

Sent to  
Prof Brecher  
on 22/1/66

(30)

Mr. M.R. Masani's Answers to the questions put by Mr. Michael  
Brecher, Professor of Political Science, McGill University.

---

I Family Background and Early Life

1. Bombay City
2. Bombay City
3. Bombay City
4. Nation-wide.
  - 1.a Grandfather - Railway Official
  - 2.a Parsee
    - b Zoroastrian
    - c Sir R.D. Masani - Chief Executive of Bombay Municipality;  
Bank Manager; Vice-Chancellor of Bombay  
University and author of several books.
    - d. Middle class
    - e. On a pension
    - f. Father - Master of Arts, Bombay University.  
Mother - School Final and School Teacher.
  3. Gandhiji
  4. Through reading Western authors in School and College.
1. Bharda New High School, Bombay - Ending 1921
2. Elphinstone College, University of Bombay - From 1921 to 1925  
History, Economics and Politics.  
London School of Economics, 1925-28, Law.
3. English and French.



1 and 2 Considerably interested.

1. Respectful but not terribly interested.

2. To the maximum extent suitable.

No, Indian culture has great resilience, but partial submergence would do no harm.

1. & 2. I do not share the general scepticism.

The experience since 1947 has been reasonably good considering the massive illiteracy of the people. Compared to most countries of Asia, barring, Japan, Israel and Phillipines, and compared to almost all the countries of Africa, the progress is very heartening.

3. There can never be too much freedom.  
What is there should be appreciated.

1. & 2. Position held was of an extreme Nationalist.

Was a Member of the All India Congress Committee from 1936 to 1938; Member of the Indian Legislative Assembly in 1945. of the Constituent Assembly of India in 1947; one of the founders and Joint Secretary of the All India Congress Socialist Party from its inception in 1934 till 1939; Mayor of Bombay in 1943;

1. Strong opposition to British rule in India.

2. & 3 Great friendship and regard.

4. By and large yes, except for the policy of appeasement with the Soviet Union over Berlin and the recognition of Communist China, which has weakened ~~the~~ world peace.

5. Yes.

6. A great deal, particularly in the nature of building up individual and national character.

7. Nothing I can think of.

1. Yes.
  2. Yes - Because it anchors India somewhat more firmly in the free world and also helps to keep India a member of the English-speaking community of nations.
  3. In case the Commonwealth joins the Soviet Union!
- 
1. Friendly, because of their fine qualities, but not very respectful because of their immaturity.
  2. Yes.
  - 3.. Yes.
  4. Ditto as from Britain plus capacity to produce food and consumer goods.
  5. Nothing that I can think of.
- 
1. Towards Russians very friendly, but not towards the Soviet regime.
  2. No.
  3. Cannot be because of <sup>the</sup> International Communist ambitions.
  4. A lot negatively - about the failure of communism to deliver the goods and the dangers of totalitarian dictatorship.
  5. It is not likely that the Soviet dictatorship would like to learn anything from India. The Russian people would, however, benefit from knowing about the freedom the Indian people enjoy.
- 
1. Friendly but I am afraid somewhat patronising like most Indians.
  2. Ditto.
  3. Notably Malaysia under Tunku.  
Others who could be friendly could be Thailand, Iran, Turkey and



Israel at whom we turn up our noses. I would be inclined to include President Ayub Khan of Pakistan provided India does something to gain Pakistan's friendship which we have spurned so far.

Those who are not friends of India are Sukarno of Indonesia, Nasser of Egypt, Mrs. Bandaranaike of Ceylon and the present regime of Burma.

4. India should pursue more active diplomacy in South and South-East Asia but should stay away from Conferences like for instance the one that took place in Cairo and the one that is due in Algeria.

1. Yes, very much so. Not on any terms but on almost any terms consistent with self-respect.

I believe that friendship with Pakistan is possible on the condition that India and Pakistan stop using Kashmir as a tool to serve their own needs. It should be for the people of Kashmir to decide their destiny. They should be treated as a junior friend and ally whose security both should guarantee from external aggression but in whose internal affairs neither of them should interfere.

2. Reunion is not at present possible. An agreement for the common defence of the Sub-continent offered by President Ayub Khan but curtly rejected by Prime Minister Nehru would however be very desirable. Perhaps an Indian Common Market could be added. Beyond that, there is no need to go. India and Pakistan could form part of a world order that would in course of time emerge.

1. It would have been avoidable if a strong firm anti-communist policy had been followed and collective security ensured on the lines similar to what Turkey, Iran, Phillipines, Thailand and

Japan have followed. Given Nehru's policy of Panchasheela and appeasement, conflict was inevitable.

2. A settlement of the border issue would be desirable if it involved a total evacuation of Indian territory by the Communist Chinese forces. It is not likely on those terms. It should be eschewed on any other terms.

1. Yes, India under Nehru was inclined to throw her weight about too much. The policy of co-existence with Communist China, Panchasheela, etc. was a Himalayan blunder arising out of Nehru's refusal to recognise the true nature of international communism.

India's foreign policy since 1947 was altogether doctrinaire and had nothing to do with India's national interests.

2. India can afford to take a somewhat more passive role in global affairs, while being more active in regional affairs. India has so far neglected her own backyard in South and South-East Asia and it would be to her advantage to attend to this region.
3. No. India should enter into mutual security arrangement with the U.S. (and the U.K.) on the lines offered by President Lyndon Johnson in his broadcast of 18th October, 1964.
4. India's national interest appears to lie fundamentally in maintenance of American and Western nuclear superiority which has prevented India and other countries like her from being overrun by communist expansionism.

India's national interest would also lie in taking the initiative in building up regional security in South and South-East Asia which could be underwritten by the West.

Contrary to the popular belief, India's national interest need

not lie particularly in the continuation of the schism between Moscow and Peking. On the contrary, by over-exaggerating the schism, India's rulers are apt to fall into the trap of believing that the Soviet Dictatorship would come to India's rescue if attacked by Communist China. As General Kong Lee has found out in Laos, reliance on the Soviet Union for military support could boomrang badly. Also Acceptance of token Soviet assistance inhibits India from asking for massive assistance from the U.S. It would perhaps be best, on balance if the Moscow-Peking Axis were restored, thus eliminating the illusion and making it clear to India who her real friends are.



Mr. M.R. Masani's Answers to the questions put by Mr. Michael Brecher, Professor of Political Science, McGill University.

---

I Family Background and Early Life

1. Bombay City
2. Bombay City
3. Bombay City
4. Nation-wide.

1.a Grandfather - Railway Official

2.a Parsee

b Zoroastrian

c *Rustam*  
Sir ~~R.~~ Masani - Chief Executive of Bombay Municipality;  
Bank Manager; Vice-Chancellor of Bombay  
University, and author of several books.

d. Middle class

e. On a pension

f. Father - Master of Arts, Bombay University.

Mother - School Final and School Teacher.

3. Gandhiji

4. Through reading Western authors in School and College.

1. Bharda New High School, Bombay - Ending 1921

2. Elphinstone College, University of Bombay - From 1921 to 1925  
History, Economics and Politics.

*Law School of Economics, 1925-28, Law*  
3. English and French.



1. Married
  - a. U.P. - Lucknow University Graduate
  - b. Civil Marriage in Ceylon
  - c. 29th April, 1946.
  - d. One son of 17 years.
  - e. More than one.
2. Reading and sports.
3. a. Regularly : In Bombay: Times of India, Indian Express.  
In Delhi: Times of India, Hindustan Times, Statesman, Indian Express and Patriot.  
Current, Thought, Mysindia, New Age, Blitz, Spectator and Encounter (London), New Leader, National Review and Time, (U.S.A.)
  - b. Occasionally: Many others.

## II Attitudes

1. Positive
- 1 & 2 Sceptical and agnostic
1. Enjoyed it.
1. Country
2. To some extent
1. For de-centralisation
2. Yes, Positive.
3. Against State Sector and for Free Sector.

- 1 and 2 Considerably interested.
1. Respectful but not terribly interested.
2. To the maximum extent suitable.  
No, Indian culture has great resilience, but partial submergence would do no harm.
1. & 2. I do not share the general scepticism.  
The experience since 1947 has been reasonably good considering the massive illiteracy of the people. Compared to most countries of Asia, barring, Japan, Israel and Phillipines, and compared to almost all the countries of Africa, the progress is very heartening.
3. There can never be too much freedom.  
What is there should be appreciated.
- 1 & 2. Position held was of an extreme Nationalist.  
Was a Member of the All India Congress Committee from 1936 to 1938; Member of the Indian Legislative Assembly in 1945; of the Constituent Assembly of India in 1947; one of the founders and Joint Secretary of the All India Congress Socialist Party from its inception in 1934 till 1939; Mayor of Bombay in 1943;
1. Strong opposition to British rule in India.
2. & 3 Great friendship and regard.
4. By and large yes, except for the policy of appeasement with the Soviet Union over Berlin and the recognition of Communist China, which has weakened the world peace.
5. Yes.
6. A great deal, particularly in the nature of building up individual and national character.
7. Nothing I can think of.

1. Yes.
  2. Yes - Because it anchors India somewhat more firmly in the free world and also helps to keep India a member of the English-speaking community of nations.
  3. In case the Commonwealth joins the Soviet Union!
- 
1. Friendly, because of their fine qualities, but not very respectful because of their immaturity.
  2. Yes.
  3. Yes.
  4. Ditto as from Britain plus capacity to produce food and consumer goods.
  5. Nothing that I can think of.
- 
1. Towards Russians very friendly, but not towards the Soviet regime.
  2. No.
  3. Cannot be because of the International Communist ambitions.
  4. A lot negatively - about the failure of communism to deliver the goods and the dangers of totalitarian dictatorship.
  5. It is not likely that the Soviet dictatorship would like to learn anything from India. The Russian people would, however, benefit from knowing about the freedom the Indian people enjoy.
- 
1. Friendly but I am afraid somewhat patronising like most Indians.
  2. Ditto.
  3. Notably Malaysia under Tunku.  
Others who could be friendly could be Thailand, Iran, Turkey and

Israel at whom we turn up our noses. I would be inclined to include President Ayub Khan of Pakistan provided India does something to gain Pakistan's friendship which we have spurned so far.

Those who are not friends of India are Sukarno of Indonesia, Nasser of Egypt, Mrs. Bandaranaike of Ceylon and the present regime of Burma.

4. India should pursue more active diplomacy in South and South-East Asia but should stay away from Conferences like for instance the one that took place in Cairo and the one that is due in Algeria.

1. Yes, very much so. Not on any terms but on almost any terms consistent with self-respect.

I believe that friendship with Pakistan is possible on the condition that India and Pakistan stop using Kashmir as a tool to serve their own needs. It should be for the people of Kashmir to decide their destiny. They should be treated as a junior friend and ally whose security both should guarantee from external aggression but in whose internal affairs neither of them should interfere.

2. Reunion is not at present possible. An agreement for the common defence of the Sub-continent offered by President Ayub Khan but curtly rejected by Prime Minister Nehru would however be very desirable. Perhaps an Indian Common Market could be added. Beyond that, there is no need to go. India and Pakistan could form part of a world order that would in course of time emerge.

1. It would have been avoidable if a strong firm anti-communist policy had been followed and collective security ensured on the lines similar to what Turkey, Iran, Phillipines, Thailand and



Japan have followed. Given Nehru's policy of Panchasheel and appeasement, conflict was inevitable.

2. A settlement of the border issue would be desirable if it involved a total evacuation of Indian territory by the Communist Chinese forces. It is not likely on those terms. It should be eschewed on any other terms.

1. Yes, India under Nehru was inclined to throw her weight about too much. The policy of co-existence with Communist China, Panchasheel, etc. was a Himalayan blunder arising out of Nehru's refusal to recognise the true nature of international communism.

India's foreign policy since 1947 was altogether doctrinaire and had nothing to do with India's national interests.

2. India can afford to take a somewhat more passive role in global affairs, while being more active in regional affairs. India has so far neglected her own backyard in South and South-East Asia and it would be to her advantage to attend to this region.
3. No. India should enter into mutual security arrangement with the U.S. (and the U.K.) on the lines offered by President Lyndon Johnson in his broadcast of 18th October, 1964.
4. India's national interest appear to lie fundamentally in maintenance of American and Western nuclear superiority which has prevented India and other countries like her from being overrun by communist expansionism.

India's national interest would also lie in taking the initiative in building up regional security in South and South-East Asia which could be underwritten by the West.

Contrary to the popular belief, India's national interest need

not lie particularly in the continuation of the schism between Moscow and Peking. On the contrary, by over-exaggerating the schism, India's rulers are apt to fall into the trap of believing that the Soviet Dictatorship would come to India's rescue if attacked by Communist China. As General Kong Lee has found out in Laos, reliance on the Soviet Union for military support could boomerang badly. Also Acceptance of token Soviet assistance inhibits India from asking for massive assistance from the U.S. It would perhaps be best, on balance if the Moscow-Peking Axis were restored, thus eliminating the illusion and making it clear to India who her real friends are.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

### I. Family Background and Early Life

#### Geographical Factors:

1. Place of family origin: State and District
2. Place of birth: State and District
3. Place of childhood and youth: State and District
4. Region(s) in which individual's greatest activity:  
State(s) and District(s)

#### Family and Home Background:

1. Brief identification(names) of immediate members of individual's family:  
a. grandparents.      b. parents.      c. close relatives.
2. Socio-cultural background:  
a. caste      b. Family religion  
c. Father's occupation      d. Social status of immediate family  
e. Father's annual income      f. Parent's education
3. People who influenced the life of the individual directly
4. Age at which Western influence had first significant impact on the life of the individual.

#### Education:

1. School
2. College and University education - major subjects
3. Knowledge of different languages and degree of proficiency.

#### Personal Life:

1. Marriage  
a. Background of spouse  
b. Form of marriage: traditional or otherwise  
c. Date of marriage  
d. Children  
e. No marriage or more than one marriage
2. Interests and hobbies
3. Which newspapers and periodicals, Indian and foreign, do you read: a) regularly; b) occasionally

### II. Attitudes

#### Toward Social Reform

1. Caste, widow remarriage, status of women, etc.



### Toward Religion

1. Religious convictions
2. Orthodoxy-modernism

### Toward Education

1. Own education
2. Preferred method of education

### Toward Regionalism

1. In identifying yourself to foreigners, which do you note first: your country, region or State.
2. Is regionalism a barrier to Indian unity?

### Toward Industrialization and Modernization

1. Centralization-decentralization
2. Village work
3. Public sector and private sector

### Toward History

1. Indian
2. World

### Toward Culture

1. Traditional Indian Culture
2. Modern Western Culture - to what extent should India adopt it? Is it likely to submerge Indian culture?

### Toward Democracy

1. Its suitability within the Indian milieu
2. The experience since 1947 - its effectiveness
3. Is there too much "freedom" in India?

### Toward National Movement for Independence

1. Positions held during nationalist movement
2. Attitudes toward nationalist movement- before 1947

### Attitudes toward Britain

1. British rule in India
2. Toward England
3. Toward Englishmen
4. Is she force for world peace?
5. Is she genuine friend of India?
6. What can India learn from her?
7. What can India teach her?

### Toward Commonwealth

1. Did you favour Commonwealth tie?
2. Do you favour continued Indian membership-and why?
3. In what circumstances should India leave the Commonwealth?



Toward United States

1. Toward Americans
2. Is she force for world peace?
3. Is she genuine friend of India?
4. What can India learn from her?
5. What can India teach her?

Toward the Soviet Union

1. Toward Russians
2. Is she force for world peace?
3. Is she genuine friend of India?
4. What can India learn from her?
5. What can India teach her?

Toward Newly-Independent Asian-African Countries

1. Toward Africans
2. Toward other Asians
3. Which are genuine friends of India?
4. Should India pursue more active diplomacy in Afro-Asia?

Toward Pakistan

1. Is friendship desirable, possible, on what terms?
2. Is reunion desirable, possible?

Toward China

1. Was open conflict avoidable or inevitable?
2. Is a settlement of the border dispute desirable, possible, on what terms?

Role of India in World Affairs

1. Assessment of past 17 years - was it too active, successful, etc.?
2. Did India's foreign policy since 1947 serve her national interests or was it too idealistic?
2. Should there be more Indian withdrawal from, or more involvement in global affairs, regional affairs?
3. Should India become a Nuclear Power?
4. What are India's national interests in the present setting of world politics?