

Established 1946

Pages 16

Price : Rupees Five

janata

Vol. 71 No. 28

August 7, 2016

Brief note on NEP

Ramesh Patnaik

British Raj in india

Chandra Bhal Tripathi

Rammanohar Lohia

**Political parties and
our Constitution**

Jawaharlal Jasthi

Mahatma Gandhi's Speech

Editor :

G. G. Parikh

Managing Editor : Guddi

D-15, Ganesh Prasad,
Naushir Bharucha Marg,
Mumbai - 400 007.

Email : janataweekly@gmail.com

Segregation in democracy

Kuldip Nayar

Yet another Dalit family was hacked to death because it was suspected to have eaten beef. The laboratory tests of the “beef” showed that it was some other cattle. Some time ago, the Kerala House in Delhi was attacked by *gau rakshks* because beef was served there. But the most shameful aspect is that there was no repentance among the upper caste and even the leaders of the RSS, who are supposed to work for the social upliftment, did not utter a word of either condemnation or sorrow.

All religions indulge in social, economic or political discrimination but it is not the part of the religion itself as it is among the Hindus. And for centuries, it is going on without much challenge. There are still certain parts of India where the Dalit cannot use the road or well which are frequented by the upper castes. The worst part is that the funeral ground which the upper caste use is exclusive for them.

Islam which teaches equality has also been affected and the burial places of those placed high in life cannot be used by ordinary Muslims. In fact, a different kind of caste

system prevails in Islam. For example, Sayyds are considered the Brahmins of the community and they practise the same kind of discrimination as the Hindus do when it comes to marriage or death. They refuse to consign the bodies at the common burial ground.

In fact, an ordinary Muslim suffers from both sides—one because he is poor and, two, because he is considered not at par with the well-placed Muslims. Here, the economic factor has come into play. And then it has got mixed with preferences and prejudices, making the poor Muslims’ plight still more pitiful. True, the Indian constitution does not allow discrimination on the basis of religion. But it is practised all over and even the police force has come to be contaminated and it connives at the violation of the upper caste without a demur.

The practice has become more glaring and persistent since the advent of Prime Minister Narendra Modi’s regime. That the upper caste people have been appointed to key positions in universities and other institutions at the behest of the government make some of the best

brains rot. The RSS makes it sure that the people appointed are from the “right” background to ensure that the Hindutva philosophy is taken as the guideline.

Not long ago, the Pune film institute went on strike for months together when its head was replaced by a television artiste who had the blessings of the RSS. The government did not change its decision even in the midst of widespread discontentment. Ultimately, the students had to give in because their career was at peril.

Time has come for introspection. The upper castes have not accepted the presence of Dalit or even members of other backward classes in their midst. The numerous agitations in Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh or, for that matter, in other parts of the country have not jolted the conscience of the upper castes. These are the results of the government pursuing with reservations despite the 10-year time-limit set by the Constituent Assembly way back in 1950.

I recall that during the debates of the Constituent Assembly when Dr B.R. Ambedkar, a revered Dalit leader, declared that they did not want any reservation. He was persuaded by the assurance that the period will not be more than 10 years. Now the situation is such that as soon as the period is over, parliament unanimously extends it to another 10 years. No political party, including the communists, has stood up to resist and say enough was enough.

Now that elections in Uttar Pradesh, the largest state in the country, are scheduled to take place in 2017, Dalit leader Mayawati is

(Continued on Page 8)

Brief note on NEP

Ramesh Patnaik

The Ministry of Human Resources Development preferred not to put T.S.R. Subramanian Committee Report (30 April, 2016) on Draft New Education Policy (NEP 2016) in public domain. Keeping the nation in dark about a report of a public committee is most undemocratic and highly condemnable particularly when it is related to education, a fundamental right of the people. Now, it has issued a document of its own with a title '*Some Inputs for Draft National Education Policy 2016*' and is seeking response from the people before 31st July which we may call as Proto-NPE because, the government will not change it in essence unless there is a strong peoples' movement against the nefarious designs built into it. The document plans for a great deal of commercialization and communalization of education as expected.

This is a most ill conceived document on education from the central government ever. Though the MHRD played safe by stating that it is only an input from the government in making the policy, it speaks clearly the mindset of the government. The government does not propose abolition of commercialisation of education. That is the first acid test in deciding the nature of any policy document in education. Government is rather going to facilitate the growth of commercialisation of education further. Again, it is now clear that the government will pursue more vigorously the pet policy of the ruling classes - Public Private Partnership to siphon public funds to private

agencies. So, naturally government doesn't speak about 'Common School System' and least about Common Education System. Multi standard institutions, in terms of infrastructure and teaching faculty, would continue both in public and private sectors. The government is going to proceed with globalisation of trade in education services by preparing ground by tribunalisation of justice and multi-nationalisation of accreditation along with bringing legislation for allowing foreign universities. The document gives assurance in weak terms for allocation of 6 per cent GDP for education. But, its stress on commercialisation would only prove the things otherwise. On the other hand, it does not even hint at cumulative gap mounted over 30 years from the time of NPE 1986 due to far lower allotments over the period made to education against the assured 6 per cent of GDP in the policy.

On the other hand the government proceeds with its project of reestablishing Manu Dharma not only by denying education to the SCs, STs, and all disadvantaged sections and minorities — religious and linguistic but also confining the sections to skill training which all probability would reproduce caste system. Drop outs will be encouraged by rigorous screening akin to Brahminical practices and the children so dropped out, mostly from disadvantaged sections, will be diverted for 'skilling'. Child labor is not going to be abolished and rather will be institutionalized by providing

'alternate schools'. Open schools, open colleges and open educational facilities on one hand and skilling on the other hand will be the main thrusts of the government and all disadvantaged will be pushed towards these thrust areas. Increasing majority of the disadvantaged sections on all counts, caste, religion, region, gender and linguistic-cultural group will be denied formal, liberal and really professional education. Majority of them will be denied even upper primary education as the diversion would start as early as at class V for them.

Though government in the document talks of social justice, nowhere it talks about need of reservations, applying reservations to all institutions and at all levels and applying rule of reservation in privately run schools and colleges. There is no even mention of need of hostels and other affirmative measures to bring the poor and socially disadvantaged to the schools, colleges and universities. Languages of the people will be looked down. Mother tongue as a medium of education will be confined only up to class V. Again, the state governments are given free hand to introduce English medium even at primary level. The government is clearly against mother tongue as a medium of education only to produce cheap labor for corporate service sectors and consumers for their products. Sanskrit will be introduced in all states at school level and college levels and the glory of a particular religion, a particular culture, a particular language, a particular caste and a particular gender against the rest will be sung through it in the name of glorious past. The medieval period of Indian history (which RSS consider as Muslim Period) is not even referred to in the

document and it makes a clear indication of the government approach to mitigate the contributions of the period in development of the civilization of this land. The communal approach which this government pursues leads to neglect or playing down of contributions of all religious and linguistic minorities, tribes and suppressed casts and marginalized sections. Coming to the campus democracy, there will be selective ban on student and teacher activists to curb opposition to the projects of neo-liberalism and communalism in the campuses. High level of bureaucratization of administration and centralisation of curricula is sought on one hand to regiment thought and on the other hand to subordinate education system to global market in content and form. The document nowhere gives a clear historical understanding of what education stands for. Further it does not give recognition to the fact that education was denied to vast majority of this country in the name of caste and gender. Neither the document notes the historical development of the present education system, the contributions of reformers nor does it think for a scientific secular democratic education system for future. It does not look like a policy document or like a document in preparation of a policy framework. It is a techno-managerial document than a socio-political one. It only tried to reorient the education system to sub-serve the interest of the corporate capital - domestic and foreign on one hand and to communalize education on the other hand by interfering with the system in a post-modernist method.

The government wants through this policy to further commercialise and communalize education system.

The thrust will not be knowledge and enlightenment of individual and development of the people and the country but skilling individual and benefiting corporate market. Further, it seeks the increase of caste discrimination, religious, cultural and linguistic discriminations, gender and normal body discriminations. The policy is not interested in reservations, hostels and stipends to support poor and disadvantaged sections rather it stands for screening and excluding the poor and disadvantaged and divert them for vocational training and open learning. It is opposed to mother tongues of the people. Now, the rights and entitlements of the poor and disadvantaged are at stake. It seeks to centralize curricula, bureaucratize administration and globalize accreditation and tribunalise justice to facilitate multi-lateral and plurilateral possible agreements in 'trade in education service' either under World Trade Organisation or outside of it. Government is highly allergic to the rights of the students and teachers, autonomy of the universities and is out to weed out any opposition to its project of commercialisation and communalisation of education. It seems out of place to expect something like transformative education from this government and inclusion of subjects like civil liberties, human rights, subjects to sensitize the students about social discriminations and cultural diversities, alternative models of development and subjects like public policy for sustenance of small holding peasant economy and so on and so forth. The government policy perspective seems is meant to serve the ruling classes and the neo-

(Continued on Page 15)

Thus spoke Mahatma Gandhi

It is a well known fact that on the night of December 22-23, 1949, idols were put under the central dome of the Babri mosque, at Ayodhya by some miscreants and an FIR was lodged by the police constables posted there at that time. The 1949 violation was a result of premeditated collusion between bigoted sections of the then ruling Congress party and the local Faizabad bureaucracy led by a deputy commissioner whose blatant partisanship was proved by his subsequent admission to the Bharatiya Jan Sangh.

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru expressed his distress at the 1949 incident in a series of letters, to Deputy Prime Minister Vallabhbhai Patel, to Governor-General C. Rajagopalachari, to Uttar Pradesh Chief Minister Govind Ballabh Pant and to a close friend K.G. Mashruwala (The Babri Masjid, edited by A.G. Noorani). In a December 26, 1949, telegram to Pant, he presciently described the installation as a “dangerous example” that will have “bad consequences.” To Mashruwala (letter dated March 5, 1950), Nehru confessed that the district officer in Faizabad “misbehaved,” further that while UP CM Pant “condemned the act on several occasions” he refrained from “taking definite action.” In a letter dated April 17, 1950, to the U.P. Chief Minister, the Prime Minister Nehru poured out his anguish: “... U.P is becoming an almost foreign land to me ... I find that communalism has invaded the minds and hearts of those who were the pillars of the Congress in the past. It is a creeping paralysis and the patient does not even realize it ... It seems to me that for some reason or other, or perhaps mere political expediency, we have been far too lenient with this disease ...” These exchanges conclusively nail the lie that the 1949 installation of idols was an act of faith on the part of the Hindu masses.

In this context here is an important speech delivered by Mahatma Gandhi in Delhi at prayer meeting on 27-28th November 1947, well before the Ayodhya controversy erupted.

—Qurban Ali

Brothers and Sisters,

Yesterday I wanted to mention one point but since I had to talk about many other things, it was left out.

I have received many telegrams from Kathiawar. I have already told you about what I heard and what subsequently appeared in the Pakistani newspapers. Those papers are read by thousands of people there. May be some ten thousand or so. I do not know how many people must be reading them. But nothing would be achieved if I started thinking whether those things had really happened. Hence it was good that I placed before you what I had read in those newspapers. I do not know if all those things are true. If they are true, they are a matter of great shame for Kathiawar. And if

they are not true, it is a matter of shame for the newspapers. Thus it is a matter of shame for either side. I have also told you what the Sardar has to comment on the matter. He came today also and told me that whatever reports came from there were not worth mentioning. They were highly exaggerated. But the telegram I have received from Rajkot is worth noting. It is a fairly long telegram and I would like to mention it to you in brief. After all, I know the Muslims of Kathiawar. I do not know them individually, but I know the Khojas, Meenas, Vaghers and some Kumbis among the peasants, and Mahers. After all, I was born there and lived there for almost 17 years. In fact I lived there for full 17 years, because I did not go out to study anywhere. My father never sent me anywhere. I

completed my studies there and attended college for a few months, and that too at Bhavnagar. Even for the examination I could not go beyond Ahmedabad. That was my condition. I saw everything that happened there and, later too, kept contact with the people by visiting them. So, the sender of that telegram says that I am greatly worried on their account, and, in turn, my worry has become their worry. He says it is true that some Hindus in Kathiawar had lost their balance, but is there any place where this has not happened. They resorted to violence and even harmed some Muslims. They destroyed their houses and even burnt them down.

But, he says, the Congressmen did not let the situation go far. They were under the leadership of Dhebarbhai.

I know him very well. He went forward to protect the Muslims and succeeded to a great extent. Not all Hindus were involved in those acts of loot and arson. Had that been the case, all Muslim houses in Rajkot would have been set ablaze, there would have been large-scale violence and some people would have been killed. But things did not reach that point. The Congressmen and others took every precaution. Dhebarbhai was abused and manhandled. Even though he is a big man and also a lawyer, when the mob gets excited all considerations of big and small are forgotten. They harassed him because he was trying to protect the Muslims. Some people who accompanied Dhebarbhai write, that, though some injury was caused, Dhebarbhai was saved by other people. The telegram also mentions help from the Thakore Saheb and the police. In that case, who are left to be suspected of creating the trouble? They say “the *Hindu Mahasabha* and the *Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh*—these organizations have certainly done some mischief—their aim was to drive out the Muslims at least from Rajkot. However they could not do so. But now we have nothing more to worry and there is no danger to the Muslims. So you also should not worry. We are watching the situation elsewhere too and we would send you another telegram.” I have received a telegram from a Muslim gentleman from the same place. He expresses his extreme gratitude to the Congressmen and others who tried their best to save the life and property of the Muslims. But there is yet another telegram from Bombay also sent by a Muslim gentleman. He states that what I had said earlier about Kathiawar was correct but what I have been told later about it is not correct. That lots of things

have happened there and are still happening. I do not know whether I should believe the telegram from Bombay or the one from the other Muslim gentleman. But I doubt the truth about the telegram from Bombay because it has been sent from Bombay, while the other one has been sent by those who are right in Kathiawar. Moreover, the people of Kathiawar cannot deceive me. Where would they escape after deceiving me? Hence I feel that the telegram from Bombay gives an exaggerated version. The actual situation would be known to me in due course. For the present, let me at least put all this before you.

There is also a telegram from Bhavnagar. It is from the Maharaja of Bhavnagar. I know him too, because I have lived there for three or four months. So he felt concerned about me and wondered why I was so much worried. He has said in the telegram that I need not worry. He says that they are all vigilant. The Hindus also are vigilant. They would not let any harm come to the Muslims and I should have no doubt at all about it. But there is a telegram from Junagadh sent by some Muslims. They say that I am being deceived, and I should set up a commission and inquire whether the Muslims are being harassed or not. Similar telegrams have also been sent to Jawaharlal, the Sardar and others. I would like to say that it is not possible to appoint a commission for anything and everything. Setting up a commission is no joke. Where is the need for having a commission even though some harm might have been done? As for Kathiawar, I am like a commission myself. If anything comes to my notice, I can check it. I can handle the Princes as well as the people of Kathiawar. I do not claim to succeed in everything I

undertake or that they abide by everything I say. But is not Kathiawar the same as Bihar? If someone wants me to set up a commission in Bihar, do you think I would oblige? I am at their disposal myself. People there love me and listen to me. And so, it would not be proper to set up any commission there. I have also received several letters from the Muslims in Rajkot. Many of them are friendly with the Hindus and also happy with the Congress. Then, who belongs to the *Hindu Mahasabha* and the *Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh*? I can have no enmity towards them. They think theirs is the only way of saving Hinduism. But I believe that Hinduism will not be saved in that manner. They believe in violent opposition to those who commit an evil act. But I would ask how fighting an evil by another evil will help. We have got our own Government. Take it to task and demand an explanation as to why such things are happening. Moreover, our Government is vigilant and it is trying its best. And so I would like to tell the *Hindu Mahasabha* and also the *Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh*—both are Hindu organizations and many influential and educated people are associated with them as in other organizations—that they cannot save Hinduism in this manner. Is it true that they have harassed the Muslims? If not, who has? The Congress has not harassed them, nor has either of the Governments done it. Who then are the other Hindus who did it?

Today all the Hindus and Sikhs are to be blamed for this just as in Pakistan all the Muslims are to be blamed, and rightly so. That is why I would suggest that those who are innocent and yet are accused should clear their names. The Muslims in

Junagadh can get justice if they want. Why then should we set up a commission? Having talked about the situation there let me also talk about the situation here. The Sardar has made some arrangements and he is going to protect all the mosques we have here. You must have read the notice sent by him in the newspapers that the occupied premises of the mosques should be vacated in a week's time otherwise they will be vacated with the help of the police. But I ask you what will he gain by sending the police? If some Hindus have installed an idol in some mosque—the idol may be of gold or silver or brass or earth or stone—but it is said, and I also believe, that so long as it has not been sanctified and not worshipped by pure hands, in my view it is not an idol but a mere piece of stone or gold.

Such idols have been installed in the mosque at the corner of Connaught Place (in New Delhi). In my view, there is no Hanuman in those idols. To me it is a mere piece of stone which has been shaped like Hanuman and to which some *sindoor* has also been applied. In my view it is not worthy of worship. It can be worshipped only if it is legitimately installed and sanctified. But all this was not done. Hence it is the duty of those who have installed the idols to remove them from there at daybreak and then keep them wherever they choose. By thus installing idols in the mosques they are desecrating the mosques and also insulting the idols. As followers of Hinduism we are idol-worshippers, but worshipping any idol in this manner is not religion but the opposite of it. So, why should the Sardar send the police there? Those who are Hindus among you should become watchmen and remove the idols so installed. We

should offer to repair the mosques which have been damaged. But the Sardar says that the Government would bear the expenses of the repairs of those mosques. Why should the Government do it? Is it not because we are not doing it ourselves? The Government has to protect everybody. But it would be a matter of shame for us all—Sikhs and Hindus today.

Of course I have not heard about any Sikh having installed the idols, for the Sikhs have only one idol or, say, the holy treatise, that is, the *Granthsaheb*. I have not known of any Sikh having kept the *Granthsaheb* in any mosque. Even if any of them has done so he has insulted the *Granthsaheb*. The *Granthsaheb* can be kept only in a Gurudwara. Only the holy Sikhs keep it on a high pedestal after nicely decorating it. Somebody like me would wrap it in a nice khadi cloth. But today, even though people do not think in terms of swadeshi or foreign things we do manufacture beautiful woollens and silks by hand. If we spread such silk cloth and keep the *Granthsaheb* on it, it would be worthy of worship. And if any Sikh goes and keeps it in a mosque, he insults the *Granthsaheb* and then it cannot be worthy of worship. A Muslim gentleman came to see me today. I could not make out what he wanted to say. But he was holding a copy of the Koran which was half burnt. Even that was sacred for him and so he had wrapped it in a very clean cloth. He opened the cloth and showed the burnt Koran to me. He did not say anything but looked at me with tearful eyes and then went away. He talked a few things with Brajkishan, since I was busy with my work. Similarly, if any Muslim comes here and installs the Koran here and beats you and me up, I would say

that he is insulting the Koran. The Koran does not ordain that people should be compelled to accept it. That is why I very respectfully wish to tell the *Hindu Mahasabha* and the *Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh* and others who wish to listen to me and also the Sikhs that the Sikhs are great and if they turn good and become true followers of Guru Nanak, the Hindus would then automatically become good. I have great respect for the Sikhs in my heart but today, everybody, whether Hindu or Sikh is going astray and India is being destroyed. Are we going to drag India into dust after raising her high? Are we going to destroy our religion, our achievements and our country? May God save us from all this.

[From Hindi] Vide "Speech at Prayer Meeting", 27-11-1947 and "Speech at Prayer Meeting", 28-11-1947. *Prarthana Pravachan—II*, pp. 144-50. (Abridged)

The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi

Vol. 97: 27 September, 1947 - 5 December, 1947

Janata Subscription

Annual Rs. : 260/-

Three Years : 750/-

Demand Draft / Cheque

on

Mumbai Bank

in favour of

JANATA TRUST

D-15, Ganesh Prasad,
Naushir Bharucha Marg,
Mumbai 400 007

Forgotten history of misrule of British Raj in india

Chandra Bhal Tripathi

An article by Dinyar Patel that appeared on BBC News-India on June 11, 2016 is heartrending. In the famine in Orissa in 1866 one million people perished. All due to the policies of the British colonial rulers. What a shame that we all have forgotten this tragedy. We salute the great Dadabhai Naoroji, President, Indian National Congress and the first Indian Member of the British House of Commons, to have seriously investigated into the issues of Indian poverty. We also salute the great nationalist and historian Ramesh Chandra Datt, also President of the INC who thoroughly exposed the British misrule. In this article he has been quoted as follows:

“By 1901, Romesh Chunder Dutt, another leading nationalist, enumerated 10 mass famines since the 1860s, setting the total death toll at a whopping 15 million. Indians were now so poor - and the government so indifferent in its response - that, he stated, “every year of drought was a year of famine.”

The following are some more excerpts from the BBC News article:

“In modern-day Orissa state, the worst hit region, one out of every three people perished, a mortality rate far more staggering than that caused by the Irish Potato Famine.

“Famine, while no stranger to the subcontinent, increased in frequency and deadliness with the advent of British colonial rule.

The East India Company helped kill off India’s once-robust textile industries, pushing more and more

It is a pity that after Independence the Government of India decided to remain in the British Commonwealth by dropping the word ‘British’ and even today continues to acknowledge the British monarch as the Head of Commonwealth. It was a British Labour Party MP, Fenner Brockway, who strongly urged India to leave the Commonwealth. I read his brilliant article in the Congress Socialist Party weekly Janata in 1948. We continue to pay homage to the British monarch and yet claim to be a free country. Burma severed all links with Britain in 1948 under the leadership of Gen. Aung Sain, father of Nobel laureate Suu Kyi Aung Sain.

The cruelties of the British colonial rulers are galore. Jallianwala Bagh is a permanent blot on the British rule. I remember the man-created Bengal famine of 1943 when my revered mother, a selfless social worker, organised commendable relief work for Bengal famine victims in our small eastern

people into agriculture. This, in turn, made the Indian economy much more dependent on the whims of seasonal monsoons.

“It can, we fear, no longer be concealed that we are on the eve of a period of general scarcity,” announced the Englishman, a Calcutta newspaper, in late 1865.

“The Indian and British press carried reports of rising prices, dwindling grain reserves, and the

UP town Basti. The shameless British Government never apologised to the Indian people for their cruel deeds. What prevents us from giving up this vestige of the colonial rule? Cannot we do it even now? But we perhaps cannot expect any such self-respecting step from people like Narasimha Rao, Manmohan Singh, Narendra Modi who feel happy in being *chamchas* of their new masters, the United States of America. Even in recent years more than 3,00,000 kisans have committed suicide due to highly discriminatory policies of World Bank and International Monetary Fund which are nothing but appendages of the US Govt. For serious drought situation in parts of Maharashtra and some other States and perennial scarcity areas of Orissa our Central and State Governments are squarely responsible though indirectly to an extent the exploitative US Government, WB and IMF cannot absolve themselves of their complicity.

desperation of peasants no longer able to afford rice.

“All of this did little to stir the colonial administration into action. In the mid-19th Century, it was common economic wisdom that government intervention in famines was unnecessary and even harmful. The market would restore a proper balance. Any excess deaths, according to Malthusian principles, were nature’s way of responding to overpopulation.

“On a flying visit to Orissa in February 1866, Cecil Beadon, the colonial governor of Bengal (which then included Orissa), staked out a similar position. “Such visitations of providence as these no government can do much either to prevent or alleviate,” he pronounced.

“Regulating the skyrocketing grain prices would risk tampering with the natural laws of economics. “If I were to attempt to do this,” the governor said, “I should consider myself no better than a dacoit or thief.” With that, Mr Beadon deserted his emaciated subjects in Orissa and returned to Kolkata (Calcutta) and busied himself with quashing privately funded relief efforts.

“In May 1866, it was no longer easy to ignore the mounting catastrophe in Orissa. British administrators in Cuttack found their troops and police officers starving. The remaining inhabitants of Puri were carving out trenches in which to pile the dead. “For miles round you heard their yell for food,” commented one observer.

“As more chilling accounts trickled into Calcutta and London, Mr Beadon made a belated attempt to import rice into Orissa. It was, with cruel irony, hindered by an overabundant monsoon and flooding. Relief was too little, too late, too rotten. Orissans paid with their lives for bureaucratic foot-dragging.

“For years, a rising generation of western-educated Indians had alleged that British rule was grossly impoverishing India. The Orissa famine served as eye-popping proof of this thesis. It prompted one early

nationalist, Dadabhai Naoroji, to begin his lifelong investigations into Indian poverty.

dated picture of Indian famine victims

“As the famine abated in early 1867, Mr Naoroji sketched out the earliest version of his “drain theory”—the idea that Britain was enriching itself by literally sucking the lifeblood out of India.

“Security of life and property we have better in these times, no doubt,” he conceded. “But the destruction

of a million and a half lives in one famine is a strange illustration of the worth of the life and property thus secured.”

“His point was simple. India had enough food supplies to feed the starving - why had the government instead let them die? While Orissans perished in droves in 1866, Mr Naoroji noted that India had actually exported over 200m pounds of rice to Britain. He discovered a similar pattern of mass exportation during other famine years. “Good God,” Mr Naoroji declared, “when will this end?”

(Continued from Page 2)

being wooed by all political parties. She has said that her party would go it alone and there is every possibility that she might return with a majority. Her advantage is that the Dalit voter obediently follows her instruction. She is the only one who can get the Dalit votes transferred to some other community. Even though the Congress has traditionally fought for social justice, Mahatma Gandhi was the only leader who believed in giving equal status to the Dalits. True, they did not like the title “Harijan” (sons of God) given by him because they thought it was too patronizing.

Dr Rajendra Prasad after finishing his task as the president of the constituent assembly was appointed as the food minister. He went to Gandhiji to seek his advice on his accommodation. The Mahatma, who was living then in a *bhangi* (sweeper) colony told him to live in the cottage next to the one he was residing. Dr Rajendra Prasad was so horrified over the idea that he went to the then Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru and complained on Gandhiji’s suggestion.

No legislation is going to help, as has been India’s experience. Ultimately, it depends on the upper castes to change their attitude. They believe in democracy but not in equality which is the integral part of the system. People in the world feel hard to believe that the country which has sent rocket to the Mars, something which the advanced countries envy, practise discrimination against human beings.

Their horror is glaring when they see that a democratic country where people queue before the ballot box to choose their leader cannot get over the prejudice which they have inherited from the time even before the British who divided the society caste-wise and religion-wise to make their rule easy.

Whatever parliament does to eliminate this malady will not help until the upper castes realize that what they are doing is against the democratic polity which they cherish. The sooner this realization takes place, the better it would be for the country and its polity.

Letter to H. J. Laski

Central Jail, Agra (No date)

Dear Prof. Laski,

“As the newspapers of my country have not yet learnt to cut the question hour in your Parliament, I have to trouble you over something you would know nothing about. The Under-Secretary for State, India, Mr. Arthur Henderson, has said that I have made unfounded allegations in respect of my detention in the Lahore Fort. “I doubt if the Under-Secretary knows what my accusation is. The amazing thing is the repose with which the British Government has asked my country to dismiss my accusation when, in practice, it has made some very awkward though successful attempts at suppressing its publication. Aside from odd bits, my country does not to this day know of what I have accused the Government. While still a prisoner in the Lahore Fort, but after I was allowed to write to the High Court, I made a Habeas Corpus application in December 1944, and supplemented it with somewhat fuller details in January 1945. When the hearing was held, the Judge ordered it to be secret. The Government had earlier taken an added precaution and banned, under one Ordinance or another, all reference in the newspapers to this Habeas Corpus case. At the hearing, the Judge declared his intention to go into the merits of my application and I was examined on oath, and they were on the way to enquiring into my accusation, when he accepted the Indian Government’s plea that I was under

orders of transfer to another province and the proceedings were scotched. In the order dismissing my applications, the Judge also felt that the ‘sole motive’ of the India Government in detaining me was not to torture me. I regret I am unable to give you the exact wording of this strange order. I may add that I was arrested in Bombay in May 1944, and kept there for a month. If it was the Government’s intention to secure the King’s peace, that could have been very well achieved by continuing to hold me in the Bombay jail or taking me to another as now, in my home province, the United Provinces. In respect of prisoners ill-treated in the Lahore Fort, the Punjab Government has often amused the country by passing the responsibility on to the Government of India. The British Under-Secretary has now almost passed it back to the Punjab Government.

So far as it concerns me, the Government of India is the culprit, for I have been its prisoner in law as in fact and recurrent orders for my ill-treatment emanated from it, and the Punjab Government is an associate in crime. No Government in your country could so interfere with Justice or shirk a criminal charge against it. On my transfer to this jail, I made an application to the Federal Court, but the Chief Justice of India felt that he had no jurisdiction of any sort. After several months’ delay, I have succeeded in contacting my lawyer Mr. Madanlal Pittie, but I do not know how much longer it would be before he is supplied with

copies of my applications to the Lahore High Court. These were seized from me on my transfer from Lahore to Agra.

I do not intend to detail to you my rather long experience in the Lahore Fort. Should your Parliamentary Party or any of its members be genuinely interested, they could easily obtain the two applications to the Lahore High Court and the third to the Federal Court as court documents. I must add that these applications are a definite understatement of what I had to go through. In the first place, I have avoided mention of vulgarities and, in the second, the short scope of a court application and inadequate talents would have made me sound dramatic, if I had tried to communicate the dull but ugly cruelty as I felt it. I had hoped that the hearing in the court would bring it out more fully. I would here indicate that I was ill-treated in one way or another for over four months, that I was kept awake day after day, night after night, the longest single stretch running into ten days; and that, when I resisted the police in their efforts to make me stand, they wheeled me round on my manacled hands on the matted floor. It took me some time to learn as a physical feat, and a lesson I should like never to forget, that no pain is actually unbearable; it has either been unbearable in the past, but then the man is insensible or dead, or it appears to be unbearable as an imagined state of the next moment. “It is true that I was not beaten nor were needless driven under toe-nails. I do not wish

to make comparisons. A European, more than another, with his better sensibility to the human body and if he is not dulled with horrors, may realise what I underwent. But, beating and bastinadoing to death or near about it and forcing the human mouth to considerable atrocities—these and worse have also taken place. I will give you one or two instances, as readily come to my mind.

One man swallowed poison in a police outpost of the Bombay Province, another threw himself down a well in a United Provinces jail; and of those who died through beating or ill-treatment after their arrest, there is no checking up except that in one Orissa jail out of over 300 in the country, the number of deaths among political prisoners rose to around 29 or 39—I cannot exactly recollect. My country has gone through a great deal in the past three and a half years. Men have been shot dead by the thousand, some out of moving vehicles as a test of marksmanship or to instil terror, women have been strung up on trees and lacerated or raped on the public road, and houses razed in the Lidice or Becassi fashion, though not as intensive in a single area but in the total vaster by the score. This is not surprising. Once it is understood that the country was reconquered in terror and vengefulness, the fact that nothing more massive than the August Rebellion is known to modern history explains itself. Three to four million died in the created famine. Already there was beating of an another kind fifteen years ago. My father, who died in a bus two weeks back, was beaten unconscious in the wholly peaceful raid of the Dharsana Salt Depot.

Aside from my regret that we had not enough time together, it is as well that he is freed from successive imprisonments and worse in his own country, and from the oppressive sense of a nation's suffering that goes with these.

I have given you the national picture to fit into it my own experience as very small bit. The British Labour Movement, as any other socialist movement, has been erring, because it views foreign rule on the ground of democracy or fascism or other political forms at home. If pre-conceived notions are cast away, it is just possible that the British system of ruling my country may be found to be slightly worse than any other, or it may be slightly better. That would depend on one's understanding of facts. No one would deny that British rule in Hindustan has, as a young brute, been heinously atrocious. It is again becoming so, now that it is declining into an aging ogre. The middle period of secured and comparatively orderly rule is gone beyond recall. I do not know if it is at all possible to prevent or even to mitigate the ugly doings of this ogre. But this I know that the British Labour Movement will not even have made an attempt, if it theorises foreign rule on any other view than that of bloody youth and crueller decline, with the middle period, at any rate in my country, dead and gone. In face of all this, the Under-Secretary has had the brass to call me a liar.

All Governments, as known to everybody, tell lies on the plane of high policy, but when a Government does so at the level of persons and minor things, it must be wholly mucked. Isn't there one man in the

Parliamentary Labour Party who can bring this out? Should it be said that the doers of these atrocities are in large numbers my own countrymen in British employ? I do not deny that there is a great deal of rottenness in my country and that is what makes it so galling, but the Englishman thinks he would not be here unless he made use of it.

Miss Usha Mehta's case

Not wanting to release me, the Under-Secretary has also said that the Government is considering the question of my prosecution. I am now under detention for over a year and a half, apart from my imprisonment of two years early in the war, and if the Government has not yet completed considering this question, it may as well go on doing so indefinitely. There is a young woman in a Bombay jail, Miss Usha Mehta, perhaps the only woman political in the jails of that province, who is doing a term of four years for running a freedom radio. I am not quarrelling with her sentence, although, had this young woman of rare attainment and rare courage been Spanish or Russian, your countrymen would have glamorised her into a heroine. She was held under detention for a year and for several months more as an under-trial, so that, if this judicial lapse had not taken place, she might have well completed her term and be out now. I might add that her trial and that of her colleagues was banned from the newspapers.

Of the eight to ten thousand political prisoners, a large number of whom are classified as ordinary criminals, almost the entire lot are held in prison, aside from the inherent inequity of their sentence or

detention owing to one lapse or another even under the existing law. A few days back, ten persons serving life terms were released, because the Allahabad High Court found they had been convicted on the evidence of an 'unmitigated liar'.

Jayaprakash Narayan

Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan, General Secretary of the Socialist Party, is now under detention for over two years, apart from his earlier conviction and detention of nearly three years, and the India Government, on its own declaration, has been considering the question of his prosecution ever since his arrest. It will presumably go on considering the question, meanwhile holding him in prison.

I do not know what kind of an answer Mr. Leopold Amery would have returned, had he been asked about my detention and presuming that he had still wanted to hold me in prison. I like to think that he would have taken his stand on the usurper's unhedged power and would have just said that I was detained under the laws of the land, whatever they might be. That would have been better than a Labour Under-Secretary's screening of a bad deed.

The Government is afraid of placing us on trial and it will continue to be so a freighted. Our trial may end up in its own trial. Except for the Indo-Russians, no one can possibly think that we have worked for Axis victory in intention or even in the unintended results of our deeds. In fact, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan had wanted that an appeal be sent from the Freedom Press of this country to the British Socialist

Movement, but I felt that there was not at that time a worthy enough head of the movement nor any actively favourable element to whom such an appeal could be sent.

Then the charge is levelled against us that we have tried to achieve our aim through violence. It is a vague charge and as such has no validity in law nor a place in any coherent political discussion. The drawing of the line between violence and nonviolence as a method of political endeavour is an essentially Indian beginning and is wholly distinct from the accepted opposition between constitutional and unconstitutional means. It must, therefore, await recognition, until, if at all, the Indian National Congress is able to create a State with its politics. Such an event will also radically alter the concept of Government and its obligations. Meanwhile, it does not lie in the mouth of the British Government or of any other, to throw about this charge, for the right to violence is, in the dominated world, linked up with some of the finest efforts of man. If I were to follow the British Prime Minister, Mr. Clement Attlee, or the Archbishop of Canterbury, I would have to call it the sacred right to violence. For the rest, the Indian Penal Code is drastic enough, more drastic than any now prevalent. There is ghastly provision in it against the political kind of killing, or the very vaguest association with it, or sedition, or the mere owning of arms. I have not been put up for trial on any of these counts, nor the many hundreds, who have been detained almost throughout the war and are still in prison several months after the last fascist was let out in your own country.

In lending the smallest countenance to Government's plea that everybody still in prison is a Socialist and advocate of violence, the British Socialist is deliberately enabling the British Fascist in this country to work out his lawless ire against the Indian Socialist.

If Mr. Stephen Davies, a member of your Parliamentary Party, thought it worthwhile to question the Under-Secretary about me he should also have acquired necessary information to bring out through supplementaries how inept and unworthy the answer was. Questions asked in a hurry and in pursuit of an unpleasing duty or to create illusion are worse than no questions at all. For the present, at any rate, I have little desire for release and there is no urgency of any sort whatever. The British Government is welcome to hold me in prison as long as it lasts in this country. But the fact remains that there was not one man in your Parliamentary Party who could tell the Secretary with facts that he was lying, that he has not so far, nor shall, put me up for trial, that he did his habitual screening to make my detention more palatable to the stupid.

All writing from a slave country to the ruler's land is largely ineffectual, and wearies, but I hope you have not asked yourself why I have not addressed this letter to your Parliamentary Party.

Please accept my warm greetings.

Yours sincerely,

Rammanohar Lohia.

(From *The Price of Liberty*,
Edited by Yusuf Meharally)

Political parties and our Constitution

Jawaharlal Jasthi

Every one born is deemed to belong to a religion and a caste. Similarly every individual is supposed to belong to some political party or other. We cannot, or not willing to, think of politics without parties. Strangely, there is no mention of political parties in our constitution as drafted originally and also in the constitution of the USA. It is not that the framers of the constitution were not aware of the existence of political parties at that time. There were political parties even before the constitution was written and while it was being written. But the parties did not find a place in the constitution as it was originally finalized and adopted on 26th January, 1950. It must have been a deliberate omission.

We, at present, are not able to think of politics without parties. When they are so fundamental for political practice, why did the constituent assembly refused to give them a place in the constitution? It is felt necessary to raise this question because the parties are introduced into the constitution with effect from 1 March 1985 by the 51st amendment. The need for it and its justification is to be verified in the light of the latest judicial decisions of the highest court of the country.

In the course of judicial review, the validity of any law passed by the legislature and anything done by the executive is tested against the constitution. But when the constitution itself is amended, there is no reference frame to verify the validity of it. The doctrine of *basic*

structure is invented for the purpose. The judicial review of laws by the courts is considered one of the basic structures of the constitution. But the very first amendment restricted that right by opening the Ninth Schedule. At that time the doctrine was not invented and in spite of objections from some of the judges, it was declared valid by the court. The courts accepted it and continue to honor it even after the doctrine is applied later. That first amendment has changed the basic structure of the constitution radically. The change itself is now the part of basic structure.

Giving constitutional recognition to the political parties also is such a change that has shattered the basic structure of the constitution. It has also made real democracy impossible by replacing representatives of people with representatives of the political parties. Even the Representation of People Act, one of the earliest Acts passed, did not contain any reference to political parties. Part IVA was added to the Act after the Ninth Schedule was added to the constitution. It replaced people with political parties. This is clearly against the intentions of those 300 intellectuals, who framed the constitution after deliberating for nearly three years. If they were convinced of the need for political parties, they would have mentioned so at the time of constituting the Council of Ministers. Art.75(1) of the constitution states that "The Prime Minister shall be appointed by the President and the other Ministers

shall be appointed by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister." What is the criterion for the President to appoint the Prime Minister? Can it be an arbitrary choice? Why is it not stated directly that the person enjoying the support of majority of elected members shall be appointed as Prime Minister? Art.75(3) states that "The Council of Ministers shall be collectively responsible to the House of the People." Nowhere is it mentioned as a party in majority or a party in opposition. Political party is mentioned in Art.75(1B) which is introduced after the Tenth Schedule was added to the constitution. Similar provision is made under Art.164 in regard to the constitution of the Council of Ministers for the states.

Party affiliation is considered to be an essential requirement for a member of legislature which is negation of his character as a representative of the people. Art.102(2) states that "A person shall be disqualified for being a member of either House of Parliament if he is so disqualified under the Tenth Schedule." Similar provision is made under Art.191(2) in regard to members of state legislatures. What is this Tenth Schedule that has become so effective that it can override the main provisions of the constitution? In the normal drafting process, a schedule is supposed to serve as an adjunct to the main provision in the Act. Usually it may contain some details of procedures or explanations. But here the main part

of the legislation is incorporated in the Tenth Schedule and the main provisions are sought to be changed to fall in line with it. How strange! The tail is wagging the dog.

A need was felt to regulate the behavior of members elected to the legislature and it is shown as a justification for the provisions made in the Tenth Schedule. The need itself arose because of some erroneous presumptions that were allowed to rule the body politic of the country against the will of the framers of the constitution. The constitution did not say that the Prime Minister shall be selected based on his support in the House. He, along with his Council of Ministers, shall be responsible to the House. It is implied that he shall have the support of the majority of members in the House. It was never the intention that the majority must belong to a party. It was not the intention that a particular group of members hold the House under their control. It is not democracy. The government has to deal with so many problems and solutions are to be proposed. Those who support the government on one issue may not support in all other issues. That is their prerogative. On other issues, some other members will support the government. It may include some of the original members and some new members who opposed the government on the earlier issue. What is wrong in it? It depends on the nature of the problem and its effect on the people whom they represent. Just because the proposal of the government was not approved by the legislature, the government need not fall. If the government is persistently doing things not acceptable to the members in general, they can bring a 'no confidence motion' and get a new government. But such a situation is

not allowed in our system all these days. A change in the stand of a member is taken as a defiance of the party to which he is supposed to belong. This gave rise to the slogan: "Aya Ram, Gaya Ram". It led to horse trading and a change in the government and started instability. That is because the members are not allowed to express their preferences on the various issues freely. And what is wrong if there is frequent change in government? At one stage, there were changes of government within three months in Italy. But that condition did not last long. People learnt the lesson and the system got stabilized. The real merit and justification for democracy is that the people get the government they deserve. They learn only if they are allowed to learn.

The elected members are supposed to be members of a political party and are expected to tow the line of the party. How is it democracy? A strange logic is adopted to sanctify the subordination to the party. The members contest the election as representatives of the party and so they must act according to the dictates of the party. By that the members became representatives of the party and ceased to represent the people who elected them. In fact, the people are supposed to have elected the party and not the candidate. That concept was given hold even if there is no base for it in the constitution in the name of practicability.

Here the nature of a political party has to be studied. The party is supposed to consist of members who have a common program on the various issues that face the country and the program is the basis for the people to vote to the candidates of that party. The various political

parties are supposed to have different programs. That itself is a myth. There is less difference between the programs of the parties, nothing to choose from. Moreover, they never try to fulfill the promises made in the programs, manifestos. They promise the heaven knowing fully well that it is an impossibility. People know it as well and they vote based on other considerations. The purpose in forming a party is to come to power. The basic conviction is that they cannot do anything unless there is power in the hands. Many more things can be done if there is power in hands. To get the power it is necessary to form a group of people who are willing to contribute to their philosophy. There is no party in which the members have a homogeneous outlook. The main criterion is the possibility of coming to power. If the party has no possibility to come to power, the member discards it and joins the party which is in power or which has more possibility to come to power. That is why the floor crossing happens. The reason is that there is nothing like a commitment to any particular theory or program of action.

In fact the comprehensive program of a party, if any, put before the electorate, confuses the voter. An ordinary voter is not concerned with many of the areas covered in the manifesto. The common man in the village is not concerned with the foreign policy or with nuclear agreements. He is concerned more with the local issues, which affect him closely. In fact, he may find some aspects that are not to his liking and some to his liking. In such a situation what is he expected to do? When he votes for a candidate in election, he is not voting for all the points in the manifesto. But he votes as there is

no alternative. Similar is the case with the elected member. He finds that what the government is proposing is quite reasonable and could be supported, but his party is against it for no other reason except that they are not in the government. The party has its own plans and its own way of dealing with the government. The main aim is to come to power and to create the situation favorable for that. The member knows that it is wrong. But he is not allowed to express his opinion. That is the result of giving recognition to political parties. That is now constitutionally valid. It strikes at the very root of democracy. It has shattered the basic structure of the constitution itself.

It is usually argued that parties make it possible to devise a basis for government and seek the approval of the people for it. Even if they are not in power they form an alternative and make the party in power behave. That is the fundamental mistake in understanding democracy. The problems will not remain the same, the same solutions will not hold good in all circumstances. New problems arise. New solutions have to be devised. The situation is dynamic. The party refuses to take note of it while the elected member is capable of it. He must be allowed to reflect his opinion, the intention of the people who elected him. It is not the party that the voter chooses. It is the candidate that is visible and answerable to him.

By recognizing the parties, opportunity is given to make politics a career. It legitimized the collection of money, black and green, and accumulate funds in the name of party. Money is the cement for the edifice of the party. Families like "political families" have come into

existence. If politics is allowed as a career, naturally a tendency develops to get himself perpetuated in the career line. The son of a doctor tends to become a doctor, because the facilities are made readily available. The son of an advocate tends to become an advocate for the same reason. So also the son of a politician. Politics is family business. It is a career, not a service. The entire picture of politics is changed. It is an area of struggle for existence and efficiency in perpetuating themselves in the field. No other values stand in the way.

You cannot forbid the formation of political parties. It is part of fundamental right to form associations. It is true. It is not necessary to forbid the formation of parties. Let them have any number of parties and any sort of regulations. But they shall not be allowed to rule the legislature. What the Tenth Schedule did is exactly that. The Schedule recognizes the right of parties to issue "whips" and the members are supposed to follow the dictates of the party. Instead of the elected members, the parties are involved in the legislation process with constitutional support. By defying the whip of the party, the member is losing not only the membership of the party but also the membership of the legislature which is unwarranted and beyond comprehension by any logic. It helps the government to be partisan and retain its power even after losing the support of majority of members. Because, all the members of the party that is supporting the government are not happy with it, but are not allowed to express their reservations. The democratic nature of the legislature is destroyed. It is against the fundamental feature of the constitution. It is agreed that

democracy is the most fundamental part of the basic structure of the constitution and the same is now allowed to be destroyed.

In this respect, the system followed by the Americans appears to be pragmatic. The candidates are allowed to contest elections in the name of parties. But the elected members are free to vote on the various issues according to their own preference. Parties do not interfere. In fact many of the bills introduced by private members are sponsored by two members each belonging to one of the two parties. It frequently happens that the bill proposed by the government is opposed by some of the members of the same party and supported by some of the other party. It gets passed and becomes an Act. There are many Acts that are passed like that. The merit is that parties are not allowed to dictate the members on how to vote on the various issues. They remain the representatives of the people of their constituencies. At worst, they may play for their own interests at times, but that does not amount to much.

This right given to parties becomes more sinister as the law does not exercise any right to regulate or control the parties. Even when the parties were asked to reveal information about the funds received and spent by them, they claimed exemption from the provisions of the Right To Information Act (RTI) and the government stood helpless. That is because the government itself belongs to a party and depends on the support of parties and not of members themselves. If the whip is not recognized on the floor of the legislature, by defying the whip the member may lose the party

membership at the most, but not the membership of the legislature which is his constitutional right. Even when all the conditions prescribed in the Tenth Schedule for disqualifying a member are fulfilled, the Speaker may refuse to announce the disqualification. Nobody can do anything as he has the support of the majority party in the House and the

proceedings of the legislature cannot be questioned in any court. That is what is happening in most of the legislatures now. The recognition to political parties by virtue of the Tenth Schedule has undermined the independence of the elected members and made them subordinates to the respective parties. The democratic nature of the

elected body is undermined. It is more regrettable that the judiciary that has invented and adopted the doctrine of basic structure so zealously, did not care to raise any objection to the Ninth Schedule or to the Tenth Schedule which have undermined the very basic democratic structure of the constitution.

(Continued from Page 3)

middle class that emerged in the course of enforcement of neo-liberal economic, political and cultural model. The neo-liberal and the fascist agenda of the party in power are through in this policy document of the government and there is an all out attack on the constitutional values and prescriptions.

People of this country cannot take these attacks unprotected. 'We the people of India' should defeat it and proceed further to achieve abolition of commercialisation of education

and establishment of common education system fully funded by state and administered in decentralized and participative democratic mode. We should fight for a common education system that stands against all inequalities based on economic capacity, caste, religion, belief, language, culture, gender and normal body and consider diversity as the potentiality of the country. We shall fight for free, equal and quality education for all from KG to PG and Research. We shall fight against age-old bigotry and stand for scientific temperament. India has got

diversified and rich cultures and languages and education system should stand for all that. Education system should work for lessening all inequalities and democratizing all diversities and shall stand as a social process for radical reconstruction of society on the basis of equality and social justice. We shall work for building a democratic, secular, egalitarian, scientific and enlightened education system rooted in socio-cultural, religious and linguistic plurality of India, in consonance with the values enshrined in the preamble of the constitution.



Nature never takes a holiday.

We're open 365 days to offer you the best of nature services.

Landscaping | Farm Management | Garden Consultancy | Garden Maintenance Contract
Tree Transplantation | Over 1500 Varieties Of Plants | Over 250 Medicinal Plants | Indigenous Plants
8 - 12 Feet Developed Trees | Tabletop Landscapes | Garden Tools & Equipments



Go Green Nursery Pvt. Ltd.

Farm : Tara (Karnala), Post : Barapada, Mumbai - Goa Road, Near Yusuf Meherally Centre, Taluka : Panvel,
Dist : Raigad - 410 206. Tel : (952143) 226212. Telefax: (952143) 226369.

Regd. Office : 401/402, Acme Industrial Park, Krishna Metal Compound, Off. I. B. Patel Road, Goregaon (E), Mumbai 400 063.
Tel.: 2686 5315/16/17/18. Fax : 2686 4924. Email : info@gogreennursery.com www.gogreennursery.com

Postal Registration No. MCW/275/2015-2017.

License to Post without prepayment WPP License No. MH/Tech/WPP-210/West/2016

Published on Sunday, August 7, 2016 & Posted on Wednesday August 10, 2016 at Mumbai Patrika Channel, Mumbai GPO-1



GANNON DUNKERLEY & CO., LTD.

An infrastructure company established since 1924

REGD. OFFICE :

*New Excelsior Building, (3rd Floor),
A. K. Nayak Marg, Fort, Mumbai 400 001.
Tel.: 022 2205 1231 Fax : 022-2205 1232*

Office : Ahmedabad, Hyderabad, Kolkata, Mumbai & New Delhi