

Opinion

SUNDAY, APRIL 21, 2019

EVERY LOK SABHA election in India is unique even if the two main contestants are the same. One of the reasons is that the political parties, other than the two main contestants, change their positions between elections.

There is another important reason: a main contestant may undergo a radical transformation, for better or worse, and the party's entry into the battle in a new avatar may not resemble any previous occasion. That's what has happened in 2019.

The incumbent of 2014 (the Congress) has become the principal challenger and the challenger of 2014 (the BJP) is the incumbent. The apparent role reversal has, however, acquired a twist because the BJP of 2019 is not the BJP of 2014. The BJP of 2014 was a structured political party while the BJP of 2019 is a one-person show. Mr Narendra Modi has swept aside all the structures in the BJP and has become the party. Consequently, the battle lines are different. It was the BJP vs the Congress in 2014; now, it is Mr Modi vs the Congress.

Money and power

Mr Modi is supported by the most powerful combination of money, power and political authority. Let's take money. A Modi rally will cost at least ₹10 crore and he holds three or four a day. Not even a fraction of the cost is accounted for and I wonder if the cost is added to the expenditure account(s) of the candidate(s) who were on the stage. On State power, it is well known that Mr Modi has by-passed the ministers concerned and controls all the levers of State power — the Intelligence Bureau, the Home Ministry, the Department of Revenue and the investigative agencies. Regarding political authority, he is the only voice that matters in the BJP on forging alliances, choice of candidates, election strategy and setting the narrative. The job of the famous blog-writer is only to provide ex-post justification.

The Congress was no match to the BJP in money or power. However, it stole a march in the realm of ideas. Early in the election season, the Congress realised that there was a yearning among the people for less noise, more security, vastly more jobs, relief to the farmers and welfare of the poor. The Congress decided to listen to the voices of the people. In due course, those voices supplied the ideas and the narrative for the most talked about election manifesto in Indian politics.

Within days of the release of the Congress manifesto on April 2, the battle line was no longer Mr Modi vs the Congress; it was Mr Modi vs the Congress manifesto. Just listen to any speech of Mr Modi. Apart from the usual quota of falsehoods and abuse of the Gandhi family, Mr Modi will launch into the Congress manifesto, erect imaginary ghosts and pretend to slay them. He will not utter a word about the BJP's manifesto that was released a few days after April 2 and turned out to be eminently forgettable! Mr Modi has realised the power of the ideas contained in the Congress manifesto.

Manifesto captures imagination

I have just returned from a gruelling two weeks on the campaign trail in Tamil Nadu and I can tell you what captured the imagination of the Tamil vot-

ACROSS THE AISLE

P Chidambaram



Mr Modi vs manifesto



BJP supporters wearing masks of Prime Minister Narendra Modi at an election campaign rally, during the ongoing general elections, at Kathua in Jammu & Kashmir

ers. The top six were:

- ₹72,000 a year (₹6,000 a month) to families below the poverty line;
- waiver of agricultural loans (The DMK added waiver of small-value jewel loans);
- increase in MGNREGA entitlement to 150 days a year;
- 24 lakh government jobs in nine months as part of an earnest promise to create several lakh jobs;
- security for women, Dalits, Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, forest dwellers, journalists, writers, academics, NGOs and practically every one who is chafing at the misuse of the government's power (the income-tax raids on opposition candidates and leaders was the 'proof' that sealed the argument); and
- respect for the Tamil language,

race, culture, icons and history.

Undoubtedly, most of the endearing promises were related to welfare, but that is because the people believe that Defence and Economy are the elected government's responsibilities and complex issues that cannot be debated in an election campaign. If the elected government messes up these issues, it will pay a price (e.g. demonetisation, for which the people will punish the Modi government).

Power of ideas

Unless the field reports are hopelessly wrong, the Congress manifesto and Mr Rahul Gandhi's articulation of each idea in a measured voice will carry the DMK-led alliance to a grand victory in Tamil Nadu. Besides, by a clever amalgam of the Congress's promises and the DMK's promises, Mr M K Stalin demon-

strated the power of the idea of 'Welfare'.

But it is early days and only two phases of the election (comprising 186 seats) are over. The crucial phases are Phase III (115 seats) and Phase IV (71 seats) when the battle of ideas will be taken to the Hindi heartland.

'Wealth and Welfare' is a powerful message to the people. Mr Modi would understand it if he walked on the streets of India's small towns and villages, but he prefers to fly. If the opposition parties understand the potential of the message and carry it to every corner of the country (even if they do so separately), they will win their separate battles against the BJP. I keep my fingers crossed.



Website: pchidambaram.in
@Pchidambaram_IN



INSIDE TRACK

COOMI KAPOOR

Plane unfair

The BJP with foresight and deep pockets booked nearly all the chartered helicopters available in West Bengal months back. (The Congress's Anand Sharma, in fact, earlier complained of the BJP's near monopoly on aircraft all over India. But the national party managed eventually to put together a fleet of planes thanks to help from private owners and some charter companies.) By the time Mamata Banerjee's Trinamool Congress woke up to the need for helicopters for the campaign, there were no aircraft for hire. One solitary charter company offered a rather outdated model. Banerjee had perforce to use this helicopter on her election trips. In Jalpaiguri, the undependable helicopter broke down and *Didi* lost her cool, especially when she saw her petrified party workers trying to give the aircraft a manual push as if it was a stalled car. Eventually Banerjee had no option but to go by road to her next destination. She later called up her good friend, TDP leader Chandrababu Naidu, to request for his helicopter, since the elections in Andhra Pradesh are over. Naidu is reportedly taking his own time to respond.

Sandalwood strikes

Karnataka chief minister H D Kumaraswamy wept copiously at a rally in Mandya. The family has a tradition of bursting into tears when things get tough and the CM fears that his son Nikhil could lose. Pitted against Nikhil in the Mandya parliamentary constituency is film actress Sumalatha Ambareesh, whose late husband actor Ambareesh has a lot of goodwill in the Karnataka film fraternity, nicknamed Sandalwood. Sumalatha is backed totally by Sandalwood and even southern actors from other states, such as Rajinikanth, are pitching in. The BJP is also supporting Sumalatha and has not fielded a candidate in this Vokkaliga belt. Kumaraswamy's fear is that some in the Congress, particularly his old rival Siddaramiah, may secretly be working against Nikhil. The Congress is furious that it had to give up the Mandya seat for the CM's son even though the Gowda family had already appropriated constituencies for two other members, patriarch H D Deve Gowda and his grandson Prajwal Revanna. If Nikhil loses, it bodes ill for the Congress-JD(U) government in the state.

Disowning past

K Veeramani, the elderly leader of the Dravida Kazhagam movement, is a headache for DMK president M K Stalin, just as former RSS chief K S Sudarshan was an embarrassment to the late PM Atal Bihari Vajpayee when he spoke out of turn. The DMK is an offspring of the DK rationalist and atheist movement in Tamil Nadu. So when Veeramani speaks, the DMK gets associated with his remarks. Recently Veeramani took a potshot at the way Hindu gods and goddesses are depicted, and referred to Sita dancing and Lord Krishna in the pool with *gopis*. There was widespread condemnation, since Hindu sentiment in the state is growing. Stalin is now at pains to disown the DMK's anti-religious past. After Veeramani's remark, Stalin declared that leaders should be careful when they speak so as to not offend religious feelings. He denied that the DMK was an anti-Hindu party and pointed out that his wife visited the temple daily. He even issued a press release claiming that 80% of party members are Hindus.

Row (tele) prompted

There were many caustic comments on the internet about a curious video of several SPG men scurrying away from the landing pad at Chitradurga, Karnataka, carrying an enormous black box, after arrival of the PM's helicopter. It was whisked away to a waiting vehicle even as Narendra Modi was still greeting those who had come to receive him. The local DCP and SP clarified that the box only contained "security and logistics material". In fact, the box, which is transported on all the PM's trips, contains two large teleprompters and a synchronisation unit, plus cables to assist Modi when he makes speeches at rallies.

BJP's new slogan

Whether because the electoral campaign is so long drawn out or the BJP feels its advertising material needs to be buttressed, the party has come out with yet another slogan which will be introduced in the later phases of the polls. The earlier slogans centered around Modi. First it was 'Modi Hai Toh Mumkin Hai', later 'Phir Ek Baar Modi Sarkar', and 'Choukedar Modi'. The new catch line is 'Kaam Ruke Na, Desh Jhuke Na' (The work should not stop, the country should not bow). This is meant to reinforce two themes. The ongoing development work should be allowed to continue. And that the nation must be strong and not falter, an indirect allusion to the Balakot air strikes.

Miss Me?

Two years after the golfing world had written him off, Tiger Woods scripts his greatest comeback yet

OVER THE TOP

Meraj Shah

AT THE 14TH hole at Augusta, playing his opening round at the 2019 Masters Tournament, Tiger Woods found himself under the trees on the left after an errant drive. With no direct line to the green, Woods produced a high, sweeping draw that threaded its way out of trouble, and then swung back toward the green before rolling on to the putting surface. He followed that up with yet another unlikely shot—an up-and-down slider from 25 feet—to go two-under par and seize an early share of the lead. The momentousness of that moment wasn't lost on anyone, let alone the gallery (patrons in Augusta lingo) that burst into a roar that echoed across the golf course. Two years after being undone by a bad back, and struggling to walk, let alone play golf, Woods—after a radical 'spinal fusion' surgery and a brand new golf swing—was back in contention at The Masters.

Even on the first day of play, the signs were ominous. Woods signed off for a two-under 70—the score he's shot each of the four times that he's won this tournament in the past.

Averaging over 300 yards off the tee, holing impossibly long putts, and working the ball in both directions, Woods didn't just look in control: he looked in complete command of his game. That was reaffirmed in round two when the four-time Masters Champion rolled in a 37-footer for birdie on the 10th hole; effected an escape from the pines on the 14th for the second day in a row, and curled in a stunner from 28 feet for birdie on the 15th hole. Even though he missed an easy birdie on the last (which would have tied him for the lead at 7-under par), the four-under-par 68 put Woods one shot back of the leaders going into the weekend.

A couple of years back, videos of Woods flubbing chips like an amateur had gone viral. For those of us who watched his sublime effort from off the green on the 15th hole on the third day, it was clear that those demons had been put to rest. Woods drained the tap-in to go to 11-under and take a share of the lead. With a 67, five-under on day three,



Tiger Woods celebrates on the 18th hole to win the 2019 Masters

REUTERS

Woods was very much in the hunt.

In his previous four triumphs here, Woods has had the 54-hole lead to himself going into the final day's play. This year, not only did he trail Francesco

Molinari by two shots, but was tied with long-hitting Brooks Koepka and Tony Finau. Koepka, a big-stage specialist, has won three of the last seven Majors, while reigning Open Champion, Mol-

nari, successfully fended off Woods at the Open Championship. The 36-year-old's game is based on precision and consistency and the Italian is hard to catch when his putter gets going.

Molinari shot a six-under 66 on Saturday to go into the final day with sole possession of the lead at 13-under, with Woods and Finau two shots back. Molinari has never been reticent about his admiration for Woods and the Italian's quest to win the Open Championship and the Masters consecutively hasn't been accomplished in 17 years. The last man to do it? Tiger Woods in 2001.

Molinari started his final round in assured fashion: with sublime rhythm and stoic temperament, he refused to be drawn out of his percentage-play strategy, despite being paired with an aggressive Woods and long-hitting Tony Finau. Molinari's Masters nightmare began at the eighth hole, where he dropped a stroke—astoundingly, his first bogey in 50 holes. Things continued downhill on the par-3 13th when an eight-iron rolled back down the bank and into the water, dropping Molinari into a share of the lead with Woods, Molinari, Koepka, and Finau at 12-under.

The bitter end came on the 15th hole when Molinari found the water yet again—the ensuing double bogey dropped him out of contention, while Tiger birdied to take sole possession of the lead. Yet another birdie on the 16th

hole set up a two-shot cushion for Woods that a closing bogey could not deflate. And just like that, 14 years after his last victory at Augusta, and 11 years from his last Major triumph, 43-year-old Tiger Woods had won the Masters Tournament. Wood's tally of 22 birdies in the week was second best in the field and he was second to none in driving accuracy and avoiding big numbers on the scorecard.

It's hard to describe the accomplishments of individuals for whom there are no models in the order of people amongst whom they rank. Woods not only stands head-and-shoulders above his peers, but I'm hard pressed to find a comparable figure across eras.

Only Jack Nicklaus, with his six Green Jackets and 18 Major victories, comes close. But Wood's otherworldly abilities to overcome professional, personal, and physical setbacks are unrivalled. Along the way he's redefined the way the game is played, influenced an entire generation of young players, taken the game to new audiences and single-handedly driven the growth of the sport. Until last Sunday, your columnist used to refer to him as the pre-eminent player of our generation. I stand corrected: 43-year-old Tiger Woods is the greatest player in the history of the game. And he's not done yet.

A golfer, Meraj Shah also writes about the game

Idea Exchange

SUNDAY, APRIL 21, 2019

150,000 Indian industrialists have taken up residence in Dubai, London in the past 5-6 years...I don't know how much impact it has, but I see people investing overseas when they should be investing here"



WHY NAUSHAD FORBES

A LEADING VOICE in India's corporate sector, Forbes brings clarity and reason to discussions on business-government relations. As co-chairman of Forbes Marshall, an engineering firm, he has implemented 'affirmative action' policies in his company — consistently ranked amongst India's 'Great Places to Work'. He has a

doctorate from Stanford University, where he was also a consulting professor for over 15 years till 2004. As president of the Confederation of Indian Industry (CII) in 2016-17, Forbes worked closely with the government as it put in place two of the biggest reforms — the GST and Bankruptcy Code



"I admire the PM for his desire to find a place in our history books...But when we want to do many things, sometimes, we see people who block us along the way as unnecessary, to be knocked out of the way"

I respect this govt trying to enforce rules... (but) there's a view that industry is somehow suspect

Co-chairman of Forbes Marshall Naushad Forbes says while jobs are being created, these are in the informal sector, says blocking the NSSO survey data backfired, explains why the RBI cut was necessary, and expresses concern over more powers being granted to tax officials



Naushad Forbes with Executive Editor (National Affairs) P Vaidyanathan Iyer in *The Indian Express* newsroom

GAJENDRA YADAV

PVAIDYANATHAN IYER: What has been your impression of the political campaigns in this general election?

I think it has been a terribly negative campaign. I don't remember a campaign that has been as negative and vicious as this one. I worry that the content is personal and vicious because they think that's a safer basis to get elected or re-elected than to deal with issues or take positions on positive messaging.

PVAIDYANATHAN IYER: Job creation has been a big issue. How are we doing on that front?

If you look at job creation in the larger industry, it has been very low... in terms of officially reported job creation. I think there has been more job creation in contract employment, which is very often prompted by large industry. I'll give you an example of a factory of a leading FMCG company. There are several hundred people working in that factory, which has a certain degree of automation. From the time the raw materials come in, to the time you have the finished product, there are 15 or 20 people. But then, when you get to the end of the line, there's this huge hall full of people who are taking the finished product and putting it in boxes. So they're doing the final packaging and then the shipping activity. All those people are contract labourers. The 20 or so people in the factory are employed by the company and the 300 people in the packaging area are not employed by them. They are contract labourers. That doesn't show in manufacturing employment. There is better and better data on contract labour but it's still not by any means robust.

I think there's a fair amount of employment of that kind that's being created. In the official statistics, I think, total employment has been flat, not just over the last five years, but I would say the last 10 years.

PVAIDYANATHAN IYER: But the claim that the economy is creating a large number of jobs, and that we are growing at, say, 6.5 or 7%... Clearly, we are not absorbing many people who are entering the labour force every year.

There's no good, robust job statistics, but if I had to guess, I would say that we are actually creating if not millions of jobs, certainly hundreds of thousands of jobs... How many, I don't know and I'm not sure anyone really knows. But the bulk of those jobs, it seems to me, are in informal services... The problem with

these kinds of professions is that they're not really good quality jobs. These are informal jobs without much security and these are jobs that are very dependent on the immediate employer in terms of how well the individual is treated and what kind of dignity they're accorded.

PVAIDYANATHAN IYER: The government blocked the report of the National Sample Survey Office which talked about how jobs in the country have shrunk. It's now being called a draft report. What does this say about respect for institutions, the hallmark of any democracy, in the country?

If you look at the regard that governments has for institutions, especially when governments are in a hurry, when they are clear on what they want to do, they see anything that seems to come in their way as an unnecessary encumbrance. I admire the Prime Minister for his desire to find a place in our history books. I think he came to office with that as part of his ambition. But when we want to do many things, sometimes we see people who block us along the way as unnecessary, to be knocked out of the way.

Somewhere along the way, we learn that institutions are actually the hallmark of democracy. They provide checks and balances, they enable a free society to operate with a set of rules. And even though some things tend to go off track from time to time, a properly functioning institution can bring them back. Take the example of the NSSO survey. As a result of not releasing the survey, the average Indian, who had never heard of the NSSO, suddenly has. So I think it backfires when one attempts to do that because we have institutions like the free press that will then publish the leaked report and the results of the survey. There's a group of people who would normally never read an employment survey but they have read all the articles about it simply because the government tried not to release it. The best way of dealing with it is to actually put the data out there and let people fall over it and argue about it and point holes in it. That's what a noisy democracy should enable.

PVAIDYANATHAN IYER: During the previous government, there was this group of 11-13 people led by Jamshyd Godrej and Deepak Parekh who wrote open letters. Why is the corporate sector silent on critical issues now, be it the jobs data or Ujjit Patel's exit?

I think this government is more sensitive to criticism than previous govern-

ments have been. Maybe that's because several ministers are first-time national ministers. And as they get more used to the role, maybe they will develop broader shoulders and thicker skins and be less sensitive. The most vocal are people such as finance minister Arun Jaitley, transport minister Nitin Gadkari. You can talk with them, argue with them and criticise them, and they will come right back at you and tell you where you are wrong. They are very happy to engage. I think sometimes it takes that perspective, of having served in the government and then having lost power and then serving in the Opposition. Losing power is a lesson in humility like no other. It teaches respect for debate and argument that is very healthy. So maybe we need to see that pattern work its way out.

HARISH DAMODARAN: Your company makes boilers. The best barometer of investments in the economy is the number of boilers and compressors being sold. How has it been?

We get business from people setting up new industrial projects and from existing plants that are trying to become more efficient. The latter has been pretty robust over the last 10 years. The former, in terms of fresh industrial investment, has been pretty flat and low for the last seven years. It was low and depressed for the last two years of the UPA and for the full five years of the current government. Broadly speaking, we have seen industrial investment be flat. So our personal experience ties in perfectly with the macro data on industrial investment, which is that it's low and depressed and that depression has been sustained for the last seven years.

SANDEEP SINGH: Do you see any kind of recovery on the capital expenditure front? Also, the RBI went in for a rate cut recently. It's a time when not only is

private investment not happening but even the consumption demand is slowing down.

I think the rate cut was necessary. It reflects the widespread understanding that the economy has been slowing. Will it in itself turn things around? I don't think so. I think it was a reflection of this wider concern about where the economy is now. What will turn things around? For some reason, I don't know why, but usually, regardless of how the year has gone, Q4 is quite strong. Everyone is trying to achieve more. All the OEMs (Original Equipment Manufacturers) are trying to ship out more, people want to commission plants etc... We saw less of a pull this last year in Q4 than we have generally seen in Q4s. We're not sure.

SANDEEP SINGH: What is the missing cog in the wheel?

I think there are actually two. One is inclusive growth. Take the FMCG sector — not durables, but fast-moving consumer goods. The FMCG growth for many years through the '90s, through the 2000s, was pretty robust. Whatever the GDP growth was, the estimate was that the FMCG should grow one-and-a-half times to twice that. In the last five or six years, that seems to have turned and the FMCG multiple seems to now be 0.8 or 0.9. So if you look at volume growth over a longer period of time, it's now less than the GDP growth. I haven't seen a really good analysis that asks why but I have a hypothesis. My hypothesis is that in the last few years, our growth has for some reason become less inclusive, and so fewer and fewer people have become first-time buyers of toothpaste and soap and detergent and burgers and chips. As a result, it's showing in the wider FMCG data.

Secondly, I think there's an issue with sentiment among industrialists, in terms of investment. And while I really respect

the initiatives of this government to try to get people to comply with all applicable rules and regulations, I think the general tenor of debate has been... there's this sort of view that industry is somehow suspect, and I worry about that, because if you do that, then you will end up depressing investment. The story that I hear is that there are 150,000 Indian industrialists who have taken up residence in either Singapore or Dubai or London, in the last say five-six years. These are big numbers. It means that you've got thousands and thousands of people who are economically active and want to do something. And if they want to do something, they are going to invest. They will invest where they are, as opposed to where they should be, which is here. And, I think, we haven't figured out the cost of some of this wider sentiment — not the sentiment of how the economy is doing, but the sentiment of how the industry is regarded. So, there is that going on as well. I don't know how much of an impact it has, but speaking anecdotally, I see people investing overseas when they should be investing here.

HARISH DAMODARAN: Do you think the Goods and Services Tax and demonetisation were responsible for the lack of inclusive growth?

I think demonetisation definitely affected consumption. We saw that very dramatically in the first months. But within a year, there was a recovery. So if you look at Q3 or Q4 of 2016-17, and Q1 of 2017-18, you definitely saw demand significantly depressed as a result of demonetisation and later the introduction of GST. But by Q2 of 2017-18, FMCG companies were reporting significant volume growth, quarter-on-quarter, and by Q3 and Q4 of 2017-18 they were reporting significant volume growth similar to two years before demonetisation was done. So I think by the end of 2017-18 and certainly going into 2018-19, FMCG companies had recovered from demonetisation. There was that fall and then recovery in volume growth. So yes, it had an effect, but I think it was transient.

ANIL SASI: During UPA-2, the industry had come out in the open to talk about overreach by tax officials. Now, there is anecdotal evidence, that the government is struggling to meet tax targets and there is pressure on the industry to cough up advance taxes.

Honestly, I haven't heard of real and widespread incidents of raids and such goings on as a way of increasing rev-

enues. I think, some of that is politically motivated, but I don't think it's tax terrorism running amok.

Having said that, where I'm concerned is that this government has changed some rules that give greater powers to tax officials than they had earlier on. This was done in the Budget about two years ago. And I don't think enough has been made out of that, because the general comment, when we have spoken about it, has been, 'Yes, yes, but we won't use this'. And my reaction has always been that if you are telling me to trust in the inherent goodness of the tax-man, I have a problem. History doesn't tell me that that's what I should do. I think we should worry about changing rules that move us backwards when it comes to issues relating to tax terrorism... But as of now, my sense is that there isn't widespread use of those existing rules.

SUNNY VERMA: The relationship between the government and industry is a tricky one. There is a dilemma on both sides...

The government should be close to industry, it should not be close to individual industrialists. I'm talking about all governments, whether present or previous, or future. There should be a closeness in terms of listening to the industry... And if the government listens to the industry too much, it's not good for the country. It has to hear the industry and then do what's right.

...I think the industry department is actually very open and receptive. The industry minister is very proactive, very keen to get inputs, very keen to pick up ideas. I think that needs to turn into a wider view of industry as being something positive. Yes, you may have some deviants along the way who do the wrong thing. Go after them in every possible way because criminality should be prosecuted. But at the end of the day, don't let that become a basis for making policy that affects everyone else.

SANDEEP SINGH: As part of the Confederation of Indian Industry (CII), do you see an increase in incidents of some industrialists having more access to the Government of India?

No, I don't think so. You would have to go back to the pre-1991 days to see that kind of phenomenon really playing out, where certain industrialists had a real connect. I don't think that there's this group now in the industry that has an inside track to the government. There may be particular individuals who have relationships that they carry forward, but that's always true. But I don't think they listen to some industrialists and not others.

AMITAVA CHAKRABORTY: The refrain of national security, that look we went and hit Pakistan and the fact that it strikes a chord with a section of the electorate... What does it say about our politics and country?

The whole nationalism claim has been a gamechanger in terms of popularity. We will see what happens in the actual election. I wish such issues were actually beyond the political sphere. My own view is that this government and the previous government have broadly done the right thing when it comes to national security. And to accuse either in either direction, that they are damaging the fabric of the nation or not protecting its interests, is wrong. I don't think I'm the only Indian who doesn't buy that. I think there are many millions of Indians who will think similarly that this debate is actually not a debate.

PVAIDYANATHAN IYER: We discussed the distrust towards the industry. Do you see a lack of trust, of respect towards other sections as well, such as minority communities, Scheduled Castes etc.

I worry when, in a country that is as diverse as ours, you hear people making statements about a more majoritarian identity. I think that is dangerous for us as a country. I would like to hear a much more inclusive identity being pushed by our political leaders. For them to say that we want to be elected by all Indians — from all communities, economic backgrounds, professions. Seeing that narrative of inclusiveness in our political discourse would be a really healthy thing. What will get us there I think will be the results of the election. I think when people start showing that they win elections on the basis of an inclusive message, it will turn very quickly and all of a sudden everyone will become 'includers'. I think we underestimate the good sense of our people.



I worry when people make statements about a majoritarian identity. When people win polls on an inclusive message... everyone will become 'includers'. We underestimate the good sense of our people