

Chandernagar Singh 1st Inst.
Sub. File No-57 (D)

CH. RAM SINGH,
Chairman, E. K. D./

34, Mall Avenue,
Lucknow,
January 28, 1972.

Dear Verma Ji,

Your letter dated January 27, 1972, was placed in my hand at about 9.00 this morning.

You are mistaken if you think that legislators are not bound by party discipline on the floor of the legislature. Were it so, they would not be able to function as a political entity in the legislature — which will make nonsense of parliamentary life. Perhaps, you will recollect that when a show-cause notice was served on Shri Udit Narain Sharma in 1970, then a member of E.K.D., a similar question, viz., that I had committed a breach of privilege in asking him to explain, was raised by the Opposition. On the basis of previous rulings, the Speaker decided that there was no question of breach of privilege.

Second, you have said that in making the speech I did, on January 3, I went against the resolution passed by the Party Executive on December 14, or expressed "views which had already been disapproved by the Party Executive" and, thus, 'flouted the party mandate'. I enclose a copy of the resolution which stands virtually as I drafted it. I need not say wherein I differed from the resolution, but you will find that there is nothing in it which I might have contravened. There is only one point which you might, perhaps, like to stretch, viz., the one appreciating the role of the USSR. In my speech I did thank the USSR and appreciate its role, but I was, and am opposed to being emotional about it. In international relations, every country acts only in its national interest, and not out of humanitarian or even ideological motives. If the USSR helped us, it is not for nothing: Today it needs India as much as we need it. It should not be forgotten that till October last, Russia also had supplied arms to Pakistan as the USA was doing. Today, we are raising slogans of HINDI-ROOSI BHAI-BHAI: Not much time has passed when we raised similar slogans of HINDI-CHINA BHAI-BHAI.

You forget that at two of the Executive Committee meetings you had taken a stand that no recognition should be extended to Bangla Desh under any circumstance whatsoever.

You have said that my speech on the official resolution of felicitations to Sheikh Mujib-ur-Rehman echoed the line of Jan Sangh. Again, you are mistaken. I had simply said that a voluntary confeder-



8

ation of the three countries, viz., Pakistan, India and Bangla Desh, was the only lasting solution of our problems or problems that faced all the three countries in common, and that the initiative should come from a Muslim leader, preferably the Sheikh himself, and not from India. I do not know what exactly the position of the Jan Sangh on the question is. I have only a vague impression that they want to see the two (now three) countries united again, and old India revived, if necessary, by force. That was not, and is not by position. I do not know whether you have read in the press that Shri Bhutto himself has gone on record, perhaps, on Jan. 17 or 18, that instead of having a confederation with Iran and Afghanistan, Pakistan will prefer a confederation with India which was the mother-country of Pakistan.

Some ten or twelve years ago, the then President of Pakistan, Shri Ayub Khan, had proposed a military alliance between India and Pakistan to meet foreign aggression, if any. As far as I remember, Shri Rajgopalachari and Gen. Cariappa favoured the idea. I see no harm, if, as soon as the present situation passes, the three countries of India, Pakistan and Bangla Desh enter into an arrangement for a common market on the lines of European countries.

You have, inter alia, referred to my 'legacy', 'my autocratic ways and dictatorial tendencies' and my denseness inasmuch as I have failed to understand the foreign policy of the present Government. Perhaps, your purpose would have been sufficiently served if you had rested content with your statement contained in your press hand-out which, to use your own language, runs as follows :

" On every occasion we wanted to align with progressive forces and parties and wanted to solve the problems of poverty and of strengthening the country through secularism, democracy and socialism but unfortunately we failed to take our leader along this path."

I plead guilty. I did not agree to EKD's merger in the New Congress, and I think I was in the right. If dittoing or blindly supporting whatever Smt. Indira Gandhi says or does, makes a man 'progressive', and holding a different view from her in any respect, makes a man 'reactionary', then I would gladly remain a reactionary.

Incidentally, this confession puts your action and talk of merger since 1970 in the correct perspective.

(Contd....3



There is no escape but to make a reply once you have published your views in the press, but I would very much like to avoid a public controversy with an individual like you whom I once held so near and on whom I pinned such great hopes. Also, I would like to avoid the choice language that you have thought fit to employ in regard to me.

Enc: One.

Shri Virendra Verma, M.L.A.,
3, Royal Hotel,
Lucknow.

I am,
Yours

Charan Singh
(CHARAN SINGH)

P.S.: I would like to inform your comrade, Shri Shripat Mishra, through you that no decision was taken to the effect that those who had had to fight an election petition, need not ever pay their subscription to the Party, or till it was fully adjusted against the expenses of the petition. All that was decided, was that subscription need not be paid till the election petition lasted. Further, such a decision obviously applied to ordinary members, not to Ministers. Petition against him took hardly eight months.

Charan Singh
(CHARAN SINGH)
Chairman,
Bharatiya Kranti Dal,
Lucknow.
28.1.72.

