

Resolution

From
Charan Singh

Bangalore,
December 28, 1959.

Agricultural production being a biological process, enlargement of the size of an undertaking does not lead to increased production in agriculture as it does or may in industry. There are no scientific methods or modern technologies which cannot be used on small farms, except tractors and other large machinery which, admittedly, we do not propose to use, at least, today. Nor can there be any economy of time and space in plant growth even if we use large machinery or if, instead of being operated by hand or animal, an agricultural implement is powered by oil or electric energy. On the contrary, inasmuch as incentives in a joint undertaking are weakened, a joint farm will lead to decrease in production. Also, increase in the size of farms does not increase employment opportunities. Rather, because of rationalisation of labour and all the pressures in a large undertaking being on the side of mechanisation, a joint farm will aggravate the unemployment problem. Nor will it inculcate or enhance a sense of responsibility in the members. Larger the size of an economic undertaking, greater the risk of a member or worker losing his responsibility in the multitude. Instead of relying on his own judgment, as a peasant farmer does, a member of a joint firm will lean upon the management. The few who are ambitious and unscrupulous, or hold office and authority over the farm will exploit the credulity, the simplicity and the ignorance of the many. This will result in emergence of authoritarian trends in the economic life of our people, which will ultimately infect politics.

Further, granting that these arguments are not valid and a joint cooperative farm is a very desirable development—a grand, attractive ideal—worth

The following is the text of resolution of which notice was given by Chaudhry Charan Singh formally at the Cogress Session at Bangalore on January, 1960, but did not secure a place in the agenda.

working for, but it is impracticable. And governments work for what is practicable today or in the near future, not for a Kingdom of God on earth in the distant future. Besides being a science and business, agriculture is a way of life which cannot, rather should not, be rushed. A joint cooperative farm seeks to effect a complete change in the farmer's way of life. Understandably enough, he sees in it a loss both of his identity and that of his farm. Hardly any farmer, therefore, is a candidate for its membership. Joining a cooperative farm means voluntarily giving up a great deal of one's individual authority in favour of a group with which one's ties are incomparably more tenuous than in a family. There must be an over-powering reason—a reason which he can make personal—that will make a person subordinate his economic interest to group interest. Such a reason once operated in Israel where alone in the wide, wide world two hundred and odd farms on a perfectly voluntary basis have been working successfully for some time. No such reason operates in India today. Even if, owing to fortuitous circumstances, a cooperative farm comes into existence, the centrifugal forces in a joint venture embracing the entire economic life of the members are so powerful that it will soon disintegrate.

Second :—The Nagpur Resolution as worded, would make it appear that service cooperatives are only a preliminary step to joint cooperative farms which are the ultimate consummation. This has created psychological barrier even to the establishment and success of service cooperatives about

whose role and utility there was absolutely no controversy. No farmer will ever set out on a course which, though otherwise welcome to him, is regarded by its sponsors themselves as a half-way house to a destination where he does not want to arrive at all.

Third :—Advocacy of the joint cooperative farm as our ideal of a social and economic organisation for the countryside, is doing immense harm to Congress. It creates an apprehension among the farmers, which is being exploited by our political opponents to their great advantage. Being a democratic party, we can fail to take notice of people's reactions only at our peril.

Therefore, instead of campaigning for universal acceptance of the joint cooperative farm as the only solution of our problems in the rural sector, we would do better, as the Prime Minister himself has said, on more than one occasion, to promote and assist voluntary experiments wherever they are possible and truly understood by those engaged in them. If successful, they will inevitably find imitators, and will multiply. Farms which came into existence as a result of official cajolery and persuasion, and are nurtured by loans and subsidies, will remain a hot-house growth and soon wither away, leading

to great economic wastage, frustration and loss of valuable time.

As a national policy we have to confine ourselves to explaining to the farmers the advantages that service cooperatives or pooling of financial resources and cooperation in all non-farm activities, will bring. Our aim must be the creation or maintenance of independent existences bound together with the principle of co-operation, rejecting both economic anarchy and collectivism. It is such a system in Japan and Europe that has resulted in greater production per acre than where land and, therefore labour also have been pooled. Indeed, looking to the deficiency of our human factor and other social and economic conditions, even the service cooperatives will take decades or more to establish or spring up as an organic growth. A high percentage of the present-day societies are not genuine or truly cooperative. They are borrowers' societies disbursing government credit or controlled by government servants. We need to hasten slowly, therefore. Whether cooperative farms will or will not follow upon the success of service cooperatives, is not our concern at all, but that of the farmers alone.

Yours sincerely,
Charan Singh.

"Be wiser than other people if you can, but do not tell them so."

—Lord Chesterfield.

Sampurnanand Exposed

From
Charan Singh

Vidhan Bhavan,
Lucknow.
March 13, 1959.

My dear Panditji,

It is with great diffidence that I write this letter. I do so because in spite of the fact that you were kind enough that day to spare more than an hour for a talk with me, the picture that I gave you remained incomplete.

To begin with, Dr. Sampurnanand's lack of knowledge of matters relating to administration is extreme. He does not even know what subjects fall within the jurisdiction of a particular department. In fact, he is not conversant with the working of the departments at all. Particularly, he has little or no inkling how the official machinery works at the village level. His reply to the letter you wrote after the General Election in 1957 about acquisition of cultivators' lands by the Irrigation Department without payment of compensation, is only one instance in point. No Minister or Chief Minister who knows anything about the countryside would have believed the information on which the reply was based.

For another instance, I may point to his statement in the Assembly on August, 12, 1957, that the question of retention or otherwise of the posts of District Magistrates was engaging the attention of Government. The fact was that only the District Boards or Councils Bill was under examination of the Cabinet, and the question of abolition of the District Officers did not fall for consideration at all, nor was the abolition a practicable proposition in our country, at least, for 25 years to come.

He has been a member of the Cabinet since 1938 and Chief Minister since 1954, yet he does not know that flood relief is a matter concerning the Revenue and not the Irrigation Department, that remission of revenue is a matter concerning the Revenue and not the Agriculture Department, that cane-cess falls within the purview of the Industries and not the Agriculture Department and that the Pilibhit-cum-Lakhimpur Colonization scheme costing some eighty lakhs of rupees which is under implementation since 1955, is the responsibility of the Agriculture and not the Revenue Department.

In the circumstances, the guidance which he can give to the Ministers or the respect which he can command among officers can well be imagined.

This would not have mattered much had he a desire to understand things. It is seldom that he applies his mind to the proposals that are made by the Chief Secretary or other officers. He does not put a single question to district officers when they go to see him or when he goes to districts. He does not attend even important Assembly debates and has, more than once, been found reading one book or another during debates on no-confidence and adjournment motions. He comes to his office rarely, if ever, when the Assembly is not in session, and does not always return to office in the afternoon, even when it is in session.

The food situation began to worsen since the beginning of June, 1958, and had become very grave by mid-July, but the matter was not discussed in either of the two Cabinet meetings, which were held during this period, viz., on June 26 and July 19. It was at my instance that the matter was

brought before the Cabinet on July 21 and for the second time in the last week of August, although Food was not my charge. Food is the prime necessity of man and, therefore, the most vital subject for a Government yet our Chief Minister, divorced from realities of life and absorbed in non-worldly pursuits, had little or no realization of this truth.

I have suggested to him about a dozen times since May, 1957, to hold a detailed discussion with our experts and other officers about all questions concerning agricultural production, but he has not found time nor, in spite of several requests, has he cared to visit any of the tahsils, where consolidation operations are under way.

The fact of the matter is that his interest lies in things, which have no concern with administration and have no bearing on economic conditions of the State. His reviews or articles to the press during the last twenty months, dealing with astrology, space travel, flying saucers and Badrinath, will bear ample testimony to this statement of mine.

He has no contact with the masses. He does not know their psychology and does not care to understand their needs. I do not remember any instance where he has addressed a mass meeting in the countryside for even half an hour. We have had some eleven bye-elections since March, 1957, but except in his home district, he did not go to address a single public meeting in any of these constituencies. Nor has he cared to know what forces were arrayed against a particular Congress candidate. Not only this: one should not be surprised if, knowing how little influence he enjoys with the people, our Congress workers themselves have not cared to bother him. So that success or failure of a Congress candidate is not his headache. His Chief Ministership is assured for the next three years, he thinks. Panditji, you will pardon me if I say that this may be anything but is far from leadership.

It is from lack of confidence in the masses that the bye-election in a Varanasi constituency,

which became due owing to Smt. Sajjan Devi's death in the beginning of January this year, is being postponed to November next. And in order that the real reason may not become apparent, one or two other bye-elections are being postponed similarly. But it is not thus that nemesis to Congress in the U. P. can be averted for long.

He does not feel the courage in himself to face the Party at the PCC. He made no reply in the PCC in July, 1957, when Government's decision on the retirement age was openly questioned. He kept silent, for he was not confident that he could convince the PCC of the reasonableness of the decision. Again, when in the meeting of the PCC on November 3 a motion tabled by 58 members demanded that the District Boards should continue to function till the proposed District Councils were constituted and not be replaced by ad hoc bodies under the chairmanship of the District Magistrates, Dr. Sampurnanand twice declared emphatically that Govt. had not till then taken any decision about the interim arrangement. Now to put it mildly, this was an incorrect statement made in utter contradiction of a decision of the Council of Ministers taken after full discussion on October 6 preceding. He made this statement obviously because he was not sure that he would be able to carry the PCC with him.

Inasmuch as he lacks self-confidence, he shirks taking action against members of the Congress Legislature Party, who may be guilty of indiscipline or any malpractice. Instances have been brought to his notice but he has slept on them all.

He is an escapist in the true sense of the term. He is prepared to adjourn the Assembly on the merest pretext, so that the inconvenient presence of members of the Legislature may be avoided as far as possible. Meetings of the Congress Party have become a rare phenomenon.

From this lack of self-confidence born of want of contact with the masses or the Congressmen in general, stems his diffidence in dealing with the Opposition parties. He ordered the release of Socialist satyagrahis in June, 1957, when the move-

ment for removal of statues and use of Hindi had almost fizzled out. Later on, in December, 1957, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia was released although the High Court had decided against him and he had appealed to the Supreme Court. The latter made adverse remarks against the State Government on this score, while passing the release order.

Once, Sri Genda Singh, a P.S.P. M.L.A., gave him an ultimatum that unless certain demands of his were conceded, he will go on an indefinite fast (not a fast unto death). The Chief Minister rejected the demands categorically. When, the fast ran into a week, he categorically accepted them.

As a recent instance, he had refused originally even to hold talks with the Opposition leaders on the food problem (which any Chief Minister would or should have agreed to) and made brave speeches about crushing the satyagraha, if any, was started. But the satyagraha had hardly lasted a week, when he entered into negotiations with the Opposition Leader, Sri Triloki Singh, and conceded their main demand regarding the constitution of a Food Committee. This meant that, instead of holding talks for a day or two, a semi-permanent committee was conceded, and in the bargain, 9,000 persons, who went to jail; were offered as workers to the Opposition parties on a platter! His assessment of the political forces or psychology of the people is rarely correct.

He always strains himself to conciliate the opposition leaders and there is a taunt in the PSP circles that their leader, Sri Triloki Singh, is nearer to Dr. Sampurnanand than many of his own colleagues. As an instance of how he can go out of his way to conciliate a member of the opposition : one, Sri Baldeo Singh, MLA from Gonda, was wanted for murder. He was not arrested for a month or so. The matter came to the notice of Congress President Sri Dhebar, when he visited the district in June, 1957. Sri Dhebar brought this matter to the notice of the Home Minister and it was after this that Sri Baldeo Singh was arrested. The lower courts refused bail. He went in appeal. When the matter came up before the High Court, bail was again refused,

but the matter was re-opened the same afternoon at the instance of the Government Advocate, who said that he had instructions from State Government not to oppose the bail. The Judge wrote out the release order making caustic remarks against the Government. The instructions to the Government Advocate were issued at the express instance of our Chief Minister.

In absence of hard work and a missionary zeal for economic uplift of the masses that is expected of a Chief Minister, particularly, in this poor State, Dr. Sampurnanand had to resort to steps which have little or no substance but have a propaganda value. There are several examples : Social Welfare Department and old Age Pensions are only two. 'Cultural functions' mostly at the expence of the State exchequer are the order of the day in Lucknow. The less said about them, the better. But these functions are passion with our Chief Minister. In keeping with this attitude, he had reduced office time by half an hour.

He finds in the Central Government an easy scapegoat for all the ills the State suffers from. Perhaps, there is not a single major speech which he may have delivered since he took over as Chief Minister which does not contain an attack, veiled or otherwise, on the Central Government.

The Chief Minister may or may not have any interest in administration, yet the machine has to be kept going. So, direction of affairs has passed almost entirely into hands of the bureaucracy. If you ask any Congress legislator, he will unhesitatingly testify to this unwelcome development in U. P. during the last four years. Only a year before, when Sri A.N. Jha was Chief Secretary, it was to him that every officer and even almost every public man looked for decisions. One instance is very typical of his attitude towards the bureaucracy. A Member of the Legislative Council made certain allegations against this officer during the course of a debate. Dr. Sampurnanand who rarely goes to the Council went to the House and apologised to the Chief Secretary in abject terms for allegations which are not all known to be incorrect and some of which even the officer himself would not deny.

He has not only allowed the bureaucracy to increase its powers and its privileges, but has also lacked courage to take notice of cases of corruption. The housing scandal in which several officers constructed houses even without getting their plans approved by the Municipal Board, apart from doubtful deals about purchase of land and controlled materials like cement and iron in large quantities, is another instance in point. Cases of corruption of highest officers have come or been brought to his notice but almost invariably either they have been let off completely or let off lightly. Perhaps, this approach of his is due to the fact that he feels a lack of moral authority within himself.

There is a long list of acts of nepotism. Facts are so glaring that they strike everybody's notice and draw everybody's attention. To give only one example : Sri Rameshwar Sahai Sinha, an ex-MLA at the time, who was appointed by him as an Officer on Special Duty in connection with primary education text-books during his term as Education Minister, 1946-51, had to be removed owing to serious allegations against him and was refused a Congress ticket for membership of the Legislature in 1952. He was appointed as an Officer on Special Duty, Political Pensions, immediately Dr. Sampurnanand took over as Chief Minister. Standards of administration in the State slumped by yards the day this appointment was made. I refrain from quoting other instances because names will have to be mentioned which perhaps, will not be in good taste.

His views on caste—the greatest bane of our public life—are archaic. To give one illustration : In the time of Pantji in 1954 we had lost several bye-elections in succession. The State Ministers met to discuss the reasons why. Dr. Sampurnanand submitted a note which contains his views on the subject. The note discloses an outlook or attitude towards our social and economic problems which do little honour to a public man. The memory of how caste was pressed into service in his election to the Assembly in March, 1957, must be still fresh in minds of the people of Varanasi.

The Chief Minister does not know how to deal with his colleagues. He rarely holds consultation

with them and is an adept in rubbing them on the wrong side. No feeling of affection or respect or even kinship exists between most of his colleagues and himself. He will not draw them to himself either by his behaviour or by his understanding of public questions. He is unable to infuse a spirit of hard work and sacrifice in his colleagues or public workers.

He not only does not know his own mind and has gone back on his own decisions: decisions of the Cabinet have been rescinded without putting the matter before the Cabinet again. There are various instances in which he has taken a decision on very important matters without, taking his colleagues into confidence. He had ordered the release of Socialist satyagrahis, conceded the demand of Sri Genda Singh and ordered the release of Dr. Lohia all on his own. In the matter of the formation of the Food Committee constituted after the recent food agitation, he had assured the Party and his colleagues that no negotiations were under way and that, at least, no Food Committee in the circumstances of the State was under contemplation. Yet negotiations were, in fact, carried on and a Food Committee was appointed. A Cabinet decision on the disbandment of Prantiya Rakshak Dal in 1957 which had been announced in the Press, was nullified by him a few days later through an announcement in the Assembly. Dates of the meetings of the Assembly have often been changed without reference to the Cabinet. A Cabinet decision on amalgamation of the two cadres of the Panchayat Raj Secretary and the Lekhpal, which had been taken in November 1953, during the days of Pantji but could not be implemented in his time because elections to the panchayats had still to be held has not been put into effect. He does not realize the confusion in administration and public mind that exists at the village level on this account.

Very recently, viz., on February 9, he wanted the Cabinet to commit itself to supplying 51000 Kilowatt of electric energy from the Rihand to Birlas for running an aluminium plant, only on the basis of a verbal reference, without the matter being

included in the agenda or a note on the subject. I hold the portfolio of Power, but had not been consulted. The Rihand, which will cost Rs. 46 crores to the public exchequer, will be generating only 1,03,000 Kw. So that a gift of an investment of Rs. 23 crores to one person was sought to be made by the Chief Minister all on his own or on the strength of casual references in the Cabinet. Incidentally, with 40,000 Kw. reserved for railways and 10,300 Kw. for Madhya Pradesh, practically no energy, or only 1,500 Kw., will be left for consumption by the public (at least for three years, when the railways will release 15,000 Kws.) — and this when he had made a political issue of the Rihand Dam with the Planning Commission and the Centre and had fed the people of the eastern districts for a long time on hopes of plenty of material prosperity after the Dam had materialised.

Financially, the State is almost on the verge of bankruptcy. Jobs are being multiplied with practically little work to perform so that bureaucracy has expanded unduly. My meaning will become apparent when it is known that out of the budgeted income of Rs. 121 crores for 1959-60 — of which, by the way, looking from past experience, not more than Rs. 118 crores or so are likely to be spent— Rs. 46.80 crores will be absorbed by salaries and various allowances, Rs. 2.43 crores by pensions, and Rs. 19.19 crores by debt charges. Of the contingencies, Rs. 2.70 crores will be spent on office buildings, furniture, stationery and other amenities concomitant with expansion of the services. So that not much, or only Rs. (118-71)=47 crores or roughly 40 per cent remains that can be spent on development of the State.

This situation has been reached, that is, expenditure has mounted up and bureaucracy multiplied, simply because the Chief Minister is imbued with a squandermania. The Finance Department is circumvented and its advice ignored only too often. What importance he attaches to the financial interest of the State will be clear from the fact that an Economy Committee, which was appointed under the chairmanship of Sri Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim in 1954, could not submit its report till 1958, and that

too only when I raked up the question in June 1957. Neither the Chief Minister, nor the Finance Minister, was worried over the delay.

The prestige of the administration and the Congress in a State or the country hinges largely on the faith that people repose in the words of its chief spokesman and leader. But I must be excused for saying that, owing to the way Dr. Sampurnanand has conducted himself, this faith is diminishing day by day. One example has already been referred to, viz., that about the decision about the Interim District Council. Incidentally, it was this that was the immediate cause of my resignation in November, 1957.

Second, the way that he handled the matter of Sri Algu Rai Shastri's nomination by the party to the Chairmanship of the Legislative Council was a peculiar one. He had assured Shastriji of his full support; in fact, he himself had already sent up his name to the Governor for working Chairmanship. His conduct and his specific words had lulled Shastriji into a sense of security. The way that he handled the matter has, perhaps, already been related to you by Shastriji himself. No man even in the street would have let down a friend or a colleague in the manner Dr. Sampurnanand let down Shastriji.

The question arises—why this soft corner for Sri S. P. Jain? Tongues are wagging—whether with reason or without reason, is not for me to say. Similarly, I will not refer to other things which reflect on other members of Government, but are on everybody's lips and make congressmen hang down their heads in sorrow.

I have dealt only with the attitude, interests and capacities of the Chief Minister, and not with the deplorable state to which the administration has been reduced. But to refer only to one department, viz., the Police : law and order is at the lowest ebb. Four Legislators have been murdered in the State during the last four or five years. There was a greater sense of security in the public mind during the British days than today. Reasons are obvious. It is Dr. Sampurnanand who held the portfolio (home)

from 1951 to 1961 in which year he made it over to Sri Kamlapati Tripathi. A junior Officer, Sri M. S. Mathur, was appointed an I. G., after superseding six D. I. Gs. and a superseded officer was made a D. I. G. Under these conditions, appeals for integrity and hard work made to police officers fall on deaf ears.

It is not without great emotional strain that I have penned these lines to you. But every statement that has been made here can be backed up by specific instances, if and when you ask for them.

Such are the affairs today in the State of Uttar Pradesh. Maybe, I am wrong in any one particular or two, or have laid undue emphasis on certain aspects of the situation. But broadly, the picture is correct. The name of Congress and its Government in U. P. is mud. Things will not improve simply if we refuse to take notice of them. There is utter lack of leadership in the State. I leave it now to you—to you, on whom the supreme responsibility both in the Congress and the administration of the country lies—to do what you consider to be proper or in public interest.

Two things more. You very discreetly said that day that you had received complaints almost against every Minister. But a complaint may be both true or untrue: it may be about an error of judgment or a grave breach of public standards. All I will plead is that the man concerned should be given an opportunity of defence before you form an opinion. In politics or administration any attempt to improve matters will involve personalities, and can, therefore, be easily interpreted as a 'struggle for power'. All I can say is that when I had resigned in disgust as long ago as in November, 1957, I made no calculations in terms of personal gain or loss. (By the way, I did not withdraw my resignation; only Dr. Sampurnanand chose to treat it as non-existent). Nor have I entered into any pact or deal with anybody. Only circumstances have forced others to come round to my point of view, which I have held since, rather, before Dr. Sampurnanand became the Chief Minister. If, however, Congress interest so demands or you so

feel, I need only an indication and I will get out of the legislature altogether. Once I begin to feel that I am not wanted or am not able to help in building a house in U. P. in accordance with the dream that we used to conjure up in pre-independence days, I will have no zest left in public life and will make haste to quit.

With regards,

I am,
Yours

Charan Singh

Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru,
Prime Minister of India,
New Delhi.

From
Jawaharlal Nehru
No. 688/PMH/59

Prime Minister's House
New Delhi
21 March, 1959

My dear Charan Singh,

Your letter dated March 13th reached me a few days ago. It is a very long letter, but I have read it carefully. As a matter of fact, your letter is more or less a repetition of what you had said to me when I met you in Lucknow.

I have some knowledge, though necessarily incomplete, of conditions in Uttar Pradesh as in other States and, of course, the Centre. There are innumerable matters with which I am not satisfied and some distress me greatly.

We function in a country which, with all its many virtues, is socially and economically backward, and we suffer the consequences of this backwardness in whatever we might do. Individuals count, of course, but the real way to understand a situation is not so much through individuals, but through more basic causes. I find that the main burden of your argument is a complaint about Sampurnanandji.

I confess I do not like an argument being based almost entirely on personal complaints even though some of those complaints might be justified. I suppose it is not difficult to draw up some kind of an indictment of the best of our colleagues. I have known Sampurnanandji for a very long time, and though I have not worked with him in a Government, he has been my colleague in many activities. So to some extent, I have got to know him—I do not agree with some of his views and attitudes, at the same time, I have a good deal of respect for him. He is a man of high intelligence, even though he might sometimes direct his intelligence into channels which are not very fruitful. He has the failing of an intellectual, which comes to his way sometimes. His very virtue in trying to keep apart from personal groups has come in his way. I could easily go on writing about his or any other persons good points and failings. That does not help much. We have to take persons as they are and judge situations as they are.

I am afraid you have been acting recently in a manner which I consider quite wrong. This has put you in a very difficult position, and I can well understand your desire to resign from the Ministership. Indeed, a situation was created when you made it clear that either Sampurnanandji had to go or you had to go. It was peculiarly unfortunate that you should have acted in this manner, while you were a colleague of Sampurnanandji in his Cabinet. That set a bad example and reacted against you in the minds of many people.

You have been in the U. P. Cabinet for many years. It seems odd that all this accumulation of complaints should come to a head just at this stage. Further, it is equally odd that you should have openly allied yourself with people who, in your opinion, were completely in the wrong. When you saw me you laid great stress on your utter disagreement with and disapproval of some people. Yet you did not find it too difficult to join up with them. To say that they had come round to your views, is hardly an adequate example.

I do not think it will serve any particular purpose for you and me to have an argument about

these matters. Something has happened or has been done, which cannot be called back, and we have to face the consequences. Whatever my difference may be with your views, I have a high opinion of your capacity for good work, if only this does not get entangled with rivalries and personal animosities. I hope that opportunities of such good work will come to you. I would welcome that. The problems we have to face are too big for us to lose ourselves in smaller matters.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru.

From
Sampurnanand

Camp New Delhi,
April 5, 1959.

My dear Charan Singhji,

I have already acknowledged the letter received from you on the 2nd. It seems to me that no useful purpose will be served by me discussing the reasons you have advanced for your resignation. The political events, which have been happening in Uttar Pradesh for the last few months, are public property and much, before the date on which you tendered your resignation, everyone had come to feel that it would not be possible for you and me to continue for long to be members of the same council of Ministers. The advice given to you by the Prime Minister was the only one which the logic of events could have permitted in the circumstances.

I am not sure how far the results of the Meerut by-election will be influenced by your continuing to remain in the Ministry but, I have no desire to prejudice the chances of the Congress candidate and shall have no objection to your offer to continuing in office till the 19th. I appreciate your offer to pilot the Kumoan Zamindari Abolition Bill in the Assembly, but it seems to me it would be wrong on my part to accept the offer. In any case, someone

else will have to implement the provisions of the Bill when it becomes an Act. It is only proper that this person your successor, should be associated with the measure from the beginning. Moreover, a Minister about whom it is known that he will not now continue in office cannot fully pull his weight whether with the official machinery or with the opposition. It would be undesirable to create or prolong a situation which cannot be embarrassing for all concerned. I propose, therefore, to advise the Governor to accept your resignation with effect from the afternoon of April 20. Let me hope this will suit you.

I trust that I shall always continue to receive from you the fullest help and cooperation in the furtherance of all schemes of public good.

Yours sincerely,
Sampurnanand.

Sri Charan Singh,
Minister for Revenue,
Uttar Pradesh,
Lucknow.

From
Jawaharlal Nehru

No. 244-PMO/59
New Delhi
April 22, 1959

My dear Charan Singh,

I am sorry for the delay in answering your letter of April 3rd. I have been terribly busy and for about a week I was away from Delhi.

It is clear from your letter that you were in no way responsible for the items of news that appeared in the Times of India or other papers. Since, how-

ever this, news-item had appeared there, I felt I should write to you. There is no question of my being in an angry mood.

I do not understand how Chaturbhuj Sharma had misunderstood me. I cannot remember, of course, what exactly I said to him. Probably what I said was that I hoped that you will continue to do good work in some form or other. That, indeed, is my wish.

Quite apart from the merits of the various points that have been raised in connection with this matter, I think that the general attitude you took up made it very difficult, and indeed impossible, for you to continue in the Ministry. In fact, you had told me so yourself. You had taken a step which inevitably led either to your leaving the Ministry or the whole Ministry going and something new taking its place.

It is thus not a question of my appreciating or not what you told me about conditions in Uttar Pradesh. I am not at all happy about those conditions. But you made it a personal equation. Personal matters, of course, count and one has to balance many factors. Often we have to choose between what is considered the lesser evil. None of us is above criticism or can pretend to be completely right.

You refer, at the end of your letter, to a feeling that because of your views on certain questions, you have been labouring under a handicap. I take it you are referring to Joint Cooperative cultivation. I do not think this particular matter really affected any decision, though it may be that unconsciously it created an impression.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru.

Shri Charan Singh,
Minister,
Government of Uttar Pradesh,
Lucknow.

From

Chief Minister,
Uttar Pradesh.

Lucknow
April 22, 1959.

My dear Charan Singh,

The Governor informed me over the phone sometime ago that he has been pleased to accept your resignation with effect from today.

This puts an end to the chapter of your association for several years as member of the U. P. Government. It is unfortunate that our relations of late have not been as happy as I might wished, but I have every hope that we shall be able to forget all unpleasant memories and work together in the service of the Congress and the country. Devotion to the well-being of Uttar Pradesh demands the loyal and united service of everyone of us and you can always count upon me, as I am sure I can count upon you, for the fullest cooperation in the attainment of our common objective.

With regards.

Your sincerely,
Sampurnanand

Shri Charan Singh,
Minister for Revenue,
Uttar Pradesh,
Lucknow.

From
Chandra Bhanu Gupta

Rejendra Mansion,
Pandariba,
Lucknow.
19.8.1959

My dear Charan Singh Ji

I had a telephonic talk with the Congress President Smt. Indira Gandhi at about 9 P. M. this night. It is desired that the statement you are going to make in the Legislative Assembly may not be made in the interest of the Party and the Organisation to which we belong. She authorises me to

communicate this to you and suggest that the statement be sent to her instead for any action that may be necessary. Hope you will appreciate it and agree to it.

Yours sincerely,
C. B. Gupta

Shri Charan Singh,
3, La-Place,
Lucknow.

From
Pt. Govind Ballabh Pant

Home Minister
India
New Delhi,
July 22, 1960.

My dear Charan Singh,

I was looking forward to your arrival here on the 21st but your letter of 16th has deprived me of that opportunity and has also caused me a mixed feeling of disappointment and concern. The line that you chose some weeks ago as a result of your careful study of the situation should not be given up. Evidently you were guided into adopting it in the larger interest and needs of the state and the Congress. In such cases patience and perseverance are necessary and one should not give way to a feeling of dismay because of any delay in the realisation of the expected results.

I do not exactly know when I shall be going to Assam. Jawaharlalji has just returned from an extensive tour of the Assam State and the situation there has been almost restored to normal. I would still like to go to Assam some time but it is difficult to fix any date as the Lok Sabha is meeting on the 1st of August and I have many other questions to attend to during the interval.

Hope you and your family are all well.

With good wishes,

Yours sincerely,
Govind Ballabh Pant

Shri Charan Singh,
La Place,
Shanajaf Road,
Lucknow,

On Congress In-Fighting

From
Charan Singh

Lucknow,
September 11, 1960,

My dear Pandit Ji,

Your letter dated September 4, redirected from Meerut, was delivered to me here on Sept. 8. I had left for Lucknow on September 5.

I did not come to Delhi, because in this connection I find myself torn between two opposite pulls or considerations. My heart tells me that I should see you — you who love Uttar Pradesh so well and have also the power to set things right at Lucknow. Not only that I regard my past association with you as a privilege which I will cherish all my life, and I also know that I firmly occupy a corner in your heart. But, at the same time, my experience tells me that despite your best wishes you have your own difficulties. Therefore, it would seem to be no use bothering you too frequently. So, as in July last it is this latter feeling which prevailed, and I came back without seeing you.

It is the doings of the State Government that matter to the people and bring good or bad name to Congress, not the PCC or its composition. If the Ministerialists capture the PCC, obviously they will go their old way with redoubled vigour, and administration will further deteriorate. If the other group wins, prestige of the State Government will go down still further in the eyes of the people. In either case, the present breach between Congressmen and Congressmen all over the State will only

widen. So that whichever of the groups, which, even by disinterested accounts, are evenly balanced, wins, Congress as a whole will definitely lose. The proposal, that I mooted with you, was an honourable way out for all those who might feel concerned about the good name of Congress and its Government.

Another thing is also equally clear. Whoever might actually be responsible for the conflict for which frantic preparations are being made, people will not spare you either. For, as everybody in the country knows, the present Ministry stays because of your support.

The election of office-bearers of Meerut DCC is over. I went there on August 31, and scraped through with a majority of eight (including four invalid votes). You may well ask—why so slender a majority? The reasons are simply stated. All the office-bearers of the DCC were, after my resignation, gradually won over by the Ministers. And it is they who conducted and manoeuvred the election from the Village Committees upwards. The General Secretary as well as one of the Secretaries, whom I continued to trust till the very last, were made members of loan distributing bodies in the industries Department at the State level. The DCC office became a centre of distribution of permits and licences — a place where transfer of officials was made and un-made, where recommendations even in judicial cases were arranged, etc. Since May, 1959, the General Secretary, Shri Uma Datt Sharma, who was the Ministerialist candidate for presidentship of the DCC in opposition to Shri Fateh Singh Rana, could

order about the Police, Cane, Co-operative, Industries, Civil Supplies, Irrigation and other departmental officials in the district as he pleased. The unwritten orders from Lucknow were that in Meerut it was Uma Dutt who represented the Government.

Nothing was left to chance by the Ministers to ensure a victory on September 4. It is understood an elephant with a band was kept in readiness to celebrate the victory by way of a procession in the city. Meerut was a prestige district and had to be annexed at all costs—the word had gone forth from Ministerial seats of power. Money was no consideration: promises of honorary magistracy and membership of the Legislature were ordinary matters. It is success alone that counted, not the means or costs it might involve. Shrimati Prakashvati Sood told me that at one stage she seriously thought of running up to you in order that you might come over to Meerut to witness how the darlings of the U. P. State Government and their supporters were indulging in wine-drinking etc.

The Prime Minister had, in October or November last, been pleased to make certain remarks about me in a Congress Worker's meeting in Meerut. These remarks were now completely twisted and exploited. Some time ago the Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon, made enquiries from a Congress worker about the Meerut Congress election and volunteered to him that the Prime Minister was displeased with me (By the way, I do not think I have done anything to deserve this displeasure. Perhaps, in any other country or political party the Leader would have, instead, hugged me to his bosom. I was an ordinary follower, not a rival). As Shri Shah Nawaz Sahib himself vouchsafed to a friend on the phone, it was Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim Sahib who prevented him from coming to Meerut in order to cast his vote. It seems Hafiz Sahib has not yet forgotten the role that he ascribes to me in dropping of Parliamentary Secretaries, Mahfooz-ul-Rahman of Bahraich and Latafat Hussain of Moradabad. Shri Krishna Chandra, Sharma, M. P., who, day in and day out, used to condemn Uma Dutt, was persuaded

by somebody not to cast his vote in favour of Rana Ji. Shri Din Dayal Sharma, M. L. A., Bulandshahr, who came to Meerut in order to canvass for Uma Dutt, is reported to have used your name to further his cause (I told everybody, however, that you would feel genuinely pained if Rana Ji lost).

In view of these circumstances and others it is a miracle, indeed, that we won at all: I can assert without fear of contradiction that not a single lapse of the slightest sort can be attributed to Rana Ji and his supporters. We were prepared to risk a defeat, rather than do a single act of which any Congressman, even in the old, old days of idealism, would have been ashamed of.

Shri Uma Dutt Sharma and his band now propose on the pattern of 'Mass Contact Committee' set up in Varanasi to occupy a room in the Congress office or, in the alternative, hire a house and carry on their activities under the name of "Congress Workers Club". They have at their disposal an amount of about Rs. 33,030 deposited in a bank, which was collected for them by the Deputy Minister of Industries, Shri H. N. Bahuguna, about six weeks ago. In spite of these and other funds at their disposal Shri Uma Dutt Sharma and his colleagues so managed or mis-managed things that DCC is under a debt of several thousand of rupees; the DCC jeep was sold off; the telephone stands disconnected, and salary of the staff for the last five months remain unpaid.

Harkhyal Singh was ill. So he could not go to Delhi to see you. I have written to him to see you as soon as he is fit enough to travel. He is financially a broken man.

May be, I have used a word or two which I should not have used, I hope you will be indulgent as ever.

With highest regards,

I am,
Yours sincerely,
Charan Singh

Pt. Govind Ballabh Pant,
Home Minister,
Govt. of India,
New Delhi.

From

Charan Singh

My dear Pandit Ji,

I understand you have been told that my friends and I spent a huge amount over the D. C. C. elections in Meerut. The facts, however, are all the other way round. The odds we had to contend with, will be clear from a letter which I wrote to Pant Ji in September (copy enclosed). I would request you to be good enough to go through it.

The story which has reached you is of a piece with those which have led you to form more than one wrong impression about me. If it is the military authorities which are your source, then it appears to me that there is some confusion about the parties. As my misfortune has it, you may perhaps not like to accept my version. I would, therefore, only suggest that you may be pleased to have an inquiry made through any of the so many agencies at your disposal. To give only one example of the way, the election was fought on our side : The then President of the D. C. C. had so managed things that 14 members elected to the D. C. C. out of 29 in his tahsil came from his own caste and relations. He sent me word that, provided I promised to recommend him for Congress ticket to a seat in the Legislature in 1962, there will be no contest at all in the D. C. C. elections. I rejected the suggestion without a moment's thought.

Now that I am writing to you after such a long time, I would have very much liked to refer to things which constitute my offences in your eyes. But, lest I be misunderstood and also knowing that in such matters arguments are of little avail, I refrain. I have suffered in silence and choose to do so in the future. All I will say is that the people of Meerut district who know me as a Congress worker since 1929 and the people of Uttar Pradesh who have seen me as a Member of the State Government since 1946, will find it difficult to regard me as a

man holding " sixteenth century views " or views reactionary in any sense whatsoever.

With regards,

I am,
your sincerely,
Charan Singh

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru,
Prime Minister, India,
New Delhi.

From
Jawaharlal Nehru

Prime Minister's House,
New Delhi.
November 9, 1960.

Dear Charan Singh,

I have your letter without date.

It is true that I mentioned to Chandra Bhanu Gupta about what I had heard through a military officer. But your name had not been mentioned in this connection to me, nor had I said anything about you to Guptaji in this matter.

I have no recollection of referring to you anywhere as a person holding sixteenth century views.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru.

Shri Charan Singh, M. L. A.,
La Place,
Shahnajaf Road,
Lucknow.

Party Intrigues & Bickerings

From
Jawaharlal Nehru

Prime Minister's House,
New Delhi.
February 9, 1961,

My dear Charan Singh,

I enclose a copy of a letter I have received, which refers to you. The allegations made in this letter seem very odd to me, and the statements referred to are not very proper. Possibly, you were

misunderstood or the report is exaggerated. It would be desirable for you to clear this up and remove any misapprehension that might exist.

It is not good to run down a previous government. I do not understand also why the district authorities should be asked to attend only to those complaints which reach them through certain persons.

Is it a fact that you are the Treasurer of the District Congress Committee? I do not think it is right for a Minister to hold such an office.

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru.

Shri Charan Singh,
Minister, U. P. Government,
Lucknow.

Enclosure

Copy of a letter dated the 7th February, 1951, from Shri Mahesh Dutt Chaturvedi, Managing Director, Distt., Cooperative Bank Limited, Etawah, to the Prime Minister.

I beg to draw your kind attention to the following facts in connection with the visit of Hon'ble Home Minister Shri Choudhari Charan Singh, who visited this place on 22-1-61.

He addressed the Congress workers in the Congress office and created a wide-spread dissatisfaction among the rank and file of Congress by his following observations :—

1. That during the regime of the outgoing ministry in this State, there remained a general atmosphere of dishonesty and bribery. He further remarked that it was common knowledge that the horse understands the rider and then

behaves well or otherwise; now that the rider is changed the horse will behave properly.

2. He further tried to impress upon the audience that he had asked the District Magistrate and the superintendent police to attend to only those complaints which reach them through Shri Hoti Lal Agarwal who was defeated by more than 50,000 votes in last general election and Shri Bankey Lal Sharma, the President of the Distt. Congress Committee and advised the Congressmen present to ventilate their grievances through the aforesaid gentlemen only.
3. The third thing he said was that he was the treasurer of the District Congress Committee.

In the light of the aforesaid observations it appears that the Hon'ble Minister has purposely and deliberately tried to defame the tried Congressmen of the State who had joined the Government in order to extol his own partymen. To direct the District Magistrate and S. P. to attend only to the complaints put forth by the only 2 persons of a particular group look like strangulating the very spirit of parliamentary democracy.

To give an assurance that Provincial Congress Committee will act according to the wishes of the District Congress Committee is to sow the seed of dissatisfaction and frustration in that none the less insignificant group of Congressmen in the district which claims in the Mandal Congress Committee more than 40% of its elected members.

I, therefore, appeal to stop this type of activities on the part of the present ministers, which if persisted in, will further widen the existing gulf in the ranks of the Congress, which every well-wisher of the country but none more than yourself is anxious to bridge over.

From
Charan Singh

Vidhan Bhavan,
Lucknow.
February 14, 1961.

My dear Panditji,

I have received your letter of February 9 along with a complaint from one Sri Mahesh Dutt Chaturvedi of Etawah.

Some of the statements attributed to me were not made at all, and others distorted. For example, I did not say that during the regime of the outgoing Ministry. 'There remained a general atmosphere of dishonesty and bribery.' I do not remember exactly where, but I have said somewhere that it all depends upon the Ministers and highly-placed officers whether the administration will run efficiently or not. Administration is governed in a large measure by the behaviour of those at the top: just as a horse instantaneously understands whether the man riding over a horse is an efficient rider or not and behaves accordingly, so does the administrative machinery.

It has always been my opinion that Congressmen should not approach the District Magistrates and other officers regarding the complaints in their knowledge or jurisdiction directly but only through the President or the Secretary of the DCC. The office-bearers of the DCC should first satisfy themselves about the veracity of the complaints, or, at least, about the dependability of their source and it is only then that they should contact the District Magistrate or the SP or the Engineer with the authority of the DCC behind them. If this is not done and Mandal Congress workers and members of the DCC are allowed to approach subordinate officials directly, then it is not unoften that they pull in different directions and the subordinate officials try to play off one against another. I have persuaded Congress workers to act upon my views in Meerut district and the arrangement has always worked very satisfactorily—to the satisfaction both of the

Congress workers and the district administration. Perhaps, some years ago, the PCC also had, at my instance, issued a circular to DCCs to this effect. Anyway, there was not question of advising the Congress workers to approach the District Magistrate through Sri Hoti Lal Agarwal at all. It is Sri Bankey Lal Sharma, whose name I mentioned because he is the President of the DCC. By the way, though Sri Agarwal might have been defeated by any number of votes, yet he is an old and scrupulous worker who commands great respect among Congressmen and the public in general.

I have never been the Treasurer of the Meerut District Congress Committee; in fact, I have held no office at all in the DCC since 1946. So, I could not have possibly made such a statement. I am the treasurer of the PCC, although not a very active Treasurer at that, but there was absolutely no occasion of referring to this office in the meeting of the Congress workers.

Nor did I give any assurance that the PCC will act only according to the wishes of the DCC. By the way I may bring to your notice that the DCC of Etawah is manned by persons who are all old Congressmen and represent 80 to 90 per cent of the Congressmen in the district.

I know Etawah district and Etawah Congressmen so well. But I have never met or heard of Sri Mahesh Chandra Chaturvedi, Managing Director of the District Cooperative Bank as a Congressman. I will write to you later about the antecedents of this gentleman.

With regards,

I am,
Yours
Charan Singh.

Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru,
Prime Minister of India,
New Delhi.

On National Integration

From
Jawaharlal Nehru

Prime Minister's House,
New Delhi,
October 22, 1961.

My dear Charan Singh,

Hifzur Rahman came to see me today. He complained of the charges you had brought against the Jamiat Ulema. I had not followed this argument, but I saw some reports in the *Hindustan Times* and the *Times of India*. In these reports you had practically put the Jamiat on the same level as the Jamaat Islami and charged them with promoting exclusiveness among the Muslims and thereby damaging the cause of national integration.

There is no doubt that Jamiat is necessarily a purely Muslim organisation. It is also true that they have stood up often for Muslim claims. While all this is true, I think there is a great difference between the Jamiat and the Jamaat Islami. On the political plane, however, they have been always with the Congress and have been held high offices in the Congress. Maulana Azad himself was associated with the Jamiat. Inevitably the Moulvi type of mind comes out from time to time. But these people have not only been associated with us on the political platform and have been our candidates for parliament and Assemblies, but also have done often good work among Muslims even for the cause of integration.

It would be a good thing if we had no organisation of this kind among the Muslims, Hindus or

others. But the situation being what it is, it is difficult to prevent them from functioning or even to condemn them. On the whole, they have done good work though occasionally they have erred. They are strong opponents of the Jamaat Islami which is definitely a bigoted, narrow-minded organisation with ideals which are entirely opposed to any kind of common living or integration in India. I do not think it is right to put the Jamiat and the Jamaat on the same level.

Hifzur Rahman also drew my attention to some correspondence received from the U.P. Government about the Deobund Academy. Apparently this was in regard to some Pakistani students who had been admitted there without proper papers. It was also alleged that some students who had complained or given evidence to the Police were subsequently expelled from the Academy.

The Deobund Academy has about 1,500 or more students from a number of countries. There are a number of Pakistanis too and it is quite possible that a few of them crept in under false pretences. I do not know all the facts, but it appeared to me from what Hifzur Rahman said to me that he had fairly adequate explanation about these few persons, numbering perhaps a dozen or less. There are at present probably thousands of Pakistanis without papers in India and especially in the U. P. It may not be easy for them to be distinguished or found out. We can evolve some proper method for that. I understand that some of these persons were charged in the court and acquitted.

Then there was the case of some students who were expelled for giving evidence before the

Police. They may be guilty of this to some extent. At the same time, I would not accept wholesale the account of the Police. The story that Hifzur Rahman gave me was rather different. In fact he said that two or three of these persons who had been expelled were Pakistani students who had been misbehaving. There had been a general outcry among the Muslim students against the activities of these two as well as the interference of the Police in their internal activities.

Whatever the facts may be, it would be better to see them in proper perspective. Here is an Academy with a large number of students from a number of countries. It has an international reputation and draws students from many countries in West Asia and East Asia. It would hardly be fair to run down a big institution because of some mistakes or even deliberate errors. Exaggerated accounts of these go to foreign countries and even in India they create a certain atmosphere of harassing Muslims even in educational institutions.

We know that in many of our old colleges there are Hindu communal groups who function in an aggressive, communal and even violent way from time to time. We do not run down the whole institution because of this, although sometimes it might well deserve this. Much of the trouble caused recently in Meerut, Chandausi, Aligarh, etc. was largely due to Hindu students, apart from the Muslim students who misbehaved round about the University.

We have to deal with a vital and difficult problem which is essentially one of changing psychologies and creating a proper atmosphere both for the Muslims and the Hindus. We should particularly avoid doing anything which worsen this atmosphere.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru.

From
Charan Singh

Vidhan Bhavan,
Lucknow.
October 30, 1961.

My dear Panditji,

I have received your letter dated Oct. 22, 1961 in regard to the Jamiat-ul-Ulema and the Dar-ul-Ulum, Deoband.

In a press conference on October 20, I had simply said that there were more than half a dozen organisations which were fostering a spirit of exclusiveness amongst the Muslims. On being specifically so asked, I admitted that I included both the Jamiat ul-Ulema and the Jamaat-e-Islami in the list. I did not charge the Jamiat with communalism. Maulana Hifzur Rahman, however, sent a letter to the press which contained the following sentences :

"If, however, the efforts of this organisation to wipe out existing discrimination against the Muslims are taken to be the work of the forces of separatism, the Jamiaat-ul-Ulema is not afraid to continue doing so in future as fervently as it has done in the past. I can assure Mr. Charan Singh that the Jamiat has in its fold hundreds of workers whose words and deeds to bring about national integration are in no way less, if not more, than Mr. Charan Singh."

I remained unconvinced and, so, issued a rejoinder. I contended that, despite Maulana's claim to the contrary, inasmuch as the Jamiaat had undertaken to guard the interests of Muslims alone, it was psychologically impossible for its members to work for national integration.

I would submit that, despite differences between the Jamaat-e-Islami and Jamiat-ul-Ulema, the latter is not less responsible for fostering a spirit of aloofness and exclusiveness amongst the Muslims. It is only in this respect that I lumped the two together with other Muslim organisations.

Besides the creation of an avowedly theocratic State on our frontiers, an important reason why our efforts to weld the Hindus and Muslims into one nation, are coming to nought lies in the fact that political leadership of the Muslims, to a large degree, vests in the hands of religious leaders who see danger to Islam in every move for obliteration of the barriers, social or cultural, that separate the two communities.

Utterances on the part of Jamiat-ul-Ulema leaders have been noticed through which they have tried to make their audiences believe as if they were living in a land hostile to their interests. I give only one instance below. It is an extract from a note prepared by the Intelligence Section :

"Maulana Shahid Fakhri of Allahabad, the ex-President of the U.P. Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hindi, has reiterated, time and again, that Muslims in India were not being given fair treatment by the majority community as well as by Government and that the future of Muslim community in India was dark. Addressing a meeting at Varanasi on night of June 24/25, 1961, Maulana Shahid Fakhri made a violent anti-Hindu speech in which he said that on the night of August 15, 1947 when a part of the population of this country (meaning thereby Hindus) became independent, a part of the population of the same land (that is, Muslims) became slaves. In an earlier meeting held at Varanasi on November 21, 1960, Shahid Fakhri, while criticising the Government, said that the Muslims should be well-versed in handling swords and further added that time has come when Islam wanted sacrifice from them."

The Jamiat-ul-Ulema does not lag behind any other religious organisation in laying emphasis on the superiority of Islam over all other religions. Muslims are often reminded in secret and open meetings that only a handful of their ancestors were able to conquer India. The intention is to make an average Muslim believe that he is made of a superior metal and has nothing in common with his counter-

part in the Hindu community. Now, for all that we, as members of a secular political party, care, this may be all right, but the leaders of such an organisation cannot, at the same time, claim to be Congress workers or workers in the cause of national integration.

The 'Al Jamiat' published from Delhi is the chief organ of the Jamiat. Its writings breathe as intense communalism as any other paper. Perhaps, it has already come to your notice that in its issue of December 18, 1960, it reproduced from a Pakistani paper an article comparing Kashmir with Algiers and you with Gen. De Gaule. When there was a hue and cry, the 'Al Jamiat' disassociated itself from the views expressed in the article. But its mind stood bare before all of us. I enclose five extracts two from its editorials and three from articles from other papers which the 'Al Jamiat' has reproduced, presumably, with approval. Any comment on my part will be unnecessary.

It is true that the late Maulana Azad was a member of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hindi. But the circumstances during the British days were different from today. Also, the late Maulana was never an active worker in the cause of the Jamiat. He devoted all his time and attention to the work of the Congress. Today, however, Maulana Hifzur Rahman Sahib of the organisation who is the General Secretary of the Jamiat as also office workers who may have participated in the struggle for independence, are devoting all their time and energy solely in the cause of one community. And they do not make any secret of it. In these circumstances it is simply untenable on their part to claim that they are as good Congress Workers or workers in the cause of national integration as anybody else, solely devoted to Congress work, may be.

The role which Maulana Hifzur Rahman is playing in the public life of India become all too apparent from the title of Mujahid-i-Millat (crusader in the cause of the Muslim community) which his followers have bestowed upon him.

A booklet written by him in reply to Shri Meher Chand Khanna on the question of evacuee

property describes the author as "Mujahid-i-Millat Hazrat Maulana Mohammed Hifz-ur-Rahman Sahib". It sounds just as "Qayad-i-Millat".

As regards the Dar-ul-Ulum: It is not the presence in the Dar-ul-Ulum of a few students from Pakistan, who might have come without proper travel documents, so much as the attitude of the authorities in shielding them, that matters. Maulana Hif-zur-Rahman had seen me in connection with the complaint he had made to you about the conduct of the police towards the Dar-ul-Ulum. The Home Secretary was present. A note of what he said was prepared at the time. He was not able to give us any valid or coherent reason for expulsion either of the five Indian or two Pakistani students. On the contrary, Maulana Mohammed Tayyab Mohatmin of the Institution, told me the day before yesterday in so many words that he did not agree with the order of expulsion or the policy underlying it. But that he found himself helpless.

Besides this, there are several instances showing the attitude of the management of the Dar-ul-Ulum which have been quoted in the enclosure to the letter addressed by Guptaji to you on the subject. I will refer only to one here. A student from Pakistan, named Abdul Matin, was prosecuted for illegal entry. An Indian student, named Abul Mazid, gave evidence for the prosecution. The case ended in conviction. Sometime after, Abdul Mazid was expelled on the ground that he had failed to inform the authorities of the institution about the presence of the Pakistani students.

Running down the institution is far, far from my intention. On the contrary, in reply to a question on the floor of the Assembly whether the institution had become a rendezvous of agents from Pakistan, I gave a clear and definite denial which, I understand, was greatly appreciated by the authorities of the Dar-ul-Ulum.

So far as the virus of communalism is concerned certain Hindu organisations and institutions are equally guilty, but my only submission is that

their leaders or managers cannot pass off as national leaders, claim the blessings of the Congress, or enjoy the privileges attaching to its membership.

I hope I will be pardoned for expressing it as my humble opinion that our policy in regard to the Jamiaat-ul-Ulma is, in view of its present-day activities, open to misinterpretation both by the Hindus and Muslims, whether it should be re-considered, is more than I can say.

Maulana Hifz-ur-Rahman's standards of public debate are very revealing, indeed. He has attributed motives to me in more than one statement but the following is unbeatable. The 'Al Jamiat' of October 23, 1961, writes :

"A Muslim would be safe only when he defends himself; otherwise he would continue to suffer. Mr. Charan Singh's nonsense can only make the lives of Muslims increasingly miserable. They cannot be protected. We do not hope that Mr. Charan Singh will give up his *hereditary profession* of making accusations and sprinkling salt on the wounds of Muslims and will allow them to heave a sigh of relief and will desist from paving the way for fresh disturbances."

I have said nothing which is, perhaps, not already known to you. Still, you thought it necessary in Congress interest to write the letter you did. I will, therefore, take care to observe the approach indicated in your letter and not to say or do anything in future that gives offence to Maulana Hifz-ur-Rahman or provides him an occasion to kick up a controversy. I do not propose to reply publicly to whatever abuses he may heap upon me in the press or on the platform.

With respects.

I am,
Yours,
Charan Singh.

Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru,
Prime Minister of India,
New Delhi.

★

On Casteism and Jatpan

From
Charan Singh

Lucknow-2
May 22, 1954.

My dear Pandit Ji,

It is after a long time and with great hesitation indeed, that I write this letter to you.

As you have so often emphasized in your speeches, India fell a slave to foreign aggression solely due to our social weaknesses, rather than due to any superiority of the foreigner in numbers, resources, valour or culture. This is admitted even by an English historian in his book, "Expansion of England". This truth may or may not be obvious to the people at large, but is brought home almost daily to those entrusted with public affairs. Of these weaknesses, viz., religious and linguistic differences and the caste system based on birth, I regard the last as the greatest single cause of our political subjugation for centuries. It is also largely responsible for partition of the country. When caste Hindus could not accord equal treatment to their own co-religionists lower down in the social scale, Muslims rightly apprehended that, after the Britishers had left, they will not get a fair deal from the Hindus who formed a vast majority in the country as a whole. All this is now a matter of past history.

The regret, however, is that we seem to have learnt no lessons. The caste feeling, instead of being on the decline, is on the increase obviously owing to advent of democracy and the scramble for

jobs. Not only has it invaded the highest reaches of our public life, but has affected the services also. It leads to acts of discrimination and injustice, warps and narrows a man's mind and heart and creates a vicious circle of accusation and counter-accusation, distrust and suspicion in society. Lately, it has become a weapon of political vendetta.

The question remains : how to eradicate it. Attempts have been made by Teachers and Reformers since the times of Gautam Buddha, but to no avail.

I make bold to offer a suggestion, which I have been recommending in a feeble way in my own sphere for the last six years or so. In modern times caste comes in the life of an individual only at the time of marriage. So, if the evil has to be tackled successfully, steps have to be taken which will rob the caste of its relevance or significance in marriage. That is, the evil has to be tackled at the source. While laying down rules for recruitment to Services, we prescribe all sorts of qualifications in order to ensure that a man, fit and suitable for the job alone gets in. These qualifications have only his mind and body in view. But there is no test laid down to measure his heart—to find out how large his sympathies are, whether he will be able to act impartially, whether his heart is big enough to contain all those with whom he will have to deal in the course of his official duties, etc. In my opinion, in the conditions of our country this test will be fulfilled in a large measure if we require the candidates at least, for gazetted jobs in the first instance, to

marry outside the narrow circle of their own caste. By enacting such a provision we will not be compelling anybody to marry against his wish, just as we do not compel anybody to become a graduate today, which is the educational qualification required for many a Government job. It will not at all be difficult to secure such young men in adequate numbers. Today young boys and girls receiving education in our colleges are all prepared for this step. I would lay down the same qualification of the marriage being an inter-caste will apply only to marriages that take place after a certain date, say, 1st January, 1955. An unmarried man will be free to enter the services or the Legislature but if, later on, he marries inside his caste he will have to resign. Further, for Services under the Union we may say that marriage in a different linguistic group will entitle a candidate to a preferential claim. This will be all the more desirable inasmuch as linguistic States are now clearly in the offing. Such provisions should not offend the feelings even of orthodox people, for *anuloma* marriages have been sanctified by our Shastras also. In effect, we will be converting the present-day castes into so many gotras and discouraging a man's marriage in the gotra of his father.

If an article to this intent is inserted in the constitution, India's greatest social evil and, to use Raja Ji's aphorism, India's Enemy No. 1, would have been laid to rest within a period of ten years. The country will never become strong unless caste is rooted out. And this consummation will never be accomplished, unless the State intervenes, and strikes at the source. Otherwise, some day the fire of mutual suspicion and hatred, which the caste system has kindled for centuries now, will have consumed the country to ashes as surely and imperceptibly as night follows day.

I hope my suggestion will not sound fantastic to you. Men like me know from experience what it means to be born in castes other than those which are regarded or regard themselves as privileged. The contemptuous treatment that is meted out, and the social discrimination that attaches by

virtue of mere birth, to members of such castes has often led to mass desertions or conversions to other faiths, not only amongst those occupying the lowest rungs of the ladder but also amongst others. For example, only in the Punjab during a period of forty years, viz., from 1891 to 1931, fifty-six per cent of Hindu Jats, finding, inter alia, that they were looked down by their co-religionists, that is, for reasons other than spiritual, left the fold of their ancestors for good.

There will certainly be great opposition to the proposed amendment, but if you are determined to see it through, the opposition will melt away in no time. According to my reading of the situation the proposal will receive a greater welcome amongst the educated sections than certain provisions of the Hindu Code Bill.

Whatever be the obstacles, if an amendment of the constitution on these lines can be secured, it will, according to my little mind, be a service to the country of equal import with the attainment of Swaraj. Then alone, and not till then, will foundations of our stability have been truly laid;

With respects,

I am,
Your
Charan Singh.

Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru,
Prime Minister, India,
New Delhi.

From
Jawaharlal Nehru

Camp: The Retreat,
Mashobra, Simla.
May 27, 1954.

My dear Charan Singh,

Thank you for your letter of May 22nd.

You know that I attach the greatest importance to the ending of the caste system. I think

this is certainly the biggest weakening factor in our society. I also agree with you that finally caste will not go till inter-caste marriages are not unusual and are looked upon as something which is quite normal. I would go further and say that there will be no real unity in the country till our prejudice against marriages between people of different religions also does not go.

But to say, as you do, that we should try to compel people by constitutional provisions and rules to marry outside their castes seems to me to offend against basic principle of individual freedom. Marriage is very much a personal affair and to take it out of the old ruts of conventions and customs. What you suggest is definitely a retrograde step from that point of view, although it is meant to encourage a desirable tendency.

We have to create conditions otherwise. The Special Marriage Bill is one such step. Other steps should also follow. Ultimately people marry those, who more or less fit in with their way of thinking and living. Indeed any other marriage is a misfit and any imposition from above is likely to lead to disaster in so far as the married couple are concerned. I cannot bring myself to think of the choice of marriage being controlled by legislation or by inducements offered.

Yours sincerely,
Jawahar Lal Nehru.

Shri Charan Singh,
Minister, U. P. Government,
Lucknow.

From
Jawaharlal Nehru

New Delhi,
March 14, 1957.

My dear Charan Singh,

I have your letter of March 11th,

From time to time, I have received letters from various parts of India, from Congressmen and

others, in regard to the elections. Among these letters, there were one or two of complaint against you and making some rather ridiculous charges. It was my practice to send all these letters to the Congress President, and I think I sent those referring to you also, to him. I did not know and do not remember the names of the persons who sent these letters. Some days later, I was going to Meerut and Shah Nawaz Khan was accompanying me. In the course of conversation I mentioned to him that I had received some letters about you, which I think accused you of helping anti-Congress candidates. Shah Nawaz replied that he did not believe such a charge. He added, however, that you were not in favour of Kailash Prakash, who was standing from Meerut City. That is all that he said to me, so far as I remember, about this matter.

In your letter, you mention a number of persons like Aijaz Hussain, Vijaipal Singh and others, whom I do not know at all. Indeed, I am not acquainted with Meerut politics.

There is no question of my having an enquiry into anything. As is my practice, I shall forward your letter to the Congress President.

As you have written to me, I might tell you that I do not believe any such charges. But, I have certainly had an impression that you are rather narrow and rigid in your outlook and have been associated with some grouping in the U. P. Congress. At the same time, my other impression is that your work in administration is efficient and, more particularly, that you have studied and paid a great deal of attention to agricultural classes.

I received your book on cooperative farming. I am afraid I have not read it. I have little time for reading books.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru.

Shri Charan Singh,
Minister, U. P. Government,
Lucknow.

From
Charan Singhji

Lucknow,
October 6, 1958.

My dear Pandit Ji,

This is with reference to a remark that you were pleased to make when I saw you the other day in New Delhi. You said that you did not like the 'JATPAN' (Jatism) that I had exhibited in my handling of the Congress affairs of Meerut District.

I do not know what you had in mind. The facts, however, are that, owing to consistent propaganda carried on against the caste system in Meerut by me, politically the most prominent Jat of the district, since I entered public life, sometimes against great odds and at great risks, the Jat community votes on non-sectarian lines in far greater proportion than any other in Meerut. As, perhaps, you yourself will testify, Meerut District, is the strongest bastion of Congress in the western parts of Uttar Pradesh and I should be pardoned if I claim some credit for it.

Although the Jats far outnumber any other caste (except, perhaps, the Chamars), They contributed only three members out of 22. And all these legislators were set up as Congress candidates at my suggestion. The Vaishyas, the Tiagis and the Brahmins have all received higher representation than their numerical strength warrants as compared with the Jats. I can say with confidence that there is not a single district in the State in which the most dominant community has got such low representation in the legislature as the Jats of Meerut. And there is not a single act in public life which can be laid at my door for my being a Jat. Yet Panditji, in your eyes and in those of many others, the fact of my having been born in a Jat peasant's home is so prominent. Why ?

The reason is not far to seek. When the charge of inefficiency, want of ability, sloth or lack

of will to work hard, want of character in the widest possible term, or unpopularity, cannot be made against me, the best method of beating the dog is to give him a bad name which will stick and stick without enquiry.

In the campaign of vilification Jats come out badly. For example, the propaganda that certain quarters carried on at the time of re-organisation of States in 1954-55 that the proposed Delhi State will be a 'Jatistan' went on uncontradicted, although it was a lie. They are uneducated, live in villages, have no pull in the public, economic or administrative life of the country, and yet would not reconcile themselves to an inferior position in the society. So they would not put up with the taunt of being a 'Jat' that the term in influential urban circles has come to signify. With the result that 56 per cent of the Hindu Jats in the Punjab within a short period of 40 years (1891-1931) left their old faith to turn Sikhs or Muslims so that nobody could any longer treat them with contempt. This desertion or conversion contributed largely to the demand for the Punjabee Sooba.

Our caste-system based on birth has been singly the most potent cause of our political subjugation for centuries and the partition of the country. But it would seem that we have not yet learnt any lessons from history. For, people holding important positions in public life all over the country are not able to rise above this weakness even today.

In April 1954 I wrote a longer letter to you suggesting amendment of the Constitution to the effect that no young man in the future will be allowed to enter the ranks of a gazetted service in the States (or, in the Centre) unless he married or intends to marry outside his caste (or, in a linguistic group other than his own). You did not agree.

I hope you will pardon me for writing in the strain I have done. I was greatly pained and had communicated my feelings to Pant Ji who, I believe, has already spoken to you in this regard.

With respects,

I am,
Yours
Charan Singh

Shri Jawahar Lal Nehru,
Prime Minister, India,
New Delhi.

From
Jawaharlal Nehru

Prime Minister's House,
New Delhi.
October 10, 1958.

Dear Charan Singh,

I have your letter of October 6.

When I used the word "Jatpan" in my talk with you, I was not thinking of caste or anything like it. What I had in mind was a certain toughness on group lines. The group need not be Jat or any caste group.

As for Jats, I have always liked them very much and admired many qualities in them. There is no question of a taunt about the word in my mind.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru.

Shri Charan Singh,
Minister, U. P. Government,
Lucknow.

It reminds me of a person, who killed his both parents and on the date of pronouncement of the Judgement pleaded for mercy on the plea that he is an orphan. So she butchered the Indian Constitution and killed the democracy and on the question of impeachment pleads that her father was the maker of modern India and her son is innocent and she is not prepared to face the trial.

—An'onym.

Chinese Designs Forestalled

From
Charan Singh

Civil Secretariat, U. P.,
Lucknow.
November 16, 1950.

Respected Sardar Sahib,

It is in the hope that you will, out of your large-heartedness, forgive me that I commit the impudence of writing what I do.

Communist China—and behind it Russian influence—is steadily moving closer to our country. The obvious precaution for us to take is to strengthen our northern defences, that it, *inter alia*, to take a positive line in support of the democratic forces in Nepal which also happen to be in alliance or identified with her lawful Government or Sovereign. The Maharajadhiraj of Nepal and the Nepal Congress have, presumably, sought, and will welcome, our active help. Geography, common interest and popular wishes demand not only that we extend all possible aid to them at this juncture, but that the Indian Union and Nepal bind themselves together in the closest possible ties for ever. Yet, we are behaving in a manner in which no other country in the world, placed in similar circumstances, would have done. It were the Britishers who declared Nepal an independent country in 1923, and, again, it were they, and not Nature or Providence, that drew the present frontiers of India. Are these frontiers so sacrosanct? Suppose, they are violated by the Chinese Communists tomorrow or day after, whom will we appeal to and whom we blame? Shall we

turn round and again express our vehement concern and amazement and try to deceive ourselves and the world that thereby we have done our duty? But history will not forgive us, nor the coming generations.

There is a sentence in the Presidential Address delivered in Parliament day before yesterday saying that "while aggression has to be met it has to be remembered that war itself is an evil which brings even greater evils in its train". But how is aggression to be met, if not by war? War or use of force may be an evil, but it is to war that Israel owes its existence and to which we also have recently accorded our recognition; it is to use of force and fraud that Pakistan owes its birth; it is by our "police action"—not by the grand gesture in the form of withdrawal of troops from Secunderabad that the problem of Hyderabad was solved; it is by force that we hold what little we do of Kashmir today, and, again, it was the likelihood of war that brought Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan to Delhi for talk on the situation in East Pakistan early this year.

And if war or aggression is such an evil, why should we be so enthusiastic in the praises of Communist China and her leader, Mao-tse-Tung, and, at least, why should our policy towards them remain unchanged even after their aggression in Korea and Tibet? Has aggression anywhere been stayed by appeasement? Such are the questions that assail the common man and even public workers like myself are unable to answer them with any degree of satisfaction.

Much less are the people able to follow the reasoning behind our policy towards Pondicherry and Goa. It seems our leaders have tied themselves in knots of their own making, and are incapable of taking realistic decisions. Our foreign policy, however we may delude ourselves, is blind to national interests and is one of the main causes of public discontent against Congress.

I can write a lot, but I do not want to waste your time further. My point in writing this letter is that these big policies must be framed and hammered out in the Cabinet and, I must be excused, revered Sardar Sahib, for saying that you are such as much responsible as anybody else. If you also agree with them, or, at least, let things drift as they do, then whom will the country turn to? India rose from dust after centuries; will her leaders fail her again and so soon? When I write in this strain, I simply express the agony of the entire thinking section of our people.

You are coming to Lucknow on 1st December and we are all looking to your visit with hope and pleasure. I would request you to please grant me an interview of an hour or thereabout so that I may just discuss things with you and learn first-hand what it is that atrophies and paralyses the hand and heart of our beloved leader or leaders.

With regards,

I am,
Yours sincerely,
Charan Singh

Hon'ble Sardar Vallabh Bhai Patel,
Deputy Prime Minister,
Government of India,
New Delhi.

After Chinese Aggression

From
Charan Singh

Camp : Circuit House
Meerut
October 31, 1962.

My dear Shastriji,

For obvious reasons, instead of writing to the Prime Minister, I unburden my heart to you in this hour of deep national sorrow and humiliation.

The past is past, but I must say what every man in the street could foresee and apprehend—and I had forecast in a letter addressed to Sardar Patel in November 1950—has, at least, happened.

My purpose in writing this letter to you is that, although the Prime Minister has confessed that we had till now been living in "an artificial world of our own creation", it seems we have not yet walked out of it altogether or stepped into the world of reality. Sense of realism demands that—

The present Defence Minister should quit at once. Granting that he has not at all been in the wrong and that he has discharged his duties conscientiously, the nation has no faith in him and this should be a sufficient reason for his immediate exit. In fact, as a self-respecting man, he should have himself offered to resign and refused to stay even if the Prime Minister wanted him to.

In order to build up the morale of the Army the ex-Generals like Carriapa, Thimmaya, Thorat, Kulwant Singh and Verma should be recalled immediately and put in active command of the forces according to their ranking. The Generals in charge today can possibly have no cause of complaint, for they have all hitherto served under them and, in view of national interest, should have no qualms in

conceding primacy to their former superiors. I may point to the example of Marshal Hindenburg who was recalled from his retirement by the German Emperor in 1914 and put in the supreme command of the German Forces at the age of 70. Generals like Thapar and Kaul cannot evoke the best in our soldier.

If people have to be impressed without determination to resist and fight the Chinese to the bitter end, diplomatic relations with China should be severed at once. Maybe, a formal declaration of war will change its present character and result in developments for which we are not prepared today, but not a break of diplomatic relations. As it is. I believe when our resistance mounts and the Chinese find themselves in a tight corner, they will not care for these niceties and will use all the military power at their disposal, continuance of diplomatic relations notwithstanding,

There should be no talk of any negotiations whatsoever : now, there can be only one objective, viz., victory. Negotiations in the present context can only imply that we are prepared to surrender some of our territory. Further, the possibility of negotiations, whatever the conditions, serves only to psychologically relax those who are fighting at the front or organising the defence from behind the lines. People can, and will lay down their lives only for the sake of an honourable objective and not for the sake of negotiations. I will go further : it will be a misfortune if the Chinese hordes, for some mysterious reason or due to pressure brought to bear by friendly nations (if there are any left), choose to retire to the position held by them on September 8. That will not be an honourable situation for India. Our independence being liable to be robbed by China at their wish, we could then be called an independent people only in name. To such a dishonourable state I would prefer war and all it means, a thousand times.

The present Defence Minister has, for the last three years or more and even as late as about a week ago, been talking of fighting "to the best of

our ability" or "to the best of our means". Now, this is the language of a defeatist. It should be and is within our power to acquire the ability and the means to drive the enemy out of the country and beat him to the knees.

Again, harking on every conceivable occasion to India having been a peaceful nation, serves no purpose. Instead of putting heart into our people, it only creates a doubt whether our Government even today considers a war necessary or will be able to summon the necessary will and determination to fight a war. Further, if we go on referring to our peaceful policy, the people will be entitled to ask whether this policy could justify the Government to take risks about the security of the country, or should have made it unmindful about the safety of our frontiers or prevented it from defending or acquiring the means to defend the honour and integrity of our own motherland.

Our non-alignment policy, at least, all talk, even oblique references about it, particularly in view of the attitude of the USSR, are out of tune with the present situation. All Government policies can have but one aim, viz., that of subserving the national interest. And National interest today requires seeking all possible aid from, and understanding with, every possible quarter;

It is often said that India and China had been friends for twenty centuries, and that it is China who had betrayed us. Now, that is not correct history. As a matter of fact, we were neither friends nor foes. Except for a few Chinese travellers to our country, several centuries ago, there has been no contact between India and China, political or economic. The Himalayas were such a mighty barrier between the two. Talk about this supposed old friendship only proves our guillibility. So, we will do well to keep silent about it;

There is absolutely no panic in the country and no disunity, at least, on this issue. So, the talk about allaying panic and forging unity is absolutely out of place. In fact, it only serves to delight

the hearts of our enemies beyond the frontiers. Nor, in my humble opinion was there any necessity today of an appeal for funds or for ornaments. Thousands of millions of rupees will be required to fight the enemy. An appeal for ornaments or for gifts could be only the last resort. First, let us employ all means that are open to a Government engaged in a war to find the necessary funds. Let us prove to our people that their Government is in earnest, that it has done its best and is doing its utmost, and I do not doubt for a moment that, if an appeal is made at an opportune time, our mothers and daughters will hasten to donate the last ring and the last bangle to the national pool. But this is simply just not the time. This creates an impression in the mind of our foes within and foes without, that we are at the tether's end already although the battle has hardly been joined.

Although today we are not in a position to strike behind the lines of the enemy, we should no longer talk of merely fighting a defensive battle. As every soldier knows, offence is sometimes the best and the only way of defence. An army pledged to remain on the defensive will never win victories. So, as and when time permits, our armies should be free to take up the offensive or strike at the enemy in any way the Commanders consider fit and feasible.

We should do our best to win back Nepal by doing all that the King wants in respect of rebel activities on our soil. There can be no greater failure of our diplomacy than that we allowed Nepal—the bone of our bone and the flesh of our flesh—to drift away from us. If Nepal falls into the lap of China, then woe betide us;

Home Departments, in particular, all over the country have to be geared up, with a view to ensure that all saboteurs, whether working in the interest of China or that of Pakistan, get a short shrift. As I have already said above, saboteurs and traitors will not proclaim their identity and their views from housetops; they will have to be assiduously spotted out. In my humble opinion, the Home

Ministry of Assam has been a complete failure hitherto. In this context, perhaps, it will not be out of place, if I should say that, at least, Governments of all the States adjoining the frontier, right from Kashmir to Assam, should be so conducted that they are positively able to command the support of not only Congressmen, in general, but of all Opposition Parties and evoke the respect and confidence of the masses.

Our minds today should be occupied with one and only one thought, viz., that of recruiting, training and equipping an army at least, three times the present size. It is the soldiers and the Generals at the front that matter today and not any slogans, speeches, pledges, subscriptions, or any other activities reminiscent of the Congress struggle during the British days. We are face to face with an enemy who knows no honour and no scruples. It is hard long road that lies ahead. So, there should be no dilly-dallying, no looking back and no qualms of conscience. It is the task of leadership to fire the people with the necessary sense of zeal and grim determination. To the extent we succeed in doing this, we will succeed in vacating the aggression and also ultimately in forging an India capable of commanding respect of our neighbours.

We are on the point of losing all that it took us three, rather four generations to win and acquire for this unfortunate motherland of ours. Today we are sitting at the edge of a period of dark slavery such as history does not record. Posterity will cause the memory of Congress and its leaders for their failures and omissions.

Such are my random thoughts. I may have overdrawn a point or two, but I have only given expression to the agony which Congressmen go about hiding in their hearts and non-Congressmen go about expressing in bitter language. I had gone to attend Gopashtami celebrations in a village in Meerut tahsil yesterday. The agony and the grief of the people at the recent developments on our frontiers and the retreat of our forces, is simply indescribable.

I wanted to see you and Din Dayal is in contact with Jagannath Sahai, but understandably enough, you are too busy and I may have no occasion to talk things over with you. So, I thought I should put my feelings—and feelings are not always all rational or based on reason—into writing.

With warmest regards,

I am,
Yours sincerely,
Charan Singh.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri,
Home Minister, Govt. of India,
New Delhi.

P.S. After the above had been written I understood from the radio on my return from the interior of the district last night that the Prime Minister has taken over the Defence himself and made Shri Menon a Defence Production Minister. Now, in my humble opinion, this will not satisfy the people. They no longer believe in the bonafides or patriotism of a man who had, even after seizure of some twelve thousand miles of our territory by the Chinese in 1959, refused to acknowledge it as an "aggression" because aggression had not yet been defined anywhere, who told the Allahabad Students, Union in 1961 that by its act of aggression it was China and not India which had lost, because China had thereby forfeited world opinion, who said only ten days ago that India will fight till "world opinion compels China to negotiate with us" and tried to make a distinction between the Chinese Government and the Chinese people, and who only two days ago said that, although the vast territory had further been aggressed upon by China in the NEFA area, China was no longer in a position to surprise us etc. etc. It is all too clear the Prime Minister has taken even the step that he has done, hesitatingly and due to pressure of public opinion and not of his own accord. This psychological gap between the people and its leadership cannot but have its consequences.

Stories about General Kaul that are going round every village and every town, are simply such that even if they are true to the extent of 50 per cent nobody in the country can believe that he will be able to give a correct lead to the army or inspire it to deeds of valour in repelling the foe.

Yesterday's "Hindustan Times" has published extract from a secret Communist circular. This only serves further to underline the necessity of putting at least those who are immediately responsible for this circular, into prison without wasting a moment.

The way that the situation has developed since October 20 shows that it is the people who are leading the leaders and it is events or the logic of the situation which is forcing the hands of our Government. I hope our leaders at the top will soon take the initiative into their own hands and, without casting a single wistful look behind or at our ideals and principles that now constitute a debris of history, give a clear lead to the people.

If steps have not already been taken to this effect, I would urge that our armies in Congo or elsewhere abroad should be recalled immediately.

It is understood that arms from abroad are being purchased or acquired on a commercial basis. I think our financial position can hardly afford this. If the USA and the UK and other countries who have proved themselves our friends in this hour of need are prepared to give—as it appears they are—arms and other equipment to us as a gift or to lend lease them, we should hasten to accept them on these terms. Also, if necessary military experts from abroad should be allowed to train our armies in the use of the new equipment.

There is not a single soldier on that part of the frontier of our country that divides the State of Uttar Pradesh from Tibet. On the other hand, there are reliable reports that a full Division of the Chinese