

[Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsi]

have done for the last three years in this international conspiracy. Why is it that the Washington Post hailed you people while the Vietnamese people hailed us? Why is it that the people of the Socialist countries support us while the reactionary press of the imperialist stooges are supporting you? Don't you understand this difference? Yet, you are saying you are patriots.

When the English people were in this country and the Congress fought against them, we got the support of those countries who are fighting for freedom. When emergency was declared in this country, we got the support of those people who believe in liberation, while you are getting the support of those who try to destroy their independence. Don't you see the difference as in a mirror?

Though the emergency is necessary, I feel that we must implement our programme with speed. As Babuji said yesterday, there are political forces in the country which are not reconciled to the present situation. There should be no question of sentiment or sympathy in dealing with them. It may be that some of the leaders may have participated in the 1942 movement or some other movement in the freedom struggle. For that we will salute them in the pages of history. But that should not guide us in dealing with them or in deciding what should be our programmes for the future. I would appeal to the members of the opposition who had ganged with us, who connived with them, who did mischief, let them realise their mistakes; let wisdom dawn on them. Let them come forward to support these policies.

12 hrs.

Only one word and that is about the speech which was delivered by Shri Gopalan yesterday. He has said one thing which is wrong, that

the Anand Marg was used to kill the Marxists or Naxalites for money. This is absolutely false. On the contrary, I would like to say that the Anand Marg and the Marxists and Naxalites combined together in the last three years, and the Anand Margis fought in Purulia and there the Congress people were killed, and not the Marxists. Your weapon is found in Margi's house and their weapon is found in your house. What the conspiracy is you can understand.

We have not done it so far, neither do we believe in it, but I shall certainly say with all my respect to Mr. Gopalan that in the Marxist Party there are some forces who would like to support our programme, support this country, but unfortunately due to the direct interference of some conspirators they are not doing it, but I can certainly forecast here today that the Marxist Communist Party in a big number will within a fortnight in this country support Mrs. Gandhi's programme, defying their leadership. That day is not far off.

With these words I conclude, and I hope that the Opposition, particularly Mr. Chavda and Mr. Jagannathrao Joshi, will now realise that a new India has to be made under new system and that their systems have finally collapsed.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF ELECTRONICS, MINISTER OF SPACE, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI):

Mr. Chairman, May I continue from where my young friend left off just now? Yesterday a charge was made that the Government action was aimed not at the right reactionaries—this is not my word by the way, it is their word—but against the leftists. It was instructive for me to note during that speech, which I heard very carefully, never once was any

of the communal parties criticised. Indeed, how could he do so when his party had made a deal with them?

Some people have been arrested. The largest number are not political, they are people who normally indulge in violence or criminal acts, people who are known as anti-social elements. But next to them the largest number amongst the political people, although some of the groups say they are not political, are the communal parties or groups wedded to terror and murder.

It was said that Government has launched an onslaught on workers. Perhaps the hon. Member has not noticed that workers from all over have welcomed our move and have given us full support. The programme that we have announced helps workers to achieve a larger share of real power, and that is why labour organisations have overwhelmingly welcomed this economic programme and offered their full co-operation: Industrial relations have improved almost beyond our imagination in a short while.

It seems to me that the hon. Member was speaking not to this House, but to his own cadres outside. As Shri Das Munsi has said, there is confusion in their ranks because of the nature of the groups and people outside the country who have supporting us and the others which are supporting the Opposition front.

Some friends opposite are preaching radicalism and socialism to us. I have never claimed to be a doctrinaire socialist. I have my own version of socialism and my own vision of what Indian society should be like, and I have been working and going ahead towards that vision and in that direction steadfastly. It is a slow movement, but I believe that it is a surer way of moving ahead. And this is why, although the people may sometimes be angry with us and may sometimes want to reject us, as the

House will notice, in all times of crisis, all sections of the people have stood solidly behind us.

Today, the hon. Member's party has aligned itself with quite different elements. Even in this House, they were criticised by their friends and allies.

The next speaker seemed to be apologising all the time, trying to explain away history and historical facts. He said that the sword of the RSS was a wooden one. Quite frankly, I don't see the point of it; either you have a sword or you do not have it; but why a toy sword? What games are they going to play with it? Much as I deplore the type of training that is given to young people in their shakhas, much as I condemn the violence which they preach, their real weapon has been something else. It has been the whispering campaign.

Yesterday another member of the Opposition said he would like to know what is fascims. I have spoken about this on earlier occasions. Fascism does not merely mean repression; it does not merely mean that the police use excessive force, or that people are imprisoned; it is falsehood, over and above everything, it is the propagation of the big lie. It is this whispering campaign; it is the finding of scapegoats to sacrifice and divert the people's attention so that you can go ahead. And this has been the major weapon of the Jan Sangh and the RSS. It was interesting to notice that although sometimes the two organisations want to be regarded as separate, in yesterday's speech, the names of the two parties were used as if they were interchangeable.

What has been appearing in their newspapers? If any party had a feeling for democracy, and for the truth, they could have dissociated themselves from the lies. What falsehood have they left out and not propagated? What insinuation have they not

[[**[Shrimati Indira Gandhi.]**]

made? Not merely since the Emergency has been declared, but consistently for four whole years day in and day out?

Even today there is a massive whispering campaign: somebody is supposed to be under house arrest, somebody is supposed to be on fast, somebody is supposed to have died, something else is supposed to have happened. This is their way of following democracy and this is their vision of truth. Well, if this is so, I must emphatically say that this is not our way. We do not believe in untruth, in falsehood, and we do not believe in that type of democracy.

I am not in habit of quoting, either outside or in the House. But, today, I should like to do so because I find that some hon. Members often deny the truth of what has been said by their side. In a book called "Our Nationhood Defined"—first published in 1939, and later reprinted—with regard to Hitler's Germany, Golwalkar wrote:

"The national pride of the German, is the talk of the whole world. The Germans drove out of their country the Jews only in order to maintain their racial and cultural purity. Germany has also shown that it is very difficult for fundamentally different races to live together. This is a lesson which India could learn and profit by."

With reference to the Muslims who remained in India after partition, this has been said, and I quote:

"It would be suicidal to delude ourselves into believing that they have turned patriots overnight after the creation of Pakistan. On the contrary, the muslim menace has increased a hundred-fold by the creation of Pakistan which has become a springboard for all their

future aggressive designs on our country."

Much was made of the words in one report—and it was maintained that the RSS was not involved 'as such'. I do not know what the words as such mean. I am not a legal luminary. I am glad I am not. But I quote this from the Ahmedabad Enquiry Report—

"This evidence shows that organised attacks were being made on Muslim properties and Muslims Lorries being used to carry rioters and weapons, the crowds being led and directed by a worker of Jan Sangh."

This was in September 1969.

In December 1971 there were riots in Tellicherry.

What does the Report say?

"I have no doubt the R.S.S. had taken an active part in rousing up anti-Muslim feeling among the Hindus of Tellicherry."

What do the R.S.S. say about Christians?

"So far as the Christians are concerned, to a superficial observer, they appear not only quite harmless..... They are not only irreligious but anti-national."

It is quite a long statement, I am not reading it, but this sentence reveals their attitude.

On Gandhiji's leaderships, in a book called "Bunch of Thoughts", page 153—

This leadership came as a bitter climax of the despicable tribe of so many of our ancestors who during the past 1200 years sold their national honour and freedom to foreigners and joined hands with the inveterate enemies of our country and religion in cutting the throats of their kith and kin to gratify their personal egoism, selfishness and rivalry."

On women—this is not by any person, it is in their newspaper, the *Organiser*—

“Also it is becoming clear that female franchise in this country is an unnecessary duplication of effort.”

On democracy—this was in a speech in October 1965:

“The democracy we speak of is a borrowed hotch-potch... the name does not strike responsive chord in the common man.”

Of course you all know what Sardar Patel wrote in his letter of September 11, 1948—

“Organising the Hindus and helping them is one thing but going for revenge for its sufferings on innocent and helpless men, women and children is quite another thing.”

“Apart from this, their (of R.S.S. men) opposition to Congress, that too of such virulence, disregarding all considerations of personality, decency, decorum, created a kind of unrest among people. All their speeches were full of communal poison. It was not necessary to spread poison in order to enthuse Hindus and organise for their protection. As a final result of that poison, the country had to suffer the sacrifice of the invaluable life of Gandhiji. Even an iota of sympathy or of Government or of the people no more remained for RSS.”

There are a lot of other such remarks.

I spoke just now about fascism. Apart from this whispering campaign of spreading falsehood and finding scapegoats, its main feature is the total advocacy of violence, training youth in ways of violence and terror. We know which groups are wedded to violence today, and they are all with the Morcha. The Congress is the only Party which has had a consistent, unsullied record of opposition

to fascism since before our independence, and this continues.

Some snide remarks were made about our saying that we had acted according to the Constitution and it was suggested or hinted that Hitler also had done the same thing. Of course there is no similarity. If you like you can read the history books of that period. I don't have to read them because I was there and witnessed a great deal of what was happening in Germany at that time.

I should like to know from the Hon'ble members of the Opposition whether he can name any one Head of State who would have tolerated so much for so long. Which country in the world do you think would have tolerated this campaign of falsehood, calumny and violence? (*Interruptions*). And now they talk of democracy. Who is lecturing to us on democracy?

I am going to quote some more. In the *Indian Express* of May 8, 1967, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was quoted as saying that he was “toying with the idea of military dictatorship in India” and suggesting that “in the political instability created as a result of the General Election in 1967, the nation should summon the services of the army to fill the vacuum and set right the instability”. At that time the hon'ble member opposite, Shri Gopalan, is quoted as having said:—

“... warned that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's remarks amounted to patronising flattery of the armed forces and utter contempt of the people and their democratic and patriotic aspirations”.

Another great leader and sympathiser of the Morcha made the following speech:

“We are now entering a revolutionary situation. For a time, extra-constitutional forces will take over ... I would prefer temporarily a

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi.]

patriotic army rule which takes a pragmatic economic line. gives the people a good life, stops population growth. When the army calls in politicians.....they would call in some prominent people. Suppose they called me" and 'me' means Minoo Masani "or Jayaprakash... people of that kind."

This was the version of democracy that was being preached (it is there in black and white) by the leaders of the Morcha. Today they are lecturing us on what democracy should be! One could speak on this subject for hours.

Many points were made in the speeches yesterday. After the judgment of the Allahabad High Court, it was not I who suggested that we should go out on the streets. That call came from the so-called Morcha that the issue should be decided on the streets. It had openly been stated that the movement in Bihar was unconstitutional—not by me but by the person who was at the head of the movement. He said that it may be unconstitutional but that does not necessarily mean that it was undemocratic! Perhaps, it makes sense to you, but it does not make much sense to me. I can say that our actions are not against anybody—neither against a person nor against a party. Whatever we are doing is pro-something; it is pro-India, it is pro-Indian people, it is pro-the direction and the future of India. (*Interruptions*).

As was said yesterday, the very summoning of Parliament is proof that democracy is functioning in India. The large number of Opposition members present are evidence that not every one of them is in detention or behind bars. This action is totally within our Constitutional framework. It was undertaken not to destroy the Constitution but to

preserve the Constitution. to preserve and safeguard our democracy.

Our Constitution makers had foreseen that a situation might be created, not only external aggression but internal disturbances, when the fabric of national life might be threatened. That is why they provided an entire Part entitled 'Emergency Provisions.' Democracy has not been endangered by what Government has done, but democracy was being weakened, was being endangered and would have been destroyed had the Opposition Front been allowed to launch the direct action and its plan of sabotage under RSS guidance and to go ahead with its campaign to create dissatisfaction in the army, the police and amongst our industrial workers. So, each one of us has to search our hearts and ask ourselves solemnly who was for the destruction of democracy as it has evolved in this country. Whenever this discussion has come up, we have always said that there are faults in the system let us talk about them, let us see how they can be removed. No system is perfect and each country, as it goes ahead, may find new situations and must find ways in which to deal with them.

The House is aware of the violent agitation in Gujarat. Some Hon'ble Members have spoken about it, but I do not remember whether any member drew attention to the manner in which resignations were demanded and obtained. What type of intimidation was resorted to. A mother or father was told 'to sign a resignation letter or we shall kidnap your child'. Is that democracy? When a senior member of the Congress was lying in hospital with heart attack, some students went in there, beat him up and wanted to throw him out of the window. Was that democracy? Was that normal life? Did it show respect for democracy and the Constitution?

After the dissolution of the Gujarat Assembly, it was proclaimed openly

in public meetings that Parliamentary institutions were unsuitable to India. The electoral system provided in the Constitution was under constant attack. Who was responsible for this? Who withstood this challenge and fought to uphold the sanctity of the Constitution and of Parliament? The so-called leaders of this disruptive agitation had no qualms at all about handing over the management of their campaign to the RSS in spite of the Known record of the RSS in national life, in fomenting communal riots and communal hatred. Was the call for a gherao of Parliament during its Winter Session and appeal to the Naxalite leaders to devote their revolutionary zeal to the cause of total revolution an exercise in democratic politics?

It was obvious that certain political elements who do not have anything in common had chosen to come together for the sole purpose of paralysing and removing a duly elected Government. Groups and parties, whose ideologies were poles apart, joined together. Established democratic norms and political practices were done away with.

It is time now to think seriously about basic matters, about democracy and the functioning of democratic institutions. Political liberty and political rights can exist only so long as political order remains. A state of anarchy can lead only to the quick erosion of every freedom and political right of the individual. There is no doubt about the need for a regulated expression of public discontent against the policies of even an elected Government. We have always accepted that; we have never tried to stop criticism. If we have lost any election, we have never said that the election was rigged or that somebody had done wrong. Now if the opposition wins an election, they say it is free and fair but if they lose it, then they talk of some secret ink which has mysteriously helped the other person to win. Or

some other flights of fancy are indulged in.

However, when protest and resistance is conceived to destroy the very fabric of society and undo the stability of the political system, such actions become a disguise for action to destroy democracy. Every right that the State concedes to the individual imposes an obligation on him. Similarly, groups and organised associations, who enjoy political freedom in a democracy must respect the limits within which those rights have to be exercised. Such are the norms of any functioning democracy anywhere in the world. The makers of almost every Constitution have made provisions to deal with elements who try to undo the democratic process through methods and liberties made available to them by the democratic process itself. In no modern democracy can the question of economic betterment and social justice be separated from the proper functioning of democracy.

Democracy implies the existence of representative institutions, the expression of the will of the people as to who their representatives would be and the participation of the people in national tasks. It also implies that once representatives are chosen and Government comes into being with the approval of the majority, it functions freely to bring about the social and economic changes that it promised to the people.

When we had a majority, but had a smaller percentage of votes, we were taunted about it in the House. Now when in Gujarat we have got 41 per cent of the votes, and the entire Morcha together—I do not know how many parties there were, I think five parties together—got 34 per cent then the question of percentage is conveniently ignored.

Here in India, democracy is evolving in a set of unique circumstances. Millions of extremely poor people are hankering for a better life, for grea-

[[Shrimati Indira Gandhi.]]

ter equality of opportunity, for social justice and they are electing Governments and participating in the process of Government in order to realise these aspirations. Therefore, it is a question of striking a balance, a balance between the political rights of the individual and the social and economic rights of the collective mass of people. Any narrow definition of democracy which tries to ignore these realities can only mean the growth of political ideas which are anti-democratic. The challenges to Indian democracy must be seen in the light of the general problems that this particular system of Government faces in the world and the very unique problems that it faces within India. The essence of the democratic system is the continuous participation of people in political, social and economic processes. The existence of representative Governments and institutions would facilitate such participation and this has been our endeavour. It is true that it has not always worked. The Panchayat system came about in order to give people at a particular level a chance of participation. It sometimes went into wrong hands. That does not mean that the institution is wrong. It does mean that we have to correct its functioning, remove its faults and weaknesses and make whatever changes are necessary.

By the same definition, it is incumbent on a democratic regime to remove all obstacles and impediments to such participation for social, political and economic progress. The great national task we face makes it necessary for us to evolve a political system in which the right balance is struck, in which the essence of freedom is maintained, while conditions are created for a higher level of social discipline and economic progress.

As I said earlier, the people's response to the emergency has been wholesome. Why is this so? Because the people genuinely believe that the Opposition Front was holding the country to ransom and was weakening

us at a time of delicate alterations in international power relations and structures.

The Opposition, used to hear its own voice and that of a few newspapers, imagined it to be the voice of the people and now it is sadly disillusioned.

But a few determined and unreconciled elements are still at large and are at work. They are announcing plans of sabotage of essential services and strategic installations. Desparadoes belonging to criminal organisations like the Anand Marg are still busy with their plots to murder and kill people. And a few newspapers outside the country, either out of mistaken analysis or by deliberate design, are building this up as a resistance movement. So vigilance cannot be relaxed at the moment.

The question is asked: where do we go from here and when do we return to normalcy? I dealt with this question the other day. First we have to decide what is normalcy. People are free to move about on the roads. Does this mean that some people should decide that although the rule of the road is to drive on the left, they are free to drive on the right side? Is that the meaning of freedom of the road? What kind of chaos would be created if some people did so. Unfortunately, this has happened a couple of times, resulting in tragic accidents.

There has been greater freedom of speech in India than anywhere else in the world. Most countries which are today lecturing us on democracy, what kind of regimes are they supporting, morally and materially? Would you like to look at their list?

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: No voice is heard except your voice outside.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The Emergency is very young. What was happening in the four years before that? This is what I am asking. And even today, all those people who are talking the loudest about democracy,

what democracy have they had in their regime? Earlier did they lay claim to democracy at any time?.....
(Interruptions).

Today's situation is an exceptional one. But so far as you are concerned: there has been no change because you have been calling me dictator all these four years. So what is the change? I was a dictator before and I am a dictator now!.....

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: So many thousands of people have been jailed and murdered. We have the bitter experience. People are not allowed to cast their votes. Is this democracy?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The Hon'ble Member's party formed a Government in West Bengal and anybody can find out what was the situation then. Could people walk in the streets after dark?...*(Interruptions).*

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: There is a boycott of the Assembly there because there has been a total rigging of the elections. Our trade union leaders and workers cannot even go to their places.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mukherjee, will you please take the permission of the Chair before rising? You have to take the permission of the Chair. Hereafter, anything said without my permission will not go on the record. You must ask the Chair first. Please don't interrupt without asking the Chair. I will not allow that. Please cooperate. You must take the permission of the Chair. At least, show that much respect to the Chair.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I know their conscience pricks them. So, I shall not mention that period. I should only like to say that anybody who wants to read the newspapers of that period can know about the murders and the insecurity in Bengal when the Marxist Government was there. That is all that I want to say. The Marxist Party's adherence to

democracy is very new. So, perhaps, they are more vocal in its support.

The political ill-health which prevailed before the Emergency is certainly not normalcy in any language or in any part of the world. There can be no return to the days of total licence and political permissiveness. Democracy demands self-restraint of all. It is the responsibility of the Government to allow the Opposition to function, to allow freedom of speech and freedom of association. But it is equally the responsibility of the Opposition not to take advantage of them to destroy democracy or to "paralyse the Government". The words "paralyse the Government" are not mine. I am using them in quotes; they were used by them in public meetings here in Delhi and elsewhere.

There has to be greater self-restraint. When individuals or groups do not learn to cultivate self-restraint, the Constitution has to tell them where they have to stop.

The people at large have come to associate Emergency with the beginning of a new era in national life. We should demonstrate during this period how to bring about an atmosphere of self-discipline, an atmosphere when each group tries not to get what it can for itself, but to join together in a common endeavour. We have to convert this painful necessity into a new opportunity for forward movement and towards the realisation of our programmes.

Some hon. Members said yesterday that there is not much new in the programmes that were announced. What is new is that there is an atmosphere today when it is easier to implement what we want to do. The workers have assured us and it is our duty to protect them and see that because of their assurance, they do not suffer any hardship. Similarly, all sections of the people should combine in this endeavour.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

We have announced some programmes. But very much more has to be done to change life in our cities, in our villages, in our desert areas and in our hilly areas. I would respectfully and humbly request the Opposition to try and help in this positive effort. Many of them who have criticised the Emergency, have welcomed the economic programmes. Therefore, at least in this area, let us come up with new suggestions pointing out what we have left out and what can be done. If they come up with new suggestions, let us try to see whether we can convert this 'painful necessity', as I said, into an opportunity to work together and to take this country forward. Thank you.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka): Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the Prime Minister's appeal for cooperation would have been given heed to by Members of the House by remaining attentive to whatever I have got to say just as they did when listening to her. If I had not seen the manner in which the proceedings of this House yesterday were reported in the newspapers this morning and by the A.I.R. yesterday evening, had I any doubts about the dangers of this emergency about the proclamation of this emergency, I would have been converted by that. What has been done? The only speech that has been reported is that of the Minister, Mr. Jagjivan Ram, who moved the Resolution. That was reported fairly fully, at considerable length. In regard to speeches made by others, there is no mention of them except that, of those who spoke, some supported and some others opposed. I fail to understand this. Is this a fair thing to do? What has been placed before the country is only the Government's point of view in regard to why emergency was necessary. But the opposition's point of view as to why such proclamation of emergency was uncalled for has not been reported. Is this, I again ask a fair thing to do? The Prime

Minister objected to 'whispering campaigns' going on. But, in a situation like this, where there is such complete press censorship how can people get correct and authentic news? Because there is only one side or one source of information for them, and no other source of information is provided for them, rumours have freer scope.

I have no doubt whatever that if the law of the land had been enforced, the licence to which the Prime Minister referred would not have come into being. It is the failure of the Government to give effect to such laws as already exist that is responsible for this. There were plenty of laws; under some laws, extraordinary powers had also been given to them. Now you have brought in this press censorship which, in so far as Parliamentary proceedings are concerned, when they operate in this way, the consequences are, to say the least, most unfortunate. What is the Parliament for? Parliament is, after all, the guardian of the rights and liberties of the people and it is the one forum to which the elected representatives of the people can come and put forward their respective points of view. And if their differing points of view are not reported and are not communicated to the people who have elected them, then how do they come to know what their representatives have said. How do they come to know that there is an answer to what Shri Jagjivan Ram had to say about the necessity for this emergency? The Prime Minister's speech will be reported in which she has made a number of statements some of which definitely require to be answered and, for which, some answer exists. She has argued her case cogently but surely an opportunity should be given to those of us who speak in a constructive manner and for those of us who put forward their points of view in sober terms, to have their views also reported. Some suitable guidelines could be laid down for the censors to make this possible. And, if even they are not to be reported, what is