

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

GEORGE MEANY
PRESIDENT

WM. F. SCHNITZLER
SECRETARY-TREASURER

WALTER P. REUTHER
WM. C. BIRTHRIGHT
DAVID J. McDONALD
JOSEPH CURRAN
JOSEPH D. KEENAN
RICHARD F. WALSH
JAMES A. SUFFRIDGE
PAUL L. PHILLIPS
PAUL HALL

GEORGE M. HARRISON
JAMES B. CAREY
EMIL RIEVE
MAURICE A. HUTCHESON
JACOB S. POTOFKY
LEE W. MINTON
D. A. KNIGHT
PETER T. SCHOEMANN
HERMAN D. KENIN

HARRY C. BATES
DAVID DUBINSKY
WM. L. McFETRIDGE
A. J. HAYES
A. PHILIP RANDOLPH
JOSEPH A. BEIRNE
KARL F. FELLER
L. M. RAFTERY



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

GEORGE MEANY
WALTER P. REUTHER
GEORGE M. HARRISON
JAMES B. CAREY
HARRY C. BATES
DAVID J. McDONALD
DAVID DUBINSKY
WM. F. SCHNITZLER

Handwritten signature and initials

709

815 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON 6, D. C. NATIONAL 8-3870

October 23, 1963

Mr. Minoo Masani
Personnel & Productivity Service
148 Mahatma Gandhi Road
Bombay 1, India

Dear Mr. Masani:

Many thanks for your cooperation in connection with the recent program in the AS WE SEE IT program.

Enclosed is a transcript of the program. If you would like to have additional copies, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

Handwritten signature of Harry W. Flannery

Harry W. Flannery
Radio Coordinator

HWF:mb
oeiu#2-aflcio

Enclosure

SUBJECT: "Non-Nehru View from India"

PARTICIPANT: Minoo Masani, member of the Swatantra Party of India

MODERATOR: Harry W. Flannery
Harry Goldberg

Time: 13:12

FLANNERY: AS WE SEE IT, India's continued neutralist stand and insistence on admission of Communist China to the United Nations is hard to understand in view especially of recent Communist Chinese aggression against India.

One man from India who has definite views on the situation is Minoo Masani, member of the India parliament, and general secretary of the Swatantra (Freedom) Party of India. This party, formed only a few years ago, emerged in the last national elections, both on the national and state levels, as main opposition to Premier Nehru's Congress Party.

Before your reporter, Harry W. Flannery, talks with Mr. Masani for this radio station of the ABC network and the AFL-CIO, I want to add that Mr. Masani is one of India's distinguished orators. He was a friend and co-worker of Gandhi, was the mayor of Bombay in 1943 and his country's first ambassador to Brazil, 1948-40.

With Mr. Masani is Harry Goldberg, of the AFL-CIO Department of International Affairs, who served the federation in the Far East for many years.

Mr. Goldberg will ask most of the questions. Go ahead Mr. Goldberg.

GOLDBERG: Mr. Masani, would you say that most Indians were surprised by Communist China's attack against your country?

MASANI: I don't know what the proportions would be, but in India there were people who were surprised and others who weren't. Now there are people like me who had been studying this situation ever since the occupation of Tibet in 1950, who thought such an attack was inevitable at some time or another. On the other hand, there were others like Premier Nehru and Mr. Krishna Menon who professed to be greatly surprised when the Chinese landed down the slopes of the Himalayas last October and November.

GOLDBERG: What would you say, Mr. Masani, has been the effect upon Indian public opinion of this attack by Communist China against your country?

MASANI: I should think it has been pretty educative and salutary. A great deal of the fog or mist or illusion that existed because of the nature of the Chinese Communist Regime has been cleared -- though not quite all. When the fighting started, the Indian people were able to see in action who was who and what was what. The result was that most people among the intelligensia were able to say; "Now we know who our friends are." Meaning the United States and Britain. On the other hand, they also found out about the so-called Un-Aligned Club. The members of that club, to which we belonged, turned non-alignment against us. And it was rather bitter to taste the medicine which we had administered to other countries involved in the cold war.

FLANNERY: Mr. Masani, how do you account, therefore, since India's been informed of the nature of Communist China, for the government's insistence, continued insistence, on Communist China being in the United Nations?

MASANI: I think, frankly, there is a gulf between the majority of intelligent Indian opinion and the present government. Most Indians would like to see India break off diplomatic relations with Communist China and oppose its entry into the United Nations. Similarly, they would like to see an entirely different policy pursued towards Tibet. Most Indians stand for the assertion of the right to self-determination of the Tibetan people. But the

AS WE SEE IT

government has put this in cold storage, presumably so as not to annoy Communist China further. So, I would say that the government is lagging well behind public opinion. There was a moment last November when Mr. Nehru was shaken. He seemed to emerge from the dreamland in which he had been all those years about Communist China and he said so. But within a few weeks, when the fighting stopped, he seems to revert now to his old position of make-believe of believing that it is possible to co-exist with the Chinese Communist regime.

GOLDBERG: Mr. Masani, against the background of these differences and the different political pushes and pulls, what was the significances of the recent cabinet reshuffle that the Prime Minister made?

MASANI: I find a great deal of interest in this country on this subject. It all started with a move by the chief minister of Madras to resign from the chief ministership of his state to go back to organizational work within his own party. This was probably as a result of one or two bi-elections being lost by the Congress Party in his state. As the Kamaraj plan as it is called after this gentlemen, therefore, started by being an organizational gimmick or move. To take some good people out of government and put them into the party machine in order to give it new life and vigor.

As evidenced, however, by the elimination of certain members of the union cabinet and of six chief ministers of state governments, it appears to have taken a different form. For instance, among the six cabinet union ministers who have been eliminated, there are two who have no relation to the Congress organization at all. Now this means that other motives, and other reasons have entered into this picture. There are people in India in the Congress Party who have told me that they look upon this as a move to please Mr. Khrushchev, because Pravda had pointed a finger at two of the cabinet ministers -- the finance minister and the food minister -- whose resignations were later accepted and the Congress Party certainly in parliament had demanded their ouster. So one of the motives some people think is a kind of pro-Soviet gesture, presumably in the misguided belief that by such moves Khrushchev could be induced to protect India from Mao Tse-tung. The other motive that has been discussed in Congress circles in India, is that this might be a way of clearing the path to the succession to Mr. Nehru himself. All kinds of speculations are going on. And among the names mentioned for such a possible successor is that of Mr. Nehru's own daughter, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. The fear being that she would be a somewhat blind Prime Minister who would be guided even more than Mr. Nehru by Mr. Krishna Menon who continues to be a very powerful factor in Indian situation.

FLANNERY: He is still behind the scenes in India?

MASANI: Oh, I think he is still a very good friend of the Prime Minister and a very close adviser of the Prime Minister.

GOLDBERG: What in your opinion, Mr. Masani, are India's chief problems today, as you see them, in this very difficult situation which your country faces? And what is the problem of your own party, the Swatantra party, as calculated to meet these problems?

MASANI: Well, I think there are problems that are tremendous and almost overwhelming. We have, first of all, the population problem, which seems to defeat any effort or any system of political thought that India might adopt by sheer impact of the increased population which goes up at the rate of 2.5 percent a year. Therefore, one might say, that the main problem is to increase production and technology and the fruits of technology. Now India has too many people and too little capital; so I would say that the other need is to increase the sum total of capital from within the country and to supplement it from what can be gotten from outside. This again means there must be proper incentives in economic policy. My party's policy is therefore, to provide the necessary incentive, to increase production and productivity both on the land and in industry.

AS WE SEE IT

MASANI: (cont.) Now we don't think that the present government is providing those incentives. So inflationary policies through excessive taxation, through the attempt of collectivizing the land under the slogan of cooperative farming. In many ways in this way incentives in fact are denied and the result is that India is not making economically the same progress that it might have made under what may be called a more liberal policy. We believe for instance, with Erhardt of Germany, in the slogan, let the men and the money loose and they will make the country strong. So in industry we stand for a mixed economy of state and free enterprise, but we do stand for encouraging private enterprise. In agriculture, we stand for peasant proprietorship and a greater assistance to the farmer on the lines that have been so successful in Japan and Formosa.

FLANNERY: Mr. Masani, has your party been able to put into the elections people in practically all of these state elections for the various congressional seats, or not?

MASANI: No, I am afraid not. At the last elections due to our limitations in material resources -- money and people -- we only put into the field 170 parliamentary candidates out of a possible 500. But, of course, we hope to do very much better in 1967.

FLANNERY: You were quite successful, however, in these races.

MASANI: We were successful in the recent bi-elections, particularly, because out of eight parliamentary bi-elections that have taken place since the last general election my party has carried three seats including one by myself. The Communist party has only carried two and the rest have gone to Independents. That is pretty satisfying in terms of our general election effort.

GOLDBERG: Mr. Masani, as a labor organization, obviously we are interested in the labor situation in your own country. How about the situation in labor, the progress of the trade unions, the relations between the trade unions and government on issues, etc?

MASANI: I am glad you asked me that, because I find that in this country my party has been misrepresented as a conservative party. Actually, I would call it a liberal party in the European continental sense of the term. As it happens, I happen to be a patron of the Liberal International and have come here after attending the Congress of the Liberal International at St. Gallen in Switzerland. Now my party stands for a fair deal to labor, for the fullest rights of trade union organization for the normal processes of collective bargaining and for the right to strike being preserved even for government or state employees. There have been some interesting debates in parliament in which Prime Minister Nehru has argued that in a nationalized enterprise under socialism the right to strike has no place. While I, on behalf of my party, have argued that the right to strike and the right to bargain collectively is an essential part of a free society. So we put free trade unions along with free enterprise as essential elements of a free social order.

FLANNERY: The Congress party up to now has been the only real party in India. Do you have a hope, I should imagine from what you have been able to do so far, of being able to bring about a two-party system in India?

MASANI: Well, I was a member of the Congress Party for a quarter of a century, mostly under British rule. And some of us have left the Congress party in the hope that you just mentioned of building up a two-party system which will give India a real parliamentary democracy. And until that two-party system comes into existence I'm afraid one of the elements of democracy in opposition that can provide a representative government is still lacking.

FLANNERY: Thank you, Minoo Masani, general secretary of the Swatantra (Freedom) Party of India, and Harry Goldberg of the AFL-CIO Department of International Affairs. This is Harry W. Flannery, speaking for the AFL-CIO and inviting you to be with us next week at this same time for AS WE SEE IT.

This program a presentation of ABC public affairs has been brought to you by the ABC radio network and the affiliated stations to which you are listening.

SUBJECT: "Non-Nehru View from India"
PARTICIPANT: Minoo Masani, member of the Swatantra Party of India
MODERATOR: Harry W. Flannery
Harry Goldberg Time: 13:12

FLANNERY: AS WE SEE IT, India's continued neutralist stand and insistence on admission of Communist China to the United Nations is hard to understand in view especially of recent Communist Chinese aggression against India.

One man from India who has definite views on the situation is Minoo Masani, member of the India parliament, and general secretary of the Swatantra (Freedom) Party of India. This party, formed only a few years ago, emerged in the last national elections, both on the national and state levels, as main opposition to Premier Nehru's Congress Party.

Before your reporter, Harry W. Flannery, talks with Mr. Masani for this radio station of the ABC network and the AFL-CIO, I want to add that Mr. Masani is one of India's distinguished orators. He was a friend and co-worker of Gandhi, was the mayor of Bombay in 1943 and his country's first ambassador to Brazil, 1948-40.

With Mr. Masani is Harry Goldberg, of the AFL-CIO Department of International Affairs, who served the federation in the Far East for many years.

Mr. Goldberg will ask most of the questions. Go ahead Mr. Goldberg.

GOLDBERG: Mr. Masani, would you say that most Indians were surprised by Communist China's attack against your country?

MASANI: I don't know what the proportions would be, but in India there were people who were surprised and others who weren't. Now there are people like me who had been studying this situation ever since the occupation of Tibet in 1950, who thought such an attack was inevitable at some time or another. On the other hand, there were others like Premier Nehru and Mr. Krishna Menon who professed to be greatly surprised when the Chinese landed down the slopes of the Himalayas last October and November.

GOLDBERG: What would you say, Mr. Masani, has been the effect upon Indian public opinion of this attack by Communist China against your country?

MASANI: I should think it has been pretty educative and salutary. A great deal of the fog or mist or illusion that existed because of the nature of the Chinese Communist Regime has been cleared -- though not quite all. When the fighting started, the Indian people were able to see in action who was who and what was what. The result was that most people among the intelligentsia were able to say; "Now we know who our friends are." Meaning the United States and Britain. On the other hand, they also found out about the so-called Un-Aligned Club. The members of that club, to which we belonged, turned non-alignment against us. And it was rather bitter to taste the medicine which we had administered to other countries involved in the cold war.

FLANNERY: Mr. Masani, how do you account, therefore, since India's been informed of the nature of Communist China, for the government's insistence, continued insistence, on Communist China being in the United Nations?

MASANI: I think, frankly, there is a gulf between the majority of intelligent Indian opinion and the present government. Most Indians would like to see India break off diplomatic relations with Communist China and oppose its entry into the United Nations. Similarly, they would like to see an entirely different policy pursued towards Tibet. Most Indians stand for the assertion of the right to self-determination of the Tibetan people. But the

AS WE SEE IT

government has put this in cold storage, presumably so as not to annoy Communist China further. So, I would say that the government is lagging well behind public opinion. There was a moment last November when Mr. Nehru was shaken. He seemed to emerge from the dreamland in which he had been all those years about Communist China and he said so. But within a few weeks, when the fighting stopped, he seems to revert now to his old position of make-believe of believing that it is possible to co-exist with the Chinese Communist regime.

GOLDBERG: Mr. Masani, against the background of these differences and the different political pushes and pulls, what was the significances of the recent cabinet reshuffle that the Prime Minister made?

MASANI: I find a great deal of interest in this country on this subject. It all started with a move by the chief minister of Madras to resign from the chief ministership of his state to go back to organizational work within his own party. This was probably as a result of one or two bi-elections being lost by the Congress Party in his state. As the Kamaraj plan as it is called after this gentlemen, therefore, started by being a organizational gimmick or move. To take some good people out of government and put them into the party machine in order to give it new life and vigor.

As evidenced, however, by the elimination of certain members of the union cabinet and of six chief ministers of state governments, it appears to have taken a different form. For instance, among the six cabinet union ministers who have been eliminated, there are two who have no relation to the Congress organization at all. Now this means that other motives, and other reasons have entered into this picture. There are people in India in the Congress Party who have told me that they look upon this as a move to please Mr. Khrushchev, because Pravda had pointed a finger at two of the cabinet ministers -- the finance minister and the food minister -- whose resignations were later accepted and the Congress Party certainly in parliament had demanded their ouster. So one of the motives some people think is a kind of pro-Soviet gesture, presumably in the misguided belief that by such moves Khrushchev could be induced to protect India from Mao Tse-tung. The other motive that has been discussed in Congress circles in India, is that this might be a way of clearing the path to the succession to Mr. Nehru himself. All kinds of speculations are going on. And among the names mentioned for such a possible successor is that of Mr. Nehru's own daughter, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. The fear being that she would be a somewhat blind Prime Minister who would be guided even more than Mr. Nehru by Mr. Krishna Menon who continues to be a very powerful factor in Indian situation.

FLANNERY: He is still behind the scenes in India?

MASANI: Oh, I think he is still a very good friend of the Prime Minister and a very close adviser of the Prime Minister.

GOLDBERG: What in your opinion, Mr. Masani, are India's chief problems today, as you see them, in this very difficult situation which your country faces? And what is the problem of your own party, the Swatantra party, as calculated to meet these problems?

MASANI: Well, I think there are problems that are tremendous and almost overwhelming. We have, first of all, the population problem, which seems to defeat any effort or any system of political thought that India might adopt by sheer impact of the increased population which goes up at the rate of 2.5 percent a year. Therefore, one might say, that the main problem is to increase production and technology and the fruits of technology. Now India has too many people and too little capital; so I would say that the other need is to increase the sum total of capital from within the country and to supplement it from what can be gotten from outside. This again means there must be proper incentives in economic policy. My party's policy is therefore, to provide the necessary incentive, to increase production and productivity both on the land and in industry.

AS WE SEE IT

MASANI: (cont.) Now we don't think that the present government is providing those incentives. So inflationary policies through excessive taxation, through the attempt of collectivizing the land under the slogan of cooperative farming. In many ways in this way incentives in fact are denied and the result is that India is not making economically the same progress that it might have made under what may be called a more liberal policy. We believe for instance, with Erhardt of Germany, in the slogan, let the men and the money loose and they will make the country strong. So in industry we stand for a mixed economy of state and free enterprise, but we do stand for encouraging private enterprise. In agriculture, we stand for peasant proprietorship and a greater assistance to the farmer on the lines that have been so successful in Japan and Formosa.

FLANNERY: Mr. Masani, has your party been able to put into the elections people in practically all of these state elections for the various congressional seats, or not?

MASANI: No, I am afraid not. At the last elections due to our limitations in material resources -- money and people -- we only put into the field 170 parliamentary candidates out of a possible 500. But, of course, we hope to do very much better in 1967.

FLANNERY: You were quite successful, however, in these races.

MASANI: We were successful in the recent bi-elections, particularly, because out of eight parliamentary bi-elections that have taken place since the last general election my party has carried three seats including one by myself. The Communist party has only carried two and the rest have gone to Independents. That is pretty satisfying in terms of our general election effort.

GOLDBERG: Mr. Masani, as a labor organization, obviously we are interested in the labor situation in your own country. How about the situation in labor, the progress of the trade unions, the relations between the trade unions and government on issues, etc?

MASANI: I am glad you asked me that, because I find that in this country my party has been misrepresented as a conservative party. Actually, I would call it a liberal party in the European continental sense of the term. As it happens, I happen to be a patron of the Liberal International and have come here after attending the Congress of the Liberal International at St. Galle in Switzerland. Now my party stands for a fair deal to labor, for the fullest rights of trade union organization for the normal processes of collective bargaining and for the right to strike being preserved even for government or state employees. There have been some interesting debates in parliament in which Prime Minister Nehru has argued that in a nationalized enterprise under socialism the right to strike has no place. While I, on behalf of my party, have argued that the right to strike and the right to bargain collectively is an essential part of a free society. So we put free trade unions along with free enterprise as essential elements of a free social order.

FLANNERY: The Congress party up to now has been the only real party in India. Do you have a hope, I should imagine from what you have been able to do so far, of being able to bring about a two-party system in India?

MASANI: Well, I was a member of the Congress Party for a quarter of a century, mostly under British rule. And some of us have left the Congress party in the hope that you just mentioned of building up a two-party system which will give India a real parliamentary democracy. And until that two-party system comes into existence I'm afraid one of the elements of democracy in opposition that can provide a representative government is still lacking.

FLANNERY: Thank you, Minoo Masani, general secretary of the Swatantra (Freedom) Party of India, and Harry Goldberg of the AFL-CIO Department of International Affairs. This is Harry W. Flannery, speaking for the AFL-CIO and inviting you to be with us next week at this same time for AS WE SEE IT.

This program a presentation of ABC public affairs has been brought to you by the ABC radio network and the affiliated stations to which you are listening.

SUBJECT: "Non-Nehru View from India"
PARTICIPANT: Minoo Masani, member of the Swatantra Party of India
MODERATOR: Harry W. Flannery
Harry Goldberg Time: 13:12

FLANNERY: AS WE SEE IT, India's continued neutralist stand and insistence on admission of Communist China to the United Nations is hard to understand in view especially of recent Communist Chinese aggression against India.

One man from India who has definite views on the situation is Minoo Masani, member of the India parliament, and general secretary of the Swatantra (Freedom) Party of India. This party, formed only a few years ago, emerged in the last national elections, both on the national and state levels, as main opposition to Premier Nehru's Congress Party.

Before your reporter, Harry W. Flannery, talks with Mr. Masani for this radio station of the ABC network and the AFL-CIO, I want to add that Mr. Masani is one of India's distinguished orators. He was a friend and co-worker of Gandhi, was the mayor of Bombay in 1943 and his country's first ambassador to Brazil, 1948-40.

With Mr. Masani is Harry Goldberg, of the AFL-CIO Department of International Affairs, who served the federation in the Far East for many years.

Mr. Goldberg will ask most of the questions. Go ahead Mr. Goldberg.

GOLDBERG: Mr. Masani, would you say that most Indians were surprised by Communist China's attack against your country?

MASANI: I don't know what the proportions would be, but in India there were people who were surprised and others who weren't. Now there are people like me who had been studying this situation ever since the occupation of Tibet in 1950, who thought such an attack was inevitable at some time or another. On the other hand, there were others like Premier Nehru and Mr. Krishna Menon who professed to be greatly surprised when the Chinese landed down the slopes of the Himalayas last October and November.

GOLDBERG: What would you say, Mr. Masani, has been the effect upon Indian public opinion of this attack by Communist China against your country?

MASANI: I should think it has been pretty educative and salutary. A great deal of the fog or mist or illusion that existed because of the nature of the Chinese Communist Regime has been cleared -- though not quite all. When the fighting started, the Indian people were able to see in action who was who and what was what. The result was that most people among the intelligensia were able to say; "Now we know who our friends are." Meaning the United States and Britain. On the other hand, they also found out about the so-called Un-Aligned Club. The members of that club, to which we belonged, turned non-alignment against us. And it was rather bitter to taste the medicine which we had administered to other countries involved in the cold war.

FLANNERY: Mr. Masani, how do you account, therefore, since India's been informed of the nature of Communist China, for the government's insistence, continued insistence, on Communist China being in the United Nations?

MASANI: I think, frankly, there is a gulf between the majority of intelligent Indian opinion and the present government. Most Indians would like to see India break off diplomatic relations with Communist China and oppose its entry into the United Nations. Similarly, they would like to see an entirely different policy pursued towards Tibet. Most Indians stand for the assertion of the right to self-determination of the Tibetan people. But the

AS WE SEE IT

government has put this in cold storage, presumably so as not to annoy Communist China further. So, I would say that the government is lagging well behind public opinion. There was a moment last November when Mr. Nehru was shaken. He seemed to emerge from the dreamland in which he had been all those years about Communist China and he said so. But within a few weeks, when the fighting stopped, he seems to revert now to his old position of make-believe of believing that it is possible to co-exist with the Chinese Communist regime.

GOLDBERG: Mr. Masani, against the background of these differences and the different political pushes and pulls, what was the significances of the recent cabinet reshuffle that the Prime Minister made?

MASANI: I find a great deal of interest in this country on this subject. It all started with a move by the chief minister of Madras to resign from the chief ministership of his state to go back to organizational work within his own party. This was probably as a result of one or two bi-elections being lost by the Congress Party in his state. As the Kamaraj plan as it is called after this gentlemen, therefore, started by being a organizational gimmick or move. To take some good people out of government and put them into the party machine in order to give it new life and vigor.

As evidenced, however, by the elimination of certain members of the union cabinet and of six chief ministers of state governments, it appears to have taken a different form. For instance, among the six cabinet union ministers who have been eliminated, there are two who have no relation to the Congress organization at all. Now this means that other motives, and other reasons have entered into this picture. There are people in India in the Congress Party who have told me that they look upon this as a move to please Mr. Khrushchev, because Pravda had pointed a finger at two of the cabinet ministers -- the finance minister and the food minister -- whose resignations were later accepted and the Congress Party certainly in parliament had demanded their ouster. So one of the motives some people think is a kind of pro-Soviet gesture, presumably in the misguided belief that by such moves Khrushchev could be induced to protect India from Mao Tse-tung. The other motive that has been discussed in Congress circles in India, is that this might be a way of clearing the path to the succession to Mr. Nehru himself. All kinds of speculations are going on. And among the names mentioned for such a possible successor is that of Mr. Nehru's own daughter, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. The fear being that she would be a somewhat blind Prime Minister who would be guided even more than Mr. Nehru by Mr. Krishna Menon who continues to be a very powerful factor in Indian situation.

FLANNERY: He is still behind the scenes in India?

MASANI: Oh, I think he is still a very good friend of the Prime Minister and a very close adviser of the Prime Minister.

GOLDBERG: What in your opinion, Mr. Masani, are India's chief problems today, as you see them, in this very difficult situation which your country faces? And what is the problem of your own party, the Swatantra party, as calculated to meet these problems?

MASANI: Well, I think there are problems that are tremendous and almost overwhelming. We have, first of all, the population problem, which seems to defeat any effort or any system of political thought that India might adopt by sheer impact of the increased population which goes up at the rate of 2.5 percent a year. Therefore, one might say, that the main problem is to increase production and technology and the fruits of technology. Now India has too many people and too little capital; so I would say that the other need is to increase the sum total of capital from within the country and to supplement it from what can be gotten from outside. This again means there must be proper incentives in economic policy. My party's policy is therefore, to provide the necessary incentive, to increase production and productivity both on the land and in industry.

AS WE SEE IT

MASANI: (cont.) Now we don't think that the present government is providing those incentives. So inflationary policies through excessive taxation, through the attempt of collectivizing the land under the slogan of cooperative farming. In many ways in this way incentives in fact are denied and the result is that India is not making economically the same progress that it might have made under what may be called a more liberal policy. We believe for instance, with Erhardt of Germany, in the slogan, let the men and the money loose and they will make the country strong. So in industry we stand for a mixed economy of state and free enterprise, but we do stand for encouraging private enterprise. In agriculture, we stand for peasant proprietorship and a greater assistance to the farmer on the lines that have been so successful in Japan and Formosa.

FLANNERY: Mr. Masani, has your party been able to put into the elections people in practically all of these state elections for the various congressional seats, or not?

MASANI: No, I am afraid not. At the last elections due to our limitations in material resources -- money and people -- we only put into the field 170 parliamentary candidates out of a possible 500. But, of course, we hope to do very much better in 1967.

FLANNERY: You were quite successful, however, in these races.

MASANI: We were successful in the recent bi-elections, particularly, because out of eight parliamentary bi-elections that have taken place since the last general election my party has carried three seats including one by myself. The Communist party has only carried two and the rest have gone to Independents. That is pretty satisfying in terms of our general election effort.

GOLDBERG: Mr. Masani, as a labor organization, obviously we are interested in the labor situation in your own country. How about the situation in labor, the progress of the trade unions, the relations between the trade unions and government on issues, etc?

MASANI: I am glad you asked me that, because I find that in this country my party has been misrepresented as a conservative party. Actually, I would call it a liberal party in the European continental sense of the term. As it happens, I happen to be a patron of the Liberal International and have come here after attending the Congress of the Liberal International at St. Galle in Switzerland. Now my party stands for a fair deal to labor, for the fullest rights of trade union organization for the normal processes of collective bargaining and for the right to strike being preserved even for government or state employees. There have been some interesting debates in parliament in which Prime Minister Nehru has argued that in a nationalized enterprise under socialism the right to strike has no place. While I, on behalf of my party, have argued that the right to strike and the right to bargain collectively is an essential part of a free society. So we put free trade unions along with free enterprise as essential elements of a free social order.

FLANNERY: The Congress party up to now has been the only real party in India. Do you have a hope, I should imagine from what you have been able to do so far, of being able to bring about a two-party system in India?

MASANI: Well, I was a member of the Congress Party for a quarter of a century, mostly under British rule. And some of us have left the Congress party in the hope that you just mentioned of building up a two-party system which will give India a real parliamentary democracy. And until that two-party system comes into existence I'm afraid one of the elements of democracy in opposition that can provide a representative government is still lacking.

FLANNERY: Thank you, Minoo Masani, general secretary of the Swatantra (Freedom) Party of India, and Harry Goldberg of the AFL-CIO Department of International Affairs. This is Harry W. Flannery, speaking for the AFL-CIO and inviting you to be with us next week at this same time for AS WE SEE IT.

This program a presentation of ABC public affairs has been brought to you by the ABC radio network and the affiliated stations to which you are listening.