Whatever Mrs. Gandhi's compulsions, the fact that she decided to go back to the people - the real master of democracy - is commendable. It is the first time since Independence that a Prime Minister has taken the risk of a snap election. She has faced a tough task in making this decision, and the result is now in the hands of the electorate. It is not understandable if Mrs. Gandhi has acted unilaterally.

MRS. GANDHI FINDS HERSELF IN TROUBLE

Indira Gandhi is a woman of great promise, or still has five weeks. She is the first woman in the world to head a government and an election. But it is a measure of the problems and politics in the last three weeks that India came to the brink of a political crisis.

The vote is now history. The Indian government has been forced to go to the people in an election. The pressure on the government to resign has been mounting, and the country is in a state of uncertainty. The political situation in India is volatile, and the future is uncertain.

J.P. RETURNS HOME

J.P. (Jayaprakash Narain) has returned home after months in exile. He was welcomed by thousands of supporters. The return of J.P. is a significant event in Indian politics. It has brought hope to the millions of Indians who support his cause.

Salute to the Brave

ONLY THEY CAN STOP INDIA TURNING INTO A TIN TIP DICOTATORSHIP!

Indonesia, South Korea, and China have been critical of India's actions and have declared their support for J.P. and the Indian people. The Indian government has been forced to act, and the future is uncertain. The political situation in India is volatile, and the future is uncertain.
Traditionally, "emergencies" become part of the unchanging scene in India. They are declared with extraordinary fanfare, implemented ironically with the systems they are supposed to replace, and soon generate a plethora of cliche concepts and ideas which become part of the political status quo. All emergencies in India's years of freedom have been invariably sparked by a crisis of the ruling junta or class; apart from short-cuts to irregular decision making, seldom has there been a desire to structurally remould society and to give it new strengths to tackle old and tough problems.

India, living under one emergency rooted in the 1970 crisis which developed round Bangla Desh, found itself thrust into a second emergency a year ago, on June 26th, 1975. It is not our purpose in this issue to probe the immediate pressures, personal or otherwise, which pushed India into its most critical political crisis. These studies we will leave for less tense times when facts are not censored and comment is free. We are concerned at this moment with the indefinite prolongation of two emergencies, for these emergencies and their implementation can begin to develop overtones, which are extremely dangerous, both to ruler and ruled.

It would not be inexact to say that, with the possible exception of some extremist opinion which believes in violent stirrings, political parties were by and large disturbed by the visible breakdown of the administrative system and the accepted disciplines of democratic functioning long before the crisis of June 1975. While the opposition accused the ruling party of eroding the norms on which rights and responsibilities rested, the ruling party charged that the opposition was "ganging up" to embarrass by any opportunist stratagem the government in power. For our immediate purpose, it is necessary to recognise the general political collapse in the years preceding the emergency without going into the more ramified area of who did what.

If events had not conspired to create a sudden pressure in 1975, and if national leadership had been more thoughtful and more committed to national interests and national objectives, it may well have been possible without extraordinary powers to halt the spread of the political cancer and to begin a slow and steady recovery so necessary for a sensitive and sprawling continent of many cultures and characteristics. That was not to be. In fact, the ruling elite, covering many political complexions, appeared more or less unaware of the breakdown taking place, more so than the working people who were as always the recipients of inefficiency, corruption and harassment.

What we have witnessed over this year has been a carefully co-ordinated suppression of major opposition activities, the drastic curbing of press and legal freedoms, the use of state machinery against political opponents, open interference in normal administrative procedures, the spread of considerable fear and insecurity, the subservience and silence of the ruling party and other allied groups, the suffocation of parliamentary debate and the indefinite postponement of elections, permissible under the emergency. All this, it has been argued, is designed to halt the rot, to save the country from anarchy and chaos, and to give the working people a fair deal. The glossy promises are fading as we chalk up one year of emergency activity at ground level. The old order continues, less anarchic, less chaotic, but otherwise much the same.

If we take note of the whispered debate that is on in the corridors of the secretariats, we would conclude that the dominant group of politicians who now rule on the debris of the structures built by the founding fathers of the Republic can continue so long as the economic picture does not blacken. This superficial assumption refuses to take note of the politics in towns and villages and how angers of various description have a knack of breaking the confidence of many presumptuous rulers. Censorship creates the official myth of political silence and acceptance. Who knows if the silence may not be a deliberate cover for turbulence.

When we study the apparent silence, we find it punctuated by terror and violence, the weapons of those who feel that they have no other avenue of
A LETTER FROM MRS. GANDHI'S INDIA

by Azad
(Since revealed to be Nayanatara Sahgal)
Satyavani News Service

On June 26, 1975, Indira Gandhi, using as an argument that the opposition had plans to overthrow the government, declared an emergency in India and arrested an estimated 100,000 citizens during the next few months. In later speeches she and other government spokesmen also insisted that the opposition was receiving money and help from abroad for its plans. She did not produce any evidence for her accusation, and no one accused of the monstrous charge of conspiracy has been produced in court to answer it.

According to the prime minister, the chief "conspirator" is Jayaprakash Narayan, for whom non-violence, in the tradition of Mahatma Gandhi, is an article of faith. Jayaprakash, aged 73, was released on November 16, presumably because of his suddenly and dramatically deteriorating health in detention. Only the restoration of a free society in India will uncover the reason why he came so close to death in the hands of government doctors and in the care of India's two premier medical institutions, both government-owned, the All-India Medical Institute at Delhi and the Post-Graduate Medical Institute at Chandigarh. Now, cared for by private doctors in Bombay, he has made a partial recovery though the damage to his kidneys is permanent and he will never be normally active again. Another "conspirator" is Morarji Desai, also an apostle of non-violence. Aged 81, he is still in detention. Significantly, he has refused to eat any cooked food in jail except what is on occasion provided by his family. These are perhaps the last two living Gandhian leaders of national stature now left in India. They did, it is true, wish most emphatically to replace Mrs. Gandhi's government, believing that in a democratic system governments are and should be replaced when they fail to fulfill their mandate or when they transgress the limits of decent and democratic functioning.

Mrs. Gandhi's government had clearly failed to fulfill the enthusiastic mandate it had received in 1971—a disappointment Indians could have lived with had her government not also come to represent and shield growing corruption in its own ranks and a vulgar and arrogant use of power that made a mockery of democratic procedures and the decencies of life. Her own insensitivity to the rising resentment against such behaviour and her refusal to consider specific charges brought in parliament against ministers known to be corrupt, e.g., Bansi Lal (now defense minister) and L.N. Mishra (former railway minister, killed by a bomb explosion in early 1975), went far to aggravate conditions of severe economic distress. In 1974 a popular movement against her government took shape and a perennially divided opposition began to come together under Jayaprakash Narayan to discuss such issues as the erosion of citizens' rights, corruption that included the manner of collection and use of money by the Congress, and the need for electoral and educational reform—all of which had assumed grave national proportions. The demand that she should cleanse the Congress and take action against the corrupt began to be heard within her own party. It became obvious that there was a growing caucus within the Congress dissatisfied with her leadership, and which did not believe she had divine right to rule.

When Mrs. Gandhi declared an emergency, she acted in character. Having become increasingly authoritarian over the past six years she finally took the plunge. Three events seem to have precipitated the decision. The election in Gujarat state in early June 1975 revealed that a united opposition could get the better of the Congress. With the general election due less than a year away, this was an ominous sign. On June 12 the Allahabad High Court judgement found her guilty of corruption on two counts in the conduct of her election to parliament in 1971. The judge's courage caused a stir; his judgement did not. Her ambiguous and evasive statements in court, reported in detail in the newspapers, had left the public with the definite impression that she had been neither straightforward nor truthful. Her agent, Yashpal Kapoor, a highly controversial political figure, had made matters worse for her by his own brash statements in court. But, above all, her own party seemed to be coming to the boil, alerting her to a possible move to replace her. Among those...
to Pakistan, citing its erosion of democracy and its military dictatorship as evidence justifying his fears and beliefs. In fact, the weight of the entire history of the subcontinent was on the side of war and division rather than on the side of unity and peace. As we have seen, within a few years of Nehru's death, Pakistan, a much smaller and much more homogeneous country than India, became two antagonistic nations; of course, the causes of its break-up may have been as much geographic as they were political, but the civil war and the chaos that led up to it were directly traceable to the repressive policies of the dictatorship.

Mrs. Gandhi has now launched her country upon the same all too familiar course, and lately there have been signs that the drive for secession in South India, which the Indian democracy had managed to contain for many years, is again gathering strength, with South Indians portraying her rule as domination by the North. The South India movement is only the strongest of a number of sectionist movements that are afoot from east to west. It may be, as Mrs. Gandhi and her apologists claim, that to see the political form of government in India only in terms of human rights and civil liberties is to see India through Western eyes. But surely no Indian who within the last quarter of a century or so has lived through a bloody religious civil war and has fought three wars with Pakistan can be blind to the dangers of sweeping dictatorships and further partitions, despite the superficial tranquility Mrs. Gandhi has provided.

Satyavani, January 12, 1977

ELITIST ATTITUDE
To The Editor, The New York Times:
While 200 million Americans elected their President, 600 million Indians were denied again their right to choose their leaders.
Contrary to popular belief, Indians have generally exercised their voting rights in greater percentages than citizens in many developed countries. The Indian masses may be poor, uneducated and unsophisticated in the western sense, but they are not stupid. Mrs. Gandhi realizes this, hence the repeated postponement of elections. Unfortunately, many Americans and Westernized Indians continue to believe that democracy and universal adult franchise cannot work in poor and developing countries. This persistent elitist attitude is no different from the racist rationalization of western colonialists of yesteryear.

Faruk B. Presswalla
Coordinator, Indians for Democracy
Virginia Beach, Va., Nov. 7, 1976
(Satyavani, January 26, 1977)
INTRODUCTION
SATYAVANI—The truth about all those lies

The Emergency was long in coming. But the suddenness with which it was preponed shocked everyone. The initial hope that it was some kind of madness, which will soon pass, evaporated. And, as the Emergency machine systematically closed every avenue of individual and public freedom, no casualty was bigger than Truth. Truth became a scarce commodity—you could not read it, hear it or talk about it. It had to be exchanged in secret, behind closed doors, and transported like contraband goods. The purveyors of truth had to learn the smuggling game.

Once the initial shock wore off, the strugglers against the Emergency settled down for a long fight and the Lok Sangharsh Samiti planned accordingly. Gujarat, with its Janata Morcha Government, was an island of freedom in an otherwise enslaved India. Many national struggles have originated in Gujarat, from Mahatma Gandhi’s Salt Satyagraha to Nav Nirman in 1974. It was also in Gujarat that the Congress, on June 12, 1975, was defeated by a combined opposition, thus precipitating the Emergency.

During the nine months of Janata rule, Gujarat served as a haven for the Lok Sangharsh Samiti and numerous resistance workers. My residence (No. 11, Minister’s Bungalow, Gandhinagar) became a ‘Dharmashala’. Nanaji Deshmukh, Karpoori Thakur, Dr. Swamy, George Fernandes, and many more, became frequent and unexpected visitors. Numerous meetings and discussions were held about the course of the future struggle. An idea emerged, that there should be an international arm of the struggle for democracy in India. Even if the entire nation lay hidden behind the censorship curtain, the truth about the Emergency in India must be told to the world. An organisation must be created abroad to assist and sustain the prolonged struggle. And it must be done before the last vestiges of freedom in Gujarat vanished. So, the Friends of India Society International was born and Dr. Subramaniam Swamy and I were selected to be smuggled abroad—one to be the spokesman, the other the organiser.

The Friends of India Society International’s objective was to organise people of Indian origin and friends of India abroad and, with their help and support, promote the cause of freedom in India. Even before either of us could go, instructions had been sent and work initiated. Preliminary work for the first International Conference of the Society to be held in London in April 1976 was finalised. The Conference was a success beyond our wildest expectations. Dr. Swamy was elected President and I Secretary General by more than 700 delegates from 13 nations. The future plans for the activities and objectives of the Friends of India Society International were decided.

At this Conference ‘Satyavani’ was born, coincidentally on the very day, June 12, 1976, when Jayaparakash Narayan’s ‘Satya Samachar’ began publication in Bombay.

The purpose of Satyavani and its news service was to conduct two-way smuggling of news about India. News was brought out and fed to world media. Reactions were collected, published and, together with news from India, carried back into India. News and underground literature from every possible struggle centre in India were arranged to be sent out. Friends of India affiliates around the world surveyed the world press and sent the press cuttings to our publication headquarters. From this collection emerged the fortnightly Satyavani. It was individually mailed, disguised as personal letters, business correspondence or trade literature to hundreds of innocuous addresses. It was mailed from many locations around the world. For example, a dozen individual copies of Satyavani would reach Delhi from a dozen different centres—from Hong Kong or Nairobi or London or Ottawa. This never allowed the Indian censors to intercept the copies. It is an evidence of this system’s efficiency that Satyavani could be read in the various jails where thousands were behind bars. Satyavani News Service’s credibility in the world media improved as our news proved to be correct. It became a source of continuous embarrassment to the Indian government that the lies and propaganda that they were spreading were being exposed. And this
forced the Indian government to make admissions of events many days after their occurrence. Satyavani, when it reached India, became a source of news for the underground press. There were many centres where issues of Satyavani were duplicated and reduplicated to be distributed widely.

The impact of the Friends of India Society International and Satyavani was so severe that no spokesman of the Indian government would dare hold public meetings or meet the press in any country where the society was in operation, particularly in the latter half of 1976. We operated in most democratic countries—England, Canada, U.S.A., West Germany and many others. Its impact was further evident when the Indian government sought to counter this organisation by starting another and Mr. Arthur Lal, India's former representative in U.N.O., was selected for the job. Naturally, he could not even get off the ground. Through B.B.C. the impact of Friends of India Society and its news service could be felt deep within India. News which the Indian government sought to censor but which was smuggled out by Satyavani was heard by the people in India through the B.B.C. Our credibility and rapport with the B.B.C. was a major reason for the success of the efforts of Satyavani News Service.

'The Smugglers of Truth' is a compilation of selections from Satyavani. What we could not read here in India was in the Satyavani of those times. The compilation will serve as a constant reminder of the topsy-turvy world of untruth that ruled this nation. It is also a collection of assessments from a distance. It is also contemporary history, and not just an expose after the event.

Mercifully, the Emergency ended much earlier than our wildest expectations. In retrospect, being smuggled in and out of India and carrying a crusade abroad seems romantic. But at that time it was a job that had to be done. A job that was made possible by people who had faith in the ultimate destiny of this nation, people who carried on their struggle even when there was no light at the end of the tunnel. To acknowledge their help individually will mean drawing up a list running into several pages.

I hope that this compilation 'The Smugglers of Truth' will be a constant reminder of what can and did happen. Whenever we have doubts about freedom, democracy and the rule of law, let us open this book at random and reinforce our faith in a free and democratic Bharat.

Makarand Desai
June 25, 1978
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RESISTANCE GROWING

by Dr. Subramaniam Swamy (M.P.)
Satyavani News Service

Since last June 26, when Prime Minister Indira Gandhi proclaimed a state of emergency in India, 140,000 persons have been incarcerated without formal charges. In a recent speech Mrs. Gandhi declared that the emergency could not be ended because of the current nationwide satyagraha (passive resistance) by the opposition parties. She said that if the measure was withdrawn, the opposition would organise even bigger demonstrations.

In that one speech, Mrs. Gandhi gave it all away. For months her government has issued bulletins in a heavily censored press, stating that the people overwhelmingly had welcomed the "emergency".

Now Mrs. Gandhi has confirmed what had become public knowledge: that since last November 100,000 Indians had voluntarily subjected themselves to arrest, merely by peacefully assembling in groups of 20 or 25 (under present law, it is illegal to assemble in groups of five or more). Not even under British rule had so many people participated in a disobedience campaign in so short a period. By acknowledging the passive resistance of the people to her emergency rule, Mrs Gandhi admits to her vulnerability. She is the lady on the tiger. That is her crisis.

In the last three months, the laws passed by our captive parliament (with only 33% of the members of parliament attending) highlight the crisis. National parliament elections have been postponed, new press laws have been enacted to censor even music sheets, and Article 19 of the Constitution (which guarantees such basic freedoms as association and movement) has been suspended.

Some people have sought to explain away all these stringent measures on the grounds that in a poor country of 600 million people such an approach might be necessary for introducing reforms. However, the trend in India during the emergency has been in the exact opposite direction—towards an aggravation of problems and not their solution. The crucial fact is that whatever progress under opposition pressure was being made before the emergency (towards, for example, combating corruption and economic disparities) has now been halted.

The groups most hurt by Mrs. Gandhi's rule are factory labourers, farmers with small holdings, the small and medium businesses, the middle classes and the urban poor. On the other hand, senior bureaucrats, giant corporations ("monopoly houses" as we label them in India) and police officials have generally welcomed the emergency because under it they are no longer accountable to parliament or to the people.

These groups have also acquired new and unchecked power. Certainly India needs the bureaucracy, the corporations and the police, but unfettered powers vested in them lead to the negation of what these institutions are supposed to be guardians
YOU HAVE BEEN CONVICTED OF ELECTION LAW VIOLATIONS. DO YOU WISH TO SAY ANYTHING TO THE COURT BEFORE SENTENCING?

WHY NOT GET RID OF THOSE LAWS, YOUR HONOR?

SOUNDS GOOD TO ME! NOT GUILTY! CASE DISMISSED!

THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR!
THE GAGGING OF THE PRESS

R.K. Laxman
(Satyavani, October 26, 1976)
An interview with Ram Jethmalani
Newsweek

Ram Jethmalani, a prominent lawyer who was chairman of India's Bar Council for six years, fled his country last April after his outspoken opposition to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's assumption of dictatorial powers resulted in a warrant for his arrest. Jethmalani, 52, has been granted political asylum by the U.S. and now teaches comparative constitutional law at Wayne State University in Detroit, Mich. Recently, he discussed with Newsweek's Andres Nagorski Mrs. Gandhi's latest efforts to amend the Indian constitution and further diminish the powers of the Indian judiciary. Excerpts from their conversation:

NAGORSKI: Why did you leave India?
JETHMALANI: I left because the fight for judicial independence had virtually ended. The judgement of the Supreme Court that in an emergency no citizen can enforce his rights of personal liberty against a government order, however bad, immoral or unauthorized it is, gave me an indication of how far the judges of the Supreme Court had gone in toeing Mrs. Gandhi's line. It appeared that the judiciary had caved in—and once your role as a lawyer comes to an end you have a feeling of impotence and total helplessness. The only thing you can do under such circumstances is to break into conditions of comparative freedom where you can at least speak your mind from the outside.

Q. Do Mrs. Gandhi's latest efforts to amend the constitution represent a major turning point in Indian history?
A. Up till now, it was possible—not really probable but all the same possible—to argue that she had not violated the letter of the constitution. She flagrantly destroyed and violated every convention of the constitution, but so long as you keep within the letter of the law it is still possible to say you have the facade of legitimacy. The latest proposals will amount to the extraconstitutional destruction of our constitution. To my mind, this is nothing more than intimidating parliament into destroying the constitution by processes alien to the constitution. The new changes are an interference with the basic features of the constitution. Have you ever heard of a president having the power to amend the constitution by decree? That did not even happen in de Gaulle's France. But Mrs. Gandhi has the power to change the constitution, which means that she has decided to institutionalize her dictatorship. In law this is an act that amounts to a coup.

Q. Is there any chance that Mrs. Gandhi will not get the two-thirds of the votes in parliament she needs to make those changes?
A. Only a one-in-a-million chance. Yet, I don't see why (the members of parliament) are not capable of doing it. Some of them have been freedom fighters before. I can't imagine why they can't rise and revolt. If 100 M.P.s rose in revolt, she'd have to use naked military force. The only explanation is that their moral muscle is paralyzed by their enjoyment of power or by skeletons in their cupboards.

Q. Is Mrs. Gandhi's attack on the judicial system motivated by a personal vendetta against India's judges? After all, the crisis that led her to assume the emergency powers began in the courts.
A. It's a matter of personal ego. She wishes to humiliate the judges because it is a judge who humiliated her. Another factor in this is the Marxist advice she is getting from her Russian friends; that's how the Russians treat their judges.

Q. Mrs. Gandhi's justification for her attacks on the courts and the constitution is that they are necessary to abolish private property and push through radical economic measures.
A. That is a total lie. There is no measure of economic reform that cannot go through under the present constitution. The judges themselves ruled three years ago that the right of private property is no longer a fundamental right in the Indian constitution.

Q. Does Mrs. Gandhi have the popular support she claims to have?
A. That is yet another myth. After all, how do you measure a person's popular support except by holding free elections? The very fact that Mrs. Gandhi is not willing to hold them and the very fact that she has...
broken every convention in the constitution by prolonging the life of parliament artificially shows that she is feeling shaky. Why does she not hold elections if she is so sure of popular support?

Q. How much of an opposition still exists in India?

A. The opposition today is the majority of the population. But they should be given a free and fair chance to assert themselves. I have no doubt that if she holds elections she'll lose hands down now. But she could intimidate many people and so she might hold some kind of rigged election which would provide no evidence of her popularity.

Q. If, as you say, the majority of people are against Mrs. Gandhi, what kind of political future does India face?

A. I have no doubt that this regime will crack up much sooner than the world expects. My principal reason for saying so is that basically her party is a group of robber barons with no ideological cohesion or commitment of any kind. Some of her senior colleagues have suffered humiliation at her hands—pinpricks, constant insults. They must be smarting. She came to power as a compromise candidate and most of her party colleagues consider her a usurper of power. They have no personal loyalty of any kind to her. Any day when it suits their self-interest they will be willing to stab her. That is why she is bringing up her son. She must be a terribly lonely woman: she can't trust anybody. The best guess is that a revolt within her own party would synchronize with the acute misery and discontent of the people. The only ground to depose her is in the interest of democracy. Any change will be a change for the better now.

Satyavani, November 12, 1976

INDIRA'S AUNT 'TROUBLED'

Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, who was one of India's early leaders and is an aunt of its present Prime Minister, said in an interview the other day that she was "profoundly troubled" at the direction the government was taking.

"If there are no civil liberties and no dissent, then where is the democracy we fought for?" asked Mrs. Pandit, who held some of the country's top diplomatic posts when her brother, Jawaharlal Nehru, was Prime Minister. "It is far more repressive today, in many ways, than it was under the British."

"The essence of democracy has always been the right to dissent," she declared. "And it was working in India, though slowly, and perhaps awkwardly. One can't govern simply by clapping into jail everyone who disagrees."

"I was in British jails three times," she recalled. "But when they came for us, it was with a warrant, and in the daytime, not in the middle of the night, the way it is being done now in India." Recalling Mohandas K. Gandhi, who, though not related, was an intimate friend of her family's in the independence struggle that he led, Mrs. Pandit said: "Gandhi made us Indians into big people. But when a man loses his right to speak out, he becomes a littler person and we are now becoming a little people."

William Borders
The New York Times
(Satyavani, January 26, 1977)

THUS SPAKE NEHRU

"I have never had any doubt about the stability and integrity of Jayaprakash, whom I value as a friend, and I am sure that a time will come when he will play a very important part in shaping India's destiny."

(Broadcast by Jawaharlal Nehru, on February 14, 1948)
(Satyavani, March 19, 1977)