

Why 60 per cent. services should be reserved for sons of cultivators?

ACCORDING to the census of 1931, persons or earners who are actually engaged in cultivation of land they hold either as tenants or as owners, as apart from labourers or those who depend solely or principally on agricultural rent, form the largest bulk of the total earners of our province, viz, 57.75 per cent. When the agricultural labourers are included, the figure swells to 75.5 per cent. Occupational statistics were not collected in the Census of 1941, but there is no reason to suppose that the proportion has changed in any material degree since 1931. It is the agriculturists, therefore, who are entitled to be called the people—the masses—of the United Provinces. All the departments of the Government have been created with a view to serve the interests of the people. Constituting as they do such an overwhelming percentage of the population, one would expect that the Government services in the United Provinces would be manned largely by the sons of agriculturists or that at any rate their number in the services would somewhat nearly reflect their strength in the entire populace. But that is far from the case; a census of Government servants, according to the profession of their parents or guardians, is not available, but it can be asserted without fear of contradiction that their proportion, excluding the services that are either risky or are very properly paid, does not in any way exceed ten per cent. It is submitted that this state of things has to be radically altered.

The argument based on the factum of numerical strength has been adverted to. What, however, I consider to be a more important and compelling consideration is the existence of an inherent conflict of sympathies and interests between the farmer and the classes which have upto now supplied the officers and other ranks of Government service. A man's opinions are to a great extent dictated by his surroundings. Education makes very little difference, if any, to his real opinions; it rather tends to confirm them. His parents, his environment, his business, his past profession, his present friends, acquaintances and relatives—it is the sum-total of these things that determines his outlook on life. "The social philosophy of a man", writes Simon Harry, "is largely that of the people among whom he moves. The conservative M. P. associates with directors of limited companies, with the equally wealthy members of his own exclusive clubs, with his hunting, shooting and fishing friends. It is this society which produces his conservative philosophy. His mode of life makes it unlikely that he will understand the real problems of ordinary people his political views must reflect the interests of the class from which he comes" (*vide* "Fory M. P.", page 193).

In our country the classes whose scions dominate the public services are either those which have been "raised to unexampled prominence and importance" by the Britisher, e.g., the money-lender, the big zamindar or taluqdar, the *arhati* or the trader; or those which have been, so to say, actually called into being by him—the vakil, the doctor, the contractor. These classes have all, in subordinate co-operation with the foreigner, exploited the masses in all kinds of manner during these last two hundred years. The interests and views of these classes, on the whole, are, therefore, manifestly opposed to those of the masses. The social philosophy of a member of the non-agricultural, urban classes is entirely different from that of a person belonging to the agricultural, rural classes.

A memorandum submitted to the Statutory Commission by an Association in the Punjab asserts that "an immense cleavage exists in India between the trading classes in the cities and towns on the one hand, and the agricultural classes on the other." Then it would impress the Commission with all possible emphasis "that the urban middle class, which is akin to and includes the money lending class, has no sympathy with agricultural classes whatever and that the interests of the two classes are diametrically opposed to one another. The urban middle-class, with the academical education they have received, look down upon agriculturists as being only good enough to plough land, produce food, supply the revenues, act as cannon fodder and to be exploited in every way conceivable." The language of the memorandum may sound a bit too harsh and blunt to many an ear; but there is no gainsaying the fact that the city people act superior towards the peasant. That the reading of the Punjab Association is correct is, however, proved by the fact that only the other day when I was talking to an M. L. A. from one of the big cities of the United Provinces about my move for greater representation to the agriculturists in the services, his instant reaction was to enquire—"who will cultivate the land, then?" It is a matter of daily observation that a townbred non-agriculturist calls his poor countryman from the village a *dehati*, *gunwar* or *dahgani* in the same contemptuous tone in which a heaven-born European flings, or used to fling, terms "native" or 'nigger' at us all the Indians without distinction.

The truth has to be recognized that the environment in which the rural workers live is different from that of the towns. Agriculture produces "a type of citizen, an attitude of mind and a way of life" quite distinct from those developed by any other industry or occupation. "For the peasant," says Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi in his book "*Totalitarian State against man*", "lives in nature, with nature, and by nature, in symbiosis with animals and plants. For this reason his picture of the world is fundamentally different from that of the townsman remote from nature, who spends his days among all kinds of machinery and often himself becomes a semi-machine. The peasant has the slow tempo of the seasons and not the quick tempo of motor cars. His attitude towards the world and to things is organic and not mechanical."

He, therefore, is likely to be a more successful administrator or interpreter of law in a country overful with agriculturists who has had the benefits of a rural environment and tasted the bitter experience of a farmer's life. For, his values of life, more than those of any other, are likely to correspond with those of men whose affairs he is called upon to administer. He alone can understand the psychology of the villager and appreciate his needs. He knows the motive-springs of the farmer and is aware of the handicaps of rural life. A hierarchy of services, composed, as at present, largely of sons of town-dwellers or shopkeepers, money-lenders or those who practise law and medicine, and big taluqdars or rentiers cannot, even with the best of intentions, govern this predominantly agricultural province in the interests of the masses. An officer drawn from these classes simply cannot put himself into the shoes of the common man or realize where the shoe pinches him. He has no sympathy with the feelings of the villager or the peasant. Rather, all his interests and sympathies lie the other way; they unconsciously lead him to take a view favourable to, and to the exercise of his power in the good of, the class from which he himself has risen. It would be straining human nature too much to expect an officer, or even a legislator, drawn from the above classes to bring to bear the correct outlook on the problems whose right solution often-times means the liquidation of, or, affects adversely, the classes to which he himself belongs. I am fortified in this view by the opinion of Hon'ble Shri Sampurnanand, Education Minister of the United Provinces:—

"Judges and legislators", he says, "need not be deliberately unfair; being human, they would find it almost impossible to transcend the limitations imposed upon them by their class affiliations and group interests" (*vide "The Individual and the State"*, pages 121-22).

Those who have any experience of law-courts know full well the difference between the attitude and behaviour of judicial officers according to the classes in society from which they have sprung. Given the same set of circumstances in a law suit, the reaction of a judge from a money-lending or taluqdar family differs greatly from that of a judge belonging to an agriculturist family. All those who have eyes to see must bewail with the author of the *The Punjab Peasant in Prosperity and in Debt*. (Darling, 1932) the havoc wrought by civil courts, presided as they have been by men "for the most part born in the town, knowing little of the village, and often allied with the money-lender by caste, if not by actual relationship." In a law court, particularly in a money suit, the agriculturist finds the scales heavily loaded against him; true, the non-agriculturists have ruled in their own interests. I will reinforce this point by a quotation from a British legal journal:

"It is increasingly recognized that if justices are to do their work satisfactorily, they must have not only a working knowledge of the law they administer, but also a realization of the difficulties and problems of the people whose cases they try. It is said that a bench of justices from an agricultural district would fail to understand the conditions prevailing in a mining town, or in an industrial centre, and that equally the townsmen would fail to appreciate the problems of an agricultural community."

The above conclusions are true of non-judicial officers as well. If one would take the trouble of sifting records, one would find glaring difference in the estimates of remission in times of drought or in cases of damage by hail-storm or flood submitted in exactly similar conditions by officers of the Canal and Revenue Departments, according as they come from the farming or non-farming classes; the latter simply do not possess the insight to realize the plight of the cultivator. Their economic bias—their whole mental make-up—stands in the way of giving a true picture. An important reason, *inter alia*, why the Agriculture Department has been a failure is the fact that it is officered largely by men whose families have had nothing to do with agriculture for generations past, to whom the life of the farmer in the village, before they entered the Department, was virtually a sealed book and who, therefore, make inefficient agriculturists, unimaginative organizers and unsympathetic officers.

There are officers in the Agriculture Department who cannot distinguish between a barley plant and a wheat plant and those in the Canal Department who do not know how many waterings and at what time a certain crop requires. Similar is the case with the Co-operative and Rural Development Departments in all the various branches of their activities, and, one is sorry to note, that even the advent of the Congress Ministry in 1937 did not improve matters in this respect. We would do well to realize, sooner the better, that men having roots in the countryside alone can make these and many other departments the success that they ought to be; that the interest which a candidate for public employment has in village life should be one of the basic principles upon which his selection should depend and the efficiency of an incumbent judged. Commenting on the "Co-operative Plan for the United Provinces" outlined by Hon'ble Dr. Kailas Nath Katju, Minister of Justice and Co-operation, Mr. Shridhar Misra, M.A., M. COM writes in the *Leader*, dated December 29, 1946 as follows:

"Finally, it may be pointed out that the method of recruitment of the co-operative staff also requires a great change. The city 'Sahebs' who might have been, if at all, to villages only on picnics or for sight-seeing, howsoever highly qualified, cannot share in the difficulties of the village people nor can win their favour or confidence, which is one of the most important essential requisites for a social reformer in the rural areas. Selection should, therefore, be made entirely from among those who belong to rural areas and still maintain their association with village life. It is only such persons who can prevail on the countryfolk without causing much disfavour or suspicion in respect of any movement for village re-organization".

I think the point, viz. that men's opinions are, on the average, determined by the sources of their incomes, will be conclusively settled when it is stated that members of the Congress Party in the last Punjab Legislative Assembly, almost all of whom represented the urban interests or non-agricultural classes, refused to support the Restitution of Mortgaged Lands Bills and the Agricultural Marketing Bill in spite of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad's specific instructions to that effect. Comment is useless; I leave it to the reader to guess the reasons for their refusal. When such is the conduct of people who claim to be public workers, who call themselves Congressmen and this in an age when our leaders have set their hearts on vivifying the villages and when establishment of the "Peasants' and Workers' Raj" is the avowed aim of all our political work, what shall we expect from ordinary people that usually secure the jobs in the various departments, who are neither public workers nor Congressmen and whose one avowed aim in life is the aggrandizement of self and the conscious or unconscious furtherance of the interest of their group? Marx had propagated the view that the class which controls the State will always use its power in its own interest. Though this view may be unjustified as an absolute principle—and there are few absolute principles in this world, if any—still it contains a very large measure of truth.

It is axiomatic to say that the policy and intentions of a Government can be carried out only by willing instruments who are themselves actuated by the spirit which inspires the efforts of the Government, as it is always the spirit that matters and not the letter which can be only too easily twisted. A large measure of discretion shall always vest in an officer how-so-much you may limit it by circulars or seek to control it by rules and sections. And it will be readily admitted that this discretion is exclusively governed by the psychology or personal equation of the officer concerned—his predilections, which, I must repeat, with honourable exceptions, are in turn determined, consciously or unconsciously, by his self-interest or the interest of his group. This personal or class equation, if I may say so, has been in the past, and still is, responsible for rendering infructuous many a beneficial legal provision and many a scheme framed by the various governments to relieve the masses or help them out of the slough into which they are sunk at present. It, therefore, behoves the popular Government to employ only such agents as will faithfully interpret their will to the people, i.e. recruit officers and men with a rural mentality in a far greater proportion than hitherto in this predominantly agricultural province.

Not only the administration of the province will be carried on in the desired spirit if the rural element in the public services is sufficiently strengthened, but, further, their efficiency will be greatly increased; it will give them a tone, a virility of character as nothing else will. For, a farmer's son by reason of the surroundings in which he is brought up, possesses strong nerves, an internal stability, a robustness of spirit and a capacity for administration which the son of a non-agriculturist or a town-dweller has no opportunity to cultivate or develop. Agriculture is a pursuit wherein contest with the forces of nature brings home to the peasant a daily lesson in patience and perseverance, and breeds in him a hardihood and an endurance, i.e. a character, denied to the followers of

other pursuits. An agriculturist's son, has, therefore; the strength and firmness to see decisions through, which the non-agriculturist often lacks; his hands and heart will not tremble in a crisis as those of a soft person from the city are likely to do. The peasant's son can be safely relied upon not only to give orders, but carry them out honestly and in the right spirit, as he is simpler and less sophisticated and less amenable to calls of ease and comfort, than his fellow-officer from the urban classes. He will not know how to deceive, or, at least, deceive successfully, as his father (for influence of heredity cannot be denied altogether) and he himself in his childhood were brought up in the company of those who do not tell lies, viz. land, plants and animals; whereas a non-agriculturist and his son in the work of earning their living have had almost exclusively to deal with fellowmen who in the attempt to over-reach one another, unfortunately, speak untruths and prevaricate. Further, a cultivator's son is, perhaps, less open to corruption than a city-dweller because his standard of life is comparatively lower and conforms more nearly to the average and therefore he requires less money than one brought up in the luxurious surroundings of a city life. It may be difficult to win an argument, but the voice of honest criticism should be silenced by the following opinion of the famous American '*Businessmen's Commission on Agriculture*', on the personnel whereof, as the name itself suggests, there was not a single farmer :

"From the social point of view there are potentialities in rural life which nothing else can supply. It is, perhaps, not clearly proved that the human social stuff which is developed in a rural environment is of better quality than that which issues from the city, though there is some reason to suspect that this is true" (p. 152.)

I shall add another unimpeachable testimony, viz. :

"As a result of his study of the influx of rural population to London, Sir Herbert Llewellyn Smith pointed out more than half a century ago that it is on the whole the most vigorous in body who leave the country for the town; and their valuable mental qualities are indicated by the fact that country-bred men are so often preferred in London for "employment requiring special standing and imposing special responsibility."

"London is kept up in bone and sinew by the country element flowing in..... It is the result of the conditions of life in great towns that muscular strength and energy get used up; the second generation of Londoners is of lower physique and has less power of persistent work than the first; and the third generation (where it exists) is lower than the second" (*vide* memorandum on '*Considerations of National Health*' submitted by William Ashley in July, 1923 to the British Agricultural Tribunal of Investigation).

Yet another argument : It is the tiller of the soil who bears the brunt of taxation. Being almost the only producer of wealth, all taxes are ultimately passed on to him. As for direct taxation, he has to pay rent or land revenue and canal dues to the State, though the land that he may possess be 5 bighas in extent and though no surplus may be left to him after the payment of the above dues. A non-cultivator, on the other hand, pays a tax to the Central Revenues only if his income exceeds Rs.2,000 a year. The difference in the burden of the two is too patent to need elaboration. This enormity, however, becomes aggravated when one realizes that by far the major portion of the money that comes out of the pocket of the farmer goes to pay the salaries of young men other than his own. Thus the moisture sucked up from the cultivator's farm, instead of returning to his cottage and his village, descends as fertilizing rain on the towns, in a way. Will it then be absurd to claim that at least a part of the taxes raised from the cultivators be returned to him in the form of salaries to his children ?

Reservation of public employments for sons of agriculturists can further be justified on the ground of their educational backwardness for which, not the agriculturists themselves, but the State or Society is responsible. All educational institutions other than primary are located in towns and, while at least secondary education should have been free and the concern of the Government, such prohibitive fees are charged and expenses of board and lodging in a town so high as are beyond the capacity of the poor farmer who can with difficulty keep his body and soul together. And in these institutions too, boys coming from rural parts are admitted only after all the candidates from the town have been provided for. Even institutions like the Government Agricultural College, Cawnpore, meant exclusively to serve the interest of villagers, or, agriculturists, are no exception.

Why? And this leads us to still another plea which can be advanced in favour of such reservation, viz. powers of patronage in 90 cases out of 100 lie in the hands of the townsmen or non-agriculturists; all key places are concentrated in the hands of those who have no relationship or community of interest with the farmer. Charity has always and everywhere begun at home; those in whose power it is to dispense favour will dispense it first to those with whom they are connected by ties of blood or of economic interest. Consequently, the villager's son has no such facilities for securing a job as are available to others and it is not seldom the case that candidates less qualified get a job because the former—villager's son—could not secure recommendations of the highly-placed. The present policy of open-door, therefore, has no meaning in most cases; it has no relation to facts and has to go.

It is for such reasons as these that I plead for reservation in favour of the class which has had far less share in the administration of the province than is its rightful due and whose case has, until now, gone by default.

Those who are opposed to this proposal may say that as agricultural classes are composed overwhelmingly of certain hereditary castes it amounts to communal representation in another form—an evil which has to be scotched rather than encouraged. To call the proposal communal would be, however, a deliberate attempt to mislead people. Nor does the objection come with good grace from those who monopolize the public services today. Communal representation is only that which is based on religion or on caste determined by birth. It may, if one likes, be called vocational, functional or occupational representation, but, by no stretch of imagination, communal. As long as man is man, differences shall always exist between one individual and another. Classes or groups performing different economic functions are a *sine qua non* of human society; mankind can never be brought to a dead uniformity in all respects, nor is it desirable to attempt such a consummation. It is for us, however, to say whether in the structure of our society or administration of our province or country, religion or birth shall be the determining or distinguishing factor as between man and man or his occupation and economic interest. Caste based on birth has had its day; it must be abolished. Even as originally contemplated, caste was determined by occupation (aptitude and qualities); it was much later on that it became stereotyped and confined to birth. It is a matter of common observation that people, irrespective of the hereditary castes they may belong to or the religious labels they may wear, if they are brought up in the same profession or similar conditions of life, react almost similarly and, because of their common economic ties, develop the same mentality common to the particular profession. However it may be, those at least who believe in class conflicts and have always advocated the rights of peasants and labourers as against their exploiters, should support every step including this proposal which safeguards the interest of the masses, and by seeking to swift the contact of differentiation from birth to occupation, in a way, accelerates the operation of modern forces. To convince the doubters of socialist hue I may quote the example of the USSR. There "until June 1931 even children of the intelligentsia—engineers, physicians, College professors, school teachers—though their parents were in the employ of the Government and enjoyed citizenship rights, were admitted to the University only after the quotas of peasants and factory-workers were filled" (vide "*The Great Offensive*", 1933, by Maurice Hindus).

Be it as may, it is not expedient, nor can it be justified by any standard of fairness, that Public Administration should be monopolized by members of certain non-agricultural classes or by the town-dwellers. Democracy means everywhere Government by the common people, not domination by certain hereditary ruling castes or classes, Hindus or Muslims, as in India hitherto. The claims of the various classes with different economic and social functions have, therefore, to be harmonized on a basis of equality; otherwise bitterness will remain and continue to increase.

The critic may retort that if you reserve public employment for cultivators, why not for carpenters, weavers, etc. etc. This criticism is born of ridicule. No principle of administrative convenience is absolute or applicable to all sorts of facts and circumstances; there is none which, when stretched, cannot be reduced to an absurdity, and the principle here advocated of reservation for rural or agricultural interests is no exception to the general rule. It is the agriculturists who form the masses—the demos—and fill the treasury, not the followers of professions above-mentioned. Also, as is apparent, I am not claiming more than what the agriculturists are fairly entitled to; the claim, if conceded, cannot work out injuriously to anybody. Let all the rest take their chance in the remaining 40 per cent. (I would, rather, that the departments of Agriculture and Co-operation should be manned exclusively by

agriculturist's sons. At the same time I may make it clear that the proportion of sixty per cent. that I deem reasonable and necessary by all canons of fairness and justice is not sacrosanct; even fifty per cent. may do, but not less in any case whatsoever. We should not forget in this connexion that this proposal, if accepted, will affect only future recruitment and it may take a generation to reach the proportion of fifty or sixty per cent. in the entire cadre of the services).

Theoreticians may argue that careers should be open to talent and talent alone, that by reservation in favour of any class efficiency will suffer as it will prevent the best men from coming in, that it is the essence of democracy to treat all men on terms of absolute equality, and so on. To such our reply is that talent does not consist in academic or bookish knowledge alone, that men should be adjudged "best" or otherwise only in relation to the task they are required to discharge and not merely be reference to a certain *a priori* uniform standard of answers to question-papers, and that in matters of public employment men should be treated equally only after the society or the democratic Government has afforded equal opportunities of instruction and progress to all men within its fold or under its charge. It would be patently unjust first to deny the vast mass of the people opportunities of advancement and enlightenment and then to justify their exclusion from Public Administration on the ground that they are inefficient. Uniform academic standards can with reason be applied only when equal facilities have been provided. Sticklers for efficiency should further note that I do not urge a complete disregard of what are called "educational qualifications"; only those sons of cultivators should be recruited as possess the minimum educational efficiency or have attained a certain qualifying standard. It will not be out of place to state here that a belief is held in certain quarters that sufficient young men from rural areas with requisite qualifications will not be forthcoming; firstly, this is baseless; secondly, if they will not, let then the unfilled jobs go to the other classes. I may say here that the argument about dearth of suitable candidates from the agriculturist classes is, or, can be, advanced by those alone who are conversant with eastern and central parts of the United Provinces only where the actual cultivator is very backward economically and culturally, where manual work is looked down upon by the heaven-born caste Hindus and therefore the tiller of the soil occupies a still lower scale in the social ladder than what he does in the western part.

An objection may also be raised that the proposal is impracticable inasmuch as in many cases it is difficult to determine whether a particular candidate is the son or dependant of a *bona fide* cultivator or not, as many people residing in towns or carrying on other business are also entered as agriculturists in the Patwari's papers. My reply is, firstly, that people who have returned cultivation as their subsidiary occupation at the time of the census do not exceed eight per cent. of the total and, secondly, that rules can be easily made for the guidance of appointing authority and amended as often as experience dictates. Statesmen all the world over have been set far more serious problems in the administration of their country and they have been satisfactorily solved. This difficulty was one of the main considerations which led the Punjab Government, which have reserved since 1938 sixty per cent. of public employment for agricultural classes, to define an agriculturist with reference to a person's caste or religion. I hope the United Provinces Government will not commit that mistake and yet do justice to the peasants by solving the problem in accordance with the requirements of national solidarity.

I know that town-folk and country-folk and all classes of this ancient land are bound together for good or ill and that it is a crime to make jealousies between them, but I regard it as a still greater crime to exclude, on any pretext whatsoever, the rural and agricultural classes—the bearers of the inheritance of our health and the source of our nation's youth—from their due share in the administration of their country, and the power and patronage that it carries with it. Because public service, while it solves the economic problem of hundreds of thousands of persons in a manner far more luxurious than is the lot of the average member of the public, is also an instrument of political power and supremacy. It would in no way interfere with, but advance, the cause of nationalism to let all sections of the people feel that administrative machinery is not the close preserve of the town-dwellers or non-agriculturists, or, education and all good things of life the monopoly of the few, but the common heritage of all the sons of the soil. The present disequilibrium has to go, therefore.

It may be that confirmed democrats or others with the tongue in their cheek may trump up some other objections than the above. There are, however, arguments and arguments; I can only say that the legitimate claims of the peasantry have too long been subordinated to the interests of the propertied and educated classes—the privileged, non-agriculturist classes; that, as it is the cultivator who pays everybody's interest and carries almost the entire burden of the provincial administration on his shoulders, all those who have any control over the destinies of this province and have the interest of the

cultivator at heart should use their influence in seeing that justice is done to him in the matter of recruitment to public services. "In the absence of action of this kind", as the author of the *Wheat Marketing Report* remarks in another connection, "expression of interest in the welfare of the cultivator may be regarded with scepticism". The author of the *Indian Peasant*, Dr. N. Gangulee, a member of the Royal Commission on Agriculture, also complains in the same vein—

"The urban element dominates the political life of the country. The voice of the cultivator is not heard in the land. Yet he represents nearly seventy-five per cent. of the Indian people. Everyone pays lip-service to the cultivator; save a section of the Congressmen drawn from the rural parts, no one is jealous of his interests."

It will help the cause that I advocate to state that I have said nothing novel or surprising; the Congress Government had themselves, in their last brief spell of office, accepted this principle of reserving a few jobs, say, one out of ten, to sons of "tenants" in the various departments. This reservation, however, is very meagre and, in addition to having been greatly abused, has had practically no influence on the tone of the administration. I plead for the extension of this principle, if it is not to remain a mere platitude and if it is really to benefit the peasantry, for the very reasons which led our leaders to think on these lines.

To conclude: only as late as January 29, 1947, the Hon'ble the Premier, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, in his inaugural address to the Development Conference of departmental officers held at Lucknow had laid stress on the psychological factor as occupying the first place in all human affairs. Speaking of the failure of our nation-building departments to achieve their end, he said:

"There have been air-tight compartments. Every department has been functioning in an artificial atmosphere and the poor simpleton called the villager has been bewildered by the conflicting appeals addressed to him mechanically by a number of individuals *none of whom seemed to him to be really sharing his own life or to be really imbued with a feeling of service to him.* You have to convince him that you and I are really his well-wishers and do intend to serve him. Unless and until you have done that, our appeal will fall flat; it will receive no response. And pardon me for saying that with your collars and pants and hats you cannot make a natural appeal.....I personally think that it is time that when our officers went out, instead of going to the inspection house they spent their night with the cultivator's family. It will certainly mean a certain amount of discomfort and inconvenience but it will make their task immensely easy. It is a petty, trivial and small thing, but we do not care to know how little trivial things really influence the psychological attitude of individuals and masses towards big insoluble problems. You just move a little switch and you see light blazing out all over a field for miles and miles. Similar is the case there. If you can just apply the switch rightly, you will see that light glowing forth all over and you will be surprised to see how easily you can capture his mind and his imagination."

The Premier has laid his finger at the right place; the disease from which our services are suffering has been correctly diagnosed. But I respectfully venture to point out that his appeal will generally fall flat on our officers, coming from the classes they do and nurtured in the environment they are. Only those who are brought up in the swaddling clothes of the cultivator will share his life or spend the night with him. Only those who are connected with him by ties of economic interest, by cultural bonds and psychological affinities will strike the right chord or turn on the switch that will illumine his life and dispel the darkness that surrounds him today. Only those can appeal to the cultivator's or villager's heart or touch his imagination whose reaction to things is similar to that of his, none else. We have, therefore, to go a step further, and not stop at exhortations; the source of recruitment has to be changed.

LUCKNOW:
March 21, 1947.

CHARAN SINGH.