CHAPTER-VI

Neelam Sanjeeva Reddy as President of India
Mrs. Indhira Gandhi began to rule this country with dictatorial attitude after 1971 mid-term elections. There were some movements against her including Allahabad High court judgment. Mrs.Gandhi proclaimed a state of emergency under Article 352 of the constitution on the morning of 26 June, 1975 suspending the normal political process, but promising to return to normalcy as soon as conditions warranted it.\footnote{1}

During this emergency period the internal security Act and the prevention of publication of objectionable matter continued as potential threats to freedom of speech. Top leaders of the opposition parties were imprisoned. Thus the opposition was crushed and weakened to such an extent that it could not effectively contest in the elections.

The darkest hour of the night fore-shadows the down. Eternal Providence exceeding thought finds a way where none perceives. Sri Reddy bided his time in his farm- house eventually to emerge in the full aura and sunlight to reach the highest pinnacle of his political career in the memorable year, 1977.

At one time everyone felt that the political career of Sri Sanjiva Reddy had come to an end and that his future was permanently sealed. But the 1977 Mid-term polls to the Loksabha proved to be a turning point in his career. After the release of all the political leaders in quick succession during the emergency, and with the announcement of the dissolution of the Loksabha on the 19\textsuperscript{th} January,1977, in an unprecedented move and to the utter surprise of
even the shrewdest of the political pundits, all the main opposition party leaders like Sri Morarji Desai (Congress(o) ) Sri Charan Sing (B.L.D.) Sri A.B.Vajpayee (Jan Sangh) and Socialist Party leaders like Sri Raj Narayan, Sri Chandrasekhar and Sri George Fernandez and others rallied together and formed the Janata party under the leadership of Sri Jaya Prakash Narayan to offer strong and determined opposition to the Congress party. Despite elements had come under one political umbrella forgetting for the nonce their personality conflicts and ideological differences.

Sri Neelam sanjiva Reddy was entrusted with the challenging task of forming and building up of the Janata Party in the South. Sri Reddy constituted the Janata Party of Andhra Pradesh Unit with Sri Tenneti Viswanatham as chairman. From then onwards he conducted an intensive campaign in the entire south. In a sense, Dr.Reddy, came to be regarded as a pivot of the Janata Party in the south. Unfortunately Kamaraj was dead by that time and hence the responsibility fell on Sri Reddy. He expressed confidence that the new party would win.

The new–born Janata party set up 42 candidates in all the 42 constituencies in Andhra Pradesh against the Congress party but ironically, the Congress bagged all the seats except the lone Nandyal constituency, from which Sri Neelam Sanjiva Reddy was elected as the only Janata Party candidate for the entire Andhra Pradesh. Commenting on the election results Sri Reddy Jocularly likened the Congress Party’s winning of all the 41 seats to
“a body without a head” when Smt. Indira Gandhi was declared defeated, and Janata Party’s success to “a head without a body”. At the national level, however, the Janata strategy worked and the party emerged as the majority party in the Loksabha and formed a Government at the centre under the Prime ministership of Sri Morarji Desai, who was selected by J.P. Narayana and Acharya J.B. Kripalani, the veteran leaders to whom the choice of the leader was left.

Sri Reddy was unanimously elected as Speaker of the Lok Sabha. In course of time the question of the election of the President of India cropped up in view of the sudden demise of Fakruddin Ali Ahmad, the then President of India, in February, 1977. In the midst of election to the Lok Sabha Sri B.D. Jatti, the then Vice-President of India, was the Acting President. Speculation was rife as to who would be the next President of India.

In an unprecedented move, Sri Morarji Desai, the Prime minister of India, presented the panel of names for the President’s post to the leader of opposition, Y.B. Chavan, for consideration and perhaps with a view to obtaining unanimity. Dr. Neelam Sanjiva Reddy’s name did not appear in it. In the meanwhile Sri Desai expressed his personal preference for Mrs. Rukmini Arundel, a well-known exponent of Bharata Natyam (Dance) and Director of Kalakshetra of Adyar in Madras. On Sri Charan Sing’s insistence, the second panel was presented by Morarji Desai to the leader of the opposition party, in which Sri Neelam Sanjiva Reddy’s name was included.
Displaying characteristic sagacity and political shrewdness, Sri Reddy issued a statement even before the opposition Congress party was still considering the Prime minister's panel of names, that as speaker he would offer himself as candidate for the presidency, as proposed by the ruling party, only on the condition that he should be given a categorical assurance from the opposition parties that his election would be a unanimous one. Many politicians and indeed the elite in the country as well as the press considered Sanjiva Reddy's statement at that time as "premature" and "over-confident" but later they realized the wisdom and far-sighted thinking that lay behind it.

The leader of the opposition party, Y.B.Chavan was authorized by the A.I.C.C. President Sri Kasu Brahmananda Reddy to inform the Prime minister and his ruling party that the Congress would support the name of Sri Reddy to atone for the injustice done to him in 1969. There was grapevine in the political lobbies hinting at the possibility that Y.B.Chavan and Sri Kasu Brahmananda Reddy either did not consult Mrs.Gandhi who kept herself aloof in view of her defeat in the Lok Sabha elections from her Rai Beraily constituency, or ignored the alternative she had proposed to the candidature of Sri Reddy. In knowledgeable circles, this was construed as a first shot aimed at her political isolation from the Congress party itself in view of the fact that along with other ministers were kept in a humiliating position as non-entities during the infamous emergency.
Finally Sri Reddy was unanimously chosen as President. At the parliament House some of the stalwarts received Sri Sanjiva Reddy among others by the Prime minister, Morarji Desai, the Chief Justice of India M.H.Beg, the Speaker of the LokSabha K.S.Hegde and Deputy Chairman of Rajya Sabha R.N.Mirdha. A glittering swearing-in ceremony was held on Monday, the 25th July, 1977 at 10.00 A.M. in the historic high-boomed Central Hall of parliament House. He was sworn in as India’s sixth elected President before a distinguished assemblage. It was the auspicious hour 10.11 A.M. when the Chief Justice of India M.H.Beg administered the oath of office to the 64 years old former Speaker of the Lok Sabha. The various ceremonies were completed four minutes ahead of schedule. A 21-gun salute boomed as Sanjiva Reddy assumed office.

This had added a new meaning to the democratic process itself. All the News Papers welcomed his election. The *Times of India* commented “SANJIVA REDDY IS SIMPLE AND UNASSUMING,” *Hindustan Times* hailed him as a “MAN OF RUSTIC CANDOUR.” *Free Press Journal* called it “A HAPPY CHOICE”. *Deccan Herald* said “HOUSE’S LOSS IS NATION’S GAIN” *Tribune* hailed his “GENIUS FOR DOING THINGS BETTER THAN OTHERS “. *Hindustan Times* greeted him as “THE ONE WHO DESIDES”. Nothing succeeds like success!
What SanJiva Reddy lost in 1969, he got it in 1977. His long cherished ambition and desire materialized. His dream realized. With dint of his hard work and honesty he got this position.

It was indeed a singular and monumental event, in that a peasant from the farm in a remote village in Anantapur of the famine stricken Rayalaseema district rose to the highest office of the land by dint of his meritorious and selfless service to the nation. It was a memorable landmark in the history of India.

The first act of the president-designate manifesting the values of the rich cultural heritage of India as well as his own innate quality of humility was to go to his native village Illur, to receive the blessings of his dear old mother, Smt. Subbamma. “Matru Devobhava“ is one of the unanishadic injunctions in which Sri Sanjiva Reddy believed.

Sri Sanjiva Reddy did not like to live in the Rashtrapati Bhavan which was an awe-some, sprawling mansion-like building, designed by the famous British Architect Lutyens and previously used as the Vice-Roy’s residence with all its imperialistic traditions and regal grandeur. It is said that the standing Buddha of the 5th century in the Asoka Hall is as high as the top of India Gate which is three kilometers away. This place has 340 rooms stretching over a ground of nearly 350 acres. The building itself covers an area of 5 acres. It is a small township in which 1100 people lived and worked, containing
extensive playgrounds, a posh shopping centre, a veterinary hospital and a green wood land with flowers of many hues.

A brief description will serve as a sample of its splendour and its old-world flavor. There are over 450 persons employed as the house hold staff of Rastrapati Bhavan including the Durbar Hall where ceremonial receptions are held. One of its aesthetic attractions is its art collection comprising over 3500 pieces of sculpture, paintings, ceramics and miniatures. The kitchen caters to the varied palates of international culinary and gastronomic preferences. The Presidents regal bed was of 12 inches of spring topped by a 12 inch mattress. Everything was monarchial in style and splendour.

The resplendent ceremonies of Rastrapati Bhavan are replete with oriental pomp. The Republic Day is a grand occasion marked by elaborate and glittering ceremonies. In fact, Sri Sanjiva Reddy suggested that it should be celebrated on a less lavish scale and in different state capitals by rotation.

SANJIVA REDDY WAS MAN OF INDIVIDUALITY

At a public meeting held in the Public Gardens, Hyderabad, convened to felicitate the President, Sri Reddy frankly and almost bluntly declared without mincing matters, “I will not be a rubber Stamp president“. For the first time a president of India came out openly with his Individual views, proving to the free world outside that he was not a “Rubber Stamp” or a wire-pulled puppet. He began to speak his own voice, asserting his independence.
An incident which proved Sri Reddy’s steadfast loyalty to Nehru was his visit to the Shantivan (Nehru’s Samadhi) in New Delhi in 1977 on Nehru’s birth day, 14th November. Smt. Gandhi who was then in political wilderness, had visited her father’s Samadhi (Shantivan) in the early hours of the morning along with her family members. To her pleasant surprise, Mrs.Gandhi found the President of India, Dr. Reddy already sitting reverentially before the Samadhi and offering his prayers. The President and Smt. Gandhi were later joined by Y.B.Chavan, the opposition leader and Kasu BrahmanandaReddy, the A.I.C.C. President and other celebrities. Curiously enough, none from the Janata Cabinet felt like honouring the soul of this great departed leader. But SanjivaReddy, was not afraid of taking a lonely road.

Many people wondered how the members of the Janata Cabinet and the party might have felt on the President’s public display of his reverence for Pandit Nehru. They were piqued by the fact that Mrs. Gandhi was invited by the British people to London to be the Chief Guest at a function on 14th November, 1978, Jawaharlal Nehru’s birthday. But the Janata leaders’ indifference to the memory of a great son of India whom Mahatma Gandhi, chose to describe as the “Jewel of India”, Rabindranath Tagore hailed as “Rithuraj” and John F. Kennedy had considered as the “Abraham Lincoln of the World’ created a disgusting impression among the people. One could understand Janata leaders’ disdain for Mrs. Gandhi but one would never
appreciate their disrespect for Jawaharlal Nehru, the acknowledged leader of the people and the unquestioned architect of modern India.

The President’s visit to Shantivan, as the first dignitary to pay respects to Nehru despite his awareness that he had been the Janata candidate, was proof of his individuality. This courage of his conviction enhanced Sri Reddy’s standing among the people. He believed that national heroes should be kept above party politics and narrow concepts of partisanship, and that it is not fair to consider them as partymen. When a person occupies a post like that of a Speaker or President of India he should forget his narrow party affiliations. So it indicates that Sanjiva Reddy was a man of Independent thought and action. He assessed things properly and rightly. Previously there was no any president like this. So in this way he brought name and fame to this position

HE WAS AGAINST LANGUAGE CHAUVUNISM

As President he was bold and unconventional. Time and again he did not hesitate to get involved in controversies and contentious issues by giving vent to his feelings, unmindful of the consequences. On one occasion, the President attended a public function as the Chief Guest. It was organized by a well-known academic body in New Delhi. In the course of the meeting the head of the concerned institution read his report in classical Hindi and the other speakers also delivered their speeches in chaste Hindi as if to demonstrate their linguistic affinities, although they knew that the Chief Guest belonged to a non-Hindi speaking area and it was a mixed audience of several language groups.
Sri Reddy wanted to check their chauvinism and linguistic fanaticism and make them understand how embarrassing it would be for others to listen to anything in an incomprehensible language. On purpose, he deviated from the prepared text and delivered a part of his inaugural address in Telugu, his mother tongue, to teach the organizers a lesson. It was a bitter pill.

Even today, the Union Ministers and M.Ps hailing from the Hindi belt little realize that their over-anxiety to push up Hindi at the expense of the regional languages is responsible to some extent for stiff resistance in the South. They should realize that any attempt to suppress English in order to secure accelerated spread of Hindi will boomerang on them and result in further national disintegration. The way the 3-language formula has been scuttled in the North has provided grist to the political mills of the regional parties. Sri Reddy has often warned the country against the dangers of such a shortsighted policy. He had advised the Members of Parliament from the South on several occasions to speak in a language that would be understood by all the Members. He knew that the three-language formula was a farce in the Hindi belt and that only southern states took it seriously. In fact, Jawaharlal Nehru was helpless under the relentless pressure of the pro-Hindi lobby.

SANJIVA REDDY FACED UNPRECEDENTED SITUATION

Things happen in the political career of some leaders forcing them to face challenging and perplexing situations marked by constitutional crises. Such an unprecedented situation arose in July/August, 1979 owing to the
tabling of a no-confidence motion in the Lok Sabha by the Leader of the Opposition Y.B. Chavan on the eve of the monsoon session of the parliament in July 1979. Even before the motion was set for debate and put to vote, members from Bharatiya Lok Dal, constituent of Janata Parliamentary party led by Sri Raj Narain, who was second in command, began to cross the floor of the House (Lok Sabha) and finally requested the Speaker Sri Hegde to allot separate seats for them on the opposition side under the banner of Janata (Secular). But curiously the leader of the B.L.D.constituent Sri Charan Singh, continued to remain in the Janata Government as Deputy Prime Minister with Finance Portfolio. The situation grew curioser and curioser and finally led to the resignation of Sri Morarji Desai from the Prime Ministership, paving the way for Sri Charan Singh’s exit from the Janata Party and joining the Janata (S) to become its leader in the Lok Sabha.

Then arose in the country a crisis the like of which no previous President had ever faced. As luck would have it, there had all along existed in India a strong, stable and homogenous congress Party Government at the Centre. Sri Reddy was called upon to solve the constitutional crisis. Although he was known for his speedy decision-making, he had to weigh and balance all considerations. As there were no precedents to guide him, he was left to his own resources. He rose to the occasion and proved his grit by handling and solving the crisis without fear or flinching, guided by his desire “to protect and preserve the integrity of the nation”.
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After holding a series of consultations with the various groups and political personalities, the President decided to follow the British convention, and invited Y.B. Chavan, Leader of Opposition, perhaps to Chavan’s and his Party’s pleasant surprise, and offered him the first chance to explore the ways and means to form a viable alternative Government. Thus he set the ball rolling. After four days of hectic politicking, consultations and in-camera meetings with Sri Charan Singh and other Party leaders (with the exception of Mrs. Gandhi’s Congress (I) Parliamentary Party Leader Sri Stephen) Sri Chavan pleaded his inability to from a Government. Then started a series of meetings and talks among the leaders of the splinter groups which had made the task of the President more difficult.

In the meanwhile Jayaprakash Narayan, who was suffering from acute kidney trouble and was kept on dialysis in his home town, Patna, addressed a communication to Sri Morarji Desai requesting him to step down from the leadership of the Janata Parliamentary Party and see that Sri Jagjivan Ram was elected in his place. The quest for unity was in vain. Sri Desai struck to his guns and refused to relinquish his leadership of Janata Parliamentary Party and sent Sri S. Chandrasekhar, the Janata Party President and others as emissaries to the President with a view to persuading him to invite him (Sri Morarji) again to form the Government much to the amusement of even the layman in the street and to the embarrassment of the President himself.
Then Sri Charan Singh challenged the contention of Sri Morarji Desai, who resigned as Prime Minister even before facing the impending no-confidence motion tabled by Y.B. Chavan, and dubbed Morarji’s plea to the President as totally unethical and un-Gandhian.

The President in the meantime was holding consultations with constitutional experts and legal luminaries including Sri Deftari, Sri Shakdar, Sri Nani, A. Palkhivala, a few professors in the Jawaharlal Nehru University, the Attorney General and the like and even looked into the famous works on parliamentary executive system and also the recorded events in the British Parliamentary History. At this juncture, Sri S. Chandrasekhar, who had confabulations with Sri Morarji, allegedly announced that he would contest the leadership of Janata Parliamentary wing in case Sri Morarji Desai resigned. Any sensible person with a modicum of commonsense and political sense could easily discern the motives behind their consultations held incamera especially those of Sri Morarji Desai and perhaps Sri S. Chandrasekhar.

One could hardly escape the inference that they were bent upon preventing Sri Jagjivan Ram from becoming the leader of the Janata Parliamentary Party. It was perhaps too late when they sponsored him. This absolutely selfish act on their part drove the last nail as it were, on the coffin of the Janata Party. Even Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narain could not forge unity in the ranks of the Janata Party which Mrs. Gandhi dubbed in derision “a rag-tag
party and a patch-work quilt” a hatch-potch combination of splinter groups with no common programme7.

The President summoned both Sri Morarji Desai and Sri Charan Singh to Rashtrapati Bhavan and asked them to submit their lists of supporters within 24 hours. But Sri Morarji Desai seemed to have pleaded with the President for extension of time by 48 hours, to which the President did not commit himself in any way either orally or in writing. He remained silent when Sri Desai made his plea for extension of time. The next day by 4.00 p.m Sri Charan Singh sent the list of his supporters to the President through his emissaries including Sri Raj Narain. Immediately Sri Morarji received a telephone message from Rashtrapati Bhavan to send his list of supporters within the stipulated period. Sri Morarji was obviously unprepared. He argued with the President on the question of time-limit to submit the list of his supporters.

Sri Morarji Desai asked his followers to prepare the list within 30 minutes and during that hurried preparation, he phoned for support even to Sri Devraj Urs, a person on whom he himself had foisted charges and appointed the Grover Commission of enquiry. In that hurriedly prepared list of Morarji’s supporters the President found nearly fifty names of the M.P.s who had extended support to Sri Charan Singh.

It is difficult for any one, who had tasted power, to give it up under any circumstances. Power is like the Medusa’s head. Whoever has looked on her siren face, can no longer turn his gaze away, but remains for ever under its
magic spell. It causes intoxication stronger than any alcoholic drink. History shows that among thousands and thousands of rulers there were only a few who voluntarily renounced power. The temptation to play providence to millions of people is almost irresistible. Buddha, Asoka, Sulla, Charles V and Edward the Eighth are honorable exceptions. As little as a gambler can abstain from the cards-table, the drug addict from pot or marijuana, the hunter from the chase, can a politician abstain from pursuit of power. It may be very difficult for a king but it is impossible for a common man who is swept up by the wave of democracy or the vagaries of the ballot box to give up power.

The next day the President summoned those fifty M.Ps whose names figured in both the lists of Sri Morarji and Sri Charan Singh. After ascertaining the views of Mrs. Gandhi in writing that she and her group were supporting Sri Charan Singh, the President invited Sri Charan Singh to explore the possibilities of forming an alternative Government. Then, after holding consultations with Sri Kamlapathi Tripathi, Mr. C. M. Stephen, Mrs. Gandhi and some others the President asked Sri Charan Singh to form a Government.

However, the President asked Sri Charan Singh to prove his majority in the Lok Sabha as early as possible, say, in a fortnight. The Lok Sabha was summoned especially for this purpose on 20.08.79. In the meanwhile Sri Morarji Desai stepped down from the leadership and Sri Jagjivan Ram who was elected as the leader of the Janata Parliamentary Party wing tabled a no-confidence motion against the Charan Singh Ministry. Till 10.30 a.m. of 20th
August, 1979, Sri Charan Singh was kept in agonizing suspense by Mrs. Gandhi, who finally sent a missive to Mr. Charan Singh to the effect that her party extended its support to him only to the extent of his forming the Government but not for running the Government and as such her party had decided to withdraw its support. In his letter dated July 16, 1979, Mr. Ram Jhetmalani already warned Charan Singh about the consequences of his action. He said “After Mrs. Gandhi has used you she will spit you like a sucked orange”.

Mrs. Gandhi’s crucial letter was a bombshell to Mr. Charan Singh. He had to submit his resignation letter to the President in which as Prime Minister he also advised the President to dissolve the Lok Sabha. He did not face the Parliament’s vote. Mr. Charan Singh who proclaimed on the day of his appointment as Prime Minister, that his life’s ambition was fulfilled, would hardly occupy his seat as Prime Minister in Lok Sabha for a few seconds since the President after receiving his letter asked the Speaker to adjourn the House sine-die.

Later on Sri Jagjivan Ram began to lay claim for the Prime Ministership but, in the meantime, this traumatic drama which assumed the proportions of the theatre of the absurd, brought down the image of India in the comity of nations. It also internally raised among the people a question why the Lok Sabha could not be dissolved and fresh elections ordered. The President who studied the pulse of the public and who was equally concerned with the image
and welfare of the nation, finally summoned Sri Jaghivan Ram and Sri Chandrasekhar. After enquiring from them which group was supporting and Sri Jaghjivan Ram stating that he wanted to prove his majority on the floor of the House, he was convinced about their inability to form a government and took the painful decision to dissolve the Lok Sabha.

Prior to the decision, he had a talk with S.L.Shakdar the Chief Election Commissioner, on the possibility of holding mid-term poll as early as possible. Finally he asked Mr. Charan Singh to continue as interim care-taker-Prime Minister. It was not improbable that the President might have consulted the three service chiefs in his capacity as the Supreme Commander of the Defense Forces, regarding the law-and-order situation, because in such a crisis he had to prepare for the worst while hoping for the best.

Expectedly, this bold decision and announcement of the President produced mixed reactions. Generally, the President’s decision was widely acclaimed by the already disgusted people who heaved a sigh of relief as the curtain fell on the suspenseful political drama involving defections galore, log-rolling and horse-trading, display of rank opportunism and ruthless machinations. One was amazed at the hints thrown by Sri Jaghivan Ram before the dissolution of Lok Sabha to the effect that he had no compunctions even to meet Mrs. Gandhi in soliciting her party’s support in staking his claims for premiership. Equally astounding was the telephonic call alleged to have been sent by Sri Chandra Sekhar to Mrs. Gandhi extending congratulations on
her party’s decision to withdraw its support to Sri Charan Singh’s Government on 20\textsuperscript{th} August, 1979. Although some people did not like it, the President’s decision by and large, reflected the thinking of the detached observers of the political scenario. They thought that enough was enough and the numbers game should be terminated.

However, the reaction of Janata Party leaders to the President’s decision crossed all limits of decency and decorum. They all gathered in the evening of that fateful day before the closed iron gates of Rashtrapati Bhavan and held a demonstration agitating against the President’s decision to dissolve the Lok-Sabha. While addressing the gathering Sri Chandrasekhar went to the extent of hurling abuses at the President. He indulged in personal slander and cheap mudslinging, describing the President as “a small man in a big chair” and “a small Fuehrer” and revealed his long-harbored and little-concealed ill feelings towards Sri Reddy\textsuperscript{10}.

Sri Jagjivan Ram who was found for the first time out of power (since 1946 he was in office) arrived at the gates of Rashtrapati Bhavan for an interview with the President. The President sent word to Sri Jagjivan Ram through his Secretary that the President was too busy to grant an interview at that time. Sri Jagjivan Ram lost his patience and over-reacted to the situation by openly attributing to the President casteism besides alleging that the President had displayed a vindictive attitude and wreaked vengeance on him for not supporting him in the 1969 presidential elections.
Here Jagjivan Ram expressed his opinion and displeasure on the decision of President. Those were the critical days when Rastrapati Bhavan became the focus of the attention of the whole world and it was recognized that its occupant was not a figure-head. Those were the moments into which is much of the essence of history was compressed. By day and by night, at board and in bed, the President was watched. All eyes were on him. Top-most leaders of the country and political stalwarts paid several visits and made oral and written representation to the President who was also the Supreme Commander of the Armed force. For the first time, the public became aware of the importance of the post and the extent of the President power. Sanjiva Reddy justified his decision according to following matter.

Accordingly, on the morning of 22 August, the Cabinet Secretary, the Secretary to the Prime Minister, the Secretary to the President, and a few other senior officers met at my instance in Rashtrapati Bhavan to prepare the necessary drafts for dissolution of the Lok Sabha and to work out other consequential arrangements.

While the above mentioned officials were at work, Jagjivan Ram and Chandrashckhar of the Janata Party called on me at 11.30 a.m. in response to my invitation. It was my intention to talk to them informally about the political situation as I saw it. In the course of the talk, when the two leaders pressed the claim of Jagjivan Ram to form a Government. I asked them whether there was any promise to support to Jagjivan Ram from any other party. Jagjivan Ram
replied that there were no parties and that they had all broken up. He promised
to submit a list of his supporters once he was called upon to form a
Government. I pointed out that was not the method I had earlier adopted. I
made it clear that all major parties except Janata had in writing asked for
dissolution of the Lok Sabha and a fresh poll. The interview lasted about
fifteen minutes. Jagjivan Ram had nothing new to tell me, and felt that my
tentative decision on the basis of which action had been initiated called for no
change. As they were leaving, Chandrashekhar said that he would come and
see me again. I said that there was no hurry and that he was always welcome.
By these words which I had uttered in good faith I only meant that he need not
be in a hurry to call on me again, though he was always welcome. I had not
implied at all that I was not in a hurry to come to a decision in regard to the
prevailing political situation. Unfortunately, an unintended construction was
put on my words, as later events showed. I could not possibly have intended
by those words to convey any such impression when I had already made up my
mind and further when I had instructed senior officers to initiate action to give
effect to my decision and when they had begun drafting the necessary
notifications, Press Notes, and other material.

In retrospect I wonder whether I should have invited them at all to see
me. The construction put upon some words uttered by me casually and in good
faith was unfortunate indeed.
A Press communiqué was issued in the afternoon to say that the President had, under sub-clause (b) of Clause (ii) of Article 85 of the Constitution of India, dissolved the Lok sabha. It was also indicated that elections would be held during the period November-December 1979.

According to above explanation of Sanjiva Reddy, he did not display any vindictive attitude towards Jagjivan Ram.

The President's decision to dissolve the House and his refusal to commission Jagjivan Ram to form a government was strongly criticized by the Janata Party leaders and some jurists sympathetic to the Janata Party. According to them the advice of a Cabinet which had never obtained a Vote of Confidence from the Lok Sabha was not binding on the President. But the Constitution as amended by Indira Gandhi and further modified by the Janata Government, made it clear beyond all doubt that the President was bound by the advice of the Cabinet. The Constitution did not provide for the special situation such as the one which arose in August 1979. Of course the President could have dismissed Charan Singh. But whom could he have invited to form the Government? Jagjivan Ram commanded the support of only 203 members.

Sanjiva Reddy gave explanation in his book No other party was prepared to support him. In fact all Parties except the Janata Party had come to the conclusion that midterm poll was the only answer. They had conveyed their view to the President.
The orchestra did not end with that. Sri Atal Behari Vajpayee finally appeared on the scene in the company of Sri Chandrasekhar and with his customary rhetoric declared that the President played a conspiratorial role joining hands with Sri Charan Singh and Mrs. Indira Gandhi. He made it almost an electoral plank that if his party was voted to power, the first thing they would do was to impeach the President, little realizing that such a statement would only sully the image of the highest office of the land and would not bring any credit to himself. Perhaps in their desperate mood they were not able to discern the damage they were causing to the august office of the President vis-à-vis, the country.

Their intemperate fuming and fulminations against the President’s public image passed with more noise than damage. In fact, they damaged the interests of their own party. They railed against their chosen President (of their own party) because the President perhaps rose above the partisan political thinking by virtue of his position as symbolic head of the state and acted in a way that was not to their liking. After all, it was the faction-ridden politicians who were solely responsible for creating a situation which left the President with no alternative except to dissolve the Parliament to stem the rot and restore dignity to Government. They had a golden opportunity when the people elected them. But they threw it away by indulging in petty squabbles and mutual hatred. It was a sad situation, indeed.
However, when the President took the drastic step of dissolving the Lok Sabha, strangely they were united in blaming him. They did not look upon the decisions with either charity or philosophical resignation. They did not even concede that the President had the right to exercise his discretion in such an imbroglio, and act according to his own conscience in the absence of a constitutional precedent. According to Sub-clause 2 of Article 75 of the Indian Constitution: “Ministers shall hold office during the pleasure of the President”. Of course the President’s powers are the subject of national debate.

After their noisy demonstration before the Rashtrapatibhavan iron gates, the frustrated Janata leaders particularly Sri Jagjivan Ram, and Sri Chandrasekhar dispatched a lengthy letter to the President criticizing the dissolution of Lok Sabha, on the plea that the President granted four days to Sri Y.B. Chavan, and nearly 20 days to Sri Charan Singh whereas Sri Jagjivan Ram was denied even a few hours. To this lengthy letter the President sent a laconic one sentence reply. “The version given in your letter is not the correct version”.

Obviously, this curt reply from the Head of the state, though appreciated by some, led the group of Sri Jagjivan Ram, Sri Chandrasekhar and other Janata leaders into uncontrollable fury and they began to issue scurrilous statements to the press. The President in all dignity and decorum that goes with the highest office of the land chose to remain silent. It is learnt that before the President decided to dissolve the parliament, Mr. Daftari, the constitutional
expert went to him and said “The country is passing through a long crisis. The price of an M.P. is increasing day by day on the bargaining counter. For god’s sake, take a decision immediately”

For the first time in the annals of Independent India, the Rashtrapati Bhavan became the focus of attention and the President was found to discharge his functions as the real Chief executive in a decisive way. To put it in another way, President Sanjiva Reddy had the opportunity and courage to discharge his functions as Chief Executive or Head of the State. He lived upto the oath the Presidents are administered during the swearing-in ceremony on the day of assuming the high office, that is “to preserve, defend and protect the state and the constitution without fear or favour, in word, deed and spirit”. The President maintained that he acted in good faith and according to his conscience.

Hitherto the President had faced occasions like external emergencies and internal emergencies but they were able to act in accordance with the presidential oath safely on the advice of the Prime Minister who commanded a comfortable majority in the parliament. But India had for the first time a President who was forced to take a decision by circumstances which could not be visualized even by the architects and founding fathers of the Constitution, with no elected Prime Minister to advise, aid and assist and with no precedent for guidance. It was left to the President again for the first time to pick out and appoint the Prime Minister, a prerogative not even the French President under
The President allowed his detractors to vent their spleen and let off their steam. At last he broke his stoic silence during his visit to Tirupathi, the abode of his favourite deity Lord Venkateswara, when he inaugurated the Silver Jubilee Celebrations of Sri Venkateswara University in September, 1979. He said in reply to the persistent questions of the press men; “I acted according to my conscience in dissolving the Lok Sabha and ordering the Mid-term poll”\textsuperscript{17}. There were some disinterested constitutional experts who defended the dissolution of the Lok Sabha, for example Dr. Bhambrhi, Professor of Public Administration in the Jawaharlal Nehru University; Delhi supported the President’s action. In the “Spotlight” programme of the All India Radio he said that the President’s decision was justified because he was confronted with an unprecedented constitutional crisis which could not be anticipated by the Founding Fathers of the Constitution and there was no readymade solution for it in the text of the supreme law of the land (Constitutional Law). Some argued that the President was forced by a peculiar combination of circumstances and the most unpredictable political turmoil resulting in the existence of a Prime Minister and council of Ministers who were not constitutionally legalized by proving their majority in the Lok Sabha, in view of the fact that Mr. Charan Singh submitted his resignation to the President a few minutes before the Parliament was about to meet and in his letter written in his capacity as Prime
Minister recommenced to the President the dissolution of the Lok Sabha, to which advice the President was conventionally bound.

Every coin has two sides – the obverse and the reverse. Let us examine the other side of the case, that is, why then the President chose to invite Sri Jagjivan Ram and Sri Chandrasekhar on that fateful day, when Dr. Reddy seemed to have already made up his mind to dissolve the Lok Sabha which was evident from his early morning talks with the chief Election commissioner, Sri S.L. Shakder? Was it only to rub the salt on the already existing wound, which wound being, the way Sri Morarji was caught unawares on his 48 hour extension plea? Or was it a deliberate, a well-calculated and preconceived move on the part of the President, who certainly is not a novice in the art of politics? Was it meant to be a slap on Sri Jagjivan Ram’s face for the latter’s opposition to Sri Reddy in 1969 Presidential Poll?

The President said that even then, by way of abundant caution, he summoned Sri Jagjivan Ram, the newly elected leader of the Janata Parliamentary Party in the Lok Sabha and Sri S. Chandrasekhar the Janata Party President, to explore the possibilities of forming an alternative Government. But obviously these leaders could not convince the President that they commanded a majority in the Lok Sabha and as such the President had no other alternative left before him except to dissolve the Lok Sabha. In one sense, it was according to the principle of equity based on the dictates of his conscience, reflecting the feelings of the majority of the people of the country.
This being so, what made Mr. Reddy, the President, summon the two leaders just before his act of dissolution of Lok Sabha, is a matter that merits further analysis. First of all where was the need for summoning Sri Jagjivan Ram, since there would have been no end, if the President went on inviting one after another, all freshly elected leaders of the Janata Party after the inability of the party's previous leader in mopping up his supporters?

First of all, it was ridiculous on the part of Sri Moraiji Desai to have chosen to cling to the Janata Parliamentary Party's leadership even after his resignation to the Prime Minister ship. Probably Sri Jagjivan Ram, despite his being a very shrewd politician, failed to smell the rat even then and more so even after rejection of the advice of Jayaprakash Narain who gave a timely and sensible directive to Sri Moraiji Desai to step down from the leadership of the Janata Parliamentary Party in favour of Sri Jagjivan Ram. Political observers felt that Sri Morarji ought to have relinquished party leadership immediately after his resignation of the Prime Ministership and proposed the name of Sri Jagjivan Ram or any other leading figure from Janata Parliamentary Party like Sri Atal Behari Vajpayee or Sri Chandrasekhar to the post instead of staking his claim again and pleading before the President for invitation to form the Government once again.

Had Sri Morarji done that, even before being directed by Sri Jayaprakash Narayan who was lying on his death bed, and had the President denied him a chance, well then, there would have been some meaning and
substance in their criticism of the President’s decision. Even then the President was under no obligation to invite every newly elected leader from the party which lost its majority on account of wholesale and mass-scale defections. The safest and the most dignified course they ought to have adopted were to keep away from the fray after Sri Morarji’s exit not only from the Prime Ministership but also from the very leadership of the Janata Parliamentary party itself. Such an honorable step and noble gesture would have evoked respect and sympathy from the public. It required a lot of good sense, political sense and common sense to do the right thing at the right time. It is not to say that Machiavellianism is the only means to resort to; but at the same time one cannot avoid it altogether. Otherwise it is not politics.

Viewing the matter from all the angles, one may have to infer that if (at all) the President had invited Jagjivan Ram and Chandrasekhar, it could have been only as a last resort to avoid the huge expenditure and the political turmoil involved in a Mid-term poll. The President, however, did not go through such a formality since, like any political observer, he might have come to know by that time that none could be in a position to form a Ministry without the support of Mrs. Gandhi (Cong-I) who in her turn was determined to face the Mid-term poll to cash in on the disgust and revulsion generated among the public by the incessant internecine quarrels within the Janata Party and what appeared like witch-hunting of Mrs. Gandhi who was out of power. Besides, it
was the time when she was required to go through the traumatic experience of facing the slow-motion but tortuous proceedings of the Shaw Commission.

There has been a murmur in certain circles that had the President given an opportunity to Sri Jagjivan Ram regardless of the number of M.Ps behind him, Sri Jagjivan Ram with his experience, maneuverability and the loaves and fishes of office (Prime Ministership) at his disposal for liberal distribution on 'pick-and-choose' basis, could have stabilized his position as Prime Minister and the Mid-term poll with its colossal expenditure and the political turmoil associated with it, could have been easily avoided. Presuming, without conceding, that Sri Jagjivan Ram would have been able to manoeuvre and manipulate, it would have been a step in the wrong direction, because it would have aggravated the already unsettled condition by foisting a Prime Minister without a majority, and encouraging all sorts of wire-pulling, money-changing, floor-crossing, defections galore and sordid manipulations. Sri Reddy as President had to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution. Madhu Limaye’s letter published in The Hindu dated 9.5.1987 perhaps shows the correct position justifying the painful decision taken by President Sanjiva Reddy.

He believed in standards and a self-regulated code of ethics in politics as is evident from his own earlier record. As he knew the pulse of the people, whose faith in the efficacy of the democratic polity was diminishing day by day, he thought that drastic deceases required desperate remedies. This being
so, reluctantly he decided to give the choice to the people (Electorate) who are the ultimate arbiters of India's destiny. Expense there would be but it was unavoidable. Perhaps the correctness of his stand was vindicated by the subsequent events and the emergence of a strong, stable and viable government after the Mid-term elections.

The Janata leader's contention that it was the President's subjective predilections that prevented a Harijan from becoming the Prime Minister, which would have gone a long way in satisfying the soul of Mahatma Gandhi is no doubt a grandiloquent sentiment but it did not carry conviction with the people at large, because every one watched the political drama that unfolded in its successive stages. As Mrs. Gandhi reportedly said in an election meeting at Chittore, it was Sri Chandrasekhar who by his announcement after his consultations with Sri Morarji Desai that he would contest the leadership of the Janata Parliamentary Party that perhaps made Sri Jagjivan Ram's position difficult. However, it was II in the realm of speculation.

The repeated utterances of the Janata Leaders on impeaching the President did not redound to their credit. Obviously, they did not realize that such loose talk and careless utterances would bring down the very image of the party as well as that of the nation and would eventually; jeopardize their chances of getting elected in the Mid-poll. On the other hand, Mrs. Gandhi who was always quick to seize an opportunity, made it clear in her election speeches that she and her party were against the very thought of impeachment.
As for the Janata, and from the view-point of their own election prospects, it was a little unwise on their part to have unleashed such strong criticism against a President of their own choice and of their own party.

The irony is that Mrs. Gandhi, who had been accused by these leaders in the Janata clique (then congress (o)) of letting down Sri Reddy in the 1969 Presidential Elections, was then castigated by the same people for supporting the President’s stance and for opposing their impeachment proposal. As the Janata Government’s track record was not very bright and its leaders were caught in the vortex of internal squabbles and factions pulling in different directions, Mrs. Gandhi discreetly promised to the nation in her election speeches “a Government that works”. This timely slogan caught the imagination of the people and raised their expectations.

Everyone knows that in a democracy where there is universal franchise without universal literacy (not to speck to the capacity for discrimination) people are fed upon empty slogans and rabblerousing emotions. All that the leaders have to do is to change the slogan when its gloss dims and it becomes stale. As expected, Mrs. Gandhi and her party were swept back into power. The tide turned in their favour. The slogan of “Garibi Hatao” was replaced by “A Government that works”. Slogans and the negative vote did the trick. Illiteracy of the voters is always exploited in India to such an extent that one suspects that the Governments have a vested interest in illiteracy.
President Sanjiva Reddy was capable of being firm and flexible as the circumstances warranted. He expected reasonably high standards in public life. When he was critical, his humour was incisive. While openly commenting on Sri Charan Singh’s Kisan Rally arranged by his cohorts on his birthday perhaps to impress and intimidate Sri Morarji Desai, the then Prime Minister and his followers in Janata conglomerate Government, the President, who was himself a Kisan, remarked humorously that those who never wielded the plough in their life-time styled themselves as Kisans and leaders of Kisans.

This reminds us of an interesting episode about which we heard from a reliable source. There was a meeting of the Congress Working Committee in Sardar Patel’s residence at Delhi in 1949. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru entered the meeting place and on seeing the members who were present, cracked a joke. He said: “the only kisan in India is N.G. Ranga and the only bachelor in India is Shankar Rao Deo (Secretary of A.I.C.C.)!” Sardar Patel quipped: “The only Nationalist Muslim in India is Jawaharlal Nehru”! Everyone laughed and even Maulana Azad seemed to have enjoyed the joke. But Nehru’s face turned red.

In Chandigarh (in 1980-81) President Sanjiva Rrddy lamented: I am becoming sick of it” (he meant Rastrapati Bhavan) and indeed “counting days to go back to my native occupation”. Such off-and-on observations of the President showed that he was not the sort to cling to power. He gave ample proof of his earnestness by resigning several times before. Although he was not
averse to power, he was not hooked on it. Certainly he was not an unprincipled opportunist. In fact he displayed many a time his sensitiveness and self-respect even at the risk of losing his power. Perhaps it is this ethical or ready-to-renounce aspect of his character that was mainly responsible for his not being able to continue in any post for a complete term and that was why his political career had been a sporadic and chequered one.

On many occasions, he summoned the Union Ministers and asked them to convince him before he accorded the Presidential as sent to ordinances or bills. He exercised the “three powers“ that were conferred, in Walter Baghot’s classic, “English Constitution” as the constitutional head of the State, namely, “to advise“, “to caution“ and “to cheer up“ the ministers. During the caretaker-government of Sri Charan Sing, a bill on the Preventive Detention Ordinance was presented in a casual and matter-of-fact manner, taking his approval for granted. Mrs. Gandhi went to the extent of saying that it would be unwise on the part of the President to accord his assent to the politically motivated and highly controversial ordinance.

They perhaps thought that the President would append his seal in a mechanical manner as it was expected of a titular figure-head. To their surprise, he ordered the Charan Sing Government to place before him the Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting which discussed and finalized the Ordinance. It was only after the Deputy Prim Minister and Home Minister Y.B.Chavan explained to the President in detail, and gave the necessary clarifications in
writing, that the President accorded his conditional assent directing the Government to refrain from using the ordinance against political leaders. This significant reservation had rocked the ship of Charan Sing’s Government without wrecking it.

The President had received appreciative comments from all sections of society for asserting himself. But the question was being asked by some people whether the President would assert his authority and exercise Bagehot’s three powers when Mrs. Gandhi returned to power, implying there by that Sri Sanjiva Reddy could afford to exercise his authority as an assertive President because of comparatively “safe “ Prime Minister like Sri Morarji Desai and Sri Charan Singh. Every one felt that Sri Reddy might not have a smooth sailing with his wonted aggressiveness when Mrs.Gandhi was back in the saddle. In other words, they thought that he would hold the stirrup for her.

After the results of the 1980 Mid-term poll to the Lok Sabha were announced, the President chose to send a congratulatory communication to Mrs Gandhi on the resounding victory of her party, setting aside the protocol. It was another controversial matter. Those who knew him knew that he never hesitated to do what he wanted. Earlier when he was Speaker of Lok Sabha, he received Jaya Prakash Narayan who did not possess any official status. He was not a political Hamlet. Nor did he act in indecent haste.
Neither too flexible nor too rigid

Sri Neelam Sanjiva Reddy silenced the prophets of doom who had entertained doubts about the President’s assertion of not being a rubber stamp, especially in the changed political situation, after Mrs. Gandhi’s return to power. He was neither too flexible nor too rigid. He was never known for his sycophancy. Even, when he was in humbler positions he never know-towed before his superiors. He was a stickler to discipline and proprieties. When Mrs. Gandhi returned to power on 14th January, 1980, her cabinet’s recommendation for dissolution of nine state assemblies on the basis of the Janata precedent, supported by the Supreme Court’s verdict in 1977, was duly approved by the President and President’s rule was imposed till the Mid-term Polls for those states were over.

Later on, the President, after spending a few days in his native town, Anantapur, to celebrate “Ugadi” (The Telugu New Year Day) in the company of his kin returned to the Capital. During the absence of the President, the Central Cabinet took a decision to dissolve the Delhi Metropolitan Council which was dominated by Jan Sangh. The draft ordinance was sent to the Air Port through the Minister of State for Home Affairs, Sri Pendekanti Venkata Subbaiah for the President’s approval. On being shown the draft ordinance the President advised Sri Pendekanti Venkata Subbaiah to get the papers to the Rashtrapati Bhavan after lunch. It was a polite way of pointing out the need to observe proprieties of time and place. Accordingly, the Minister placed the
papers before the President in the afternoon. After going through the constitutional modalities and ascertaining certain clarifications from the Minister, Sri Reddy, accorded the Presidential assent. 

The human side of his personality could be seen in the way he cancelled his programme in Anantapur (after Sri Reddy’s usual visit to Tirumala to offer prayers to Lord Venkateswara on his birthday) and air-dashed to New Delhi, on hearing the news of Snjay Gandhi’s (son of Mrs. Indira Gandhi) unnatural death in an air accident. From the Palam Air-port, the President went straight to Mrs. Gandhi’s official residence at No.1 Safdarjung Road on 23rd June, 1980, to console her. After laying the customary wreath on Sanjay’s body, the President affectionately took the two closed palms of Mrs. Gandhi in his hand and bowed in deep sympathy. It was a touching scene — a spontaneous gesture to comfort the bereaved mother. It moved everyone, more so Mrs. Gandhi who followed the Rashtrapati upto his car and saw him off. Few expected that Sri Reddy, who once expressed his agony and disapproval for the questionable ways of Sanjay Gandhi and his followers, would to this. He was tender-hearted. “Nil nisi bonum ad mortui” (Nothing but good about the dead)

Everyone knew that Mrs. Indira Gandhi’s debacle at the hustings in 1977 — was due not only to the excesses committed during the period of emergency but also to her younger son’s conduct as an extra-constitutional authority. Yet we cannot blame her entirely for her authoritarian style of functioning. She was encouraged to adopt that style by a cohort of spineless
politicians – practiced sycophants – who cast aside all dignity and self-respect to wangle favours from her. These servile men behaved like King Canute’s courtiers in the story, to please the Prime Minister.

**He expressed displeasure on growing corruption**

Once President Sanjiva Reddy wrote a letter to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi expressing his displeasure with the growing corruption in the party and the Government. She sent a reply making special reference to the record of sacrifice of her own family members for the country. She wrote about her own grand-father, father and herself. Then the President sent her another letter in which he pointed out to her that the members of the Nehru family were not the only people who made sacrifices for the country and there were several greatmen like C. Rajagopalachary and Tanguguturi Prakasam who were known for their sacrifice. He added “There were thousands of unknown men all over the country but for whose whole-hearted participation in the freedom struggle, in response to Gandhiji’s cell, the country might not have achieved independence at all. Many of them had to sell their properties to support themselves and their families. Not only had they to undergo privation during their life time but their families are now living in penury. On the other hand, some of us who are living today have the good fortune of reaping the benefit of their sacrifice”\(^{21}\).
Warned on economic disparities

It is common knowledge that a large percentage of India’s population remains today below the poverty-line not because there is no production but because something is seriously wrong with our distribution and the existing lines of transmission. Work and wealth are not available to many. There is a parallel economy of black money flourishing with a nexus with political leaders. Our “mixed economy has become a fertile field of profit and corruption involving business and industry”. The President struck a note of warning concerning the unscrupulous men in trade and commerce; “Wealth is concentrated in a few hands and your Federation should give serious thought to this subject, before it is too late.” Today we know everything about the economic offences of the business magnates, the flight of capital form the country and the secret accounts in Swiss Banks.

President Sanjiva Reddy’s political career was thus packed with events in which he displayed a rare courage and imagination in combating adverse circumstances and personal or political challenges. He was not flamboyant. Although he appeared to be home-spun and low-key, he exercised a strong influence on the course of events in the post-Nehru era of Indian politics. His style was not impulsive and hasty but determined and calculated. Decisions were premised on considerations of logic and well-thought-out principles. He never exuded power; he contained it. Lofty morality was not a ground rule in politics, but he tried to maintain high standards and balance. Here in lies the true measure of his greatness.
He was widely travelled person. As President of India he visited to develop good and cordial relations with all countries. He visited U.K., France, West Germany, GDR, Switzerland, Hungary, Poland, USSR, Kenya, Zambia, Uganda, Australia, USA, Canada, Peru, South America, and Nepal, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Ireland and Yugoslavia. After his tenure, he resided in Bangalore city where he passed away on 1st June 1996 with illness. His body given a state funeral in the presence of the country's highest dignitaries. After service to country in various positions his eventful and meaningful life had been ended.

**Critical Analysis Of Neelam Sanjiva Reddy**

Dr. Neelam Sanjiva Reddy was a leader with values and morals. He participated in freedom movement and moved with great leaders. He was activist always. In 1946 Neelam Sanjiva Reddy was elected member of Madras legislative assembly from Anantapur constancy. From Anantapur constituency he won. This was the first and last victory from this place. Again in 1952 he contested but he was defeated. This was a shocking result to Sanjiva Reddy. Later in 1971 Sanjiva Reddy contested again from Anantapur constituency to the Loksabha. This time also he was bitterly defeated. He could not digest. He accepted his defeat.

Sanjiva Reddy always moved in national politics with national views. He could not concentrate much on his constituency. He did not have mass contacts. He had no strong public base. So Sanjiva Reddy always changed his constituency from one to another. He was elected to Andhra Assembly from Sreekalalahasthy constituency in 1953 and 1955 respectively twice. In 1962
general elections he contested from Dhone constituency and won. In 1967 general elections he contested from Hindupur Parliamentary constituency and elected to Loksabha and became speaker also. In 1977 general elections he contested from Nadyala Parliamentary constituency and elected to Loksabha and he became speaker second time.

After impartial and critical analysis about his elections we have to come to conclusion that he did not have strong mass support in any constituency. As long as party was strong his efforts were successful. If the party was not strong he could not success. So he utilized party’s image for his political development. From 1971 to 1977 he remained in his native village. Even though in 1977 he was incharge of Janatha Party of South India, he did not contribute in electing more candidates from South India. He could not build and develop any another alternative political party against Congress. “He is infact more a politician than administrator” According to above statement to some extent it is true. According to Innaiah author of ‘political Power’ Sanjiva Reddy admired and loved loyalties, and total surrender but not dissent or arguments. It is unfortunate that the first chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh was caste minded, conscious of religion, practiced caste politics, encouraged defections and above all received strictures from the Supreme Court. He is the first Chief Minister who politicized religion by encouraging pilgrimages’ to Tirupathi though the motive was winning over the people for in the power game. He went out of the way to receive an honorary doctorate degree from Sri Venkateswara University.
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which he could use only when a suit against him was cleared in the court of law. He created artificial terror among his Cabinet colleagues and Legislators and behaved in a very undemocratic way throughout but being a shrewd politician Sanjiva Reddy resigned when the court passed strictures on him and got appreciation because normally people sympathize the leader when he voluntarily relinquishes power, whatever the reason might be. The way in which Sanjiva Reddy behaved in retaining his grip over Andhra Pradesh politics while remaining in New Delhi shows his mind.

When the Chief Minister has no integrity and could not set right example, naturally the State goes astray. Andhra Pradesh could achieve very little during his regime in spite of his socialistic postures through nationalization of bus routes and text books but actually he was a feudal to the core and several Zamindars and Rajas found berths in his Cabinet. Once he believed that his luck never allowed him to continue in any office, not more than two years. It seems that prediction belies him.

If we observe assessment of Innaiah it is far away from truth. India is a country with caste ridden society. It is not possible to live without caste attachment. From the very beginning caste is part of society. Sanjiva Reddy was not a caste biased leader. From the beginning in the field of election he always fought with his caste people like Bejavada Gopal Reddy. No doubt Sanjiva Reddy was a tactful politician, at the same time he liked development of the state in all fields. He was instrumental in constructing Irrigation Projects
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and Canals and Agricultural development. Today Andhra Pradesh got more progress in agricultural field; this greatness goes to Neelam Sanjiva Reddy. Even his political enemies also cannot deny this.

Sanjiva Reddy tried to the best of his capacity to strengthen his position as the chief Minister. He merged both Andhra and Telangana Congress Committees and promoted cultural and social unity between these two reasons. He acted in every movement by keeping welfare of society. He was always positive, proactive and dynamic towards any problem.

Sanjiva Reddy was a deep Philosopher. He always believed in honesty and hard work in his public life. He kept his own Philosophy and his attitude to life with absolute faith in God and Hard and earnest work, without preaching Philosophy to others. He was accustomed to simple life and he had developed detachment and his lifestyle had no change, he got to his original Agricultural in the village which was his permanent profession. He liked and admired Mahathma Ghandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru in his life. He firmly believed that this country has and will have bright future. So the country should be strengthened in every aspect.