

5669

ORDER

Home Department (Special),
Sachivalaya, Bombay-400 032,
Dated the 2nd July 1976

Defence and
Internal
Security
of India
Rules, 1971.

No. Desk XIX/WBM.2975/S/12459. - Whereas the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, by its Order No. S.O. 275(E) dated the 26th June 1975 issued and amended, from time to time, under sub-rule (1) of rule 48 of the Defence and Internal Security of India Rules, 1971, has directed that no news, comments, rumour or other report, relating to any matters specified in the said Order, shall be published in any newspapers, periodical or other document, unless such news, comments, rumour or other report has been submitted for scrutiny to an authorised officer and the publication thereof is authorised in writing by such officer;

And whereas an English Weekly entitled 'Opinion' is owned, edited, printed or cyclostyled and published by Shri A.D. Gorrwala, 40-C Ridge Road, Bombay-400 006;

And whereas, in the opinion of the Government of Maharashtra, the production and publication of an extract from the Economist (London) of the 29th May 1976 in the issue of the said English Weekly 'Opinion' dated the 15th June 1976 contains prejudicial reports as defined in clause (7) read with sub-clauses (a), (g), (h), (n) and (s) of clause (6) of rule 36 of the Defence and Internal Security of India Rules, 1971, and the issue was published in contravention of the said Order of the Government of India dated the 26th June 1975;

And whereas the Government of Maharashtra is of opinion that for the purpose of securing the public safety and the maintenance of public order and internal security it is necessary to do so;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred on it by clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of rule 48 of the Defence and Internal Security of India Rules, 1971, and with the previous approval of the Government of India, the Government of Maharashtra hereby prohibits Shri A.D. Gorrwala from making and publishing the said English Weekly 'Opinion' and also prohibits him from using any press for the purposes aforesaid.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Maharashtra,

Sd/-
(D.N. Shamrao)
Deputy Secretary to Government.

Less than two weeks from the first anniversary of the imposition of Emergency is an appropriate time for introspection, both by the imposer and those on whom it was imposed. To assist in that process is published below an extract from a notably perspicacious world Journal:

"When Mrs. Gandhi closed down the world's biggest democracy last June the key question was: why? Was it, as she claimed, to defeat a conspiracy of reactionaries, Hindu nationalists and criminals poised to tear India apart? Was it, as we hoped (and still wish it were), a high price in freedom to be paid for the necessary task of dragging India by its bootstraps out of a never-ending economic mire? Or was it merely an expedient means of saving Mrs. Gandhi's own political skin? Thanks largely to the monsoon and increased exports, India's economy is in a rare mood of hope; but even if Mrs. Gandhi's economic policy as dictator is a jot or two better (because less anti-business) than it was as a democrat, the right way to move towards freer markets is hardly to shut down freedom first. As for conspiracy, if conspiracy there was, it had crumbled under the first blow. It looks as if self-preservation was her main motive.

The remarkable ascent of a 30-year-old youth leader named Sanjay Gandhi has revived the same questions, in another form. Did Mrs. Gandhi put many thousand people in jail, remove freedom of speech and habeas corpus and muzzle the press not just to preserve a throne but to build a dynasty? The answer, after 11 months of one-mother-one-son rule, seems to be yes.

It is a measure of the cult which has developed around the son of Indira Gandhi and the grandson of Jawaharlal Nehru that last week, when Indian newspapers were reporting (albeit on inside pages) that a canal was being named after him, that a constituency in Uttar Pradesh had asked him to stand as its member of parliament and that his supporters there had acclaimed him as 'Messiah Sanjay', other Indians were insisting that he had suffered a relative eclipse. There was almost certainly an element of wishful thinking in the belief that India's prime minister had decided to cut her son down to size: Sanjay is the favourite devil figure for critics of Mrs. Gandhi's regime. But there also seems to be some substance behind the rumours that the prime minister has started reining in her Wunderkind because of a series of misjudgements that could yet cost her dear.

Reining him in for the moment, anyway. Although Sanjay has admitted that he and his mother do not always see eye to eye - for example, about Mrs. Gandhi's Communist allies, whom Sanjay has publicly insulted - the prime minister has undoubtedly endorsed her son's arrogation of power, much as her father encouraged her own early political career. Amateur psychologists in India offer two plausible explanations for this phenomenon: the classic suspiciousness of a dictator who ends up trusting only family and family retainers; the equally classic guilt of a working mother and single parent who overcompensates by bestowing gifts - first money, in the form of the licence to build a non-productive car factory, and now power. A third explanation for Sanjay's meteoric rise since last June is that he proved himself his mother's best political adviser at that difficult time by counselling her to defy the courts, the opposition and even her own party and to proclaim that emergency.

Sanjay's ever-increasing authority during the past 11 months has not been based on any formal position; his only official job is on the executive of the Congress party's youth wing. But his magic name and the control his mother has delegated to him over appointments have allowed him to extend his influence - in an unpredictable and fear-inducing way - right through the Congress party and the bureaucracy. He has also used his patronage powers to build up the

beginnings of an independent political base, particularly in the states nearest the capital. Ironically, however, it was in Delhi itself, where control over the local administration is strongest, that his aggressive political style caused the first major explosion of anger since last June.

The seeds of what is now known as the Turkman gate incident were sown last autumn, when Sanjay embarked on a campaign to clear out Delhi's slums. The aim of demolishing tumbledown shops and shacks, which were often both illegal and dangerous, and resettling their occupants in proper housing outside the city, was hygienic in itself. But not only did the abrupt removals damage a functioning community; they imposed punitive transport costs on subsistence workers and often landed them in worse sanitary conditions than those they had left behind. Still, none of these grievances stirred people to action until the clearances coincided with Sanjay's other favourite campaign, compulsory sterilisation.

More use of sterilisation in India would do much good. But Sanjay Gandhi's ham-fisted way of going about it has already discredited it. Sterilisation vans moved into the Moslem quarter of old Delhi near the Turkman gate in early April, accompanied by bejewelled members of Sanjay's youthful entourage. Reports that young boys, newly married and old men were being hauled in for instant vasectomies raised tempers among local Moslems who oppose sterilisation on religious grounds. In this atmosphere, on April 19th, bulldozers arrived to raze yet another set of hutments.

Like most stories in censor-bound Delhi, what happened next comes in several different versions. One account has it that the spark was lit when Moslem women, defending their homes, were attacked, and carried off by police; in another it was the demand that displaced residents show proof of sterilisation before being granted a suburban plot as promised that set the Moslems off; in the official version, the Moslems provoked police retaliation by hurling stones and bricks at the demolition men. What is certain is that several hours of fighting followed in which hundreds of people were injured and perhaps 50 or more killed.

Courtesy: The Economist, 29/5/76.

It is said a high dignitary, addressing a gathering of pressmen, referred to them as "you journalists" and later "as journalists" and after a time again "being journalists". At this an old man interrupted, "I am afraid, sir, you are speaking to the wrong audience. We here are a collection of Government's advertising agents; true, some of us used to be journalists, but that was oh, so long ago, why, even before the Emergency."

And so, to us the people, much that is happening in the country remains unknown.

Proprietor: A.D. GORWALA
14m.
and published by
Ridge Road, Bombay-6
by A.D. GORWALA at 40C
Edited and published
not pre-payment.
Licenced to post with-
69 Licence No. 14.
on 15.6.76 Regd. No. BYW
Sorting Office, Bombay
Posted at Central Packet

MA. A. D. Gorwala.