



CBS NEWS  
2020 M Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

FACE THE NATION

as broadcast over the  
CBS Television Network  
and the

CBS Radio Network

Sunday, August 17, 1975 -- 11:30 AM - 12:00 Noon, EDT

Origination: Washington, D. C.

GUEST: TRILOKI NATH KAUL  
Ambassador of India

REPORTERS:

Marvin Kalb, CBS News  
Jerrold Schecter, Time  
Bernard Kalb, CBS News

Producer: Mary O. Yates

Associate Producer: Joan Barone

EDITORS: All copyright and right to copyright in this transcript and in the broadcast are owned by CBS. Newspapers and periodicals are permitted to reprint up to 250 words of this transcript for the purpose of reference, discussion or review. For permission to reprint more than this, contact Director, CBS News Information Services, 524 W. 57th Street, New York, N. Y. 10019 (212) 765-4321.

RECEIVED

AUG 18 1975

MARVIN KALB: Mr. Ambassador, you have described what has been happening in India as a revolution. Is it any longer proper or fair to describe India as a democracy?

AMB. KAUL: Well, Mr. Kalb, revolutions need not necessarily be undemocratic or violent. The--what's happened in India recently is a revolution, because we are trying to give social and economic content to our political democracy in order to make it meaningful for the broad masses of our people, while it was only a political democracy before; and a political democracy cannot be stable or viable unless it has a social and economic content; in that sense, it is a revolution.

MARVIN KALB: Well, do you still feel it is a democracy?

AMB. KAUL: Democracy was defined, I believe, by Winston Churchill as the worst form of government, but no better system has yet been invented. I think democracy is government of the people, by the people, for the people, and not democracy by an elite, for the elite or of the elite. And what we are trying to do is make democracy by the people, of the people and for the people instead of only the elite.

ANNOUNCER: From CBS News, Washington, a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview on FACE THE NATION, with Triloki Nath Kaul, Ambassador of India. Ambassador Kaul will be questioned by CBS News Correspondent Bernard Kalb; Jerrold Schecter, Diplomatic Editor of Time Magazine; and CBS News Diplomatic Correspondent Marvin Kalb.

MARVIN KALB: Mr. Ambassador, you have defined democracy in a way that many Americans would find familiar, and yet, since June 26 in India, if my facts are correct, there has been a state of emergency, there has been rigid press censorship, constitutional rights to some degree have been suspended, three thousand people have been arrested,

including many very prominent Indian politicians. Is that really democracy, sir?

AMB. KAUL: Democracy functions within the framework of the constitution of any democratic country. Even in your Constitution, in the very Preamble, domestic tranquility is one of the objectives mentioned, and under Section 8 and 9 of Article One, there is provision for temporary suspension of some of the fundamental rights, like habeas corpus. And what has been done in India has been done entirely within the framework of her constitution. Our founding fathers had the wisdom and the foresight to foresee such situations arising and provide for meeting them. Therefore, whatever has happened in India has happened under the constitution, Article 352, and if there's a threat to the very existence of the state, to the very existence of democracy, then certain actions are to be taken within the constitution and within the law in order to protect the democratic constitutional framework. There's not a denial of denial of democracy; in fact, it was the minority political opposition parties who wanted to kill democracy through unconstitutional methods--by inciting the armed forces, the police and the civil administration to disobey government's orders. And what the government has done--as any responsible government elected by the people must do--is to protect democracy.

SCHECTER: But Mr. Ambassador, hasn't Prime Minister Gandhi identified her own survival in office with the constitution rather than the development of democracy in India? That's what the critics are charging.

AMB. KAUL: Prime Minister Gandhi, as an individual, is not at all involved in this. Prime Minister Gandhi, as the leader of the majority

political party, which in a democracy runs the government, is certainly involved. But no Prime Minister would be fulfilling his or her duty if she failed to be--to respond to the positive call of her majority party to stay in power. And this right of hers to constitutionally and legally continue as Prime Minister has been upheld by the vacations under the Supreme Court. Why should a Prime Minister be denied the right that an ordinary citizen enjoys of appealing to the highest court of the land?

BERNARD KALB: To rewrite the laws and to make the laws retro-active--as I listen to your reply, Mr. Ambassador, I have the feeling that we're off here on some sort of a semantic excursion--a reluctance on the part of India to recognize and to admit, as a matter of fact, that there has been a severe dilution of the democratic practices that India was terribly proud of for a quarter of a century, and that in fact India has moved toward authoritarian rule. And I think the fundamental question now is not so much a defense of democracy in India, but rather--are we now moving, irreversibly, toward an authoritarian form of government, and have we in fact said farewell to the democracy India once knew?

AMB. KAUL: Well, I can appreciate and understand the genuine concern of other democracies about the future of democracy in India. We welcome this genuine interest. But in order to understand a vast, complex country like India, you should not jump to hasty conclusions. Already the emergency has led to certain steps which have benefited the common man. For instance, the prices of essential commodities have fallen by ten to fifteen per cent. The rate of inflation, which in July last year was thirty per cent, has come down below zero in July

this year. And land reforms are being implemented, minimum fair wages for agricultural labor have been fixed, the bureaucratic red tape has been cut and streamlined--the common man is very happy. After all, what is democracy?

BERNARD KALB: But this has been done by fiat.

AMB. KAUL: I beg your pardon--not if you can call any measure or amendment to legislation, approved by the parliament of the country--that is not fiat. Mrs. Gandhi is not a dictator--

BERNARD KALB: The opposition never attended those sessions.

AMB. KAUL: Well, it is for the opposition--after all, who prevented the opposition from attending. It's because the opposition could not win through the ballot box and tried to take this battle to the streets that they were imprisoned. No one is above the law, whether it's the opposition or the ruling party or any individual, or the press or anyone.

SCHECTER: But wasn't this done before the opposition took to the streets, Mr. Ambassador?

AMB. KAUL: I beg your pardon. That's where your facts are wrong, if I may say so. It was on the twenty-fifth of June that five of the opposition parties held a public meeting in Delhi--and I was there then--and they called upon the police, the armed forces and the civil administration to disobey government's orders. They announced a program which was to have been launched on the following Sunday--that's the twenty-ninth of June--to surround the houses of Congress leaders and to physically coerce them to resign, to start a no-tax campaign and disobedience movement.

Now no government, duly elected by the majority of the people,

and holding the majority in Parliament, could take such a threat lightly. And let me tell you, if you've studied the recent history of India, if government had not proclaimed an emergency--which was done under the constitution--there would have been civil disorder, chaos, and possibly religious strife of an order which was never seen before. Would you have welcomed that?

MARVIN KALB: Mr. Ambassador, throughout the history of India, there has been just what you've just described, and it's really been a prescription for the unfolding of democracy in a very large country. As a matter of fact, philosophically, ever since--I guess--Communist China came into being, there has been the philosophical debate whether you could have economic prosperity along with political freedom, and India was always the example that was upheld--that it can happen. It doesn't have to happen as it did in China. Now perhaps what we're witnessing now is the beginning of confirmation of the fact that democracy cannot work in a country the size of India, and perhaps it is over. Is that--is it not possible to admit that?

AMB. KAUL: I think that's an oversimplification of the situation. No two countries are alike--neither China and India nor India and America. But India and America have much more in common than India and China. We have had an ancient tradition of democracy going back about four thousand years, in our villagemen, tribes and local self-government. That is why, in a country like India, where there are so many languages and diverse cultures, democracy is the only form of government that can work. But let me tell you one thing. In other countries in our area--I won't name them--democracy could not function because a minority with the backing of the armed forces was able to

overthrow a majority, duly elected party. That--it was to prevent that happening that the emergency was proclaimed in India.

BERNARD KALB: Let me interrupt you, if I may, Mr. Ambassador, to move on to the specific question that you have just raised. Do you believe there's a possibility of the Indian army abandoning its past practice of non-political moves, moving this particular time--I'm suggesting flatly the question of the possibility of a military coup in India. Is that--?

AMB. KAUL: Certainly not. And I'm not saying this just for the sake of propaganda. I have been in close touch with our armed forces for the last forty years or so, and our army has a tradition of accepting civilian supremacy and not aligning itself with any political party. And this is also the tradition of our civil services.

SCHECTER: Do you think the army will accept the coup in Bangladesh, Mr. Ambassador?

AMB. KAUL: Which army?

SCHECTER: The Indian army -- the army that just fought a war there?

AMB. KAUL: It's not for the Indian army to accept or not to accept what's happened in another country. That is an internal affair for the people of that country. But if it should lead to any repercussions against us, then we'll have to consider that. But that will be considered by the duly elected government of India, not by the army.

MARVIN KALB: Sir, is India disappointed at the turn of events in Bangladesh?

AMB. KAUL: Well, we are sorry that their--

MARVIN KALB: In a diplomatic and political sense, sir.

AMB. KAUL: Well, we are sorry that a great man, who was the father of Bangladesh, met a tragic death. But as I said, it's an internal affair for the people of Bangladesh. We wish them well; we hope conditions will stabilize and that they will prosper. You see, the problem on the subcontinent--the various problems, whether between India and Pakistan, or Pakistan and Bangladesh, or between India and Bangladesh--can and will be solved only on a subcontinental basis, as was agreed in the Simla Agreement and the Delhi Agreement. If there is no outside interference, I'm positive that India, Pakistan and Bangladesh can settle their problems bilaterally and neutrally.

MARVIN KALB: Mr. Ambassador, I've got to go back a moment to a point you made. You were talking about the fear of a political minority operating with the military in order to upset constitutional rights. When Bernie asked you the question, are you fearful of a military coup in India, you said absolutely not, that the Indian army would stick with political supremacy. What were you referring to before then, when you talked about some kind of alliance between a military and a political minority as causing the very actions that we're now discussing?

AMB. KAUL: No, I was not referring to any alliance between the political minority and the military in India. I said in some other countries in that region this has happened, and it was to prevent the domination by a minority over the majority that we had to proclaim an emergency. If--

MARVIN KALB: But could that happen without the Indian army?

AMB. KAUL: Well, it can or it cannot, but in India, any government that is duly elected by the majority, if it fails in its duty to



prevent that happening, then it would not be a democratically elected government trying to protect democracy. It was exactly to prevent such a thing happening.

You were asking me hypothetical questions. I'll give you a hypothetical answer. In the context of India, where people have enjoyed democracy for centuries, where people are politically well organized and politically very conscious, such a thing cannot happen.

(MORE)

BERNARD KALB: Mr. Ambassador, you used the word failure, and I'd like to explore for a moment the motivations that were behind Madame Gandhi's action that went beyond the political challenge to her. Do you see the actions that she took in June, and the consequent actions that have since taken place, as a kind of anguished outcry, as it were, of the failure of India up to this point to meet the extraordinary problems of human growth, population, lack of food, and so forth? Is there in this action by Madame Gandhi a proclamation of past failure and a search now, an experiment as it were, for some sort of political, governmental structure designed to meet the overwhelming needs of the Indian people?

AMB. KAUL: Well, this is again, if I may say so with due deference, Mr. Kalb, an oversimplification. Now look at the situation in India for the past few years. It was because Mrs. Gandhi and her party had the courage to split the Congress on an economic program like nationalization of banks, land reforms, removal of the privileges of the princes, etcetera, that the Congress split, so this program could have succeeded, would have succeeded, if the minority opposition political parties, ranging from the extreme right to the extreme left, who have no common social economic program, opposed the ruling party at every step. There were other factors too, the international economic situation, the rise in oil prices, the war with Pakistan, ten million refugees from Bangladesh, two successive, unprecedented drought years that made it difficult for the government. But I will say this, that this emergency will have effect, and has already had the effect of giving a stimulus, acting as a catalytic agent to the ruling party to fulfill the promises they made in the 1971 elections,

And also I hope the minority political opposition parties will learn the lesson that they can operate in a democracy only within the law and the constitution and not outside it.

BERNARD KALB: Do you believe India will ever go back to pre-June?

AMB. KAUL: I hope not in the sense in which sometimes it is said. We will have to be more disciplined, we will have to work harder, and I'm glad that already there are harmonious relations between industry and labor. Productivity must increase; we must produce more. We have the human resources, the natural resources, which must be fully exploited. So in that sense we'll not go back, but if you mean removal of the emergency, I'm confident that within the next few months, if things go on improving as they are, we will return to normalcy.

BERNARD KALB: The next two months, or few months?

AMB. KAUL: The next few months, I said.

BERNARD KALB: And if they don't?

AMB. KAUL: If they don't, if the opposition and other elements do not cooperate, then the emergency may have to continue a little longer. It's a judgment that has to be made by the government, and the ruling party.

SCHECTER: Mr. Ambassador, but many Americans who have just been through Watergate see many parallels between what's happening now in India and our own problems with Watergate, and are suggesting that Mrs. Gandhi is behaving in many ways the way former President Nixon did in trying to maintain himself in office, she seems to be following the same pattern, and she's even gone him some steps better by being able

to crack down on the press, as former President Nixon was not able to do. Now, don't you see those parallels, as a student of history?

AMB. KAUL: It's really easy to draw parallels between different situations and different countries. But to point out a few differences, Mrs. Gandhi is not involved in any crime, in bugging, or breaking in. Mrs. Gandhi is not acting on her own, but in accordance with the wishes of the majority political party, which reaffirmed their faith in her, which was not the case --

SCHECTER: But she was accused of an election violation.

AMB. KAUL: Well, if those same standards of elections are applied to your country or to England, as the London Times said, it would be difficult for any British Prime Minister or American President to be elected. These were experiments in election law which we found were too drastic, and that's why the election law has been amended. But there is no parallel between Watergate and what's happened in India, because Mrs. Gandhi has acted entirely within the framework of the constitution at the behest of two-thirds of the members of parliament who have ratified it, so it's not as if it was dictatorship by one person or violation of any law. She has appealed to the highest court of the land, and the amendment has been -- the constitution has been amended before, it's been amended now. Any system of government, democratic, or any ideology, in order to survive must have the resilience and the dynamism to be adapted to developing different situations. Otherwise, it becomes static..

MARVIN KALB: Mr. Ambassador, it looks as though President Ford will not be paying a visit to India, as he said. I believe it was announced that he was going to pay a visit to India this fall, and --

AMB. KAUL: There was never any announcement about the timing.

MARVIN KALB: Well, it was said that it would be in connection with his visit to China, I believe, and --

AMB. KAUL: It was never said officially. I'll tell you what the official version is, and I have been assured by the U.S. government that the visit is still on, but the timing was not settled, and the timing will be settled according to mutual convenience. We would welcome to have him there whenever it is convenient for him to come there.

MARVIN KALB: In view of the word that everybody is getting, though, sir, is that he is not going to go there this fall, because he is unhappy with the state of political development, and this is his way of saying it.

AMB. KAUL: We have checked it with the State Department, and we have been told that there is no truth behind that. You had better ask the State Department about it.

MARVIN KALB: No truth behind that?

AMB. KAUL: No truth behind the statement that he has -- he was due to go there in the fall, and is not going there in the fall because of what's happened in India. We have been told that the visit is still on, and the timing will be decided by mutual convenience.

MARVIN KALB: Mr. Ambassador, you've been in this business, I believe, 35 - 38 years now?

AMB. KAUL: Yes.

MARVIN KALB: Do you believe the State Department when it tells you that?

AMB. KAUL: Well, I had it from the Secretary of State himself.

I have no reason to doubt it, and he's a very fine man, and I don't think he would try to mislead me.

MARVIN KALB: I see.

SCHECTER: Mr. Ambassador, when are conditions going to improve for the foreign press to operate in India, and what's happened to the local Newsweek man who's had his phone cut off and had his apartment taken away and had his accreditations lifted?

AMB. KAUL: Now you must realize that neither the press nor anybody is above the law. There is an emergency law prevailing in India, and please do not compare the Indian press with the American press. The Indian press mainly was owned by a few big business houses or industrialists, not like your press where you have a different system. Its circulation was hardly two to four million in all, while here it is 200 to 400 million. Here you have a system of moderators who at least balance reporting on one extreme or the other. So the comparison is not valid. Now since we had to enforce and impose certain restrictions on the press, because they were highlighting and publicizing incitements to revolt and character assassination, we could not apply different laws to the foreign press. After all, everyone has to obey the law of the land. And I'm glad that 30-odd foreign correspondents agreed to acknowledge the guidelines that were laid down, and said that they would take full responsibility for the dispatches. Some of the foreign correspondents violated the guidelines. We took a lenient view in some cases, but where there were gross violations, we had to ask them either to leave or to suspend some of the facilities they enjoyed because of their accreditation.

SCHECTER: That's sheer intimidation, sir, with all due respect.

AMB. KAUL: I think it's the other way around. Any foreign correspondent who is not willing to obey the law of the land but tries to intimidate that country's policies of what's happening there, is trying to intimidate that country.

SCHECTER: But there is no dispute about what a free press means.

AMB. KAUL: A free press is subject to the laws of the land. You can perhaps afford the luxury of having a press because your social and economic order has had two centuries to stabilize itself. We have had 28 years of independence, and there are differences between your press and our press. Even in your case, I know wherever the security of the state is involved, or foreign relations are involved, you at least take the trouble of checking with the State Department or the Pentagon. You may not agree with them, but you give both sides to the picture. In our country, I know of instances both Indian correspondents, foreign correspondents, who send reports based on rumors without even bothering to check on them. That's not fair. My idea of professional journalistic etiquette is that while views are free, facts are sacred. But these people were treating their facts as free and their views as sacred. That's not fair.

BERNARD KALF: Well, sir, this panel here consists of three reporters, all of whom have served as foreign correspondents, and in defense of foreign correspondents, I am impelled to suggest that we do check, we do make the checks that you are suggesting we do not. And having said that, I'd like to just go on to another question.

AMB. KAUL: Well, some didn't.

BERNARD KALB: As the Ambassador from India, are you deeply

angered by the fact that the United States has not responded publicly to what is happening in India?

AMB. KAUL: Why should I be disappointed?

BERNARD KALB: Well, because I raise it -- I raised that question in the context of your approval of what has happened in India, and therefore wouldn't you hope as the ambassador that there would be some expressions of approval?

AMB. KAUL: It is an entirely internal affair of India. We neither want approval nor disapproval from any foreign government.

BERNARD KAUL: You're disappointed there's been no comment from--

AMB. KAUL: I--in fact; I appreciate the responsible restraint that has been exercised, both by the U.S. administration, as well as by the majority of leaders of the Senate and the House. We appreciate that, and they realize that it is an internal affair of India, and Indians know best how to solve their problems.

SCHECTER: But the thrust of your argument is that conditions are going to continue pretty much the way they are in India. Is that right, Mr. Ambassador?

AMB. KAUL: For a few months, yes. And we have to until normalcy is restored and the opposition gives up its unconstitutional methods.

SCHECTER: Normalcy as defined by Mrs. Gandhi?

AMB. KAUL: No, normalcy as defined by the situation, by the opposition being willing to abide by the constitutional and legal framework. That is what is normalcy. Mrs. Gandhi is not just alone. She has two-thirds of the parliament behind her, and I think it is an insult to any parliament --

SCHECTER: The rest are in jail.



AMB. KAUL: Not the rest. About a dozen leaders are in jail, not because they are in the opposition, but because they violated the law.

MARVIN KALB: What's the arrest figure, sir? We only have about 20 seconds.

AMB. KAUL: I said about -- no -- about 12 leaders of the opposition party, but 85 per cent of those arrested, the figure that you quoted, are black-marketers --

MARVIN KALB: I'm/terribly sorry, sir, our time is up. Thank you, gentlemen, thank you very much for being here on Face the Nation.

ANNOUNCER: Today on FACE THE NATION, Triloki Nath Kaul, Ambassador of India, was interviewed by CBS News Correspondent Bernard Kalb, Gerald Schecter, Diplomatic Editor of Time Magazine, and CBS News Diplomatic Correspondent Marvin Kalb. Next week, Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, will FACE THE NATION.