

CHEMICAL FERTILISERS

FOR WHOSE BENEFIT ?

- INDIAN FARMERS ?**
- INDIAN MASSES ?**

NO !

BUT

**FOR THE BENEFITS OF POLITICIANS
AND VESTED INTERESTS !**

WRITTEN BY:

LATE SHRI VENISHANKAR M. VASU



CHEMICAL FERTILISER

A NAIL IN THE COFFIN OF INDIAN AGRICULTURE

We Indians describe our country as an Agricultural country. Our pride in describing ours as a predominantly agricultural country will be rightly placed only if our agriculture is most prosperous in the world and only if we produce delicious as well as nutritious foodgrains.

We do have all the basic necessary means for a prosperous agriculture. However, we have ignored these means and thus ignored our agriculture and brought down the noble activity of agriculture to a low pedestal.

The basic pre-requisites for prosperous Agriculture:

- 1. The type of land**
- 2. Proper ploughing of land:**

Land should be ploughed thrice in a year. Then whether it is ploughed with the help of a wooden plough or with a tractor, it does not affect the yield of the crop. However, by ploughing with a tractor, the production cost of agriculture increases substantially. Unless the rain fall is 125mm at a time, the land ploughed with tractor cannot be sowed. This may result in loss of crop also. However, if the farm is ploughed with a wooden plough it can be sowed even if the rain fall is 25 to 30mm.

- 3. Sufficient application of dung manure:**

Sufficient dung manure means 10 cart loads or 4 tonnes of dung manure per acre.

- 4. Good quality of virgin seed:**

If hybrid seeds are used, it increases the production cost of agriculture. The hybrid seeds yield 25% more crop. However its stalk is useless for feeding animals and thus the additional earning from additional crops gets spent in purchasing fodder for animals. Besides, the foodgrain grown with the help of hybrid seeds do not have the resistance power against diseases and thus disease and sickness spreads among people. A chapatti made out of the foodgrains grown with the help of virgin seeds can be eaten ever after 3 days, whereas a chapatti made out of hybrid foodgrains gets petrified within 12 to 24 hours. Thus there is lot of petrification of cooked food in our country. Hence overall there is more loss than gain in using hybrid seeds.

- 5. Availability of just sufficient water at definite intervals:**



Whether the water is drawn out of well with the help of bullocks or whether it is drawn from a canal, it does not affect the yield of foodgrains.

6. A knowledgeable farmer:

More a farmer is knowledgeable, better is the yield of crop. A farmer has to have good knowledge about ploughing, applying dung manure, sowing, irrigating, weeding out unnecessary plants etc. All the above stated six factors are the pre-requisites of a prosperous agriculture.

Irrigation Projects are for whom - Agriculture or Industry

To make our country self-reliant in the area of foodgrains we have spent hundreds of crores of rupees after various irrigation projects. However, 5 other basic aspects narrated above were ignored in implementing these schemes. The irrigation projects also had two purposes i.e. the dams which were built under these projects were used for production of electricity and for laying out canals for irrigating agriculture. Thus though the projects claimed to help irrigation, the interest of industrial sector was also attached to it. Thus to protect the interest of industrial sector, the first four basic requirements of good agriculture described above were ignored and importance was given to the 5th requirement i.e. irrigation. As a result, the Industrial sector did get electricity but the talk of self-reliance in the foodgrains sector remained on paper only.

The entry of fertiliser:

In the 3rd Five Year Plan it was again declared that the Government will rest only after achieving self reliance in foodgrains. To achieve this aim, the 3rd Five Year Plan decided to import chemical fertiliser as well as to establish fertiliser projects in the country. By taking such decision also, the interest of industry were combined with the interest of agricultural sector and thus the farmer as well as farming became dependent on the fertiliser industry.

In order to justify this basically wrong decision and to divert the public opinion in favour of chemical fertiliser, a very aggressive propaganda was started highlighting the need and the utility of chemical fertiliser. False stories were planted in the leading newspapers of the country describing the phenomenal rise in agricultural production in countries which use chemical fertiliser attributing such increase naturally to the use of chemical fertiliser. In public meetings the political leaders started emphasizing the utility and qualities of chemical fertilisers. The newspapers started repeatedly giving comparative figures of crop and cultivation per acre in our country in other countries which used chemical fertilisers. By highlighting higher production in other countries they started painting a dismal picture of our agriculture and thus tried to justify the spending of hundreds of crores of rupees on import of chemical fertilisers.

Perverse Publicity

Our political leaders and newspapers created an impression that it is shameful to do agriculture with the help of bullocks and wooden ploughs. This was considered as a sign of backwardness. They emphasized that the Western countries have immensely benefitted by using chemical fertiliser. Our news papers repeatedly published statistics about the utilisation of chemical fertiliser per hectare in the Western Countries and the crop yielded. Some of these statistics are given hereunder. If these figures are analysed minutely one would come to know that the claim of higher productivity with the help of chemical fertiliser is baseless. The abundance or scarcity of foodgrains is based mainly on the soil and climatic conditions of the concerned country.

Name of the Country	Fertiliser used per hectare (kg.)	Yield of crop per acre (kg.)
India	4.0	372
Canada	8.6	380
Russia	10.3	436
Australia	22.1	436
USA	39.6	1008
Italy	55.5	875
Sweden	83.0	1068
Czechoslovakia	91.6	924
France	108.5	916
Denmark	151.7	1388
Norway	172.4	1112
Britain	190.7	1272
W. Germany	294.4	1032
Japan	270.2	1632
Belgium	372.0	1340
Netherlands (Holland)	547.0	1368

The above figures have indicated that the per acre production in India is the lowest. Canada used double the quantity of fertiliser compared to India. However its production per acre is just 8 kg. more compared to India.

The Indian farmer is more wise:

Before analysing the above figures one thing has to be kept in mind that the Indian farmer always does mixed farming. For example if he has sowed jowar or bajra in his field it is said that he has sowed jowar or bajra. But in fact it is not so. In the same farm alongwith jowar or bajra he also sows mung, udad, sesame etc. If one row is of jowar or bajra another row is of some pulses. Thus 2/3rd of the farming might

be having the common crop of jowar or bajra and 1/3rd will be having some other crops. However, while computing the statistics, the yield of jowar or bajra which is the main crop, the yield of only 2/3rd of farm is accounted as if it is from the full farm and thus the figures make poor showing. On the other hand in Western countries the farmers sow only one type of crop in the entire field thus the production figure of the entire field will definitely appear to be higher than the yield of 1/3rd of an acre in our country.

Our farmers do mixed cultivation because they are more experienced and wiser compared to the Western farmers. They know that if some pests affect the crop in a field, the pest which affects one type of crop does not affect the other type. Thus one of the 2 crops is saved. For example if bajra and mung are sowed in the same field and if the pest attack either mung or bajra then the crop which is not affected survives the attack of the pest and is saved. If mixed cultivation is not done, the entire crop gets destroyed.

Where are the answers for the following questions?

Even for argument sake, if we consider that the statistics given above are true, still the following questions remain unanswered. The population of Russia is just 40% of our population whereas areawise it is six times larger than our country. If its crop yield per acre is 64 kgs. more than the crop yield per acre in our country, why does it import foodgrains? If the above published statistics were to be true, Russia should be exporting foodgrains. But it is not so. Australia uses double the quantity of the fertilisers used by Russia. Still its crop yield is only equal to Russia. This shows that the importance does not lie in use of chemical fertiliser. Because the soil and climatic conditions are better in Russia, it is able to grow as much as Australia grows even though it uses only half the quantity of fertiliser.

Similarly take the example of USA and France. France uses about 2 times more fertiliser compared to USA. Still its per acre crop production is less by 92 kg. compared to USA. Same is the case with Denmark and Holland and Holland and Belgium who have common borders. Belgium uses 22 times more fertiliser than that used by Denmark and still produces 40 kg. less. Holland uses 396 kgs. more fertiliser compared to Denmark and still produces 20 kgs. less. The above figures prove that the claim of higher productivity by use of chemical fertiliser is absolutely hollow. The yield pattern in the above figures is dependent not on fertilisers but on the quality of soil as well as the climatic conditions.

During 1987-88 the fertiliser consumption in India was 51 kg. per hectare and the crop yield per hector was 1173 kg. However, as comparative figures of the same year (i.e. 1987-88) for other countries are not available, the analysis of co-relation between use of fertiliser and its effect on crop yield could not be done.

However, if we analyse the situation in the Indian context only, the fertiliser consumption during 1960-61 was just 2 kg. per hectare and the crop yield was 710 kg. During 1987-88, the fertiliser consumption increased to 51 kg. per hectare. This means that over a period of 27 years, the use of chemical fertiliser increased by 2450%, whereas the increase in crop yield was just 64%. Even this increase in crop yield is partly due also to increased use of hybrid seeds as also due to bringing more land under cultivation. Despite this situation, the Agriculture Dept. of Government of India keeps on praising the chemical fertiliser and is busy in spreading a lie that crop production increases with use of chemical fertiliser. Indian soil which used to yield 710 kg. of crop per hectare during 1960-61, when just 2 kg. of chemical fertiliser was used, now needs 51 kg. of fertiliser to yield 1173 kg. This itself proves how much the fertility of the soil has suffered due to use of chemical fertiliser! It appears as though the Agriculture Department of Government of India is created to convert the rich fertile land of this country into a desert!

News paper columnist misleading the people

A well known weekly of Bombay had published figures of price production in some of the Western countries. The columnists have described these figures as if they are of rice, but in fact the figures are of paddy. May be the author did not know the difference between rice and paddy or may be that authors with improper knowledge of agriculture become instrumental in misleading the people. They create wrong notions and wrong complexes in the minds of people. The following are the figures of paddy production in different countries per acre.

Country	Production Kg.	Country	Production Kg.
Philippines	710	India	870
Brazil	1020	Thailand	1240
Burma	1500	China (61-62)	1560
Poland	1780	Thailand	1960
France	2140	USA	2210
Japan	2720	Egypt	2920
Italy	3290	Denmark	3790
Australia	3840		

The rice production in India per hectare was 668 kg. in 1950-51. It increased to 1013 kg. in 1960-61. The use of chemical fertiliser during this decade was almost nil. This means that only with the help

of dung manure, the yield in rice production increased by 51.6% i.e. by 345 kg.

The use of chemical fertiliser increased at a greater pace after 1960-61. However, to take the yield from 1013 kg. during 1960-61, to 1471 kg. during 1986-87, it took 26 years as also increase in use of chemical fertiliser upto 51 kg. per hectare.

During the first decade (1950-51 to 1960-61), the crop yield of rice increased by 51.6% **without use of chemical fertiliser**. Whereas in the following 26 years, despite phenomenal rise in use of chemical fertiliser the crop yield of rice increased only by 44%. This proves beyond doubt that its a gross falsehood to believe that use of chemical fertiliser increases foodgrain production.

China does not use chemical fertiliser. It uses only organic manure. It has used 10 tons of organic manure per 'mow' (mow means 1/6th of an acre) and increased its per acre production by 60% (Source - Communist China Today' by Chandrasekhar, Publisher Asian Publishing House 1962 edition page 40) Shri Chandrasekhar had obtained these figures about food production and consumption from the Director of Economic Department of Agricultural Research and from Mr. Chensen who was a director in Long Term Economic Planning Department.

Doubtful Figures

How far the statistics of other countries are correct; we do not know. However, they do appear to be doubtful because one of the columnist has put Australia at 3rd last number as far as crop production is concerned whereas another columnist has put Australia on top. Similarly different columnists have given different figures of production for other countries also. Surprisingly people who only praise the production figures of other countries do not bother to find out what was the production in India about a century ago and why it has come down now. What should be done to reach and surpass the earlier production figures? These analysts are mum about this and are only engaged in singing the praise of fertilisers.

It appears that our political leaders and the so-called experts writers know a very little about agriculture, animal rearing as well as industries also and thus knowingly or unknowingly they play as pawns to safeguard the vested interest created by foreign countries. They paint rosy pictures of prosperous agriculture in the Western countries and thus create an inferiority complex and despair in the minds of our own people.

However, Shri V. Parasran, correspondent of Indian Express in USA has thrown good light on the mechanised farming in America. In the issue dated 31-1-67 he writes from America "With mechanisation of farming in America, the production cost of agriculture has increased by 30% in 20 years. The then U.S. Agriculture Minister Mr. Freeman had

said, "Annual income of an Industrial worker in America is 2610 dollars whereas annual income of the farmer is only 1700 dollars." This was so, because by mechanisation of farming only the expenses increased and not the crop yield. The benefits of mechanisation have gone to the manufacturers of farming machines rather than the farmer. The independent farmer becomes dependent on manufacturers of farming machines.

Production might be rising but the quality declines:

It is important that with the per acre increase in production the quality of the crop also must be maintained. The urban population of India does not know how inferior in quality is the foodgrains grown with the help of chemical fertilisers and hybrid seeds. Some times even the birds do not find such foodgrains worth consuming. However, our starving and hungry population has to feed itself on such rotten and even stinking foodgrain.

Alongwith per acre increase in the production, the quality of the foodgrains should also improve and at the same time it should lead to reduction in prices. On the contrary, the quality keeps on dwindling and the prices keep on increasing. Increase in the production cost in agriculture sector is a very serious matter. The mechanisation of farming increases the production cost and the profit of the farmer gets wiped out which he obtains by price rise. The mechanised farming benefits only the manufacturers of tractors, fertilisers, pesticides, motor pumps etc. and now the diesel exporting oil rich countries. As a result of increase in production cost the prices of foodgrain also increased. This leads to price rise in the industrial sector. Hence workers and government employees demand increased dearness allowance. Government imposes new and additional taxes to meet the demand of its employees for additional dearness allowance. This leads to further price rise. This again leads to renewed demand for more dearness allowance and if they are not conceded it leads to agitation, strikes, riots etc. and thus this vicious circle goes on and on. there is increased cost in the industrial sector as a result of increased dearness allowance, increased taxation and increased costs of raw-materials. This adversely affects exports. If concessions are given in the form of subsidies etc. to promote export its ultimate burden falls on the common masses. Thus the ever increasing prices of foodgrains, cloth and other essential items crush the common man.

The entire national structure gets disturbed:

If the use of chemical fertiliser is really beneficial nobody should have any objection to its use. However, its use disturbs the entire national structure and benefits only the selected class having vested interests. Thus promoting its use is nothing but treason.

The figures given above do not prove that with the help of fertiliser the crop yield increases. In the beginning of this essay six basic things necessary for good agriculture have been indicated. Fertiliser

does not find place in those six things. The table giving figures of fertiliser used and crop yielded in different countries also prove that linking of fertiliser with crop yield is faulty.

Why Morarji Desai had to enter into such agreements?

During his tour of Gujarat in 1968 Shri Morarji Desai had narrated that when he was young and had not heard of tractors or fertilisers, he (as an agriculturist) used to obtain a yield of 9000 pound (i.e. approx. 4410 kg.) of paddy per acre with the help of dung manure. This yield was much more than any other country using fertiliser. Why then in only 50 years, the per acre yield of paddy in our country came down to just 870 kg. Basically there is only one reason behind this and that is slaughter of cow and cow family which resulted in scarcity of bullocks for ploughing and dung for manure.

For some unknown reasons, on return to Delhi after his tour of Gujarat, Shri Morarji Desai entered into agreement for import of chemical fertilisers worth Rs.. 200 to 250 crores from America, instead of declaring a total ban on animal slaughter which should have been the right thing to do. These agreements were very surprising and at the same time creating doubt that they were to cater to the interest of some vested interest both within the country and outside.

What is the experiments conducted at Telan Kheri farm suggest?

A very successful experiment was conducted on the Government's Telan Kheri farm to assess the impact of using only dung manure and its effect on crop yield. For this, the farm had kept its own animals. The results are given below. However, these findings have been lost in government files and the entire government machinery is busy justifying its policy of import of fertiliser, its production in the country and for this, a very aggressive propaganda machinery is utilised as if on war front.

Telan Kheri Dairy Farm

Year	Grass Prodn. in monds	Crop Prodn. in monds
1932-33	12595	219
1933-34	12624	506
1934-35	18202	350
1935-36	15143	529
1936-37	18272	624
1937-38	19024	433
1938-39	19473	610

The above figures indicating crop yield at Telankheri farm obtained with the help of only dung manure and without using chemical fertiliser prove that substantially larger yield can be obtained compared to the yield from chemical fertiliser and at the same time the production cost also remains very low.

Opinions of experts:

Is chemical fertiliser really necessary for agriculture? Or whether it is just a very strong tool for exploitation? To obtain an answer for this question I had asked several questions to the Agricultural Research Department of the Govt. a geology expert and an officer of the Agricultural University. Some of the answers which I got were as under:

"It is not advisable to use only chemical fertiliser without mixing it with the dung manure or the compost manure (made of mixture of dung dead leaves, waste food of animals etc.) This was so because by using only chemical fertilisers, the fertility of the soil gets destroyed."

"As a result of using chemical fertilisers, the roots of the plants go deep inside the soil which makes the soil hard." "On saline or on barren land the dung manure should be applied in large quantities. Dung manure is the best way to improve barren land."

"If more yield is desired from the soil, 6 tons of dung manure per acre should be applied. The soil loses its fertility if manure in such quantity is not used. This is so because soil erosion has been taking place after destruction of grazing land and forests and in the absence of proper ploughing and sufficient manure." (The ratio of manure requirements depends on the kind of soil and the type of foodgrains to be sowed.)

On one hand we keep on increasing the land under cultivation. We also keep on increasing the need for bullocks and dung for proper ploughing and proper manure. On the other hand by slaughtering animals we increase the scarcity of bullocks and dung manure. As a result of this our soil is gradually losing its fertility.

Could this be a pre-planned conspiracy?

There appear to be reasons to believe that all this has happened according to a pre-planned conspiracy. Animal slaughter results in shortage of dung manure and thereby the necessity of using chemical fertiliser is imposed. The use of chemical fertiliser hardens the soil and thus it can not be ploughed with the help of bullocks; which leads to the need for use of tractors. In the name of modern agriculture, the government propaganda machinery promotes fertiliser and tractors. The arrangement for bank loans for purchase of fertiliser and tractors to lure the farmer, deliberate creation of scarcity of bullocks by permitting animal slaughter and thereby permitting increase in price of bullocks and

thus promoting the purchase of tractors through co-operatives of the farmers; the use of chemical fertiliser which invariably leads to the attack of pests and hence the arrangement for spraying pesticides on the crops; - all these appear as a well thought out scheme to cater to the interest of certain vested interest industries and oil rich countries.

Nothing is wise in the present scheme:

The farmer is made indebted to the money lender (or now the banks) for purchase of tractors, fertilisers, pesticides etc. The naive and illiterate farmer is led into this by the onslaught of government propaganda. The use of tractor, fertiliser and pesticides lead to increase in production cost and in turn increase in prices of industrial products. By slaughtering cows, scarcity of milk and ghee is created so that the dairies in foreign countries capture the milk and ghee market in India. An opportunity is provided to multinational pharmaceutical giants to exploit Indian market by spreading malnutrition related diseases, resulting from scarcity of milk and ghee. The people will be justified and also right in thinking that this entire scheme of throwing the common man in the clutches of inflation, scarcity, malnutrition related diseases and resultant mental and economic tensions is being inflicted only to cater to the interest of handful of people within the country as well as some Western countries. It is impossible to agree that there is any economic or scientific wisdom on the part of the government in indulging in such anti people policies.

The reactions of the use of chemical fertiliser:

Let us come back again to examine other reactions of use of chemical fertiliser.

When the soil gets exploited beyond its limit, when it is not fed with nutrition that it requires in the form of dung manure and its fertility is over-exploited; the things grown on such soil, whether they are foodgrains, grass or cattle feed, vegetables, fruits or flowers also lose their essence, be it the nutrition or taste or fragrance. Human beings, animals or birds who consume such nutritionless food grown on such land also become weaker and weaker with each passing generation. Wild animals which survive on such weak animals such as deer, antelopes, sheep, goat, cow or buffalo also become weaker. This is because these vegetarian animals subsist on nutritionless foodgrains or grass and hence their meat is incapable of providing proper nutrition to wild animals.

The human beings and the animals lose their health, stamina and resistance against diseases after eating such nutritionless foodgrains or grass. The wild animals and birds who depend on meat of other animals also lose their health, stamina and resistance and thus slowly the entire living universe is marching towards total destruction.

Blame on hunters:

The faulty government policy is resulting into destruction of domestic as well as wild animals. However, government blames the hunters for destruction of wild life. This is a hollow and baseless defence of its own misdeeds. Hunting of wild animals has been going on for ages. On the contrary, now the ban on possessing weapon has reduced hunting. When there was no ban on hunting, our forests and millions of lions, tigers, panthers, wolves etc. The population of deer and antelopes was in millions. However, the destruction of forests and grazing lands, destruction of water reservoirs and destruction of fertility of soil has led to the destruction of crores of our animals due to scarcity of proper food, water and their natural shelters. Instead of acknowledging and removing the basic causes of their destruction, the Government has started sanctuaries at the cost of hundreds of crores of rupees. There is not even an iota of economic and scientific wisdom or even common sense behind creating such sanctuaries. If the government wants to save the wild as well as the vegetarian animals and birds, it should impose a total ban on animal slaughter and revive the destroyed forests, grazing lands and water reservoirs.

Capacity of animals is fast declining:

Our cows have been losing their capacity of yielding milk day by day. The bullocks are also losing their capacity of labouring in the farms. During the era of Akbar the great Indian cows used to yield 64 seers of milk every day and bullocks could carry loads upto a distance of 230 miles per day. Fifty years ago one could find exceptionally good cows giving 30 seers of milk a day and bullock carrying load upto 60 miles a day. Now-a-days bullocks get tired after walking only twenty miles a day. Cows yield hardly 2/3 litres of milk. The reason behind this pitiable decline is the erosion in the fertility of soil and the reason for erosion of fertility of soil are cow slaughter and destruction of forests as well as grazing lands. All this has not happened unknowingly. This is a result of a pre-planned conspiracy.

Increase the production of dung manure:

It is recognised the world over that soil should be given proper nutrition and preservation and dung manure is the best available nutrition for soil. This is acknowledged by the Indian as well as other agricultural experts the world over. It is astonishing that not a single planning commission or not a single agricultural department of any State has ever given a thought to increase the production of dung manure. Instead, the Planning Commission one after the other have approved plans to spend crores of rupees on import of chemical fertilisers as well as its production within the country at the cost of hundreds of crores of rupees and thus they have pushed the farming community of this nation to be exploited by vested Indian as well as alien interest.

It is uneconomical and impracticable to use chemical fertiliser:

Let us now examine the economic and practical aspects of using chemical fertiliser. India has 14.60 crore hectare of land under cultivation. Out of this only 4.4 crore hectare land has got irrigation facility (Source: India 1990). (Even this irrigation facility exists on paper only because most of the wells, lakes and rivers have dried up and even canals in dry area have dried up).

It is very much harmful to use chemical fertilisers, for the balance land of 10.2 crore hectare under cultivation which depends on only monsoon and has no other irrigation facility. This is so because after using chemical fertiliser the crop needs more water and that too at fixed intervals. If water is not available at fixed time then the crop gets destroyed. Hence for these remaining 10.2 crore hectare land the dung manure only is suitable both economically and practically. For this no efforts have been made in the last 40 years. Whereas for 4.4 crore hectare land which has got irrigation facility, 18000 crores of rupees have been wasted on irrigation projects, till the end of 6th five year plan. The Seventh Five Year Plan has provided further Rs. 17861 crores for irrigation projects to bring 1.29 crore hectare of land under irrigation.

Appoint an Enquiry Commission:

It is surprising that even after putting chemical fertiliser, the land needs dung manure and compost manure. Ignoring this basic fact, why hundreds of crores of rupees have been wasted on chemical fertiliser which is secondary in importance. This must be probed. Definitely there is a hand of Indian as well as alien vested interest behind all these.

Our nation has been damaged severely on economic front by ignoring the need for dung manure for dry land farming and by enlarging the scope of animal slaughter. We have wasted thousands of crores of rupees on chemical fertiliser ignoring the need for providing shelter to the population.

Leave aside there being any foresightedness in this, it is a proof of insolvency of our wisdom.

The farmer is tempted under the pressure of propaganda machinery and the lure of government loan for purchase of chemical fertiliser. After using chemical fertiliser if the monsoon fails, the farmer losses his crop, and is unable to repay the loan he has taken for purchasing chemical fertiliser. Next year he has to borrow afresh. If monsoon fails or is irregular or is less than required, the only sufferer is farmer and the beneficiary always are the government or non government fertiliser plants.

How much government's as well as banks' money has been involved in the fertiliser loans during past so many years? No definite figures

are available on this. However, in Orissa alone, government loans of Rs. 6 crores could not be recovered, which is a known fact. According to "India 1991" page 380 & 381, the outstanding loans to the Agricultural Sector from the Nationalised Banks alone stood at Rs.16000 crores as on 31-3-90. Needless to say that bulk of these loans were for purchase of fertiliser.

The nation had recently witnessed the social economical and political turmoil arising out of the demand for waiver of Agricultural loans.

In the Economic Times Issue dated 11-10-69 the Agriculture Minister of the then Union Cabinet had issued a statement saying that in the previous year India had used 7,56,000 tons chemicals fertiliser and it was targetted to use 15,15,000 tons in the following year. However, the actual lifting of chemical fertiliser from the plant was only 85,200 tons. Despite the substantial shortfall in use of chemical fertilisers by 6.70 lac tons compared to the targetted figures, the agriculture production had in fact increased instead of decreasing. This hard fact also proves the futility of use of chemical fertiliser. It also proves that the farmers were not attracted by results of use of chemical fertilisers, but on the contrary they had become careful against the loss which chemical fertiliser causes. It is possible that the farmers purchase this harmful fertiliser under indirect pressure. The government itself has become an interested party by establishing fertiliser plants in public sector, and hence is clinging onto promote use of chemical fertilisers at the cost of farmers, agriculture and in fact the entire nation.

The government had tried to explain the reason for reduced consumption of chemical fertiliser by saying that the farmer was afraid that the prices of agricultural produce might fall if the production increases and hence the farmer used less chemical fertiliser. Such an argument is senseless because if the prices of agricultural produce get reduced the farmer does not lose, he gains in the end and the entire nation also gains.

Production has not increased but the production costs have:

It is in the interest of the entire nation if agricultural production increases and its prices come down. But the fact is that by use of chemical fertilisers production has not gone up, only the production cost has gone up. With increased production cost the prices of agricultural produce have gone up which have compelled price increase in the non-agricultural sector also. As a result of the vicious circle of demand for higher and higher dearness allowance, bonus increase, additional taxes; corruption and inflation keeps on growing.

The rate at which the animal slaughter is going on, it appears that in a few years' time the availability of dung manure will be totally wiped out and the entire agriculture will have to depend on chemical fertiliser. It appears that precisely to achieve this, the animals are being slaughtered at a fast pace or are exported and more and more multi-crore chemical fertiliser plants are being planned.

If such a situation occurs it will be a very chaotic condition. On one hand our agricultural land will become barren at a very fast pace due to lack of dung manure. The farmer will become wholly dependent on the mercy of fertiliser plant owners. Our over-stretched railway system will be burdened additionally for transport of 4 crores tons of fertiliser across the country.

Do we have a dependable transport system to reach fertiliser in each and every village?

The fertiliser must reach the farm land at appointed time. Besides fertiliser, the railways have also to transport cotton oil seeds, edible oil, foodgrains, coal, sugar etc. in crores of tons within a fixed time schedule. The railways are unable to observe the time schedule in transporting these commodities, and as a result, thousands of tons of these commodities get destroyed or the factories which depend upon the supply of these commodities have to suffer losses if they do not receive these in time. Even coal which is required on day-to-day basis to keep the factories running, does not reach in time. Railways which are under tremendous pressure already, will not be able to transport the additional load of 4 crores tons of fertiliser to every nook and corner of the country.

Railways have 7090 stations. Through these stations it will have to reach the fertiliser to 6 lakhs villages and that too on appointed time. The railways have 3,82,000 wagon of which 17,000 wagons are set aside for movement of petrol.

All these wagons transport 20 crores tons of various materials in a year, which means they transport 1.75 crore tons of material every month. In this situation to transport 4 crores tons of fertiliser within 2 months to the far flung small stations and from these stations to transport hundreds of tons of fertiliser to farms spread in villages is very very difficult, unpracticable and uneconomical.

When crores of people are dumped on the foot paths of large cities and towns without a roof on their head, how is it wise that instead of providing shelter to them, we import chemical fertilisers worth over Rs. 12,000 crores per annum and burden our agriculture, by this huge burden as also by the additional expenses like those of tractor, pesticides, diesel and petrol? How can the people expect to get cheap, nutritious and enough foodgrains in this background? Only if animal slaughter is totally banned, our agriculture can be unburdened of all these unnecessary expenses and people can free themselves from the vicious circle of price rise, scarcity, inflation, corruption etc.

What if there is strike:

What if there is a strike in the chemical fertiliser plant? If it does not get its raw-material in time? Or fuel or wagon on time? What if there is a strike in the railways? All this would lead the nation in the clutches of drought.

Adverse effect on health

After examining the practical and economical aspects of use of chemical fertiliser, we should also examine its effect on health; because the foodgrains and other agricultural produce grown with the use of such chemical fertilisers are consumed by human beings as well as the animals. The following examples prove the adverse effect on the health and stamina of animals if they consume grass and fodder grown with the help of chemical fertiliser.

Opinion of Western Experts:

Sir Albert Howard had come to India in 1905 as an expert in agricultural economics. He write in his book titled "agricultural testaments" that foodgrains and grass grown with the help of dung manure is more nutritious and creates resistance against disease in our bodies. However, as soon as you apply chemical fertiliser to the land, the nutritional power and taste of grass gets destroyed. Land as well as the crops get afflicted with diseases. Foodgrains and grass and fodder grown with the help of chemical fertiliser cannot resist these diseases".

Experiment:

Dr. Howard grew in one farm grass with the help of only dung manure and in the adjoining farm he grew grass with the help of chemical fertiliser. Both farms were separated by barbed wire fencing. He tied some animals on both sides of the fence and these animals were tied to each other also with their bodies touching each others. The animals tied in the farm where grass was grown only on dung manure were fed with grass grown in that farm. Similarly the animals on the other side were fed with grass grown with the help of chemical fertiliser. After some time, animals in the farm which used chemical fertiliser got afflicted by disease. The disease of 'foot and mouth' in animals is considered to be most contagious as well as incurable. This disease is so contagious that in Europe, and USA if any incidence of this disease comes to light, then even healthy animals in the surrounding area are also killed so that the disease does not spread.

Some years ago 3,000 healthy sheep were gunned down in England because of such disease. In the above experiment all the animals which were fed on grass grown with the help of chemical fertilisers died because of the disease. However, the animals on the other side who were fed on grass grown with dung manure did not get afflicted by the disease even though they were in direct physical contact with disease afflicted animals.

This experiment proves how nutritious are the foodgrain and grass, grown with the help of dung manure and how useless are the foodgrains and grass grown with the help of chemical fertilisers. Structurally human beings are weaker than animals and hence human beings will become weaker and unable to resist disease faster by eating foodgrains grown with the help of chemical fertilisers: The capital investment in

the pharmaceutical industry has grown up in just five years by 168% between 1962 and 1966 and during the period of 20 years between 1947 to 1966 the production of medicines has grown up by 1,650%. In Independent India possibly the maximum increase in production is that of medicines.

The production in value terms in the pharmaceutical sector during 1948 was 12 crores. By 1971-72, the production in value terms increased to Rs. 300 crores and during 1990-91, it increased to Rs. 4300 crores. This valuation is based on prices prevailing during 1979-80 (Source: "India 1974" and "India 1991").

The investment in pharmaceutical sector by the end of 1990 was Rs.2011 crores.

What does the increase in production of medicines indicate?

This phenomenal rise in production of medicines does not indicate our progress on the economic, social or industrial front. But it shows the steep decline in health standard of our country. Medicines are mainly used in cities. They do not reach our villages. The poor people in villages do not have means also to buy medicines. Even within the cities, lakhs of middle class people undergo the suffering of diseases due to lack of money and time (required for rest). If all sick people have to be provided with proper medicines, then production of medicines worth even Rs.200 crores will be insufficient.

If chemical fertiliser is used, the plant's roots have to go deeper in the soil and they also spread in larger area. Due to this, the soil becomes hard and a bullock has to work hard in breaking and ploughing such land. The bullock becomes weaker by doing such labour beyond its capacity and needs replacement even though he is young in age. Thus instead of using the same bullocks for 8 to 10 years, the farmer has to change the bullock in 4 to 5 years only. This results in great financial loss. With use of chemical fertiliser over a number of years, the soil becomes so hard that it cannot be ploughed with the help of bullock. Hence the soil has to be broken and ploughed with the help of tractor. Further the stalks of the foodgrains grown in such farms are so thick and hard that animals cannot eat it. As such, separate grass or fodder has to be grown for feeding the animals and the farmers has to undergo additional expenses on this. Without the knowledge and the realisation of the damage to the soil, to the crop, to the bullock, to the farmer and to the quality of the crop and its consumer, the columnist fill pages and pages singing the praise of chemical fertiliser. The State Governments also have ignored all these ill effects and kept on propagating chemical fertiliser, wasting the precious resources of the country after it.

Cow is a 'multi purpose mini factory':

To promote and safeguard the interest of fertiliser and tractor lobby, all the useful aspects of a cow are veiled and it is projected only

as a milk yielding animal. In fact cow is a formidable competitor for chemical fertilisers and tractors. In India cow is not a mere dairy animal. It does yield milk and ghee, but at the same time the bullock is a mini tractor who can successfully compete with a tractor. It works without diesel. Besides, a cow is a mini factory giving free dung manure. It is also a mini cement factory giving dung for construction of dwelling houses. It is also a mini pharmaceutical factory preventing (which is better than curing) people from falling sick. It is also a mini fuel factory giving free fuel.

A famous veterinary expert Dr. B.D. Leander has said that an adult and well maintained cow gives 4 tons of dung and about 1½ tons of urine in a year. This can yield about 10 tons of farmyard manure. This is sufficient manure for an hectare of irrigated land. There is about 200 to 225 kg. of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium in this quantity of farmyard manure. If we have 10 lac such cows, at today's rate, these 10 lac mini manure factories costing Rs.200 crores can provide 1 crore tons of farmyard manure. Besides it will give employment to 50,000 people engaged in cow breeding and manufacturing of pure ghee. The pure ghee would value Rs. 180 crores per year. By resorting to total ban on cow slaughter, the total cost of these mini factories in the form of cows can be reduced from Rs. 200 crores to Rs. 100 crores.

As against these economics of cow and farmyard manure, a fertiliser plant set up with an investment of Rs. 200 crores can give employment to hardly 1000 people. Such large investment also would yield just as much fertiliser as 10 lac cows will yield. Coupled with such disadvantages, the chemical fertiliser will damage the soil and the crop. It will not yield any ghee and on the contrary create various problems. If the planning commission and the council of Ministers keep on deciding to establish more and more chemical fertiliser plants without giving due consideration to the economic, health and other practical aspects, it definitely shows that there is a very strong vested interest lobby behind all this, whether such interested group is Indian or alien or both. Such decisions also create rift between various States who want the chemical fertiliser plants to be set up in their State. This creates rift among the States and damages harmony of the Nation.

Agriculture is not a commercial activity aimed at profit:

Agriculture is the foundation for the health, prosperity and culture of the people of a nation. The moment it is converted into business activity aimed at profit, the activity of agriculture gets converted into a tool of loot. Today's agricultural research has trained the farmer into becoming an expert exploiter rather than training him to produce better quality, more nutritious and delicious foodgrains. Today's farmer is being taught as to how best his profit can be secured, ignoring all other sections of the population. He is even instigated into doing this.

If we blindly run after mechanisation of our farming, then total failure due to economic and practical reasons will follow. Consequently a sinister game will start between the farming and non-farming sections of our population to exploit each other. The game has already started and it will lead nothing but towards scarcity, drought and a class conflict.

Agriculture is one of the basic foundations of a nation's economy and it reflects the kind of economic model which the nation has adopted.

Two types of Economic Models:

There are 2 types of economic model in the world:

1. The exploitative and violent economic system of the Western countries based on machinery.

The Western economic model survives on exploitation and violence. This exploitative economic system has manifested itself into two world wars, exploitation of Afro-Asian nations who were converted into colonies of the Western Nations for 2 centuries, wars between newly born nations after the second world war, civil wars, mutiny, scarcity of essential commodities, hoarding and black marketing and rampant corruption.

This economic model has two sections viz. Capitalism and communism. However, both have a common aim, which is exploitation. This is so because they cannot survive unless they exploit. The only distinction between these two sections lies in the right of exploitation. Under Capitalism an individual or a group of individual exploit people with the help and protection from the State. Whereas in Communism the State itself exploits. To sustain this exploitative economic system only, the super powers would have adopted either capitalism or communism are trying to inflict economic slavery on the newly born nations and trying to exploit them.

A nation which has adopted this exploitative economic system will, naturally for its agriculture also depend on exploitation. Without any efforts the agricultural activity becomes a profiteer and utterly selfish.

We have also adopted the exploitative and violent economic model of the West based on machinery and to avoid friction between the section of capitalism and communism, we resorted to 'mixed economy' and thus promoted both the private sector and public sector to indulge in exploitation. As a result the quality of agriculture is falling and selfishness and profiteering is increasing. Slowly the entire agriculture sector is coming in the grips of particular industry and diesel selling nations.

2. The Second Economic Model is the ancient Indian model. This economic model is based on preservation of cow, preservation of forests, preservation of soil and preservation of water resources. The

main emphasize of this system is protection and nurturing of the entire living universe. It is for this reason that Indian Agriculture was considered a 'Yagna'.

In the Indian economic model each village was a self sufficient unit and cattle wealth and the spinning wheel were its back bone. Each village was like an independent republic. For this reason only India could withstand alien attacks for thousands of years.

To destroy this strong structure, the Britishers started slaughtering our cows and destroyed the spinning wheel and thus made us slaves. Mahatma Gandhi tried through out his life to stop the slaughter of cows, restore the spinning wheel and thus bring back the ancient Indian economic model. However, after his death we undid his life long efforts, ignored the spinning wheel, resorted to cow slaughter on a massive scale, ditched our noble ancient economic system and adopted the western exploitative and violent economic model. This destroyed our villages and made them dependent on cities and our agriculture is now controlled by the Indian as well as foreign vested interests.

Agriculture is the basis of prosperity of villages. However, by a sinister conspiracy, agriculture has been made dependent on tractor, chemical fertiliser, pesticides, motor pump, lorries, railways etc. This will result in serious class conflict, dreadful scarcity, black marketing, corruption, inflation and foreign debts. because we have adopted exploitative and violent economic model, it has made a deep impression on the psyche of the entire population and the desire to earn more and more by exploiting each other and by violence has been growing. This has become a routine, natural and common thing without any stigma attached..

BULLOCK V/S. TRACTORS

Troika of destruction:

If the confluence of Ganga, Jamuna and Saraswati rivers make India a pious land, the unholy meeting of tractors, fertilisers and insecticides is destroying the cultural, economic and social structure of India.

The moment agriculture takes help of chemical fertiliser, the pesticides start killing pests in the farm and the soil becomes harder and harder and eventually needs tractor for ploughing.

Real Sisters:

If we start agriculture with the help of tractor, immediately we need fertiliser because tractor does not yield fertiliser. Tractor does not function like a bullock which eats the stalk of foodgrain plants and which are useless for human beings. A tractor cannot work without diesel and thus tractor, fertiliser and pesticides descend on the farms together. They raise a storm of high production cost. They indulge in killing of pests on the farm. They spread poison in the bodies of the entire population through the poisonous spray of pesticides on foodgrains and thus open the doors for the multinational pharmaceutical companies for exploitation.

Viswanathan says....

An eminent Agricultural expert of The Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Shri Vishwanathan says "it has not been proved that by using tractor the crop yield increases". It is not necessary to plough the field only with tractor for getting good crop. What it needs is proper ploughing i.e. vertical, horizontal and again vertical. It does not matter whether the ploughing is done with the help of tractor or the wooden plough pulled by bullocks. If a field is ploughed only once with the help of a tractor and another adjoining field is ploughed thrice with the help of bullocks, the crop yield in the field ploughed thrice is much more.

The economic and practical aspects of tractor:

There are economical and practical aspects to a tractor also. In the first place, to use a 5 ton heavy tractor made of iron instead of only 10 kg. of iron in a wooden plough, for doing the same work is wasting the precious national wealth of iron. Iron ore and other minerals have been gifted by nature to the nation and instead of putting them to proper use, if they are used for the benefit of a very small vested interest group, this mineral wealth is lost for ever and it cannot be regenerated.

Dung - an unlimited treasure:

Dung is such a wealth that it never exhausts. By cattle rearing it can be replenished within 24 hours and can be made available wherever needed.

When you use it as manure in the farm, whether you use it as fuel for cooking or whether you use it for building of houses for the crores of homeless people; whatever is its use and wherever it is used, it gets replenished within 24 hours.

Wood used for fuel or for construction of house or for making furniture can also be grown again, but it takes 20 years for replenishment and hence it should be used keeping this cycle in mind.

It is a treachery against mankind to use mineral resources in an unfrittered way:

On the other hand, mineral resources such as coal, iron-ore, petrol etc. are not replenishable once they are used. Their reserves get diminished with their use and hence if such mineral resources are controlled by a handful of people and converted into means of exploitation, it is nothing but a treachery against mankind. It should not be tolerated. Hence to use a tractor instead of wooden plough, to waste 5 tons of iron instead of using only 10 kg. and thereby to destroy the precious wealth of the nation, and to throw the entire agricultural sector at the mercy of tractor, fertiliser and pesticides manufacturers and thus to push the entire nation in the clutches of other nations who are our enemies for centuries, is nothing but a treachery against the nation. We obtain diesel from foreign countries and in return we have to give them whatever they ask for and they can strangulate us any time by stopping supply of diesel and make us bend on our knees before them.

Deceptive Arguments:

There is only one argument in favour of tractor; that it ploughs the land very fast. However, even this argument is baseless and deceptive. A tractor can plough 30 acres of land in a month. To plough similar area of land, 3 pairs of bullocks would be needed. A tractor costs Rs.1,50,000 whereas 3 pairs of bullocks even at today's exorbitant rates will cost Rs.24,000/- to Rs.30,000/-. If a total ban on slaughter of cow family is resorted, the cost of 3 pairs of bullocks can be reduced even to Rs.6000/-.

Why prices of bullocks have increased?

Before the British started slaughter of cows and cow family, a pair of bullock was costing Rs. 6 to 12/-. With the increase in slaughter, the prices of bullocks kept on rising. During second World War i.e. between 1940-45 there was an unprecedented slaughter of all animals to feed the white armies which had come to India. This resulted in increase of the price of a pair of bullock to Rs. 200/- to 400/-. In

independent India, the Nehru Government continued the onslaught on young cows and calves also and the bullock population was so much reduced that the price of a pair rose to Rs.1500/- to 2000/-. The succeeding governments also continued the same policy of animals slaughter and that too at a much faster pace and today a pair of bullock is priced Rs.8000/- to Rs.10,000/-.

Conspiracy of the Government Machinery to ensure an absolute non-availability of bullocks:

There are reasons to believe that the Government machinery wants to create a situation whereby bullocks will not be available at any price and thus the farmers will be compelled to use tractors, fertilisers and pesticides. The Government itself has got vested interest in chemical fertilisers and pesticides because it has got its own plants in public sector for manufacturing all these.

Even today, a farmer will naturally like to buy a pair of bullock for Rs.10,000/- instead of a tractor costing Rs.1,50,000/-. However, on one pretext or the other, the government machinery is indulging into slaughter of cows, calves and bullocks and reducing their population on flimsy grounds. Live stock is exported and thus despite the wish of the farmer to buy a pair of bullock for farming, bullocks will be unavailable in the near future. On the other hand, the Government has formulated liberal loan policy for purchase of tractors, fertilisers and pesticides. It has also tried to reduce the excise and custom duties on tractor in a bid to make them cheaper.

The people wish that they get cheap and nutritious foodgrains. However, they have started firmly believing that now there is no way the foodgrains can be cheaper and, because of this belief, instead of opposing the ever rising price of foodgrains they have accepted helplessness.

Use of tractor purchases up the production cost of Agriculture:

Compared to a pair of bullocks costing Rs. 15,000/- a tractor costs Rs.1,50,000/- resulting into an additional capital investment of Rs.1,35,000/-. In addition the interest cost also increases. But if bullocks are used we get free dung and there is no expenses towards feeding them because they can feed themselves on the stalk of foodgrain plants. Further, as soon as you bring in tractor, it needs diesel without which it is useless.

Thus the expense of diesel gets added and then chemical fertiliser is needed in the absence of dung manure. For a 30 acre plot, you need fertiliser worth atleast Rs.12,000/-. Thus there is an additional cost of Rs.12,000/- and interest cost on such investment. Add to this the cost of pesticides and the cost of spraying the pesticides in the farm. All these expenses are unnecessary. However to cater to the vested interest of a definite section, the farmer is forced into bearing this burden and thus the government is participating in a heartless exploitation of the farmers and thereby the population of our nation.

Do you want to provide foodgrains at cheaper rates to the people? Here are the ways:

If all these unnecessary expenses which are aimed at benefitting a certain section of vested interests are stopped, if a total ban is imposed on slaughter of cow and cow family, it is possible to provide foodgrains at the rates prevalent around Second World War. If this happens, the prices of industrial products also can come down and there will not be any need to pay dearness allowances. However, the government itself does not wish that prices come down because at higher prices the profit margins of the traders also will have to be high to cover the return on high investments. Higher the profits higher the income tax and sales tax and thus at the cost of the common man the govt. wants to raise its revenue.

The farmers are being cheated:

On one hand, by pushing the agriculture towards more and more mechanisation, the government is increasing the production cost and on the other hand, it is instigating the farmers by a propaganda saying that the farmers should get proper return and that the farmers will stand to lose if the prices come down. By certain administrative measures, the prices of foodgrains are maintained at a high level and thus the farmers are entangled into the web of mechanisation.

If the government honestly desires that the farmers should get an appropriate return on his produce, then the right way is to reduce the production cost rather than the inhuman course of keeping the prices of foodgrains at high level. There is only one way of reducing the production cost and that is to stop the pressure of mechanisation in the agricultural sector, and to co-ordinate the interest of human beings, animals and the entire living universe with agriculture by a total ban on slaughter of cow and cow family.

Do not make the independent farmer a slave of mechanisation!

A farmer engaged in agriculture with the help of bullocks is independent. He is not the slave of any one. However, the moment a tractor enters his world, he becomes dependent on the government department or bank giving loan for tractor, he becomes dependent on manufacturers and traders of diesel, fertilisers, pesticides and even the petty mechanics when his tractor breaks down.

It is sheer folly to use tractor for agriculture:

After ploughing the land with tractor if there is no irrigation facility or if the land is dry, there are additional problems. If the field is ploughed with the help of bullocks, as soon as there is rain fall of 25 to 50mm, the farmer can immediately go ahead with sowing. However, if the field is ploughed with tractor, unless there is 125mm of rain fall at one stretch, the farmer cannot do sowing, because with deep digging of the soil, the inner moisture of the soil gets destroyed and hence if the rainfall is not sufficient, the water seeps deep into the dried soil and the fertiliser also soaks the water leaving no room for sowing.

It may so happen that in two adjoining fields, one ploughed with the help of wooden plough and the other with the help of tractor, if there is no rainfall of 125mm at a stretch, but at an interval of 10 to 12 days and upto 50mm at a time, it is possible that the crop in the field ploughed with the help of wooden plough will be almost one feet high, whereas in the field ploughed with the help of tractor, the sowing itself may not have taken place or if at all sowing is done the crop may not be growing at a satisfactory pace.

Here one may argue that are the Western countries who do agriculture with the help of tractor, not affected by scarcity of monsoon.

This belief is wrong:

The answer to this argument is that it is a wrong belief that the Western countries do their agriculture only with the help of fertilisers and tractors. Bulk of their agriculture is with the help of horses. For prevention against extreme cold conditions people need woollen cloth and hence they rear sheep on large scale. The droppings of these sheep are used as manure and after meeting their local needs for wool the additional wool is exported. Thus with the help of sheep they get milk, manure and woollen cloth also. They also earn foreign exchange by exporting woollen clothes. Whereas in our country by slaughtering the sheep we lose all the three i.e. milk, manure and wool. And on the contrary import woollen cloth worth rs. 14 crores per annum. As this woollen cloth is insufficient, as also very costly, people fall sick during winter.

In entire Russia agriculture is done with the help of horses and horses are the life line of their transportation system also. The life line of our transport system is bullock. Only wherever irrigation facilities are available, they use tractors. America and Canada have fully mechanised farming. However, these two countries as well as other European countries having mechanised farming do not have any irrigation problem because there is a lot of snow during winter in these countries and when this snow melts, there is enough water for their fields. besides if the monsoon is not good they are able to get water from rivers, lakes and canals.

Have our rivers dried up?

We have allowed most of our rivers to dry up. Large rivers of Gujarat like Sabarmati have dried up because of silting of their bed by 30 ft. The government is not at all perturbed by this development. Possibly by the time the Narmada dam is erected, Narmada also would have dried up. In Europe and America they take care that the rivers do not dry up due to silting. The large rivers also are periodically de-silted. Just about 8 to 10 years ago all the rivers in France were de-silted. A multi crore 12 years project to de-silt one of the large rivers like Mississippi is also going on. In our country also before the British

Rule, our rivers used to be de-silted. However, after the rule of the British, de-silting was topped. On the contrary, steps leading to drying up of all rivers due to silting were encouraged so that the destruction of the animal wealth becomes faster.

Machinery manufacturers are the only beneficiary:

It is true that farming is totally mechanised in America and Canada. However, this has not benefitted the farmers. The only beneficiaries have been manufacturers of machinery. Now war weapon industry and Agriculture have become the backbone of American Economy. Hence if large profits are to be reaped by exporting foodgrains they need to resort to mechanisation. Our country is being pushed towards mechanised farming so that our production costs increase substantially, thereby making imports from Western countries cheaper. Besides this, the Western countries create a situation of scarcity of foodgrains and water and then give us large loans for import of foodgrains and for irrigation projects. They also give large loans for setting up slaughter houses so that our animal wealth gets destroyed very fast. Of course, there is an unwritten condition that as a consideration for all these loans, we would buy milk powder and butter oil from them in large quantities and at exorbitant prices.

Do we have the capacity to produce so many tractors?

If our bullocks are totally destroyed, we will need 1,30,00,000 tractors, the cost of which at today's rates will be Rs. 2,00,000 crores. The government departments claim that we have 7 crores bullocks to present. This figure is very much doubtful. However, even if we accept this, it would mean that these bullocks represent national wealth of Rs. 10,000 crores. Only our ministers can bring to light as to what sort of economic wisdom lies in destroying this colossal national wealth and invest Rs.2,00,000 crores in tractors, waste 5 crore tons of steel and to burden the agriculture with unnecessary expenses of thousands of crores of rupees.

We do not have capacity or the means to invest such colossal capital and manufacture the required tractors. Even Russia is unable to manufacture so many tractors. To save petrol and to keep the production cost at lower level Russia uses horses, both for agriculture as well as for transportation. When America will give up mechanisation from the farming, it will dump on us its old tractors at high price under PL-480. It has also fixed up dumping of its chemical fertiliser stock worth Rs. 250 crore on us every year.

What will you export in return?

Today in return for diesel we export wheat, rice, pulses animal meat, sugar etc. However, in few years' time when the entire cattle wealth will be destroyed what will we export? With total mechanised farming the cost of production of foodgrains will be very high but we will have to sell the foodgrains at the prices dictated by the diesel

suppliers in return of the diesel and to bridge or recover the loss the prices in local market will have to be substantially increased. For example presently we sell sugar at very low price to the foreign countries and charge Rs.8 to 10 per kg. in the local market.

Tractors crush wealth worth crores of rupees:

With entry of one tractor six bullocks become useless and have to be slaughtered. For running a tractor or any other mode of transport run with the help of petrol, for one year we have to slaughter 70 animals and export their meat. This is so because the diesel exporting Arab countries ask for meat in return of diesel. Slaughter of 70 animals means destruction of national wealth worth Rs. 70,000/-. Besides, we also lose income worth lakhs of rupees which is otherwise generated from the milk or the manure or the wool obtained from these animals. Thus the roaring tractor moving on our agricultural fields crushes under it national wealth and income worth crores of rupees.

The Europeans will once again establish their rule:

Today the Government struggles to retain power by tempting the farming community with promises of giving various benefits. However, when our country will have nothing to export in return of diesel, kerosene or tractor, then the Western Powers who have their hold on World Bank and other International Monetary Institution will take possession of all our important installation and projects to recover their debts like the British did 200 years ago, by giving bait of assistance.

Nation will be engulfed in Civil War:

For bringing total mechanisation in the farming sector, 80% of our farmers who hold 2.1/2 to 5 acres of land will have to be removed from the agriculture scene. It will not be surprising if landless Harijans and Adivasis who are being given agricultural plots of 2.1/2 acres in the name of their 'economic upliftment' will be deprived of these plots again after being accused of becoming unsuccessful and also under the guise of national need for acquiring their land and thus they will be forced to become farm labourers once again. The same thing has happened in Russia and China also. The entire population was converted into slaves and one crores farmers in Russia (Source: Memoirs of wars by Churchill) and 3 crores farmers in China (Source: Communist China by Chandrasekhar) were gunned down. Farmers in India who have become pawns in the hands of selfish politician moving around with flags of farmers' interest in their hands and demanding price increase, growing of cash crops and export of farm produce, hardly have an idea that they (farmers) are going to face bullets at the hands of military in future.

The Hurricane of total destruction is fast approaching:

In the past 40 years we have been able to manufacture 8,593 railway engines, 37,913 passenger carriages and 3,49,560 wagons

(Source: India 1991 page 285) then how many years will be required to manufacture 1.30 crore tractors? We do not have the required capital or the required steel and hence we do not have any other option but to import tractors. The government is taking this suicidal step. The common man is unable to think and realise all this, burdened as he is with his day-to-day harassment and torture.

A destructive hurricane is advancing at fast pace to engulf us. What will be the result? The destruction of the entire population? or the destruction of the vile powers indulging in all these? The answer is difficult.

But if we believe in our religion, scriptures, if we believe in our history of lakhs of years we can confidently say that eventually the vile powers only will be destroyed.

We need not get disheartened by this gory dance of destruction around this great Aryan race and must have full faith in our religion and philosophy which assure deliverance for the rightful.

Our this great land of Aryan race has never been deprived of sages and it will never be in future. I am confident that with the blessing of our great saints, the great population of India will be able to defeat the advancing hurricane of doom and come out as winner.