

Mrs. Indira Gandhi and National Emergency: How the Emergency altered India's Political Dynamics

¹D.Thippe Naik and ²Prof.K.Krishna Naik

¹Research Scholar, Dept. of History, Sri Krishnadevaraya University Anantapur – 515 003, Andhra Pradesh

²Professor of History, Sri Krishnadevaraya University Anantapur – 515 003, Andhra Pradesh

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History

Published Online: 13 March 2019

Keywords

Democracy, Emergency, Federal Structure, Freedom, Rule of Law

ABSTRACT

The declaration of National Emergency in 1975 was more than just the result of an action of an audacious Prime Minister. There is no doubt that the determination of Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi played a decisive role in spurring the turmoil, however, there were deep-seated reasons for that political hiccup in Indian politics. One of the main reasons was the attaining of absolute majority in the lower house of the Parliament of India and as a result, she became an uncrowned monarch of Indian politics and an undisputed leader in the ruling Congress party between the years 1967 and 1971. After 44 years of declaration of emergency in the country certain authoritarian trends are again being witnessed in the Indian political system of the present day because of again the majority in the Lok Sabha. This research paper has adopted a descriptive analysis with the help of secondary sources for analysing the objectives of this paper. This paper has explained the rise of Mrs.. Indira Gandhi to power and the proclamation of National Emergency in 1975, the timeline of emergency and the federal structure, along with the loss of freedom to the citizens and the suppression of rule of law.

1. Introduction

“Instead of a military overthrow or a constitutional coup like the emergency, authoritarian rulers usually kill democracies through everyday subversion of the political game. This takes three forms: capturing of referees, sidelining of players, and rewriting of rules.”

-----Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt (2018).¹

The National Emergency was imposed in India from 25th June 1975 and lasted for a period of 21 months when it was revoked on 21st March, 1977. It was declared by Mrs.. Indira Gandhi across the length and breadth of the nation. Under Article 352 of the Indian Constitution, the President of India, Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed imposed emergency on the advice of the Council of ministers led by Mrs.. Indira Gandhi due to “Internal Disturbance” in the country. The order of emergency granted the Indian Prime Minister unbridled power and to rule by law, which invested in the Prime Minister the power to suspend elections and to curb the civil liberties of the people. All the political adversaries of Mrs.. Indira Gandhi were behind bars and the general public was also suppressed. Humongous amount of cases of violations and abuse of human rights were reported and recorded during the period. There was also an issue of widespread forced sterilisation drive orchestrated by Sanjay Gandhi, the son of Mrs.. Indira Gandhi. The national emergency declared by Mrs.. Indira Gandhi was one of the most contentious periods in the history of independent India.²

The advice that was tendered to the President of India by the Council of ministers for imposing of National Emergency regarding the immediate internal and external challenges that are being faced by the Indian state resulted in the declaration of emergency on 25th June 1975.³ The Emergency was not merely the result of audacity Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi, in spite of the fact that Mrs. Gandhi played a very decisive role in spurring the turmoil. There are also other factors that were at

play. In 1975, there was the political uncertainty and a crippling economic crisis that proved detrimental and fatal to the Indian democracy. In order to address the situation, the Indian government was left with no choice but to take recourse to declaration of Emergency. Commenting on the declaration of Emergency in India, Alexis de Tocqueville stated that America must strive to make the best of the situation that is existing in India, both positive and its bad tendencies.⁴ He further stated that the constitutional crisis is awaiting is inevitable in such an atmosphere where the enthusiasm of a dictator and aspirations of the judge are at play.

2. Rise of Indira Gandhi

Let us start with a quick overview of rise of Indira Gandhi in Indian politics, declaration of Emergency by her, take into reckoning the economic, financial and structural implications of the declaration of Emergency and then begin to draw the Indian political system's weaknesses and its fundamental causes and results.

Mrs. Indira Gandhi came to power in January 1966 after the demise of Prime Minister Shastri. Between the years 1967 and 1971 Mrs. Gandhi happened to attain absolute power over the government and the Indian National Congress Party and also won a thumping majority in the Lok Sabha, the lower House of Indian Parliament. She had gained supremacy in the context of central government by concentrating all the powers of the central government in the Secretariat of the Prime Minister, instead of the Council of ministers who are the elected representatives of the people. This was the result of the basic mistrust that she fostered for the people who were around her. She depended to a large extent on the, Chief Secretary, P.N.Haksar, her man Friday, a key leader in the inner sanctum advisors of Mrs. Indira Gandhi. P.N.Haskar embraced the idea of a “committed bureaucracy” that demanded from the

government officials who were hitherto neutral to be “committed” to the dominant party’s ideology of the day.

Mrs. Indira Gandhi relentlessly outsmarted her opponents within Congress party, causing the group to break in 1969-into Congress (O) (which included the old-guard which is regarded as the “Syndicate”) and Congress (R) which was led and represented by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. A majority of the Committee of All-India Congress and Members of Parliament from the Congress went with Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Indira Gandhi’s party proved to be quite distinct from the old Congress which had been a powerful body with internal Democratic traditions. On the other hand, in the Congress (R) leaders quickly came to a conclusion that their advancements in the ranks of the party depended entirely on their allegiance to Indira Gandhi and her supporters and as a result it led to a lot of sycophancy in the Congress party which led by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. In the years to come it became quite evident that Indira Gandhi’s power was to grow by leaps and bounds and she could appoint hand-picked followers as the chief ministers of the State Governments instead of being chosen in a democratic fashion by the concerned legislature party of the State where the Congress party has won the majority of the seats in the state legislature.⁵

Her flamboyant popularity made her to take radical left turns with regard to her decisions pertaining to administration. This included the nationalization of many big private banks in July 1969 and the abolishment of the Privy Purses in September 1970 by a decree. These reforms are often rendered unexpectedly to the surprise of her critics. Among the deprived sections of the society she had a huge following and it consisted of the people from the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, farmers, working class, minorities and women. Indira Gandhi was seen as “fighting for economic nationalism and secularism in religious affairs, as also being pro-poor, and for the growth of the country as a whole” (RamachandraGuha, 2000).

In the general elections that were conducted in 1971 the voters were mobilized by Mrs. Indira Gandhi through her slogan of “GaribiHatao” (Abolish poverty). This gave a massive mandate of 352 seats out of 518 seats in the Lok Sabha, the lower House of Indian Parliament. By this victory, Indira Gandhi and her party became so popular that Congress (R) came to be regarded as a true Congress and “it needed no qualifying suffix”.

3. Raj Narain verdict:

Raj Narain who was defeated in the General elections of 1971 by Mrs. Indira Gandhi filed a lawsuit in the Allahabad High Court questioning the practices that were adopted by Mrs. Indira Gandhi like poll bribery and usage of state machinery for electoral gains against him. Shanti Bhushan defended the argument for Raj Narain. Indira Gandhi was also cross examined in the High Court and it was the first occasion that an Indian Prime Minister had attended a trial in the court of law.⁶ Justice Jaganmohanlal Sinha of the Allahabad High Court, on 12 June 1975, convicted Mrs. Indira Gandhi on charges of abuse of government resources and power for winning her election. The High Court had declared her victory null and void and unseated her from her Lok Sabha seat. Apart from this, the court barred her from contesting in any elections for an additional six years. Her supporters held large-scale protests in

Delhi streets near to the home of the Prime Minister. Raj Narain’s relentless pursuit of the court case has won him commendations across the country, though it took more than four years for Justice Sinha to impose judgement on the Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi.⁷

The verdict of the High Court was challenged by Mrs. Indira Gandhi in the Supreme Court of India. On 24 June 1975, Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer affirmed the decision that was taken by the High Court of Allahabad and directed that all rights that were enjoyed by Mrs. Indira Gandhi as an MP should be stopped and she should be excluded from voting. However, she was permitted to remain as Prime Minister until her challenge in the court of law was settled. Jayprakash Narain and Morarji Desai asked the people to hold demonstrations against the central government headed by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. The next day, Jayprakash Narain had a major rally in New Delhi that the order that is being given by the government is illegal and unethical and as a result, the police officer should refuse the government instructions because that was the slogan of Mahatma Gandhi during the fight for Indian independence. Such a call that was given by Jayprakash Narain was treated to be a sign of incitement to violence and revolt. Mrs. Indira Gandhi, later, on that day, had given advice to the President of the Indian Republic, Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed to declare a state of national emergency and he was willing to abide by the decision that was given by the Prime Minister and the Council of ministers. The electric power to all the main newspapers was disconnected within three hours of the declaration of national Emergency and all the opponents of Mrs. Indira Gandhi were detained and were put behind bars.⁸

4. Emergency Proclamation:

The country was in a grave crisis because of the revolt that was being staged against the regime of Mrs. Gandhi by Jayprakash Narain and other popular leaders and also because of the problems of economic depression and the oil crisis of 1973. The government stated that the strikes and the demonstrations that were staged by the people have crippled the economy and the decision-making of the country and is not allowing the functioning of the government machinery and is ruining the economy of the nation. Mrs. Indira Gandhi was listening only to the counsel that was rendered by her staunch loyalists and her younger son, Sanjay Gandhi. The influence of Sanjay Gandhi and other cronies of Mrs. Indira Gandhi had become a kind of “extra-constitutional authority”, in the face of significant political resistance across the country. Siddhartha Shankar Ray, the Chief Minister of West Bengal has suggested proclamation of Emergency to the P.M. Indira Gandhi.⁹ He drafted a letter to the President requesting him to impose Emergency based on the intelligence provided by Mrs. Indira Gandhi that ‘there is an immediate danger to India’s stability that is endangered by internal disturbances.’ After a brief request on a constitutional issue, on 25th of June, 1975, only a few minutes before the clock struck midnight, President Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed announced a state of national emergency on the recommendation of the Prime Minister.¹⁰ As per the Constitution, Mrs. Indira Gandhi recommended for the imposition of emergency and the President Ahmed accepted the continuation of Emergency every six months before she agreed to lift the Emergency and go for general elections in 1977

5. Emergency Timeline (The Indian Express; June 29, 2015):

1975 to 1976:

Arrests, persecution, judicial assaults, marches, and criticism from across the globe.

1975:

JUL 7: CRPF encircles Jawaharlal Nehru University's living quarters, captures 60 students, 10 of whom are kept in custody for weeks.

JUL 10: Teachers at Bombay University write to Indira to oppose emergency. Four months later, their representatives are imprisoned under MISA.

JUL 21: Parliament continues to meet; Jagjivan Ram moves Emergency Approval Motion, approved by Lok Sabha. Newspapers excluded Opposition leaders such as A K Gopalan, Somnath Chatterjee, H M Patel, and Era Sezhiyan from giving speeches.

JUL 22: Rajya Sabha also endorses emergency; both Houses approve the 38th Amendment Act, banning judicial examination of the declaration of emergency and associated independence curbs.

AUG 1: The head of State accepts the 38th Amendment, with 30 M.P.s in detention.

AUG 6: Election Laws (Amendment) Act 1975 expressly amends the legislation to nullify the judgment of the High Court of Justice of Allahabad Jagmohan Lal Sinha convicting Indira Gandhi of electoral violence.

AUG 7-8: Parliament passes the 39th Amendment Bill with several leaders imprisoned or going undercover, putting the authority of the President, Vice-President, Prime Minister and Speaker beyond the authority of the judiciary. Often positions MISA in Ninth Week, granting it protection from legal action. State legislators are called upon to ratify the Amendment on August 9; on August 10, India's "fastest ever" constitutional reform earns presidential approval.

AUG 9: Weeks ahead of the Supreme Court hearing on Indira's petition, Rajya Sabha introduced the 41st Amendment providing complete protection from civil and criminal charges to the Prime Minister.

AUG 15: Advertisement endorsed by plenty of hundred influential individual's surface in "The Times, London and The New York Times," stating, "This is the Independence Day of India. Do not let the illumination emanate from Indian Democracy. Free Jaiprakash Narayan."

April 19: Bulldozers demolish tenements in Old Delhi near Jama Masjid at Turkman Street. Officers shoot at opposing people, killing and injuring many.

1976:

JAN 8: President disables the "Seven Freedoms" provided in Article 19 of the Constitution.

JAN 24: Parliament passes an Ordinance which abolished the jurisdiction of courts to inquire for reasons for detention under MISA.

26 JAN: 2,000 march in London on "Alliance against Fascist Dictatorship in India;" world leaders call on Indira to "Let Mahatma Gandhi come to India."

JAN 31: Government of DMK ousted, Assembly of Tamil Nadu suspended, 700 jailed.

MAR 5: 80 U.S. Nobel laureates, scholars and peace activists call on Indira to regain basic rights.

MAR 12: Government of Gujarat suspended, Order of President established.

APR 28: Reversal of orders passed by seven High Courts, a Supreme Court bench headed by Chief Justice A N Ray rules by a 4-1 majority that no one will be allowed to file a written petition for habeas corpus or an emergency constitutional issue. In the notorious "Habeas Corpus trial," the dissident lawyer, the renowned justice Hans Raj Khanna, who claimed that the constitutional right to life and freedom was not subject to an executive decree, was rewarded by being superseded for the CJI role.

MAY 1: Bangalore's Lawrence Fernandez is arrested and tortured to compel him to disclose his unionist brother George's location, the only big opposition leader to have fled the dragnet of the police.

MAY 2: All India Radio forbids the songs of Kishore Kumar as retaliation for failing to back the Youth Congress.

MAY 24: The government gives estimates of arrests of those "interested in the dissemination of secret literature objected to Emergency" since June 26, 1975: more than 7000.

JUN 3: The International Human Rights League is protesting to the United Nations against India's official program of abuse, violence, starvation, and ill-treatment of political prisoners.

JUN 11: The ashram of Vinoba Bhave is searched for copies of their Maitree newspaper. Many publications are abused or censored, such as Opinion, Himmat, Freedom First, Srujana, Bhumi Putra, Thuglak, and Swarajya.

JUN 31: Silence of more journals: Seminar, Janata, Sadhana, and Search.

AUG 10: With a warrant issued for him, Subramanian Swamy, who had fled to the U.S., makes a dramatic appearance in Parliament and slips out and flees the country once again after a quick intervention.

AUG 16: Eight versions of The Indian Express are fully re-censored and put on hold; on the same day, Indira Gandhi announces that there is "no censorship in India" to non-aligned countries in Colombo.

SEP 20: 'Indians for Democracy' begins Long March from Liberty Bell, Philadelphia, on October 1 to meet the U.N. The same day, the Home Ministry confirms that 22 Lok Sabha leaders and 11 Rajya Sabha leaders are being arrested. Sales are secretly withheld to The Indian Express, The Statesman, and The Newspaper.

OCT 2: At Rajghat, former freedom fighters Acharya J B Kripalani, H V Kamath, and Dr. Sushila Nayyar are being arrested.

OCT 18: Police kill 43 in Muzaffarnagar for demonstrating against compulsory sterilization.

OCT 30: 28 MISA detainees are put into solitary confinement in chains in Varanasi prison for demonstrating and creating slogans against Indira Gandhi.

NOV 5: Lok Sabha, the tenure of which was to expire in March 1976, has granted itself a second extension until November 1977.

NOV 6: Huge police force rounding up and conducting compulsory sterilization of 180 UP peasants.

June 10: George Fernandez is finally arrested in Calcutta for supposedly importing dynamite in order to blow up government buildings (the so-called Baroda Dynamite Case). On June 16, Willy Brandt, President of the German Social Democratic Party, Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky, and Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme released a joint statement voicing "great worry and dismay" over the ill-treatment of Fernandez in lock-up.

1977:

The massive heart Shift of Indira, The Restoration to Democracy.

JAN 18: Indira Gandhi dissolves Lok Sabha, declares "new elections."

JAN 20: Several Emergency Laws are deemed "relaxed," including surveillance by the public. The Janata Party which comprised of Congress (O), Jana Sangh, Bharatiya Lok Dal, and Socialist Party is formed.

JAN 23: Morarji Desai presides over the Janata party's National Committee.

FEB 2: Jagjivan Ram steps down as minister; joins Congress for Democracy on February 5.

MAR 16: Ends surveys.

MAR 19-20: Indira, Sanjay, Bansi Lal, and several members of the Cabinet lose votes.

MAR 21: Directives for national emergencies and press control are revoked.

MAR 22: Indira Gandhi resigns; Janata Party gets parliamentary majority; the prohibition on 26 organizations lifted.

MAR 24-25: the Prime Minister Morarji Desai appoints Janata Party Cabinet.

MAY 28: Janata Government assigns an Inquiry Commission under former Indian Chief Justice J C Shah to investigate depredations, malpractice, and misuse of power during the emergency.

6. Altered dynamics of Indian Political System

The consequence of National Emergency is hard to tell. No doubt, there was significant economic growth during the time of emergency but that cannot be an excuse for the suspension of democratic discourse. Take into cognizance the Emergency situation De Tocqueville observed that the Indian regime, occurred before the emergency, collapsed on the foundations of a large democracy: "a federal structure, taste of freedom and the rule of law."¹¹ With this, the crisis revealed some of the worst weaknesses in a badly designed or improperly implemented system.

7. Administration:

During the time of emergency, Mrs. Indira Gandhi had established a 20-point economic policy for the agricultural and industrial rejuvenation of the country and also for the enhancing of public infrastructure along with the amelioration of economic deprivation of the people.¹² In addition to the 20 point programme of Mrs. Gandhi, her son Sanjay Gandhi had also announced his five-point initiative to encourage literacy, family planning, tree planting, Caste eradication and abolish of the dowry. All this was done to lessen the impact of the Emergency

that was imposed in the country and to win back the people to the side of the government.¹³

8. The Federal Structure:

In a typical federal system, the federal government or the central government caters to the needs of the national general interests and as a result it is endowed with all the powers that are necessary to discharge its duties. In the same breath, the states or the federating units are also given the due powers for discharging their duties. In a realistic sense, this ensure sensitive and efficient governance.

The Indian model of Parliamentary Democracy terms the amalgamation of a union, which was meant to minimize division and secession chances intentionally, thus maintaining a clear national identity. As constitutional theorist Girdhali Lal pointed out in 'A Critical Review of the Indian Constitution,' "Nonetheless, the Indian Constitution aims to maintain continuity in these important matters by ... creating similar all-India services." Additionally, he continued, "A very peculiar aspect of the Indian Constitution is that while it is meant to act normally as a federal structure, it can also be turned into a similar all-India operation. It is troublesome for a country with a population of 1.3 billion in an area one-third the size of the U.S.

Tummala, K. K.¹⁴ (1996) political scientist, In his essay 'The Indian Union and Emergency Forces,' has revealed the actual consequences of this quasi-federalism and states that even though India's constitution envisages a federal government, its growth over the years, along with some of its clauses, undermines its meaning and disrupts its functions. This was a recent statement, but that assertion was also valid in 1968. As Jayaprakash Narayan observed: "Relations between the Center-State [National-State government] were primarily a result of ties between Congress Party and its state branches and Central leadership. The federal system has never had a chance to work ... "Economists and political scientists now accredit some of India's recent economic problems to this lop-sided federalism. In "The Structure of Indian Federalism: A Critique," H. M. Rajashekara argues, "An over-centralized federal structure is incapable of solving socio-economic problems efficiently"

Therefore, to some degree, the Indian government's quasi-federal structure cursed the people to suffer from a regime that was powerless to boost the economy. Such economic hardships converted into general government discontent and mistrust, which, together with the regime's other malaises, proved lethal.

Tocqueville presented another federal type of value, the inability to reduce inequality, and a despotic downfall. "Because the Union's authority is small and incomplete, its practice is not harmful to freedom; for it does not excite those insatiable impulses for glory and influence which have proven so fatal to the great republics ... political zeal, rather than spreading across the land like a fire on the prairies, invests its energy against the needs and individual passions of each state." As a consequence, an impassioned leader will not only harm the Center but also undermine regional governments. The government has also allowed advice from the Prime Ministers on appointing chief ministers in the states, so power could easily spread. And they did. As Dunn writes, after the remarkable success of Mrs. Gandhi in 1971, she "started to believe that she might render the Congress Party an organ of

her own will ... Hence, the age of what became derisively termed 'appointed' chief ministers started, who attributed their ascendance to the desires of her high command." Therefore, the charismatic national leader was able to penetrate and conquer the state governments. Such power only rendered the unsuccessful bureaucratic measures harder and empowered the increasing resistance, alleging hypocrisy, and immoral influence. Besides, the emergency provisions enabled Mrs. Gandhi to seize complete charge of the States, restricting the quasi-federal system to a rigid, almost authoritarian, unitary type. In the *Triumph of India's Democracy*, Atul Kohli (2001)¹⁵ sums up this plunge: "Indira Gandhi named obedient subordinates to major political offices in the nation, pressured whoever opposed her, and when the opposing side itself became vehement — as it did in the mid-1970s — imposed a two-year (1975–1977) national emergency, restricting democratic activities, and taking India's Democracy to its brink". Here we can observe how a ruler's overbearing ambitions and passions were able to make Democracy go down on its knees.

9. Taste for freedom;

In the Indian situation, we can see the power of the election — albeit, as we have said, to a faulty structure — but there was a shortage of party alliances and parties.

India had just one dominant political body, the Congress, during the first decades of Democracy. According to historian Anton Pelinka, "it is the continuity of the National Indian Congress; the all-inclusive organization of the independence movement ... The Congress Party has long depended on the personal attributes of Nehru, his youngest daughter Indira Gandhi, and her son Rajiv Gandhi." Jawaharlal Nehru — a close friend of Mohandas Gandhi — was India's first prime minister. This was strongly illustrated in the dominance of early Indian politics by the Nehru family, and hence by the Congress Party. In reality, due to its nationalist ideology and near 'personality worship,' the Congress Party enjoyed such degrees of dominance that no other group came close to the hegemony of the Centre. Elections were conducted with unflinching regularity and the Congress Party spared money and power to be spent in elections from the Indian political landscape for its complete dominance.

We can see signs of Tocqueville's collective dictatorship in the domination. Of course, he cautioned against the explicit despotic policies such a party is introducing (e.g., curtailing civil liberties), but he also raised concern about a subtler problem: a soft despotism. Citizens tend to perceive the legislative body to be biased against their interests. There is no real opposition to or disagreement against the administration. The people consent to mutual subservience of the governing state's "tutelary force."

This obsession is seen in the Indian context, though to a lesser degree. There was opposition — the essence of it is a question that we should discuss later on — but it came from the upper class. Kohli remarks, "Political strife has mainly taken the form of competing class allegations and counterclaims ... Many of India's poor were lower-caste, landless peasants. In general, these communities were dependent on those above, the landed aristocracy upper-caste rulers, for their subsistence. These vertical relations of privilege and reliance, in effect, restricted the political conduct of rural, illiterate Indians. "Democracy became essentially insensitive to the majority of

men, the lower and mid-to-lower class. There were no powerful national groups, just the Congress, as Pelinka. A¹⁶ (2003) states. The dominance of a single, detached group reduced the role of the citizen in the cycle of Democracy. The pledge of economic prosperity and progressive initiatives by Congress nurtured the confidence and dependence of the citizens on the centralized government. In fact, in the face of economic hardship, citizens would be less responsible for satisfying their "free taste" and more concentrated on fulfilling their appetites.

The causal association with Democracy can explain the general indifference to the authoritarianism of Gandhi. In his essay "Indira's India: Government of Independence and the Crisis," Klieman, A.¹⁷ (2010). (1981) says this well: "The Indian citizens went along with the emergency rule, first because they had no alternative, and second because Indira Gandhi was willing to mitigate popular discontent ... Policy reforms met with almost complete indifference; however, signs of economic growth were cheered." The *London Guardian* wrote: "India's state of emergency is already almost three months old and quickly becoming the Mystery of the Lost Opposition."

Indira Gandhi has, therefore, been able to draw on the desires, ignorance, and faith of the country to retain a powerful executive capacity. However, that was only feasible due to the lack of a well-organized government or democratic society's international environment. One dominant group appealed to the emotions of the citizens to establish control, and instead, their complete dominance disheartened the opposition. In a wider tradition of undemocratic activism, which blatantly ignored the rule of law, this negative perception was cultured.

The Rule of Law;

We will consider the history of democratic activism in India here. The liberation struggle was just two and a half decades old at the time of the emergency, and its vestigial leaders were already around. Upon liberation, the transformative mechanisms did not wane. They are tradition, riots, strikes, and crime have characterized the Indian political landscape. Such activities have, of course, been eliminated are more brutal than the Satyagraha conducted by Mahatma Gandhi, but the sentiment may be tracked back. Gandhi's Satyagraha stressed moral integrity, honesty, and disengagement above all else. Gandhi has also emphasized the contrast between passive resistance and Satyagraha throughout the revolt. Satyagraha prevented unfair practices or programs from being deployed in a way, that has an individualistic dimension about it — and maybe Tocqueville will support it — but it severs relations with the entity that remains. There should be no compromise; Reality and Falsehood alone. This exclusion is risky in a country, as it is antithetical to the concept of Democracy. There must be consensus, engagement, and cooperation. According to Tocqueville, as we saw earlier, minorities must feel assured of their ability to come to power one day; if they lose their desire and expectation, they are opposed to peace and stability. It was successful, indeed, to overturn the colonial system and then to promote a new democracy. The custom, though, deteriorated over time from Gandhi's peaceful nonviolence to the violent protests of leftists and disenfranchised youngsters. They started to engage more but in aggressive, chaotic ways with the political entities. The result was similar: the absolutists, fervent policies disregarded the rule of law and therefore disrespected the institution of Democracy.

This Indian democratic deficiency came to great strength in two protests shortly before the emergency that built up the economic misery felt by the railway workers and students and then spread quickly and dramatically.

The Indian rail network was a huge investment in public service, and as such, the staff — according to Dhar P.N (2001)¹⁸, and Indira Gandhi adviser — had been well paying. Economic uncertainty and comparable salaries for public employees (the rail workers paid less) nonetheless sparked obvious dissatisfaction in the workplace. Several independent groups emerged, each taking direct measures to pressure the government to make compromises. Economist Dunn characterized this period of unionism as "a time of go-slow, work-to-rule, wild-cat strikes and disrespect for legal norms." Initially, their lawless actions were successful, as the railway minister caved to their demands. Nevertheless, the positioning contributed to radicalization.

The diverse groups united — one of a national political association's first protests — and it made significant requests, which included full benefits for part-time workers and a month's salary allowance for all employees. Such a compromise would be financially unfeasible to the struggling government, and would likely lead many public service workers to similar movements, further compressing the national budget. The reluctance of the government, then, was fair, but the reaction of the union was not: they demanded a strike nationally, cursed, and potentially unrecoverable. The union leader inspired his fellow activists, arguing, "A ten-day Indian Railways strike — any steel mill in India will shut, and the country's factories would cease for the next twelve months. If the steel mill furnace is shut off once, re-fire takes nine months. A fifteen-day strike on the Indian Railways—the world will starve to death." Here, we see the Indian political associations' utter disrespect not just of the rule of law, but for the popular good. We were able to starve the country to death. Surprisingly, the government stood on its feet, and the union caved in to the Centre. However, this parlays came at a cost. The Centre cited India's Rules of Defense, organized the local force, and captured the union members who were likely to go undercover and trigger more havoc. As predicted, the upshot had been more concentrated control in the Gandhi government's eyes.

A party of graduates kindles one more subtle revolt. In Gujarat province, after the 1972 drought, students banded together to oppose the steep increase in food prices. The students finally managed to put the municipal government to a stop. Jayaprakash Narayan, a national leader — and Indira Gandhi dissenter — latched onto this campaign and brought it to the next point. When asked why Narayan gave the telling answer: "I spent two years attempting to bring in mainstream politics. Then I saw students in Gujarat bring about a political shift with people's support ... and I thought this was the Way

out. "He called for" complete transformation, "which would include all facets of Indian life — economic, political, social, cultural, religious, educational, and moral. Political reconciliation with a man who calls for the full subversion of the Indian Way of life appears impossible.

The campaign got the Indian citizens some attention but failed to realize successful political change. The ultimate effect was Indian political radicalization and stronger discontentment with the standing government. Dhar summed up as "Extra constitutional and violent forms of agitation used by radical political groups, whose ideology is based on a denial of democratic procedures, have become the preferred technique among traditional political parties and groups,"¹⁹

There, the words of Alex Tocqueville ring true: "... inexperience with Democracy causes us to see the freedom of association only as a right to attack the state. The first notion that introduces itself to a group, as well as to a person, when it has gained knowledge of its power is that of violence; the notion of argument emerges at a later stage and is extracted from practice. "The new society and also the new political alliances had a new conception of politics that may have coincided with their practices."²⁰ This chaos does not only make emergency appear possible but unavoidable. Confronted with an extra-constitutional political group, a member may also be tempted to push through the boundaries of her constitutional power.

10. Conclusion

Therefore, Indira Gandhi sat above an unsound administration and a starving yet disengaged citizenry, and those who were determined to create an uprising, resorted to arrogant, extra-constitutional steps to bring the administration to its knees. This may have been a judicial decision that suddenly triggered the 1975 emergency, but as we have shown, for quite some time, the Indian government has been in (or at least heading to) a state of emergency. Each of that is not intended to defend the action or describe it completely, but the acts can have greater significance in context. We can say that the emergency was, to some degree, the result of the government, and we know that the claims made by Tocqueville remain accurate and obtain more insight into a young democracy. The permissive Constitution in young India permitted the concentration of power at the Centre, and an unstable quasi-federal system allowed more populism than good governance. Such flaws, as Tocqueville told us, are inherent to society and can only be resolved by confidence and reverence for the political institutions. The Indian people had shown little of either until 1975--the liberal voters still had to learn the art of being safe.

References

1. Steven Levitsky and Daniel Zisblatt (2018): "How Democracies Die: What History Reveals About Our Future." Penguin Publications, Available at https://www.audible.in/pd/How-Democracies-Die-Audiobook/B078YWS6XB?source_code=IAAOTH13112181_9001W&qclid=EAlalQobChMI-86yqrGT6wIVlx0rCh34rQEPEAMYASAAEglo-PD_BwE
2. India Times; Indira Gandhi - Interview - T.V. Eye – 1978; retrieved on 11/08/2020. Available at: <https://www.indiatimes.com/culture/who-we-are/indira-gandhi-interview-tv-eye-1978-585652e6031fe-290724.html>
3. AbhiNemani (2019). "Emergency in India: Lessons from Democracy from 1975", Medium>History section, Published on Feb19, 2019. Available at:

- <https://medium.com/@abhinemani/the-emergency-in-india-a-democratic-diagnosis-c23dc8bfc5f2>
4. Alexis de Tocqueville's (2002). "Democracy in America-Vol-II," translated by Henry Reeve, Pennsylvania State University, Chapter-2, p-711. Available at: file:///C:/Users/home/Downloads/Tocqueville_1593-01.pdf
 5. RamchandraGuha. (2000). Indira Gandhi and the Indian Emergency, The Hindu (published in June 2000 on the 25th Anniversary of the Emergency). Available at: <http://ramachandraguha.in/archives/indira-gandhi-and-the-indian-emergency-the-hindu.html>
 6. The Indian Express: (March 22, 2008). The Indian Express: March 22, 2008. "Justice Sinha, who set aside Indira Gandhi's election, dies at 87". Archived from the original on March 9, 2012. Retrieved August 10, 2020. Available at: <https://web.archive.org/web/20120309151210/http://www.expressindia.com/latest-news/aaJustice-Sinha-who-set-aside-Indira-Gandhis-election-dies-at-87/287227/>
 7. Katherine Frank (2001). "Indira: The Life of Indira Nehru Gandhi." HarperCollins. Pp. 372–373. ISBN 0-00-255646-4.
 8. Indian Herald, (June 26, 1975): "The Rise of Indira Gandhi." Library of Congress Country Studies. Retrieved 10, August 2020, Available at <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/~ghosh20p/page1.html#declare>
 9. Nayar, Kuldip (June 25, 2000). "Yes, Prime Minister" Archived February 11, 2010, at the Way Back Machine. The Indian Express. Available at: <https://indianexpress.com/ie/daily/20000713/e1.htm>
 10. Narayan S (June 25, 2020). Explained] Why Did Indira Gandhi Impose Emergency In 1975? The Hans India. Available at: <https://www.thehansindia.com/hans/opinion/news-analysis/why-did-indira-gandhi-impose-emergency-in-1975-630015>
 11. The Indian Express (June 29, 2015). "Recalling the Emergency years" adopted from Prabhudas T Sanghvi for Voices of Emergency, (ed) John Oliver Perry). Available at: <https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/recalling-the-emergency-1975-77-the-emergency-at-work/>
 12. Jaitely, Arun (November 5, 2007) – "A tale of three Emergencies: real reason, always different," The Indian Express. Available at: <http://archive.indianexpress.com/news/a-tale-of-three-emergencies-real-reason-always-different/235992/0>
 13. Tarlo, Emma (2001). Unsettling memories: narratives of the Emergency in Delhi. University of California Press. Pp. 27–28. ISBN 0-520-23122-8. Retrieved August 11, 2020.
 14. Tummala, K. K. (1996). The Indian Union and Emergency Powers. International Political Science Review, 17(4), 373–384. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251296017004003>
 15. AtulKholi (2001). The Success of India's Democracy, Cambridge University Press, Chapter-2, p-23. Available; <http://acme.highpoint.edu/~msetzler/ComPol/CPSreadingsbank/IndiaDemocratizationKohli2001.13.pdf>
 16. Pelinka A (2003): "Democracy Indian style- Subhas Chandra Bose and the Creation of Indian Political Culture," Routledge, Chapter-6, P-109.
 17. Klieman, A. (1981). Indira's India: Democracy and Crisis Government. Political Science Quarterly, 96(2), 241-259. DOI: 10.2307/2150338. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2150338?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
 18. Dhar PN (2001). "Indira Gandhi, the Emergency, and Indian Democracy," OUP India, ISBN: 9780195656459,
 19. YogendraYadav. (The Print; June 24, 2020). This is no Emergency. Modi and Shah are using Democracy to subvert Democracy. Available at: <https://theprint.in/opinion/no-emergency-modi-shah-are-using-democracy-to-subvert-democracy/447685/>
 20. Deva Sahayam; (2020). "Indira's Emergency and Modi's Neo Emergency," Published in News Click on June 24, 2020. Available at: <https://www.newsclick.in/Indira-Gandhi-Emergency-Narendra-Modi-Neo-Ememergency-COVID-19-Lockdown-Anti-CAA-Protest>