

janata

Vol. 71 No. 45
December 11, 2016

**Learning from Hundred years
of Dravidian Movement**

K. S. Chalam

**Social sciences and
public policy in India**

Anand Kumar

India versus India

Gopalkrishna Gandhi

**Solidarity with the peoples of
Kashmir**

**Socialist Party (India)
Economic Resolution**

Editor :

G. G. Parikh

Managing Editor : Guddi

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

Email : janataweekly@gmail.com

Farooq should resign from Rajya Sabha

Kuldip Nayar

You can tell from the speeches of Farooq Abdullah whether he is in power or not. Obviously, he is in the wilderness these days because the speeches he is making are bitter and blatantly against India to the integrity of which he has sworn loyalty as a Rajya Sabha member. His latest is the support to the Hurriyat, which advocates secession of Kashmir from the country.

In his speech, he says: "I want to tell the workers of National Conference not be out of this struggle. I warn you: We are a part of this struggle. We have fought every time for the interests of this state."

Farooq will be well advised to resign from the Rajya Sabha because he cannot be with India and the Hurriyat at the same time. In fact, I am shocked how a person who has been a Union Minister and Kashmir's Chief Minister can make such a statement which runs counter to the constitution. Significantly, he addressed the gathering in Kashmiri.

Farooq is a person who has no control over himself when he is angry. He can say anything. I recall that when once he addressed the Aligarh University, he spoke like a

fundamentalist. I, sitting at the same dais, chided him. In my speech, I said that he reminded me of the Muslim League days before partition when Mohammad Ali Jinnah would say that Hindus and Muslims were two different nations and would make the religion at the basis of nationality.

A couple of weeks ago, Farooq wrote in a Srinagar journal that his father Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah would have been happy that the Kashmiri youth had picked up the gun to support their demand for independence. I knew the Sheikh well and I do not think that he would have made such an irresponsible statement.

The problem with Farooq is that he wants to remain in headlines. To do so he would say anything. Is Farooq confident that what the Hurriyat is preaching is in the interest of the people in Kashmir, much less India. Has he ever weighed the repercussion of the valley's separation from the rest of country? Kashmir is a land locked territory and does not have an easy success to any place except India.

The boys who are fighting against the Indian forces are very clear about what they desire. Only recently when I was in Srinagar, many among them

met me. They said that they wanted the valley to be converted into an independent sovereign Islamic state. They did not favour integration with Pakistan. Syed Ali Shah Geelani, a separatist Hurriyat leader does not represent them because he now wants Kashmir to be part of Pakistan, even at the expense of undoing the partition arrangement.

In fact, the Maharaja of Kashmir, Hari Singh wanted to stay independent after the British quitted. But tribals and the irregular Pakistani forces (the regular ones also) marched from the Pakistan occupied Kashmir to Srinagar. They would have captured it if they had not stopped at Baramula to loot and plunder.

At that time, Farooq Abdullah's father, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, released from the jail on the insistence of then India's Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, organized the people's militia during the Maharaja regime and stalled the forces marching towards Srinagar till regular Indian forces landed at the airport to push back the invaders to the territory, what is now known as PoK (Pakistan Occupied Kashmir).

Those who are saying all the time that Kashmir is an integral part of India are wrong in the sense that the state of Jammu and Kashmir enjoys autonomy as enunciated in Article 370 which says that except the three subjects—foreign affairs, defence and communications—the other articles of the Constitution that gave powers to the Central Government would not be applied to Jammu and Kashmir. The exception would be made only with the concurrence of the state's assembly.

In other words, because of these constitutional provisions, the State of Jammu & Kashmir enjoyed the type

(Contd. on Page 4)

Learning from Hundred years of Dravidian Movement

K. S. Chalam

The year 2016 being projected as the centenary year of Dravidian movement, there are desperate and euphoric attempts by different camps to evaluate the impact of the movement on the non-Brahmin population in India in general and in the South in particular. One hundred years of social history of the country with two divergent movements, one in the South in the form of Dravidian self-respect and the other in the West in the guise of Brahminical Hindutva, started almost at the same time, deliver contrasting narratives today. The triumph of the so-called Hindutva attributed to RSS and its political arm BJP and the gloomy presence of confused strategies of fragmented Dravidian protest in the political outfits of DMK, AIDMK and umpteen number of so called Dravidian parties in Tamil Nadu seems to be a serious challenge for scholars to analyse the historicity of two contemporary phenomena. Interestingly, the role of the Left in the socio-cultural life of India is said to be not outstanding as they remained non-committal to the ideological postures of the two and the so-called secular Congress and other parties are looked upon by people with suspicion. The role of the civil society in the area of social reform, typically, appears to be dismal?

The Dravidian movement characterised as the South Indian (composite Madras state) non-Brahmin revolt against the social taboos imposed by the Brahminical Hinduism is being reviewed by scholars and commentators while the champions are preparing to

celebrate the centenary year in December 2016. It is noted that the release of the non-Brahmin manifesto issued by Thegarayar in December 1916 is the beginning of the movement. However academics and some of the Dravidian activists do not agree with the date of the beginning of the movement. In fact, Dr Subrahmanya Swamy wrote an article in Frontline during the NDA-1 regime in 2003 claiming that the Dravidian movement began in 1916 and was being fading away now. He made interesting observations on the movement, being an activist from Tamil Nadu settled in Delhi. Dr. K. Veeramani, General Secretary of D.K reacted to the article denying the allegations and protested against the distortions of Dr Swamy who held that, "In 1932, the (Dravidian) movement suffered a setback when Dr. B. R. Ambedkar rejected the British offer of separate electorates for the Scheduled Castes, and sided with Mahatma Gandhi to sign the Poona Pact." Dr. Veeramani retorted saying, "But what happened actually? Dr. Ambedkar accepted the British Prime Minister Ramsey McDonald's Communal Award, Gandhi stoutly opposed this and undertook a fast unto death, saying that he would give up the fast only if his alternative proposal was accepted. So Dr. Ambedkar was put to intense, unfair psychological pressure, rather coerced, and made to sign the Poona Pact which, again, was not fully implemented in the proper spirit. The Scheduled Castes and Dr. Ambedkar were betrayed. This strengthened their disillusionment with Gandhi and his party, and brought them closer to Periyar and

his followers.” It is interesting to note that the Dravidian movement is being evaluated with reference to the presence of scheduled castes in the movement and is being disparaged for the kind of assaults perpetuated against dalits in Tamil Nadu mostly by the backward castes who are supposed to have been inspired by the Dravidian movement. Thus, some commentators are inclined to call the whole movement as hoax. It seems the evaluation of a social movement that has been recorded as one of the greatest events in the social history of modern India whose leader Periyar EVR was labelled as the Prophet of New Age by UNESCO in June 1970 is a misdemeanour. There are hundreds of studies on Periyar and the movement undertaken both by Western and Indian scholars eulogising it as an epoch cannot be simply wished away as an ingenuous social outburst.

Scholars like M. S. Gore and other social scientists have developed parameters in contextualising and evaluating the achievements of a social movement. It appears that subjecting a movement like the Dravidian ideology of protest in terms of Dalit bashing is unwise as Dalits are being subjected to lynching not only in the South where a social reform movement was present but it is much severe even in the home state of Babasaheb Ambedkar like Maharashtra where Phooley had a similar initiative much before Periyar. The evil is spread into areas that were not known for such brutalities before. It is exactly for the reasons of discrimination, humiliation and inhuman treatment meted out to Dalits by caste Hindus and the tenets of Manu Dharma upheld overtly and covertly by the Dvijias, Phooley, Periyar, Ambedkar, Lohia and others critiqued Brahminism and not Brahmins. As one of the defenders of Dravidian

movement N. Nandhivarman, General Secretary, Dravida Peravai put it, “the Dalit movement that is on the rise at the dawn of 21st century is a natural offspring of the Dravidian movement. Wherever men claim equality and whenever all human beings seek equal rights, the spirit of the Dravidian movement will live there. No one can say that with the withering away of the Soviet Union, the Socialist movement is dead; the same logic and historical compulsions apply to the existence of the Dravidian movement.” One may still differ with the views of the remorseful defendants, but we cannot reduce a social movement to a protest ideology merely on the basis of its temporary setback or unintentional flaws.

The greatest miscarriage of the Dravidian movement appears to be in its inward looking strategy of programme of action limited to select pockets of space, time and families. There are several impediments and shortcomings in the expansion of the movement beyond Tamil speaking areas. It was perhaps due to the reorganisation of erstwhile Madras state as Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala and Tamil Nadu in 1956 reordering the Dravidian speaking language regions as four, the movement got divided?. Perhaps it was at this juncture that the Dravidian spirit got fragmented and the Dravidian sensibility did not go beyond Madras. Though reformers like Tripuraneni, Thapi and others in Andhra, Narayana Guru, Ayyankali and others in Kerala and Brahmanetara Parishat, Veerashaivasangh, Dharmalingam, Devraj Urs and others in Karnataka protested against the hegemony of Brahminism in social, cultural and political life of the people, they did not work however under a single platform. In fact the above movements in the South got their inspiration from Justice Party and

Periyar. Yet, they did not go beyond their immediate regional needs and issues of the backward classes and Dalits. It appears that they were all together to fight for the First amendment to the Constitution to uphold caste based reservations in the South based on Communal order issued in 1920s. They could do it in 1951 because the states were not formed at that time and Periyar and Ambedkar were alive to lead the movement. But, the Dravidian ideology seems to have watered down to that of defending caste based reservations after independence and reorganisation of the states. We cannot attribute the failure of the movement to Periyar alone as he became old and got exhausted and internal bickering in the movement through splits of Annadurai, later Karuananidhi, and MGR further shortened the life of Dravidian upsurge.

A section of the critiques of Dravidian movement subscribing to the exclusionary vision from that of a section of the Dalits, reading the rationalist outburst of the Black shirts as negative due to their allegiance to Christianity, Islam and other faiths is not really conducive to make comments by the dispassionate observers. It seems the derisive elements have failed to look at the emergence of Hindutva and its expanding tentacles in Tamil Nadu heartland as a threat to the Dravidian concept. Tactically, RSS as per a report in *The Hindu* in November 2014, appropriated the Dravidian symbols such as celebrating the 1000th year of the coronation of Chola King Rajendra I and was able to attract people in the age group of 25-40. The paper has cited Mr Sadgopan saying that, ‘as the number of people coming to RSS grows, the BJP will get ideologically committed individuals,’ and it has gained confidence after the resounding victory in Parliamentary elections.

We do not have such statements by others who are joining the opposite camps. There seem to be very few attempts as of now to evaluate the impact of the new developments in the South on the social tensions.

Dravidian movement is not an upshot of Periyar or Tamilians and is not directly related to the so-called non-Brahmins alone. The concept Dravida as per pundits is a derivative of Tamil in Sanskrit and Periyar asserted 'there is only one language, and she is Tamil'. He went on to say that, "it is my firm conviction that the Kural was especially created to demonstrate that the arts, culture, ethics and conduct of the Tamils were vastly different from and antithetical to those of Aryans". In my Dravidian University Foundation day lecture I tried to bring out the origin of the word citing Iravatham Mahadevan, Asko Parapola and others that the name 'Harappa' itself constituted two Dravidian words *Hara* and *Appa* typical to South India. The Kharavela Hathigumpha inscription contains reference to Tramira countries and so on. Therefore, the Dravidian movement should have been an all-inclusive and culturally diverse campaign to bring in the historical significance of the first settlers in India. In fact a careful reading of the movement shows that several diverse movements are integrated and Periyar is shown as the leader of the movement. As EVR himself agreed that the Dravidian nation is very old and he wanted to bring in reform to bring all the groups together. In fact the self-respect movement, anti-Brahmin movement, caste-based reservations, atheism and social reform are distinct genres of a large species of a binary called Aryan-Dravidian classification in Indology/Dravidology that remained an orphan in academic discourse in an age of post-colonialism. This appears to be typical to Indian

scholarship in India as compared to the Palestinian, Jewish, African, etc identity movements based on common threads of links of blood, genetics, language, culture and history.

The contemporary political situation in the world where Donald Trump seemingly a German heir won and some NRIs identifying with him and the so-called fringe groups in India parading openly supporting him indicate that Periyar and the Dravidian movement in a different form would re-emerge if the present trends are an indication. We wish that Indians whose destiny was sealed under the Constitution should respect diversity and pluralism to

(Contd. from Page 2)

of autonomy which other states do not have. Subsequently, the Sheikh Sahib had the state constituent assembly pass a resolution that the state of Jammu and Kashmir had acceded to India irrevocably. Before doing so, he sent Sadiq Sahib, who became the state chief minister later, to Pakistan to assess what kind of polity Islamabad was going to pursue.

After hearing Sadq's view that Pakistan wanted to be an Islamic state, the Sheikh Sahib, a product of people's struggle to obtain independence from the Maharaja and the British, took no time in joining India because he wanted the state to be pluralistic. A democratic India, where there would be religious freedom, was the obvious choice for him because Pakistan wanted to be an Islamic Republic.

With the passage of time, the Sheikh became the only liberal voice which could be heard clearly in the midst of challenges and counter-challenges by Hindus and Muslims. I recall when I was released from

help create conditions of live and let live. The Dravidian movement has initiated a paradigm shift in our social relations in recent years that need to be carried with care. Otherwise the nation would again get divided and this time caste wars and communal violence would be diverted against those who are considered as responsible in maintaining divisions and despairs. Dravidian movement might disappear now due to cunning collusions and distortions of the select few under the weight of the movement's own limitations in the short run, but it would never vanish as long as discrimination, indignity and inhumanity are perpetuated in the name caste, religion, colour, language and culture.

the Tihar Jail during the Emergency my co-prisoners asked me to visit Srinagar and request the Sheikh to speak against the Emergency because he was respected all over the country. He had no hesitation in issuing a statement that the Emergency had overstayed and should be withdrawn.

I wish Farooq had imbibed the qualities of Sheikh Sahib and guided New Delhi instead of flirting with the separatists to harm India's cause. He is acceptable throughout the country even though he is found whimsical. He should think twice before he gives even indirect help to separatists. By announcing his support for the Hurriyat he has raised many questions in the minds of people, both in Kashmir and the rest of India.

Farooq should realize that his constituency is the entire country. When he says anything which tells upon on India's unity he confuses people because they see him on the side of India's integrity, not its dismemberment.

Solidarity with the peoples of Kashmir

We, twenty five citizens of India, representing people's movements, women's organisations, trade unions, human rights organisations, youth organisations and individuals who are journalists, writers and filmmakers, from the states of Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Nagaland, Odisha and Tamil Nadu, visited Kashmir from 11 to 20 November 2016 with the objective of understanding first-hand, from ordinary people and civil society, the situation of the peoples of the Kashmir Valley that has emerged over the past four-and-a-half months since the killing of three Hizbul Mujahideen militants, Burhan Wani, Sartaj Sheikh and Pervaiz Lashkari by the Indian Army and J&K Police on 8 July 2016.

In the last 135 days, over 102 unarmed civilians have been killed by the Indian Army, the J&K Police and central paramilitary forces. More than 15,000 people have been injured by armed firing and in pellet firing and shelling, of which around 7,000 are cases of severe injury. A majority of those who have been killed are young and many are minors. This information has been documented by the media.

Over the nine days, we visited the districts of Anantnag, Bandipora, Baramulla, Budgam, Ganderbal, Kulgam, Kupwara, Pulwama, Shopian and Srinagar.

We met with families of those who have been killed by the Indian Army, the Border Security Force (BSF), the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF), and the J&K Police (JKP)

including the Special Operations Group (SOG) and Special Task Forces (STF). We met with families of those who have disappeared or have been jailed, including human rights defenders. We also met with victims grievously injured, including being blinded by pellet gunfire and PAVA shell fire over these past four-and-a-half-months.

Apart from ordinary people of the 10 districts mentioned above, we met with lawyers including the leadership of the J&K Bar Association (JKBA); trading and business communities including the Kashmir Economic Alliance (KEA), Kashmir Fruit Growers & Dealers Association, and district-level traders federations; state government employees and their unions including the Employees' Joint Action Committee (EJAC); students' unions; human rights defenders including the Jammu Kashmir Coalition of Civil Society and the Association of Parents of Disappeared Persons; political organisations and parties including the Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF), other member parties of the All Party Hurriyat Conference, Jammu & Kashmir Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), and the Muslim League; Kashmiri Pandit community including the Kashmiri Pandit Sangharsh Samiti (KPSS); relief, voluntary and social welfare organisations including Kashmir Centre for Social and Development Studies, Firdous Educational Trust for Orphans as well as scholars, academics, journalists, doctors and other medical practitioners, artists, and theatre professionals.

Following the, alleged extrajudicial, killing of 8 July there have been large, unprecedented protests across the Kashmir valley starting on 9 July, the day of Burhan Wani's funeral. These unarmed protests have been met with sustained attack by the Indian Army, J&K police and paramilitary, including with the use of pellet guns, PAVA shells and firearms. We learnt of several deaths caused by targeted killings of unarmed civilians by armed forces in the absence of protests or demonstrations. Most deaths we came across have been caused by injuries waist-above, without any warning fire. Deaths and injuries caused by pellet guns too are all above the waist and preponderantly at eye level causing blinding or long-term ophthalmic damage. In the case of deaths, we learnt that the J&K Police has lodged 'cross' FIRs using similar and repetitive, if not identical, charges of the victim being 'anti-national'. These government actions amount to a violation of the right to life.

Families that have pursued the legal remedy to identify the representatives of the Indian Army, J&K police and paramilitary, including those granted immunity under the Armed Forces (Jammu and Kashmir) Special Powers Act, 1990, who engaged in acts of killing innocent people, have become targets of repeated arrests, torture and raids. These government actions amount to criminal intimidation and have served as a deterrent to many families from pursuing the course of justice.

Of the papers of those who have been arrested, especially under the Jammu and Kashmir Public Safety Act, 1978 (PSA), that we were able to look at, the charges lack prima facie substance and employ similar, if not identical, language. We spent a morning attending proceedings at the J&K High Court. In all the cases involving arrests under the PSA, including the case of PSA filed against human rights defender Khurram Pervez, the Government Counsel merely sought to delay cases by seeking more time to file documents when in fact the FIR/case dossier forms the basis of the arrest. We came across several cases of those who won their release through the courts, being promptly rearrested on the basis of new FIRs filed against them by the government. Cases of arrests of minors, including under the PSA, were also brought to our notice. These government actions amount to a violation of the principles of natural justice.

Families of detained and arrested persons also brought to our attention instances of grievous custodial torture by government interrogators in police stations and jails, indicating the levels of impunity enjoyed by the Indian Army, under the Armed Forces (Jammu and Kashmir) Special Powers Act, 1990, and the state police, under the Jammu and Kashmir Public Safety Act, 1978. People also reported that multiple wings of the intelligence were in operation, causing fear, mistrust and suspicion among people.

In the towns and villages where there were killings by the Indian Army, J&K police and paramilitary, we met with ordinary people who narrated a cycle of search and seizure raids following killings, and

of indiscriminate firing, including at funerals and memorial gatherings. In several of these instances the Indian Army, J&K police and paramilitary broke windows and destroyed household goods, livestock, and food rations in peoples' homes. In several of the villages and towns we visited, the armed forces, during their search and seizure operations, routinely destroy the local electricity transformer or sub-station, denying the entire village or locality access to electricity. These government actions amount to handing out collective punishment. Women spoke of being subjected to violence and molestation by the Indian Army, J&K police and paramilitary, and reported several instances of verbal and physical abuse during the search and seizure operations. Paramedics working in the government health system reported that during this period they witnessed a significant increase in the number of miscarriages, which were caused by physical violence. These government actions amount to a violation of every law and the international covenant that is aimed at protecting women from sexual and other forms of violence.

We were very moved by the extraordinary efforts of the doctors, nurses and paramedics of the state's public health system in responding to the huge number of cases of those injured by the Indian Army, J&K police and paramilitary. Most of them, at various points in the last four-and-a-half-months, have worked twenty-four hours a day, two to three days at a stretch. We, however, found that many doctors were harassed by government intelligence to reveal the identity of their patients. The J&K police and paramilitary have also raided hospitals, including in one instance

a women's ward. We met with ambulance drivers who were intimidated and threatened by the armed forces for ferrying the injured. We learnt that pharmacies and kitchens setup by relief and social welfare organisations and the business community, who stepped in to assist the government hospitals in meeting the extraordinary challenge of saving lives, were disbanded by the armed forces. In at least one case, a key leader of this 'critical assistance', as described by a senior government doctor, was arrested and jailed for over a fortnight. These government actions against emergency relief workers and health professionals are in violation of international covenants and India's own commitment to UN treaties.

We were witness to the closure of local town and village mosques by government authorities, across the Kashmir valley, including the Jamia Masjid in Srinagar and Jamia Masjid in Shopian. These government actions amount to violation of the right to freedom of religion.

We were witness to the ban on internet on mobile telephone services. We also noted from media reports of raids at newspaper offices, the shutting down of all newspapers in Kashmir for three days in July, and the blanket ban on the publishing of the newspaper *Kashmir Reader*. These government actions amount to a violation of the right to freedom of speech and internationally accepted norms of freedom of the press.

We noted the targeting of J&K state government employees, including the summary dismissal of 12 employees and the denial of salaries, issuing of show cause notices, and the suspension of

several others. Office bearers of government employees' unions who have protested these government actions of unfair labour practice have been detained or arrested. These government actions amount to a violation of the right to freedom of association.

We witnessed the people's affirmative response to the strike call issued by the All Party Hurriyat Conference through the nine days that we were in Kashmir. We see this as the resilience and resoluteness of the resistance of the peoples of Kashmir against the actions of the Indian state.

Nearly every voice that we heard of the Kashmir peoples talked of the long-standing Kashmir dispute from the days of India's independence and partition, the division of Kashmir between India and Pakistan in 1948, and the sustained efforts of the peoples of Kashmir to assert their right to self-determination. From common people we heard articulate accounts of what they have faced from the Indian state and, in particular, of the sustained attack on their democratic rights from 1989 onwards. The failure of the Indian state and every government since independence to address the political sentiments of Kashmir's peoples is a source of both hurt and enormous resentment.

We heard from every quarter we spoke to that, in this present phase, the BJP government at the centre and the PDP-BJP government in J&K has refused to address the strongly felt sentiments of the peoples of Kashmir. The stubbornness of the BJP government at the centre and the PDP-BJP government in J&K to dialogue with the people of the Kashmir valley

and their representatives is well documented in the media. The PDP, in our meeting with them, confirmed Delhi's policy of non-dialogue and non-compromise and set out their support for this policy.

We also noted that, over these four-and-a-half-months, the BJP government at the centre has sought to create a war-like situation with Pakistan along the border of J&K, employing the alleged Uri attack to build a Hindu majoritarian sentiment against Kashmir, Pakistan and those of the Islamic faith.

We conclude that the BJP government at the centre and the PDP-BJP government in J&K are engaged in actions that amount to a complete violation of universally accepted human and democratic rights and of the very Indian Constitution they claim to want to impose in the Kashmir valley. With use of government force and the rest of the machinery at their disposal, the government has acted and continues to act in grievous violation of the right to life, the right to free speech, the right to freedom of association, the right to freedom of religion, the right to freedom of press and the principles of natural justice. We are also distressed by the fact that senior members of the BJP government have made, and continue to make, inflammatory and provocative statements against the peoples of Kashmir. Regrettably, the parliamentary opposition has lacked the political courage and will to call upon the accountability of government actions.

We also conclude that the actions of the BJP government at the centre and the PDP-BJP government in J&K are acts of vengeance aimed at forcing the peoples of Kashmir into

subjugation by using every possible force available to government for breaking the peoples' resolve for a democratic settlement to achieve their aspirations. As representatives of diverse peoples' movements, trade unions and other organisations in India, and as India's citizens, we can say without reservation that the actions of the Indian state in Kashmir amount to profound violation of democratic and human rights. Hence, we call upon the Government of India to forthwith:

Recognise the Kashmir dispute and accept that its resolution can only come through a political solution, not through military intervention and a suppression of all human and democratic rights;

Withdraw the army and other paramilitary forces including the Central Reserve Police Force, Border Security Force and Indo Tibetan Border Police from civilian areas of Jammu and Kashmir;

Repeal the Jammu and Kashmir Public Safety Act, 1978 and the Armed Forces (Jammu and Kashmir) Special Powers Act, 1990;

Release all political prisoners and, in particular, all prisoners arrested under the Jammu and Kashmir Public Safety Act, 1978;

Grant access to the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights for a UN fact-finding mission in Jammu & Kashmir;

Establish a judicial tribunal under the supervision of the Supreme Court to examine all cases of extra-judicial killings, including that of Burhan Wani;

Enter into an open and transparent dialogue, without pre-conditions, with all sections of the Kashmir

(Contd. on Page 16)

Social sciences and public policy in India: Need of reciprocity

Anand Kumar

India is engaged in democratic nation-building after successful culmination in 1947 of a century long freedom mobilizations from foreign rule into a sovereign republic. It has mobilized all kinds of intellectual and material resources for it. This process has gone through three distinct cycles since independence: 1. Planning for self-reliance (1950-1971); 2. Politics of poverty eradication (1971-1984); 3. Combining economic liberalism and social justice about gender, caste and ethnic groups (1984-2014). A new cycle has been initiated around centrality of cultural nationalism after the Lok Sabha elections of 2014 which has brought in National Democratic Alliance led by Narendra Modi as prime minister and Bharatiya Janata Party as the dominant party.

It is strange that there has been decline in the significance of social sciences in these seventy years of nation-building while we witnessed increasing intensity of mobilizations for socio-political reforms in the context of gender, caste, religions, languages, and ethnicity. The social scientists are found to be lagging behind the social activists in most of the instances. There has been change of role of social scientists from 'partner in progress' during the years of Prime Minister Nehru (1947-1964) to 'selective support' in the short period of Lal Bahadur Shastri (1964-1966) and long years of Indira Gandhi (1966-1984) with an interval during 1977-1979 and 'increasing exclusion from public policies' since 1984. It is a strange

situation where the space of public policy is seen to be occupied by politicians and social activists at the cost of social scientific inputs.

It has created an atmosphere of ad-hocism, benign neglect and lack of sustainability in the sphere of public policy in all major domains. A glance at the fate of some of the major episodes of public policy making may be sufficient to sense the growing gaps in the interdependence between public policies and social sciences. Let us mention a few examples about it: 1) Justice Verma Committee Report on violence against women, 2. Justice Sacchar Committee Report on the deteriorating condition of Muslims, 3. Prof. Arjun Sengupta Committee Report about the conditions of workers in the un-organised sector, 4. Bandopadhyay Committee Report about the challenge of extremist activities in a large number of Indian districts, 5) Indrajeet Gupta Committee Report on electoral reforms, and 6) Prof. Yashpal Committee Report on educational reforms. All these reports have four common features: i. They are about some of the most burning problems of nation-building in India; ii. Each report received wide support from intellectuals, media and aggrieved sections of the society; iii. All the committees, with people of substance as members, were appointed by the highest authority of the country; and iv. All the reports remain least implemented so far - this lack of commitment of the power elite to engage in public policy making process on the basis of careful

deliberations and considerations is quite suicidal as it promotes cynicism as well as lack of trust in the policymaking process. But there is no effort from the side of policy makers or social scientists to get closer to each other for sustained dialogue and deliberations and course correction.

A situation of concern

The problem of interfaces between social sciences and public policy has been a recurring concern of social scientists as well as the public policy makers since the emergence of '3 Ms' as the new imperatives of nation-building in early 1990s – Mandal Report based reservations for the Other Backward Classes, Mandir mobilisation, and Market-centric initiatives. There is need on the part of the social scientists to be aware about their social responsibilities which include a meaningful role in public policy system. On the other hand, it is relevant and necessary for the public policy making to be in constructive interaction with the social sciences to avoid trappings of populist politics and political opportunism at the cost of national objectives and consensual progress.

Social sciences are the source of authentic knowledge of the social realities. A socially indifferent social science has no relevance or influence in society, including the policy makers. They are treated as 'ivory tower intellectuals'. A public policy regime without organic relationship with the social sciences is often victim of short sightedness as well as the conspiracies of the

vested interests. It causes a) mal-development, b) governance crisis, c) legitimacy deficits, and d) limit to citizenship building due to wasted opportunities and failed programs. Therefore it is always helpful for both - the public policy making system and the community of social scientists - to keep enquiring about the nature and result of mutual interfaces.

Some features

Let us try to identify the essential features of this relationship as it has evolved in the last seven decades since independence from the foreign rule.

First of all, it is an uneven relationship where economics is the privileged social science due to our national emphasis upon 'economic planning and development'.

Secondly, it is a state-centric. There has been primacy of state in establishing and promoting social sciences through the state funded research centres and universities. The LPG paradigm has not created much change in the centrality of state funding in the context of social sciences in the last two decades as the private universities and foundations have adopted an attitude of benign neglect towards social sciences due to their preference for 'technology' over social philosophy, history, sociology and psychology and 'management' over 'politics'.

Thirdly, the social scientists are found to be working under two pressures - western paradigms and state patronage. They have shown limited capacity for autonomy from 'Western and corporate 'dominance' and commitment for 'people-centric' social sciences. Increase in the centres of studies and research in

social sciences has created some difference since the 1980-90s. But the barriers between the elite institutions and masses' concerns has not lowered much due to calculated indifference of the state and policy makers towards non-English and non-metropolitan sites of knowledge generation about the dynamics of social realities.

Fourthly, there is some change at the ground level with changes in a) the composition and interests of the power elite, b) enlargement of the social basis of democratic system, and c) increasing social mobilizations and protest movements. It has impacted the character of social sciences and their priorities in teaching and research.

Fifthly, the social scientists are finding new constituencies and relevance in the context of public policy discourses in the recent times. It is due to emergence of a 'rainbow of protest politics' as exemplified by i. new urgency about the gender issues, ii. the Dalit assertion, iii. the problems of dignity and security of the tribal communities, iv. crisis of confidence among the minorities including the Muslims due to majoritarian thrusts in the public sphere and public policies, v. ecological concerns, displacements and disasters, vi. anti-corruption protests, vii. ungovernable pockets of extremist and separatist politics, viii. propensity of social violence, ix. new legitimacy of identity politics and vote banks, and x. disenchantment with liberalization driven industrialization and consumerism. The introduction of new policies in promoting gender justice, social justice, health, education, employment, and governance reforms are some of the most outstanding examples of this

change in the status and relevance of social scientists.

Finally, the interface between social sciences and public policy has been deeply affected by politics of knowledge and corporate lobbies within the LPG framework of policymaking.

What is wrong?

It seems that there are few major problems in promoting a meaningful bonding between the public policy system and social scientists these days. Our system is developing legitimacy deficiencies that make power elite nervous about dissent and criticism. Then there is the reality of transition from state-centric public policy framework to market mediated public policy initiatives. It has ideological barriers which are preventing meaningful dialogues not only between the policy establishment and the social sciences, but also within the community of social scientists. Moreover, the universities and research institutes based social scientists are found to be inclined towards a bit 'sanitised' version of the social issues and their solutions. It makes them 'un-trustworthy' in the eyes of the affected sections of our society.

Let us not forget that all democratic regimes must learn to live with differences and dissent by maintaining commitment for sustaining the culture of dialogue. In historical terms, the heretics, radicals and rebels have been always there among the social scientists. But their presence should be utilized by our policy establishment and knowledge systems as 'catalytic agents'. But often they are getting marginalized by their fraternity as well as the public policy patrons

due to their unorthodox ways and views. They are labeled as 'public intellectuals', 'dissenters' and 'too theoretical and academic' and treated with benign neglect. There has been always a silent conflict between the 'relevant and respected' social scientists and 'heretic' and 'marginal' social scientists with reference to analysis and assessment of public policies, their meaning, functions and relevance. It is interesting that this conflict has been a relevant source for hegemonic and counter-hegemonic trends in social sciences which created spaces for new initiatives and voices. Given the Indian experience, we can safely suggest that so far the relationship between social sciences and public policy has been informed by the triple imperatives of i) democratic nation-building, ii) constitutional commitment of justice - economic, social and political, and iii) intervention in the dynamics of social changes, including traditionalization, modernization to globalization. But it has been a relationship between two extremely unequal entities bordering patron-client system due to lack of insufficient autonomy of the social scientists and 'distant' relationship between the social sciences and non-state aspects of our national life, including the dynamics of market forces and post-colonial communitarian issues.

In a national dialogue held in 1970s, it was observed there are four kinds of social scientists who have been available for various roles in public policies: 1. Liberal, 2. Managerial, 3. Marxist, and 4. Moralistic. We can add a few more categories today. But it is evident that we have moved far away from the 1970s as the setting for public policies has changed due to increasing relevance of new

realities created by the togetherness of global factors and regional-local imperatives. The status of social sciences has been also affected because of our dissatisfactory role in understanding and interpreting the social changes which were promoting new discourses of power and challenges before the people. The experts of modern Indian history and political science are still baffled about the causes and consequences of major shifts like the expansion-decline expansion of the Maoist influence, the rise and success of JP Movement, the beginnings and the end of the Emergency Raj and the evolution of LPG regime. Similarly, the sociologists were found to be lagging behind the women's movement, the Dalit assertion particularly the rise of Bahujan politics, Mandal-Mandir mobilizations, and failure of nation-building process in Kashmir and the Northeastern communities. The economists continue to fiddle with facts of poverty with changing regimes at the states and the centre.

The way ahead

Our public policy setting is marked by three major changes. There is the end of planning and rolling back of the state. Then there has been devaluation of the university system due to commercialization of higher education. We are also witness to increasing primacy of politics over academics since 1980s. Therefore, there is need to create 'intermediate spaces' for maintaining a critical minimum relevance of social sciences in public policy making and evaluation. These intermediate spaces can mediate between the social sciences and public policy in a non-hegemonic and contested political system in democratic societies.

There are five such spaces which need our attention and support :

1. Interdisciplinary platforms of research and interaction;
2. Research institutes of interest groups including the political parties, the trade unions, the informal sector labor, peasant associations, chambers of commerce and industry, professionals' bodies and social communities;
3. Continuous engagements of social scientists with social movements and protest processes as 'economics, sociology and politics from below';
4. Preventing primacy of pseudo-social scientists including failed politicians, semi-educated bureaucrats and social sciences administrators in policy discourses; and
5. Self-sustainable processes of public education and opinion building about contemporary issues and problems by social scientists through media, semi-professional forums and mass oriented literature dissemination in popular language and terminology.

We cannot wait for funding from global or national agencies for it because we are fast becoming a nation which is suffering with truth deficit about public policies. Restoring truth in public sphere and promoting peoples' well being on the basis of sound public policies is expected from social sciences as a social responsibility. It is our contribution for promoting and deepening Swaraj.

(Contd. on Page 13)

Socialist Party (India)

Economic Resolution

Policies of liberalization, privatization and globalization, dictated by the World Bank, IMF, WTO and other such world economic institutions, are playing havoc world over, particularly to the lives of poor and weaker sections of society. Despite repeated failures and shortcomings of these very policies, the ruling establishment of India and the world is pursuing them shamelessly with even greater intensity. These policies have resulted into the greatest poor-rich divide ever! The divide is also increasing among the developed, developing and under-developed nations. On one hand the luxuries enjoyed by the rich do not know limits on the other hand the poor are forced to suffer from epidemics, natural disasters and to live undignified life without basic civic facilities. The neo-liberal policies have resulted in immense inequality and corruption during last three decades.

But the governments, talking only GDP, are not ready to listen anything against these economic policies. GDP is a poor economic indicator and reveals little about the condition of lives of poor. A developed nation of Europe has shown increase in GDP by including the earnings from prostitution in its country. And here in India, the present government is changing the basis of price rise, GDP and other indicators to somehow show growth. The government has shown the difference between production and expenses to be more than 1 lakh 30 thousand crores, which if removed, will reduce the growth rate by 2%.

Cheap imports, especially from countries like China, are killing the skills of the local craftsmen as the work done by them is costlier. Even big industries like garments, engineering and machinery are being pushed towards closure by cheap imports. The MNCs in automobile, mobile, electronics/computers sectors are reaping huge profits. The policy of minimum imports in petroleum sector has been done away with. These policies have resulted into suicides of lakhs of farmers, displacement of crores of people, massive unemployment and destruction of the environment.

The agrarian sector and tribal population face the direct brunt of these economic policies and capitalist development model based upon them. This year, in spite of a good monsoon and a good farm produce, the farmers have not got good returns. This is reflected by the increase in suicides of farmers. The backbone of the agrarian sector has been broken by the two and half decades of implementation of neo-liberal policies. The farming is continually oriented towards foreign needs and cash crops. Local basic needs like pulses are increasingly made dependent on imports. Pulses are the only source of protein in plate of poor and that too has become unaffordable now. The entire agrarian sector, which includes seeds, pesticides, fertilizers, is becoming more and more dependent on MNCs. The government is adamantly pushing for introduction of GM crops, which can cause irreversible, disastrous impacts on health and environment.

In the name of breed improvement indigenous animal husbandry, fish farming, poultry and all such sectors are being opened up for MNCs. Local varieties of crops, fruits and animals are disappearing. There is a lesson that needs to be learnt from the spread of epidemic diseases like bird flu, mad cow disease, etc. But who cares?

Since its beginning, the Modi government has launched a campaign of land grabbing, which is being resisted by farmer unions and unity of opposition parties. But behind this thrust there are huge corporations and MNCs, which are eying the land of farmers and tribals. Socialist Party, since its inception, has been demanding that all available land should be equitably and appropriately used and for the same purpose a land use commission, which comprises of representation of farmers and tribals, should be set up.

It is not just land but all other natural resources are also at stake. There is a fast move to hand over water of rivers to MNCs and big industries. Red carpets are being laid for big industrial houses, foreign capital and foreign trade. But there is no increase in either manufacturing or in foreign trade. The government is filling its coffers finding respite in low crude oil prices and throwing away huge amounts of money to big business houses. The stock market and commodity markets are death fields for common investors and farmers. For the last three years there is no change in this situation. Whether it be neem-

coated fertilizers or copying of Israel drip farming, all have turned out to be total failures for farmers.

Neo-liberal economic policies have caused havoc for tribal people. So-called development programs have resulted in displacement of crores of tribals. Their land, minerals below land, rivers, forest produce, and even sand stones are sold to make enormous money by corporates, politicians and bureaucrats. Dalits don't own means of production and this loot of land, forest and other natural resources has eliminated their chances of getting a share of these resources. Availability of land for residential purposes has also become an issue in villages. The retail sector, which has been the backbone of agrarian and the rest of our economy, is now under grave threat from the FDI from giant MNCs, like Wall Mart, Tesco, Carrefour, Metro, etc.

The availability and condition of employment has been worsening. Government says that FDI is our only option for fast economic growth. So government is offering big sops to MNCs. But the MNCs have sophisticated manufacturing which use automation to reduce

expenditure on salaries, and in turn lead to a jobless growth. Crores of degree holder youth are jobless. This was when Modi, in his election speeches, had promised 1 crore jobs every year, but those jobs are simply not there. The Socialist Party believes in self-reliant and independent economy that operates on cooperative basis with a target of total employment in the field of agriculture, animal husbandry and other small scale industries with Indian capital. Agricultural land should not be acquired. Irrigation facilities and easy loans with guarantee of profitable prices should be provided to farmers.

Recently Rs. 500 and 1000 notes have been invalidated. Tall claims are being made by the Prime Minister that this demonetization will end corruption, black money, tax evasion, boom in property prices, terrorism from across the border and so on. These tall claims are sufficient to show the hollowness of demonetization. This decision is made essentially to cover the failure to bring back black money from outside India. The claim of depositing Rs. 15 lakh to each Indians' bank account by Modi was based on estimation of this black money

Defence Resolution

The present BJP government at the centre is implementing anti-constitution neo-liberal policies at a faster pace than the previous UPA government. The most striking example of this is increasing the FDI limit in defence equipments manufacturing to 100% from the earlier limit of 49%; and the government is working overtime signing defence related agreements with various foreign companies.

The only condition government has put for this is that once FDI reaches 100% it will need government's permission. All other essential restrictions and conditions imposed on foreign investment in the Defence sector have been removed. For instance, under the Arms Act of 1959, the manufacture of small weapons and ammunition was to be done within the country only. For this FDI was not needed. Now

parked outside India. This sudden declaration of demonetization has caused immense inconvenience to the ordinary people. They are standing in long queues for exchange at the loss of wages. The Socialist Party believes that black money is an unavoidable result of the capitalist-neoliberal policies. We can see the same across the world. The claim made by government, which is implementing neo-liberal policies on a much faster pace than the previous UPA government, is principally untenable.

The Socialist Party rejects the neo-liberal economic policies and demands that development policies, which are decentralized, complementary to the local ecosystem, diverse and based on sustainable development, should be implemented. Only such pro-people and pro-environment policies can guarantee full employment and balanced usage of natural resources. Country's wealth is its people and resources. We see reflection of decentralized, diverse and sustainable development's clear vision in the thoughts of Mahatma Gandhi, Rammanohar Lohia, Jayaprakash Narayan and Kishan Patnayak.

this is not the case. Another thing to be taken into account is that earlier there was a condition for FDI that it was supposed to transfer technology to India. But now, even this condition has been withdrawn. This means that foreign companies can now manufacture with old technology or just acquire an Indian company and do their business. Therefore the biggest example of "Make in Foreign" under the Modi

government's "Make in India" campaign is of allowing 100% FDI in Defence sector. This move is both shocking and ironic as it encourages "Make in Foreign" rather than "Make in India".

Another important restriction on FDI in the earlier regime was that foreign companies were required to make a joint venture with the original equipment manufacturer. Now this condition has been removed. This will make foreign companies operate at the same level as Indian companies. This means stiff competition for Indian manufacturers. It will not be long before foreign companies take over Indian companies.

The dangers of agreements with foreign companies are not just financial and technological. There is always a danger of leaking designs of defence equipments to enemies. Recently a case validating this suspicion came into light when 22,400 pages of documents leaked from the data bank of French submarine manufacturer DCNS, which has the contract of manufacturing submarines at Goa. Investigations show that the leak occurred at some South Asian location, and via China it reached Pakistan. Though government has ensured a probe, but so far there is no action against the company. The government has not even initiated the cancelation of the contract of manufacturing the submarines with the French company. Meanwhile a deal has been signed for purchase of Rafale French fighter jets. It is alleged that the said deal is the costliest in the history of our defence sector purchases. Government will purchase 36 Rafale jets for a total of Rs. 59,000 crores, which means that each jet will cost a whopping Rs. 1600 crores!

Raising any question/suspicion on defence related issues is fussed about in an ugly way now-a-days. Country's Minister of State for Home Affairs Kiren Rijiju's statement that a new culture of questioning the defence forces is taking shape and it is wrong is a specimen of such mind-set. The armed forces, security and defence deals are being made a question of patriotism and pride in such a way that people, media and organisations would desist from raising questions. In such a scenario, we will not even be in a position to address corruption scams in the defence sector like the Bofors scam. In our democracy elected government and the parliament take decisions on all defence related issues. Therefore questions and suspicion are raised about the government and not the armed forces. There is a conscious attempt to soft-pedal the voice against the present government in the guise of armed forces.

The farce of government's OROP (One Rank One Pension) claim has been exposed by the tragic suicide of a 70-year old ex-army man. The irony is that opposition parties like AAP and Congress are making it an emotional issue, which is being used taken advantage of by the ruling BJP.

So, on one hand the government is escalating tensions at the border and signing new defence deals with Russia, France and USA and on the other hand soldiers coming from poor and farmers' families are being abandoned to commit suicide. Furthermore, there is an attempt that playing politics and raising emotional fervour in the name of armed forces is a sole right of one party i.e. BJP; and citizens/media do not have a right to seek or furnish information and to ask questions in this matter!

The Socialist Party firmly believes that when the present government has jeopardized national security and the interests of the armed forces by opening the defence sector to trade by foreign companies, there should be maximum possible transparency and discussion on defence related issues. The Socialist Party also demands that permission for 100% FDI in the defence sector be withdrawn immediately.

(passed in 4th National Convention held in Lucknow on 14-15 November 2016)

(Contd. from Page 10)

Let us end this short essay with a quote from Tagore from his foreword to his monumental work Towards Universal Man in 1892:

"I once read a story of a poor man who wanted to buy himself winter clothes for winter and summer clothes for summer. So he used to save up all the money he could get by begging. But he could not save up enough to buy summer clothes until summer was gone. This went on year after year until God, moved by piety, told the man that He would grant him a wish. "All I ask for," the man said, "is this: let the vicissitudes of fortune end, so that I no longer get winter clothes in summer and summer clothes in winter." We too pray that God would end the vicissitudes of our education, and grant us winter clothes in winter and summer clothes in summer. God has put before us everything we need, but we cannot help ourselves to the right thing at the right moment. And that is why we live like that beggar in the story. So let us pray to God to give us food when we are hungry and clothes when we are cold. Let us pray that He would unite our language with our thought and our education with our life."

India versus India

Gopalkrishna Gandhi

Before entering into the theme, I want to say that there is a deep dichotomy, a fundamental two-ness in the Indian psyche which can be seen as an 'India versus India' phenomenon. We are as a people steeped in the fatalistic acceptance of anything that happens around us as 'given by kismet, ordained by karma, etched on our foreheads as the lines of Fate. And so, acceptance, resignation, detachment are seen as philosophically desirable, spiritually advised and pragmatically sensible. On the other hand, India has also been the site of great reforms, of revolutionary changes, campaigns, agitations, movements for change all of which are about anything but quietist, accepting. They militate against 'kismet'. Fatalist acceptance of the given on the one hand contrasts with the anti-fatalist urge for change. So we have two Indian mindsets at the very taproot of our civilisation. And our present preoccupation with the famine of currency makes me wonder whether we are to admire the great patience being shown by our people or lament the lack of protest among them.

'India versus India' sounds like a litigious title. Do I mean by it that despite the money and the strain involved in litigation, despite all the time it takes up, legal action is a favourite Indian habit, amounting to an addiction? That we, as a people, delight in taking one another, especially relatives, to court or that the Indian State rather routinely fills its already over-crowded jails with more and ever more under-trials, many if not most of them innocent?

In truth I believe that to be quite true. If we were to roll all Indians who are plaintiffs and respondents into two giant collectivities we would have India versus India, a Mahabharata of Mahabharatas that neither Ramanand Sagar nor Peter Brooks would be able to handle. Next to temples, mosques, gurudwaras, the most favoured place of recourse is the *nyayalay*. We can be, in a generalisation with exceptions discounted, as a people, *vivadi, adalatbaz*. Where but in India would private perceptions of the public's interest or the public's interest in individual hurt or the travails of an identifiable group, become a whole genre of litigation - the PIL ?

If the *awam* seems to be an adept in litigation, the State is on board as well, keeping hundreds of thousands of lawyers in silk, keeping attorneys general, advocates general, solicitors general, their additional alternatives, and a platoon of public prosecutors and standing counsel ceaselessly, sleeplessly and thanklessly occupied. Together they keep notaries public ready with ink-pad and stamp paper, clerks in the kindergarten of the law but post-Docs in the legal system, tippety-tappetying away on their Remington or Olivetti typewriters, rolling out *vakalats*, affidavits, counters, anticipatory bail applications, now in panic over the famine of fifties, twennies and tenners and the most prized of all, the blue note '*ikksau da note...please...bas...thank you, soniye...*'. The precarious car slots for the judges outside courts beside a mayhem of

mis-parked cars, autos, Media OB vans, motor-cycles, fruit-juice, tea and chat vendors all around and oh, threading their course with grim determination through the tangled mass of dismayed men women, those streams, streams upon streams of starched white shirts, shiny black coats and gleaming shoes, heading towards the equivalent of *suryodaya* on a foggy morning in Kasi, which is that moment when, in the hall there is a sudden hush, chatter ends, laughter freezes, all stand, the Judges enter, take their seats, and as the case on top of the day's listing begins, there comes to be intoned, the mantra of mantras, litigant India's one and true *suprabhatich Aum*, which is 'Milord...' And we have India versus India.

But our laws, our courts, judges and lawyers are not about litigation alone. They have led to decisive, courageous interventions. They have nursed foresight, gestated evolution, protected the intelligence that conserves and the wisdom that reforms. Husnara Khatoon v/s the State of Bihar gives an example. India has been notoriously sluggish in the matter of prison reforms, on the condition of prisoners. Kapila Hingorani's petition on behalf of several prisoners won for 40,000 of them release. India versus India stood in *Husnara* in the shape of a thirst for *insaf* versus a fatalistic surrender to *kismet*. Our laws and our law courts have judged issues on the claims of two faculties which make humans of the homo sapien - IQ and MQ, the intelligence quotient and the moral quotient, better known

as the human conscience. With a bandaged arm, elbow in sling, wrist in a compress of crepe, every digit on the palm wearing, like medallions, square or round patches of band-aid, the bruised yet trusting Indian salutes India's pre-eminent site where India's IQ meets India's MQ – the Indian judiciary.

Every society through each generation knows men and women of high IQs and also men and women of high MQs and, very significantly, men and women, with both high IQs and high MDs, showing thereby that if it feels great to be smart but it also feels good to have a sense of right and wrong. Such persons are few in number, but they are there. Among them some, even fewer, add courage to their conviction. They express their views without hesitation. No *agar-magar* stops them.

Ever since Gandhi used the phrase 'keeper of my conscience' or 'conscience-keeper' for Rajagopalachari, it has been overdone. That is one among the minor hassles Gandhi has created. Because of him now, every blunder is a "Himalayan blunder", every hollow promise is 'a post-dated cheque'. And poor old Western civilisation has become forever 'a good idea'. Overuse however is no reason to not use the phrase 'conscience keeper' when it is right to use it, necessary to use it. Individuals need conscience keepers because their consciences frequently doze off. Nations need conscience keepers because their consciences only occasionally wake up.

Jayaprakash Narayan was one exceptional conscience keeper to our beloved India - a country at once wise and foolish, loving and murderous, offering shelter, sanctuary, *sharanam*, *ashraya*

but also distancing, abandoning, expelling, a country at once varied and yet bonding, so united and so hopelessly divided as to become a spoonerist's special : diversity in unity...I mean... ..university in diversity...sorry....unity in diversity. JP had humour aplenty in him to laugh at that but he was essentially the most earnest man I have ever met. He knew how India could be at war with a part of itself, a part of India at war with India. He said to Kashmiris - these are not his exact words, but a paraphrasing of what he said - 'Countries, people, behave in strange ways. You know Pakistan and what it did to you in 1947-48. You know India and what it did for you in 1947-48. You and I can be proud of the Indian officers and Jawans who laid down their lives here, staving the invaders off. Later, things have happened between India and you that should not have happened. I am ashamed of those. I know you mistrust India. I can understand why. India sees Kashmir as part of its map, whereas it should have seen India as part of Kashmir's mind. Your shikaras, your bokharas, your walnuts, your carpets, your summer breeze, your winter snows have gone into India's consciousness, but India's great Constitution, its independent judiciary, its free media, its resurgent womanhood, has not enter your minds. This is not your fault, it is India's. The way Sheikh sahib was treated, the way your elections turned into farces, hurt your izzat, your Kashmiriyat is all shameful. But, please, please do recognise the fact that India is a Republic, whose conscience though often asleep, even comatose, can be and is awakened. If shown its error, India can correct its methods. I will do my best to help it do so. Trust India, trust me. Do not, and I repeat, do not go with some delusive dreams which

could become the most horrible nightmares'.

This was India versus India trying the non-litigious road of mediation.

And at another end of the country he told the diverse Naga people, similarly, something like (again not his exact words but certainly his message), 'You are a proud, self-respecting people with a distinct culture and history. India, its hinterland particularly, is so wrapped up in its own sense of glory and greatness, real and imaginary, that it does not have the time or the temperament to appreciate your heritage enough. Just as it has branded all south Indians as Madrasi, it has branded all of you as Naga. It does not even know that the Naga are many people, at least 17 distinct people, with distinct cultures, language, dress. Most Indians think of you in terms of red and black shawls, spears and Republic Day parades. That is India's loss, not yours. India can be mulishly adamant but somewhere it knows how to correct itself, rectify its errors. India can go wrong, India cannot be evil. Trust it, not those further to your north or east, who tell you to look in their direction. That way lies a steep fall into an unknown valley'.

This was again India mediating India.

JP was asked by the Indian state to help solve the problem of dacoits in the ravines of Madhya Pradesh. He got through to them, which was no small success. They wore belts of bullets, their palms were red, their fingernails, black. They were ferocious, yet trapped. Trapped, yet ferocious. The state had roned them in but was yet afraid to touch them. A giant among the daku asked

JP if they can trust the state. What guarantee could he, JP, give them that if they surrendered. Will they, on surrendering, not be tried for multiple murders and hanged? JP said he could not guarantee that they would not be, he could not speak for the Indian state. But this much he said he could guarantee them: If after having been promised amnesty due to Jayaprakash's mediation a surrendering dacoit is hanged, Jayaprakash will die with him. That was enough. The bullet belts were unloosened, guns dropped. To be fair to the Indian state, it kept its word to JP. To a lesser man, one who was no conscience-keeper, it may not have.

Kashmir, Nagaland trusted him. The denizens of Chambal's ravines put their faith in him. The south of India, too, curiously, bonded with him. He was, after all a socialist. The south never saw him in terms of a Hindiwala who without knowing the next thing about, say, Tamil, still insists on their speaking to him in his language, a typical India versus India signpost. JP was not the shallow politician who would go all vanakkam-vanakkam in Madras and then in Hyderabad mix up his Tiru-s with his Garu-s. He knew his India, north-south, east-west. He knew its boundaries and neighbours as well. He knew the India that could hurt its many Indias, the many Indias that could harm India. Conscience is not a mushy heart; it has a taut mind.

And yet what did the State do to the same JP when he raised his voice against corruption, against dictatorship? *Vinashakale viparitabuddhi*, JP said softly as he was led to the van taking him to prison, in 1975. What the state did

was shameful but what civil society did was worse. In utter cowardice it watched in silence and then went about its business. In Faiz Ahmed Faiz's immortal words persons of conscience are inconvenient and unwelcome to the State and to society. They suffer at the hands of both the King and his loyal subjects.

Hakim-e-shaharbhi, majma 'e-am bhi

The Governor and the populace, both, send

Tir-e-ilzambhi, sang-e-dushnambhi

Calumny's keen arrow, insult's hurtling stone

Such rare people, so rare as to be countable on the fingers of

one hand, personify more than the word 'conscience'. Their restless conscience stands four square against its envious opponent, calm cunning, its clever rival, conformism.

When their comments are addressed to or are about seats of power, they suffer victimisation, persecution, and worse. Even fewer have the greater courage - temerity, almost - to speak their minds not just to the sovereign but to society, to their own *samaja*. If the sovereign can be vengeful, society can be vicious. If the state can prosecute, society can victimize. Its weapons are ridicule, calumny, spite. Those who speak up against an unjust State are brave; those who speak up against an unkind people are braver.

(to be Concluded)

(Contd. from Page 7)

peoples and their representatives in order to bring about a resolution of the Kashmir dispute that recognises the aspirations of people to determine their own destiny through demonstrably democratic means.

We also call upon all Indian citizens to recognise that the actions of the Indian state in the Kashmir

valley are far removed from the values of a democratic republic and beyond the pale by any acceptable norms of a civilised society in the 21st century. We call upon all Indian peoples to ensure that the injustices against Kashmir's peoples are brought to an end and their democratic aspirations addressed.

—Amirtharaj Stephen, Photographer; Anuradha Bhasin, Pakistan India Peoples Forum for Peace and Democracy; Bilal Khan, Ghar Bachao Ghar Banao Andolan; Devisingh Tomar, Narmada Bachao Andolan; Gautam Mody, New Trade Union Initiative; Id Khajuria, Pakistan India Peoples Forum for Peace and Democracy; Jatin Desai, Pakistan India Peoples Forum for Peace and Democracy; Kavita Krishnan, All India Progressive Women's Association; Lakshmi Premkumar, Researcher; Madhuresh Kumar, National Alliance of Peoples Movements; Medha Patkar, Narmada Bachao Andolan; Ujahid Nafees, National Forum on Right to Education; Pfokehil Kriizini, Naga Peoples Movement for Human Rights; Pramod Puzha, Journalist; Prajakta Dhulap, Journalist; Khajuria, Pakistan India Peoples Forum for Peace and Democracy; Shankar Mahanand, Janwadi Sanskritik Andolan; Soroj Mohanty, Peoples Union of Civil Liberties (Odisha); S P Udaykumar, Peoples Movement against Nuclear Energy; Swathi Seshadri, Researcher; Vasundhara Jairath, New Socialist Initiative