a very short span of life. An original thinker, a unique leader, an eminent Parliamentarian and a rebel, Dr. Lohia passed away at New Delhi on 12 October, 1967 at an early age of 57. The news of his death spread like wild fire. The whole country was in mourning.

Glowing tributes were paid to Lohia in both the Houses of Parliament. His death was described as a great loss to the country and greater loss to Parliament. He was described as a valiant fighter, a great thinker and a dynamic personality in the true sense of the terms.

Describing his death as premature, the then Speaker, Lok Sabha, Dr. N. Sanjiva Reddy said that his death had removed from the Indian political scene and the House one of its outstanding leaders. The then Prime Minister, the late Shrimati Indira Gandhi, describing Lohia as a leading Parliamentarian, said that his untimely death had removed a vigorous mind and a dynamic character from the country. His whole life, according to her, was a "struggle for causes he held dear, for the downtrodden and the under-privileged."

Though he had never been a member of the Rajya Sabha, touching tributes were paid to him in that House also. The then Chairman of the Rajya Sabha, the late Shri V.V. Giri, described him as the founder of the socialist movement in the country and said that as a member of the Lok Sabha, Dr. Lohia 'established for himself an abiding reputation as a powerful speaker and an outstanding parliamentarian'. He added that though Dr. Lohia often "vigorously attacked Government's policies, his intentions

and sincerity were never in doubt; he always had the welfare of the people in mind.”*

Dr. Lohia was unmarried. He left behind no family, and no property but only his great ideas not only to the benefit of the people of India but to the benefit of whole mankind.

* For obituary references made in Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha on the death of Dr. Lohia, please see Part Four of the book.

Sources consulted

1. Arumugam, M.: *Socialist Thought in India—The Contribution of Rammanohar Lohia*, New Delhi, Sterling Publishers, 1978.
2. Kaushik, Karuna: *Russian Revolution and Indian Nationalism*. Delhi, Chanakya Publications, 1984.
3. Parameswaran, P. (ed): *Gandhi, Lohia and Deendayal*, New Delhi, Deendayal Research Institute, 1978.
4. Sen, S.P. (ed): *Dictionary of National Biography Vol. II*, Calcutta, Institute of Historical Studies, 1973.
5. Sharad, Onkar: *Lohia: A Biography*, Lucknow, Prakashan Kendra, 1972.
6. Vishnoo Bhagwan: *Indian Political Thinkers*, Delhi, Atma Ram & Sons, 1976.
7. Who's Who, Fourth Lok Sabha, 1967.
8. Lok Sabha Bulletin—Part II, dated 16 May, 1969.
9. *The Hindu*, 25 March, 1933.

P A R T T W O

ARTICLES

Lohia's Quest for a New Dimension

— Professor Madhu Dandavate

"He glorified the chains and jails of his captors into the shining ornaments of martyrdom"

This was the eloquent tribute paid to Mahatma Gandhi by the Negro leader, Mrs. Mary Bethune. How appropriate would this homage be in the case of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia as well! Dr. Lohia more than any one else wielded most effectively the Gandhian weapon of *satyagraha*, even after independence, to fight every form of injustice against the oppressed and the neglected. If Leon Trotsky, one of the leaders of the Russian Revolution professed the theory of "Permanent revolution", Dr. Lohia preached and practised the concept of "permanent civil disobedience" as a peaceful rebellion against injustice. To the overcautious "pragmatists" both of them appeared as "visionaries" or to use the term of the uncharitable critics "eccentrics". However, was not the Father of our Nation who showed obsession for 'Swadeshi', 'Şatyagraha' and 'non-cooperation', dubbed as a "fadist" and "eccentric"? The history records ample evidence to show that the revolutionaries whom their contemporaries dubbed as 'eccentric' were held by the succeeding generations as great beacon lights.

Immediacy in struggle and organisation

On the question of dynamics of action the traditional debate has been as to whether action should precede the organisation or whether organisation should be a bye-product of the programme of action. In his presidential address at the national convention of the Socialist Party held in May, 1952 at Pachmarhi, Dr. Lohia added a new dimension to this debate by propounding the theory of "immediacy in struggle and organisa-

tion". Those who mechanically applied their mind to the problems of organisation and indefinitely waited for the struggle to ripen at the highest stage of organisational work completely missed the opportunity to join the mainstream of the nation's struggle. The best instance is that of the RSS which for years harped on perfecting a disciplined organisation in search of the "opportune moment" for launching a struggle for independence. In this process the RSS remained completely isolated from the current of nation's freedom struggle. The other extreme is that of the adventurist actionists who considered organisation as the subsidiary part of the militant struggles and hoped that sharpening of people's struggles would itself throw up the necessary organisation with the militant outlook. Dr. Lohia exposed the futility of both these extreme viewpoints and pleaded in his theory of "immediacy" that organisation and action must continue as parallel currents. The preparations for organisation are to be linked up with the perspective of a programme of action and even in the midst of the most militant and dynamic action, the claims of organisation are not to be sacrificed. A careful study of revolutionary movements the world over has vindicated the correctness of his perspective, so ably put forward by Dr. Rammanohar Lohia.

Militancy Construction

In the early Years after the Second World War, when the Socialist Party had commendable strength in the field of organisation as well as action, Dr. Lohia revealed a mind which was most constructive and refreshing. He strongly pleaded for "constructive militancy" and "militant construction". In his own inimitable style he described "spade, prison and vote" as the symbols of this new perspective of action and construction. It was Dr. Lohia's imagination that, when the mammoth Janwani march of the people proceeds to the Rashtrapati Bhavan to present to the President of India the charter of demands it should do so after passing through hundrede and thousands of villages on its way undertaking mass constructive activities like digging wells, building bunds and cleansing the tanks with a direct involvement of the villagers in this mass constructive

work. It was a novel scheme indeed in which the people on the march reconciled the spirit of struggle with the spirit of construction. Will the socialist movement of our time show the robustness to recapture once again that spirit of constructive militancy? That would be the most meaningful tribute to the memory of late Dr. Lohia.

Search for Identity

Ever since the formation of the Congress Socialist Party in 1934, the socialist movement in India was in search of ideological identity. In the initial stages, the vague generalisations of Marxism dominated the ideology of the party. Many developments in the socio-economic field in Europe and elsewhere had challenged the validity of some of the basic postulates of Marxism. The history had posed many questions that remained unanswered by Marxism. Unfortunately, the socialists too had not displayed an enquiring mind to examine some of the fundamental formulations of the Marxian theory. The situation remained fluid till the Second World War. The period of the Second World War represented a period of ideological churning in the socialist movement. The process continued even in the post-War years. It cannot be denied that Rammanohar Lohia with his fresh mind made the most valuable contribution to this process of re-thinking in the socialist movement.

Marxism Re-examined

In his well-known article "*Economics after Marx*", written during the Second World War, Dr. Lohia sharply analysed the basic premises of the Marxian thought. His approach was most non-doctrinaire. He emphasised that no individual's thought could be made the sole frame of reference for the ideology of a movement. That summed up his attitude to Marx as well as to Gandhi. "I want the winds of all cultures to blow freely about my house, but not to be swept off my feet by any", said Mahatma Gandhi. These words of Gandhiji were the corner-stone of Dr. Lohia's approach to the ideological problems of the socialist movement. He showed the willingness to assimilate in the

socialist movement those elements of Marxism which had stood the test of time. However, he did not blindly accept some of the postulates of Marxism which were proved to be irrelevant in the new situation. Dr. Lohia, therefore, accepted broadly Marx's scientific method of interpreting history but at the same time he realised the limitation of this interpretation. Dr. Lohia emphasised that economic factors do contribute to the development of history but human will too was a factor to be reckoned with. In his own picturesque way he stated that "logic of events" as well as "logic of will" govern the path of human history.

Dr. Lohia seriously contested the claim of Marxism that revolution would take place at the highest level of economic and industrial development in a society. The facts that revolution took place in an economically backward country like Russia and it was bypassed in an industrially developed society in England and America confirm Dr. Lohia's analysis more than the predictions of Marx.

New Technology

The thread which Dr. Lohia had left in his article '*Economics after Marx*' was later on picked up by him in his presidential address delivered at Pachmarhi in 1952. He showed kinship between the techniques of production both under communism and capitalism and claimed that they were irrelevant to two thirds of the underdeveloped world that had high density of population, inadequacy of capital, and large unemployment. Dr. Lohia brought out the most glaring fact that communism borrowed from capitalism its conventional production techniques; it only sought to change relationship among the forces of production. Such a process, Dr. Lohia emphasised was completely unsuited to the conditions prevailing in India. He, therefore, pleaded for a small unit technology and the corresponding decentralised economy which is not to be confused with the Gandhian economy based on village self sufficiency. Dr. Lohia's insistence was on research and innovation to invent a new small unit machine run on electricity or diesel that could be taken to the remotest villages in India so as to fulfil the twin claims of providing jobs to the rural population as well as

augmenting production. Dr. Lohia claimed that such a small unit technology would be able to overcome the difficulties created by inadequacy of capital and the technique being labour intensive it would also eliminate, to a great extent, the concealed rural unemployment.

Preferential Opportunity

The traditional socialist thought based on pure "economic determinism" could not provide solutions to the problems of tradition bound Indian society which was marked not only by sharp class distinctions but by caste stratifications as well. The social exploitation resulting out of these caste stratifications had plagued the Indian society for centuries and strait-jacket theory of class struggle could not provide answers to complex questions created by our society. Dr. Lohia's greatest contribution to the socialist movement is his concept of a total revolution that would envelop the economic as well as social fields. He strongly pleaded for the viewpoint that Indian society oscillated between class and caste and unless the submerged castes and communities were liberated, the task of revolution in India would never be complete.

Even in the midst of fierce opposition from the upper caste orthodoxy, Dr. Lohia strongly espoused the cause of "preferential opportunities" for the backward castes and communities. Since these weaker sections of the society have developed a lag for centuries, mere equality of opportunity would not help in lifting up the oppressed sections from the miserable depths of degradation to which they have sunk. The concept of preferential opportunities to the weaker sections has been widely accepted today as an integral part of socialist thinking in India.

The scientific core of Marxian thought has been destroyed by the doctrinaire and dogmatic Marxists while Gandhiji's ideals have been buried by the Gandhians who have reduced the Gandhian way of life to a mere ritual. The socialists in India must ensure that Dr. Lohia's valuable contribution, which has introduced a new dimension in socialist thought and action, does not meet the same fate.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia: The Iconoclast

—*George Fernandes*

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was undoubtedly the most original thinker, and perhaps, the only one, India has produced during the last hundred odd years. Unlike most thinkers whose thoughts remain encapsuled for others to act upon, Dr. Lohia was a man of action who paid a heavy price for the courage of his convictions, having been arrested and jailed on innumerable occasions by the governments of Britain, India, Portugal, Nepal and the United States. He was also a political seer whose foresight regarding events always put him in a situation of being at least twenty years ahead of his time. Perhaps it is this prophet in him which once made him say: 'People will listen to me. Perhaps, after I am dead. But they will certainly listen to me'.

And people are listening to Dr. Lohia — in India and outside — nearly twenty years after he is dead.

At some point of time, Dr. Lohia summed up the essence of the great struggles in which humanity was engaged in the middle of the twentieth century, and of which he and the Socialist Party he had helped to create, were a part. The Seven Revolutions, as he called them, were: (1) for equality between man and woman; (2) against political, economic and spiritual inequality based on skin colour; (3) against inequality between backward and high groups or castes based on long tradition, and for giving special opportunities to the backward; (4) against foreign enslavement and for freedom and world democratic rule; (5) for economic equality and planned production and against the existence of and attachment for private capital; (6) against

unjust encroachments on private life and for democratic methods; (7) against weapons and for *satyagraha*.

It is around these struggles or revolutions that Lohia weaved his thoughts and programmes, constantly spearheading movements that earned him the opprobrium of the upholders of the old order which these struggles sought to overturn. The media in India, and for that matter the world over, which has generally been the handmaiden when it is not the whiplash of the ruling establishment, went to great lengths to denounce and denigrate Lohia like no other public personality in the country, through the clever subterfuge of distortion and the projection of the shadow but seldom the substance of what he said or did.

When, for instance, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru described his father Motilal Nehru as a prince among men, Lohia was quick to see in it a sinister design to distance the ruler from the ruled, the prince from the plebians. Recalling that Motilal Nehru's father (Jawaharlal's grandfather) was a Kotwal in the service of the British Government in Delhi, Lohia went on to speak of the tremendous inspiration and encouragement which the youth of India could have drawn, if they were made aware of the great drama that lay in the act of the grandson of a Kotwal and the offspring of a pleader coming to occupy the high office of the Prime Minister.

Hell was let loose on Lohia for what was described by the Prime Minister himself as an effort at the debasement of his pedigree, while all that Lohia wanted to do was to give hope to a people who had just been liberated from servitude and make them realize that, with freedom, a new, egalitarian order had dawned replacing the old feudal order. But Lohia was right. Nehru was seeking to destroy the very kernel of the democratic idea, by projecting himself as the son of a so-called prince. The dynasty was in the making.

Again, when the international media got into a simulated debate on 'after Nehru, who?', and authors and journalists vied with each other to scan the Indian scene in search of their prime ministerial candidates, Lohia tried to put an end to this

sham debate by declaring that Nehru had taken enough care to see that after him, it would be his daughter, adding, in a lighter aside, that this would enable the readers of the morning papers to have a bright and smiling face staring at them rather than the jaded face one had got tired of, and then, seriously expressing his fear and concern at the kind of snide attacks a woman Prime Minister would have to face in a male-dominated society. The scorn and derision with which this prophecy was received in 1958 by the media did not bother Lohia. It is his detractors who ultimately had to eat the humble pie.

For all the efforts of some savants of political history to trace the beginnings of socialism in the vedic literature and in the teachings of Jesus Christ, socialism is an idea which is of recent origin, the word itself making its first appearance around 1830. While many thinkers and writers in Europe propounded varying themes of the same idea, often laced with the Christian ethics, it was Karl Marx who proceeded to synthesize these themes into his theory of scientific socialism. The First International founded in 1864 was used by Marx to spread his ideas as distinct from the ideas of those whom he chose to brand as 'utopian socialists'. But scientific or utopian, all socialists strongly believed in the international brotherhood of the working people whose united strength would ultimately break the chains which bound them. The First International was dissolved in 1876 and the Second International founded in 1889. And by that time, the socialists were emerging as the most significant political force in Europe, more convinced than ever that the future lay with the workers of the world.

It was the First World War that destroyed all dreams (or were they illusions?) of socialist universalism, when the workers took up arms not to destroy their oppressors and exploiters but to defend their respective father or mother-lands, ruled by the very oppressors against whom they were fighting till the day before. With the death of the dream of the brave new world, what remained was the hope that socialism would provide the working people with better standards of living by capturing power whether through parliamentary or other means. The

period between the Russian Revolution and the Second World War, with Hitler and other fascist leaders holding the centre-stage in Europe, created ideological convulsions that drove the workers more and more into their own national cocoons and later into the armies that devastated most of Europe. Lohia was studying then at the Berlin university and was a ringside spectator of the cataclysmic developments that made a mockery of socialist and working class internationalism. And that is where he must have begun his search for truth which not only made him an inveterate foe of all dogma, Marxist or any other, and an iconoclast, but also a person who doggedly sought to marry precept with practice, both at personal and political levels.

Lohia's rejection of capitalism and communism was rooted in his intellectual perception of the "community of economic aims" they both shared and in their inadequacy to deal with the problems of large sections of humanity. He was unable to reconcile with those who believed that communism created conditions for economic democracy while capitalism allowed political democracy to flower. Lohia asserted that "communism (inherited) from capitalism its technique of production; it only (sought) to smash the capitalist relations of production", and went on to point out that communism claimed to be the continuator and developer of capitalist technology when capitalism itself was no longer able to do so.

To Lohia, socialism was a "newer doctrine than capitalism or communism", which had to devise its own ideological and programmatic formulations that could chart a new course to liberate humanity from the misery into which capitalism had pushed it. The evolution of European socialism into some kind of 'welfare-statism' had already convinced Lohia of its irrelevance to nearly two-thirds of the world whose economies had been ravaged by world capitalism. If European socialists had achieved distributive justice through constitutional methods applied gradually over a period of time, Lohia wanted socialism to be "drastic, unconstitutional when necessary, and to lay the accent on production".

And it is in the area of production that Lohia propounded his theory of the small unit technology. Arguing that given the population densities in countries inhabited by the 'coloured people' and their woefully meagre productive apparatus as compared to that of the white people of the world, it would be inconceivable for them to imitate the production patterns developed by capitalism. Lohia pleaded for "a new mode of rationalisation and a corresponding mode of ownership" for the 'coloured people' of the world. He wanted science to be as concerned with the environment as with the people it sought to serve. Improving on Mahatma Gandhi's ideas of decentralised technology, Lohia wanted the invention and production of machines which would be available in towns and villages. "This immediacy in science and planning", as he called it, had to be matched with "immediacy in ownership and political control".

Lohia believed that the "vast agrarian masses of India, except the big landlords, are the builders of socialism, one and all of them" and he decried the cavalier manner in which traditional socialism had treated the farmer. "European socialism and communism have drawn their main strength from the vast masses of factory workers and they have disliked the farmer, both because he is an owner of property and an exacter of high prices for their food", he wrote. If the western theory of the factory worker being the sole agency of the revolution was absurd, so was the one that sought to elevate the farmer into the sole instrument of the new order. According to Lohia: "Undoubtedly, the farmer in India, as elsewhere, has a great role to play, than whom none is greater, but others may have equal roles to play. The talk of subsidiary alliances between farmers and workers and artisans and city poor must be replaced by the concept of equal relationship in the revolution."

The struggle for this new political and economic order, however, had to be a peaceful one, though Lohia did not rule out spontaneous violence at a certain stage of an intense struggle by the people. While Gandhiji mystified his concept of

satyagraha, Lohia called for individual and mass civil disobedience against injustice in all its forms and for the creation of a new order.

Lohia believed that unless the spirit of Indian people which had declined over the centuries was revived, there would be no genuine forward movement for the country. "I am convinced that the two segregations of caste and woman are primarily responsible for this decline of the spirit. These segregations have enough power to kill all capacity for adventure and joy", he wrote. Stating that poverty and these two segregations thrived on each other's worms, he asserted that "all war on poverty is a shame, unless it is, at the same time, a conscious and sustained war on these two segregations". It is this insight into the social situation in India which made him devise his theory of special opportunities or preferential treatment to the socially deprived sections of the humanity. In the Socialist Party which he founded in 1955, sixty percent of all offices and committees had to be filled by electing people who belonged to the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Backward Castes, women, as well as religious minorities from the backward castes. He applied the same rule for all elective positions from Parliament down to the local bodies.

Lohia's idea of preferential opportunities invited the wrath of the Indian establishment which has been and is still dominated by the upper castes. Lohia was aware of the odds he faced while seeking to give a real meaning to the abstract concept of equality in the specific Indian context, where five thousand years of history had condemned over eighty per cent of the people to a life of secondary status. He met the arguments of the Marxist dogmatists who were vicious in their attack on this concept of preferential opportunities and accused him of indulging in casteist politics by telling them that class was but ossified caste.

Lohia believed that woman in India suffered from two handicaps: one, from the usual, universal male domination; and two, and more important, from the obnoxious caste system. Therefore, it was all the more necessary that women were

given special opportunities if they were ever to achieve equality with men in the Indian situation. "All politics in the country, Congress, Communist or Socialist, has one big area of national agreement, whether by design or through custom, and that is to keep down and disenfranchise the Sudra and the women who constitute over three-fourths of our entire population", he wrote in 1953.

While he appreciated and supported the concerns of urban feminists, he felt that the problems of women went far beyond matters like marriage and property rights. According to Lohia: "The problem of the majority of Indian women is the lack of water taps and latrines. The Indian woman is condemned to the drudgery of drawing water, often dirty and muddy, from distant wells or ponds and carry it home every morning and evening. She must also save her modesty by easing herself in the open fields either before sunrise or after sunset. Her slavery in the kitchen is an abomination, with a stove that smokes horribly". These became the issues of his campaigns and struggles for women's emancipation. At the same time, he wanted women to be involved in the agitations against under-feeding and unemployment and other injustices. Any talk of radical changes without women being involved in the struggles did not impress him. He once wrote: "I was part of a coffee-house group of talkers one day, when someone suggested that it was such coffee-talk that bred the French revolution. I boiled with rage. There was not one Sudra among us. There was not one woman among us. A dull, effete and insipid lot we were, cattle ever cudding yesterday's feed."

Lohia believed that for democracy to be real, the use of people's language was a *sine qua non*. The stranglehold of English had to be broken, and children taught in their mother-tongue. Here again, he was up against the power of the microscopic minority of English-read people who had acquired a grip on services and industry, even if their denial of people's languages was destroying the very soul of India. Sizing up the magnitude of the struggle to create a just

society in India, he warned against the deadly combination of the power of money, English language and upper castes in India's life.

The failure of the socialist movement to create an adequate enough instrument to spearhead the "seven revolutions" frustrated Lohia. But, unlike his comrade-in-arms, Jayaprakash Narayan, who was so overwhelmed by the enormity of the task of taking socialism to power that he chose to withdraw himself into the world of non-party politics, Lohia soldiered on, prodding socialists to organise themselves into a party capable of capturing power in seven years, even while exhorting them to have patience and commitment to carry on the struggle for one hundred years.

The Chinese aggression in 1962 made Lohia change his tactical line of going it alone in the struggle for political power. He persuaded the entire spectrum of opposition parties to have mutual adjustments to overthrow Congress rule. The new tactical line of non-Congressism paid rich dividends in the elections to Parliament and the State Assemblies in January 1967, and Lohia was acknowledged as the tallest among all political leaders in the country. His death in October of the same year "caused by medical and governmental negligence", as Madhu Limaye put it, was a setback not only to the socialist movement but to the entire country.

While there is no reason to doubt that Indian history would have taken a different course if Lohia had survived a little longer, who knows if he would have lived to see his dreams converted into reality or died a sad and disillusioned man like Mahatma Gandhi before him and Jayaprakash Narayan after him. But Lohia's thought will remain and acquire greater relevance as humanity grapples with the myriad crises facing it and pursues the "seven revolutions" that Lohia had identified.

Lohia Today

—P. Upendra

".... I have nothing of my own except the fact that the poor, the common people of India, believe that perhaps I belong to them."

These were the words of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, a towering personality among the freedom fighters of India, who had a superb combination of courage, bravery, piety, love, modesty and suffering. Dr. Lohia was a relentless fighter of masses.

Dr. Lohia used to say: "India has two unifying forces — Mahatma Gandhi and the movies." He would go on speaking on this topic for hours together in coffee houses and cafes provided he had argumentative companions. In fact, his audience comprised a variety of people from all walks of life like, labourers, intellectuals, journalists, politicians, students, including poets and writers, with empty pockets but who could devote their time without looking at their watches. But, above all, he was a revolutionary from his heart and soul. Onkar Sharad writes:

"Whatever Lohia said or did, it was a bitter and strong reaction against injustice. He had a strong will, restraint, courage and patience. It was due to these sterling qualities that Lohia could bear the repeated sufferings and insults showered on him. With the lapse of time he became immune to these human onslaughts. His steps never faltered. He went ahead with a broad grin from ear to ear. It was like a tigerish grin, a grin of derision."

Rammanohar, born at Akbarpur in Faizabad district in Uttar Pradesh on 23 March 1910, never married and after obtaining his Ph. D. degree from Berlin University, he got some

assignment in Birla concerns but soon after gave up his job and his final choice of politics as a career was made when the Congress Socialist Party was formed in 1934. He was elected as a Member of Executive Committee and also the first editor of the new weekly, the Congress Socialist. This election brought him a change of place also and he shifted from Calcutta to Allahabad.

Quoting the qualities of Mahatma Gandhi, Dr. Lohia once said in his statement during a trial case on 26 July 1954:

"The third man of right is Mahatma Gandhi. I believe that he was the most learned righteous person, not only in India but far more than 500 years in the whole of the world. He was perhaps not a constructive thinker. But he has probably never used his tongue in uttering vague words. For instance, he had said that it was the oldest, easy and birth right of every individual and public men not to pay taxes. Once I had conversations with Gandhiji....at that time I and other persons like me did not find themselves in accord with his policies, yet we wanted that his call for civil disobedience should be got spread over for centuries onwards in the entire world. Then Gandhiji had told that he could not understand how such a dual would continue, but he indicated us to proceed onwards..."

Dr. Lohia had his own way of life. Once he had made up his mind on a particular issue, he would not easily bow down before the arguments given by any other person. He had heated discussions with the Congress leaders also. As a true Socialist he tried to make this movement popular all over the country.

About the distinction between the Marxism and Socialism, Dr. Lohia says: "one would have to admit that Marxism and Communism construe their task by one-half. They think alone in

terms of destroying the relations of capitalist production, whereas genuine Socialism would have to think in terms of destroying both the capitalist relations of production and the capitalist forces of production, or atleast vastly remodelling them....apart from social gains, there is no way yet to compare the accountancy of 'round-about production', with that of immediate production. Furthermore, the advocates of the small-unit machine do not totally reject mass production where it is inescapable."

Dr. Lohia and his other Socialist followers left the Congress in 1948. He fought relentless battles for social and economic emancipation of the poor, depressed, down-trodden and weaker sections of the society. He inaugurated the Socialist Party at Hyderabad and became its Chairman and Editor of the Mankind in 1956.

He went to jail many times during the freedom struggle but could he get the freedom for poor even after the independence?—a big question mark which took his life ultimately on 12 October 1967. His dreams remained unfulfilled. He is no more but his ideals are taking shape in new India—in modern India—today. He is more relevant today in our country than he was during his life-time. Perhaps he thought much ahead of his time. He has become a legend and an inspiring force to the nation.

Though a follower of Gandhiji he differed from him on many issues. He was bold enough to speak to Gandhiji on many controversial matters. Sometimes Gandhiji had sleepless nights while brooding over Dr. Lohia's suggestions.

In the annals of Indian history, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia's name can be entered as a great thinker, representative of the poor and the downtrodden, an idealist and a visionary who dreamt of one world inhabited by intellectual world citizens.

A Profound Thinker— Dr. Rammanohar Lohia

—*Laloo Prasad*

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was a man of multifarious personality. He was a profound thinker who could analyse political, economic and social problems in their totality. He has widely influenced the present generation through his unique personality and ideas. His ideas about the solution to the problems facing the nation and society were original.

So far as originality of ideas, action, courage of conviction, fulfilment of life and continuous struggle is concerned, Dr. Lohia has been a unique personality of the socialist movement in the country. His knowledge was vast. He had a wonderful art of delving deep into the problems to find out a solution. He was a man of the masses in the real sense. Masses were his prime concern and he used to fight for their upliftment. It was he who had initiated a discussion on the wide economic disparity in the country, which came to be widely known as the debate on 'Fifteen Annas Vs three Annas'. He left an indelible mark on the political and economic thought, social ethics, administrative, national and international policies of the socialist movement. He was known throughout the world as a bitter critic of the contemporary rulers in the country. He was an avowed critic of the policies of Pt. Nehru. He always believed that one's profession and practice should be same. He stood for a constant struggle against injustice. He not only preached it but also practised it. That is why the number of his supporters, followers and disciples slowly swelled and he became a unique leader of the masses.

Lohiaji was the propounder of a radical ideology. He gave

many famous slogans like Destroy Caste, Contain Prices, Save Himalayas, Ceiling on Expenditure, Bhoomi Sena, Lok Bhasha, Lok Bhoosha, Lok Bhawan, Lok Bhojan etc. Each of them has its own significance in nation building.

Lohia, at the outset, did a survey of the problems of our society and came to the conclusion that the cancer of casteism was eating into the vitals of our society. He made a detailed study and rejected the theory of Marx which implied that the purgation of the society is possible only through a class struggle but Lohiaji said that alongwith that struggle, unless there was a two-pronged attack on caste system, no equality could be brought about in this country and capitalist economy could not be abolished. While on the one hand, the world philosophers and thinkers said that to bring an end to this situation, equal opportunities will have to be given to all, Dr. Lohia said that in all the countries of the world, at least 60 per cent jobs should be reserved for those who have been hitherto suppressed and exploited. At least in the Indian context, it was true where the people belonging to certain castes were always humiliated and exploited and branded as backward and untouchables. Lohiaji included women and backwards in the minorities in this category and wanted that in Government jobs, 60 per cent reservation should be made for them. He wanted it to continue until the so called upper classes and backward classes came at par. The day they come at par, there will be no provision of special opportunities for them. Such a provision is required to be made only under these special circumstances and as soon as this situation ceases to persist, there will be no necessity of such special opportunities. Thereafter everybody will be treated equally and get equal opportunities according to his merit.

The Gandhian era of sacrifice has now come to an end and a materialistic age has set in wherein hard earned money of the poor and oppressed is being squandered away in the name of developmental projects. Even today, there are crores of people in this country who do not have two square meals a day and they sleep on the footpaths and pavements. Even drinking

water facility is not available in all the villages. Lohiaji gave a clarion call to the people and said that there is limit to one's patience. Now that patience has crossed all limits and the situation has become explosive.

Lohiaji had a vision of such a Socialist Government which might be in line with the present form of Government of some country and quite contrary to that in some other's case. However, he wanted to blend all the good points of various types of Government in that Socialist State. Though a Gandhian, he never liked to be called a Gandhian and though a Marxist he never considered himself to be a Marxist. He used to say that he was neither a supporter nor an opponent of Gandhi or Marx. Thus he had his own original ideas about politics in this country.

In keeping with his claim of being a Gandhian, a harmonization of Gandhian thought and ideology in his programmes and conduct was an integral part of Dr. Lohia's personality. In active politics, perhaps no other political leader personified Gandhian thought as much as Dr. Lohia did. Then, why did he say like this? There can be a question on this. In reply to it, one can say that perhaps he said it because he was aware that the politicians of this country knew how to serve their selfish ends by exploiting his name; because the Government which claimed to uphold Gandhian ideology functioned contrary to that ideology and this tantamounted to an outright negation of the principles and policies Gandhiji stood for and as Dr. Lohia said, time and again, in this country Gandhiji has been reduced to a relic, a showpiece kept in the museum. Government wants to escape from its responsibilities by organising meetings on the occasions of Gandhiji's birthday and the martyrdom day, but almost everyday we have been witnessing it with our own eyes that our Government has been squandering money. This used to take place in a country where the average per capita daily income was a mere 20 paise. It is indeed a ludicrous situation, that the so-called leaders of this country who call themselves Gandhians, drive a nail in the coffin of his thoughts everyday.

Perhaps, the reason why Dr. Lohia never wanted to call himself a Gandhian was that he did not like to be called a blind follower of Mahatma Gandhi. The points on which he agreed with Gandhiji were evident in his conduct itself. Dr. Lohia championed the cause of Hindi by insisting upon that it should be the national language, he stood for the all round development of the villages, he called for providing drinking water facilities in all the villages and he wanted the villages to benefit from the fruits of development so that developmental activities could be accelerated in the underdeveloped villages to bring them at par with the cities in terms of development. Now, in our country, there is discrimination between villages and cities too and the enlightened people of this country can do nothing, but laugh to see that the people living in cities, which are well-electrified, get double the quantity of their requirement of kerosene oil, while only a minimum quantity is made available to those living in the rural areas. The Government which functioned in that manner was correctly called '*aundhi khopdi ki sarkar*' (stupid Government) by Dr. Lohia.

All these things took place in independent India, about which people had great hopes and aspirations, that once the country became independent, development work would be taken up afresh and that the people of this country would have better housing and educational facilities and ample employment opportunities, but after attaining independence the people saw that the ruling party belied their hopes. No doubt, all these facilities and opportunities were provided, but only to those forty lakh people who had received their education in English schools and these are the people who are now holding the reins of power in this country. So, the charges levelled by Dr. Lohia were true and based on facts. He was in favour of such a language which could be understood by a common man because only then the people would be fully seized of the programmes and policies of the Government and everyone would be able to evaluate the performance of the Government. It is indeed a strange situation in our country, where we do have universal Adult Franchise, but there is nobody to tell and

educate the people on how to choose their representatives. People are misled in the name of caste and religion and the situation in this country is deteriorating day by day.

Dr. Lohia was a person of extraordinary talent, from the point of view that he was a radical thinker. Now-a-days petty interests and narrow regional and linguistic loyalties are common in our politics but loftier than all this was Dr. Lohia's nationalism of the highest order, which sought equal rights for both the minorities and the majority community. He wanted both of them to become responsible with their ardent faith in socialism. Dr. Lohia had in him, all the qualities of an international leader, because outside India too, he sounded the bugle of rebellion against the monarchy in Nepal, rose in revolt against the colonial rule of the Portuguese in Goa and faced the grim tortures of prison life too. Dr. Lohia also held a demonstration against apartheid and racial discrimination and courted arrest in the Texas city of the world's richest country, the United States of America. Apart from Mahatma Gandhi, no other leader so successfully attracted world wide attention, through his conduct, as much as Dr. Lohia did. We find in Dr. Lohia, a sense of deep trust and faith in the world i.e. in humanity as a whole. He was a champion par excellence for the cause of women's rights. It seemed as if a thorough study of women's plight throughout the world and a solution of their problems permeated his very thoughts and each and every word of his writings. The efforts of Dr. Lohia in case of Svetalana for her staying on in India are unforgettable. We find in Dr. Lohia, an affection, an affinity and a fraternal relationship towards all the people and that is the very base of his political philosophy.

Future generation would find it difficult to believe that such a person too lived in this world, who did not have an iota of selfishness or other petty considerations in him. Dr. Lohia lived with the aspiration to alleviate the sufferings of crores of his countrymen and he died with the longing to help them overcome their distress and agony. Even today, Dr. Lohia's thoughts are relevant to give proper guidance to the Government and people of our country. Even now, our country

can recapture its lost glory, if it implements atleast some of the policies advocated by Dr. Lohia.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia: A Far-sighted Revolutionary

—*Mulayam Singh Yadav*

I feel immense pleasure and pride to associate myself with this book on the personality, works and ideology of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia which is being published on the occasion of his birthday. On this occasion, I pay my rich tributes to our great leader and guide and wish this publication a success.

True to his name, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was a prudent revolutionary and a great socialist leader, thinker and philosopher and he made a significant contribution to give a concrete shape to socialism in India. He struggled throughout his life for achieving the objects of socialism in the country and gave revolutionary slogans like save Himalayas, banish English, destroy caste system etc.

Working in association with Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan and Acharya Narendra Deva, Dr. Saheb propounded a new concept of Indian socialism by giving it a new shape to bring it in line with the expectations and aspirations of the people of this country. Nevertheless, he prepared a team of valiant and brave youngsters to give a concrete shape to the philosophy of Indian socialism. I take it as one of his great achievements.

Dr. Saheb was a great leader who was blessed with a deep foresight. He was a great visionary who could foresee and analyse the coming events. Whatever he said during his life time is now coming up in that very shape. In 1956, when Russia came forward with its troops in Hungary to crush the populist movement with their suppressive measures, Dr. Saheb

had predicted that like British imperialism, the Russian Communism will also be thrown into shambles. The present shape and sequence of events in the Communist World and Russia itself has proved that he had foreseen all these things in their true shape.

Similarly, Dr. Saheb had emphatically stressed on the need of formulating a policy on Himalayas. I am of the firm opinion that if a comprehensive policy on Himalayas regarding Nepal, Tibet, Sikkim and Kashmir had been discussed at that time and a decision in this regard had been taken, it would have been an altogether different situation today.

Dr. Saheb was the originator of non-Congressional ideology. Due to his initiative in the direction of non-Congress ideology after independence, it was for the first time in 1967 that non-Congress Governments were formed in different parts of the country right from Chandigarh to Calcutta and today the change of Government at the Centre and in many of the States has been a success in a big way. It is necessary for strengthening and successful working of democracy but Dr. Saheb was of the clear opinion that no radical change could be brought about by winning Lok Sabha and Assembly elections through manipulations. Such a change could be brought about only through a change in the condition of our masses, farmers and the marketing system.

During the last elections, we had resolved for a change in power alongwith the change in system. No doubt, Governments have changed but we are yet to provide social and economic justice to the people. For this, we will have to mobilise a campaign to bring about a change in our marketing, transportation and farm management systems. Having done that, we will be able to fulfil the dreams of Dr. Saheb.

In this struggle for change in system, our youths will have to play an important role. However, it is something very sad that our youths do not have that political consciousness. This was the initiative of only a prudent leader like Dr. Lohia who came forward to support the participation of youth in the politics. Dr.

Lohia was the first person who advocated and fought for voting right to the youth of 18 years of age. Today, when they have been granted this right, they will have to come forward in the active politics. Only then we will be able to bring out our youth from the state of directionless pursuits in the society and engage our youth power in the creative activities through their political involvement.

How great Dr. Lohia was, can be adjudged from the fact that Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru himself accepted all his ideas. Immediately after independence he gave a slogan '*Ek ghanta desh ko, baki apne pet ko*' (one hour for the nation and rest for our own livelihood) so Pt. Nehru cleverly started '*Shramdan*' programme. When Dr. Lohia gave the slogan of maintaining equal distance from both the power blocs at international level, Nehruji gave it the name of '*Non-Alignment*'. When Dr. Lohia said that the Prime Minister should be from South, Pt. Nehru appointed President from the South.

Dr. Lohia was not only a revolutionary in political field but he was also a revolutionary social reformer. He was the first leader in our country who thought in terms of equality between men and women. He was the first leader who advocated compulsory reservation for the women. There is hardly any aspect of life on which he has not written anything. Moreover on every aspect of life, his thoughts are radical and thought provoking.

At present our country is passing through a critical phase. Today some forces are creating an atmosphere of tension and violence in the name of religion and community and hatching a conspiracy aimed at the destabilisation and disintegration of this country. Of late our country has been witnessing communal tension on such a large scale as we have never seen since independence. Today, it is the first and foremost duty of every Indian to strengthen the national unity and promote communal harmony. To achieve this end Dr. Lohia has also shown us the way.

Dr. Lohia had said it much earlier that *Ram Janambhoomi Babri Masjid* controversy was not a new one. To trace the

origin of the problem we shall have to go back into our history of past 700 to 800 years. Today Hindus have developed a feeling that atrocities were committed on them during the Muslim rule and similarly Muslims think that there was a time when they ruled this country and now they have fallen on bad days. Dr. Lohia had emphasised it much earlier that such apprehensions should be removed from the minds of the people. We will have to make our people understand that it was not a confrontation between Hindus and Muslims but between the Indians and foreigners.

If we want to ease communal tension, we shall have to adopt the path shown by Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Lohia. In the time of crisis it is the duty of Hindus as well as Muslims, where they are in majority, to come forward to protect the lives of the minority Community at the risk of their own life and remove the fear of insecurity from the minds of the people of the minority community.

Today Dr. Lohia is not with us but his ideals will last long. If we want to save this country we shall have to follow those ideals. His followers are firmly trying to follow his ideals, be it the question of organising Bhumi Sena, banishing English or be it the question of development and welfare of villages and farmers.

Like me there are a number of his followers and successors of his great political legacy who are committed to realise his dreams and for that they are ready to make any sacrifice. There will be no difference between our words and deeds. I would like to assure that the Lohia Trust which has been set up at Lucknow with a view to commemorate and propagate the ideals of Dr. Lohia, will have my full support and cooperation in the implementation of its publicity programmes.

As a mark of respect we have also taken certain decisions in Uttar Pradesh to refresh in the minds of the people the memory of Dr. Lohia. In all jails of Uttar Pradesh, where he was kept as prisoner, the placards giving all details of his life, will be displayed. A 40-km. long ring road being constructed at

Lucknow will be named after Dr. Lohia and a statue of Dr. Lohia will be erected at his native place Akbarpur (Faizabad). A big hospital is being constructed at Farrukhabad which will be named after him. It is also our earnest desire that a big institution is set up after the name of Dr. Lohia in Uttar Pradesh.

Lohia—An Immortal Personality

—Madhukar Dighe

In 1948-49, I was in Gorakhpur (U.P.) and used to live in the office of Socialist Party. By the end of 1946, I had gone to Gorakhpur at the instance of Jayaprakashji to work for railway organisation. In those days, Shri Jayaprakash was the General Secretary of the All India Socialist Party. In those days the membership of the socialist party was restricted and there were only 30 or 35 members of that party in Gorakhpur District. Deoria, which is a District at present, was merely a tehsil then. Dr. Lohia had to address a public meeting in Nautanava, a famous township in other tehsil Farendia of District Gorakhpur. Nautanava is situated at the borders of Gorakhpur District and Nepal. There was a special purpose for holding a meeting in Nautanava. There was a growing feeling of resentment among the masses against Rana regime of Nepal and Nepali Congress was launching an agitation. We had received a telegram that Dr. Lohia was arriving at Gorakhpur. At that time we were sitting in the office with our leader Suryanath Pandey. Seeing the telegram, one of the workers Shri Kalapnath Singh remarked "what a beautiful handwriting Dr. Lohia has got". There was a very happy atmosphere, I had, therefore, said jocularly, "Perhaps Dr. Lohia after writing the telegram in his own handwriting, posted it on a telegraphic pole, with the result the telegram has reached here." Shri Kalapnath Singh did not follow my joke and he got angry with me. Later on, I explained to him that it was the handwriting of the Post Master and not that of Dr. Lohia.

But, I was very much surprised when I saw an article written by Dr. Lohia in his own handwriting. The handwriting in that article was even more beautiful than that of the Post Master,

whether it was Hindi or English. I was thinking that handwriting of Dr. Lohia would not be more beautiful than that of the postmaster, but my presumption proved to be wrong.

I have explained this incident in detail, because it was not so easy, but it was rather impossible to know and understand Dr. Lohia or his views in the first instance.

Hundreds of workers like me, who were known as marxists and liked to remain in the company of Shri Jayaprakash, in the beginning took Dr. Lohia a conservative and Gandhian person. We did not like criticism of marxism by him and his more stress upon organisations of farmers in comparison to those of the workers. We recognised organisations of workers as revolutionary group and farmers' organisations as organisations of property holders and their spokes man as a conservative person. We gave due importance to the ideas of Dr. Lohia only after the success of Chinese Revolution.

We could understand a little his famous thesis of Pachmarhi only in Hardoi Conference of U.P. Socialist Party and that too after detailed explanatory analysis by respected Acharya Narendra Devji.

I recollect that occasion even today when the slogans "*U.P. ka kisan jaga, aur Pant Minister bhaga*" and "*Socialist Party ka elan, nahin denge dus guna lagan*" were raised by more than one lakh farmers when they had demonstrated before Vidhan Sabha Bhavan in Lucknow. Senior leaders of the party like Dr. Lohia, Shri Jayaprakash and Acharya Narendra were leading that demonstration. Gathering of farmers looked like a sea of red caps. We were all happy and were feeling proud of wearing red caps. On the request of the Party workers, Shri Jayaprakash and Acharyaji also had to wear red caps. Dr. Lohia not only refused to wear a red cap but also put off his white cap and in his speech said that it was dangerous for the

party to identify the workers by red caps or by any other symbol. That speech of Dr. Lohia did not have very good effect on us, and some persons even said that Dr. Lohia was a hurdle in the progress of Socialist Party. We could not understand Dr. Lohia's point at that time. We understood him when we saw that even honest people, people having no power or authority, patriots, revolutionary persons and freedom fighters wearing white Gandhian caps and Kurta-Pyjama made of Khadi were also being abused by the common man in buses and no one was ready to hear them. I do not remember that Gandhiji had ever worn Gandhi cap or cloths made of Khadi. A dirty fish spoils the clean water of the entire pond. Though the pond is not responsible for it, yet we call it a dirty pond. Dr. Lohia had the foresight to see its implications.

He was a visionary. He was endowed with the quality of foresight as he could visualize the incidents many years before they actually happened. When he put forward the idea for formation of an Indo-Pak Confederation, people called him 'Utopian' and dismissed his ideas as a foolish proposition. Years ago, when he had predicted that East Pakistan would not continue to remain a part of Pakistan for three reasons and it is bound to secede from Pakistan, at that time, the vulgar allegations which were made against him by the press, can never be forgotten. It is my firm opinion that not only most of the newspapers but majority of journalists also are opposed to any change in the country. Earlier, they were pro-British, later on they became pro-Nehru family and now they are pro-high castes and pro-communalism. For sometime, a journalist might not be subjected or influenced by any temptation, but ultimately he or she is influenced by the temptation. Generally, there is hold of high castes on newspapers, journalism and media. But, of course, there are certain journalists who are still honest.

The freedom struggle of Bangladesh was based on the three reasons given by Dr. Lohia. Three reasons given by Dr. Lohia were as follows: "The language spoken in East Pakistan and West Pakistan is totally different". The distance between East

Pakistan and West Pakistan is 1500 kms. The economy of West Pakistan survives on the exploitation of East Pakistan. When Dr. Lohia had put forward these ideas, not only the Pakistan but also the Government of India had called him an irresponsible person. When the situation changed in 1970-71 and violent agitation started in Bangladesh, the people, who called Dr. Lohia an irresponsible person and a mad man, started taking advantage and credit for the situation. After Nagpur Conference of the party and after reorganisation of the party in the Hyderabad Conference, all of us felt ourselves almost pigmy and insignificant in the face of revolutionary, scientific and socialist ideas of Dr. Lohia and active revolutionism and we became not only followers of Dr. Lohia, but also his ardent supporters.

The situation which has developed in Russia and whole of Europe almost 70 years after communist Revolutions of USSR was possible to be perceived 35 or 40 years ago for the wisdom of Dr. Lohia only. The methods and means of production of capitalism and communism are similar. Therefore, both of them are not suitable for those countries of Asia and particularly India, where population is more, land is scarce and capital is inadequate for development. The principles of his Seven Revolutions (*Sapta Kranti*) such as use of small machines, end of exploitation of a human being by another human being or that of a nation by another nation with the help of non-violent, civil disobedience movement, end of racial discrimination, caste based discrimination and equality between man and woman, right to form World Government to all on the basis of one vote, are now being recognised in the World gradually, but only after his death. Dr. Lohia had correctly said, that he would perhaps be understood after his death.

Dr. Lohia was one of the most original thinkers of this century. Not only his personality but his activity also was multi-dimensional. There was no subject as Politics, Sociology, Literature, History, Religion which was left untouched by him. Right from the freedom struggle of the country till his death, he always fought for his principles.

Dr. Lohia was not only a revolutionary thinker and a devoted worker, but also a truthful man, a friend, a guide, a well wisher of the poor, a person having highest regards for women and a person who never tolerated any sort of discrimination between man and woman. He had a very unique personality. He was a unique person in all respects.

Once Dr. Lohia was to come to Lucknow. We went to the station to receive him. In those days, it was not at all possible to arrange even for a single motor vehicle, leave aside present day motorcades. Generally, a rickshaw or a tonga was used to be hired. Dr. Lohia always used to avoid rickshaw. In his opinion, travelling on a rickshaw was a sin. He used to say that the rickshaw puller had been made "half-man and half-horse" and so he used to refuse to travel on a rickshaw. That is why we used to bring him to our residence on a tonga only. On that day also, we took him to the residence of Acharya Narendra Deva at New-Hyderabad on a tonga, Acharyaji gave him a very warm reception and took him to a room for his stay there. Later, taking breakfast on the table, Acharyaji handed over a book to Dr. Lohia and asked him whether he had read that new book. Whenever Acharyaji asked anything, his eyes were generally full of meaningful smile. Dr. Lohia saw the title page of the book and told at once that he had already read its manuscript. I and several others who were standing around the table were surprised to hear this. When Dr. Lohia went out of the room, Acharyaji told us that if Dr. Lohia would not have joined politics, he would have been an eminent scholar in the world. He had one bad habit. He could not stick to one place otherwise his writings would have largely benefited the world and the socialism and that is why Yusuf Meher Ali used to say, "I wish Dr. Rammanohar Lohia may be put in a closed room alongwith pen, paper, food, tea and cigarette—555 and he should not be allowed to come out until he has written a complete book".

Acharyaji was living in Hazaratganj near New-Hyderabad in those days. He had converted his official residence (Vice-Chancellor's residence) of Lucknow University into a 'hostel' in view of the students hardships.

Whenever Acharyaji addressed Lohia, he always addressed him as Dr. Saheb but Dr. Saheb always used to address Acharyaji as Narendra Devji. I could not resist myself and when I was going along with him to the office located at Pandariba, I mustered courage to ask him my question. I said that Acharyaji being senior in age to him (Dr. Lohia) always addressed him as Dr., but he always used to address Acharyaji as Narendra Deva. Why was it so? The reply of Dr. Saheb forced me to have pity only on my ignorance. Dr. Saheb said, "you see; if your father or elder brother happens to be Vice-Chancellor or President, will you call him with the name of his designation? It is immaterial if he calls you with any of the respectable names to give you honour."

Once Dr. Lohia came to Gorakhpur in connection with a programme. We had made arrangements for his stay in a Railway Retiring Room. For the morning breakfast, I along with other colleagues took him to Railway Restaurant. After making Dr. Saheb and other important colleagues who all were white collared sit on a table and asking the bearer to bring the breakfast etc. for them, I became busy in making the arrangements outside the Restaurant for the sitting of the other party colleagues who had come from the villages so that they might not enter the Restaurant. I wanted to make them sit at some distance. It was my intention that Dr. Saheb could take breakfast without any obstacle. But some people sat on the bench kept at the door of the Restaurant so that they might see Dr. Saheb properly. It was natural. But my difficulty was that I was neither in a position to pay the breakfast bill for a large number of persons nor did I want that they should come inside the Restaurant in their dirty and filthy clothes. Before I could return Dr. Saheb, he came outside with the entire plate of toasts in one hand and his plate of toasts in other and sat among the people sitting outside on the bench. He distributed the toasts among them. The people sitting inside could be able to have tea only. We all had got his intention. Dr. Saheb told us not to look down upon even a rural worker and not to hate his filthy clothes.

After this incident, we never dared to have any sort of discrimination with anybody. Woman, Harijan, Mohammedan, Hindu, the poor, the rich whosoever one might be, all were equal in his eyes. He gave equal respect to all.

Such was Dr. Lohia. Even the smallest thing could not escape his sight. There are thousands of incidents it mentioned will go to make a voluminous book. Today not only the lakhs of socialist workers but also the country is feeling his absence. Dr. Lohia is immortal and he will be immortal also in the ages to come. He and his thoughts will always be relevant.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia — The Great Socialist

— *Surendranath Dwivedy*

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was a comrade and leader. We worked together in the socialist movement for more than three decades. His untimely death at a very crucial stage of the socialist movement was a great loss to the nation as a whole.

He was the only person who rose to great heights from among our generation. His name would always be remembered amongst the galaxy of valiant freedom-fighters and national leaders in this country. He was imprisoned many times more during Congress regime than under the British rule. He was a great fighter who would not tolerate injustice, no matter wherever it existed and would resist it by all means, if necessary alone. He was not prepared to take rest until and unless the last vestiges of British Imperialism and feudal system got eliminated from the soil of India. His vision of free India was from Kailash Mansarovar to Cape Camorin and therefore he raised his powerful voice against Portuguese Imperialism and was the first Indian to be jailed in Goa; as well as against so called Innerline bar in North-East regions and was imprisoned in Manipur also. His was a revolutionary mind and after Mahatma Gandhi, he became a symbol of resistant movement in free India.

He joined the socialist movement right from the moment he landed in India after getting Doctorate from the Berlin University. He saw with his own eyes the horror of Nazi movement in Germany and became a great hater of violence and Nazism.

He worked and struggled hard to give Indian socialism a new

concept and philosophy. He was the first among the socialist leaders to revolt against the policy of United Front with communists, then followed by the Congress Socialist Party. In that sense, he was not a traditional socialist and was against Marxism and Communist totalitarianism. He wanted the Indian socialist movement to be freed from Marxian thought and action. He was a believer in Gandhian principle of non-violence and played a great part in bringing up a synthesis between Gandhian and Marxian concepts. His most effective contribution was to give a new meaning and method of action to make the Socialist Party the most effective weapon against the capitalist system. He used to say that communism and capitalism are two sides of the same coin which believes in centralisation and suppression of human freedom and rights. Marxians like Acharya Narendra Deva and Jayaprakash Narayan ultimately had to part company with the communists.

Then the entire socialist movement was influenced by the thought and action of these three leaders. The socialists developed a positive, objective outlook, absolutely separated themselves from communist totalitarianism and democratic socialism became ideology, aim and objective of the movement. It is a matter of great pride for the Indian socialists that not only the Communist empire both in Soviet Russia and Eastern Europe is collapsing but democratic socialism is gradually being replaced in its place. We are vindicated in a great way. At this hour, if J.P., Lohia and Acharyaji were alive, they would have been honoured by the entire country and I am sure if yougest amongst them, Lohia had survived the whole Indian polity would have taken a new revolutionary turn.

It is largely on account of the assertive attitude and pioneering role that Lohia played that the Indian socialists developed their international policy. He was advocating third world in foreign affairs and in tune with that policy, international socialist policy was oriented. We were neither with the Socialist International nor with the Communist International. But independent of these two organisations, an independent Asian socialist front was sought to be created. Lohia visited almost all

South Asian countries, established contact with sister socialist Parties and as a result the Asian Socialist Conference was held at Rangoon in 1953. Jayaprakash Narayan had inaugurated this Conference. This was not an anti-Communist Conference, but first ever Congregation of Asian Socialists who largely subscribed to the democratic socialist ideology. The Asian Socialist Bureau functioned for a few years, but gradually with the weakening of the socialist Parties in Asian countries as well as in India, this effort had a natural death. I want to drive the point that Lohia had the foresight to give the socialist movement a positive international and internal image. I am sure all those who are interested in developing democratic socialist ideology would very greatly be benefited from the literature produced by the socialist movement.

Lohia, no doubt, was a genius, original thinker and a great socialist fighter. But where he failed miserably is in the matter of maintaining unity in the socialist movement. I don't agree that there were fundamental and basic differences amongst the socialist brothers. But personal bickerings, intolerance and impatience were factors responsible for the division amongst socialist ranks. It is a great tragedy that even a semblance of socialist organisation does not exist today. The entire socialist structure was shattered to pieces and now remained a part of the historical record.

Importance of Compassion in Lohia's Philosophy

— *Dhanik Lal Mandal*

There are numerous memories associated with the multi-dimensional and dynamic personality of the great socialist leader, philosopher and thinker, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, which are still fresh in my mind. These memories and memoirs highlight some bright and lustrous aspects of his personality. The memories which I am going to mention here about Dr. Lohia will make it clear as to how compassion and love had got an important place in the philosophy of his life.

After the conclusion of the Annual Conference of the Socialist Party at Sherghati, when I was seeing Dr. Rammanohar Lohia off, he said to me, "Dhanik Lal, I shall stay for a few days in the dormitory of Bodh Gaya. You come there after you settle the accounts etc. of the Conference. I shall be waiting for you."

Hence I hurriedly prepared the accounts of the Conference submitted them to the Reception Committee and reached Bodh Gaya by bus the next day. When I reached the dormitory, Dr. Saheb was lying on his bed in a pensive mood as usual and Romaji and others were sitting in the chairs. As soon as I entered the dormitory, Romaji said, "Dr. Saheb, Dhanik Lal has come." Dr. Saheb opened his eyes and pointing towards a chair asked me to sit.

Then he said to Romaji, "Give Dhanik Lal something to eat, he is coming from sherghati," then he closed his eyes. After a shortwhile, all others left the place and I was left alone with Dr. Saheb. Dr. Saheb again opened his eyes and said, "Dhanik Lal, Pandit Jawaharlal says that I do not know the art of

politicking. So I am not politicking. Like Buddha, I am acting on Dharam Neeti, creating mass awareness and spreading ideals”.

I said, “Dr. Saheb, what Panditji is saying is right”. “How”, he asked. In reply I said, “When you give a call at a time for ‘Angrezi Hatao’ (Remove English), ‘Jaati Todo’ (Abolish Caste System), ‘Daam Bandho’ (Fix Prices), ‘Himalaya Bachao’ (Save the Himalayas), ‘Akela Insaan Satyagraha Karo’ (Every Person should observe Satyagraha), ‘Charitra Nirman Karo’ (Build Character), etc., all the forces who rule this country and the world join hands together. We do not get assistance from anywhere. After all, how long shall we fight by bringing financial help individually from our families? This is the reason that such a scene is created against you in the conference which is very distressing for us and for which we feel ashamed. In the conference, the situation comes to even exchange of blows”.

To this, Doctor Saheb replied, “you appear to have become my Guru”. Thereupon I begged his pardon and said that I was asking this question from him just for the sake of learning.

Reacting to my submission, Dr. Saheb said “I also know the question that you are asking. Yet in all my wisdom, I am giving a call for ‘*Sapta Kranti*’ or total revolution. Why I am doing so is because this is no time for partial revolution. Partial revolution is not going to solve the problems. The moment you bring about one revolution, need for another is felt. Therefore, now total revolution is the only solution. That is why I am giving a call for total revolution”.

Out of curiosity I asked him, “we consider you our teacher, friend and guide, what should we do?” He replied that had God given him money, he could have shown Pandit Nehru how to practise politics. To this I replied that if he ordered, his

disciples like me could arrange money for him. Since dowry system was prevalent in the society, we could take dowry and give that money to him, if he so ordered.

Thereupon Dr. Saheb who was lying on the bed so far got up and spoke agitatedly in a high pitch, "Dhanik Lal, never do such a thing. Putting a label of Dharma (right) on Adharma (wrong) is of no use. It destroys both Dharma and Adharma."

I have mentioned this incident, because it highlights his personality as well as his teachings. Dr. Lohia was a man free from all sorts of attachments. Wealth and Woman never enslaved him in the worldly meaning of the term, but his life was not prosaic and dry. He was an adorer of happiness and beauty. What is happiness and beauty and how to attain that was the pursuit of his life.

Dr. Lohia used to talk of 'Pal' (moment), 'Pravah' (flow), 'Path' (way), 'Pathik' (way-farer), 'Sadhan' (means) and 'Sadhya' (end). He used to speak of linking religion and politics.

He was in favour of bringing about cultural revolution in the country. He was of the view that the present crisis — world wide crisis—and the crisis of this century was in fact the cultural crisis. This is the root cause of the malady which erupts in different forms in different situations.

Motivation behind capitalist culture is profit, meaning thereby that its motivating force is gold (wealth). It gives birth to competition. Competition is the cause of violence and other evils associated with it. This culture cannot be helpful in propounding the doctrine of happiness and beauty. On the contrary, the violence will continue to spread and we will find ourselves on the verge of destruction.

Compassion born of his understanding of this destruction manifested as guiding factor to the humanity. Compassion is the supreme form of love and affection. When it is expressed, it ensures equality and it has its own yardstick. In this sense, Dr. Lohia was unparalleled.

Remembering Dr. Rammanohar Lohia

—Chintamani Panigrahi

It was a life's privilege and proudest moment for me when I first came in contact with Dr. Rammanohar Lohia at Calcutta during the historic Quit India struggle days in 1942, when he was directing our freedom struggle from underground.

I came to Calcutta in that crucial period after being rusticated from Ravenshaw College, Cuttack, as I had unfurled the National flag on that historic day, on 9 August, 1942, and addressed the students and after the meeting the office of the Ravenshaw College was ransacked. I was then the elected Secretary of the Ravenshaw College Students Union. In those days Bengal was in ferment and Calcutta was pulsating with revolutionary upsurge and mass movements. Late Ram Babu Shah of Bihar and myself were living together. He was deeply involved in Quit India struggle in Calcutta and was also a great admirer of Dr. Lohia. It was he who arranged my meeting with Dr. Lohia and introduced me to him. From the underground he was giving interviews to foreign correspondents and was conducting broadcasts of the secret Congress Radio.

My first meeting with him deeply impressed me. He was always original in his revolutionary ideas and also provocative. He was burning with intense patriotism. His outlook was very broad. In that period he was trying to provide a broad platform for the intellectuals. The setting up of the "*Khoj Parishad*" was his idea. Inspired by him, I started writing articles in the "*Janata*" a periodical which, in those days, was a mouthpiece of socialist thoughts.

Dr. Lohia was a student of Vidyasagar College, Calcutta. It

may be by way of coincidence that I joined Vidyasagar College after twelve years of his passing out from the College. It was perhaps again by coincidence that I became his colleague in Lok Sabha in 1967, I being in the treasury bench and he being in the opposition. But he had the same comradely affection for me, as before. His speeches in Lok Sabha were very hard hitting. He was a critic *par excellence*, uncompromising to the hilt and when he took the floor he liked to tear his opponent to pieces with biting words and supporting hard statistics.

It is again by coincidence that I came to Manipur, which was his centre of activity. He inspired many youngmen in Manipur towards socialist ideas. He has left his indelible footprint in the history of Manipur people's democratic movement for restoring popular government in the State. Prominent leaders belonging to Praja Socialist Party in Manipur in 1954 started a movement to restore Legislative Assembly in Manipur. After some time the movement was getting weakened. Late Smt. Sucheta Kriplani, leader of Praja Socialist Party, visited Manipur during March, 1955 to boost the morale of the satyagrahis and to give a fillip to the movement. Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, the irrepressible fighter rushed to Manipur in 1955 and took part in the agitation for helping the leaders of the movement and stepping up the sagging morale of the workers and the people of Manipur in their struggle for restoring democratic rights. Shri L. Achaw Singh, ex-MP and my colleague in Lok Sabha, was the Chairman, Council of Action of the Manipur Satyagrah Committee during that period.

On 13 April, 1955, Dr. Lohia and six other socialist leaders including Shri L. Achaw Singh were arrested while attempting to address public meeting at Bir Tikendrajit Park in Imphal. Dr. Lohia and the other six were convicted and jailed under Preventive Detention Act. Dr. Lohia presented his *habeas corpus* petition in the Court of Judicial Commissioner of Manipur. The Court set Lohia at liberty. He was released. But he was re-arrested on the gate of the prison itself and was put into the prison again. The matter relating to his arrest was also

raised in the Parliament. Dr. Lohia again moved the Court against the District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Imphal Central Jail under the Contempt of Court Act. On this petition, the Judicial Commissioner again set Dr. Lohia at liberty and he also fined Rs. 25/- to the District Magistrate. With the release of Dr. Lohia, Section 144 was also lifted. In Shri L. Achaw Singh's words, who worked and courted arrest with him, Dr. Lohia was so fond of Manipur and her struggle for democratic rights that he personally made it his own. He used to call Manipur as Lion's gate and the last outpost of Indianism.

We should cherish Dr. Lohia's memories. In darkest moments, his memories will give us indomitable courage to face all challenges which threaten the integrity and unity of our country.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia and Socialism

—*B. Satyanarayan Reddy*

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia is a leading name among the great personalities of India's freedom struggle and socialist movement. He was the champion of the cause of the downtrodden, the oppressed and the exploited and was known as the well-wisher of the farmers, labourers and women. In fact, Dr. Lohia had made social service and ushering in of socialism as the sole aim of his life, for achieving which he relentlessly struggled throughout his life. Whether it was inequality at the national or international level, poverty, unemployment or injustice, he carried on his fight against these with indomitable courage and self-confidence and worked ceaselessly for giving a new direction to the nation and injected new zeal and consciousness among his fellow countrymen. Once he stepped out with self determination to work for the absolute welfare of the suffering humanity, he never looked back. He knew no compromise. No offer of any office or temptation of any kind could dissuade him from pursuing his sole aim of 'socialism'.

Born on 23 March, 1910 at Akbarpur (Faizabad) in Uttar Pradesh, he received his early education in Bombay and Calcutta. Thereafter, he went to Germany, where he obtained Ph.D. degree in Economics and entered the amphitheatre of politics with complete dedication and devoted the rest of his life to it. However, he had earlier participated in the Congress session at the young age of 16. Becoming deeply engrossed in politics after his return from Germany, Dr. Lohia in the first instance, provided guidance in the formulation of foreign policy of the country, which instantly left an indelible mark of his

wisdom on the minds of the people. He fearlessly took active part in the freedom struggle and was imprisoned a number of times after 1938. Not only that, even after India attained freedom, he was arrested on several occasions for continuing his struggle for social upliftment. Undeterred, he steadfastly worked for achieving the goal of socialism.

Although Dr. Lohia is generally remembered by the people as a politician, yet his socialistic thinking is clearly reflected in all his activities and work. In fact, he was the kind of a great social thinker who not only was committed to the immediate welfare, but also had a strong desire in his heart for building India into an 'ideal nation' in future. He worked with Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Nehru for a considerably long time with whole-hearted dedication and commitment for furthering the national interest, although he had already acquired a distinct identity in the society by virtue of his socialistic thinking. This was the reason why, later on when some differences developed among certain national leaders on the issue of socialism, he left the Congress Party along with some eminent socialists like Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, Acharya Narendra Deva, Shri Asoka Mehta, Shrimati Aruna Asaf Ali and Shri Achyut Patwardhan and formed the Socialist Party. Outlining the aims and objects of this party, Dr. Lohia used to say that the Socialist Party could not remain content with merely bringing about some improvements in the society. Rather, it had to bring radical changes in the entire social structure and it could be possible only when along with the will power, a sense of discretion was also displayed to subject one's action to the discipline of rules and propriety. He held the view that it was impossible for the Socialist Party to make progress, otherwise.

In fact, Dr. Lohia conceived the idea of 'Samyukta Socialist Party', which was to be formed in a democratic manner, with the sole objective of ushering in socialism in the country at all

costs but without taking recourse to any kind of violence or bloodshed. Thus it would be seen that it was Dr. Lohia who with his singularly unique thoughts, gave a new revolutionary social dimension to the socialist movement and left no stone unturned in making it both powerful and popular. He was a person endowed with foresight and a creative mind. When the idea of abolishing the class distinction through class-war was mooted, he immediately spelt out in no uncertain terms that unless a struggle was also launched to end the caste system along with the class-war, the revolution shall remain incomplete. Dr. Lohia often emphasised the need to further develop the Marxist theory of class-war and the concept of establishment of a classless society to provide full opportunity to the backward people to make progress.

Dr. Lohia was truly a staunch supporter of equality. He believed that casteism and class-conflict were mainly responsible for the decline of India. Keeping this in mind he had started a movement for the abolition of caste system. In this context, he held the view that in a society encumbered with traditionally based distinctions, equality could not be brought about merely by providing equal opportunities to all. He emphasised that people belonging to backward classes, women, Harijans, Adivasis and the neglected minorities could achieve the level of the advanced, only when special opportunities were given to them.

Although Dr. Lohia was a critic of modern civilization, he had all praise for the movement to bring about equality. The economic disparity and social injustice prevalent in Indian society aroused in him a keen desire to bring about radical change in the social structure of his country. Hence, he propounded seven revolutions. He firmly believed that these seven revolutions had the potential to change not only India but the entire world once they were materialized. These following seven socialistic revolutions are well known all over the world: "(1) A revolt to establish equality between men and women; (2) A revolt against the political, economic and spiritual inequalities based on the colour of the skin; (3) A revolt against inequalities

between backward and advanced groups or castes on the basis of traditional concept, and in favour of special opportunities for the backward; (4) A revolt for the over-throw of foreign rule and in favour of forming a world government based on democratic principles; (5) A revolt against the accumulation of capital and in favour of economic equality and planned production; (6) A revolt against unlawful interference in private life of citizens and in favour of the democratic system; and (7) A revolt against weapons and in favour of *Satyagraha*. Dr. Lohia termed these seven revolutions as a precursor for a healthy environment in the 20th century. He considered cruelty, poverty and unemployment as evils of this century and always stressed the need to make collective efforts for their eradication.

In fact, according to Dr. Lohia, socialism and democracy were in no way distinct. He was of the view that they were complementary to each other. He thought that socialism would remain socialism, irrespective of the name we give to it, democratic, revolutionary or scientific or some other name or an amalgam of all these. In Europe, in an attempt to highlight the miserable conditions, the name was changed from social democracy to democratic socialism. This exercise was nothing but a fight aimed at heralding socialism. Indian socialism also imitated them and used various adjectives. Socialism could not be distinguished from other systems by merely prefixing adjectives. Programmes and actions alone could be a testimony to it. It would be better if instead of getting involved in grammatical controversy, socialism was called by its very name only. Its sole objective should be to guarantee freedom of expression.

Dr. Lohia considered equality, democracy, non-violence, decentralisation and principles based on socialism as the five cardinal objectives of socialistic system. These were of paramount importance not only for India but also for the entire world. What is socialism? Dr. Lohia tried to explain it in a very interesting manner. While defining socialism, he said in Lok Sabha on 16 March, 1965 that "one step down the ladder of socialism is equality, a step further down is economic equality,

social equality, equality in governance and religious equality. Still further a step down is economic equality. Then only comes complete equality and egalitarianism."

Dr. Lohia was a great patriot but he never allowed himself to be swayed by narrow considerations and parochial feelings. He was a man of vision and sagacity with a universal approach. He was of the firm belief that neither capitalism nor communism could help guarantee human freedom and world unity because both these systems were not tailored for achieving this goal.

Dr. Lohia was deady opposed to the use of feudal language in public affairs and administration. He was also against the feudal attire and palatial buildings. According to him, all these things had in fact no right to exist keeping in view the miserable condition and poverty of the common man. Dr. Lohia also used to say that we could not usher in a new era for the common man of this country as long as we continued to use a language alien to our country. It was Dr. Lohia from whom we drew inspiration to introduce the use of south Indian languages like Tamil and Telugu in the Lok Sabha. Besides, under the leadership of Dr. Lohia, non-Hindi speaking people like me emphasized the need of using Hindi and other Indian languages inside and outside the Lok Sabha.

Dr. Lohia was a great supporter of Hindu-Muslim unity. While addressing a meeting at Hyderabad on 3 October 1963 he said in unequivocal terms, "Until all the minorities feel happy in a country, the country cannot be happy. I do not mean Muslims alone. Of course, I give special importance to Muslims in every matter whether it is education, poverty or such other matters. But there are other people also who are in minority. Until and unless the Harijans and the Adivasis etc. are happy, India cannot be happy. It is the foremost requirement. We will have to pay attention to bring about emotional unity among them."

Along with Hindu-Muslim unity Dr. Lohia advocated unity between India and Pakistan. He was fully confident of this idea that, "If some how or the other, we could unite the Hindu-Muslim minds, we may, perhaps, start the process of unifying

India and Pakistan as well. I do not take it for granted that, once the country has been divided into two parts i.e. India and Pakistan, the partition has taken place for all times to come. No gentleman should accept such a view."

In fact, Dr. Lohia favoured the ideal of "*Vasudhaiv Kutumbakam*" (the whole world is a family). That is why he did not relish the partition of the country and expressing sorrow at the partition of the country he had said, "I am very much distressed that when the partition of the country took place, people like me did nothing against it. Perhaps we would not have been able to stop it. But we could have done some thing. At least, we could have remained in the prison at that time and consoled ourselves that at least we had opposed it. We missed the chance at that time. There were a number of reasons. Mahatma Gandhi was also one of the reasons. Let us leave this point now. Now the question arises whether the partition that took place in the country means partition for ever or some way out could be found which would reunite both the countries. Some people thought that there would be love and peace between the two countries and there would be no violence, but that did not happen. In place of love, malice between the two countries has increased. The only difference is that earlier dislike and estrangement used to be there in the minds of people and now they have surfaced in the form of two countries. The Governments of India and Pakistan are spending a major part of their resources in propoganda and foreign policy aimed at defaming each other."

He has excellently analysed the tendency of levelling uncalled for charges against each other by both the countries. While criticising the Governments of both the countries he had said categorically, "When Governments of these two countries want, sometimes, they provoke the minds of the people and sometimes, instigate them for a war and some times estrange their relations. It is altogether a different thing that nothing notable takes place. But when the Governments publish the reports of some minor incidents taking place along the border, it creates a feeling of animosity in the minds of the people. This

type of information originates from the Government departments. One should go through the newspapers thoroughly. May be that like several other occasions the Government of India is playing the trick so as to divert the attention of 44 crore people of India to Pakistan, from China. China is a big and strong enemy. Suppose that Government wants to rouse the feelings of the people against China, but it is fearing. In such an eventuality, it makes up its mind and diverts people's attention from a bigger enemy like China to a smaller enemy like Pakistan. That is why it gives this sort of information and we are befooled. We divert our attention from China to Pakistan. Similarly, when the Government of Pakistan comes across any difficulty and it fails to solve the problem, it adopts the same method of misleading its people by saying that India has ruined them, India is making preparations to invade them etc. On this ground, it asks its people to remain vigilant. It tells its people that their country is in danger. In this way some how or the other it provokes the minds of its people. In the right sense of the term, the Indo-Pak relations have deteriorated to a great extent at the Government level and there is no doubt about it. Hence, as and when I take up this issue, it sounds very odd that mountain is made out of a mole hill. Both the countries are fighting. Everyday they are provoking each other through press reports and getting prepared physically for an assault."

That is why Dr. Lohia called upon the people indicating the need of forming an Indo-Pak Confederation and said, "I would like to tell you about forming an Indo-Pak Confederation. They may not merge into one country and have a single Government, but at least on certain issues they could make a beginning. If they are able to pull on in one matter, it will be a good sign. Some way out could be found out if they are not able to pull on in remaining matters. If not in other matters, in the matter of citizenship and if possible, more or less, in the matter of foreign policy, military affairs talks could be initiated for forming a Confederation. I would like to make it clear to you that I expressed the same view in the Lok Sabha which I am telling to

you now. Perhaps my views do not carry any importance in the eyes of the Government. It has nothing to do with the Government of India and Government of Pakistan, because both of them are bad. Only, it is the people of both the countries who should think in these terms. You form small groups and have discussions on it. You form groups at various places in your colonies. Raise a political forum, a mixed forum in which both the Hindus and Muslims should come forward in all matters whether it is the case of removing English or checking price rise. It will be a step forward in this direction."

Not only that Dr. Lohia was a great supporter of socialist system, but also he considered secularism indispensable for a model society. In fact, religion cannot be separated from politics. With regard to relationship between religion and politics, the father of the nation, Mahatma Gandhi had written in 27 November 1924 issue of "Young India", "For me there is no politics without religion. Religion does not mean the religion which has blind devotion and talks of ill-will and war, rather religion means universal religion of tolerance. Politics which is devoid of morality should be kept aloof."

In this regard Dr. Lohia had also clearly stated that though jurisdictions of religion and politics are separate, but both have the same origin. There is the need to understand the basic characteristics of religion and politics. Imprudent mixture of religion and politics corrupts both. In his words:

"(In fact) Religion is long term politics and politics is short term religion. Religion should work for doing good and praising goodness. Politics should work for fighting the evil and condemning it. When the religion instead of doing something good confines itself to praising the goodness only, it becomes lifeless. And when politics, instead of fighting the evil, only condemns it, it becomes quarrelsome. But it is a fact that imprudent mixture of religion and politics corrupts both of them. No particular religion should associate itself with any particular politics.

It creates communal fanaticism. The main purpose of the modern ideology of keeping religion separate from politics is to ensure that communal fanaticism does not originate. There is also one more idea that power of awarding punishment in politics and religious orders should be placed separately, otherwise it could give impetus to conservatism and corruption. Despite keeping all the above precautions in view, it is all the more necessary that religion and politics should be complementary to each other, but they should not encroach upon each other's jurisdiction"

Dr. Lohia ceaselessly struggled for achieving social equality, equity and fraternity with a firm belief that although he might die, yet humanity would survive and ultimately only socialism would emerge victorious.

The untimely demise of this great thinker and philosopher, who was still struggling for the establishment of socialism, can be termed as an irreparable loss to the country, society and the political world. For the people of this country, he left behind him a legacy of social thinking, for which he will always be remembered and revered by the future generations of this country and his name will be written in golden letters in the history of socialism and will continue to glow.

It was on account of proper attention not being paid by the Government to take care of his health and treatment that Dr. Lohia breathed his last on 12 October, 1967. He was born penniless and at the time of his death he left behind no property. He was absolutely free from all worldly attachments such as wealth or family ties. In fact the entire humanity was his family.

Another fact about Dr. Lohia which needs to be mentioned is that he was cremated at the electric crematorium in Delhi where a number of unclaimed dead bodies of the poor were cremated daily. This fact itself shows his love and affection for the poor.

Dr. Lohia: A True Social Reformer

—Yagya Dutt Sharma

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia had his own independent political, economic and social thought. He was a revolutionary, but he was not a captive of any coined isms as he was a leader of very straight forward thinking. In his view, the history of few centuries of India's recent past has been stashed up with such a stifling and stinking slush in the name of culture that until the country is salvaged from this quagmire, social revolution is not possible.

His views on casteism were very clear, "This system has smothered up the human values and the natural strength and instinct of man to rise. The cancer of casteism has thrown the entire social balance in shambles. The people belonging to upper castes were not ashamed of begging, but they considered it shameful and insulting to do their work with their own hands. This mentality still persists to some extent. The person who was giving alms to these worthless people belonging to upper castes in this world was to get manifold returns of what he was giving, in the other world. Committing thefts, cunningness, shameless servitude and crookedness were considered to be apt skills of a successful person, but living a life of courage and honesty was considered as a sign of weakness and stupidity. Falsehood and duping were considered synonym of a successful life. Casteism was serving as a cover of all evils of social life."

* Gist of Dr. Lohia's speeches on casteism delivered at Hyderabad and other places.

Dr. Lohia's socialist viewpoints were deeply rooted in the Indian soil. No doubt, he recognised and accepted the significance of the positive attributes of our ancient culture and civilization, but nevertheless, he was opposed to the over-glorification of the past as against bringing about changes within the present set up. He entirely disagreed with the liberals among the social reformers like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Mahadev Govind Ranade and Gopal Krishna Gokhale, who in the name of social reform, advocated a westernised way of life. These liberal minded persons, in his view, were in fact advocating the cause of westernisation, by comparing the positive aspects of India's ancient social set up with the present social structure of the West. Dr. Lohia's nationalist ideas were in sharp contrast to this distorted mentality. Rather, he was influenced to a great extent by Gandhian Socialist thought. In Dr. Lohia's opinion, Gandhian Socialism, stood for the preservation of India's honour and its unique identity. Gandhiji was the least fascinated by the superficial razzle dazzle of the West. Dr. Lohia was a great admirer of the Mahatma's simplicity and ingenuity, which in the former's opinion, was the only significant way to link the downtrodden and resourceless plebeian with the ruling elite or the nation's leadership in an impoverished country like India. The aristocratic life style of Nehru always caused annoyance to Dr. Lohia. Dr. Lohia believed that it was more important to carry forward the country on the liberal tradition which extended from Vishwamitra to Visweswaraiah or Valmiki as against the tradition of fanatical justice which stretched from Parasuram to Nehru.

Lohiaji was no doubt in favour of modernising India, but he was opposed to the superficial and incomplete modernisation on the pattern of the West. He was of the considered view that our most ancient past was very bright and great. This is a stigma of the last four-five centuries of our history that we have taken the distortions for our culture. Speaking before the University students, Dr. Lohia used to say repeatedly, "Delve

deep to have your most ancient treasure, carry out research on it, it is full of potentiality to enrich you with a high degree of knowledge on thousand subjects." In Lohia's view, "Pandit Nehru has divided the personality of India. He has painted the image of India in altogether a different colour. Nehruji has brought about a change in our national language, national attire, eating and living habits to cast them into a feudal mould."

Lohiaji's views on language

The service rendered by Dr. Lohia on the question of language is commendable and unparalleled. In spite of the fact that he was a great speaker and writer of English language, he adopted the national language Hindi and enriched it with numerous new words. By giving "report" the form of "*rapat*", he not only converted an English word into a Hindi one, but also gave the language the form of language of the masses. This was the originality of his talent and imagination's socialistic set up. He used to speak in the Lok Sabha in Hindi only. Unless it was very essential to put forward his views in English so as to make the audience understand what he spoke, he avoided the use of English.

Lohiaji guided his workers by casting the idealistic philosophy of Gandhiji in the mould of definite and well-measured programmes. He was of the considered view that as Gandhiji believed in abridging the gap between the words and deeds and making the both unisonous through continuous practice in his experimental life, the public leaders will be able to bring real reform in the society if they follow the life of Gandhiji. As long as we do not link our words with our deeds to make them unisonous, ostentatious rituals will be of no use. If words and deeds are not in tune with each other, in our words we will continue preaching non-violence and in actual practice we will be engaged in violence. Therefore, he used to insist that we have to carry our simple and innocent countrymen on the path of social reform through the language of life because cunningness and slogan mongering will not lead us to our goal.

In the context of the present-day conditions in the country,

Dr. Lohia's social thought can save us from the storm of destruction in which we have forgotten the welfare of the down-trodden and have plunged ourselves into the jungle fire of casteism on one hand and plague of communalism on the other. Service, simplicity, use of swadeshi goods, and one's own language and patriotism should be the watch words of the nation which can prove to be useful for the welfare of society.

A Man Who Never Compromised His Principles

—Upendra Nath Verma

Dr. Lohia was an original thinker. He never compromised his principles. He used to say, "Have more concern for the 'path' (way) and less concern for 'pathik' (way-farer)." If the path is smooth and straight, even a weak person can walk on it and reach his destination, but if it is zigzag, tough and misleading, even the strongest and wisest of the persons cannot reach his destination. He had intense hatred for those who changed parties off and on, like 'Aya Rams and Gaya Rams'. He used to say, "For a clean administration, you need clean politics." As long as politics is practised on the basis of caste, muscle power and money, the administration cannot be clean. Politics should be based on principles, policies and programmes. He liked simple living. He was deadly against pomp and show, luxury and comfort, grandeur and splendour, fashionableness and extravagance. He used to hit hard the extravagance of leaders in power and high ranking officials of the administration. He did not spare even the Prime Minister. He alleged that he was spending rupees twenty five thousand per day. He used to call the persons who indulge in extravagance as 'Kale Saheb'. Commenting on India's poverty he had once said that the person who had more than two 'Kurtas' (Shirts) in his possession must have made some compromise. He was not in the habit of beating about the bush. He was a plain-speaking man, his remarks used to be pointed, pinching and categorical. He was of the view that a person should be straightforward.

He had a deep study of the composition of Indian society and

social and economic inequalities afflicting it. He had watched poverty and exploitation very closely and had even formed a remedy for it. The policies which he propounded, such as, 'Sapta Kranti' (seven-pronged revolution), 'Chaukhamba Raj', the principle of Special Opportunity, language policy (boycott of use of English language and replacing it by Indian languages), 'Price Policy', 'Save Himalayas', 'Indo-Pak Unity', 'Bhoomi Sena' 'Sakshra Sena' Non-Congressism and fixing ceiling on income and spending were such policies which cannot be challenged. They are relevant even today and would continue to be so in future as well. Dr. Lohia's policies are unparalleled in abridging the gap between man and man and for paving way for development provided they are implemented sincerely.

It was for the first time that a socialist Government was formed in Kerala in 1954. Shri Pattam Thanu Pillai became the Chief Minister. At that time, organisation of socialists was known as Praja Socialist Party. Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was its General Secretary. When he was in jail, Shri Pillai's socialist Government opened fire on unarmed crowd killing seven of them and wounding eight others. The moment Dr. Lohia heard the news of firing, he sent a telegram from the jail demanding the resignation of Thanu Pillai's Government. He also demanded suspension of officers who issued orders to open fire and setting up of non-official enquiry in this regard. This caused a commotion in the P.S.P. Shri Pillai refused to resign. A meeting of the party was convened on 26, 27 and 28 November, 1954 at Nagpur to consider this question. Dr. Lohia's proposal lost in the voting with 217 votes in favour and 303 against. Still he stood his ground. He was of the view that when fire is opened on unarmed people in the Congress rule, we demand its resignation by saying that the Government which believes in the use of force and bullets will not be allowed to continue. Then why should not we demand the same from a socialist Government? By raising this demand, Dr. Lohia set a shining example. He was against going back on one's words. Pillai Government did not last long. The

Congress brought it down in the beginning of 1955 itself. Had Lohia's view been accepted, socialist movement would have gained an impetus.

A similar incident took place in Patna where a number of people died in police firing. An agitation was launched to protest against the firing. Justifying the police firing, the Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had said that not one but many people could be killed to uphold the honour of the National Flag. This was unbearable for Dr. Lohia. He retorted, "Honour of the National Flag should be upheld not by killing the people, but by sacrificing our lives."

The Nagpur Convention forced Dr. Lohia to form a separate party and on January 1, 1956 he called a convention of the Socialists in Hyderabad and formed the socialist party. Spirited socialist leaders joined the party and gave a new direction to the socialist movement. Vote, spade and jail became their slogan. In place of politics of convenience, politics of struggle started. Dr. Lohia's influence went on increasing. Dr. Lohia was second to none in giving direction or formulating policies. But he never liked that the entire party should depend on him for every small matter. He made lot of efforts in this direction. He asked his colleagues to exercise their mind on various issues and participate in formulation of policies and their implementation. In August, 1956 he started the publication of an English magazine 'Mankind.'

Dr. Lohia played a significant role in getting support for the socialist movement from abroad. He had the experience of being the incharge of Congress party's foreign department. He was the brain behind the Asian Convention which was held in Rangoon in 1953, though he could not attend it.

Lohia's life was a life of struggle. He had vigorously participated in the freedom struggle. He was arrested for the first time in Calcutta on 24 May, 1939. He went to jail on twenty five occasions. Most of the arrests were made during Congress regime. He was always ready to face the consequences for his principled stand. When the then Speaker of United Province,

Shri Purushottam Das Tandon saw Dr. Lohia hand-cuffed in Bareilly jail he was so moved that he was in tears, but Dr. Lohia had become habitual of these things. While describing the courage and simplicity of Dr. Lohia, Mahatma Gandhi once said "I have never seen such a bold and courageous man in my life. Now, when he is in jail I cannot remain silent." In the 1942 revolution Dr. Lohia was underground for 21 months (from 8 August 1942 to 20 May 1944) from where he led the movement. While addressing the "Azad Dasta" he said that "if we fail this time it would be a historical mistake. We have to attack the British forces with all our might and force them to leave this land. Getting ourselves arrested and thinking that we have done our duty, will be a folly on our part. We will have to remain underground and fight till the country gets freedom. Those, who get arrested will be treated as worthless." He was not allowed to sleep in Lahore jail for about four months. One or the other jail official used to ask questions from him day and night. He was not provided even brush or toothpaste to brush his teeth for four months. In spite of this inhuman and intolerable treatment Dr. Lohia did not yield to the jail authorities. He remained a bachelor throughout his life and did not have a family. He dedicated his life to the motherland and mankind.

He was the champion of the cause of the poor in the society. He tried his best to bring the people working for the poor on one platform. In 1956-57 he spoke to Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar—the leader of the oppressed and the father of Indian Constitution—about it. Both of them decided to form one organisation but unfortunately Dr. Ambedkar expired suddenly.

Lohia continued scathing attack on the principles, policies and programmes of the Congress. In 1962 Dr. Lohia filed his nomination against the then Prime Minister Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru in the General Elections. At the outset, Pt. Nehru took it lightly and said that he would not go for campaigning to his constituency. But when he saw that the wave had changed he had to rush to Phulpur many a time. Dr. Lohia was the candidate of socialists and he threw the policies of Congress to winds. Though Dr. Lohia lost the election but he was ahead of

Pt. Nehru in 43 polling booths. While commenting on his defeat Dr. Lohia said "the rock has not broken but a crack has appeared."

On 20 October, 1962 China attacked India. The Indian Army had to retreat at a speed of 30 miles per day. Dr. Lohia was depressed at this. He said "During the Congress regime neither agriculture and industry nor the army has improved." When danger was looming large on the North East border of India-China, Dr. Lohia had drawn the attention of the Government a number of times but the Government had ignored it and ultimately it had to face the danger. While discussing the North-East border he had said "McMahon Line can become the border only when Tibet is a free country. If Tibet is not free, our border cannot be McMahon Line. Then our border line would be Mansarovar, Kailash and Mansar village. Mansar village had been giving revenue to India even after Independence. We have been ruling over it. The geographical location, culture and language of that area prove that these areas have always been a part of India and never of China." He used to quote the famous Sanskrit poet Kalidas and used to say that Kailash-Mansarovar was the abode of gods and goddesses and China did not have any proof that these areas belonged to them. He used to say that it was folly on the part of our Government not to stake its claim over these areas. Nehruji used to say that it was a waste and unfertile land, not a blade of grass grows there and nobody lives there. These statements give encouragement to China. Who can forget the logic mooted by Dr. Lohia regarding the abovementioned border dispute. Dr. Lohia had said that the Government did not even know its boundaries. How can it defend the boundaries then?

Dr. Lohia was elected to Lok Sabha in a bye-election from Farrukhabad in 1963. As soon as he came in the Lok Sabha he started the debate on disparity in per capita income which later came to be known as "*Three Annas Vs Fifteen Annas*" debate. People throughout the country used to discuss the questions raised by Dr. Lohia and the suggestions extended by him in the Lok Sabha. Keen readers of newspapers, first of all used to

read Dr. Lohia's speech. He used to say something new every now and then. During the 1965 Indo-Pak war Dr. Lohia said "Indians will have to stand like a rock against Pakistan and will have to take care of Indian Muslims like tender flowers." The country set a memorable example of communal harmony at that time.

The Government arrested Dr. Lohia in Patna on 9 August 1965. As usual he pleaded his case himself. The Supreme Court acquitted him. He proclaimed that Congress would be defeated in most of the States in 1967 General Elections and it proved true later on. Non-Congress Governments were installed in nine States viz., Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Madras, Kerala, Haryana and Punjab. He knew that these Governments would not complete their term and that is why he emphasized that these Governments should do something which was of permanent nature and also had the flash of light, like abolition of land revenue on uneconomic holdings, to stop use of English as official language and study of English as a compulsory subject etc.

Dr. Lohia became popular throughout the country. People in remote villages started saying "Dr. Lohia is the man of the masses and speaks truth." When he was attracting the attention of the entire country the cruel hands of death snatched him away from us at five minutes past 1 O' clock on the night of 11 October, 1967.

*Bade shauk se sun raha tha zamana
Ki khud so gaye dastan kehte-kehte*

There are no two opinions that the press ignored the original ideas of Dr. Lohia. He used to say that politics cannot be done through newspapers. The press will never publish things which may seek a change in the system itself. The press barons are generally reactionary and conservative. They will never publish revolutionary ideas in their newspapers. He stressed that the achievements should be such which may spread through word of mouth. Dr. Lohia's ideas are relevant to India even today.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia

—*Murlidhar C. Bhandare*

The history of our independence struggle is principally the history of Indian National Congress. The socialist group within the Indian National Congress has its own significant contribution, particularly in this struggle during 1942 Quit India Movement. At the vanguard of this movement, among other leaders, was Dr. Rammanohar Lohia.

Born of an ordinary middle class Bania family in U.P., Rammanohar Lohia's father, Hiralal, was a freedom fighter and disciple of Mahatma Gandhi. During individual Civil Disobedience Movement, Hiralal, at the behest of Gandhiji, marched on foot, in the summer heat from Calcutta to Delhi shouting antiwar slogans. Rammanohar was educated in Akbarpur, Bombay, Calcutta and Banaras Hindu University. This helped him to be proficient in Marathi, Gujarati, Bengali and Hindi. Later in his life he was to acquire mastery over English, German and French. He was thus an outstanding linguist. He went for higher education to Europe and returned with a doctorate from Berlin University.

Lohia decided to devote his energies to politics and became a member of the Congress Socialist Group formed in 1934. In 1936, Jawaharlal Nehru set up the foreign department of the AICC and invited Lohia to organise it. Lohia opened up the windows of the world establishing liaisons with freedom movements in different parts of the world. This was the precursor of the independent India's foreign policy.

Lohia was prosecuted in Calcutta in the year 1938 for

sedition. He conducted the defence with such brilliance that he won not only the Magistrate's encomiums but also his own acquittal. He was to repeat this performance years later appearing before the Supreme Court in person in defence of fundamental human freedoms.

Gandhiji inspired and moulded almost every future leader of India. Lohia was no exception. He was influenced by Gandhiji's creed of non-violence and Charkha which symbolised self reliance and independence for every villager. Lohia shared Gandhiji's dream "to remove tears from every eye." During the life time of Gandhiji the Congress remained united. Gandhiji's concern for Lohia was seen when he reacted sharply against the arrest of Lohia for anti-war speeches in 1940.

It was Dr. Lohia's passion to liberate his motherland from enslavement that made him a freedom fighter at a very early age. He played a heroic part in giving direction and ideological content to the 1942 Quit India Movement under the banner of 'underground AICC'. It is well known that he had a key role in keeping alive the flame of resistance after the arrest of Mahatma Gandhi and other leaders. Lohia would regularly broadcast on the Congress Radio operated clandestinely from Bombay city. The broadcasts could be heard as far as Madras. He was arrested in May, 1944. After release from jail in 1946, Lohia immediately launched his crusade for civil liberties at Margaon in Goa. To this day he is remembered as the liberator of Goa.

While Ambedkar spoke of liberty, equality and fraternity, Lohia emphasised on equality of opportunity as an essential element of all the three. Both were against the caste system which was organised on ascending scale of respect and descending scale of contempt. More than anything both of them believed that caste system was at the root of inequality in the country. To Lohia casteless society was a sine-qua-non for a classless society. Ambedkar succeeded in securing for the Scheduled Castes political power and recognition by providing reserved seats for them in the constitution. He was not satisfied with the system of reservation conceded to the backward

castes and that too on the basis of ability. Lohia argued: "How could people with the tradition of generations of lowly existence ever compete with high born? To make this battle a somewhat equal encounter, unequal opportunity would have to be extended to the women, harijans, sudras, depressed muslims, christians, adivasis and other backward classes". According to Lohia, 'this depressed and backward 90 per cent must be assured 60 per cent of all opportunities in the country until they are able to run the race equally which would make a classless society a reality'. He was the torch bearer of affirmative action and positive discrimination.

This yearning for change made him define the following seven universal revolutions:

1. for man-woman equality;
2. against inequality based on colour;
3. against social inequality and caste, and for special opportunities;
4. against colonialism and foreign rule;
5. for maximum achievable economic equality;
6. for privacy and democratic rights; and
7. against weapons and for civil disobedience against tyranny.

Lohia was a champion of equality of sexes. But never could the socialists elect a woman to the Lok Sabha during his life time. Twelve members were elected to the first Lok Sabha. None was a woman. The party which Lohia founded, won eight Lok Sabha seats in 1957. But none was held by a woman. In the fourth Lok Sabha his party had twenty-three members, but not one belonged to the fair sex. This was extremely galling for Lohia. His repeated attempts to get women elected failed.

He was convinced that the use of popular languages in government schools and universities would spell a sudden release of the shackled energy of the masses. He was unhappy that not much was really done in either sphere by the non-congress coalitions. He feared that any tinkering would produce

a backlash. If the high castes and upper classes continued to educate their children in English and if the foreign language continued to be used in government work, the backward classes would feel cheated and reject the whole policy. "Half-hearted measures", he warned, "will ultimately harm the children of the poor. The supremacy of English will continue".

Lohia was dedicated to the ideals of social and economic equality. He equally valued privacy and freedom and detested the pretension of the State to control every aspect of individual life. He felt that freedom of dissent and of expression were an inseparable aspect of the seven revolutions. Lohia continued to fight for civil liberties and against draconian laws in the courts as well as outside. The Supreme Court gave two decisions in his favour where he appeared in person. Those decisions constitute an important landmark in the struggle to promote and protect human freedoms.

He had a great sense of humour and lost no opportunity to enjoy a joke at his own cost as much as at the cost of others. He was an essential humanist who felt deeply for his fellow beings. He was a simple man. He spurned all worldly possessions. He preserved his interests in literature and fine arts.

Lohia had a multi-splendoured versatile personality. Patriot, scholar, thinker and visionary, he mixed vision with action, razor-sharp intellect with great organising capacity. His vision transcended even the national frontiers. He dreamt of a just and humane world order. He was essentially a man of action whom philosophical systems made no sense unless they provided inspiration and guidance for effective revolutionary action to change the society. He was unyielding in his approach and his unconventional technique made him one of the most controversial political leaders of his time.

Lohia worked hard to destroy the Congress. For him without destroying the Congress the nation could not build itself anew. He failed to realise that a national party having roots on every inch of Indian soil could not be uprooted without irreparable

damage to the basic values which the Congress had imported and nurtured in the Indian society over the years. He failed to perceive that blind hatred for the Congress was not an answer to its failings. After all the nationalist feelings of unity and harmony—transcending all differences, religious, communal, caste and lingual—were sown by the Congress.

Today what would he have felt? The unity of all parties forged on anti-Congress passions in November 1989 did not last beyond a bare fifteen months plunging the country in its unprecedented chaos of communal and caste-divide. What would he have felt when he saw that those who opposed Congress for the good of the country practised the motto 'self above all' and not "country above self"? What would he have felt to find political ideologies sacrificed for political power and office attendant on such power? What would he have felt at the increasing criminalisation of politics resulting in surrender of democratic values to muscle and money-power? What would he have felt to see that power meant money and not the good of the people? What would he then have suggested to restore the spiritual values and the democratic principles; to ensure the upliftment of a poor citizen; to preserve the vitality and strength of our systems and Institutions?

Would he have an answer as to why did the Socialists fail to be an alternative to the Congress or why did the Dalits and the Shoshits (the Scheduled Castes and the other Backward Castes) not combine to become the third power in the country? The relevance of Lohia's ideologies and thoughts must await judgement from history.

The Stormy Socialist

—Professor Samar Guha

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was a sparking personality, a stormy socialist who made an indelible mark in the history of Indian socialist movement. He was a man of restless mind, always pulsating with original thinking. His political penchant for jolting acts was amazing. After the transfer of power in 1947, Dr. Lohia never ceased to cause worry to the ruling authority or his elder colleagues in the socialist fraternity. However, in his reckless journey in post-independence Indian politics, he had one mission fixed before him — it was his passion to build up a socialist movement in India based on its own national genius and heritage. History of Indian socialist movement can never be written without respectfully acknowledging the originality of Dr. Lohia's contributions to it.

Born of a devoted Gandhian father, Shri Hiralal, Lohia had the rare privilege to come in close contact with Mahatma Gandhi when he was very young. Though in his outlook and attitude to life and in his mood and temper, he was opposite in every sense to Gandhi, but still the spell of the personality of the Mahatmic aura in him and his absorbing love for the young Lohia had an emotional pull with him so much so that he could never get away from the old man at any time. Lohia was often erratic, typically bohemian in his way of life, but hypnotism of Gandhi had an imperceptible restraint on him. He gave up his habit of chain-smoking as Gandhi disliked it but resumed it again when he was mortally shocked by the news of Mahatma's assassination. About Gandhi, Lohia wrote, "With

great man wanting one to do certain thing, aided by number of arguments, although one may not be wholly in agreement with them, under the influence of that man and the loyalty one has to him, a certain self-discipline starts. That has also something to do with the reconstruction of humanity." Although Lohia could never live up to Gandhian ethics and values of life, nevertheless, in the last resort for this ever restive man, Gandhi was the solace for his inner self.

In the days of the freedom movement of the thirties Lohia—born in 1910—was just in his twenties. Although he was initiated into politics by the Gandhian idealism and the technique of peaceful and non-violent civil disobedience, yet, like many other young Congressmen, he also joined the Congress Socialist Party organised mainly by Acharya Narendra Deva and Jayaprakash Narayan when the younger elements in the Congress were in search of an alternative way of mass awakening after the failure of the 1930 Salt Satyagraha of Gandhi. During those days Lohia came under the influence of a mix of Gandhi, Marx and Nehru. The Congress Socialist Party (CSP) committed itself in broad principles to Marxian thinkings of Socialism. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was also talking in support of socialist ideas. Nehru was never a member of CSP but the socialists came largely under the spell of Nehru's modernism and socialist shibboleths. Nehru gave Lohia the charge of running the foreign desk in the AICC office of Anandabhanu. The young socialist proved to be very worthy to Nehru's liking.

Lohia proved to be a fiery activist, not absolutely in the tradition of Gandhian technique but of a revolutionary thrust during the days of the 1942 movement. Going underground, he organised rebel radio, consolidated the socialists to hit the imperialists by any means by joining hands with J.P. who by the time took up the leadership of the August Revolution after

escaping from the Hazaribagh jail. After his arrest and confinement in the solitary cell of Lahore Fort, a basic question started haunting Lohia's mind: what was essentially wrong with Marxism that goaded its Indian adherents to join hands with the British Imperialism as against the freedom struggle of their own enslaved motherland? Lohia's disenchantment with Marxism began from Lahore Fort. He moved to penetrating quest into the fundamentals of Marxism.

Partition of India was a terrible shock to Lohia. He was only 37 when historic India was dismembered by the British. He had not attained that amount of political weight yet to effectively oppose partition. But Nehru's role in it completely disillusioned Lohia about the man whom he had adored so ardently and so long. In his remarkable book on partition, "*Guilty Men of India's Partition*" he dubbed Nehru as its principal culprit. Thereafter, Lohia completely broke away from Nehru and adopted an uncompromising attitude of strident hostility towards him. During Nehru's days of Prime Ministership, Lohia offered *satyagraha* many times. It remained a mystery, whether it was only the partition or something else that bitterly alienated Lohia from Pandit Nehru.

From Lahore Fort, Dr. Lohia surged towards a new mission of discovering a new concept and new technique of mass mobilisation for the Indian socialist movement. In disentangling Indian Socialism from its Marxian nexus, Lohia wrote a number of fundamental articles like 'Economics after Marx', 'Marxism and Socialism', 'Gandhism and Socialism', 'International Aspects of Communism' etc.

His book on motivation of the movement of human history called "*Wheel of History*" was refreshingly original. He could not agree with many of the basic postulates of Marxian doctrines. To Lohia Marxism appeared essentially as an European outlook and he could not differentiate communism from the essentiality of the system of capitalist production and its productive motivation. In the caste-ridden Indian society Marxian invariability of class struggle appeared to him as too inadequate an instrument of mobilisation of the oppressed masses of India.

Dialectical materialism, the propulsive axis of the communist philosophy, appeared to him too unresponsive to modern science and philosophy. For the Indian socialists to develop the basic plank of their ideological concept, he outlined the politics of "Equal irrelevance of Capitalism and Communism."

In his search for a new horizon, of a new vision of socialism for India discarding CSP days' Marxian variant of socialism, Dr. Lohia wrote, "I am neither anti-Marx nor pro-Marx and this equally applies to my attitude towards Mahatma Gandhi." By this Lohia meant that he never disparaged Marx and his contributions towards the liberation movement of the exploited classes. But he could not accept the claim of Marxism as an infallible social philosophy to predetermine the course of human history. By fifties Lohia was free from the influence of Marx and Nehru which he had in him along with other socialists.

About the impact of Gandhi on his socialist thoughts it may be added that although he did not call himself a Gandhian in any classical term but as regards his sense of political values, his concept of social transformation and political re-structuring of India, he was profoundly influenced by the Gandhian ideas of equality and socio-political and economic philosophy of decentralisation and small-unit technology and his ethics of non-violence and *satyagraha*. Indeed, Lohia talked loudly of his faith in the theory of permanence of *satyagraha* as the means to fight political and social injustice and oppression. To build up socialism in India, Lohia enunciated seven principles of revolution or '*Sapta Kranti*', namely, "(i) for equality between men and women, (ii) against political, economic and spiritual inequality based on skin colour; (iii) against inequalities of backward and high groups or castes based on long tradition and for giving preferential opportunities to the backward; (iv) against foreign enslavements and for freedom and world democratic rule; (v) for economic equality and planned production and against the existence of and attachment for private capital; (vi) against unjust encroachments on private life and for democratic methods; and (vii) against weapons and for *satyagraha*." These

are the seven pillars of his main plank to build Indian socialism on.

Dr. Lohia did not aspire to limit his socialist ideas within the geographic contour of India alone. He also visualised emergence of a new world civilisation, again on seven principles of: "first, maximum attainable equality; two, maximum geographical distribution of power; three, social ownership; fourth, small unit technology; fifth, a decent standard of living within national frontiers; sixth, a minimum privacy of individual life protected from all collective encroachments; seventh, world parliament and government." Dr. Lohia was an idealist, a visionary and loved to build a scenario of his own new society and new civilisation, ignoring the criticism even if somebody called it utopia.

In late fifties and until 1967, Lohia deeply engaged himself in finding the dynamics of his socialist programme. He evolved the cliché of 'non-Congressism' to consolidate all the opposition forces to challenge the monopoly of the dynastic domination of Congress over the Indian democracy. Indeed for the first time an alternative under the banner of *Samjukt Vidhayak Dal* emerged in north India after the 1967 national polls. Though the experiment proved short-lived, nevertheless Indian democracy tasted the freedom for the first time from the monopoly hold of a single party.

During these days, Dr. Lohia innovated another new theory of preferential opportunities to the backward castes, including the women, throwing a new challenge to the Marxian theory of class struggle for mobilisation of the exploited classes. Today the 'Report of the Mandal Commission' is the outcome of Lohia's thesis of consolidation of backward castes for bringing about socio-economic transformation of the Indian society. No doubt, Lohia's new theory of consolidation of deprived castes has succeeded in creating a new awareness and aspiration in the minds of the backward communities to build themselves as the most powerful political force as against the domination of power-politics by the higher castes, but a vital question remained unanswered as to how this new technique of mass

awakening will eventually lead to elimination of the evils of permanence of caste stratifications in the Indian society.

Dr. Lohia started another aggressive crusade for complete abolition of English; and use of Hindi and other languages as national languages of equal status for the Indian people. In his tirade against English, Dr. Lohia adopted such a fanatic posture that on an occasion in the PSP days Dr. Lohia refused to talk in English with the veteran Gandhian leader Dr. P.C. Ghosh while the latter also declined to use Hindi in their conversation and both then switched on to talk in German. Although Lohia's best writings are in English, yet he adopted a strident stance not to speak in English on any occasion in India. However, in actual development, this anti-English tirade has turned into an angry pro-Hindi campaign, which belied Lohia's idea of giving equal status to all Indian languages. It is a matter of worry if Dr. Lohia's language policy may not raise a Frankenstein of pro-Hindi jehad detrimental to the cause of national integration.

Dr. Lohia contributed many new ideas, new programmes of mass mobilisation and many effective political cliches to enthuse his followers but his objective of building an Indian socialist solidarity remained very much unattained. PSP was formed to unite all the Indian socialists and in its forum joined almost all the outstanding Congress leaders of the freedom movement other than Nehru and a few others of his standing. But largely because of Dr. Lohia's uncompromising faith in his own concept of socialism and socialist values and socialist programme and his over-convinced aggressiveness in the efficacy of his thrust for continuous *satyagraha*—all these led to splitting of PSP and disorganisation of the socialist forces all through the years of the fifties and early sixties. J.P. had his full support for the Bhoodan movement of Acharya Vinobaji, but, it was not unknown in the inner circle of the socialists that J.P. left PSP to join Sarvodaya movement forsaking his socialist friends because of his dismay over the disintegration of the socialist forces. In mid-sixties, Dr. Lohia realised in his new mood of heart-searching that what he aspired did not in reality materialise. He could not build up his socialist movement to

assume the character of a real national movement of the Indian people as against the monopoly domination of a single party over Indian democracy. He was keenly feeling for bringing J.P. back into the Socialist movement.

I had the rare opportunity to witness a sensitive episode—how passionately Lohiaji was wanting J.P. to lead the socialist movement again. About a few weeks before he fell ill, Dr. Lohia came to Calcutta. I went to see him in the Marble House of his friend. I found Lohiaji on that day unusually emotional. He very feelingly told me: “Samar babu, *aap jao. J.P. ko wapas laoo. Main to tor sakta, hila nahi sakta. Agar hila sakta to wohi hila sakta. Jao J.P. ko fir lao.* — (Samar babu, you go and bring J.P. back. I can break, but cannot pull down. If any body can pull down the present regime, only J.P. can do it. Please go and bring back J.P.)”

In those days I had the good fortune to be quite close to J.P. and his Sarvodaya movement without leaving PSP altogether. Dr. Lohia knew that. Next day I rushed to Patna. On hearing what Dr. Lohia had said, J.P. was perceptibly moved. A day after, he left for Delhi to meet his lost friend, Dr. Lohia. Aias! it was too late. Lohia was then in the Willingdon Hospital fighting for his life. J.P. remained all those days with Lohia in the hospital but could not save him. Had Dr. Lohia survived his operation to join hands with his August Revolution leader, Jayaprakash Narayan, the history of Indian Socialist movement would have been written in golden letters in the seventies

In paying tribute to Dr. Lohia, Indian Socialist movement will always remember him as a man who brought fresh, very fresh wind into it and that wind should blow even now.

Rammanohar Lohia: A Many-faceted Personality

—*Madhu Limaye*

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was an original thinker, a unique leader and a rebel. He played an important part in the making of modern India. But Rammanohar was not an ivory tower philosopher or an academic system builder in the tradition of Kant, Hegel, or Comte. He was essentially a man of action. To him philosophical systems made no sense unless they provided inspiration and guidance for effective revolutionary action to change society. So in spite of the sweep of his thinking and the original contributions which he made to political, economic and social thought, he never lost sight of the fact that without revolutionary practice neither can these ideas be implemented nor can the lot of the people be improved. Thus he was essentially a man of action.

I met Rammanoharji in 1939 when I was a student of the Fergusson College, Pune. His ideas and personality made a profound impact on me.

Rammanoharji was born in an ordinary middle class family in Akbarpur, U.P. His father, Hiralal, was himself a freedom fighter. Dr. Lohia completed his schooling in Bombay, and received his higher education at the Banaras Hindu University and Vidyasagar College, Calcutta.

He had an admirable command over English, German and French. His Hindi was down to earth and also very forceful.

He had also a good knowledge of Bengali, Gujarati, Marathi and other Indian languages.

As a sensitive person born in a subject country which has been the victim of aggression and enslavement from time immemorial, it was Dr. Lohia's passion to liberate his motherland. He, therefore, became a freedom fighter at a very early age and played a magnificent part in giving direction and ideological content to the August 1942 movement.

When he returned to India after obtaining his Doctorate from the Berlin University in 1933, he was only 23 years old. There was a great ideological ferment among the young people in those days. The result of this churning was the formation of a socialist party within the Indian National Congress. From the very beginning Dr. Lohia was a pillar of the Congress Socialist Party. Jawaharlal Nehru heard from Jamnalal Bajaj about his brilliant mind and attractive personality. When Jawaharlal re-organised in 1936 the All India Congress Committee's Office in Allahabad, he put the young Rammanohar in charge of the AICC's Foreign Department.

As Foreign Secretary of the Congress, Lohiaji had established close relations with the freedom movements and progressive organisations in Asia, Africa and Latin America. He made a deep study of the problems of the overseas Indians and drew the attention of the Indian people to the pitiable lot of their brethren overseas. He was wide awake to the suppression of civil liberties in India and other countries. He wrote an important pamphlet on the subject.

He came in close touch with Mahatma Gandhi soon upon his return to India. He was deeply influenced by Gandhiji's ideals, values and methods. He considered Gandhiji's ideas of civil resistance and non-cooperation as original creations of the 20th century. When J.P. and Lohia were arrested for anti-war speeches in 1940, Mahatma Gandhi reacted very strongly. He said that imprisonment of patriots like Rammanohar and Jayaprakash cannot be tolerated, that he cannot remain a silent witness to this increasing encroachment on popular freedom.

The individual civil disobedience campaign which he inaugurated in October 1940 was designed to assert the people's right to democratic freedoms.

After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour and the collapse of Western imperialist rule in South-east Asia within a short period of two months from December 1941 to February 1942, the coalition government in Britain sent Sir Stafford Cripps to India to secure the cooperation of her people in the war effort. The talks failed. Mahatma Gandhi, Rammanohar Lohia and other socialists were opposed to the Cripps plan. In the enveloping darkness, Gandhiji gave the 'Quit India' call to galvanise his people, who found themselves caught up between a desperate British imperialism on the one hand and an aggressive Japanese imperialism knocking at India's doorstep on the other. When the national leaders were arrested on the morning of 9 August 1942, Dr. Lohia took the initiative in organising massive resistance against British rule in the name of "Underground AICC" in concert with leaders like Achyut Patwardhan, Aruna Asaf Ali, Sucheta Kripalani and so on. A little later Jayaprakash made his sensational escape from the Hazaribagh jail in Bihar and joined the resisters. Jayaprakash and Lohia guided the movement from their hideouts in Nepal. Without doubt Rammanohar's name will for ever be linked with this glorious chapter of our freedom movement.

After the achievement of freedom, when communal riots had engulfed large parts of North India and Bengal, Dr. Lohia offered his services to Mahatma Gandhi in his effort to restore peace. Many times Dr. Lohia risked his own life while doing the pacification work.

As long as Mahatma Gandhi was alive, Rammanohar hoped for a socialistic transformation of the Indian National Congress. After Gandhiji's assassination he finally despaired of Congress transforming itself and therefore agreed to leave the Congress in order to build up a progressive and dynamic alternative to it. He thought the Congress had become a status quo party and that only a progressive alternative can bring about a radical change in the Indian society.

Dr. Lohia never called himself a Marxist. At the same time, he did not proclaim himself an anti-Marxist either. Both these attitudes he deplored. He had, however, made a deep study of the ideas of Karl Marx and other Socialist thinkers in Europe and America.

Dr. Lohia wrote a critique of Marx's economic theory during the 1942 movement. This academic exercise remained incomplete, but the fragment which was published and is available sets out in outline his own theory of capitalism and imperialism. He differed from theorists like Hobson, Hilferding and Lenin who held that imperialism was the last phase of financial capitalism. These theorists were generalising from the then latest phase of Western imperialist expansion in Africa and other countries in the second half of the 19th century. The history of Western expansion and aggression in fact goes back to many centuries, to the so-called middle ages. Just as industrial revolution was only the culmination of the long process of capitalist development in Western Europe, similarly the late 19th century imperialism was the penultimate phase in the political expansion of Western world and its economic system.

"The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners", wrote Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto. This was not true. The first objectionable thing was the use of the word barbarian in relation to all non-Western societies. They were of course backward in terms of scientific progress, but they were no barbarians. The Chinese, the Muslim Arabs and Indians had reached a high level of culture. Secondly the Indian textile industry did not go down as a result of competition, Lohia argued. It was the political power which the British exercised that killed the Indian textiles. Dr. Lohia therefore argued that imperialism and capitalism were twins and that initially it was not the machine-made goods of British capitalist industry that were primarily responsible for the destruction of Indian industry and handicrafts; the primary element that brought this result

was the political power which the East India Company and the British Government had acquired in India. The political dominance was systematically used by them to crush the age-old Indian industries and secure unfair advantage for their own commerce and manufactures. The Indian industry became as a result increasingly impoverished. It was starved of capital, technical innovations and markets. Millions of people were thrown out of their traditional occupations, and the political authority blatantly discriminated in favour of the British cotton textile industry and products of iron and steel, engineering and other industries in the large Indian market. The exploitation of Indian resources, transfer of profits, dividends, salaries of civil servants and remittances fuelled the British industrial revolution.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia's contribution to the socialist movement was outstanding. He was the first socialist thinker in India who refused to let his mental horizon be limited or dominated by the ideas drawn from the West or the Soviet Union. In his written address to Pachmarhi Conference of the Socialist Party in 1952, Lohia wrote:

“The modern man, whether in the US or Soviet Russia, is moved by identical aims of increasing output through mass production and a beautiful home and wants these purposes to be placed within the reach of all, primarily within his own nation. At the end of the realisation of these aims lies heaven on earth and the ideal kingdom, equality, peace and the full life. But road-blocks are multiplying. . . . The tensions and emptiness of modern life seem difficult to overcome, whether under capitalism or communism, as the hunger for rising standards is their mother and is common to both. Capitalists expected their ideal kingdom to arise out of each man's self-interest operating under a perfect competition; communists still expect their ideal kingdom to arise out of social ownership over means of production. Their common fallacy has now shown up that the general aims of society do not inevitably flow out of certain economic aims. An integrated relationship between the two sets of aims has to be set up by the intelligence of man.”²²

Lohia took into account the special conditions prevailing in the two-thirds of the retarded Afro-Asian-Latin American world, and especially, India and sought to work out his ideas in consonance with these conditions. Although profoundly influenced by Gandhiji's ideals, he was no slavish follower of Mahatma Gandhi. He was a great votary of the principle of decentralisation in all its aspects, but he was sensible enough to say that the solution of India's problems cannot be achieved at the technological level of the *Charkha*. He held the views that an innovative technology involving application of power and the fashioning of small machines would avoid the pitfalls of centralised production such as concentration of wealth, pollution, creation of urban slums, unemployment, alienation, income disparities and so on, and, at the same time, lower costs and raise the productivity and income of ordinary workers, whether working in the fields or in little family workshops or small cooperative factories.

Dr. Lohia resisted the fascination of armed revolution which radicals found so irresistible. During the August struggle he sought the destruction of British imperialism's nerve centres—the police stations—but supported the non-killing, non-injury formula. He had come to the conclusion that in non-violent civil resistance a new method had been forged by Mahatma Gandhi for the liberation of mankind. It avoided the dangers of Stalinism which a violent revolution was likely to produce.

Lohia was dismayed by Moscow trials (1938) and the communists' attempt to defend them. Lohia said that he heartily paid homage to the land of the October Revolution. "But I will not, therefore, shut my eyes to any dark spots that might reveal themselves. I consider the trials even such a dark spot and criticise them and their anti-humanist and anti-democratic origins. I would not like such a development to take place in my own country. And had it not been for the fact that I see a link, however remote, between the Bengal resolution (in

defence of this inhumanity) and Russian trials, I would not have dared to criticise the resolution of a provincial conference of my Party." This he wrote in 1938 fully eighteen years before Khrushchev and forty-seven years before the advent of Gorbachev.

His ideological writings are characterised by original thinking. Dr. Lohia was fond of posing problems as antonyms or paradoxes and contradictions, and providing solutions in the form of unity of opposites or synthesis on a new higher plane. His concept of civil disobedience as a mixture of anger and love, of democratic functioning as free speech and controlled action, his idea of tranquil activity as distinguished from strife *versus* and indolence, his theory of co-existence with approximation as against confrontation *versus* co-existence in world affairs are examples of this kind. In this sense, Dr. Lohia could be said to have been influenced by the Hegelian school of philosophy.

While Dr. Lohia laid great stress on resistance to evil, he constantly harped on the importance of constructive activity. He knew very well that politics is inseparable from power and that the question of power cannot be evaded. At the same time he was clear in his mind that no fundamental transformation is possible unless state power is controlled, guided and tamed by people's power. That is the reason why he gave the formula of combining jail, spade and vote for achieving a social revolution in the country. He sought to persuade the youth to contribute "one hour's free and voluntary labour" for national reconstruction.

In Rammanohar's lifetime there was scarcely a movement which he himself did not inspire or with which he was not connected. After his release from jail in 1946, Dr. Lohia happened to visit Goa. When he saw that elementary civil liberties were being denied to the Goan

people by the Portuguese fascist régime, he immediately launched his crusade for civil liberties at Margaon in Goa. The Portuguese rulers arrested him on 18 June, 1946. The date of his arrest is celebrated as the Freedom Day in Goa.

Lohia entered Parliament at a late stage in his life (in 1963). He was a member of the Lok Sabha for less than five years. Yet he left a deep impression on its proceedings. He has been accused of encouraging unruly behaviour. But this accusation was motivated. He raised a number of serious issues, like the question of poverty of the bottom 60 per cent of our population (the famous fifteen annas *versus* three annas debate) and uncovered the elitist character of our economic development. He exposed corruption and forcefully championed the cause of the downtrodden people.

Rammanoharji knew that a vast majority of our people live in the countryside. He became the symbol of the aspirations of the poor peasants, the landless people and agricultural labourers. Dr. Lohia was one of those great leaders who not only advocated the need for a fundamental reordering of our social relations but also provided an ideological basis for this revolutionary transformation. Dr. Lohia called this radical transformation seven revolutions or *Saptakranti*. If one rejects the superficial view and goes to the heart of the problem, it will be realised that Gandhiji's concept of Sarvodaya or the improvement of the lot of the poorest and the lowliest, Lohiaji's concept of seven revolutions and Jayaprakashji's idea of total revolution are only different names of the same process of revolutionary change. The main difference was that it was free from J.P.'s vagueness, and Gandhi's one-step-enough-for-me practicalness of an extreme kind. Lohia's ideas were clear, concrete and comprehensive—leaning, perhaps, a bit on the idealistic side.

Rammanoharji wanted the speedy consummation of the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial revolution. He was for the establishment of a world parliament and a world government to which the sovereign national states would voluntarily transfer a part of their sovereignty. Lohiaji was lucky enough to see the

near fulfilment of his dream of a world free from direct imperialist domination. However, he did not live long enough to see the triumph of economic freedom, of near—equal return to human labour the world over or the establishment of a world government. The objective remains elusive even on his eighty-first birth anniversary.

He not only supported the revolution against racism and colour bar, but he himself was arrested in 1964 for his participation in the American blacks' equal rights movements. That he was set free almost immediately with a gracious apology from the American government is another matter.

Dr. Lohia was a firm believer in economic equality, not absolute equality but the maximum possible and achievable equality. He held the view that for the regeneration of Africa, Asia and Latin America, communism and capitalism were not relevant. Both subscribed to what is called in the current parlance "consumerism". Lohia rejected consumerist ideal, the craving for the acquisition of material goods and wealth. He believed that only a decentralised economic and political order, a four pillar state, and small-unit machine industrialisation can solve the problems of the retarded world.

Dr. Lohia was all praise for the spirit of inquiry and adventure that characterised the Western civilisation. He also respected the Western drive for equality, including man-woman equality. But he disliked the exploitative aspect of world capitalism. He was not unappreciative of what the communist societies did to ensure the minimum consumption needs and social security guarantees for the common people of these lands. But he detested the centralisation, violence and suppression of the mind implicit in the communist system. His major criticism of both the systems was that these ideologies subscribed to the self-centred ideal of an ever-increasing material standard of living *within* the frontiers of Euro-American-Communist national states and not to the concept of a decent standard of living for *all* mankind. His remark on the similarity between the ideals of Henry Ford and Josef Stalin has to be understood in this wider philosophical context.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was a redoubtable champion of social equality. He held that the caste system and the hierarchical order based on birth were the single most important factor for the decline of this great nation and its repeated subjection to external aggression and foreign rule. He launched a "destroy caste" movement. In a traditionally unequal society, he said, equality cannot be established by merely providing *equal opportunities* to all. He said that for a long time to come the backward classes, women, harijans, adivasis and the retarded among the minorities will have to be given special opportunities to bring them up to the level of the advanced. He wanted a scheme of 60 per cent reservation not to perpetuate backwardness, but to end it. Reservation was only an item in his total programme of revolutionary change, not a vote-catching device.

The economic inequalities and the social injustices that characterised Indian society created in him a burning desire to bring about an all round revolution in the structure of our society. Thus arose his formulation of seven revolutions. These seven revolutions, he believed would not only change India, but he also held that these seven revolutions when completed would change the whole world.

While Dr. Lohia was a great patriot, he was not a narrow nationalist. He had a world vision and a world mind. He believed that the emancipation of mankind and world unity can be achieved neither on the basis of the capitalist system nor on the basis of the communist system both of which he held to be irrelevant for this purpose.

He was totally opposed to the propagation of an elitist or feudalistic language as a medium of instruction and administration. He was also opposed to feudal forms of dress and palatial residential buildings. He pointed out that the existence of these privileges was only the other side of the dire misery and poverty of the common people. It was his conviction that new life cannot be instilled into the people of this country by the continued use of a foreign language. It was under his

inspiration that simultaneous translation of Telugu, Tamil, and other southern languages was introduced in the debates in Lok Sabha. It was again under his leadership that non-Hindi speaking people like me made it a point to use Hindi and other Indian languages in Parliament and outside.

Apart from Mahatma Gandhi, no other leader has put so much emphasis on man-woman equality. He always encouraged women to play an active role not only in politics but in all walks of life. He had deep sympathy for their cause. He talked of the terrible problems of village women who fetch water from long distances, and have to make do without latrines and smoke-free fuel and stoves.

Dr. Lohia maintained that so long as there is injustice in the world, so long as the levels of labour productivity and return to labour are so unequal between the white one-third and the coloured two-thirds of the world, neither can armaments be abolished nor permanent peace established on this earth. However, he argued that after the invention of nuclear weapons a saturation point had been reached and the method of armed revolution had become irrelevant.

While Dr. Lohia was dedicated to the ideals of social and economic equality, he was a firm opponent of statism. He valued privacy and freedom and detested the pretension of the state to control every aspect of national life. He held that freedom of dissent and freedom of expression was an inseparable aspect of the seven revolutions. He was greatly moved by the misuse of sections 107-109 of the Criminal Procedure Code against the poor and the helpless. He exposed the racket of fulfilment of fixed quotas for arrests under these sections. He called these sections the MISA(or NASA) of the poor people. He continued to fight for civil liberties in the courts as well as outside. The Supreme Court gave two decisions in his favour. They constitute an important landmark in the struggle for human freedom.

While Dr. Lohia loved his country he also possessed a world mind. While he wanted to raise his country from squalor and

misery, he sought to establish friendship with other sections of the human race. His fraternal feeling was devoid of the dross of the so-called cosmopolitans. The foundation of his concept of the unity of the human race was his abiding love of *Bharatmata*. He subscribed to the novel concept of the citizenship of the mind, citizenship of ideals without the restrictiveness of nationality or race. He dreamt of an international order where he would be able to travel around the world without passports and without visas. No other national leader had such an unusual and charming dream. I have seen many leaders in the past fifty-five years but there was none other than Dr. Lohia who treated a prince and a pauper alike. He gave the pauper in his tattered and soiled clothes the same affection and love which a friend of his from the princely order like, say the Maharaja of Bikaner would get. He had a spiritual bond with the poor, the neglected and the exploited. He was also a source of inspiration for the youth of the country. He always encouraged the young people to forge ahead and show their mettle. He shared this endearing quality with Mahatma Gandhi and Jayaprakash Narayan. In Dr. Lohia intelligence was married to personal charm. He was a brilliant conversationalist. Lohia was a colourful person, and had a sense of drama. He could match words to the occasion as no other leaders could do. Nevertheless he was not an easy man to get on with. He was acid-tongued. He was also very demanding, and did not possess the Gandhi ability to take the best out of men. He sometimes forgot that a human being, especially an Indian, was a weak vessel.

However, Dr. Lohia was not a dry, narrow minded politician. Bigotry was foreign to his nature. He was a man of wide interests, equally at home in history and philosophy as well as in literature, sculpture, painting and architecture. His views on these subjects had an endearing freshness. That is why quite a few specialists in these fields were among his admirers.

Rammanohar wanted to change the Indian's outlook on history. Whereas he asked the Muslims to look upon Gazni, Ghor and Babar as foreign aggressors, he invited the Hindus to regard Raziya, Shershah Bahim and Jaisi as the blood of their

blood, as their own revered ancestors. Only then, he felt, harmony would be established between the Hindus and Muslims of this land.

Dr. Lohia was extremely solicitous about the welfare of the Muslim community, especially its backward sections, as also about the interests of other minorities. He was a great lover of Urdu. Nothing pained him more than the barbarism implicit in communal riots. On several occasions he risked his own life to protect the life and limb of Muslims. He held no sacrifice great enough for the proper discharge by the Hindu community or the State of its duty in this regard. He favoured Hindu-Muslim social get-togethers and suggested that on Raksha Bandhan day, the majority community should reiterate its firm resolve to protect the life and dignity of its brothers and sisters belonging to the minority communities.

Dr. Lohia's death less than 24 years ago was caused by medical and governmental negligence. He came into this world without any property, and departed without leaving behind him any property. He was free from attachment to money and family. In fact, the entire human race was his family; as a Sanskrit saying has it, his motto was: "*Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*". He was cremated in the same electric crematorium where are disposed of daily the unclaimed corpses of the poor of this capital city of India, Delhi.

Dr. Lohia was a many-faceted personality. Undoubtedly, he was controversial. All revolutionaries provoke conflicts and controversies. Even the great Prophet of Love, Jesus Christ, claimed that he had come to divide families and set son against father. It is, perhaps, true that he was at times intolerant of criticism. And even his admirers felt that sometimes he made uncharitable remarks about his contemporaries and colleagues. But in spite of these failings, nobody can deny that he made abiding contribution to the regeneration and rebuilding of the nation.

Some critics of Dr. Lohia hold that some of Dr. Lohia's views were utopian. All visionaries and great revolutionaries have

something of an idealist and utopian in them. Without such vision people cannot be inspired into making sacrifices for larger causes. It is my belief that Dr. Lohia's views and thoughts, which during his lifetime were never dispassionately examined, will in future come to be accepted to have great relevance for solving the country's problems. The stormy reservation debate which rocked the country last year is a tribute to the vitality of Lohia's ideas. As time passes, the negative and controversial aspects of his personality and work will recede into the background. What will continue to shine and glitter is the substantive aspect of Lohia's thoughts on politics, economics, history, culture and social problems. In the perspective of history, I have no doubt that his contribution to modern India will come to be regarded as only second to that of Mahatma Gandhi.

Lohia as Disciple of Nehru

—Madhu Limaye

Rammanohar Lohia did his matriculation from Bombay, his intermediate at the Banaras Hindu University and graduation from Calcutta. He went to Germany for higher studies, from where he obtained his Ph.D. Upon his return to India in 1933, Lohia was drawn into the political ferment which led to the formation of the first organised socialist party with deep links with the national freedom struggle. During his stay abroad as a student Lohia was not politically quiescent. His contemporary has stated that Lohia was a member of a radically minded Indian students' group in Germany. This group propagated the cause of Indian freedom in Germany and Europe and Lohia played a "prominent role" in the activities of the group. Lohia was only 19 years old when he enrolled as a student at the Berlin University in 1929.

Lohia's father was a Congress activist in Calcutta. It was through Jamnalal Bajaj, the Congress Treasurer, that Lohia was introduced to Mahatma Gandhi and, eventually, to Nehru.

In 1936 Jawaharlal, who had been released following the aggravation of Kamala Nehru's illness and her subsequent death in Switzerland, had been elected Congress President for the second time at Gandhi's instance. It was at the Lucknow session that Lohia met Nehru. The meeting took place in the Presidential tent. Nehru turned on his terrific charm. He greeted Lohia as the rising star in the Socialist firmament. He asked Lohia whether he had read the Presidential Address. Lohia said, "yes, it was a noble speech." "Noble speech"? Nehru was much pleased with the unusual adjective used by Lohia to describe the Presidential Address. The two hit it off well

together. The President was full of dreams and plans for injecting new life into the Congress movement. At that point of time Lohia was a great admirer of Nehru, and his love and respect for Jawaharlal was only next to that for Gandhi.

Jawaharlal had a weakness for bright foreign-educated young men and women, and was much impressed by the young Lohia. Lohia was not only highly intelligent, he was a brilliant conversationalist and could talk "refreshingly on most subjects". Nehru offered him charge of the Foreign Department which he proposed to set up at the AICC headquarters. Lohia as always was reluctant to tie himself down to a specific organizational responsibility, but so great was Nehru's hold over him at the time that Lohia agreed to take up the job.

As Foreign Secretary of the AICC Lohia built contacts with progressive movements abroad. He published a bulletin and issued several pamphlets on issues of foreign policy. A Communist colleague of Lohia considered his work an "outstanding achievement" of Jawaharlal Nehru's "new organisational set up", and called him the "first non-official Foreign Minister" of the Indian Freedom Movement.

Lohia's attitude to Nehru in the early years of their association is well reflected in the former's review of his autobiography. Lohia thought that Jawaharlal—who lived in all three stages through which India had passed in the previous twenty years—had given to each his "indelible impress". In his "musings on recent events", Lohia said, Jawaharlal had succeeded "in catching the time-spirit and, in seeking to evolve it and further it, he has ever been moved along". To Lohia the story of Jawaharlal's life was also the story of his age—of self-borne suffering, more spiritual than physical. Jawaharlal lived a life of "profound and harmonious interaction with his times". Only a man who had his eyes "always pinned to the final and worthiest standards of human life of beauty and culture and faith in progress" could in the midst of cruel conflict afford a smile at a Black Maria (a symbol of arrest by the Police) or see in a lathi charge hateful

sides. According to Lohia two words summed up Jawaharlal's striving, Justice and Beauty.

But even when Lohia was a hero-worshipping associate of Nehru he had not allowed his grasp of the fundamentals to slip. He had concluded his review of Nehru's autobiography on the significant note that Jawaharlal's "experiment of working for socialism from top, provided the work at the bottom is not neglected, is not necessarily a foregone failure."

Lohia could not feel happy in a job which would largely confine him to his office. He wanted to lead an active life both as a Socialist and Congress leader. He was a member of the AICC and also of the National Executive of the CSP. But it was not easy to get out of his commitment to Nehru. Even after Nehru ceased to be Congress President, Lohia continued to work in the AICC's Foreign Department. He wanted to quit but Kripalani told him that he could not leave before Nehru returned from Europe.

Kamaladevi, his colleague in the CSP, recalling her impressions of Lohia said that there was no "ready frame for him to fit into." He was like an "odd man" even in the early years of the Socialist Movement. She could not pinpoint where exactly the variance began and ended. Lohia was conscious of it himself, and gave expression to it but did not "talk loudly" about it or "make it an issue." Kamaladevi wrote:

One sensed the same want of ease when he was working as head of the foreign department in the All India Congress Office, Allahabad. I had an occasion to visit him more than once, while he worked there. He just did not seem to belong there. I remember, I felt rather sad. He looked so forlorn, dejected, as though his spirits were in a cage. I thought probably the solemnity and decorum of the Swaraj Bhawan community affected him adversely. True, it was not particularly inspiring setting with its old world structures, sprawling rooms and corridors but later, as I watched this element in him getting more and more pronounced,

I knew the reason must lie elsewhere; may be in more than one cause or factor.

Perhaps Nehru was aware of Lohia's uneasiness. And so finally he allowed him to leave the AICC Office. But he continued to have a high opinion of Lohia's ability. Thus in 1940 when the American Institute of Pacific Relations asked him to select a "scholar of the highest rank" to write on India's economic and political relations with East Asia, Nehru's thought naturally turned to Lohia who, he believed could do the job "competently", provided of course he took it up and gave time to it.

During the latter half of the nineteen-thirties, Nehru and Lohia thought alike on most policy questions. Soon after the Lucknow Session differences arose over the mode of functioning between Nehru and the official majority. Gandhi as usual mediated between the two. Gandhi told Nehru not to take matters to the AICC. "Why should it be so difficult for you to get on with those with whom you have worked without a jar for years?... The country should not be made to suffer for your mutual intolerance." Jawaharlal deferred to Gandhi's wishes, for he himself was convinced that a break would have serious consequences.

Acharya Kripalani, who relished controversy with Gandhi's critics, conveyed to Nehru his view that it was wrong on the Socialists' part to attack Mahatma Gandhi's policies. It was politically unwise to "undermine" Gandhiji's influence. "We shall again need him for a fight", Kripalani wrote.

A capacity to criticise and attack the old Congress leadership was not a test of leftism in politics, Nehru said in a letter to Subhas Bose. But in leftist circles in the thirties bitter criticism of the official leadership was considered to be the hall mark of progress. To the Communists, Royists, Subhasists and many Socialists, Gandhi was a backward looking reactionary. Lohia, however, was an exception to the general run of leftists and shared Nehru's evaluation of Mahatma Gandhi's leadership. When the crisis of the Presidential election overtook the

Congress in 1939 Lohia in a series of articles passionately argued against splitting the Congress. He thought Gandhi's leadership was indispensable for the success of the freedom struggle and deprecated all talk of an "alternative leadership".

The concept of an alternative leadership arose out of a "mistaken understanding of the class struggle". The Socialist concept of abolition of private property and Gandhi's idea of social ownership through the earlier stage of trusteeship were not necessarily antagonistic. "The two ends might coalesce; they might collide. But only when they do so collide will it be time for anyone to talk of the overthrow of the existing leadership on this score", Lohia said. He wanted that use of expressions Right and Left should be cut down. Instead of thinking of alternative leadership and incompatible groups he wanted the Leftists to keep in view joint action, joint programme and joint leadership. Lohia thought that Nehru's role in achieving this was crucial. In 1939 he was closer to Nehru than Subhas Bose. About the interrelationship of Gandhiji's followers and the Socialists, Lohia wrote:

"I feel that Gandhists and Socialists can be good friends and, for a long part of the journey. It may even be that, through long travelling together, they may revise some of their opinions and never part. History has seldom provided such happy conclusions, but, be that as it may, we may never forget that there is an element in Gandhiji which rises above all groups and is of all time. That is his insistence on non-violent *satyagraha* and the choice of good means."

Jawaharlal, too, was very clear about this. He was not prepared to "do anything to split the Congress." They might have to face a big struggle in the near future, and "that struggle, without Gandhiji's active participation and leadership, was not likely to be an effective one."

Lohia did not support Subhas Bose's candidature and he was critical of the formation of the Forward Bloc, the so-called Left Consolidation, and unification with the Communists which he

feared would make the CSP an agency of the Communist International. Lohia was in favour of Jawaharlal Nehru's Resolution at the Calcutta AICC appealing to Subhas Bose to withdraw his resignation and renominate the old working committee in the interest of unity. So deep were the differences in the CSP on this issue that Lohia even resigned from CSP National Executive along with some of his colleagues.

Lohia's agreement with Nehru is underscored by the mild protest he made on his being made a party to a joint appeal to Mahatma Gandhi, Subhash Bose and Jawaharlal Nehru to come together. "Who am I, why must I, and to what end should I appeal to the three finest men in the country to unite and take the lead", Lohia wrote self-deprecatingly to Minoo Masani. "I find that Jawaharlalji alone of the three that you have named is making some efforts in that direction."

Lohia suggested to fellow Socialists that the stand taken up by Jawaharlal towards the Congress crisis merited "deeper thought" than some of them were likely to bestow upon it. "We of the Left can be easily irritated with him for forsaking us. But there is another side to the picture.... whether one agrees or not with his present position, not much good can be done by finding fault with it, and a far more pertinent effort would be to help him in restoring the unity of the Congress on a firmer basis and greater understanding than before."

But despite the closeness between Nehru and Lohia already there were seeds of a possible disagreement between the two. And this lay in the unfolding of international events and their impact on India. On this issue of the freedom Movement's attitude to War, the leader and his disciple would show the first sign of divergence.

The AICC Foreign Department was developing a very sophisticated approach to the developing crisis. The various elements had to be delicately balanced and priorities in the matter of cooperation with the progressive forces properly fixed.

Lohia divided the world forces broadly into four broad Categories:

In the first category were the capitalists, the financial interests and other exploiting classes of the imperialist and fascist powers.

In the second category were the peoples of the subject nations struggling to shake off the imperialist domination.

In the third category was Russia, which had "socialised its economic life and created a state of workers and peasants."

The fourth category was the exploited and liberty loving people of the imperialist countries themselves.

Lohia then described fascism as a degenerated form of imperialism—a classic Marxist formulation—which had inevitably arisen in the context of shrinking markets and falling rates of profits. Lohia thought it likely that before its final demise capitalism in its two forms of imperialism and fascism might plunge the world into another destructive war.

Now herein lay the source of future disagreement. In western democratic countries the Communists and Socialists were working towards the creation of a peoples' front to fight the danger of fascist aggression, both internally and externally. Those European Leftists (of France, Holland etc.) adopted a "backward line on the colonial question." They denounced demonstrations and struggles of the Arabs and the East Indies people (now called Indonesians) as likely to help fascism and Japanese militarism. It was argued falsely by the European Communists and Leftists that the issue was "one of choice" between the "stable imperialisms" of France and Holland and the "brutal fascisms" of Germany, Italy and Japan.

Lohia warned that such an argument was heavy with "considerable long term mischief". The essential problem of the victims of imperialisms—Dutch, French and British—was one "obtaining freedom and of increasing strength to maintain it." A contrary choice would have disastrous consequences:

First, it emasculates a large part of the human race, which would otherwise have been gaining strength through its fight for freedom and which is now an easier prey of fascist invasion. Secondly, it besmirches and soils the ideal of human freedom and takes away much from the superiority of democracy to fascism. Thirdly, it entrenches in power the capitalist class which owns the world.

Lohia ended up by appealing to the Dutch and French Socialists and Communists to change their colonial policies.

Lohia's analysis of An Anti-imperialist's Dilemma was not only acute but also farsighted. An Indian Communist equally clear-headed, of course from the point of view of a Moscow-oriented Communist ideologist, had argued in an article in the *Congress Socialist* that in the event of peace loving countries like Russia, Britain and France getting involved in a war with Nazi Germany and Fascist Japan it would be the duty of the Communists and other leftists to forget about the Congress resolutions on War Resistance and assist in the war efforts of the British Indian Government to win the common struggle against Fascism!

At the beginning of the Second World War the alignment of international forces was not on the anticipated basis. The war broke out between Britain and France on the one hand and Germany on the other. Russia stayed neutral. The Communists in India did not have to make an excruciating choice. The interests of Russia and India did not conflict. But after the war became truly global in 1941, the situation changed, and the Communists altered their course as the perceptive Communist mentioned above had foreseen four years back.

When the War broke out the Socialists wanted the Congress to implement the War Resistance resolutions it had been adopting since its session in Madras in 1927. To begin with Gandhi was not in favour of this course, and Jawaharlal also temporised, awaiting the British Government's response to the Congress demand to clarify its war aims.

Lohia still had full faith in Jawaharlal and thought that the

move was a part of the effort to mobilise world opinion in favour of India's demand for independence. At this point Lohia did not notice any cooling of Nehru's enthusiasm for a relentless struggle against imperialism. It was the ardour of Nehru's anti-imperialism coupled with his advocacy of socialism which had, in the first instance, endeared him to the young generation in 1927.

To coordinate the action of three forces ranged against imperialism and fascism was not easy. Nor could it be said that imperialism and fascism would team up forever and never fall apart and push the world over the brink into a war. How could the colonial people then suspend their fight for freedom in the name of winning the war of the democracies against fascism? And should Russia become involved in the war against fascism, how could the short term interests of Russia be reconciled with the immediate and short term interests of the subject countries? There was a contradiction here, and the good and evil being "so mixed up" in the world one had to avoid "either untruth or unthinking negation or unthinking affirmation", Lohia said. What did this conundrum mean in actual practice? For an Indian, to deny the value and absolute priority of the national liberation struggle was wrong.

No matter if the British people is right and is involved in the defence of democracy against fascist aggression, it will still be the democratic duty of the Indian people to disrupt the British Empire in India. This is the long-range defence of democracy, a defence that might yet bring the day of cheer and hope to the world. If out of a purely opportunist consideration of democracy or of weakness, the colonial peoples are made to stand alongside of their imperialist masters, the world of freedom will be poorer and narrower.

Equally wrong would it be for the people trampled upon by fascism to negate unthinkingly the urgency and importance of the struggle against fascism as the Communist International asked Western Europe to do in 1939-41. At the same time the Socialists and Communists of Western Europe could not unthinkingly affirm their Governments colonial policy. Lohia

addressed an additional plea to the West's Socialists and Communists, namely that resistance to imperialism would strengthen the Arabs, the East Indians and the Indians against possible Nazi and Japanese aggression. Non-resistance would demoralise them and weaken them, and they would collapse like nine pins when confronted with this aggression. Lohia was proved right in 1942. Gandhi himself adopted this reasoning to justify his Quit India line. Eventually Nehru also found the logic of Lohia un rebuttable in July-August 1942.

The position of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal on the war issue—in the first six months of the European war—coincided. If there was any hesitation on Nehru's part it was effectively cloaked by Gandhi's own reluctance to be rushed into starting a civil disobedience movement immediately. Lohia offered an elaborate justification of Congress policy. "It was little use fighting with Gandhiji's language, Congressmen must learn to know better." The Ramgarh Session in March, 1940 was sure to give a call. Meanwhile, Lohia cited Jawaharlal's warning on the arrests of Congress workers, including J.P.—"one of the dearest and most valued of our comrades." "We have held ourselves patiently for the time when action was to be demanded of us. That patience did not signify acceptance of this growing attack on us."

Because of Nehru's dislike of fascism and his sympathy for the Western Democracies, China and Russia, Nehru could not get his priorities right. The German invasion of the low countries and the battle of France in May, 1940 unnerved him. He could not resolve the dilemma of an anti-imperialist in a subject nation. His anti-fascism paralysed his will for effective action against British imperialism. He forgot that his historic contribution to the Freedom struggle was the uncompromising anti-Empire tone he had lent to it. Now Nehru had to be pulled up by Maulana Azad in 1940 and Mahatma Gandhi and the Socialists in 1942.

Nehru had said in a speech at Lucknow on the eve of the fall of France that it was against the *shaan* (honour) of India to take advantage of Britain's peril and "rush at her throat". Azad

differed sharply with Nehru. The Congress was committed to stop help in the war and this war resistance, the Maulana felt, would "automatically take the form of civil disobedience" because of the existence of war ordinances and government's arrest of individual leaders and workers. If Nehru's "moral philosophy" was correct it meant that "the Ramgarh decision was absolutely against the honour and dignity of India". The Maulana thought that Jawaharlal's thinking was confused and illogical.

Lohia was arrested in 1940 and sentenced to a long term of imprisonment under DIR. He was not aware of Nehru's hesitations in the summer of 1940. With the opening of the campaign of individual Civil Disobedience, Nehru, too, was given a heavy sentence of four years. At the end of 1941, however, there was a general discharge of civil resisters. Japan, having entered the War, had scored stunning victories.

Now Nehru was a changed man. He was as eager as Rajaji to settle on the basis of the Cripps plan and join the enlarged Executive Council of the Viceroy without the assurance that the Council would be allowed to function as a Cabinet. Nehru was actuated by complex motives. He wanted to wield authority and also to help in the defeat of fascism, for he was an anti-fascist of long standing. Thanks largely to Gandhi's opposition, the Cripps offer was rejected. Deeply frustrated and anguished by his inability to join hands with China and Russia as a leader of the Indian Government, Jawaharlal spoke about raising a guerrilla force against Japan and vowed to fight Subhas Bose if he came to India with the invading army of Japan. Lohia was mortified by Nehru's speeches. Lohia remonstrated with Nehru about his "neurotic pro-British and pro-allied attitude". But Nehru continued to speak in the same vein. In a speech at the Almora political Conference in 1942 Lohia therefore called Nehru a Quick-Change Artist and warned him that if he did not mend his ways the people and particularly the youth would listen to just one man (Gandhi) when they were then listening to two (Gandhi and Nehru).

But Nehru was not indifferent to changes in popular mood

and was "extraordinarily flexible". He did not act as Rajaji did. He remained with the mainstream. Nehru supported in course of time Gandhi's struggle programme and went to jail. In August 1942 Lohia still considered himself a "disciple of Nehru, however heretical". The Nehru grip over Lohia had however begun to loosen.

Nehru's old ardour was gone, but still he was a very sensitive man and greatly admired all those who had kept the flag of resistance flying. Among them were Lohia, J.P., Achyut Patwardhan and Aruna Asaf Ali.

Nehru's attitude to Lohia can be gauged easily from the tone of the letter which Jawaharlal sent to the latter after his release. It is a beautiful letter and typical of the man:

New Delhi
17th April, 1946

My dear Rammanohar,

When was it I wrote to you last or met you? It seems long ago and I have been wondering how you must look now and how you must feel. After all, the inner changes are more important than external ones. I myself have a continuous sensation of changing. But it is really for others to judge what these changes are, good or bad.

I hoped that you might come here on your release, but of course you had to go to Calcutta. Meanwhile, I am stuck up here in the imperial capital which is trying very unsuccessfully to shape its own garb. I have no idea how long this business will last and what its outcome will be.

It was a delight to meet Jayaprakash and to find the same dear and delightful person, so little changed and yet perhaps changed in many ways. We had two brief talks, much too brief, and then he went away.

Are you still your old self, bright and intelligent and a little erratic and vagrant? Has life hardened you? But these are questions that you cannot answer. And I shall have to meet

you to find out I hope when we meet you will not look at me as if through a shell.

I was in Assam when your father died and memories of his kindly self came to me. I realised what a grief it must have been to you.

As you must know I have written another book—very subjective as usual. I should like to send you a copy, but I have none here with me. I think the easiest way for me is to enclose a note for the publishers. Even the publisher has, I believe, no copy left. But if there is a copy it will be given to you.

Keep bright and cheerful and do not be over-burdened by the stress of events.

With love.

Yours affectionately,

But the warmth, which Lohia still reciprocated, did not last long. In May, 1946 Nehru replaced Azad as Congress President. Nehru invited Lohia to become the General Secretary, and J. P. to join the Working Committee. The suggestion, if it had not emanated from Gandhi, had at least his enthusiastic support:

We had three sessions, all past midnight and one reaching up to three in the morning... Mr. Nehru rejected outright two of my demands, one, that no member of the Congress working committee should be a government minister, two, that some formula permitting benevolent criticism by the Congress party of its own government should be evolved, and partly accepted my third demand that the Congress president should keep out of the government... but refused my request to apply it to his own person.

Nehru said—not without an affectionate appeal for understanding—that the provincial Ministries had rarely responded to his suggestions, although he was then the Congress President. "Advisers and executors are two different

entities and, except in very rare circumstances, executors tend to follow their own line."

The Nehru argument for joining the Government did not impress Lohia and so he declined Nehru's offer of General Secretaryship. J.P. also did not join the Working Committee.

Why did Lohia lay down these conditions? In the troublous years that lay ahead Lohia thought that they were confronted with two tasks. One was to win a state, establish a strong authority and then make it secure. The other task was to initiate a process of transforming the decayed social order. To accomplish the two-fold task Lohia wanted a marriage of top solutions and bottom solutions, of government's effort and people's action. Lohia and the Socialists placed their views before the Congress leaders. Gandhi was sympathetic. But both Nehru and Patel denounced Lohia's demands as impractical and academic.

Nehru and Patel concentrated their energies on the top solutions, on governmental efforts to the exclusion of people's initiatives. Lohia thought that some tension between the Government and the Congress organization was inevitable. It did not matter as long as there was a basic understanding between the two. But this was not there between the Socialists and Government leaders. Both Nehru and Patel felt embarrassed by the outbreak of any popular struggle—whether in the field of trade union strike or peasant action or State's people's agitation or whether in regard to the struggle of the Goan people for civil liberties or the Nepalese masses for democratic rights.

In 1946 Lohia had initiated civil disobedience in Goa against the fascist Salazar regime as well as in Nepal against the Rana autocracy. Nehru had succeeded in winning over J. P. and persuaded him to join the Working Committee in August, 1946. Now he began to pressurise J. P. and the Socialists to drop the Nepal programme of action. On October 10, 1946 Nehru telegraphed Lohia to refrain from going to Goa or taking any precipitate action. "I am dealing with the matter officially... the

approaches must not conflict with each other", Nehru wrote to Lohia the same day. He had also informed Krishna Menon that he proposed to take action on the Goa issue. In fact Nehru did nothing till December, 1961, that is, the eve of the Third General Election!

Nehru could have had little confidence in his persuasive power. His charm had begun to wear off. The disillusionment was on the increase and before the assassination of Gandhi Lohia fell in line with the general Socialist consensus of leaving the Congress. In fact he had made up his mind before the end of 1947. The phase of discipleship was over for Lohia. The adversary relationship had begun. But that is a different story altogether.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia as a Revolutionary

—*Jagdish Prasad Chaturvedi*

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was a great politician who heralded a new era in India. It is a fact that the magnitude of the greatness of this politician was not easily recognised either in India or abroad. But it is also true that we are not appreciating the results of the far-reaching impact that Dr. Rammanohar Lohia made on independent India's politics. The decisive role of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia in India's freedom struggle is often forgotten, reason being that at that time there were senior leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Acharya Narendra Deva, Dr. Rajendra Prasad in whose comparison, Dr. Lohia was considered to be of a lesser stature. Abiding by his principles and in order to give honour to others, Dr. Lohia avoided holding high offices. The result was that persons who owed their positions to him earned high fame. I do not say that Dr. Lohia made greater contribution in comparison to the persons I have mentioned above, but while they were leaders of the past, Dr. Lohia was a leader of the India of tomorrow. Had he been alive today, he would have been reckoned among the most honoured and powerful persons. It was Dr. Lohia who conceived the structure of the country which we see today.

It was Dr. Lohia's misfortune that he conceived of the future much ahead of him. Besides, many of his fellow politicians whom he trusted betrayed him and joined those who wielded power, while Dr. Lohia stuck to his principles. I had the opportunity of having a heart to heart talk with Dr. Lohia on the

day or a day before he was admitted to the Willingdon Hospital for getting the prostate gland operated upon. It was evening time and very few persons were sitting in the Central Hall and we two were sitting close to each other and had been talking for quite sometime. When I recollect about that conversation now, I feel as if he had been talking from the innermost recesses of his heart in the last days of his life and that I was the only person who had been listening to his deepest thoughts. While he was talking, he said to me, "Chaturvedi, life has offered no pleasure." I replied, "No, it is not like that. You are a leader of the lakhs. People can do anything on a mere inkling from you." To this, he said, "Nobody listens to me." Upon this, I told him that when he spoke people listened to him spell-bound; pin drop silence prevails during his meetings; whatever he writes, people read it with great respect and hold it in a testamentary esteem. Still, he told me that he could not project an image. I lightly told him: "Dr. Saheb, you hardly had time to project your image, you have been devoting your time to tarnishing the image of others." But now, I realise that Dr. Lohia's complaint was true and it was against whole of the Indian society. His countrymen did not recognise his importance during his lifetime. There were two reasons for this: first, he was so candid that he did not hesitate in highlighting the smallest mistake of the greatest man in a forceful manner. Secondly, he neither proclaimed about his achievements himself nor did he let others do so.

I first heard of the name of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was elected President of the Indian National Congress in 1936. Acharya Kripalani was made General Secretary, but four educated youth were made Department Secretaries in the All India Congress Committee office. These were, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, Dr. K.M. Ashraf, Dr. Zainal Abedin Ahmed (Z.A. Ahmed) and the fourth one probably was a European — Leonard Shiff. Dr. Lohia had returned from Germany after obtaining his doctorate and he was an expert in economic affairs. Congress had already become a socialist party at that time. Dr. Lohia had sympathy

with it while the other three were considered to be followers of communist ideology. Persons like Acharya Narendra Deva, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Shri Achyut Patwardhan had since joined the Congress Working Committee. Mahatma Gandhi was not convinced of the ideology of the Congress Socialists, although he praised their qualities—especially that of Acharya Narendra Deva and Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. When the 'Do or Die Movement' of 1942 started and big leaders of the country including Mahatma Gandhi were arrested, it was Dr. Rammanohar Lohia and his followers who at that time avoiding the police action, conducted the 'August Revolution' — which should be its correct name. He was one of those leaders who could not be arrested then. Thereafter, he had been conducting a sort of a violent revolution, against the British in Maharashtra, at Bombay and elsewhere, in Bihar, in Bengal, in Calcutta and elsewhere and in Uttar Pradesh. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was in the Hazaribagh Jail and it was then that he escaped from the Hazaribagh Jail alongwith some of his other associates. Government knew that this news would spread in the country like wild fire and, therefore, the Associated Press published that day a small list of those persons who had escaped from the Hazaribagh Jail and the names of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and five others were in the list. Newspapers could not assess the importance of that news and little coverage was given to this news in *The Statesman* Delhi edition and in the *National Call*. But the editor of daily *Vishwamitra*, published from Delhi, Shri Satyadev Vidyalkar realised the importance of this news and published it under the caption "*Jayaprakash Jail Se Bhag Nikle*" (Jayaprakash escaped from Jail). Jayaprakash Narayan reached Banaras from Hazaribagh and then it was decided to form an 'Azad Dasta' with him in Nepal. There were two leaders of that 'Azad Dasta' — Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. A radio station was established in Nepal adjoining Bihar. Dr. Lohia brought along his transmitter and became the Director of Radio Publicity Department. His statements inflamed the Hindi regions. The British regime became restless. The concept of this movement, of the future revolution, which was in the

mind of Dr. Lohia was described in his article "*Kranti Kee Taiyaree Karo*" (Prepare for the Revolution) as follows: "Groups of five educated and dedicated persons each should be formed to come forward and lead the people to success as the revolution starts. These groups may be able to perform the task which the volunteers would be unable to fulfil even after making great sacrifices. Whether it is about wresting arms from the armed personnel in guard of the British Government Centres or from the armed personnel posted for firing on the processions, or cutting off roads, or dismantling the railway tracks or jamming rail traffic, or mass attacking the Police Stations, Jails, Courts and the Secretariat, these groups comprising the specially trained personnel can do wonders. Wherever such a group will be in action, the British rule could be put an end to in no time soon after the revolution starts and this would encourage the revolutionary spirit in other areas also reducing the British rule to naught."

Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Dr. Lohia had their working offices in the "Goats' Island" located in the basin of the river Kosi. Hardly two months had elapsed since their stay there when the British administration got tip of the fact that revolutionaries were being recruited in the Nepal region and radio broadcasts were beamed from there. Dr. Lohia firmly believed that even if a hundred strong persons could be mustered from every district, the revolution could become a success. While recruitment was on and publicity in progress, the Nepalese police cordoned them off. Yet, Jayaprakash Narayan and Dr. Lohia escaped from the police cordon during night and reached Calcutta. From Calcutta, a letter was sent to Shri Subhas Chandra Bose. But later, both of them were arrested and kept in Lahore Fort separately. They were subjected to inhuman persecution and were thereafter transferred to Agra Jail. Dr. Lohia sent a letter to the then Chairman of the Labour Party and British economist, Harold Laski, informing him of the atrocities being perpetrated throughout the country. In 1945, after detaining them for 16 months, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Dr. Lohia were sent to

Agra Jail and when a delegation of the British MPs visited India, it also went to the Agra Jail and met these two Socialist leaders. Later, when the Cabinet Mission came to India to discuss grant of freedom to India, these two leaders were let off from Agra jail on 11 April, 1946.

On his release from the jail, Mahatma Gandhi had dissociated himself and the Congress from the violent activities connected with the 'August Revolution'. At that time, the whole of the revolution owed its continuance to Dr. Lohia and his compatriots and it is known too well that the British decided to leave India following the deadly blow to them by the said revolution. But not many would give credit to Dr. Lohia for that success.

That was not the first freedom struggle of Dr. Lohia. It was he who had started movement for the freedom of Goa, which was declared illegal by the then Chief Minister of the Bombay State, Shri Morarji Desai, and still the Government of India was compelled to take police action for the liberation of Goa. How many persons are aware of Dr. Lohia's strategy in helping install the coalition Governments in several States in 1967 and of the reasons for Dr. Lohia's accepting Chaudhri Charan Singh as Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh.

It was Dr. Lohia's conviction — we may not agree with him — that popular rule would come to the country only when the people, who had all along been devoid of power and prosperity, would hold the reins of power. This, of course, is the basic principle of socialism, but Dr. Lohia held the view that even if the high caste persons who had all along been enjoying social, economic and political superiority, started calling themselves socialists or communists, the economically backward persons would never get power. He was also of the view that the caste system was so deep-rooted in India that it would be hard to get rid of it even in a socialist set-up. Hence, he thought that the backward classes should be collectively trained in the tenets of socialism. As a sequel to it, leaders like Karpoori Thakur came up in Bihar who encouraged persons like Chaudhri Charan Singh, Rao Birender Singh, etc. the representatives of the Jats,

the Yadavas, the Kewats, the Malees and so on, and its results are now before us today.

Though Dr. Lohia was a socialist, he did not consider himself to be a marxist. He, therefore, had a separate concept of the class conflict. But it does not mean that Dr. Lohia was unaware of international ideologies. He had stayed in Germany for four years and had studied Economics, History and Philosophy in The Berlin Univesity. The subject for his Ph.D. thesis was, the Taxation of Salt in India . In his thesis, he had explained the economic, historical and political impact of imposition of tax on salt in India. While in Berlin he had been the Secretary of the Hindustan Association of the Central Europe for a long time. He had written an article in *The Hindu*, published from Madras, on the 'Emergence of Hitlerism in Germany'. Later on, when he joined the office of Indian National Congress, he got ample opportunity to study the economic theories in the international perspective. Dr. Lohia himself belonged to a Vaishya family of Faizabad and had a deep knowledge of national and international economic system. He was a bachelor and therefore, most of his time was spent in 'Swaraj Bhavan' at Allahabad. The room where he stayed in 'Swaraj Bhavan' for a long time is even now referred to by the old guides of 'Swaraj Bhavan' as Dr. Lohia's room.

When Dr. Lohia became a member of Congress Socialist Group, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was appointed as its General Secretary. Acharya Narendra Deva was the eldest leader and had equal command on both socialism and Buddhist philosophy. Both these leaders had very good personal relations with Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Mahatma Gandhi used to call Shri Jayaprakash Narayan as his son-in-law because his wife Prabhawati was a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi, although at that time, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan did not agree with Mahatma Gandhi's ideology and severely criticised his *Khadi* and *Charkha* programmes. In 1936, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan made a mention of Marxism in the goal set for Congress socialism. Even after independence, he thought that the

socialists have in the form of Jawaharlal Nehru, inducted a socialist member in the Congress Party and he had no intention of forming a party against Congress with a view to form its Government. But in 1952, Socialist Party contested the election and Praja Socialist Party came into existence in 1952 in alliance with the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party. Dr. Lohia was in favour of this because he was of the opinion that it would avoid division of votes against Congress and an alternative to Congress would emerge. But the Praja Socialist Party did not prove as successful as communists, despite good poll results in its favour. It was realised that had the Praja Socialist Party contested the elections from a lesser number of constituencies the results would have been more favourable for it. Even then in 1953, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru invited Shri Jayaprakash Narayan to join the Central Cabinet. But Shri Jayaprakash Narayan declined the offer and wrote a letter to him making it clear that if an effort was made for national reconstruction in the direction of socialism only then this offer would carry some weight; joining the Cabinet merely for getting a few seats either in Centre or in the States did not attract him and as such he did not attach much importance to joining the Cabinet. In March 1953, I had met Shri Jayaprakash Narayan at Brij Krishan Chandiwala's residence where he was staying after he had come back having declined the offer made by Pandit Nehru. I asked Jayaprakash Babu: "Why did you not accept the offer; after Nehru you would have been the most influential person." He replied: "What could I have done alone? Unless Pandit Nehru agrees to induct my other colleagues, I will not be able to do much." While talking to him it became clear that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru was not prepared to take Dr. Rammanohar Lohia in the Cabinet and Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was not ready to join the Cabinet without Dr. Lohia. He was right in his decision because till then if the Praja Socialist Party or its socialist element considered anybody as their leader, it was only Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. He was a good organiser, gave due respect to his party workers and shared their joys and sorrows. Politically he was very far-sighted and critically sharp-eyed. He had dexterity over expression of

thought. Dr. Lohia did not have that much faith in Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as Shri Jayaprakashji had and as was apprehended by Dr. Lohia, Pandit Nehru did not accept the fourteen-point programme of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan whereby economic reforms such as distribution of land, nationalisation of banks, insurance companies, coal and other mineral industries, promotion of state trade and reduction in the salaries of high Government officials, were sought to be made. Pandit Nehru opposed neither of it in principle, but he did not think it appropriate to commit for bringing a resolution in this regard in the next four years. Dr. Lohia was already not in favour of negotiations, because he felt that if they negotiate with Government, people will not consider the Praja Socialist Party as a party with a different ideology.

How candidly Dr. Lohia expressed ~~his views~~ could be seen from his article which appeared in '*Janta Patra*' in May 1953. He wrote: "There are two ways by which Shri Jayaprakash Narayan can become Pandit Nehru's successor. One is by compassionate goodwill of Shri Nehru and by reaching a compromise, which would definitely be opposed with full fervour by people like me, because in such a situation Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, will prove worse than Pandit Nehru. The alternate way is that he be provided with an opportunity to become the leader of the crores of people, who will either be casting vote for the socialism or will be participating in the great Civil Disobedience Movement. I feel in this manner the people will heartily extend their support in installing Jayaprakash Narayan as their Prime Minister and Shri Jayaprakash Narayan will definitely prove to be a better Prime Minister."

When some differences cropped up between Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Dr. Lohia, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and some of his associates resigned from the party. Dr. Lohia requested them to take back their resignations saying: "What more could I say in regard to relations between me and Jayaprakash that we both faced bullets together when we were freed from Nepal Jail by

Azad Dasta in 1944. It was a different thing that we both escaped unhurt. Except to add that I have no brother of my own, I would not like to elaborate further on my relations with Jayaprakash. What difference does it make that we had differences in the past and may have in future too."

Shri Jayaprakash Narayan gave due regard and weightage to Dr. Lohia's ideology. The principles of socialism evolved by Dr. Lohia ultimately became the fundamental tenets for socialists. The Congress Government accepted all those proposals sooner or later, although land reforms remained incomplete and the pay and the other perquisites of Government officers kept on increasing instead of decreasing. These were the reasons which made achievement of socialism difficult and after incorporating socialism in the Constitution, India proceeded more and more towards capitalism.

I came in contact with Dr. Rammanohar Lohia when he entered the Lok Sabha as its Member. But I was taken by surprise when he talked to me very cordially immediately after entering the House. I did not understand the reason of receiving so much of respect from an unknown person. But I immediately came to know the reason that brought so much harmony between Dr. Lohia and myself. Though, it is a fact that I was a member of the Congress Socialist Party in my student life, but I had contacts either with Acharya Narendra Deva or with Shri M.R. Masani who was the General Secretary of the Party at that time. Dr. Lohia was the Secretary of Economic Affairs Cell of the Congress Party, but as a student activist, I was more associated with two of his associates, Dr. K.A. Ashraf and Dr. Z.A. Ahmed. Later on, these two persons became the prominent leaders of the communist party. As such, I can say that until Dr. Lohia had come to Delhi, I had neither any contact with him nor our views were completely identical. During the student agitation, I used to be an associate of the communist activists and due to this, later on, I dissociated myself from the Congress Socialist Workers. With an end to student life, my student politics also came to an end. Thereafter, if at all, I took active part in any organisation, it was Congress organisation or

Akhil Bhartiya Deshi Rajya Lok Parishad. It was an organisation in which people having different political ideologies participated. In order to give momentum to this movement, after coming to New Delhi in 1947, I established a news agency called the Lok Samachar Samiti or Peoples' Press of India in March itself which used to give publicity to news and activities, relating to subjects of princely states. Initially, I was associated with Daily *Navbharat Times*, Delhi and "*Amar Bharat*" of Delhi and later on worked for this news agency for many years. Since several activists of Tikamgarh were active in Vindhya Pradesh Rajya Sangh, Vindhya Pradesh became a special centre of my activities. I had already lived in Tikamgarh for 4 years and had participated in political activities with the activists of Orachha Seva Sangh.

On 13 March, 1948, the Rulers of Bundelkhand and the Maharaja of Rewa had signed an agreement to form an association of the States under the title Vindhya Pradesh States Union. On 14 April, 1949, all the Ministers had resigned due to mutual rift in the council of ministers and following the arrest of a minister on the charge of accepting a bribe of Rs.25,000, and a Government Officer was appointed the Chief Minister. In September 1949, at the instance of Sardar Patel, an I.C.S. Officer, Shri N.M. Buch visited Vindhya Pradesh for reviewing the administrative and political situation there. After receiving his report Sardar Patel had decided that this State should be divided between Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. In fact, Sardar's intention was to merge that State with Madhya Pradesh and that is why, an officer of Madhya Pradesh Government, Shri S.N. Mehta was asked to take over as the Chief Minister. The Inspector-General was also called from Madhya Pradesh. Secretary to the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri B.P. Menon reached Naugaon on 17 December and when he wanted to get the signatures of all the rulers for the merger of all the States, the Maharaja of Rewa did not reach there and sent a message that he was very ill. Though 3 or 4 rulers put their signatures, yet the other rulers of Bundelkhand agency said that they would sign only when the Maharaja of

Rewa has signed. Subsequently, Shri Menon went to Rewa. This news had already reached Rewa as to why Shri Menon was going there. When Shri Menon was proceeding towards the fort to meet the Maharaja of Rewa, a mob of about 2,000 people stopped him and did not allow him to proceed further. The demonstrators were demanding to maintain *status quo* in respect of Vindhya Pradesh. Shri Menon returned, but later he exerted pressure on the Maharaja of Rewa through other rulers and obtained his signatures. It was almost certain that either Vindhya Pradesh would be divided or transferred to Madhya Pradesh. The State Congress Committee opposed division by adopting a resolution in this regard. But knowing it fully well that the State Congress Committee would do nothing except adopting a resolution, the Vindhya Pradesh Socialist Party, which had emerged very powerful by that time, decided to launch an agitation against the merger. Dr. Lohia had gone to Rewa in this connection and on 28 December, 1949, he delivered a forceful speech in a public meeting in Rewa. He exhorted the people that if they were united nobody could force his decision on them. A torchlight procession was taken out on 1 January, 1950 and a strike was observed on 2 January.

The focal point of the strike in Rewa was the bus stand or the *Larikhana*, where the activists staged a *dharna* and stopped movement of buses. Section-144 had not been enforced in the city and hundreds of people were watching the clash between the police and the demonstrators. Later on, the Inspector General of Police also reached there. The District Magistrate neither ordered lathi-charge on the people nor declared it an unlawful assembly, but gave orders for firing against some incidents of stone throwing. As a result of this eighteen people suffered bullet injuries and two of the injured succumbed to their injuries. The police banned transmission of any message through Post and Telegraph offices. As a result, nobody was able to make a phone call from there. A socialist activist of Tikamgarh, Shri Nandram Kathail reached Tikamgarh and sent a telegram to the Minister of

Communications, Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai complaining about it and he telephonically asked me to reach Rewa for publishing the news for general information.

At that time, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was in Bombay. Since all these incidents had taken place at the instance of the Socialist Party and Dr. Lohia, he was given this information from Allahabad. On 4 January, 1950 the General Secretary of the Socialist Party, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan; General Secretary of the Hindi Mazdoor Sabha, Shri Asoka Mehta and Chairman of the Hind Kisan Panchayat, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, in a statement, made the complaint that the Government had suppressed all the news from Rewa and they demanded that Vindhya Day be observed on 15 January all over the country. Thereafter, Dr. Lohia reached Rewa on the night of 7 January, 1950. In the morning, he visited the Victoria Hospital and saw the injured persons there and that day he tried to convene a public meeting. But he was informed by the Divisional Commissioner that since Section-144 had been enforced in the city and there was a lot of tension, hence Dr. Lohia cannot convene a meeting. The officers told him that it was not advisable to convene a meeting at that time. When Dr. Lohia reiterated his resolve to convene the meeting in violation of Section 144, he was ordered to leave Vindhya Pradesh.

No news was coming from Rewa. At that time Shri Nandram Kathail telephoned me with the request that I should reach Rewa and probe the incident of firing and publish my report in the newspapers. I immediately proceeded to Rewa. After alighting at Satna Railway Station while I was about to board a bus for Rewa, I was enquired as to who was I and where was I going. On this occasion, I somehow entered the city by misguiding them. Later on I met the Chief Minister, the Chief Secretary, the Inspector General of Police, the District Magistrate and obtained reports of 3 January and 6 January respectively from the Director of Health and Medical Services, Lt. Col. L. Oswal and Medical Officer, Shri S.T. Bhattacharya and gave a detailed report for publication in the newspapers. I gave a copy of my report to Shri Pramod Sen, Editor of Amrit

Bazar Patrika whom I knew, at Allahabad. This newspaper used to publish articles and reports of our service. I sent one more copy to *National Herald*. The *National Herald* had deputed its correspondent, Shri Lakshmi Kant Tripathi also for this assignment and had also published his report. Even then it published my report in 8 columns. In my report, I had proved that firing by the police was not only unlawful, but also unwarranted and the people were deliberately made the targets of bullets just as retaliation of an old revenge. I had quoted from conflicting and contradictory statements that I had collected from various authorities. The Government was not able to give any justification for the above incident of firing. During the Budget Session when Shri Balkrishna Sharma 'Navin' and several other Members of the Treasury Benches criticised the Government of Vindhya Pradesh and the Ministry of Home Affairs for the incident of firing, Sardar Patel who was incharge of the Ministry of Home Affairs chided Dr. Lohia for that but he could not prove that there was any justification for firing.

In this way, the incident of firing at Rewa had become a very sensitive issue for Dr. Lohia. When he was informed by the Socialist workers of Bundelkhand region as to who had collected this report and published, a kind of special sympathy for me had developed in Dr. Lohia's mind.

Another incident also took place. In those days, I used to be the special correspondent of Daily "Aaj" published from Varanasi, at their New Delhi office. I had gone to the Economic Research Institute for some work where I received a survey report prepared by Dr. Lohia. I came to know from the report that the per capita income in Tehri Garhwal and Deoria Districts was the lowest in the country. I got this report published in "Aaj". The income figures in the said report were annual and had been given in rupees. After going through the above report Dr. Lohia worked out by his own arithmetic that, the daily wages came to two annas only. He created a problem for the Minister of Planning, Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda in the Lok Sabha by raising the issue of wages of two annas and it became a very important debate in the annals of Parliamentary debates.

When my book "*China Me Vistarvad Ke Do Hajar Varsh*" was published, he made a commendable review of the book in the *Jan'*, the magazine of socialist ideologies.

The eyes of Dr. Lohia were very watchful and he paid highest respects to even the most ordinary persons. With his untimely demise, a pillar of Indian socialism had crashed to the ground.

PART THREE

HIS IDEAS

**(Excerpts from some select Speeches of
Dr. Lohia in Lok Sabha)**

19

Motion of No-Confidence in the Council of Ministers*

Some people may be taken by surprise to know that upto 3-4 months I also was under illusion for this Government, but due to a number of reasons that has vanished. One of such reasons is that once I was discussing with Gandhiji about changing a new land into a cultivable land by the Anna Sena. In the meantime the Hon. Prime Minister came and asked in an agitated mood as to where the said land was located. He asked in the same manner as the Hon. Minister of Food had put a similar question in the House yesterday. I had replied that he should himself find it from his own records. I told him that at least 17 or 18 crore acres of land, which has all along been there in the present condition, can be used for agricultural purposes. Out of it 3 or 4 crore acres of land can be used for agriculture purposes easily without making any investment on it. Instead of following the above path, the Prime Minister has shown peculiar ways to people viz. growing crops in flower pots and on roof tops. He has made this suggestion not once, but on several occasions. As a result of that.....

It is my maiden speech in the House. As such, please give me some more time.

I was saying as to what different methods were prescribed by the Hon. Prime Minister. He advised people to grow crops in

Lok Sabha Debates, 21 August, 1963

flower pots and on roof tops. This advice had its effect in Purulia some days ago when Faqir Mahato who had gone to jail while fighting against the Britishers and due to his sacrifices, the Hon. Prime Minister is occupying his chair now, had lost his father who died of starvation. In this way, in many parts of Rajasthan and several places in Hissar Tehsil, the condition of live stock also deteriorated for want of fodder. Some people might say that raising crops on flower pots is a sign of insanity, but I do not agree to that. It is indicative of the fact that a person could mesmerise people by virtue of his exciting expression. The situation has come to such a pass where all utterances seem to be meaningless. The first charge that I would like to level against this Government is that it is managing its work due to ignorance of people and by using sterile and ineffective words. Yesterday, the Hon. Minister of Food made a claim here that agricultural production had increased a lot. What is the increase? I would like him to correct his figures. The production has increased from 6 crore tonnes to 8 crore tonnes. But they should also keep a note of tremendous growth of population. According to that there should have been an increase of about 7.25 crore tonnes.

If there is any logic, one must say and he will get a direct reply. Do not create a noise unnecessarily. Do you have any logic? You do not have any logic. It should have increased proportionately at the rate of 6 to 7 crore of increase in population. Then, what increase has been achieved in the production of foodgrains?

At the same time, I would like to tell you that China, against which we are fighting, produces 24 crore tonnes of foodgrains. They make a claim that they produce 30-40 crore of tonnes. But as per assessment, their production comes to 24 crore tonnes. At that rate, foodgrains production in our country should have been 16 crore tonnes. Apart from this, I would like to tell you that ours is the most starving country in the world. Our intake of calories is in between 1500 to 1600 calories. I feel ashamed when I see a Food Minister boasting of growing food production in the House.

In addition to it I would submit about the prices. There is much talk about the prices but what actually those prices are? They are wholesale prices of few markets. The Government never discuss the retail prices because it is the Government of 50 lakh rich people only and has nothing to do with the remaining 43.5 crores of poor people of this country. As such the Government is failure and it has created a misconception in the Government as well as in the country. Who is an efficient Minister today? The Minister is not efficient who boosts domestic production, but the efficient is one who brings Mig aircrafts from Russia or wheat from America. Thinking of the Government and the country has become so distorted that today we have more confidence in external efforts than the internal efforts.

Vishnu Maharaj has several arms and I would caution Shri Hiren Mukherjee not to come under the grip of the arms of Sahasrabahu. No one knows when such a arm would grip him. One Minister is inclined towards America and the other towards Soviet Union. It has happened due to the policy of non-alignment. I would say it emphatically that it is not at all the policy of non-alignment. Efforts have been made from the very beginning that some Ministers should stick to Soviet Camp and some to U.S. Camp and the Prime Minister thought that with the magic of his personality he would be able to maintain balance between the two. It is not a policy of non-alignment. Had it been so, we would have acted on the external matters as a country. But today we are divided. The Council of Ministers is divided into two. The Lok Sabha is divided on external matters. Had we divided on internal matters that could be understood. The whole country is divided and her soul has been divided. I would like to know whether there is any country in the world which was so divided on a matter of external affairs as India has been divided today.

As a result of it, the country could not make any development. In this regard, I would not like to give any laymen's figures. Though I am not a very highly qualified person, yet I am able to talk to these friends. So far as the development is

concerned, we have to keep two things in our mind—firstly our position as compared to our neighbouring countries and secondly our condition as compared to our past.

So far as our position as compared to our neighbour is concerned, Ghana, an African country, had got independence very recently, but its per capita income is increasing by Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 per year. Per Capita Income of USA and USSR is increasing by Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 per year. As against such an increase, India's per capita income is increasing only by Rs. six to seven per year. These figures in percentage are very dangerous because increase in the per capita income of both USA and India, if shown in percentage, is 2 or 2.5 per cent, but in USA this increase of 2 or 2.5 per cent means an increase of Rs. 300 whereas in India it is only Rs. 7. I am talking about per capita income and not about the present gross national income.

As compared to our past, we have been making progress at a snail pace during first ten years of independence and that had given a chance to some people to say that the country is making progress. The country was making progress at a snail's pace, be it the setting up of a new plant at Sindri or anything else. But today our production is increasing at the rate of 1.5 per cent whereas our population is increasing at the rate of 2 or 2.5 per cent. We are also bound by our past. As the stagnating water becomes stale, our economy is also stagnating.

Now I put it in other way also. In 1948, our national income was Rs. 8500 crores and now it has gone up to Rs. 13,500 crores at the constant prices. Now I give you figures about the increase of Rs. 5,000 crores in national income and the items on which it has been spent. In 1948, the Government expenditure was Rs. 1,000 crores which has now gone up to Rs. 5,500 crores. The number of Government employees who were 1.5 per cent of the total population, has now increased to 3 per cent. I would have no objection to their increased number had they been useful for increasing production, but they are only pen-pushing Government servants; wasting papers to no use to boost our production. They merely show that some thing is being done.

In this regard as a matter of detail, I would like to point out that the plan is evaluated at the end of the year with the expenditure incurred on it. It is not evaluated in terms of men or material, but in terms of expenditure on it. As a result of it, at the end of the financial year, the Government offices and department start spending funds indiscriminately and they engage their own people and relatives in the services. It is said that funds have been spent on development works, but in fact funds are spent for the upliftment of their own families and relatives.

Therefore, I would like to ask a question as to why all this has happened? I seriously thought over it and got only this reply that when Britishers left this country, the main question before this Government was as to how to run the country. Instead of running the country on a different pattern they perhaps thought that their greatness lies in running the country on the same pattern on which the Britishers used to run. Instead of bringing rich people down and uplifting the poor, the Ministers thought that they would also make a big jump to sit with the rich people.

As has been stated by a Member of Planning Commission that 60 per cent of the families in our country maintain themselves by spending Rs. 25 only on each family. It means that 27 crore people in our country spend only three annas per head per day. I want that it should be remembered for ever that while 27 crore people live on three annas per head per day, an amount of Rs. 3 is spent per day on the dog of our Prime Minister. It is the present condition of our country. It may be more than that, but I am deliberately telling it less so that no one may hold my tongue.

As a result, the disparities in our country are increasing by leaps and bounds. I would like to say only this much that the farm labourers in our country earn a meagre 12 annas daily, the teachers who teach the alphabets of Hindi and Persian languages earn just two rupees a day, but there is a business house in this country, which earns Rs. three lakh a day, the richest man in the country earns Rs. thirty thousand daily and

about twenty five to thirty thousand rupees are spent daily on the most important person of the Government, the Prime Minister.

...

...

...

... People have a misconception that I have some malice against the Prime Minister. This is not true. I don't have any ill will towards him, at the personal level. I would have forgiven, considering that he is elder to me and much more experienced, but this country has been ruined by fifty lakh big people, who imitated him. These fifty lakh people usurp Rs. 5,000 crore from a national income of Rs. 15,000 crore and 43.5 crore people of this country are left with a meagre Rs. 10,000 crore. Capital formation becomes impossible due to this. What are the reasons responsible for this pitiable condition of our capital, agriculture and industry? Why are we not able to make progress? The Chinese attacked us, not because our forces were inferior to theirs, of course, that was one of the reasons, but the aggression was made mainly because of our economy, which was in doldrums and in this, the Chinese found a golden opportunity to carry out their nefarious designs.

About this plan, I would certainly like to say one thing. This plan has spoilt the relationship between men and commodities. We are not mute creatures like the cows, goats or bullocks. We human beings are capable of communicating with each other, but that capacity of ours has been given a go-bye. Efforts are on to carry out this plan, through the medium of English. Had it been a case of cattle grazing in a field we could have managed without the help of any language. However, here I would like to clarify that I am not stressing on the need to use Hindi, rather, I am stressing the need to use one's mother tongue. Production can be given a big boost, if official work is carried out through the medium of mother tongue. In this regard, I would like to appreciate the stand taken by the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, which stands for a multilingual or bilingual Centre and they too want to remove English. I would like to request the Prime Minister to sit together with the D.M.K. and find out ways and means to

eliminate the English language from the Indian soil, as soon as possible.

In this regard, I would also like to say that we are killing the spirit behind Article 344 of the Constitution, almost everyday. That Article calls for making progressive use of the Hindi language and phasing out the English language. I myself would prefer to use the term 'Mother tongue' in place of 'Hindi'. I would not like the Hon. Members to deliver speeches in English in the Lok Sabha, rather everyone should speak in his or her own mother tongue and if people can listen to interpretations over the earphone at Vigyan Bhawan, why we cannot make similar arrangements here as well?

When such an issue is under discussion, I would like to say something with regard to big business and politics as well. As such, Shri Dwivedi is a strong man and he doesn't need my protection, but I was astonished, when a question regarding corruption was raised. What is the main issue here? Will the link between big business and politics be such that both would benefit from each other?... The main point is that the link between politics and business has become so inseparable in our country that today they have become two sides of the same coin. Many politicians and businessmen belong to one and the same family and may such famous pairs of husbands and wives and fathers and sons are there in our country. If you want, I would like to say something with regard to such pairs of fathers and sons.

...

...

...

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like to say something with regard to father-son nexus. If you want, I can place such documents before the House, which would prove my point beyond doubt. I can cite examples wherein a father is incharge of the transportation system in a particular state, while his son supplies motor vehicles to that State Government. This is an example of corruption and unholy alliance between business and politics, wherein one member of the family becomes a politician while the other becomes a businessman.

Apart from this, there is one more dimension to this nexus. Some companies get their work done by making contributions to political parties or by providing high-salaried jobs to the wards of the Ministers, as is done by the Bird Company. The matter is quite clear. In this connection, I would also like to say that till now there was a misconception that Englishmen are very honest as far as business is concerned, but now it has been proved that they practiced unfair means at least as far as their business in India was concerned. This can be substantiated by the fact that they earned a colossal profit of Rs. 80-90 lakhs in one single shipment of Chrome Ore from India. I am not in a position to say so but I do miss my friend Shri Tyagi, who is not present in the House. I would have liked him to be present in the House, for he belonged to the ruling party. However, here I would like to make a mention about the scandal involving a Kanpur-based company, which forced one Minister to quit office. Many more heads may roll, as a result of the scandals that have recently rocked that company.

As a result of all this, prices have gone up sharply. If you look at the sale price of any essential commodity produced by any company, you will find that the average cost of production is a meagre 40 per cent, Government taxes account for 30 per cent, miscellaneous expenses account for 10 per cent and the company earns a profit of 20 per cent. Same is the case with sugar, kerosene or any other item. I would like to mention about vaccine which is given to protect against Tuberculosis. Now this streptomycin vaccine is produced in Government factories and the cost of production is just two annas, but it is being sold in the market at a price of 12-14 annas. Isn't the Government ashamed of usurping the money earmarked for the purpose of fighting a dreaded disease like tuberculosis? Government and private companies are indulging in loot by hiking the prices of essential commodities, but I would like to clarify one point here. It is true that some of us are interested only in checking the loot being carried out by private companies while some others are interested only in checking the

loot by the Government, but at least I am among those people, who want to put an end to the loot being carried out by both.

Russia is very much concerned about us and they are saying, that some reactionaries in India had tried to topple this Government. I would like to say that Russia is extreme leftist, China is a demon, who interferes in other's affairs and what about Government of India? The Hon. Prime Minister calls himself a leftist. He pretends himself to be a leftist and only talks of leftist ideologies and socialism. But practically, he is not only a capitalist, but a feudalist. He wants to run the Government of our country on the basis of hypocrisy and corrupt leftist ideologies. A person like me has given a verdict on it. Russia may misunderstand us but with a view to bring a revolution among the masses we shall introduce a healthy leftist ideology in our country.

Regarding the policies, I would like to call your attention on four measures. They are prohibition, ban on prostitution, consolidation of land holdings and restriction on gold. Till now, I was in favour of prohibition but now, I am not. One should not think that I have become habitual of liquor now. But now, I am not in favour of prohibition because I have observed that a State, which imposed prohibition after continued atrocities and police excesses for twelve-thirteen years, lifted the ban once the China war started. It appears to me that this Government is like that child which swings to and fro. This Government is always going in opposite direction. Sometimes there is prohibition for twelve-thirteen years and sometimes it is lifted. I am afraid that the same thing would happen again in regard to restriction on gold. So much oppression and atrocities yield no result, because the work which was done openly till now, will now be done clandestinely. The police will of course get some new avenues of income.

What is the reason behind it? The main reason is that the Government lack determination. They are not firm on any issue. If it imposes prohibition, it should do it with firmness, so that some results could be achieved, but the moment they received a mild set back and they lifted the ban. They may get a mild set

back and may lift the restriction on gold also. I was surprised to hear the Hon. Finance Minister yesterday or day before yesterday, when he said that the smuggling of gold has almost been stopped. I don't know how he gave this reply. The smuggling of gold is still continuing. I would also like to submit that the goldsmiths and other workers have assured the Government that they are ready to cooperate in stopping the smuggling of gold totally, if the Government is prepared to carry out all type of legal action against the smugglers, even if they may be sons of Ministers. There was not need to impose restriction on gold for this purpose.

There is another policy of the Government. It wants to do good for the nation as well as modernisation at the same time. But it wants to do both the things before time. That is why, such policy is followed. Because of this policy we are covered under emergent-law today. I would like to call your attention towards an Hon. Member of this House—Shri Kishan Patnaik. He should have been with us today, but he is in jail. What is the reason behind it? In one of his speeches, he had said that all should make sacrifices in this hour of crisis and the Government officials who try to add one more room in their palatial bungalows should be caught by the neck and thrown out. Some people may say that such language as to catch by the neck or ear and throw out, should not be used. The opinions may differ. Such language is often used by Shri Churchill. Shri George Fernandes is languishing in jail for the last four months. Who is this George Fernandes? Our Prime Minister has apologised to the Chinese Prime Minister for a person, who is having such a great sense of patriotism. That George Fernandes is lying in Jail. What is the fault of the lawyer, Shri Ahmed Kaifi, who belong to Darbhanga? A contractor is given Rs. 110 for digging 1000 maunds of soil. But the head labourer gets Rs. 30 only. Such massive loot is taking place.

Similarly, take the case of strike in Bombay. I will not go into details, but will only say that the sweepers, who are on strike there, had started getting a salary of Rs. 90 p.m. since July 1962, but after September 1962, they started getting Rs. 85

p.m. Their salary has been decreased instead of increasing. If any one says that the cost of living in Bombay has gone down at that particular point of time, I would say this data is not reliable. I would also like to suggest that if the salary of sweepers is raised to an extent that upper caste people may also take up the job of sweepers, then there may be some chance of abolition of this casteism. It would be better if some brahmins and banyas also take up this job.

Besides the massive internal degradation of our country, I would like to submit some points about China also. What is the mystery behind China? Why we adopted such a bad policy with regard to China. I have been thinking on this point for years together and I came to the conclusion that it was because of our approach of merely touching the revolutionary zeal. When a person looks backward and is not able to guide the country on the path of progress and is unable to remove its inequality and bring revolution, he tries to come in close proximity to a revolutionary country, so that, he too may become a revolutionary to some extent. Most humbly I would like to place my views before the House that I have been observing since 1948 that foreign policy of India regarding China has deteriorated in terms of principles of our own Prime Minister, because he had said that every country who has got effective control over its land should be given membership of the UNO. There were two Chinas. One was the Communist China and other was the Kunitang China of Chang Kai Shek. The Prime Minister touched China just to be called as a revolutionary. But the results were bad. The views about the Communism of Asia could not gain ground in the entire Africa and Asia. The communism in Asia was taken as interference and became devilish because the opposing forces such as capitalism, imperialism and hypocrisy and corrupt leftist ideologies were not strong enough. Such forces were strong in the European countries like Germany, France and America. They could have opposed Russia. Asia had not become strong enough as yet to oppose China. I think that that opportunity was lost in 1948. when our country adopted such a policy towards China. Car

there be another example of such lack of policy? Our country was attacked by China. There has been war. But even then, India advocates enrollment of China as a Member of UNO. If a boy wants his mother to get married to her rapist, what sort of thing it is?

*** *** ***

... I shall give more examples of an absence of policy. But I firmly believe that in August 1962, the Government could have got a better deal from the Chinese instead of the proposals in the Colombo Accord. At that time, he was feeling proud. I would like to remind you of the Hon. Prime Minister's speech of 12th October and of 19th November. On 12th October he said that the Chinese should be routed. After 37 days, on 19th November when he delivered a speech over the radio, his voice had become meek because Bomdilla and Walong had fallen. A Minister must exercise self-restraint, without giving way to emotions at the slightest pretext. If the rulers of the country or Ministers do not exercise self-restraint, India cannot have a proper foreign policy.

In the same context, I would like to draw your attention towards aircraft. Nagas are a rebellious tribe of India. Naga settlements were strafed. The fleeing Portuguese were also strafed. Had there been no bombardment from India's side, I would have understood the point. But there were no bombardment on the advancing Chinese forces. People say that we desire world peace. The entire world knows that the countries which can disturb world peace are U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. Apart from these two countries, no other country can disturb world peace even if it wants to and communist China does not have the power to disturb world peace.

*** *** ***

I shall try to conclude as soon as possible but this is a No-Confidence Motion. Probably I am the only person in this House who had no faith in this Government for the last 15 years barring the first four months.

*** *** ***

I have no personal enmity with the Hon. Prime Minister. I am only against the policy of the Government. Let me tell you one thing in this context. When the Indian Ambassador in Washington was asked as to why his Government was not using aircraft he flatly replied that his country feared that China would retaliate with their own aircraft. This is a fact. I have heard rumours that whenever rumbling sounds were heard in Delhi's corridors of power during October and November, people used to ask "whether they have come"?

There is much talk of weapons. There is no relation between weapons and non-aligned policy?

I would like to remind the Hon. Prime Minister of the time when he used to say that reins have no use without a horse. When the country itself does not survive, a non-aligned policy or any other policy for that matter has no meaning. Our first and foremost duty is to protect the country from invasion. Now look at the policy in this context. At one time the Hon. Prime Minister says that we can face Chinese aggression even with our traditional weapons and at another time he says we will buy weapons. When the Chinese aggression becomes fierce there is talk of taking loans and when it gets uncontrollable there is talk of inviting instructors for training in air-warfare. If the matter gets more serious, even recruitment of soldiers is contemplated. In personal life one may say thus far and no further but the same thing cannot apply to a nation.

Now I would like to tell one more thing about the Hon. Prime Minister. There was a lot of discussion here regarding the Voice of America. The only thing I said is that I had read it but you may take it as not read. This is not a new thing. When an agreement was signed with the Muslim League of Kerala, when the results of the agreement were evident and there was a possibility of the Congress winning in the elections he did not say anything. When the Congress won he said that he had not read the election manifesto of the Muslim League properly. I would ask Shri Hiren Mukerjee to realise what sort of habits his friend has.

I do not know of the time before he became Prime Minister. There was a time when I too was under his spell but ever since he became Prime Minister he has abandoned his habit of saying things clearly. He always speaks in vague terms. I have heard that he scrutinized the Voice of America agreement page-by-page and ticked each sheet. But even that is not needed. After all what was the purpose of the voice of America agreement? The sole purpose was that America could relay its programmes from Indian soil. What is the need for going into details?

I would like to draw attention towards another point. Before 1957 the Prime Minister was least concerned about the Sino-Pak border issue. When Indian officials conferred with their Chinese counterparts there was no mention in the files. But now he seems over-concerned about the Sino-Pak border issue.

Now I shall touch upon the Longju issue. Longju is a valley. The Prime Minister has often said that it is a disputed area. Firstly, a Prime Minister of a country must not say that an area of his country is disputed particularly during war time. No right thinking Prime Minister would utter such words. The Prime Minister has misled the House on a number of occasions regarding the Longju issue because I know that Longju is not a 2-3 square mile area but a several hundred square mile area inhabited by people.

I don't know why the Prime Minister is shying away from the debate. Others also start copying him. I shall cite an example relevant to our country. A number of times we have demanded that farmers with less than 6.5 acres of land be exempted from land revenue. The Prime Minister was himself in favour of this. Now he thinks that if such revenue exemptions are affected, the Government cannot run. The current Government expenditure is Rs. 5,500 crores per annum while the revenue earned from farmers having upto 6.5 acres of land is just Rs. 70-80 crores. Which is one paise in one rupee. The Government can well choose to ignore this amount if it so desires. These 35-40 crore

farmers manage their food, clothing, shelter and children's fees in their daily earnings of three annas. But when we plead for exemption of land revenue in their case then what do they say?

Similarly, what is the argument given in the context of the annexation of Tibet. First of all, let me clarify that I am not a war-monger. Never was one. China has occupied a large part of Indian territory. I don't want Indian forces to go to the occupied territory and retrieve it. How can I say such a thing to a Government which has been retreating for the last five days at the rate of 30 miles? The only thing I am saying is that the reasons for our weakness must be found out. The reasons for our lagging behind in the Tibetan issue is quite clear. In 1949 people like me had said that Tibet should be protected and protection does not always mean war. I had said that the Chinese move should not be recognised. The Prime Minister did a great mistake by supporting the Chinese annexation of Tibet. When I said that the Chinese move must not be supported, it did not imply that our forces should be sent there. To that the Prime Minister said that India was weak at the time of Tibet issue but now we are becoming strong. This is totally wrong because at that time China was weak. In this connection I am giving you figures. At that time China was producing 10 lakh tonnes of steel every year, whereas our country was producing 11 lakh tonnes of steel. But today, cChina is producing 15 million tonnes of steel every year, whereas our country's production of steel is only 35 lakh tonnes per annum. These figures are often quoted.

*** *** ***

At that time, due to civil war between kuomintang and communists, the situation in China was very fluid. At that time, had India taken a positive stand regarding Tibet the result would have been achieved.

Much is said about diplomacy. It is said that although we had lost in the battle field but we had succeeded in our

diplomacy. If the result was to be achieved through diplomacy why it was not adopted in 1962 and an agreement could have been signed with China on more favourable terms.

Prime Minister does not repent, in spite of his committing many errors.

...

...

...

In spite of the fact that country is going backward, he claims that country is progressing. I have no business with the Government. The British Government had put me in jail eight times whereas Prime Minister too had put me in jail ten times. I feel ashamed to see today that country remained weak and we could not do anything for it. But the Prime Minister does not feel ashamed of it. We are also unable to compete the Chinese. Twenty Seven million people of our country are earning merely three annas, per day.

The Prime Minister repeatedly says that mistakes have been committed but he does not take responsibility of any particular mistake, because if he does so, he will have to rectify the same.

It is also said that China betrayed us. It is altogether wrong. China had made it very clear that it had not betrayed any one. But it is taken for granted for a moment that China had betrayed us. What is the opinion about the Minister, who puts forward the argument. About 2500 years ago Chanakya had said that if a king said that he had been betrayed by opposition or by the enemy he must be dethroned.

Now I will come to a subject, which will not be tolerable to some of my old friends. But I want to tell you that we are all victims of it and it is a caste system. This system is prevailing in our country for the last more than fifteen hundred years which had badly effected the Indian social fabric for last 15 years. Due to this caste system, there has been a continuous fall in the number of opportunities and efficiency has been eroded and very few qualified and efficient persons get the opportunity of job.

...

...

...

People come to me and say that they are my brothers and sisters. But I disapprove of this attitude. I hate casteism and nepotism. But I want to stress that the Prime Minister is harbinger of casteism and nepotism. You will find that his relatives and members of his caste are employed in each ministry and department of the Union Government. I do not want to identify them. I will only quote one example. It had made a false statement about an army Commander that he had been in the battle field, and witnessed war which is totally wrong. He had never been deputed there as an officer of Urvashiam. I had asked the Prime Minister a few days ago whether any circular was issued from Delhi wherein it was stated that in the event of any place likely to fall down it must be vacated. What does it mean? No shooting incident was reported in Bomdilla and even then people have decided to vacate it. Whatever has happened in regard to both downfall and vacating is known to everybody. There may be misunderstanding about the words but I must tell you that at that time Mr. Menon was not Defence Minister but Prime Minister himself was holding defence portfolio.

Some times situations take such an ugly turn that father becomes head of the Government and daughter the guardian of the public. The opportunities have got squeezed to a greater extent. Women, harijan, tribals, backward classes, religious minorities and shudras, these five sections of our society constitute 90% of the population. Unless these sections of our society are given special opportunity the country will not progress. People talk about equality of opportunity. But we have to follow the principle of special opportunity. We know the revolution in U.S.S.R. against Czar and the French revolution. We have to follow the principle of providing special opportunity. The efficiency and opportunity have been confined to only a few people at present.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is announcing that I have won election. Hundreds of people come to me to get their problems solved. We involve ourselves in personal matters leaving no time to solve national problem. We have to spare time to attend to public or national issues.

Now, I want to draw your attention to this fact that big changes took place in the country since October-November. Figures in this regard has been provided here. I want to put an argument of 1962. Perhaps in the beginning of year 1962 this would have been the situation that the Congress Government would have been enjoying the support of the people of the country but after October-November 1962 this was not the situation. After November 1962 Congress Government has not been getting such a support from the Indian public. Therefore I demand that in such a changing situation this Government should resign and hold new elections in the country. I demand for general elections.

It is truly said that Opposition is not united. It is certainly shattered today but still there are certain segments which can come together, and it is sure that there is rift in the Opposition. But how much they themselves are disunited? There is rift in State Cabinets. Central Cabinet, is divided. Than what to say about the members sitting in the treasury benches? They would have been even thumping tables against me in support of Government but at night on reaching home they would certainly say that Lohia has put forward our views boldly and that he has outspoken it very clearly. This all they will say outside I would only like to say about this divided Opposition that situation is still not out of control and it seems that it is still not divided but this split is ripening. Perhaps it may take such a shape in next two or three years that even in a single party it may divide in two segments, one group of the opinion of confining itself only upto the limit of 15 August 1947 and the other group only upto 8 September, 1962.

*** *** ***

It can be true that there may be some rift among the members who are confined only upto the limit of 15th August, 1947. As I have said in the begining that there are some people among them who are against both company loot and Government loot but some of the people out of them are only against loot of Government and not against loot of company. But I hope

like to submit that Prime Minister speaks emphatically daringly, rudely and often passes taunting remarks. Only in this context, I had stated that the Prime Minister is the servant whereas this House is the Lord. This decent word should have pleased everyone but, instead, all sort of things were uttered against me by many people. I would like to make it clear that I do not want to enter into personal disputes, which I have never entered into till now and I will not as long as I am not compelled to do so. If the matter is taken to court, then it would be proved that I have never entered into a personal dispute, but the Prime Minister has always called me bad names and he has branded me a hooligan, a liar and indecent. Once upon a time, I used to retort, but now I do not do so. I take pity. Sometimes, I feel that when they call me hooligan, they should be shown hooliganism.

...

...

...

Once upon a time, this face had such an appeal that I used to love it. Some misunderstanding may still prevail. I want to make it clear that now I do not love at all, so that there is no misunderstanding.

...

...

...

....In one of my speeches, it has been stated that I do not want government's resignation. But this had been valid, if they had acted voluntarily. I wanted that the Prime Minister should again contest elections from Phoolpur after tendering his resignation so that whatever has occurred after November, should be clear. But at present, the question is not that of his resignation but to make them quit.

Motion of No-Confidence in the Council of Ministers

One question must have arisen in the minds of everybody while listening the speech of Shri Ashoke Sen that at one time he says Ministers of Orissa are guilty and at the other time he says they are innocent. The problem before this Govt. is that it is unable to decide whether Ministers of Orissa are found guilty or not. When asked to constitute an Enquiry Committee whatever may be its size, to enable it to examine all the facts, the Govt. replies that how can you call an innocent person guilty without proving the charges. When he is told that such big charges have been levelled against them, then Mr. Chagla and other say that after all they have held them responsible.

This Government must have the courage to say that there is no need to conduct an enquiry, if both the Ministers are found to be innocent. And if they are held responsible and their charges are discussed to ascertain how far these charges are true—whether they should be imprisoned or it is liable that their property should be forfeited. It has become necessary to conduct an enquiry into the matter. But the problem with Shri Ashok Sen is that he wanted to follow two paths at the same time. That's why he had two different directions and this Govt. will also be following the same practice. He has two conflicting things together in his mind. This is the reason that nobody reply when he is not fit for becoming Chief Minister. Why an enquiry is not being con-

*Lok Sabha Debates, 16 March, 1965.

ducted. Even he is not able to reply to this when he was guiltyless why the charges had been levelled against him.

Shri Chagla spoke yesterday. He said so many things about the presentation of confidential papers by these persons. Gandhiji's instance will not be a big one for Mr. Chagla this I agree. But when in August, 1942, the Britishers somehow managed to send a Circular from their information department, then Gandhiji himself got it printed and said it is necessary to print such things in the public interest. I would like to mention a Legislation about this to Mr. Chagla. The documents with the Govt. which are known as classified and the leakage of these documents can be beneficial to foreign national or a State, it is crime against country to print such documents. On the contrary if Govt. have documents which are meant to benefit the people and misdeeds of Govt. are exposed, then printing of such documents are in public interest and it should be done. The Ministers must always keep in mind this difference in classified and non-classified documents.

I do not want to say much about the character of Shri Chagla. The people are suspicious of him, because now-a-days he is sitting with a person about whom he has said as a judge that he used to speak a lie on oath. Besides this, recently he has committed an act which create doubts about his integrity. On the one hand he told Shri Jyotish Chand Roy, a scientist in Calcutta to become an Emirates Scientist and on the other hand he said you can not enter into your laboratory. There must be something wrong in the bottom. That's why he had to issue two contradictory orders.

This is the background. The point is why this matter has come to the light and who is this Patnaik. There was a time when I knew him. In 1942 he was a brave man. He himself made me flow from Delhi to Calcutta taking the risk against the British regime. Where he has lost that Character? All the politicians wanted to take advantage of such persons for their own or party's interest. A person like Shri Patnaik who should have continued working either in some factory or as a pilot or have been engaged in some other work was brought into

politics and impediments were created from which the country is suffering.

You should remember that a lot has been written about Shri Patnaik and Shri Mitra saying that they are expert in management, they are very efficient, or they can bring about good result. Hence we need them. It is also said about them that a new generation of leaders is coming up in India—The generation which was idealistic and out-spoken and which could express its views is getting extinguished now such a generation is coming the new leadership is emerging which would do something for the country because of its organising capabilities and efficiency. What is that efficiency? Is it the capability to win elections? How did they manage to win elections? Just by getting funds collected for their party. If you try to find out the answer to this question, you will come to a conclusion that their efficiency meant corruption because they aimed to promote such politics in the country which could ensure their success through these means.

Similarly, what did you all observe in the morning? What did Shri Ashoke Sen say repeatedly? He said that Shri Atulya Ghosh is a very efficient person and he has won the elections three times. That is why you are angry with him. I don't want to enter into any arguments in this regard. He has won the elections thrice, so does it washes all the sins? If any person wins an election does it mean that all the sins committed by him have been washed. I know that Shri Raghunath Singh and many others make such a big mistake that same standards are applied to a common, an ordinary poor, and incapable person like me and to those who have come to power. This is correct. They should remember one thing that if I am given power, I will make them to put their minds to use.

It has already been mentioned that it is the dishonesty which is the root cause of this situation. Many a times I feel that lack of understanding is also the reason for this situation alongwith dishonesty and my hon. friends sitting on the other side some time display such a lack of understanding. I would specially like to tell my leftist friends who call themselves Socialists they

should understand that if they are interested in the prosperity of the country but wish that it should happen through charity, it should take place through some case corruption and all such things are bound to flourish. Otherwise how will leftists play their politics. If they do not form labour Unions, Farmers Organisations then from where they would get funds. On one side they propagate Socialism and Leftism and on the other hand they want to make money through such means. When Socialism is sought to be fostered in this manner there will always be dishonesty. But if they make efforts to bring socialism through educating the masses and through their participation in agitations, in that case honesty may survive in this country.

While I am saying such things about Socialism I would like to say something about Capitalism also. Today's Capitalist and pseudo Leftists, whether they are on this side or the other side I am not saying this not only to those who are sitting on the opposite side. They sometimes unnecessarily get worried and all these persons are spoiling the polity of the country.

Now the question arises that if it is so, why this government does not fall? I have been thinking for a number of days—particularly yesterday and today—that when these persons are indulging in so many misdeeds, for instance with regard to Orissa and Kashmir, I don't want to count them at this time, but there are so many mis-deeds, which have not come to light so far but are sure to see the light of the day then why this Govt. does not fall.

This side should also think about reasons for this situation. There is something wrong some-where. I know that there are a number of historical reasons behind this situation. Many things have happened during the last 17 years. There are a number of reasons because of which it takes time to uproot those things which have become deep-rooted. I am not going to lose my patience, may be, others do it. Our friends who belong to Congress have been successful in projecting in themselves all the forces in the country. All those who are involved in Orissa scandle belong to Congress Party and such persons are also there in the Congress. Who are against such things. As a

result, when this matter is resolved they will claim credit for it. There are many other such issues. In a number of states people are dissatisfied with Congress on one or the other issues. Are you aware of the consequences of such dissatisfaction? When Shri Kairon was at the helm of affairs the Sikhs were happy to an extent, but when Shri Kairon is replaced by Shri Ram Kishan then Hindus become happy and think it is good that at least there is a Hindu at the helm of affairs. Sikhs nourish the hope that their turn will again come. There are Yadav's as well as Rajputs. There is feeling of North and South. There are all such forces in the Congress and it has become virtually a configuration of all such contradictory forces. So long as it remains like that the country is not going to prosper. I do not want to use harsh words but I want to peep into your minds. When there is configuration of all contradictions in the minds, in that situation a man does not simply remain a man, he is elevated to a higher position. I would request you to consider over what I have said. You may continue to remain in power, for a little longer time by becoming configuration of all castes, all languages, all kinds of policies, higher values and ills, but it is certain, that can not do any good to the country.

I therefore say that we should look towards the root-cause of this situation. Why are you pointing out towards this side? Such contradictions take place in this side also. That is why we are not able to bring you down from power.

...

...

...

Interruptions@

...

...

...

There are contradictions in us also and because of that you people are getting chance to remain in power for some more time.

@ Shri A.N. Vidyalkar (Hoshiarpur): There are contradictory feelings in you also.

like to talk about the case which has come into light in Bihar. Before telling anything about the sons of the Chief Minister of Bihar, I would like to talk about the sons of the Prime Minister of India and the persons related to them. Here, I think it is necessary to mention one thing. How have they made money after finding a beryl from a farmer's field.

This is happening not only in Orissa, but in other states also. The Cabinet Sub-Committee on the case of Bihar has come to the conclusion that generally speaking nothing wrong has been found and the facts which we have collected do not prove anything. But if the case becomes serious it becomes the duty of the government to bring it to the notice of the people, get a thorough enquiry conducted and prosecution proceedings started properly. It is wrong to say that prosecution has hardly any meaning, and that any Member other than a Minister or any outsider cannot win a case against a Minister, even if the charges are genuine. Prosecution proceedings can be instituted properly only when all the government papers are made available to the people and the court. After all what is the root cause of this malady? The root cause is this that our thinking has gone wrong about amassing property and raising our standard of living during the last seventeen years. Every person wants to amass property, raise his standard of living irrespective of any consideration for others.

I want to talk about our 15 persons of the Cabinet, who are at the helm of affairs of the country. There is none of them that has not raised his standard of living or not added to his properties since last seventeen years. Even after, if it is called Socialism, it is not fair.

So when the aim of the whole nation is to add to the properties and raise the standard of living, the corruption that took place in Orissa, is inevitable. At the same time, this too is inevitable that the Law Minister at one time says that he is not accused, so no enquiry need to be conducted; and other moment he says that we are very nice persons because we did dare call him accused. So if you want to set all things right, you must look into as to where the trouble lies.

I find that there are 59 persons in the Council of Ministers. Of them, at the most fifteen have been to jails. I do not want to say that the persons having been imprisoned are more nice to those not having been imprisoned in any respect. But if you boast of having participated in India's freedom-struggle, how many persons are there in the Council of Ministers who participated in the struggle. They are hardly 30%. Then one may ask that why the learned persons like Mr. Chagla and Krishnamachari might not be included in the Council of Ministers. Should the persons having not been to jail be dropped from the Council of Ministers? My answer to this is that the poor folks—farmers, labourers and the people of lower strata of society—how can they be in the Council of Ministers? The persons finding place in the Council of Ministers are those who have been hereditary slaves and who know how to be second-ranked ruler. Top ruler has been changing. Moghul rule came to an end. Britishers came to rule and left too. Now Congress comes to power. Top leader changes but the hereditary—slaves second-ranked persons continue to be in power. If you want to know how the country reached this sorry state of affairs, the answer is that we people so far have been unable to deal with such hereditary slaves.

I know hundred of my friends sitting in front are millionaire. They want to maintain this status. I, however, want to submit it humbly that at least 100 people are there superior than those present here in respect of Language and Caste. I think about language and caste time and again that what ails India on this score. Why don't you do something, why do you bear with this rule? At the moment, I leave this point here itself, but I want to put a question to you that 100 of you people are though nice on the question of Caste and Language, but are party to the misdeeds of government. You just kindly think about it.

Revolution has been curbed or it has not taken place fully 17 years back, or it has been suppressed for all these years and everything is going worsened for want of decisions. There was an outburst of riots on the question of language. But I want to raise an alarm that for the last seventeen years due to want of

decision, problems are arising one after another on different issues, and this government is unable to take any measures to solve these issues and all these problems are burning. So long this government is there, no one can prevent it. The problems will go on increasing and the country will go on burning in these problems.

The problems should not be created and if these are there, then ways should be sorted out to solve them. These people here raised the issue of language and then left it. These people raised issue of property and then left it, they raised the issue of casteism and then left it. For the last seventeen years these people have been raising the issues, but they did not know how to solve them. The House should consider this situation. It does not concern much to me, as I am to live only for two or four or five or ten years. But you should take seriously what I say. The people get frustrated to see where you have brought the country. The Leader of Lok Sabha is not here today at this time, but he should know how he should run his 'Darbar', how he should keep his majority, how to bring the issues in Lok Sabha which are in the interest of the country and the issues which are not in the interest of the country. 'Raj Darbar' has always been rigid and Dropadi has often been insulted. The person, who is harrassed and caused atrocities is treated as worthless.

This is not all, I want to tell you how displeased I felt on the day when the leader of Communist Party provoked you to say that the presence of a person like me is not a matter of dignity to Lok Sabha. But today I am sorry to tell you who Shri Hiran Mukerjee is? I want to introduce him a little when our young aged students were fighting against the British at that time Shri Hiren Mukerjee used to act as approver of the police. He has been doing the same task till today. He has been doing all that sort of things till today.

The faith of the people by this time has lost in the Govt. and the Govt. is acting in opposite direction. Once I had said that instead of one head the government has two, but for some time I feel that it has no head at all. I want to tell Shri Ashoke Sen

that this government is running without head. I had seen a picture of a cock, walking without head. Similar is the position of this Govt. and Shri Ashoke Sen says that his Govt. goes on functioning. The sheer responsibility of it is on the people like me who allow this government to work in the country. But the reality is this that you cannot decide anything. You cannot think about anything, cannot go ahead by taking decision on anything. It is as you have given your fate in the hands of God and can only pray to abide by you. Because we are worthless.

I may be given five or seven minutes more. Actually I want to state something of principle. I know that there is wastage of time in that.

In fact, what is the malady? We have been talking about Socialism during the last seventy years. Like other issues, Socialism has two aspects viz. theory and practice. They have all along been talking about socialism and have done nothing to put it into practice. We should now come to the next stage and that stage is to bring about equality-economic, social, political, religious etc. Then we will have total equality. Try to have total equality. In child-hood and even now, I dream of total equality. But it should be a possible one and keeping in view the present circumstances, to what extent, equality can be achieved in our country? In order to achieve this end one has to fix the limits of maximum and minimum incomes. What should be the limits?

I have been hearing much about corruption. Maximum and minimum limits of incomes should be fixed. Keeping in view the conditions prevailing in the country, it would be better if we fix these limits as Rs. 1000/- and Rs. 100/- respectively after giving a serious thought to it.

If such a government comes to power which follows my instructions I would like to say that it may take five or seven years to raise the minimum limit, but it will take not more than two or three months to bring down the maximum limit. So bring down the maximum limit and thus save for using it in factories and agriculture. Then you will come to know the meaning of socialism.

1. All primary schools should be of the same kind where any person whether a son of the President or a sweeper may carry on his studies alike. I am saying this for only primary schools, not for colleges and universities;
2. All classes in trains should be abolished except one class;
3. No one should be allowed to spend more than one thousand rupees; and
4. The use of English should be discontinued. I want to say that it is impossible to usher in socialism in the country through the use of English. It would be a hypocrisy and falsehood. So use of English should be discontinued.

I want to say one thing more also.

5. Water should be provided to the farmers for all the thirty or thirty one crore acres of land without any irrigation charges. Unless it is done, socialism cannot be ushered in.

The people ask us that we say many things but it is the Congress which wins the election. I want to say something in that regard also? How does it win? You have seen that all people like Shri Atulva Ghosh, Shri Sanjiva Reddy, Shri Krishnamachari and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri our Prime Minister, indulge in all sorts of misdeeds in the country to ensure the victory of their party in the election. Misdeeds for a good cause. I am finishing in one minute.

I want to say that during election time, the following things should be ensured.

1. Vehicles should not be allowed to ply in the constituency on election day; and
2. The distribution of slips by candidates should be banned and the slip containing election symbols of the candidates and the numbers of voters should be distributed to the people by the government itself.

Alongwith it I want to make a fervent appeal that the Prime Minister of India should not be from any Hindi speaking area because in that case the constitution is violated, the Language is insulted, and there are impediments in working. When I say so it does not mean that only a Tamil should be a Prime Minister. He may be anyone, a Gujarati, Marathi, or a Bengali, Tamil if a Bengali or a Tamil becomes a Prime Minister, I shall not ask him not to speak in English, though I would like otherwise. But if a Gujarati or a Marathi is a Prime Minister, then I would ask him that he should not speak in English in the house.

Uplift of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes*

This Government only intricates the issues instead of solving them and numerous problems like that of drought, right to property, language issue and casteism are assuming alarming proportions rather than being solved. The caste—Hindus, particularly in the rural areas, are enraged due to advancement of Harijans and the people belonging to other backward classes. Out of a total population of 7-8 crores of the Harijans, the economic condition of not more than 70—80 thousand harijans has improved. Their number may be a little more. But it is not more than one per thousand in any case. Even then, they have become an eye-sore to almost all caste—Hindus. In such circumstances, let it be understood very clearly that the country cannot make progress. It is mostly attributed to our faulty system of governance. The present Government is responsible for it. If we follow this faulty system, we will be also responsible for it. Whatever is done by the Government today, it is done for the benefit of the rich who could muster votes for them. They never intend to do good to the people or the country, they intend to bring influential people into their fold who could get them votes. Now these 70—80 thousand harijans have become the centre of attraction for the rest of the Harijans and are playing the role of vote catcher for the Government.

Under the Five Year Plans, the amount of grants meant for Harijans and the backward classes are separately ear-marked,

* *Lok Sabha Debates*, 12 March, 1965.

but no appraisal is ever made as to how many people belonging to backward classes were actually benefitted from these plans. Evaluation of Five Year Plans is made in other terms. A number of reports are received by me but I have never seen any report which could elaborate on the specific number of beneficiaries belonging to Harijans and Adivasis whose standard was raised with the money spent under the Plans.

The Fourth Five Year Plan is being formulated. Over two thousand crore would be spent during this plan period. Probably Rs. 70, 80 crores may be allocated exclusively for the Harijans which is of course a meagre amount. In fact these monstrous Five Year Plans make the rich further richer and the downtrodden do not get any relief.

Under these circumstances I would like to appeal to the entire society to have a broader outlook. Our population is 48 crores and there are 7-8 crore Harijans in it. In all there are 43 crore backward people. I consider all the women as backward, irrespective of the caste to which they belong. There are 43 crore backward men and women in the country. Again there are poor people among upper castes. Their number is about four and a half crore so there are only 50 lakh people who are rich in the real sense of the term and mostly belong to upper castes. Unless we try to understand the flaw in the present social set up that four and a half crore poor people belonging to upper castes always align themselves with the people of their own caste and are guided by them, no improvement can be expected. Unless these four and a half crore people cut off their link with the rich belonging to their castes and align themselves with the 43 crore backward people, nothing much would be achieved. When 43 crore backward people and four and a half crore poor among the high castes join hands then they would emerge as a powerful force which would blast the palatial castles of the fifty lakh rich and reduce them to ashes. It is only then that the edifice of modern India could be built over it. There is no other alternative.

....In fact India appears to be disunited, I think that at the top of the long list of sins and misdeeds that this Government

has committed is the sin of splitting the approach of the people. Non-sectarian and perspective outlook is nowhere in evidence. The people do not believe that the entire country can make progress and prosper by collective efforts. Everybody is busy in trying to maximising his share in the national wealth.

In the absence of broader outlook, Harijans and backward classes will never get their rightful share. Everybody will prosper only when the Harijans prosper. There is a feeling among the people who employ Harijans and persons belonging the backward classes that if their wages are raised to Rs. 50—60 their own share of income will diminish. Unless they stop thinking in these terms and start believing that the country can make progress only if the Harijans, potters, domestic servants and sweepers prosper the problem can never be solved.

At times, I feel that the wages of a sweeper should be the same—Mr. Speaker, Sir—I wanted to say—as that of the Prime Minister but I dare not say that because it will not be proper keeping in view the requirements of the office of the Prime Minister. Let their wages be equal to the salary of a Minister, say that of Shri Krishnamachari. Even if a sweeper is paid Rs. 300 to Rs. 400 as monthly salary, I think it would have a great impact and I dare say that these high caste people would prefer to sweep and clean lavatories. Only then will the country make progress.

Distribution of National Income*

Mr. Speaker, the conclusion drawn from the discussion held so far is that I believe, the daily earnings of 27 crore Indians is 3 *annas* according to me, the Hon. Prime Minister think it is 15 *annas*, whereas the Planning Minister says it is 7½ *annas*. Now it is between the Hon. Prime Minister and the Planning Minister to decide who is right.

My argument is not that daily earnings of the common man particularly of 27 crore Indians is 3 *annas* or 3½ *annas* or 2½ *annas*. But the point is that the Government has turned a blind eye to the poverty in the country and unless there is a will to eradicate poverty tangible formula cannot be worked out. I have to say one thing about the figures that have been placed here by the Planning Minister. They were meant for the Taxation Enquiry Committee. The Finance Ministry desired to know the income and expenditure of people so that substantial amount could be recovered by imposing higher taxes. Therefore, the figures of this committee were even otherwise doubtful because they were meant for a different purpose.

*** *** ***

Interruptions@

*** *** ***

Alright but they wanted to substantiate that Indians spend more, therefore, higher taxes should be imposed. This is quite clear. It is there in the report which is published by the National Survey. The Taxation Enquiry Committee has recommended it so that the Finance Ministry could carry on its job effectively....

Secondly, instead of taking prices prevalent in 1948-49 as base, generally current prices are taken into account. I fail to understand who are these statisticians who furnish these

* Lok Sabha Debates, 6 September, 1963.

@ Shri Tyagi (Dehradun): Those were the figures relating to expenditure and not to income.

figures. When 50 lakh people died in the Bengal famine, they proved that only .5 lakhs had died. Therefore, the Ministers should remain cautious and give them some guidelines. I would not take their figures as it is but I shall use my own sense of judgement as far as possible. According to the figures of the Planning Minister, rural expenditure comes to about Rs. 8700 crores whereas income from agriculture which includes income from livestock also comes to about Rs. 6600 crores. This is clear from the figures placed before us by the Planning Minister. I should have kept the income from livestock and agriculture separate but even without doing so there is a variation of Rs. 2000 crores. In a way the variation is of about Rs. 3000 to 3500 crores if we take the two heads separately. The Government may say that there is variation between the income and expenditure because donations, charity and debts are also included in the expenditure. In this connection, I would like to say that one cannot be under debt for ever. Debts can be for a limited period for 2, 4, 5 or 10 years. After all the figure of income and expenditure should be the same. There may be slight variation between the two.

A major mistake that is committed in the figures of consumer index is that the price difference is added. For example the data pertaining to fuel and electricity which have been published so far relate to 13 series but the Planning Minister has referred to the 17th series. We cannot verify it. On the basis of the data of the 13 series. I would like to tell that expenditure on fuel and electricity by the lowest income group has been computed as 20 p. and other expenditure as 91 p. Similarly for another group cash expenditure is 28 p. whereas other expenditure is Re. 1 and 2 paise. For sugar cash expenditure is 15 p. whereas other expenditure is 19 p. In this way the total expenditure is inflated but if it is inflated from Rs. 6600 crores to Rs. 8700 crores, it will not be proper.

I would tell you another way of calculation. In 1960-61 the daily earnings of 32 crore agricultural labour was 45 paise and in 1961-62 the daily earnings of 35 crore agricultural labour came down to 43 paise. Now how I calculated, this is a long

story. I would like to make it clear that the official figures are the basis of my calculation. Ordinarily, it is believed that 10 per cent of the upper strata swallow 50 per cent of their earning. As a result there of, actual daily earning of agricultural labourer in 1960-61 was 25 paise and in 1961-62 it was 23 paise. This is evident from the official figures. Suppose we add the income from livestock even then the earnings will not be more than 27 paise i.e. $4\frac{1}{2}$ annas. But we should not add this income because the people about whom we are discussing, cannot afford to keep the cattle to augment their income. Therefore, the official figures prove that over 27 crore people in this country survive on 4 annas a day. This is based on figures of national income published by the Government.

In this connection, I would like to share a piece of information which I have collected. I cannot say whether it is correct or incorrect. Any way, I would like to submit that the Government has fudged the national income by 20 per cent from the very beginning. One reason might be that they wanted to show that India is rich. Second can be that they wanted to facilitate taxation and everyone knows that the figures are fudged.

Now I would like to submit one thing more and that is about per capita income in poor States. The figures that the Planning Minister had placed were based on the second census of the country. Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and Andhra Pradesh are the six poorest States. Their total rural population is 20 crores, though in fact it is 23 crores. I know about Uttar Pradesh. The Government has published those figures. At one time, the per capita income in rural areas was Rs. 182. We can go by the same argument that the top 10 per cent swallow 50 per cent of the income or I can adopt another method, which I generally use *viz.* that top 20 per cent consume 60 per cent of the income whereas remaining 80 per cent of the populace is left with 40 per cent. I have got these figures from the official sources. It is another thing that these figures are official whereas the calculation is my personal. I would like to advise the Government not to take the figures provided by experts as such, there should be some guidelines

otherwise consequences can be bad. The per capita income of Uttar Pradesh would come down to Rs. 101 from Rs. 182 if we do not count the top 10 per cent who swallow 50 per cent of the income. Similarly, it would be reduced to Rs. 91 if we include those 20 per cent who swallow 60 per cent of the income. This means that the daily earnings per head remain under 4 *annas*. This is evident from the figures provided by the Government itself that 27 crore people in this country survive on a daily earning of less than 4 *annas*. Then there is another figure of Rs. 193 per head. If it may be a little more, even then it would be about 4 *annas* or $3\frac{1}{2}$ *annas* or $3\frac{1}{4}$ *annas*. There will not be much difference. This is about Uttar Pradesh... which is so poor. The plight of the people of Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and Rajasthan is also the same. Crores of people, say 20 crore rural people — out of which leave apart 2 crores at the rate of 10 per cent or 4 crores at the rate of 20 per cent — or 18 crore or 16 crore people are surviving on a daily earning of 4 *annas* or $3\frac{1}{2}$ *annas* according to official figures.

...The Hon. Prime Minister had stated on 22 August, 1960 that national income had increased by 42% and per capita income by 20%. However, he was surprised to find as to where that increase evaporated. In a way the Government had already accepted that it was not aware as to where that increase had gone. Thereafter, a committee on the Distribution of National Income was constituted. Now my question is as to where that Committee disappeared? I would go into the details of this matter a little later but before that I would like to draw your attention to another point. In India, 34 per cent of the families own less than one acre of land and 14 per cent of the land is owned by only one per cent of families. From this figure certain dangerous results can be observed. Previously I had submitted that 27 crores of Indians earn only 3 *annas* for their livelihood. Now I would submit that 10 to 15 crores of our people subsist on only 2 *annas*. I have received several letters condemning me for my statement about our people earning only 3 *annas* for their living. If these figures are analysed differently we will find

that there are about 7 crores agricultural labourers in our country. We can deduct half or one crore out of this because they may be slightly better off.

As regards the small farmers, their number is at least 14 to 15 crores who own less than two and a half acres of land. The number of artisans is about 2 to 3 crore. Then in urban areas also the plight of 20 to 25 per cent people is pitiable who find it difficult to make both ends meet.

In fact they live in such horrible condition which is surprising as to how they are surviving. They live on pavements and Jhuggi-Jhopri clusters and somehow manage to survive by picking grains from garbage dumps. As regards those who have migrated from rural areas and have some means of income, they try to spend minimum on themselves as they have to support their families living in the rural areas. Then there are *adivasis*, widows and I may be allowed to say so, the carefree monks. The total number of all these categories of people is 27 to 30 crore.

Apart from referring to the aforementioned figures, I would like to present a first hand account of the situation which the Hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Minister of Planning and the Government should keep in view. In Banaras I have seen cows eating corpses. In Orissa, where little fish is available in the rivers, I have seen hundreds of people spreading their fishing nets to catch fish. At Salem in Tamil Nadu, I have seen lakhs of artisans earning only 10, 12 or 14 *annas* per day. If calculations are made about the average income of these people, the average is bound to work out to less than 3 *annas* per day. Similarly, if we look into the income of the other weaker sections, we will find that they also earn the same amount per day.

....These are Government figures. The statisticians also compete with each other in presenting a brighter picture. One such organisation is based in Delhi and is called the National Council of Economic Research. It has given the names of 29 districts where the per capita income is less than Rs. 100. I am

mentioning here the names of some of these districts—in Darbhanga it is Rs. 96, in Saran and Chapra it is Rs. 96; in Deoria it is Rs. 98; in Tehri Garhwal it is Rs. 84. If the method of calculation which I had previously submitted is applied here that is to deduct 50 per cent income for the 10 per cent upper strata and 60 per cent of the amount for next 20 per cent people, the daily income of the remaining lower sections in these districts comes to less than 3 annas. I have referred to only 4 districts. There are similarly 40 districts where the income is Rs. 110, Rs. 120 and Rs. 125.

 If we refer to the thirteenth series it will become evident as to how our living standard is going down. In 1952 the per capita expenditure of 30 per cent of the population was Rs. 10 and 28 paise and in 1957-58 it was reduced to Rs. 10 and 14 paise. The figures which I have quoted are Government figures. The Hon. Prime Minister should go through the publication of his own Government in order to know about the declining standards of living. Similarly, the expenditure of 30 per cent families was reduced from Rs. 15 and 70 paise to Rs. 14 and 50 paise. The expenditure of only 2 per cent families has increased from Rs. 45 to Rs. 48. This is how the standard of living of the people is constantly declining.

Previously per capita income used to increase by Rs. 7 per year. This holds good no longer. It now increases by 2 Naya paise every year and if this is the pace of our progress, we shall be vulnerable to outside threat. In this connection I would particularly like to refer to China and Ghana and not the U.S.S.R and U.S.A. In Ghana, the per capita income is increasing by Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 and in China it is increasing by Rs. 50 to Rs. 60. Why have we not been able to make similar progress? Because the pattern of consumption underwent change and modernisation but without corresponding modernisation in our production process, we started aping the Western countries in our consumption patterns but it did not reflect in our production system. The standard of living of our leaders, businessmen and bureaucrats went up day by day so that they came at par with their counterparts in Europe and U.S.A but the

standard of living of the common man remained where it was.

Two or three lakh persons grow rich every year. It is the only effect of the Five Year Plans and a major portion of the increased national income is siphoned off for that purpose. In my opinion there are 50 lakh rich people at the moment and 3 lakh people are becoming rich every year. During the last 12 to 15 years 3 lakh people have been becoming rich. The British Government functioned with the support of 3 lakh people and the present Government is run by 50 lakh people.

If we examine the figures of the income of the people and the income-tax which they are paying, we will find that 9,52,000 persons are paying taxes and they are paying Rs. 200 crores as income tax having an income of Rs. 1200 crore. But it is common knowledge that their actual income is double of this amount of Rs. 120 crore. Moreover a very huge expenditure is being incurred on the facilities being provided to Ministers etc. In this way the total expenditure comes to about Rs. 2500 crore. This amount is taken away by only one per cent of the population as is evident from the Government statistics. The figures which I have collected from my own sources are, however, even more.

I think that we can easily save Rs. 1000 to Rs. 1200 crores according to one way and Rs. 1500 to Rs. 2000 crores according to the other by rationalising the expenditure. The Government can function more effectively, the income tax burden can be reduced and there can be better development of agriculture and industries. But only the person, whose heart bleeds for the common man can do it.

This Government has turned into a Government of directionless experts and whatever recommendations the experts make, the Government blindly follows them. The Ministers have little knowledge about agriculture, industries, national income etc. The hon. Ministers should apply their own mind instead of blindly following the recommendations of the experts. They should think over the recommendations and then give directions because the statisticians and the economists are like poisonous

snakes who dance to the tune of the snake charmers. But if you are incapable of playing the flute the results are bound to be disastrous.

I would like to claim that if the distribution of national income is rationalised, it can be increased by Rs. 20 every year and this can be done by any ordinary individual but only when everyone gets a share in the increase in the national income.

Motion Regarding Appointment of Committee for Restriction of Monthly Expenditure of an Individual*

"That this House resolves that the Government should appoint a committee to work out the proposals for restricting individual monthly expenditure to Rs. 1,500 in order that Rs. 1,000 crores may annually be made available for investment in developmental work."

Mr. Speaker, the earlier discussion related to the point whether the income was 3 annas or 15 annas. Today I am raising the point of fixing a ceiling of Rs. 1500 on individual monthly expenditure. This restriction is a solution to that problem. While making this point I would like to make it clear that had I been asked to speak on this point 6 months or a year ago, I would have proposed a limit of Rs. 1000. I say this with certainty that if my suggestion is implemented the ceiling would rise to Rs. 2000 instead of Rs. 1500 due to inflation after one month because within one month, it would require Rs. 125 instead of Rs. 100 for purchasing the same quantity as the purchasing power of money goes on declining due to rise in prices.

First of all I would like to raise a question. On several occasions hon. Members pose this question as to how it could be done. Their point is very appealing. I would like to go into the genesis. How will it be possible? We impose different kinds of taxes. We levy income tax of Rs. 92,000 on an income of Rs. 1 lakh. Even then our purpose has not been served. Then

This motion was moved by Dr. Rammanohar Lohia in Lok Sabha on 4.8.1967. Excerpts of the views expressed by Dr. Lohia during the course of the discussion are given here.

we imposed wealth tax. Even that did not have the desired effect. Then we imposed expenditure tax. That also did not yield results. In this connection I would like to make a point just for example. We should strike the source. But what is the source? Find a way out so that the expenditure made by people on luxury could be checked. For example, let me cite the case of possession of vehicles. Presently, there are 4 lakh private cars in the country. If we fix Rs. 500 as average expenditure on a private vehicle - of course - there are cars on which the monthly expenditure comes to Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 and there are others on which the monthly expenditure touches the point of Rs. 1000 to Rs. 2000. Hence, let us take the average of Rs. 500 per car and in that case about Rs. 200 crores could be saved. Let us accept for a while that after all we have to move from one place to other and the distance could be covered by buses, taxies or other means of transport owned by public institutions. Even then, a sum to the extent of Rs. 200 crores could be saved by prohibiting the plying of private cars and we can reach the source by this method.

In fact, it is not that I raised this issue only for establishing justice in the society. The most important thing is that there is scarcity, there are shortages of various articles due to various factors such as famine or other calamities, poverty, etc. Until and unless we establish an order in the society to ensure that these shortages are equally shared by all, how can we ask the people to make sacrifices for the development of the country. If the people who are at the helm of affairs of the country, who are the law makers and who run the Government lead a luxurious life, they would have no moral strength to exhort the people to make sacrifices for nation building...

Our ^{***}society is dependent ^{***}on the Government ^{***}and the Government is dependent on bureaucracy. In other words the people are subservient to the Government and the Government is subservient to its bureaucracy. To certain extent what I am saying is true...

There are about 1 crore Government servants, a large number of whom do not do any productive work. It is quite

evident that Parkinson's Law is not in force in our country in the same form as it existed in some other countries. In our country vacancies are created just to accommodate one's own kith and kin. These vacancies have no utility at all. According to my estimates, there are 30 to 40 lakh such employees who have no utility. Even then they have been employed in Government service. It is difficult to assess the wasteful expenditure on this account. Even if the number of employees engaged in unproductive work is not 30 to 40 lakhs, and we accept this figure to be 20 lakhs, we can save Rs. 300 crores under this Head.

Interruptions@

Until and unless this Government is prepared to share all the difficulties and prove before the general public that it is also suffering the hardships like the common man, it cannot do anything. I do not plead for dismissing these employees from service. The only thing I ask is that instead of putting them on desk work, they should be put on some productive work so that they could contribute their might in country's prosperity. This Government can do this thing for which I have initiated this debate. What is happening today? If this Government continues to function in this manner, our country will become a land of idle people. Today, each and every category of workers demands dearness allowance. Mr. Banerjee is strongly supporting the demand. May I ask him as to why he is not taking proper steps. Why do the higher authorities lead a luxurious life? Had I been a trade union leader, I would not have talked of dearness allowance. Instead, I would have made a plea to cut the expenditure being incurred by big people so that prices of commodities could come down and our society ran smoothly.

If we are able to cut the expenditure being made by big people like the Birlas and senior Government officials, we can build our society.

I have given you the figures. Please do not lay stress on figures. Though I gave the figure at Rs. 1000 crore very hesitantly, yet my estimate was Rs. 1500 crores. Two hon. Ministers have quoted the figure as Rs. 25 crores here - one is Shri Mehta and the other is Shri Morarji Desai. There was a time when Shri Mehta was in his hey days. I do not know if Shri

@ An Hon. Member: You suggest that it be deleted.

Desai ever had his hey-days. He has not made any significant proclamation, whereas Shri Mehta has made many proclamations worth mentioning and I quote:—

“In India 0.14 per cent takes five per cent of the national income.”

It means that seven lakh individuals or in other words 1.5 lakh rich families take away Rs. 1000 crore of the national income. I may agree with these figures. But the fact is that disparities have further widened since 1953 when he wrote this book. Now the figure will be much higher than 1000 crore. Even if you take it Rs. 1000 crore and implement my suggestion of limiting the expenditure to Rs. 1500 for these 1.5 lakh families, the expenditure would come to Rs. 250 crore and there would be a savings of Rs. 750 crore from this.

This is an instance of the past when Shri Mehta was in his youthful hey-days. Now he has come to Rs. 25 crore. I am not aware of Mr. Morarji Desai whether he was ever in his hey-days. He must have been but I have no such instance before me to quote. So I cannot say anything about him.

...

...

...

...Now, I would not like to go into the entire gamout of distribution of national income. But one thing I can assure you that if you go by my suggestions, we can save upto Rs. 57 crore even according to the figures of the Chamber of Commerce. But if you go by the figures available with the Income Tax Commissioner, you will draw a blank, because, these figures serve no purpose. There are many such persons who do not pay income tax. They evade tax. If we take the income of such persons into account the figure will go up by 3 times of Rs. 57 crore. Even if you double it, it comes to Rs. 114 crore. If you add the income accrued from agriculture etc. to this figure, we can save Rs. 300 crore. If I work out the figures under each head of account, I can prove that we can save much higher amount.

Once a discussion was going on. Shri Nanda is sitting here. He had accepted one thing. I would not like to say any thing about his leader at that time. He had conceded 7 1/2 annas.

repeat the mistake that we had committed in the Karachi resolution by laying down a ceiling in respect of the salaries of Government officials and Ministers as an idealistic measure leaving all sorts of temptations around them and thus placing them on the high pedestal of ideals whereas the capitalists had been given full liberty to accumulate more and more wealth. It was a paradox. This was something impossible. The Government officials and Ministers can be honest and idealistic only when there is an overall curb on all sections of the society.

Now there is a question. Many people say why do you stress cutting down consumption and expenditure. Why don't you talk of nationalisation. I would like to tell these people that my proposal is much more than this. It is funny if some people feel it that Bank nationalisation will give an inspiration and incentive to work which they do not have. They are wrong. If they think that nationalisation can give them inspiration to work, we can consider it. I have heard that generally man is anxious about the future of his children and is emotionally attached. In this connection I would suggest that we can open a Saving account in their names to save a certain amount of money for a period of twenty years. For that matter, I say a period of just twenty years only because after those 20 years when your country becomes self-reliant you can spend your money the way you like it. The money thus saved can be given to them or their progeny. But as I have suggested, you contrive to manage your expenses in that way for a period of just 20 years.

Often people ask about my plight. I tell them that we are a privileged class. Though my salary is only Rs. 500 per month but if I take into account all the facilities that I avail—like the accommodation that I have—it is in no way less than Rs. 2500 per month. I have cited my own case but let me submit about the Ministers as well. They also get about Rs. 7000 per month but that comes to about Rs. one lakh per annum. Moreover one envies their life style. Once I had said that they had planned to spend a sum of Rs. 40 lakh only on the replacement of lifts in Rashtrapati Bhawan and Rs. 5 to 6 lakh had already been spent on that account. It is well known that though a sum of

only Rs. 10 to 30 lakh is shown to be spent on the President of India and the Prime Minister but I have proved that at least Rs. one crore is spent on each of them annually. Is such a lavish life style justified in this country? Is it the way we want to increase our agricultural production by just imitating the ways of Europe and America. In case we are able to increase our agricultural production in the first twenty years, I won't have any objection to imitating their life style.

I myself want to live in comfort. Once I had a Russian friend. Probably he was an agent of Russian Intelligence. He used to visit me twice a day. Those were the days before Tashkent accord was made. Now he is nowhere to be seen. He asked me as to why I hadn't installed an air conditioner in my house? He asked me as to how I could manage to work without it for the welfare of the workers? I told him that first of all I would like to make my country self-reliant in terms of agriculture like Russia and then I would like to think of the air conditioner.

I would like to clarify that nowhere in the resolution I have said that people should renounce their old traditions. That is done by religious people. They are prompted either by some inspiration or by their own saintly nature. But those in politics work on inspiration and according to the constitution of the country. We are here not to exhibit our saintly nature but to undertake the work of legislation for the welfare of crores of people. We are here not to project the nobility and saintly nature of some of us just to win appreciation of people for it.

Therefore, I would like to tell you about the management of water resources. According to my rough calculations, a sum of Rs. 4000 crore to 10000 crore is required for the provision of irrigation facilities in the entire country. I think that taking up this work at such a large scale will not be possible unless we seek the participation of people as volunteers but that too is also possible only when we project ourselves before the people as a model to prove that we have also started sharing with them the scarcities in this country.

Some people may ask me as to why I did not say anything

about the private sector and the public sector. But I have said the fundamental thing. However I would like to say it in all seriousness that if the people running this country, whether they are in the private sector or the public sector, are unwise enough to say that they prefer to export their production to Indonesia, Burma or to some other country and import rice and wheat from those countries—such words may be uttered not only by the people working in the public sector but also by those who are working in the private sector—we will be committing the same mistake which we have been doing for the last twenty years in this country. What I mean to say is that we have built up a number of factories to produce several unnecessary things like nylon, rayon, tereylene etc. but we could not make a stride in respect of the provision of irrigation facilities.

Those who say that consumers should be left to decide on their own and free trade should be allowed, should see the results of it we are facing today? Those who say that more public sector units should be set up, I would like to inform them that now there is no difference as such between Rourkela Steel Plant and Jamshedpur Steel Plant. The bureaucracy exploits the workers and labour and same thing is happening in Jamshedpur as in Rourkela. I would not hesitate to say that they have been absorbing the people of their own caste and families in these places.

In fact this is a matter relating to property and assets. Love of wealth and institutionalisation of wealth cannot go together. No individual society or country has come forward with a solution to both these problems. Marx had found a solution to the institutionalisation of wealth. Our *Upanishads* had tried to find a way out for excessive attachment with wealth; similarly we should also try to find out a solution to these problems, particularly, the longing to lead a luxurious life. Thus the point I am trying to plead is that we should keep a check on the desire for luxurious items and the provision of such items.

A short while ago I gave the example of vehicles. As another instance I would like to take schools. There are about 5 to 10

lakh children in the country who study in the best schools and pay a fee of Rs. 20 to Rs. 100 every month—only fee i.e. bus fee, school fee etc which is exclusive of expenses on their food and clothes. If this item of expenditure is checked and such schools are opened in the country where the children of all the sections of the society, be it the child of the President of India or that of a sweeper, may study together, we can save at least Rs 60 to Rs 100 crore.

In the end I would like to appeal to all the hon. Members that while speaking on this subject they should bear in mind all that I have said. I was speaking about desire for acquisition of wealth, institutionalisation of wealth and provision of luxury items. I was trying to find a way out for my country. I don't think people have ever bothered to think in this direction. The hon. Members should seriously think over it and contribute to the building up of their nation.

Interruptions(a)

I am happy that the hon. Minister has said that we can save upto Rs. 50 crore, though three weeks back he was saying that it cannot be more than Rs. 25 crore. Today he said it can be between Rs. 50 to Rs. 60 crore. If he goes at by this speed he will agree with me in the next six months.

Interruptions(b)

When you are cornered, you should not become restless. At the moment you have been a little snipped. Today you have come to Rs. 50 crore and perhaps on Monday when we meet

(a) While intervening in the debate, the Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister Shri Morarji Desai said, "During general discussion on the General Budget (7 June, 1967) Dr. Lohia has said that if the total expenses are incurred Rs. 1500/- per month, an amount of rupees one thousand crore would be saved. At that time I said, "I don't know how he arrived at these figures. If you do all this then an amount of Rs. 25 crores can be saved." On 4 August, 1967, speaking on this Motion, Shri Morarji Desai said that not more than Rs. 50 crores would be saved.

(b) Shri Morarji Desai: I said that at the maximum Rs. 50 crores would be saved. But you should not catch it, it is possible-if this is done.

again it would be Rs. 300 crore. However I am saying that it can be Rs. 1000 to Rs. 1500 crores. I have given the figures. I do not want to waste more time.

I just want to say one thing to Shri Ramamoorthy and Shri Sharma. I have deliberately asked to restrict individual expenditure because many bureaucrats and Ministers get a salary of Rs. 3000 to Rs. 4000 but their perks range between Rs. 10,000 to Rs. one lakh. It should be very clear that when I talk of expenditure I mean both salaries and perks. Here in India we enjoy lot of facilities and in this respect, this country tops the countries of the world. I have already told you about my perks. I know that one does not like to part with the facilities available to him. If a law to this effect is passed we shall be forced to forgo them. Therefore it should be clear that when I talk of expenditure, I mean salaries and perks both. Some Members suggested that there should be a ceiling on income. I would like to make it clear that the ceiling of expenditure of Rs. 1500 is for the family as a whole and not for any single individual. This will not be meant for filling their coffers. I had already stated that it is a different matter if Rs. 500 to Rs. 1000 is given per month to every individual for the upbringing of his children. It clearly means that this resolution leaves no scope for indirect accumulation of wealth by an individual.

My communist friends should not misunderstand me. I want to make it clear that I am not in favour of such a type of nationalisation wherein the officers get a salary of Rs. two to three thousand alongwith the perks ranging upto Rs. 50,000. Even at present the factories which have been nationalised are also running like private factories that is why I used the word 'expenditure'.

Shri Somani has expressed his views today. You are aware that I exercise much self-restraint. Mink Coat, diamonds etc. have been subjects of discussion. I would like to make one point clear. There has always been a nexus between the big business and bureaucracy since centuries. That is why they will feel sore over such a matter. It will cause much displeasure to them.

There has been a reference to inspiration. I do not lose my temper normally But I would like to give my reply to it. Shri Morarji Desai said that there are only one lakhs people in the top income bracket. As per my estimate of 1500 there are 20 lakhs of affluent people in the country. I would like to submit dispassionately today that if these 20 lakh people die and people do not draw inspiration from them, it will benefit the country. We have no need of such people in the country. The inspiration which they are talking about is not required. If these 20 lakh people derive their inspiration merely for amassing wealth and by indulging in wasteful expenditure, they cannot be allowed to exist and sooner such people cease to exist in this world the better it will be for the society. After all their number is only 20 lakh. Their number is not more than this figure and therefore I would like that the interests of the rest of 49 crore and 80 lakh of population should also be given due consideration. The aspirations of the 49 crore and 80 lakh are not considered. It is essential to consider the aspirations of those earning Rs. 500, Rs. 400, Rs. 200, 8 annas, 4 annas or 2 annas. Therefore, whenever there is a discussion on diamonds etc. in this connection, I do not want to reveal anyone's name, but the members of the Swatantra party visited my house and gave me an interesting information that there is a stock of Rs. 8 thousand crore worth of silver and about Rs. 4 thousand crore worth of gold and as regards diamonds. I would like to inform you that we have a stock of Rs. 15 thousand crore in the shape of diamonds and other precious items. Just pay attention in that direction. There is stockpiling of such items which have no utility. I would like that some law should be enacted and a machinery created so that the gold, silver and diamonds worth Rs. 15 thousand....

Now certain matters can create misunderstanding. As Dr. Sushila Nayyar has stated and which has been repeated by others that I wanted 20 lakh Government employees to be dismissed from service. I had not said anything like this. I had stated that they should be removed from desk work and utilised for productive work such as in agriculture or in industry...

It has been said that my Government should set an example. The first point is that there is no such Government which may be termed as my Government. This Government is not my Government. My Government will be there when Shri Morarji Desai joins my party or my party is able to form the Government. A Government which has the participation of my party cannot be formed in any other way. Is Shri Morarji Desai suggesting a third method? Still I would like to submit that I have been telling all these Ministers on whom I can exert some influence that policemen escort them and provide them a security cover and salute them. Do you want to become the "langoor"? I have reiterated the same in my speeches and I feel happy to say that some hon. Ministers have refused to accept police escort. I have also been able to influence some hon. Ministers to give up the facility of Government vehicles to some extent and some other such facilities...

One of the major evil is that two sets of accounts are maintained. Shri Morarji Desai thinks that only Rs. 8 thousand are left out of an income of Rs. 1 lakh. In other words, after paying the required taxes on an income exceeding Rs. 1 lakh, they are left with only Rs. 8 thousand. However, some people tell me and I am not going to reveal the names of those who are present here, that his saving is only on paper and actually Rs. 50 thousand are left. The mistake is being committed here in qualifying the estimates because one account is kept for perusal of the Government authorities and the Finance Ministry and the other account is kept secret resulting in evasion of Rs. 50 thousand. Both these accounts should be taken into account. The figures on paper have no meaning.

Apart from that I would like to submit that the Members of the Swatantra Party as well as the Communist Party taunt me time and again by pointing out as to how am I able to bring the Members of the Swatantra Party as well as the Communist Party together inspite of the kind of outlook which I have. Why should I not make efforts to bring them together? When the Congress Party also shrinks and becomes equal to the size of my party, I will like to take the members of the Congress Party

also with me. I do not want to woo such a big party which is like a monster. It will devour us all. If the size of our parties were the same, the situation would have been different. I have no personal grudge against the Congress. This makes me feel resentful but I feel so only for one or two days. My resentment does not last longer than this. As regards bringing such opposite camps together, you must have already comprehended that I can get their support on two different grounds. The Swatantra Party will support my stand in regard to the curbing of wasteful expenditure by the bureaucracy and I can get the support of the Communists in regard to checking the amassing of wealth by the capitalists and their lavish spending. Then why should not I make efforts to get the support of both of them. After all a final settlement will definitely be reached. If we lose some people during the course of our mission, it does not matter much. But if we are able to persist with our united efforts, we will achieve our target in the end and a new India will emerge.

24 Corruption*

...Misconduct and corruption are just synonyms and while discussing this issue we should examine that if corruption exists at the apex level, would it be worthwhile to conduct the cleansing operation at lower level. I would request the hon. Members to exercise utmost restraint while discussing the corruption at the apex level. They should not direct their resentment against me but against the situation today in which India is rotting. I shall try to exercise restraint but other hon. Members should also exercise restraint and deliberate on the issue dispassionately. They should not mind my words, but should think about eradicating the evil...

...So I had mentioned that corruption was at apex level. There is no rule of law in India, as the administration is functioning arbitrarily. Either the rules are not appropriate or they are not enforced properly. The result is that one finds favouritism in every action of the Government. It is a secondary question whether one gains monetarily or not as a result of this favouritism. Favouritism, functioning arbitrarily, bribery and contravention of rules should be considered corruption.

What else is corruption? It is not only dishonesty but lack of realisation also. I find this thing in Parliament as well that people take corruption as dishonesty only. I want to say that it is not only dishonesty but lack of realisation also. If we do not comprehend the situation in India and the World as a whole and do not try to know the circumstances which cause corruption and why corruption exists and do not identify the

* Lok Sabha Debates, 21 December, 1963.

areas of corruption, we shall not be able to eradicate it. I still find that Government has not understood the problem because in order to eradicate corruption, the Government is proposed to create an institution of Central Vigilance Commission. What is meant by it? It means that Central Vigilance Commission would identify the areas of corruption and curb the same. This may be a remedy. This is a way of awarding punishment for the crime that has already been committed. The Government has not so far thought of any way out to prevent corruption.

One approach is to prevent corruption and the other is to remedy the situation. First of all I would like to say that the approach of the Central Vigilance Commission would not be that of prevention of the evil but that of only remedying the situation. This would prove to be a failure and I may tell you the main reason of its failure i.e. whenever some influential individual would come into its dragnet, he will go scot free and only ordinary persons will be awarded punishment. Therefore, it would prove to be a failure even as a remedy and so far as the question of prevention is concerned, the hon'ble Minister of Home Affairs has not applied his mind towards it.

Here I may tell you one thing more that now-a-days so many fool proof methods have been evolved in India even that of punishment by proxy. When people used to court arrest on the issue of prohibition, the people engaged in distilling illicit liquor used to send some of their own men to set themselves arrested just to please the police and the hon. Minister and at the same time they continued their illegal trade. If necessary, such elements would get some persons arrested by proxy and make the Central Vigilance Commission quite ineffective.

Besides, I would like to draw your attention towards that statement made by the hon. Minister of Home Affairs, in which he stated that saints and leaders of social organisations could help in solving this problem by creating public opinion and eradicate the evil of corruption. After all what is meant by morality? Should it be confined to only saints? At present politics and economic life has become so much complicated that it cannot be left to saints that they should give sermons

and convince the people to become honest and truthful and everything would be alright.

I can say that an hon'ble Minister who talks of truthfulness and honesty more and speaks against casteism tries to provide maximum benefit to the people of his own caste. I would like to make it quite clear that more a Minister of India speaks against casteism, more he practises it in his practical life.

Therefore, it is the question of realisation and I may give you another instance in this regard. I myself had agreed to the proposal in the past—but at that time I had not comprehended the idea fully—that neither any Minister nor any official should be paid more than Rs. 500/-. But no limit was imposed on the income of an advocate, doctor, businessman and Jagirdar. How a Code of Conduct can be framed for the Ministers and bureaucrats while corruption is rampant all around. This Code of Conduct will not be able to withstand the force of greed and avarice inherent in corruption and will be swept away by its force. So, it proves that this matter should be viewed in proper perspective.

Besides, I would like to draw your attention towards the fact that people have started saying that corruption has become a part and parcel of our life. I make a humble submission—I was just going to use the words "to my old congress colleagues" but my mind does not permit me to say those words although my heart sometimes commits the slip—that they should ponder over what they utter before the people during their election campaign in villages. They explain to the people that they are contented because they have earned a lot for themselves and now their bellies are full and if they cast their votes in favour of those whose bellies are empty and who are very hungry, they have their own axe to grind and they will indulge in amassing wealth and doing everything for themselves. The villagers feel convinced and think that if they cast their votes against Congress Party, the new Government would eat into the resources of the country afresh. Therefore, there is no other alternative left with the people but to allow these very corrupt elements to remain in the Government. This is not a matter to

be laughed at. It is a matter of shame. I feel perturbed to learn that people throughout the country are being taught the lesson of corruption through elections.

Besides, economists of India have propounded a theory that when a nation with a backward economy makes progress there is inadequate production due to obsolete methods of production and in such a situation corruption is bound to take place. I think I have made the things clear but there is a majority of people in India who possess a little knowledge of English, so they call it a developing economy. They are of the view that in a developing economy corruption is bound to take place. I assert that it is a false theory. If a weak and backward economy is to be improved and strengthened, there should be no place for corruption and I am placing an example before you to make it clear. Though it should have been a Gandhian example yet I am giving a Russian one.

USSR never bothered about the quality of the items of consumption made in their country for 40 to 50 years. The razor they manufactured would give a very rough and painful shave. The foreign visitors used to tell after their return from USSR that the consumer items were of inferior quality in USSR. But they were laying the foundation of their production and were not wasting their money on consumer items. Similarly, had we laid more emphasis on production instead of consumption in our country, the corruption would not have increased to such an extent.

I would like to draw your attention towards the relation between the Government and the trade. The extent to which it has become polluted, corrupt and dishonest in India, it had never happened in the history of the world. The relation between the trade and Government has not been so strained in America, Britain, Germany etc. as it has been in India. I am going to give an example instead of a theory. National Motors is a company of Punjab. That company is run by a Minister's son. He gets licence, quota etc. from the Government. He is minting money. Whenever a question is raised in this regard, it is said that why do you quote such example and has the Chief Minister

of Punjab made any recommendation to this effect that his son should be issued such and such licence. You should produce documentary evidence to prove that he has done so and give other facts. I want to make a special mention in this regard. We should only see whether a son, a daughter or a relative and in my opinion a relative upto two generations has taken any advantage of the high position of his relative. Today, in India, the criterion should be to check whether anybody has taken any advantage of the official position in the Government of his guardians to further his trade or business interests.

There is another criterion which I want to place before you. It is very often said whether Ministers do not have sons? Its first reply is whether others do not have sons; whether only Ministers have sons, who would always reap the benefit in all respects. But in the present situation, in today's economy, there is one sphere of competition and there is another sphere of permit, quota, licence etc. We should learn to distinguish between the two. They talk about independent countries like Germany, Britain etc. which allow open and free competition in which Government does not interfere. Mostly this is the situation there. If here in India, the sons, daughters and the relatives of Ministers are more intelligent, let them face free competition and if they succeed, let them prosper. In a trade in which some quota or permit or licence is required to be given by the Minister, there the relatives upto two generations of the Ministers should not come forward. So long you do not follow this policy, the relation between the Government and the trade will remain strained.

Now, I come to the employment aspect. Some way out should be found out so that anybody occupying a high office in the Government should not be able to offer high posts to his relatives. You will ask for a proof in this regard also. The proof is that the graph of the business and trade prosperity of a son, who failed to secure a job in the normal course earlier, shows an upward trend synchronising with the enhancement of the Ministerial status of his father. This is such a big proof that it cannot be countered. In this respect also some positive rules

should be framed.....

I submit that I am a representative of the last capital of ancient India i.e. Kannauj and in this capacity I was about to utter a few literary epithets about this new capital but I am hesitant to utter those words because I do not know whether those words would be followed in their right perspective or not. Delhi has been capital of the country for the last 700-800 years. It has its own charm and beauty but that of an unchaste woman. There is no doubt about it because it could never repel the foreign invaders. The capital has a history of 700-800 years. I want to give her a message. I have just come from Kannauj. There was a Nallah there and water used to flow through it carrying with it the dirt. During rains or floods people did not face any difficulty. The Nallah is about 600-700 years old. With the passage of time, it got silted. It is filled up with soil. Time has harmed it. Another harm done is that 50-60 persons have illegally occupied that land and have started cultivation and have grown some vegetables there. Therefore, I will make a submission that in a way it is a malady of 1000-1500 years and on the other hand, it is a malady of fifteen years. I want to speak more about the malady of 1000-1500 years because the malady of 15 years is a passing phase. The Ministers, Prime Ministers, Chief Ministers come and go in millions. Sometime I am unable to control myself. I do not get sufficient time otherwise I would have explained in detail the malady and the treatment of the malady of 1500 years which has infiltrated into the malady of 15 years also. Indian people are not one unit, they consist of one thousand or ten thousand units. There is no harmony among the different castes. They are harming each other, they have different thinking, different ideologies. Their vested interest, justice, thinking, discretion have attained different meanings. When they think of their self-interest they forget the distinction between profession, practice, justice and injustice, honesty and dishonesty. These ten thousand units are plundering the country and it is happening for the last 1500 years. As long as a distinction is not made between them, corruption cannot be eliminated because everybody will think

that if anybody has done any good to his caste, community and sons, what is wrong in it. It has been carried forward from our scriptures, I would not mention them, that if someone attains a high place, he should help and benefit his people. Till today, it is happening.

Aspersions are cast on me but you know that I have not spoken about the Prime Minister and I make the least comments about him. Aspersions are cast on me but I raise the issues based on facts. With due regard, I humbly submit that till this day, I never raised any personal issues about the Prime Minister. I always raised those issues which concerned the Government. Now if during his tenure as Prime Minister, the people of his family, community have got promotions, it is not a personal issue, it becomes a public issue. In its defence it is said that it is happening because they possess ability for it. Had you been the Prime Minister at the moment who would have possessed the maximum ability? If the Finance Minister becomes Prime Minister, as sometime we hear, if it happens, you will see that most able persons will be found among Tamil, Ayangar and there is no doubt about it. This is the criterion of ability followed in our country. When a person occupying a high post attains a higher position, all the persons belonging to his family, his community become so able, so qualified that others cannot compete with them. We have to change this trend and tendency. As long as we do not eliminate the discrimination among the four thousand or ten thousand different units, we will not be able to banish corruption.

On the one hand there is a question of poverty of 43 crore people and on the other hand about 50 lakh people continuously think of raising their standard of living in an effort to bring it at par with that of the people of U.S.A. and Europe. What is the aim of life of an average Indian today— to buy a luxury chair, to buy elegant furniture. They feel that since they have seen an attractive sofa in some one's house, why should they also not possess the same. When such thoughts come and gain roots in the minds and hearts of ministers and their wives, how can moral values thrive. On the one side there is hunger of

43 crore people, which is so intense and overpowering that they cannot distinguish between honesty and dishonesty. I want to say that 43½ crore people can be dishonest for two paise and four paise but 50 lakh people are dishonest in the eyes of lakhs and crores of people. On the one hand there are people who spend 100 times, 500 times more than their salary and on the other hand the persons entrusted with the administration spend at least 4 times of their salaries. Thus, it has become imperative that we should get rid of the maladies that we have acquired during the last 15 years...

...This is incumbent on our part to find out remedies of these maladies. The glaring inequality prevailing in the society and the ever increasing desire of the people for raising their standard of living often induce them to resort to corrupt practices. I would like to submit that special attention is required to be paid, particularly by the members of this House towards these inconsistencies. The era of Mahatama Gandhi was the era of simple living and dedication to duty, but the present era of the Hon. Prime Minister is an era of fashion and luxury. In order to safeguard the interests of a handful of 5 million people, you ignore the general condition of the masses. I find people here blindly following the life style of the people of U.S.A. and European countries. To them, I can say that the people there could be in a position to enjoy the present standard of living after putting in constant hard labour during the last 300 years for increasing the production of farms and factories, whereas here we are yearning for the life style of the western countries without increasing our production. In such circumstances, corruption is bound to afflict the society. That is why I would like to put these two points before you.

Similarly, this Government has concealed the truth in a 'Hiranya Patra' (golden pot). I am using the word 'Hiranya Patra' which dates back to two to two and half thousand years ago. You will find the Government is spending a lot of money in order to partially or fully shut the mouth of the people who could not be a Minister or are not inclined to be a Minister. Such people can be found in all walks of life, no matter whether they

which are acquired by other Ministers and the Chief Ministers through other means are acquired by the Prime Minister under the normal rules. There is a fund called as Prime Minister's Relief Fund. An amount of Rupees one and a half crore has been spent from this fund during the last 10 to 15 years. There are no prescribed rules and regulations for drawing the amount from this fund and it is the discretion of the Prime Minister which reigns supreme in the matter. This reply has been given by him in this very House. Anyone can improve his governmental status with the help of such funds. I would like to humbly submit that had I at my disposal even 100th part of this fund, I would have also wielded more political clout and a large number of people could be seen hanging around me also. It is a means to increase one's political power...

.....I would like to tell you one thing which has been badly pinching me to the core of my heart. The matter would have been discussed in the House. You please see as to how rules are to be applied. A grave danger is looming large over the country. Is it a good parliamentary tradition to discuss the same thing again and again? Tension is building up on all fronts but tension at one front only has been discussed in the current session of the House again and again. The Government has an agency through which it feeds the newspapers the news suiting its convenience, diverting the attention of the people by giving news of killings, dacoities, and firings etc. Of course, the Government of Pakistan is notorious for its stance but the Government of India also does not think all these things and creates such conditions which are not in a good taste.

Next, I would like to submit that though I don't crave for power I am of the opinion if a central vigilance commission is constituted, it must be vested with the power to arrest "anyone" after giving two warnings for repeating similar acts of corruption. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am laying stress on the word 'anyone' which includes everybody, he may be a Chief Minister or a Prime Minister or anybody else. It should also be empowered to remove the wide economic disparity which is eating into the edifice of our country. I would also like to add that instead of

paying attention to consumption, attention is required to be paid to increase the production. If this is done, I can say with certainty that not only I but even hon. Shri Mahavir Tyagi can eradicate corruption from this country within two years. But I am sure that Shri Nanda will never be successful in eradicating corruption from the country.

I would also like to add that under the present Five Year Plan the average income of about 27 crore people is merely three annas per day and that of 16.5 crore people is only one rupee per day with which they have to make both ends meet. But I can plan the economy in such a way that the daily average income of these 27 crores could be raised to eight annas a day from three annas and that of 16.5 crore to Rs. 1.5 or Rs. 1.75 within a span of seven years.

Student Unrest*

Five students of Delhi University have been released from jail two days back. Their case has been dismissed. This has been done in view of the apprehension of a strike in the colleges in Delhi. But surprisingly students of Orissa, Bengal, Uttar Pradesh and Gujarat Universities who had been arrested for the same reason are still languishing in jails.

* *

Their case is not even coming up for hearing. The dates are being postponed. Perhaps the Government will say that when the Magistrate is not deciding, what can they do. But this is not a fact. The Government is behind the postponement of these cases whereas cases of students of Delhi University are coming up for hearing in rapid succession and the students are being released. There is a strong feeling that power and pelf holds the sway in today's world and law is of least importance. When we were released from the jail, day before yesterday at 9 p.m., three others with us were Shri Janeshwar Mishra, Satyadev Tripathi and Ramashray Verma who have been Presidents of Students Union of their Universities. They were again arrested at the gate of the jail under Preventive Detention Act. I think it is ridiculous and a mockery of law. Those who were to be arrested under the Preventive Detention Act could have been kept in the jail itself. There was no need to release them. What impression does it leave on young minds. In fact, they are not satisfied with the system itself. There is no justice. The younger

* Lok Sabha Debates, 24 November, 1966

generation has no faith in the present system. An ordinary student who may have passed in second or third division may not get admission in a University or a college, but here I agree, with Shrimati Renu Chakravorty, that the sons and daughters of Ministers manage to get admission even if they fail. They do not have high calibre but they get admission in American and European Universities even if they fail. What impression would it leave on young minds. They feel that justice does not exist at all. Whims and fancies are holding sway. Percentage of failure in examinations in other countries is generally around ten, but unfortunately in our country, it is 50 per cent and even more. What happens thereafter? What impression does it leave on tender minds? Even after hard work and studying for so many years, they fail. Had we been in their place, we would have understood their difficulties and felt that whatever is happening today should not have happened. Similarly, there are many other matters like food for students and accommodation for them.

Banaras University is a Central University. 18 years back, 8,000 students studied there. Now that the population has risen manifolds and students are desirous of getting higher education but even then the number of students in this University has been restricted to 8,000 only. I do not know whether the Government has succeeded in the Family Planning Programme but it has definitely planned the family of Banaras University. Poor students do not have access to this institution. Had there been civilised Government, the University would have a strength of 25,000 students. Even then this Government boasts of higher education. What type of education is being imparted there? Where are our mathematicians and scientists? I would not go into the statistics, but would like to mention here that in Russia and America 20 to 25 students per thousand go for higher education whereas in our country 4 to 5 students per thousand go to colleges and Universities and in areas where students' agitation is going on 4 students per thousand go in for higher education whereas in Orissa and Andhra Pradesh hardly one or one and a half student per thousand get higher

education, in colleges and Universities. The thinking is to exploit the poor and the illiterate. After all what will happen to the tender minds.

For 20 years, they have held the youth together by celebrating youth festivals once or twice a year. That is good. I am for it. They should celebrate and there should be lot of dancing, singing and fun. But why should they celebrate separately. Both boys and girls should dance together. If this cultural programme is to divert their attention from mental activity or at the cost of their studies we may have to suffer the consequences—We are already suffering the consequences. Had there been open discussion for the last 20 years on Marxism, Socialism and political thoughts, this thing would not have happened. But why should they have done it? They were nervous.

The persons having close links with the Government are becoming millionaires overnight. Their cases are opened, but even then nothing is being done against them. Recently, I had gone to Calcutta. I saw that a person who has been involved in many cases and has been exposed many times is getting rich overnight. He is constructing a hotel and has a palatial house. If a young man comes across this thing, he will think that one should earn as much as possible through foul means because this world is becoming worthless.

Same is true of Ministers also. Have you ever thought why buses and cars are being burnt today? I do not like them to be burnt. Those who drive cars never think about the pedestrians and they manoeuvre in such a way on slushy roads that the filth and slush spoils the clothes of pedestrians. So, Mr. Chairman, Sir, this hostility is bound to exist. In the days to come we may see more of this hostility. The girls have not come to the fore yet. They will also join the students and with them the other categories like Harijans, Adivasis will also come forward. Why? They will join the movement because they are fed up with the social system wherein their parents tell them to walk slowly, talk quietly and things like that. Girls are being suppressed to such an extent that one day they

will throw of the yoke and take to streets as it happened in European countries and then the matter may take a serious turn.

On 18th November, I was very much ashamed of myself when I learnt that an insignificant person like a constable arrested us and nothing happened. In spite of this there was hope that our country was awakening. I would like to tell the people here who have used their force on our new generation that the youth of India have excelled their past generations in one thing i.e., their fearlessness though they might have shown some deterioration in certain things. Perhaps they might be indulging in the habit of telling lies. They might be wanting in studies and might have gone wayward in their behaviour. They are becoming more fearless. I feel that when our country will continue to become fearless, no power can check our students, farmers, Harijans, Adivasis and women and then this insignificant constable will become completely powerless.

I would like to place before you the results of a school in Delhi. Two students who had failed very badly in the examination had been shown as passed. One of them had secured 223 marks which were changed to 274 and he was shown as passed.....

...
 Interruption@

let it be—it's useless. I give you this paper—why do you waste my time. The marks of other student were changed from 241 to 279. Whereas.....

...

Now-a-days the teachers and managers of schools and colleges indulge in large scale mal-practices and change the

@ Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey (Salemipur): What was the name of School?

* Later on, with the permission of Mr. Speaker Dr. Lohia laid the papers on the Table.

results of the schools and colleges for the sake of money or for the sake of their relatives. I would like to know as to what impact it will have on those tender hearts? Similarly, in today's newspaper published from Calcutta, there is a report that Calcutta University was likely to be closed indefinitely. On the one hand it has been reported in the daily "Basumati" that:—

"Viswa Vidyalaya anirdista kaler janya banda hoibar ashanka".

On the other hand another report precedes the above report—

Matar sanmukhe Pita Kartruk Howara Bridge hoite kanya ke Gangay nikshap."

A father threw his daughter into Ganga in the presence of latter's mother. This is the situation that has developed now. The students are oppressed, victimised and insulted. They are not able to know as to where they could get some shelter. They are not able to know as to how they are becoming wayward and who is to blame for that—parents, teachers, leaders or any other person. While on the one hand the hon. President receives 'prasad' from one Shankaracharya and on the other hand, another Shankaracharya is arrested for no fault at all and sent to jail in Pondicherry. They are mentally disturbed at these developments and want to know if there is any justice or logic in this world.

* * * *

An anomaly has developed in which people's thinking has been divided into two parts. This Government intends to divide people's thinking into many parts and thereby create a society which can never be reformed without taking recourse to a student agitation or some other agitation and march ahead with their own strength. Let us march ahead and destroy this unjudicious and unequal society and create a new society in which different organs would be helpful to each other. Today, that is not there. Different organs of the society are separated from each other.

Rickshaw Pulling*

Mr. Chairman, Sir, yesterday a Councillor phoned me from a city with a population of 4 lakh. He told me that one year prior to independence i.e. 1945-46 to 1950 the number of rickshaw pullers in his city was 679. There may be some more also, You can add 100 more at the most. But now in 1965-66 the number of rickshaws has gone upto 5898 and the number of rickshaw pullers has increased to 17,910.

In this, I am not including those rickshaw pullers who have no licence to pull the rickshaws. I am giving the number of those who have licences. Before independence, the number of rickshaws was just 700 which has now increased to 6000. Similarly, the number of rickshawpullers before independence was two thousand which has now increased to 18,000, which means there has been a nine fold increase in this field. These figures relate to just one city i.e. Allahabad which have been made available by Shri Laxmi Bhushan Varshney, the Councillor of the city, which has a population of 4 lakh. May be these are not the exact figures but I could get only these figures. Shri Ram Sagar Mishra has informed me on telephone from Lucknow that about 10,000 rickshaw licences have been issued there which is 9 to 10 times more in comparison to the number prevailing before independence. You will be surprised to know that in a city like Hyderabad which has a population of 14 lakh, the number of rickshaw pullers is staggering 50 to 60 thousand.

How is it that during these seventeen or eighteen years of

*Lok Sabha Debates, 12 April, 1966.

Independence the number of rickshaw pullers has increased by nine to ten times. Before going into the details of this, I would like to tell you as to who these rickshaw pullers are. There was a time when coaches driven by horse were plying on the roads, though very few in number. There used to be a horse and a coachman. Now in the changing circumstances people do not find it convenient to keep a horse in view of the many difficulties such as feeding them attached to it. So preferred to choose rickshaw pulling as an occupation. Now you must have this scenario of free India before your eyes where the number of people in rickshaw pulling occupation, which is half human and half animal, has gone up by ten times. They thought it better to pull rickshaws by becoming half animal rather than feeding the horse to avoid the difficulties which are there in this job of feeding the horses.

The other occupation in which the number has increased is that of prostitutes. My impression is that the number in these two occupations has registered a marked increase. Perhaps the number of rickshaw puller has registered a steep increase as compared to the increase in the number of prostitutes.

*** *** ***

If you go through the reply given by the hon. Minister, you will find that he has no interest in the problem. He is neither interested to find out its solution nor to go into the root cause of this problem. He would give an evasive reply not touching the actual subject. Let me tell you my recent experience of Lok Sabha. Here we are able to extract a reply from the Government in respect of isolated questions at best. However, on the front of fundamental issues concerning the state or reorganisation, our Lok Sabha has miserably failed to extract any worthwhile reply. The factors responsible for this is that our ministers do not evince keen interest to go into the depth of such questions as to why these people have adopted the

occupation of rickshaw pulling, why their number has registered such enormous increase and their number has increased ten times in the entire country. As per my estimates there are thirty lakhs of rickshaw pullers in our country at present, that is one per cent of the total population. Now you will ask the basis of this estimate. My estimates are based on the sample survey of different cities in this regard. Now what make them adopt this occupation. This is the hunger which drives them to adopt this occupation. Remuneration in agricultural occupations is very low as compared to the earnings of a rickshaw puller while he has to part with some of his earnings to the rickshaw owner and the policemen, still he manages to earn Rs. 5/- to Rs. 6/- daily in addition to what he has to part with. Besides the hunger, the underlying cause for adopting this occupation is attraction towards modernism. In these 18 years our country has witnessed great changes and is fast marching towards modernism. Specially our youth does not like to live in villages because of caste system from which he is fed up. Suppose I were a chamar or a Bhangi, I would never like to live in village because all the people will constantly keep an eye over my activities. Even a person from high caste can not escape their vigilant eyes about his activities. Thus a village has become a sort of prisonhouse and there is a tendency among people to run away from such a prison and enjoy colourful life of the cities. Suppose there is a rickshaw puller and he wants to know the way of life of the rich people, he can do so by visiting a hotel or any other place at least once in a year. Just as air-conditioned cars, air-conditioned rooms have become modern status symbols for the affluent people, in the same way rickshaw has become a modern status symbol for agricultural labourers and people belonging to depressed classes. It has become a means to escape from the village life, caste system and hunger. It does have a new life for them even though it results in a sub-human existence for them.

I would, therefore, like to point out that our country has degenerated to such an extent that the leader of this new world, is half animal, half human. If Government and other people —

social workers or political workers — pay attention to this, then some improvement may be expected.

It is a fact that police also exploits this man. You are aware that police extract whatever they can from such a man ranging from four annas to two rupees. I have assessed the position of the rickshaw owners by talking to several people. The rickshaw owners earn profit from thirty per cent to fifty per cent per year. A rickshaw owner has got to be a ruffian otherwise it would be difficult for him to run this business. He earns 40-50 per cent profit on his capital. He makes the rickshaw puller work hard and does not care about him. The Minister in his reply had said that rickshaw pulling does not affect the health of a rickshaw puller. I want Shri Shahnawaj Khan and his minister Shri Jagjivan Ram to follow the methods adopted in America. Judges visit the prisons to study the conditions there. I would suggest that both of them should pull a rickshaw for a month and see how it affects their health. I have come to know from doctors that whatever be the age of a rickshaw puller, 15-20 years or more than 40 years, his lungs get damaged and he either dies within two or three years or falls victim to a serious disease.

At the same time, I would like to say that firing often takes place now-a-days and it is the rickshaw puller who becomes the victim, because they have to roam the city while plying the rickshaw.

Besides, sometimes Bandhs are organised in cities such as Bombay, Calcutta, Allahabad and the rickshaw-puller gets involved in those bandhs knowingly or unknowingly. I do not think that the rickshaw pullers have become revolutionaries. But sometimes he becomes a revolutionary unwillingly and comes to the forefront as a torchbearer of revolution. Through this Lok Sabha, I would like to exhort 3, 4 or 5 million Rickshaw-pullers to ponder over the present day world and the society which have gone far ahead. I call upon them to come forward and participate in the transformation of the society so that the revolution to be brought by them becomes a future history.

I would like to tell a story of a Rickshaw-puller, Shri Chandan

who is known to me for the last 8 to 10 years and who reached the position of a pleader while pulling rickshaw. I am narrating the story to arouse a sense of self-amelioration among rickshaw-pullers although this is not a very important social event. This is, in fact, a legacy of capitalism. If one rickshaw-puller Chandan, who is a very good friend of mine, can rise to the position of a lawyer, why can not thousands and millions of rickshaw-puller do so? I would, therefore, urge upon the Government as well as the union's of rickshaw-pullers to extend their help in the advancement of these people. I feel there is no difference between a sweeper, a chamar and other low caste people and you and I because they have been given this low status by old and rotten scriptures and it is necessary to discard such things. The job of rickshaw-puller is that of an animal, it leads us to a barbaric society. The Government does not have any answer to this. They will give meaningless reply which will have no relevance to this issue.

* *** *** ***

Mr. Shahnawaz will simply comply with the formalities. In fact, the solution of the problem is to agree in principle to pay at least Rs. 250 per month to the scavenging staff and the President should be given not more than Rs. 1000 inclusive of all allowances. Whether it is TATA or BIRLA he should also have a maximum of Rs. 1000 per month to spend and if this proposition is followed then we will certainly be able to do away with this inhuman practice.

Criticism of Indian History*

Mr. Speaker, today, we are discussing the contents of the book on human history brought out by the International Commission constituted by the UNESCO, an organ of the United Nations. This is the first book on the history of man which deals with ancient oriental history and the origin of civilisation. Though it has been published by the International Commission on History, but the responsibility for it lies equally on the United Nations, UNESCO and the Government of India in as much as the name of even Dr. Radhakrishnan figures among the people who entered into correspondence with this International Commission on History. This is about the responsibility.

Now this is perhaps for the first time that we are discussing in the Lok Sabha some classical work and, therefore, it would not be inappropriate if Government and the hon. Minister pay attention to the fundamentals of the book and work for some sort of reorientation. I do not want them to reply to insignificant and frivolous points.

We know the serious consequences of the errors committed in writing history and of misinterpretation and distortions of history. After all, what is history? It tells us about our past; it is the perception of our past whether complete, incomplete, wrong or right. Our future and present is built by this perception of the past. If the past is understood in a wrong manner, our future and present will also be built wrongly. I would like to give an example. Our temples were destroyed during medieval period.

* Lok Sabha Debates, 26 March, 1966.

But if their history is recorded now and simply it is written that the temples were destroyed by Muslim conquerors, then it would be only a half-truth, a partial historic truth, only an initiative. But if it is also recorded that our ancestors were so incompetent and incapable that they could not halt foreign aggression, then it would be to some extent, a complete history, a history that evinces an agony, which compels us not to allow such things happen in future and makes us realise that the Muslims living with us—after-all, they were once Hindus—had no hand in that invasion and that we should not avenge that on them. We should try to assess the history dispassionately and not with anger.

Now the errors committed in this book may appear to be frivolous, but by giving examples I shall try to show how the Indian history has been distorted by both Indian and foreign writers. Whatever creative work is done here is considered by them to be essentially imitation of China, Egypt etc. The result is that Mr. Leynord Wooli, the writer of the history book for the U.N., tends to think that the architectural work of the northern gate of the great Stupa of Sanchi is an imitation of wooden architecture of China. Now, Mr. Speaker, the interesting part of it is that the error was pointed out not by any member of this Commission on Indian History who are supposed to point out such a thing, nor even by Dr. Radhakrishnan or any person of his calibre, but by a Russian, Professor Diaknoff and Mr. Ilyin.

Then Leynord Wooli writes a small note saying that as far as impact of China is concerned Prof. Ilyin has, no doubt, pointed out this error, but I had such an impression, although there is no proof of it and I thought it fit to reflect that impression in the book. This is the history written by him. The Stupa was erected at Sanchi and inspiration was stated to have been got from China; Prof. Ilyin of Russia points out the error in the history book brought out by U.N. Above all, Prof. Wooli thinks it fit to record the impression in the book without any valid proof..... Dr. Singh, you say that he was a cynic, but I say all the historians, whether Indian or foreign suffer from cynicism. The result is that today every Indian child thinks that every good

many arguments in support of his contention. I would like to refer to only one thing. The poetry is old and there are separate evidences to prove it. I had asked Shri Govardhan Rai Sharma who is a teacher and has been engaged in the excavation work of Kaushambi, to write an article in this regard after deep study. He has sent his article to me. It is in many parts and some of them are very technical. I would read out one sentence from his article. There is a device called radio carbon of analysing old things. This device can determine the age of antiques. He has said that the method of Radio Carbon has been found after the publication of the report on Kaushambi. On examination of various items of pottery found during excavation of Kaushambi, it could be said with certainty that these items of pottery belong to the period from 2035 B.C. to 640 B.C. The foreign scholars have ignored the results of excavation work done in Kaushambi or other places. The historians of even our own country do not attach much importance to these results. If you like, I would send this note to you and it may be laid on the Table of the House. The Government of India may like to discuss the matter with the United Nations in the light of this note.

Now the main problem is that historians always hold the view that whatever good had happened in India was the contribution of alien stock. The indigenous inhabitants of this country were not competent to discover new things. This book also says that the large fortification in Harappa.

I will conclude, if you give me three ^{***} or four ^{***} minutes more. Instead of translating it into Hindi, I read out English Text. The writer says:

"The elaborate fortification of the citadels would hardly have been necessary to protect the cities against raiding parties from the mountains of Baluchistan; more probably they were intended to overawe the countryside, the assumption being that the ruler and citizens were of an alien stock which had reduced their indigenous inhabitants to the status of serfs."

This is what the Historians write. I need not go in detail. In

* When Hon. Chairman pointed out that his time was over.

this context, I would like to praise the Historians of USSR, though they have not given fair account of the Czar of their own country. I salute them. After all, they have given better account of ancient history of India than that was given by Britishers and other Western Historians. Prof. I.M. Diakonoff and Prof. G.F. Ilyin have written:—

“Prof. I.M. Diakonoff and Prof. G.F. Ilyin note that no conclusive proof exists that the ruling class was of foreign origin. The citadels may have been similar to the baronial castles of Germany in the Middle Ages.”

Now Sir Leynord Wooli writes that there are two reasons which prove that this fort was built by foreigners and the inhabitants of the fort were alien. No doubt, the new civilisation was brought to this country, but the remnants of old civilisation were also available. I would like to submit that if research is conducted in the same manner in Germany, USSR and England, one may find ruins of various wars fought among them and the remains of different civilisations. New civilisation is the result of inter-action and intuition. But historians are not prepared to agree that intuition of indigenous inhabitants can develop new civilisation in this country. I would like to say that such Historians have totally destroyed the real History of India, because even the renowned Historians of our country harbour the concept that any sort of renaissance that takes place in our country, is the outcome of physical interaction of alien stock, may it be Afghans, Moghuls or Britishers. The result is that a tendency has developed among the speakers to say that our's is a unique country and it can absorb and compromise with all the civilisations. We believe that there is unity in diversity in our country and this very poisonous line of thinking in our history has affected the minds of the present day Indian politician to the extent that he thinks himself to be progressive and says, let the foreign invader come and win our country. It makes no difference to us, because gradually our rich, most powerful and immortal culture will win him, absorb him. This line of thinking in the history should be done away with altogether. The approach is of two types. One is of a slave and the other is that of the

master. For the last one thousand years, our approach has been that of the slave and not of the master.

In this connection I would not blame only the foreigners. All the historians absorb the same poison. Today, there are two schools of thought of history in India. One is of Dr. Tara Chand and the other is that of Dr. Majoomdar and both of them toe the same line of thinking i.e., the unity in diversity line. Forgetting what is real India, we concentrate on diversities in India.

So far as the advent of new civilization is concerned, we have renaissance again and again. Sometimes Raja Ram Mohan Roy and sometimes Man Singh and Abul Fazal brought renaissance and before that Ghazni and Ghauri were responsible for it. But this renaissance could never face the next foreign invader. So, I would request the Government to consider seriously this aspect of the history. We are having half-an-hour discussion on it, but the discussion on this subject should continue for two to three days because it concerns Mizos, Nagas, Kashmiris etc.

....Today, the same poison of history is behind all the conflicts of Mizos, Nagas, Kashmiris or adivasis. They play one culture against the other and categorise the people into Aryans; Non-aryans, Mangols, Dravids. They say that the particular community was original inhabitants. There is no proof of it. This edifice has been built only on the basis of a small issue like language. We have seen the results of all this. U.N.O., the world body, has brought out this particular book of history. I would request Chagla Saheb not to try to reply to me.

I do not want any reply. I want that he should do something about History and Mathematics, because these two subjects will make or mar India's future. History is the knowledge of past and if we do not know our history in the right perspective and if we do not teach our children properly, this country can never become prosperous and happy. Mathematics is the base of science which has taken the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. to the Moon. In our universities History & Mathematics are in the state of decay. Some efforts should be made to improve the situation.

Budget—General Discussion

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are holding a discussion on the question of mobilising Rs. 20 billions and in one sense Rs. 55 billions. This amount has to be mobilised. Is there any other better method to mobilise this amount and how much of this amount should be spent and on what different heads it could be spent? It is a very wide question and concerns the entire country.

First of all, I would like to draw your attention towards politics and administration in regard to relationship between the Ministers and the bureaucrats. The number of people doing politics including MLAs is 4,000 and among them the number of Ministers is about 400. The number of employees working under the Government is about one crore. Now what should be the relationship between the Ministers and the bureaucrats? It is a very serious issue. In this connection, I would like to say a few words about the hon. Minister of Home Affairs.....

*** *** ***

In February this year, the hon. Minister of Home Affairs got a gentleman (this is what I would like to call him here) appointed as a member of the Public Service Commission. The gentleman was a Chief Engineer upto March 1956 in Bihar.

*** *** ***

*Lok Sabha Debates, 5 March, 1964.

Interruptions^a

*** *** ***

As a matter of fact, I had told the hon. Minister and had given him in writing that - I would raise this issue in my Budget speech. He has also written letters to me in this regard. But it is between him and me.

*** *** ***

Interruptions^b

*** *** ***

I was not aware that it was necessary to write to you. As a matter of fact it would have been my pleasure to write to you and I would, definitely, have written to you. But question is such that.....

*** *** ***

Interruptions^c

*** *** ***

Then, please let me complete it, because he knows about it.

He was 53 years old. He had two years more service to attain the age of superannuation. Even then, the Bihar Council of Ministers decided that no more job would be assigned to him in the State. A discussion to this effect took place in the Bihar Legislative Assembly on 6 March, 1956. The Members put a barrage of questions. In his reply the hon. Minister informed the House that the Council of Ministers had decided to dispense with his services and not to give him any further extension. This

^a Mr. Speaker: I would like to state that in case you want to raise a case about a particular person and a reply is sought from the Minister in this connection, a prior notice is to be given so that the Minister is in a position to go through the entire case and give a reply. Now, the hon. Member, who is going to make a point in respect of an individual case, perhaps, has not given any prior notice.

^b Mr. Speaker: Had you given me in writing, I would have told you.

^c Mr. Speaker: Exactly, it would also have been a pleasure for me to receive your letter.

decision was taken on 6 March, 1956 not on Government papers, but in the open House debate of the State Legislative Assembly.

In July, 1956 *i.e.* after a lapse of 2-3 months of the above decision the present Home Minister who was the Minister of Irrigation at that time got him appointed as the Chief Engineer of Flood Controls at Delhi.

Now I put forth these two points before you for consideration. In 1964, when the hon. Minister of Home Affairs assumed charge, this officer was appointed as a Member of the Public Service Commission and in 1956, when the hon. Minister was the Minister of Irrigation, he got the officer appointed as the Chief Engineer even though the Government of Bihar had already ruled out granting him further extension of service.

In case it will be said that Shri Patil or Shri Kanungo had recommended his case, I would like to say that the recommendation was made later on and it has no connection with the case. Even if his case was recommended, the other persons who have been holding the charge of the Ministry of Home Affairs got 3-5 people appointed as Members of the Public Service Commission except this officer.

I would like to say about a very minor thing that on the occasion of the marriage ceremony of the daughter of the Hon. Home Minister's maternal aunt's son...

*** *** ***

I have nothing to do with the officer. I am concerned with the Minister

*** *** ***

Here, we are discussing about the administration and politics and the leaders and bureaucrats. If these 400 Ministers become partial and use their discretionary powers in their relationship with one crore Government servants, it will prove disastrous for the entire country. People can go to any extent in becoming partial and using discretionary powers for their relatives. I have already said how strong are the relationship in the family, and

working under them used to get only Rs. 70 and the people below them used to receive only Rs. 60 and the labourers used to get only Rs. 15 to Rs. 20. Their average wages used to be only Rs. 40. There is a wide gap between Rs. 110, which was claimed by the Corporation and Rs. 40, the average paid to the workers. This is the height of dishonesty. All this bungling was done during the construction of Darbhanga Aerodrome. I don't want to name the contractors or the persons to whom they were related and who had pocketed those funds. But all this happens due to the collusion between the bureaucrats and Ministers and if this system is not checked, it will bring chaos to the country.

Suppose Minister himself does not accumulate money, his relatives do this job or he collects money for his Party, he thinks himself a saint. His mind gets blocked and he starts thinking that he is not doing anything wrong and is leading a simple life. Therefore, he becomes more corrupt than that Minister who leads a gay life. If we do not keep an eye on such things, the country will not achieve any progress.

I would like to mention relations between trade and politics. I have been asked to tell about all those things about which I have not got the reply. There are several things. If I start telling about them, it will take a lot of time. But I would like to relate one instance which shows the relation between trade and politics. There is one person, whose name is Shri Chiranjilal Bajuria. He is a Managing Agent in a big company at Kanpur. That company is called British India Corporation, which has earned a bad name in the entire country. A number of Ministers were involved in making him the Managing Agent and the Life Insurance Corporation, which is a Government body, also voted in favour of his appointment. Before that, the Govt. had imposed fine on him in the case of violation of FERA while in Meghna and Mackelyog Company. Such a person, who was fined by the Government, was voted to the post of Managing Agent in British India Corporation. This is the relation between trade and politics. This person is involved in some criminal cases also such as murder etc. The entire Calcutta and Kanpur is aware of it. Such people are given preference. What is the

I am giving an example of principle. I have given an example of the relations between the Minister and the bureaucrat and secondly, I have given an example of the relations existing between the trade and the politics. Thirdly, I would like to submit that a detailed discussion should be held in this House immediately on this issue that human life has lost its value in our country. It has become worst than that of a fly. People settle their disputes through murders etc. Sometimes such incidents take place in Raichur and sometimes in Shillong. So a detailed discussion should be held on this issue. At least, we should understand the value of life.

The hon. Minister has not replied to many of my points. I will not raise any question about No. 1. I have raised them a lot, but do not get any reply. I would like to submit about the issues about No. 2. I may draw your attention to No. 1, the Prime Minister about one thing. The issue of tax evasion is mentioned here every now and then and it is said that Rs. 30 billion or Rs. 80 billion of unaccounted money is floating in the market. People evade taxes. I have information of the house of the Prime Minister situated in Allahabad upto 1962. I have got on official letter that the tax being paid on the house is only Rs. 1800 per annum, where as it should be Rs. 1800 to Rs. 2000 per month.....

A question on the subject was asked from the Prime Minister Five years ago, he had said that he will ask the Allahabad Municipal corporation to increase the tax, but nothing has been done in that regard. How can we expect from the citizens of our country...

*** *** ***
Interruptions^a
 *** *** ***

I am saying the Hon. Prime Minister to look towards himself before saying anything to others.

*** *** ***
Interruptions^b
 *** *** ***

I am not happy to raise all these things. I give more preference to fundamental issues. But some rubbish has been

^a Mr. Speaker: If the Corporation does not increase the tax can we order them to do so, after holding a discussion?

^b Mr. Speaker: It is not related with it.

collected. If this crowd thinks that it will shout me down, it is impossible. I will say what I want even if I am alone and I will only obey the hon. Speaker. I will never listen to the orders of any crowd. I may make it clear. Therefore, I would like to take up the fundamental issues.

*** *** ***

Interruptions^a

*** *** ***

The entire House is not my target. My remarks are directed at some Members in particular. I shall give them respect only if they respect me.

*** *** ***

Interruptions^b

*** *** ***

I should be allowed to express my views. I want protection only to that extent.

I want to touch the fundamental reasons. As current issues gain importance, I am unable to go into the details of fundamental issues. There may be some things which Hindus lack. These things must be noted. The majority of the population in this country consists of Hindus. But we can see that we have made no progress in the last 1500 years. Just now I heard a story. The World Champion in Boxing, Cassius Clay has

^a **Mr. Speaker:** It is all right, if you mean what you say. But to call the entire House a crowd and to say that you will not listen to them, it is not reasonable... (*Interruptions*)... When I am saying, why do you interfere? However much we may be angry with one another or however much we may hate the next person, we must have respect for others in some matters. If we respect each other here, people will respect us outside the House. If we talk to each other in this way, we all will be humiliated and not any single person. You can say whatever you want but certainly not using such language.

^b **Mr. Speaker:** When the time comes, I shall protect your honour as I do in case of others.

converted to Islam. People will say that such cases are rare and his conversion to Islam has got no importance. Today, we find people all over the world converting to Christianity or Islam, but not to Hinduism. Doesn't this phenomenon warrant serious thought keeping in view their huge population? Something is fundamentally wrong somewhere. If we look at the root cause, we shall find that we are not an integrated nation. We may spend Rs. 20 billion or Rs. 50 billion but all this comes to nothing if we are unable to reform ourselves or the society we live in. Our society should be a unified whole of 44 crore people. What we have today is a disintegrated society. Things have become so artificial that even the Government has played a role in this matter. Over the radio we hear the songs of "Zara aankh mein bhar lo paani".

For soldiers who have been killed at the hands of the Chinese, it is said—"Zara aankh mein bhar lo paani." What a superficial culture! To face the enemy we must arrest our tears and control our anger, but we are asked to shed tears "aankh mein bhar lo paani." These are crocodile tears. Beating of women is common all over the world but not to the extent as is seen in India. My first reaction to this was one of anger, but later on, I realized that India, male is subjected to unlimited humiliation and verbal abuse at work, in the field and in the market. Being unable to reply in the same coin, he vents his pent-up fury on his wife. The Women in turn take out their anger on their children. A number of times, I have felt that atrocities on Children....

At least you can give me freedom to say that hon. Members have no concern for the country's welfare judging by their attitude.

What will be the result of an atrocity which has been perpetrated from the very beginning. Spending Rs. 20 billion or Rs. 50 billion is no remedy for this deep-rooted malaise. There has been such a tremendous erosion of values in Indian society that the Government is not willing to run the country. Drastic steps have to be taken to redeem the situation. Society is now divided into classes and groups on the basis of caste and

income. There is no unified nation as such. On the other hand each of the classes or groups is content in its own customs, traditions and religious rites. Today there is no concept of a nation and factionalism still exists in society.

At this juncture the role of Council of Ministers comes up. What does the Council of Ministers do? Once on a visit to the Japanese town of Kobe, one morning I saw thousands of little boys and girls wearing white shirt and blue shorts. When I asked about it, I was told that the children were going to school. In cities of India, children are made to wear colourful dresses and the hon. Minister calls it unity in diversity. This is Indian culture. Is this the way to build a nation? Attention must be paid to this fundamental malaise and its drift in society.

I am trying to present the figures in respect of 27 crore people who subsist on an income of three annas per day; 16.5 crore people subsisting on Re. 1 per day and 50 lakh people on Rs. 35 per day. In other words there are 39 crore people in this country belonging to backward classes. This group not only consists of Hindus but Muslims, Harijans and all the women also.

*** *** ***

....Among the 5 crore people of higher castes, 4.5 crore are poor and 50 lakh are rich. As long as our society remains fragmented on economic and caste lines and our Budget does not have provision to remove this fragmentation,....it is pointless to talk of capitalism, socialism or monopoly. There cannot be any capital formation in this situation. I will explain the basic reason underlying this. According to my calculation, Rs. 50 billion of the country's national income is held by 50 lakh people of this country. Even according to official estimates, the figure should stand around Rs. 25 billion. In India, private entrepreneurs earn profit at the rate of 30% or 40%. There is no use repeating this point, but I know that Members from both sides have said that very few incentives are offered to businessmen. Is it possible for a private entrepreneur anywhere

in the world to earn profit at the rate of 30% to 40%? It is said that incentives should be offered to businessmen. But when I raise this point, my attention is drawn to other aspects also.

On every bureaucrat who earns Rs. 1000, the Government spends Rs. 5,000 in perks such as housing and various allowances etc. At present, perks and profit margin in this country are very high. Until this is controlled, mobilisation of capital and reducing the tax burden is not possible.

Similarly I mentioned estate duty, expenditure tax and gift tax. It was opined that such taxes would weaken industry and trade. I made some calculations. The States got a maximum of Rs. 8 crores. There are no new tax proposals in this Budget. The Central Government gets hardly Rs. 5 crores. The total revenue is Rs. 20 billion or Rs. 25 billion and even if my estimate is on the higher side, it should be around Rs. 15 billion. So it is futile on our part to discuss an amount of Rs. 10 crores which constitutes a very small portion of the total tax receipts. Whenever we discuss the matter of tax burden, we get into controversies instead of fixing a limit. Octroi is levied on kerosene oil, coarse cloth and sugar. Sugar costs 9 annas per 'seer' but octroi and other taxes are levied on sugar at the rate of 7 annas per 'seer'. The Government earns huge amount of revenue through octroi and other taxes. In this process the rich people also earn a profit of 3 annas per 'seer'. We can save Rs. 15 billion to Rs. 20 billion if we can exercise some control over the 50 lakh people who have a collective income of Rs. 50 billion earned through high profits and perks. Until then we cannot ease the tax burden.

Today, I take this opportunity to thank Shri Man Singh Patel who proposed that land revenue should be done away with in case of farmers who have upto 5 acres of land holdings. I think that this limit should be raised to 6.5 acres but even 5 acres would be acceptable. When such ideas are mooted there is always a difference of opinion. Replying to this question in particular, the Prime Minister rather posed a question as to how to go about abolishing land revenue. It does not signify maturity of thought if one thinks that the

Government will not be able to function if land revenue is abolished. The maturity of thought would be that out of total sum of 55 billion rupees hardly sixty to seventy crore rupees are received as land revenue from the farmers having six and a half acres of land. Therefore, it should be abolished.

Similarly, as regards the prices of foodgrains, I would emphatically urge that the prices of foodgrains should be checked so that they do not escalate beyond one *anna per seer* between two harvests. The Ministers are unable to give proper reply. On the contrary they cleverly complicate the issues and create confusion whether the prices of foodgrains should be controlled to curb price rise or not and whether the banks should be nationalised or not, I would like to say that the objective of restricting the price hike to one *anna per seer* between two harvests is not being achieved. As such first of all, this objective should be set and thereafter this issue should be discussed. But this objective is not set.

Similarly, the issue of mobilisation of capital has been referred to in this House. In this context, I would like to say that the Indian Society has disintegrated to such a large extent that there is wide spread jealousy, animosity and selfishness all around. You must have seen people taking out processions in support of their demands in front of the Parliament House very often. Sometimes, workers of an Insurance Company take out a procession, as they are going to do today itself, sometimes we see the procession taken out by the hawkers who are the victims of police atrocities and at times the procession of the bank employees but a procession representing the grievances of the common men of this country is rarely seen. The main reason is that the Finance Ministry have divided Central Government employees into several grades with marginal difference. Some employees get Rs. 105 whereas others get Rs. 110. There is good number of grades as in the case of castes. There is heart burning among the people on account of these grades. This takes the shape of clash of interest between the groups. The factual position of the country is not projected before the common man. They are not aware of the fact that

the country cannot develop unless there is mobilisation of capital resources. Every one is struggling to extract the maximum from the Centre. This trend has spread throughout the length and breadth of this country.

I would like to urge that when I gave the suggestion to do away with all other classes except the third class in Railways, Shri Dasappa quoted the example of Russia. In Russia an appropriate example to be quoted for the Indian situation. I am referring to Britain which is a capitalist country....

...I want to say one thing regarding Shri Ashok Sen. I was deeply pained yesterday when he read opinion of the Law Secretary and took its shelter. A Minister should not behave in this manner. I would urge that since childhood whatever I have read is that in Parliament, it is the Minister and not the Secretary who is solely responsible for taking decisions in any matter. If the decision is good, the entire credit goes to the Minister and he is commended but if the decision is disliked by the people, the Minister is condemned....

*** *** ***

Shri Banerjee has referred to Dara and Shahjahan in this context. I have great regard for Shri Banerjee and Shri Indulal Jainik. Both of them have proved that even if the mother tongue of a person is other than Hindi, he can speak the language more fluently than a Hindi speaking person.

From the biography of Aurangzeb, written by Shri Yadunath Sarkar, I am reading out a portion which pertains to Dara and Shahjahan. It is as follows:

“The Emperor’s illness was taking serious turn. His lower limbs were gradually swelling. His tongue was becoming dry. The king stopped the practice of coming to the *Jharokha* to enable his people to have a glance of their emperor as he used to do in the past every morning. His courtiers were not allowed to go close to the ailing king. Only Dara and some of his trusted officers could go near him. But requirements of the State have greater importance and as such Shahjahan had to go to the *Jharokha* on 14th September in a critical condition.”

*** *** ***

I only wish to say that Dara's policies were not strong enough. Had he ruled his kingdom single handed without depending on others, results of his policies would have been commendable. Since Shahjahan had lost his physical and intellectual capabilities, his policies could not achieve any thing. I only wish to say that there is something inherent in the Delhi seat that the policies take wrong shape. Things cannot be streamlined till the 43 crore population living in this country resort to protest. Malaviyaji, socialism cannot be brought through budget. Socialism can come only when the 43 crore people of this country become alert and start registering their protest against wrong policies.

Supplementary Demands for Grants (Railways)*

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I stand to oppose, and will continue to oppose these grants untill all the classes, other than the third class, in railway compartments are not abolished. In this connection, the Minister for Railways has stated that there are four classes of Railway compartments in Soviet Union. Such examples are not valid in our context; but if at all he has to give examples, let him cite the one in Britain where only two classes—first and third exist and many trains have only third class compartments. The only difference between the first and the third class is that in the third class, seats and berths have artefact velvet coverings whereas in first class, these are covered with leather; but as for the fare, the difference is of one and a half times only. However, leaving aside examples of foreign countries, we should think in the context of our own country's present condition as to whether we can abolish all the classes other than the third class. I am of the view that these should be done away with.

*** *** ***

This demand for grant pertains to the administrative expenditure. Therefore, I can speak on all these things since these affect the trains as also the administration of trains. This department governs first, second and third that is all the classes of compartments. Therefore, unless the authorities abolish all other classes except the third class, we should not grant funds

*Lok Sabha Debates, 10 March, 1964

to them. I wish we could focus our attention on this basic ailment whereas, we always get entangled in other trifles.

Today, our country is in such a wretched state to the extent that it does not have any match in the world. On one hand our society is divided, income and expenditure-wise into numerous strata, so much so that no other country had ever been in such a situation in the past or in the present times. Economically, this country is substantially broken down and as much down is its moral too. I may draw your attention towards our history of last ten-fifteen centuries. From Ramanujam to Dayanand, all great souls, like Vasvanna, Mahavira, Guru Nanak, Kabir all of them tried to unite this country, all of them wanted to abolish casteism, but ultimately each of them left behind a sect of his own. We have to find out a solution for all these things. Our country has been rundown economically and disheartened morally. Taking in view the wide disparity between the poor and the rich, as also inequality between people of higher castes and lower castes, we would have to find out some basic solution of these evils. That's why I ask for abolishment of all the classes other than the third class, in railways so as to unite this disintegrated country where do exist a big gap between the rich and the poor.

While raising this point I also want to draw your attention toward the fact that all the arrangements that we have made in our country—take for instance, the whole administration of Railway—speak of inequality in income, expenditure, and dearness allowance etc., because all the grants are being given on the old pattern. Instead of uniting the country, they are disintegrating it, economically as well as caste-wise. So, it has become more necessary to take some measures to wipe out economic inequality and inequality of status among various castes. Small measures will not work here. That's why I have moved this motion. Today, such examples of foreign countries does not have any relevance because no other country in the world is as much disintegrated as our India is. If you connect all these things you will find the same trend everywhere in our country.

Further, I want to say that all children in the age group of 5 to 11 years should be imparted education in the schools on the same pattern, irrespective of the status of their parents. We can build nation only if we take such measures, and only in this context, I have placed before you the Indian history of the last ten-fifteen centuries.

I urge upon the hon. members as well as hon. Minister of Railways, not to just brush aside my suggestions. They should consider my suggestions seriously. I do not say that they may do so for ever. It is quite possible that after ten-fifteen or twenty years, India's economic condition might improve to such an extent that even the poorest among the poors may get a square meal and regain his self respect. And the employees of Railways such as the scavengers, the guards, the conductors etc. too may learn to respect all human beings alike without drawing any distinction between them on the basis of their appearance reflected from their faces and dresses.

When, after fifteen, twenty or thirty years, such a situation may arise, then you may make more classes in the Railways if you then so desire. In this connection, it is not correct to give this argument that we have to provide facilities to the foreigners, and that is why we are providing air-conditioned compartments or 1st class compartments in the trains. My clear-cut reply is: let separate classes be provided for the foreigners. As the Government have to earn foreign exchange from the foreigners let separate bogies be attached for them and there should be a rule to the effect that no Indian citizen can travel in these higher-class coaches. It will create a different mentality in our minds and in our society, as against the nation that none, else than about fifty lakh people of high classes, get these facilities. The Railways are a very large organisation in which 12 or 14 lakh employees are working, for whom are these employees working? They are for the 44 crores people of the country. But I would like to emphasize that these 12 or 14 lakhs employees have been serving only the high class people and not the 44 crores ordinary people of the country. When this type of situation will change? And how it will change? I have cited

my own example. I tell you from my own experience that all the employees in the trains—such as Guards, Conductors, sweepers—give attention only to the travellers who are travelling in the Air-Conditioned or the 1st class compartments; or to the persons like me whom they know to be the Members of Parliament lest they should not raise any issue in the Parliament. Therefore, they give full attention to these people. General Compartments are not even cleaned by the sweepers. After all how will it change? It will be changed neither by giving speeches nor by any other manner nor by providing petty facilities to the lower class travellers. It can be changed only when all the classes, except the third class, are abolished so that all the rich and poor people travel by the same class for the next ten, fifteen or twenty years.

Well, if the Minister of Railways or the Deputy Speaker, or some rich people, some Saints or Mahatamas start travelling in the same class then what will be the result. Saint Kabir wanted to unite the society and to make it one community by bringing together thousands of communities; but, at last the result was that one more separate community known as 'Kabir Panth' was added to the already existing thousands of other communities and its followers went on increasing. Therefore, I ask you to remove the Casteism, to remove the distinction between high and low, to reduce disparity in economic condition. Here I would like to add one thing that I am asking only to reduce it and I am not very much emphasizing on removing it. Here the classes in the railways should be such as in Russia and in England so that disparity in the income may be restricted to a certain level. Therefore, I say that all other classes except class-III may be removed for a short period.

Demands for Grants of Ministry of Information and Broadcasting*

Sir, one of my friends returned from Russia recently and told me that Russians are of the opinion that there is no 'Izvestia' in 'Pravda' and there is no 'Pravda' in 'Izvestia'. These are two newspapers of Russia. 'Pravda' means truth and 'Izvestia' means news. The same thing holds good for India also. Here there is no news in truth and no truth in news. I cite an example from AIR's programmes. Only one half-an-hour programme is liked by me. Whenever the dance of Meera with Lord Krishna is depicted or the unblemished character of Kabir is portrayed, it gives momentary pleasure to a traditionalist like me. But even this truth is not powerful enough to change our society and to give it a new direction. Apart from this, what type of truth we find in the news is quite clear. From newspapers it appears as if India is respected in the world. Today the world ridicules at our country. Perhaps no other country has made itself a laughing stock to such an extent. We are not receiving the correct news. Regarding the Kashmir issue in the Security Council, the local newspapers made out as if we had won. After 10 days we came to know that it was not a victory but a defeat. What will we gain from this type of news? A lot of development was taking place in the country but all that was nullified in one stroke. This type of news will not benefit the country. News must be based on facts.

In the developing countries the largest source of news is the

*Lok Sabha Debates, 17 March, 1964

Government and a Government wants to remain in power even if it has to tell lies. My first advice is that as far as possible news should reflect the truth. If the Government is unable to ensure this, let the public take on the responsibility.

The state of newspapers is quite apparent. If I were in power, I would have introduced a law for people like Shri Goenka so that they relinquish the co-ownership of newspapers and mills.

I wish that I may say some more on this topic. But this Government is not capable of taking over the newspapers which Mr. Goenka owns. I shall only say this much that in India mill-owners, be they sugar mills or jute mills, should not have the right to ownership of newspapers. Actually this is a complex issue and minor steps will not resolve it. Probably nobody among us, not even the Hon. Minister, may be able to do it because this country has lost its identity. I have always wanted to speak on this reality instead of bringing up mundane issues. But what to do? For the last 1500 years the picture before us is of lord Vishnu. We merely offer prayers to Him and expect that we shall get justice when we see progress in terms of 'prayers', 'bhajans' and 'yagnas' how can we face realities or achieve our objectives? Nothing will be achieved until the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting makes people realise the futility of 'pujas' and 'Yagnas' as far as attainment of their objectives is concerned. Perhaps I am giving suggestions to people who are themselves afflicted by this disease. In fact the whole of this country is gripped by this disease. I shall give an example and also make a clarification. Last time when I told that there was no proper scientific research I meant that scientists in India would become productive when they focus their attention on qualities of the human mind rather than the religious side of life in this country. I also told that a scientist could make better progress if he marries a daughter of an influential person instead of breaking new ground in scientific research. At that time people thought that my remarks were targetted at a particular scientist. That was not my intention at all. In our country there is a tendency to resort to sycophancy, name-dropping, glib-talk, 'pujas' and 'Kirtans'. Until the Hon. Minister

takes steps to curb such tendencies , there can be no objective information and broadcasting work in this country.

*** *** ***

....Let me tender one more advice. I do not know every one working in the All India Radio, but I know a lady of that department since long. She is very smart, very diligent and very intelligent. Had she been a little bit sycophant, she would have become a very high officer in the A.I.R. by now. Now she is holding a lower position and might be at the seventh, eighth or ninth position. It has to be noted that people are being promoted through sycophancy. That is why performance of most of the departments in the Government is not good, irrespective of the fact whether it is the A.I.R., the Ministry of Education or any other Ministry. Before I proceed further in this regard, I would like to give an account of the some minor details in this regard. If possible, the Hon. Minister should open an university through the A.I.R. A teaching programme could be started for 3-4 hours daily through the A.I.R. through which people could be imparted education equal to B.A. and M.A. or something better than that. It is possible. But one thing about which I would like to warn is that if the aforesaid programme is conducted in English medium, it will create more problems. In case you propose to conduct this programme in English then it would be better if you ignore my suggestion. This work should be carried on in Indian languages only—A university of the A.I.R.

Alongwith this, I would like to tender one more advice about the employees working in the A.I.R or other Ministries. Employees, who carry out their work in Indian languages get about half the salary of the employees doing work in English, rather, they get even less than that. This is not a proper method of implementing a good language policy in the country. When I am talking about employees, let me say a few words about the temporary employees. They are called staff artists and their plight is miserable. If you pay attention to their plight, I am sure, there will be some

change. It has to be done. As compared to their colleagues who are permanent, their condition is deplorable.

On the basis of this report, we come to know that all the newspapers in Indian languages all over the country get advertisements worth Rs. 21 lakhs whereas English newspapers alone, got advertisements worth Rs. 30 lakhs. What should I say in this regard. If I use some strong words in this regard, people will get annoyed with me. No doubt, on this occasion I really want to utter some strong words. Similarly, I would like to tell one more thing to the Hon. Minister. I have received a letter from his State. It had considerable emotional touch. The writer of the letter wrote to me with the request to inform Shri Satya Narayan Sinha that in Bihar and I think in several other States in the country as well, girl child is eliminated even now. There are several families and castes in the country which feel so sad on the birth of a girl child that they consider it wise to kill her at that very moment. If killing of girl child continues in the country, I do not think that justice can gain ground... The writer of the letter had requested me to read out the letter to Shri Satya Narayan.

No such programme is being broadcast through the A.I.R. or by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting which is interesting and attractive and which could help in eradication of this type of evil from the society. If one says "speak the truth" or "do not indulge in adulteration", nobody would listen. Similar other advices like chewing the food while eating or not to talk while eating etc. will remain unheard. But if you air all these things through an interesting programme and try to change the habits of the people, it is possible that our country may also become civilised to some extent.

While making a reference to make the country civilised, I must say a few words about civilisation. The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting is supposed to be more connected with it. What is civilisation? Does civilisation mean that people will be arrested after 50 hours of their taking out a peaceful procession for ventilating their grievances and they are not allowed even bail. Does civilisation mean that a Member of

Parliament for example Shri Bagri should take shelter here. There was a time when there used to be an Emperor in Delhi. It is a place for shelter. Instead of allowing him to stay in any of the 50 rooms of the Parliament House, he is lying under a tree. Is it civilization?*

*** *** ***

....Here, we talk much that we are civilized. Is it our civilization to remain a mute spectator when a country attacks our country and we allow a minister of that country to use our airspace. Is this the civilization? It means dominate the weaker ones and submit before the stronger ones. If our electronic media or the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting continue to propagate this kind of civilization, the problems afflicting the country would continue for ever. Civilized conduct means to face courageously, the stronger ones and adopt a benevolent approach towards the weak. It would be in the interest of the country if the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting takes cue from this and acts accordingly.

Once, I had taken up the subject of Men, Women and Children for discussion but could not complete. It is a subject, which has got nothing to do with current politics, but Mr. Speaker, Sir, do you know why our womenfolk have suffered so much throughout the course of our 1500 years old political and social history?

*** *** ***

Earlier, I used to get furious on this matter and it kept me restless for about eight to ten years. At that time. I had not understood the crux of the problem, but when I thought deeply about it, I came to the conclusion that the desperate and helpless Indian male harassed by his boss throughout the day, gives vent to his rage and frustration by mercilessly treating the womenfolk when he returns home. Similarly, the

* In reply Mr. Speaker said, "I cannot change Parliament House into residential quarter."

women harassed by their menfolk give vent to their anger and fury on the innocent children.

*** *** ***

Sometimes, I feel an urge to quit politics and to form a children's party to launch a struggle against their thrashing by their parents for no rhyme or reason. The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting should utilize all the means at its disposal to propagate and instil in the minds of the people, such a way of life wherein powerful one restrains himself from attacking the weak, just to give vent to his or her anger and helplessness. All efforts should be made to check this negative human tendency, this unending chain of tyranny and oppression, which motivated a powerful country like China to attack its weak neighbour. The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting should draw a long term plan to weed out this malady, which is deeply rooted in our minds. However, to achieve this objective, the Government and the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting should first of all get rid of it themselves and in the process become more civilized and courteous. Only if they do so, they would be able to impart basics of civilized behaviour to their fellow countrymen. A discourteous and uncivilized person can never teach others.

Demands for Grants of Ministry of Defence

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is no relation between the forces of olden days like those which were victorious in Flanders and Al Amin and the forces of today. It would be meaningless to say that army in those days was stronger than that of today. No similarity should be struck between the two. Army at that time fought for the British Emperor or Empress, British factories supplied weapons to them and British officers did the supervision in the subjugated country which was kept under a peculiar discipline. But in today's army nothing of that sort is left, it is merely the skeleton of what it was. I regret to say that the link of the chain has worn out. British empire has gone, but except for that link the whole of the chain is as it was. This was proved in the closing ceremony of the Republic Day i.e. on the occasion of Beating Retreat Ceremony. I had gone to see this Beating Retreat ceremony just for the first time. Church bells rung and a Christian psalm was sung. I am referring to the 'Beating Retreat' ceremony "Abide with me. O'Lord" was sung. This does not mean that bells of temples or Gurudwaras or mosques should be rung or that hymns of these religions should be sung only. What I merely want to say is that the way Beating Retreat ceremony takes place makes it evident that whatever brain may be working behind it, no official can be blamed for this it is just a political strategy that such age old

Lok Sabha Debates, 21 March, 1964.

traditions are being followed and what should have been removed immediately has not been removed so far.

From that point of view if we evaluate the military capabilities of ancient India, about one thousand years ago when the emperors of various empires faced defeats and the military capabilities of today, we find no difference. In those days it was said that Anangpal's elephant ran away which led our forces to take to their heels and were defeated, otherwise we were almost victorious. Similar things are said even today. Whenever we are defeated such excuses are made like that in NEFA our army was very small or our army was not equipped with proper weapons, or we were cheated or we were fighting at greater heights as if Chinese were fighting at lower heights. Probably it may be said that General Kaul caught cold. Whatever may be the case whether Anangpal's elephant flees, someone catches cold or there is scarcity of weapons, all these things are superficial.

The malady is somewhere else. If such a big nation loses its freedom just because Anangpal's elephant ran amuck, it could be termed only as symbolic. We should find out the main reasons of it. Certainly, there were some major reasons for it, otherwise a petty incident like that could not have led to the loss of independence of such a big country. We should look for the deeprooted disease instead of being satisfied with external symptoms.

In this regard, I would like to draw your attention towards one more thing. Recently, I was going through a book, of thousands of years old history. In that book, Arab historians have told how the Indian women gave away all their ornaments and jewellery to the state for the sake of the country. In that, I found a startling resemblance to the current scenario. In spite of it we got defeated. After all, these ornaments are worthless. I have calculated and come to the conclusion that all this money that we have collected in the name of 'war-fund' can hardly meet the expenses of our Army for even ten days. Yet, hullabaloo was created over it. It is nothing, but just a matter of getting entangled over flimsy issues. It is altogether different to probe

and find out the real cause, the real malady. Demonstration of valour is within our limits, but we ultimately suffer from the colonial hangover, which has turned us into a demoralised lot over the years.

Similarly, just have a look at our way of thinking. Even today many people look upon Padmini as the ideal of Indian Womanhood, but in this era, if I am asked to name my ideal, I shall certainly look towards Natali of Russia, who in the guise of a maid-servant in German armed forces camps at Ukraine, gathered confidential information, on basis of which 50,000 German army personnel were killed. We will have to change our ideals. In this regard, I would also like to say something about Shri Saraf, whom I give due respect. He has misunderstood, that I have spoken against worship or prayer. It is not so. What I meant was that, if someone prays for 'Moksha' (Salvation), it is perfectly understandable, but if someone prays for victory in the War or elections or to increase the agricultural production and believes that everything can be achieved through prayers, in my view, he is living in a fool's paradise and his fate would be similar to the defeat we suffered in N.E.F.A. (North Eastern Frontier Agency).

Similarly, I would like to draw your attention towards a similar incident that has taken place in the past. The notorious warrior from Central Asia, Timur invaded India during the reign of Emperor Feeroze-Shah-Tughluq, but before doing so, he took cognizance of the fact that elephants constituted a deadly and dangerous element of the Indian forces. Years ago, he had seen this wonderful animal on display in Samarkand. Apart from that, a strong corps of Engineers and an effective espionage network were the backbone of his army. Timur's spies made deep inroads into the Indian forces and collected secret information about their position. As a result thereof, before dawn and much before the march of the Indian Elephants into the battle field, Timur's army laid iron claws across the battle field. The visibly shaken and injured elephants, instead of attacking the enemy, roared in rage and beat a hasty retreat and consequently the Indian forces were defeated. What had

happened in N.E.F.A. I myself went and saw it. At a place about two to three thousand feet above sea level in the N.E.F.A. hills, a gay and obliging young lady was seen, about a few days before the war. Some people said that she was a Nepalese, others claimed that she was Chinese. Perhaps, she was a Sino-nepalese, who used to sell tea. She was a very obliging and licentious kind of person. Although, I was told about her, I was not that eager to meet her. I came to know that Chinese espionage network was much stronger than ours. I was astonished to find that our forces depended on information provided by Tibetan and Sherpa Coolies. When I inquired, whether we had any other source of information, I found out that there was none. The coolies who carried goods on either side of the border were our sole source of information. There is one reason behind it. Over the past thousands of years, we, Indians have become an arrogant people, arrogant about our civilization and culture, which is nothing but a myth, and this arrogance restrains us from looking at and learning from the developments taking place in the rest of the world, and the advancement made in the field of defence by other countries, and as a result of this baseless vanity, we have to suffer later on. About espionage, you might have heard the story, wherein a feudal chieftain informed the Emperor about the concentration of enemy troops in the North and the Emperor replied to him that perhaps the former was seeing things from the ramparts of his high fort. A strange kind of vanity permeates our mind and thoughts and this was the *raison d'être* for our defeat in the battlefield.

Now, I would like to make a request to you. Earlier also, I had demanded that an inquiry by a Parliamentary Committee should be ordered which will make an indepth study of our military organisation, our military structure, since independence. It will make suggestions to prepare a new military structure. In this context, I would like to remind you that I have repeatedly referred to the said circular in this august House, but I did not receive any response from the Government. I had also made a mention about the dubious role played by the three key

persons, in N.E.F.A., but no reply was given to my question. Although, foreign policy, defence policy, defence production, industrial and agricultural production are all different matters, the country cannot progress unless there is effective co-ordination between all these sectors. The country will disintegrate if there is no co-ordination between foreign policy and Defence policy. Same is happening at present. There is no co-ordination between the Government and the public. Every thing is lying scattered, Today it has become virtually impossible to establish any kind of co-ordination between our Defence policy, foreign policy, industrial, agricultural and defence production and public opinion. As a result, some people say that we won't let the enemy have even one inch of our territory in Ladakh while some others say we will not give an inch of Kashmir. Some people say that we will teach a lesson to Phizo. While others talk of forcing the Chinese to lick the dust, if they dare to attack the country again. Apart from it, some of us also go to the extent of discussing the problems of people of Indian origin in Sri Lanka or East Africa. A vanity of immeasurable depth pervades our thoughts and our very existence and the tragedy is that it is without any solid foundation. A country, a nation cannot be built on the basis of such baseless arguments. Our foreign and defence policies are far away from reality. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you must have definitely come across some examples of it. We talk so high that their implementation seems to be a distant possibility. Despite wide ranging discussions and lofty talks, most of the time, we arrive at the conclusion, that it is better to find a solution under the aegis of the United Nations. We talk, as if the responsibility of solving international problems and changing the world, rests on our tender shoulders, but all said and done, we come to the final conclusion that we should approach the United Nations.

I would just like to refer to an incident. I don't want to name the person. Recently, there was an explosion in Poonch. Immediately, someone talks about Pakistani involvement in that and what is the result? The people have been enraged but what has it resulted in? How to take revenge for this? True, the

Pakistanis had a hand in it, but how do we propose to retaliate? Similarly, someone says that we will cross the line of control. Such things are not trumpeted around, but are done. No sensible person will talk like this. Similarly, some people say that *Telvat* is not such an important person, with whom we need to hold talks. These things are not to be said. Further there are some people who say that the time is ripe for the country to produce and purchase atomic weapons. I wonder about the world in which they are living. They talk of purchasing atomic weapons, as if they are available for sale in the market, at the Varanasi square and the Kachauri lane. Atomic weapons are not that easy to produce. Here they talk of producing atomic weapons, I would say that let us first produce solar stove, then we can think about atomic weapons. The country's foreign and defence policies can at best be termed only as 'fantastic'. I would request you to formulate such important policies, keeping in view the realities. It should be done somehow, for today the country is standing on the precipice of calamity. I feel restless day and night. I don't know how to express the state of my mind to you. It seems to me as if the whole country is moving towards disaster, which may come any moment and we won't be left with anything to save ourselves.

The people got instigated and perhaps I too am responsible for that to some extent. Perhaps, I too added fuel to fire, when in this House, when you were in the Chair, I narrated the tales of woe of the Hindus of East Bengal, where two thousand villages were burnt down, but whenever I take up such sensitive issues, I also make it a point to elucidate the policy we should adopt in such cases. But what result can we expect, if we just discuss these things in this House? How will we defend our borders when we are not capable of protecting even the life and property of our citizens, irrespective of their religious affiliation. When a country becomes incapable of maintaining law and order within its borders, it cannot defend its borders.

You must have observed that in matters relating to defence and foreign affairs, we always tend to look for support towards some or the other foreign power, whether it be the Anglo-

American bloc or the Soviet bloc. In yesterday's discussion, a third source of support, that of the Afro-Asian bloc came to our notice. It would be just like a cripple using the crutches. It would be far better if we become self-sufficient as soon as possible. The countries, we look for support, are themselves dependent on other countries. We should seek their friendship rather than their support. When the question of Pakistan arises, it is said that in their eyes Pakistan and India are equal. So their support is of no use to us.

Now I shall speak of our dependence on Anglo-American and Soviet support. To rely on either of these countries on a continuous basis would be a wrong step. It is our misfortune that the will power of our people has been shattered. We see that in our country there are some people who prefer Anglo-American support while some others prefer Soviet support. I want to emphasise that our strategy and foreign policy should be flexible enough so that we may be able to seek aid from any country whenever necessary in the interests of our national security. Our thinking should not be influenced by any particular bloc. At the same time, we must equip ourselves well. We do not have a strong will to think independently. For the last 17 years, the affairs of the State are being run by hoodwinking the public, in a manner that no politician in the world has ever done. But there was no principle behind it. Now this sort of cleverness will not do. This thing may have given us some respect in the world in the last 17 years but now those days have gone. The need of the hour is to have well-balanced policies that may take India in the right direction.

Now I would like to say something on the organisational structure of the army. I am not aware of the number of officers in the rank of Brigadier. I have tried to get this information a number of times but each time, I was told that it was against national interest to publicise such information. I guess the number is around 200. I want to know as to how many of them have risen from the rank of soldier and as to how many have risen from the rank of Lieutenant. I pose this question to the

Hon. Defence Minister. If he is not able to release information regarding the number of such officers, at least he could give a ratio that throws light on the number of soldiers and Lieutenants who have become Brigadiers. Ideally, 75% of the officers in the rank of Brigadier should have risen from the level of soldiers and the other 25% from the rank of Lieutenant. But if this idea seems too revolutionary then let it be a 50:50 ratio. That too is acceptable.

Another point that I want to raise is regarding recruitment in the army. I have received information from the recruitment centre regarding the physique of Indian people. People who have knowledge about international matters tell me that in Europe 50% to 60% of the adult population can handle a gun. I am not talking of knowing as to how to operate a gun but of only handling it. In China 20% of adults can do this whereas in India only 3% of the adult population can do so. If this be the state of affairs then I urge the Government to provide nutritious food to the people. What can be expected from an army that does not get proper diet?

Many people keep on writing to me in the belief that I can do something. But what is in my power? I am not in the Government so there is no question of my having any influence in the Government's working. Still people write to me. They seem to be under the wrong impression that if I convey their point here their problems will be solved. That is why I am compelled to relate their tales of woe here. A serviceman who is injured in the course of duty is given compensation. But many soldiers are not given this compensation and if any compensation is given to them, they are paid at the same rates as labourers are paid.

Similarly, high-ranking officers make the soldiers do a lot of unofficial work. At some places fees are being charged for recruitment. How far is this practice lawful or unlawful remains to be seen? Soldiers are paid Rs. 5 and officers are paid Rs. 50 as clothing allowance. The quality of rations is different for soldiers and officers. Officers get special rations such as powdered milk from Australia. I saw several tins of powdered

milk there. Soldiers are given just 'Dal-Roti'. This system needs to be changed. I am not suggesting a revolutionary or permanent change. But at least there should be some parity in the quality of rations given to officers and soldiers at the time of war.

From the report submitted to the Ministry, it seems that accommodation is to come up for 350 married officers at a cost of Rs. 1.5 crores. Which is nearly Rs. 50,000 per officer. Instead of spending so much money on building residential quarters at this time, the money could be used for the welfare of the soldiers. Low cost barracks could be constructed for them. This will create a good impression in the minds of the people.

A lot of concern has been expressed with regard to the education of the children of those killed in the war. Such children do not get proper education. I suggest that the Government should take on the responsibility of educating such children.

The army has a Research Directorate. I have come to know that the post of Director of this organisation has been lying vacant for the last so many days. How can the institution be run without a Director? Can there be any research for the army if the person who is responsible for it, is not there?

I have also been informed that the entire amount of monetary contributions from schools and colleges for the army is not being deposited. One person told me that a college did not deposit its contribution as it was thought that they have to give money again when the Minister comes after eight months. This is not an isolated case. It is happening at several places.

Even the money collected through dance and drama performances is not deposited in full.

The daily attendance allowance given to N.C.C. cadets is pocketed by unscrupulous elements. Such is the state of affairs in the country. Strict action should be taken against the guilty persons. I am not in favour of capital punishment. I don't think there is any point in enforcing this penalty. In this connection, I

would like to praise the Prime Minister to a limited extent; this should not be interpreted as all out praise. it is often said here that such and such person should be hanged. The Prime Minister developed this habit 18 or 19 years ago. But here in the Lok Sabha I have seen him hesitating while broaching this matter. I am against any law that pertains to hanging. At least no Lok Sabha Member should speak in favour of Capital punishment.

*** *** ***

The President's Address mentioned about pension for improving working conditions in the army. Army should not agitate for the pension or petty monetary gains. The morale of the army should be kept high.

I shall make one more submission before concluding. On one hand people are piling up weapons and on the other they talk of disarmament. Without disarmament this world will be destroyed in the next 20-30 years. So this point must be kept in mind while holding consultations with the Defence Ministry. How will this happen? One thing is that we have the right to life. There cannot be security in the country unless the State has got the power to eliminate the culprits. If fighting against injustice becomes a part of our life then we can do away with the aforesaid power of the State.

Demands for Grants of Ministry of Law

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Demands for Grants for the Ministry of law should not be passed, because there is no rule of law in the country and rule of anarchy is increasing.

*** *** ***

Interruptions@

*** *** ***

It had started much earlier but now it has increased and that too rapidly. Shri Keshav Singh has become the symbol of small man, who constantly fell victim to poverty but maintained his self-respect...

....I will not name anybody. When a poor man suffers poverty and tries to maintain his self respect, he has to face the evils of law too. The representatives of the majority class and their servants are not only making the laws in the Legislative Assembly but are also awarding punishments to them. It is important to note that the Constitution of India provides separate agencies for making laws and for enforcing

*Lok Sabha Debates, 24 March, 1964.

@ An Hon'ble member: it is beginning.

the same because we have a Supreme Court, which does not exist in the U.K.

*** *** ***

Interruptions@

*** *** ***

I am talking about the Ministry of Law. I will say whatever I like. Is it a mockery? Whether the majority here will try to stop me from speaking? Here also you can see that...

*** *** ***

....I will not talk of Uttar Pradesh, at all. I am talking about the principle. If in any House of Germany or U.K.—leave aside U.K., it is a useless country. Many people think that there exists a House of Commons, but in reality, House of Lords is the Supreme Court in that country. Judiciary may be discussed in the Parliament of that country. But in America, Supreme Court is the highest court of Law. If someone says that the American Senate and House of Representatives have a right to punish someone, then people will laugh at it. You don't talk of the Lok Sabha of our country and Legislative Assembly of Uttar Pradesh...

*** *** ***

...Everybody has its own style of expressing things. You should not control our tongues to this extent. I am not violating any rule. I am only giving you an example. Our population is about 40 crores. Even if 39 crores 99 lakhs 99 thousands and 999 persons have one voice and I have a different voice, so long I stick to it and do not violate any rule, these persons have no right to put my life in danger or to insult me. If they do so, I will call them mad.

Today, Socrates should be termed as mad or the people of Athens who hanged Socrates? He became isolated. When we see a new thing in this world, we get irritated. Today, after a

* @ Mr. Dy Speaker: You cannot speak on the subject of Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly.

lapse of two or two and a half thousand years, the entire world is saying that he was a wise and learned man; and the people of Athens of that era, were mad, who had awarded death punishment to him. These are very big issues Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, these do not merely relate to Delhi or Uttar Pradesh. I want to submit that it is the foremost duty of the Ministry of Law to provide protection of life and other things to the poor and the common man of this country as laid down in the Article 20 and 21 of our Constitution. When such protection is not provided to a person, then I will be compelled to say that it is not a rule of law but a rule of arbitrariness (Mauj ka raaj). Hence I oppose the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Law:

*** *** **

It is a law of nature that, a right person is called a mad man in his time, but the history decides who was mad.

I would like to remind the Law Minister that once Bacon had said that Judges are like lions, but are under the Government. Whenever I see a Judge, sitting in the Court and working as a lion and not working under the Government I feel happy. I feel proud while saying that, today we have some Judges of this calibre.

When I think over these issues, that a common and unresourceful man has no status in this world and suffers everywhere, I am compelled to say that the big and rich people have become so important and respectable in this country that even if they commit a murder and are awarded long term imprisonment their sentence is reduced, or waived by the Government. If this is the state of affairs, then how will we be able to ask the people to respect the law. If a crime is committed by rich and influential person, then first he is not arrested, and if he is arrested and put on trial, then he is acquitted by the Court whereas law provide no protection to poor and resourceless persons.

In this context, about the issue of delay raised by Shri Singhasan Singhji, I would like to say emphatically on the basis

of my experience that today in India, the persons responsible for dispensing of justice, particularly at district level, are in the habit of putting off things. Farmers suffer heavy losses in billions. They are told to reach the court on a particular day. Their expenditure in reaching the court, their loss in terms of work, if all these factors are taken into account, then the loss suffered comes to billions. There is very little respect for resourceless persons in this country and very little attention is paid to their convenience.

The same situation prevails in the country in respect of murders. I am not talking about the murder of one or two persons, but large number of persons are massacred in the broad day light. Ministry of Law can state that they are not concerned with this problem. But Article 20 and 21 of the Constitution of India apply equally on each individual of this country and if such a situation arises where killings of hundreds of people occur on the road side, they may be Hindus or Muslims, then what is the significance of Article 20 and 21 of the Constitution of India. The cause of their murder is to be identified. First of all, I would like to say that the roots of law and order which exist in the minds of the people, are generally shaken by the Government of India. Day in and day out, the people are provoked, sometimes by referring to violation on the border and sometimes by referring to Hinduş living in Pakistan. When the objective is not achieved, the people get agitated and are bent upon doing something to express their anger. I would like to suggest to the Ministry of Law that they should deeply ponder over this issue in order to establish the roots of law and order in the minds of the people otherwise the Hindus in Pakistan would be killed and the Government of India would be helpless to do anything in this regard except provoking the people and consequently, the Hindus in India would start massacring Muslims. Therefore, I would like to level this allegation that the Ministry of Law and the Government of India are primarily responsible for the killings of Muslims on the roadsides. Therefore, it is essential that the roots of law and order be strengthened in the minds of people. If you study the

law, you will realise that a number of Sections deserve deletion, particularly one, in respect of which I have tried my best to get it deleted from the statute book. This is section 109 under which anybody can be put behind the bars. I understand that at present, about 20 to 30 thousand people are facing imprisonment under this very section. I would like to submit that all these punishment are for the poor and resourceless persons and not for rich and resourceful persons. The poorman goes to city in search of employment, he has no relative in city and he loiters on the road upto 10 or 11 p.m. Suppose he has a argument with a policeman and the policeman makes it a prestige issue then he is apprehended and one iron rod, a match stick and a candle stick are found in his possession.

One blade is also recovered from him. But it is not given so much importance now-a-days. He is imprisoned on the charge of illegally carrying these 3 or 4 things. One iron rod is usually utilised to establish charges on 50 to 70 persons who have thereafter been sent to jails. Everybody knows that false charges are levelled under section 109 I.P.C. and even then it is still in force. It is being continuously enforced since the British rule in India. Today where are the roots of peace and tranquility and Law and Order, which is prevailing in India today. Law Minister will look into it that what are the root causes for this deteriorating peace and tranquility, where are those rights and which are such elements. Three or four elements are involved in it which usually control law and order in our country and perhaps they are maintaining it since the days of British rule. One element is goondas. Even today these goondas maintain our law and order system. Second element is police and third element is richmen because these goondas and police together act in such a way that richmen do not bother about them and do not interfere in goondas work. These hooligans together with police interfere in the life of commonman and poorman, harass them, loot them, thus the law and order system runs on their dictates and these richmen live a safe and secured life under

their protection. Until and unless this system is not done away with it will not have desired impact and it is certain that as and when it is done a large scale disturbance is inevitable because if these hooligans who are controlling the law and order system and with whom policemen are familiar are suddenly asked to refrain from such activities then it will certainly create problems. Therefore until and unless Government do not equip itself to face this triangle of police, hooligans and richmen, the law and order system can not be maintained in India.

I conclude my speech adding few more points.

The situation in Delhi is so bad that if an educated person is asked to submit his application for bail then he is asked to give his thumb impression. It is my personal experience. Five persons engaged by this Congress Government have forcibly taken my thumb impression when I refused to sign. I remember one person out of them was not in a position to hold me. They thought that my thumb impression will do. So, see, this is how our Law Ministry is functioning. Until you are not able to provide security to a person in the country, you can't be called successful and our Law Minister is aware of it but only upto English level. I would like to say that only English people have not enacted laws but Russians and Germans have enacted it. We are slaves of English language. We do not bother as to what is happening in other parts of the world, because we have not kept the windows of our mind open. The Government should see how justice is done in Russia, Germany and U.S.A. The Supreme Court there has given some remarkable judgments recently. This is possible here only when we shed the yoke of English language and throw the windows of our mind open. Still I would like to emphasise that efforts should be made to improve the judicial system in the country.

In the end I would like to say that no funds should be allocated to the Department.

Demands for Grants of Ministry of External Affairs

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, there was a time when India's foreign policy was held in high esteem throughout the world. But today, it is under heavy pressure — pressure of misdeeds — and has to keep a low profile. Earlier, we were respected for Mahatma Gandhi, our old cultural heritage, 40-44 crore population and a powerful army. But now, all these four powers have sapped. Why did it happen? I think that the main reason is that India's approach towards America, Russia and China has not been favourable. America and Russia have eighty per cent of economic and military power. India has not fully understood these countries. China is also on wrong foot. Probably, now only two powers will remain. India has never understood China and I would like to give a detailed account of it here.

China is like a creature who is suffering from a peculiar pain but it does not know the cause of pain and is indulging in all sorts of wrong deeds because of suffering. The pain is marxism. China had adopted marxism with the aim of reducing disparities in relationships with other countries. I am also suffering from this pain. There are two billion non-whites, exploited, oppressed and poor throughout the world whereas there are only one billion powerful whites—I would not say happy—in the world. There are many disparities between these two groups. Without going into the details, I would like to mention here main five disparities only: (1) Disparity in production. The quantity that is produced by an Indian in one hour, it

Lok Sabha Debates, 11 April, 1964.

is produced in five to six minutes by a Russian and in two to three minutes by an American. (2) Disparity in prices. The prices of raw material do not increase but that of finished product is sky-rocketing. (3) Disparity in military hardware. I have already mentioned it. (4) Disparity in talent and (5) Disparity in density of population. Whereas in California, Siberia and Australia only five to seven persons inhabit on one square mile, in India and China, the density of population per square mile is over 1,000. This is called inter-national feudalism. These five disparities are eating into the vitals of the world.

China had thought that perhaps Marxism would reduce the disparity. China is not bothered about disparity between her and U.S.A. But it is worried as it has not been able to come at par with Russia. Both the countries are Marxist countries and even then they are not at par. One of the reasons may be that though marxism may have a solution to reduce the disparities within the country but it might not have a solution to reduce international disparities. That is China's dilemma. What has China done. It did not invade Australia, Siberia or California. It invaded South Korea, South Vietnam and the borders of Himalayas because they were weak, China did not knock the doors of *Kumoy or Mo-tsu*. The conclusion is that bully power particularly those having weapon power suppress the weak. I would like to point out here that when I was young, I was of the view that a time would come when India and China would together take up a challenge against big power. But today, I dare say, non-Whites, open your eyes, if a non-white becomes powerful and that too militarily, he will not invade and knock the doors of whites but of non-whites itself.

There are no two opinions that China is a demon of modern times. But at the same time we should not forget that demons too have qualities. Our country produced Ravana and he was a great scholar. Similarly, China is also powerful not because of weapons alone. In fact, there is nothing in the whites to be proud of. China is powerful in the real sense and it has become the spokesman of 2 billion non-whites. The 2 billion non-whites think that they can achieve many things like self-respect etc. if

- China is their spokesman. I do not know whether it is true or just an illusion. I have my own apprehensions. Therefore, I would like to appeal to my countrymen and the Government that they should not treat this matter as just a propaganda. It is a matter of self-respect. I would urge Russia and America also not to treat the matter casually by saying that it is just an ethnic propaganda. Unless these five disparities are removed, nothing fruitful could be achieved. Today, I am ready to say—probably I was mistaken 10-15 years back—that the solution to these disparities would be brought not only by non-whites but by liberal whites also. We will be able to fight the demon only after the solution is brought about.

This is not just an attack on India or the Himalayas. The foreign policy of India has been a failure because the invader was not viewed in that background.

I have posed this question to those who are formulating the foreign policy of the country many a times. Whatever has happened is really sad.

As a result thereof China assumed the leadership on the ground of inequality in a wrong manner of a world that wants equality. India and other glamorous countries should try to ensure that China does not remain leader of that world. I do not say that anyone should wage a war on China. But I would like to say this much that if you follow the principle, then I do not understand as to what is the justification of keeping diplomatic relations with China which had attacked our country. You can sit with them if it is considered inevitable and sometimes the circumstances may demand so. Both demons and gentlemen live in this world. But it becomes clear from our continuing relationship with them that our country has not been able to understand the rudiments of foreign policy.

Why did it happen? I would like to explain its main reason before you. This world belongs to two super powers. In terms of power, one part of the world is under the influence of the U.S.A. and the other that of the U.S.S.R. you may call it Atlantic and Society. But efforts have always been made by some countries

to emerge as super powers especially by those who want to take a lesson from British foreign policy. It is because these are some of the characteristics of the Britishers. Baring their case, since the day Mr. De. Gaulle came to power in France, much publicity has been given to more than two superpowers in the world. In our country most of the people hold this view. Two super powers would not do. There are other powers. It is a good sign. It will give rise to new forces and establish peace in the world. What I want to say is that this world having more than two super powers is not a united one. Powers of Britain and France are completely showy. There is no substance in it. Even if it exists, it is not going to help them in any way. If at all the world will have more than two super powers the same will not be based on power as such. This will not happen in my life time. I also do not think that it will happen in the life time of most of other people sitting here. This world will continue to be influenced by the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. But the world can have more than two super powers in terms of idealism. The people of India, though it is painful to say, have abandoned the search of idealism and they are being influenced by the British and French powers.

I would like to draw your attention towards characteristics of Britishers'. The Indians also wanted to learn a lot from them. That habit is that even if one is less powerful he should try to capture the world. How? It is their policy of divide and rule and consolidate your position. They are friendly with the U.S.A. and at the same time interchange glances with the U.S.S.R. and China. This has been one of the main pillars of British foreign policy and is being followed by them for last 150-200 years. They achieved a lot for their country through this policy. But what happens when countries like India start following this policy, I shall let you know. There is no impact of foreign policy of India in the world. It is just discussed here and there in India.

The parties having leftist ideology in England have special characteristics and it is presumed that the Government of India or the Ministry of External Affairs took this lesson from them

that leftists does not mean a party of labourers. Leftism relates to a period from the time of Stafford Crips and Allen Willkinsan. Uptil today it is limited upto 'Ka' and 'Ma'. By 'Ka' and 'Ma' what I mean to say is that 'Ka' stands for Kingsley Martin and the second one means Krishna Menon. This British leftism has been guide of foreign policy of India, How? Maintaining oral contacts with the U.S.S.R. but for material needs keeping relations with Atlantic countries is a part of this policy. Under this policy purchase aircraft and other equipment from Britain and maintain trade relations with Britian and show sympathy with the U.S.S.R. But it would not help in establishing friendly relations. The British leftism taught these things to India. With regard to this leftism I would like to say only this much that. Since the time of Stafford Crips they have been extending silent support to aggressors—be it the case of Italy's aggression on Abbysynia or Chinese aggression on India. There is a long story behind their following such a policy. Similarly, there is one more special characteristic of British foreign policy. Under the guise of peace, they expand their trade in a big way. It is very clear that no other country plays so many tricks as they have played under the British foreign policy. There was a time when Maternic was there in Austria. He had fostered this policy in a big way. Those who are Jesuit displomats are also a base in the art of trickery as per the Britishers. Whatever we may say, they are more or less powerful and this art of diplomacy has been in practice in their country for last hundreds of years. When we Indians start learning the same art of trickery, neither we have power nor art of fostering it. We do not know art, we people are not that polished also. Then we do not achieve favourable results. This is the reason that during the last 17 years, we have not been able to achieve anything in the search of tactfulness. Be tactful and say a thing which has some relevance. Do not talk of a distant thing. Have long talks later. In this process it will take 100 or 50 years for the world to change. Talk a thing which has direct links with the present world and which may affect a change in the world. The Hon. Minister of External Affairs has always been trying to be tactful. Let me make it clear what tactfulness is. If the countries, which

are new and weak start searching tactfulness, they become useless. Who should become tactful? Countries which have power and which are required to solve the urgent problems of the World should be tactful. The U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and to same extent Britain are such countries. If the countries which are new and which are required to build a new order, are caught in the swamp of tactfulness, they will never be able to build a new society. Nobody will listen to them. Who listens to the tactfulness of a weak person. As such please leave the question of tactfulness to powerful countries today. Whatever may be its result.

Today, we read in newspapers almost daily that China has been defeated in such and such conference, nobody accepted its views. It has some distinct results. One thing is certain that its views were expressed and came up for consideration. But the same were not accepted. But every time one listens China's views. China has been defeated but it is a fact that it played its role. But India has stopped playing its role for the last several years. Therefore, there is no question of its winning or losing. You take the instance of any international conference on which we have been deliberating in the House. I would not like to go into details in this regard. Among them Afro-Asia etc. could be taken as examples. In the above conferences mention is always made of the points that China wanted to raise. At the same time sometimes there are completely false reports that China has remained unsuccessful. But there are certain reasons for it. As the orange and mango dry up, our foreign policy has also dried up, because it has received many blows, be it from China, Pakistan or from any other quarter. Our foreign policy has become so complicated on these issues that it has left with no objective to make any drastic change in the world in long run. So long as the foreign policy of India does not bring five inequalities of whites and non-whites before the world, I fear our foreign policy cannot move even one step ahead. If we go on telling our own tale of woe that we received blow from China or from Pakistan, that would not give it an International outlook.

Similarly I would like to draw your attention toward the fact that when we go to other countries with a begging bowl for foodgrains how can we adopt our independent foreign policy? At least there is some limit for it. It is possible only to some extent that on one hand a country goes on begging and on the other it might go on boasting of lofty ideals.

There are two blocs—American bloc and Russian bloc. I want that India should have a very clear cut policy towards them aiming at maintaining balance of prices and eradication of poverty. On these two things, we should try to maintain our relationships with these two blocs and not as we have been doing during the last fifteen years such as ban on nuclear test or demand for organising a Summit to reduce tension. Now that will not do. We have to come forward with some concrete issues so that non-white people of the world may realise that something concrete has been brought for their well being. Similarly I would like to say that from three points of views—capital formation, standard of life and economic equality—both America and Russia are very close to each other. We commit mistake when we make difference between the two. It appears to me that in the coming twenty or twenty five years both the nations will come very close to each other.

The Seventh fleet of America is still roaming here and there. It is a very lengthy story, so I have to say only this much that I have been opposing this Seventh fleet for the last 17 years and I am still opposing it, but what should I do? Our foreign policy has become such a failure that I have to say it today that the Hon. Minister for Foreign Affairs has silently allowed the entry of this Seventh fleet in our ocean. This should not happen. It should be done openly whatever policy is adopted, that should be followed boldly. If this fleet is coming, we should extract something in lieu of it for the country and for the world. Had it been under my control, I would have asked America that it is alright that their Seventh fleet is coming, but what are they doing about Tibet or what are they doing to maintain balance of prices? So I would have taken up this issue in a broader perspective. I would have asked the Governments of USA and

USSR to do something about the five imperialistic powers. I would have also asked the people of those countries to hold demonstration in front of U.N.O. in New York. Such demonstrations should be organised all over the world to attract the attention towards eradication of poverty, checking the price rise and other issues of the world.

Similarly question arise about the policy of non-alignment. On the one hand we have Russian bloc and on the other American bloc and about other countries we can call them without any blocs. When we see countries of Asia like India, Burma etc. who always remain under pressure, we feel that they are disloyal and opportunist countries. Therefore, we have to think seriously over the policy of non-aligned. I also support non-aligned policy but the way it has been distorted by the Foreign Ministry, I would say that it is not a policy of non-alignment, but it is a policy of disloyalty and opportunism. Sometime they sit in the lap of one bloc and sometime in the lap of other bloc. We have to give up such a policy and have to adopt an idealistic policy. Becoming Member of Commonwealth countries, assisting Afro-Asian countries and adopting of non-aligned policy—these three are dangerous things for us.

...We talk about the body and the soul. Many times these things are said merely for publicity. The soul of our foreign policy has become hollow, so it is of no use to correct the body till the soul itself is corrected. But even then, the body should be corrected to some extent. In this context, I would like to repeat a sentence of our Foreign Minister that India's Ambassador has a special quality and that is his wife. Shri Morarji Desai says that he likes beautiful faces. But it appears to me that our Hon. Foreign Minister also likes the beautiful faces. I would say that so long as the heart and mind of our Ambassadors are not closely associated with the common people on the one hand and with the world as a whole on the other...

...One thing I would like to say is that the Publicity depart-

ment of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs issues a daily bulletin. I have written a letter and also tried on telephone that one copy of the bulletin should also be supplied to me. After all, I am also a Member of the Lok Sabha so why is such discrimination being done to me.

In addition to it, I would also like to say about the language. If the matter of language is not settled, it is impossible to correct our foreign policy. In this regard I would like to quote a sentence of Mahatma Gandhi. In 1942, Gandhiji said India may go to hell but the Britishers must quit India. But today when I say that let Hindi go to hell but use of English should be stopped, supporters of Hindi get annoyed with me.

I would like to conclude after quoting a statement of Shri Habibulla Khan before you. He is the Home Minister of Pakistan. I would like to read out to you the translated version of his statement. Everything publish in English. Its translation is as follow:—

“that they do not want that India and Pakistan, the two different countries should exist as two different peoples, but should exist as a single country and two parts of one people.”

I cannot say what is the meaning of these sentences. After reading these sentences it seemed to me as if he wants that India and Pakistan should live in such a manner as if they are two bodies and one heart and they have two tongues and one mind. Let me know whether it is true. I would not like to hurt your feelings by letting you know my views about the Governments of India and Pakistan. But I would like that the people of India and Pakistan should try to ascertain the meaning of the above statement of Shri Habibulla Khan as early as possible.

Motion Regarding International Situation*

....I was surprised to hear the Minister of External Affairs. He has the expertise to entangle the Members in issue like Sino-U.S.S.R. dispute, Kashmir and Voice of America. We the Hon. Members of the House, whether we belong to the opposition or the ruling party, have not been able to analyse the foreign policy properly. I shall try to analyse it in its entirety. At the outset, I must say that our foreign policy has been a total failure even if we go by the two tests set by the External Affairs Minister. One test is the independence of the country, territory and national interest and the other is the world order.

As regards the first test, everybody knows that we have lost at least 17,000 or 18,000 square miles of territory as compared to what we had on 15th August, 1947. Our foreign policy failed in that sphere. If we take the old line of Kailash Mansarovar as the border, we have lost one lakh square miles of territory.

So far as the world order is concerned, I would like to say that barring the issue of Indonesia, I do not know if India's foreign policy has made a new impact on the international scene or has given a new direction on any major issue. After all, why has all this happened? Except the initial two-three

*Lok Sabha Debates, 17 September, 1963.

years, I think India's foreign policy has been dependent on others during the last one decade or so. On the issue of Kashmir, we have been depending on Russia's veto power and in the matter of five year plans, we have been depending on American Dollars. One who is dependent on others can boast of independence, but he cannot have an independent opinion. Therefore, my first submission is that as long as India continues to bank upon the help of these two countries, it is impossible for it to form its independent opinion. The result of this dependence has been that India's foreign policy was guided by fear psychosis. We were afraid of pursuing an independent policy on the Algerian issue lest we should earn the displeasure of Atlantic Camp. The result was that African and Asian countries recognised the then Government of Algeria and allowed it to hold the reign of that country for one and a half year. China went far ahead of us, but the Government of India failed to recognise the Government of Algeria out of fear. Similarly, there is fear of Arab countries on the question of Israel. But I must say that Arab Countries have the best friend i.e. Yugoslavia, and it has recognised Israel. The same condition applies to Congo where Government of India failed to take any action even at the time of the assassination of that brave man Patric Lumumba despite the fact that Indian Officers were present there. Our Government was afraid of the Atlantic Camp lest any help extended to Congo against its division should displease them. We failed to form an independent opinion on the question of Hungary out of fear of displeasing USSR. Although we formed an independent opinion on the issue of Suez Canal, yet we were fearful and, as a result, we could not send out crew operating in Hooghly river to Suez Canal. In the case of China, we were fearful due to Tibet and now the same fear is there on account of N.E.F.A. The result has been that we are not able to follow a forthright foreign policy. I will tell you in original language what the External Affairs Minister has been telling in a foreign language:-

“Chit jaittha bhayshunya, uchch jaittha shir”

Foreign policy of our country cannot be successful because it is not free from fear and hence it can do no good to the country. It is so not because we have no wealth or army, it is so because our foreign policy is not based on any principle, ideology or vision. What we were lacking? We have a population of 44 crores or 60 crores so to say, an ancient country with a leader like Mahatma Gandhi. All these factors were in our favour and these factors could have contributed to make our foreign policy a success. But in the absence of any principle, our foreign policy has totally flopped. I want to cite an example of lack of principle stand and it is in respect of our policy in regard to China. I have been saying since 1949 that we should adopt a policy under which a Government which is holding the rein of a country should be recognised. Under the principle being advocated by the External Affairs Ministry right from the beginning, Mao-Tse-Tung's Government in China and China-Kae-Shek's Government in Formosa should have been recognised from 1949 itself. But this was not done and the result was that the real face of communist China could not be projected before the African and Asian countries. This led to a misconception among the Afro-Asian countries that there was nothing like communist China and socialist Asia and that they were fake socialists and were, thus, the two sides of the same coin. There may be a mild difference, but basically they were toeing the same line.

The way the debate has progressed on Sino-USSR dispute, I am afraid, the foreign policy of India would continue to be directionless in the days to come, because I could see just one sentence in yesterday's speech of the Minister of External Affairs, so far as policy is concerned. I could find nothing significant in the rest of the speech. That sentence was that Sino-U.S.S.R. dispute was an important development on the international scene and it could work as a shield for us. Under the policy, Sino-USSR dispute is being viewed as a shield. The blind and lame always need others' support. But I would like to say that India is still strong enough to stand on its own feet and walk without any support from outside provided it pursues the

right policy. But how to go about it? One way is to take the Sino-USSR dispute in its proper perspective.

First of all let me tell you that Ravana was also a scholar. There is no doubt that China is a demon, but where from China derive its force. Like us, China too is weak economically and militarily, yet it is facing mighty Russia and host of other white nations. China has emerged as the voice of the non-white world because of its courage. Whomsoever the Governments in Africa and Asia may support, the non-whites easily identify themselves with China, because Australia, Siberia and California have become the centres of international feudalism where whites own land and resources disproportionate to their population. China has voiced support to the African Freedom Movement and has also extended help in material, but it does not mean that this action of theirs should prompt us to shower praise on them. As I said, China is a monster. Despite its symbolic power, it assumed the role of a monster in the world because through the power of gun and weapon it wants to undo the injustice done by the whites. If we view China from another angle, we shall find it as a wild beast who attempted at tearing the flesh of Hongkong, Macau, Formosa and Kumai but felt like losing its own teeth in the process and then found for its attack the soft flesh of Himalayas. I would say that in view of the monstrous tendency of China, India must shape its foreign policy in a proper way.

We shall be committing a mistake if we try to take shelter under U.S.S.R. in the context of Sino-USSR dispute. I am apprehending a danger since yesterday that India's foreign policy is once again becoming directionless. It is useless to find shelter. What we should do is to extend help to the non-white world as far as possible. But our Ministry of Foreign Affairs may feel that by doing so they would run the risk of displeasing America, U.S.S.R and other white nations and their Governments. To some extent, they may earn their displeasure, but there is a large population of whites who want apartheid to be abolished simultaneously alongwith other injustices.

At the same time, we should also think in terms of extending

support to the struggle of the hon-whites against the whites as far as possible. We should also do all that is in our command to check the monstrous tendencies. I am distressed to note that India is still continuing its efforts to get recognition for China in the United Nations. During the last 15 years, India has converted the entire Asia into a quagmire. Asia is already a quagmire-quagmire of poverty, quagmire of nepotism and quagmire of unscrupulousness. India took no principled stand in the prevailing situation. Therefore, my first suggestion would be that India must take a principled stand on the Asian situation. But this can be done only when India tells in no uncertain terms that it is not prepared to recognise China. However, as a matter of principle, we stand for both the Chinas.

Let me tell you that when I said this in 1949-50, it was dismissed as absurd. But now it has come to knowledge that Russia too had voiced the same view at that time and wanted to ease the world tension. But I regret to point out that India is scared of thinking in this direction. Why so? The reason is that this Government symbolises the left wing of England which dances to the tune of Labour Party and Russia. This leftist party is in fact a part of the labour party. The result is that when the Government of India tries to take a stand on an issue, signals are received from there. Signals were received suggesting summit meeting between China and U.S.S.R. Accordingly, our Government also put forward such a proposal. Similar signals were received for disarmament and ban on atom bomb. The Government of India simply repeated these proposals. Thereafter a signal was received to the effect that nuclear tests should be banned and our Government simply echoed its master's voice. But it has never been the endeavour of our Government to give a new direction to its foreign policy keeping in view the prevailing situation in Asia, Africa and the world as a whole. I want to put forward a suggestion in this regard. The Government of India have referred to the proposal for a summit meeting between President Kennedy and Khrushchev regarding disarmament besides touching upon other important international events. It would have been better had our Government

impressed upon the two big masters of the world to sit together to find ways and means to remove poverty from the world. Such a suggestion should have given 10-15 years back, but it is not too late. Had I been given a free hand or had the Minister of External Affairs heeded to my suggestion, I would have told him to tell President Kennedy and Khrushchev to sit together for a couple of days to think about poverty in the world and find ways as to how a balance could be struck between the prices of farm produce and industrial goods.

This injustice has been going on since long and it is still continuing. Prices of agricultural produces have increased by three-fourth whereas the prices of industrial products have doubled. As a result of this India is required to pay more than what it gets as financial assistance from the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. due to high price of their industrial products. Both Kennedy and Khrushchev may sit together and think over it. Then the question rises why should they do so? Why should the whites help the non-whites? Why should the people who manufacture finished goods from their factories help the people producing agricultural commodities? I have a reply to this. After 1945 the world has taken a new shape. In next 20 to 30 years either the weapons will be eliminated or the world will come to an end. Because, prior to 1945 a Jesus Christ or a Mahatma Gandhi condemned the weapons and used to say that their use was undesirable. Even then people used to succeed by using weapons. But now use of weapons has become non-essential and useless. I am talking of real weapons. I am not talking of traditional guns which India and China use in their skirmishes. I am talking of real weapons which are in the possession of U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. They are not being used and they will not be used. If they will be put to use, 2 billion people out of the total world population of 3 billion will be annihilated. It will be decided in next 20 to 30 years. Earlier, while Jesus-Christ and Mahatma Gandhi condemned the use of weapons, in future a Bismarck will emerge in the world scenario who will realise the worthlessness of the weapons and eliminate them. I just took the name of Bismarck. How a single person can possess so

much of power? That man will be a symbol of groups. What can a person do by remaining aloof from the group? If such people do not remain in groups, they become useless. Hence, either these weapons will be eliminated or the world will come to an end. And when the weapons will be eliminated? Weapons will be eliminated when injustice will end. So, I would like to say that India's foreign policy will become successful only when it associates itself with one of the seven revolutions presently active in the world which is prospering, and not earlier than that.

Earlier to this, I had made a mention of touch revolution. I was glad at that time when Shri Ashoke Sen wanted to know its meaning. Now I would like to explain as to what touch revolution is. In order to understand it, it is necessary to understand two universities of Britain. Boys in these universities who are doing under graduate courses become revolutionaries, but how? Do not create a new thing in your own country. Do not make any efforts, but touch any revolutionary who comes from abroad and feel the warmth of revolution in you. Till such time this touch revolution exists, our foreign policy cannot achieve anything. Whenever I made such a proposal, it was said that I was not a practical person, my submission did not carry any weight and it did not take into account the situation prevailing in the world. But I would like to ask as to what has our foreign policy achieved in the last 15 years? What impact did it have on our neighbours? And till such time we carry this feeling in our mind, India cannot achieve anything. 15 years have elapsed. What I want to say is that we must have some definite ideology and give it a concrete shape. If we do, it will have its impact, if not in 10 years, definitely in 15 to 20 years. I am called upon to sum up the foreign policy pursued by India during the last fifteen years, I will term it as futile attempts to emerge as promoter of world peace and crafty diplomacy. It lacks principle, thought on any future plan. The result of following the policy has proved that it is dangerous for our country. Let us review our relationship with our neighbouring countries which is the main criterion of our foreign policy. Which

are our neighbouring countries? They are Afghanistan, Pakistan and Tibet. What is the use of mentioning the name of poor Tibet: There are other countries viz. Nepal, Burma and Sri Lanka. Let any hon. Member in the entire House tell me the name of a single country among all the above mentioned countries which is more friendly towards India than China. No one—Am I right? There is not a single neighbouring country which is more friendly to India than China. There might be two or three neighbouring countries which can be called friends, but none of them is a real friend. Even after listening to all this, if any hon. Member gets up and makes tall claims about our foreign policy, I will say that he has no knowledge of the factual position. Why did it so happen? What I feel is that the party which is in power at present forgot its first foreign policy that it had laid down in 1918 or 1919. I do not know as to who had drafted the resolution. But from the hand-writing it appears that it was written by Mahatma Gandhi. It was a brief resolution. Later on lengthy resolutions were prepared. In the above mentioned resolution, it was proposed that Independent India should have maximum concern for its neighbouring countries. In this connection, it will be my main allegation that India's foreign policy either neglected its neighbours or set wrong examples before them.

I would like to cite an instance of setting wrong examples. The way India had chosen to be partially Pro-Soviet and partially Pro-China the neighbouring countries also thought that they may also gain something by following the same policy. As a result thereof the Government of this country started leaning to some extent towards the Soviet camp and to some extent towards the Chinese camp.

It could also be one of the reasons. I can say that this is also one of the reasons. We use English while implementing our foreign policy due to which India has neither been able to do any good to itself nor to the rest of the world. I have been observing for the last 15-20 days. The hon. Minister of External Affairs knows English a little but when he starts using words like "napasand" in the context of Chinese aggression, I am

constrained to think as to what has gone wrong with him. For example, for Chinese aggression he used the word 'invasion'. He uses words like "disapprove" for the Chinese action. I do not say that he is deliberately using these light words for China. Or he uses them because he is mentally disturbed. On the one hand he understands that China invaded India and on the other hand he says that there has been some minor skirmishes or some acrimonious exchanges, which we dislike. The Hon. Prime Minister uses this word. What I think is that one of the reasons for this could be that we take action in English. We do not understand the actual meaning of English words, but we go on using them. As a result of this, when any of our representatives speaks in the United Nations, he cannot express himself in an impressive manner. When Khrushchev speaks, he speaks with all seriousness and stresses his point of view, but when an Indian representative speaks, he is very superficial in his speech. The Britishers and Americans make sarcastic remarks as his speech does not have any impact on the audience. If you want to change the Indian foreign policy, first of all you will have to change the medium of expression of our spokesmen.

Besides, I would like to refer to those two points which I mentioned in the beginning of my speech. They are Pakistan and foreign assistance. As long as we are dependent on other countries of the world, say the U.S.S.R. or the U.S.A. we will not be able to follow any independent policy of our own. With regard to Pakistan the most important thing that I would like to say is that we very often do not make any difference between the Government of Pakistan and the Pakistani people and this is very bad. I consider the Government of Pakistan as bad as the Government of India. But I want that so far as the people of Pakistan are concerned, the people of India should maintain good and cordial relations with them....

In this connection, the question of Kashmir is very often mentioned. I would like to say that though efforts have been made to solve the issue of river water management or any other dispute, by signing accords heavily weighed in favour of

the other party, this approach is not going to yield any results in respect of Kashmir. Even if we give Kashmir to Pakistan today, the Indo-Pak disputes will not come to an end. One or the other dispute will come up. They will again start quarrelling for one reason or the other. We should find out some permanent solution to the entire problem. For this, what I feel is that there is no other solution but to form a confederation. Efforts should be made to form an Indo-Pak confederation. Fingers may be raised at me for making such a peculiar suggestion and people might call me mad. They may say that when Indo-Pak relations have deteriorated to such an extent and Pakistan is about to sign an accord with China, I am talking of forming a confederation.

Interruptions@

In reply to this, I would simply like to ask them to dream and see the results. People have stopped dreaming. It was there in the draft proposal of the party in power which had suggested partition of the country. At that time, I had also been invited along with another person. In the resolution that was moved by the hon. Minister of External Affairs, only the question of partition was accepted. At that time, of course, it was my weakness, I should not have given my consent to the above proposal. In the said meetings one more sentence was added that from Kashmir to Kanya Kumari and from far east to west, India is one. We saw its map and learnt to worship it. We can never forget these facts. But I would like to remind the Congress Members that in that very resolution in which partition of the country was proposed, the question of whole India was also taken up. The same picture will continue to remain in our minds. But it is a matter of regret that the Congress members have totally wiped out the same picture from their minds. The same picture should once again be brought back into the minds of the people of this country....

●Shri Sham Lal Saraf: How is it possible?

Since, we have stopped dreaming, it does not seem feasible on our part. Ultimately, how Pakistan was formed? It was formed because some people far away in England dreamt about Pakistan. May be that it was a wrong dream, but some people had dreamt it. Again there after Mr. Jinnah and the Muslim League dreamt it and later on, their dream became a reality. But what stand we Indians are taking now? One person dreams and advises you to start dreaming, but people cause obstructions and say that we cannot think of unifying India and Pakistan.....

The people here act as prompted and have no idea of the factual situation. Therefore, they are unable to bear any new ideas. If such people had been there, this country would never have achieved independence and Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, some Britisher would have been on your seat and a puppet assembly would have continued here. We achieved independence, because we dreamt about it. Now, I am dreaming about the confederation and I would like to submit that in the next ten or twenty years, India and Pakistan will be united. A confederation of the two countries will be formed and they will unite into one. As China proudly boasts of having a population of 60 crores, we will also be able to call ourselves a country of 60 crores. Regarding the confederation, I would like to submit that then we will be able to consider afresh the issue of Kashmir as to whether it remains in India or goes to Pakistan or forms an independent state as also the issue of divided Bengal.

I also want that the Hon. Prime Minister should have some restraint while speaking. I was surprised to hear him that day when he mentioned the name of the Muslim spy, but hesitated, while telling about the name of the second spy. We came to know his name as Sharma only the next day. These trifle issues sometimes become very dangerous for us. Who is a spy after all? There is no difference of Hindu or Muslim in it. Whosoever deceives his own country for money is a spy and

such people can be found in both the communities. So, such a mistake should not be committed in this regard.

Regarding foreign aid, I would like to submit that we have become like that beggar, who starts abusing when he does not get alms. And USSR as well as USA—all the whites—are like those donors who expect the beneficiaries...

Interruptions@

Not only to be grateful but also dance to their tunes. Therefore, now it has become necessary that our country should take a firm stand and refuse to accept such foreign aid. Such types of foreign aid should not be there in the world, which are at present given by one country to another. Now a world development corporation should be formed, in which a country should provide funds according to its capability and should borrow according to its need.

If we can adopt an independent foreign policy on these two issues, it is still possible that—although the condition has deteriorated to a great extent during these last 15 years—the foreign policy of India may be strengthened. If we only keep thinking that the duty of the Government of India, its External Affairs Ministry and our Ambassadors is to protect and improve the image of External Affairs Minister in foreign countries, the image of India can never be projected. If we want to uphold the image of our country in other countries and want to safeguard the interests, the independence and the territories of our country, it is necessary that the External Affairs Ministry should give up its solitary aim of upholding the image of Hon. Prime Minister in the foreign countries, which it has followed during the last 15 years.

If you allow, I will conclude in one minute by giving an example in this regard. Otherwise, I will resume my seat. When

@An Hon'ble Member: Will bless you.

I went to USA in 1951, some Americans wanted to know my opinion about their President Trueman. By that time, a rapport had been established between me and the audience there and the barriers of nationality had some what disappeared. When I replied to them, they became distressed and said that you are not telling the entire thing—when you go back to India, take Mr. Trueman with yourself. Then suddenly, I thought of one reply which would have upheld the image of India, but would have some what distorted the image of our Prime Minister—would not have distorted it much but as a matter of fact, it would have raised his status—and I told them that on one condition, I am ready to take Mr. Trueman with me to India and it is that you should call our Prime Minister Shri Nehru to America and let him reside here.

Therefore, my American audience were convinced that we were very much democrats like them and people in India had diverse views and they enjoyed full freedom to express these views in accordance with the basic principles of democracy.

It is very necessary in a foreign policy that the masses of one country should have contact with the masses of another country. At present, this contact is only between the Governments. It is being said about us that we only make noise. But at present, the Congress Party also does not raise any big issue—an issue providing a new direction—regarding the foreign policy. All have become dependent on the Government. I accept that in comparison to 19th Century, it has been the weakness of the 20th Century that the contact between the masses has lessened and that of the Governments has strengthened but we should at least make efforts to establish a contact between the people at the world level.

Motion Regarding Pakistani Forces' Attack on Kutch Border

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Prime Minister, the Minister of External Affairs and the Defence Minister, all the three, should have been present during this debate, but at the moment none of them is present. It is not only painful for me, but also it might create suspicion in the minds of people all over the world and they would desire to know if this matter is only an acrimonious exchange.

It was midnight, Indian troops had already marched for Hyderabad. At that time the Army Chief reached Prime Minister's residence. The former informed the latter that Pakistan has also mobilised its troops and is likely to attack, then the Prime Minister talked to Sardar Patel over phone after midnight and informed him that Pakistan has since mobilised its troops. Sardar Patel simply said, "then". Then the Prime Minister told him that the Pakistan troops are about to enter Indian territory from all fronts. Sardar Patel again said, "then". I came to know that talk went on like this for some more time and then the telephone was disconnected.

Today, I do not want to say that there is a need of Sardar Patel. It will be totally meaningless. But one thing I must say that a determination to stick to the decision is needed. It is needed even after taking the same.

At the moment I would not like to talk about war. And these

*Lok Sabha Debates, 28 April, 1965.

people also have not talked any thing of war. Had there been any move to bring essence in the present debate, it would have been decided whether it is an acrimonious exchange or war. The matter is totally hazy. Any conclusion could be drawn whether it is an acrimonious exchange or war.

When I am talking of determination, let me make it clear also. Uptil now this Government has lost a lot— Langju, Barahoti, Ladakh, Aksaichin— let us leave aside the areas in Kashmir. Now it lost Kutch. A feeling has gained ground in the minds of the people of India and Pakistan that any land of India can be snatched at any time. As such now you have to think with the determination that Kanjarkot which had been taken away from India will have to be got back and till such time India would not sit in peace. I am not talking of the earlier land. No one should misunderstand it. It becomes very easy for these people to say that belligerent people are sitting on this side. I would like to make it clear that. I do not like weapons. But no other way is left for me though I am trying my best to find one. But so long as India exists the land area of Kanjarkot will have to be got back. In future also, if any country—say China, Pakistan or any other country attacks any part of our land, we will fight to the end. Either our country will be wiped out or we will get back our land. While taking a decision in this regard, we have to keep our mind clear as to the direction to which we should proceed.

No light has been thrown on the entire gamut of Indo-Pak relations. No reference has been made in this regard. The Indo-Pak relations are such that we cannot live as friends under ordinary circumstances. Either there will be hostility or the two countries, India and Pakistan would become one nation. No intermediary situation can exist. This has been proved in the course of the events that took place in last 17 years. I would not like to give any historical reasons for this. It is possible that for a short spell say for 4,5 or 7 years we can be friends. Thereafter, either the friendship will increase towards unification or it will have other consequences. There are various stages of unification. First, there should be a federation and then there will be unification. Otherwise, friendship will go astray and

enmity will develop. I would like to remind you that when an accord on river water management was signed, people thought that all disputes between the two countries had come to an end and henceforward both the countries would live as friends. But where did it happen? For one or two years they remained as friends and there after they fell out. This will happen always. Either both the countries will unify or they will continue to have hostilities. We should take a decision in this regard. I would like to make this clear not only to the people of India but also to the people of Pakistan. Thereafter I shall draw a conclusion in this regard. If you want to get back Kanjarkot, then do not talk of water etc., please do not talk that it is raining and water is accumulating etc. Please do not talk that Langju is a hill area and the Chinese are marching down from the top. These are all meaningless. Take a decision, then you will see what East Bengal is. Just as two parts of demon Jara were united and Jarasandh came into being. Pakistan has been formed of two unnatural—artificial parts. I want to say that if the matter goes to extremes, East Bengal can be annexed by India in 4-5 days. Nobody should think that it is so easy a matter that Pakistan will be able to advance from both the sides. Shri Krishna had to teach the clues how to tear Jarasandh. But who is here to teach you people?

...I would not like to say anything about the wisdom of people who are present here. They have some wisdom. Let them learn more. My advice will be useful for them. Be a little intelligent as it will be helpful to you. I would not like to use a more stronger word than this. The East Bengal issue is similar to the case of Jarasandha. You should also know about it. The Pakistanis already know this thing. That is why they are so disturbed. They will always have hostilities with you.

I have checked myself. I have been receiving countless letters and telegrams from East Bengal. I do not utter anything because even though, I am having everything in my mind, picture of the federation is still there in my mind. Even after saying all this, there will be unification one day at last.

Some people have criticised me very bitterly and told me as to why I was talking about confederation. Today also, a gentleman told me a lot of things and alongwith that added "till that Government is there". Shri Ansar abused me a lot and then added "till that Government is there". He should have also said that "till this Government is here". He should have added this also. The day, the Government in this country will adopt a socialist attitude towards the masses, it is possible that the masses of Pakistan will also revolt against the Ayub Government there and the masses of both the countries will again unite both the countries into one. It may take a lot of time. At present, I am speaking about the confederation.....

While dealing with Pakistan one should always differentiate between the Government and the masses there. We should adopt a hard attitude towards the Government there, but with the people we should adopt a soft attitude. The masses of both the countries were brothers and they will remain brothers, even if, they slit one another's throats. They will always remain as brothers. The countries will unite into one. Therefore, our country should never leave its soft attitude towards the people, even if, it has to be hard against the Government there.

Regretfully, I call your attention towards the news, which has come out in the press today. It is about an American professor, who has recently been an ambassador here. I mean Prof. Galbraith. He has stated that while he was holding the post of Ambassador here, he had advised the Indian Government not to carry out air raids on the advancing Chinese forces. First of all, I would like to do one thing. At present, Pt. Nehru is not here. Any way, I am an atheist....

If you are a believer, look, what has become the situation of the country. There was no progress at all. I would like to submit one thing about Pt. Nehru. I withdraw the criticism, I did about Pt. Nehru for not carrying out the air-raids on China and I would like to submit as to what authority America had got to advise us

through its Ambassador who was a scholar and a professor, not to carry out air raids on China, who had already occupied 20,000 sq. miles of our territory and had brought its forces inside our territory? If some one occupies 20,000 sq. miles of land of America, will any American ask not to protect his land and not to carry out air-raids? This question is totally clear. This brings out a fact before us. So far as the question of the countries of the coloured and backward people is concerned, these powerful countries have no concern whether their lands are occupied by the others. It is very regretful to say this. I would also like to say that while in America if any American seriously thinks about the matters relating to the foreign policy, he should give some suggestions on this issue.

I am among those people of South Asia, who want that the Government of India should not say anything on Vietnam, because no such thing should take place in South Asia which increases the strength of China or North Vietnam. But the American professor, who has been the Ambassador here, states such a thing. Attention should be paid in this regard.

Besides this, I would like to submit about Shri Josef Stalin. Neither I am a devotee of Stalin nor of communism. But Shri Menon who was the Indian Ambassador to Moscow has written an account of the talks he had with Shri Stalin. Shri Stalin had told Shri Menon, not our Shri Menon, but Shri K.P.S. Menon that if he had gone there to discuss the issues of Korea and other issues, leaving them aside he should discuss the issue of India and Pakistan with him. His country has been artificially divided, so he should talk with him about reuniting the countries into one country or about the confederation. Anyway, it was the opinion of Stalin. I don't know as to what was the opinion of Khrushchev or Brezhnev or Kosigyn. But I would like to submit that any person, who has a farsight in international matters and thinks of justice and wants to do the work peacefully, has to adopt this principle in one form or the other that an effort should be made to form a confederation to reunite such a country, which has been artificially divided into two parts. Both Russia and America would have to adopt this principle. Therefore, both

Russia and Pakistan should give serious thought to the issue of resolving the differences between India and Pakistan.

It is true that several times, it has been mentioned here that American arms were recovered from the Pakistanis. Is it not true that the Chinese were also armed with Russian arms. The countries should not be made to fight on such small and trifle issues. Today, the world has become so much complex that the Russians, who had provided a lot of help to China and are still providing, today say that they have disputes with them. Similarly, America is also providing help to Pakistan. So, instead of getting involved into such small issues, we should take up the major issue. Are America and Russia prepared to accept the idea of an India-Pakistan confederation and unity for maintaining peace in the entire world. I have already said that this principle is also applicable in the case of East and West Germany, in the case of Vietnam, in the case of Korea and in the case of other countries also...

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am surprised that Shri Chaunan has been making such statements over the past 10-15 days. It seems that a man whose muscles have atrophied is displaying his muscle-power as if he were a muscleman. He always flexes his muscles and declares that we can face China or Pakistan. This is an oft-repeated rhetoric. At this time, Indians must choose their words carefully. It is true that we are weak but we have decided that we will not let any other part of our territory to go into foreign hands. We shall fight hard, however great be the enemy. Initially, we may have to face setbacks, but we will fight to the very end. We will fight until our country is destroyed or we regain our occupied territories. This is the sort of language that our Defence Minister should use instead of making provocative statements.

In this context, we must pay attention to Pakistan also. Our Government has often talked of having a no-war pact with Pakistan, but I go back to the year 1959 or thereabouts when Ayub Khan offered India a joint security plan. This Government

did not accept that offer. Both Governments are acting in like manner. I would advise that there should be another offer in line with the agreement for having a confederation. The country should be prepared to sacrifice anything for this purpose. It is possible that the President might be from Pakistan and the Prime Minister from India. Some or the other solution can be found out. The human mind is such that even a Constitutional solution can be found out. As to the Prime Minister's appeal for unity, there is no need for that. I am not making tall claims but I am as concerned about the nation's security as everyone else. I am perhaps even more concerned than others. There is no need to make such appeals, because one cannot speak of protecting this country after formulating destructive policies for the last 17 years. Why should one go further, just today the Prime Minister was comparing freedom and poverty. What is the meaning of this comparison? Can we be poor and free at the same time? It is impossible. So we should try to become rich. And when I speak of becoming rich I am speaking of raising the standard of living of the 48 crore people of this country. Only then we can face China and Pakistan.

These days I am in correspondence with the Prime Minister. I had written to him that this was my last letter to him. This letter was not addressed to the Prime Minister, but was addressed as "My Dear Leader." I used the word "Leader" as he is the leader of the House. So, that makes him my leader also to that extent. So I wrote to "My Dear Leader" that his Government, by using the word "disputed" for the last 17 or 18 years has committed an act of treason against the nation. The use of the word "disputed" should now be stopped.

Discussion on Resolution Regarding Ceasefire of Hostilities between India and Pakistan and Resolution Regard- ing India Quitting Commonwealth*

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Chagla Saheb was hundred per cent correct when he stated that Pakistan was not satisfied with the resolution passed by the Security Council. To this extent the House may be grateful to him and to anyone else responsible for this — but when he tried to explain that the resolution of the Security Council was not disadvantageous for India, many things came to my mind. The first thing is that Chhagla Sahib advocated the cause of India in New York, while here in this House he was speaking as an advocate of the Security Council. Mr. U. thant might feel happy with it, but I will prove it that he will be no more happy because the Security Council will prove defunct in respect of this resolution.

Had Chagla Saheb spoken like a judge, and not as an advocate, we would have felt indebted to him. To substantiate his viewpoint he quoted from his own speeches, but he should have told what Goldberg stated, what U.S.S.R. said and what were the comments of those who reviewed the Security Council resolution. What he himself said was not going to prove anything.

Chagla Saheb spoke like an advocate for 31 minutes and like a soldier for 4 minutes. If this 4 minutes speech ever

* *Lok Sabha Debates*, 24 September, 1965.

prevailed upon his 31 minutes speech, India will certainly come victorious, but if we relied upon what he stated in his 31 minutes speech then our position will be very awkward. I would like to advise not only him but also his friends that had the reign of the wisdom run supreme in the world it would have been better, but I believe that the affairs of the world are guided partly by the wisdom and partly by might.

I would like to tell Mr. U. Thant and my friends in Government about the experience I had of the League of Nations at Geneva. League of Nations had its headquarters at Geneva at that time, as the United Nations is having it in New York presently. Only the name has been changed. Chagla Saheb has no experience of the former, while I had seen and heard it. I noted one thing that when it was being highly praised it was having a drawback. The same drawback I find in the Security Council of the UNO today. This drawback is clear from the fact that the Security Council neither passes any resolution on American intervention in Vietnam nor about the doings of USSR in Hungary, nor can it do so. It passes resolutions only about those countries which are poor, weak and have no military power to go their own way.

I have seen and heard these things in my student life at Geneva. If this Government and Mr. U. Thant learn some lesson from this, it will be good for the world, because I do not wish that the Security Council meets its doom. I wish that it may live long and serve the world. This is possible. But only if a miracle, i.e. basic change in its policy, takes place. Otherwise, whenever the Security Council will take up any matter concerning any country other than USA and USSR, it will not pass any resolution based on justice or with a view to create a new world order, but such a resolution would be based on bargaining and give and take basis. The resolution recently passed or the agreement made is on give and take basis and it does not

ensure justice and a new world order. What it contains is one, to go back to the position that existed on 5th August, and the second, to initiate dialouge on Kashmir issue. These two things are evident in this resolution. At this juncture I do not say that both these points will prove dangerous for our country, but if you continue to stick to what you stated in 31 minutes, it will certainly prove harmful. And if you stand to what you stated in 4 minutes, it is not necessary that it may finally prove harmful. But remember, these two points contained in the resolution are going to prove harmful, not only for the world but for Indo-Pak relations too. When you have made a provision for talks in the resolution it is certain that talks will be held. If the talks go in favour of Pakistan it will prove suicidal for Government of India —I think no one in the Government will be ready for that, but who knows there might be someone willing to go to that extent —but if the talks linger on what would be the result then. No problem will be solved. Relations between India and Pakistan will remain strained and bitterness will increase. Advocacy will fail here.

On my behalf, therefore, please tell Mr. U. Thant that if he wishes to save the Security Council he must resist from treading the path of the League of Nations, Geneva. Otherwise it will not be able to take any decision in the matters relating to these two bigs and when these two nations come together the Security Council will become defunct and will only continue to interfere in the matters relating to other countries, not for the sake of justice but for arranging give and take. This is the basic point.

Now the question arises as to what the Britishers did. I would like to tell you about my views which I am having from my childhood. It is possible that I might have been influenced by Mahatma Gandhi and the place where I was born, but Mr. Chagla Saheb you are somewhat deprived of that. It is why I wish to tell Mr. Chhagla that in this world I found no other Government, worst than the British Government, irrespective of the party which was in power there.

But I would also like to add that I have not seen people more politically conscious than the English-men in the world. So, the question is that you should draw some conclusion. Governments are formed to do some business, but what sort of Government is this? I doubt whether this Government had entered into any written or unwritten agreement with Mr. Jinnah who had exhorted the Muslims not to be cowed down and assured them to come to their rescue when they were in danger. In support of my above contention, I would like to cite an example. Of course, I do not want to disclose the name but once a big Afghan leader had put a poser to Mr. Jinnah who was spearheading his campaign for creation of Pakistan, whether he (Mr. Jinnah) was prepared to give the right of self-determination to Pakhtoons also, as was being demanded by him for Muslims. To this, Mr. Jinnah replied that they should first ask for this right. Upon this, the said Afghan leader retorted that if they asked for that right, they would be crushed with the help of piled British arms and ammunitions along the borders and forced to go to the wall. Then Mr. Jinnah replied to him that he should have no doubt about it that after creation of Pakistan British arms and ammunitions would be withdrawn from the soil. The arms and ammunition supplied by the Britishers would remain there to provide protection and they would not get Pakhtoonistan even then. This conversation took place between Mr. Jinnah and one of the big Pakhtoon leaders. From the above conversation, my belief gains further ground that either a written or unwritten agreement has been reached between Pakistanis and Britishers. I do not want to refer to the agreement entered into with you, as it is a separate matter. Though these agreements bear serious consequences but for the moment I do not want to raise this issue.

You have to decide one thing. There has been much contrast in the foreign policy of India as if the mind of it, if at all it is in it, is inclined to U.S.S.R and the body has fondness for U.K., For the last eight to ten years I have seen that most of the goods such as ships and machinery have been purchased from U.K. Major chunk of our foreign trade has been done with U.K. over this period. This shows that our body still vies for goods made

in U.K. whereas our mind is inclined to U.S.S.R. This is a very contradictory situation for our foreign policy. This will not last long. We have to strike some balance. If mind is inclined to something, the body will have to follow suit, even a bit. Unless this is done, things will not improve.

I forgot what Mr Bhagwat Jha Azad spoke but he has, certainly, spoken well. I am happy to know that he forgot his party affiliation while speaking. I liked his contention that one should forget one's party affiliation while speaking the truth and treading the path of truth. One should be prepared even to discard his party if it comes in the way of telling the truth. Therefore, I would like to offer a suggestion that our relations with Britishers be lessened, rather I would like to sever our relations with them. If it is not possible, we may at least bring our relations with them to the minimum.

Now I would like to cite the example of De Gaulle of France who has been making all out efforts to convert purely a dilettantish community into a martial race. He is yearning for it and taking actions consequences of which might have been seen by you. We will have to bear the brunt of his policy in the days to come. As regards your Afro-Asian friends, your foreign policy has been fully exposed on this score. You should be thankful to only one country i.e. Malasia which helped you and that too for certain reasons. You do not understand Jordan. You explored the possibility to strengthen relations with Arab countries. But see as to who has created Jordan? Who is patronising Jordan? It is the mighty English people who created Jordan and are patronising it.

Now I would like to tell a basic thing. You have said a very good thing that this year your experience has been good as compared to last year. What change has been brought about in foreign policy this year? India has allowed its troops to combat even moving a bit forward. Only this significant change has been made in our foreign policy. That is why I would like to submit to our Government to effect basic changes in our foreign policy. On the one hand, the Government should pay attention to strengthen relations with neighbouring countries such as

Afghanistan, Nepal, Malasia, etc which could be befriended. Thailand is also one of such countries which could be befriended. So are U.S.S.R and U.S.A, which have been our friends, and this friendship can be deepened. The Government should make efforts to remove the drawbacks of its foreign policy. You should put your foreign policy to test on two counts i.e. our relation with Pakistan and removal of poverty from the world both U.S.S.R and U.S.A can be our best friends if they lend their help to us on the above counts. The Government should not spoil its foreign policy in the name of any principle or 'ism'.

One question arises as to what lesson we learnt from it? One lesson that we learnt from it is that we discarded our policy pursued for the last 18 years to give fight only at the place where we were challenged. Now we have started to give fight to our enemies at their vulnerable points so that we could be able to give serious blow to them. I would like to tell the people of India this thing in particular that the Government would stick to this policy under compulsion as I do not believe in this Government. So I would like to add that you should give fight to the enemy not only at your land, but you order your troops to move forward to give fight at the enemy land.

I would like to tell yet another thing. The military pride of Pakistan* (*Interruptions*) I do not want to use the word 'smashed' but at least it received a blow, if it is not smashed. The attitude of Pakistan has softened but I can't say the degree to which it has softened. If the leaders of Pakistan change their old attitude or new good leadership emerges in Pakistan, it will bear fruitful results. Then people like us will be heard in both the countries. These two things have emerged out of it.

Only one slogan worth remembering and which will be remembered has emerged out of this war i.e. India will not go in for from one cease-fire to another cease-fire every time. But I regret to say that it proved to be hollow words, as we are still resorting to from one cease-fire to another.

* An honourable member: has been Smashed

The second point which is evident from the resolution of the Security Council is that the Prime Minister has made certain commitments to solve this problem. But I do not want to say anything about it except reminding this that this commitment is yours, not mine; my word goes far ahead.

The third point is that howsoever strongly India's cause is pleaded, whether in Tashkant or elsewhere, talks will have to be held with Pakistan and it will prove very dangerous. I agree that he will prove to be a wise person because he is soft-spoken, but talks bear serious consequence. If Pakistan is not satisfied then it is clear that it may prove to be very dangerous, no matter which is benefited from the talks—whether it is Hindustan, for that matter India that is Bharat, or Pakistan. Because if the leadership of Pakistan is not changed, the military pride of Pakistan which, I think, has received a jolt is not smashed, then Pakistan will try to attack again. And Shri Bhutto has stated so before the cease-fire was declared and when the war was on. This has to be kept in mind by Shri Shastri when he takes parts in talks that possibility of another attack is being oft repeated by them.

Kindly listen to me patiently in this regard. Don't lose temper, because what I say is in your interest. India should have captured Lahore and Sialkot within four to six days at the most. But we failed to do so. What were the reasons behind it. May be it was strategical inefficacy. Now, I have to say nothing in this regard.

*** *** ***

Interruptions@

*** *** ***

Listen, Raghunath Singhji, speak only if you know something. I am saying "May be". Therefore, I have nothing to say on this. But possibility is that the Government of India was afraid that if it could not capture those areas in the first attempt and second

@Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi) : No, No.

or third attempts were made, it will entail heavy loss of personnel and arms and ammunition and that in case of attack we would not be able to face China. If it was so, I would like to make it amply clear in this House that no defence or foreign policy works like this. When you fix a target, put your men and material to achieve it. Target should have been to capture Lahore and Sialkot, because if Lahore and Sialkot would have been under the control of Indian troops today and in that case we could have withdrawn from there after cease-fire, then our position would have been better and then only it would have been clear that military pride of Pakistan has been smashed. China debacle must be forgotten by Government of India once for all. If you want to solve the problem with Pakistan, you should get rid of the fear and apprehension that China will interfere. If China interferes we will deal with them also firmly.

Two words were frequently used during the war and this should have been done. One of the words is an English word and that is 'secularism' which has immensely harmed us. Excuse me, very few people know the meaning of the word 'secularism'. 'Dharam Nirpekshata' is only a smaller aspect of it. Secularism means 'Lokwadi'. 'Lokwadi' is on the line 'Parlokwadi' If you want to put it into practice, a clear decision will have to be taken in respect of Hindus and Muslims. Get rid of the false show of unity being practised for the last 18 years that both be united while maintaining their separate entity. I wish to unite them by minimising their separate entities. If you follow that path then only you may succeed in arousing a feeling of revolt among the people of Pakistan and Pakistani troops.

* * *

....So, one thing should be kept in mind that you are to make attempts to win the confidence of the common muslim masses numbering 499 lacs and keep 5 thousand affluent Muslim families a bit at bay. It has been a blunder on the part of the Government that not only in the case of Muslims but in the case of Hindus and other communities too, it attempted to bring changes with the help of a handful of affluent families. Now try to change the people with the help of common masses.

Likewise in the case of Pakistan, remember that Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan—the Sarhadi Gandhi—who remained in prison for fifteen to sixteen years, and Khan Abdussamad Khan—the Baluchi Gandhi—are not ordinary persons. They are the representatives of more than half of their people. I have heard yet another news, probably you might not be aware of it, that Khijar Hayyat Khan of Punjab is under house-arrest or in jail for the last eight or ten days...

*** *** ***
Interruption@
 *** *** ***

Yes, that very Khijar Hayyat Khan Tiwana. Let it be known to the Government. Chagla Saheb please keep it in mind that next time, when Pakistan attacks India, it is my belief that Pakistan will collapse at our very first stroke, provided you strictly put into practice true democracy and secularism. This belief is based on the fact that Pakistan has been created with various sects like Pathans, Baluchis, Bengalis, all kept together at one place.

There are two major evils in the world and they are abundantly found in Hindustan. These are inequality and feeling of separatism which could be eradicated by ensuring equality and affinity among the masses.

I suggest that our foreign policy relating to Pakistan and China should be amended on the one hand and on the other food problem should be solved. People need food. Remember that when a person like me asks people that instead of dying of hunger, they should enter into the houses of the Ministers and the bureaucrats and not allow them to take their meals unless they (people) get it, then it should not be taken as a mere threat. This is the voice of the people of India and of their health.

Likewise, with regard to democracy, I would like to say that our democracy is only for the name sake. Democracy by name

@Some Hon'ble Members : Tiwana.

alone will not yield any fruitful result. We will have to put the soul into it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, my humble submission to you is that whatever has happened this time has happened, but it should never happen again that the war goes on for 20-30 days and there is no mention, no discussion of it in the country's highest institution of democracy *i.e.* Lok Sabha. It shows that in the body of democracy, the soul is that of dictatorship. We should learn something in this regard from those Britishers, whom I term as vicious on Government level.

Now, coming to myself, journey is prohibited for me. We have constructed the road by demolishing the hills, but you do not allow us to travel on it, whereas others are being allowed. The whole world is watching and perceiving this situation. You too should try to perceive it and pay attention to it.

Lastly, I would like to reiterate that you should make all out efforts to make India strong by following the two principles of 'Jantantra' (democracy) and 'Lokwadi' (Secularism). I firmly believe that either by force or conciliation we would create such a situation in which within a period of two, five or ten years Pakistan as well as India would not no longer exist as such, and a new nation Hindustan would emerge.

Discussion on Illegal Occupation of Indian Territory by China and Pakistan and Statement made by The Minister of Education Regarding The Area of Indian Territory

Mr. Speaker, Sir, debate on area of Indian territory is in fact the debate on motherland and the August House has been discussing this issue for the last 1½-2 years. In fact it is a matter of sense of Nationality and two-three days ago, someone asked me about Nationality, whether it is increasing or decreasing in our country? The reply struck in my mind at once which I think is true, if we take it internally, it is decreasing and regionalism is increasing. If we see externally, particularly about China, then sense of Nationality is increasing except in a few sections for whom I can not take responsibility. And similarly about Pakistan I as well as many others have mixed feelings. Generally we want that if such a situation arises India and Pakistan will unite and again become Hindustan but if Pakistan attacks, then the same spirit of Nationality which was about China will awake. One thing about this issue is true that if one day the World Lok Sabha—Lok Sabha elected by the franchise—is formed; I am not talking about the United Nations of today because that organization is elected body of the governments, and it takes such decisions which goes against us or against some other nation, whatsoever may be the publicity

**Lok Sabha Debates, 8 August, 1967.*

about those decisions, but I think people will start accepting them gradually. Now, if we see the map released by United Nations, you will see one interesting thing there. In that map, from 1950-52 to 1960 i.e. upto 10 years, our area has been shown about 32 lakh km., sometime, 32,60,000 k.m. and sometimes 32,40,000 k.m. And in 1961 it is shown a few k.m. more than 30 lakh. Hon. Minister would like to say that at that time the area of Jammu and Kashmir was excluded. This is not the fact but it is half truth, I will tell you the whole truth. Census was conducted in 1960 and the census work was going on at the time of sending the report to U.N. as census work could not be completed and this Government is incompetent because it sent incomplete statistics to the U.N. They say that they attached a note that the work relating to the census is going on as and when this work is completed we will be able to clarify the position, whether that note was sent or not, I do not know. You can see all from the file of that time. But it is certain that incomplete statistics were sent in 1961 and since then, United Nations Council started showing the same which according to my calculation is nearly 5 lakh acre less. So this is the case of 61 which I have described. And I want a clear-cut reply from the Hon'ble Minister through you as to why this worthless work of sending figures of incomplete census to U.N. had taken place. Then one more argument was given that whatever the U.N. say we have nothing to do with that. This is our own territory. Is it a Roshanara Club or Gymkhana Club where a member is at liberty to say or to do whatever he likes? This is the Supreme body. May be it has not got till now full sovereignty but being a member of supreme body we should

be more careful about what we say. We see a strange change in the statement which was laid last time by Hon. Minister. He said that this sort of errors are committed also by other countries. This is a misleading argument. He has figures of many countries with him but due to shortage of time he may not give these figures. He has given figures only about Australia. The reason for giving these figures was that some Greeks were excluded in Australia, that is why they reduced those figures. The figures of America remain static for 10 years, again in 1958 suddenly there was an increase of about 10 lakh due to the inclusion of Hawaii. Same is the case with Russia and other countries, their figures remain unchanged. The Hon'ble Minister should not give a misleading argument and the August House should be very cautious about it so that the ministers do not give wrong and baseless examples in order to prove their statement correct.

One thing which I see very strange is that there is no mention of occupied Kashmir in the ~~statement~~ statement laid by Hon. Minister on 31st July in this regard. There is mention of Langju and Laddakh. Please differentiate these two things. About Langju it is said that this is disputed area about which India and China both have some doubts. But in the case of Aksai China area of Laddakh, there is no ambiguity about the stand of India and China. China says it belongs to her and India says it belongs to her. So here the mention of disputed and undisputed area of Laddakh has been made. But there is no mention of Azad Kashmir which seems very strange. Hon'ble Speaker, Sir, is there something going on about it? This statement was made on 31st July. If something is going on, I have no objection. I would like to tell you that if India and Pakistan form a federation they become Hindustan only, I have no worry about Kashmir, where it remains. But until I would must say that a federation is

formed it is shameful not to show Azad Kashmir, as Indian territory, they stated many time in this House that Langju has an area of one or two miles only.

When I reached there after my arrest for two or three items, I was told by the officers, not at Langju but somewhere around that the place was spread in atleast two to three hundred square miles. Similarly there was no mention of Burma Treaty. I am not sure how much land of our country two, three or four thousand square miles or whatever it might have been given to them though certainly it did go out of our hands. Well, there is a mention of Barahoti also. There are two Barahoties-Chhoti Barahoti, Badi Barahoti. It is not known which one has gone. The manner in which the Hon. Minister has made a reference to Sikkim, it causes suspicion since the details about Sikkim are not put forth in the way as it used to be done earlier. It is all a case worth suspicion. Not only that Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minister may, with reference to report by the Survey of India, say that we have lost only two thousand square miles but in my view we have lost about ten to fifteen thousand square miles of land. Since they admit that they had already taken in account the areas of Goa and Pondicherry as parts of India even before these areas were merged with India. One can count only when one gets it. I agree that the area should expand, but not by account for the one which you do not actively have in your possession. How can we trust in that? They counted even before getting. Actually, some very significant events must have taken place. They give the plea that in the past the Britishers were not looking after property. Now aerial surveys are being done. I do understand that this way we can know all about all the pits and hills as also the totality of the land but the device of measuring out the land while sitting in the aeroplane can be a creation of these ministers only. Nowhere else it is done this

way. Besides this they often say that, now-a-days, more scientific methods are being adopted. In this connection also I would quote an incident. I had written a letter to Surveyor General on 2nd July 1960 in English, although, you know, I don't usually use writing a letter in English language. But in view of the seriousness of the case I acted against my principles. However, till date, even when the matter has come up here in the House, I have not received a satisfactory reply from him. And as such I now want a satisfactory reply from you. Sir, you will certainly appreciate that when a member of Parliament, writes a letter to any bureaucrat on a subject not of his own interest, but of public importance, the bureaucrat is duty bound to send a reply, otherwise he is supposed to have failed in discharging his duties. Now I handover this letter to you and request you to send it to him and get a reply from him. I read it to you:

"I will thank you to answer my questions as fully as you can and at your earliest convenience.

*** *** ***

Interruptions@

*** *** ***

I have already stated that I never use English in public meetings. When on such an occasion or in my private conversations I have to use English, I do not relish it

- "1. What is the total area of India at present or according to the last tabulation?
2. What was the total area of India on 15th August, 1947. This must include areas which acceded to and were joined to India later. It must not exclude areas which have been usurped and are now in unlawful possession of foreigners.

@ Sh. M. A. Khan (Kasganj): Dr. Saheb wrote a letter in English.

3. If there is any difference between 1 and 2, how do you account for it?
4. Is the current survey of India 190 years old? No matter how much survey methods have become more scientific, what is the outside margin of rectification of errors? Do better methods mean anything more than change in the scale of mapping for instance, from one inch to four miles earlier to two miles and in some cases of detail now even lesser?
5. What is the area of Goa and other Portugese possessions in India and Pondicherry and other French possessions and since when are they being counted with the Indian total?

I have written this letter as part of my parliamentary work and will thank you for giving me an early answer. Accept my salutations, Brigadier."

I had written this letter to Brigadier Gambhir Singh on 2nd July 1966, a reply to which I have not yet received. Now I wish you to send this letter to him so that you as well as the House could know the seriousness of this matter. I have already told you the fate of the orders passed by the ministers. Factually, Mansar is village near Mansarover. This matter does not relate only to collection of land revenue which, they say we dont't get now, but the point on which I want to stress upon is that the population of Mansar, which is near Mansarover, used to be counted as Indian, as per the census held in 1931 and later, probably, in 1941 also. The officers of that place told me that this Mansar has also been abandoned. Sikkim has also been abandoned. Many places under Burma Agreement have been abandoned. It seems that this Government treat India as its family property, and its any part can be abandoned, or given to any one; and there is no check thereon.

Then, I fear Russia and America have some collusion or a

pact between them. I like their one pact that there should be no war in the world, but I do not at all appreciate their second pact, to the effect that there should be no big revolution. They fear that if there is some big revolution, they would not be able to contain it. Thus the Russian & American have joined hands to avoid any revolution or war. In such circumstances they may win, or they may even lose. But in case, the war breaks after one or two months putting West Asia on the side and India on the other, none knows what would happen. And you very well know what are the consequences of a war.

Now I would like to tell you the name of a place. The friends of Assam may tell you that a small town Makoom is there in between Tinsukia and Digboi. I wanted to know the meaning of Makoom from the local people there and I was told that in the past invaders from Thailand occupied some land there. Explaining the meaning to me they said that it meant come, sit and have mutual discussion. From that very day this place is called Makoom. Even today there are such innocent people in our country who indulge in Makoom or negotiated settlement when invaders occupy our land and ask for Colombo plan proposal and for other settlements. This has been our tradition. I am of the opinion that on being attacked we should act like a hawk. We may act like a dove or pigeon, a symbol of peace—if our country is not invaded and our territory is not occupied. We will not be able to survive as a nation if we will not act like hawk. This Government will not be able to withstand the onslaught of the enemy even for a week if our country is invaded again say in September, October or November. Our Government is not in a position to face the challenge of the combined armies of China and Pakistan. We are bound to be defeated, if attacked. During the last war, which continued for about a month, a Minister had to quit and if war had continued a little longer this whole Government might have gone. This war continued for one and a half months. Keeping in view the present position of the country it cannot last long for more than a week. It lacks self confidence...

The border of the country is just like the skin of a body. Just as we take care of our skin, similarly the borders of the country should also be looked after. What will you say to a person if he remains calm like a yogi when his skin is hurt and similarly to a Government when the borders of its country are encroached. In case Dover hills are attacked or Syberia or Chewan is invaded, many hon'ble members of our Lok Sabha will make hue and cry and shout of world war but they never speak when our own skin, our own borders are encroached. I am talking about borders of which we have lost 85 lakhs acres as per our Survey report and five crores acres of land as per entries in the books of United Nation. There is difference in both the calculations. Under the circumstances mentioned above, I appeal to you, Sir, as an Hon'ble Speaker of Lok Sabha and that it is very critical time and self determination and self-reliance is the need of the time. At this juncture there should be no weak or kneeling government lest we perish. This weak government—Makoom government will fall and the honourable members should be ready to replace this government and establish such a government which can safeguard the boundaries and the territory of India as well as the country itself with its self-confidence and self-determination.

... I have forgotten to mention one thing. I have got a map which shows that 12 Thanas have gone under control of Pakistan. You may see it and put it on the table of the House* if you deem it proper.

* The Speaker not having subsequently accorded the necessary permission, the map was not treated as laid on the table.

Constitution (Amendment) Bill (Amendment of Articles 124 and 217)*

Mr. Chairman, Sir, in the first instance I may submit that though it is said that the average age in the country has increased, yet the basis on which this conclusion has been arrived at has not been revealed. Therefore, I doubt that the average age has really gone up, and if at all it is so, it is not what is claimed. Unless the Government reveals the basis of arriving at this conclusion, the statistical figures are meaningless. Secondly, earlier, most of the newly born babies had to die within six months or a year of their birth, but now their number is less. But that does not mean that the average age of elderly people, adults and middle aged persons have increased. Actually due to the fall in the rate of death of infants it appears that average age has increased. But that is merely an appearance but actually it has not increased.

After making this submission I oppose this Bill introduced by Shri Sharma because what we expected from the judges is missing in this Bill.

What do we expect from judges? We expect from the judges to protect our life and property and also our liberty. Judge is supposed to protect us from unlawful and illegal arrest. In case I am arrested under any executive or legislative order, I would expect

* (i) Lok Sabha Debates. 10 April, 1964.

(ii) Private Member Pandit K.C. Sharma's Bill.

from a judge to protect me under sections 20 and 21 of the Constitution. However, sometimes even these sections become futile because of executive or the legislative order particularly when they are determined to ignore these provisions. Those countries where Constitution is followed and where all the sections are under the purview of judiciary, I am not referring to Britain, the cases of arrest and of awarding capital or any other punishment are considered by the judiciary as per the laws of that country. The case is initiated and everything depends on the outcome of the case. Judge has the full authority to order the release of the person arrested illegitimately.

I would like a similar Bill to be passed in India, so that no doubt is left anywhere in this regard. Insignificant matters are of no use.

In our Constitution it has been clearly provided in section 20 and 21 that the powers of judiciary cannot be diminished under any circumstances. If any suit which comes before the court is listed for hearing. There is only one exception when President declares emergency and suspends the various provisions of Constitution. Otherwise they will have to follow the various provision of the Constitution. When somebody violates the provisions of the Constitution, unless emergency is declared under which powers of the judges are withdrawn and a citizen is deprived of his liberty, I would expect from the judge to provide full protection to him. Actually judge loses this authority by then. Therefore, in the first instance, I would like that Shri Sharma should introduce a Bill providing for adequate safeguard to judges to enable them to discharge their duties without any hindrance. If such a Bill is introduced, I would accept that at long last a Bill has come to protect the Constitution of India.

You know it very well that sometimes legislatures also play a role in curbing the rights of citizens. Sometimes they unduly raise the issues of their privilege and encroachment of their

rights. They also want the people to follow the rules framed by them. First of all, I would like to distinguish between a rule and a law. Our Constitution clearly states that the privileges, the powers, the rights accepted by the law are far greater than those accepted by rule. There is a big difference between a rule and a law. But what happens actually, most of the actions are taken under the rules and when a judge makes distinction between the rule and the law outside interference takes place.

So I would like the judge to be protected from such circumstances. He should not be harassed in any way. Otherwise any legislature would punish any judge at any time. Legislature can formulate its own rule in this regard and since nothing specific has been mentioned in regard to the punishment it may award even capital punishment. Sometimes majority is so brute that it gives a practical shape to whatever it decides. Therefore, in regard to this Bill I would submit that the judge and the judiciary must be protected and strengthened, and it must be competent to implement and protect the provisions of the Constitution. We will welcome and support such a bill.

Bacon, a great British judge once said that a judge is like a lion but he is subordinate to executive. His statement was based on his personal experience. In those days a tussle was going on between the judges and the Parliament in England. He was brilliant and scholarly. I have a strong desire to see the judges who are like lions, who are not subordinate to the executive, who are on the equal footing with executive, so that they may protect the liberty of the citizens of India.

Interruptions@

**

I would not like them to place above the executive. I would not like the judges to be above the Parliament. So far as the question of formulating laws is concerned, you people are supreme but so far as the question of taking decisions on the

@ An hon. Member: Why not above them?

laws is concerned, the judge should be supreme. If the members of Parliament agree to this principle, most of the problems would be solved.

Constitution Amendment Bill (Omission of Article 370)*

Mr. Chairman, Sir, a lot of people want that the relation between India and Pakistan should improve and I am one of them. People also say that Kashmir problem is the main reason behind these relations getting sour. But this problem should be understood properly. If one says that only the people of Pakistan want Kashmir and it is a one sided problem, it will be a dangerous thing. This is a two-sided problem. Whereas the people of Pakistan want Kashmir, the people of our country or majority of them may revolt, if Kashmir is annexed by Pakistan. Therefore, this is a two sided problem and it should be understood properly. I request President Ayub also to understand this thing and so far as this Government is concerned, it is somewhat handicapped. Not only one but its both legs are paralysed and that is why it is always looking for supports. Now it has got the support of Sarvodaya Movement, but I would like to warn that Sarvodaya is also a very weak support. It cannot give solid support, because just by publicising a thing or saying one sided things, problems cannot be solved. I would like to remind Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri that Sarvodaya Movement was not able to solve any of the problems whether that was the dacoit problem, land problem or the problem of obscene film posters, except it made some propaganda. May be the same will happen in the case of Kashmir also, because Shastriji was already a weak person and now he has become even weaker.

* (i) *Lok Sabha Debates*, 11 September, 1964.

(ii) Private Member, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri's Bill.

He will also not be able to support this idea and he is not able to face a revolt or disorder in India for implementing his policies which he thinks to be good. If he had that much strength, we could have thought in some other way. Therefore, as on one hand, it is undesirable to hand over Kashmir to Pakistan on the other hand, it is impossible also, unless some requirements are met. That is why, I would like to submit about this two sided problem. I have a very flexible mind. The crime which was committed by the people of India and that of Pakistan seventeen years ago, could be again considered if a small step is taken in this regard and flexibility can be brought in the minds. One should make one's mind flexible. I am in favour of a flexible mind, but a flexible mind does not mean that we should leave one obstinacy in favour of another obstinacy. On one hand, we become obstinate that we will not give Kashmir under any circumstances and on the other hand, we take the stubborn stand that we are ready to give up our claim to Kashmir to improve the relations between India and Pakistan. Make your minds flexible. A flexible mind can be of only one opinion that a confederation of India and Pakistan should be formed, which can only solve the problem and some way out can be found on the basis of it. A confederation should be formed. Some people say that first Kashmir should be transferred to Pakistan. Then the Government of Pakistan will be agreeable to form a confederation. I would like to submit that those, who indulge in the talks of the past and the present, don't know as to what extent the matter has worsened. It will increase the scope for even more disorder.

Interruptions@

@ Minister of State in the Ministry of Railway (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh) We should have strength to retain Kashmir without making confederation.

I am in favour of the formation of confederation. Because in my opinion, it would be better that the sinful act committed by your leaders seventeen years ago including, of course, myself and you to some extent, is undone in our lifetime itself. To those who believe that President Ayub and the Government of Pakistan are not ready even to think in regard to the confederation, I would like to submit that a noble person ought not be totally unconcerned about the matter even after the Governments have thought over it. Governments keep on changing, their ideas keep on changing. Therefore, the formation of confederation is a noble idea, however, I would like to make one thing clear that in any condition it should be taken for granted that not much will be given in that case. I am ready even to agree to make the provision of offering one post either of the President or that of the Prime Minister to Pakistan in the constitution of new Confederation so long as Pakistan is ready to change that system.

Besides, I would also like to submit that whatever policy may be adopted in regard to the Defence, foreign affairs and also in matters to the transportations, a firm policy should be adopted in regard to the citizenship. Separate citizenship should not be there as it is at present in India and Pakistan. Only single citizenship should be there. I would like to assert that liberal attitude may be adopted in other matters under the new confederation.

I would like to make the same appeal to Russia, but particularly to U.S.A. pressurised to solve this issue. Though I am also of the same opinion but the question is as to how it should be solved. Merely by indulging in wishful thinking without studying it properly, or by suggesting a way for it, this matter would not be solved. Americans should also realise that solution to the problem can be reached only if the two separated countries are united. Some of the Americans asked me whether their Government could put such pressure on the Government of Pakistan? It would definitely displease the Pakistanis, and

Constitution Amendment Bill (Amendment of Article 352)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, today, I whole-heartedly appreciate Shri Kamath's views. I do so, not because he has put forward any proposal to remedy this malady, but because this House will get an opportunity every six months to have discussion on this malady which has now taken an epidemic form. Ours is the poorest country of the world and, I think, for a short period, it has become the most deceitful too. One of the main reasons for it is the Article 352 of the Constitution. Under this Article, the President is empowered to declare the state of emergency in the country under four conditions. The first is war, second-external aggression and third internal disturbance. I would like to lay emphasis on the fourth condition, i.e. financial crisis. Under these four conditions, the President i.e. his advisers can declare the state of emergency. You know who his advisers are. They are sitting there in front of us. They say that there is impending crisis. What is this impending crisis? No war is going on for the last 3-4 years. Suppose, these advisers say that though no war is going on, yet there is a danger of external aggression. But that danger too is not there. Is there any internal disturbance? I can also say that there is impending crisis before me because I am not in a position to make timely payments in respect of printing works I undertake. I want to give you another instance which did happen. Suppose for a

* (i) Lok Sabha Debates, 26 August, 1966.

(ii) Private Member, Shri H.V. Kamath's Bill.

while that it is raining heavily and I have to catch a train, but no taxi is available. In that situation, I can say that I am facing a big crisis. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had to raise money from somewhere to buy an air ticket and I travelled by air. If such petty problems are brought under the definition of crisis, it will be nothing but stretching of words. Where is that impending crisis which apprehends internal disturbance or an external aggression?

In all seriousness, I would like to say that this article empowers the Government to commit the biggest fraud on this country. I can understand foreign Governments committing fraud on the foreigners, but I do not find any instance whereby a Government has committed such a big fraud on its own people. When Government sets such an example before the people, the people too start committing petty fraud on its fellow beings in their day to day dealings. Article 352 teaches the entire nation to commit fraud. If I get a chance to see the President, I would ask him as to what is the impending crisis. In the years, that followed after the British Rule, whenever I got an opportunity to meet the President, I used to ask him whether he had satisfied himself of the impending crisis. What does an impending crisis mean? It means the dangers that lie ahead. If we talk of impending internal disturbance, internal disturbance means that the daily life of a common man would become impossible. Internal disturbance does not mean bursting of a cracker in Chandni Chowk causing fire in five or ten buildings leading to death of some people. Such an incident does not affect the life of the people in the entire capital because the daily life goes on uninterrupted. Therefore, such a situation cannot be termed as internal disturbance. To call such incidents as internal disturbance would amount to stretching of words too far and committing fraud on the politics. Situation of internal disturbance is created only when the daily life of citizen and carrying on trade and business becomes impossible. Internal disturbance means that free movement of the citizens has become impossible, there is terror among the people and conditions of chaos prevail. I want to say that the conditions

freedom. The Constitution I am referring to is the 'Constitution of Weimar. This Constitution was framed following the First World War which was fought in 1914-18. I have respect for only two Constitutions. The first is the Constitution of U.S.A. in which it was written for the first time that 'we, the people of U.S.A. give ourselves this Constitution.' It was a very good Constitution. Then came the Constitution of Germany, i.e. Weimar. This too was a good Constitution but it's article 48 was similar to article 352 of our Constitution. But later on, that Constitution was distorted to such an extent that it became the cause of destruction of Germany. The result is that you will find this Constitution only in the library.

Now, I have to mention only two incidents. The first one though small but is of vital importance. A person named Shri Lakhanpal is currently under detention in Delhi. He was a free man in September when Indo-Pak war was going on because at that time, it was not considered necessary to put him in jail. I am not against detaining the criminals but that man has not committed any crime, why then he has been kept under detention? There seems to be old animosity against him because at one time he supported the demand of plebiscite in Kashmir. Although he is no more a supporter of that demand, but he has been kept under detention.

The second incident relates to ESSO company. This company mixed kerosene in diesel at the instance of the Government and supplied it to its traders for sale. When the traders sold it, they were arrested in hundreds. This Government arrests those who work for them.

In the end, I would like to raise a point concerning the common man. Normally, Preventive Detention Act and Defence of India Act comes under attack quite frequently. But I would like to say that article 109 is a dangerous article for the citizens and common man of this country and it continues to be there in our Constitution for the last 125

years. Under the provisions of this article, a policeman is empowered to arrest anybody without any charge against him.

Interruptions@

Yet, that is right. So he will arrest him saying that he was moving under suspicious circumstances with the intention of committing a crime and that he had no means of livelihood. What does it mean? This Government will not feel ashamed. An unemployed man comes from a village to a city in search of job. He is hungry and has nothing to eat. At 10 or 11 O'clock in the night, a policeman will arrest him and produce a candle, a match box or a iron stick in the court. The court will put him behind the bars. Such a big fraud is being committed.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to say that this country is the poorest in the world, but now it has also become to be the biggest liar, because it is this Government which is telling this lie. It would have been better had this article 352 been abrogated. The Government should have accepted Shri Kamath's amendment....

@ An Hon. Member: He will not arrest him if he greases his palm.

Constitution Amendment Bill (Amendment of Article 368)*

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this question of the Supreme Court and the Parliament is not meant for me alone. It concerns the very character and complexion of our State. If I had not appreciated it in that perspective, I would not have tried to take part in this discussion after taking a good deal of trouble. In the course of my conversation with Shri Nath Pai about 15 days back about the structure of the State, I had told him that after the passage of his Bill, this debate on it would become infructuous and there will be only one meaningful sentence and that sentence is:

“Any provision of this Constitution may be amended in accordance with the procedure hereafter provided in this article.”

Besides this, there will be no change in it. In all other articles, the words “an amendment of the Constitution,” will be replaced by “an amendment to any Provision of any article of the Constitution”. When it is passed, any speech on right to property, liberty and Centre-State relations will not be there. Only one thing will remain that any article of the Constitution can be changed. When he introduced the Bill, I asked him whether he has thought over it properly that our main role is according to the pledge that we made, i.e.

“We, THE PEOPLE OF INDIA, having solemnly resolved to

(i) Lok Sabha Debates, 21 July, 1967.

(ii) Private Member, Shri Nath Pai's Bill.

Constitute India into a SOVEREIGN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC and to secure to all its citizens.....”

I will not read further. When I have asked him whether this Preamble “We, the people of India having solemnly resolved to Constitute India into a Sovereign Democratic Republic” can be deleted, he might remember that he had said that it could be deleted. If this law, which we are discussing today, is passed, it could be deleted.....

*** *** ***

Interruptions@

*** *** ***

All right, both of us will oppose it and meet the fate the Communists and Socialists which met in Germany. Hon'ble Chairman, if this bill is passed, the situation will become worse. I am telling you all this with a very heavy heart. May be I am visualising the end. I have witnessed the History for the last 10-15 years. Hon'ble Minister has been asked questions about future again and again. I need not ask questions about future. I have seen the past, I have witnessed it in Bastar, I have seen it in Kerala and in numerable places. I have observed that people can do much without passing this bill and if you provide them with such a powerful weapon, that would affect the very fabric of the country. I am not talking about the future but I am talking about the past. Articles 352 to 360 of the Constitution and especially Article 356 are Emergency Provisions. Our Constitution can be compared to a human being. A man becomes deficient if he develops some defect in his eyes. Similarly, these emergency provisions can cripple our Constitution. President's rule can be imposed in every State. Now, I ask you a question, that if any Union Government enforces Article 356 in all the states then all the State

@Shri Nath Pai: If Fundamental rights are attacked, I shall certainly oppose it.

Assemblies, Councils and Governments will be dissolved. Don't think that I am telling some cock and bull story. I will tell you how all this has happened in the World history. All those will come to an end. Then there is No. 2 and No. 3 of 308 in Shri Nath Pai's bill, in which words, "provided that if" occur, which means states etc. would be dissolved. There is no need to ask them. Legislative Assemblies cease to exist. Now remains the question of Parliament. You know there is one statute.

"Gesetz Zur Behebung Der Not von Volk und Reich"

I now tell you about one law which provided those powers to Hitler in Germany. I would also like to inform Prof. Ranga that as there are articles 352 to 360 in our Constitution in the same way there was an article in Weimar Constitution which is considered one of the Liberal Constitutions, which brought bad name to it. It was article 48. This law was enacted by virtue of article 48. I will only tell Shri Nath Pai that the bill which he has brought forward unknowingly shall provide so much powers that:

"Gezetz Zur Behebung der Not von Volk und Reich". The Laws are there to solve the problems of the public and the state and you know there are also problems in Madhya Pradesh

*** *** ***
Interruptions@
*** *** ***

Leave the Court. I am not talking about the High Court or Supreme Court. I am just telling that perhaps a person like me is simply liquidated and Shri Nath Paj is also put behind the bars. I am talking about it and you should pay attention to it. This was the Law which established dictatorship of Hitler. If you want I can read it out for you but there is no use of reading it in English.

*** *** ***

@Shri Nath Pai: No Court can help the public.

That was called Enabling Bill, but in Germany it was not so. As I have told earlier, it was called trouble shooter.

"The Enabling Bill which was laid before the House contained five clauses. The first and fifth gave the Government the power for four years to enact laws without the co-operation of the Reichstag". It means registration stopped for four years, Lok Sabha dissolved and everything finished.

"The second and fourth specifically stated that this power should include the right to deviate from the Constitution and to conclude treaties with foreign States, the only subject reserved being the institutions of the Reichstag and Reichsrat."

There is no need to mention it. Because I have already told that this bill of Shri Nath Pai needs only one thing:

We hereby resolve that this Constitution be suspended and in its place whatever is to be done that should be done and it is upto you what is to be done Will you please listen:

"The third provided that Laws to be enacted by the Government should be drafted by the Chancellor, and should come into effect on the day after publication."

After passing of this law, I do not think there will be any need for the remaining four. Only this fifth clause says that Constitution be scrapped. We legislate a law to give powers to certain persons. I do not know in whom the power is being vested through this law, whether he is a Military Officer, or the President or the Prime Minister, but if the absolute power is concentrated in one hand, then what will happen. You should know it also.

An oath was taken on 2nd August, 1934 by not only the German people, but also by German Army, which had caused quite a stir all over the World.

The army here cannot cause any stir in the world but they are able to do the same within the country. That oath was:

"Ich schwore bei Gott diesen heiligen Eid, dass ich

dem Führer des Deutschen Reiches und Volkes, Adolf Hitler....

Please listen to it. This is very dangerous oath which I am telling you....

“Ich schwore bei Gott diesen heiligen Eid, dass ich dem Führer des Deutschen Reiches und Volkes, Adolf Hitler, dem Oberbefehlshaber der Wehrmacht unbedingten Gehorsam leisten und tapferer Soldat bereit sein will, jederzeit für diesen Eid mein Leben einzusetzen.”

This oath had to be taken on 2 August, 1934 by the forces of Hitler or by German forces. What had not happened in Germany, perhaps, not even in the world, that can happen here after this Bill is adopted. The meaning of this oath is: “I take this sacred oath in the name of God that I will follow unconditionally, the dictates of Adolf Hitler, leader of German people and the Chief of Army, that means, that I will act under his control, be a brave soldier and will be ready to lay down my life to fulfil this oath.” This oath was taken in the name of Adolf Hitler and all this happened in Germany, because of the bill of similar nature.

Deputy Speaker, Sir, it may be because of my imaginary fear. I have suffered a lot and you too have suffered to some extent and, therefore, I expect some sympathy from you. Many of us have suffered.

*** *** ***

But, I will tell you about the State of affairs during that time. When these things were taking place, the Nazis of German Parliament were agitating that they wanted introduction of the bill otherwise there would be fire and blood all around. Then, at that time.

“It needed courage to stand up before the packed assembly—most of the communists and about a dozen of the Social Democratic Deputies had already been thrown into prison.”

I would like to tell Shri Ranga that right moment has come

and there should be no delay. When Communists are finished, then sometimes, not always, people like yourself and myself are also finished

Now I tell you something which would please Mr. Nath Pai. "..... and to tell Hitler and the Nazis to their faces that the Social Democratic Party would vote against the Bill."

I would like to remember the name of that person today with reverence. Otto Wells was present in the House. You have asked me this question. So you may be Otto Wells or you may become Otto Wells and I may not be alive by that time.

"Otto Wells spoke with moderation. "To be defenceless," he added, "was not to be without honour."

Mr. Nath Pai may withdraw the bill and then there will be no need to repeat this sentence.

"To be defenceless is not to be without honour."

I have no liking for Constitution. I want you to see the Articles 132 and 133. These are very unique Articles. Such thing would not have happened anywhere in the world. You are talking about wealth.

Suppose, if any person is sentenced to death by High Court and in case High Court does not allow him to appeal against its decision, then it becomes very difficult for the Supreme Court. But, if the case involves more than twenty thousand rupees, then one gets the opportunity to go to the Supreme Court at once. There is no logic behind it. I do not know who has framed this Constitution. Twenty thousand rupees have been given more importance in this Constitution. *vis-a-vis* life of a man. A man is on the verge of death; he has been awarded death sentence and he does not get a chance to appeal and go to court. But if the case involves more than twenty thousand rupees, he may proceed to court. That is why, it has become imperative that this Constitution should be made more rigid.

I am pleased to learn that Mr. Modi is of the view that the provisions relating to property should be struck down. This

temptation for property should be eliminated. This institution of property should be finished. I know certain gentlemen are present here who want to finish the institution of property while maintaining temptation for property. But, I want that both these things should be eliminated. Besides this, it is also imperative to record in the Constitution that nobody would be empowered to dismantle this sovereign, supreme Republic. No dictatorship or autocracy would be able to scrap this. For this purpose, you should constitute some law making council, which has been demanded by Shri Madhu Limaye and others. Not only this, but this time the law making council should be such which would be able to frame Constitution after seeking the opinion of adult population of the country because, you might remember that this Constitution was framed by the people, who had limited votes and they were elected when the Britishers were still here. Their influence is there.

I request Mr. Nath Pai to withdraw this bill.

I will not use harsh language against Nath Paiji. We were together once. I would only like to leave it for the Law Minister. This only suits him. You abstain yourself from such things.

Today I have spoken with an open heart. But I am afraid that such a thing may not develop in next 6 months or a year because you know that China and Pakistan are making preparations. Perhaps they are imitating Isreal. They are waiting for a proper opportunity and when India is attacked you will find that many things are likely to come up due to this Bill. I am sorry that we had great enmity in the past and were on the point of completely destroying each other. But there were only verbal exchanges between us and if we are really determined to do so than we must unite and get rid of the Collector also. So only removing Patwaris will not solve any purpose, whether they are Patwaris of Madhya Pradesh or Lucknow, remove the collector first of all, because until and unless, he is removed he will always be dangerous for us. Here Collector means Central Government and Patwari means State Government. So unless this collector is removed such danger will prevail. Therefore, I appeal to Shri Nath Pai to withdraw this Bill.

Company (Amendment) Bill

Hon'ble Chairman, Shri Tyagi has pleaded on behalf of the supporters of this bill that monopoly will have to be reduced step by step as we want to adopt democratic ways. Had this been correct, I would not have spoken anything against this bill. It would have been right if we should have opposed the monopoly step by step. I feel that this Bill will bring the companies under government's control, which is already there, and it will further increase and the companies or their owners will not be in a position to function in arbitrary fashion, but it will hardly affect the criterion regarding welfare of the people.

So, first of all I differentiate between government's control and people's welfare. In this regard, I want to say that since Shri Krishnamachari took the charge of Finance Minister, in India the market prices of shares are increasing. He is a strange socialistic Finance Minister because after his taking over as Finance Minister the share market is soaring high....

*** *** ***

Interruptions[@]

*** *** ***

As regards the point of share market going down, I will talk it later on, and the mystery will be revealed. But presently I am talking about the booming trend in the share market. Shri Krishnamachari should give an explanation about this trend. In

*Lok Sabha Debates, 28 November, 1963.

@Shri B.R. Bhagat; Going down.

India capitalists earn thirty to forty percent profit, I am not talking about the petty shopkeepers. In fact, big capitalists earn such a big margin of profit. I feel, if more than this profit is hoped, then share market will jump up. If the percentage of profit goes beyond forty percent then India will literally top the world nations, where income is less and the prices of the food items are more. You will not find this much difference between income and prices of food items and other essential items like milk or house anywhere else in the world. The difference between these two will further increase if Shri Krishnamachari allows the increase in the share market.

It is fact that whosoever may be the Finance Minister of India, he will have to keep some faith in the capitalists so long as they exist in India. As regards the coming down of the share market, I may mention that it pleases not all the capitalists, but only a few. I want to know the reason why there is some impact on the share market, whenever the Minister makes such a speech or brings such a legislation, If all the capitalists uniformly gain or loss, then I have nothing much to say. But what happens is that some capitalists lose, while some others get benefited. Therefore, it should be investigated as to whether it really affects the share market. Whenever a legislation of this type is brought or such a speech is made, it makes the share market to come down, or to go up or to leap or to jump. So long as the Finance Minister of India is a capitalist, he will certainly continue to bestow benefits on the capitalists here. Otherwise the whole system will collapse. But he gives only to a few and not to all capitalists, whether knowingly, or unknowingly, and it is a point which needs serious thinking

*** *** ***

Interruptions@

*** *** ***

It is not just a speculation. Had it been so, you and I also could have tried our luck. But if our friendship is developed with

@Shri Tyagi: It is bound to happen as long as speculation is there.

Shri Krishnamachari, then we will be in a better position to try our luck. ...

Now, the point to be looked at is as to what fundamental difference it would make if this Bill is passed. It is bound to make a difference, of course not a fundamental one, but merely in the sense that we will have a tribunal for an initiating judicial inquiry and also a Board to streamline the administration. Basically, this law provides for two things—a Tribunal and a Board. I would like to place before the Finance Minister and the House a few things, which will remain unaffected even after the formation of the proposed Tribunal and the Board.

After all, why do these companies resort to mismanagement which results in prices soaring up. I will give two major reasons for it. One is donation i.e. the legal donation, and the other is that which is given secretly. All kinds of donations in whatever form they may be, are its root cause. I would like to mention a company with which the Finance Minister had been once closely associated. That company proved a little unlucky for him. It is the Kanpur based British India Corporation and still some strange things are taking place there. The present Managing Agent of that company and his subsidiaries had openly donated Rs. 20 or Rs. 25 lakhs to the Congress for election purposes. What was given secretly. I do not know But I was given rough estimate about it. The another happening which took place later was that the Shareholders of that Company organised a meeting. In that meeting majority share holders made Shri Vajoria Saheb the owner of the company giving him all powers to control and manage the affairs of the Company. Can any number of Tribunals or Boards can check such type of manipulation and can change the situation. Neither you want to change the situation nor intend to do so, nor you will be in a position to change it, as you will simply say that it is a donation. There is company law and according to that law, a company can give donation. The company will also claim that they are legally right in giving such donations. On the other hand it is said that Life Insurance Corporation has got absolute right to enquire into the matter and can vote for anybody of

their choice. When these two events are probed separately then both of them will appear to be lawful and neither the Board nor the Tribunal will be able to do anything in the matter. But the reality is that these two events are interrelated.

I agree so long as capitalism is there and the capitalists are there, they will continue to enjoy the right to give donations to the Party of their choice and if they give donations to the ruling Party, then there is no point in making any hue and cry. The capitalists think that due to this kind of donations their capitalism will flourish and in fact, is flourishing. I would like to tell Tyagiji that on one hand, you receive such heavy donations and on the other, you call your party as a Socialist Party....

..... I was telling that the capitalists have full right to give donations to the party of their choice. It does happen in West European countries also. But the politics of West European countries is so fair that the capitalist parties of those countries do not hide themselves under the guise of socialism. At the same time I would also like to say that you may get subscriptions from all the capitalists but it is not fare on your part to get subscriptions from the capitalists unlawful for bailing them out from punishment for their business practices. Therefore, I would like to say a basic thing that wherever subscriptions are given in hope of some return, i.e. on give and take basis, I think such subscriptions pose grave danger.

Now I leave this point and would like to tell you about an incidence relating to that very city of Kanpur. There is a textile committee of small and medium capitalists. A very senior minister paid a visit there. That company was not authorised to give high amount as subscription as per the Company Law but the company straightaway gave a cheque of Rs. 50 thousand to the said Minister on his arrival. This is known as the textile committee.

Interruptions@

@ Shri S.M. Banerjee: 51 thousand.

51 thousand. Banerjée Saheb, I always tell one thousand or so less so that I am not caught. If you wish, I can tell the name of the Minister.

...

Interruptions^a

...

It would be good to disclose the name, because the poor Finance Minister gets trapped whereas he will go scot free.

...

Interruptions^b

...

Is it because he is Prime Minister who receives illegal gratifications?

...

Interruptions^c

...

The Prime Minister receives illegal gratifications by way of subscriptions from the companies in violation of the provision of the company laws. Complaints are received by the Finance Minister from Kanpur, but who dares to ask the Prime Minister? Which of the tribunals or for that matter boards will discharge this onerous duty? Therefore, I am to submit that even after passage of this Bill, things will not change, and if this situation continues to prevail in the country, we have to give them increased prices of essential commodities. I can cite hundreds

^aAn Honourable Member: No, do not mention the name.

^bMr. Chairman: It would not be proper to mention names here.

^cMr. S.M. Banerji: O.K. He is Prime Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Order, Order he has got to preserve decorum.

of such examples which prove association of the Prime Minister with companies through funds, subscriptions and trusts. Trusts were also discussed here. So, not only capitalists are having trusts, but socialist politicians are also having trusts to run their political activities and to win the favour of the people by using money. All these things make dent on the prices of the goods.

Likewise, I would like to draw your attention to yet another thing. The Select Committee may examine it. The Finance Minister should also look into it. This matter relates to relatives. First of all the capitalists themselves appoint their relatives as agents of the companies or put them on high posts by violating the laws. No remedy has so far been found. Everybody knows that there is hardly any big capitalists who do not provide employment to their relatives even distant relatives belonging to two to five generations back in their companies. Not to talk of employment, they illegally enriched them in violation of the Company Law, but this practice is not being checked, because, who will check it. Don't Ministers have relatives? They are also involved in it. Most of the Ministers get their relatives appointed. I would like to know as to whether there is even a single Cabinet Minister who have not got their relatives upto two generations back appointed in those companies? This attachment has assumed dangerous preposition to the extent that today for every company which wants to do business in collaboration with the Government it has become incumbent upon it to employ the relatives of the Ministers of Government to please them. This matter of giving employments to relations is not taken seriously on the plea as to why the Ministers alone should be attacked on this count. After all relatives and sons of Ministers are also citizens of the country and they have every right to try their luck. At its face value, this principle sounds good but this holds good where shortage has been removed by sound economic arrangement. But where there is shortage of resources, production is less, monopoly of trade and Ministers or for that matter the Government is in a position to influence things with the help of administration, laws and orders, this principle is not a good one.

At least two generations of relatives of Ministers should not be allowed to reach near any company. So long as a company law prohibiting the relatives of Ministers to reach near the company is not enacted, it will be meaningless and to say that all citizens should get equal rights is also meaningless because it does not ensure equality to all. In fact, it creates certain privileges. The ordinary man can never have the facilities or the rights that Ministers and their relatives can get in the companies.

I want to say one more thing. In modern world organisation, the experience and the means play a very great role, whether it is Russia or America, companies are growing bigger and bigger. The only difference is that in Russia there is public control over them through Government and in America these are under the control of some big people and such a phenomenon exists very much in India also and whatever law is passed, it is difficult to stop such a trend. I was told that Shri Umanathji said and rightly said that even if a number of laws are passed on this subject, they would not change the situation, because big organisations are involved therein. Certain people are increasing the number of their organisations on the basis of their experience, organising capacity and means.

How does Birla go on getting all things? Reason is that he has a big organisation at his command and he is in a position to engage more qualified and experienced persons. Thus he can easily get all things. You cannot stop it.

Another thing, which I have already mentioned is about the close relations with the Government. The extent to which they can manage the things, the small capitalist cannot go to that extent.

The more facilities one gets on account of his organisations and means, the more big corporations and private business organisations come into existence and you are not stopping this trend. In America, a number of anti-trust laws have been passed but in spite of such laws the number of trusts went on increasing there instead of decreasing, only their shape

changed and that too on paper only. For example, some companies were renamed as Stenvok, Standard Oil Company, Standard Vacuum Oil Company etc. Thus the trusts continued to exist but their names were changed on the record. Therefore I want to give one suggestion and acceptance of this suggestion will mean the change of the Government. What an innocent man I am, I am giving such a suggestion to the Government. Will government step down. Certainly not. So I want to warn the public that unless this Government goes out of power or does not represent the interests of the public in the real sense, it is impossible to bring the big organisations under the public or Government control. These organisations will go on increasing. Whatever may be mentioned in the papers, these organisations will go on flourishing and nobody will be able to stop them. The only way to stop such big companies or corporations is that such a Government is formed in India who may take a bold decision to put a limit on income and living standard of the people and also to enforce it strictly, so that nobody is allowed to cross that limit. So long as people are allowed to maintain their living standard and income and also increase the same further the nexus between the Government and the company will exist and will be further strengthened because it is a nexus between the self interest of the individual and the party interests.

You are going on making laws but without result. So, I request you that the committee which is to consider it, should ponder over it seriously.

Preventive Detention (Continuance) Bill

Mr. Chairman, Sir, during these fifteen years of independence I could not get an opportunity to see closely the Congress leaders and Ministers. Now, I have been watching them for the last three-four months. I have seen functioning of specially two Home Ministers and I am feeling a bit perturbed. One, who wields sceptre should be humble and soft spoken. I do not know whether Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri has been tender at heart or not but he has been soft spoken. Shri Nanda is both hard hearted and harsh in speech. We have to express our resentment because the sceptre is used on us and it is natural for us to cry but those who wield sceptre should be kind. They wield sceptre. I cannot say who is good and who is bad. I think Nandaji is better because the revolt takes place soon when both heart and speech are hard and harsh respectively. But instead of entering into this discussion, I would say that the Home Minister should be very careful and he should always endeavour to be compassionate and soft spoken. Therefore, with regard to Preventive Detention Act I would like to say that the Government should keep its police, its sceptre and its Home Minister under some restraint. This Preventive Detention Act is somewhat perturbing me particularly keeping in view the happenings which I witnessed here during the last 3 months. Normally I believe in non-violence. I would like to tell you that in 1942, I used to be in a fix when I had to resort to derailment of trains. I used to be in two minds as to which train should be derailed—goods train or the train carrying soldiers. I was against derailment of trains carrying soldiers, but I regret to tell

* Lok Sabha Debates, 18 December, 1963.

you that the present happenings have a bearing on my non-violent mind, may be for a few moments.

The Preventive Detention Act, brought here by the Government time and again has actually become a section of the Indian Penal Code, though the same has not been declared as such. It relates to Article 21 and 22 of the Constitution. But the Home Minister has uttered such things in his speech, had I been in power I would have prosecuted him and sent him to prison on the charge of violation of the Constitution. However, this question does not arise because I would have not proposed the Preventive Detention Act. But I would have prosecuted him because he stated that if all the Articles of the Constitution pertaining to the rights of the citizens are looked into, it would appear that one Article contradicts the other. If the Constitution is interpreted in this manner, it will lose its existence. The Articles pertaining to the rights of the citizens do not contradict each other instead these are complementary to each other. Articles 21 and 22 are not related to any other Article. Other Articles cannot modify the provisions of Articles 21 and 22. Article 22 itself modifies it to some extent.

...He was referring to section 19 which is related to the security of the country and its relations with foreign countries. That is not at all related to preventive detention. The Preventive Detention Act is a totally different thing. We have every right to live freely and to be produced before a magistrate within 24 hours of detention. So we should look into the condition laid down under this section only.

He further added that ours is an infant democracy. In order to protect it from outside danger and to create condition for its proper growth, we have to safeguard it in a similar way as we safeguard a growing plant by laying a fence around it. But the steps proposed by the Government, instead of providing protection to our infant democracy, prove an 'Amar bel' which destroys the plant on which it creeps up. If they are actually interested to protect the plant of democracy, people should be

* Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda.

have misused the provisions of this law to settle personal score. I have been a victim of it. When the Collector lost the case in the court against me, he got me arrested under the Preventive Detention Act. Though I was put under that detention only for a short period as I was later convicted and a number of other incidents also took place.

As far as ineffectiveness of the law is concerned, I would like to tell the hon. Minister of Home Affairs that a tendency has developed in our country to take recourse to violence and killings to settle not only political score but even personal score. There is a lot of violence in our society at present even to settle personal score...

...For the moment you only need to know that big people have also begun to take recourse to murder to meet their personal ambitions.

In one case, two students were murdered simply because of falling in love with girls, of course belonging to different castes which was not at all a bad thing, but the fathers of the girls did not like it who happened to be their teachers also. When the rule of laws is eroded to this extent, the people, particularly the big people, develop a feeling that they can do whatever they like.

There has been continuous erosion in the rule of law. The situation of anarchy is created not only by the people but by the Government also. At present, an anarchic situation created by the Government is prevailing to the extent that the existing laws are not enforced impartially and this is nothing but corruption. This Preventive Detention Act, is eroding the rule of law.

As regards the Preventive Detention Act, I have already said that with the enforcement of this law, our implementation machinery has become ineffective. Though normally we have a right to challenge our arrest but when we are detained under the provisions of the aforesaid Act, we no more enjoy that right and for that matter even the Collectors, Commissioners and other high officers tend to become inactive. Similarly, the Minister of Home Affairs and even the Prime Minister becomes

inactive. All these things lead to a situation where there is no rule of law. Hence the Government should repeal the Preventive Detention Act as it will enable all the people and the Government itself to work more efficiently like a musical instrument which plays well when its loose strings are tightened to the required level. At present the Government resembles a mandolin with its loose strings and continuance of the Preventive Detention Act is helping them to sag further. It can play the desired notes only when its loose strings are tightened to serve the purpose. With that I mean that the Government can work more efficiently if this Detention Act is rendered null and void. That is an idea I have given to the Government to think over it very seriously.

I would like to mention about the lawlessness created by the State in particular because a lot has been said about the lawlessness prevailing among the general public, about goondas, communists and the people practising non-violence. I am not a supporter of communists, I do not like communism although I have started thinking in a different way from what I used to think ten or fifteen years back. There was a time when I and Shri Masani used to lend ear to each other and it is now that I have started agreeing a bit with him but it would be welcome if he also responds with equal keenness. I would like to tell him that he may not like communist ideology but he should not hate the persons who are communists. It would not be proper to suggest that Preventive Detention Act is necessary just to arrest communists. You may keep your gates closed for communism but do not go in for the detention of communists. It makes a great difference.

Here I would like to appreciate Shri Trivedi, though in view of the way the communists are going, I should say that in a way they are harping their tune with the Government. Yesterday, I was stunned to observe that Smt. Renu Chakravarti, instead of extending her support for more rights for the members, was raising her point of order to seek the curtailment of their rights. Had I been allowed to make my submission here, it would have resulted in securing more rights for them. It is surprising that

or in the Government, he should not feel nervous. Suppose, that due to some resentment, the people resort to stone throwing, firing or hooliganism, the Government is free to use force. But the Government should give a different treatment to persons like me who violate the law and resort to Satyagrah in order to transform the society and to make the country strong because I am of the view that if we continue our fight against the tyrants within the country, we would be able to face the external aggression too.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to make one thing clear because a misunderstanding about me has gained ground that I am a totally frustrated man. I have said a number of times in the House that this Government is very cruel and we are so worthless that we are not able to remove it. It speaks of my confidence that in spite of all these odds, I am pursuing my struggle to change this Government. I am not only hopeful but confident that this Government will be removed. When the Preventive Detention Act which is an infringement of Article 22 is being brought on the Indian Penal Code time and again, I am sure, the people of India will rise in revolt because resurrection of this country is not possible without it. The only question that is to be decided is whether this goal is to be achieved through violent means or through non-violence. Do not shadow our minds too much as it may lead to bad consequences...

... I told you that force is used against us. Since it is you who use the force, that is why I told you to remain calm. We have the right to cry and to express our resentment. Keep yourself cool even when you use force. However, while doing so, you must ensure that whatever is being done is according to the law. Since Preventive Detention is not according to the law, this Act should be repealed. If you do it, your conduct, your thinking and your actions will undergo transformation because you will have a dividing line before you which will remind you of your jurisdiction beyond which you cannot go. The name of Maryada Purushottam is uttered by you everyday: Articles 21 and 22 have their Maryada (sanctity). The citizens of India are not only to live freely but they should be assured of their safety

all the time. When India attained independence, I thought that at least henceforth I would not be arrested the way the Britishers arrested me time and again. But the same feeling is no more there. Two-three days back, Shri George Fernandes, who was detained under Preventive Detention Act, was released. I wanted to congratulate the Home Minister for this, but I would not like to comment upon the way he has been released. 25-30 thousand people reached the station to receive him. Such a rousing reception is given only to a patriot. There is yet another similar case of Kafil Ahmed Kaifi of Darbhanga who is under detention in jail. Why is he being kept under detention? He was put in jail because the Government pays Rs. 110 for earth work to a company of which an hon. Member of this House is the Chairman, he is making all out efforts to gain re-entry. The labourers are paid hardly Rs. 40-50 for that earth work. The Preventive Detention Act is being used for this purpose. I would request you to consider it seriously and repeal the Preventive Detention Act.

Press Council Bill*

Mr. Speaker Sir, while listening the speeches made by Shri Vidyalkar and Shri Wariyar, this issue came to my mind since they are saying about the monopoly of newspapers and at the sametime talking about a conflict between the government and the newspapers. Afterall, what does it mean? So far as I understand, most of the newspapers in India are the orderlies and messengers of the government. Therefore, this point should be kept in mind and there is no doubt in it that from economic point of view, the newspapers are under the control of millionaires whether it is the Indian Express, the Time of India or the Hindustan Times. Financially their owners have the monopoly on them. Owners get profit from them, but regarding policy, ideas and power they are the orderlies of the government, as I have already stated. The main reason behind this is that these millionaires are minting money in India by unfair means. They are always afraid of the government lest it should take action against them any time. Therefore, they can not write against the government. May be that any speech of a Prime Minister might not have been published on a single day during his entire tenure. But if the news, even though distorted, about a person, like me, is published even once in fifteen days, is terms as something big. You know it very well that Indian newspapers do not published what I say, but they always publish what others say about me.

The ideological monopoly is vested with the Government and

* Lok Sabha Debates, 30 September, 1964

the right of ownership and profit making lies with the millionaires. If we do not understand this, any future policy about the newspapers would not work properly.

I want to draw your attention to one thing. These days government have become the largest source of information in India. Government mean not only that at the Centre and State, but also at district level. And I want to say on behalf of reporters of the districts that they are so much dependent on the Superintendents of Police or the Collectors that these reporters almost become like their slaves. Government itself is the source of information and also so powerful that it always gets its news published, by hook or by crook, by allurement in some ways or by giving advertisement or by any other means that is possible. Government can create friction between two nations, and can win the favour also of people if it so heads, by just manipulating the matters in that behalf.

In such a situation, keeping in view that basic aspects, I would like to give you suggestions regarding administration and law. The first one will not have any effect except that of degree only. These millionaires who are owners of newspaper, should not be the owner of an Industry. It will make only little difference. They will go on investing their money somewhere, but their direct ownership of the newspapers will be removed. Only then, the millionaires who are the owners of newspapers, may try to run their newspapers with sincerity and vigour, and do a little justice with people like us.

My second suggestion is that with the amendments in this Companies Act Government can go before the tribunal against a company if the latter is not running properly, and Government may get the right of appointing an administrator there. This can be applicable to any company, but Government should not be given such a right in case of a newspaper. Opposition must be cautious, and be ready to oppose such a move. However, this too will not make any difference as, basically, the newspapers are pro-government and with the appointment of an Administrator even a few anti-government news which do sometime appear might also disappear. I have to add in this context that

every millionaire keeps a link with a minister and every millionaire has a link with any newspaper which is done wrong. If any newspaper interferes with the affairs of the Government and is to be checked, it can well be done through the Administrator and from my point of view, it would be better if any body from opposition party is appointed as the Administrator or this right be given to the press council. These were my two suggestions.

While talking about truthfulness, I would like to give an example. On 25th there was a strike in Calcutta. Newspapers reported that the strike was only 12 per cent it was absolutely incorrect. I proclaim, the strike was 80 to 90 per cent and the employees did not attend offices. About the officers I gave the example of Calcutta because it is the biggest city of India, and it applies everywhere. Whose monopoly prevails over the newspapers perhaps that of millionaires or of the Government? Government do not want that any procession or agitation against its food policy should be encouraged; and hence it spoke lies about the strike. Though I am not pleased with this, 'Bharat Bandh' agitation, yet I wanted it to continue for five to seven days so that the matter could have been finally decided this way or that way. I wanted the Railways also to participate in the agitation but let us leave this issue aside for the time being. I want to tell you that the newspaper owners always suppress the news which they do not like. They even publish distorted news about the number of those killed. I give you one more example. There was a proposal to increase the salary and allowances of Members. Some members have grudge that news regarding me always publishes what is published is just about my walking somewhere, or that I am happy to find that our allowances are being increased. You know it very well that it is not possible to sit in the House throughout the day, and nobody knows what is happening inside unless he himself sits there. So it was pointed out that I left the House when the Bill regarding increase in our allowances was being introduced. How unfair it is actually, when the Bill regarding increase in salary and allowances was being introduced. I raised much hue

and cry to the effect that this must not be done. I had pleaded that we must try to reduce the prices, and not to increase our allowances. I am giving you this example to show how fallacious stories are fabricated against a person to malign him in public's eyes.

I am giving you one more example which you might also be knowing.

Nearly one or one and a half months ago, the newspapers had published about me in bold letters that, this time, I would not be allowed to return from Bihar alive. What was my fault? My speech in Jackson on the 28th was about the ex-Prime Minister of India. In fact it was as touching and forceful as had not been delivered by any other Speaker. However, it was not about the Prime Minister of the day, but about the Jawaharlal Nehru of Pre-1946 times. I had said it all before Jackson Mississippi of Associated Press. I was forced to say something, but that fact was withdrawn and not published. And suddenly, on the 30th of May, they published those words which should have never been published. Such a distorted and half baked story was published in India which had not published ever in America. As a result thereof, people of Bihar were aroused against me. It was a mix up of truth and lies, consequent upon which the people in Bihar got it published in the newspapers, in bold letters, to the effect that, next time, they would not allow me to return intact from Bihar. That news spoke of hitting me with stones and shoes. Please mind it, that whenever I say anything, I say it in a particular context. Although I had assured that I would not say anything against the Prime Minister if I am not provoked, yet I was provoked beyond limits. However, I would not tell you what I had or had not spoken there.

But I would like to submit to the Prime Minister, whether it may come out in the press or not, and although many things about the coins and vows do publish day and night, that a great sin is being committed in this country. As a matter of principles, I would like to say that you should not mint a coin or raise a memorial in respect of any person until three hundred years after his death. Only by that time it could be decided about his

being historic or just temporal, or about the sort of fame did he have. It is a matter of principle. Let wisdom come to this nation. What for we read newspapers? Just for acquiring wisdom. But we have been unable to cultivate wisdom. I just cite an example. It is quite clear, and I am sorry to say it with pleasure, that we are committing a sin. There may well come a time, when 30 or 40 years hence, the coming generations will undo the works done by this generation, as there is a great difference between historic and temporal things. I would like to give you a recent example. Hon. Prime Minister has ordained that Jeeps should be taken away from community development organisations. I liked this. Not just to relish but with the hope that it would herald the beginning of a new era of simplicity and would put an end to a 17 years long era of fashion and luxury. But, then, what happened afterwards? Some other honourable Minister said that this was not feasible as the large chunk of the community development organisations was under the control of Panchayat council and that in such a situation it was difficult to adhere to that order. Whereas the news regarding taking away of the jeeps was published in bold letters headings-in the likeness of the greatest news in the world, the news regarding Minister's expressed inability to do it on the basis that it was under Panchayat Parishad, was published in just a small corner so as to easily escape public notice. Now, this type of manipulation is going on in this country. Making all promises but taking no action, has become our national characteristic, and it is even more so with our statesmen. In a bid to get public appeasement they go on putting forth new ideas, one after another, without taking any care about their implementation. If this trend continues people would become devoid of wisdom and without wisdom, nation will fail to march ahead. Similarly, English is also the root cause for the absence of freshness and newness in the news. I feel that thoughtfulness and sense of analysis is very difficult to bring out in English because for a native it is at times difficult to express himself properly even in his own language, what to say of expressing in a Foreign Language. A foreign language remains just a combination of words despite someone having acquired all skill in that lan-

guage. And a language which is just a congregation of words or an assemblage of phrases, is nothing more than a verbosity. It fails to transmit any concept and analysis. I think that our legislators are unable to work efficiently. These legislators get trapped in out dated conventions of grammar and traditions and fail to present that freshness in concepts. The Press Council which is going to be consituted, would in all probability, remain ineffective as all such councils have the character of being just traditional and conventional. After all who would be selected for it? Most probably they would be some influential and well known personalities and, to my opinion, the well known are those who tread only the beaten path. I would therefore, frankly say that it is not the responsibility of the Press Council but of the Government itself. No freshness or truthfulness in the news can be expected from Indian newspapers till Government telegraph & teleprinter services are carried out in English. Therefore, my foremost demand is that English should be removed from telegraph and teleprinters services as soon as possible because this language makes our nation vulnerable to become the tool to the spies and our newspapers to lies. This is not just a small demand. I have not pleaded Hindi as its substitute. It can be replaced by any other Indian language viz Bangla etc. But English must go. I would not like to name that particular news agency but you know what mischief it had played and got me almost attacked physically. incidently this is the same communication network which is financed by the Government in various ways for its being a semi-government organisation.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, every debate in our country swings away from its main objective on the pretext that whether it is a case of capitalists or bureaucrats or whether this will be in favour of a few rich people or not or whether it will benefit state or the people of the state i.e. public. So I think that the said debate is out of context due to the fact that who is to be called the owner of the horse here and it can only be decided when actually there exists any horse. My first complaint in regard to patents is that India has been lagging behind in respect of scientific inventions and research for the last 18 years and she is perhaps the most backward country in the world. Therefore, we have to examine it from three angles, one from the angle of invention, secondly from the angle of inventor and thirdly from the angle of foreigners. First of all I take the third angle that is from the angle of foreigners.

I can't say it definitely, but we have to pay 10 to 15% on cost as patent royalty to foreigners on all those items which we are producing in the country or manufacturing in factories. So the first thing in this regard is that whether this bill counteract the effect of that very law or not by which such a huge amount goes in the hands of foreigners. To differentiate it, I would like to say some thing in regard to the name's patent and other type of patents. The name's patent is useless. What is left in it now? I will tell you my personal experience in this regard. Once a multi-millionaire of India thought of manufacturing bicycle and

*Lok Sabha Debates, 23 November, 1965

he thought to name it 'India'. Gandhiji was alive at that time. We used to meet there. I asked him not to name it 'India' but name it 'Hind'. Thus it was named 'Hind'. But he did not pay any money to me for it, so far. I should have at least been paid 50 or 60 thousand rupees as I had proposed the name 'Hind'. I have no objection to this name but he had not paid any money to me in regard to name's patent as I had suggested him this name. I want to bring it in the notice of hon. Minister. He is his fast friend.

One thing which I would like to mention in regard to the process of patents is that we are too much a backward country in respect of research. For example take the case of sugar candy. Still we could not be able to manufacture sugar candy from sugar properly. When I was abroad, I came to know that there is hardly 5 or 6% loss in the manufacture of sugar candy there. And in our country still we could not find any such method to reduce this loss below 10 percent. It hardly matters if there is loss of 10 to 15%. Why could not we ascertain as to where the fault lies? I quote one sentence from a book. This book is famous book for scientific inventions and it is written by Palwar Putnam and is called "Energy in the Future". The Minister, who holds the portfolio of science must read it. There is one sentence in it.

"A 5000 a month production rate of low cost of Solar Cookers was inaugurated at Bombay on May 27, 1953 by Shri K.D. Malaria...."

Shri K.D. Malaria is written in it.

"by Shri K.D. Malaria, Deputy Minister for Natural Resources and Scientific Research."

I don't know, but perhaps this Malaria Saheb would have been Malviya Saheb. Thus Solar Cookers were inaugurated on May 27, 1953. Now 12 years have passed. At that time, it was much advertised that the said cookers were likely to be manufactured on an average of 5000 per month. Hon. Minister, I think it would also have had any patent.

month. Hon. Minister, I think it would also have had any patent.

Interruption^a

It is right. I have heard each Minister saying that other people know better than him. But you must know these things. Thus 5000 solar cookers were to be produced in a month. There might have been a patent in this regard. But it could not be accomplished. I want that law should provide for certain matters on which hon. Minister and just now Sharma Sahib were speaking and referring controller etc. or bureaucrats who spend lots of money regarding patents and scientific research and make announcements of such things and if such things are not fulfilled then concerned persons should be punished. As far as temptation is concerned, I think Malaria Sahib should also be punished and persons above Malaria Sahib or those sahibs who replace them, should also be punished. After all, it is power. So punishment must be given.

Interruption^b

In which cases punishment has been given. See, I am talking of those who are in power. They should be punished, because the money spent, in a way, is not substantial but as per the standards of our country, we are spending rupees one billion for scientific research in our country. Don't talk about capitalists. I have heard that yesterday Sh. Dandekar of Swantantara Party had talked here about the research work being carried by the capitalists. A capitalist is not spending much amount for this purpose. He might be spending ten, twenty crores of rupees at the most. But Government are spending rupees 1 billion and 60 crore on Atomic research and 40 crores on general research. The outcome of the research after spending this rupees one billion is also important and as far as I think, inspite of this law

^aLok Sabha Debate, 23 November, 1965.

^bShri T.N. Singh: You would be knowing better than me.

^cShri D.H. Sharma: They have adequately been punished.

that such explosion can be used for some other purpose any time. It seems that Project Plaun Sair or Project Nom is coming in our country in some form or the other. But therein also, troubles arise and as just now Sharmaji told that in such works there is a controller who becomes all powerful. This system has also become so much defective that someone becomes Minister and someone, a Chairman. I have heard that in Atomic Energy the person who is Chairman is also secretary of that department.

It results in ineffective monitoring as one person performs the work of research as well as administrative work, thus the administration in India has reached such a stage that skilled persons have got no importance. Persons who have become I.A.S. etc, who have gone in some administration, only they get importance. This whole concept should be changed. Only those persons should get importance who know skills, who know some work and it can be possible only when we learn a bit of criticism in our country. Just bearing how to respect everytime has spoiled everything. In the Universities also it is preached that education of ancient times and old things should be respected excessively and as a result thereof old things are also not learnt thoroughly. And I want to say that till scientist of India after studying ancient education, does not learn to criticise it he can't invent new education. Thus, talking so much about respect and to continue its imitation will not help in any invention, research etc. When I talk about criticism and universities, again we face the same situation about our whole system. What is this system? It is the system of flattery and back-biting. How research can be done in such an atmosphere. I have met many scientists. They said that how they can find out a scientific invention when our promotions are based on such matters that who is whose relative and who has married whose daughter. When such matters are the criterion for promotion in the field of research, the whole base is demolished.

So, while debating the rules and laws on Patent, we should

keep in mind this fundamental thing. It is right that inventors, persons who bring excellent ideas should be given some reward. If people feel happy because of this step, give them reward although I am not in favour of giving a very costly gift.

It can be accepted to some extent that an inventor must be given remuneration for his invention. Had it been in my power, I would have never allowed that money was given so much importance in society. Instead, I would have preferred to confer honours and titles on such a man. But it is possible only when nepotism is removed from the society. Therefore, the hon. Minister must pay attention towards these points, while discussing here and implementing this law afterwards.

First of all, the prices of indigenously made items should be decreased by controlling rights and profits of foreigners and there should be no name's patent. I would like to say that some techniques are so popular all over the world that these do not need patents. We, ourselves can formulate and implement these techniques. For them, there is no need of any patent-price. If some foreign companies, as I learnt, charge for their world-wide popular old patent rights against this threat that if we do not pay for their old techniques, they will not make us known new techniques. I would like that we should get rid of such companies and contact other countries for new companies, inventions and techniques. I do not know which countries will prove better at this juncture. I would also like to point out in this connection that we committed a blunder in the year 1945 and 1946, when Germany and Japan were in their worst and if at that time we had treated them friendly, we must have been in a better position today, regarding patents. As regards U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. I would also like to submit that U.S.S.R.'s policies seem to be liberal in regard to patents. I cannot say whether they are actually liberal or not? U.S.A. has to decide that what type of world they want to build? Whether America wants to build the world by grabbing money from the poor countries like India, for their inventions and patents. Then certainly, this world will be destroyed by atomic explosions, one day. A time was there, when U.S.A. provided their techniques and patents

liberally to poor countries. I would like to appeal Americans to bring those old days. There is a possibility that this fact is more prevailing in U.S.S.R., due to new ideology. The fact is that a Russian behaves better in humane way, may be it is genuine or more it is a show-with an Indian or black man. Similarly U.S.A. has to change her policies in case of research.

Resolution on Proclamation Regarding President's Rule In Kerala

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the present proposal should be put aside. If democracy and socialism is adopted in real sense, the way is quite clear in Kerala. The former Chief Minister of Kerala has said one thing. He has not asked a question rather I suppose it as a question. What symbolises as a mirror in Kerala and what image is reflected on it. Although the image of Kerala does not appear to be good, they have called the Governor of Kerala, a mirror. This is the basic fault. It is for the reason that the way is not clear. The mirror for the image of Kerala is the Legislative Assembly of Kerala and not the Governor of that state. The evil deed of this Government behind the dissolution of the Legislative Assembly six months prior to its term should be put to an end. The Legislative Assembly should be revived and thus the mirror should be rectified. Then the image will illustrate.

I would like to draw your attention towards Shri Ranga's statement that this is the latent rule of Congress. But it is not latent. It is open. It is not even open, it is a rigid rule of the Congress. The people like us often get an opportunity to express their views in the Legislative Assembly or in the Lok Sabha. But this trend does not exist in Kerala. This is nothing but a rigid rule of Congress. No body can speak anything. The Legislative Assembly is no more there. So, whenever Members of the Opposition cast aspersion at the Governor, it comes to my mind that why they cast aspersion at him. He is only a

* Lok Sabha Debates, 5 November, 1965

means to achieve an end in the hands of Government. You Know English better. In English, such a thing is called 'creature'. What is the Hindi equivalent for it.

Interruptions^a

Yes, that is called 'Jantu' (creature). Therefore, there should not be any type of strike at the Governor here. Whose creature is he? He is creature of Government. So. I

Interruptions^b

Hindi equivalent of the word 'creature' is used here. You give any Marathi equivalent for it. I will use that word. I have just uttered the word 'creature' otherwise nothing could go wrong. However, you have got my point.

To whom he belongs. In fact, Kerala Government is not being run by the Congress. Only one and half persons are ruling the State. Who are those one and half persons. Mr. Hathi, you should not count yourself. The Home Minister is the half person and the Prime Minister is one person and these two persons, thus, consisting of one and half, are running the Government of Kerala.

I would like to tell you one thing if you understand the actual meaning of democracy and socialism. It may be a little problem for me that the Leftist Communist Party emerged as a major party in the Legislative Assembly of Kerala which was formed six months ago. I put aside one of the character of Leftist Communists.

^aShri D.C. Sharma : Jantu

^b Mr. Chairman : It would be better to use the word 'representative'

What is that? They do not concentrate their attention on India or the entire world but their thinking revolves around such a country which acts like a mediator. Their thinking is confined in condemning America and praising China. If their thinking revolves around the universe, it might have proved a good practice. In fact, they should concentrate their attention towards India and then think over it. Since I am pointing out about the fallacy of leftist Communists, at the same time I would like to mention that Congress Party is also in the grip of this fallacy and some of the members sitting in Opposition benches here have also this fallacy to some extent they do not concentrate their attention towards the world or India, they focus their attention towards a mediator. Even then I say that you call the Legislative Assembly and let them decide whether a government in Kerala can be formed or not. Leftist Communists might be able to form a government there and if not, other party can do so. It is neither the job of Governor nor of these one and half persons.

It has been repeatedly mentioned that the report is very good, objective and factual. They have no right to take decision in this regard. In democracy, Legislative Assembly can decide it. But it has not been summoned for even an hour. I want to say that we should dispel the sin which was committed six months ago. You summon the Legislative Assembly. Give them opportunity. If one is unable to form a Cabinet, let others try to do so and so on. It might be possible that in this process your Congress Party get a chance. If nobody is able to do so then you form a Cabinet. But the Legislative Assembly is going to decide that the Assembly is a mirror. Only then you would be able to rule democratically. I say it also for the reason that when there is such type of fallacy in the country or in the party, as in the case of Leftist Communists, then it should be removed. In democracy, the sole practice which works as a purgative is to pave the way for the Government of the representatives elected by the people. Then, if that Government commits any wrong the people would root it out.

Here, some people often create a problem. I wish to submit

that here these one and half persons, have spirit of revenge. It is not a good thing. If a person is enjoying a high rank, one should act in a proper way. During the last war, whatever Winston Churchill for whom I had some reservation wrote to his Home Minister about a fascist prisoner Mosale, I quote it. During war when Mosale was kept in jail, Churchill wrote to Home Minister as if Shashtriji was writing to Nandaji that the Home Minister, you have kept Mosale in jail, his wife is also in jail but in a separate room, why? You have done it with the spirit of revenge. Do not separate them. If they have been kept in jail for some political reasons. Keep them in same room. This is the text of the letter of Churchill. I have said, whatever I wanted to say against Leftist Communists and one more thing which I wish to say is that why Mr. Gopalan and his wife have been separated. I think, it is an inhuman act on your part. You are doing it with a vengeance. If you cannot do anything, keep both of them together.

The point is that how to bring up democracy and socialism. For that you give a chance to Legislative Assembly and after giving chance to Legislative Assembly you will notice here that the ongoing proceedings will get reversed automatically. I am talking about this Lok Sabha. Here a Committee—Kerala Advisory Committee has been constituted. I have nothing to say about the members of Lok Sabha from Kerala in this Committee, but two persons from that Opposition Party have been included in the Committee which has only one Member in Kerala Legislative Assembly. But, take the example of Sanyukata Socialist Party. I am saying it just to bring to your knowledge, I don't say that you praise our Party, as the Government consider our Party as a rebel Party. The real position is that from a Party which comprises of 14 Members, from which 13 Members belong to our Party and one is independent Member, there is not a single representative in this Committee. Whereas a Party which has only one Member is having two representatives in the Committee. It may harm the democratic process. The main reason is that the Government

have failed to understand the meaning of democracy. It may be that we too have not understood it. The position will further deteriorate if we go on discussing only trivial matters.

Just now Prof. Ranga has repeatedly stated that joint Council of Ministers be formed like the Swiss country. However, it is their own business and also of their friends which are close to each other and there is not much difference among them. Now what should I do because the majority of people are alike. In fact, it is not the question of procedural matters as to whom and in what manner bring them together in democracy. If such a consensus is reached it will become baseless thing. Then there will be no policy. The policy can be framed only when there is enough struggle of thought and disputes. In my opinion this Government has often been on a wrong track on all matters. The question of forming a joint Council of Minister with them does not arise but at the same time I say that try such a move even outside Lok Sabha. I say one thing that—give an opportunity to people to decide in this regard and that would be possible only when there will be a debate on this subject.

If any reply from the Home Ministry or by the Prime Minister is given to the points raised by me during the debates then it should be deemed that the country is being run through debates and if no reply is given then it should be deemed that this Government is of different type. What is democracy? Democracy means a system in which Government functions through debates. But in this case no reply will be given for the debates. There is no reply of the points which have been raised by me because here they have 390 Members in the House, and they will conclude by expressing their individual views. This Government is functioning in this way.

*** *** ***

Interruptions[@]

*** *** ***

[@]Mr. Chairman: Why anticipated that?

This has happened fifty times. Once while replying to my point the Prime Minister was so entrapped that the Members of Council of Ministers decided that Prime Minister should not reply to any point otherwise we will be entrapped. This has so happened. Now, I would like to tell you about the facts of this Government: Neither this Government is a democratic Government nor a socialist Government. This is a Government of flatterers and backbiters. You know that by means of flattering, everybody gets an important place in the Government. There is no doubt that where a flatterer exists, the backbiting will take its place necessarily. Both of these things go hand in hand and this Government, which is of one and half persons' Government, run on the basis of flatterers and backbitings. What to tell about this country. One day in the morning, I surprised to see the direction in which this country is going. You would be surprised to know that I use to listen some times the 'bhajans' of Meera, Kabir and Tulsī on radio in the morning as my habit. I found that a great singer as well as poet had come. I thought that Lalita Devi perhaps, would be some friend of Rādhā or Lord Krishna. But later on it was known that this country has so downgraded that the wife of present Prime Minister, who has started to write songs has been put in the same category of Meera. This Government which dissolve the Legislative Assembly in Kerala, solve the disputed problems in India, do not allow to have debates in Lok Sabha. The result is that we cannot discuss even any of the points in this country.

In the case of Pakistan, I can say what is going on. You are witnessing the result of rooting out the democracy in Kerala. I have told many major things in this Lok Sabha during this period of two days. Hon'ble Prime Minister was about to leave for Lahore. But in the meantime he sprained his foot. If it was another independent country, it would have very important news for the Press for that particular day about the postponement of his visit due to his sprained foot. After all, some consideration is invariable necessary about the lapses took place in the current struggle. But it will not be allowed in Lok Sabha. If it is so, then what is the importance of debates in democracy. I would like to submit that if the business of this House is conducted through

debates in a democratic way, it would become very clear which I told you for want of quorum. I told that Ayub Khan of Pakistan was not only cruel but I think he was foolish also to some extent.

...
interruptions[@]

The same Ayub Khan, the same Bhutto, I am using the word foolish for them. If I had told this in your words, then I would have mentioned the word boorish and not foolish. The thing about which you had raised the question, being happened in India during the month of August, would have increased in the month of September, October and November to such extent that you people would have not been able to move on the roads in cities and villages of India. You would have become a target of taunting by people. So far as the food situation in the country is concerned, you have created such situation that the way in which the Government had killed hundreds of persons in firings and put thousands of people in jails in Bihar and other places during the period of August 9 to August 16, if Ayub Khan had not come to interfere, the situation would have been worsen. But it must be remembered that only after a few days people started to ask the questions that why did he not go to Lahore, why talks are going on to come back from Hazipir, why the 5th day of August is being discussed. The kind of discussion has started in the country. Sometimes crowd gathers but one should not be glad to see it because it gathers very much automatically. If crowd is faced individually then one will come to know as to who can muster more crowd.

Besides this, I would also like to say that in this debate the Article 352 of the Constitution incorporating the provisions about emergency and Article 356 relating to dismissal of a State Government have been inter-mixed, while in fact they deal with different situations. Article 352 is meant for situation when there

@ Shri D.C. Sharma: Who?

is a war or there is a threat of war whereas Article 356 is for a situation when it is not possible to run a State Government. The report of the Governor is not of very much importance. I am thankful to Dr. Mahishi who have read the relevant Articles, which are quite clear. It is not necessary to obtain Governor's report. If President has got an information from some other source, then also he can take action. Thus, it depends only on the President. I would not like to say anything about the President. In fact, only one and half persons have decided to run such a Congress Government in Kerala which will be rigid and also open but in which there will be no place for discussion.

When both the issues of emergency and failure of Constitutional machinery in a State are mixed together then it is bound to prove disastrous. Now, Shri Govinda Menon said here something about my party and Shri Chandra Shekhar also said that elections in Palghat should not be held. I do not know whether he has said it or not. Had I come to know of it earlier I would have confirmed it today in the morning itself by making a telephone call to Travancore....

*** *** ***

Interruptions@

*** *** ***

That is the report of the Governor. Though I should have confirmed it from my man but I suppose it true for the time being.

The President of the party to which Shri Govinda Menon belongs, mistakenly read a change in the mind of people and, therefore, tried to hold elections in 1966 instead of 1967. Is it not correct? What have you to say on this, Mr. Govinda Menon?

@Shri P.G. Menon: It is in the Report.

...
Interruptions@

Well, let him think over it or consult his advocate before he replies.

The President of this Party said openly, of course by mistake, that the mind of the public is changing in favour of Congress and said that elections should be held early. Thus, I want to reply to what Shri Chandrashekharan has said by repeating the words of Shri Kamraj and Krishnamachary. When it was said that elections should be held early, I prepared myself for early elections. So that the superficial impression which they have gathered is removed and the reality may come out.

Besides, I would like to say that he, the big Saheb, should think over it. He said that the election should not be held during this emergency. Then how long this emergency will continue? First question I would like to ask the Members of the Jana Sangh because they have shown splendid kindness to this Govt. Let them ask as to how long this will continue or Hathiji may give the reply, if he desires so. Is there no reply?

...
Interruptions

If you could reply just now, it would help me in making my speech. I am not such a person that I will not change my opinion after hearing the views of others. If you specifically say that this emergency will continue for two months, four months or six months, then my argument will be different. But if you want to say, as I have heard, that it will continue for one or two generations, the matter will be complicated further.

^aShri P.G. Menon : On a proper occasion.

^bShri Hathi : Will reply.

continue. You know that the Section 352 says that when there is external aggression, "imminent emergency" may be declared. These words are so horrible that under its guise, this Govt. can do anything. If their majority continues in the Lok Sabha, all the Legislative Assemblies of the country may be dissolved as the Kerala Assembly has been dissolved. No rule and regulation can keep a check on it from doing so. It is sufficient to say that the legal government cannot run, we dissolve all the Legislative Assemblies. In principle, you may do it.

Therefore, I desire that this "imminent emergency" must be defined. I tried that Supreme Court should define it. I appreciate their efforts as the judges of the court tried their best but could not locate their point. If the impending crisis had been defined, it would have been treated as invasion. Otherwise, there is no comparison between India having population of 48 crores and Pakistan which have population of 10 crores only. It is a fight between an elephant and a she-buffalo, I did not utter he-buffalo. Conclusion of this war should not go longer. This war is very ordinary but keep it continued. Sometimes I doubt lest Ayub Khan Saheb or Bhutto Saheb are having silent consent to this situation so that their forces be involved in war for time being and tense-situation be created in the country so that they could survive the reign.

Therefore, your reply is not to the point. Your reply should be with this intention that we will conclude Pakistan-issue within 6 months or one year. This will be a fitting reply. Otherwise, matter is going to worse.

Now I would like to raise a point relating to Kerala. It has been said that fishing work was going on large scale there and for this purpose, the people praised Govt. as well as themselves. As far as fishing work is concerned, I would like to produce some facts abstracted from the letter received from Sh. Mohammad. This letter is written in Malayalam language which shows that our work is done in our different languages. They have written that there is a factory in Kerala named 'Gwalior Rayon'. Dirty water comes out of this factory in a large scale which is

diverted to Ghaliyar river. Due to this, fishes die in the river and crops are also affected there. While granting licence to this factory, an agreement was made with the factory-owners regarding diversion of this water towards Arabian sea. Arabian sea is hardly ten-twelve miles away from the factory place. Instead diverting this water to the Arabian sea it is thrown out to the river which kills the fishes and destroys the crops.

In Kerala two litre i.e. three bottles kerosene oil is given to a family. You don't take it otherwise that this Govt. is annoyed particularly of Kerala. In recent past, I visited Uttar Pradesh. Some peculiar event came to my notice. In Uttar Pradesh, people, living in urban areas having electricity facility, are given more quantity of kerosene oil than those living in the villages. How long you will be able to run this perverted Government. You are going in quite opposite direction—villagers are allotted lesser quantity of kerosene oil than that allotted to the people living in urban areas where electricity has also been provided. However, now I conclude my speech putting forward the views of my party. Here discussion was held on that party. I never praise my own party nor I want to do so because until we do something praise worthy, there is no use to make propaganda of it. But principally, I would like to say something. Particularly when Ranga Saheb referred socialism, some other Members also quoted it. At the same time I would like to say one thing that we are on the opposition benches and they try to have pretending relation with each other. So I want that this pretending relation should be replaced with real relation. We are not running successful in this direction. Whatever is understood by the people, we should at least distribute the election-seats with mutual agreements and understanding. We may distribute the seats among ourselves. Now I am not going in details about what happens or not but I would like to mention one thing that the Congress government is proud of the fact that they can never lose the election and that is true to some extent. Swatantra Party, Jansangh Party and Communist Party cannot win election against Congress. Congress can be defeated by only such party which has got characteristics of

economic revolution and nationality in an equal manner. Whether that party has come in existence or not, on this point I do not want to express my opinion but one must remember one thing that Krishna may look like a child but he is very much capable of killing Kansa as and when he wants. This much can only be done by the party which has got characteristics of economic revolution and nationality. I wish that a chance should be given in Kerala. Recall the elected Legislative Assembly again. If one argues that it has been dissolved once then even with your two-third majority if necessary by amending the Constitution kindly recall that Assembly. That is a mirror, a democracy and if you want to finish it then remember that sometimes things like this may turn into dangerous one which may provoke the people like me who do not wish to take things in their own hands but sometimes they are pressed to do so, I have to say this much only.

Motion Regarding Food Situation in the Country*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, had this crisis prevailed in any other country of the world, the Government would have been thrown out of power.

*** *** ***

One of the reasons responsible for the situation is that our people have become disinterested and disheartened and the other reason is that our opposition leaders are not serious about their job. Either they do not want to do agitation or they are not aware of such things. Sometimes they go on 24 hours fast or more day's peaceful strike and sometimes they resort to 'Satyagrah' for seven days. Now it has become necessary that the people of India should take a firm decision, as the problem of the foodgrains has been created by the Government and it is not directly related to the economy of the country. To prove my contention I would like to quote an instance of export of edible commodities to foreign countries. This Government is selling sugar to the public of the country at the rate of Rs. 1.50 kg. whereas the same is being exported at the rate of seven and half annas per kg. All this happened in last August. I want to stress upon the members of Swatantra Party, who were against some of the Ministers of the Government in the past, but do not criticise the Government now, as some of the Ministers have changed. I only want to convey to them that

*Lok Sabha Debates, 9 September, 1964.

instead of criticising individuals they should base their criticism on the policy of the Government. If we keep on criticising persons instead of the policies, the mistakes are bound to be repeated.

I will give more instances in regard to our exports. The prices of pulses have increased now a days. The rates of pulses are Rs. one to Rs. one and half per seer. It is true that the gram is not being exported now a days, but the gram pulse is still being exported. Such is the policy that is prevailing in our country these days.

Similar is the position in respect of bananas and mangoes. I want to warn that, after sometimes, the people of the country will not get good quality bananas and mangoes as the export policy of the country has become quite useless. When it is not possible to earn foreign exchange from factory products, the Government resorts to export foodgrains for earning foreign exchange.

*** *** ***

As regard export policy, I would like to make it clear that a lot of non-essential items and things of comforts are being imported in the country for which we have to spent a substantial amount of foreign exchange. When we do not find other goods for export to earn foreign exchange, we do look to foodgrains for earning foreign exchange.

Now, I come to the issue of production of foodgrains. A lot of things have been said here that production of foodgrains has increased by 35% during the last 15 years in the country but why this fact is not stated that the population of the country has also registered an increase of 33% over the period. That is why I say that this 30 to 35% increase will hardly make any difference as the production of foodgrains and population of the country have increased side by side with the result that nothing tangible has been achieved. Rather some drawbacks have cropped in per capita availability of foodgrains which is not more than 14 ounce or 7¼ 'Chhatanks' per head per day. This is an average in which seeds, etc. have not been included.

Even this 7¼ 'chhatanks' of foodgrains are not available per head per day as things have further deteriorated. Now I say with certainty that even four 'chhatanks' of foodgrains are not available per head per day to as many as 27 crores of the people in the country. Now I am pointing to a very grave situation which would continue as long as this Government remains in power because it has so far been pursuing the policy under which 5 to 7 crores of population of the country are flourishing at the cost of remaining 42 crores of the people. Now it has become crystal clear that only a few rich people numbering not more than 50 lakhs and their henchmen are growing rich under this planning. I know that the condition of ordinary people has not improved much and cannot afford a luxurious life. Of course, availability of foodgrains for them has increased a bit. When production of foodgrains does not register any increase, but its consumption increase, then increased consumption adversely affects the availability of foodgrains for the poor people. Just now I stated about availability of four 'chhatanks' of foodgrains to as many as 27 crores of the people. Now I would like to state that in next five years even this quantity is likely to be reduced to 3½ 'chhatanks' because of faulty planning of the Government. This is a question directly related with the Government policy.

Why does production of foodgrains not increase? This is because agriculture is no more a profitable enterprise. From the plans so far made, one could easily derive this fact that millionaires earn profits ranging from 30% to 40%. Donations are taken from the big factory owners and building contractors, to run the party. So is the case with the heavy industries like steel and aluminium set up at places like Ranchi and other places with a cost ranging from Rs. 100 crore to Rs. 400 crore. These are the factories from where they receive personal benefits for themselves and their kith and kins. I would like to draw your attention to the points mentioned by me. These industries are the source of donation for political leaders to do their political activities. And the

bureaucrats take advantage of the situation to subserve the interests of their kith & kins and the millionaire factory owners.

Today, such a situation is there that funds of the Plan cannot be spent on agriculture. The farmers having three, four or six acres of land will get nothing. I find some of my friends in the Congress Party who are supporters of the farmers, generally saying that farmers should be given loans. But where are the loans? Loans are sanctioned to the industrialists and the factory owners who have got linkage with the Ministers and bureaucrats and get benefited. The small farmers cannot get loans and if sometimes they get some of it, it is not worthwhile.

Money is in trade and industry and not in agriculture. And if it is there, it is with those who are having five hundred or one thousand acres of land. Therefore, I would like to say that we will have to import foodgrains till this Government exists. Since the time the present Government came in power, we have already imported foodgrains of the value of at least Rs. 1500 crores. From America alone, foodgrains worth Rs. ten to twelve hundred crores have been imported and the rest has been imported from other countries.... I think that if we had been a vibrant country, we would have revolted on the issue that during the last fifteen years, foodgrains worth rupees fifteen hundred crores have been imported.

Now, I would like to say something about this fifteen hundred crore rupees. If no Minister, bureaucrat or industrialist is allowed to be permitted to spend more than rupees one thousand per month, we may be saving every year Rs. 1200 crores according to Government statistics and Rs. 2500 crores according to my calculations. It will become a big capital for us. The first aim of this capital should be to bring improvement in agriculture. We should not waste time on matters like loan, co-operative farming or State farming. It is necessary that capital should be invested in agriculture whether it is beneficial or not. We will have to frame our policy keeping in view this fact that capital is to be invested in the agricultural sector.

It has another aspect also. People say that prices should be

increased. I often hear ₹ and like it to some extent. But I would say one thing. What will be the result of increasing the farm products? The industrialists and the farmers will increase prices. Here I would like to draw your attention towards a dangerous aspect. In India it is going to happen. The simple question is that either you reduce the prices of industrial products or increase the prices of farm products. And there is no other alternative because during the last ten to fifteen years the prices of the factory products have increased speedily but the prices of the farm products have not increased in the same proportion. For the first time now in 1964 the prices of farm products have been increased. The prices of all the commodities are co-related. The kerosene oil is being sold six annas a bottle. The situation in cement industry is also not happy. Its controlled price is rupees eight and twelve annas a bag. But it is not available. It is available at the cost of rupees twelve or fourteen a bag. As compared to controlled rate of eight rupees per bag the actual market price is fourteen rupees a bag. Who gets these six rupees, the ministers or the bureaucrats or the businessman? The collusion of these three categories of persons should never be forgotten. If a farmer particularly a big farmer, who sells his foodgrains in the market, purchases cement at a price of fourteen rupees a bag, it is quite natural that he will also try to sell his produce at higher prices. So, this ugly situation will continue in India, because for the first time the prices of agricultural produce have also begun to rise with the prices of the industrial goods. If we want to improve this situation the prices of industrial goods would have to be brought down. This can be achieved by reducing the burden of taxes, by reducing extravagant Government expenditure and by changing the present policies of the Government. The functioning of the Government for the last seventeen years has so far been far from satisfactory. There is no other way to improve the situation except bringing radical changes in the functioning of the Government in the manner suggested by me.

I would like to tell you yet another basic principle. If it is not possible to control the prices of various goods, at least a

co-relation can be maintained among the prices of various goods. I am not among persons who demand that commodities like wheat and cement should be sold at administered prices only and their prices are kept stable for a pretty long time. I am of the opinion that the prices of wheat, cement, kerosene and textile should be co-related so that fluctuation in prices of various commodities takes place side by side. It would be in the interest of farmers, urban consumers and for that matter the country as a whole. This could form the basis of preparing a better plan.

I regret to say that the politicians of India have not paid attention to all these things. I think even layman or a petty worker can well understand my view point but the persons, who matter and do not care for the welfare of people, do not relish it.

Now I would like to tell something to our socialist friends, no matter whether they sit on this side or the other side in the House. Now, they are more concerned with the body than with the soul, which is the real life line of the body. Now a days it has become a fashion among the people, particularly educated people to discuss the question whether there should be state trading in foodgrains or not, whether there should be nationalisation of banks or not and whether there should be regional trade or not in order to usher in socialism in the country. But these are only superficial changes which hardly matter unless something concrete changes are made in the system. They think that with the change of organisations and institutions, socialism can be brought in the country. But I would like to tell our friends, whether they call themselves as leftist or rightist or for that matter with any other name, that if they think so, they are mistaken. In fact they must care for the soul, if they want to transform the body politic. Mere changing the form of organisations will not bring socialism in the country. I would like to tell you a drawback of the cooperative societies. This will give you an idea as to how it is being misused in the name of socialism. On one hand, the affluent in villages and on the other traders in urban areas particularly commission-agents, though big busi-

ness houses in cities are not party to it, are forming cooperative societies and indulging in profiteering and fleecing the people. This is the state of the cooperative societies. If you go by the outward appearance of socialism without looking its spirit then this would always be the end result of socialism. Congress men pay lip service to socialism and this side the people raise slogans, but had the communists realised the situation it would have been better. Unfortunately, they are not realising the real position. They are enamoured by the outward appearance. In a way it is good. Clouds that thunder and bring rain are pleasing to look at and a man like me does appreciate such clouds, but looking at the mere sight of appearances does not suffice.

Just see how have the village been benefited by this scheme. Various facilities have been provided such as of cooperative societies, cold storage, distribution of seeds, advancing of loans and means of irrigation etc., but who are the people who have been benefited by all these schemes. It should be looked into. Only 5 per cent people have been benefited. The Government spends millions of rupees on these schemes, but only 5 to 10 per cent people derive the benefit. What is the outcome? Had the villagers utilised these funds in the villages for improving the agriculture, I would have overlooked it, but I am so crest fallen that today I desire more for enhanced production than social justice. My aim is enhanced national productivity. I am even prepared to tolerate the unfair means which one resorts to for increasing the production. The affluent are being favoured by the Congress be they from the urban or rural areas. Congress gives them advantage and in turn gets vote from them. These people are quite influential and they are in a position to motivate the people so as to cast their votes in favour of the Congress. With this, all the affluent people of villages have made lot of money and instead of investing the money in villages in agriculture they are investing money in factories or in other business in the cities. The villagers know this fact well. This is the law of nature, one runs after the profit. We may keep pleading that the villagers do not migrate to cities, invest money in agriculture, improve the agriculture, but their entire

capital infact, is invested in trade and industries, no improvement is made in agricultural side. Therefore, I submit that this House and this country should look forward to socialism.

Members of both the sides have pointed out that prices have gone up because of hoarding and profiteering. Even I felt to some extent they are right but how naive it is to put the entire blame on hoarding and profiteering. It is correct to say that there used to be much fluctuations in the prices of foodgrains in this country. Sometimes, the foodgrains, such as rice or wheat are sold at the rate of 6 or 7 annas but afterwards, the prices go up even to 11 to 12 annas per seer. This has always been the practice. But to say that the price rise of 1964 is due to hoarding and profiteering is not correct because it creates an impression that Government is innocent and not responsible for the price rise and it is the others, who are fully responsible for it. If the Government is guilty it is only to the extent that it is not booking the culprits or conniving with them. I want to point out that the entire policy on foodgrains, its import and export or allocations for agriculture, is wrong and it has nothing to do with the practice of hoarding or profiteering but is related to Government planning about industry and agriculture. Attention should be paid to these aspects. If this is not done, we would not be able to apprehend the real culprits. I would like to cite some instances relating to the real hoarders and profiteers. What does hoarding mean? The meaning of it is that who hoards foodgrains is a hoarder. If anybody hoards foodgrains even for two days, it would be a case of hoarding. When they conducted raids on the houses of the traders in Delhi, they had to say that raids were conducted not to unearth hoarded stock, but to test whether the arrangements of the police are adequate to conduct such raids. Such are these persons and the Government. I would give you an instance of a case of hoarding. Sometime back there was a ban on the movement of Gur from Uttar Pradesh. That was 'Gupt' Gur in two ways i.e. its clandestine movement was there and Shri Gupta was the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh. If you try to go into this, you will find the same unholy nexus between the three, responsible

therefor i.e. contributions to political parties for winning elections, corrupt Police and the bureaucracy and the profiteering by the big traders.

*** *** ***

....It is true of all the Congressmen that whenever any Congressman becomes a Minister, undue benefits accrue to their sons, relatives and other persons, with the result that the benefits of irrigation do not reach the people and the farmers of the country. In case the production increases to some extent, much more than that is spent on bribery, contributions and taxes.

Similarly, in Farrukhabad it was only very recently that a Senior Marketing Inspector had been apprehended while accepting bribe. I am here not to cite only one instance of this sort. In fact, what I want to submit is that today almost all the Government servants, whether they belong to the category of inspectors or are entrusted with the responsibility of public distribution at a particular place or they are the supervisory staff of such department, are always busy with all sorts of such activities which may contribute to the sustenance of their own political party or family. Here I have used both the words i.e. political party and family.

The very word political party creates a very wrong impression in our minds because we tend to think that the victory of our own political party or its emergence as the ruling party is the only way to the welfare of entire humanity or this country. When one particular individual is obsessed with such notions, he is prepared to go to any extent and nothing falls in the category of undesirable for him. So he thinks always in terms of the survival of the present Government. He also thinks that as soon as the Congress Government goes out of power it will lead to the disintegration of the country and what else could be more damaging. So we should strive to preserve the unity of this country. In order to save it, if we are to accept the triumvirate of ministers, bureaucrats and the traders alongwith the practice of bribe, fund raising and earning high profits to the extent of even

40 per cent, we should not hesitate. Let the affairs of the country continue to be run on the lines of the instance of the Senior Marketing Inspector, I have cited above.

Hitherto whatever I have spoken, is based on a lot of study. Now I would like to tell you about an incident of Calcutta. Though I wanted to get the facts verified by Shri Nandaji, but upto now he has not been able to verify it. That is why I would like to give you that information. I will not tell the names of those congressmen who were involved in it. Some big mill owners of Calcutta like Shri Manmohan Khan, Kashi Nath Pal and the son-in-law of Shri Ishwardas Jalan have been under arrest since long. But what for they have been arrested? The reasons therefor should be found out and I would like Shri Hiren Mukerjee to find out the reasons. In case Shri Atulya Ghosh was present there, he should tell us about the facts as to how and why he was arrested. However, if my information is correct, in spite of my condemnation of this act, I would also like to appreciate Nandaji for his efforts in case he has made any such effort in this regard. But I would like to avoid it because I am not sure about the correctness of my information.

There is one thing more, I would like to bring to your notice. Just now I have received a telegram saying that Butta Kol of Manikpur had died of starvation. Even earlier when I had gone to Sahasaram, I was told by Parasnath Tiwari that only two hours before my arrival there, some Anamika had died of starvation. But I would like to tell you that a lot of work has been done by Shri Keshav Shastri in this regard. When he found that a man was dying, he brought the S.H.O. of the area to take care of him. He told him that though the man was without a penny in his pocket, he should take care of his life. Life and property of each and every individual should be saved. If all the people of this country behave that way, it will be something very good.

Just now when I was about to leave my residence to come here, I received a packet of wheat from Hyderabad. You may please have a look at it and then pass it on to the Hon'ble minister to bring to his notice the quality of wheat which was

being distributed to the people of that city from the fair price shops. There are 400 fair price shops in that area. This sample has been collected from shop No. 321 (1). Shri Badri Prasad has sent this from Hyderabad. Someone should take it from me and hand it over to the Hon'ble Speaker. I do not say that this type of wheat is being sold at every shop but a large number of shops are selling such rotten wheat. You may kindly examine it minutely.

*** *** ***

Interruptions^a

*** *** ***

I think in U.S.A. this type of wheat is not being given even to the animals.

Now before I conclude I would like to say something about Bharat Bandh also, because it has now become very clear that no other alternative except Bharat Bandh has been left. To remove this Government, it is very essential to organise people's strength to express their anger. What is being complained is that this call of Bharat Bandh is being given quite late and it is only for one day. I want a Bharat Bandh which is not restricted to one day only. The work should be struck indefinitely. In this connection, I want to say to Jan Sangh also that enough is enough. They keep on criticising the Communists and others and the Communists keep on finding faults with the Jan Sangh. This should be stopped. The time has come when all the people should be organised and be asked to stop work so that this Government is overthrown. The policies of the Government in respect of production, investment, interest, exports should be changed. I would request Mrs. Renu Chakrawarti not to confine her ire to hoarders. She should find out from Calcutta as to why these people have been arrested. Shri Atulya Ghosh has given a statement denying any connection with the rice mill owners in regard to collection of Rs. 25 lakhs for the Congress session going to be held there. But I would

^a An Hon'ble member: What type of wheat is available in America.

like to submit only this that where there is a smoke, the fire is bound to be there.

Motions Regarding Committee on Public Undertakings*

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, from the debate on the Committee continuing for the last one hour, we might have realised that in the Lok Sabha debates we discuss the form more rather than substance. The country will be benefited more if we discuss the substance adequately.

Yesterday I heard with rapt attention the speech of Shri Daji with a view to know the attitude of the communists and their supporters. Although he appreciated the public enterprises, he tried to prove by his arguments that sooner the public sector is wound up better it would be. When I tried to know how could it be possible, I suddenly recollected the speech made by Shri Kanoongo. The instances quoted by Shri Kanoongo during his speech were from U.K. and the House of Commons. When the subject of discussion was public sector, he should have kept in mind more about instances from U.S.S.R. and such other things. But we have developed a habit of mixing up the public sector and private sector as a result of which we are not able to come to any concrete conclusion. It was quite possible that if the developments in U.S.S.R. were discussed more here we would have come to know more and more about that country. I know that atrocities are committed in U.S.S.R. and I do not like them at all, but if the public enterprises in U.S.S.R. were run in the way they are being run in India, then it is difficult to say what would have happened to the Ministers and the persons managing the public undertakings. While dwelling on the good or bad deeds of the Prime Minister I will try to state what would

* Lok Sabha Debates, 19 and 20 November, 1963.

have been his fate had he been in U.S.S.R. At the moment I will simply like to tell that, as usual, our public sector and private sector have influenced each other to a great extent. Throughout the world the private sector is considered better in the matter of management, but it is worse as far as greed is concerned. So far as public sector enterprises are concerned, mismanagement is rampant there, but at the same time they are more dutiful. This difference is prevalent throughout the world, but we Indians believe in adjustment. For this reason the management in private enterprises and industries run by capitalists is also deteriorating, in addition to loot and profiteering indulged in by them. Similarly, on the one hand the public sector enterprises are going from bad to worse in the matter of management and on the other hand they are developing the habit of looting the people like private sector enterprises run by capitalists. Such a trend is quite manifest in our country and until and unless we understand the basic fact that public undertakings can run efficiently only when they have public interest in mind and we change our attitude towards life, these industries are not going to benefit us in any way.

I am of the opinion that public sector and the private sector should not be mixed up. Public sector undertakings should be run in a way different than the way in which the private industries are run. If the public undertakings are to be run in the same way then where is the need for them. I have gathered from this debate that one and the same yardstick is applied for judging the performance of the public sector and the private sector. For judging the performance of public sector yardsticks too should be separate. I will place before you some of the yardsticks that should be applied in the case of public sector.

The public sector undertakings can be more helpful in the expansion of industrialisation as compared to the private sector enterprises run by capitalists. Our growth rate is very low. We are unable to mobilise required resources. There is very little scope for earning profit in public sector undertakings—at least it is not there to that extent to which it is seen in case of private enterprises run by capitalists. As such, whatever little profits the

public sector undertakings are earning, they should be utilised for setting up more and more industries. Therefore, the first yardstick for judging the performance of public sector undertakings should be the extent to which they prove helpful in the industrialisation of the country.

I want to make it clear that by saying so here I do not mean growth of business like that of LIC. LIC has expanded its business. I have nothing to do with that. What I want to say is that LIC should be able to provide that much help to the public undertakings whereby the rate of industrialisation of the country can be accelerated. This is the first yardstick.

Secondly, the public sector undertakings should be able to promote socialism in the country. There should be equitable distribution of wealth. There is a wide gap between the workers and the management as well as the consumers and the manufacturers because of the loot by industries run by capitalist. Such a gap should not exist in the public sector. In public sector the methods of distribution should promote equality.

Thirdly, there is no doubt that relationship between the management and the workers should be cordial in the industries run by capitalists also, but this relationship in the public sector should be more democratic and the entire democratic set up in the country should also extend full help to public sector.

Fourthly, it should be seen how far the public sector undertakings serve for the furtherance of Public interest. Public interest covers the points like price of commodities, the availability or non-availability of facility to the people or the difficulty faced by them in getting it, etc.

Fifthly, these undertakings should be well managed. Competent persons should be appointed there who do not violate law and pay attention towards expansion of trade and industrialisation, instead of looking their own well-being and satisfying their greed.

These are the five yardsticks to judge the correct performances of the public sector undertakings.....

Interruptions @

There should not be any disparity in the pay of employees. As I said, there should be equitable distribution. Swamiji has made a very good point. I would therefore like to put my second

@ Shri Rameshwaranand (Karnal): There should not be so much disparity in the pay, this should also be one of the yardsticks.

point first and cite some examples. I will request Shri Kanungo to go into them and apprise Lok Sabha of the facts.

Now take Rourkela Steel Plant. I cannot say that it is working smoothly. After long calculations I have come to the conclusion that one thousand officers there get about Rs. 20 lakhs as pay and perquisites while 30 thousand workers get only Rs. 30 lakhs. It is a big disparity. Once I had asked a question as to whether such a big disparity is prevailing in Tatanagar? I can say that disparity of this magnitude cannot be there in Tatanagar. This is not the case with Rourkela only, but this position is found in other steel plants also. You should pay more attention to the ratio in which disparity is there and not to the figures. The ratio is this that one thousand officers get Rs. 20 lakhs while 30 thousand workers get Rs. 30 lakhs per month.

I would also like to say something about the accommodation facilities provided by LIC to its officers and staff. There are about 2,000 officers in LIC. The amount being spent on providing accommodation to them is beyond our comprehension and there is no proper scrutiny or verification thereof. On the other hand 35,000 staff members get only Rs. 15 per month as house rent whereas 7,000 field workers and 2½ lakh agents do not get any relief on this account. There are four categories of people serving LIC among which 2.50 lakhs are agents, 7,000 others, and about 2.75 lakhs persons are there.

I have quoted this example just to show the glaring disparities that exist in the public undertakings. We pinpoint such disparities found in the enterprises run by Birlas and Tatas, but when we find the same in public sector undertakings and enterprises we are very much pained.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, mismanagement which was the legacy of public enterprises has crept in private enterprises and exploitation which was the legacy of private enterprises has crept in public enterprises with the result that I do not find any difference in the concept of Nehru and that of Birlas about industries. There is no difference between the public and

private enterprises except that the former appear to be public and popular. Its results have, however, been very dangerous. I was drawing your attention towards the measures which can bring about improvement in the management of Public Undertakings.

I had made one suggestion about equality and quoted some instances in this regard. It is my submission that the magnitude of disparity and not the figures should be taken into account. To elaborate my point I will like to bring to your notice the perquisites of officers. The perquisites of an officer drawing Rs. 2,500 per month cost the State exchequer Rs. 10,000 p.m. on an average. I am not taking into account the high ups on whom the State has to spend lakhs of rupees per month. I have quoted only an average figure. Therefore, when we talk of disparity, we in India, should not talk of disparity in salary alone. The high ups enjoy the facilities which cost the exchequer 4 to 6 times more than their salary and because of these perquisites rules and regulations are also violated to some extent. Here I will not divulge the name of any person. I will simply tell how the rules are violated. A high Government official looking after public undertakings was posted in Delhi. He maintained a bungalow in Bombay for his family on Government expenses. Similarly, there is another high official who very often makes private calls from Bombay to Delhi and also performs air journey to Delhi and back almost every week.

Similarly, I would like to draw your attention to the breach of agreement between Romania and India. Kerosene unit of the oil refinery in Guwahati is lying almost idle since long. It works only for 50 to 80 days in a year. These days it is lying completely closed. I have come to know that in violation of terms of Indo-Romania agreement, rusted machines have been installed in the refinery. I do not know anything about the favour which the officers got for this. But if they got any, it would have been very dangerous. Law is being violated very frequently. I can give many more examples, but at the moment I would only like to say that this practice of violating the laws by the officers and also of protecting each other is prevalent throughout the world in public undertakings. Even U.S.S.R. had to face this evil. It is

difficult to put a stop to such practices because Government wants to extend the same facilities to its officers which are available to their counterparts in private sector. This has been repeatedly said by the Prime Minister that if Tatas and Birlas etc. provide the luxuries of life to their officers, Government of India would also like to provide the same to its officers also. It is this bad practice which is giving rise to ostentatious and extravagant expenditure and there is no attempt at bringing about equality. Prime Minister himself sets the example in this regard. Whenever he or any other Minister inaugurates a public enterprise, lot of expenditure is incurred. Once he said that he will no longer inaugurate any plant and instead a labourer will be invited to inaugurate a plant. Once a woman labourer inaugurated a plant in his presence. But this hypocrisy was never repeated again. He always goes for inauguration and lot of money is spent thereon.

Although Hirakund and Rourkela cover an area of about 50 to 60 miles only, yet three airports have been provided there. Why? Just to add to the luxuries available to the Prime Minister and other Ministers. Now, they are no longer in use. These airports are neither being used for lifting freight nor for passenger traffic. This goes to suggest that the extravagance on luxuries has increased enormously.

Shri Daji is an ardent supporter of public enterprises yet the arguments advanced by him in this regard run counter to his theory. It seems he has not given ample thought as to what the position is in U.S.S.R. Large scale atrocities and excesses were perpetrated in U.S.S.R. I do not favour such things, but at the same time I am opposed to any liking for luxuries in India. Had this things, which is being done here for the last 15 years, been done in U.S.S.R., no one knows how many bureaucrats and Ministers responsible therefor would have been made to face the wall and shot dead...

Committee on Public Undertakings should have some knowledge about the manner in which the public enterprises should be run.

Interruptions@

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I know it as I have stated earlier, had this extravagance been indulged

@ Mr. Speaker: Instead of putting your point in brief on the subject, you initiated a long discussion which should have been avoided.

in U.S.S.R., Ministers and bureaucrats responsible therefor would have been shot dead. But no exception should be taken to my statement in any quarter. Though I don't like such things and consider it an atrocity, yet I have no hesitation in saying that this extravagance in India has reached a level where public enterprises are bound to incur heavy losses if they are not run on socialistic lines. This is the first point I want to emphasise.

So far as the question of labour-management relationship in a democracy is concerned, I would like to point out that labour is not so much discontented in private enterprises, as it is in the public enterprises.

I would like to cite a wonderful example about our democracy. Tatanagar, a company city which belongs to capitalists, has its own ways, but Chittranjan has surpassed even this, where even entry to the city is by permit. This type of democracy we are having. I can cite hundreds of such examples.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if these things are not included in terms of reference of the committees while constituting them, we the members of Lok Sabha would be rendered helpless.

As regards the question of commercial viability, public enterprises have many shortcomings which can be enumerated in one sentence...

I shall give my arguments in support of constituting a new Committee. I will be concluding soon. Hon'ble Minister should himself try to learn from me the factors responsible for worsening the condition of public enterprises.

The steel being sold in India today should be made available at cheaper rates as there is abundance of iron ore and coal deposits in India. We export our iron ore to Japan which is about 4-6 thousand miles away from our country and then Japan sells steel in our country at cheaper rates as compared to the steel produced indigenously by us. Our steel prices are very high. I feel that the private sector enterprises like it that the prices remain at a higher level due to the manner of functioning

of our public sector undertakings so that the private sector could reap more profit.

All sorts of such things are happening in public enterprises. Had this happened in private enterprises, they would have gone bankrupt but public sector enterprises do not face such eventualities because of their being run by the State. Therefore, my suggestion to the hon'ble Minister is that he should be vigilant about cost accounting in the public sector undertakings. Proper cost accounting would reveal as to where rules are being violated and by whom. It would be better if Government remain vigilant about the guilty. It is seen that whenever the guilty is caught, another person is passed on as a guilty person in order to provide a scape goat to the actual guilty. The new Minister will come to know all about it. Sometimes it may happen that the responsibility is pinned down on the Finance Minister and later on passed on to Patil Saheb and then Mr. Kamath is held responsible for that and in this manner the person actually responsible for the guilt manages to go scot free. So, in these circumstances, it is better that our Government concentrates on the removal of the guilt itself instead of trying to catch the guilty.

Before I conclude, I would say that all those Ministers who are in the Government at present will become ardent supporters of the private enterprise as soon as they are dropped from the cabinet but a person like me would always remain a supporter of the public sector enterprises.

Reorganisation of Punjab State*

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have received some information yesterday as well as today which I want to share with this august House and which will enrage the people of this country. This House has many a time discussed. Telugu province, Marathi province and Gujarati province but the territory of India out of which these provinces are carved has not been discussed. It is true that some Indian territory here and there has gone under the occupation of Pakistan and China but the time has come when this House should very carefully take stock of whole territory of India. In this context, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read out from the Year Book of 1950 of the UNO. At Page 1010 it says—

'The total area of India is 31,62,454 sq. k.m.' But on page 579 of the year Book of 1964 of the same Organisation, it is stated that 'the total area of India is 30,46,232 sq. kilometers.' Both these book have been brought out by the same international organisation of which India is a member. Now if we compare the two figures we find that 1,22,222 sq. k.m. territory is missing.

interruptions@

I am sorry to hear the hon. Member say that it has no relevance with the Motion. He may say this, but punjab State has been formed out of this very territory of India.

interruptions@@

I would request the hon. Members to ponder over this fact dispassionately. Who supplies these figures to the U.N.? They are furnished by the Government of India. India is a member of the U.N. Is it not the duty of the member country to point out

* Lok Sabha Debate, 14 May, 1966.

@ An Hon. Member: How it is related to this Motion?

●● Shri Tyagi: The figures given by you are of United Nations and India has not corroborated them.

this blunder? Should it not take up the matter with the U.N.? Where has this 1,22,000 sq. k.m. territory gone? Why has it been reduced? If this is under the occupation of Pakistan or China then it should not have been reduced.

This is about the book brought out by the U.N. I would like to draw your attention to another blunder which has been committed in the Year Book published by the Survey of India. The Year Book of 1953 says that the total area of India is 12,69,640 sq. miles while the Year book of 1964 of the same department puts this figure as 12,61,597 sq. miles. 8,042 sq. miles territory is missing. Where has this territory gone?

In a country, where masses are strong and powerful, if such a thing happens, no Government can remain in power for a minute. When this august House discusses the formation of Punjab State, etc. it should take note of what this Government is doing with the country.

As far as formation of States is concerned, during the last 14-15 years several States like Punjab, Maharashtra, Gujarat have been formed on the basis of and for the promotion of Indian languages. But I can say with certainty that none of the provincial languages have progressed as compared to the use of English. Marathi was the language of Aurangabad, but today English has taken the place of Marathi. Same is the position in other provinces.

Besides, I would also like to focus attention on one more grand failure of the Government. If these States were to be formed, then these should have been formed in one go, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Vidarbha etc. States should have been formed in 1948-49 itself. But in 1948-49 these States were not formed and the matter was shelved. For the last 15 years this issue has been agitating the minds of the Indian people and I charge this Government with having deliberately kept this issue in cold storage so that the minds of the people remain preoccupied with it.

Then there is another issue. We, in the Opposition, often pay more attention to improper questions than to the proper

questions. These improper questions are raised either by Government itself or under certain circumstances by some other persons. The Opposition should raise good questions but often improper questions are raised with the result that the very purpose of asking questions is defeated. The Opposition need not reply to every question but pay more attention to issues like eliminating English language and bringing about necessary improvements in the fields of agriculture and industry. The result is that when the Opposition asks for the formation of Maharashtra State, Government refuses to do so with the result that a fight ensues. This goes on for 4 to 6 years resulting in a good deal of hardships to the people. Then one day Government forms the Maharashtra State and the people become happy. This makes no difference to the Congress Government. So, whatever has been done, has been done. The Opposition in future should not waste time on improper questions and pay due attention to proper questions.

...^{***}This matter should not rest here. We should decide about the areas of India before this Session ends. We should get a categorical reply as to where, 1,22,222 sq. kms of our territory has gone.

I had been advising the Opposition to ask proper questions and not reply to irrelevant questions, raised by Government and others. Whether atom bomb is manufactured or not and whether a State has been formed or not—we need not reply to such questions. I had visited a place. Durg was on its way. There a demand was made for the formation of Vidarbha State and then for Gondwana State. Demands were also made for the formation of Jharkhand State and Haryana State. If the Opposition engages itself in such demands, then 4 to 5 years more will be wasted in this way and we will come back to square one. Therefore, the Opposition should follow an appropriate policy in this regard. They should pay particular attention to the questions raised. Only proper questions should be asked and improper ones avoided. If improper questions are asked, they need not be replied. Then we should try to get a categorical reply from this Government about the area of our

country. There is some deep rooted mystery about it due to which these people have forfeited their right to remain in power. We are afraid, we may not have to take certain drastic steps in the matter of UN and also in the matter of Survey of India.

Report on Midterm Appraisal of Third Five Year Plan*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this plan has been formulated by foolish intellectuals who lack national feeling and direction and it is implemented by people who believe in leading a luxurious life.

interruptions@

They are foolish intellectuals and the proof of this is that this document which consists of 175 pages could be easily confined to 40-50 pages if the unnecessary and irrelevant matter was not given place in it and it is because possibly you have not yet achieved perfection even in imitating the Britishers...

It contains a chapter on economic background which runs into ten pages and could be easily reduced to one and a half page. It contains illogical, irrational formulae, jugglery of words and unnecessary details.

It is directionless and lacks objectivity and as such is unable to find any solution as if lost in the winding alleys of a labyrinth. They do not have national feeling because they are drawn to the systems of USSR and America and think little of the indigenous systems. They are more concerned about them. Besides, they want to build the edifice of consumption on the pattern of America and USSR on the archaic foundation of production of our country. So far as the question of corruption is concerned, if the hon. Minister has the patience for hearing, I would like to point that the residence of the Head of our Government has been furnished with carpets and *durries* worth rupees two lakh which have been drawn from the National Exchequer. It also affects the Plan because that amount could have been invested in some factory. It is not

* Lok Sabha Debates, 9 December, 1963.

@ An Hon. Member: How can a fool be an intellectual?

known as to how many lakhs of rupees are thus spent. In this way Rs. 200 crore- or even Rs. 20,000 crore are wasted...

I was talking about consumption. The edifice of consumption is raised on the alien pattern of USSR and USA although the foundation of production continues to be Indian. There can be no forceful and stronger argument, than this against this Plan.

A reference was made to the objective approach of the report. I would like to say that if you go through the figures of irrigation, you will find the figures for the first and second year but for the third year only projections have been given. Consequently, the area under major and medium irrigation is hardly 12 lakh acres during first and second year and the target fixed for the third year is 25 lakh acres. As a result the percentage comes to 35 and in my view if we take into account only the work accomplished the percentage works out to only 27. Similarly the figures for minor irrigation will also come down. I am of the view that the report has not been prepared honestly.

I am going to give one more example to substantiate my point. The basic statistics regarding machines and implements have not been given and only their value has been given. It has been mentioned that sugar mills worth so many rupees and machines and implements worth so many rupees have been installed but there is no mention about their capacity. Before elucidating this point further, I would like to mention some general points to which the ruling party also should not have any objection. One of the points relates to shifting of responsibility for lapses. I am of the opinion that the persons who formulate, prepare and write the plan put the blame on the persons who implement it and all the officials of the Government have developed a habit of defending their acts of omission and commission and no one tries to find the proper solution. Consequently, if you go through their files you will find in the margin written like "I am not at fault, someone else was responsible." We have seen this thing in this House also. When *gur* issue was raised in the House Brahm Parkash said that he was in no way responsible and it was due to the fault of the

Ministry of Railways and they accepted illegal gratification from the people. Ministry of Railways could say that they were not to be blamed and what could they do when the Prime Minister was ushering in an era of fashion and luxury. Thus, the tendency of evading responsibility for lapses is picking up. First of all, I would recommend that do not disown the mistake, take remedial measures, fix responsibility and punish the guilty, if necessary, though it is of secondary importance.

In the same way I want to say about targets. In this regard the first thing is expenditure, the second is articles and the third is the human being. With regard to expenditure, I have to mention that allocation is made for the expenditure, under different heads and at the end of the year in March or April all the departments hasten to fully spend the amount which results in extravagance. So the target of expenditure should not be high instead the target for things should be high and highest target should be for the human beings to be benefited, the aspect which has been forgotten by this Government. In India human beings have become very weak, they cannot work hard, they cannot work with spade, they cannot dig the land, what to talk of using a rifle. I have seen that only one out of 20 men can lift a rifle, others are not even capable of doing that much. However, I am not concerned more with rifles. The same thing applies to spade also. Thus Indian people are becoming weaker. So, you should come forward with a plan which can make them strong enough to work hard.

Now, I come to the main thrust of the Plan. If the main thrusts are to be given in the plan, what these should be? For example take agriculture. It has a long history. It is true that efforts should be made to improve it. In this respect instead of all the aspects, one aspect of it should be given attention and we should see that it is achieved. With regard to agriculture, it has been mentioned that measures for soil conservation will be taken to save the land from erosion by river waters and the submerged land will be reclaimed. As far as the question of all round improvement is concerned, you may do that but along with decide a definite direction, fix a positive goal that the

entire submerged land in the country would be made cultivable, whether it is three crore acres or four crore acres. Determined efforts should be made to accomplish this thrust.

Now, I take up education. For education, there is a provision for radical change. O.K. you keep this target but in this plan out of many aspects of education select one aspect and make sure that you achieve complete literacy through out the country and everybody will become literate. Thus, achieve the goal of literacy.

In the same way, we can give priority to health. Make overall improvement but give priority to one aspect that we will provide drinking water taps in each and every village and city throughout the country.

Thus, I have emphasised that while doing overall improvements in any field, give priority to and concentrate on one of the aspects and try to achieve that.

In this plan expenditure is more than the income. I find this thing in almost all the departments. At present I take up industry and mines only. In 1960-61 an indication was given that rupees 450 crore would be spent on construction works in that year but that increased to rupees 690 crore, which works out to about $1\frac{3}{4}$ times. Thus in the whole plan it would increase from 1800 crore to 2300 crore. So, in industry and mines alone the expenditure increased by Rs. 500 crore. Why there was an increase? Let me explain how it increased? An Oil Refinery was to be set up in Barauni. The land acquired for this purpose was so low lying that rain water collected there and crores of rupees were spent to fill that land.

Let us take the case of Trombay. A fertilizer factory was to be set up there keeping in view that the gas from the Oil Refinery would be easily available there but here the cost of land paid was very high. Gas could be supplied through pipes upto the factory if it was located at a site where land was available at low cost. But this fact was not taken into consideration because the money belonged to Government and the Government money is spent carelessly and extravagantly.

Now, I would like to come to income. In this plan a profit of rupees 450 crore has been projected from the public sector industries. I tried to estimate total amount that has been invested in public sector industries. There were some public sector industries even before this Government came to power. So I wanted to arrive at the quantum of investment made in these industries so that I could know the amount of investment on which such profits may be earned. But I could not do that. I do not know whether this report contains that information. If at all it contains, it is not an easy task to locate that, it will be like groping in the dark. But the profit has been indicated as rupees 450 crore. I think it can be easily raised to rupees 1000 crore. The expenditure can be reduced by rupees 400 to 500 crore and then the profits can be increased by rupees 400-500 crore. In this way a resource mobilisation worth Rs. 1000 crore is possible in this plan, through higher profits and savings in the industries and mines sector.

So far as the question of whole plan is concerned, which involves an outlay of 10,000 crore, I cannot say exactly but my estimate is that about Rs. 3000 to 4000 crore would go as wasteful expenditure and as extravagance. Wasteful expenditure is the one which I mentioned in reference to Barauni Oil Refinery and extravagance is to live in luxury and with pomp and show and imitate European way of life.

Now, if you see the total annual expenditure of the Government on this Plan it is 10,000 crore. The expenditure for 5 years is 25,000 crore. I think out of rupees 25,000 crore, rupees 10,000 crore will be wasteful and extravagant expenditure. Therefore, I want that we should have a wider outlook and we should not concentrate on petty matters. It will serve no purpose even if we effect some economy in insignificant areas. We should concentrate on areas where significant savings can be achieved.

I do not want to say anything to others present here but I certainly want them convey it to their leader, who often does not sit here. He brags that the average age of Indians has gone

upto 40 or 42 years. I want to tell that such statistics are always wrong because there has been some change in the infant mortality rate and as a consequence the average age has increased but this is not that the age of the people has increased like that of Malaviyaji.

In the same way, mention is made here about bicycles or radios. With regard to planning, we should have three criteria before us. Firstly, we should look to the progress made by us as compared to our past performance, secondly, what progress we have made as compared to our neighbours and the other countries of the world and thirdly, what are our aspirations.

I want to say that any literate person—I do not mean an educated person from university, I mean to say that in comparison to those people who make a mention about bicycle or radio, will admit that India has made some progress as compared to her past but we have made a little progress as compared to our neighbours and other countries of the world. If we look to our aspirations, we have not made any progress during these 15 years. Instead we have been left behind China which has made a good progress as compared to her position 15 years ago. Leave China, that is a big country, even a small country like Ghana has made significant progress. We have certainly made some progress but as compared to other countries we are far behind. That is why I say that we will have to broaden our perspective.

I wanted to place the very wider perspective before the House when I said that there are 27 crore people in this country who are living on 3 annas per day. This is such a figure about which there is no scope left for any further discussion. The other day Nandaji spoke vehemently and today also we have heard him speaking with that very degree of vehemence. One mistake he committed was that he counted the earning of the non-agricultural occupations twice. According to him the difference was of rupees 1500 crore. So, such a mistake was committed by him at that time, but I do not want to go into that at present I said that in this country 27 crores people are living on 3 annas per day. In saying so my intention was to place the

true picture of the Government before you and the people of India. But my intention was not just this. My intention was to show you the problem as well as its solution. What is the problem? The malady is this that as many as 27 crore people of the country have to remain content with an average income of three annas a day only and there are yet another 16 crore people whose average per capita income is rupee one only. As compared to this, there are 50 lakhs people in the country whose average per capita spending is as high as Rs. 33/- a day. When our society is suffering from this kind of malady, it is obvious that we have to find out some remedy for it. I am not saying that the people spending rupees thirty three a day be brought down to the level of those who are spending three annas a day. However, if they are brought down to the level of Rs. 15 or 16, an amount of Rs. 2500 crore or Rs. 1500 crore as per the statistics pertaining to the Government Taxes can be easily saved. Thus in a full plan period, total saving may be estimated to be Rs. 7500 crore or Rs. 10,000 crore which would contribute to the smooth sailing of the Five Year Plan.

On an earlier occasion also, I had referred to this malady and its possible cure before the House and now once again I reiterate it here. Unless some corrective measures are taken, this problem will not be solved. In India, we have adopted the structural pattern of development obtaining in affluent countries such as U.S.A., U.S.S.R. and other European countries. Unless we change this pattern of development alien to our soil, we cannot achieve the aims and objectives laid down under our plans. Merely saying these words will serve no purpose that this is a Governmental plan and public enterprises and the private enterprises owned by our millionaire capitalists are totally distinct, as both the public and the private enterprises are being run on the same lines. Their aims and objectives as well as their style of functioning are the same. So are the pay and allowances of their executives and the standard of living enjoyed by their managers. Hence it is no logic in drawing a line of distinction between the two in this respect. However we should distinguish between the two and that basic distinction

can be made only when we come to realise it that we have to bring the people spending Rs. 33 a day down to the level of Rs. 15 or 16 a day. I do not like to add anything more in this regard as any further comments will put them on tenter hooks. However, I would like to make yet another point about the stages to be crossed by the poor in this country. There are a number of stages of poverty and affluence to be crossed by the poor as well the rich in this country. The number of such stages runs not in one or two but in lakhs. If not in lakhs, it must be running certainly in thousands. Had it been two or three stages to be crossed, the problem would have been solved by now. Because of this multiplicity of echelons in our society, it is very difficult to restructure it. The basic drawbacks witnessed in our economy are reflected in our plans also. By the term 'basic drawback' I mean that our system of farming and agriculture production still dates back to the medieval period and our farmers work with the kinds of implements which were in use 1500 years ago. Of course, tractors have come at few places but more or less the same age-old agricultural implements are still used by our farmers. The looms on which our weavers work are the same which were used 2000 or 1000 years ago. There is no change in it. It is true that some mills have also been set up but these could not bring any basic changes in our infrastructure of production which continued to be archaic in nature, whereas our pattern of consumption has undergone a sea-change i.e. from modern to ultra modern. Can our archaic system of production meet the requirements of this ultra modern pattern of consumption which we have copied from western countries. From this plan which has been launched recently, it is proved beyond doubt that such a situation can hardly last for long.

...

...

...

The Government and its bureaucrats are supposed to serve the people. But what I have to submit is that in order to provide comforts to 5000 top officials of the Government, there are as many as 1,00,000 persons to serve them. The total number of Government servants is estimated to be one crore. Thus a big army of servants has been placed at the disposal of these high

ups at the cost of huge government expenditure so that they could lead a life of luxury and pomp and show. This increases burden on the public exchequer. Our plan makers have been of the opinion that with the economic development of the country, all things would be automatically set right. This is the most erroneous line of thinking. Infact, it has resulted in our failure to solve any of the problems facing the country during the last 15 years.

Yet another peculiar 'Kainchi' (scissors) was applied to each and every problem I call it the 'Kainchi' of the Congress Party. A brazen example of this sort of double-dealing can be seen in granting privy purses to the erstwhile Rajas and the Maharajas of the princely states. On the one hand, the Congress party vehemently denounces granting of privy purses to them, while on the other, they express their inability to abolish the same by saying that they are bound by the commitment they had made to them. That is the example of this quality of the Congress party which denounces the privy purses in one breath and reiterates its commitment in the other. May I ask these people who had made this commitment, to quit? Yield your place to others who must have guts to abolish the privy purses. There is no rationale in their arguments. This kainchi of the Congress party has been applied to almost all the problems, be it the problem of language or the problem relating to wealth.

Similarly, I would like you to know about the service conditions of the people belonging to All India Services and other government services with reference to which you ought to know that there are people in the rural areas who are working as 'chaukidar' on a meagre monthly salary of Rs 5/- only. Now I would not like to dwell on the point of highest amount of salaries being given by the Government as it will again prick them.

Now I come to yet another point with regard to Mathone Dam project which is a Government venture. In this project, the number of employees continuously increased because of two reasons. Firstly, there was a competition between the Bengali and the Bihari as to who surpasses the other in matter of giving

more and more employment to the natives of their respective states. Secondly, this was followed by yet another similar competition between the 'Kayasthas' and the 'Brahmins' to accommodate more and more persons of their respective castes. I am reminded of an incident which occurred with me. Before Shri Morarji Desai was dropped from the Union Cabinet under the Kamaraj plan, he once told me that I unnecessarily raised much hue and cry. He added that as a matter of fact no one could stop capable persons from entering into Government services. I would like to submit in all humbleness that had he been the Prime Minister of India, persons belonging to his sub-caste known as 'Anamil Brahmins' only would have been considered as the most capable persons in India. It is the tragedy of our country that whosoever happens to occupy a seat of power here, he makes the persons belonging to his own caste or creed capable of holding the various positions.

Similarly, I would like to point out towards a major drawback of pomp and show displayed under the plan. I would like to cite a brazen example of this kind of pomp and show. Recently, Allahabad railway station was renovated at a cost of rupees one crore, otherwise it would have continued to render useful service to the people for another 50 years. But it was reconstructed in the name of its beautification. In place of it, if a bridge at the cost of rupees 4 to 5 crore had been constructed across the river Ganges or the Ramganga at the point from where military supplies are transported to north Pithoragarh for the jawans who are braving the challenge of China in those poor and backward areas, it would have reduced the travelling time from present 10 hours to 3 hours.

Further, if you want to judge the worth of this plan, you need only to go through the part of the plan, relating to Delhi. The preparation of plan for Delhi alone cost Rs. 7 lakh to the exchequer. If that is the state of affairs in case of Delhi, rest of it I leave to your imagination. Similarly, if you would like to know about yet another feature of this plan, you simply need to go to Ahmedabad...

*** *** ***

....In Ahmedabad 10-15 thousand bungalows have been constructed for our brown 'Sahebs'. In fact, this plan has been made not for the benefit of general public. It is aimed at somehow gradually increasing the number of a handful of affluent persons in the country now numbering about 50 lakh. Every year, as many as 2 to 3 lakh new sahebs are created in India. It blocks our way to socialism in India because as and when India is posed for socialistic revolution, these sahebs accustomed to live in cosy bungalows will take up cudgels against the very concept of revolution.

I was listening to Tiwariji. He said a remarkable thing that Bihar had been discriminated against. But he put it wrongly as a result of which a good and genuine case was spoiled. In fact, what is happening? Of course, discrimination is there but it is against the poor. To substantiate my point, I would like to cite the example of Orissa, Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar where average annual income is Rs. 200/- only as against the average income of Rs. 400/- of the people of some of the areas of this country such as Bombay and Calcutta which had inherited the residue of the foreign trade interests from the Britishers.

Moreover, a big man manages to beautify the place he comes from. For example, a Minister invariably manages to develop his area at the cost of other areas.

...There is an area of two lakh and forty thousand acres under co-operative farming. During the days of elections, a loud propaganda of co-operative farming was made. But in fact, against the figure of 30 crore acres of cultivable land, there is hardly an area of 2 lakh 40 thousand acres under actual co-operative farming. By that I mean that they make false promises at the time of elections. There is a wide gap between the practice and profession of the Government.

As regards corruption, least said the better. An amount of Rs. 52 crore was spent on khadi and village Industries under the plan. With that investment, production of cloth increased from 6.4 crore yards to 7.7 crore yards. This increase in cloth production is insignificant as compared to the total production of

cloth which runs into hundreds of crore of yards, So what is the purpose of this plan? This plan has been made at the behest of the Prime Minister with some ulterior motives. Perhaps one of the motives may be to shut the mouth of truth knowing people by luring them with other temptations. In India, a large chunk of people belonging to different castes and creeds who could not be inducted into the Cabinet or who are not willing to be a Minister are kept occupied otherwise with government assignments. They include people belonging to various walks of life such as saints, servants, preachers and academicians. It has deformed and debased our entire plan. In order to correct the situation, only way left is that an organisation is evolved to bring about a change in our agricultural and industrial set up. I do not expect it from the Government which has neither any such organisation nor any will power to set up an organisation which may bring about a change in working of our farms and factories. But I regret to say that we are also not making an organisation of the kind which could get rid this country of this outworn system. The problem before the country is this that the Government itself is not evolving an organisation which could rectify the faulty system in our farms and factories. Even the people of this country have not been able to evolve such an organisation which could throw this Government out of power. This could be attributed to the fact that we have become narrow minded. Everyone thinks in terms of one's own interest or in terms of the interest of one's own area or the community to which he belongs. I am telling you sincerely. Since I came to Delhi, I am feeling like a fish out of water and I start thinking as to why I have come to this wretched place. A number of people come to me to tell their woes daily, They belong to All India radio, Posts and Telegraphs, farm labourers and so on. They have their own tales of woes to tell. Despite all these things, a concerted effort is not being made to improve the lot of the people. A national effort is lacking. The biggest reason of it could be attributed to this plan through which the Government has shattered the confidence of the people of this country. The people are found saying that there is no guarantee of it that in case the present government which consists of

inefficient lot of leaders is replaced by the people of other parties, they will also not turn into an inefficient lot. I do not see any logic in this argument. If the Government of other parties also fails to meet the aspirations of the people, it can also be replaced by the people in the same way as we throw our garbage of the house into dustbins daily. But we have not been able to evolve any such organisations. While commenting on this plan, I can say that this shows our inability. In our economic life, now-a-days, we see a trend of expansionism which could be easily comprehended if we witness the scene in a third class railway compartment where some robust passengers can be seen occupying more and more space while the rest of the passengers are compelled to squeeze themselves into a corner. But I would like to submit that unless and until these weak people come forward to assert themselves to check this trend in the country, our plans cannot be successful.

History

After all, what is history? It tells us about our past it is the perception of our past whether complete, incomplete, wrong or right. Our future and present is built by this perception of the past.

....if we do not know our history in the right perspective and if we do not teach history to our children properly, this country can never become prosperous and happy.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 26 April, 1966)

The situation prevailing in India under foreign rule should not continue in independent India. The continuity should be broken.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 19 September, 1963)

Socialism

Like all other isms socialism has also facets to be unfolded step by step—one is wholesale and the other is retail; its one aspect is 'Sagun' while the other is 'Nirgun' or for that matter one is principle and the other is programme.... The step next below to socialism is called equality. A further step below leads to economic equality, social equality, political equality and religious equality. Again if you come down one step below then comes parity, complete parity, probable parity....

*Quotations taken from the speeches of Dr. Lohia in Lok Sabha.

Descend another step below and then put the ceiling of maximum and minimum....

(Lok Sabha Debates, 16 March, 1965)

Nobody in any society in any country, in the entire world has been able to find a solution to love for wealth and institutionalisation of wealth. Marx had found a solution to the institutionalisation of wealth. Our *Upanishads* had found a way out from excessive attachment with wealth. Similarly we should also try to find out a solution to both these problems, the desire to enjoy and arrangements therefor.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 4 August, 1967)

Lok Sabha

...In Lok Sabha the Ministers and not the Secretaries are responsible for decisions. Ministers should get credit for good decisions, as they get discredit for bad ones.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 5 March, 1964)

...So long as article (344) exists in our Constitution, to speak in English in this House is violation of the provisions of the Constitution. Therefore, either that article should be repealed or use of English in this House be discontinued. I do not mean that English should be replaced by Hindi. Rather I would like that all the Indian languages should take place of English in the House and arrangements for their simultaneous interpretation should be made.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 19 September, 1963)

We, in the opposition, pay more attention to inappropriate questions as compared to appropriate ones.... The Opposition should mainly aim at raising good issues. When inappropriate questions are raised, howsoever good the reply may be, it is not going to meet the purpose.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 26 April, 1966)

...The dignity of the House could be maintained only if the dignity of the country is protected. So long as the practice of keeping the dignity of the country separate from that of the

House continues, the dignity of the House will go on diminishing. We, therefore, have to maintain the dignity of both.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 26 July, 1966)

People and Government

Our countrymen, our society are dependent on Government and Government is dependent on bureaucracy, which means that the people are subservient to Government and Government to its bureaucracy.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 4 August, 1967)

I am against violence. But still I am not of the opinion that the violence committed by Government should be met by violence by the people.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 7 April, 1966)

I may like anarchism—that is a different matter, if there is a violation of law—I may like it, day to day relations may change — I like it, instability may be put an end to in any manner and change be brought — I like it, but I do not like violence, riots and killings....

(Lok Sabha Debates, 24 May, 1967)

Civilized behaviour means to face courageously the stronger one and adopt a benevolent approach towards the weak. It would be in the interest of the country if the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting takes a clue from this and preach accordingly for being followed in future.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 17 March, 1964)

If a liar says loudly that he was not telling a lie, then will it become a truth?

(Lok Sabha Debates, 22 August, 1966)

The 'Sitar' plays well only when its loose strings are tightened. Similarly this Government will work more efficiently if the Preventive Detention Act is repealed.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 18 December, 1963)

There has been a gradual curtailment of the civil rights and gradual erosion of rule of law in India. Flood water causes soil

erosion unabatedly, similarly these laws^{*} are also causing erosion of the civil rights enjoyed by the people of India.

(*Lok Sabha Debates*, 18 December, 1963)

Planning

Planning should be production oriented. Discussions on priority to village or city, heavy machines or small scale industries or agriculture are useless, unless planning is honest. If planning is not honest, no fruitful result can be achieved.

(*Lok Sabha Debates*, 2 September, 1966)

Land Policy

So far as land is concerned, our policy is very clear that every farmer's family should possess three times of that land which it can cultivate without machines.

(*Lok Sabha Debates*, 19 September, 1963)

Industrial Policy

.....Unless a ceiling is put on the consumption and income or expenditure of an individual, industrialisation is not at all possible in India.

(*Lok Sabha Debates*, 4 April, 1964)

Nationalisation

.....Nationalisation to the maximum extent should take place as soon as possible. But right now I want to say that a ceiling should be put on the consumption, big industries should be nationalised and small industries should be freed from controls forthwith.

(*Lok Sabha Debates*, 4 April, 1964)

Food Policy

.....I feel that Government takes starvation deaths as deaths caused by wilful fasting... I would like to elaborate the meaning of starvation. If a person does not get anything to eat the whole day and then gets a few nibbles late in the evening and the process is repeated next day and continues for two, three or

^{*}Preventive Detention Act.

four months, it should be taken as starvation, whether go by English word or Hindi.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 9 September, 1963)

The very denial of starvation deaths in India spoils our Food Policy. The day you muster the courage to admit that starvation deaths are taking place in India, you will find a way to remove hunger.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 9 September, 1963)

When a Government or a country treads the path of accumulation of wealth and speaking untruth, it is no longer capable of combating hunger. Only he who speaks the truth and shuns amassing wealth, can eradicate hunger.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 8 April, 1967)

Price Hike

The law-makers should make efforts to bring down the prices of commodities, rather than enhancing their own salaries.... Why don't you try to use all the force at your command to bring down the prices instead of enhancing your salaries?

(Lok Sabha Debates, 10 April, 1964)

...It is not possible to control the prices. But a co-relation between prices of different commodities must be established. I am of the opinion that the prices of wheat, cement, kerosene and textile should be co-related so that fall or rise in the price of one may affect the other. It would be in the interest of farmers, in the interest of urban consumers as also in the interest of the country as a whole. Better planning could be done on this basis only. Co-relation between the prices of different commodities is essential.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 9 September, 1964)

Had I been a trade union leader, I would not have talked about dearness allowance, I would have rather made a demand to take steps to get cut the expenditure being incurred by affluent people so that prices of commodities could be brought down and our society turns better.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 4 August, 1967)

Education Policy

.... All children in the age group of 5 to 11 years, should get similar schooling facilities and there should be no difference between the child of the President and that of the scavenger on this count. Only by taking such steps, we will be able to build our country....

(Lok Sabha Debates, 10 March, 1964)

Freedom of education on the one hand means that teachers should enjoy freedom in their search of knowledge, as freedom goes hand in hand with talent and intellect. On the other hand it means the freedom for students in selection of subjects of their study.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 15 December, 1964)

What is a university? It is a world within a country. It should manage its own affairs. It should be autonomous. It should have freedom to the extent that it could acquire new knowledge, could conduct research for exploring new disciplines of knowledge and could make available the old treasure of knowledge in the best possible way.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 15 December, 1964)

Corruption

.....There is no rule of law in India, as the administration is functioning arbitrarily. Either the rules are not good or these are not enforced properly. The result is that one finds favouritism in every action of the Government. It is secondary whether one gains monetarily or not as a result of this favouritism. Favouritism, arbitrariness, bribery and contravention of rules should be considered as corruption.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 21 December, 1963)

I would like to draw your attention towards the relation between the Government and the trade. The extent to which this relation has become polluted, corrupt and dishonest in India, it has never happened in the history of the world..... We

have only to see whether the son or the daughter or a relative, and in my opinion a relative upto two generations, of a person in high position has ever taken any advantage of his high position. Today, in India, the criterion should be to check whether anybody has taken any undue advantage of the official positions of persons in authority to further his trade interests.

.... In a trade in which a quota or permit or licence is to be granted by the Minister, it should not at all cover the relatives of the Minister upto two generations. Until and unless you do not follow this policy, the relation between the Government and the trade will remain strained.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 21 December, 1963)

.... This Government have put golden pot on the face of truth.... You will find that Government is spending a lot of money to partially or fully shut the mouth of the people who could not be a Minister or are not inclined to be a Minister. Such people can be found in all walks of life, be it a servant or a saint or a social reformer or an academician or a teacher.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 21 December, 1963)

After 1947 till date has been the era of "be corrupt and accumulate wealth".

(Lok Sabha Debates, 3 April, 1967)

Social Revolution

...If we do not change the caste-based system the inequality would go on increasing with the progress of the country. Development in India, if caste-system continues, means increase in inequality.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 3 September, 1963)

...Either the Constitutional provisions providing for reservation should be abrogated and it should be made clear that we do not want to give equal opportunities to Harijans, Adivasis and other backward classes or if we want to retain these provisions, then the quota reserved for these communities should invariably be filled irrespective of suitability of their candidates.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 3 September, 1963)

...Abolish all classes except III class in Indian Railways, so that in this country where there is wide gap between the poor and the rich, the poor may get some relief at least.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 10 March, 1964)

I feel there is no difference between me and a Sweeper or a cobbler or any other low caste person, nor is there any difference between you and them. They have been given this low status by old and rotten scriptures and now it has become necessary to discard such things.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 12 April, 1966)

Foreign Policy

If I am called upon to sum up the foreign policy pursued by India during the last fifteen years, I will say it is a futile attempt to emerge as promoter of world peace and crafty diplomacy. It lacks a principle, thought and vision. The result of following this policy has proved dangerous for our country.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 17 September, 1963)

.....We use English in our foreign affairs as a result of which India has neither been able to do any good to itself nor to the rest of the world...If you want to change the foreign policy of India, first of all you will have to change the medium of its working.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 17 September, 1963)

.....While in the one hand we should have power to punish in the other we should have readiness to forgive. The people of both the countries India and Pakistan were brothers, are brothers and will remain brothers, even if, they slit one another's throat. Both countries will ultimately unite together. Therefore, our country should never give up forgiveness in spite of its readiness to punish.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 28 April, 1965)

You may fight as many wars as you like and even cause destruction to any extent, but my advice is that you should invite them once to make a confederation of two countries.* You should be prepared to make any sacrifice for achieving this objective.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 28 April, 1965)

I also support non-aligned policy but keeping in view the way in which it has been distorted by the Foreign Ministry, I will have to say that it is not a policy of non-alignment, rather it is a policy of disloyalty and opportunism to sit some time in the lap of one block and some time in the lap of other. We will have to give up such a policy and will have to adopt an idealistic policy.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 11 April, 1964)

* India and Pakistan.

.... The principle* is that anywhere in any country if a Government is powerful, even if it comes in existence too late, all the countries should recognise it and should establish and maintain diplomatic relations with it.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 16 November, 1965)

There is a saying "Where there lives Ram, there is Awadh." My opinion is that where Dalai Lama lived, his Government should be accepted there and Government of India should recognise it.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 16 November, 1965)

If you want to become revolutionary in the internal and external affairs, I would like to say that we shall have to be Russian in our internal affairs and American in our external affairs. We shall have to change our agricultural methods and structure of industries and raise capital to run the industries by checking the expenditure being incurred on the luxuries by rich people... In the case of external affairs we shall have to mostly follow America.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 23 September, 1964)

...As the meeting point of two rivers is called confluence and it creates a thrill and becomes a place of pilgrimage, similarly where the borders of two countries meet that point either becomes a pilgrimage or is converted into war field.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 1 December, 1965)

...A great ideal** as to how the right to live is, perhaps, the most cherished right in the world should be put before the people of both India and Pakistan. Let an Indian Muslim as well as Pakistani Hindu live. I totally reject the idea that Pakistani Hindus are the citizens of Pakistan and, therefore, we should be least concerned for them. It is equally obligatory on our part to care for the security and welfare of a Pakistani Hindu, no matter whatsoever his citizenship is, as it is for an Indian Hindu

*Regarding recognition of Governments.

**Urging the Government to issue a White Paper on Indo-Pak relations.

or Muslim. To draw a line of distinction on the basis of citizenship is an exercise in futility. It distorts the very issue itself. We have to provide right to live and security of life to everybody.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 3 April, 1964)

I would like to make one thing very much clear about this policy of Non-alignment that today this has no meaning. Try to understand it in the real sense of the term. That is, we would align ourselves with those who are willing to pursue our path and the one that leads to the welfare and well being of the entire world... We are one with all those forces who stand by us in eradicating poverty, in unifying India and Pakistan and in maintaining a world order.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 16 November, 1965)

Equality of Men and Women

...I would like to say that the word of address, 'Shrimati' should be discontinued. Every person, whether a man or a woman, a boy or a girl should be addressed as 'Shri'.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 16 November, 1965)

Flattery

Flattery leads to greed which causes loss of reason and then disappears the faculty to make distinction between truth and untruth and this all leads to ruin the country.

(Lok Sabha Debates, 16 September, 1964)

PART FOUR

TRIBUTES

Obituary References made in Lok Sabha/Rajya Sabha on the passing away of Dr. Lohia

LOK SABHA*

I have to inform the House of the sad demise of nine of our friends....

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was a sitting Member of this House from Kannauj constituency of Uttar Pradesh. He passed away at New Delhi on the 12th October, 1967. His death was premature.

As all of us know, Dr. Lohia joined the national movement for the independence of our country with the zeal of a missionary. He took a very active part in the Quit India Movement of 1942. After India attained independence, Dr. Lohia played an active part in the freedom movement of Goa. He suffered imprisonment nearly 18 times for his participation in various movements in India, Goa and Nepal. He was a believer in socialism which was of a secular order. He made ceaseless efforts in the realms of thought and action to fight out the social tyranny.

Dr. Lohia entered Parliament in 1963 when he was elected to Third Lok Sabha in a bye-election from Farrukhabad constituency of Uttar Pradesh. As a member of this House he raised a number of debates which aroused great interest not only in this House but in the country also. He was a powerful speaker. No one could even think that death would take him

* (i) Lok Sabha Debates, 13 November 1967.

(ii) On 13 November, 1967 obituary references were made on the passing away of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia and eight other sitting/former members.

away so soon from us. His death removes from the Indian political scene and this House one of the outstanding leaders.

We deeply mourn the loss of all these friends and I am sure the House will join me in conveying our condolences to the bereaved families.

— **Speaker, N. Sanjiva Reddy**

Mr. Speaker, Sir we recessed here this morning under the shadow of grief at the departure from our midst of a number of our valued colleagues and comrades. This particular inter-session period has taken a rather heavy toll.

The House will miss Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, who was one of our leading parliamentarians. His whole life was a struggle for causes he held dear, for the down-trodden and the under-privileged. He played a memorable part in our freedom struggle, specially in the Quit India movement, and was among the founders of the Socialist movement in the country. His untimely death removes from our midst a vigorous mind and a dynamic character. This House will not be the same without him.

It is with sorrow in our hearts that we remember these Members, who have served their country well, each according to his own light. We pay them our humble tribute and offer our sincere condolences to the bereaved families.

— **Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi**

The members of our party* and myself associate ourselves with what you have said and what the Prime Minister has said about all these valued comrades and colleagues of ours in this House and also in the previous Houses.

Dr. Lohia was one of our national leaders. It was given to him to have taken part in many popular movements that raged in our country during the last three decades. It was my privilege to have enjoyed his comradeship in the kisan movement when I was trying to build up the units in West Bengal. Though he hailed from Rajasthan, and was working in U.P., he had so much influence in West Bengal also even as early as 1935. And then in Goa, in Nepal, in NEFA and in so many other places where he felt the need for courageous leadership he placed himself unhesitatingly in the vanguard, faced the risks of that position and advanced the cause of the people in their fight for freedom.

Like so many of us, he also had the privilege of working under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. His sense of discipline was so great that when Mahatma Gandhi did not agree with his proposition in regard to South Africa which was accepted by the AICC, and Mahatma Gandhi wanted the AICC, to resile from its position, like a loyal soldier he accepted Mahatma Gandhi's suggestion. And he allowed the AICC to rescind its own resolution. This, I am mentioning, because he has always been known as a rebel among rebels and yet he had also that strain of discipline within himself. In this House, as well as in the country as a whole, he played a notable part and he always had the genius to give a turn which has not been taken by the others and to make the issue look very different when he began to handle it. That is why it was that as soon as he came into this House he drew the attention of the House to the existence of starvation as he conceived it and made this House as well as the State legislatures understand what is meant by starvation in a different manner, with very good results, so far as the recent famines in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Orissa were concerned.

Sir, Dr. Lohia passed away much too soon. The country cannot afford it nor this House. The Prime Minister said the right thing, on our behalf, what was very much in our mind, that the House cannot be the same after his death. We mourn his death and the whole country also feels the same.

I request you, on behalf of our party, to convey our condolences to the members of the bereaved families.

— Professor N.G. Ranga

Mr. Speaker, Sir, one by one the veterans of old generation are leaving, the guides are going away from us leaving the boat of this country in mid-stream. We bow our heads with respect to those who fought for independence throughout their lives, spent their lives in jails, toiled very hard and contributed a lot for the development of the nation, and whose names have been mentioned by you. We are grateful to them from the core of our heart.

I received the news of the sad demise of Dr. Lohia in Bangkok. Shri Solanki of Swatantra Party and Chaudhary Ram Sewak of Congress party were also with me. For a moment we were stunned, we almost lost our senses. This news was like a thunderbolt to us. We had never expected that a soldier who fought so bravely at every front and encouraged all types of struggle against injustice and want; a leader who with his irresistible selfconfidence turned every situation favourable will lose the battle of life so soon. Perhaps there was some negligence in his treatment or perhaps the fate was cruel to him.

Dr. Lohia was a great patriot, a prominent freedom fighter an original thinker and a great revolutionary. He was a man of unique and multi-faceted personality. He always remained controversial and took pleasure in raising new controversies. He was a born rebel rather rebellion was an innate quality of his nature. He tried to give a new direction to the nation. He wanted to bring about a new regime and new administration. A

person may have difference of opinion with him, but his heart bled for the welfare of down-trodden and influenced those who came close to him.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Dr. Lohia is no more. The Vacuum he has created perhaps will never be filled. This loss in the national life will never be filled. Although he was a socialist, yet he opposed Governmentalisation. He was against old capitalists as well as against old and new rulers. He was against English and criticised those who were against Indian languages. He gave new name to Everest and called it 'Sagarmatha', he called NEFA as 'Uvasiam'. He was harsh and unpalatable to all and never spared anyone in criticism whether he belonged to his own party or other parties and yet he would embrace all of them. Time has taken away him from us, but his soul is immortal. He advocated Confederation of India and Pakistan, freedom for Tibet, free Pakhtoonistan. He wanted removal of all inequalities based on birth or family. We have inherited from him respect for regional languages. Those dreams of his are our legacy now. Our best tribute to him would be to accomplish his ideals.

— Atal Bihari Vajpayee

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of my party, the D.M.K. Party in Parliament, I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the Leader of the House on the demise of Dr. Lohia and others.

It is really a tragedy that this country is losing her finest flowers periodically when she is passing through crisis after crisis. It might be a natural phenomenon, but the shock it produces cannot be endured and the vacuum it creates cannot be filled up.

Dr. Lohia, one of the veteran national leaders this country has ever produced, whose contribution to the noble cause of this nation's freedom was historic and resplendent, is no more with us today.

Dr. Lohia represented an idea, a theme, a philosophy. Ultimately he has become an institution — an era. He has been dynamic, resolute, fearless, indignant, critical, pungent and, what more, “human” ultimately.

He was uncompromising in principles. At times he gave an impression that he was an impossible man to deal with. He was essentially a man, a leader of the masses, nothing to do with the people in the ivory tower. He disquieted the oppressors and reassured the suppressed. His words might have been harsh, attacks might have been invidious, criticisms might have been too much personal, suggestions might have been too big an ideal to be swallowed, but his intention was pure and noble completely for the well-being and welfare of this country. The ways adopted by him in explaining his views might invite criticism, evoke anger also. But the ultimate goal he wanted this country to reach should warrant no dispute.

Despite the sincere attempt on the part of the Government, despite the meticulous attention shown by the trusted and experienced doctors, we could not save Dr. Lohia. Let us not brood over that. Let us try to give new life to the principles of Dr. Lohia and let us try to give them a correct and concrete shape.

Sir, on behalf of my party, I offer my heartfelt condolences to the bereaved family of all these finest leaders of our country who are not with us.

— K. Manoharan

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the members of my party^{*} share the views expressed by the leader of the House about Dr. Rammanohar

^{*}Communist Party of India

Lohiaand other departed souls. Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was an uncommon and fearless fighter in the India's struggle for freedom. He was a symbol of socialist movement and ideals and had become a hope for the downtrodden and depressed people of the country. We could not believe his untimely death. I have been in personal contact with Dr. Rammanohar Lohia since the days when he was organising the youths of the country for the uncompromising struggle against the British rule in the Congress Socialist party. I remember that in 1936 when I participated in Socialist Study Organisation under the auspices of Congress Socialist party as a student, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was our professor. Since then till his death he endeavoured hard to liberate the country and to strengthen it through simplicity, equality and in the spirit of *Swadeshi*. The significant role he played in the quit India Movement inspired lakhs of youths to join the movement, who sacrificed everything for the sake of it. After achieving independence when our country faced a new situation which it has been facing till today, he led the struggle against injustice, poverty and exploitation and gave hope to the weaker sections that they could free themselves of this by organised efforts. The exploited and afflicted people will remain grateful to Dr. Rammanohar Lohia for enabling them to develop new ideas and ideals to move forward.

During the last elections when the situation demanded a change, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia who was a great champion of development and change, paved the way and succeeded in achieving the target. He felt uneasy as to how developmental change can be brought about in the economic, social and political spheres. The great leader tried utmost for this till his death, he consulted about it not only his colleagues but also others and tried to persuade them. Despite his difference of opinion he tried to agree with their views. I remember that three or four days before the adjournment of last session, he called me and said that people of our generation are in the last lag of their journey and I want that their dreams should be fulfilled.

Will our dream of constructing socialistic, prosperous, and strong India ever be fulfilled? For the fulfilment of that dream it is essential that in this country and also here in the Parliament—people having revolutionary views should unite on the basis of a minimum programme to bring about a new change in political, economic and social fields.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia has gone, but we must realise that our best tribute to him will be that we work to give a concrete shape to his aspiration and follow the ideals he has shown us. I remember that in his last meeting, besides other things, he told me that if a united front of all the progressive powers on the basis of the prescribed programme could not be formed, at least Socialist Party and C.P.I should unite together and if this is done, then the progressive forces which favour a change and development in the country can gain a lot of strength. It would be our best tribute to Dr. Lohia if we fulfil this idea.

—Yogendra Sharma

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia is no more with us. Our public life has become lifeless due to his untimely demise. This House has lost its charm and loneliness has come in our life and I do not think that it would ever be possible to fill that vacuum.

Dr. Lohia played an important role in our struggle for independence. He was one of the leading figures who had built up opposition to British oppression in 1942 after the arrest of Mahatma Gandhi and other members of the Congress Working Committee. He was dead against the partition of the country. Today, I recollect when the resolution was passed in the working committee on the Mountbatten Plan, at the behest of Gandhiji and Dr. Lohia a sentence was incorporated in that resolution that although the partition is taking place but we are not admitting that Hindus and Muslims are separate nations and that the geographical shape that India takes by virtue of its mountains, rivers and seas, the picture of unity shall ever remain in our hearts.

Dr. Lohia was of the view that till Goa and Pondicherry were liberated and a democratic social order was established in Nepal, Tibet, Sikkim and Bhutan, India's struggle for independence would not be complete. Dr. Lohia was first who took the initiative to bring democratic revolution in Nepal and to get Goa liberated. He was arrested in Goa twice and I think that but for Mahatma Gandhi he was to remain in prison for years. Similarly, he had to launch Civil Disobedience Movement to end the alienation of 'Urvasiam' which is even now called 'NEFA' by the Government of India.

He had to fight for the cause of the poor and downtrodden and had to undergo imprisonment 18 times even after independence. He not only had that national sentiment but his ambition was to work for the welfare of humanity. He dreamt of a world in which any person could go anywhere in the world without any passport and he should have full liberty to live or die at the place of his choice. He not only raised his voice against the injustice done to the Negroes in America but at one place he resorted to Civil Disobedience Movement and was arrested there. But the American Government realised their mistake and President Johnson apologised for that and he was set free. Dr. Lohia abhorred regionalism and parochialism. On the one hand, he was of the view that nationality should be the basis of our politics. He was of the view that so long as there are sovereign States and the boundaries in the world, we should not allow any foreigners to occupy our land. He very well knew that at last we have to establish a world Government which would not include the representatives of sovereign nations like United Nations but it would consist of the people's representatives like Lok Sabha.

He was one of the founders of Socialist Movement in our country and contributed new ideas to Socialist thinking. He was a man of creative brilliance. We socialists always believed that the class-war is essential to end the class system but he was the first socialist leader who said that our revolution will be incomplete in case we do not struggle to thrive for a casteless

society too. He said that to develop the idea of Marx's class struggle and casteless society in the context of Indian situation, the backward class people should be provided special opportunities to come forward. He was of the view that French Revolution has given an idea of equal opportunity and equality before law, but by applying the principles of special opportunity we should establish social equality besides economic equality in India. Therefore, at the time of formation of non-congress governments in States he always recommended that sixty per cent of our representatives in the Cabinets should be from backward classes.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, today in the House of People, we should be thankful to Mahatma Gandhi and after independence to Dr. Rammanohar Lohia who insisted on Indian languages in our day to day life, Government work, courts and universities in place of English. He was accused of imposing Hindi on non-Hindi speaking areas, but he was opposed to the imposition of English over the people. He wanted that Hindi should be used in all spheres. As such at time to express his views in a lighter vein he used to say whether Hindi was adopted or not it was not his concern but he wanted English to go from this land for ever. It did not imply that he had any kind of animosity against English. He was in favour of removing the portraits of the British Governors General. But I feel that he would not have opposed the roads being named after Shakespeare or Isaac Newton. He was against the names of Clive Street, Dalhousie Square but he was not against Shakespeare and Bernard Shaw. Mr. Speaker, Sir, as such he stood for a synthesis of nationalism and international brotherhood. He wanted to establish a coordination between the two.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, he stood for putting an end to pomp and show, luxury and extravagance which had crept into our public life after independence and wanted to usher in an era of simplicity, equality, hard work and sacrifice without which he said that our nation cannot be reconstructed. Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the last days of his life he gave emphasis on unification

of socialist forces. Today our politics is heading towards disintegration and he wanted the ruling party to split because he was of the view that Congress Party should be dissolved after independence as suggested by Mahatma Gandhi. But at the same time he wanted that divisive forces should not grow and unification efforts should gain momentum otherwise the unity and independence, of our country will be threatened. As such he advocated the idea of unification of socialistic forces and wanted the opposition parties to form the united front. But when the question of forming alternative Governments was raised he advised the opposition parties to form programme-oriented Governments instead of power-oriented Governments. He did not approve the idea of continuing in Government, just to attain selfish motive or to retain the chair in case the Governments did not make any earnest effort to complete certain specific programmes in a time bound manner. Therefore, he advised whether it may be Uttar Pradesh, Bihar or other States where our party members are ministers, they should try to make Government's work programme-oriented.

He has been accused of following destructive politics. I admit that there was some sign of destructiveness in his politics, but it was for removing evils that crept into politics and for adopting good qualities. It was the principle of his life and therefore, he was not satisfied with the work of alternative non-Congress Governments as he wanted that these Governments should be programme-oriented.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it would be impossible to fill the gap created by his death. He had set before us an example of austerity and sacrifice which would continue to inspire us.

Besides the demise of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia I condole the loss of other friends also and convey my condolences to their bereaved families.

—Madhu Limaye

On behalf of my party* I wish to join in the sentiments expressed by all Members who have spoken here today.....

Dr. Lohia's death is a great loss to the country and a greater loss as far as Parliament is concerned. Dr. Lohia and myself, from the early days of the national movement, had been together in the National Congress, in the Congress Socialist Party and afterwards, though we parted ways, we had always been working together for the common cause of the people and the country. Dr. Lohia's death is also a personal loss to me because, as a Member of Parliament, whenever there were controversial issues he used to call me, discuss with me, and he was so affectionate that not only myself but the other members of the Opposition also would hear him. Though he was hitting hard, those who did not understand him did not know that it was his passion for the downtrodden people and the cause for which he stood and the suffering of humanity that made him speak so hard. He was also a unifying force as far as the Opposition was concerned, and I also had the experience of his personal friendship, of his good character and affection, and his new thoughts, as my hon. friend Limaye said, as far as the movement in the country is concerned.

*** *** ***

On behalf of my group I pay our respects and I join in the sentiments expressed by the other friends here and mourn the loss of all the others whose names have been mentioned.

—A.K.Gopalan

I associate myself and the Praja Socialist Party with the sentiments expressed here in this House. It is a tragedy that this Parliament is meeting under the shadow of death of so many of our colleagues and it will be proper for us, in the circumstances, to adjourn for the day and mourn these losses.

Dr. Lohia was not only a comrade-in-arms a fellow Socialist, a valiant fighter, but also a great thinker and a dynamic personality in the true sense of the term. I had the privilege to

*Communist Party of India (Marxist)

know him since his entry into Indian politics as a socialist. We have worked together for years. We have exchanged thoughts; he had a vision of a socialist society which might appear to be unorthodox but his entire philosophy was based on the opposition to bondage in any form or manner. He based his philosophy on that, and his entire thinking and action was always motivated by that spirit. Therefore he was feeling restless at the social and economic inequalities of our life and the political instability in the country. Therefore he was ruthless in his criticisms; he was fearless in action. He was also impatient with his own colleagues. Such a spirit is no more in our country. A void has been created which will remain unfilled and the younger generation of this country, I hope and trust, would rally together to take up the cause of the down trodden so that a new revolution can be brought about for the social transformation of the society as a whole.

With these words, I again associate myself with the feelings expressed here. I hope that so far as others are concerned, you will send our condolences to the bereaved families. But so far as Dr. Lohia is concerned, while we pay tributes to him, we know he was a non-conformist. From the way his cremation took place, and the way he had gone through all his personal life he remained a non-conformist. Today, when we are mourning his death, probably there is no occasion for us to send any message to any member of his family. The country as a whole should consider that he was her son and we all should mourn his loss.

—**Surendranath Dwivedy**

Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to associate the Independent Parliamentary Group with the sentiments that have been expressed on the passing away of so many of our valued colleagues.

I would like to say a few words specially about Dr. Lohia. I knew him well enough to call him by his first name. Quite frankly, I did not agree with some of his actions. But however much one might have disagreed with some of the views and actions of Rammanohar Lohia, one could not but help like him personally and like him intensely. He projected certain image in public life. It was the image essentially of a rebel. As my friend, Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, said, he was a confirmed non-conformist.

Whatever else one may have accused Rammanohar Lohia of, no one could accuse him of not being original both in his thinking and in his action.

Not so long ago when we met at a party, he asked me why whenever I met him, I had a broad smile on my face. I asked him, "Have you ever looked closely at your own face?" He said, why?, I said: "It is a personification of impishness. It is a puckish face. You must have been a personification of an imp when you were a young and naughty boy. You projected that into your public life." Whenever he prodded or goaded or criticised, there was this quality of impishness. There was not any malice—at least that was my own assessment—about what he said or did. Of course, in a way, that amidst other qualities was responsible for the not inconsiderable following he had and his special capacity to attract not only loyalty but affection.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you to convey our deepest condolences to the members of the bereaved families.

—Frank Anthony

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of myself and the members of the Progressive Group, I associate myself with the tributes which have been paid. This Parliament today is meeting under the shadow of a true national calamity. Dr. Lohia is gone. That creates a void which cannot be filled up. He was not merely one of the greatest fighters in the Indian liberation movement but was a passionate champion of the oppressed and down-trodden. He did so much for helping all backward people and people who were down-trodden and suppressed. References have been made by one of the previous speakers to his passionate pleading for the Hindi language. Although there is a great deal of controversy over that in my part of India—West Bengal—he was still the idol of the youth of Bengal. Voluntarily, without my asking, he came to my constituency—Burdwan—during the election and he captured the audience by his wonderful speeches in Bengali. You know he spent a good part of his life in Bengal and actually we looked upon him as a fellow Bengali. In every crisis, he stood by us and helped us. We could never forget his services. We shall miss him for all time to come.

*** *** ***

Sir, I associate myself with the tributes paid to our friends who have passed away.

— N. C. Chatterjee

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to pay on my behalf as well as on behalf of my colleagues the homage to those former as well as four sitting deceased members whose names have just been mentioned by you.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there have been very few occasions when homage had to be paid to four sitting members at a time. We are sad to listen this tragic reference. Such a departing of our beloved colleagues is painful to all of us.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia not only led the socialist movement but was also an eloquent speaker of the House. He was also a watchful guard of the democracy. At times the speeches and the decisions of Dr. Lohia would put a strong pressure on

Government decisions. With the passing away of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, Parliament suffered a great loss.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia always felt very much pained at the partition of the country as India and Pakistan both have to spend billions of rupees on their security. Had such a situation not arisen, billions of rupees would have been spent on the development of this great country.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia mentioned such things time and again in the last days of his life. He also felt very much pained for Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and he expressed it both in and outside the House. In the last days of his life he used to say that the Government and the people of India should pay heed to the cry eeking out of the soul of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, and also consider the ways and means to put his ideas into action.

Dr. Lohia had a great sympathy for the downtrodden people of India. A serious allegation on Dr. Lohia was levelled by some people that he was as much in favour of bringing Hindi in India as much he was in favour of removing the British from India. Actually, Shri Lohia was a supporter of not only Hindi but of all the Indian Languages. He was of the view that when Hindi has been accepted as official language in the Constitution, Government should implement this provision as early as possible.

The Government and Dr. Lohia's friends tried their best to save him from the clutches of death but of no avail. Now a controversy has arisen over the enquiry into the immediate causes of his death. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to discuss that thing here in the House nor do I want to go into this controversy. But I would definitely like to say that since Delhi is the capital of India, the Government should review the conditions of the hospitals of Delhi vis-a-vis the facilities available in the hospitals of Bombay, Madras and Calcutta.

With these words I pay homage to the departed leaders, as also the four sitting Members whose voice will no more echo in

this House. I pay homage to the departed souls on behalf of all the independent members of the House.

—Prakash Vir Shastri

Mr. Speaker, Sir, 11th-12th October night will go down as the darkest night in the History of India because on this night Dr. Saheb was snatched from us by the cruel hands of death. Dr. Rammanohar Lohia took leave from us at a time when he was needed most. It is a great tragedy for India. The people of this country have realised the importance and need of Gandhiji after independence during the last twenty years. After twenty years of hard labour and struggle a new atmosphere has been created and non-Congress Governments have been formed in various states, which needed the guidance of people like Dr. Lohia. Alas, that great personality has been snatched away from us by the cruel hands of destiny.

Homages are being paid to Dr. Lohia by all and one. Now his views are being appreciated and all are one about his views. But I am apprehensive and I would like to express my apprehension. I have a fear that we have a kind of a disease in our country that if a person wants to reform this country by his original ideas and thinking during his life time, then he is rejected by this country and no respect is given to him. But when he passes away, rich homages are paid to him, he is admired. With the result, the path shown by him, his ideas and policies are forgotten. Just as Gandhiji is worshipped and admired but Gandhism, his simplicity and truthfulness have been forgotten. All of us, the House, all honourable Members and Leaders have to be remain cautious that the same is not repeated. We are now appreciating the ideas, policies and views of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. We should also follow the path shown by him and that will be the real homage to him.

Throughout his life, he fought against injustice and told the people and all of us to go on fighting against injustice till it was removed. I remember a minor incident of his life. This incident is related to his student days, when he was very young. That time he could not do anything. He saw that a youngman was

beating a boy. He could not tolerate this. Since, he could not do anything, he clung to his legs and began beating him. In a way, he told him that he was doing injustice.

Besides all this, he had no attachment for property. One day, I asked doctor Saheb if we can set up our party office in his ancestral house in Akbarpur which is in a dilapidated condition. He listened to me and said angrily "you are teaching me love for property at this age."

I said, "Doctor Sahib, no we want that the society should be benefited, your everything belongs to the country." He was a man who owned nothing, everything belonged to the country.

In this way he continued to fight for the cause of the poor people. At last, when he passed away his body was cremated in electric crematorium like other poor people for whom he fought throughout his life.

True homage to him would be to follow the path shown by him for the welfare of backward and downtrodden classes and to provide special opportunities to the poor people and to implement his views on language etc.

Alongwith this, I pay homage to other Members who have passed away. Much has already been said about them. I express my sympathies to the bereaved families.

— Ram Sewak Yadav

RAJYA SABHA*

I have also to refer to the passing away of another colleague of ours. He was not a Member of this House, but as an eminent son of our country he secured a place of affection in the hearts of all of us. I refer to Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. During my long years of public life, I have known intimately the young ebullient spirit that Dr. Lohia represented. Hard and ceaseless work was his life's mission in whatever cause he has espoused—whether

* (i) *Rajya Sabha Debates*, 20 November 1967.

(ii) On 20 November 1967 Obituary references were made on the passing away of a sitting member and two ex-members and Dr. Rammanohar Lohia.

as a disciplined soldier in our freedom movement, or the movement for the liberation of Goa, or as a champion of the cause of the oppressed and the downtrodden. As a Member of the other House, he establish for himself an abiding reputation as a powerful speaker and an outstanding parliamentarian. He was rightly recognised as one of the founders of the socialist movement in this country. Though often he vigorously attacked Government's policies, his intentions and sincerity were never in doubt; he always had the welfare of the people in mind. In the political life of our country, the number of trusted and devoted leaders is dwindling. Rammanohar Lohia's death at a comparatively early age has been a great shock not only to those of us who knew him personally but also to the vast millions of our countrymen for whose well-being he had dedicated himself.

— **Chairman, V.V. Giri**

Mr. Chairman, I fully associate myself with the sentiments expressed by you and the tributes paid to Dr. Rammanohar Lohia in so touching words. I would not like to narrate the various phases of Dr. Lohia's life or the part that he played in the country's fight for freedom. He dedicated his life and he lived and died for the cause of the weak, for the cause of the oppressed, for the cause of those who could not raise their heads against those who were in power or powerful in other ways. His heart had learnt to melt at the woes of others. He could not see disparity between man and man, and that was one thing where he fought when he found that injustice was being done. He was a great national leader. He was a champion of the cause of the weak, and today we mourn his loss as a national leader. Although he is not with us, he will ever remain with us and we shall remember him for the struggle, for the cause for which he lived and died. I pay my humble tribute, Sir, in these words to Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, and I am sure that I am voicing the feelings of the House here when I pay this tribute to him.

— **Leader of the House, Jaisukhlal Hathi**

Sir, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to speak and to

associate myself with the remarks that have fallen from your lips and from the previous speaker. Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was perhaps the embodiment of youth in revolt even during the days of our struggle for independence. He was so impatient and he wanted the country's freedom earlier. He perhaps at times felt that the older leaders were not moving fast enough. So he was in revolt and impatient all the time. That spirit perhaps continued even when he came to Parliament. He was a ceaseless toiler. He felt himself suffering when he saw other people suffering. He was impatient and wanted to improve the lot of the masses, particularly the weaker sections of society, and so he devoted his whole life, his entire time, to them.

This country is poorer by the loss of such a ceaseless worker. I associate myself with the sentiments expressed in this House.

— **Dahyabhai V. Patel**

Sir, my party* and I fully share the sentiments and feelings expressed in this house concerning the sad and untimely death of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. In his death, the country has lost not only a redoubtable Parliamentarian, a staunch fighter for freedom, democracy and socialism but also an independent thinker, a bold critic, a good writer and above all, a great humanist. Dr. Rammanohar Lohia not only championed the cause of the oppressed and the down-trodden and fought against their oppressors but also tried to unite all the leftist and socialist forces in the country to go forward. I am sure the glorious battle waged by Dr. Lohia in his hard but inspiring life will not go in vain.

— **K. Damodaran**

Sir, on behalf of myself and the Praja Socialist Party, I associate with the sentiments expressed by you and other Members of this House and the tributes paid to the departed leader, Dr. Lohia. He was one of the foremost freedom fighters. He had established a reputation for himself that he was a

* Communist Party of India.

ceaseless fighter against injustice, wherever it was. I had the great privilege of working with him. In his death, the country has lost a valiant fighter and it is a great set-back to the socialist movement. His inspiring leadership and his thought-provoking actions will be guiding the destinies of this country and particularly the socialist movement will be benefited by his thoughts. I once again associate myself with the sentiments expressed in this House.

—**Mulka Govinda Reddy**

Mr. Chairman, Sir, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia occupies a place among the national leaders of this country. His untimely demise has deeply shocked the entire country. All of us have a feeling that now we will miss him very much. He was very clear in his perceptions of the national unity and whenever he found any thing going against the territorial integrity of the country, he never hesitated to bring it before the people and parliament of this country. His observations and points of concern were always very clear and unambiguous, not only in respect of territorial integrity of the country but also on the national unity and integrity. Dr. Lohia did not spare anybody for any attempt of disintegration or obstruction and it is here that his greatness lies.

For him, nation's respect was always paramount. So now when a foreign rule has come to an end in this country, we should not continue to remain dependent on a foreign language. Instead we should recognise one of the languages of this country as our national language to give an expression to our self respect as a nation. It is what he advocated and struggled for throughout his life.

He was deadly against corruption in public life irrespective of the fact that it was practised by a person who might be known as a top political leader or a person standing at the lowest political rung. He never tolerated it. Even as a member of Parliament, he brought forth all the instances of corrupt practices of the persons even in the highest positions and that way, he tried to open the eyes of his countrymen. To my mind,

the greatest thing Dr. Lohia gave us is the practice of putting into action all that what he professed and believed in. To believe in a particular thing and to put it into practice with a sincere effort is a great quality and the country needs it today. If the people of this country are able to imbibe this single quality of Dr. Lohia's oneness of words and deeds, the country will be making strides in several fields.

We are really very much indebted to Dr. Lohia for the national way of life he propounded to be emulated by his countrymen and it is for that reason that his untimely departure for his heavenly abode has left us sad and in agony. Now on my own behalf and on the behalf of my party,* I pay our homage to the departed soul.

—Sundar Singh Bhandari

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have not been able to decide as to what I should say on Dr. Rammanohar Lohia on my own behalf and on behalf on my party** because for many people of this generation Dr. Lohia as a towering person ranked only next to Mahatma Gandhi. We have also accepted it. It is indeed a fact that such historical personages are rarely recognised during their life time. It is only after their departure for their celestial abode that their ideas and actions get recognition of the people and for the policies and doctrines propounded by them, the people hold them in high regards with such utterances that they made the world rich with all that they could give them. Today one such person has left us and the wide gap that has been created by his untimely demise particularly with regard to the promotion of socialism will never be bridged. I think it is an irreparable loss for the Indian politics.

Dr. Lohia contributed not only to the freedom struggle of this country but also to such struggles world over. An exhaustive narration of developments in each and every country will require a lot of time.

*Jan Saugh

**Samyukta Socialist Party

However what I would like to say is that wherever the people raised their voice for freedom, be it South Africa, India or Indonesia, he made all possible contribution to it. In all the small neighbouring around us, he put in the best of him to get a democratically constituted form of Government installed.

I would not like to speak about the rural areas of this country as they have already been exhaustively discussed.

He had given a serious thought to all the issues pertaining to this country and I think that in future this country shall have to follow all that line of action he had laid down for them. There is no doubt that that day will come and we will be thinking on his lines in respect of all our problems, be it the problem of language, caste, extravagance, equality or any other thing of that sort.

I know that the worst sufferers in this country have been the people belonging to the backward classes and the downtrodden for whom he was one of their great leaders because he had given a serious thought to all these problems and had come to a conclusion that mere talks of equality or socialism was not going to be reasonable and adequate solution of their problems. To this day, caste system continues to be the predominantly powerful preposition in this country and without breaking down all these barriers, we cannot even think of ushering in an era of socialism in India and it was he who taught us this lesson for the first time.

Regarding the use of language, he was of the view that the entire work of this country should be done in the language of the common man. Moreover he wanted that the rulers or the ruling party of this country which is merely a small group of people should not concentrate all the powers in their hands. Instead entire work of the country should be done with language of the common man.

Similarly he devoted the entire span of his life for the cause of the common man. While working in the political field, he never thought in terms of his selfish ends. Perhaps he was the only man of that type. I had a chance to know him from very

close quarters and it is on that basis that I can say it with an element of certainty that he might have used some bitter words for any of us but internally, it was the general welfare of the people of this country and that of the entire mankind which reigned supreme in him. That is why whenever he used a harsh word against the corrupt practice of an individual or passed some pungent remarks on a particular issue, it was only with a view to bring it to the notice of the general public so as to set a process of thinking in their minds in this regard. It was for that reason that he chose that unpleasant way of putting things before the people.

I would not like to dwell on it in greater details. Only the history will unfold the untouched vistas of his philosophy as to how relevant it is for finding out the solutions to our day to day problems in the times to come.

While paying him homage on behalf of my party I would like to urge upon the members of all those parties that may come to power in this country, to delve deep into the philosophy of Dr. Lohia to explore and understand it because it is only through this path of Dr. Lohia's philosophy that this country will be able to usher in an era of happiness and prosperity.

—Gaure Murahari

Mr. Chairman, Sir I on behalf of my party* associate myself with the sentiments that have been expressed for the late Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. Mr. Chairman, every person evokes an image in your mind, and the image that is evoked by the mere mention of the name of Dr. Lohia in our minds is the image of a dynamic person, not merely a dynamic person, I will go to a little further and say, he was in the political field of India an iconoclast. He could never tolerate shibboleths. He could never tolerate conventions and shames and false respectability.

We know how he was against the setting up of idols in our political life. Mr. Chairman, Sir, the necessity of such a person was there and is still there in our life. Sir, we Indians suffer from

*Communist Party of India (Marxist)

one defect and if I may pinpoint that single defect, we have a tendency of turning great men into *Avatars*. We have seen in our country this tendency of converting everybody into an Avatar even during his own life-time. Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was one of those political personalities who, we found, could never tolerate setting up of idols, converting of men into Avatars of God. And, therefore, we found that he often had passages at arms with men of distinction in our political life to whom we would have bowed from a distance, to whom we had a tendency to bow from a distance. Therefore, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia's contribution to political life, when he lived amidst us, was great because he attempted to divest the Indian political life of the tendency to lionise and idolise great men who might have risen to great heights and stature because of certain factors which combined to make them great.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, not merely that. I look upon him also as a great architect and a great organiser. We know how he gathered together the united socialist forces whom he called the Samyukta Socialist Party. And while I think of it I cannot but pay handsome tribute to his idea of striking together and bringing together a united socialist offensive, so to say, upon the miseries and sufferings of India. And that is why he was a great admirer of united leftist action in the Indian political sphere. We have found instances and examples of his contributions in this respect in the matter of formation of Ministries in different parts of Indian states particularly in West Bengal and Kerala where we find that a united leftist movement is afoot to bring these two States out of the ruts, out of that deep suffering into which they had been thrown in the last twenty years or so after independence. Dr. Rammanohar Lohia had a great contribution to make to the forging of this united left offensive. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, Sir, we leftists, particularly our group, the Left Communist Party (Marxist), are grateful to his memory that he has laid down a path for combined united socialist action in various parts of India and we hope that his successors in the political field will carry forward his thoughts and message.

—A. P. Chatterjee

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to say something on this occasion. It is very difficult for me to say something about Dr. Lohia at this moment, particularly because he was 5 to 6 years younger to me. While speaking on his death, I recollect many things and feel the pangs of separation.

I worked closely with Dr. Lohia for 20 years i.e. between 1934 to 1954. Later on also though we kept on meeting, but the memories of the good as well as bad times of those 20 years keep me tormenting and I become restless to recollect them. I clearly remember the day when a few days before his death on 13 September, he came to Patna to meet Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. He insisted that I should also be present in the talks. When he came to know that I had refused to join the talks, he sent a message that I must come, otherwise he himself would come to take me. After that we three met after several years and remained together for four and a half hours. While departing I had hoped that we would meet again and that it would not be the last meeting. I wish more such meetings had been held and Dr. Lohia would not have passed away, it would have been better for Indian politics.

Dr. Lohia has a special place in our politics. Even those who have not been agreeing with him will concede that he had certain distinguished qualities. Ordinarily, the approach of the politicians is very limited, but Dr. Lohia had the quality of seeing beyond the horizon. He had an insight which could penetrate deeply and go beyond time and place. Therefore, Dr. Lohia could bring to light several such issues which usually are victims of indifference of the politicians. I had the occasion of working with him on some of these issues. One such issue related to the Himalayas. I do not remember any Indian politician who might have given so much importance to the Himalayas as was given by Dr. Lohia. At his instance, we had convened the Himalayan Conference in Lucknow. Similarly, there were several other issues like that of Goa, Nepal, etc.,

towards which we were indifferent, but Dr. Lohia was attracted towards them. His activities were not restricted to attainment of political freedom of his own country. He used to think of those questions also which, though of not immediate concern, could have been of importance to us in future.

He was a dauntless person. His originality and forthrightness were the two qualities which even his critics will concede. It is true that we had difference of opinion on his method of functioning over several matters, but in spite of this, he had certain qualities which no one can refute. He has carved out a niche for himself in the Indian polity. Therefore, with his death not only that corner of Parliament where he used to sit and not only that house of Rakabganj where he used to reside, have been orphaned, he has left a void on the Indian politics also. The truth is that though he could make a place for himself in the hearts of the people and in the politics of the country, he did not bother for mundane gains like property, wealth etc. About Dr. Lohia, the following words are true:

'Nasti Yesham Yashkaya Jaramaranjam Bhayam' i.e. He was beyond life and death. I am sure his traits of dauntlessness, originality, nationality and his other qualities will find more and more place in our country and the political workers will be benefited from them.

Many people may not be knowing that Dr. Lohia not only participated actively in the 1942— Movement, he contributed a lot in its philosophy and policy making also. The definition given by Dr. Lohia in respect of non-violence has its own place in political definitions, history and literature. He was imbibed with these qualities.

I thought Dr. Lohia would be living and would be serving the country for longer time, but unfortunately, though elder to him by 5 years, I am taking part in his obituary and he has left earlier than I.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to congratulate you for strengthening the practice of condoling the sad demise of those personalities who had not been member of this House. This

practice was once started, but was discontinued. Today, you have restarted this practice that the House will condole the death of those distinguished persons also who were not members of this House. For this I thank you.

*** *** ***

During my tenure, we have never condoled in Rajya Sabha the death of so many personalities at a time. Therefore, it is a sad day for Rajya Sabha. With these words, I pay homage to my friends who are no more with us.

—Ganga Sharan Sinha

Sir, I and my party would like to associate with the feelings and sentiments that have been expressed by the various Members of this august House about Dr. Lohia the fact that Dr. Lohia had fought heroically for days together against death proves that he was a champion fighter. He was a champion freedom fighter. During the period of British rule, he fought heroically against the British imperialists and during the 1942 Movement also, he played one of the greatest roles and organised the youth of the country at that time so that we could overthrow the British rule from this country. ...He noticed that inequality prevailed in economic life as well as in social life and he wanted to eradicate that inequality not only from the economic sphere but from the social sphere also. He gave more importance to social equality. He said that until and unless there is social equality there would not be economic equality and political equality in this country. I think, it was because of his persistence that there was only one party—apart from the other political parties of the down-trodden people who are striving for social equality—which has included in its programme the task of establishing a social order based on social equality. Not only that, it was one of their programmes that the caste system should be abolished. And Dr. Lohia always strove to establish a new social order based on equality. Therefore, Sir, he was a champion of the underdogs and a friend of the downtrodden people of this country. Sir, he was an outspoken man. He worshipped only principles. He never

worshipped idols. He sincerely believed in whatever his principles were and he followed only those principles irrespective of the warth and displeasure that he might incur because of his policies. Therefore, Sir, he was never afraid of criticising or attacking even highest personalities and the greatest leaders in this country. Therefore, he had to suffer displeasure but he never cared about all those things. He was one of the greatest sons of this country and therefore I would like to pay homage and tribute on behalf of myself and the Republican Party of India.

—B. D. Khobaragade

Mr. Chairman, Sir, may I join my colleagues in paying my very humble tribute to the memory of Dr. Lohia? Dr. Lohia's life and career are a part of our national history and revolution. He was a person of indomitable courage and he suffered as many as 18 imprisonments during his lifetime. He made very great contributions to the creation of a strong socialist ideology in the country and his determination has led to the emergence of a strong socialist opposition all over the country. Sir, Dr. Lohia's greatest contribution to parliamentary democracy is the creation of an active and virile opinion which is the essence of the democratic system. Dr. Lohia has gone leaving us and the country poorer and the country was in every sense of the term his family because he had no family of his own. Though he is no longer with us, the flame of his life and achievements will continue to guide the path for us and the succeeding generations.

—A. D. Mani

Sir, I join you and other hon. Members of this House, on my behalf and on behalf of my Party, the Forward Bloc, to pay our respectful homage to Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. Dr. Lohia was a great patriot and a great freedom fighter of the country and we cherish his role particularly in those fateful days of the year 1942 when the country rose like a man to break the imperialist chain that bound our country and country's youths were inspired under the leadership of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia in the absence of the leadership of the Congress to take to the path

of struggle. He was a great admirer of the principles, policies and programmes of the great leader, Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose. Sir, he was a great socialist of our country. He was not only a socialist for preaching but he practised socialist norms in his practical day-to-day life. He was not only a socialist of classical book style but he sought to introduce new dimensions in the socialist thought in the world, nay, in this country of ours he sought to unify the socialist, democratic, patriotic and secular forces of our country so that a new social order, new political order in this country can be built up. Sir, he was not only a socialist whose activities and programmes were limited only to this country of ours. He was a great humanist and he thought in terms of having new values for the mankind and in this way he enriched the culture of the mankind itself. Sir, he had some original thought in the matter of having socialist programmes in our country. Therefore he was a great nationalist, a great patriot and a great socialist of our country. The country and the younger generation of our country will do well if his spirit of non-conformism is emulated and his path is followed.

With these words, Sir, I join you to pay my respectful homage to Dr. Rammanohar Lohia.

—Chitt Basu

Mr. Chairman Sir, I and my Akali Party are shocked at the untimely demise of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. His death at this time is a matter of sadness. He was a prominent Opposition leader. He was a bold leader and he always took up cudgels against injustice and for the cause of the poor and the downtrodden. He used to give lead to the opposition. In him we have lost a very good friend.

I remember that when he was ill and undergoing treatment in the hospital, he remarked that he would be really happy if every poor patient in the country was given medical attention which he was getting on his death bed. The spirit of his words showed his feelings and sympathy towards the poor of the country and he had not forgotten them even when he himself was ill and in

great pain. He has set an example by showing his concern for the poor people during his life and on his death bed.

Without going into further details, I offer my heartfelt condolences to his friends and pay my tributes on my own behalf and on behalf of the Akali Party.

—Narindar Singh Brar

I associate myself with the feeling expressed in this House on the sad demise of Dr. Lohia.

On 24th September Dr. Lohia who had for some time anticipating a combined Pak-China attack on India had given a telegram to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, the text of which he had written in his own handwriting, stating that with due regards from his side, he was sending Shri Rajnarain to see him on 30th and the matter should be discussed with him in detail. I never knew that 30th would be such a sad day for us, on the 30th morning at about 9 O'clock I visited him in the Hospital and asked him, 'Dr. Sahib do you know that you are going to be operated upon and still you are sending me to Afghanistan' but he told me not to worry as he would recover very soon, and he will be discharged from the hospital within two or four days. He insisted that I must leave for Afghanistan. But he cautioned me not to lose balance and whatever transpired between Badsha Khan and myself should not be leaked to the press and then he instructed all others who were there in his room to send me off immediately. Before leaving I met Dr. Lal and requested him to keep me informed about his health. On 30th itself I received a telegram that the operation has been successful. I received another telegram on 1st October stating that his condition was not stable. On 2nd October when I was getting ready for going to meet Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, as Khan Sahib was not in Kabul and had gone out of station on tour leaving instructions on telephone that arrangements should be made for sending Rajnarain to the place where he was. Meanwhile our Ambassador General Thapar had received a call from deputy Ambassador Shri Brij Kumar that a message had come from Delhi that Dr. Lohia's condition was critical and they

wanted Rajnarain to come back immediately: The message was conveyed to me and I was in a fix how to get back to Delhi fast. However, I could manage a seat for myself in the Airana airlines. The aircraft was late by an hour or so but ultimately I reached Delhi on the same day itself. I tried to contact the Prime Minister and the president from Kabul on Telephone but was unsuccessful. Then I tried for Brig. Lal. Fortunately he was available and he told me that till yesterday his condition was stable but suddenly it deteriorated and had become quite critical then. On landing I straight away rushed to hospital. Dr. Lohia was conscious, he asked me whether I had accomplished the job for which I was sent there, I replied in the affirmative and told him that I would tell him the details once he recovered. From 2nd October to 12th October I virtually remained with him day and night, for 24 hours, I never used to get sleep. I used always to lay my hand on his forehead and I felt as if my hand was placed on some precious treasure which I did not want to lose and somebody was trying to snatch that from me. On 11th at about 10.30 or 11p.m., I came back to 95, South Avenue for having a bath, normally I used to come everyday at this time to take bath as I had to remain awake throughout the night. On reaching home I received a call from the hospital and was told to rush back. I told the caller that a few minutes ago when I left him he was alright. I have n't had my bath even but Dr. Uddpa of Kashi University told me to leave for hospital immediately. When I reached there I saw two persons were trying to revive him, he was given electric shock, his ECG was done and for good 20 minutes my hand was on his forehead. Brig. Lal patted on my shoulder and said "we could not save Dr. Lohia", I asked him again and again to confirm what he said then I could no longer hold myself, tears starting rolling down my cheeks. I have lost faith in Doctors but that subject I will touch upon later on. I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to pay homage to the departed soul.

I feel Dr. Lohia was not understood fully during the life time and he also held the same view. Once he told me that Man Singh claimed respect only during his life time but Rana Pratap

was held in great esteem even after his death. I had never dreamt that his end would come so soon. Just two months back he had gone to Varanasi. He was there for three four days. Whenever, he used to go to Varanasi he always, made it a point to visit Sarnath and if he had some spare time he often visited Manikarnika Ghat. There he used to go by boat. Manikarnika Ghat is a place in Kashi where dead bodies are cremated. Last time when we went there we saw that one body which was not burnt fully was immersed in the same state in the Ganga. Dr. Lohia on seeing that body told me, it appeared that this dead man belonged to some poor family and his family did not have enough money to buy fire wood to cremate his body. He failed to understand when science has advanced so much and the facilities for electric cremation are available why this system was not being adopted and propogated and why, such half burnt dead bodies are being immersed. We saw one more dead body on which a tin of ghee was being poured and Dr. Lohia remarked that this dead man must have been from some rich family and that was why ghee was being poured on his dead body. Most likely his relatives might have used sandal wood for his pyre and thereafter a number of questions followed. He asked me where did we cremate dead bodies of our relatives, etc. etc. At about 3.30 a.m. I told him to take rest otherwise he may fall sick.

Dr. Lohia was a great philosopher. I wish the people study his philosophy. By and large, we all are the students of philosophy. Sankhya Darshan, the oldest and the most developed philosophy of our country envisages two aspects of universe viz. man and nature. As per this philosophy, man is only the observer and it is the nature which plays the role. Karl Marx based his philosophy on dialectic and he conceived of evolution and revolution. He termed qualitative change as revolution and quantitative difference as evolution, if you increase the quantity it will change the quality. He saw the history of human society in terms of evolution and revolution. Those who have read Gandhian Literature must be aware that Gandhiji believed in two basic principles i.e. evolution and

death. The cardinal principle is, the process of evolution takes place and the end is inevitable. The philosophy propounded by Dr. Lohia also envisages these two points—infinity and continuity. Thus we have seen that these great men have more or less propounded the same theory except the difference of terminology because of time gap and advancement of science.

Sir, I would like the countrymen to read Dr. Lohia's book "Wheel of History." Dr. Lohia has given a beautiful description of class and caste in it. He has enumerated that class and caste are the stages. At one stage class becomes caste and at other stage caste become class, in other words, dynamic caste is class and static class is caste. What a great philosopher he was to have evolved a universal socialism by combination of Indian socialism with the ideologies propounded by Karl Marx. In the Conferences held at Sherghati and Varanasi he urged the combined socialist party, at that time it was called Samajwadi Socialist Party, to make provision for 60 per cent reservation for backwards. He said that if we were really for a classless society such classless society cannot be established unless we make it casteless in the first place. Unless these two classes are created, true socialism cannot be ushered. Mobile caste is class, mobile class is caste. This is how the whole thing has been described by Dr. Lohia. When I tried to read **Gandhiji's works in order to resolve some problems in my mind**, Gandhiji also did not separate politics from religion in the manner as all other people do. When after independence Gandhiji was asked to give up politics, he had replied that that was the right time to take part in politics, because they had to work hard for the progress of the country. So it was not right to renounce politics. He further added that as soon as he come to know that anti social elements had entered politics, he would not remain in politics. Lohiaji said that politics and religion are inter-related. Instant duty is politics and perspective politics is duty. I am speaking here because you permitted me to speak. In this way I am performing my duty. But my speech in Rajya Sabha is politics.

Similarly, he used to say that long range programme is policy

and short range policy is programme. It is not correct to say that there is big difference between policy and programme. Dr. Lohia always said that we must practice what we profess. Unless it is maintained no country, person and society and even the world can progress.

Dr. Lohia was a philosopher and also a great economist. Dr. Lohia wrote a booklet "Economics after Marx" during the days of turmoil in 1942.

The book was later published by Usuf Meher Ali. In that book he defined surplus value in a very beautiful way. Dr. Lohia said that so far as production is concerned 3 minutes of U.S.A., 6 minutes of Russia, 40 minutes of China and 60 minutes of India are equal. Are the workers of India different from those of Russia? Are their needs more than the needs of our workers? Have they some special quality, which the workers of India do not have? Lenin wrote, "Imperialism is the last phase of Capitalism". But Lohia said that it is not so. He said that imperialism and Capitalism are twins. Had India not been a colony of Britain, Capitalism would not have attained such a height in Britain. It flourished in Britain due to exploitation of Indian labour. So we will have to think afresh regarding surplus value theory. Surplus labour creates surplus value. That is why Dr. Lohia said that distribution of surplus value should be made after taking into consideration the capital and labour of the whole world. Everybody should be given his due share. If one gets more he is a exploiter to that extent. It can be done only when we take the whole world as a single unit. Do not divide humanity. In this way he gave a sermon of universal brotherhood.

Sir, I consider Dr. Lohia a progressive and true patriot. If we go deep into the ideas of Dr. Lohia, we will find that in 1949 in a press conference of London when a reference regarding Tibet was made he also made a reference to Kailash, Mansarovar and Macmahn line. Dr. Lohia said that this issue should be considered on the basis of the proximity of the two countries. It should be decided, keeping in view of their way of life, religion, culture, opinion of the people. Dr. Lohia put forward these

seven conditions before the world and said that an atmosphere should be created to demarcate Indian border.

Dr. Lohia propagated his philosophy in a very beautiful manner. Those were the days when a call to go on strike and to increase dearness allowance and pay was being given. He was of the opinion that without fixing prices nothing could be achieved. So he gave a formula to fix the prices. He said that arrangement for marketing the goods produced by the industries should be made. Government should not realise more than 50 per cent as tax or as profit. If it is done only then we can avoid strikes or demand for increasing dearness allowance and pay. Unless prices are fixed this question will be raised time and again.

Dr. Lohia also broke the caste barriers. Morarji Bhai went to Samath on 17th and a question for opening Buddha University was mooted. But after research Dr. Lohia said that our philosophy provides for a common caste in respect of species having common method of procreation. So question of the existence of Harijans and untouchables does not arise. He used to say that we should go in for horizontal form of social development, it should not be otherwise.

There should be no vertical division of the society. Otherwise, the society will not be free from upper and low castes. If the division is horizontal then the scavenger will give up scavenging, the brahmin will give up brahminism and the 'thakur' his 'thakurai' and we will thus have a very healthy society. Today the casteism is the greatest hurdle for our socialism and democracy. Special opportunities should be available to the backwards according to their backwardness. Dr. Lohia made a deep study of human society, Indian culture and civilisation during the last few years. He called upon the people to go to Badrinath and see what happens there. People visit the shrine and come back without knowing anything. He thought that one should have darshana of the idol of Badrinath after removing the garlands and the attire from it. He got such arrangement made through the local 'Rawal'. When garlands and attire were removed at mid night, the entire idol was visible.

Then Dr. Lohia asked us to observe how that idol differed from the idols of Lord Shiva and Lord Vishnu. He used to penetrate deep into all such things.

After 1952 elections, Dr. Lohia organised a 15 day camp and observed that we should identify the causes as to why, the first position having gone to the Congress Party, socialist party secured second position in the area having the influence of Lord Rama, the communist party in the area of Lord Shiva and the Ram Rajya Parishad, Hindu Maha Sabha and Jan Sangh in the area having the influence of Lord Krishna. He raised the issue and left its analysis to the wisdom of the people.

....During the last days of his life, Dr. Lohia had once said that after his death, he would like to be cremated in the Electric Crematorium. However after his death, there was a lot of dispute on the point as to how the last rites of Dr. Lohia should be performed—by way of handing over his deadbody to the Lucknow Medical College to realise his expressions to that effect on some earlier occasions or by way of consigning it to flames in the electric crematorium to honour his last wishes, particularly, in view of the existent provision of such a facility. Ultimately a decision had to be taken to act according to his last wishes so that there was minimum expenditure on that account. All these things have to be emulated by us in our own life to quote Lord Budha, there should be oneness of thought and action, absence of which might lead to corrupt practices and one would not be able to see the things in their true perspective.

The decision of Dr. Lohia to start a movement to banish English was not an instinctive one. In fact, there was a scientific reasoning behind it, that to strengthen democracy in this country, we should use common man's language for our discussion and day to day work. English is not the language of the common man of this country. Dr. Lohia initiated a number of movements in this country. A few to name are, save the Himalaya, Reunification of India and Pakistan and 'Devote one

hour for the country'. None of these movements is such which is not required for the welfare of the people of this country and all the human beings living in other countries of the world.

Before I conclude, I would like to quote here the words of Mahatma Gandhi he had said in Sultanpur on the arrest and 3 year imprisonment of Dr. Lohia in 1940. He had said that to that day he had not seen a single man as straightforward and dauntless as Dr. Lohia and he would not sit peacefully till Dr. Lohia was in jail.

'The Harijan' quoted him to have said the following words in English;

"I cannot sit still while I see Dr. Lohia in prison".

Again on the arrest of Dr. Lohia in Goa on 19 June, 1946 Mahatma Gandhi had said that in case the Government of India kept silent over the arrest of Dr. Lohia, he would go all alone to oppose it. Also in one of his letters, he wrote that Dr. Lohia possessed a number of qualities of body and mind, but his leading quality was his consistency.

Sir, today I had an opportunity to go through three books of Dr. Lohia he had written in 1938. A reading of the Preface of these books published under the title 'Foreign Policy of India' 'Sino-Indian Relations' and 'What should be the foreign policy of India' gave me immense pleasure. One of these prefaces, Shri Jawahar Lal Nehru has observed that many of us would agree that the book of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia on Foreign Policy would be a very useful publication for the people of this country and they should go through it.

I have seen that Dr. Lohia was a man of principles with a feeling deep sympathy for the oppressed on the one hand and had a feeling of annoyance and fury for the perpetrators of injustice and atrocities. The very sight of such people infuriated him. He was of the view that the persons working for the upliftment of the society should work with determination.

It was a great pleasure to listen to a representative of Gandhi Smarak Nidhi in Varanasi on the 12th of this month, saying that during the last days of his life, Dr. Lohia had

written an article on Mahatma Gandhi in which he had enumerated his vices.

That was one of his last articles. He has written that some one informed him that Vinobaji was fully agreeable to his views regarding Gandhiji. Vinobaji had said that Gandhiji gave preference to personality over facts at the time of division of India.

I do not want to take more time of the House. Leaders of all the parties have followed the procedure laid down by you. But I would like you to convey to the whole country and the world our feelings about Dr. Lohia. Dr. Lohia has no family. During his last days our President Dr. Zakir Hussain went to see him, when he came out of the hospital, he enquired, "whether his relations have been informed?" Hearing this it was not possible for me to stop my tears. I said "Whether good or bad, we are the only relatives of Dr. Lohia, Dr. Lohia does not have any real brother or sister and the question of wife and children does not arise at all. His father Hiralal had already died".

Dr. Lohia had thoroughly studied Indian and western philosophy. He also had deep knowledge of economics. He made a distinction between human and humanity. He said that lover of humanity cannot always be a lover of human being, but a person who loves human being, will surely love humanity. Once he said to me, "Rajnarain, never be a lover of humanity only. You can find many persons, who may say that humanity is crying, but they will not do anything for that human being who is dying before their eyes". So, there is a distinction between human being and humanity. Dr. Lohia understood this fact and acted accordingly. . . .

With these words I want to pay my homage to the exploited human beings of the world. Today Dr. Lohia is not with us, but his programme and ideas will guide us for the years to come. It is a fact that Samyukta Socialist Party has received a direct blow. It is a progressive revolutionary and dynamic party and it will always lit the torch of nationalism, socialism and

democracy. We will glorify socialism and humanity in true sense. With these words I pay my homage to Dr. Lohia.

—Rajnarain

**Excerpts from the Speeches Delivered at the
Function held under the Auspices of the Indian
Parliamentary Group on 23 March, 1990 on the
Birth Anniversary of Dr. Lohia**

Lohia—My Mentor and Guru

—Rabi Ray

I deem it a great honour and privilege to have this opportunity to pay my respectful tributes to the memory of the eminent socialist leader, the late Dr. Rammanohar Lohia whose 80th birth anniversary we are celebrating today.

Soon after my election to the office of the Speaker, I realised that while Parliament had been observing the birth centenaries or anniversaries of some important national leaders, there were several other stalwarts who had not been remembered. I, therefore, got a list of such eminent leaders and parliamentarians drawn up so that we could recapitulate their contributions to the national reconstruction and pay our humble tributes to them. I am glad that the Indian Parliamentary Group accepted my suggestion. It is a happy coincidence that the first function under this new series is being held today to remember and pay our homage to Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, an eminent son of India, who was not only a great freedom fighter but, after independence, proved to be an outstanding parliamentarian.

As you all know, I was deeply attached to Dr. Lohia as he had been my mentor and *guru* under whose guidance, I was initiated into the socialist faith.

Friends, Dr. Lohia was a man of action. He always believed in hard and ceaseless work. He was an excellent orator and whenever he spoke he poured out his heart. He always raised his voice against every form of injustice—whether social, economic or political. That was why he was so popular among the masses whose undisputed leader he was. He was an amalgam of piety, love, modesty, anger and sufferings.

Dr. Lohia played a very significant role in our freedom

struggle. When he was just ten years old he had organised a students' strike. Besides being an ardent socialist, he was also a staunch Gandhian. Along with Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, Shrimati Aruna Asaf Ali and others he led the "Quit India" Movement of 1942 and was, in fact, its hero.

Fully aware of the fact that India was a country of villages of which 60 to 70 per cent population lived below the poverty line, he stood for the cause of upliftment of the rural masses, the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and other weaker sections of society and women. India's partition deeply hurt his nationalist spirit. Lohiaji worked fearlessly to maintain the unity and communal harmony in various parts of the country. He was fully devoted to the cause of Hindu-Muslim unity.

As one of the founders of the socialist movement in the country, Lohiaji was instrumental in giving a new orientation to the socialist movement in our country. A firm believer in social equality, Lohiaji deplored the caste system and the hierarchical order based on birth and advocated for preferential opportunity for the socially oppressed sections of the society. To achieve this objective, he also started what came to be known as the "destroy caste" movement. He became the symbol of the aspirations of the poor peasants, the landless people and agricultural labourers and initiated the Kisan movements.

Lohiaji believed in decentralised economy and held the view that India needed small machines where maximum man-power could be used. An original thinker, Lohiaji expounded the theory of 'Seven Revolutions' or *Sapta Kranti* which provided an ideological basis to the revolutionary transformation in our political and economic system. He supported the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial revolution and suffered imprisonment in America in 1964 for participation in the Negro equal right movements.

Lohiaji was a true democrat and always stood for power to

the elected representatives of the people through parliamentary means. He was opposed to the view that State should be given unrestricted powers. He wanted that State power should be controlled by people's power. It was in this context that he talked of '*Lok Sakti*'.

Friends, Lohiaji's parliamentary career was very short. He was a member of Lok Sabha almost for four years from 1963 to 1967. But even during that short period, his awe-inspiring presence was discernible not only inside the House but outside too. His ability as an effective speaker was beyond doubt. A dedicated and vigilant parliamentarian Lohiaji took his work in Parliament seriously and was always ready with facts and figures to buttress his arguments. It was the irrepressible Lohiaji who had proved through unchallengeable statistics that the average income of a person in our country at that time was just three and a half annas or four annas per day and not fifteen annas as was asserted by the then Government. It is difficult to find today the likes of Lohiaji.

Transcending the barriers of caste, religion and region, Lohiaji possessed a universal outlook. He was for the citizenship of mind and citizenship of ideals. He hated imposing restrictions of nationality or race on his people. He advocated the idea of one world in which one could go to any country without a passport or a visa. He forcefully advocated the establishment of a World Government with a World Parliament to which the sovereign national states would voluntarily transfer a part of their sovereignty.

On this day, the best tribute to the memory of Lohiaji would be to dedicate ourselves to the tasks he had undertaken, to commit ourselves to his ideas and philosophy and to bridge the gulf between our precepts and practice.

I once again pay my respectful homage to the memory of Lohiaji, the ideals he stood for, and the valuable services he rendered for the cause of the poor, the neglected and the exploited in our country.

I am happy that a new Monograph Series on eminent

Parliamentarians is being started by the Lok Sabha Secretariat. The first Monograph in this Series is on Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. This is our humble tribute to his memory. It is indeed a matter of privilege for me to release this Monograph on this occasion.

Lohia — A Saint

— Hukumdeo Narayan Yadav

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was our guide and Guru. He was known to people as a political leader and not as a saint or spiritualist... Some Saints used to congregate at the house of his close friend, Pandit Ramanandan Mishra for religious discourse where it was said that Dr. Lohia was not only a political leader but he was a great spiritualist and saint. One of the saints present there asked if Lohiaji was a saint, why did he not put on a saint-like apparel. In this respect I am reminded of following couplet of Kabir;

*Bhesh dekh mat **boojiye**,
 boojh lijiye jyan
 Bina kasauti hot nahin,
 kanchan ki pahchan.*

(Don't go by one's apparel, but see his knowledge, as the purity of gold can only be tested by touchstone.)

Another thing people talk about Dr. Lohia is his farsightedness. When we think over this aspect, we find ourselves unable to fathom it. It is said that he was a super human being but in fact he was beyond that, and he can be properly described by quoting following couplet of Kabir.

*Had chale so manva,
 behad chalhi susadhu
 Had, behad dou tajai,
 taki mata agadh.*

(Those bound in limits are human beings, those who are beyond limits are saints. But there are people who are far above these two and their thinking is unfathomed.)

Dr. Lohia belonged to the third category. He had the capacity to observe the universe minutely. He was a farsighted man. In the field of politics or spiritualism, most of the persons can go up to 'Shunya' only but Dr. Rammanohar could go even beyond that. This situation is properly described by the couplet:

*Shunya Shaher Tak Sab Gaye, Age Ke Gam Nahin
Jo Age Ke Gam Kare, So Mand Mand Muskaye.*

Thus besides being greatman, saint and spiritualist, he was a politician also.

Pandit Ramanandan Mishra told us that words 'Sam' and 'Samta' are quite frequently found in Dr. Lohia's books: 'Samdrishti', 'Samlakshya', 'Sambodh', 'Sambhav' are some of his books. The meaning of the words 'Sam' and 'Samta' cannot be properly understood unless one has attained certain spiritual height. That is why he emphasised on these two words 'Sam' and 'Samta'. Once Lohiaji told that he understood the meaning of 'Sam' and 'Samta' from the shloka No. 48 of Chapter two of Gita, while he was in jail. The shloka means: 'Being steadfast in yoga, O Dhananjaya, perform actions, abandoning attachment, remaining unconcerned as regards success and failure. This evenness of mind (in regard to success and failure) is known as yoga.'

Lohiaji used to say that the greatest yogi is one who works with a feeling to 'Samta', 'Samanata' and 'Samatva Bhaav'. Dr. Lohia was endowed with a rare quality of doing work with efficiency and perfection. Therefore, I pay my tributes to my guru and guide not only as a politician but also as a 'Mahatma' and as a Saint.

A Tribute to Lohiaji

—Dr. (Shrimati) Najma Heptulla

We will not be paying a real tribute to Lohiaji, in the real sense if in this today's meeting no lady gives expression to her thoughts and feelings by way of a speech. To start with my tribute, I would like to recite a couplet from Iqbal that, I perceive, he would have made in the praise of such a worthy sort of the soil as Lohiaji.

*"Yaqin mohkam amal paiham muhabbat phatahe alam,
Jihade zindagani mein yeh hain mardoon ke shamshiren".*

Lohiaji followed and acted upon his cherished principles with courage and fortitude throughout his life and propounded his message of love to all the people engaged in their struggle for independence. Throughout his life he worked for downtrodden people who were oppressed and trampled for centuries and the women were the worst affected lot among them. He was in favour of giving equality of status to women.

While complying with Gandhiji's principles, Lohiaji laid the foundation of a socialistic pattern of society and followed the same line throughout his life. He least cared for the fact that some people opposed his ideology or that some people paid little heed to what he said. In keeping with the same couplet of Iqbal, he repeatedly propounded his thoughts among the people and he was confident that people will surely study and comprehend his ideas after his death if they were reluctant to do so during his lifetime and I hope and trust that we should follow his path in order to pay real tribute to him.

Under the prevalent atmosphere of discrimination, disparity, inequality, casteism that is building up within the country, I am sure that today we need people like Lohiaji, Gandhiji and Abul Kalam. They are no more with us today but the values they

have left behind in the shape of their work — both published and unpublished — are so rich that they will never diminish. I recall another two couplets of Iqbal with regard to Lohiaji's active participation in the movement of lakhs of farmers of our country:

*"Utho meri duniya ke garibon ko jaga do,
Kakhe umra ke daro deevaar gira do,
jis khet se miltee nahin dahkat ko roti,
us khet ke har boshaye gandum ko jala do".*

Lohiaji believed that if the poor farmers of our country, who toil in the fields round the clock to produce food for others, do not get a square meal for themselves, then the persons responsible therefore should be taken to task for creating such conditions.

I pay tribute to Lohiaji on my behalf and on behalf of all my sisters present here.

Another couplet echoes in my mind for Lohiaji:

*"Hazon Saal Nargis apni benoori pe roti nai,
badi mushkil se hota hai, chaman main didawar paida."*

Such personalities are rare and we are fortunate that a person of his stature was born in our country and today we can achieve success only if we tread the path shown by him.

Lohia—A Man Who Practised What He Professed

—George Fernandes

If Dr. Lohia were alive today, he would have been of 80 years and it is difficult for us to imagine how his physique would have been. He died 23 years ago and at that time, he looked much older than of his age. But he remained ever young so far his thinking and attitude are concerned. Those who saw him in person, can understand him well.

We had told him many a time that his thinking was ahead of time and that was why the people could not understand him. We told him that even his own party and his colleagues were not able to keep pace with him. In 1977 when I, on behalf of Government, went on an official visit to Bonn, the capital of West Germany, then Socialist Government was there in power and Mr. Hans was the Minister of Science and Technology in that Government. Remembering Dr. Lohia he told me that in 1950 Socialist International was reorganised and on that occasion they were at Frankfurt. After the evening meeting, from 8.00 P.M. to 4 A.M. Dr. Lohia continued to discuss with us the issues like new world order, eradication of war, unification of Germany etc. and expressed many new ideas. Mr. Hans told me that at that time he and others were young boys and had the fresh experience of war, and had their own approach towards the problems of the world. After a period of 25-30 years, they realized that Lohiaji was right whereas their concept was wrong; and after hearing Dr. Lohia for 8 hours they thought that the person like him was not a man of this world and his ideology is not possible to be translated into action. I told Mr. Hans that not only he but many others, who spent their

whole life in company of Lohiaji think like this. After coming to know of this thinking about him, Dr. Lohia often said "The people will have to pay heed to my words, but probably after my death." Now when we sit here to discuss the problems of the country, of the world, and try to find their solution, we remember Dr. Lohia and his above quoted words.

Today his '*Sapta Kranti*' (Seven Revolutions) and his principles are being translated into action in one way or the other in the country and on that basis we are achieving success in many fields. In his '*Sapta Kranti*' he gave first place to equality of men and women. In our country we only talk of equality of men and women but in actual practice it is not there. We find here a male-dominated society in which a woman has no place. In this context also we remember Dr. Lohia because he used to say that "there should be no difference between what one professes and what one practises." In the political and social history of India, the name of the person which strikes in our mind other than Lohiaji is that of Mahatma Gandhi who fought for the equality of man and woman.

Under his '*Sapta Kranti*' Dr. Lohia not only raised his voice against racial, political, economic, social and spiritual discrimination but fought also against it. When in America apartheid was being practised, Dr. Lohia launched 'Satyagraha' against it in 1964 and was arrested. The American President, Lyndon Johnson having come to know of his arrest sent a telegram apologising that a mistake had been committed and it should not have happened. Dr. Lohia replied telegraphically that instead of tendering apology to me the President should tender apology to the 'Statue of Liberty', which was installed in New York by the people of America but whose ideals they were not following. This struggle is still going on. Today, we see that Nelson Mandela has been released from jail in South Africa. Namibia has become free. Lohiaji fought not only himself

against apartheid but involved all the socialists in this struggle and gave inspiration to the whole world in some way or other. Thus the struggle is still going on successfully.

The Third Revolution which Lohiaji included in his 'Seven Revolutions' was against the inequality being practised between backward castes and upper castes. When Lohiaji talked about giving special opportunities to backward people, he was abused profusely by the upper caste people. I remember when a resolution about giving equal opportunities to the backward communities was moved in the conference of the Socialist Party held in Varanasi, a very old colleague from Bihar came on the platform, snatched the mike and threw it on the ground and shouted that he had been a socialist for last thirty years, but now he was no more a socialist but a Brahmin and left the dias saying so, though he returned back to the Party after five years. Lohiaji championed the cause of depressed classes everywhere, whether he was in the Party, or outside the Party, in the Parliament or outside the Parliament. He used to say that certain lower castes were being exploited by higher castes for the last 5000 years but the work of bringing the exploited at par with those exploiting them is not being done honestly. Until and unless, the oppressed and suppressed classes were helped to raise their status there could not be parity between the two.

Ours is a very strange country. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had great regard for Martin Luther King, who fought against apartheid in America and lost his life during the struggle. Martin Luther King got Nobel Peace Prize for it and our country awarded him Jawaharlal Nehru Prize posthumously because he had talked of giving special opportunities to particular communities on the basis of his principle of "Positive Discrimination". But when Dr. Lohia tried to introduce that very principle in our country through his Party programmes, he was not only opposed but abused too by intellectuals as well as others. But it is a matter of pleasure that the situation is changing now.

Another thing in his Seven Revolutions was the fight against foreign rule. Lohiaji fought courageously against the British

slavery. Our country won that struggle but the foreign language i.e., English is still continuing in the country. We usually justify the continuance of English language, on the ground that it is necessary for the unity of the country. But this argument does not hold good because if Britishers had not come here, would not this country have been unified one. It is also wrong to argue that raising the language dispute will be to divide the country. The sole purpose of the struggle against continuance of English is to root out slavery. We worship Gandhiji but do not try to understand his principles. Gandhiji clearly said that for attaining real independence, the use of English language will have to be discontinued and the regional languages will have to be adopted. This struggle is still continuing.

In his 'Seven Revolutions' Dr. Lohia included a revolution against accumulation of private wealth and in favour of economic parity and planned production. Lohiaji called people to engage themselves in such a struggle in the country. He also felt the need of struggle against exploitation of one nation by another. Such a struggle must go on. In our country several governments have come and gone but the struggle against economic disparity has not gained momentum as much as it should have.

Dr. Lohia tried to bring a revolution against unlawful interference in private life of people and in favour of democratic system. Now we are winning this struggle, though we are lagging behind in this respect as compared to other countries. In Eastern Europe, particularly in Russia and its neighbouring countries the situation has been changing rapidly for the last 3-4 years, which gives a ray of hope that a new world order is coming up. In fact, the entire world has accepted the idea of revolution in favour of democratic measures and against unlawful interference in private life. The role of Mr. Gorbachev has been very helpful in bringing such a change. There is a great need of continuing vigorously this revolution in our country.

We have to solve our problems through peaceful means and 'Satyagrahs' and should abandon the path of violence or use of

arms wherever in the world it is being resorted to. The revolution against weapons and in the favour of Satyagraha was the last of Dr. Lohia's 'Seven Revolutions'. He made efforts to bring disarmament in the world, though, the Super Powers have begun talking about disarmament and they have taken some steps for destroying the weapons yet two nations of south Asia i.e., India and Pakistan, who are the poorest in the region, are competing with each other in procuring the latest types of arms and weapons. It is really tragic for both the nations. After our country was divided into India and Pakistan, Lohiaji observed: "We will have to unite the country again." India and Pakistan will have to be united by making a confederation of these two nations and if such a confederation comes into existence, the question of Kashmir will not arise and other problems of the region will also be automatically solved.

We have assembled here to pay our homage to the pioneer of "*Sapta Kranti*" i.e., Seven Revolutions. In spite of the fact that we belong to different political parties, we all had been in association with Lohiaji on one point or the other. Fortunately, Shri Rangaji is also present here, whose relations with Dr. Lohia had been very close and cordial. Probably, here is not even a single person who once met Dr. Lohia or came into his contact in any way, and was not influenced by his thinking in one way or the other. Dr. Lohia felt necessary to start struggle against poverty all over the world and made it an issue by initiating a discussion on '3 annas *banam* 15 annas' (Three annas *versus* fifteen annas). But these days politics revolves round the petty issues, which have no concern with the poor or with the nation-building. In such a changed scenario we all, irrespective of our party affiliations, should sit together to discuss and solve the problems facing the country keeping in view Lohia's 'Seven Revolutions', then we will be able to face boldly the challenges we are facing here. I feel that the dream of Dr. Lohia still remains to be fulfilled. Now I would like to conclude by quoting again his sentence, "The People will have

to pay heed to my words, but probably after my death." That time has come now. Let us all proceed unitedly to fulfil the dream of Dr. Lohia.

I Have Learnt from Dr. Lohia

— Ram Vilas Paswan

I am one of those unfortunates who had neither seen Dr. Lohia nor heard him. After completing my college education when I thought of joining the politics, the basic question before me was which of the political parties should I join? Then I had no guide except an ideology, which was that of Dr. Lohia.

I was so much impressed by Lohiaji's ideology that I established a close relation with him at ideological level. I think, such relation is more deep than the blood relation and it never breaks. I have learnt and have been still learning from the personalities like Dr. Lohia and Dr. Ambedkar. The ideologies of these personalities brought about basic changes in existing systems in the country. I have always been saying that there is clear difference between policy and motive. Unless we are honest, no change is possible. Honest people should be ready to receive bouquets and brick-bats both. This is the teaching of Dr. Lohia. We are proud that we used to read and recite certain poetic stanzas of Dr. Lohia in gatherings of Socialists. So far as the language is concerned, his views were as follows—

*"Rashtrapati Ka Beta ho ya Chaprasi Kee ho santan,
Brahmin ya Bhangi Ka beta, sabki shiksha Ek-saman.
Angrej yahan se chale gaye, Angreji ko bhi jana hai,
Angrezi mein kam na hoga, phir se desh gulam na
hoga,*

*Raj Path hai kiske hath, Angrezi aur unchee jat,
Unchee jat ki kya Pahchan, git-pit bole Kare na Kam,
Chhoti jat ki kya Pahchan, Kare kam Aur sahe apman."*

(Every body should be given equal opportunity of

education irrespective of his social status, caste and creed. Englishmen have gone, now use of English Language should be stopped. The identity based on high and low castes must be abolished).

On the Caste system he gave the slogan that—

"Sansopa Ne Bandhi Ganth Pichhada Pawe 100 Mein 60."

(Backward people should be given 60 seats out of 100)

He used to say—

*"Kar Khania Damon Ki keemat, Aane dhari mein Dyora ho,
Anna ki dhan ki Ghatati Barhati Aane ser ke bhitar ho."*

On every thing, he used to say that a real Indian is one who is half Muslim and half Hindu. But today, each community fights for the cause of its own community. Thus we are not true Indians. On television when we see a news report on any particular incident, first of all we try to find out which religion the deceased belonged to. If the deceased is a Hindu, the Sikh has no feeling of sorrow, if he is a Sikh, a Hindu does not weep for the loss of life. Unless we have a basic change in our approach, we cannot become true Indians. When a beggar child comes, we give him something but never try to find out who are his parents. Suppose the child is of Ram Vilas Paswan or of yours, then we feel it and give a call for a revolutionary change. Since he is not our child, we just feel contended by giving him something in his begging bowl.

That is why, I say that the commitment is the most important thing. Unless we are committed to bring a social change, we cannot change the existing social set-up. So, I studied the ideology of Dr. Lohia and all the other great personalities of India. All of them have stressed upon cultural change, and social revolution and economic upliftment. Unless there is a cultural revolution, the social revolution cannot take place in this country and similarly unless there is a social revolution,

the economic revolution will never come because the society and its economy go together. Dr. Lohia used to say that the law of this country is in the hands of Brahmins and economy is in the hands of Banias. Both the castes are having good relations with each other since generations. He also used to say that Brahminism does not mean that a Brahmin can be an opponent of Brahminism and a depressed can also be an admirer of the Brahminism. A Brahmin can boycott religious ceremony and a depressed can regularly pay his obeisance in the temples. This is a struggle to find out his own way. In this struggle, Brahmin can be the closest friend of a depressed, and depressed may become the biggest enemy of his fellow-brother of the same class.

This is why, I say that ideology has an important role to play in such a struggle. The true tribute to Dr. Lohia is to translate his ideology into action.

The elected representatives of public and other leaders are present here. If we want to bring any change, we will have to translate his ideology into action and then only we will be able to do.

With these words I pay my tributes to Dr. Lohia.

Lohia—The Source of Inspiration

—Vasant Sathe

Today, it is a matter of privilege for all of us that we have assembled here to pay homage to the memory of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. During the 'Quit India Movement of 1942,' most of us who are sitting here were under teens. Although Gandhiji and Jawaharlal Nehru were at the helm of affairs at the national political scene at that time but it was Dr. Lohia who was the real source of inspiration for the younger generation. Acharya Narendra Deva, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, Jayaprakash Narayan, Yusuf Meher Ali, Aruna Asaf Ali and Achyut Patwardhan were the leaders of the Congress Socialist Party at that time and they all were the source of inspiration to us, as a result of which we joined that movement. If at all we imbibed the lesson of socialism, the credit should go to their writings and speeches which had gone a long way in teaching us all about the socialism. So, when it was proposed to form the Socialist Party in India, I very well remember, we lent our support to Acharya Narendra Deva at that time. Of course, there were some people who were of the opinion that there was no need of leaving the Congress Party and forming a new Party by the name of Socialist Party as the Congress Party could itself be renamed as the Socialist Party. Dr. Lohia emphatically said to those who were opposed to the idea of forming a new party that you should not look up to Jawaharlal alone, because he was of the opinion that the Congress Party in the leadership of Pt. Nehru would not take to socialism. He was of the firm view that if we wanted to protect the democracy in the country, we would have to provide an alternative to the people so that their faith in democracy or for that matter in socialist democracy was not shaken. Buttressing his point, he cited the example of

Labour Party which was formed in England in similar circumstances. He strongly advocated formation of a separate alternative party by name of Socialist Party to achieve this end. At his call all the youngmen like us joined the Socialist Party, though we mentally remained associated with and influenced by Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi whose leadership continued to inspire us. The greatest contribution of Dr. Lohia is that he introduced an element of rationality in the process of thinking. He believed that there should be a rationale in each and every action and everything should be put to the test of wisdom and reasoning and if it stands to that test, we should not give in and stick to it firmly without allowing any room for compromise and there should be uniformity in our profession and practice. The Socialist Party formed its first Government in Kerala State. An incident of firing took place in that state and Dr. Lohia asked the then Government to resign on the issue. This stand of Dr. Lohia resulted in the division of the Party in that State, but he did not compromise and said there was nothing to be worried about. He opined that there should be unison in our words and deeds.

The seven ideals of Dr. Lohia are the fundamental ideals for ushering in global revolution for mankind as a whole and in order to put them into practice we need to rise above the narrow concept of nationalism. He was a staunch believer of humanity and for him there was no compromise on the basis of castes, creed and community. If we make an introspection, we will find that everywhere in our life and in our parties we are making compromises. Then where is the uniformity in our profession and practice? Today, if we follow these ideals of Dr. Lohia, I think that there will be a great revolution in the country. Though we often make mention of his ideals of socialism, communism and global humanism but in practice we do exactly the opposite. In the name of practicality we have become hypocrites, whereas Dr. Lohia had at one time severed his relations even with one of his very close friends on this issue. He clearly stated that his friend was a hypocrite and he did not believe in hypocrisy. Therefore, I want to say that if today we

really want to pay tribute to Dr. Lohia, we will have to think whether we are prepared to follow his ideals or not. I think that will be the real tribute to him.

Lohia—A Social and Economic Reformist

—P. Shiv Shanker

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia is one of those prominent leaders of the country who sacrificed everything during freedom struggle. Dr. Rammanohar Lohia's life has been unique. It was his firm decision that he would work for the people without seeking any office. On many occasions he could have easily got high office but he was of the view that when we dedicate ourselves to the service of the poor and in a country where millions of people are living below poverty-line, it is not fair to accept any office. Considering the prevailing economic, political and social structure of the country, he became not merely a political leader, but a social and economic reformer too. When he saw that there was casteism and inequality in the society, he decided to work hard to create a casteless and classless society and dedicated his whole life to achieve this goal.

Dr. Lohia was one of those great leaders who blended Gandhism. and Marxism. In order to bring social, political and economic changes in the society, he blended basic principles of Gandhism with principles of Marxism and termed it as socialism. He was of the opinion that for the Welfare and upliftment of the society, our country needs a socialism mainly based on the principles of Gandhism

Dr. Lohia was a great thinker and philosopher. He wrote many books and expressed his views on many issues with utmost clarity and harshness. Whatever he said or did, he said or did it fearlessly and never went back on what he had said. I remember, in 1961 a prominent socialist leader, Shri Badri Prasad, who lived in Hyderabad, invited him. There is a Begum

Bazar Mohalla in that city, where mostly Marwaris lived. Dr. Lohia addressed them and criticised them. After he finished his speech, I asked him whether the audience would like him. He replied that he did not bother about that and that he had said whatever he wanted to say and did not try to hide anything and he did not care if it hurt anybody. Dr. Lohia was very much committed to his principles and adhered strictly to those principles. He was so much dedicated to the upliftment of the women that he wanted to establish *Sita-Ram Raj* instead of *Ram-Raj*, which Gandhiji wanted to establish.

He had faith in all religions. After independence he dedicated himself to the cause of Hindu-Muslim unity and placed his services at the disposal of Gandhiji to utilise them for the purpose. We have assembled today to praise the qualities of such great man. The Hon'ble Speaker has just mentioned that the real tribute to him will be not only to praise him but to follow his ideals and the path shown by him. I fully agree with him. We will be paying real tribute to a great man like him, who sacrificed everything and did not seek anything in return for himself, if we follow his ideals and principles. By doing so, we will be able to bring an overall change in thinking process of Indian people.

With these few words, I pay my tribute and conclude.

Lohia: A Dynamic Personality

— Dr G. Vijay Mohan Reddy

...In the Quit India movement, we were all participating. We were inspired by the revolutionaries. Dr Lohia was a revolutionary. In the post-War Naval Ratings' uprising, lakhs and lakhs of people came on the roads. Dr Lohia stood with the people. He was the first man to support that uprising. If the same path had been followed by the entire nation, there would have been no division; the British might have been thrown out. I always think about that post-War uprising.

The purpose of the movement was to give leadership. Had it been done, I think the history of our country would have taken a turn for the better, and the vivisection would not have then taken place. We were very near to establishing a rule which could have been just to everybody.

Dr Lohia, as is well known all over the country, had taken the anti-racial struggle into the heart of United States itself. This shows the dynamism of the man, and the struggle he had put in to further the great ideas of humanism. His idea of socialism being indivisible from democracy was not properly understood. But today, events in the world are demonstrating to everybody that socialism is indivisible from democracy, and that only in a democratic society can the full flowering of man take place.

Our party (Telugu Desam) has taken great inspiration from the ideas of Dr Lohia. Our State has decentralised power to the rural people. I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity—and to my party—to pay homage to Dr Lohia who was a great revolutionary not only of India, but also one of the great revolutionaries of the world.

Lohia: A Creative Thinker

— *Dr. Nagen Saikia*

Actually in 1979, I was asked by one of the Editors of the Assamese papers to write an article and I wrote one, under the caption '*Ganatantric Samajbadi Jatiya Morcha*'. At that time, I had to read so many things and writings of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. Then I found that what I was trying to say in that article, had already been told by Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, much earlier. I felt myself very much small and little.

Lohia had a compassion of Buddha; Lohia had a love of Mohammad; Lohia had a fury of Shankara; Lohia was a terror to the rulers and the power-drunk; Lohia was the greatest hope and aspiration for the poor and the down-trodden; Lohia was the savior and inspiror; Lohia was the voice of speechless and the strength of the weak.

This was how his biographer, Onkar Sharad, tried to make the sketch of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, an original and creative thinker of modern India. He was a man with the vision of a prophet and a poet. Lohia was the spirit himself—an indomitable humanist spirit,—with a perspective of age-long history of the cultural India and a vision for the healthy future of the country, where down-trodden toiling masses would be free from all sorts of direct and indirect bondages and would have the privilege to raise their heads equally with all under the sky. A studious student and voracious reader, Lohia made himself familiar with the thoughts and writings of the great philosophers, thinkers and creative writers. A Humanist, in the true sense of the word, Lohia from his childhood felt the need of political freedom and social reform for the people of India. An indomitable

human spirit was always powerfully active in him up to the last hours of his life.

At first, he built up himself as a marxist and socialist; of course he did not call himself either a marxist or an anti-marxist. He maintained that only after the installation of socialism, in the true sense of the term, talent will come from the classes which are considered backward and inferior to others. Only after attaining that state, India would be able to see all round development in art, literature, science, philosophy etc, along with the prosperity of her material life. Dr. Lohia's India is the India of colourful varieties, but with a strong unity in diversities—the diversities of the geographical features, cultural surfaces, languages, livelihood; but with strong feeling of oneness.

In the context of the present affairs of India, Lohia, alongwith Gandhiji, Acharya Narendra Deva and Jayaprakash is becoming more and more relevant. Lohia's major concern was with leading the Socialist Party in India and giving it an independent standing on Indian realities. He even expressed the need of setting up *Ashrams* for the training of the spirit of socialism and the spread of the doctrine. He said, "Nothing new was ever born without struggle." He was a nationalist who was for the limit attaining equality, – economic, social and cultural for the people of India. "*Angrezi hatao*" movement was launched by him to infuse among the people of India a feeling of self-respect. But on many occasions, this was misunderstood. He said, "The feeling of nationalism, for instance, of Indianism, should be encouraged until the nation achieve equality of power with other nations and a world law is established"....

Dr. Lohia maintained that a consistent, worthwhile, sociological or economic theory must be able to face the problems of backward economy, like the Indian economy. This original and creative thinker left three messages to the world: (i) non-violent revolution; (ii) equality; and (iii) freedom for all.

Another point I want to mention is that most of the people saw him as indomitable tough politician. But under his tough:

political skin, there was a poet. He was not writing poetry but his admiration and appreciation of the finer things of life found projection in his speeches and writings also. Lohia's view about beauty itself is poetic both from the point of view of content and the form. He wrote, "Brilliance of daylight does not enhance beauty. It is the evening twilight that enhances it. Beauty at its height is the moonlight. The full moon is the best. The moon bathes everyone in beauty, yet it is unable to see the purity of dawn, which comes in slow steps and bashfully like a newly-wed maiden, has always received my esteem and I have never failed to recall the pure beauty of its form without a joyous throb in the core of my heart."

Dr. Lohia was an internationalist and he advocated for a world Parliament. He was prophetic in his vision, when he realised, quite early, the necessity of a 'Third Camp'. Now it has taken concrete shape in the form of non-aligned movement. In the memory of this great leader of India, I pay my heartfelt tributes.

Lohia: A Fighter Against Discrimination

— G. Swaminathan

Dr Rammanohar Lohia was a person who always fought against discrimination on the basis of caste, creed and sex and he always said that women had to be treated equally.

Today morning when I was in the Rajya Sabha Notice Office, a curious thing happened, which reminded me of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. A member wanted a pass for a lady, who was also present in the Notice Office along with the member. The member while filling the form wanted to know the name of the lady's husband. Immediately she got annoyed and said: "Why do you want the name of my husband?" When she was told that it was required in order to fill the form, she asked: "Do you write the name of the wife also if the pass is required for a male person. Why this discrimination?" This is what is happening after 23 years of Dr Rammanohar Lohia's death. I think, in memory of Dr Rammanohar Lohia, this form should be rectified from tomorrow so that this discrimination is removed.

When I was asked to speak at this gathering, I just wanted to have from the Reference Section a bibliography of his speeches so that I could, at least, read a few of his speeches, and understand the man. I got the bibliography containing about five pages. Then I made a rough calculation. It was about 1,450 subjects on which he had spoken. I do not know whether it was during 2 or 4 years; maybe, within a period of 3½ years. He might have spoken on more subjects, *i.e.* on all kinds of subjects. He should have been a remarkable man.

I have been a member in the Assembly and the Council for 24 years. I do not think I would have spoken on more than 300

or 400 subjects. But he must have been an astonishing person. To such a person we are paying homage. It is a welcome augury....

Lohia –A True Patriot

— Somnath Chatterjee

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia was a great son of India, a true patriot and one of the most effective parliamentarians that we have had. His concern for the poor and the downtrodden and his vision of a prosperous India, free from foreign domination as well as economic exploitation, marked his endeavours both as a political leader and a parliamentarian. He was an original thinker and his contribution to the development of the political process in this country has been of great value.

Dr. Lohia maintained that only by practising equality—political, economic and social—India could establish a classless society, as conceived by the socialist thinkers. Keeping in view India's poverty and population, he stressed on an economy in which the capital-intensity per worker would rise up sufficiently so as to enable the Indians to live decently. He emphasised that India had to solve her problems by standing on her own legs. He was a strong advocate for self-reliance. His emphasis was on a decent standard of living for our people, instead of on an ever increasing standard of life.

Dr. Lohia wanted political powers to be transferred to the people and he advocated the four-pillar State. In Dr. Lohia's four pillar State, the Central Government would deal with national problems, the provincial Government with provincial and regional problems, the district government with the general problems of law and order and the village government with the rest of the problems, including the development of minor industries and agriculture. And this diffusion of power would help in decentralisation of the administration. His idea has now assumed greater relevance, considering the recent attempt to centralise power.

In the sphere of industry, Dr. Lohia advocated nationalisation

of big industries throughout his political career although occasionally he advocated the nationalisation of all industries in the country so as to have good industrial relations and to avoid exploitation by private capital. Small-scale industry played a crucial role in Dr. Lohia's thought. All through his life, he encouraged it. He was not opposed to machinery as such but he maintained that machine should serve man and not man the machine.

He wanted a social order in which no man was permitted to exploit another. He fought against the division of the Indian society according to birth, wealth and occupation and he believed that a classless society would effectively demolish the communal barriers that were keeping the communities apart and would give impetus to the nation for a mass endeavour.

He always fought for Hindu-Muslim unity and after India became independent and was partitioned, he worked tirelessly to improve the relations between the major communities in various parts of the country.

Dr. Lohia was a rebel—rebel against feudalism, and against all forms of oppression and ideas which divided the society and the people. His life and work provide us with inspiration to serve the people better and it is proper that we, in Parliament, should try to follow his teachings and examples in the discharge of our duties and functions.

I pay my respectful homage to the memory of this great Indian.

Lohia—A Revolutionary of Revolutionaries

— Professor N.G. Ranga

It is a privilege for all of us to be paying homage to that great patriot, revolutionary of revolutionaries, and parliamentarian—Rammanohar Lohia.

I had a grievance against him that he passed away so soon, but then he lived so fully during those few years of his life that he left behind him a great saga of sacrifice, bearing original ideas and creativity, and organisational means and methods. It was my happy experience to have enjoyed his friendship. Years ago, in 1936, I think, when I had very few powerful top-ranking Congressmen to support me, he came forward to strengthen my efforts to develop a Kisan movement in our country. He was then the editor of the *Socialist*, paper of the Socialist Party. We met in Calcutta. He embraced me and took me round to the leaders of the Kisans in that State especially among the socialists and in that way it became possible for me to develop a branch of the All India Kisan Congress, as we called it. Later on, others also came, especially the Communists and his own friends, the socialists, and Bengal—as it used to be—came to play a very important role in the All India Kisan Movement. Many other things have been said here, but not about his role in strengthening the Kisan movement.

He came to Parliament and he inaugurated a new era. Till then, like myself, most of us on different benches used to speak only in English. Even those who could not speak so well, somehow or other had to make an effort to speak in English in order to catch the eyes of the Speaker and also the ears of the members. With him commenced the era of Hindi becoming the principal mode of expression so far as the leaders were

concerned. At least, he started speaking only in Hindi and he insisted upon speaking in Hindi all the time except when he had to quote something in English. I do not want to say that to speak in Hindi was the most important revolutionary achievement; but it was, nevertheless, a revolutionary move. So many of us who could not speak in Hindi began to wonder how the non-Hindi speaking people would react. Fortunately, history has proved that the non-Hindi speaking people of India also appreciated the lead he had given since the nation continues to be committed to Nehru's Three language formula and the non-Hindi people are privileged to speak in English also as long as they wish. Ever since quite a number of our prominent Ministers, including the Prime Minister, also have begun to speak in Hindi.

He was a revolutionary of revolutionaries. We thought we played a very great, unique and revolutionary role in achieving freedom for India in non-violent manner and we were content also with the freedom that we got for India which we have come to know now and not for the India for which Bhagat Singh and several others and indeed Mahatma Gandhi had fought in our national struggle. Even with this truncated India we were content to carry on the Government in Delhi, but it was not so with Lohia. He insisted upon keeping up the struggle also—in spite of the advice given by the then Chief Minister of Maharashtra and several Ministers in Delhi—for the freedom of Goa; and we achieved freedom. His followers were all dare-devils and he was known to be the leader of the dare-devils. That is a unique achievement. Such struggle is even now necessary in order to make India sprong and the India of our dreams. We do not know who is going to be the next Lohia, but certainly the history will call upon somebody or other, not necessarily in India, to achieve what has not so far been achieved. Lohia was a wonderful man, very troublesome; he was troublesome to Jawaharlal Nehru and Jayaprakash Narayan. As I have said, he was a rebel among rebels and in the end he died as a rebel too.

I wish to congratulate our Parliamentary Group for their initiative in publishing this Monograph just in time for this

function. In the last sentence of the Profile, they have stated that Dr Lohia was unmarried; he left behind no family; he left behind no property also; but only his great ideas. I wish to add that he left behind quite a number of good followers also. Our Speaker is one of them and Shri George Fernandes is another. There are several others also. They are holding now very prominent place in our national life and especially in our parliamentary life. I hope and trust that not only his followers but also several others among our young people, among our politicians and parliamentarians, will try to emulate the example of Dr. Lohia in serving the country and our people.

Lohia — A Great Son of India

— Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait

It is a matter of great privilege for me that today I have got this opportunity of offering tribute to a great son of India. I recall a couplet which, I think, is most suited for this occasion, It says:—

*"Mat sahal ise samajh, phirta hai phalak barsõh,
Tab khak ke parde se insaan nikalta hai."*

Lohiaji was such a great personality. Throughout his life he dedicated himself to the service of the nation. I hardly need to remind that Lohiaji was a great freedom fighter, and that he was in the forefront of the independence struggle. He was endowed with distinguished mental faculties. He was an eloquent orator who could win over the hearts of the people. He was a staunch opponent of social discrimination and believed in universal fraternity. He was the great son of the soil. He is no more today, but his achievements and ideals will keep him immortal. The need of the hour is to follow his ideals and footprint so that this country becomes a better place for all of us. Hindu-Muslim unity is the most desired objective today for which he had been striving throughout his life. We should work according to his ideals so that we can march ahead with success.

A couplet goes as follows:

*"Hayat le ke chalo, kaynat le ke chalo'
Chalo to sare zamane ko saath le ke chalo."*

In order to claim our love and respect for Lohiaji, we must follow the ideals propounded by him.

Lohia — A Great Socialist Thinker

— Dr. Ram Sajiwan

Dr. Lohia was a great socialist thinker. He struggled all his life to create a casteless society. He worked hard to bring social and economic equality. There is a famous religious place, Chitrakut in district Banda of Uttar Pradesh, where Tulsi Dasji wrote Ramcharitmanas. Dr. Lohia tried to explain the verses of Ramcharitmanas, according to his own ideology. There is a verse in *Ramcharitmanas* "*Dhol, Ganwar, Shudra, Pashu, Nari, Sakal tadana ke adhikari*" which is often misunderstood and mis-interpreted. Giving absolutely new meaning to this verse Dr. Lohia said that the interpretation being given to the verse is totally against the interest of the society and does not help in providing social and economic justice to the people in society and creating an egalitarian society. Thus, he tried to analyse it in a different way and gave new meaning to this and such other verses of Ramcharitmanas. His ideas inspired us very much and under that inspiration some tangible work was also done. But today we find that the school of socialist thinking, which started with Dr. Lohia, is getting weakened and diluted today, whereas it should have emerged more strong in our country.

You have made efforts to remember Dr. Lohia and have arranged this meeting for us to remember that great man. It is certainly a good step and we are feeling proud of this moment. We feel inspired to further the work done by Dr. Lohia in the field of socialism and egalitarian thinking. We get inspiration from his ideas and thinking and it becomes our duty to spread his views and ideas in the society. I pay, my tributes to Dr. Lohia.

Lohia : A Great Man

—Yadvendra Dutt

I had the good fortune of meeting Lohiaji in July 1957 and also had a talk with him for a shortwhile. While talking to him, it became evident to me that he was not an ordinary person but a great personality. The ultimate aim of a great man is to bring radical change in the multifaceted society through rational thinking and harmony. The formation of such a society was his aim and he made efforts to achieve it. May be, people did not give much importance to his thoughts during his life-time but now due importance is being given to his views, principles and ideals. Even Western countries are trying to bring changes in their systems on the basis of his philosophy.

Our country has the tradition of following the concept of decentralisation of power, in which Lohiaji had firm faith. He was the first leader who united the opposition in the country and an SVD Government was formed in Uttar Pradesh as part of this experiment. Certain changes are bound to be there in the society in the lifetime of such a greatman. But it is our inherent weakness that we start worshipping a great man instead of following his words and deeds. I think, the real tribute to this greatman would be to follow the path of harmony, fraternity and fellow-feeling which was advocated by Shri Deendayalji also. We should bring changes in our society on that basis. That will be the real tribute to Dr. Lohiaji, who was a great leader.

With these words, I pay homage to this greatman on my behalf and on behalf of Bhartiya Janata Party.

INDEX

Adult Franchise,	36-37	Basu, Chitta,	446
Ahmed, Zainal Abedin,	121, 128	on Lohia,	445-46
Ali, Aruna Asaf,	61, 93, 116	Bethune, Mary,	17
Ali, Yusuf Meher,	48	Bhandare, Murlidhar C., on Lohia,	79 79-83
Ambedkar, Bhim Rao,	76, 80, 473	Bhandari, Sundar Singh, on Lohia,	438 437-38
Anthony, Frank, on Lohia,	430	Bhave, Acharya Vinoba,	89
Ashraf, K.,	121, 128	Bhoodan Movement, Bills	89
August Revolution, (See under 'Quit India Move- ment')		Company (Amend- ment) Bill,	326-33
Azad, Bhagwat Jha,	292	Constitution (Amend- ment) Bill (Amend- ment of Articles 124 and 217),	306-09
Azad Dasta,	122, 128	Constitution (Amend- ment) Bill (Amend- ment of Article 352),	314-18
Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam,	114, 115, 117	Constitution (Amend- ment) Bill (Amend- ment of Article 368),	319-25
Babri Masjid-Ram Janambhoomi, controversy,	41	Constitution (Amend- ment) Bill (Omission of Article 370),	310-13
Backward Classes,	6, 7, 8, 10, 21, 27, 32, 34, 39, 62, 69, 80-81, 88, 100, 124, 152-53, 168-70, 412	Patents Bill,	348-54
Bajaj, Jamnalal,	92, 105	Press Council Bill,	342-47
Bajuria, Chiranji Lal,	223	Preventive Detention (Continuance) Bill,	334-41

Bose, Subhas Chandra,	108, 109, 110, 115, 123	Chatterjee, A.P., on Lohia,	441 440-41
Brar, Narindar Singh, on Lohia,	447 446-47	Chatterjee, N.C., on Lohia,	431
British India Corporation,	223	Chatterjee, Somnath, on Lohia,	487 487-88
British Labour Party,	5, 123	Chaturvedi, Jagdish Prasad, on Lohia,	120, 121 120—133
Budget, General Discus- sion,	219-32	Churchill, Winston	146
Bureaucracy,	180-81, 221, 222, 225, 229, 407	Civil Disobedience Move- ments	6, 27, 31, 47, 89, 92, 97, 114, 115, 118, 127, 425
Cabinet Mission,	124	Committees	
Capital Punishment,	252	for restriction of monthly expenditure of an individual, motion re.	179—91
Capitalism,	9, 20, 25-26, 34, 47, 52, 56, 64, 86-87, 94-95, 99, 111, 147, 160, 228	on public undertak- ings, motions re. Communism,	380—87 20, 24—28, 31-32, 34, 40, 47, 52, 64, 86-87, 94-96, 99, 100, 108-09, 111-12, 114, 122, 124, 129, 147, 160
Caste System,	7, 21, 27, 34, 62, 69, 80-81, 100, 152-53, 168—70, 412	Congress Party (See under 'Indian National Congress')	
Central Vigilance Com- mission,	193, 201	Congress Socialist Party,	4, 6, 19, 31, 52, 79, 85
Chagla, M.C.,	157, 158, 164, 215, 288, 289, 290, 296		
Chakravorty, Renu,	204		
Charan Singh,	124		

- | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| formation of, | 4, 19, 31,
85, 92,
107, 110,
125, 128 | Dwivedy, Surendranath,
on Lohia, | 51, 429
51—53,
428—29 |
| (Also see under
'Indian National Congress') | | Fernandes, George,
on Lohia, | 22, 146,
341, 467
22—29,
467—72 |
| Corruption, | 10, 98,
192—202,
410 | Five-Year Plan (Third), | 392—404 |
| Cripps Plan, | 93, 115 | Food Situation, | 368—79 |
| Damodaran, K.,
on Lohia, | 436 | Foreign Policy (India) | 259—67 |
| Dandavate, Madhu,
on Lohia, | 17
17—21 | India-China relations, | 147—54,
298—305 |
| Demands for Grants | | Indo-Pak relations | |
| Ministry of Defence, | 243—52 | ceasefire of hos-
tilities between India
and Pakistan, | 288—97 |
| Ministry of External
Affairs, | 259—67 | East Pakistan, | 46-47 |
| Ministry of Information
and Broadcasting, | 237—42 | Illegal occupation of
Indian Territory by China
and Pakistan, | 298—305 |
| Ministry of Law, | 253—58 | Indo-Pak confedera-
tion, | 46, 64, 65,
66-67, 74,
277, |
| Railways
(supplementary), | 233—36 | proposal for, | 284, 285,
286,
300-01,
311—13 |
| Democracy, | 28, 40, 63,
88, 113,
297 | Pakistani forces at-
tack on Kutch, | 281-87 |
| Democratic Socialism | 6, 52-53,
63 | International situation, | 268—80 |
| Desai, Morarji | 124,
181-82,
187,
189-90,
266 | Gandhi, Indira, | 11, 24,
418 |
| Dighe, Madhukar,
on Lohia, | 44
44—50 | on Lohia, | 418 |
| Disarmament, | 272 | | |

Gandhi, Mahatma,	3, 4, 5, 9, 17, 19, 20, 21, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 45, 46, 51, 61, 65, 67, 70, 71, 76, 79, 80, 84-85, 86, 87, 92, 93, 96, 98, 101, 102, 105, 106, 108-110, 114, 115, 116, 118-119, 120, 122, 124, 125, 137, 158, 259, 267, 270, 273, 275, 290, 419, 424-27, 433, 454, 476-77, 480, 483	Hindu-Muslim Unity,	9, 41-42, 64-67, 78, 93, 102-03
		History,	20, 27, 29, 32, 41-42, 47, 69, 70-71, 79, 86-87, 102-03, 104, 213-18, 405
		Criticism of,	213-18
		Indian National Congress,	3, 4, 5, 6, 28, 29, 31, 32, 51, 60, 61, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 85, 88, 89, 92, 93, 105, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114, 115, 117-19, 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 128, 130, 149, 154, 160- 61, 164, 190-91
Gandhism,	4, 5, 19-20, 26, 31-32, 34-36, 70-71, 80, 84-87, 92, 96, 479		
Ghosh, P.C.,	89		
Giri, V.V., on Lohia,	11, 435 434-35	Congress radio,	5, 57, 80, 85, 122-23
Gopalan, A.K., on Lohia,	428	Congress socialist party,	4, 6, 31, 52, 79, 85
Guha, Samar, on Lohia,	84, 90 84-90	formation of,	4, 19, 79, 85, 92, 107, 110, 121, 122, 125, 128
Hathi, Jaisukhlal, on Lohia,	435		
Heptulla, Najma, on Lohia,	465 465-66		

- | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| foreign affairs,
department of, | 4-5, 75,
79, 85, 92,
106,
107-08,
110 | Kripalani, Acharya, | 107, 108,
121 |
| Individual Civil
Disobedience
Movement, | 5, 79, 92,
115 | Kripalani, Sucheta, | 58, 93 |
| International Relations
(see under 'Foreign
Policy') | | Krishnamachari, T.T., | 164, 170 |
| Jagjivan Ram, | 211 | Laloo Prasad,
on Lohia, | 33
33-38 |
| Janvani Day, | 11 | Languages, Indian and
other, | 9, 28, 36,
39, 64, 67,
71, 74, 78,
81, 89,
100-01,
142-43,
167, 239,
258, 267,
275, 406 |
| Janvani March, | 18 | Laski, Harold, | 123 |
| Jayaprakash Narayan, | 5, 29, 39,
44, 45, 52,
53, 61,
85-86, 89,
90, 92, 93,
98, 102,
114,
116-18,
122-23,
125, 126,
127, 128,
131, 442,
460, 476,
483, 490 | Limaye, Madhu,
on Lohia, | 91, 105,
427
91-104,
424-27 |
| Jinnah, M.A., | 291 | on Lohia as disciple of
Nehru, | 105-119 |
| Kamaladevi, | 107 | Lohia, Hiralal, | 3, 79, 84,
91, 105 |
| Keshav Singh, | 253 | Lohia, Rammanohar | |
| Khan, Shahnawaz, | 211, 212 | arrests and
imprisonments, | 5, 6, 7,
22, 32, 37,
51, 58-59,
61, 74,
75-76, 78,
80, 86, 92,
97, 98,
115,
123-24,
125, 152,
417 |
| Khobaragade, B.D.,
on Lohia, | 445
444-45 | birth of, | 3, 30, 60 |
| Khoj Parishad, | 57 | | |
| Kidwai, Rafi Ahmed, | 131 | | |
| Kisan Marches and
Struggles, | 7, 26,
45-46,
118, 419 | | |

- books and writings of, 5-6, 9, 19, 20, 41, 86, 92, 94, 95, 97, 123, 125, 127 33-34, 54-56, 69, 82, 91, 449
- death of, 11-12, 29, 32, 68, 78, 90, 103 seven revolutions see under 'S'
- early life, 3-4, 30-31, 60, 79, 91, 105 socialist, 6-8, 17-21, 22, 25-29, 31-32, 33, 35, 39, 45-46, 51-53, 58, 60-64, 68, 70-71, 74-75, 84-90, 92-102, 105, 107-19, 121-33, 166-67, 405-06, 412, 417, 418, 423, 425, 428, 429, 431, 435, 436, 437, 444-46, 450, 460, 465, 477, 483, 493
- education, 3-4, 30, 60, 79, 91-92, 105, 125
- exponent of new theories, 9-10, 17-21, 84-90, 92-102, 105, 107-19, 121-33, 166-67, 405-06, 412, 417, 418, 423, 425, 428, 429, 431, 435, 436, 437, 444-46, 450, 460, 465, 477, 483, 493
- freedom fighter, 4-6, 30, 57, 60, 75-76, 80, 85-86, 92, 93, 120, 122-24, 412, 418, 420, 423, 424, 431, 435, 436-37, 444, 459, 492
- leader, 7, 8-9, 37
- member of CSP, 4, 6, 31, 85, 92
- parliamentarian, 10-12, 58, 71, 98, 417, 419, 436, 461 tributes to, (see under 'Tributes to Lohia') 11-12
- (Also see under 'Lok Sabha', 'Rajya Sabha' and 'Parliament')
- philosophy of, 6-8, 9-10, 17-21, 25-28, Views on 137-38
- agriculture, 180-81, 221, 222, 225, 229
- bureaucracy, 407

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| caste system, | 7, 21, 27,
34, 62, 69,
80-81,
100,
152-153,
168-170,
412 | social equality, | 6, 7, 8,
21, 27, 34,
37, 62,
63-64,
68,
80-82,
87, 99,
100,
152-53 |
| decentralised economy, | 7, 8,
20-21, 32,
87,
96-99 | social revolution, | 7, 8,
20-21,
22, 26,
62, 69,
87, 97,
98, 100 |
| Hindu-muslim unity, | 9, 41-42,
64-67,
78, 93,
102-03 | Tibet, | 151 |
| institution of wealth, | 186-87 | Lok Sabha, | 8, 40, 58,
63, 68,
77-78,
81, 128,
132, 139,
150, 165 |
| land policy, | 137,
150-51,
167, 408 | dignity of, | 406 |
| languages, Hindi and
other, | 9, 28, 36,
39, 64, 67,
71, 74, 78,
81, 89,
100-101,
142-143,
239, 258,
267, 275,
406 | languages, use of, during
debates in, | 64, 101,
143, 406 |
| preferential oppor-
tunities for
backward castes/
classes etc. | 6-8, 21,
27, 34, 62,
74, 80-81,
88, 100,
152-53 | Lohia's election to | 10, 77 |
| price policy | 139, 144,
181, 409 | Lohia's speeches on: | |
| religion and politics | 56, 57,
67-68 | appointment of Commit-
tee for restriction of ex-
penditure of an indi-
vidual, | 179-91 |
| | | budget, general discus-
sion, | 219-32 |
| | | ceasefire of hostilities
between India and
Pakistan, | 288-97 |
| | | committee on public
undertakings, | 380-87 |
| | | Company (Amendment)
Bill, | 326-33 |

Constitution (Amendment) Bill (Amendment of Articles 124 and 217),	306—09	no-confidence in the council of ministers (1965),	157—67
Constitution Amendment Bill (Amendment of Article 352),	314—18	Pakistani forces attack on Kutch,	281—87
Constitution Amendment Bill (Amendment of Article 368),	319—25	Patents Bill,	348—54
Constitution Amendment Bill (omission of Article 370),	310—13	President's rule in Kerala,	355—67
corruption,	192—202	Press Council Bill,	342—47
demands for grants:		Preventive Detention (Continuance) Bill,	334—41
Ministry of Defence,	243—52	Punjab, re-organisation of,	388—91
Ministry of External Affairs,	259—67	rickshaw-pulling,	208—12
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,	237—42	scheduled castes and scheduled tribes, uplift of,	168—70
Ministry of Law,	253—58	student unrest,	203—07
Railways (supplementary),	233—36	three annas vs. fifteen annas debate,	10-11 33, 77, 98, 132, 137—56, 171—78, 179—91
five-year plan (third), mid-term appraisal,	392—404	tributes to Lohia	417—34
food situation,	368—79	Mandal, Dhanik Lal,	54
illegal occupation of Indian territory by China and Pakistan,	298—305	on Lohia,	54—56
Indian history, criticism of,	213—18	Mani, A.D.,	
international situation,	268—80	on Lohia,	445
national income, distribution of,	171—78	Manoharan, K.,	422
no-confidence in the council of ministers (1963),	137—56	on Lohia,	421-22
		Marx	4, 19, 20, 24, 34, 35, 85, 87, 94, 186, 426, 450

- | | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|---|
| Marxism, | 4, 19-20,
21, 24,
25, 27,
31-32,
34, 45,
47, 52,
62, 85,
86-87,
88, 94,
111, 125,
259, 479 | Nehru, Jawaharlal, | 5, 23,
24, 33,
41, 46,
54, 55,
61, 70,
71, 73,
75, 76,
77, 85,
86, 87,
89, 92,
105-119,
120, 121,
125, 126,
127, 198,
200, 201,
225, 229,
276, 278,
280, 284,
383, 469,
476, 477 |
| Masani, M.R., | 110, 128 | Nehru, Kamla, | 105 |
| Mass Media, | 23, 24,
46, 78,
342 | Nehru, Motilal, | 23 |
| Mehta, Ashoka, | 61, 131 | No-Confidence in the
Council of Ministers,
Motions of, | 137-67 |
| Menon, Krishna, | 119 | Non-Congressim, | 29, 40,
74, 78,
88, 154 |
| Minority Communities, | 7, 34,
37, 62,
64-67,
78, 81,
100,
102-03,
153 | Obituary References,
Lok Sabha,
Rajya Sabha, | 417-434
434-456 |
| Mishra, Janeshwar, | 203 | Panigrahi, Chintamani,
on Lohia, | 57
57-59 |
| Mukerjee, Hiren, | 139, 149,
155, 165 | Parliament,`
tributes to Lohia in, | 27, 29,
59, 98
11-12,
417-56 |
| Murahari, Gaure, | 440, | Paswan, Ram Vilas,
on Lohia, | 473,
473-75 |
| on Lohia, | 438-40 | Patel, Dahyabhai V.,
on Lohia, | 436
435-36, |
| Nanda, Gulzari Lal, | 132, 182,
189, 202 | | |
| Narendra Deva, Acharya | 39, 45,
48, 49,
52, 61,
85, 120,
122,
125, 476,
483 | | |
| National Income, | 171-78,
140-45, | | |

Patel, Vallabhbhai,	129, 281	land policy	408
Patwardhan, Achyut,	61, 93, 116, 122	Lok Sabha	406-07
Pillai, Pattam Thanu,	74	nationalisation	408
Lohia's demand for resignation of,	74-75	people and government	407-08
Prabhawati,	125	planning	408
Praja Socialist Party,	6, 7, 74, 89, 90, 126, 127	price hike	409
Preferential opportunities for backward castes/classes/ women etc.,	6-8, 21-27, 34, 62, 74, 80-81, 88, 100, 152-53	social revolution	412
President's Rule, in Kerala,	355-67	socialism	405-06
Punjab, reorganisation of,	388-91	Radhakrishnan, S.	213, 214, 215
Quit India Movement,	5, 57, 76, 79, 80, 85-86, 90, 92, 93, 94, 114, 122, 124, 158	Rajagopalachari, C.	115, 116, 183
'Quotes' from Lohia, on	405-15	Rajendra Prasad,	120
corruption	410-11	Rajnarain, on Lohia,	456 447-56
education policy	410	Rajya Sabha, tributes to Lohia in,	11-12, 434-56
equality of men and women	415	Ram Janambhoomi-Babri Masjid Controversy,	41
flattery	415	Ram Sajiwan, on Lohia,	413
food policy	408-09	Ranga, N.G.,	420, 489
foreign policy	412-15	on Lohia,	419-20, 489-91
history	405	Rao Birender Singh,	124
industrial policy	408	Rashtriya Swayam-sevak Sangh,	18
		Ray, Rabi, on Lohia,	459 459-62
		Reddy, B. Satyanarayan, on Lohia,	60 60-68
		Reddy, G. Vijay Mohan, on Lohia,	481
		Reddy, Mulka Govinda, on Lohia,	437 436-37

Reddy, N. Sanjiva, on Lohia,	11, 418 417-18	Shiff, Leonard,	121
Religion and Politics,	56, 67-68	Shiv Shanker, P., on Lohia,	479 479-80
Rickshaw-Pulling,	208-212		
Right to life,	256-57	Singh, L. Achaw,	58, 59
Saikia, Nagen, on Lohia,	482 482-84	Sinha, Ganga Sharán, on Lohia,	444 442-444
Sait, Ebrahim Sulaiman, on Lohia,	492		
Salt Satyagraha,	85	Sinha, Satya Narayan,	240
Sarvodaya Movement,	89, 90		
Sathe, Vasant, on Lohia,	476 476-78	Socialism,	4, 6-7, 11, 17-21, 22, 24-29, 31-32, 35, 37, 39, 48, 51, 52, 53, 60-64, 68, 74-75, 84, 85-90, 92-102, 105, 124-31, 160, 161, 166-67, 228, 232, 374, 405
Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes,	7, 21, 27, 34, 62, 80-81, 83, 100, 168-70, 412		
Sen, Ashoke,	157, 159, 165-66, 231, 274		
Seven Revolutions,	8, 10, 22, 29, 47, 55, 62, 63, 74, 81, 82, 87, 98, 100, 101, 468-71, 477		
Sharma, Yagya Dutt, on Lohia,	69 69-72	beginnings of,	24
Sharma, Yogendra, on Lohia,	424 422-24	definition of,	63-64
Shastri, Lal Bahadur,	310, 312	democratic socialism,	52-53, 63
Shastri, Prakash Vir, on Lohia,	433 431-33	objectives, of,	61, 63

socialist universalism,	24—25	Student Unrest,	203-07
(Also see under Socialist Movement and Socialist Party)		(Also see under 'Youth')	
Socialist Movement,	4, 6, 7, 11, 17—21, 24—29, 31—32, 33, 39, 51—53, 57, 60—64, 75, 84—90, 92—102, 105, 107—19, 124—33, 402	Supreme Court,	78, 80, 82, 101 485 485-86 76
Asian Socialist Bureau,	53	Swaminathan G.,	485
Asian Socialist Conference,	53	on Lohia,	485-86
democratic socialism,	6, 52—53, 63	Tandon, Purushottam Das,	76
aims of,		Thakur, Karpoori,	124
influences of Lohia, Jayaprakash and Narendra Deva on,	52	tributes to Lohia,	
international socialist policy,	52—53	Anthony, Frank,	430
socialist systems,	61, 63	Basu, Chitta,	445
objectives of,		Bhandari, Sundar Singh,	437
(Also see under, 'Socialism' and 'Socialist Movement')		Brar, Narindar Singh,	446
Socialist Party	6, 17, 18, 22, 27, 29, 32, 44, 45, 46, 47, 52, 54, 61, 74, 75, 95, 126, 127, 130, 131	Chatterjee, A.P.,	440
		Chatterjee, N.C.,	431
		Chatterjee, Somnath,	487
		Damodaran, K.,	436
		Dwivedy, Surendranath,	428
		Fernandes, George,	467
		Gandhi, Indira,	418
		Giri, V.V.,	434
		Gopalan, A.K.,	428
		Hathi, Jaisukhlal,	435
		Heptulla, Najma,	465
		Khobaragade, B.D.,	444
		Limaye, Madhu,	424
		Mani, A.D.,	445
		Manoharan, K.,	421
		Murahari, Gaure,	438
		Paswan, Ram Vilas,	473
		Patel, Dahyabhai V.,	435
		Rajnarain,	442
		Ram Sajiwan,	493
		Ranga, N.G.,	419, 489
		Ray, Rabi,	459
		Reddy, G. Vijay Mohan,	481
		Reddy, Mulka Govinda,	436
		Reddy, N. Sanjiva	417
		Saikia, Nagen,	482
		Sait, Ebrahim Sulaiman,	492
		Sathe, Vasant,	476
		Sharma, Yogendra,	422
		Shastri, Prakash Vir,	431
		Shiv Shanker, P.,	479

Sinha, Ganga Sharan,	444	problems of,	28, 37
Swaminathan. G.,	485	World Civilisation,	
Vajpayee, Atal Bihari,	420	seven principles of,	88
Yadav, Hukumdeo	463	World War,	
Narayan,		First,	24
Yadav, Ram Sewak,	433	Second,	5, 18, 19,
Yadvendra Dutt,	494		24, 79,
II			80, 92,
			93,
Trotsky, Leon	17		110—12
Upendra, P.,	30	Yadav, Hukumdeo	463
on Lohia,	30-32	Narayan,	463—64
Vajpayee, Atal Bihari,	421	on Lohia,	
on Lohia,	420—21	Yadav, Mulayam Singh,	39
Verma, Upendra Nath,	73	on Lohia,	39—43
on Lohia,	73—78	Yadav, Ram Sewak,	434
Weimar Constitution,	317	on Lohia,	433-34
Women,		Yadvendra Dutt,	
equality with men,	8,	on Lohai,	494
	27—28,	Youth,	
	41, 81,	role in change,	40—41
	415	unrest,	203-07
preferential opportunities	7, 27, 34,	voting rights,	41
for,	41, 62,		
	81, 88,		
	100, 101,		
	153		

**SOME RECENT TITLES FROM THE
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**

Books

NATIONAL POLICY STUDIES: National policies and programmes in various fields analysed. Subjects covered include industry, agriculture, health, education, science and technology etc. (Rs. 365/-)

POLITICAL EVENTS ANNUAL: An annotated chronology of important national and international events of the year 1989 as contemporaneously reported in the Press and other news media. (Rs. 350/-)

KAUL AND SHAKDHER'S PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE OF PARLIAMENT : The most authentic and authoritative treatise on parliamentary practice and procedure in India (4th ed.) (Rs. 630/-)

Eminent Parliamentarians Monograph Series

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia	Rs. 50.00
Dr. Lanka Sundaram	Rs. 50.00
Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee	Rs. 50.00
Pandit Neelakantha Das	Rs. 50.00
Panampilli Govinda Menon	Rs. 50.00
Bhupesh Gupta	Rs. 50.00
Dr. Rajendra Prasad	Rs. 50.00
Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah	Rs. 50.00