

MR. RAJU:

5733

1. The attached commentary on Mr.C.C.Desai's explanation is precisely what it should not have been.
2. It is a rejoinder to Mr.CCD's explanation; and it reads as if the reader is the judge before whom:-
 - (a) the N.E. has accused Mr.CCD of certain misdemeanours;
 - (b) Mr.CCD has hit back (at the N.E., the C.P.B. and Mr.MRM)
 - (c) Mr.MRM is defending himself, the N.E. and the CPB against Mr.CCD's backlash.
3. Like Mr.CCD's explanation, this rejoinder is much too long, argumentative and explanatory, - almost apologetic.
4. Instead of being "brief comments" on Mr.CCD's long winded "explanation", -- it has become a long winded and defensive "explanation" in answer to Mr.CCD's "comments".
5. I would make the comments on Mr.CCD's Explanation very brief, as attached.

(N. DANDEKAR)

31.3.70.