

A Challenge To Mr. Nehru

V. B. Karnik

OPPPOSITION forces have won two crucial by-elections in U.P. This victory will gladden the hearts of all those who are opposed to the Congress monopoly of power. As democrats, they stand for the rise and growth of various trends in the political life of the country and desire that all of them should have a voice in the formulation of public policies. The two veterans who have been elected will be a tower of strength to the Opposition in Parliament and will enable it to give a more powerful and effective expression to the people's dissatisfaction against many of the policies and actions of the ruling party. Their election is specifically a challenge to Mr. Nehru as both contested the seats on the basis of their opposition to many of his policies.

The victory of Acharya Kripalani and Dr. Lohia is all the more significant because the Congress looked upon both contests as prestige contests and was keen on winning them. It spared no pains and no resources in its efforts and yet it was soundly beaten in both. The result proved that the Congress is not an invincible force and, with unity in its ranks and with a popular figure to back its appeal, the opposition can win an electoral contest against the Congress.

Acharya Kripalani and Dr. Lohia are known all over the country as veteran fighters for freedom. They are men of courage and conviction with a long and unsullied record of public service to their credit. It is not necessary to be in agreement with all their views to believe that their presence in Parliament will be of immense benefit to the democratic movement. They can be relied upon to be alert and vigilant and to speak out their minds boldly and clearly.

Acharya Kripalani contested in Amroha as a loyal follower of the Gandhian Congress. He received help from many quarters, but he made no compromises and no reservations in order to get it. As in North Bombay, it was essentially a one-man campaign for the acceptance of Gandhian values and for the rejection of national and international policies of the Government which ran counter to those values. He was clear and forthright in his opposition to Mr. Nehru's policies in relation to China and other communist countries, and in relation to defence and defence efforts. His election by an overwhelming majority of over fifty thousand votes can be regarded as

the people's endorsement of the criticisms that he levelled.

It is this implication of the result of the contest that persuaded the Congress to do its best and worst to secure his defeat. It put up against him its best candidate, a Muslim Minister of the Central Government, who by virtue of his being a Muslim was expected to secure the sizable number of Muslim votes in the constituency. It was decided to put him up at the eleventh hour in preference to an already selected candidate entirely on communal considerations. It is this blatant communalism practised by the Congress which tended later to give a communal character to the election campaign.

It is the Congress which imported communalism into the campaign. It also resorted to a number of other unfair practices against which Acharya Kripalani protested from time to time. It is reported that about twenty Central and State Ministers were in the constituency to canvass support for the Congress candidate. The presence of such a large number of dignitaries would, it was expected, influence the voters in favour of the Congress. But all calculations went wrong and the voters voted for Acharya Kripalani rather than for the Congress candidate. Apart from everything else, they registered thereby their resentment and protest against the communalist and opportunist approach of the Congress.

It is significant that this vicious communalist approach was adopted by the Congress under the pressure of the so-called progressive and socialist group against the advice of the leaders of the State Congress. The group led by Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon and Mr. K. D. Malaviya was dead set against Acharya Kripalani and wanted to defeat him by hook or by crook. It is Mr. Menon and Mr. Malaviya who prevailed upon the universally respected Mr. Hafiz Mohammed Ibrahim to agree to enter the electoral contest in spite of his old age and weak health. They expected him to win by getting all Muslim votes on the ground of his being a Muslim. This machination exposes the real character of the group. Its only object is to drive out of public life all those who are opposed to its policies and it has no compunction about the means to be used for attaining its end. In Amroha, the voters frustrated the group's game; but the Congress as a whole and an old and venerable Congress leader were dragged through the mire of communalism. Moreover, as a result of his defeat at the polls, the Minister will now have to vacate his post. This is the service that the group has rendered to the Congress!

In Amroha as well as in Farrukhabad, the Congress had the active support of the Communists. In Amroha particularly, the Communists were active in large

numbers. They were more keen on defeating Acharya Kripalani than Congressmen themselves. They and their fellow-travellers organised through their journals and through other means a raging and tearing campaign against Kripalani, showering upon him all possible abuses and attributing to him the worst possible motives. The Communists did this in accordance with their set policy of infiltrating the Congress. It may at the moment bring some support, but the Congress will rue later the day it allowed the Trojan Horse to enter its gate.

In Farrukhabad there was no such sensational development. Dr. Lohia, who contested as a socialist, had to face a three-cornered fight, one of his opponents being a candidate of the Praja Socialist Party. It is regrettable that this contest was not avoided. It is clear from the result that the PSP would have been well-advised to keep out of it. Dr. Lohia has won a convincing victory over the Congress. The victory is significant because the defeated Congress candidate was a Central Minister until his defeat in the general election of 1962. The Congress was no doubt anxious to secure his re-election; but it was far more anxious to secure the defeat of Dr. Lohia who is known to be one of the most uncompromising and virulent critics of Mr. Nehru's policies and actions. The electorate, however, chose the critic in preference to the camp follower.

The third by-election which took place on the same day went in favour of the Congress. The Congress wrested the seat from the Jan Sangh. It is true that except in the case of the two by-elections mentioned above, the Congress has not so far met with many reverses. It will not be proper, therefore, to interpret the result of the two by-elections as the country's loss of faith in the Congress. It is clear,

however, that the country is critical about its policies and actions and, whenever an electorate comes across an eminent individual with a different policy and outlook, it is prepared to turn to him in preference to a Congress leader. This should serve as a warning. The two by-elections are straws in the wind. They indicate a drift away from the Congress, the growing dissatisfaction of the people with its policies and actions. Acharya Kripalani's dazzling success over one of the Ministers of the Central Government is the people's verdict against those policies of Mr. Nehru, which were specifically challenged during the election campaign. Will he change them and prove himself a democrat, or will he remain indifferent and allow discontent to pile up? That is the challenge that he has to face.

* After the article went to the Press, came the news of the resounding success of Mr. M. R. Masani in the Rajkot constituency. This is the third successive defeat that the Congress has suffered. It is as significant as the first two as this contest was also regarded as a prestige contest. It was a contest not between two personalities, but between two radically different points of view and sets of policy. The electorate has decisively rejected the one represented by the Congress. Mr. Masani won the election in spite of heavy odds pitted against him, represented by all the talent, the money and the influence of the Congress. He deserves heartiest congratulations for winning the election in spite of all these heavy odds. His success reinforces the challenge that Mr. Nehru has to face.

Famous Last Words

Rajkot: Votes polled by	Mr. Masani	83,365
	Mr. Joshi	69,214

Mr. Vajubhai Shah, M.L.A., former secretary, Gujarat Congress said: "Never in my 30 years of life had I been so deceived by the voters."

(And may not the voters now feel equally deceived for as many years? Ed.)

Amroha And Farrukhabad

Reactions of the Press

Hindustan Times:

If public opinion is to regard the defeats in Amroha and Farrukhabad as major disasters for the Congress, the blame entirely belongs to the party leadership. From nomination day it was apparent that there was an unusual degree of personal commitment by Mr. Nehru in the fortunes of the Congress candidates and the point was continually hammered in the campaign that the stake was not local issues but the Government's national policies. At the height of the campaign, there were never fewer than 20 Central and State Ministers in camp in Amroha and the effort in Farrukhabad was not of a much lesser order. The Congress had chosen to turn the two by-elections into a full-scale trial of strength on ground of its own choosing and it was badly worsted. The party leadership might take thought on some other lessons from Amroha and Farrukhabad. The questioning regarding the rightness of the party's policies is now far more general than is suspected by the leadership and

the recent revelations of failure on the food and planning fronts and laxity in the maintenance of standards of public life have doubtless cost the party dear in terms of its prestige and authority.

The Indian Express:

The voters' verdict at Amroha is a resounding slap on the face of the Congress Party and a rebuke to the Prime Minister who ill-advisedly allowed the prestige of his name to be used in one of the most degrading electoral contest to be held in our country since independence. The circumstances in which Hafiz Mohammed Ibrahim, the Union Minister for Irrigation and Power, with a seat in the Rajya Sabha, was surreptitiously foisted at the last moment on an unsuspecting constituency by the Congress High Command, are too well-known to need reiteration. It was a malevolent plot hatched to oust for ever out of public life a great national worker, one of Gandhiji's

(Continued on page 11)

Suppression Of News

Raman Desai

THE desire for news is as old as the settlement of man in a Group. The statement of news, in the form of gossip or as a statement of dry fact, involves an element of opinion, a presentation and an interpretation. It is the function of a newspaper to state facts and present news as objectively as possible. Whatever opinions are held by the editor or the management, the primary crime attaches to a denial or suppression of news. Recently I came across two items, one small and another significant, where attempt at suppression appeared to have been made. In a case of defamation, the name of a Church dignitary, wholly innocent himself, was mentioned and the news was suppressed, in at least two papers. The other case is the reportage of Vivian Bose Commission Report on Dalmia Group of business enterprise.

Recently Mr. Nehru has made several statements denigrating the way the larger newspapers conduct themselves in the country. He regretted the departure of the individualist among editors, the dedicated journalist with a mission, may be possessed even of a vast egotism. Mr. Nehru, in turn, has been criticised for his attack on the Press; it is represented that the passing of a rugged individual, who dictated the policy of a paper, is a wholesome gain in favour of a stable tradition and policy of the paper as an objective institution. Those who remember the race of giants, Annie Besant, Natarajan, Chintamani, Motilal Ghosh, Horniman, will wholly agree with Mr. Nehru and remember with gratitude their contribution to the mould of opinion of several generations of intelligentsia, even though the proof reading, arrangement of news, the shabby get up, often left much to be desired. The last in the line was Pandit M.S.M. Sharma of *Searchlight*, Patna, whom I came to know intimately. Pandit Sharma was irascible, difficult, impossible, but thoroughly dependable where injustice had to be redressed, authorities to be chastised, be they the Ministers or the bureaucrats or the police. Often enough Pandit Sharma was threatened by the Chief Minister; often did he travel to Calcutta to meet his employers in dread every time of being dismissed; once he was remorselessly beaten up by easily identified hirelings of eminent politicians. Be it said to the credit of his employers, they gave him full powers and backed him, not because they agreed with him but because he was respected by them and by the people. His newspaper was shabby, proof-reading was atrocious, the news badly arranged, but his opinions were beyond purchase and they represented hope in the minds of many who had no faith in the then administration. He was eminently the one "shouting, thumping even" whom Mr. Nehru would welcome. He died in poverty, befitting a learned Brahmin.

But we are told by the modern editor with polished paper, perfect proof-reading, that men like him were

irrelevant and indeed a most unhealthy product. We are told that the paper must speak with the voice of tradition and policy and the editor should be unobtrusive.

This debate on the essence of what a newspaper has come to mean in this country has become relevant in the face of reportage of news where newspaper owners are themselves affected. Can there be any doubt that the Vivian Bose Report on Dalmia Group is the most damning event in the history of free enterprise in Company management in the country? A limited company is an artificial creation of society, intended to limit the capital which would be staked by a shareholder in an enterprise thereby encouraging the investment of the savings of vast number of citizens into a private enterprise. But if this artificial entity is used to plunder these savings by cunning men guided by legal talents, escaping the law of the land, the public must question the very purpose of protection to such management, and the public may well demand nationalisation of all such enterprise. And what was the reportage of this Report in our national newspapers? Most of us learnt the details from so-called leftist papers and barely a few lines in a back page appeared in other papers. In contrast, when a rebuttal was given by one of the defendants in the Report, more than four solid columns, right through the centre page were allotted by at least one national paper. It is true the Daphtary Report was given adequate publicity. What one would like to ask the unobtrusive editors is: would they have given the same treatment to a Report, even one tenth as scathing, on a public nationalised undertaking? And would they not have written long editorials on the general depravity of public enterprise?

The Press in India, due to the services rendered by the eccentric egoistic journalists in the freedom movement, is a highly respected organ of public opinion in India. In this it has resemblance to a similar role in U.S.A. history. And it has been remarked that the freedom, even license, enjoyed by the Press in U.S.A. in comparison with the Press in Britain, is due to this historical parallel. In Britain the periodical elections do not reflect the views or the tendentious news of the Press, but they are affected more by the platform and the personalities involved. It would be a pity if the Press lost its prestige and its power over the minds of men in this country; for, this would mean the loss of one more aspect of leadership in a political scene, where stern, unbending individuals, dedicated to public service, were never more needed than today.

Strategic Hamlets Of South Viet Nam

Rama Swarup Sabherwal

IN the course of the history of South Viet Nam, the hamlet, after the family, is the basic social unit of the country. Through political upheavals and many other changes, the structure of the hamlet has retained its essential character. This demonstrates the strength of its organization and the permanence of this basic unit. Any revolutionary movement in order to be effective needs therefore to start from the hamlet.

Under the new Strategic Hamlet Scheme started in March 1962, Government activities are centered on the hamlet. The villagers' needs are met through direct contact between them and the authorities. All means are used to give the hamlet direct assistance and to bring it into the orbit of the nation. The aim of the scheme is to make the hamlet residents realize their rights and responsibilities, to provide them with the means for active participation in the reconstruction and defence of the country.

Realizing the importance of the hamlet, the Viet Cong (Communists) have always considered the hamlet as an ideal field for the implementation of their plan of subversion, and at the same time a source for the replenishment of their guerrilla forces. In order to eliminate this danger, to uncover guerrilla activities and to force the Viet Cong to accept combat under conditions chosen by Government forces, the authorities have decided to reorganize the hamlet.

At its first stage the Strategic Hamlet Scheme calls for the building of defence works around the existing villages: watch-towers, earthworks, moats lined with bamboo spears, etc.

When a strategic hamlet is created, it must first rely on regular armed forces for its defence: army, civil guard and self-defence corps units from the district. At this stage, a hamlet is known as a "secure hamlet" not a strategic hamlet. It becomes "strategic" when regular armed forces are no longer necessary. With Government assistance, the hamlet forms its own Self-Defence Corps and Republican Youth and Combatant Youth organizations. Hamlet residents are trained in military matters by special instruction teams which are sent in to set up and maintain defences. Local defence forces begin manning watch-towers, gun slots, guard posts and patrols. To check infiltration by communist agents, hamlet authorities keep a close watch on the population.

In this war without a frontline, the communists are attempting to use the hamlet to carry out their plan of sabotage. Theirs is a system of hiding in the forest or among the population. They thus seek opportunities for their hit-and-run tactics. Disguised as peasants, they mingle with them. Through terrorism they attempt to maintain fear among the population, and warn people of reprisals if they inform the army of their movements.

It is, therefore, necessary for the authorities to reconsider their strategy and tactics, by converting these unfavourable conditions to their own advantage.

From now on, whenever the communists want to launch an attack they must attack the fortified villages. Government forces are not to pursue the enemy and to run into ambushes; the enemy is to attack the villages and to fall into government traps.

Strategic hamlets are also aimed at political and social revolution, which will automatically lead to an economic revolution. As a result of this, the present life of the people and all the laws which command it will be subject to a sweeping change.

The two main features of the political life in a strategic hamlet are administration by the people themselves and no arbitrary arrests.

Strategic hamlets help in discriminating between friends and enemies in the context of a war without a frontline. Arbitrary arrests which often occurred in the state of a "war without a frontline" — made necessary by communist infiltration — are to be brought to an end with the new organization in the hamlets.

On the other hand a policy of clemency is now possible, for those who were on the enemy side and wish to redeem themselves.

The hamlet as a social unit is no more ruled by the law of the powerful and the rich as is still the case in the city society where those who have power and money "enjoy every privilege and yet are the last to be punished for their mistakes or not punished at all."

This regime of injustice must be eradicated by establishing a new system of values based on the contribution of each in the common struggle, with privileges going to those who face danger of death to defend the community and those who work hard for its welfare.

Finally, by establishing strategic hamlets, South Viet Nam Government is taking advantage of the war created by the communists to implement democracy. The present conditions are more favourable than at any other time for the implementation of democracy in South Viet Nam as an underdeveloped country.

Democracy established within the strategic hamlets will open the path for the liquidation of all injustice, corruption, and other illogical situations in towns and cities, thus laying the foundation for a new society, a new civilization.

The ambition of the strategic hamlet policy is to find a way out of underdevelopment without sacrificing democracy and freedom. In the historic movement of the underdeveloped countries, in the world of today, the building of strategic hamlets in South Viet Nam will therefore represent a new approach which will have consequences far beyond its national frontier.

Corruption In Public Life

M. R. Pai

MACAULAY observed in his monumental History of England that during the Cromwellian era in England, standards of puritanical public morality were such that the game of bear baiting was banned not because it pained the bear so much as it gave pleasure to the spectators. The era which followed was one notorious for laxity in morals in every sphere of public and private life. Something analogous seems to be happening in our country. The first flush of enthusiasm over Independence having subsided, and the moral ardour generated during the freedom movement having lost its edge, there has been a confusion in values in public life.

During recent months, a number of incidents have brought into focus the extent to which this deterioration has taken place. Of the several instances, two are outstanding and may be taken as representative of the New Morals which have become the norm.

The first instance is the result of the Vivian Bose inquiry into what are known as Dalmia-Jain firms. After labouring for years, amidst legal wranglings, the Commission has finally produced a document. The revelations of the malpractices in the enterprises run by this group are such as to make anyone hang his head in shame. Important issues are, therefore, raised.

One reason for this state of affairs is the attitude of the public in our nascent democracy. Over the centuries, we have learnt to look up to a "Maa Baap Sircar" for succour and protection instead of learning to stand on our own legs and to fend for ourselves. Shareholders as a class are no exception to this attitude. There can be no doubt that until and unless shareholders learn to act for themselves, in their individual as well as collective capacities, men of the shrewdness of Mr. Ramkrishna Dalmia will exercise their skills. Recent reports from Soviet Russia have revealed extensive corruption even in a completely state-owned economy. That a Police State armed with ruthless powers is unable to check such malpractices makes it clear that ultimately the best check and limitation on every loci of power in society is the group which is directly affected. The overall regulatory power of the state will be useful only in such a context. Mere tightening up of the laws will mean harassment to the honest who have to spend nowadays the best part of their productive energies in complying with intricate, and at times, stupid laws. It will mean expansion of the bureaucracy, and also more scope for the cunning to take advantage of the larger number of loopholes that complex legislation inevitably presents. In fact, the trend with regard to company law should be in the other direction. A simple law is called for private companies, while public limited companies can come under the purview of more detailed legislation. This enables the freeing of the productive energies of the people for increasing the national wealth; at the

same time, it enables the Government to administer the law more vigorously.

This brings us to the second factor in the situation. It is a well-known fact that today there is no single piece of legislation in the country which cannot be circumvented either by *political or administrative intervention*. At the administrative level, the multiplicity of controls and complexity of legislation have given rise to a new profession of "contact men", influence-peddling by legislators and tremendous amount of corruption all round "to get things done." Political intervention, on the other hand, operates more subtly.

It was highly questionable in propriety, for instance, that the Prime Minister of India should have received an "Abhinandan Granth" (Commemoration Volume) on the occasion of his 70th birthday from Mr. Shanti Prasad Jain, one of the persons who was being questioned by the Bose Commission then in sitting.

Political intervention at other levels is not so subtle after all. It would be a revealing list, if it could be compiled, as to the beneficiaries among Union and State Ministers, M.P.'s and M.L.A.'s of the following three types of favours from the parties before the Bose Commission:

- (a) Contributions accepted for elections purposes.
- (b) Hospitality received in their bungalows in Bombay, Calcutta and elsewhere.
- (c) Relations appointed in numerous concerns.

It becomes apparent why the law cannot be enforced.

The Malaviya-Sirajuddin affair is of the same character, but far more dangerous to the very stability of the Republic. *Prima facie* the only impropriety is Minister Malaviya's arranging to get Rs. 10,000 for elections for a candidate in Basti District from Sirajuddin & Co. The firm has dealings with the Ministry with whose fortunes Mr. Malaviya is concerned. The inference as to the motive for contribution cannot be far-fetched considering the average businessman's calculations on the return on moneys disbursed for non-commercial enterprises. The letter written by Mr. Ansar Harvani, Member of Parliament, to the Finance Minister, interceding on Mr. Sirajuddin's behalf for dropping pending cases once again brings into sharp focus influence-peddling which is going on today. In addition, the emergence of what is known as the Left in the Congress, whose vociferous spokesmen include Mr. Malaviya and Mr. Harvani, and the dealings in connection with the Left's mouthpieces "Link" and "Patriot", show the new pattern of alignment between the vociferous Left and Big Business of a new kind. There is no doubt that if this situation is allowed to continue, its cancerous growth will snuff out the light from our body politic.

(Continued on page 6)

Tortuous Foreign Policy

IN the course of the joint declaration of 17th April 1963, the United Arab Republic, now incorporating Egypt, Syria and Iraq, it is stated: "Unity is a revolution especially because it is strongly connected with the question of Palestine and the national duty to liberate it." The statement stresses the need for military unity capable of liberating the Arab homeland from the dangers of Zionism. President Nasser had been stating this policy for many a month. It may be noted that these contesting parties are all member states of the United Nations and it is strange that some of them should openly avow the intention to destroy another member state. Israel has protested to the Security Council on the 28th April 1963 in this matter.

It is well to remember that Israel came into existence with the goodwill of all nations, to provide a home for the destitute Jews, whose kinsmen were slaughtered in millions during the two World Wars. Israel has built itself, through donations from abroad, over a desert soil, bought and paid for from willing Arabs, and now turned into an orchard and an industrial complex. Israel is an object of envy among the Arabs and Egypt has threatened and even

attacked it several times. Egypt has openly followed the policy of arming rebels in Syria and Iraq as long as they come under the aegis of President Nasser. The official Cairo Radio poured insults and threats at the King of Jordan when he was fighting rebels for his life. This indeed is strange morality in international relations worthy of the Communists whom President Nasser chose to imprison in his own State. It is in these circumstances that our foreign policy, which never tires of declaiming praise for President Nasser and is cold towards Israel, assumes a sinister shape. The declaration of Arab Unity dated 17th April 1963, far from evoking apprehension of disturbing world peace, earned high praise from Mr. Nehru: "This is a great and historic achievement. We welcome it as a significant development towards the realisation of its cherished goals by the Arab people. We would particularly like to congratulate you on your wisdom and statesmanship in guiding the progressive forces of the Arab world into constructive channels." One must regret that the Indian Press seemed not to notice the implications of the threats to Israel in terms of world peace.

Mr. Nehru's foreign policy, while it praises a party dictatorship in the Middle East, is indifferent to another union, Malaysia, brought about by one of our best friends, Tunku Abdul Rahman, a great Democrat and incidentally the only Oriental who expressed himself in our favour on the China War. Speaking about Malaysia, Mr. Nehru said that India does not like to get "involved in the dispute over the Federation of Malaysia as we have enough troubles of our own."

What is Mr. Nehru worried about, is he afraid of Dr. Sukarno? Does he not realise that fifteen years ago our Independence brought hope and expectation in the hearts of democrats in South East Asia and that since then we have not only failed to keep our moral stature about our sister Nations but definitely alienated them by our pro-Chinese, pro-Communist, phoney non-alignment?

Indeed, it is time the Opposition parties stated a fresh foreign policy for India, a policy based on our needs of security, our stature among the sister undeveloped states of the Middle East and the South East Asia, above all a policy based on alliance among those democracies which fear and abhor the obvious menace of Communist imperialism, based either on Russia or on China.

R. K. D.

(Continued from page 5)

What is particularly distressing in the situation is the protection afforded by the Prime Minister to persons who are no longer above suspicion.

There are various other forms of corruption in the public life of the country. But a sophist attitude that so long as one does not get caught it is all right and success at any cost is the thing to be aimed at persists, corruption will manifest itself in various forms. What then, is the remedy, it may be asked.

In a brief article, it is not possible to discuss different factors. It is realistic to face that, especially in an underdeveloped economy, the complete elimination of corruption is not an easy task. But corruption can certainly be minimised. One step in this direction is to place limitations on power centres in society. So far as the Government is concerned, economic power should not mean *ownership* but *regulation*; planning should not mean complete control on the economy and its administration, but guidance of the direction of the economy and stimulation of its growth. So far as the economic activities are concerned, the operation of the market forces is the most effective limitation on the individuals. As Milton Friedman, a leading economist says, the market forces give the least power to the capitalists.

In fine, the time has come for giving up false postures of morality and for a frank admission that despite our heritage we are today a morally degenerate and stagnant nation. Out of this, new values will have to be forged for building an enduring structure. Human nature being what it is, limitation of power at the source and the strengthening of the pluralistic base of society seems to be the way out of the present mess.

Tibet Fights For Freedom

An Orient Longmans Publication

Price Rs. 15

Sino-Soviet Conflict

Adam Adil

THERE is considerable talk in the world on what is called the Sino-Soviet conflict. Some time ago, Panditji also referred to it and seemed to hope that it would help to build India's case in relation to the Chinese aggression in the Communist world. Some political observers even go to the extent of pointing out that the Chinese lobby is fairly strong in the Soviet Union and is likely to weaken Khrushchev's hold on the Communist Party as well as on the Government in Russia.

It is, therefore, pertinent to ask how far the 'Sino-Soviet Conflict' is real.

The Sino-Soviet conflict does not seem to be of a serious kind. It is, as Khrushchev has put it, only a 'family quarrel'. To hope, therefore, that this quarrel would help to buttress India's case against China in the communist world would be futile. The fundamental fact is that China is a communist country as much as the Soviet Union, and the communist countries would always remain united against the free world. This is also evident from the fact that while the Western countries offered massive military aid to India to stop Chinese aggression, Russia gave practically nothing—the MIG planes which Russia supplied with great reluctance and inordinate delay are indeed an insignificant help. (There are reports that Russia had supplied better and superior MIG's to China!)

Further, the so-called Sino-Soviet conflict has not divided the communist world into two sharply conflicting camps. With the probable exception of tiny Albania, the whole communist world, including the communist parties in free countries, are on the side of Russia. Even China looks upon Russia as the leader of the communist world. This is clear from the fact that every ideological statement by the Chinese communist leaders, including those which could be regarded as critical of the Soviets, invariably ends with spirited assertions that the communist camp is led by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and that all Communist Parties in the world must rally around it. Whenever the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party sends its greetings to other Communist Parties of the world, it takes care not to challenge the leadership of the Soviet Union.

Further, there is no material basis for China to repudiate Soviet leadership or for the communists the world over to follow China in contravention to the writ of Russia. What can China offer in terms of material benefits? As James Burnham has rightly put: "food? medicine? machinery? chemicals? ships? steel? aluminium? consumer goods? surplus modern arms? a strategic nuclear shield? gold or convertible monies? The answers are No, No and No." The Peking press usually indulges in peroration about wars and revolutions. The Chinese comrades express their solidarity with the revolutionary liberators of Algeria, Angola, Spain, Guiana, Cuba and pledge total sup-

port in all dimensions. But what that support amounts to in every case—except in some of the Chinese border areas—is only talking and nothing more. What more could it be?

The Chinese do not possess economic resources to translate their words into material reality. They don't possess the decisive weapons system of the nuclear age. Therefore, they cannot, in the present period, carry through an independent world strategy.

The greatest weapon the Chinese have, and which far exceeds that of the Russians, is the colossal population. Therefore, the Chinese communists have been able to infiltrate neighbouring regions in enormous human waves and almost overrun them. By means of their massed humans, the Chinese today dominate the regimes of North Korea and North Viet Nam and threaten the freedom of Burma, Malaya, Laos, Cambodia and even Indonesia.

Russia has not only not showed any annoyance or concern at the threat the Communist China constitutes to the freedom and integrity of the neighbouring countries but has almost endorsed every Chinese offensive action. Even in relation to the Chinese aggression against India, Russia has sought to describe China as "brotherly" and India only as "friendly". Also earlier, when Chinese incursions into Indian territory were made known, Russia took up decidedly pro-Chinese line, only condescending to advise India and China to settle their dispute in a peaceful friendly way.

All this is not to suggest, however, that Russia and China are on the best of terms or that there is absolutely no conflict between them. (That way, there are conflicts even in the Western camp!) It is quite clear that Mao and Khrushchev dislike each other and Russians and Chinese are not on the same happy relations as before. As a matter of fact, the quarrel between the Russians and the Chinese is bitter and often expresses itself into virulent terms. "It is even more certain," as Burnham observes, "that the basis of the conflict is not a doctrinal argument over the soft versus the hard road to the world revolution. To believe so is to turn things upside down, as anyone who has studied past intra-Bolshevik conflicts should know."

The reason for the mutual dislike between Mao and Khrushchev is that while Mao feels that by virtue of seniority he has better moral claim to be regarded as number one world communist (although, he would concede to Russia the leadership of the communist bloc) Khrushchev fears that once number one place is given to Mao, it would be difficult to restrain the Chinese from trying to assume the leadership of the whole communist bloc. (Further, why should Khrushchev yield number one position to Mao? Is it not true that according to common communist practice, the quantum of power one wields determines one's place in communist hierar-

chy and hence, Khrushchev enjoying nuclear power must remain the number one?) And also, Russians and the Chinese quarrel because many inconvenient issues over trade, aid and payments arise between them which mar their happy relationship.

These mutual dislikes and quarrels often express themselves into open. For instance, when, faced with American challenge, Khrushchev faltered in relation to Soviet missile bases in Cuba, China described Russian action as "cowardice" and "capitulation." Similarly, when Albania proved too recalcitrant, Khrushchev did not hesitate to lose temper at Chinese encouragement of that tiny kingdom.

In spite of these mutual dislikes and quarrels, it would be politically naive to assume that there is a pro-Chinese faction in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is generally supposed that this 'pro-Chinese faction' is the neo-Stalinist against whom Khrushchev is desperately contending. On all reliable evidence it is established that there are no serious factions in the Soviet apparatus—neither pro-Chinese-neo-Stalinist nor military. As Boris Souvarine has recently pointed out, Khrushchev, in reality, is the representative of a collective leadership specifically of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party, which finally resolved the post-Stalin contests for leadership. The very fact that he is at the top shows that he occupies the most dominant position in the Central Committee, and that whenever differences of opinion arise, he carries the majority with him. As such, he is the number one communist of the world, whether Mao likes this fact or not.

The issues which have generated particular heat in the dispute between Russia and China, according to Professor Zbigniew Brzezinski, are (1) the problem of war in the period prior to a complete communist victory; (2) the matter of peaceful co-existence and the related problems of how to capitalise on the anti-colonial struggle; (3) the issue of disagreement on the sharing of nuclear weapons; (4) the stages of the domestic construction of communism.

Although the issues as listed by Professor Brzezinski lend doctrinal colour to the Sino-Soviet dispute, it is clear that they are not of major consequence. Further according to Professor Brzezinski himself the Sino-Soviet differences express themselves within certain well-defined limits—the limits, in the main, being (1) there is no conscious effort on the part of the weaker unit to displace the major party of the leadership of the camp; (2) both parties are very conscious of the fact that their unity is a decisive factor of strength in relation to the non-Communist world, which both of them (but perhaps, not to the same degree) interpret as hostile; (3) unlike the situation of 1948 with respect to Yugoslavia when the Soviets erroneously calculated that an open condemnation would result in Tito's fall, Moscow presumably realises that Mao Tse Tung's leadership is firm. Similarly, the Chinese probably entertain lower illusions concerning the stability of Khrushchev's regime than do many Western commentators. As a result, both

regimes realise that in one way or another they will have to deal with each other.

It is thus clear that the foremost anxiety of the Chinese as much as that of the Russians is to remain united, and to this overwhelming aim all other considerations are subordinated. Within the framework of their overall relationship they may criticise each other, but they continue as two major units of one super structure of world communism. Their relative strength may be uneven on many planes, but they feel morally and spiritually equals. Russia is superior in terms of nuclear power, armaments, industrial and agricultural developments. China is superior in terms of population, rigidity of ideology and fanaticism of belief in Marxism and Leninism. Hence, in ultimate analysis, both Russia and China compliment each other.

It would be, therefore, disastrous for the non-Communist world to lull itself into an illusion that the tensions in the Communist world would result into the final breakdown between Russia and China, and to formulate its policies accordingly. Basing their beliefs on such an illusion, some Western observers advocate a policy of compromise or 'soft-line' towards Moscow. Any compromise or soft-line or any attempt purported to isolate Peking from Moscow would only help to strengthen the communists against the free world. Let us disabuse our mind from any idea that communists can be idiots!

Without Comment

A week before the Russians launched their newest earth satellite, Cosmos 14, *Pravda* admitted that letters were being received from indignant parents complaining of the shortage of children's exercise books. Children in Verchni Uryum, near Novosibirsk, were writing on newspapers and leaves torn out of old registers, *Pravda* disclosed. From places as far apart as Archangel and Volgograd (Stalingrad) came letters demanding: "Why is there a crisis of copybooks in the Russian Federation?"

The RSFSR Trade Ministry admitted, *Pravda* said, that production targets for copybooks had not been fulfilled for four years. In the last two years the State paper industry had piled up a debt equivalent to 232 million copybooks. This year *Gospplan* had allocated 650 million copybooks FEWER than the number needed. "And even the plan they have approved is in danger of not being fulfilled. In the Archangel and Krasnoyarsk paper and cellulose combines, the relevant sections have not even been equipped, and other enterprises have shown themselves unequal to their tasks. Moreover, many teachers, pupils and parents complain of the bad quality of the copybooks they do get. This is caused by a deterioration in the quality of the paper used in their production."

India's Tradition In Foreign Policy

M. A. Venkata Rao

THE claim is often made for India's present foreign policy that it is the natural and logical outcome of India's spiritual tradition and philosophy. The Prime Minister and his supporters do not appear to have any grounds for this confidence other than a vague idea of the ethics of non-injury (ahimsa) which reached its apogee in Buddhist and Jaina schools and became a powerful tradition among large sections of people down the centuries.

The term *panchsheel* that the Prime Minister has taken over from Buddhist ethics was primarily promulgated as rules for the guidance of Buddhist *bhikkus* or monks who left the world and embraced the "homeless state", as the saying goes.

The content of *panchsheel* marks the chief virtues that the *bhikku* is to make it his constant endeavour to realise in all the strata of his conscious being, extending down to several unconscious levels. The Buddhist psychologists distinguished nearly two dozen layers of consciousness!

Ahimsa (non-injury), asteya, (non-stealing), aparigraha (non-covetousness or nonreceipt of goods or favours) kshanti (fortitude) kshama (forgiveness of injuries done to oneself) are the principal virtues covered by *panchsheel*.

It will be seen that this five-fold code has but a remote resemblance to the five articles laid down as the basic principles of foreign policy or international conduct for nations in their mutual relations. Non-interference, nonaggression either direct or indirect through propaganda and infiltration, respect for each other's sovereignty and so on.

It will be conceded that the five rules of *panchsheel* certainly do specify the relations that ought to subsist among independent nations in their relations to each other if peace is to prevail.

What is wrong with *panchsheel* is not its inapplicability or irrelevance or unwisdom but the fatal absence of any sanctions. International treaties and agreements and so-called international "laws" have just as much force as they derive from the fear of punishment by other nations if any nation breaks them to his own selfish advantage.

This was the fatal weakness of the Locarno and the Kellogg Pacts which were formulated in the early 1914-18 post-war period in Europe at the instance of America.

This was also the defect of the League of Nations for though its Covenant had devised some sort of sanction based on the idea of collective security, its effect depended on the sovereign will of each nation. The sanctions failed against Italy because they were not enforced with honesty and vigour. Imperial interests cut across collective security.

The Charter of the UNO too has not provided a sanction to function on in the manner of a court of law supported by a world police force, both institutions capable of being set in motion indepen-

dently of the national decisions of members on particular issues.

The fatal flaw of the Indian prime minister's *panchsheel* too is of the same kind. It has no sanctions. Further, it has the added disadvantage that its philosophy did not envisage any necessity for any sanction at all. Its sponsor thought that the mere signature of parties to such a document and their verbal adherence to its provisions and diplomatic declarations in the same vein were sufficient to secure their enforcement. The Chinese aggression on India has proved the disastrous error of this philosophy, psychology and diplomacy conclusively. One may smile and smile and yet be a villain—is an adage that should have been familiar to Indian diplomats.

Now, there is no ground whatever to ascribe any historical or political roots for such a foreign policy to India's heritage.

The classical political tradition in general and of foreign policy in particular goes back 2300 years at least to the days of Alexander's invasion, to the days of Chanakya and the first Mauryan emperor Chandragupta.

Chanakya (wrongly called Kautilya, which should be Kautilya) refers to a whole school of political teachers on each important issue and defines his point of view in relation to them, sometimes agreeing, and sometimes disagreeing with them.

His central idea in foreign policy centres round the idea of *Mandala* and nothing even remotely resembling *panchsheel*. *Mandala* means sphere or circle of influence or power. It is equivalent to the modern expression of the balance of power which has governed the relations between nations in the international field for as long as nations have come into existence.

Dr. Zimmer, (whose significant work *The Great Philosophies of India* has been the most important of the large surveys of Indian thought after those of Dr. Das Gupta, Dr. Radhakrishnan and Prof. Hiriyanna) is more explicit than the others in stressing the realistic aspects of India's tradition.

He points out that the Indian scheme of life is not fully or typically represented by the doctrine of *maya* but by the sociological chart of life—the stages of student, householder, hermit and lonely monk or sanyasi. The role of sanyas is exceptional and comes after fulfilment of life's obligations normally and that the stage of the householder is the key to success or full contribution to life and derivation of life's values.

He gives brief accounts of other values under the heads of the *sastras* devoted to dharma or social morality, artha or economic and political interests and love and art.

Philosophy is a science of salvation or *moksha*
(Continued on page 10)

Review

One Day In the Life of Ivan Denisovich

by Alexander Solzhenitsyn. Translated by Ralph Parker.
Victor Gollancz Ltd. pp. 190 Price sh. 18/-

SOLZHENITSYN, we are told, spent eight years in various labour camps, first in general camps in the Arctic (politicals & criminals), then in "special" camps (politicals only). Ivan Denisovich Shukhov, the hero of this novel, did the same. We can safely take it that the novel is largely autobiographical and this explains the undoubted ring of authenticity throughout.

Ivan Denisovich is in a special camp in Kazakhstan, where he is serving the last two years of his ten years sentence for a flimsy and unjustified charge of having collaborated with the Germans. The book does exactly what the title indicates (what a relief to have a novel where the title does relate to the contents) and describes a day in his life from reveille at five in the freezing morning to the time he falls asleep after what has been "almost a happy day." And in doing so, it tells us more about these labour camps than a library of reports and documents.

Solzhenitsyn manages to convey realistically and without melodrama, the atmosphere of these labour camps and the main impression that one receives is not of the cruelty and misery but of the appalling futility and human waste. Ivan Denisovich is an excellent vehicle for conveying this, for he spends no time in tirades against his unjust lot, against the system that has put him there, the venality of the guards, the cooks, his co-prisoners. He concentrates on getting through his day, actually enjoying the skilled mason's job he does and taking pride in it. He applies the same skill in getting himself an extra bowl of food and generally making life in the camp a little less intolerable. And in spending this day with Ivan, we also learn how men managed to spend years in such camps and survive.

It is inevitable, of course, that Solzhenitsyn should be compared to Dostoevsky, and the publishers have kindly done this for us already. Suffice it to say that this comparison is not nearly so unjustified as it usually is.

While this is a powerful and elemental novel, a large part of its phenomenal success is of course due to the fact that a Russian has described a labour camp in all its horrifying starkness, and made no bones about the sort of "crimes" that were being expiated in them. Khrushchev's speech to the 20th Party Congress marked a major turning point in Russian history; that a Soviet writer should write such a book — and that it should be published — is another major step forward in that direction. The recent tightening up was perhaps inevitable as the move seemed to be gathering too much momentum, but the general movement and its direction can hardly be stopped or turned.

AAMIR ALI

(Continued from page 9)

sastra and comes at the end and supplements the other secular pursuits of life.

The Indian vision of life was a balanced one and held the scales of value even as between secular and spiritual realms.

In statesmanship, the ruler was enjoined to make the security of the state his primary concern in matters of foreign relations.

The first principle was that he should keep a vigilant eye on states neighbouring his own. The neighbour should be regarded secretly as a possible enemy.

Sudden attack by neighbours was to be anticipated and provided against by a system of alliances with States lying to the farther side of the immediate neighbours.

If the neighbours should attack, the neighbours of the neighbours should attack the aggressors in the rear automatically. Such a system or balance of alliances was called a *mandala*. Of course, the neighbouring states might be trying to counteract such alliances and forming *mandalas* of their own to the disadvantage of the state in question.

But this is the whole-time business of the foreign department. It should have an efficient system of intelligence and guide its moves accordingly. Sleepless vigilance was the watchword recommended by Chanakya.

The very life of the Raja was always in danger. He was advised to sleep in a different chamber every night. The palace guard should be changing the personnel of the guard frequently without notice!

This is a climate of politics and security far removed from the innocent but perilous (as it has proved) psychology of "*panchsheel*".

The principle is explicitly laid down that the Raja should not trust those who should not be trusted. This is a skill that he should acquire and fortify with the counsel of experts. No quarter is given in Indian classics on policy to the notion that good intentions are enough.

The atmosphere of the Upanishads and Vedanta dwelling on the immanence of an infinite consciousness (Brahman) in all things is far removed from that of law and politics and administration.

Today's *panchsheel* has no basis as a political policy in Indian tradition which is ruled by ideas of balance of power.

FREEDOM FIRST

Published on the first of each month

Annual Subscription: Rs. 3

Single Copy: 25 nP

Maneckji Wadia Building, 4th Floor,
127 Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

(Continued from page 2)

oldest colleagues and a truer Gandhite than the motley mob of office-hunters who today masquerade as Gandhites. . . . Amroha carries many lessons both for the Congress and the Opposition parties. It is obvious that the Congress prestige is rapidly reaching its nadir. For that it has only itself to blame. In electing Acharya Kripalani by so impressive a majority against his Congress opponent, the voters of Amroha registered not only their distaste for Communism but their disgust at the communal tactics to which the Congress, an avowedly secular party, shamelessly stooped by putting up Hafiz Mohammed Ibrahim as its candidate in the manner it did. Amroha was a decisive verdict against communalism as well as Communism.

The Statesman, (Calcutta):

If in Amroha and Farrukhabad people in the summer of their discontent appear to have voted heavily against the Congress, the reasons for this are certainly susceptible of a variety of interpretations. If excessive excitement attended these two frays, the stimuli were mostly external; there is no obvious reasons why burdens of additional taxation should weigh more heavily on Farrukhabad in Uttar Pradesh than on Bankura in West Bengal. Injection of a certain communal tone into the Amroha by-election, as the eleventh-hour nomination of Hafiz Mohammed Ibrahim was widely interpreted, proved admirably maladroit. The defeat of the Jan Sangh in Jaunpur additionally encourages the hope that people may well be considering elections in terms other than communal or parochial.

The Hindu:

India's third Parliament will be all the livelier for the presence of two such extraordinary characters as Acharya Kripalani and Dr. Lohia in the Opposition benches. Whatever mortification the Congress High Command may feel over the reverses in the two prestige contests at Amroha and Farrukhabad, the results are a clear gain from the democratic point of view. . . . Acharya Kripalani's return to the Lok Sabha, after a keenly fought election in which his chances did not seem over-bright, is a distinct accession of strength to the Opposition. . . . The charge that the Congress was trying to cash in on a communal appeal to the electorate might not be quite justified, but much that happened during the election campaign has lent colour to that view. Appeals to communal affiliations are never totally absent in an Indian election, but that U.P. results suggest that the voters are rising above communal considerations. It is significant that Mr. Kripalani obtained a solid majority in all the five Assembly constituencies comprising the Amroha Parliamentary constituency. . . . His victory must be attributed mainly to the painstaking and assiduous door-to-door canvassing he conducted and the electors' sympathy for a veteran leader of the freedom struggle who seemed to be fighting a lone battle against the massive forces of

the ruling party. . . . There is a mass of discontent, especially over taxation measures and economic policies, which may not so far have found organised expression, but which is bound to gain in strength unless the Congress can show itself to be more responsive to public opinion. With the Opposition reinforced by the return of Mr. Kripalani the Government will have a less easy time in the Lok Sabha than hitherto. While Dr. Lohia's methods are unpredictable and his influence may be largely negative, Acharya Kripalani may well play the role of an elder statesman who is in a position to place national interests above those of party which must necessarily be narrower.

The Times of India, (Bombay):

To the extent that the addition of Mr. Kripalani and Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia strengthens the front benches of the opposition in the Lok Sabha their success in the parliamentary by-elections will be welcomed even by those who do not share their political beliefs. . . . An altogether exaggerated importance has been attached to these by-elections and particularly to the contest in Amroha. There is a danger that a correspondingly exaggerated significance will be attached to the results. It would be as naive to claim that Mr. Kripalani's victory in Amroha amounts to the nation's endorsement of whatever Mr. Kripalani stands for as it would be to contend that Mr. Krishna Menon's victory in North Bombay amounted to the nation's endorsement of whatever Mr. Menon stands for. Neither Amroha nor North Bombay is India, but only a very small part of it. . . . These three by-elections have shown how easily communal feelings can be aroused and also that neither the Congress nor the Jan Sangh in Uttar Pradesh is in a position today to repulse the united challenge of the other parties. Finally, it is difficult to see how Hafiz Mohammed Ibrahim can avoid submitting his resignation from the Union Government following his defeat at the polls. The letter of the Constitution perhaps does not require his resignation, but the democratic spirit underlying it certainly demands it.

Patriot:

The reactionaries have won in Amroha and Farrukhabad. Their victory is not any the less dangerous because of the defeat of Mr. Deendayal Upadhyaya by Mr. Raj Deo Singh in Jaunpur. . . . What therefore we have to conclude about Amroha and Farrukhabad is that the Communalism of the Jana Sangh and the feudal and capitalist influence of Swatantra could not have saved the face of Acharya Kripalani or Dr. Lohia's special brand of socialism, had there not been a hidden ally. . . . This hidden ally is the reactionary trend in the State Congress. . . . The victory of Acharya Kripalani and Dr. Lohia will not bring about any change in the larger political balance in the country. But it certainly warns us that reaction is becoming a permanent characteristic of certain groups within the Congress.

With Many Voices

"The deep
Moans round with many voices. Come, my friends,
'Tis not too late to seek a newer world."
—Tennyson.

For the existence of the nation balance of power
is even more vital than the balance of payments.
—Mr. G. L. Mehta, *Times of India*, May 10.

✓ In the questions of art, the Central Committee will
demand from everybody, from the most merited and
renowned as well as from the young budding artist,
unswerving obedience to the party line.
—Mr. Khrushchev, *Indian Express*, May 8.

While India has no military alliance with the
United States, she is clearly developing a policy of
military reliance on the western powers; and this
seems to render non-alignment, if not non-existent,
at least a hollow shell.
—Seminar, May 1963.

What does freedom and talk of socialism mean to
people if we cannot get even a kilo of sugar without
having to pay black market prices?
—Mr. N. V. Gadgil, *The Hindustan Times*, May 12.

Our alliance has not had to act. It has been our
main aim to deter. It has achieved that and that is
its success.
—Lord Home, Foreign Secretary of U.K.
The Statesman, May 1.

The communists are 100 per cent patriots.
—Pandit Nehru, *New Age*, May 5.

✓ Communism is Socialism, minus democracy, plus
centralization, plus civil war, plus Russia.
—Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, *The Statesman*, May 22.

To the Editor,
FREEDOM FIRST,
C/o Democratic Research Service,
127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.
I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3.00

Name:

Address:

Signature

My guess is that Mr. Khrushchev is stumped
because he does not know how to let freedom
advance without risking the very existence of the
regime.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, *The Hindu*, May 4.

Indian Ocean should be renamed Indonesian
Ocean.

—President Sukarno, *Patriot*, May 7.

Contrary to the rest of the world, in the Soviet
Union the future is certain, drafted by plans and
governed by "inevitable" laws of development, while
the past is most uncertain.

—Mr. Ram Chandra Gupta, *The Radical Humanist*,
May 5.

The CPI is no more a threat or challenge to the
Congress. The challenge is from the right reaction in
the country.

—Mr. D. Sanjivayya, Congress
President, *Indian Express*, May 11.

Non-alignment policy is a bridge between Con-
gress and the Communist Party.

—Mr. Dange, Chairman CPI,
Times of India, May 13.

My charge is that big business wants to use social-
ism as a means to get licences.

—Mr. A. D. Mani, M. P., *The Hindustan Times*,
May 1.

As it is, the executive has the inveterate tendency
to encroach upon the independence of the judiciary.

—Mr. V. K. K. Menon, *Blitz*, May 11.

If India refused to accept the accession of Kashmir
as final, then maybe we would have to accede to
Russia.

—Mr. Bakshi Ghulam Mohamed, *Blitz*, May 25.

Non-alignment as a positive concept can only mean
"look upon all as your friends, but just as all men are
not equal, it is necessary to postulate that some friends
will be more disinterested than others."

—Mr. H. M. Patel, *Current*, May 25.

Should "forces of counter-revolution, reaction and
imperialism" try to subvert the policy of non-align-
ment "which has brought us glory, we will fight it not
in Parliament, but outside, and not only by talk but
otherwise."

—Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, *The Times of India*, May 27.