

*Continued from page 6*

alone among heavily populated countries in trying to industrialize after introducing full political democracy. Of course she has so far demonstrated that, despite the handicaps, her leaders have done better for their people than those who opted for authoritarianism and lost touch with their people.

In 1960 we drove 6,000 miles around India. It was a tough trip—*islands of riches* (cultural and material) in a sea of poverty. No doubt Mrs. Gandhi was exaggerating when she told me after her last election campaign (which took her 30,000 miles in two months) that she now found only *islands of crushing poverty*. But the trend is in that direction, though the eradication of poverty (even to the extent that China has succeeded) has yet to be achieved in India. Nevertheless, the mass of the people in their 500,000 villages are today better dressed and housed, better fed, living longer and more literate than they were twelve years ago. In six years, production of wheat has doubled. India can now feed herself. Roads have improved beyond recognition, even though some of the main highways are still single lane. People can move easily from village to village by bus and bicycle where before there were only bullock carts for villages not served by the extensive rail system left by the British. Their new transistor radios link them now to the rest of India and to the "world village" as McLuhan calls it.

But if life is getting better, it is still hard. Services for the public have improved faster than per capita income in real terms. There are still more than 200 million Indians out of 570 million existing on less than one rupee (14 cents) per head per day. India

still rates as among the poorest countries in the world. That kind of poverty, perhaps worse, has been the lot of the Indian masses for hundreds of years, ever since their population became too big for the resources of their land. Traditionally it has been accepted by the poor that their destined lot is different from that of the rich and powerful. "Upper" and "lower" are social concepts firmly ingrained from feudal times and still persisting today. But now this passive acceptance of misery is being challenged as never before, not only by the intellectuals but by an increasing number of the very poor. This is a new and dynamic situation. Expectations have been aroused. People know how others in more fortunate countries live, how even in China people now have a modest minimum of food and clothing, having abolished the greatest extremes.

Great riches can (and probably will) be abolished in India, as the Princes have been dethroned. To bring up the masses is going to be much more difficult. To do so at the same time as the population continues to explode may be impossible. Death control must be maintained but birth control must outstrip it. Today 60% of the annual growth in real terms is nullified by the growth of population. Just over 10% of the people are practising family planning and the remainder in their villages will be harder to convert. As most Westerners see it, this is India's No. 1 priority; but not all in the Government of India would agree. Some of them would say the key was rapid industrialization, pointing out that many industrialized Western countries have a higher population density than India's. Maybe today; but they should look at the population projections to the end

of the century (1.16 billion) and beyond. They should also remember that 80% of Indians are still dependent on agriculture. They are too many for their land.

So far we have looked mainly at one side of the picture—what we can do in partnership with India to modernize this country. But I cannot close this flying survey without asking what India may be able to do for us.

It is the opinion of the Western scholar, Robert Lannoy, that "India is probably the best fitted to meet, and more predisposed to face the challenge of a future change of attitudes than almost any other country in the world." (*The Speaking Tree* p. 423) There is stress in the Indian body politic; but it is not a sick society. At its best, it sees that "modern" and "traditional", "west" and "east", are no more irreconcilable than the rationalist and intuitive approaches to reality. Both are needed to balance each other. This is much more obviously true in the electronic age we are entering than it was in the old industrial age. Today education can no longer be just linear and mental. It has to develop an awareness—a consciousness—that is all-round, like a radar sweep. There is a necessary revolution taking place in our modes of perception, due partly to electronic technology. In understanding and expanding consciousness of the new age, India can help us.

Giving expression to this idea at the political level, Mrs. Gandhi has just asked the UN Conference on the Environment at Stockholm, "Will the growing awareness of one earth and one environment guide us to the concept of one humanity?" At least Canada and India could have complementary roles in that process. □