THE BOOK WAS DRENCHED

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY
OU_164859
UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

POLITICAL SCIENCE IN INDIA

(Presidential Addresses delivered at the All India Political Science Conference)

Volume I
(1938—1947)

V. N. CHAWLA
Head, Post-Graduate Department of Political Science
D.A.V. College, Jullundur.

S. K. SHARMA
Reader, Department of Public Administration,
Panjab University, Chandigarh.

International Book Company (Regd.)
Educational Publishers
Mai Hiran Gate, JULLUNDUR CITY—144001.

Printed in India

By Jiwan Dutt Chawla, Prop. Indian National Press, Jullundur,
And published by V. K. Dhingra, International Book Company (Regd.)
Jullundur.

Homage to

All those who enriched the discipline of
Political Science in India
with their wisdom and knowledge
but are no more with us.

CONTENTS

	Foreword by Professor A. Appadorai	4
	Introducing the Presidents	5—8
	Introduction	9—16
1.	Postulates of Political Science *Pandit Gobind Vallabh Pant*	17—24
2.	The Indian Political Scene *Dr. Premathanath Banerjee*	25—42
3.	Civilization and State *Prof. Beni Parsad*	43—65
4.	Plea For a World Federation *Prof. V. Shiva Ram*	66—90
5.	The Birth and Growth of Muslim Nationalism *Principal Gurmukh Nihal Singh*	91—112
6.	The Role of Political Scientists *Principal G. D. Sondhi*	113—129
7.	Search For a Political Theory *Prof. S. P. Puntembekar*	130—155
8.	A Case For Indian Independence *Prof. M. Venkatrangaiya*	156—190
9.	Right of Self-Determination For India *Prof. D. N. Banerjee*	191—206
10.	Civil Services In Independent India *Dr. J. N. Khosla*	207—224

FOREWORD

Dr. S. K. Sharma and Prof V. N. Chawla have to be commended for their effort in presenting the Presidential Addresses of the first ten Political Science Conferences in India. The Indian Political Science Conference represented a desirable effort to bring together students of Political Science from all parts of India to discuss important political issues. It has, through the publication of the proceedings of the Political Science Conference and its Journal, the Indian Journal of Political Science, provided an excellent forum for the furtherance of political science in India. The addresses presented here include discussions of such topics as Postulates of Political Science, Plea for a World Federation, Civilization and State and the Birth and Growth of Muslim Nationalism. Some of the issues discussed in these addresses and the conclusions arrived at are still relevant to contemporary India and the world.

It is to be hoped that at least one or two Presidents of future conferences will devote attention specifically to the professional problems of political scientists. It is not an exaggeration to say that in the emerging India of today Political Science can play a most useful part in relating political concepts to the Indian environment social, economic, and political. Indeed political theories to be useful must emerge from a study of the social and economic environment to which they have to apply and much needs to be done in identifying essential political data and working out appropriate theories relating to the relation between the State and the individual in India. New techniques of teaching and research have developed in advanced countries. Indian students of political science have to evolve the techniques appropriate to their situation. A discussion of political science in India and the improvement in the teaching methods and methods of research will be an appropriate subject for a Presidential Address.

I hope that the Editors of this volume who have, incidentally, provided a useful summary of each address at the beginning will publish the remaining Presidential Addresses not included in this volume as soon as possible.

Jawaharlal Nehru University,
New Delhi.

A. Appadorai

INTRODUCING THE PRESIDENTS

Pandit Govind Vallabh, Pant : B. A. ; LL.B ; LL. D. (Allahabad, Banares and Lucknow) b. September 10, 1887 in Almora District ; **Education** ; Almora ; Muir Central College, Allahabad ; School of law, Allahabad University ; Enrolled Advocate, Allahabad High Court, 1909 ; joined the Bar at Naini Tal ; took active part in politics ; started Kumaon Parisbad in 1916 to study local problems and redress of grievances ; elected member A.I.C.C, 1916 ; U. P. Legislative Council, 1923, on Swaraj Party Ticket ; Leader Swraj Party, U. P. Council for 7 years ; elected President, U. P. C. C; 1927 & president at Aligarh Session ; took prominent part in anti-Simon Commission agitation ; twice imprisoned for C.D ; 1930-32 ; appointed Chairman, U. P. Agrarian Committee, by the U. P. C. C, submitted Pant-Report, 1931 ; General Secretary, All-India Parliamentary Board, 1934 ; elected M. L. A. (Central), 1934 and was Deputy Leader of the Congress Party ; arrested and kept in detention in Ahamed Nagar Fort, August 9, 1942—March 31, 1945 ; member, Central Parliamentary Board ; re-elected to U. P. Legislative Assembly and Leader of Congress Party in the U. P. Assembly ; elected member Constituent Assembly and member of several Committees and Sub-Committees of Constituent Assembly ; Chief Minister, U. P ; April 1946 to January 1955 ; Also Minister of Home Affairs, Government of India.

Dr. Pramathanath Banerjee : M. A. D. Sc ; Economic ; Barrister-at-law, 1940 ; formerly Minto Professor of Economics Calcutta University, and President, Council of Post-graduate Teaching in Arts, Calcutta University ; **Education** : Presidency College Calcutta ; School of Economics, London ; Worked as Professor in Colleges of the Calcutta University ; Member of the Senate, Syndicate Calcutta University; Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Calcutta University, President of the Boards of Studies in Economics and Commerce ; represented the University at the Congress of the Universities of the British Empire at Oxford, 1921 ; Member of the Bengal Legislative Council, 1923-30 ; President, Indian Economic Conference, 1931 ; Leader, Nationalist Party, Central Legislative Assembly, 1942-45 ; President, Bengal Economic Society : **Publications** :—"A study of

Indian Economics" ; "Public Administration in Ancient India" ; "Fiscal Policy in India" ; "Indian Finance in the Days of the Company" ; "A History of Indian Taxation" ; Provincial Finance in India" ; "The Future of Finance in India;" "Industry in India," etc ; He is chiefly remembered as an educationist ; served the Calcutta University for fifteen years as Minto Professor. He remained a nationalist till his death, although he did not accept the Congress position on the Communal Award and became inclined to Hindu nationalism in later life.

Prof. Beni Prasad. M. A., Ph. D; D.Sc. ; b. 1894. Educated at Allahbad, Cownpore and London. Indian History Research Scholar, Allahbad University, Profesor of Indian History and Administration, Allahbad University. Has written several books i. e. History of Jahangir ; Theory of the State in Ancient India; Problems of the Indian Constitution ; (Ed.) Maasir-ul-umrah etc.

Prof. V. Shiva Ram, was one of the few leading political scientists in India at a time when the subject was fighting its battle of survival. He was one of the pioneers who mooted the idea of founding an independent learned Association with a quarterly journal. A Provisional Committee was set up under the chairmansip of Professor G. N. Singh to chalk out details for starting the Association and Professor Ram was one of the members of the Committee. Hailing from the South, he did not confine his activities to that direction and settled in the North. It may be mentioned that the first full fledged Department of Political Science was set up by tne University of Lucknow and Professor Ram was called upon to head it. Most of the leading professors of Political Science in India were at one time or the other students of Prof. Ram. He served the Association in various capacities for a number of years.

Principal Gurmukh Nihal Singh : b. 1895. M.sc. (Economics), (Lordon), Bar-at-Law. Professor of Economics and Political Science, Rana Varma Professor of Political Science and later Dean, Faculty of Arts, Banares Hindu University ; Principal H. L. College of Commerce, Ahmedabad ; Ramjas College Delhi, S. R. College of Commerce Delhi. Elected speaker, Delhi State Legislative Assembly. Leader, Congress Vidhan Sabha Party, Delhi State. Chief Minister, Delhi State. Governor of Rajastan. Was member, almost of all University bodies at Allahabad, Lucknow and Bombay ; first secretary and Treasurer of Indian Political Science Association.

Publications : Indian States and British India: Their Future Relations, 1928 ; Landmarks in Indian Constitutional and National Development ; The Changing Concept of Citizenship, 1958, and several other books.

Principal Guru Dutt Sondhi : Son of late Raizada Bhagat Ram Sondhi, an eminent advocate of Jullundur. After passing M.A. from Government College Lahore, he went to Cambridge and got his Tripos. On return to India, he was appointed in the Indian Education Service as Professor of Economics, Government College, Lahore. He was the founder Head of the Department of Political Science of the Panjab University at Lahore. He was the Fellow of the Panjab University and member of the syndicate for a number of years. One year before Independence, he was appointed honorary secretary of the Department of Education, Government of India. He was a distinguished Sportsman, a great hockey player. He was a member of the Executive Committee of the International Olympic Association for a number of years. His hobbies included Art and painting, drama, stage techniques, photography etc.

Prof. S. P. **Puntambekar** : M. A. (Oxon); Bar-at-Law b. November, 1890, University Professor of Political Science, Nagpur University and held Dr. E. Raghavendra Rao Chair. Educated at St. Vincent High School, Poona ; Deccan College, Poona ; St. Catharines Institute, Oxford ; Lincoln's Inn, London ; Barrister, practised at Amraoti (Berar), 1915-20 ; Principal, National College Bombay (non-co-operation movement) 1921-25 ; University Professor of History and Political Science, Hindu University, Banares, 1925-46 ; attended the first World Political Science Conference at Zurich, September 1950 ; Publication : Civics and Politics ; Citizenship and Civilization ; English Constitutional History ; Maratha Polity ; Paramountcy in Indian Politics , Foreign Policy & the Indian Union ; etc.

Prof. M. Venkatarangiya : M. A. (Madras) b. January 1889. Sir Pherozesha Mehta Prof. of Politics and Civics, University of Bombay. **Education** : Pachaiyappa College, Madras ; secured a triple first in Pithapur Raja's College, Cocanada, Maharaja's College, Vizianagram; Dewan, Vizianagram Estate ; Principal, V. R. College, Nellore ; Professor in Andhra University—1934—44 ; Principal, Bhemaveraj College, West Godavari ; Professor of Political Science, Osmania

University. Publications : Beginnings of Local Taxation ; Federalism (Andhra University); Fundamental Rights; ConstituentAssembly; Draft Constitution of India ; Development of Local Boards ; Fair and Free Election Manifestoes ; Competitive and Coperative Trends in Federalism ;General Election in Bombay; Translation of Kautilya into Telugu and other books. Leading a retied life but very active in reading and writing articles on Political Science.

Prof. D. N. Banerjee : Formerly Surendranath Banerjee. Profesor and Head of the Department of Political Science, University of Calcutta ; Sometime Head of Department of Political Science and Provost of Jagannath Hall, University of Dacca, and Member, International Social Science Council, UNESCO, Paris. Author of The Indian Constitution and its Actual Working. The Reforms Scheme : A Critical study, Early Land Revenue System in Bengal and Bihar, Volume I, 1765-1772. Early Administrative system of the East India Company in Bengal, Volume I 1765-1774. Partition or Federation ? A study in the Indian Constitutional Problem, The Draft Constitution of India.—A critique, Some Aspects of the New Constitution of India ; Distribution of Legislative Powers ; The Future of Democracy And others Essays ; Studies in Political Theory and Practice; Our Fundamental Rights ; Their Nature and Extent (As Judicially Determined)

Dr. Jagan Nath Khosla, b. January 28, 1906 B. Sc. (Econ.), (London), Ph. D (Econ.) (London), Bar-at-Law. Education : Srinagar, Lahore, London and Paris, Editor Indian Journal of Political Science, 1945—48 ; Fellow, Punjab University ; 1947—48 ; Represented India at several International Conferences. Head, Consular Department, High Commission of India, London 1948—51 ; Charge d' Affairs of the Indian Embassy, Rome and concurrently at Belgrade. 1951—52 ; Head of the Historical Division, Ministry of External Affairs, 1953—54 ; President, International Commission for Control and Supervision, Laos, Indo-china, 1954—55 ; Ambassador to Czechoslovakia , 1955—58 and concurrently to Rumania, February-October 1958 : Ambassador to Indonesia 1958—61 Ambassador to Yogoslavia, Bulgaria and Greece, 1961—64. President Indian Council of Cultural Affairs, Director Indian Institute of Public Administration; Currently U. N. Consultant to the Government of Ethopia.

INTRODUCTION

Political Science is comparatively a new entrant to the family of social sciences in India. For long it enjoyed the patronage of History and Economics and its syllabus was an integral part of either of them in most of the universities in India during the British Period. One of the reasons for the laggard status of political science had been that it came into existence within the household of History and did not make any particular effort to survive. Down to the nineteenth century, the relationship of Political Science with History was not only accepted but glorified as "History without Political Science has no fruits ; Political Science without History has no roots". John W. Burgess expressed it as "the two spheres so lap over one another and interpenetrate each other that they cannot be distinctly separated...Separate them, and the one becomes a cripple, if not a corpse, the other a will-o-the-wisp". In initial years the study of politics and political institutions was not looked with favour by the rulers and was subject to active hostility of sister disciplines who saw in its flourish the shrinkage of their empire. The undaunted determination of the founding fathers and their skill helped the discipline to grow.

After the inauguration of the Provincial Autonomy, the necessity of stimulating interest in the study of the working of the new experiment was however felt and three leading professors of Political Science in the country, Prof. G. N. Singh (Banares), Prof. V. S. Ram (Lucknow) and Principal G. D. Sondhi (Lahore) mooted the idea of founding an independent learned Association with a quarterly journal. A provisional committee was constituted with Professor G. N. Singh as Convener and professors of Political Science of the leading Universities of India as members. The need for starting the Association, and under its auspices, an annual conference had been felt for a long time but the actual decision to do so was made at Lahore, in the house of Principal G. D. Sondhi in May, 1938. The First Session of the Indian Political Science Conference was held at the Benares Hindu University on the 22nd, 23rd and 24th December, 1938, on the kind invitation of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, the Vice-Chancellor of the University and under the general presidentship of the Hon'ble Pandit G. B. Pant, the Prime Minister of the United Provinces.

The Association was formally *born* on the second day of the first Conference, i. e. December 23, 1938 when at the general business meeting presided over by Professor Tara Chand of Allahabad University, a short Constitution of the Association was provisionally adopted. At the time of inauguration, the number of Universities that taught political science as an independent discipline hardly exceeded twenty and much of the credit in securing recognition of Political Science as a separate discipline goes to the efforts of the Association.

The British Government, being interested in keeping India under subjection did not appreciate any expansion of programmes in the study of political phenomenon in an atmosphere surcharged with momentum for India's freedom. Thus not only the Association ran in serious financial worries in the formative years but there was hardly any momentary incentive for research or development of the discipline. Political Science, being mainly concerned with the study and analysis of the political action, in the process has to draw on various sources in order to analyse contemporary political problems. Added to this, in our developing country, every problem that we have to face can be related to politics. Due to the constant emergence of new problems demanding action, political system is always in a state of dynamic and often turbulent change. There were hardly any facilities to study the challenges.

With the dawn of Independence, there were more avenues for careers in administration and active politics. Various specialized institutes like the Indian Council of World Affairs, the Indian Institute of Public Administration, the Indian School of International Studies, the Indian Academy of International Law and Diplomacy, the Institute of Constitutional and Parliamentary Studies. Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Indian Council of Social Science Research were set up. These bodies are instrumental for the grant of funds and for supplementing facilities for research and teaching in the social sciences. Due to these developments there has been a marked preference in developing new objectives, the introduction of different methods and approaches, the initiation of expanded research activities, and the growth of a vigorous spirit of questioning and self-analysis among the political scientists in India. The refinement and extension of political vocabulary, the revolution or reorientation of methodology, the impact of other disciplines like sociology, geography or mathematics have all constituted to

make the study of Political Science far more self conscious today of its scope, of its design, its methods, of its purposes.

Political Science in recent years cannot be confined to the battle-field of the philosophical theoretician who quarrel over the prescriptions, but the discipline is slowly concerning itself more and more with the practical political phenomenon. For long, political scientists in India had been relying on the traditional approach which has the following general characteristics :

(a) It was mostly historical and chronological in its approach.

(b) There was no interest in methodology and there was no emphasis on the Study of the General theory of politics.

(c) There was the focus on political and governmental institutions in an isolated and legalistic sense.

(d) There was general indifference to look into the realities of political action or behavior within the framework.

(e) The approach was purely descriptive in terms of the endless piling of fact on fact.

(f) There was a single-track approach or outlook on political development.

In the earlier period, political scientists tried to apply the scientific method to the solution of the problems which they faced. Later there came keen interest in the development of empirical theory and for pushing towards the creation of a unified science concerned with all aspects of man's role in society. For pursuing this new concern, a group of scientists at the University of Chicago coined the term **behavioral sciences** in 1949. They were motivated by a desire to find a term which could be used by both social and biological scientists. The aims of the movement were :

(a) To make political science capable of prediction and explanation in the realm of political happenings.

(b) To make the theoretical framework strong enough.

(c) To find out some unit, comparable to the cell in biology, which could serve as a base for broad generalisations.

(d) To collect factual material for deeper analysis

(e) To make use of all available facilities like computers, electric data processing Machines etc.

(f) To emphasize that all institutional activity is a combination of the political roles which various individuals are playing.

There is hardly any doubt that political scientists cannot sit aloof from the current of behaviour studies which is sweeping many disciplines and have to become familiar with the structure and functions of voluntary and conditional aggregate of humans which are not strictly political in themselves but compose the total political society which is the unit of Political Science. Ignoring this would be at their cost and the challenge of other disciplines like Sociology, Psychology and Anthropology cannot be effectively met.

Those who are allergic to the new dimensions of political science point out that India's major contribution has been in the field of speculative thought and the search for the first principles of social and moral action. They regard it a unique heritage which has often stimulated intellectual endeavour to cope with the problems as they arise. It is also pointed out that India cannot afford the luxury of spending huge funds on behavioural research. Further, other methods of studying political phenomena with the help of documentary material, have not as yet been fully exploited. Our archives are reservoirs of material and empirical research, but are neglected.

It may not be easy to make definite assessments regarding the impact of behaviouralism on Political Scientists in India, but the long and bitter controversy over behaviouralism probably has generated both some significant insights into the nature of the discipline and some woefully misdirected charges and counter-charges in attempting to grapple with the issues produced by the behavioural movement. Political scientists have found some common areas of agreement, but they have uncovered even more sources of diviseveness and discord. It is also a fact that even in the United States with vast financial resources, a reaction has set in against the behavioural orthodoxy. It is pointed out that the behaviouralists ignore all the institutional and structural aspects of government which were the main stay of traditional political scientists. There is also a charge that many contemporary political scientists are so obsessed with the problems of methodological theory that they tend to ignore its basic function i. e. serving as a tool for analysing and explaining political affairs. However, there have been the following advantages of applying the behavioural approach to the study of political phenomena.

(a) There has been a greater emphasis on developing a theoretical framework for conducting research.

(b) Many new words have been borrowed from other behavioural sciences and a new political vocabulary has emerged.

(c) There has been a focus on the need to test theoretical hypotheses against reality.

(d) Methodology has become an essential field of study and there is more and more use of computors.

(e) There is an increasingly inter-disciplinary focus.

Despite the claims and counterclaims produced by the pros and cons of behaviouralism, many basic questions remain unanswered. How 'behavioural' has Political Science in India become ? What changes has the behavioural movement or controversy produced in the discipline ? Has the behavioural movement had any influence on the questions that political scientists have sought to answer or the subjects that they have chosen to study ? What has been the effect if any, of behaviouralism on the prestige of political science ? A final answer to the questions probably cannot be offered as yet.

It is not very easy to delimit the purpose and scope of Political Science as a discipline. F. Sorauf and C. Hyneman have rightly said "No concept will define the discipline of Political Science with complete exactitude ; for the slow process and institution of the real world, are not cast into the rigid moulds of the academic discipline." To the extent that politics deals with the organisation of men and resources for the fulfilment of common goals, the science of Politics need to be conceived as pre-eminently a 'policy science'. The processes of politics, institutional structure, ideology, functions etc. must all be subjected to the final test of 'performance'—its ability to deliver the goods and to reconcile diverse interests and values and produce results that are commensurate with the needs and aspirations of the people. In the years as a world-wide phenomena the tendency has been to give more purposeful orientation to Political Science. Recent definitions of Politics as a study signify the shift in emphasis. Robson thinks, "the purpose of political science is to throw light on political ideas and political action in order that the government of man may be improved." Quincy Wright suggests that "political science should seek to devise formulae to predict those aspects of group be-

haviour centering about tension, struggle and conflict," and whatever it can do to increase the probability that the political struggles going on in this world will utilize methods consistent with human dignity and human progress." Van Dyke comments that the main social purpose of political scientists is and should be to influence choices, to contribute to the rationality of decisions. Lasswell and A Kaplan regard political science, "as one of the policy science whose function is to provide intelligence to the integration of values realised and embodied in inter-personnel relations.....as such it studies influence and power as instruments of integration." Wiseman advocates greater participation of political scientist in the affairs of the Government, "If wise government is the key to the growth of civilized societies, a knowledge of politics helps to guide those who through political decision-making finally bring the infinity of demands into temporary balance with the scarcity of resources.....and later at the lowest. Professors of Political Science presumably have a key role as investigators and advisers, teachers, if not actual participants in the political process."

It is a reflection of the present state of discipline of Political Science in India that very few persons have come to grips with issues of performance in any systematic manner. Rajni Kothari thinks that major areas that appear to be the most salient for India are (i) performance in respect of economic policy and planned social change, (ii) performance in regard to national integration, regional policy and the social and demographic structure of politics and the larger issues of size and structure that follow it, and (iii) performance of the domestic system in meeting international threats and challenges. All social sciences have to contribute to policy processes and help in extending the frontiers of knowledge. In the social transformation of Indian society, the administrators and the academic community have to reorient their role to suit the formulation, implementation and evaluation of policies and programmes. The social relevance of research would be possible only if efforts are made to enrich the theories and to sharpen the tools of research methodology. To study the 'Art of Politics' in the true perspective, it is necessary to learn to view problems and issues comparatively. Unfortunately much attention has not been paid in this direction and it continues to be the most neglected field of research in India. On the other hand, comparative politics, both as an approach to theory and as a method of research, has come to dominate it. There has

been a fundamental shift in emphasis-from formal analysis of foreign policy statements to the sources of foreign policy. It may be useful to study inter-national and intra-national issues which may provide a fruitful line of enquiry and may provide further scope for considerable theoretical and methodological effort.

To undertake comparative research in developing countries like India is not easy as it involves huge expenditure. Good comparative research necessitates spatial mobility and access to information, data, documents and scholarly conferences. Comparative research cannot be pursued by lone scholars, working in isolated corners and operating through meagre libraries and departmental funds. There is the need for team work and meaningful collaboration for the studies of inter-disciplinary kind and developing the capacity to experiment with new ideas and scale for pursuring research on an uninterrupted basis.

In order to improve quality, there must be close relevance of research and teaching. Syllabi and courses at the undergraduate level should be so revised as to provide an adequate fundamental and basic knowledge for subsequent research. It is also necessary to evolve scale for the measurement of motives, values and feelings involved in politics. An inventory of various types of measurements already in use in politics together with a technical commentary on them should be taken up early with emphasis on criteria and the construction of validities to rate political attitudes. A Review Committee appointed by the Indian Council of Social Science Research under the chairmanship of Dr. Malcolm S. Adiseshiah identified gaps in the major areas of research as — "The study of the interaction between the social base and political structure is very necessary, Indian socialism, equality and secularism were the basic concerns of the nation and should all form the subject-matter of detailed research, the entire area under the rubric of Indian democracy and bureaucracy lay unexploited. No significant research had been attempted on political leadership and recruitment. Studies relating to political theory, the party system, the politics of coalitions, legistature elites and rural politics would answer to a genuine need."

In this volume, we have made a modest attempt to present the full text of the Presidential Addresses delivered to the **First Ten sessions** of Indian Political Science Conference. The Presidents whose addresses have been included have been distinguished torch bearers of the discipline and it is hoped that a study of their writings will opr-

voke thinking on the subject. We, however, claim no originality or scholarship in presenting this volume but our labours will be amply rewarded if our effort is found useful by researchers and others engaged in the study of Political Science.

Professor A. Appadorai, Honorary Professor, Jawahar Lal Nehru University has obliged us by writing a very valuable foreword. A teacher of rare repute and a scholar of outstanding merit, his writings have always been a beacon of light and a perennial source of enlightenment. We are thankful to Shri Suraj Bhan, Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University for his patronage and encouragement. We are indebted to Professer B. S. Khanna, Dean of University Instruction for his ever helpful attitude. We are greatly beholden to Principal P. L. Anand for his affection and kindness.

In the end, we want to place on record before our fraternity sincere indebtedness to Professor Bodh Raj Sharma formerly Head of the Department of Political Science and ex-President of the Asscioation and Dr. Jagdish S. Sharma, Librarian, Panjab University for providing us timely help and guidance, but for which this volume would not have seen the light of the day.

V. N. Chawla
S. K. Sharma

PANDIT GOBIND VALLABH PANT

POSTULATES OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

(First Conference held at Banaras in December, 1938)

It is a misnomer to call political science a science by itself as there are hardly any pillars or scientific basis on which it can claim to have its foundations. Political Science can have no existence apart from human psychology and to study political science, we have to study human psychology in relation to social problems, how man and humanity are co-related, how individual and society are connected, and how they react on each other and what should be the best system in which both the individual and the society may unfold himself and themselves to the fullest capacity and achieve the maximum without encroaching upon the field of one another.

This conference has assembled here at Banaras, what I regard, a psychological moment. Whether looked at from the national or from an international point of view, this is just the appropriate time for those who are in a position to examine the postulates on which political science rests or is supposed to rest. I myself, as I will indicate later, do not see any pillars on which political science can claim to have its foundation or its basis. Perhaps it is a misnomer to call political science a science by itself, and a conference which has to deal with problems that are supposed to fall within the purview of political science is primarily one, I assume, for examining the political position and for examining the monstrosities that are being committed in the name and under the garb of political science and for, I hope, finding proper, wholesome and effective remedies for the political ills of the day.

Changing Times

I said that it was very opportune moment for a conference of this type. All that philosophers and statesmen held as of eternal value in the past is now being thrown into the melting pot. The old order is crumbling and one sees that the values which dominated

human conscience in the past are now being turned upside down. One finds that the postulates which were believed to be the basic foundation of political principles are themselves being thrown to dunghill. In the circumstances, it is desirable that the students of political science should ponder, reflect and find out appropriate remedies.

Apart from that, India is going to attain its full nationhood very soon. I am one of those who believe that independence is coming and noboby can impede us in our march towards our goal. I heard the very pathetic and inspiring speech of Pandit Malaviyaji just now. It is a pity to a young man sitting by his side when he sees him pouring out his grief, his feeling of disappointment for the delay and his anxiety to march ahead fast and rapid, as quickly as human brain, ingenuity and resources can enable us to march. I felt too for the time being that the chair was not a place for a man like me, or even any one of us, but at the same time I felt that the dream which he had cherished all his life is going to manifest itself in a concrete shape very soon. (*Hear, hear*) I hold and I am confident that no power on earth can to-day stand in the way of our full self-realisation. I think it is in our hands, it is before us ; only we have to create order out of disorder amongst ourselves. Once we do that, no outside authority can stifle our growth or hamper us in any way on our march onward.

Method of Approach to Problems.

I think it is time that the professors and teachers should apply their mind to concrete problems in order to prepare ourselves for what we have to do after the day of redemption, which, as I believe, is close by.

But what should be our approach towards political problems ? How are we to separate the substance from the dross, and what is the real factor in what is known as political science ? That seems to be the fundamental problem to which, I believe, the conference will at the outset apply itself.

In reality, nobody can think of political science as a science in the same way as chemistry, biology, psychology or mathematics, is a science, because it has to deal with complex problems of human life and we cannot deal with human affairs on a static basis. The basis of society is dynamic and change is the order of the day. Apart from that the data on which certain conclusions are based at

a certain stage are themselves exploded by the time you come to apply them to the real facts.

So, I think, it is worthwhile considering what is the real scientific element in political science. What is it that we can regard as eternal ? What is it that we must guard against ?

Divine Theory.

If you look at historical developments in the political field, there was a time when the state was identified with religion and that was supposed to be its vital principle. The king was the representative of God. We had to respect the one and obey the other not because one or the other represented any ideals of collective wisdom, but because God had ordained like that and it was our duty to do so.

But when we advanced further we found that religion and politics had little to do with each other and in fact that is the main tragedy of the present situation. In our country, we are still mixing religion with politics and we have not yet learnt to differentiate between politics and religion. But we have to confess that there was a time when religion was supposed to be a vital element in a state and the king was to be guided by its precepts and the laws were to be based on religion.

That was the first stage, if I may say so, and yet people at that time would have asserted with perhaps, complete confidence and certainly with emphasis that was the fundamental principle of political science, that the state was a creation of spiritual forces and that man should obey the law not because it was intended to fulfil its destinies, but because it carried out the will of God as reflected in its scriptures. But that has been exploded and nobody except a few believe in that principle today.

Later on, we had other stages. We had the ideal state and what was associated with it and that too was thrown overboard, because in affairs of life these things have to be studied not only subjectively but also objectively. The ideal state is a utopia ; it may be of Aristotle or of Plato ; but so far as realities go, the ideal state, which was interpreted in more ways than one, was soon found to be not a real process of science whatsoever.

Later on, we saw another stage when individualism became the order of the day. '*Laissez faire*' as much in economics as in politics was to be the guiding principle. Touch me not and do not touch

others, the devil will take care of himself. That seemed to be the principle. They thought that they were going to see the last era in political science ; yet that was based on data which had now been found to be utterly unsound. In fact, the principle of competition has given place to the principle of co-operation. Nobody now holds that growth of population is bound to outstrip the growth of commodity. Nature is magnificent ; its munificence is unlimited. So that we may have any number of people and with the aid of science and technical processes, we can produce commodities, which will be enough to make everyone happy, and yet enable us to leave something for those who come after us.

Human Heritage being Destroyed.

In the circumstances the very basis on which individualism existed disappeared and we find now that anchor-sheet has vanished and political science has left off the old doctrine. We do not know what it is now. We have the League of Nations ; we have collective security. But I should like to emphasise upon those who have come here that in this conference of political science I do not find any science anywhere and do not see any scientific basis for what is known as political science. Then what do we see ? We see the people straggling all that man has regarded as his heritage, not under any disguise but with blatant shamelessness. Will those people who have the following of the millions in their respective countries tell us as to where your political science is going to lead us ? Is that the destiny after all for which we have been working all these years ? Are the states meant for this ?

This is the question which confronts me. I turned to books of political science to seek an answer, but found nothing but chaos and confusion. But I believe I will have better luck here where I find such a galaxy of experts in that science if not in the art of administration.

What really seems to me to be evident—and the conclusion seems to be irresistible—is this, that political science can have no existence apart from human psychology and if you want to study political science you must study human psychology in relation to social problem: how man and humanity are co-related, how individual and society are connected, and how they react on each other and what should be the best system in which both the individual and the society may unfold himself and themselves to the fullest capacity and achieve the maximum without encroaching upon the field of one another.

Fundamental Principle.

The first thing that comes to me is that man lives not by bread alone. That is the fundamental principle of political science and if people were to place it before themselves they would solve many problems. If once man learns to care less for his own self and more for others, the woes of the world will, I think, vanish. Misapprehensions will be allayed and fellowships established, and we will see all around us a fresh green field where there is enough of fresh air and nourishment for everyone.

So, I should think that we can find a solution for political misfortunes by perhaps throwing into the Ganges here, which is a sacred stream, many of the text-books on political science and if this is done, perhaps you will lay the foundation of a real working basis, for political realisation. And what has been the tragedy of the world so far ? ...man preying upon man with all the ferocity and doing all that in the name of science, science which has given us more than anything. Science, which has given us means for the satisfaction of our material wants, has now become a monstrous engine of oppression because of the destructive use to which the discoveries of science have been applied. At least life would have been easier and less exposed to danger if we had properly applied science.

Social Service : Basis of Political Science.

What we have to remember is this : that science can have only one basis and that is service. If we want political science to serve the purpose for which it was designed, we should rise above our own. When we do that, we will usher in a new era. We will see subjection and subordination giving place to freedom and national independence, and we will see mutual rivalry converted into friendship of a fruitful type. That should be the object of human endeavour.

If we look at things in this manner, we find that we have to work for a state in which moral values will have a supreme place, in which everything will be subordinated for a moral purpose and in which all that a man does, whether in his individual capacity or in co-operation with others, is directed towards one supreme purpose of social advance. The State can have only one objective before it and that is the maximum happiness of the community and, what is to be remembered, of every individual of the community.

Slavery.

The Greek politicians in the olden days thought that the institution of slavery was essential for the maximum good of the community. The people who settled in America thought that the institution of slavery was absolutely necessary at least for the southern states. What we have to remember now is that a state has not only to work for the maximum good of the community but that it can achieve it only by striving for the maximum good of every individual...the individual that forms the unit of the community.

For that we have to see that individual freedom is not stifled, that civil liberties of the right type are maintained and what is still more necessary, that what is given with the right hand is not taken away by the left, that a man who is given the vote is in a position to exercise it not only as a citizen, but also as a citizen who is not subject to any economic thraldom of any other citizen and who is not forced to enslave himself to others.

Therefore, if we want the co-operative state in which the maximum effort is made to achieve the destiny of the people, then our endeavour should be to secure the maximum for individual, and ensure a constitution in which every individual can exercise his free will freely, without being constrained by subjective factors over which circumstances have no control.

Genuine Democracy.

If these oppressing features are removed, then we have genuine democracy. On the one hand, we will have to give real liberty to every individual and we will have to see that the economic resources of the nation are so worked that every individual gets what he needs and that none is subjected to invisible control, which is all the more tyrannical, because it is not visible. If such a change can be brought about, I believe that the states will be in a better position to fulfil the purpose that they are ostensibly intended to serve.

But over and above all that you have also to bear in mind that economic relations now transcend geographical limits. When prices can go down in the village of Ramnagar or in the remotest corner of Banaras as a result of world factors, we hope to see that the world will really be converted into a comity of nations, nations that joined nations for purposes political as well as economic, which would enable them to unfold themselves to their utmost to achieve the best in themselves and for humanity. The individual must be linked with

the rest of the nation and the nation with all other free nations so that each may rise to the highest and fullest stature of which one is capable.

The Objective.

If that objective is placed by states before them, then all serfdom should cease and exploitation vanish. That is the moral purpose for which political science should exist, and if it does not exist for that, well, let us bury it altogether. We should place the objective before us on which this science is to be founded.

Let us take a vow that the freedom of every state, the independence of every nation, will be the objective of the science. Every individual will be guilty of heresy if he does not work and strive for the independence of nation on the face of the globe, and as charity begins at home, he must begin at the place where he happens to be for the time being. So, that seems to me to be the 'summum bonum' of political science.

Same Germs.

We hear of dictators and of fascism; we hear of other 'isms'. We hear of Mussolini and Hitler. But I tell you that the same germs are to be found all over Europe ; they take different shapes at different times, Sometimes it is poison and at others it is massacre and at others it is very subtle, it is blood sucking. But the basis is the same fundamental basis, and unless we purge the system of it, it will assert itself in so many various forms from time to time. We are ourselves victims to this disease and we are not struck by its monstrosity. It is said that Hitler is killing Jews and he is saying that ; but others in the past could kill Jews without saying that ; that is the difference.

The real remedy is to be found in the world realising that moral principles are not only to be initiated and defined in the halls of universities but to be acted upon in the battle field of life. We must move forward to attain real international freedom and brotherhood and a free voluntary federation of free peoples of the world. Every nation should join hands freely without the least pressure of one on another with the common object of elevating humanity to the highest summit determined to put an end in every state to those forces which lead to disorder and result in exploitation and suppression, whether economic or political.

If this is realised, you will be putting an end to Fascism, Nazism and imperialism. The last is the poison which in course of time may give rise to other violent forms of that disease. These are the eruptions of the same venom in the system. The same germ is appearing in some form or other.

Those who are associated with political science should take a vow that they will achieve the real object; they will approach the real problems of life with courage so that all these evils are remedied and all that we desire is achieved. Let academic life be no longer isolated from the real currents of life. If you all who work in political science will have achieved this purpose, then I for one believe we will have achieved independence and Swaraj.

———

DR. PREMATHANATH BANERJEE **2**

THE INDIAN POLITICAL SCENE

(Second Conference held at Lahore in January, 1940)

Political thinkers are normally enamoured of theories and often become oblivious of the contemporaenous problems. Large-scale industry has started making a head way in India and considerable amount of labour legislation has been enacted, therefore a true interpretation of socialism as applicable to India is to be sought. The differences based on divergences of race, colour, religion, language and culture are being discarded the world over but in India, this policy is still in vogue as a fundamental part of her administrative policy. The net result of the working of the multi-party system in India has been an enormous growth of communalism in India. A great deal of provincial mindedness has become evident since the advent of provincial autonomy. The representation in public services on communal considerations has resulted in a considerable deterioration of administrative efficiency. The existing system of government, with democracy in the provinces and autocracy at the centre is an anomoly. The solution to all these problems is to be found by the political scientists. India's attitude towards Britain has never been one of uncompromising hostility but will British statesmanship rise to the occasion and make it possible for India to march side by side with Britain in defence of democracy and freedom and for the good of humanity.

It is often said that politicians live from day to day and from hand to mouth. Although this indictment seems to be too severe, the fact remains that few politicians find time to go to the roots of political questions or to take comprehensive views of public matters requiring immediate decision. They are, generally speaking, so engrossed with the present and the near future that they are apt to lose sight of the ultimate consequences of the measures adopted by them. The result is that statesmen often find it difficult to correlate

their actions with their professed principles. On the other hand, there is a tendency on the part of political thinkers to be so enamoured of theories that they often become oblivious of the existence of facts. Besides, as most of the scholars are not in active touch with public affairs, they hardly find opportunities to test their theories in the light of experience. This circumstance fosters a mentality which is not favourable to the proper appreciation of the realities of the situation at a particular moment. Thus there arises a gulf between politicians and political theorists. Our Association seeks to bridge this gulf. But the application of this principle of bridging gulfs may be extended to other spheres of thought and action. In India, the divergences are so many and so great that it may perhaps be found useful to consider to what extent this principle may be applied to the existing political situation of the country. Therefore, I take this topic as the subject of my brief discourse at this Conference.

Opinion differs in India on the value to be attached to the ideas of realism and idealism in politics. This difference is more temperamental than fundamental, and it is not impossible to reconcile the views of the advocates of the two schools of thought. Nothing of enduring value can be achieved in a country unless its people are influenced by high ideals, but it should be remembered that ideals which have no relation to the facts of the situation tend to become idols. On the other hand, while an intimate touch with facts is essential in the conduct of public affairs, too great an emphasis on relation leads to stagnation. Therefore, a combination of idealism and realism is the best means of ensuring the growth of a healthy public life in India.

The apparent antagonism between the claims of the individual and of society furnishes a ground for controversy. Individualists suggest that society exists for the individual, while socialists maintain that society is of greater importance than the individual. The difference arises from the fact that undue emphasis is laid by each side on one aspect of the problem. But if a balanced view is taken, it will be found that there is no real conflict between the two rival theories. Man is born an individual, but he is born in society. Therefore, he has two aspects, one individual and the other social, and both these aspects are interdependent. In fact, while society is the creation of individuals, individuals themselves are the products of society. Modern socialism is in a considerable degree the reaction

from the extreme individualism of the first half of the nineteenth century. In India, society and individual have been reconciled through the ages, and it ought not to be a difficult task to bring about the same reconciliation at the present day.

Capitalism is a particular phase of individualism. The phenomenal growth of large-scale industry after the commencement of the Industrial Revolution led to a concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a small number of persons in every economically advanced country of the world. Thus arose a conflict between the rich few and the poor many. In order to avoid the evils of the capitalistic system, various forms of socialism were advocated, the most extreme of these forms being communism. This form of socialism was established in Russia two decades ago, but during the period of its existence it has undergone considerable modification. The system is still in the experimental stage, but the politicians and economists of all countries may learn valuable lessons from the partial success which it has already achieved. It should, however, be remembered that the circumstances in which this great experiment was and is being tried in Russia are very different from those in India. Besides, the methods adopted for introducing and maintaining the system hardly appear to be suitable for India.

Large-scale industry is beginning to make a headway in India, although so far its progress has not been very rapid. This is, therefore, the most opportune moment when we should carefully examine the merits and defects of capitalism. Considerable amount of labour legislation has already been enacted in India in order to improve the lot of the working class. But it would be taking too optimistic a view of the situation to think that all that was needed has been done. As for the theory of socialism, it seems that Marx's economic interpretation, whatever may have been the case in other countries has found only a limited application in the history of India. Man has not lived in this country by bread alone in the past and is not likely to live by bread alone in future. But it cannot be denied that the economic motive is one of the most important motives which bring about absolute equality among individuals, but equality of opportunity should be afforded to all, the greatest measure to be available without bringing in its train the evils usually attendant on capitalism. Competition should be supplemented, and in a considerable measure replaced, by co-operative effort. This will show whether it will be possible to bring about a compromise between capitalism

and socialism by mitigating the rigours of the former and making the latter more consonant with human nature. Meanwhile, serious efforts should be made to rid the capitalistic system of its undesirable features.

A conflict between the ideas of stability and change gives rise to considerable difference of opinion. The advocates of order seem often to ignore the necessity for progress, while those who favour change often forget that order is the most essential condition of progress. An appeal to reason, however, convinces us that too much insistence on stability arrests all development, while too frequent changes open the door to chaos and confusion. Again, the question of the pace of progress gives rise to a controversy about the respective merits and demerits of evolution and revolution. If we bestow serious thought on the question, we become convinced that evolution should be regarded as the normal process and revolution should be regarded as the abnormal process and revolution can be justified only in the most extreme circumstances. The true test by which the desirability or otherwise of a resort to a revolution should be judged is whether its consequences are likely to be beneficial or disastrous. A light-hearted talk about the creation of a revolutionary mentality in the country is fraught with the most dangerous possibilities. The ultimate aim of revolutionists is the establishment of a new order. Thus nothing is more absurd than the cry which is often heard, "Long Live Revolution."

Revolutions in other countries mostly take a violent shape, but in India a non-violent revolution is suggested by many of the revolutionists. This is due to the influence of Mahatama Gandhi whose abhorrence of violence has created a healthy atmosphere in Indian politics. Almost all political parties have now adopted non-violence as their creed or policy. Whether or not this attitude will be permanent depends very largely on the attitude of the authorities who control India's destiny. Non-violent resistance as a means of attaining aims is consonant with India's tradition. Although this method was mostly applied in respect of non-political matters, instances are not wanting in the history of India of its application to political issues. The historian, James Mill, records that in 1815 the residents of the city of Banaras adopted the policy of non-violent resistance when a house tax was first sought to be introduced within its municipal limits.

But while politically minded Indians have agreed to use non-

violent weapons in their fight with the British Government, many of them do not see eye to eye with Mahatama Gandhi in respect of the effectiveness of these weapons for other purposes. They do not think that non-violence is likely to be of any use for defence against an invading army either from the west or from the east. They, therefore, urge that India should be fully equipped in all the branches of its fighting force,...the army, the navy, and the air force,...that the distinction between martial and non-martial races be removed, that Indians be appointed as commissioned officers in all the ranks of the defence service, and that a large volunteer force be created on a national basis. Thus, a compromise is sought to be made between the rival doctrines of violence and non-violence. Nor is there any inconsistency in the view that, while violence should not be used as a weapon of offence, force is necessary for the purpose of defence so long as other countries remain wedded to the cult of force. Mahatama Gandhi's creed of non-violence in thought, word and deed at all times and in all circumstances, will remain an ideal to be realised when the cult of force will give place to the creed of reason in every country of the world.

The differences based on divergences of race, colour, religion language and culture serve as great impediments to the progress of the country. The theory of racial superiority has been rejected by all political thinkers, and inspite of Hitler's attempt to revive it, is not likely to be accepted again. But in India, this policy is still in vogue as a fundamental part of her administrative policy. The colour bar, despite solemn pledges of its removal, continues to be a fruitful source of irritation and discontent. Amongst Indians themselves diversity of religions is productive of a wholly irrational and erratic attitude. If the essence of all religions really be the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, religion should be a unifying factor. But, unfortunately, the reverse is the case in India at the present moment. Differences based on religion were, until recently, the causes of strife and discord in many European countries, but a better state of things has been brought into existence by the separation of politics from religion. The most recent instance of such separation is to be found in Turkey, where a phenomenal progress has been made possible within a short period of time by the adoption of such a policy. As for the observance of religious rites, the followers of every religion should be left free. If cow-sacrifice and devotional music be regarded as religious rites, surely one community

can perform them without wounding the susceptibilities of the other communities. What is needed to avoid a conflict is a spirit of tolerance and accommodation, and there is no reason why this should not be forthcoming. It is worthy of note that the Congress has recently taken up the question and instructed all its town and village committees to persuade the people to avoid all causes of conflict and to spread ideas of amity and goodwill among all classes.

A large number of languages are used in India, but this fact is not an insuperable obstacle in the way of achieving political unity. The English language has so far helped to a great extent the inter-provincial communication of thought, and there is no reason to think that its spread will be checked in future. Besides, some of the Indian languages are making such tremendous headway that any one of them may in course of time become the lingua franca of the country. Such development, however, stimulus given to one language in preference to others is likely to produce more harm than good. The compulsory teaching of Hindusthani in the schools of the Madras Presidency has given rise to much dissatisfaction. It would be wise to make Hindusthani an optional language and to abandon the attempt to force it on unwilling persons. Culture, if it is real, should improve the relations between the different classes of society. But, unfortunately, it has formed a basis of conflict in recent years. It should be regarded as a fortunate circumstance that India is a land of many cultures, for, if proper steps are taken, a synthesis of these cultures may lead to the formation of a higher and nobler culture than what exists in any other part of the world.

Coming to purely political issues we find that differences of opinion exist in India as in other countries in regard to the functions of government, though these are of less vital importance here than elsewhere. The idea of an all-embracing, all-pervading State has never found favour in this country. On the other hand, the view that the functions of government should be restricted only to the maintenance of external security and internal order is considered to be extremely inadequate. The state will have to play a very important part in the development of the political, economic and social life of the people, but it will be desirable for it to adopt a policy of non intervention in regard to questions like religion, culture and language. Such a policy is likely to promote harmony and goodwill among the different sections of the population. While the state should be the supreme organisation, the autonomy of institutions created for special purposes ought not to be interfered with.

As for the form of Government, democracy has been accepted as the most desirable form by all the political parties in India, although a few persons have recently expressed doubts as to its suitability to the conditions of the country. Dictatorship, whether of the right or of the left, is wholly unacceptable to India. Some critics say that democracy is foreign to the traditions of the people. Nothing can be farther from truth than such a statement. In ancient times, republican governments existed in many parts of the country. Even after monarchy had become the prevalent form of government, democratic tradition coutinued to exist, especially in the sphere of local administration. This fact did not escape the attention of the more careful among the early European observers. For instance, Samuel Laing, an eminent thinker and distinguished member of the British House of Commons, who came out to India as a Finance Member of the Government, remarked in 1862, "India is not altogether devoid of that spirit of self-government which characterises the Anglo-Saxon, for in her village communities and panchayats can still be found traces which remind us that the Hindu, as well as the Englishman, is descended from a common stock of Aryan ancestors."

Democracy possesses elements of strength as well as of weakness. In order to derive the largest measure of benefit from the working of this system of government it should be our earnest endeavour to secure its good features and eschew its evil aspects. The type of democracy which we should try to establish in India ought to be one in which it may be possible to combine popular association and control with guidance by "the wisest, the most intelligent, and the best." We should also place highest ideals before our eyes. The aim of government in India ought to be nothing less than "the greatest good of the greatest number."

Democratic government is often described as the rule of the majority. This is not quite correct. In a true democracy every variety of opinion is heard and the legitimate interests of every section of the population are safeguarded. The practice of deciding disputed questions by the device of counting heads is an arrangement adopted for the sake of convenience. It does not imply that the majority has an inherent right, apart from the reasonableness of its action, to ride roughshod over the desires of the minority. The rigour of the doctrine of majority rule is, as a matter of fact, greatly softened by a spirit of compromise in every democratic country. Indeed, as

Lord Acton points out, "the most certain test by which we judge whether a country is really free is the amount of security enjoyed by minorities." Democracy is government by discussion and persuasion and this fact is calculated to bring about harmony in the relations of the different classes of people in India.

Indian opinion is almost unanimous in respect of the desirability of establishing responsible government at the centre as well as in the provinces. The manner in which the Congress ministers have worked the limited measure of responsibility in the provincial field during the last two years and a half affords ample hope for its future success. But there is considerable difference of opinion as to the composition of the cabinet. Until a few weeks ago, six of the autonomous provinces possessed homogeneous cabinets, which in the remaining five provinces the cabinets were constructed on the coalition principle. The advantage of the homogeneous cabinet is that the formulation of policy is easy, and the programme can be carried out expeditiously and without much difficulty. But in a unified cabinet the minority parties remain unrepresented, with the result that their co-operation is not available. A composite cabinet is helpful to the growth of solidarity among the different sections of the people. It must be admitted, however, that it is difficult to form a coalition between representatives of parties which differ widely and fundamentally not only in outlook but also in respect of the goal. But no great harm is likely to ensure if further experiments are made in forming coalition cabinets in the provinces.

This brings me to the discussion of the existing party system in India. Some of the parties are founded on political principles while others are based on racial, communal, or class considerations. The Congress Party is the biggest and the most influential of all the parties in India. Its assertion that it seeks to represent the people of India as a whole has been described in certain quarters as a claim verging on totalitarianism. This is an unfair accusation. The Congress does not represent the interests of any class or community but represents the political aspirations of the Indian nation. In the sense, it is a national, and not a sectional institution. Surely, it does not put forward the absurd claim that it represents the views of every individual and every class in India. The Congress Nationalist Party has the same goal as the Congress Party but it differs from the latter mainly in regard to its attitude towards the Communal Award. The Socialist Party is a group

group within the Congress whose object is to establish democratic socialism in India. The outlook of the Hindu Mahasabha is national, although its membership is restricted to the followers of a particular religion. The Indian Christian Association has recently adopted a national attitude in respect of political questions. The other parties are frankly communal both in composition and in outlook. The net result of the activities of some of the parties has been an enormous growth of communalism in the country in recent years.

The situation in respect of parties in India is a very complex one, but it is not more complex than the party situations in most countries of continental Europe. The party system is a useful, if not an indispensable, adjunct of democracy ; but its demerits are as serious as its merits are undoubted. In a country like India, where the multiple-party system prevails, the demerits tend to outweigh the merits. Narrowness, arrogance, and intolerance have already become the marked characteristics of the attitude of some of the parties in their dealings with others. Besides, the complaint is often heard that a rigid enforcement of party discipline is tending to impair individual liberty. It should be remembered that an indiscriminate or a too frequent use of the disciplinary rod often defeats its own object. Nor should it be forgotten that an excess of party spirit is destructive of the spirit of nationalism.

This brings me to the question of Indian nationalism. There are some critics who say that racial, religious, and linguistic differences are so great in the country that the growth of Indian nationality is well nigh-impossible. This is a superficial view. Geographical distinctness, identity of economic interests, a common tradition of a suffering, and a keen desire for freedom and self-rule bind together the different elements of Indian society in an indissoluble bond and constitute the bases of a fundamental unity. Differences exist, but they are not of so serious a character as to hinder permanently the growth of nationalism in the country. It is true that in recent years the differences have in some cases taken a more or less acute form, but this state of things must be regarded as a passing phase. By mutual tolerance and forbearance the divergences can be made to assume insignificant proportions. As a matter of fact, a considerable degree of national feeling already exists in the country, and the future of Indian nationalism is by no means so dark as some people assume it to be.

Nationalism is an indispensable necessity for India for enabling

the country not only to gain freedom but also to retain it. But it is not an unmixed good for all countries, and in all circumstances. 'My country, right or wrong' is a doctrine which is full of mischievous implications. A crude form of patriotism encourages the desire for national aggrendisement. The history of ill-conceived nationalism is the record of disastrous struggles between country and country and race and race. The present war in Europe is the outcome of aggressive nationalism. India should be on her guard, from the beginning of her career as a free nation, against the growth of a feeling of aggression among her people.

Aggressive nationalism, when successful, takes the form of imperialism. This is a great evil, for it has been responsible in the past for the enslavement of free nations, the exploitation of weak countries, the destruction of cultures, and the dwarfing of the human race. The services rendered by imperialist countries to the subordinate races are exceedingly small in comparison with the wrongs inflicted on them. Imperialism is one of the most important causes of war. A clash of imperialism led to the European War of 1914-18. Some of the participants in the present war, if not all of them, have been actuated by imperialistic aims. India herself has felt the full weight of imperialism and although there have been some redeeming features in the system of British rule in India, the people of the country are not in a mood now to tolerate it any longer. A British minister said a few days ago that imperialism no longer governed the relations between England and India. If this be a correct statement, it is to be welcomed as a happy augury for the future relations between the two countries.

The only safeguard against aggressive nationalism and imperialism is internationalism. While every individual should be proud to regard himself as a unit of his nation, he should feel equally proud to be a unit of the great human race. Internationalism is not the antithesis of nationalism ; it is the extension of the nation idea to humanity. It was a noble impulse which urged President Woodrow Wilson to take the initiative in founding the League of Nations. But this institution has failed to attain most of the objects for which it was created. On the economic side it has done good work. It has also done a considerable amount of useful work in regard to questions relating to education, sanitation and public health. Further, it has served as a clearing house of information on many important subjects. But on the political side, its failure has been almost complete. Among

the causes of its failure may be mentioned the non-participation of the United States, the association of the League with the Versailles Treaty, and the non-provision of an international army of police force under its control. But the most important cause of the failure of the League has been the existence of weak nations side by side with strong nations wedded to an imperialist policy. The League is now practically dead, but it is to be hoped that out of its ashes will soon arise a new League of Peoples, resplendent in glory and full of life. But this can happen only when India becomes independent, when imperialism becomes a thing of the past, and when all nations of the world, strong and weak, become free. It will be then, and not till then, that there will be a real parliament of man and a true federation of the world.

While internationalism is an ideal in advance of nationalism, provincialism is a retrograde idea. Unfortunately, a great deal of provincial-mindedness has become evident in India since the advent of provincial autonomy. This has been due, in the main, to narrowness of outlook. It is quite natural that a big country like India should be divided into provinces for administrative convenience. But if provincial feeling is allowed to grow unchecked, it is sure to stand in the way of the healthy growth of nationalism. One phase of provincialism, however, is not unjustified. A demand has been made that the existing provinces of India be reconstituted on a linguistic basis. This is a fair and natural demand which should be complied with soon. On the same principle and as a corollary to this, re-arrangement of the boundaries of the older provinces should be readjusted if it be found that these contain inhabitants speaking languages different from their own.

The question of representation in the legislatures and the local bodies is a source of acute differences in India. The system which prevails at present is not the representation of the people but the representation of races, creeds, classes, sexes, and special interests. Separate electorates have been provided in the existing constitution for Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Indian Christians, the Sikhs,the Scheduled Castes, Landholders, European commerce, Indian Commerce and the Universities. Special representation has been thrust upon women in spite of their protests. It has been remarked that the object of this system is "the vivisection of the body politic of India." But the justification urged in its favour is the existence of differences. It is true that there are many differences in India, but no useful purpose is served by exaggerating them. In some cases, differences have been deliberately

fostered. Nor has the demand for separate electorates been entirely spontaneous. The consequence of this system of separate communal representation has been an enormous growth of dissensions between race and race, between class and class, and between community and community. Separation has led to the demand for further separation, and antagonism has taken the place of harmony. This system of representation, therefore, must be regarded as an evil, and in the interests of the unity and peace of the country it should be removed at the earliest possible moment.

Recruitment to the public services is a subject which has given rise to a great deal of controversy. For a long period, beginning with the establishment of British rule in this country all the superior services, both civil and military, were manned almost exclusively by recruits from Britain. The solemn pledges given by the Charter Act of 1833 and the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 were honoured more in the breach than in the observance thereof. But in recent years, a gradual though slow, process of Indianisation has resulted in a considerable proportion of the higher offices being filled by the children of the soil. The subordinate posts have always been mostly held by Indians. The services question has two aspects, one public and the other personal. The former relates to the needs of administration and the latter refers to the opportunities of individuals for securing profit and position. It need hardly be said that the first aspect is far and away the more important, but, unfortunately, greater emphasis is often laid on the latter. The fact is well known that, while administrative policies are formulated by the ministries in the provinces and the executive council at the centre, the actual carrying out of these policies devolves on the members of the various services, superior as well as inferior. Thus the success or failure of the administration depends very largely on the ability and integrity of the officers. Therefore, the qualifications which should be insisted on for recruitment to the services should be the maximum available.

Unfortunately, both at the centre and in some of the provinces, certain percentages have for sometime past been fixed for recruitment from the different communities, and in the case of some of these communities only the minimum qualifications have been demanded of the candidates. This has resulted in a considerable deterioration of administrative efficiency, and it is apprehended that a continuance of this policy will be a source of greater harm in future. If the question be considered from the personal point of view, it is found that the

system involves great injustice to those persons whose qualifications entitle them to employment but who are declared ineligible on the ground of their colour or creed. Besides, the non-recognition of the principle of equal opportunities for all cannot fail to create discontentment. But the system is sought to be defended on the ground that, as all the communities in India are not equally advanced, special treatment is necessary in order to give encouragement to the less advanced communities. The true way of getting out of this difficulty, however, lies in affording adequate educational facilities to the less advanced communities and not in giving them unfair advantages. Further. it is argued that this is a method of securing the good-will of the specially favoured communities. If it be thought desirable to purchase communal harmony even at the price of the loss of administrative efficiency and the sacrifice of equity and fairness, the percentage of reservation should not be high, and it should be definitely laid down that the reservation would automatically diminish year by year. Unless merit alone is accepted as the ultimate test, there will be no incentive on the part of the backward sections to make serious efforts to reach the level of the more advanced sections of the population.

Another matter connected with the public services deserves attention. While the administrative officers should be under the control and supervision of the minister, they should not be unduly interfered with in the discharge of their responsibilities. For the successful working of self-government in India it will be necessary to create a body of efficient and conscientious officers who will perform their duties fearlessly and without the expectation of favours. But this will not become possible unless a substancial measure of freedom is secured to the various services under Government.

Coming to the question of the future constitution of India, we find that differences of opinion which exist as to the goal of India's political aspirations are not of a serious kind. Complete Independence has been adopted as the ideal by the Indian National Congress, the Hindu Mahasabha, and the Muslim League, while the Liberal Federation still clings to the ideal of Dominion Status. The difference between the two ideals however, is one of more nomenclature than of substance. According to the definition adopted at the Imperial Conference of 1926, which was ratified by the Statute of Westminister 1931, a Dominion is equal in status to Great Britain, and is independent in every aspect of its external as well as its domestic affairs. Besides, the provision that the association of a

Dominion with the other parts of the Commonwealth of Nations should be free implies that the right of secession is guaranteed to it. It may be argued that the ideal of complete Independence carries with it greater prestige and honour than the ideal of Dominion Status, but in the modern world national prestige and glory should be considered to be of less value than peace and goodwill among nations. Lastly, if the question be looked at from the practical standpoint, it would be found that isolation may be attended with greater risk and difficulty than free association with a Commonwealth of Free Peoples.

This controversy regarding India's political goal has a history behind it. In 1906, the Indian National Congress accepted 'Self government obtaining in the self-governing British colonies' as its goal. In 1920, the goal was changed to the attainment of Swaraj by peaceful and legitimate means. In 1927, the Congress declared the goal of the Indian people to be 'Complete Independence.' In the following year, however, the Congress passed a Resolution to the effect that, if the constitution embodied in the All-Parties' Committee Report, which was based on Dominion Status, was accepted in its entirety by the British Parliament before the 31st December, 1929, it would be acceptable to the Congress. But as this condition was not complied with in the course of the year, the Congress in 1929 declared the entire scheme of the All Parties' Committee Report to have lapsed and urged "all Congressmen to devote their exclusive attention to the attainment of Complete Independence for India".

Thus it appears that time has been the most essential factor in the evolution of India's political goal. This fact has however been ignored by the authorities in India as well as in England. On the 31st October, 1929, the Governor General stated that it was implicit in the declaration of 1917 that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress, as therein contemplated, was the attainment of Dominion Status. The Government of India Act, 1935, was discreetly silent about the matter. But Lord Irwin's declaration has recently been reiterated by the Governor General as well as by the Secretary of State. Politicaly minded India, however, is not in a mood to accept Dominion Status as a goal to be reached in the distant future. If Dominion Status is granted immediately, it is likely to be acceptable to the country. The gulf between the goal and the immediate objective is not unbridgeable, and if the British Government is able to take the right step without delay, cordial relations of a permanent character may be established between India and Britain.

The existing system of government, with democracy in the provinces and autocracy at the centre, is an anomaly, and the sooner it disappears the better for all concerned. An all India Federation is contemplated in the Government of India Act, 1935, but many of its provisions are unacceptable to the Indian National Congress. The strongest exception is taken by the Congress as well as by most of the other political parties to the reservation of defence and foreign relations, the enormous powers vested in the Governor-General and the Crown Representative, indirect elections, nomination of State representatives by the Rulers, and the system of representation in British India by special electorates. The Muslim League is opposed to the Federation because it apprehends domination by the Hindu majority. The Indian Princes are not fully satisfied with the privileges which have already been granted to them and want further concessions to be made in their favour.

The objections raised by the Congress are based on sound principles and can be easily met if the British Government can make up its mind to part with real power. For the satisfaction of the Muslim League safeguards may be provided in the new constitution of the country. If the Princes, instead of being guided by sentiment, take a reasonable and farsighted view of the situation, they will become convinced that, by joining the Federation, they will not only safeguard their own positions but will be able to play a worthy part in the political evolution of the whole country.

The advent of the war in Europe has led to the suspension of activities connected with the inauguration of the Federation in view of the pre-occupation of the Government, but the scheme has not been abandoned. The war has indeed created a new situation fraught with immense possibilities for good or evil according to the manner in which it may be handled. India, true to her ancient traditions, has extended her moral support to the Allies and is willing to co-operate with Britain in the prosecution of the war. But, in order that such co-operation may be effective and whole-hearted, the British Government, should make a friendly gesture. The question of bargaining does not arise at all. India's desire for freedom is age-old; nor is the demand for its recognition a new one. Indeed, the present is the most opportune moment for Britain to recognise India's right. It is not clear what special difficulty there can be in applying the principles of democracy and self-determination to the case of India.

Unfortunately, the declarations of the high officers of Govern-

ment in this regard, both in England and in India, have so far been most disappointing. The statement of His Excellency the Governor-General did not evince any desire on the part of the Government to meet the wishes of the people. The suggestion regarding the formation of a Consultative Committee was entirely beside the point. But the tone of His Excellency's speech was mild and consiliatory. The speeches of the Secretary of State were even less helpful towards a better understanding between Britain and India. This was rather surprising, for the Marquis of Zetland had always enjoyed the reputation of being not only an astute politician and an erudite scholar but also a fair-minded man. But the worst speech was that of Sir Samuel Hoare, some parts of which were harsh in tone and provocative in spirit. Besides, his treatment of the controversial topics was most unsatisfactory. On the question of communal differences, he said : "We have shown our good faith in the matter. We showed it when we made the Communal Award." Surely, it would have been better for his own and his country's reputation if Sir Samuel had cited some instances of good faith other than that of the Communal Award. If the Award had been a fair and eqitable one, the situation in India to-day would have been entirely different. Sir Samuel observed further : "But inspite of the Award these divisions exist." The truth is that it is not inspite of, but because of, the Communal Award that divisions exist and have become greatly accentuated. The so-called Award gave an unfair advantage to some of the parties, which naturally encouraged them to clamour for more of such advantages. On the other hand it treated one party in a most inequitable manner, which created a feeling of intense discontent.

It should be said, however, to the credit of many British statesmen outside the Government that they showed a great deal of fairness and foresight in dealing with the situation. The names of men like Lord Samuel and Mr. Wedgwood Benn will always be remembered as earnest advocates of a policy of friendship between Britain and India. The more enlightened section of the British press also gave full support to India's demands. The New Statesman and Nation wrote : "India, indeed, is the crux. We are on our trial before the whole civilized world. From Washington to Moscow every impartial onlooker is asking the question that Indians have posed : Is this a war for the imperial status quo or for a new democratic world-order ? The same question shapes itself in the mind of the German people. Not to-day, but some months or years hence, the answer it frames on our record

may decide the issue of this war. If we dare give India liberty, we shall win the leadership of all free peoples. But if we meet a rebel India with coercion, will any one in Europe or America mistake us for the champions of democracy ?"

The sum and substance of the declarations of the British Government is that they have special responsibilities to the minorities and the Princes and obligations to the British commercial community, and that so long as these problems are not solved, no constitutional advance will be possible in India. The problems have been created or fostered by the British Government, and now to throw the burden of solving them on the people of India is hardly fair. But the problems, though complex and difficult, are not absolutely insoluble. A solution, however, will be possible only if goodwill is avilable on all sides. The attitude of the majority party must be conciliatory, and the demands of the minorities should be based on reason and common sence. It would be inconsistent with all principles of political science and all canons of equity to urge that the minorities should have a permanent veto on the majority. Nor can any minority, however, important and powerful, be given the right to hold up the progress of the country on the ground of the possibility of its interests being affected. The British Government can show their sincerity by taking the initiative in the matter. If they agree to do so, let them take courage in both hands to create the proper machinery for dealing with the problem. But if they do not, they will be charged with advancing a specious plea in order to perpetuate their rule in this country.

The only satisfactory machinery for settling all differences as well as for considering the details of the future constitution of India is a Constituent Assembly. It is true that a Constituent Assembly is generally formed after a successful revolution. But there is nothing to prevent the formation of such an Assembly in India by a friendly arrangement with Britain. This body should be constituted on the basis of proportional representation, so that all minorities and special intersets may be represented on it. There should be no communal representation. If the Constituent Assembly be formed on the basis of separate electrorates, the representatives will be swayed by communal considerations, and this will stand in the way of satisfactory decisions being reached on national lines. In order to allay the fear and suspicions of the minorities it may be laid down that only such decision on communal questions as are carried by a somewhat larger majority than a bare one, say three-fifths, would be given effect to.

It will be one of the main duties of the Conststituent Assembly to provide safeguards in the new constitution for the minorities in the shape of fundamental rights to be guaranteed by an appeal to the Federal Court or, if necessary, to an international tribunal.

India's attitude towards Britain has never been one of uncompromising hostility. Dadabhai Naoroji pleaded for co-operation all his life. Surrendranath Banerjea offered active co-operation even after repeated disappointments and in the face of a growing public opposition to his policy. Mahatama Gandhi, after pursuing for a time a policy of non-co-operation, is again ready for co-operation. The bulk of the people is still prepared to co-operate, provided that co-operation can be offered on fair and honourable terms. Will British statesmanship rise to the occasion and make it possible for India to march side by side with Britain in defence of democracy and freedom and for the good of humanity ?

The urgent need of the hour in India is harmony and goodwill. This can be secured by an enlightened sense of citizenship and a unity of purpose. We must all think of our country first and of everything else afterwards. As for unity, let our motto be : 'In things essential unity ; in things non-essential, liberty; in all things, charity.'' If we render not mere lip service to this motto but make it our rule of conduct in our daily relations with all individuals and races, and communities, India's cherished ideals will be realized at no distant date.

PROFESSOR BENI PARSAD **3**

CIVILIZATION AND STATE

(*Third Conference held at Mysore in December, 1940*)

The present situation demands a rational and dispassionate comprehension of problems. This could be achieved through the development of reason and promotion of intellectualism in our outlook. The power in the state has to be exercised with reason and must remain with those who have balanced personality. Creative Government relies on self-control and discipline from within. Civilisation and State are closely interlinked. Human institutions work within the framework of civilisation. Man is both social and political animal and the state is the product of his nature. Thus, State represents the common conscience and common reason of the people. Our civilisation has become more dynamic by the scientific revolution and as a result of this social life has undergone a complete change. The life has become complete with numerous mal-adjustments which become the genesis of war. Hatred, frustration and use of force are the order of the day. A movement towards international government is the only solution but strategic and economic considerations do not permit such a development. States continue to be the repository of power and the hope lies in using it for sustaining role in modern civilization. Education can play a significant role since Democracy is a Government by Public Opinion. Representative Government possesses all the virtues of a good government. It makes revolution unnecessary. However, the indifference of the people may result in the establishment of dictatorship. The legislature and executive must play their alloted role. They must be organised on scientific lines. The advisory councils could also be highly beneficial. It is through reason that an economic and political transformation can take place. We must get rid of irrational prejudices to secure the reign of the good and rational.

We are a thought-organization seeking to stimulale reflection and research on the political aspects of the great problems that have confronted mankind since the dawn of civilization. But we do not cultivate the science of political philosophers in the East as well as in West during the last twenty-five hundred years who have proclaimed the organic and spiritual unity of social life and the interdependence of its various departments.

Science looks for order in events; through obedience to the laws of that order it seeks to control the course of events. Like everything else that pertains to man, it stands in need of balance in the sense of its various branches being co-ordinated into a higher synthesis. The vue d'ensemble, a sense of the altogethernes s of things is not only one of the prime intellectual requisites but also one of the practical demands of the present age. It would facilitate the search, none too easy, into the root causes of the present distempers and their remedies; it would reinforce the effort, long overdue in India as elsewhere, on the part of the observational disciplines which study the purposes of man as a moral being living in association with other moral beings, to assert their claims in the guidance of events. All would be shocked if any one were to talk on physics or chemistry in the crude, inexact and designing style which has long passed for argumentative skill with men of affairs and, it must be confessed, also with men of letters.

The Root Cause of Social Ills.

Indeed, never was the need for a rational and dispassionate comprehensions of affairs so urgent as at present. At the root of the many ills which afflict the world to-day lies a deficiency in the development of reason, a deficiency in appreciating its proper role and a deficiency in its application in a systematic manner to the activities of social life.

Anti-intellectualism.

The inadequacy of the rational effort has been primarily responsible for anti-intellectualism through the ages. It is the governing motive in some modern schools of psychology and philosophy as a reaction against systems founded on an unduly narrow, exclusive and over-simplified conception of reason -as merely the principle of identity or of cold calculation—but mainly because reason did not seem competent to show the way through the labyrinths of our complex civilization. Men have fallen back on non-rational factors like race, blood and colour as fundamentals and prime explanations in life. It is not suggested here that ethnic differences are devoid of significance--that

is a matter for scientific investigation. But it is patent that concept of life and policy built on them shirk or belittle reason and, therefore, assume a very dogmatic form. Similarly, instinctivism or intuitionism finds the springs of life predominantly outside reason. Feeling or emotion is the avowed foundation of powerful creeds like Fascism.

The importance of instinct and emotion is obvious. Philosophically, the fallacy. of anti-intellectualism is of the same character as that against which it is a protest—over-simplification, compartmentalism, and over-emphasis on some aspects to the comparative exclusion of others. In practial life it is the fallacy of losing the balance and the correct perspective. It is imperative to-day to restore the balance, to give unto reason what belongs to reason.

Reason, Emotion and Judgement.

The plea for reason, then, must not be interpreted to imply that reason acts independently of impulse, emotion or will. These are analytical concepts, not suggestions of compartments in human nature; they are facets, not isolated parts of personality. If we may describe life as energy, mind is that aspect of it which orders and balances its outflow. Without treading on psychological controversy, it may be stated as a working assumption in politics, that reason is touched by emotion. Purpose is the outcome of the interfusion of impulse with a more or less definite ideas of an end,--purpose is incarnated, though imperfectly, as order, restraint and movement in normal life--.The fusion of intellect and emotion is conducive to what we call judgment. Actions would be impossible without reason and impulse working together. A system of emotion may cluster round an entity--an object or a concept-an d appear as a sentiment, such as nationalism, humanitarianism, etc. Volition, again, is not an independent faculty; it is the more or less unified trend of endeavour towards an end emerging out of a due subordination of impulses and desires. Will is the unification for the time being, of various volitions. The fusion of the thinking and feeling elements is very well brought out in those judgements which are called ideals or standards and which constitute ethical judgements on activities. They are the supreme discoveries in the meaning of facts.

Reason is the great principle of development. It is necessarily present in the countless judgments required in social life. The contention, however, is that there is not enough of it and that the balance is usually over-tipped in favour of impulse and passion and that a harmony among the rational, emotional, conative and other aspects of personality is the great demand of human life and society at present.

If feeling is left to conflict with thought, or if passion is allowed to run riot, there ensues a disharmony and disturbance. The interfusion of impulse and emotion with reason would produce integrated personalities, and cure some of the basic shortcoming. Take, for instance, sympathy,--the foundation of morality and religion, the cement of social union, terms of social interest--sublimination resolves the apparent quality of egoism and altruism. The exercise of power requires, above all, to be informed by reason, for then it ceases to be destructive and becomes creative. Power is exposed to serious temptations and is liable to perversion in the hands of all who have not attained to a perfect balance of personality. Man's capacity to govern others seems strictly limited; creative government is built on the foundation of moral self-government on every one's part. Power inheres in the state but creative government relies not mainly on coercion but on those influences which foster self-control; it does not seek to impose all discipline from above; it essays to organise the environment so as to evoke discipline from within.

The situation in respect of power presents a spectacle of utter confusion and anarchy. There are innumerable centres from which power is being exerted in an unbalanced and uncoordinated manner. Correspondingly there is a willingness to submit,which is accompanied by neuroses. For many, the sense of superiority has run amuck; they seem to be afraid of the very idea of a world without inferiors, a world of equals. It may be admitted that the hunger for recognition is primary; it is a consequence of man's social nature but in spite of high authority it may be permitted to deny that the hunger for superiority is primary; it is really an over-balance in the direction of egoism. One is on safe ground in suggesting that in an appropriate environment moral influence could replace domination and power as a phychological necessity. Beyond it we move perhaps in the region of perversions, disharmony and neuroses--certainly a lack of sublimination. This mentality hampers co-operation and prevents the willing of social ends. Thus it happens that disrupting forces are always present in society and the art of social equilibration consists in counteracting them.

Civilization.

It is the expansion of personality and the enhanced need of balance that produce Civilisation and State. Savagery is a system of few and simple wants and, therefore, of almost complete uniformity and stagnation. Barbarism is a slight increase in wants and complexity and

a slight shaking of stagnation. Civilisation is a progression of social differentiation and re-adjustment, growth of individual specialisation, release of new energies and potentialities. It is built on a system of ideas and habits of co-operation; in fact, our most elementary needs of food and water, shelter and security are supplied through them. Far from being taken for granted, the foundations of civilised life are quite capable of being unsettled and of disappearing with the underlying ideas, With the loss of balance, whole peoples and classes have reacted to lower levels. Civilisation cannot ,progress automatically; in fact it is quite capable of degeneration and destruction. Owing to human volition as a perennial and variable factor, there is no inevitability in social evolution.

Civilisation depends on thought because of its dynamic quality. It would change its course as men acquire clear consciousness of their purposes and see the problem of conduct as a whole. Civilisation is dynamic; that is its essential quality and that is what distinguishes it from savagery and barbarism. Rapid change strains the sense of security which comes from easy conformity to established usage. As the old moorings are loosened, men must find new, it may be deeper, sources of re-integration, and set up new habits and institutions which constitute the framework of civilisation.

Civilisation multiplies interests and objectives, and the chances of deeper happiness but it is not *ipso facto* a state of happiness. It is a perpetual challenge, it poses a problem of adjustment and harmony and, failing the requisite moral response, may spell nervous disorder, a disintegration of personality. Civilisation is subject to mushroom growth and calls for scrutiny and continuous examination. One of the present impasse is that civilisation has not devised adequate means of self-criticism and often discouraged the critical attitude. Government, for instance, have often sought to stifle independent thought. It is the function of education to produce an attitude of thinking, and not of mere acquiescence or reflection, to foster the power of social dignosis and social therapy. Civilisation progresses with a widening of the sphere of intelligence, an increase in the power of conceiving means for their at alnment and of prevision as a whole.

Human Nature and the State.

It is in this context that we may analyse the role of the state. Man is a social animal in the sense that he can live only in society.

But nature alone does not fit him for a perfectly social role. He has to learn the art of living together with much effort and varying success. And he is not a political animal even in the sense that he can live only in the state. As a matter of fact, the homo sapiens has lived for the greatest part of his history on earth without any state whatever. Rudimentary cooperation and leadership suffice under savagery and barbarism. Primitive community possesses an organic unity, a deep solidarity; it knows of division of labour, but it is almost static and can live on custom. It knows no State; it knows no law as the command of the state. It is pressure towards civilization with its growing dynamic and complex differentiation and synthesis that calls for a more deliberate effort and a more conscious formulation of purpose and brings the state into existence. Men are not born fit for the state; they have to grow to educate themselves, into statehood. Even then they seem to behave as political animals only by fits and starts. Civilisation liberates new forces; it is a matter of accumulation; it requires selection, integration and equilibration. Man has to look ahead and reflect. Individual self-consciousness is sharpened; wants and cravings press on one another; repressions and complexes are generated. In the concerted social effort, the state may be described partly as the embodiment of the common reasons, the conscience of the people. In more concrete terms it is an association thrown by society for the direction of its purpose and the co-ordination of its multifarious activities.

The State and Law.

The co-ordination implies that man should exercise a measure of control over himself--his impulses and dispositions--and over the environment. The former is an ethical problem with an important intellectual aspect; the latter is an intellectual problem with an important ethical aspect. In proportion to intelligent control does life acquire meaning ? As a co-operative venture, civilisation implies a very intricate division of labour. It is to maintain this delicate fabric of civilisation that the state comes into existence. The two rise together; they are so intimately connected that **every concept of state is a concept of civilization.**

As distinct from its executive agency called Government, the state is a subjective association, an attitude of will and mind. Interpreted in the light of creative organization, law is constraint only incidentally; it is essentially a clearance for release of energy, a liberation of wants and an opening of the way to their satisfaction. It is, along with the

other agencies of social control, fundamentally constructive, a normative integration. The actual working conception of the state embodies the reason as well as the unreason, the 'public as well as the sectional spirit, it is often a will to maintain a union for slender advantages, for power or aggrandisement. It advances towards perfection in proportion to the movement of will and mind away from prejudices and passions towards reason and social sense, an intelligent and disinterested conception of the common good and public service, a relationship not so much of obedience and command as of co-operation and mutual aid.

Stagnation and Revolution.

It will be observed that, moral and intellectual effort alone can sustain the political attitude--the attitude of concern for the commonweal. It is the inadequacy of this political effort under civilization that has been responsible naturally for many jerks and jolts. We have lost control over events because we have not put forth an effort commensurate with the scale, the complexity and rapid reaction of events. It has meant loss of rhythm between habit and adaptation, it has prevented continuous readjustment and piled up abuses which provoke revolution and temporary destruction of harmony. Revolution is the logical sequence of a lack of adaptation, of an artificial blocking of socially necessary avenues of movement, of a baulked disposition. Stagnation has been in evidence at many points where new traditions, customs and institutions should have grown up. Ideas are implicit in all institutions; they are, in the sociological perspective, ways of control over activities and their reciprocal adjustment, but they have not been widened and adapted to meet the new environment. Revolution is a sudden and violent tiding over of a hiatus created by traditionalism.

The Scientific Revolution and the Break-up of the old order.

The application of science to industry, to transport and communication, to entertainment and to warfare implies a rapid and progressive transformation of the environment. It opens, for the first time in history, possibilities of universal comfort. But it is also liable to break up established cultures so suddenly as to weaken interest in life to the point of utter listlessness and suicide. It calls for a vast effort of re-orientation, change from what is called habit in individual life and tradition in social life. Here is an inescapable conflict which can be resolved only through reason.

The Great Society.

The dynamic quality of civilisation and all the possibilities of happiness and un-happiness have been enhanced by the scientific revolution during the last two hundred years.

As distance is annihilated, the economic, cultural and political forces weave new relationship among peoples and open out prospects of conflict and co-operation, understanding and misunderstanding. The curtain rises over new scenes in the central drama of history—the competing claim of the wider and the narrower allegiances. It is a psychological fact of critical importance that the near interest is more emotional and the distant more intellectual. The larger the social growth, the less vivid it tends to become. It can be grasped only through ideas. The Great Society, as the supranational complex of social forces set in motion by the Industrial Revolution is designated, must either be an intellectual venture or dissolve in anarchy.

Caught up in a vast network of impersonal forces which seem to defy understanding, one may succumb to psychological maladies. The social mobility, inherent in modern economic conditions, may conduce to genuine education, freshness and discovery or one may feel lost and lonely in a big town and fall a prey to lassitude and dissipation. It depends on the success one achieves in re-orienting one's whole being. The large scale on which the Great Society lives its life implies an artificial plane. It tends to be a world of inference and secondary ideas, and raises, often in an acute form, the problem, how to hold on to the primary things, the essential moralities.

Features of Social Life.

The tempo of the Great Society brings into conspicuous relief certain features which often fail to strike the eye in a less dynamic and less extensive society. It shows that social accommodation, far from being automatic, is achieved consciously, through a progressively clearer apprehension of ends. The collective will, on which it rests, evolves itself only through a reconciliation of warring ideas and purposes. The Great Society and all its associations including the State are what we make them at any particular moment. Here one can observe that society has to achieve unity, a unity of being as well as of becoming; it has to advance to a progressive integration, a creative synthesis. Harmony is not a static balance but a support which the parts extend to one another in development. Society has to win its way to conational wholeness. It has to replace accident by

intention, drift by mastery. It can no longer look upon politics as an empiric art, it must find its sheet anchor in ideas and principles. It has to cultivate the habit of perpetual readjustment.

It is not implied here that it is either possible or desirable to dispense with the primary neighbourhood. As a matter of fact, it acquires a fresh value and vitality in the midst of large, impalpable associations. What the Great Society requires is that men should interknit themselves into creative wholes and weave them all into a grand harmony. As a mental interelation, society stops at no limits short of humanity. But impersonal organisation does not readily evoke sympathy, kindness and co-operation in the manner of the small village or kinship group. Hence the need of diffusing education and widening the basis of our education from the small community to the great society; man has to be enabled to find his way through the environment. The simple small scale man thrown into the large-scale complex environment is the tragic plot of the modern age.

The Genesis of War.

This psychological maladjustment is one of the prime causes of international friction. It is now a truism that the modern methods of production, with less than a forty hours week, can provide enough food, clothing, shelter and entertainment for every man, woman and child in the world. It is no longer necessary that a people should hold down others in order to keep up a high standard of life for itself. As an economic device, war is today an anachronism. It persists because of the strength of tradition and the system of hatred, animosity and exploitation which are, in final analysis. a legacy from the erstwhile plain economy. Civilisation is still over-burdened with an inheritance from feudalism... the conception of property in populations. They appear as colonialism, subjection and imperialism. These survivals from older conditions are a denial of the dignity of man as man and stimulate rivalry and turn the power of the state in a direction which leads logically to war.

War in the Social Context.

War is not an isolate, phenomenon, immediate motives apart, it is integral to an order of things which rests on an imperfect conception of justice. It is a method of pressing claims, a way of resolving disputes, an instrument of policy, natural to a scheme of things

which admits the validity of violence and is grounded, in part, in the exertion of force by group upon group. War is often the projection of an internal injustice into external affairs in an intensified form. It will disappear only when men have reasoned themselves out of the concept of property in men and in their habitats. War will not die of reaction to its own horrors, these will only evoke new precautions and new feats of organisation, endurance and heroism. War will persist and the most carefully constructed peace will turn out to be a short armistice so long as any group of mankind, in Asia, Africa, Oceania or else where, are looked upon as fit only to minister to the needs of the so called advanced races. There is something inhuman in the very idea of the Haves and Have-nots of Lebensraum, a place in the sun—it pertains to territories which can rightfully belong neither to the satiated nor to the unsatiated power but only to their own indigenous inhabitants. To exploit and perpetuate a people's weakness, instead of making it fit for higher life, is to prolong the era of grab and rivalry with the added horrors of modern mechanisation. A great effort of reason is needed to bring home to all that the present world order is freighted with war and that durable peace depends on its revision into conformity with the new economic possibilities and moral ideals. War has permeated social and political organisation, literature and outlook so deeply, force and fraud are still writ so large over associated life, that they can be eliminated only through a great intellectual and moral awakening.

Exertion of Force.

If disputes have been settled on the plane of force, it is because social life has been moving on the corresponding planes of hatred, frustration and exploitation. Force implies intense co-operation in a narrow area and antagonism beyond it. It is exerted by a number of wills in unison. It is an inevitable consequence of the change of scale that the narrow area has been steadily widening until the exertion of force is now a function of big states, empires and coalitions.

Passing of the Nation-State.

During the last three years in Europe six states have been completely, and three partly, annexed ; seven have been reduced for the time being to subjection ; two have practically lost their independence of action and the fate of three is hanging in the balance. Whatever the immediate causes, are we witnessing a deeper movement

here analogous to the disappearence in the fourth century B.C. of the Greek city-state which had like-wise ceased to be adequate to the widening economic needs of Hellas, had forfeited the old loyalty, and was betrayed by "fifth columns"? Has the sovereign independent nation-state, specially the small and medium-sized state, been outgrown in the push of long-range economic forces, cultural contacts and international ideologies? True, men persist in thinking in terms of sovereign national independence but did not Aristotle, the greatest of thinkers, continue to philosophise on the exclusive basis of the city-state to which his own patron and his own disciple, the King of Macedon, administered the final blow before his own eyes? It is now patent that the small or the medium-sized state can no longer defend itself; it is a logical corollary that the big state will stand helpless before bigger ones. They can survive only as component units in a vast federation. That much is implied in the recent revolutions and in the technique of war; it is really the culmination of a long train of development, specially in the economic field, which had been set in motion by the Industrial Revolution. How and when the final step will be taken, whether the big states or empires will knit themselves into a world federation or be bombed into it, depends on the amount of intelligence and goodwill that we can mobilize.

International Government.

It may be that men will be awakened into reason and commonsense only by recurrent war and its grim accompaniments of famine, pestilence and misery. But there is nothing inherently impossible in their turning the corner through a great effort of reason. Events have often influenced attitudes; it may be that the present war may inspire distrust of passion and throw us back on reason. It may lead men to question the wisdom of sheer acquisitiveness and domination. But if the basic causes are not checked, the war of idealism would, as in 1919, soon spend itself and the states would return to their normal mood of belligerency. The political gains would become permanent only if they are embodied in regional federations as component units in a world confederation free from all traces of political inferiorities on the score of race, colour, religion or nationality. Larger political formations would represent only a natural extension of the state's role of adjustment. They would ensure, *inter alia*, a freer flow of goods and services and a freer access to raw materials on the part of all. They would facilitate comprehensive economic planning, not necessarily of a centralised character, which

would obviate the distressing economic slumps and crises. They would multiply contacts and release processes of unification. Now that the line between domestic and foreign affairs is vanishing, the state's role of adjustment has to be international. It is only natural that international government should struggle into being. The League of Nations may be dead ; but long live the League. Its resurrection is certain ; it is rooted in the necessities of the times. It is inherent in the large scale co-operation on which people live their lives and the rapidity with which they react to one another. It is not the formation but the character of the League that would come up for discussion. Experience suggests that international organization, inevitable after the war, be based not on the sovereign nation state, like the first League of Nations, but on the idea of confederation, a common government for specified purposes.

It is symptomatic of the trend towards large-scale organization inherent in modern developments that modern political doctrines—Socialism, Communism and Fascism for instance—have an international setting. Political Science, as a discipline, has been prevented so far by traditionalism from moving decisively to the international plane but it is taking ever-increasing account of international affairs.

Statehood and Nationhood.

Apart from a world confederation, a regional federation composed of many peoples, with divergent languages, religions and cultures, means a disassociation of Statehood from Nationhood. While the former is political and economic, the latter is cultural and spiritual. Peoples who differ from one another in their outlook on life can live together in the same federal state only on the basis of tolerance of differences, on the principle of equal opportunity of development on their own respective lines. Strategic and economic considerations now forbid insistence on homogeneity of language, religion, culture or outlook as indispensable to a state. What matters is the will, the elementary commonsense, to live in a state wide enough for economic planning and resourceful enough for defence.

Majorities and Minorities.

The disassociation of statehood and nationhood would place the problem of minorities and majorities in a new light. The quest after cultural identity and assimilation would disappear ; the toleration of differences would appear not so much a virtue as a bare necessity, a condition precedent to social life. Intolerance arises from

persistence in the search, appropriate to small and simple communities, for perfect unity and homogeneity, solidarity and conformity. The composite state from which there is no longer an escape will put a ban on that search. Internal and external complications incidental to the erstwhile predominantly political concept of nationality would yield place to cross-fertilization and enrichment of cultures.

Peace and Security.

The greater the area reclaimed from force, the greater the sense of security, the greater the scope for general confidence and aspiration. To that extent is the struggle of personality raised to the higher and ethical plane. It means that mutual aid replaces the so-called struggle for survival in national and specially in international affairs. Nations are now nearer to one another but the full implications of this interdependence have yet to be grasped. In proportion to the elimination of force and the admission of mutual aid, the state becomes a moral and spiritual association in its internal and external aspects. The state still continues to be the repository of power but the power ceases to be an end in itself and is consciously felt as a means of sustaining civilization and helping it to attain higher levels.

The Moral Equivalent of War.

If mankind were ultimately to outgrow war as an instrument of policy, it would not at all diminish the opportunity of high tension of energy, endurance, indiscipline and sacrifice. There is scope enough for moral energy in the stupendous tasks of universalising education and comfort and a high standard of physical and moral health. And the crucial fact is that the genuine adventure of personality consists in the inward struggle to unfold its possibilities, a struggle towards knowledge, balance and universal love. There is nothing abnormal about conflict as struggle for adjustment. Progress consists in lifting it from the physical to the intellectual and moral plane. This struggle is often cut short not only by the supreme sacrifice but also by the passion and hatred which war evokes.

Ethical Dualism.

A rough measure of our narrow moralities and lack of imaginative sympathy is furnished by our ethical dualism the observance or at least the recognition of one code of conduct for one's own family, sect or nation and the tacit acceptance of a different, perhaps diametrically opposite code, for outsiders. Psychologically, however, it is also

an indication of the possibilities of self-transcendence and identification with a wider group. The duality will diminish in proportion to the widening of social sympathies and mental horizon and a corresponding social and political organization.

Thinking.

Limited by his own vision, experience and interests. the common man starts with an initial difficulty in comprehending the working of other minds. Every divergence adds to the difficulty until the Great Society where the whole world is his neighbour renders the attempt almost hopeless. He can rise to the occasion only if he has been trained to think. Then may be abolished the antithesis between "moral man and immoral society" which is the symbol of ethical backwardness. For thinking is teleological in its nature and has evolved as a means of re-adjustment and re-organization in face of obstacles and distances.

Education.

Social thinking has not kept pace with the growth of knowledge. Civilization has piled up knowledge without absorbing and assimilating it. A slight over-balance is inevitable and, if tipped in the direction of progress, desirable in every phase of civilisation. But an utter loss of balance spells confusion and distintegration. If the advancement of a science is not accompanied by a wide diffusion of scientific knowledge and by a corresponding advance in morality, it may break up civilization. An unbalanced society is liable to fall under the tyranny of things ; to the extent that mastery loses to drift, there is a risk of civilisation degenerating into a tragedy of children playing with fire. From the standpoint of harmony, government is, as Plato perceived, a consequence of education.

The Role of Education in Modern Civilization.

Social philosophy must recapture this intimate correlation of politics with education and point out that the latter is, far from being a luxury for the few, an imperative necessity for all. Besides, a little reflection on that interrelation of minds which we call society will show that education produces its best result not when it trickles down in small doses but when it is rapidly universalised. Too often, as in India, education has progressed so gradually as to expose the educated few to conquest afresh by the ignorant mass and to leave the reserves of crude prejudice practically untouched, or the grave inequality in the distribution of education, that is, of ability, may produce a narrow oligarchy. Now that science has placed enormous means of wealth at

the disposal of the community, there must be something radically wrong in will or intelligence with a government which fails to educate every child and to provide for continued and adult education. Nothing else can actualize the potential gains of civilization.

Emphasis on the Social Sciences.

By far the most important mode of adjustment to the complex modern civilisation, education has to put greater emphasis on the social sciences. An intelligent understanding of present-day conditions would go a long way to offset the sluggishness which often passes for conservatism. It would help to convert our modern pluralities into genuine communities. From the personal standpoint a grounding in the social sciences would go a long way to save the mind and the will from being paralysed by psychologised propaganda or the mass emotion of the crowd. By the law of its constitution, the human mind cannot rest content with negatives; it longs for positive opinions; it creates wholes--wholes which possess meaning; to deny knowledge and training to it is to leave it to the mercy of inherited dogmas, current prejudices and alluring catchwords, a prety to party demagogy. Ignorance in motion, said Goethe, is the most terrible force in nature. An analysis of economic maladjustments suggests that they arise mainly from elements which have been understood imperfectly by those in power or by those to whom they are responsible.

Educative Organisation.

Apart from schooling, all social life and organisation are implicit with education; the educational state seeks to make it as explicit as possible. That is, in ultimate analysis, one of the main justifications of democratic government. The educational state which not only diffuses education among all but is organised so as to be a powerful source of bye-education and specially political education through its elective chambers and advisory committees is the most potent means of realising political ends. Genuine creative education, whether at school or from life, is not compatible with negative and repressive government. When the Prussian Government, for instance, forbade the kindergarten of the reformer Froebel in 1851, it proclaimed that its autocracy could not harmonise with the freedom of the new education.

Opinion and Knowledge.

The bearing of the educational state on public opinion and all that pertains to it is quite obvious. Democracy is sometimes defined as government by public opinion. But no government, least of all, a

positive government engaging in multifarious activities, can be altogether an affair of opinion. Opinion pertains properly to judgments of science and, therefore, to that aspect of government which consists in the determination of ends. Here, too, opinion stands in need of the utmost assistance from knowledge, garnered by social scientists. But once the needs have been determined, the sphere of opinion ends, and that of knowledge begins. Knowledge that is, expertise has to join the ends with the means, to settle how the ends shall be given effect to. Opinion may prescribe in outline what ought to be done, knowledge has to determine, in a precise and systematic manner, how it ought to be done. Beyond it public opinion has just one other function, general supervision to make sure that the ends have been carried out. As a factor in politics, the public cannot be omnicompetent; it must have a definite role and discharge it. A political organ which may deal with anything, with everything or nothing, lends itself easily to designing intrigue and manipulation, it becomes the tool of caucuses, rings and bosses.

Public Opinion and Popular Power.

It is scarcely necessary to dilate on the magnitude of the role of public opinion, or on the importance of fitting the people for its fulfilment. The problem is how to convert the formless, dispersed inchoate popular power...the raw material so to say...into an efficient and enlightened democracy. If the problem is not solved in a rational way, popular power may turn out to be a self-cancelling business and destroy itself. The solution lies in the diffusion of education and the permeation of social, specially economic and political organisation, with the educational principle. Secondly, opinion tends to follow social cleavages and if these turn on accidents of birth, race or religion, opinion remains sectional and never attains to the rank of public opinion. The approximation of opinion to the ideal of Rousseau's General Will depends largely on the approximation of society to the standards of social justice. Justice has often been described as the right ordering of human relations ..an ordering which would assist every one to realise his personality. The social good involves an equiliberation of all the interests of every one in the light of all the interests of every one else. Universal education, equality of opportunity, social justice, genuine public opinion, democratic government and scientific administration...all these are parts of a single political process which has yet to attain completion in any state. They imply a public life dominated not by passion but

by reason, free from passive intolerance as well as from active fanaticism. In proporiton to high mass education and social justice, will popular power bring itself into form through judgment and self-control, perceive its own limitations and integrate itself with knowledge ? It is not necessary that every man should be a scientist, an expert, but it is necessary that he should understand the scientific method and confide in its worth. Politics would not then be a gamble, the plain man and the expert alike would cease to be the playthings of public life. To the art of of the statesman, the plain man should be able to apply the judgment that he applied to the art of the shoemaker or the tailor without himself being one or the other. Inter alia, they must all understand the impropriety of applying national solutions to international problems. No form of government can endure in the modern age which is not built on an intelligent collaboration between the citizen's sense of values and the expert's choice of means. It is scarcely necessary to add that political leadership takes the colour from the character of opinion. Sectional and ignorant opinion evokes narrow-minded leadership and unscrupulous propaganda.

Propaganda.

The propaganda to which the world has been subjected during the last twenty-five years may rank in the history of opinion as one of the greatest outrages ever perpetuated on humanity. The dogmatism has injured the plasticity which the course of evolution has made the basis of learing. Propaganda has invaded the very homes of learning and subordinated truth and integrity to narrow passing ideologies. "Myths" have been philosophically expounded and defended on the ground, not of truth, but of suitability for mass-consumption. They sound like escapes into animism; they are lure to thoughtless acquiescence. Modern propaganda has harnessed psychology in its service and taken advantage of ignorance and semi-education. "Propaganda is not science." "The appeal must be directed to emotions and only in a very qualified manner to so-called intelligence," writes Hitler. Propaganda has been assisted by the modern press, the cable and the radio. It has been so subtle, effective and pervasive that it has mostly neutralised the gain of the advance from force to persuasion. It falsifies history and ethnology, economics and sociology, above all, political science. The success of propaganda illustrates the craving of the human mind for ideas and the readiness, in the absence of critical education, to acquiesce in what conforms to some existing prejudice. One of the

reasons for the vogue of rigid totalitarian ideologies is that they are ready-made shelters from the inclemencies of independent thought.

Representative Government.

As a process, the state is too plastic and too dynamic for rigid formulas and admits of infinite variety in modes of organisation. The purpose which it represents embody value and justice at varying degrees. Given the requisite conditions for its operation, representative government has the merit of making revolution unnecessary, or rather of tanning and regularising revolution. The change from negative to positive government renders it very necessary to arrive at as large an agreement on ends as possible. Representative government is a contrivance for facilitating that agreement through creative discussion and compromise, more or less, in terms of social justice.

Extension of political frontiers curtails the sphere of force and seems to represent progress to that degree. But the growth in size must as the late Professor Hobhouse pointed out, be balanced by the extension of freedom and mutual aid throughout the state before it can definitely be called progress. Otherwise, territorial agglomeration may arrest development and produce stagnation. If the 'new order' which seems to be in the air in the east and west alike turns out to be a mere extension of empire or domination, it may be found to contain within it all the seeds of retrogression and decay. It will be a contribution to world progress only if it can, through provision of liberty and mutual aid, facilitate the reliasation of personality on the part of all. Democratic government, apart from its educative value, admits of justification as a means of maintaining this balance.

The Dictatorship.

Government, the executive agency of the association that we designate state, has been often hampered in the discharge of its heavy responsibilities by insufficiency of knowledge, narrowness of interest, vision and experience ; as well as by the hostility of some and the indifference of many of its subjects and, above all, by the insecurity and panic of a actual or potential war. Representative government seeks to get over the hurdles but the venture is beset with perils. The apathy of the common man and the sabotage of the dethroned groups render it difficult to readjust the balance upset by a period of transition.

When the old world seems dead and the new powerless to be born, men lose their bearing, succumb to nervous fatigue and react in

favour of a simple, despotic form of government. Militarism, inspired by motives of aggression, revenge or legitimate defence, fosters concentration of power and under modern conditions of warfare, totalitarian dictatorship. Economic distress, due to a temporary accentuation of age long maladjustments, may produce a dread of social degradation and mobilise support for the status quo under ruthless leadership. Uncertainty and confusion induces an uncritical acceptance of despotic rule. Whenever it comes to a choice between security and liberty, the mass of the people prefer the former. Parties imbued with keen and impatient enthusiasm for great and urgent programme of reform may prefer to impose their will on the "common herd" as well as on the recalcitrant opponents. A protracted revolution seeks to strengthen or save itself through an absolutist government. Last but not least, disappointment with an ill-conceived, dilatory and inefficient parliamentarianism leads to faith in one-man rule.

Dictatorship has been the most striking phase of the political response to large-scale transition and dislocation during the last twenty-three years. It is by no means improbable that it may encompass other states in the immediate future. But even if it were to become universal, it is not likely to be more durable than the Greek tyrannies of the sixth or the fourth century B.C. or the modern despotisms of Oliver Cromwell and Napoleon Bonaparte. Its militancy and regimentation do not accord with the principle of growth which must sooner or later assert itself. It is likely to fade away with the bridging of the acuter phases of the transition, the appearance of a fresh adjustment on the horizon, the abeyance of war through weariness or reasoning and the improvisation of a parliamentarianism grounded in a better understanding of psychological realities and administrative requirements. Attention to the last factor, indeed, may yet save many a state from an atavistic relapse into dictatorship. It raises the whole problem of social accommodation.

Organisation.

Co-ordination of the complex and interlocking activities of society entails a vast network of organisation in the domains of politics, economics and culture, in order to secure the necessary concentration on purposes, division of labour, pooling of knowledge and experience and economy of effort. Organisation, however, carries its own risks...tendency to substitute masses for individuals, and statistics for personality, to become rigid and formal and to project itself as an end rather than as a means.

Ends and Means.

The dynamics of civilization negate the idea of social purpose as a static plan, fixed once for all. Purpose grows with the growth of opportunity, develops in the course of its own fulfilment and calls for an ever fresh equilibration. It implies an interdependence between ends and means, so close that ends seem to grow naturally out of the means. Nothing is easier in the absence of an adequate rational discrimination than to confuse means with ends. Few learn the art of life; most people finish with the means of life. It is usual in private life to confuse wealth with the happiness it is designed to serve. It is usual in politics to confuse force, organisation and institutions with the creative order, equilibration and progress to which they stand in the relation of means. Science has now transformed the conditions and the scale of their working and the magnitude of their effect but the basic traditions remain the same.

Organisation is the most delicate and difficult of all arts, being the most liable to perversion. It calls for a continuous balance between the intensive expression of part-personality and the scope for full expression, a balance between devotion to community and spontaneity of personality. Positive government raises in an acute form the problem of the inter-relation of popular thought, organization, functional associations, legislatures and executive departments.

The Role of the Legislature.

The auto-limitation of public opinion must be accompanied by a self-denying ordinance on the part of modern legislature. During the long transition from autocracy, monarchic and oligarchic, to constitutional and popular rule, the legislature attempted a detailed formulation of policy, a vast amount of purely executive business and a minute supervision over various departments of administration. Perhaps the nature of executive and the state of public opinion left it no alternative but the recent breakdown of parliamentary government suggests that the legislature attempted too much and attempted it in too dilatory a manner. It misjudged its powers and failed to grasp the imperative need of associating science with government and of committing administration to trained expertise. Reform of parliamentary procedure, so as to make for greater thinking and greater despatch, is one of the most urgent tasks that confront statesmanship in countries that have not yet swung to

dictatorial regime. It must be tackled by every state in the light of its own conditions and large allowance may still be necessary for transitional stages. But two generalisations suggest themselves: Firstly, government is an organic whole and has to function effectively and expeditiously and cannot afford the network of checks and balances that seemed to accord with the intellectual atmosphere dominated by Newtonian physics. Secondly, the legislature has to be not merely a well-organisation but also a thought-organisation, to take affairs in the large-scale perspective of human purpose, and to restrict itself to ends and policies.

It must be a receptacle of ideas and be surrounded by organisations which would play an advisory role without detracting from its responsibility and celerity of action. Already the creative element in legislation, as in administration, comes largely from beyond the regular mechanism of government. It is desirable to go beyond the regular mechanism of government. It is desirable to regularise and replenish the supply. Thus the second chamber can represent functional associations and ventilate their ideas. Hierarchy of functional organisations—central, provincial and local—which, besides sustaining of their members, can assist the formulation and adaptation of plans of economic welfare. An advisory economic council can bring ministers and leaders of functional unions into touch with experts. Something like a chamber of sociologists can project social engineering in the long-range perspective. States which are subject to racial or religious bickerings may set up Boards of Referees at the centre as well as in the provinces, partly or entirely elected by the various denominational organisations, authorised to declare whether any legislative or executive projects violate any legitimate interests of any group and, what is more important, to offer constructive alternatives. The apparent complexity of these arrangements is hardly an argument against thems ; our complex civilisation requires a complex political constitution ; an oversimplified machinery is crime against it. Besides, advisory bodies, while letting in a flow of ideas, do not deprive the legislature or the executive of any part of its responsibility.

The Executive.

Similarly, the modern executive calls for reorganisation in accordance with the principle of rationalisation that is permeation with boards of experts, not of mere civil servants, but of trained, scientific

experts. Here we touch one of the cardinal errors of democratic government and one of the most potent causes of its eclipse during the last twenty years. It acquisced in a system of administration adapted to negative, aristocratic government of the pre-industrial era. It was content to be mainly a corrective to despotism, and oligarchy. We are now realising that the determination of ends should be followed by the selection and execution of means by experts and that the cabinet should normally confine itself to general co-ordination. The modern executive has to comprise autonomous boards—Planning Commissions, Public Service Commissions, Investment Boards, Railway Transport, Electricity, Marketing, Agricultural, Education Boards and others. It may be pointed out that experts are to be entrusted with departments of administration, not with the determination of ends and higher policy. The requisite technique is already in evidence in medical and transit departments in several states and awaits general application. It is also feasible to extend the system of associating Advisory Councils with various departments and their branches to ensure day-to-day criticism and fresh suggestion and to educate public opinion.

Such an executive should represent the principle of reason. It is, in fact, the entire range of social regulation that has to be informed by the scientific spirit.

Government.

It is obvious that highly technical administration does not lend itself to popular control. Not this does not imply a wooden, red-tape bureaucracy. Administration would pre-suppose a dispassionate survey of social conditions and formulation of economic policies by boards of social scientists and their execution by scientifically trained officers. Already, progressive administration has demonstrated that the genuine role of the civil service is that of a learned profession. It must think out policies and reforms as a systematic whole and be able to plan on the large scale inherent in modern economics and transport. It is patent, however, that such an administration can function only when the mass of the people are enlightened enough to appreciate the value of reason and science, in place of prejudice and drift, in the management of their multitudinous services.

Conditions of Progress.

Civilisation has reached a stage which requires a fresh infusion of reason into its machinery of regulation. Progress was defined

by Sir Henry Maine as the movement from status to contract. But contract admits of qualitative refinement of which we can scarcely foresee the limit. Progress continues in the transfusion of the conditions of contract with the principle of the rational good and may be held to be marked by the trend 'towards the emancipation of the psyche' and the increasing dominance of the mental aspect of life.

The world, then, stands in need of a great moral effort but it requires about all the light of reason to steady and guide that effort, lead the way to economic and political transformation and to make that way generally acceptable. There is no short cut to the goal but there rests an obligation on all who have grasped the nature of modern society and caught a vision of the world as it might be the obligation to steer clear of irrational prejudice and re-inforce the influences that make for a correct understanding. To them the logic of history assigns the function of joining the long vision and the large purpose to the massive knowledge and resources now at the disposal of humanity. It is for them to fuse with enlightenment and humanitarian enthusiasm the inclination to mutual aid and service which, though widespread, largely cancels itself in the cause of rival sects, parties and nationalities. Applied science has brought us to a point when the subject of progress is mankind as a single community, rather than smaller groups. By necessity of mutual accommodation and adaptation, things always move in circles. It may be given to us, as through cultivation of the social sciences as inter-related disciplines on the wide international plane, to break the vicious circles at a few points, help mankind in turning the corner and inaugurate the reign of the good and the rational.

PROFESSOR V. SHIVA RAM

4

PLEA FOR A WORLD FEDERATION

(The Fourth Conference held at Bombay in 1941)

The science and technology have profoundly changed the conditions of man's life on this earth. The same Science which has harnessed nature to man's peaceful progress has now harnessed it to his destruction. The only sure defence against the modern scientific warfare is the enforcement of the law made by the Community of nations. League of Nations has successfully performed many tasks like regulation of communication, international health, collection and publication of statistics and treaties and supervision of mandates etc. But the League has failed in certain respects. After all, all new machines are imperfect. We must have the courage to acknowledge the failures of past and profit by the lessons we learn from them. An international system with sufficient coercive power is the need of the hour. There is a necessity of international organisation which would reserve to itself the monopoly of use of force. National sovereignty must yield more and more to the community of nations. Each state must accept its responsibilities for preventing and stopping aggressions. Consequently, something stronger and more adjustable than the League, may be a World Federation, is the dire necessity.

The World Today.

Science has profoundly changed the conditions of man's life upon this earth. These changes have come more rapidly within recent years, changes which have annihilated time and space by steam, electricity, radio and the aeroplane. These agencies have produced our modern industrial civilization, with its increasing competition for markets and raw materials, and its pressure for the industrialisation of backward areas. Within the past century the population of the

earth has become more than double because of the application of Science to production and health. Of this population, the continent of Asia alone contains more than half. While these great changes were taking place, man discovered the last acre of land. Consequently, in the future, he must adjust his problems to an earth whose geographical limits have been explored. There are parts of the world like Canada, Australia, Africa and South America that can support additional population, but migration presents difficult economic and political problems, which are also fruitful source for friction.

But the same science which has harnessed nature to man's peaceful progress has now harnessed it to his destruction. The invention of the aeroplane, submarine, tank, motor transport, electrical communication and poisonous gas has made it possible for larger proportions of the population to be mobilized for war, for military operations to be co-ordinated over larger areas; for destruction to be more easily visited upon civilians on land and sea, in fact for the entire life of nations to be organised for war even in time of peace. Geographical division of labour has created economic dependence of one people upon another, rendering each vulnerable to starvation or industrial disorganisation by blockade and trade restrictions. Under such conditions war has assumed a totalitarian character. Only by organisation to develop and uphold the law of nations can civilisation stand up against the ever advancing machinery of modern scientific warfare. The only sure defence is the enforcement of the law made by the community of nations ; and that law can be enforced only if the power of the community, overwhelmingly greater than the power of any of its members, is brought to bear when and where lawlessness begins.

The World of Tomorrow.

The ceaseless changes wrought in human society by science, industry and economics, as well as by the spiritual, social and intellectual forces which impregnate all cultures, make political and geographical isolation of nations hereafter impossible.

As the frontier of continents has disappeared, its place has been taken by the frontier of science, and no one can foresee the effect which the indefinite extension of its borders will have upon mankind. But no matter how much his life will be changed by invention and discovery, man will continue to want from this world-freedom, social

justice, economic and political security. He wants a world in which human intelligence will organise and distribute the ample resources of nature so that all can live abundantly ; a world in which intelligence will be devoted to human progress rather than to destruction ; a world in which a man's labour may be directed towards his own advancement. This is largely a problem for local and national governments, but they cannot solve it alone. The labouring man knows that his living standards are affected by the living standards of other countries ; the agricultural man must face the fact that he can dispose of his crops only in a worldwide market ; the industrial man may find his factory idle because of inability to secure needed raw materials, or markets in other lands. These, and many other matters upon which the happiness of the individual rests, are problems which can only be solved internationally. The world has so shrunk that the loose economic and political organisation of the past, is no longer adequate to meet the needs of the day.

In a recent speech to Congress, the President of the U.S.A. defined with his habitual eloquence, the ideals we look forward to as four essential freedoms :— i.e., freedom to speech, freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, freedom from want and freedom from fear and this last freedom, he added, translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction in armaments to such a point and in such thorough fashion that no nation will be able to commit an act of aggression against another anywhere in the world. Out of the present conflict is growing a stronger conviction in the rightness of the League idea than ever before, a more profound belief in the need to establish an effective means for the preservation of the peace. As I see it, the battle of the League to-day is being fought out in Europe, Asia and Africa. The League of Nations is the concrete expression of the will to peace, of the will to secure that last freedom of President Roosevelt's once victory has been attained. It was the first great experiment, and like all great experiments it was imperfect as originally designed. It requires constant improving and perfecting, after all, all new machines are imperfect. For any part I feel convinced that the League of Nations, let us say in 1950, will bear the same resemblance to the League of 1919, as the motor car of 1942 bears to the motor car of 1900. But more important than the machine itself, is the human mind that controls it and the human will to perfect it.

That will, alas, has been lacking on certain occasions in the past but I believe it has never been stronger than it is today, never more widely and more firmly held.

What sort of life are our children going to have ? Is it going to be a repetition of our own lives, with two major wars within the space of a single generation ? Or is it going to be a life in which means will be found for the preservation of peace ? —a peace so secure that one can achieve a life such as Aristotle contemplated, in which all are free to develop to the full the faculties with which God endowed them ? To win that Greek freedom we have to show the courage and determination that the Greeks and the Russians are showing today. We must have the courage, amongst other things, to acknowledge the failures of the past and to profit by the lesson we learn from them. The London Times on December 5, 1940, wrote in a leading article as follows :—

"The great twin scourges which have most deeply touched the imaginations and seared the conscience of our generation are the scourge of war and the scourge of unemployment. For those who feel the need to think beyond the end of the present struggle, the abolition of war and the abolition of unemployment are the most urgent and imperative tasks of our civilisation. To abolish war means to create an international order in which good faith will be preserved, and in which the unchecked pursuit of national interest will be tempered by consciousness of loyalty to some wider community. To abolish unemployment means to create a social order in which the ideas of 19th-century democracy are extended from the political to the social and economic sphere - in which liberty will imply not so much freedom from interference as a chance for all ; equality, not only equal access to the polling both and the courts of law, but equal access to the more restricted field of social and economic opportunity ; fraternity, not mere formal recognition of common citizenship, but a lively sense of common responsibility for the well-being of the least fortunate".

These are the two basic problems confronting humanity today. The solution of the latter will be found by our colleagues in the Economic Conference, while I propose to devote this address towards the discussion of the larger problem of world peace and collective security and my brief association with the League of Nations' Secretariat at Geneva gives me added interest in this most difficult and complex problem. All of us want law and order in the world,

and to the average citizen this desire is sharply pointed, by the roar of war all around him, into a more specific demand, we want to get rid of war. Probably neither can be done without the other, and certainly international organisation is required to accomplish either. This conclusion would be accepted by most persons ; but having gone thus far, they are then faced with the question : must this international system have behind it sufficient coercive power to compel acceptance of its authority ? After the experience of the last ten years, it would be hard to give other than an affirmative answer to this question; and all of history gives the same answer. Law has always been maintained by force. A nation, to-day like individuals in the past, must choose between continuous and probably incompetent self-defence against aggressors or collective action against them. In the former case it may claim complete freedom, but will probably not be able to maintain it, in the latter case, it must give up some of its freedom and sovereignty in order to secure collective support for the rights which the community agrees that its members should have. This is the explanation of law and government among human beings.

This lesson is first learned by the weak and small; the strong state learns it more slowly as is the case with Great Britain and the U.S.A., particularly when, as in the case of the U. S., there is added confidence in its own might, geographic and other aids. But states in the past have felt it necessary to combine ; to meet this threat others must combine; and against such combinations maintained by law, not even the most powerful escapes war, nevertheless, feels its impact and suffers as much as if it were in war.

The Nation State.

We have come to regard the nation state as the primary unit in international society, in the same way that we have come to regard the individual as the primary unit in domestic society. The nation sums up much of political history for five hundred years. No one can predict when this concentration upon the nation state shall have run its course. Whatever the outcome of the present war, it is unlikely that there will again be 27 independent national sovereignties in Europe, each having the right to make war, to surround itself with tariff walls and to maintain a different currency.

Nevetheless, we must continue to assume that the nation state is the unit of the world society. Any federation of such states must

be flexible and capable of adjusting itself to continually changing conditions. Clearly, the organisation of international society with the greatest chance of success will be that one which will assure a dynamic peace with the minimum sacrifice of national sovereignty. As a civil community gives to the individual a security in his rights, a richness of social life and an economic surplus in which he can share, more than compensating for the freedom he sacrifices, so any future federation of nation must offer to its units political and economic security, cultural intercourse and the opportunity of a high plane of living that will more than compensate for the sovereignty sacrificed.

National governments, limited in their jurisdiction to local geographical areas, can no longer satisfy the needs or fulfil the obligations of the human race. Just as feudalism served its purpose in human history and was superceded by nationalism, so has nationalism reached its apogee in this generation and has to yield its hegemony to internationalism. Nationalism, moreover, is no longer able to preserve the full independence of the territorial integrity of nations, as recent history so tragically confirms, and individuals wherever found will be the sovereign units of the new world order. But this does not mean unrestricted national sovereignty.

Man, the source of all political authority, is a manifold political being. He is a citizen of several communities, the city, the state, the nation and the world. To each of these communities he owes inalienable obligations and from each he secures enduring benefits. Communities may exist for a time without being incorporated but, under the stress of adversity, they disintegrate unless legally orgainsed. Slowly but purposefully through centuries civilization has united the world, integrating its diverse local interests and creating an international community that now embraces every region and every person in the globe. This community has no government, and communities without government perish. Either this community must succumb to anarchy or submit to law and order.

Governments can only be established through the deliberate efforts of men. At this hour two elemental forces are struggling to organise the international community, i.e. Totalitarianism and Democracy. The former, a recent version of repudiated militarism and tyranny, is predicted upon the principle of compulsion, rules through dictatorship and enslaves man; the latter with all its defects is a proved bul-

wark of the rights of man as a human being and as a citizen, derives its authority from the content of the governed, embodies the will of free men and renders their collective judgments supreme in human affairs. The corner stone of totalitarianism is the ethnographic state, whose restricted interests define the scope of its forces. The foundation of democracy is man whose integrity is inviolable and whose welfare is its primary concern. The motivating power of the former is violence, of the latter freedom. One feeds upon unscrupulous ambitions, the other upon an enlightened sense of obligation. One or the other of these forces will now triumph and govern mankind. If totalitarianism wins this conflict, the world will be ruled by tyrants and individuals will be slaves. If democracy wins, the nations of the earth will be united in a community of free peoples.

International peace means not merely the absence of war, but justice and order in international relations. Justice is not to be achieved by yielding to each what he demands nor by preserving for each what he has, but by submitting every controversy to a fair and adequate for dealing with claims upon their merits. The problem of peace may, therefore, be approached from the political, economic, the social and the legal points of view. The desire of states to augment national power relative to others is the immediate cause of many wars. This danger will persist so long as it is not controlled by the superior power of the faimly of nations, properly organised, giving greater security to all. The lack of such organisation encourages the hopes and therefore the ambitions of aggressive minded governments, and sustains the popular opinion identifying the individual welfare with the power of the state.

Of course, non-aggression and sanctity of treaties are elements of peace, but they are by no means its totality. Peace must also take account of the fact that the life is essentially dynamic, that change is inevitable, and the transformations are bound to occur violently unless there are provided ways of peaceful change. Any world system is doomed if it identifies peace and morality with a mere maintenance of the status quo. To do this is to breed, as we have bred; the forces of revolution and revolt. Change will then resume the violent form which it always assumes under conditions which do not countenance peaceful change. There are, broadly, three different kinds of a world order which permit peaceful change : One is the League system; another is the Federation system; the third is the Voluntary system. Under the League system, we do not fundamentally alter our concept of soverei-

gnty. We leave each state possessed of exclusive power within its domain; but we seek by treaty or covenant to bind each state, in advance, to accept such changes in its domain as may from time to time seem necessary for peace. Thus Article 19 of the League Covenant gave to the Assembly power to advise with respect to revision of treaties and change of international conditions, the continuance of which would endanger the peace of the world. Under this system, the unit is the sovereign, and its domain is made subject to change.

The federal system treats the individual as the unit and seeks for him a system under which he can, though availing of opportunities elsewhere, change his own status to his advantage. It does this by taking certain powers away from the existing sovereigns, and vesting them in a body which derives its authority from and has a responsibility toward, all those affected. The powers which have broad repercussions beyond national lines, are, particularly, those over money and the movements of goods and people. Such powers the federal system would vest in a body having a base much broader than any existing nation. This would not necessarily mean free trade or unrestricted immigration or a common money. It would mean that power in these respects would be exercised by persons charged with the welfare of all concerned. The U.S.A. adopted this system successfully as long ago as 1789 and other states followed the lead. The British Commonwealth is another such example. An organisation known as the "Federal Union" was recently formed in London by Sir William Beveride and others with the following objects :

1. To obtain support for a federation of free peoples under a common Government, directly elected by and responsible to the peoples for their common affairs, with national self-government for national affairs. According to them, the Federation would control foreign policy, armed forces and armaments. It would have substantial powers over tariffs, currency, migration, communications and similar matters. It would also have power to ensure that colonies and dependencies were administered in the interest of the inhabitants and not for the benefit of any particular country.

2. To ensure that any federation so formed shall be regarded as the first step towards ultimate world federation.

3. Through such a federation to secure peace, based on economic security and civil rights for all.

Federation organises consent on the national scale while empire organises coercion on the international scale. Though coercion of the part by the whole is the essence of government, in the system of federalism that coercion can only be in accord with law, to which those bound have directly or indirectly consented. World federation, balancing the autonomy of the nation state with the authority of the family of nations was the system implied by the founders of modern International Law after the break-up of the medieval empire. Organisation to make International Law effective was, however, hampered by exaggerated developments of the idea of sovereignty. A sovereign state, at the present time, claims the power to judge its controversies, to enforce its own conception of its rights, to increase its armaments without limit, to treat its own nationals as it sees fit, and to regulate its economic life without regard to the effect of such regulations upon its neighbours. These attributes of sovereignty must be limited in the interests of the "General Will" applied to the community of nations,

Relinquishment of national sovereign powers and establishment of effective international authorities must proceed together.

The "Voluntary" system relies upon the nations which are dominant in the world to exercise their power with a sense of moral responsibility and with intelligence. It is a universally accepted doctrine that all men are of equal worth in the eyes of God, and should be so regarded by men. Also, that power should he coupled with a sense of responsibility co-extensive with the power. It is practical wisdom to recognise that attempts at arbitrary restraint and the monopolization of natural advantages in the long run defeat themselves and are self-destructive. The "Voluntary" system relies upon nation's following a course upon which both morality and expediency coincide.

It is difficult at the present time to be specific, and to seek to define the best way to achieve a new world order. A new structure cannot be intelligently planned when the foundation area is still in erupton. We can only examine the principles involved, and we can tentatively explore how best to implement them. The Atlantic Charter of August 15, 1941, may provide such a basis for discussion, but only a basis as it excludes half the world's population.

A league system, historically, has never proved long successful.

Sovereign states, even though bound by covenant, are seldom willing to shirk their domains because others think this necessary for the cause of world peace. But we need not, in advance reject the possibility of again trying a League system. For the alternatives also face practical difficulties and limitations. For example, it may be that the federal system will not operate successfully unless based upon a population which is homogeneous. If this limitation be accepted, the federal system may merely develop the world into groups which, while larger than any present nation, will still, as between themselves, be exclusive and resistant to change.

Also, it may be that we cannot confidently rely upon a voluntary system. It is a weakness of the democratic process that it tends to exaggerate short range planning. Political leaders need to be elected, and reelected, and the voters are neither satisfied by the promise of things to come nor frightened by dangers which do not appear immediate, It is day-to-day factors which are too often determining. This tends to exclude true statesmanship from public office. Such problems we must explore and study. But the indispensible for any progress is a clearer public understanding of the principles involved. It is never possible to achieve reforms through political devices which outdistance popular understanding. It is important that experts should be concentrating upon political formulae which may prove adoptable to conditions we shall face. But it is more important that people everywhere should come to understand the true nature of peace and of the fact that it can be achieved only by a world order which will permit of peaceful change. With this understanding, the task of the political expert becomes a possible one. Without it, it is impossible. The organisation of peace must have at the back of it the force of a unifying ideal. The sovereignty of the nation state is no longer adequate. The alternatives are world empire achieved by conquest, or some form of association, such as world federation, achieved by consent. The former cannot be a permanent or just means for organising the world for peace. Historical experience is against it. The alternative to organisation by conquest is organisation by consent. This implies a society in which nations participate through law to maintain the necessary curbs upon national sovreignty and establish international institutions to preserve human freedom, social justice, economic progress and political security.

Security, whether economic or political, results from confidence in the stability and continuity of the whole by the all or nearly of

all its parts. In the present interdependent world, security both for individuals and nations, depends on confidence in the stability and continuity of the world order as a whole. The powers of individual groups and nations must be so limited that the function of each in the world society, and the procedures which will be used to effect changes are known in advance. Security implies the existence of a law. National security, therefore, depends upon a general respect for and confidence in international law, and the establishment of such respect and confidence requires a better organisation of the world community.

The experience of human history shows that political institutions do not flourish if wholly lacking the support of custom. New institutions may establish themselves in time, if they serve essential interest, but those will do so most rapidly which avoid radical breach in continuity with the past ; evolutionary changes are more likely to be lasting than revolutionary changes. Thus, institutions to improve the organisation of the world community should, so far as possible, be natural development from those that already exist. The League of Nations is two things, it is an ideal and an institution. As an institution time has shown that it must be considerably modified. As an ideal, however, it must abide if civilisation is to endure. We have to build upon past experience. The failure and mistakes of the past should provide us a solid foundation to build upon. Everything that has happened since 1925 is a complete vindication of the principle of collective security upon which the League was based; and this principle though it may be embodied in a different expression and with machinery which will be a product of twenty years of disastrous experience will have to be the gurantee of future world peace.

All the lessons of human experience, especially of the League of Nations, point towards the necessity of an international organisation which would reserve to itself the monopoly of the use of force, and forbid any nation the right to use force for its own purposes, The experience of the League of Nations show -as does also, of course, that of national governments—that without proper and adequate sanctions, no law and order or peace can be established. These sanctions in the international field have been classified as positive or negative in character. Positive sanctions imply a military or police force, permanently constituted or developed and have through contribution of contingents by the members, capable of subduing the law-violator and thereby inducing him by threats or by coercion to desist from wrong-doing and

to remedy injuries due to his acts. Negative sanctions imply withholding from the law violator of advantages which he would otherwise have received, particularly of the economic requirements essential for carrying on his progression. The two sanctions may be combined, as in a naval blockade, which may contribute on the one hand to disarming the enemy and occupying his torritory, and, on the other hand, to withholding from the enemy the materials of international trade which could contribute to his aggression and even to his life. Positive sanctions always imply action against the law-violator's territory or armed forces, while negative sanctions may be carried out entirely by commercial or other regulations within the territory of sanctioning government. The League had only economic or negative sanctions which it could use, and not even these were sufficiently obligatory upon its members.

Consequently, when Mussolini, in the Ethopian affair, threatened to make war in reply to economic sanctions, there was no answer to him. Economic sanctions can thus be completely nullified by use of force; they cannot, therefore, hope to be effective unless backed by military force. This is the great lesson to be learnt from the use of sanctions by the League of Nations. Such a military force would have to be enormous unless states were disarmed; if they were disarmed, it need not be so great. Here we find ourselves in a vicious circle; no state will disarm unless it feels that the international system can give it security; but the security will be difficult to assure until states are disarmed. It is probable, therefore, that the international military force will at first have to be composed of contingents from national armies, navies and air forces. Granted faithful support by members, such a force should be able, in most cases, to overcome any state.

Pre-requisites of World Peace.

Such a system would not be the most satisfactory one. Its chief defect would be that each state retained its own military power, thus making more difficult the task of coercing it and making more easy a combination of states which might be able to defy the joint authority of the community. It would be much easier to maintain order and peace if states disarmed. Thus we come to the crux of the problem, namely, that this involves a limitation of National Sovereignty. The minimum limitation of national sovereignty to be of any use as a safeguard for peace must embody the following propositions: The national sovereignty of each state must be so limited as to secure the safety and the well-being of the community of nations.

1. The supremacy of International Law founded on justice must be accepted as the fundamental principle of international relations. A peaceful world order cannot be established if force is held to be the only thing that counts in international affairs and if any nation, powerful enough to do so, may set at defiance every principle of justice and even its own international engagements.

2. All international differences which cannot be settled by negotiations must be submitted to some kind of third party judgment which may be either by way of judicial decision, arbitration or authoritative mediation. Nations, in other words, must renounce the claim to be the final judge in their controversies with other nations and must submit to the jurisdiction of international tribunals. The basis of peace is justice ; and justice is not the asserted claim of any one party, but must be determined by the judgment of the community.

3. National armaments must be the subject of reduction and limitation by international agreement. Nations must renounce the use of force for their own purposes in relation with other nations except in self-defence. The justification for self-defence must always be subject to review by an international court or other competent body.

4. The use of force must be restricted to action approved by the international authority. It will be recollected that under the Locarno Agreement, provision was made for self-defence in an emergency provided approval of the international authority was obtained.

5. Each of the states members of the international community must be ready to accept its fair share of responsibility for preventing and stopping aggression.

The reduction and limitation of national armaments also requires that an international authority shall have power.

a) To supervise such reduction and limitation.

b) To protect a state which has limited its armaments from a state which has not done so.

The right of nations to maintain aggressive armaments must be sacrificed in consideration of an assurance of the security of all, through regional and world-wide forces subject to international law and adequate to prevent illegal resorts to international violence.

6. Nations must accept certain human and cultural rights in their constitutions and in international covenants. The destruction

of civil liberties anywhere creates danger of war. Peace is not secure if any large and efficient population is permanently subject to a control which can create a fanatical national sentiment impervious to external opinion.

7. Nations must recognise, that their right to regulate economic activities is not unlimited. The world has become an economic unit ; all nations must have access to its raw materials and its manufactured articles. The effort to divide the resources of the world into sixty or more economic compartments is one of the causes of war. The economic problem arising from this effort has increased ingravity with the scientific and industrial progress of the modern world. For this and other reasons an international authority is essential for any scheme of world order. Its form and powers will be the subject of discussion at the peace conference after the successful conclusion of the present war. In practice the international machinery of the League has not been very inadequate where its members have used it. In my humble opinion, the League should be taken as the basis of the new order, amended and strengthened where necessary.

Various approaches to the problem of organising the world for peace have been made in recent years. These include the following proposals among others :—

1. The establishment of an international police force and an international equity tribunal to solve respectively the problems of collective security and peaceful change.

2. A federal union of the democracies of the world providing a nucleus for gradual development of a democratic world union, such as the one proposed by Clarence Streit and Sir William Beveridge.

3. An European Union to establish government in the most difficult continent as proposed by Briand with the expectation that this would pave the way for organization of the other continents and regions.

4. Modification of the League of Nations' Covenant in the direction of regional and functional decentralisation.

5. Implementation of the Pact of Paris through a system of consultation to prevent hostilities, of conferences to adjust political and economic problems, and of "Locarnos" to stabilise the areas of greatest tension.

6. A world constitutional convention representing peoples rather than governments to frame a universal federal union.

These proposals recognise in varying degrees the problems of reconciling the need of universality with that of regionalism ; the need of sufficient rigidity to assure stability,with that of sufficient flexibility, to assure progress, the need of assuring cultural variety with that of developing human unity. Most of them have sought to provide for both collective security and peaceful change ; for representation both of governments and of peoples ; for securing the rights of both individuals and of nations.

It must be borne in mind, however, that effective world organisation in the present stage of world history requires in addition to national and local governments, which should continue to have primary legal authority within the territory of the respective states, (a) certain universal principles and institutions, (b) certain regional organisations, and (c) certain functional organisations.

A universal organisation of the nationals must necessarily be supported by internal public opinion. To establish the necessary universal principles and institutions all states should be invited to become parties to a pact which, in addition, should be incorporated in each national constitution thus rendering its terms at the same time international obligations between states, and obligations of individuals and governments within the states. The following obligations are suggested for incorporation in this pact : (a) An International Court with adequate jurisdiction to deal with all International disputes on the basis of law ; (b) International legislative bodies to remedy abusess in existing law and to make new law whenever technical progress requires the adjustment of international practice ; (c) To respect certain human rights protecting life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as binding international obligations and to protect the rights of miniorities. The protection accorded by the Minorities Treaties to religious, racial and linguistic minorities in certain countries should be extended to all countries including India and made more effective. The persecution of the Jews and the cry of Pakistan has greatly increased the urgency of dealing with the problem.

Institutions.

The following institutions are suggested to carry out the above objects :—

(a) A World Assembly consisting of representatives of every

considerable group with a distinctive public opinion, including not only nations but perhaps also regional organisations and world-wide functional organisations.

(b) A World Council consisting of representatives of the Great Powers and of the important political regions of the world.

(c) A World Secretariat to study world problems and to administer the decisions of the Assembly and the Council.

(d) A World Court to adjudicate all questions compulsarily as in the case of the optional clause.

These institutions will have power to supervise regional organisations, and functional international organisations in the fields of labour, commerce, social problems, transit, communication, health, colonies, and other matters of world-wide importance.

To summarise, police forces, world-wide or regional, and world-wide economic sanctions, to prevent aggression and to support international covenants are essential. In addition, international machinery with authority to regulate international communication and transportation and to deal with such problems as international commerce, finance, colonies, health, nutrition, and labour standards with regard to all of which the successful working of the constitution of the International Labour Organisation offers valuable suggestions are needed.

Regional Organisations.

While universality is fundamental to world peace, there may be regional variations in any plan for world society, such as the Pan American Organisation. These might be formed by groups of states with the consent of the World Assembly for promoting the security and advancement of the region. Among such regions might be Europe, the Danubian or Balkan area, the Near East, the British Commonwealth of Nations, India and the Indian Archipelago, the Soviet Union, the Americas and the Far East. The constituent members of a regional organisation might differ for different purposes. Each of these regions should develop its own institutions in its own way; each should have primary responsibility for maintaining order and facilitating political changes within the region, subject always to the competence of the universal organisation in matters covered by the universal covenant. While some rules of law must apply to all nations alike, in many matters variations must be provided within the distinctive regions.

Within the framework of the political institutions enumerated, functional institutions might be established to facilitate international cooperation in dealing with problems of health and nutrition, commerce and raw materials, transit and communication, labour colonies and social problems. These already exist in some measure in the technical organisations of the League of Nations, the International Labour Organisation, and other international unions. And further development was proposed by the Bruce Report. Each of these functional organisations might be adopted to give appropriate representation to the groups in the world most interested, as well as to the nations, as has been done in the constitution of the International Labour Organisation.

The Problem of Social Justice.

Economic prosperity and Social Justice are not less important for World Peace than political security. The international authority or the World Assembly should establish agencies, acting in the interest of all peoples to promote the freeing of international commerce with due regard for standards of labour and wages, to promote increased consumption and better distribution of the world's resources, and to deal with common economic problems such as post-war demobilisation.

An economic organisation dealing with problems of commerce, raw material, and markets is particularly important and should be developed with such competence as to assure a moderate freedom of trade and access to raw materials on equal terms for all nations. It might advise the World Assembly with regional arrangements on economic matters. In other words, we must make deliberate efforts to advance the federal principle of cooperation in the economic sphere. The solution of this intricate problem will have to be found by our colleagues, the economists, who are meeting today side by side with us. Suffice it to say, that if a reasonably durable peace is to be achieved some day, certain economic essentials will have to be provided for. One is economic opportunity through trade as an alternative to the alleged need to conquer territory. Another is reasonable stability in the world's economic life. A third is progressive economic development. These complex problems cannot be solved by unilateral action but only through the devices of consultations and conferences on a world-wide scale.

Colonies in an Eventual World Settlement.

Today, over the vast continent of Africa and in the far-flung islands of the Pacific, exist more than 500 million people whose destinies are largely controlled by Britain, France, Portugal, Belgium, the Netherlands, Japan and the U.S.A. In addition, there are another 500 million people under the domination of Great Britain in India and the India Archipelago. These territories contain many valuable raw materials such as tin, rubber, cotton etc., as well as possibilities for settlement and trade. Moreover, while the rights of the native populations are undoubtedly paramount they can hardly be adequately protected and permitted to develop naturally as long as their territories are made subject to the rivalries of national interests and to commercial exploitation so conducive to conflict and war. The world wars of 1914 and 1939 may be said to be the consequences of this conflict of interests.

It is for these reasons that many informed students of the colonial problem consider that the whole continent of Africa (apart from the Union of South Africa and Egypt) and the whole of the Polynesian Island group, now under colonial administration, should cease to be regarded as projections of western power interests and be placed under varying forms of international administration and supervision, using the best colonial experience and that of the League's Mandates Commission as a basis.

If colonial peoples and territories are to be regarded as a sacred trust of civilization, and not the special preserve of a limited number of powers, if the open door principle is to be fully and frankly applied in these undeveloped areas, and if opportunities for participation in the administrative services of these territories are to be made available to the nationals of all states, it will be useful to see what lessons can be drawn from the experience of the League of Nations mandate system. The experience of the last 20 years supports the contention that international supervision and responsibility to an international body afford greater security than unmodified national government for the well-being of the native peoples and for the policy of the open door.

There is today widespread agreement that the basic principles which govern the League of Nations' mandate system—(a) protection of native population and (b) equality of economic opportunity for all nations, should be made more effective and given wider application

throughout the remaining undeveloped regions of the world, colonies and mandated territories alike. Indeed, it became increasingly evident with each succeeding year since 1920 that the status quo in the mandate system was untenable. Either the principle of sacred trust as administered in certain territories under League supervision was a decided improvement over the older colonial policy and hence should have been applied to other than the former German colonies, or it was a sham and should have been dropped altogether, perhaps with compensation to their former owners.

It is true, of course, that the mandatory powers claimed that their unsupervised colonies were administered on standards as generous and enlightened as those required by the League mandates. If so, there should have been no difficulty in removing any doubt, by adopting the principle of League supervision in other territories. Either an extension of the mandates system or a reversion to the old colonial policy seemed necessary if the all too frequent charge of allied hypocrisy was not to gain ground. For instance even the British have done little so far to advance native education. Answering a question in the House of Commons about Kenya Government's expenditure in educating European and African Children, the late Secretary of State for Colonies said that the annual amount was for European children 17. 12sh. and for African children sh. 12. 3d. per head. Yet the greater part of the taxation of the country is derived from the natives. The distribution of the government revenue as between whitemen and natives shows grave discriminations. Natives are excluded from the holding of land in the best parts of the country, restricted in the crops which they can cultivate, excluded from industrial occupations except of the lowest kind, and allowed no direct part in representative political bodies.

Suggested Proposals.

Four proposals have been made for the future of the colonies, and they are as follow :—

1. The colonies should remain under their present national sovereignties, and should not be included as a subject for federal control or supervision, but each nation in the Federation should apply itself the enlightened principles of colonial administration, with the fixed condition that there should be equal economic access for the subjects of the members of the Federation. This is the proposal of Lord Lugard and is, of course, unacceptable to any but the governing powers.

2. The colonies should remain under their present national sovereignties, but the principles and institutions of the Mandate system, hitherto applied only to the former German colonial territories, should be extended to all areas dependent on Federated States which are not yet ripe for self-government. This is an advance over the present system, but the responsibility to a larger international body like the Federal Council is just in theory and likely to be effective in practice. Moreover, experience has shown that certain changes of the present system of supervision by the Mandates Commission are needed for its more efficient working; and these changes should apply either to a Federal or a League organ. The Mandates Commission itself has expressed the wish that its members should be entitled to visit officially the territories under mandate in order to obtain a clear view of the conditions, whether in peaceful times or in times of unrest. There have been occassions of serious trouble in Syria, Palestine and Samoa when, in order to form a just opinion and to be able to give helpful advice, it would have been well if one or more of its members could have inspected the conditions. The commission has also recommended that petitioners to the League should, where thought fit, be entitled to state their case in person. At present the representative of the Mandatory is regularly questioned about the matter of the petition. But the commission has to be content with his explanation and with what it can gather from the documents. Again, the experience of recent years has indicated the need for the international body to have fuller authority to implement recommendations.

3. The colonies of all members should be administered by a federal organ responsible not only to the Central Federal Council or Parliament that is to be established, but also to the League of Nations working through its international organisation on the lines of the present Mandates Commission. This is a more radical measure involving the abandoment of the national government of the colonies by their present owners, making administration of colonies a federal subject. It is objected by Lord Lugard and others that this would mean a divergence in colonial policy of the chief colonial powers and that the native peoples under British or French control, would resent being transferred to a federal administration. That this objection is imaginary may be seen from the fact that the natives of Samoa, a primitive race, when discontented with the Newzealand Mandatory, asked for direct administration of the League of Nations. It would not be difficult to awake a sense of personal loyalty to a federal body if once that policy was decided. As to the divergence in colonial out-

look, much would be gained if the colonial powers pooled their ideas. There is general agreement on the desirability of introducing, technical officers from different countries into colonial administration.

4. The proposal for the internationalisation of colonies and their administration by an international civil service, not limited to persons who are the subjects of the federal states, is made by those who look to the more radical project of the world state. Some of the considerations in favour of federal administration apply equally to this more thorough-going change. Combined federal control and supervision of the League would be a double check against any national self-seeking in colonial administration.

Through a system of international supervision and later administration, an international development fund should be created and made available for the proper development of such territories so that their progress will not be too much retarded as in Portuguese African Colonies in relation to neighbouring territories. Other colonial territories outside Africa should also be brought under a system of international supervision and administration.

In all cases where international assistance is required whether in so called colonial regions or among more advanced but naturally weak peoples as in India and the Balkans the social welfare of the native populations must be the first consideration, The International Colonial Commission should be held responsible for the social and economic development of the territories under their charge in such a way as to safeguard the long distant future as well as the immediate interests of the native populations and those who trade with them. Moreover progress must not be regarded too exclusively in the light of western standards. In this respect, the lessons to be learnt from the policies developed by the Permanent Mandates Commission are of immense value in any future settlement of the colonial problem. The Permanent Mandates Commission has laid down in the minutes of its proceedings during 1920-40 important standards in regard to education, health and labour and also as regards justice, native customs, religious freedom and protection against exploitation. Due provision should be made for the strict and proper observance of these standards, and safeguards should be provided against their violation.

These foregoing recommendations will, therefore, require as a minimum the following machinery for the efficient working of the principle of trusteeship of the so-called backward areas :—

(a) Continuation of the Permanent Mandates Commission with new territories brought under its supervision and with improved machinery as regards (1) the right to make enquiries on the spot, (2) easier petitioning procedure, (3) representation of the peoples of mandated areas on the personnel of the commission, and (4) utilisation of administrative officials drawn in part from among nationals of states other than the mandatory power. (b) The creation of an international colonial commission with power to exercise direct administration in certain specified territories, the Class B and C mandates to begin with, the others added later. The commission should also contain representatives of the peoples of the mandated areas. (c) The creation of an International Development Fund which might be administered jointly by an International Bank and the International Colonial Commission. Investments might be made both outright or in the form of grants-in-aid. (d) It should be recognised that sovereignty resides in the mandated territory itself until such time as it is considered capable of standing on its own feet and becoming full member of the organised family of nations. Suitable machinery should be devised to adjudicate whether or not a mandated territory has reached such a stage or not. In making this decision, neither the mandatory nor the mandated state should have any voice, as otherwise one becomes judge in one's own case.

The creation of the International Development Fund will be of great importance at the end of the war in order to facilitate the conversion of war time establishments into peace time activity, and to take up the shock which will result when millions of demobilised men seek normal re-employment. It may also be seen in connection with the proper utilisation of the gold supply now so largely sterlised. Finally, it will enable the prosecution of large-scale public works particularly in those parts of the world where transport and communications are so necessary for the proper development of social and economic life.

All this machinery should be designed to operate within an international system where universal and regional (continental) organisation both in the political and technical spheres would be available. The two Colonial Commissions should, however, be largely autonomous and empowered to act in specific matters without reference to superior political organs. In other words, imperialism in its present form would disappear and in its place would arise the principle of true trusteeship and guardianship. Thus a powerful economic factor causing conflict would disappear, making world peace

more stable and safe. Three checks are required to prevent the abuse and exploitation of the backward people by governing powers : (1) the check of the peoples themselves; (2) the check of the Parliaments of the govering countries, and (3) the international checks. The first can only be exercised effectively if the native peoples are increasingly responsible both for the legislative and executive organisation of government. The French have advanced more thoroughly in this respect. Their colonies send elected representatives to the French Chamber and Senate ; and a native of Senegambia was Under-Secretary for the colonies in France. The British have not yet contemplated the presence in Westminister of coloured representatives of British Colonial Empire, much less of an Under Secretary of State from among the coloured people. There is no compelling reason why single system should be applied. It might be found best to retain some colonies under national governments if that were the wish of the peoples who have attained a status where they can choose for themselves; to place others under federal administration, subject to the supervision of the League; and lastly to place one or more territories experimentally under international government directly appointed and responsible to the League. The experiments hitherto undertaken in direct international administration are too few and small to allow us to form a sound judgement of its value. The Commission of the League which governed the Saar region for fifteen years, and was a genuine international body, executed its difficult task with credit. The International Commissioners which have to deal with the administration of Danube navigation and similar technical matters have a good record. But to the world order, to which we are advancing, experiments of a bolder kind are called for. Any experiment of the kind must be governed by one condition, that the native peoples should in some way express their willingness for the change.

One thing is certain, we cannot hope to establish a peaceful order with an approach to world citizenship, whether by Federal Union or any other way, unless the colonising powers are prepared, in deed as well as in word, to renounce their national advantages in the governing of territories inhabited by less developed peoples, and to let people in other countries have a part with the 'haves'. We cannot have a 'federal omelette' without breaking some national eggs. The criterion of a federal or any other system of colonial administration must be its capacity to fit the active peoples for self-government as rapidly as possible, recognising

that colonies are not possessions of the governing power but belong to their own people and should be developed for their benefit: and that their peoples should be helped 'to stand by themselves in the strenous conditions of the modern world' and enter the Federal union or any other world organization as independent members.

Conclusions :

The movement towards federation is not something new, but rather another step in the development of International Law and institutions which must constitute the essential framework of future civilization. The League of Nations successfully performed many tasks in the field of interational administration, such as the regulation of communications, international health, collection and publication of statistics and treaties, supervision of mandates and many other activities ; it settled many disputes and prevented some wars ; but the present conflict has taught us that something at once stronger and more adjustable than the League of 1919 is necessary. National sovereignty must yield more and more to the community of nations. The world must evolve from League to federation. But just as the League grew out of the development of international law and uncoardinated international institutions, so world federation will grow out of the experience of the League, the World Court and the International Labour Organisation.

There is no alternative to the federation of all nations except endless war. No substitute for the Federation of the world can organise the international community on the basis of freedom and permanent peace. Even if continental, regional or ideological federations were attempted, the government of these federations, in an effort to make impregnable their separate defences would be obliged to maintain stupendously competitive armaments, thereby condemning humanity indefinitely to exhaustive taxation, compulsory military service and ultimate chanage, which history reveals to be not only criminally futile but positively avoidable through judicious foresight in federating all nations. No nation, not even Germany should be excluded from membership in the Federation of the World, that is willing to suppress its military, naval and air forces, retaining only a constabulary sufficient to police its territory and to maintain order within its jurisdiction, provided that the eligible voters of that nation are permitted the free expression of their opinions at the poll. Mankind must pool its resources of defence if civilization is to endure. The President of the U. S. A. should be

authorised (as was Wilson at the conclusion of the last war) to call an International Convention to formulate a constitution for the Federation of the World, which should be submitted to each nation for its ratification. Thus and thus alone can civilization be preserved and the crime of war may be suppressed by reducing to the ultimate minimum the possibility of its occurrence.

———

PRINCIPAL GURMUKH NIHAL SINGH **5**

THE BIRTH AND GROWTH OF MUSLIM NATIONALISM

(The Fifth Conference held at Agra in January, 1943)

Till almost the eighties of the last century, the Muslim community was regarded as disloyal by the British Government But forced by the Imperialistic needs the British Government adopted such policies and measures that it succeeded in getting the Muslims transformed and in creating a wedge between them and the Hindus. But soon certain events in India and abroad changed the complexion of Muslim politics and they began to realise that their natural allies were their own countrymen of other communities and not the foreigners in the bureaucracy. Now, it was for the Indian nationalists to maintain this changed complexion, but they did not acquire a liberal outlook in social matters and the clever Bureaucracy exploited this for its selfish purposes. It succeeded in making the Congress-League relations bitter and Hindu-Muslim tension increased. The Muslims, who stood for a national self government for India, changed their policy (due to certain causes). All this led to the enunciation of Two Nation Theory :— a demand for a seprate muslim state. The nationalist leaders, both Hindus and Muslims opposed it. But for Muslims unity became impossible. Because of unbridgeable differences, separation became a must according to Muslim leaders. But the creation of a separate Muslim state could not by itself solve the problem of minorities in India at best it could satisfy the desire for power on the part of the Muslim League. What then could solve the problem of minorities in Hindustan and settle the future of India—a purely secular outlook and removal of untouchability of all kinds.

We are meeting at a most critical juncture in the history of this country--when, on the one hand, there is still going on a movement for the establishment immediately of the Indian Independence and, on the other, there is a fixed determination to partition the country

and establish separate and independent Muslim States, both in the West and the East. It is true that the fear of attack on the country is very much less than a few months ago and the war situation has definitely taken a turn for the better--but who can say how long this inhuman butchery shall continue or what tremendous sacrifices it shall still entail. Already, the cost of living has risen very high--in many parts of the country, even articles of necessity cannot be obtained or obtained with great difficulty and at prohibitive prices, thus inflicting terrible hardships particularly on the poorer classes and persons with small, fixed incomes. At such a juncture what is the duty of the Indian Political Science Association and its President ? With due humility, I express the hope that it may be given to this Fifth Conference of the Association to make a constructive contribution towards the solution of the Indian Constitutional problem and towards the ending of the present political impasse.

As some of you are aware, I have devoted many years of my life to the understanding of the forces working in Indian political life and their action and interaction on the problem of constitutional development. I, therefore, feel that I can best serve the Indian Political Science Association and the country today by attempting to make clear the origin, character and consequences of what I regard as the strongest force that has arisen in Indian potitical life during the last quinquennium--i. e., the birth and growth of "Muslim Nationalism."

I am fully aware of the controvercial and delicate nature of the subject and I request for large-hearted tolerance for my treatment and conclusions and for charity in judgment. On my part, I can truthfully say that I have endeavoured to deal with the subject in as dispassionate, objective and scientific a manner as possible and as a realist, irrespective of my own ideals and desires and also of the consideration that my conclusions may or may not be found pleasing to one party or another.

II

In my book "Landmarks in Indian Constitutional and National Development" I have traced the rise and growth of Muslim communalism. It is not possible to repeat here all that I have written there, if for no other reason for considerations of time and space. All I can do is to indicate briefly the chief steps in the evolution of the movement which has culminated today in the demand for Pakistan or separate and independent Muslim State.

It may appear strange to Indians of the present generation but it is a fact that till almost the eighties of the last century it was not the educated Hindu who was distrusted by the British Government or regarded as disloyal but the oriental Mussalman who resisted the onslaught of English education and civilisation. According to Mr. Mohammad Norman, "The British had decided that for the expansion of the new power and its continuance, the only course was to crush the Mussalmans" and had deliberately adopted policies which had for their aim the Economic ruin of the Muslims and their intellectual stagnation and degeneration, which resulted in the catastrophe of 1857. Concludes Mr. Norman:-"The last attempt made by Moslems to recover their power was the War of Independence, miscalled the Mutiny."

The establishment of direct rule of the Crown, however, did not change the position. The hostility of the Muslims continued which flared up in the Wahabi movement, which became specially violent and dangerous in Bengal. The movement was vigorously suppressed but it deepened the impression still further among Englishmen that the Muhammedons were irreconcilable and disloyal. This is apparent from the very title of Sir William Hunter's book, written in 1871, "Our Indian Mussalmans: are they bound in conscience to rebel against the Queen ?"

All this, however, changed in course of time and the two persons who were largely responsible for the change were Sir Syed Ahmad, the founder of the M. A. O. College, Aligarh, and the first Principal of that College and Mr. Beck, who dominated Muslim Politics in the eighties and nineties of the last century.

III

Sir Syed Ahmad was working for the upliftment of his community and for Anglo-Muslim friendship ever since the Mutiny. For this purpose he founded papers and journals, wrote pamphlets and articles established associations and the M. A. O. College, Aligarh and preached incessantly loyalty to the British Government, Anglo-Muslim friendship, social and religious reforms, and English education. At the same time Sir Syed championed all just causes of Indians as a nation and advocated Hindu-Muslim unity until he fell under the powerful and subtle influence of Principal Beck, whose imperial services were acknowledged by English statesmen and newspapers when he died in 1899. Wrote Sir Johan Strachey:—

"An Englisnman who was engaged in Empire-building activities in a far-off land has passed away. He died like a soldier at the post of his duty. The Muslims are a suspicious people. They opposed Mr. Beck in the beginning as a British spy, but his sincerity and selflessness soon succeeded in his gaining their confidence."

In any case, Principal Beck was successful in changing the life-long convictions of Sir Syed Ahmad and in transforming him from a staunch nationalist to a pure communal leader, opposed to the Indian National movement as embodied in the Congress and to the introduction of election, simultaneous examinations and democratic institutions.

Sir Syed Ahmad not only kept himself aloof from the Indian National Congress which was established in 1885 but counselled his co-religionists to keep away from it. He formed the Patriotic Association with the help of Raja Shiv Prasad of Banares to oppose the Congress. And to keep away the Muslim from the Congress he tried to divert their minds from politics to education and founded the Muslim Educational Conference in 1886, whose sessions were to be held at the same time as those of the National Congress but in a different and a distant town. In 1893 was founded the first purely Muslim political organisation, called the Muhammadan Anglo-oriental Defence Association of Upper India, with Principal Beck as one of the Secretaries and with the following objects :- (1) to acquaint Englishmen in general and the Government in particular with the views of the Muslim Community and to protect the political rights of the Muslims ; (2) to support measures that would strengthen British rule in India ; (3) to spread feelings of loyalty among the people and (4) to prevent the spread of political agitation among the Muslims.

The activities of Sir Syed Ahmad and Mr. Beck led to the estrangement of the Hindus and the Muslims. The formation of the Anti-cow Killing Societies and the Hindi-Urdu controversy in the U.P. added to this unfortunate estrangement. Imperialistic needs forced the British Government to adopt policies and measures to further the same end.

Ever since the Mutiny, when the lesson was driven home by Sir Syed Ahmd and others, that Hindu-Muslim Unity was dangerous to the continuance of British rule, the British Government in India adopted the policy as keeping the two great communities divided. To

achieve this end the Indian army was re-organised after 1857 on the "class basis" and its recruitment restricted to the loyal, so called martial races. In civil administration the policy of "holding the scales even" was followed to begin with to create a faith in the neutrality, impartiality and sense of fair play and justice of the British among the various communities and thus strengthen the foundations of British rule in the country. British administrators resisted yielding to the demand of Muslim communal organisations for favoured treatment till the end of the 19th century. But the strength of the national movement, particularly in Bengal, brought about a change in the policy of the British bureaucracy and the first step was taken by the Government of Lord Curzon through the Partition of Bengal in 1905.

The Partition of Bengal is defended by Anglo-Indian and some recent Muslim writers like Mr. Mohammad Norman on the ground of administrative and the anti-partition agitation is characterised as selfish. However, Lord Ronaldsay, the official biographer of Lord Curzon, recognises the fact that "the intelligentia of the province" interpreted it "as a subtle attack upon the growing solidarity of Bengali nationalism" and that "it was this sentiment that gave the movement the force that it ultimately acquired" and not merely the selfish and sordid motives attributed by Lovat Frazer and others. This was stated clearly and categorically by Sir Henry Cotton in his book "Transition in India" :-

"The object of the measure was to shatter the unity and to disintegrate the feelings of solidarity which are established in the province. It was no administrative reason that lay at the root of his scheme. It was part and parcel of Lord Curzon's policy to enfeeble the growing power and to destory the political tendencies of a patriotic spirit."

Be that as it may, the Partition called forth such a strong national agitation in the country, particularly in the province of Bengal, that the British Government had ultimately to unsettle "the settled fact." However, it succeeded in driving a wedge between the Hindus and the Moslems and in embittering communal relations in Bengal, particularly on account of the invidious policy openly and deliberately pursued by the Government of Eastern Bengal of favouring the Muhammadans.

V

The second and in my view the most important step so far taken by the British Bureaucracy in furtherance of its policy of keeping the people divided in India was the introduction of a system of separate communal electrorates under the Reforms of 1909. It is no doubt true that ostensibly the demand for the establishment of separate electorates had come from a representative Moslem Deputation. But, as pointed out by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, "the Moslem leaders are inspired by certain Anglo-Indian officials and these officials have pulled wires at Simla and in London and of malice afterthought sowed discord between the Hindu and the Muhammadan communities by showing the Muslims special favours." Maulana Mohammad Ali disclosed in 1923 that the Deputation was "a command performance." Arrangements were made through Principal Archbold of the Aligarh College, who settled all details regarding the organisation of the Deputation and the text of the address to be presented with Colonel Dunlop Smith, the private Secretary of the Viceroy. They were communicated to Nawab Mohisin-ul-Mulk in a letter dated August 10, 1906. The instructions from Simla were scrplously followed and the Muslim Deputation, under the leadership of H.H. the Agha Khan, waited upon His Excellency, the Viceroy, at Simla on October 1, 1906, and presented the demands for separate communal electorates, weightage, greater representation in the services, an Indian Executive Councillorship, etc. In his reply, His Excellency, Lord Minto, without consulting the Secretary of State, accepted in its entirety the Muslim demands for weightage and separate representation and thus "started the Moslem Hane," as Lord Morley put it-who advocated a scheme of joint electoral colleges, which would have secured to each community a fair and adequate representation and would at the same time have furnished a complete answer to all further claims for representation by special classes and communities. But the Moslems and their friends in the bureaucracy were adament and they, for imperial reasons, triumphed over the Secretary of State.

To consolidate their gains the members of the Muslim Deputation founded the Moslem League at the end of 1906 at Dacca where Moslems from the various provinces had assembled in connection with the Moslem Educational Conference. The constitution of the League was drawn up in December 1906 at Karachi and ratified at Lucknow in March, 1908 and the first regular session of the

League was held at Amritsar in December, 1908. The League placed before itself two important objects – (1) to promote feelings of loyalty to the British Government and (2) to protect and advance the political rights, and interests of the Mussalmans through respectful representation. The League continued to meet annually and to pass resolutions of loyalty and demanding protection of Muslim rights and interests and the redress of Muslim grievances.

VI

Within the next few years events took place both in India and abroad which changed the complexion of Muslim Politics. The heart of Muslim youth in India was stirred by the nationlist movement in Turkey and Persia and they began to imbibe a more nationalistic spirit. The working of the reformed Council showed that political interests of the Muslims were not different from those of the other communities in the country. The rendition of the partition in 1911 proved the worthlessness of British promises and the policy followed by Great Britain towards Turkey during the Tripoli and Balkan wars, demonstrated the hollowness and insincerity of British professions of friendship. On the other hand, Moslem hearts were touched by expressions of brotherly sympathy by the Indian Nationalist Press over their grief on the treatment meted out to Turkey by the European nations. Gradually, the Indian Mussalmans began to realise that their natural allies were their own countrymen of the other communities and not the foreigners in the bureaucracy--though at times they might befriend them to serve their own selfish ends--and they began to take steps to effect rapproachment with them. The first step was taken in 1913 by amending the League constitution and adopting "attainment of a system of self-government suitable to India" as its ideal and the promotion of national unity as the chief method of attaining it. This brought important Nationalist Muslims, like Mr. M. A. Jinnah, Mr. Ansari, Hakim Ajmalkhan and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, who had so far held themselves aloof on account of its narrow communal and loyalist politics, into the Muslim League,

The second step towards the national unity and communal cooperation was taken by fixing the same place for the sessions of the Moslem League as the venue of the Congress and the two met for the first time in the same place in Xmas 1945 at Bombay--where it was decided by both the political organisations to co-operate together in formulating a common scheme of post-war reforms. Committees were

appointed for the purpose, which met in Calcutta and finally at Lucknow, where the Congress and the League held their next sessions in December, 1916 and adopted the famous Congress-League pact and Scheme of Reforms.

The Pact of 1916 accepted separate electorates and the principle of weightage and fixed percentages of Muslim representation in the various legislative concils. A provision was also made for the dropping of a measure, resolution or any part thereof if 3/4ths of the members of the community affected objected to it.

Thus, were accepted by the Indian National Congress Muslim separatist demands which it had consistently opposed throughout as anti-national and anti-democratic in order to achieve national unity and in the belief, which I have characterised elsewhere, as unnatural, that these concessions were in their nature temporary and that the system of separate electorates would disappear in a very short time, perhaps by the time the next reforms enquiry was held, as was stated by Mr. M. A. Jinnah on behalf of the Muslim League in his evidence before the Joint Select Committee of the Parliament in London in 1919.

VII

I regard the conclusion of the Lucknow Pact of 1916 as an important turning point in the history of the Indian National movement. The magnitude of the blunder committed has never been realised and its praises have been sung on account of the results achieved during the next few years.

The Indian National movement started with certain initial disadvantages which it was not able to overcome when this great danger overtook it. The fact that the Muslims sulked and did not take advantage of English education till the seventies of the last century was responsible for the leadership of the nationalist movement falling into Hindu hands and the separatist action of Sir Syed completed the process of throwing the Congress into the hands of Hindu nationalists—some of whom were orthodox Hindus and the mainspring of whose action came from Hindu revivalism. The result was that the nationalist movement could not evolve a common source of inspiration or a common national language or a ritual, anthem and symbols which could make an equal appeal to all sections of the people. Again for the sake of outward unity social reform was eschewed. The Indian nationalist talked of liberty,

equality, brotherhood and love for his Motherland but did not acquire a liberal outlook in social matters or a secular or territorial conception of law and politics. Inter-marriages, inter-dining, discarding of untouchability, giving up conceptions of personal, local and communal law, which would have created the proper atmosphere for the growth of a truly nationalistic sentiment and made the fusion of communities possible were not made part and parcel of a nationalist programme. On the other hand, to keep up outward unity on the political platform, exclusionism and communal loyalties were respected and protected. The inevitable result was the stereotyping and perpetuation of division in Indian society which the clever British bureaucracy utilised for imperial purposes. In 1919, in spite of a whole-hearted and a thorough condemnation of communal electorates by the joint-authors of the Reforms and their determination not to allow them except to the Moslems, where they were in a minority, and to the Sikhs in the Punjab, they were extended to the Moslems everywhere, Sikhs, Indian Christians, Europeans, Anglo-Indians and reservation of seats in plural-member constituencies to the non-Brahmins and the Marahattas. Provision was made for the representation of the depressed classes and labour by nomination and also for the special representation of landlords and other interests. The process of balkanising India was pushed still further by the Communal Award of 1932, embodied in the Reforms of 1935.

In 1916 the Indian National Congress cut the very ground under its feet by accepting a basis for unity which was a negation of nationalism and democracy---its two great ideals—and it further committed the blunder of entering into competition with the British Government for buying the friendship of the Muslim community—a competition in which the Congress was bound to lose as the negotiations culminating in the Communal Award of 1932 and those attempted since the outbreak of the present war have shown. In this race the only chance of success for the Congress lay, as insisted upon by Mahatama Gandhi, in presenting to the Moslems "a blank cheque" but its very indefiniteness and the existence of other minorities made it impractical. However, the greatest harm that the Pact of 1916 did was to misdirect the national policy towards the reaching of Settlements by making concessions to clamant communalism and to open the road wide for the spread of aggressive communalism instead of nipping communalism in the bud and concentrating efforts on the bridging of gulfs, and the creation of conditions favourable for the

fusion of different cultures and communities and the building up of a true Indian nationality. The results have been disastrous. Except for a brief period of real union brought about by the mingling of the blood of martyrs at the Jallianwala Bag at Amritsar and the terrible sufferings undergone under the Martial Law Regime imposed in the Punjab in 1919 and prolonged by the true spirit of fellowship displayed by the Congress under the leadership of the Mahatama of making the cause of Indian Mussalmans (the Khilafat Cause) its own—i.e., except between 1919 and 1921, the whole subsequent history of India is a woeful tale of communal squabbles leading alas ; too often to barbarous and bloody communal riots and culminating in the demand for Pakistan and the determination of the Muslim League not to allow even an interim settlement for the purpose of common defence till its demand is conceded and the various parties give a guarantee that the Partition shall be effected according to Muslim wishes.

VIII

To me, the present demands of the Muslim League appear as the natural and inevitable consequence of accepting the principle that there are important separate political rights and intersts of the various communities that require protection. With the acceptance of this principle it was inevitabte that the various communities should organise themselves on communal lines and stress their separateness from one another. After the foundation of the Muslim League, the Sikhs organised their League and the Hindus their Mahasabha. The non-Brahmins in Madras formed the so-called Justice Party and the Indian Christians their separate Conference. The Europeans and the Anglo-Indians had their own associations and the last but not the least important came the organisation of the so-called Depressed Classes, each advocating its distinctness and demanding weightage, separate representation both in the representative bodies and the Services, and protection of their communal rights and interests. These bodies become particularly active when the question of political reforms and advance comes up and there are wranings between them. The feelings of hostility become so actue that they result in disgraceful and barbarous riots.

The nobler and less communally minded elements in each community, horrified and frightened by the heartless, ferocious atrocities committed by members of one community over those of the

others, try to pacify the excited and incited elements, convene Unity Conferences, form Peace Committees and endeavour to restore confidence and normal life among the people. No permanent organisations are formed to preach national unity and solidarity or the common interests of the people. Unity Conferences discuss the question from the communal point of view and disperse without coming to any agreed conclusions. No one-communal approach is made and no common organisation with a country-wide, missionary programme of bridging the gulfs, establishing cultural and social contacts and promoting spirit of real friendship and comaraderi and discarding the touch-me-not attitude is formed on a permanent basis. After a few days when the normal life is restored and the Peace Committees cease to function, the communal organisations renew their work of spreading the separatist poison, making appeals to special communal wrongs or grievances, raising cries of religion in danger, and recreate tension in the city, district, province and the country. The Communal Press, the denominational educational institutions, movements like *Shudhi*, *Sangathan*, *Tanzeem*, *Tabligh*, *Khaksar*, etc., play their part in fanning the flames and spreading the fire.

In this communally surcharged atmosphere are discussed the problems of *Swaraj* and the next step in constitutional advancement. An occasional mistake of the over-confident bureaucracy or of a conceited imperialist statesman like Lord Birkenhead creates the semblance of unity, as over the all-white Statutory Commission, but divisions arise within each community—one part expecting that best results can be secured by a National Pact or Agreement and the other believing that more can be obtained by siding with the British and by an Award from the British Government. That is what happened during the period of the gestation of the last Reforms, i.e., between 1927 and 1935.

Negotiations started between one section of the Moslems and the leaders of other communities. Demands of the Muslims increased and were formulated in the famous fourteen points of Mr. Jinnah. At the Allahabad Unity Conference agreement was reached on all points except the communal proportions in Bengal for which purpose it was felt, consultations on the spot were necessary.

In the meantime another section of the Moslems was offering co-operation to the Simon Commission. Lord Birkenhead was pressing on the Viceroy and the Chairman of the Commission practice of the policy of divide and rule. In a letter to the Viceroy, the Secretary of State for India wrote :—

"I should advise Simon to see at all stages all people who are not boycotting the Commission, particularly Muslims and depressed classes. I should widely advertise all his interviews with representative Muslims. The whole policy is now obvious. It is to terrify the immense Hindu population, by the apprehension that the Commission is being got hold of by the Muslims, and may present a report altogether destructive of the Hindu position, thereby securing solid Muslim support and leaving Jinnah high and dry".

After the Simon Commission came the Round Table Conferences. In April 1931 was held the All-India Moslem Conference at Delhi. Mr. Robert Bernays, M.P., in according his impressions in his book, "The Naked Fakir", writes :—

".....there was a definite movement on foot to get in touch with Mr. Winston Churchill, with the view of having some definite contact between Mr. Churchill's Party in England and the Moslem Party in India.

I attended a tea party of the Moslem leaders that afternoon at Maiden's Hotel and that project of making contacts with Churchill was the one subject of conversation.

It is an awful possibility which may easily come about if the Round Table Conference is not a success. India may in very truth become another Ireland, and for thirty years the Right and Left Wing parties may be divided on communal lines."

Mr. Edward Thompson writes in "Enlist India for Freedom" that "he could prove" that there was substantial truth in the view "that there was an.. ...understanding and alliance between the more intransigent Moslems and certain particularly undemocratic British political cricles, during the Round Table Conferences.

At any rate, it is a fact that it was Sir Samuel Hoare's dramatic intervention at the psychological moment that set at naught the efforts of the Allahabad Unity Conference to conclude a National Pact. The Conference had amicably settled the two most thorny questions by agreeing to give 32% of the British Indian representation

to the Moslems and to the separation of Sind with concessions to the Hindu Minority and no financial aid from central revenue. To solve the Bengal problem a committee had gone to Calcutta when the bombshell fell. Sir Samuel Hoare announced in London that His Majesty's Government had decided to allot 33-1/3% of the British Indian seats to the Moslems; to constitute Sind into a separate Province and to provide adequate financial aid to it from the central revenues. Thus proving the truth of the contention in this race for buying the support of the Muslims the Indian National Congress could never hope to succeed against the British Government.

IX

The Reforms of 1935 have carried the policy of dividing the people politically much farther than in 1919. Under it, there are some 14 separate communities and interests that are recognised for purposes of representation. This division of the electorate into watertight compartments and the recognition of the principle that each community has important separate political rights and interests to safeguard have made it inevitable that the political life in India should run on communal lines. As Mr. M. A. Jinnah put it to Sir Fazle-Hussain, the leader of the Unionist party in the Punjab, before the elections of 1936 :—

"The reason why they wanted communal parties was, that, as the Constitution was based on communal electorates, they would have to enter the legislatures on the communal ticket."

And although Sir Fazle-Hussain and, after his death, Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan refused to join the Muslim League and fought the elections of 1936 on the Unionist ticket, later Sir Sikandar with the other Muslim members of the Unionist Party joined in a body the Muslim League. That is what happened in Bengal too and also very recently in Sind. As a matter of fact the Muslim League went very much farther by dubbing the policy of the Indian National Congress of "Muslim Mass contacts" as an attempt to divide the Muslims and warned the Congress to keep away from the Muslims together-with its exclutionist slogan : "Hands off the Muslims !" Under these circumstances, the Indian National Congress has had to confine its electioneering campaigns mainly to the general or Hindu constituencies and thus to be identified more and more with the Hindu constituencies and thus to be identified more with the Hindu electo-

rate in spite of its nationalist programme and its considerable non-Hindu membership.

The elections of 1936 showed the strong hold the Indian National Congress had on the general public mind and it made Mr. Jinnah and other leaders of the Mussalmans realise that unless they reorganised and closed up their ranks and came under the banner of one political body, chalked out a programme that would make an appeal, not only to the educated few aspirants after seats, jobs and ministerships, but also to the Muslim masses to whom franchise had been extended recently, the chief purpose of separate electorates may be defeated and the Congress may succeed in winning over the Muslim masses through its economic programme and the policy of Muslim mass contacts. In my opinion it was this fear that was largely responsible for the enunciation and the working out of the two nations' theory

Until 1937, Mr. Jinnah and the other Moslem leaders talked of Indian Mussalmans as a "community" and of the common freedom of United India as their goal. This is clear from the Presidential Address which Mr. Jinnah delivered at the Lucknow Session of the Muslim League in October 1937. Quoting the Resolution of 12th April, 1936, Mr. Jinnah said :—

"In order to strengthen the solidarty of the Muslim community and to secure for the Muslims their proper and effective share in the Provincial Governments, it is essential that the Muslims should organise themselves as one Party, with an advanced and progressive programme."

Proceeding further, he said :—

"Since last April (1936) the Mussalmans of India have rallied round the League more and I feel confident that once they understand and realise the policy and programme of the Muslim League, the entire Muslim population of India will rally round its platform and under its flag. The Moslem League stands for full national democratic self-government of India."

The last words are most significant. It is clear that till October 1937 the President of the All-India Moslem League stood for national and not merely provincial self-government and not for the creation of separate, independent Muslim States and that his ideal was a

democratic self-governing India and that he did not regard democratic institutions unsuited to Indian conditions as he has been preaching during the last three years.

What are the causes for this change of attitude on the part of Mr. Jinnah and the All-India Moslem League ?

X

The first cause is, as I have stated above, the need for an effective popular slogan, to rally the Muslim masses, which became an urgent necessity with the extension of the franchise and the starting of the "Muslim Mass Contact" programme by the Indian National Congress under the leadership of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

The second and a more important reason was the failure on the part of the Muslim League to capture power in any of the four Provinces in which Moslems have a majority. The exigencies of the local situation made the Moslem leaders of these provinces decide on forming non-communal parties and coalition ministries. The League felt that if this tendency continued and the working of the coalition ministries were successful the Muslim League shall have no chance of exercising any real power even in the future in the Muslim majority provinces pure League Raj or unadulterated Muslim rule was not possible under the existing constitution and would be possible only in Pakistan.

Thirdly, the decision of the Congress to accept office in the Provinces where it had a majority deprived the Muslims in those provinces of the temporary advantages they had gained by the formation of interim ministries, in which the Muslims occupied a most important position—as a matter of fact, most of the Interim Premiers were Moslems. The loss of office and power was felt all the more keenly on account of the understanding arrived at that the Governors will ordinarily refrain from exercising their Special Powers. This was understood by the Muslim League to mean that the safeguards provided in the constitution, particularly the one relating to the protection of minority rights and interests, would become negatory. Thus, to the loss of power and office was added a feeling of insecurity, which was later worked up to support the movement for separation by the propaganda carried on by the League.

The fourth and perhaps the most decisive factor was the failure of the Congress-League negotiations for the formation of coalition ministries in the Congress-majority provinces, particularly because coalition ministries were functioning in the Muslim-majority provinces. This acted as the proverbial last straw and completed the feelings of frustration which were already running very deep in the League circles. It made the League to sit up and to think seriously and to revise its views on the question of suitability of democratic institutions to Indian conditions. It suddenly dawned upon the League with the force of a revelation that the Muslims were doomed to perpetual opposition and permanent denial of a share in power in all these provinces and at the centre where they are in a minority. And no end of arguments have been able to convince the League that the case can never be otherwise. The only way of escape which the League has been able to find is in partition—the formation of separate Muslim States in the West and the East and no government at the centre at all. The League also worked up the feelings of the other minority communities against the Congress because the Congress insisted upon homogenous party governments on the English parliamentary model, ignoring different conditions in India, and refusing to form composite cabinets representative of the various parties in the respective legislatures.

This was "a tactical error" on the part of the Congress, to use Mr. Edward Thompson's phrase, wich has cost the country dearly and whose consequences have been disastrous. The Congress-League relations became bitter, the Hindu-Muslim tension increased in intensity and acuteness and resulted in terrible brutal riots particularly in the Congress-governed provinces. And in spite of all efforts on the part of the Congress Governments to placate the Muslims the opposition of the Muslim-League grew to such an extent that the voluntary relinquishment of office by the Congress ministries was hailed as a tremendous relief and celebrated in the form of a 'Deliverance Day' by the Muslim League--although disinterested opinion in India and abroad commended the work done by the Congress Ministries in very difficult circumstances during the short period of their rule.

Fifthly, at the psychological moment, when the Muslim League was acutely feeling the denial of a share in power by the Congress took place certain events in Europe which influenced the League in its course of action. I refer here to the Sudetan movement in Czechoslo-

vakia which led to the separation of Sudetanland and its incorporation in German Reich in October 1938. Writes Dr. Beni Prasad in his thoughtful study of "The Hindu-Muslim Question" :—

> "The progress of the Sudetan demands from a large share in administration and policy to a repudiation of minority status, the claim to separate nationhood, the denial of Czechoslovakia unity, charges of atrocities and oppression unsupported by evidence, the demand for frontier revision, the advocacy of a virtual partition together with the claim of share in the residual central organisation--all these features in the Sudetan movement of 1936-38 found their counterpart in the resolutions of the Moslem League in 1939-41. In fact, some of the phrases employed are identical."

Sixthly, the Pakistan solution has made an irresistible appeal to the Pan-Islamic feelings of the Indian Mussalmans, who believe that the establishment of Pakistan would bring their dream of a Muslim Confederacy--of the Islamic countries in the near East--within the range of practical politics and very near.

Lastly, the League propaganda in favour of separation has derived considerable help from the existence of social customs among the Hindus which make real social contact with the Muslims an impossibility. The cries "Hindu water," "Muslim tea," at the railway stations is a daily reminder to us of our disunity and unbridgeable differences. They make the talk of Hindu-Moslem brotherhood or unity a mockery and lends an air of plausibility and reality to the theory that the Hindus and the Muslims constitute separate nations.

Such are the important causes which are, in my opinion, responsible for the enunciation of the two nations' theory and for the formulation of the Muslim League demand for Partition and Pakistan. Since the end of 1938, the Muslim League has been carrying on an intensive and clever propaganda on Sudetan lines in favour of its decision, which was embodied in the famous resolution of March 26, 1940, adopted by the League of Lahore. The main part runs :—

"It is the considered view of this session of the All-India Moslem League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principle, viz., that geographically contiguous units are demar-

cated, with such territorial adjustment as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India should be grouped to constitute "Independent States," in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign."

XI

The stand taken by the Muslim League called forth in its turn vigorous opposition from the Hindus and the Nationalist elements in the country, including the Nationalist Muslims. For the last four years a battle royal has been raging in the country over the Pakistan issue. Conferences have been held in all parts of the country both in favour and against the Partition and the feelings of the people have been fully worked up. On the one hand, it has been argued that India is geographically and racially one and that the common interests of the people--economic, political and defence--demand that India should remain undivided and united. However, a united, free India has been an inspiring ideal before the people for generations and the very mention of Partition creates a jarring note. On the other hand, it has been urged that the Hindus and the Moslems are two separate nations with different languages, religions and cultures, and they live separate lives and are governed by separate codes of laws and customs. They cannot live even as good neighbours and their different modes of life and worship often lead to bloody and barbarous riots. Under the circumstances it is best to part company, live in separate, independent "home-lands" and the masters of their respective destinies. Some have gone still further and suggested that Pakistan is in fact in the best interests of the Hindu--the hostile element will be eliminated; financially they will gain by getting rid of the two heavy defict provinces and the heavy expenditure on defending the North-Western Frontier; the preponderance of the Moslems in the Police, Army and other Defence services will disappear and Hindustan will once again become a Hindu land, with milk and honey flowing everywhere, strong and free and with all her ancient glories. Again, it has been argued that Pakistan will be economically weak, it will not be in a position to defend itself and the plan to form a Moslem Confederacy is not only impractical but reactionary and will not be tolerated in the modern world. It is pointed out with great cogency and force that Pakistan will not put an end to the problem of Hindu-Moslem relationship or to the problem of safeguarding the rights and interests of the Moslem and other minorities--and that "the idea of treating minorities as hostages

for the fair treatment of one's co-religionists" in another State "implies a clean shift of the basis of politics from civilisation to barbarism." It is even suggested that the majority of the Moslims themselves are not in favour of Pakistan and that the All-India Moslem League does not really represent the Muslims of the Muslim-majority provinces. Lastly, it is asked: what about the tremendous and difficult problems which Pakistan will inevitably raise--such as those of the delimitation of boundaries, defence of borders, financial adjustments, inter-commerce, communications and other relations between Pakistan and Hindustan ?

I feel it is no use going into these or other arguments for or against Pakistan. In my opinion the question has passed beyond the realm of thought into the irrational zone of highly surcharged emotion. A quotation from "Pakistan, A Nation" by El Hamza should convince the most sceptical among us of the utter futility of any attempt at reasoning at the stage where we have unwittingly landed ourselves. Writes El Hamza :—

"The Wardha brand of imperialism is of a peculiarly insidious and dangerous nature. Compounded of cunning, hypocrisy, and metaphysical hocus-pocus it has a monstrous texture. Its exponents profess altruism and tolerance but bigotry and selfishness is the very substance of their being. After centuries of application the Europeans have made the practice of hypocrisy a fine art but even with them hypocrisy has after all remained a pose. The hypocrisy of Wardha politicians has weird and terrifying aspects. It balsphemes the heavens with its assumption of an air of spirituailty; it dumbfounds those against whom it is practised by appearing as an incarnation of protest against falsehood and insincerity ; it defies analysis by entering the very being of its perpetrators ; it ceases to be a pose and assumes objective existence. The world hears elaborate accounts of the Wardha Sadhus and saints undertaking fasts, maintaining long spells of silence, travelling third class on political missions and sees them sitting half-naked at spinning wheels in frontpage news pictures looking incarnations of godliness; but when the same Great Souls wink at such horrors as the Biswa murder conspiracy or order the imprisonment of hundreds of Dravidians for wanting to use their mother-tongue, the onlookers experience the magic emotions of pity and terror. The Muslim League inquiries into the methods of Congress Governments have shown how much the minorities have to fear the rule of these

self-denying *charkha*-spinning sympathetic looking "great-soul."...For the Pakistani mind the Congress cult is associated with hypocritical whinning about non-violence, scraggy, chocolate-coloured longevity-seekers in loincloths and weaving metaphysical hocus pocus and subtle scheme of economic pressure, five foot-four-inches procession-ists with flat noses and bulging cheeks shouting outlandish slogans in shrill voices-all this smelling strongly of usury, untouchability and an inordinate hatred and fear of the Moslems....."

Is there any scope for arguments with such advocates of Pakistan ? Can misrepresentation, venomous writing, hatred go further ?

However, it is obvious, that with them unity is impossible. There is one supreme condition for constituting nationality—the desire to live together and be one and to feel separate and distinct from others. Other conditions—community of race, religion, language, culture and historical traditions, economic interests, needs of defence, etc. may help in promoting the sense of solidarity, unity or oneness, in one word, Nationality but none of them is essential, but without this yearning to live together and to be one and to feel separate and distinct from others, there cannot come into being a separate Nationality. And if the Indian Mussalmans have been able to create this yearning, no denial on the part of others will prevent them from being a separate nation—opposition will only result in hastening the process and in bringing about its earlier materialisation.

XII

Is there then no alternative to this terrible half-solution of the Indian problem ? The answer of Mr. M.A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League, an organisation which has in the course of the last five years built up for itself a unique position among the Indian Mussalmans, seems to me to be decisive :—

"Two nations. Mr. Jinnah ! Cnfronting each other in every province, every town, every village." asked Mr. Edward Thompson.

"Two nations. Confronting each other in every province. Every town. Every village. That is the only solution." replied Mr. Jinnah.

"That is a very terrible solution, Mr. Jinnah!" interjected Mr. Thompson.

"It is a terrible solution. But it is the only one," insisted Mr. Jinnah.

It is true that the attitude of the British Government has been vacillating from one position to the other, perhaps according to the exigencies of the situation and imperial needs. The position has been made still more uncertain by the Calcutta speech of the Viceroy of 17th December, 1942, emphasising need for unity and for a strong central government in the country. It is also believed by some careful students of public and international affairs in India that considerations of foreign policy will ultimately prevent the British Government from according its approval and support to the League proposal for Partition. I, however, feel that the League is sure of the support of the British Government in which Mr. Churchill is the Prime Minister and Mr. Amery, Secretary of State for India and which has already announced its adherence to the Cripps Proposals.

What then are the prospects for India in the near future? I am afraid, I cannot paint before you a rosy picture. There are plenty of troubles and struggles ahead. The problem of delimitation of the boundaries of Pakistan, both in the West and the East, particularly in the former is bound to prove most difficult. It may be that the so-called "sub-nations," The Sikhs and the Hindus in the Punjab and Bengal shall have to be recognised as separate nations and accorded the same right of separation-and of union with Hindustan-as the Muslims. In any case I expect far greater difficulties for Hindustan from the side of the Indian States and their Paramount Power but they fall outside the scope of this address and are far too important and complex to be discussed at the end of an already lengthy address. As already stated Pakistan cannot by itself solve the problem of minorities in India—at best it can satisfy the desire for Power on the part of the Moslem League and thus ease the way for a satisfactory solution of the problem. In my opinion the future of India will depend upon how the problem of minorities is handled in Hindustan and as to what efforts are made to bring about a real fusion of the peoples into a single whole. A good beginning might be made with composite cabinets and by guaranteeing complete religious freedom and protection to the language and culture of minorities but a determined effort must be made to cultivate a

purely secular outlook in public affairs and to discard untouchability of all kinds and to abandon personal, local and communal conceptions of law and politics and thus create in course of time denational, socialist States in the country. When that is accomplished the separated States shall return and form a Union of the Indian Socialist Republics.

That may appear today a most unreal dream but if Socialist Russia emerges victorious from this titanic struggle and if the socialist order spreads in other parts of the world after the War and if an Indian Lenin or Stalin arises in our midst, the Dream may materialise at a not too distant future.

———

PRINCIPAL G. D. SONDHI **6**

THE ROLE OF THE POLITICAL SCIENTISTS

(*The Sixth Conference held at Lucknow in December, 1943*)

The teachers of Political Science have a two-fold duty. The first duty is to students. We must inspire them to pursue the study of this subject. But before it could be done, all the hurdles in the achievement of this object must be removed. We must try to induce the School Boards and the Universities to make the study of Civics a compulsory one in the early stages, to allow the study of Political Science through the modern Indian Languages and to provide our students with suitable text-books. Our second duty is towards the people. This involves in giving to the public unbiased information and guidance about their thinking and line of action in Political matters as also warning the public against the viles and appeals of insidious propaganda. In the performance of these duties, some may prefer to enter in Politics while some others may like to do so by analysing the problems and suggesting remedies for the same. Profs. Kale, Beni Prasad and few others belong to their class. What is expected of students of Political Science is dispassionate study of the problems. This object could be achieved in the Universities where facilities for research and scholarships exist and these could be further extended and strengthened. Everybody these days is busy in consitution making but this job is being done by those who have no training for it. This work should be accompalished with the help of trained Political Scientists. They could also help in educating the people to enable them to bear their economic and social burdens. The other duty of Political Scientists is to warn the public against exploitation and quackery of politicians. The dangers to our society are the cult of leader-worship, blind obedience, emotion and passions, violence, isms and false sense of Internationalism. This no doubt adds to the burdens of Political Scientists but has to be done in the interest of the society and the subject of Political Science.

Before I begin my address, permit me to thank the members of the Political Science Association for the great honour they have done me by electing me the President of this, the *6th meeting* of the Association.

This honour, I am, sure, is no recognition of any research made, or learned tomes published, for I have done neither of these things. It can only be a recognition of the fact that it was Dr. Ram and I who started the idea of such a Conference, first as an adjunct to the Economics Conference, and then, with the co-operation of Mr. Gurmukh Nihal Singh, as a separate one.

According to the constitution of the Political Science Association, the Presidential Address is in the nature of the proverbial swan song. The address done, and the ensuing sessions presided over, the President can sink back, with a sigh of relief, into the distinguished ranks of ex-presidents.

If, therefore in this address, I have succumbed to the temptation of being too didactic, you will kindly forgive me. In further extenuation of this I can plead the privilege of one who, in the near future, is to be placed on the shelf of superannuation. A poet has said :

"Heaven gives our years of fading strength."
"Indemnifying fleetness."

With much greater truth he may have substituted, "Edificatory complex" for "Indemnifying fleetness."

So I hope you will bear with me for the space of half an hour or so.

The theme of my address will be the two-fold duty of the teachers of Political Science—on one side to their students in the class room, and, on the other, to the people around them.

In some ways both duties have much in common. Their essential objective is to make Political Science both light-bearing and fruit-bearing. Some may not agree to this double objective of a subject which boasts of the term-ending of "Science," and claims to be one. A Science, they may hold, is a disinterested and dispassionate study of causes and effects. It is an unfolding and a discovery untained by any consideration of the use to which the knowledge gained may be put.

There is much truth in this. But if the laying bare of the forces at work, i.e., the discovery of the causal relationship is one aspect of the work of science, is not invention another aspect of it ? And what is invention but the utilising of the discoveries to achieve definite ends ? Discovery and invention are inseparables, and even if separables, for the majority of people at least, it is the invention or utility aspect of Science, as distinguished from its accumulation of knowledge which is of interest.

This is particularly true of social sciences, among which Political Science ranks so high. Human beings want results, and consciously, as in Legislation, or sub-consciously, as in custom-formation, act to achieve them. No doubt, blind effort unenlightened by the history of the past, unacquainted with the working of human mind, and uninformed of actual facts, often leads to action, but it can also lead to entanglements and pitfalls. A sound knowledge of Political Science can help us considerably in avoiding the mistakes of the past, and in planning for the future. So the practical bearing of Political Science on our affairs must be kept very markedly before our minds. In fact, let the study be light-bearing, but let us not forget that it has also to be fruit-bearing.

DUTY TO STUDENTS

With this preliminary discussion in mind, I turn to two duties. The first is the duty to students.

Most of us here to-day are, or—at any rate those of us who will be left here during the ensuing sessions of the Conference—will be teachers and deeply concerned with this duty and its proper discharge. Briefy this duty is to interest our students in the subject and to inspire in them a zeal for further studies and investigation along non-partisan lines and in a dispassionate manner. But, as this subject will come before us in another from—drafting a suitable syllabus of studies—not much need be said at this time. Still, one cannot help mentioning some of the hurdles in the way of the proper discharge of our duty.

The first hurdle is that when we start the study of Political Science in the B.A. in the most cases of the students have neither the foundation nor the background necessary for an intelligent understanding of the subject.

The foundation of Political Science is Civics. Yet in many of our school and college curricular, Civics either finds no place, or is consigned to a neglected corner. In my own University of the Punjab it is only an optional subject in the Matriculation, with an extremely defective syllabus ; and in the Intermediate it provides the tail ends of History and Economics. The same is the case with some other Universities. This is extremely unsatisfactory. A basic subject like Civics should be compulsory at the school stage and, at the university stage, should have been studied by all those who want to take up Political Science.

The appropritate background for the study of Political Science is also missing. History, Geography and Elementary Economics should rightly provide this. But quite a number of students do not study these subjects in the early classes. For many, Political Science is a welcome relief from Science or from the compulsory classical languages of the Intermediate. This again, is not as it should be. No student should be allowed to take up Political Scienc for the B.A. who has not studied the related subject in the Intermediate.

The second hurdle—and a very high one—is the medium of instruction. This hurdle is a common one in the way of all our studies, but its commonness does not make it the less difficult and the less unnecessary. The books and teaching are in English, a language of which even years of study do not give one a mastery. The students unable to understand the books and to follow the lectures fall back on memorising. Thinking on the part of a student is inhibited and its stimulation by the teacher thwarted. Thus the tender plants of intelligent study and appreciation wilt and die, and the thorny weeds of half-truths and pernicious prejudices fill the mind. We must also remember the wise saying of Confucius : "Thinking without learning makes one flighty, but learning without thinking is a disaster." It is our bounden duty to avert such a disaster.

The third hurdle is that there are no satisfactory text-books to supplement the teaching in the classroom. Now I know that it is the fashion among some to decry text-books. They would like the students to browse widely among many books, nibbling at a chapter here and at a section there. But they forget that the longer the list of boks given, the less inclined are the students to study even one of them. The commenders of wide reading also forget that each book has its own viewpoint, different from the other. The beginner, even

if he tries to study them, will feel hopelessly bewildered and terribly irritated. In this desperation fain will he consign the books, the subject and the teacher to terrible regions.

The cost of so many books and difficulties of getting them from ill-equipped college libraries are other prohibitive factors.

For the beginner, therefore, a text-book is indispensable because it provides him with something into which, so to say, he can fasten his teeth. Without it he feels that he is merely biting air...a process as useless as it is disconcerting.

But, though I am convinced of the necessity of a text-book, I have no hesitation in condemning most of the books that pass under that name. The American and the Canadian variety of text-books are not adapted to our needs and their treatment of the subject is considerably out of date. Those of the indigenous variety are mostly the results of the scissor and paste activity and have no consistent view point of their own. The result of such books is only too patent in the answer books. While criticising, let us say the Contract theory in one answer, the student assigns to it the true origin of the State in the next.

To sum up our duty to the student : We must try to induce the School Boards and the Universities to make the study of Civics a compulsory one in the early stages, to persuade these two sets of authorities to allow the study of Political Science, and indeed of most other Arts subjects through the Modern Indian Languages and to provide our students with suitable text-books.

DUTY TO THE PEOPLE

So much for the "Duty to Students." Now, I turn to the considerably wider sphere of our "Duty to the People." In the main, this duty may be summed up as helping in the formation of sound public opinion. This task may, somewhat arbitrarily, be divided into two parts :

I Instruction...i.e.. giving the public unbiased information and guidance about what should be their line of action in political matters.

II Warning...i.e., warning the public against the viles and appeals of insidious propaganda.

HOW TO BE DISCHARGED ?

How is this two fold duty to be discharged ? There is room for difference of opinion and action here. Some may like to step into the political arena itself to take active part in the party fights. They may be so thoroughly convinced of the rightness of the party policy in the main things that they may be willing to join forces with it even if on minor points they do not agree with it. The further fact that, unless a person has a party platform and press to help him, his view can hardly reach the public, may also determine those of the teachers of Political Science who feel acutely, to seek affiliation with political parties.

But there is another set of teachers too. They, while holding it to be their duty to help the people, may yet be averse to active participation in political squabbles. The din, the confusion and the dust of actual partisan strife might be distastful to them, and in some cases may even be frightening. But as real students, interested in a nonpartisan study of problems, such teachers may render great service by their analyses and diagnoses and by their suggestions. To select only a few, the names of Mr. Lowes Dickinson and Professor Graham Wallas and of Dr. Lindsay, Professor Ernest Barker, Professor Zimmern, and the Webbs, suggest themselves in this conneetion. These, while not belonging to any party, have yet rendered great help in the elucidation of political problems by their teaching and their works. In India we have men like the veteran teacher, Professor V. G. Kale, and Professors like Beni Prasad, V. S. Ram and Gurmukh Nihal Singh who are rendering similar service.

It is futile to advise as to which of these two is the better way to help the people in arriving at the truth. The decision in all cases will be made by the temperaments of the persons concerned. But one cannot help feeling that as students of Political Science, our real duty is, as far as possible, an impartial and non-partisan study of problems and of measures proposed to solve them, and the teaching of an accepted viewpoint as regards the end to be attained, rather than alliance with any party.

And this for two reasons :

1. No political party can have the sole possession of truth, can claim full justification or allegiance, for all its proposals. There are bound to be deviations from the straight and honest path through

considerations of expediency and personal friendships. For, "a man who wants to play politics has to alloy his truth with many lies." The place of an honest man is in a party of one only, unless he is prepared to make a nuisance of himself in the party counsels. And, if he takes this course, sooner, rather than later, he will find himself ejected from the party.

2. The second reason in favour of a non-partisan study is that the public, at least, the thinking public, will have more faith in the solutions and suggestions of an impartial writer who does not hesitate to condemn the mistaken popular view and to affirm the unpalatable truth.

The Universities should be the centres of cultivation of such impartial thinking, and of the dissemination of non-partisan opinion. It is only then that they will justify their existence and deserve their name of the educating institutions. And it is only when the teachers of a subject are imbued with the essential spirit of science that they will be best discharging their duty to their students and to the public at large.

Unfortunately quite a few of the Indian Universities are mostly examining bodies and these and others are mostly busy with communal or sectional interests and squabbles; and quite a number of the teaching staffs, though criticising the Marxian thesis of Economic Determinism in theory, are obliged by poverty to justify it in practice. Reform of the Universities and of the spirit with which they work is too big a problem, and will require time. In the meanwhile something could be done to help such teachers as are busy with research by reducing their long teaching hours, or by increasing their salaries and so freeing them from material worries.

The institution of research scholarships is another helpful suggestion. But the scholarship should be substantial enough to retain the scholars for one or two years at least and not be merely appetisers whetting their material appetites. Something like the system of Fellowships at Cambridge and Oxford will have to be adopted by our Universities.

But research scholarships alone, will not solve the problems. Research facilities too, in the form of well-equipped libraries, official Records,and up-to-date political data must be made available. Among others the Imperial and State Records Departments should be urged

to adopt a more liberal policy of giving research student freer access to records, and of reducing their scrutiny and typing charges.

After this digression into the fields of method and research let me revert to the two fold work of the teachers for the people i.e. Instruction and Warning.

In reality there is no hard and fast line between these two kinds of work. These are merely the obverse and reverse of one and the same thing. If the one tells the people what is right, the other tells them against what is false. If the one is concerned with exposition, the other is concerned with exposing.

I. INSTRUCTION AND GUIDANCE OF THE PUBLIC

As regards guiding and informing the public and giving it non-partisan opinion, it must be confessed that there cannot but be a personal interpretation, and that complete absence of bias and absolute impartiality are impossibilities. As Chesterton has said, 'The nearest one can come to being impartial is to confess that one is partial.'

This is only true. It would be expecting too much from human beings to uproot from themselves all the emotional, racial, and religious biases that heredity and environment have planted in them. But if we want to serve truth, we must replace the promptings of passion and bias by the stern dictates of reason, as much as is possible.

Now, in this direction of informing and guiding the people, I am afraid, not much has been done by the teachers. A great many of us have, perhaps, no time to spare for further studies. And of the small number, that can manage the time, their energies have mostly been absorbed by the writings of notes on text-books. But we cannot blame them for this, for the educational service is one of the lowest paid of services.

There are, however, the select, the very few, that have sought to illuminate by their writings some of our problems and have given their solutions. I am happy to mention that through the inspiration of such teachers a number of younger persons too are following in their footsteps.

CONSTITUTION MAKING

In addition to the work of these real students of Political Science, a great deal of work has been and is being done by persons whom,

without any desire to disparage, we may call 'professional politicians.' Their work has lain chiefly in the direction of constitution-making. Indeed, hardly a week passes when some new scheme, large or small, is not put forward by some one or another of these gentlemen. As a result one cannot help feeling that constitution-making is absorbing too much attention, and that it is becoming the pre-occupation of the serious and the hobby of the dilettante. But one cannot also help feeling, that, such work, admirable as some of it has been, is either too doctrinaire, or too much concerned with the solution of ephemeral practical difficulties. In the case of the first the structure seems to be mostly spires and minarets and in the case of the second the foundations and the drains seem to absorb all the attention. What is required is a harmonious building in which the spires reach high but not so high as to topple over and the foundations and the sanitation are adequate but not needlessly heavy and complicated. This pre-occupation with too much theoretical perfection, or with too many minor practical difficulties, is to my mind due to the absence of a systematic training in Political Science among these inventors of Constitutions. It is here that the trained Political Scientist can be of great help, and it is in this direction that our best contribution can lie. The student of Political Science can point to the constitutional experience of other countries and to the various devices adopted by them. He can also emphasis the great necessity of considering the workability of a system with reference to the quality and circumstances of the people concerned, and can also point to the vital necessity of looking on to the ideals to be reached.

It is a pity, therefore, that the help of the trained Political Scientists has been ignored by the Indian constitution-makers. Even the Central and Provincial Legislatures, and Governments have not yet realised the importance of the service that can be rendered by the Political Scientists in the various committees and sub-committees.

There is hope, however, in the fact, that just as these bodies have got over their suspicions of the political economists and occasionally even welcome their help, so in time, they may overcome the nervousness of consulting the political scientists too.

But apart from the help to the governments, legislators, and the professional politicians, the great contribution that the teachers of Political Science can make is in the direction of educating the people to make the latter fit to bear their social, not merely political burdens.

In the words of H. G. Wells, 'we must liquidate ignorance as an intolerable nuisance, for mental slums are more dangerous to mankind than material ones.' This implies the instruction of the public through lectures and pamphlets, the organisation of Institutes of Public Affairs and of Discussion Groups.

II. WARNING.

While this is one aspect of our public duties, there is the other aspect which is equally, if not more, important these days.

I refer to the duty of warning the public against exploitation, and of exposing or 'debunking' the various cults and 'isms' that are now so rampant. Many 'isms' and cults of unsocial and anti-national kind are now and again masquerading as true solvers of social economic, and political ills. There is lot of quackery about and it is the bounden duty of students of Political Science to expose it.

It may be said that this is widening too much the functions of the subject. But, if lawyers and judges and legislators can interest themselves in educational and university matters in addition to their own duties, why cannot the teachers of Political Science interest themselves in legislation and administration of law, in addition to theirs ? The teachers have much greater justification.

1. THE CULTS

1. CULT OF THE LEADER

What are these Cults and 'Isms' against which the public is to be warned and put on its guard ?

The chief of the cults is the cult of the Leader. Now, it must be stated that the object is to refer to not to all leaders, but only to some--to those that are intent on starting a cult of themselves. Leaders may roughly be devided into two categories. There are leaders who are "susceptible to the thoughts, and actions of the members of the group" to which they belong. Then, there are leaders who want to assert themselves and to dominate their group. In the words of Professor Bartlett the former 'expresses' the group, while the latter 'impresses' it. The 'expressive' leaders live with the people work with the people and for the people. Though, because of their desire to be like the humblest, they have a simplicity of life, yet their minds are finer, their perceptions keener, their sympathies vaster and deeper, so that they can express much better and more truly the mind and needs of their fellow-beings. Such leaders would always be welcome for they work beneficently--they truly serve the people.

Not so the 'impressive' type, for they seek to dominate the group and to press it into their service. They, too, may be born of the common people and may, like the other type, have equally keen perception of the common mind. As Hitler says, "Owing to the peculiar circumstances of my life, I am perhaps more capable than anyone else of understanding and realising the nature and the whole life of the various German castes." Yet, such men are dangerous, nay, disastrous; for, all their knowledge and gifts are directed towards self-assertion and self-aggrandisement. They exploit the group and make it serve their purposes, and end by making it servile. It is this variety of leader that seeks to get itself deified through the assumption of high-sounding titles and through the originating of their cult. Their technique is simple, they first create a disatisfaction in the people, excite their fears, and then pose as their only deliverers. Quite a number of such are at large in India at the present time. The newly introduced democratic system enables many to build platforms for self-elevation. The leader bases himself on party. The party is based on votes, the votes are directed by hopes and fears--fancied or real, these hopes and fears are aroused and stimulated by propaganda.

Psychologists tell us that in each of us there are twofold impulses, the sadistic, which likes to assert, and the masochistic which likes to submit. The hopes pander to the sadistic nature of the followers, and the fears appeal to the masochistic. Through both these the Leader draws the people to himself.

Meanwhile the drum of propaganda is loudly beaten. The Nazi method is frightfully copied--'Repeat a falsehood long enough and many will believe you.' For, as Aldous Huxley says, 'The name counts more with most people than the thing.' It may still remain true that you cannot fool all the people all the time, but it is also true that if you beat the drum of self-praise long and loud enough, many will for a time at least, take you at the face-value of your assertions. Newman has truly remarked, "Persons influence us, voices melt us, looks subdue us, deeds inflame us. Many a man will live and die upon a dogma; no man will be a martyr for a conclusion." People are only too willing to accept beliefs but not to reason about them. And not this, they are willing to die for their beliefs. For, 'when people die for an illusion it does not become more bitter but sweet.'

So the leader can start his cult by self-praise and by running down others, and if possible, by exploiting some real or fancied fears and grievances of a class or a community. As has been said, 'A noisy

man is always in the right' and 'a positive man can seldom be found wrong'. The result is that proclaiming his own virtues he gets them acknowledged and demanding first homage and then worship, the leader gets both. And, championing some grievances he can pose as the deliverer of his followers. The old-time process of demand coming first and supply afterwards, is replaced by the up-to-date process of supply coming first and creating a demand for itself. Aggressive salesmanship is the new key to open the people's hearts and even their purses. Thus is started the pernicious cult of the Leader. And against this it is our duty to warn the people and to put them on their guard.

2. CULT OF BLIND OBEDIENCE

The cult of the Leader is closely related to another cult--the cult of Blind Obedience. There is one condition on which the deluded or self-seeking worshippers are allowed to kiss the feet of the demi-god. And this condition is inscribed on the portals of the new temple- 'All Intelligence And Sense of Justice Leave Behind Ye Who Enter Within'. The Leader demands nothing less than the completest surrender of the wills of his devotees. The followers must not think for themselves, must not reason why, but must blindly obey. Obedience is their sole duty, indeed, their sole privilege. Their reason and intelligence are deliberately starved for these might make them lift up the robes of the Messiah that the leader has assumed, and might lead them to perceive that it is a spiritually shrunken scare crow that wears them.

3. CULT OF EMOTION AND PASSIONS

But obedience is a negative thing. The following cannot live on it, so a positive cult has to be provided. Starved of reason and deprived of judgement the followers are abundantly fed on the diet of suspicions, of half-truths, of envy, of hate, and of false hopes. The viewpoints of others are deliberately distorted, a vicious hatred of opponents is cleverly administered, and rations of emotional appeals are liberally served out. The mentally enslaved followers are lured on by promises of differential treatment, preferential privileges, and of territorial regions of exclusive powers.

4. CULT OF VIOLENCE

But appeals to emotions and self-interest cannot lead to toleration or peaceful living. The Cult of Violence and sheer brutality is bound to come in as a natural corollary.

Like the propaganda based leader Cult, the Cult of Violence too is an importation from Europe. The most heinous crime of which Germany has been guilty, is the revival of the cult of brutality, and the brutalising of the Youth. This is an unforgiveable sin against the Holy Ghost of Youth. Youth is dynamic, Youth is full of noble ideals, Youth is full of the urge to achieve. Those that turn this fine section of humanity into dumbly obedient animals, nay, into worse than animals, into will--less and soul-less monsters, observe the lowest depths of the inferno.

To exploit your fellow beings economically is sin enough, but to exploit and debase them mentally and spiritually is to reach the depths of cynical soul-les monstrosity.

And, what an irony. These Leaders who have God constantly on their lips, deliberately pervert His creation, and fill with hate and malice, the minds of those who they allege are made in their Maker's image.

But while deploring the Cult of the Leader, we have also to acknowledge that leaders are indispensable to humanity. Personality has played, is playing, and will play a major role in the progress of mankind. A system which prevents leadership and leaves the affairs in the hands of the uninstructed rank and file, does not last long, and works mischievously while it lasts. Democracy does not imply the absence of leaders, it implies and depends on the choice of the right kind of leaders...the leaders who 'express' us. The claims of such personalities cannot be denied, must not be denied. But if the democratic process is to work itself out smoothly and beneficiently then the personalities must be yoked to high principles. These principles must provide the curb and the curb must be applied by the people themselves. To secure this end the people must be rightly educated in civic duties and virtues.

It is, in one respect, a very hopeful sign that the Indian Press has started to make increasing use of that great debunking instrument...the Cartoon. Nothing kills false ideas more quickly, and exposes more surely hollow claims, than ridicule. As an editoral in the "New York Times" put it: "There is no right a democracy ought to cherish more tenaciously than the right to laugh at anything and anybody it thinks funny. Ideas, if they are good ones, can stand being laughed at. Personalities are more vulnerable. The bigger the wind bag the easier it is to poke holes in it, but in countries now most supinely under a boss's thumb, where such deflation is most

needed, it does not take place. Territories may be lost, spheres of influence may be contracted, but civilisation can survive if a joke continues to be called a joke and is not disguised as a great man or a great idea."

What a priceless political gift is the sense of humour and what a cathartic antidote to over weening conceit and vain self-importance. Happy indeed are the people that can laugh at their leaders and blessed indeed is the country where such laughter is not suppressed. In India, particularly, do we need the humorous outlook, for, here, most of the self-styled leaders have enormous bumps of vanity, solemnity, and pomposity. They will all be the better for the application of the blistering plaster of ridicule and laughter. One hears of the movement of moral Rearmament, but what we want more is what Adrian Alington (in his novel Sanity Island) has called 'Humorous Rearmament.' But to expect all teachers of Political Science to be Leacocks is asking for to much. So, it is a welcome sign that the Cartoonist has come to our aid. If he is true to his job, in him, we shall find a valuable ally.

II. 'ISMS'

A Leader is inseparably related to an 'ISM'. As many leaders, as many 'ISMS'. For the 'ISM' supplies the philosophic banner and camouflage under which the leader fights. Where the people are educated, and trained in civic work and imbued with civic virtue, there no virulent 'ISMS' can flourish. But in India the tale is different. Most of the other countries have one or two 'ISMS' each ; Russia has Bolshevism, Germany has Nazism, Italy has Fascism, Japan has militant Nationalism, England has Imperialism, and America 'Pacificism. But India has some of these and a few others of indigenous varieties. Chief of these are Provincialism, Separatism, Sectarianism, and last but not the least, Communalism. And the motive force behind these 'ISMS' seems to be Egoism and its manifestation, Nepotism. It is indeed a sorry tale and I need not prolong it.

'INTERNATIONALISM'

But there is another 'ism' that is very much to the fore these days, and to which backward countries like India, are advised to subscribe, if not to submit whole-heartedly. This 'Ism' is Internationalism. Now, I have already admitted the necessity of an international outlook in these fast-moving and fast-inter-linking times. But an outlook is

one thing, and complete submergence quite another. The internationalism which India is asked to accept is an internationalism almost at the cost of national life. It is forgotten that true internationalism is only possible for economically developed and politically self-dependent units who voluntarily choose to co-operate for a common purpose. A country must have national consciousness and national development before it can have an international one. Otherwise it will only be dragged along at the heels of advanced countries : a supplier of raw materials to them and a purchaser of their manufactured goods.

Besides, in the case of India a national outlook is essential for another reason as well. And, this reason lies in the geo-political position of the country. In a recent lecture at Lahore, Dr. Cressey, of the State Department of U. S. A., pointed out how geo-political forces were working to divide Asia into five more or less, compact and distinct regions. These regions being 1. Russia, 2. China and Japan, 3. Indo-China, Thailand, Dutch East India and Burma, 4. India, 5. Afghanistan, Iran and Arabia. Each of these regions is separated from the others either, by high mountains, or, by desert barriers, and each of these regions has an ethnic, and a geographical unity. He also pointed out the further geographic fact of importance; that on account of barriers on land side, each of these regions looked outward and away from others, and that the chief means of communication between them was only by the longer sea-route. Thus each of these regions was bound to have a policy and a life considerably different and distinct from those of the rest. The policy could not but be a regional one, and as India was a region by herself, her policy must be an Indian and a national one.

Thus both the facts, first, that a true internationalism is only possible when the component units are all equally advanced as nations ; and second, that geo-political forces are impelling India to be a unit by herself, make it essential for India to adopt more a national policy than an international one, at least for the immediate present and as a preparatory step to sound fruitful internationalism. But, by this I do not imply that India should cut herself off from other countries, and live in isolation, but only this, that our chief and immediate effor must lie towards evolving a national outlook and a national policy.

To revert to the 'Isms'. It is up to the teachers of the Social Sciences, and above all of those of political Science to point out that needs of mankind are so varied, life so complex and detailed that no one 'Ism', even if it is a good one, can be a cure for all its troubles.

And further, that, neither by emotional appeals, nor by hate and envy, nor by appeals to selfish interests only, nor even by pure reason alone, can our ills be cured, our difficulties solved. Reason must be our guide but emotion must supply the dynamic urge. Hate we must, but only that which reason tells us is ignoble and mean. Self, we must cherish and preserve but it must be a social self. Yet, things around us are in such a hopeless chaos, the problems so confusing and stupendous that the boldest and the bravest may be stilled into inaction.

But there is no problem that cannot be tackled, no difficulty that determination cannot overcome. 'The word impossible is in the dictionary of fools', said Napoleon. There is a way out of our communal, sectional, racial, national and international problems. And the way is to split the problem into parts and to tackle each part. Let us not attempt world-wide reforms, let us not seek to convert whole nations. Let us approach the individuals. And let us approach each in his private conduct and behaviour. Converting singly, we may convert largely, whereas attempting largely we may fail even in a single case. This to my mind is the hopeful way.

It, therefore, becomes the duty of all teachers, and of Political Science to inculcate in their students and in the citizens, the spirit of scientific enquiry and the habit of doubt and questioning. Enquiry will show whether the so-called Leader is really a leader and is pointing to something worth attending to or not. Doubt and questioning will lead us to probe into his assertions and the claims of his 'Ism'. But to this spirit of enquiry and doubt and questioning must also be joined a dynamic idealism—an idealism that will ever seek to reach the true and the just.

These, then, are the public duties of the teachers of Political Science. On one side to train and educate the people into citizenship i. e., into social-living.

On the other side there is the duty of helping in framing good laws and in exposing machiavallian policies and unsocial pratices.

Both are noble tasks and well worthy of the teachers who take their work seriously.

But it may be objected that this is enlarging too much the scope of Political Science and the functions of its teachers.

I have no hesitation in admitting that the objection is well taken. Yet, and here I come back to where I began. I hold that no social science should be content with being a mere exposition of cause and effect. Every social science, by the very nature of its being social, should have an aim and purpose beyond itself. And I hold further, that aim and purpose should be a moral and a reliable one. This is not confusing Political Science with the politics of the market place, nor is it confusing it with Ethics. It is converting it from a sterile into a fertile subject. It is to yoke the partisan and hand-to-mouth policies of the politicians, to wider conceptions and nobler ideals. We have had too much narrow politics and too much politics without ethics.

That this widening of Political Science will mean a heavy burden on the teachers I also admit. But, can any one be an inspiring teacher of a social science, who is not deeply interested in the working out of social problems, who is not in touch with the people and the difficulties, who does not understand their needs, and who does not feel and work for them ?

At the same time, I realise fully well that all of us teachers cannot reach the heights, cannot become real path-finders and nobel leaders. The narrow domestic circumstances, the small pittances, the care of dependants, the deadening overwork, the monotony of hack-work, all these and many other carking worries number our bodies and harass our spirits. The stern call of duty is bound to go unheeded by many of us. Yet some, there must be, who occasionally lift their heavy-lidded eyes to gaze at the heights and a few, there must beparticularly among the younger generation, who attempt to scale them, footsore and weary though they be. These must help in achieving common effort for common cause, at home and abroad, i. e,, help in realising the twin ideals of national unity and international harmony. A unity and harmony 'beyond the turmoil of separations and divisions.'

PROF. S. V. PUNTEMBEKAR

7

SEARCH FOR A POLITICAL THEORY

(*The Seventh Conference held at Jaipur in January, 1945*)

Under the new conditions, segregation and partitions of the modern society cannot solve its problems, because it is plural, interdepending and interpenetrating in its social life, economic welfare and political security whose homeland is the world as a whole, and not congeries of fascist states, each constisting of fixed estates, each hostile to the rest. We shall have to give up our conception of individual and group freedom and then build up a world state, world church or world community which will be the sole authority and will give one law and order for mankind. Our society has to be more authoritarian and equalitarian in its terms and practice, though more liberal and liberatarian in its aims and theory. The primary aim of any political theory is to promote the integerating tendency against the disintegerating tendency present in a plural society. Thus political sense is oneness and we-ness, its purpose is to eliminate the basic causes of human conflict. An integerated society is inevitable.

Please, allow me to thank you sincerely for the great honour you have conferred on me by electing me as the President of this *Seventh Session* of the Indian Political Science Association. The responsibility which you have imposed on me is very great, especially in times when all political traditions and 'issue' have been thrown into the world war. It becomes our duty, therefore, to estimate, revalue and restate the fundamental forces and values on which our modern political theory rests and shapes itself.

Is there a crisis in political life and relations of the nations of the world today ? Will the old political theory cover the facts and forces of the new politics which is emerging out of this crisis, and will it be able to meet necessities and promote the desirabilities of

common human security and welfare. What are the trends in the development of the new political theory ? Does the state show any signs of of withering away or is it becoming more authoritarian and totalitarian. If in the first we have no need of any new political theory then we must perform its last funeral ceremony and bury it deep. If it is tightening up and expanding then we must face the danger of a universal dictatorship. *Politeia, Civitas, Quo vadis* ? This is the most important question for political scientists of today. I intend to put before you certain reflections and considerations in which I have tried to analyse its nature in the light of our available thought and historical experience.

New World.

There are at present new experiments being made in social reorganisation, economic planning and continental grouping on a larger scale. The human outlook is directed today to the building up of a new human society and better ways of human life and healthier relations of human groups. The notion of fixed political boundaries and small geographical areas is becoming quite untenable. The progress in means of communication and conveyance and in mobile and mechanical power have made them interdependent. Modern boundaries have become fluid and fluctuating not only strategically, but economically and culturally also. Modern regions have to consider the needs of social life and economic welfare along with those of political society under new conditions. Religious and racial sentiments of small holylands and homelands have become antique. The sovereign national state cannot now be regarded as the final stage in political evolution and as the final judge in political conflicts. We think in terms of continental regions and oceanic areas. The stupendous changes wroght by science, technology and critical thought require a corresponding development of our social sciences. In this crisis national empires and international league have failed to provide a way out for an active international unity and collective security, because their ideology and framework have been outstripped in various ways by the growth of greater social relations, human ideals and administrative functions. World peace cannot be secured if we organise it by what divides its new common life and aspirations. Our interdependence has now become all-pervasive and all-embracing and it must be so organised.

Modern Society.

Modern society is primarily a territorial society, based on neighbourhood ensuring a feeling of neighbourliness and a love of the territory it inhabits. It is organised for self-defence, justice and happy ways of life. It is a plural society, neither unitary in religion and culture nor in economic and political interests. It is an inter-dependent society and cannot be easily partitioned nor any cross-section of it be given the right of self-determination and independence. It is a historical society possessing and participating in certain common needs and ways of life and cherishing a love for its territorial culture. It is not only plural in its composition, but pluralistic in its institutions and beliefs.

Modern society is not a religiously or racially unitarian society. It is not also a feudal hierarchic society, where the rights of old conquering communities, the new claims of their defeated successors and the privileges of their princely orders are to be weighed and balanced in their own favour. It is a human society whose homeland as well as holy land is the whole world. Its citizens are to be world citizens. It must be protected under a scheme of world security. It must be developed under a plan of world social insurance and service. It does not visulise any economic autarky, political self-determinism, social exclusivism and intellectual isolationism. Sagregations and partitions cannot solve its problems because they are plural, interdependent and interpenetrating. Modern society is a harmony of diverse social processes and relations and varied associations and institutions. There is a great overlapping and looseness in its grouping and structure. The divergences of its races and climates, the physique and morals of its different peoples and the sense of superiority and inferiority amongst some of them make it primarily a plural society. Therefore its problem is not one of forcing them into separate unities or into an inseparable uniformity. It is a problem of enabling their common interests to be centrally guarded and their special interests to be functionally and locally secured.

Therefore in a plural society the problem is not one of majorities and minorities...the evil contribution of democracy...unless some of them are inhabiting excluded and isolated areas and are wedded to

certain rigid and sectarian ways of life and belief and addicted to medieval or tribal ideals. This classification into majorities and minorities does not correspond to the realities of their habitation in various parts of a country or its localities. On that basis no modern society or state can be organised or can last. It exists and acts for a number of constituent functions...political and economic and also for ministrant functions...educational, hygienic, social and ethical. They cannot be organised on a majority and minority basis. Only some religious practices and some cultural forms have to be given freedom of belief and practice. But they cannot become the dominating purposes and needs of our common life which has to be organised for our social welfare and our physical and intellectual development. In modern times every village has its minorities and majorities and they cannot be isolated or segregated into separate habitations. There are no permanent majorities and minorities in any country unless we apply sociologically false racial and religious interpretations to our history and society. Racially, religiously, economically, culturally and territorially, we are all a mixture of various blends and patterns in beliefs and institutions. We cannot physically and mentally separate from one another. Doctrines of modern nationalism and internationalism, democracy and socialism do not accept purity of races and religions. To them a nation is statically a concept of neighourhood and a feeling of neighbourliness, and dynamically a movement towards common human aspirations and cultural harmony.

Nationalism.

Should we then associate nationalism with the state ? Why not separate it from the state and neutralise or disestablish it like religion, so that it will not interfere with the organisation of government, and at the same time will not be interfered with by it.I should suggest that it should be *Cujus Regio ejus natio* not *enjus religio ejus regio aut natio.* For neutralising nationalism we must take away independent political power and self-seeking economic control from the nation and associate it with regional units of large size. Nation cannot make the state, but a state can make the nation. In a plural society this is the only practicable policy. We cannot permanently segregate and maintain minorities as distinct communities inside the state. They should be integrated politically and economically into the regional community to which they belong. There was no feeling of separate nationality

as such amongst the various peoples of a distinct territorial unit till late in the 19th century in Asia. Asiatic regional units, China and India, were large and were plural in social composition. They were civilisations and nations. The people who lived in these territorial states intermingled with one another in such proportions that each had some prospect of influencing others in some scattered areas and in some groups and functions, like military, economic, intellectual, vocational and religious. This was due to large scale encroachments and infiltrations at earlier periods when they settled down in these areas and performed certain functions and joined certain groups. In Frontier districts this encroachment, infiltration, settlement and adaptation took place as their strength was greater than elsewhere. But it did not change the character of the plural society and its morale and sentiments. There were no compact blocs or islands created consisting of any compact groups. Whether due to conquest or colonisation, conversion to other religions did not change fundamentally their character, outlook and culture.

External states from which foreign conquerors came did not identify interests with those of the conquered states. The conquerors themselves thought and acted in terms of territorial units they had conquered, and fought against the states from which they came. There were no foreign states with whom they could identify or wished to identify for political purposes. They might borrow ideas and systems, soldiers and servants but would not merge themselves in outside states. The dominating factor was political conquest, a building up of new states. The religious or racial motive was subordinate and subsidiary to giving strength to the newly created states. States were not built upon the basis of religion or race. The conquerors, immigrants, and converts freely associated themselves with their subjects, the natives and the non-converts.

The central fact in this plural society was the state and not nationalities, because there were none. The state however if it remained powerful and integrated for long like the Mughal State, set in forces of tolerance, equality of association and adjustment, or comprehension and harmony and finally of assimilation, brought about by necessities of territorial neighbourhood, economic life, cultural contact, social co-operation and political security. It gradually developed at the top a national consciousness and unity, and at the bottom economic co-operation and social give and take.

The state was creating a nation, and in historical sequence the state came before the nation. This nation to be strong and self-sufficing must be a state first which must be strong politically and self-sufficing economically. In such a plural society, exchange of populations, of rulers, of temples and religions, of merchants and artisans, of languages and codes, are impossible. You cannot crave a plural society into separate unit. It only multiplies problems from one to many. The process of partition will have to be carried out logically to every village, every caste or tribe, and even to every family. Majorities cannot expel, massacre or strangulate economically minorities, because they are completely interpenetrated into the life of the society. The theory of balance of power and of hostages amongst states cannot be applied to a plural society for justifying its vivi-section. It is a futile proposition.

State and Nation.

Therefore it becomes the duty of the state to make the new nation. In a plural society we want some autonomy from below. We cannot maintain local minorities or majorities permanently as distinct communities inside a state geographically and historically united and permanent. The conceptions of puritan states and societies and sacred territories and codes of life are positively reactionery in plural society and modern world. Why build these Chinese walls round your culture and economy. A puritan polity whose future is written out in the horoscope of a rigid past and which is being built up with the intellectual, moral and economic tools of by gone and discarded ages is an anachronism and has very little future, except a legacy of permanent warfare with the neighbours and its own final decline or collapse. We have instances of such a collapse in the 18th century. No state can exist which is polyarchic in its politics, plural in its social composition, pluralistic in its institutions, and puritan in its behaviour and association, unless it is strong territorially, self-sufficing economically, and well organised militarily and financially. In a plural society, the political class and social class are not and cannot be one. They have nothing to do with each other. A political class means the net-work of governors, officers, politicians, public servants and statesmen—the whole ruling class and bureaucracy—who in a given society control public bodies, offices and organisations. Such personnel is not recruited necessarily

from one single social or religious class. All governments are primarily governments by a political class which is always a minority in the country. The main significance of nationality today will therefore be in the cultural sphere and not in the political and economic sphere. In an era of planned and plural society, there cannot be economic monopolies and political isolationisms. The technological development and economic needs, social insurances and political security require a larger territorial union, a new cosmopolis to live in securely and happily. Politics of a plural society is politics of integration, not of disintegration.

A nation has primarily a political connotation. A modern nation requires a certain territorial size, economic self-sufficingness, and political organisation for security and welfare, below which no group can exist. For it, a certain closeness of contact and co-operation are necessary. The presence of a strong central organisation is also indispensable, and finally a love for the land which has economically fed it and historically developed it must be present, A nation is not a group of persons united by a common error as to their race and religion and a common hatred of their neighbours. A world Commonwealth as well as a plural society are endangered today by racial philosophies of purity and lebensraum, by religious internationals and animosities based on puritan conceptions of ways of life and on sacredness of groups, by socialist internationals of workers and their lands, and by demands of imperialists based on conquests and vested economic interests. The amount of resistance offered by them is very great and is a permanent danger to any world or regional social order.

Democracy.

Democracy under the influence of puritanism and communalism breaks up society into atoms and collects them again into mobs. We must avoid this atomism and mobocracy. Democratic conceptions have their limits in a modern industrial and mechanised complex and interplex society. Democratic political institutions were born of a simple pastoral and agricultural society. Their problems were few and simple. They did not cross the boundaries of small states. Our new needs and problems are international and require experts and common territorial planning. We must have leaders of superior type and of expert knowledge which a large country can alone afford. If world security, social insurance, and large planning are necessary

then conceptions of democracy and national sovereignty are to be modified. If we aim at the union of a plural society we should not represent sectional and sectarian wills in a responsible assembly. They foster divisions and delays and weaken common deliberation and unity of aims. We must organise them jointly for co-operative action. Then the machinery of the state will adapt itself to the new conditions and desirabilities. We must represent neighbourly and functional interests, as no political unit corresponds with any definite social, religious, cultural or economic unit, and as there are internal strains in every body politic.

Great Society.

Therefore accepting plural society as a characteristic of every regional units in modern times we have to evolve a progressive social and political order to meet our common needs. We do not, therefore, believe in any finality in its development. There is always a grand unfinish at the top of humanity. Its objectives and directives, its virtues of life change. Its experience and experiments give new pointer-readings in the development of social relations and processes. It is still perfecting the processes of the development of the highest type of human personality which should be the aim of any social process. Its organisation must be flexible and not legalistic. It must ensure peaceful adjustment in the light of changing conditions. We do not want Fascist states or Puritan States. All nationalisms based on puritanic, racial or religious theories have an inherent tendency to expand and encroach on their neighbour's territories and cultures for living space and cultural subjection. We cannot reduce the world to a congeries of fascist states, each consisting of fixed estates and each hostile to the rest. The world is too crowded, too complex and too plural for social, political or economic self-sufficiency to be any longer possible. We want autonomism, but not atomism. An integrated society is inevitable. Human life is moving and flowing over all the world. To fashion world's peoples into a world community, to prepare a grand plan for the Great Society to come and to shape itself should be our ideal. We now possess material and mental tools, and a growing human consciousness for its construction. International science, world economy, and human adventure are driving all the peoples into each other's homelands and holylands, and making the whole earth a sacred and single theatre of the drama of human life. We have now to build up this great compound of

our earth, where natural and human barriers are fast breaking and disappearing, into a one world community, a new mandom. In politics the days of small states are numbered. In economics there is an end of the economic man and the doctrine of *laissez faire*. In social ethics castes, clans and communal groups are discredited, and in religion the sectarian man is discarded.

Whatever little political theory there is in India comes from the west. We go to Mill for liberalism, to Mazzini for nationalism, to Marx for socialism, to Rousseau for revolutionism and where not. Their third rate avatars in India have not improved upon them and many a time merely misused them. They are merchants of old world goods and theories only brushed up and distorted for modern consumption. These followers of new 'isms' are offering their new Isms for the old ones. The other-worldyism of the past still remains, and new worldyism of the present is merely vociferated or sloganed by youths. Any political theory no doubt would begin with the formation and nature, form and classification of the State, but fundamentally it must look beyond the forms of government to the political processes, and behind the processes to the systems of ideas and relations which give the processes their character.

The aim of the 19th century political theory was to restrain the powers of the authority. This led to the creation of a political man, an economic man and a political nation. The aim of the 20th century is more to develop and to co-ordinate the social scope of authority which cannot be easily defined or divided in a plural society and which is seeking a cosmopolitan outlook. Thefore, it tends more towards merging groups in a larger organisation than defining their relations or partitioning their spheres or areas. It is a unitary and integrating process not a disintegrating method. We have also shifted our approach in political science from building general, abstract and absolute theories of the configurations of the state to relative, concrete and special theories of the dynamic processes and behaviour of the state.

Past Political Theory.

If we make a survey of the past political theory we find that the Greek thinkers identified the state with the society and subordinated the individual to it. They conceived the state and society as one, as

a unity and not a duality of the state against the individual, or of the state and the individual. The individual was fused and united with it. Their political approach was secular and worldly. No divine person or natural law entered into its make up, sanction and obligation. A man could be free only in society. Outside it he was only a beast or a barbarian. To the Greeks the state was natural and essential to man. It was prior to him. It came into existence to make life possible and continued to exist to make life good or virtuous.

In the Greek political thought there was a conception of unity and commonness, of absorption and assimilation, between the state and the individual. But in the Hellenistic and Christian political thought a split took place between the man and the state. It adovocated a theory of universal community and a law of nature or reason, or a law of God binding on men. But it did not conceive of one world state which would be subordinate to that law. It left men under the control of the state of which he was already a subject to the law of reason or God. They started two inquiries, one for what is good for man in this world, and the other for what would be good for him in the next or new world. Christ's utterance "Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's and render unto God what is God's" pithily sums up this attitude. There was to be no conflict with powers that be. He was to obey the state in purely secular matters. In other matters a Christian was free from the control of the state, but must follow the dictates of the Church. Christianity found man's *reason dietre* in the next rather than in this world and located his spiritual home in the city of God or Cosmopolis rather than in the worldly or city-state. Man's life was divided into two aspects, one secular, the other religious. Thus a distinction was made between the politics and ethics or religion. In this scheme of thought and outlook the Greek conception of the unity of life and thought was destroyed and a new dualistic conception arose. Man was not only secular but also spiritual. As an individual he was bound to the laws and customs of the state and community in secular matters, and to the laws and canons of the Church in religious matters. He was not free in both spheres. If he revolted, he became seditious and anti-social in one and sinful and unrighteous in the other.

There was no theory of human freedom or independent individual conscience possible in this scheme of thought and life. Divinity,

Christ and the Bible, and infallibility and supremacy of apostles and papal fathers were its central creeds. Human freedom was only possible under divine grace and man's pre-destination, and human salvation under papal dispensation and good Christian life.

In the paternal and imperial thought unity between the state and the individual was again restored by locating secular and religious authority in one person. The king or emperor was made divine and the supreme head of the Church and the state. Hence arose the divine right theories of kingship. The rulers inherited their whole authority from God and were responsible only to him. Thus there developed a theory of absolutism based on divine sanction. The kingly power was absolute, indivisible and irresponsible. It controlled all life, both secular and religious. There was no inherent freedom possessed by the individual or group. None had any right to resist authority. His duty was of passive obedience. In this scheme of thought morals and politics which were split up under Christian conceptions were again fused and united, and were brought under one control and direction.

But the liberal thought of the 18th and 19th centuries again created split in the unity of absolutist thought. To it sacred was the man and sacred was the society. This was its approch to politics. It believed that man should be partly free and partly controlled in other-regarding actions. It recognised some aspects of life as social and others as individual, but their line of demarcation was not definite and could not be permanently fixed. There was partly fusion of man and society, and partly their separation that is of ethics and politics. It accepted that both freedom and discipline were necessary for an individual. The state, though obnoxious, was necessary. It was a means to remove evil, to maintain peace and justice, to promote happiness and co-operation. The state was however nothing apart from the individuals who composed it and that it had no independent value except such as was realised in those conditions, physical, moral and mental in which individuals could develop their personalities and achieve such happiness as belongs to their natures. Thus Liberal political theory aimed at an end beyond itself, an end which was ethical. This end could be realised in an environment, social and physical, whose nature it was the purpose of politics to deal with and discover. Good life for the individual consisted in the pursuit of certain moral values. It was the duty of good society and

state to offer opportunities for the development of personality. Therefore the good of the man and the good of the state was interdependent. Human ends could be realised with the help of society. The society was also natural to man. Man was not anti-social but he was partly social, and partly individual.

The idealist thought closed this split and embodied again man in society. It did not think that man could be really free and lead a full life without society. To it the social will was the real will, the real will, the rational will or the general will which was true and just. Good life for man could not be realised apart from society. It again fused and interwove ethics and politics. It idealised and ldolised the state which was its own end. It was the ultimate end which had an absolute right against the individual.

In the socialist thought this unity of man and society is maintained. Man is primarily an economic animal. He is not free and independent by himself. He can be free and good in a particular system of society and pattern of polity. It emphasizes a particular socio-economic class system as desirable and necessary. Then it believes that the state having performed its historical task will wither away after a necessary but temporary dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the anarchist thought, the institutions of the State are considered naturally free and good when he lives out of social or state control, and where there is no state or ruler, no punishment or punisher. All are good or virtuous enough to protect and to respect one another voluntarily. Syndical anarchists have developed a theory of producers' control as against state control. It is a case or merging politics in economics. They are against the state.

In the Fascist thought, there is also unity. The state is considered absolute, sacred and total in comparison with which all groups and individuals are relative in importance and their interests are to be considered only in relation to the supremacy of the state. The individual and the group are subordinated to it and its force which are represented by its leader and his party.

Analysis of Political Theory.

An examination of all these types of thoughts leads us to ask the question : (1) is there a necessity for the state, ?

(2)What should be its relation to groups and individuals? and (3)Is man, group, environment or God the most important as the basic factor in political thought. If we regard the environment, physical and social as given more important then the problem becomes one of modifying and controlling his desires and behaviours. If we take man, as known, more important. then the problem is one of modifying and controlling the environment. The first gives rise to types of thought which are authoritarian and absolutist. The other gives rise to liberal and radical schools. If we assume a law of God or nature as fixed and inexorable known and supreme, then both the individual and state are to be subordinated to that law and its discipline and organisation. Thus to build up a new political theory our survey shows that we shall have to give up our conception of individual and group freedom and then build up a world church or world community which will be the sole authority and will give one law and order for mankind. Here authority of the State or Community will be idolised and freedom will be controlled. This would be a theory of statefulness,.....towards the state movement. Or we shall have to set aside the conception of the authority of the state and idolise the individual and group freedom where there would be no state, but an ideal condition of anarchy, This would be a theory of statelessness...away-from-the state movement. Or we can ignore the unknown force in history...internal and external...and believe in a definite law of historical causation and development and thus help in the creation of a stable political theory by its automatism. Or we can ignore human consciousness and individual reason and intermingle man and nature in a new materialism or vitalism which would ignore individual mind and soul and thus create a material man for the political theory. Thus we can build a stable political theory on a hypothesis of statefulness or statelessness, or of one type of historical law or of one type of material man. But we cannot build it on the liberal hypothesis of accepting both the freedom of man and the authority of the state, that is, partly state and partly no-state. This is the theory of state-limitedness. Statefulness ignores freedom and statelessness ignores authority, and therefore no conflict between authority (control) and freedom (loyalty) is possible or contemplated. When we contemplate government as essential, rational and good, then no individual freedom is necessary and no limits on government are required in the interest of individual rights. When we contemplate that man's behaviour is rational and good and is a regular habit

with him or is ingrained in him, then no authority for any control is necessary and no limits on man's behaviour are required. There can be peace, security and good-will without the presence of any restraint, and free association of free individuals will not disturb social harmony and welfare. Both these schools do not assume elements in environment or man's life which would disturb their theories of politics. Difficulty arises only when dual, concurrent, or competing authorities and dual, equal or rival freedoms based on the different needs and developments of the society, the group and the individual, or God, Caesar and man, are contemplated and their spheres of control and freedom cannot be completely demarcated. But to build political theory either by idolising the state authority and its moral purpose and then destroying individual freedom, or idealising the individual and his inherent goodness and freedom, and then destroying the state authority will not help us in formulating a new political theory to cover the facts and forces of our contemporary life. Their psychology and sociology are wrong.

New Turn in Political Theory.

Since the last war political theory has taken an international turn. It has become more humanistic and less realistic. It wants to transcend conflicts...not merely to adjust them between different nations. It has begun to preach ideals of international government, world peace, mutual assistance and arbitraion and justice. It, therefore, discusses the methods of organisation and the ideals of an international state or world order and tries to adjust with or weave into it national theories of various types. Christians, liberals, imperialists, socialists and humanitarians are all doing it with an ideological vehemence justified in those who hold bigotted opinions. Though their aim is a world state, their outlook and methods of its organisation are different. Some are for unitary, some for federal, some for imperial, some for unitary, some for federal, some for functional and some for regional solutions. Some want a full dominating state, some are for temporary and transitional one party dictatorship, some for some sort of an effectual judicial league of nations, some for a new securtiy council of united victorious nations and for continental councils and imperial common-wealths, others for the abolition of any type of political control altogether. All such theories of world order and politics are saturated with conflicting economic interests and political ideas, racial and religious, fanaticisms

and forms of organisation and conceptions of moral justice. There are idealists, absolutists, democrates, utopians and anarchists amongst them. They hardly agree amongst themselves upon the fundamentals of the nature of man, the character of society, the force of environment, and the course of historical development. But with all their political sloganing, scheming and revolutionising, they could not create the conditions fundamentally necessary for the establishment of an international community, without which an international government was impossible. People still thought nationally or imperially. The present war was necessary to change the national sentiment into an international outlook, to create an international force to dominate national forces, to prefer world co-operation and security to national independence and isolation. It is transcending narrow national conceptions and is dominated by ideas and forces of a humanitarianism of a new world order. It may result in establishing a common authority for mankind. If that goal is at all realised, then the new political theory for organising the life of mankind as a whole would be possible.

What lines of theorising and principles of organisation would it assume can only be approximately stated by a study of worldly and revolutionary political philosophers. One school is absolutist which leads to the idolisation of the state. The second is anarchistic which advocates the abolition of the state or its automatic withering away after a proletarian revolution. The third is liberal which advocates gradual reform and reconstruction of a new world. The first wants a permanent omnipotent state to reform and teach, to control and punish the individual. The other wants a transitional dictatorial state to remove the evils created by old class state. The third wants a positive democratic state to remove existing evils, to reform the individual, but not to dominate all aspects of human life, and to provide conditions and institutions for individual freedom and social security and welfare. All these schools are proposing federations, unions, regional councils, continental and oceanic orders or imperial dominions and commonwealths for establishing world government.

New Political Theory.

The present difficulty in formulating political theory on old lines is the new emphasis on world authority in which regional functions

and group and individual relations are to be adjusted. The politics of the new world order cannot think in terms of freedom so much as in terms of world unity and security. It has to be to more authoritarian and equalitarian in tone and practice, though more liberal and liberatarian in its aims and theory. The new political theory should have primarily human purpose. Its aim should be to decrease the racial, religious, economic, social and political tensions lingering in the human world and to build mental respect for different ways of life and to make people understand one another's needs of life. It cannot approve any pattern or form of institutions and laws which contemplate only uniform and unitary standards. It will have to approach the problem of human security, welfare and relations from neighbouring and economic points of view, and organise her structure of institutions from regional and fuctional points of view. No doubt the age of racial, religious and feudal myths and loyalties is not yet over. But these myths and loyalties have no value in a modern territorial society. If our society cannot solve the problems of its own security and welfare as a whole on human grounds it will decline and perish. Therefore any scientific political theory must postulate a human purpose. All political ideals and functions must receive a social content and must promote social service and social insurance of man in his struggle against want, disease, ignorance, idleness and squalour and guarantee him a social minima of human life and welfare. Our new state is both a world security and a social insurance service state. But no new political theory can be evolved if the old empires like England, France, Belgium and Holland are going to remain as they are, or if new territorial divisions and acquisitions are to be made on the old basis but under new names of so-called partnerships and trusteeships, security councils and imperial commonwealths, and if new radical rehabilitation of the structure on the basis of common security, common equality and common co-operation does not take place, that is, if new collective and democratic authority is not created, and if new common public service or agency is not organised. Any new political theory expects, firstly, the creation of a common one-world authority and citizenship, and a neutral agency of administrative experts in matters of world security and welfare. Secondly, it contemplates a rearrangement of the world political structure into large regional units of territorial contiguity, historical connection and cultural bond, but links them up for purposes of world security and welfare. Such territorial units cannot be based on old conquests and imperial startegies. The problems of world security and

welfare will be problems common to all, not more important only to one group and less important to another. There will be no particular regions and areas, routes and canals, roads and rivers, seas and lakes of any special interest to any particular power because she possesses or is otherwise linked up with some territory at the other end of the world. This control or interference over all those and other far off places must be surrendered to the regional or world authority as the needs may be. These possessions and claims based on old conquests or colonisations or conversions are all the root causes of international rivalries and wars. Thirdly, the agents or servants of the new world order who will carry on the functions of society, peace and welfare must be internationalised and common and independently recruited. If this fundamental basis of organisation is accepted, and if the political independence and economic activity are interrelated to the needs of world security and welfare, there will be no cause for any objection and opposition. But if in the name of world security and world welfare certain great powers of to-day who are successful in this war divide the conquered world amongst themselves, retain their old conquests and possessions, and secure military and financial control in the name of the new Security Council of the world, and do not surrender old rights and liquidate their vested interests based on political conquests and financial power, and administer them whether jointly, continentally or separately, then the need of and force behind the new political theory will disappear. Old imperial or fascist theories will suffice to cover the new disguises assumed in the name of the world order. In the new political theory, security will become internationalised, unity territorialised, welfare socialised,independence autonomised, liberty functionalised, citizenship centralised, authority co-ordinated, functions commissioned, structure federalised, religion neutralised, and cultures harmonised. This will lead to the study and analysis of the problems of the content of security and authority, the fundamentals of unity and the size of the territory or region, the conception of welfare, the nature of independence and the quality of liberty, and in general the nature and functions of the new state, the internal relations of social and political bodies, organs and services.

Old and New Theory.

The old political theory dealt with a world in which the world community was divided into a plurality of sovereignties whose relations with one another were not related by any effective international law, and into a plurality of rights which were not

equalised or integrated by a common citizenship. There was no effective world authority. Since these sovereignties lived with one another in a state of armed camps in which public life was potentially a war of each against all, politics assumed the form of power politics in an international anarchy. Today, the age of Machiavelli and Grotius, Hobbes and Hegel is gone. It is the age of Wilson and Wilkie, Gandhi and Wells. The new theory must recognise world sovereignty. There are only two ways of achieving it, either through force subjugating all to one authority, or through peaceful means by voluntary international federation. One is an imperialist method. The other is a democratic process. We can only accept the latter. We want a world commonwealth, some kind of directing Super-State, an Ober State, a Civitas Maxima, a Respublica Humana. It will be a real Platonic search for world justice and a world republic (Cosmopolitea). A complete international government, as Bertrand Russel says, with legislature, executive and judiciary, and a monopoly of armed force is the most essential condition of world security, and group and individual liberty in a technically scientific world, or as Laski says "a world of competing nation-states, each of which is a law unto itself produces a civilisation incapable of survival." Therefore the nation-state must be considered as a mere province in a world community. For neutralising the desire for self-determination and new political partitions into small units, and for generating a process towards larger regional integration, we must transfer control over economic wealth and political power to the new world security organisation. We should have a uniarchy not a polyarchy in defence and security matters. The power of mischief and aggression by nations should be taken away. The nation is not a permanent unit of human society, possessing absolute values of its own. It is the political unit of a stage of civilisation which has passed through stages of a blood clan, a feudal estate, a church a territorial state, an ideological international, and now a world Commonwealth

Criticism of Fascist and Socialist Theories.

Some theories which are the left-overs or legacies of the 19th century have vitiated our political thought and practice. They think in terms of history as a story of racial, religious or class struggles. They want you to join one side or the other in their schemes of world reconstruction. As a result we must give up our old territorial frontiers and accept new racial, religious or class-frontiers in every country, unite in a war against other groups and thus create civil and

foreign wars till success is attained by their group and the world is dominated by their pattern of socio-political theory and ways of life when the world reaches that end. The school of Fascists advocates the complete dominance of the state for all times. The school of Socialists believes that the state will wither away. One is too despotic the other is too utopian, to be accepted. Both will therefore be of very little political value. Some neo-marxists and psudo-marxists assert that politics is a definite science which gives a set of fundamental laws governing the behaviour of human beings organised in society. They also believe in some constants and some standards of human beings organised in society. They also believe in some constants and some standards of human behaviour. To them science and philosophy are one and the same thing. They believe that the world is full of regular happenings, which are not caused by any human being. Human history also proves the existence of such a law of dialectical materialism according to their interpretation. On this they build a definite unlinear course and stages of history through which all human life has passed and must pass. The law and stages of development are definite and determined. On the basis of these they propound their theory of the origin of family and the propety, state and slavery, the rich and the poor, the owner and the worker, the landlord and the peasant, the capitalist and the wage-earner, and the course of their development. In history they choose only common repeatable facts and wanted facts and ignore unique, unrepeatable and unwanted facts and persons. They neglect the tole of man, the spirit of the age, spiritual or religious ideals, artistic inspirations, all which they subordirate to or derive from economic facts, forces and relations amongst classes. They paint the character of all institutions on the basis of class exploitation and warfare. They talk too much of objectivity when it is itself a projection and aspect of subjectivity, trying to visualise the environmental world. They talk too much of revolution and its technique when human life is primarily and historically a flow and fluctuation. To them human mind is nothing but the function of a physical entity entitled brain. Therefore the problems of politics are to be approached as scientific problems, noting the laws governing human life. They conclude that man is an economic man, that the master social science is the economic science which is the father of and includes all other social sciences such as history, politics, sociology, psychology, jurisprudence and ethics, that there is one inexorable law of dialectical materialism which is at the root of all social formations and relations and a key

to all changes, that there is only one historical necessity and that is the economic necessity, that there is one determining factor and that is the economic factor, and that there are fixed historical stages in all social formations based on and determined by this primary factor. They do not recognise any contingent or individual factors. This monocled vision, and monistic interpretation and outlook covering all knowledge of nature and man in the sphere of social sciences is the greatest heresy of the 20th century, when scientists believe in a pluralistic world, its indeterminate tone, and its multilineal historical development and future possibilities. No historian, anthropologist and sociologist of note now accepts Morgan's and Engel's theories of the origin and nature of family, property and state, and their stages of development. Even the economic forces and tendencies are in the last analysis mental forces, desires, strivings and seekings, all springing from the hidden main-springs of men, their loves and hates. We may ask, if economic conditions and forces are not merely conditioning factors but determine men's ethics and politics, how is the result accomplished ? Do men think only economically ? What place has economic thought or reason in guiding men's social behaviour ? Is man primarily economic ? If so, why do men as individuals or in groups miss their own real economic interest ? Why do they so easily move in crowds and follow demagogues carried away by a blind impulse ? Why are communal and national groups, and public crowds so tenaciously sentimental and anti-intellectual even when their policy and behaviour are suicidal or against their own or even historical economic trends ? Are not essential determining factors in their case, their human passions and attachments, their ideal aspirations and non-economic interests ? Economics now cannot hold merely to the hypothesis of an economie man and a determining economic factor. It must take into consideration all aspects of human motives and aspirations and also deal with social values which determine economic choice. Political thought must penetrate and analyse every aspect of communal life as a whole and cannot take the economic factor as the only determining and dominant factor in all social life.

Synthetic Approach.

There cannot be any divorce between politics and other social sciences such as ethics, psychology and sociology. Economics is not the only or unitary science of social life. Men have their loves and

hates, their personal and group loyalties and family affections, their patriotisms and historical instincts and values of social life, their ideals and aspirations, their passion for liberty, equality and brotherhood. Marx and his philosophy belong to the economic period of political science. His main doctrine is that every man pursues the economic interests of his class, that history is a story of class conflicts, and if there is only one class left after a revolution that is the worker's class, every man will pursue the general interest, other classes being liquidated in that revolution. This doctrine has failed in a number of countries. He endows the society as such a mystical one-ness and regards individuals as unreal abstractions. His unilinear vision and dialectical determinism are too rigid for the interpretation of the course of history and modern tendencies of human life.

There are three fundamentals in a study of any social science...(1) the individuality, the peculiar nature of man, (2) sociality...the nature and quality of human social life, and (3) the objectivity...the nature and pressure of environment, material and mental. But the problem becomes difficult when we want to know what fundamentals are more important and what their qualitative relations in a particular phase of human life are. The primary aim of any political theory is to promote the integrating tendency against the disintegrating tendency present in a plural society. The state is the bond of the territory, not of blood or religions. Political sense is a sense of one-ness and we-ness. It emphasises unity, not diversity. It exists to furnish the unnecessary guidance, restraint and frame-work to prevent the confiict of interests and to promote common welfare. The government becomes the agency of the adjustment of their claims and aims with those of other groups. We must also note that there are two currents in modern times, one is that of socialisation of a number of functions and an integration of neighbouring regions by means of improved communications and contacts. This leads to a unification of social policies, an adjustment of economic needs, a contact of peoples and a balancing of group cultures. The other is the reaction and revolt of the individual and the group against economic exploitation and moral regimentation. Both are desirable currents. We must not lose sight of the one in the interests of the other in this socialising or regimenting process.

Aim of the New Political Theory.

The new political theory proposes to eliminate the basic causes

of human confiict in the shape of protective agencies, bodies and measures, and in shape of welfare policies, plans, and services, in the shape of educational ideals for creating a common human outlook, and in the shape of social minima and insurances for raising up the standard of human life. Thus, it will start with the conception of a *new State*, revealed in the light of modern needs, as the central point of its speculation. The nucleus of this theory will be humanity and humanitarianism, not individualism, or socialism, nor race, religion or class. It will be primarily interested in achieving social security and justice and in removing social mal-adjustments and moral lags at home, and assuring political security in the world. It will therefore analyse the mutual influence of political institutions, economic facts, and psychological behaviour the social life of groups and their functions. The conflict today is not really between ideas of nation, race, religion, culture, group or class. The real issue is between *realism* of those who believe that outer conditions and forces as they have perceived in history must dicate our socio-economic and political organisation, and *humanitarianism* of those who hold that inner human values as perceived by great men and proved in history must be developed until they can take shape as new facts and qualities in social activities and relations throughout the world of practical life. We have quite a large number of proposals based on the accute differences between these realists and humanitarians. The realist may be apparently right in maintaining that the individual by himself is nothing and cannot think and maintain himself in isolation and independently. But he is wrong in denying that the mind of mau possesses initiative and inspiration from within and is an essential factor in the growth of every civilisation. The humanist is right in saying that the individual is the creater of values and promoter of inventions, and possesses inspiring qualities and aspiring ideals. It is his welfare that is mainly sought, and no organisation should sacrifice his individual abilities and power for any scheme of social idealism and automatism. We have not only to render upto the state what is the state's and to render upto the society what is the society's, but also to render into man what is man's. There is to be no surrender in the process of rendering to the other two. Of course the humanist would be wrong if he were to believe that there is nothing besides or outside the individual and everything which guides his life is inside him.

Its Nature.

Modern political theory is pragmatic, not dogmatic. It bases itself on the verdict of experience and needs of social life as it evolves. It takes into account facts and forces and practices of contemporary peoples. It does not appeal to religion or abstract reason. It takes facts of human nature, human sentiments and emotions into consideration, and utilises acts of human behaviour, human relations and functions, human associations and institutions. The direction in which political thought is moving to-day is not purely idealistic where both authority and freedom are co-ordinated and made interdependent and functional. New political theory will have to be approached from two directions : (1) Starting with the assured social minima to be assured to individuals and social functions to groups, it will lay down conditions for the rightful exercise of coercive power of the state which is necessary to make them possible and real. (2) Assuming the social purpose and control of the state it will lay down conditions for exercise of individual rights and group functions which are necessary for good human life. As both are necessary none could be eliminated or surrendered. In this liberal conception of politics man is not purely a social functionary but a social entity, and society is not a single centrelised entity or group in which all lesser groupings or individuals are assigned a definite but subordinate function and status...the aim of the new political theory should be to study and point out the objective conditions and subjective qualities necessary for social security and justice. How can social insurance and welfare be maintained, taking into consideration the contemporary facts of human life and circumstance ? It would primarily be a search for assuring conditions of the one and insuring the qualities of the other. As regards the extent of political authority, social sciences look upon the state as only one specialised agency in society, doing that work. It is not considered an omnicompetent and omnipotent authority. Its only purpose is to make an adjustment of social behaviours in a plural society for common good and welfare and ensure general order and obedience to a rule of law.

Thus Sociology looks upon the state as one organ and agency without the society for enforcing uniformity of behaviour and maintaining order according to social laws. But that does not solve the intricate problems of political theory. It asks in what kind of society can the ideals of freedon and fellowship, unity or security will be realised together. It wants to find out a Modus Vivendi between

law and liberty, order and progress, authority and conscience, community, group and individual. The state exists to provide the necessary process for this reconciliation and restraint of the conflicting interests and to insure that this process will be a beneficial and not a destructive process.

Its Function.

The state is the indispensable umpire, and regulator of social struggles and of the adjustment of the social process towards social harmony and security, peaceable change and prosperity. It is thus the dominant supervisory power in the social process of group conflict. The actual process of government is one of advancing or adjusting group interests. It develops an organisational trend towards world unity, an adjustment trend towards social harmony, and ideological trend towards human fellowship. The majority of sociologists view the national state as but a temporary stage in the evolution of political life, and look forward to the gradual evolution of world state through loose but large regional federations.

The new political theory will have two aspects, one a world political theory, and the other a state political theory in which the state conception is new and revalued. A new world order is struggling to born and therefore, is has to provide for it a philosophical basis on geographical, psychological, sociological, economic, historical and ethical considerations. Thus there is a world aspect and a regional aspect to it. How will the world be organised for common functions and how will it be redivided and reorganised after the war for regional purpose ? What will be the changes necessary in our social, ethical and economic outlook and relations to give the new order a sound foundation ? Who will be the agents and trustees of this new world and new state that we propose ? If the world authority were really established, then there would be no problem of external independence and aggression, security and equality, to be considered by us. All the territorial units, groups, and blocs will become parts of a world security order. Then there would be only problems of adjustment of functions, the settlement of relations between the larger and the smaller units, and the preservation of internal peace and the promotion of justice and welfare within the units. In short, the political problem will be intra-statal (within the state), not interstatal (between states). It will also be to a certain extent supra-statal (Super-State). Thus the political theory will be supra-statal

and intra-statal.

The first characteristic of our new political society will be its non-sovereign statehood. Already small states and weak states have lost their sovereign character and seek alliances and understandings with large states. Then why should not large and powerful states be reduced to a non-sovereign position when a world security council will be established ? They will get their own security and will not endanger that of others. In order to achieve this any world organization must take over and co-ordinate certain common and important activities hitherto controlled by the national state. It should spread in the beginning a net of international activities and agencies over existing political units from the top and thus make international government coextensive with international activities. Then it must co-ordinate common regional or ideological activities and organise them for common functional purposes from below amongst existing political groups. The very aim of political process is to make it possible for people with different views and sentiments who are geographically interspersed, economically independent and historically interconnected to live and work together for common ends. The whole trend of modern political process is to organise government along lines of specific ends and needs according to the conditions of the time and place, in lieu of old organisations on the basis of a division of jurisdictions, rights and powers. This may be seen in the numerous expert commissions and committees, national and international, which are not functional organisations whose work is allotted and expanded according to experiences and growing needs. They develop certain principles, conventions and procedure for work. This method will help in the growth of international government. We must not fall into the vicious dilemma of believing that we cannot have an international society until all the peoples are free, and that the peoples cannot be free until we have an international society. This functional and regional organisation will help the growth of common outlook and activities, common habits and common administrative agencies for the common needs. War-time experience shows that joint commissions and agencies between united nations and allies can perform definite purposes, possessing functional structures. Such an international functional system can develop even without a general political authority. In relation to the new regional state which we conceive, it shall have to deal with its desirable size and structure, its functions, and its relations to local bodies and international groups and to a central organisation for collective security

and welfare. Its old foundations of sovereignty, rigid political boundaries, economic autharchy, social exclusivism, group ethics and hard phsychology will all have to be considerably modified or discarded. The regional state will primarily be the social organ for the evaluation of various social interests and settling their relations and functions. Thus in a regional unit the political theory will take a new turn and content and a new interpretation and outlook. Its positive value, however, remains, promoting co-operation and welfare. The new conception repudiates the absolutist conception of subordinating the individual or group completely to the society or the state. It insists upon the preservation of individual and group liberty as an essential factor in civilisation. We do not think that the state will wither away as a co-ordinating or controlling or adjusting agency. We do not think it can be eliminated by any force or method of organisation. It will be there to lay down general policies, to pr o mote common welfare and to administer useful functions.

Today, societies are organised for some sort of liberty, equality and fellowship in national affairs, but not in international affairs. Our political theory must therefore establish harmony between humanity and the political institutions and groups which will make possible its existence and promote its good. We must develop our spirit of neighbourliness along with our desire of liberty and equality, which are all interdependent for the purpose of their realisation. These conceptions are not absolute by themselves, but relative in value. Liberty of a group means that within each type the requisite co-ordination should be possible without the destruction of the general ends of the whole community. Law of any given society is the expression of the social forces driving it. We cannot explain its substance or its working without regard to those forces. It must, however, embody the general ends of happiness and trends of welfare of that society in relation to contemporary needs and aspirations of human life.

———

ROFESSOR M. VENKATRANGAIYA

8

A CASE FOR INDIAN INDEPENDENCE

(*The Eighth Conference held at Annamalai Nagar in December, 1945*)

The Indian political and the constitutional deadlock, needing as it does an immediate and honest consideration, is an issue on which stands the future of the sub-continent, and sooner it is resolved, better it is. British Government is the connecting link between the parties and therefore in her hands lies the key to the solution. The political principles on which Britain will base its future policy towards India, and the nature and procedure of the constitution making body will largely shape the course of events. The treaty which Britain will make with the Constituent Assembly must provide for complete independence for India as this alone will satisfy the politically conscious people of India at the moment, otherwise the deadlock is likely to continue. The Declaration of August, 1940 and what is contained in the Cripps proposals sets a limit to the extent of power to be transferred is as such inadequate. Safeguards as provided in the Government of India Act, 1935 must go and England's self assumed responsibility must be considered as safeguard of imperial interests. India must get independence and she must be regarded as a Nation, The Britishers must stop flirting with the theory of trusteeship. India can defend herself and when Britain thinks otherwise, it betrays their lack of commonsense or tarnished honesty. The conflict between the theory of trusteeship and India's inherent right to freedom must be resolved as a realistic solution to the constitutional deadlock. Basic to the constitutional issue is the humanist conception of the state and not the communalist. The tyrany of the majority is a mere myth. We wish to build a democratic state in free India and the essence of the democratic approach is to treat every man essentially as a man-an individual.

I

Addressing a meeting of the Indian Council of World Affairs more than a year ago, Sir Maurice Gwyer observed : "The deadlock in India is unhappily a fact. It has lasted now for a long time and the longer it lasts the more difficult it will be to resolve." Subsequent experience has confirmed the truth of this observation. So far no success has been achieved in finding a way out of it. It is therefore worthwhile to reflect a little on its real nature and on the issues involved in it before proceeding to suggest any solution or solutions.

THE TWO ISSUES

There are two issues involved in the deadlock. One is the political and the other the constitutional. The political issue is in the main the issue between Britain and India and, therefore has an external element in it. It is concerned with the transfer of the reality of power from British into Indian hands. A Treaty is rightly regarded as the proper instrument for settling it. The constitutional issue is not only one between Britain and India but also one between the different groups of politically conscious people in the country and between the different political organisations claiming to represent them. It is, therefore, an internal issue also to a considerable extent. A constitution to be framed by a constitution-making body specially set up for this purpose in India is considered to be the appropriate instrument for settling it.

It is not, however, meant that a clear-cut and rigid distinction can be made between the two issues and that they can be studied in isolation. For there is in them a good deal of inter-connection. The solution of the constitutional problem depends on the solution of the political and *vice-versa.* It is only for purpose of analysis and for obtaining a clearer understanding of situation that the separation is useful and is intended.

Between the two issues there are connecting links. One of them is the British Government. It holds in a sense the key to the solution of both the issues. The other is the constitution-making body. As things stand to-day, it is with this body that Britain proposes to negotiate the Treaty which will determine the future relations between the two countries and it is also the body which will frame the future constitution of India. The political principles on which Britain will base its future policy towards India, and the nature, powers and procedure of the constitution-making body will largely shape the course of events. On these depend the early solution of the deadlock.

Political Issue More Fundamental.

In current discussions the view is held by many that the constitutional issue is the more fundamental of the two. But it is not really so. It is true of course, that there are more complications involved in the settlement of the constitutional issue ; but most of them are on points of detail. The present deadlock is to a large extent the outcome of a lack of complete agreement as yet between Britain and India on the question of the nature and amount of power that should be transferred into Indian hands. It cannot, therefore, be solved unless the proposed Treaty is satisfactory from the point of view of India. It is on the Treaty that the political chracter and status of future India will depend—whether India will become fully independent and sovereign, as independence and sovereignty are ordinarily understood in the contemporary world, whether she will be a Dominion in British Common Wealth of Nations, or occupy a position somewhere between a Dependency and a Dominion. It should not be forgotten in this connection that there are large numbers among the politically conscious people of the country whose objective is complete independence, and, unless the Treaty comes very near to satisfying their aspirations, the deadlock is likely to continue.

Moreover, a new constitution is required only when there is a real change in power-relationship within a state. As observed by Professor Lindsay : "Most states have constitutions. Change in these constitutions is a change in the theory of the State." The constitution merely creates the machinery and the general frame-work required to give effect to the new power-relationship and to the theory of the State. The urge therefore to frame a new constitution for India will arise only when it is clear what the nature and amount of the political power are for the exercise of which a new constitution is needed.

All these go to show that a relatively greater importance is to be attached to the political issue.

The Power to be Transferred.

On the nature and extent of the power to be transferred from British into Indian hands, information is available in two of the important official pronouncements on the subject. In the August Declaration of 1940, occurs the following statement : "There has been very strong insistence that the framing of that scheme (A new

constitutional scheme for India) should be primarily the responsibility of the Indians themselves.....His Majesty's Government are in sympathy with that desire, and wish to see it given the fullest practical expression, subject to the due fulfilment of the obligations which Great Britain's long connection with India has imposed upon her and for which His Majesty's Government cannot divest themselves of responsibility." It is these obligations that set a limit to the amount of power to be transferred.

The same view is expressed in the Cripps proposals. They contain the following clause : "His Majesty's Government undertake to accept and implement forthwith the constitution so framed (by a constitution -making body), subject only to the signing of a treaty which shall be negotiated between His Majesty's Government and the constitution-making body. This Treaty will cover all necessary matters arising out of the complete transfer of responsibility from British to Indian hands ; it will make provision in accordance with undertaking given by his Majesty's Government for the protection of racial and religious minorities...Whether or not an Indian State elects to adhere to the constitution, it will be necessary to negotiate a revision of its treaty-arrangements so for as this may be required in the new situation". From this also it is clear that certain obligations resting on the British Government are to set a limit to the nature of the power to be transferred.

Limitations to that Power.

What precisely will be the nature of the limitations to the power that the British will transfer into Indian hands is no where indicated in detail. It has not so far been elaborately explained in any of the official pronouncements. But it may be assumed—and the arguments proceed here on the basis of that assumption—that they will be more or less of the same character, as the safeguards for which provision was made in the Government of India Act, 1935. For it was to enable the British Government to discharge its obligations in respect of certain sections of the people and certain matters—obligations which could not be left in the hands of an Indian Government—that the clauses regarding the safeguards were introduced into that Act. And the reasons for retaining them are in the opinion of the British as valid in general to-day as in 1935.

The Need For Limitation.

The exposition of the need for the British to retain obligations

and the provisions to be made in respect of them in any settlement of the political issue is to be found in the chapter on "The Need for Safeguards," in Volum II of the Report of the Simon Commission, while an earlier exposition of it is found in the chapter on "The Conditions of the Indian problem" in Montagu-Chelmsford Report. It will not be out of place if a few extracts from the Simon Commission Report are given here. The Report observes : "The last principle which we would lay down is the paramount necessity of securing that throughout the period during which India is progressing on the road to complete self-government, there must be full provision made for the maintenance and efficiency of the fundamentals of government. However much we may subscribe to the doctrine that good Government is no substitue for self-government, we must ensure that we do not put forward proposals that will permit of Government being replaced by anarchy."

The root therefore that lies at the need for providing safeguards is that complete self-government or complete transfer of power into Indian hands would lead to anarchy. It is to prevent this that certain powers should continue to be retained by the British. And these powers are analysed in the report under certain heads.

(1) "It is an absolute condition for the development of self-government in India that the gateway (of the North West) should be safely held. The Army in India must be strong enough for its task. We hold that far many years, the presence of British troops, and British officers serving in Indian regiments will be essential.

(2) "If the external menace to India's peaceful development is serious, the possibilities of internal disturbances are no less grave. It must be borne in mind that the period during which India has been free from civil strife have been few and of short duration..... The danger of disorder in India is ever present...While we are prepared to recommend a considerable advance towards self-government and while we believe that a sense of responsibility can only be taught by making men responsible for the effects of their own actions we desire to secure that experience is not bought too dearly. There must be in India a power which can step in and save the situation before it is too late.....The Governor-General or the Governor, as the case may be, must be armed with full and ample powers.

(3) "India is a land of minorities. The spirit of toleration which is only slowly making its way in Western Europe, has made

little progress in India. Members of minority communities have unfortunately only too much reason to fear that their rights and interests will be disregarded. The failure to realise that the success of a democratic system of Government depends on the majority securing the acquiescence of the minority is one of the greatest stumbling blocks in the way of rapid progress towards self-government in India.....Until the spirit of tolerance is more widespread in India and until there is evidence that minorities are prepared to trust the sense of justice of the majority, we feel that there is indeed need for safeguards. But we consider that the only practical means of protecting the weaker or less numerous elements in the population is by the retention of an impartial power, residing in the Governor-General or Governors of Provinces, to be exercised for this purpose."

No commentary is required on these views expressed by the Simon Commission. They may be taken as justifying the need for His Majesty's Government proposing to retain even now the obligations referred to in the August Declaration of 1940, and the Cripps Proposals of 1942. There might be a modification in the technique of machinery to be devised for effectively discharging these obligations, but as to the need for keeping in hand all the powers essential for the purpose of discharging them there cannot be any modification. In regard to defence and the interests of minorities the situation to-day has not undergone any fundamental change for the better from what it was when the Simon Cammission reported.

If at all there is a change, it is for the worse. The Second World War has increased the importance of the security and defence of India in the wider context of the security of the countries bordering on the Indian Ocean and the South West Pacific. The danger now is not only in the North West but also in the North East and the East. India's defence has become a sort of World problem. In addition to this, it is the view of the British that the communal tension has been on the increase and the suspicion of the minorities towards the majority community has grown in intensity. Under these circumstances, it is the firm conviction of the British Government that they cannot transfer to an Indian Government the responsibility for the defence of India and for the protection of the minorities. The only modification that can be made is in the field of internal security to some extent.

The Treaty.

The Treaty between England and India whose content is as was announced by the Viceroy on September 19th. 1945, now being considered by the British Government will therefore contain clauses regarding the future defence of India and the protection that the British wish to give to the minorities. Besides these, there will be clauses regarding protection to be extended to the Indian princes. There will also be provisions regarding the pension, the retirement and the conditions of tenure of persons and the Defence forces and in the Civil services hitherto recruited under the authority of the British Government by the Secretary of State for India. Controversies are bound to arise in regard to every one of these subjects, but they may not be very serious in regard to the last of the subjects referred to above and that question need not, therefore, be gone through in detail here. But the same cannot be said of the other obligations.

Defence.

The treaty will determine the strength of the military, the naval and the air force to be stationed in India by the British, the places where they are to be stationed, the expenditure to be incurred by the Government of India towards their maintenance, the use to which they are to be put and the period during which these arrangements should hold good.

From one point of view it may be argued and rightly also that a Treaty containing provisions like these in regard to defence need not be regarded as a serious limitation on the sovereign powers of a self-governing India. Even independent and fully sovereign states enter into mutual defensive and offensive alliances of a military character. But all the same there are one or two features peculiar to any treaty-relationship between England and India for which there cannot be any exact parallel in the relations between sovereign states. It has for instance always been pointed out that British forces stationed in India cannot and will not receive orders from an Indian government responsible to an Indian electorate. This is quite natural in one sense, for it is similar to the position occupied by the American forces stationed in India during the second world war. They received orders from the American and not the British Government. But if this position is accepted not during a period of crisis but as a normal feature of day to day administration over a series of years

it will mean not merely that Indian government will have no control over the forces for which they are paying, but also over India's foreign policy. The effectiveness of a country's foreign policy depends ultimately upon the military forces which it commands ; and as under the proposed Treaty India will not have substantial forces whose disposition she can regulate her freedom to choose her allies will be limited. It is the British Government that will decide the uses to which the forces in India will have to be put and this will necessarily mean a considerable degree of control over India's external relations. Moreover, as matters regarding tariffs and international trade are to a great extent dependent on external policy the control which the future Indian government is likely to have over the country's foreign trade will also be limited. And since as long as the Treaty arrangements last, the security of India will depend on Britain's ability to maintain her own strength. India will have to be party to any war which British may have to fight to maintain that strength.

Another important issue that will arise out of the provisions relating to defence, is whether the future Government of India will have complete liberty to build its own defence forces in accordance with its own conception of India's future needs and also with a view to ultimately replace with them the British forces that are to be stationed here during the period of transition. Any restrictions on this liberty will also have to be taken into consideration in estimating the amount of power that future Government of India is likely to have.

Minorities.

Similar issues arise in regard to the provisions relating to the protection of minorities. Ordinarily the Muslims, the Scheduled Classes, the Indian Christians, the Anglo-Indians, the Sikhs and the people in the tribal or the backward areas are included in the category of minorities for this purpose. Out of a total population of about 400 millions in the country these constitute about 180 millions or nearly fifty percent. It will mean that in a self-governing India, a very large proportion of the people will not be entirely under the control of an Indian government. All measures passed by this government which may be suspected of having an adverse bearing directly or indirectly on the welfare of the minorities will in a way be subject to the veto of the British. The powers that the British should have for giving real protection to minorities must be

more comprehensive and more direct than those that the League of Nations had for enforcing the clauses in the Minority Treaties in Europe concluded after the first World War. As pointed out by Professor Coupland, the exercise of these powers by the British Government will mean a large measure of interference in India's domestic concerns. It will also mean the use of the Indian defence forces against the Government of India, for that is the ultimate sanction behind all treaties between country and country. Above all, it will keep alive the communal antagonism which according to British observers is the one dominating factor in India's politics and thus contribute to the weakening of the influence of the Government of India.

The inclusion therefore of provisions for the protection of minorities in the proposed Treaty will thus reduce to an appreciable degree the powers of the future Government of India.

The Princes.

The same conclusion has to be arrived at if in the Treaty any provisions are included with a view to enable the British Government to protect the Indian princes in accordance with the Treaties concluded with them in the past. There are only two positions to be conceived in this connection. Either an Indian State becomes a unit in the future Indian Union or prefers to remain outside it. In the latter case, the *status quo* will continue. But in the case of a State which has voluntarily decided to become member of the Union and agrees to the constitution according to which the government of the Union should be carried on there is no reason why it should look to the British Government for any kind of protection. So far as protection against attack from outside India is concerned, the proposed Treaty between England and India will give to the State all the protection it requires as a part of the general protection secured to India as a whole. And so far as protection against any attack from within the country or against internal rebellion is concerned, the responsibility will legitimately fall on the Union Government as a part of its general responsibility for the maintenance of internal order. The Supreme Court of the Union or a special tribunal that may be set up for the purpose by an Act of the Union Legislature may be utilised. There is, therefore, no case for the inclusion in the proposed Treaty of any clauses on the subject of obligations towards the Indian states. If this is done—as

the official pronouncements proposes to do—it will mean a reduction in the powers of a self-governing India.

India as a protectorate.

The status of India under a Treaty providing for the discharge by Britain of all those obligations which according to the Declaration of August, 1940 arise out of Britain's long-standing connection with India will be that of a Protectorate as the term is understood in the field of International Law. This is the outcome of the inconsistency found in the Cripps Proposals beween the clause which declares India to be a Dominion and the clause which lays down the conditions subject to which she can become a Dominion. The right to secession does not make any difference. If India prefers to stay within the Commonwealth, her status will be lower than that of Canada, Australia and South Africa, as these are not subject to any conditions as are proposed to be included in the Treaty with India. And if she secedes from the Commonwealth as she is permitted to do by the Cripps proposals her status will even then be lower than that of an independent sovereign state, so long as British forces continue to be stationed inside the country and so long as the British continue to exercise supervision and control over the Indian Government for securing protection to minorities. It is not understood why in the settlement of the political issue so much of exaggerated importance is attached to "secession." It is only as a legal issue that secession has any significance. The control which Britain proposes to retain over India is political in character and this can be achieved without incorporating it within a legal and constitutional system. What is relevant in this context is not the technical term of control but its actual substance ; and from this point of view the presence or absence of the right to secession does not make any difference.

Control from without.

As a matter of fact, the Treaty involves only a change in political technique. As has already been pointed out, the provisions it will contain will be more or less of the same sort as the safeguards included in the Government of India Act of 1935 and they have the same justification as that put forward in support of those safeguards. The difference between the two lies in this that while the safeguards have been included in the constitution itself and have therefore enabled the British to exercise their control over the Government of India from within through the Governor-General and

the Governors, the Treaty will be a document separate from the Constitution Act, and the Control of the British under it will be exercised from without, perhaps through a British High Commissioner and the office attached to him. Students of the evolution of the institutions of Local Government in India under the British rule are familiar with this distinction between control from within and control from without. And fundamentally it is this feature of control from without that is reproduced in determining the future relations of the two countries through a Treaty. The change is, therefore, not so much in the nature and amount of control—of course, there is some change in these also—as in the instrument through which it is exercised. Technically it is only between two sovereign States occupying an equal status that a Treaty is concluded; and when the relations between India and England come to be regulated by a Treaty instead of as has been the case for the last one hundred and fifty years by an Act of the British Parliament unilaterally passed, there is externally an improvement in the status of India. But from the point of view of the amount of power transferred from British into Indian hands, the technique of a Treaty is of little significance.

The truth is that, if we do not care for mere appearances, the future relations between England and India based on a Treaty will be more or less like the relations existing at present between the British Crown on one side and any of the Indian States like Hyderabad, Mysore or Baroda on the other. It is well-known that these relations are based on treaties. Under these treaties the Crown exercises complete control on their external affairs and protects them against all external attack with the help of armies maintained in several cases out of the subsidies contributed by them. And as the Treaties have been interpreted not literally but in accordance with the changing needs and requirements as understood by the Crown they have secured to the Crown a large measure of interference in the internal affairs of the States for preventing gross misrule and for maintaining a decent standard of good and efficient Government—just the kind of good Government which under the proposed Treaty the Government of India has to set up for promoting the welfare of minorities. And whatever power the British Crown has over the Indian states is exercised from without by the Crown Representative through the Residents.

It is in the light of these considerations that one has to form

one's opinion as to whether there is a chance of the political issue in the present deadlock being settled on the basis of the proposed Treaty. Such a settlement means that the large section of the politically conscious people in the country whose goal is independence here and now will moderate their demands to such an extent that they will be satisfied with the status of a Protectorate for India.

Why Not a Higher Status ?

One may be tempted to ask why the British are not prepared at the moment to concede to India a status higher than that of a Protectorate ? The difficulty is inherent in the standpoint from which the British have been accustomed for nearly two centuries to look at India. It is not possible in the limited space available here to give in detail the characteristic features of this standpoint. It is only the broad outlines that need be touched especially in view of the exposition made by the Simon Commission on this subject as already referred to.

This standpoint requires to be noted because it illustrates how the political institutions which we build depend upon the view we take of the country and of the people for whom they are intended. This explanation for the evolution of political systems was brought into prominence by Montesquieu and it was developed by the exponents of the Inductive and the Historical view of Politics. It is now a commonplace truth. And in determining the nature of the Government to be established in India—its structure as well as its powers—the view which the British had of the nature of India and of her people exercised a lot of influence. If they had taken a different view, the institutions which they established in the country would have been different. Even to-day the view they have is the same as that which they had two centuries ago, and this is the main reason why they are not prepared to concede a status higher than that of a Protectorate.

British view of India.

To the British, India is not a country. It is not even a sub-continent, but a great continent as Premier Attlee put it in his September broadcast announcing the Labour Ministry's policy towards India. Moreover, a series of cleavages—of religion, race and caste—run through Indian Society and constantly threaten its solidarity. Her people had become subdivided in a manner to

which there is no parallel in the world, by the inevitable antagonisms of different races and religions. The immense masses of people are poor, ignorant and helpless. Politically, they are apathetic. At present political consciousness exists only in a small minority—the intelligentsia. They are not representative of the people as a whole and therefore are not their true leaders. In the view of certain British observers the intelligentsia know less of the real conditions and the needs of the masses than the average British official who frequently tours in the country.

A people divided and helpless like this requires a government which is strong, impartial and paternalistic. It must be strong enough to maintain political unity in a continent. It must be impartial so that all comunities may get equal justice. It must be paternalistic because the people are helpless. Otherwise anarchy, civil strife and misery will rule the land, as it did in all the centuries and thousands of years that preceded the British rule.

A government needed by India has been supplied by the British for the last one century and a half ; and whatever changes in details may take place it is best that the ultimate supremacy of the British is maintained. The best expression of this view was given by Sir Alfred Lyall some decades ago and he observed as follows : "If (the task of building up any substantial edifice of constitutional government in India) must certainly be conducted within the limitations necessary to preseve undisturbed and indisputable the fabric of of British sovereignty, which is to the political machine what the iron rails are to the locomotive, the foundation and permanent way upon which all progress must move." The ruling class in Britain still upholds this view because their picture of India remains the same to-day as it was two centuries ago. Students interested in doing research in Indian politics, will find no subject of greater importance and of greater value than this study of ideas which the British ruling class—in England and in India—had of the country and of people from time to time.

A second feature characteristic of the British standpoint is that though their government in India rests like all governments on their Army, Navy, and Air force and though these have to be the main source of their strength their true moral position in India is that of a political Trustee. The task of governing the people of India is

to them a political trust and in performing this task they are subject to all the obligations that are inherent in trusteeship. The most onerous of these obligations is the training of the people in the art of self-government so that they will not require for all time the tutelage under an outsider. This is the final goal of trusteeship. The inference that is drawn from this theory of their position is that it will not be right and proper for them to withdraw from their trust, unless there is the certainty that the obligations imposed on them by the terms of the trusteeship have been fully discharged. Viewed from this angle it is their conviction that the time has not yet come for the complete termination of the trusteeship. The period of training is not yet over. The country should necessarily pass through the phase of a Protectorate before she can qualify herself for the status first of a Dominion and then of a free and independent State.

Munro and Macaulay are generally regarded as having given eloquent expression to this idea of a Trust although they were preceded by Edmund Bruke who in his speech on Fox's India Bill referred to the power of the East India Company as a trust for the people of India. The idea, however, is best explained by Sir Earnest Barker in the following words : "This idea of the Trust becomes a valuable limiting or governing factor in regard to all colonies or dependencies gained by conquest or cession. Even there the free despotic power of the Crown must own a limit, which is the limit of the trust.....This trust means that the Crown, and all associated with it or serving it, must not seek to make a profit, but to ensure the benefit of the people who are the *cestui que trust*. It also means, or may also mean, another thing. In private affairs and in the sphere of private law the beneficiary of a trust may often be a minor. When the minor grows to manhood, the trust will terminate ; he will manage his own affairs and provide for his own benefit himself. The like may happen in public affairs and in the sphere of public law ; and this analogy, along with the general analogy of the private trust, may thus be applied to the dependency gained by conquest or cession. Such a dependency is as it were, a minor, living under a trustee power during its minority. When it becomes adult and mature, it will enter into an equal responsibility with the trustee; who will relinquish his tutelage; it will become self-governing and will stand by the side of the other self-governing States in a community of such states."

On this basis the inference that is drawn is that India has not yet become completely adult and mature and the time for the complete relinquishment of British sovereignty has not yet come. Even if it comes, the next stage will be something like partnership, implying thereby that without some connection with the British the interests of India will not be safe. What will happen in consequence of the proposed Treaty between Britain and India is what Sir Earnest Barker refers to as the idea and system of indirect rule, the third phase of the general idea of trust.

Flaws in the British View.

So long as Indian society is looked at as made up of communities between whom there are irreconcilable antagonisms thich in the absence of the strong arm of an external authority will burst themselves into civil strife the conclusion naturally follows what some government like that of the British is inevitable, implying thereby that the protection, the security, peace and order which are the prerequisites of any kind of collective life and progress should come from without and not from within.

But this is a conclusion so dismal and so disheartening and also so derogatory to the self-respect of men and women in India who take pride in the greatness and glory of their age long culture and civilisation that one is tempted to ask oneself if there is not some flaw somewhere in the British standpoint —for no standpoint or no hypothesis can be correct if starting from it the only conclusion that one can draw is that India should wait for a long time before she can enjoy complete self-government.

There is a flaw and the flaw consists in equating communal division with communal antagonism and war. Division need not always imply war. It may stand—and may be made to stand—for a kind of specialisation of function necessitating and resulting in co-operation. Even if it does not mean this, the conclusion shold not be automaticallydrawn that division implies irreconcilable antagonism. Division in Indian society are not new. Caste, for instance, is not a feature of to-day or yesterday. The scheduled classes have also been there for ages. Religious differences are also ancient. But to say that during all these periods of pre-British rule the communities in India were only fighting among themselves, that wars were the rule and peace the exception, is to betray complete ignorance of the

nature of Indian social order. It is also based on an exaggerated belief in what may be called pure and simple historical determinism.

The Hobbesian Analogy.

If one is permitted to point to an analogy in this respect, it may be said that the British conception of the communities in India—and this is a part of their picture of social life in what they call their tropical colonies and dependencies, the picture of "plural economy" —is very similar to the conception of men in the State of Nature as depicted by Hobbes : "a state of war of every man against every man, no arts ; no letters ; no society ; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death ; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short." If for 'man' in the description given by Hobbes the world 'community' is substituted the similarity between the state of nature as described by him and the State of Indian Society as conceived by the British will be complete. The influence which the anarchical conditions in the eighteenth century India exercised on the British mind is of the same character as the influence of the civil war in England on the mind of Hobbes ; and the conclusions drawn are also similar. It is only through the institution of despotic government standing outside the people who enter into a contract among themselves and agree to implicitly obey the authority of the despot that Hobbes found it possible to provide men with security— the one thing which according to him man values most. It is a similar institution—a power from without that the British consider necessary if the communities in India torn by mutual distrust and strife are to get the security they need ; and whatever the small minority of the intelligentsia might say, the British think that the masses of people are agreed among themselves that the external authority is the only authority that can give them peace. There is therefore, an element of implied consent or agreement among the masses of the people of India that it is best that the British should continue to exercise their ultimate sovereignty.

Not only do the British equate division with antagonism and war ; they also equate the abnormal with the normal, and the exception with the rule. It is no doubt true that on occasion there is rioting in the country which assumes what is called a communal character although in regard to the correctness of this assumption there are wide differences of opinion. But to draw from this the

inference that the tendency to communal rioting is the normal feature of India and that it is only under exceptional circumstances that communities behave in a friendly and peaceful way towards each other is to ignore the distinction between the abnormal and the normal. The mistake made here is similar to the mistake made by those who conclude that because occasionally and against some people force has to be used by the State, the State rests only on force and on nothing else. It is also similar to the picture of society drawn by Marxists—society as consisting of classes always in mutual conflict. All theories relating to the politics of power are similar in their origin and in their analysis. It is also their tendency to attribute friction in society to consciously felt antagonisms, while in the majority of cases there may be no such feeling. Moreover, this constant reference to antagonism by men in authority becomes a contributory factor in the growth of a feeling of antagonism where it did not previously exist. It works like propaganda.

This is not meant to say that there is complete harmony among all the communities in the country. Such a thing cannot be predicted of any society in any age. It is only in a community of angels and not of men—imperfect as they are and as they are bound to be for all time—that perfect peace will reign. Professor Crane Brinton has clearly brought out this aspect in the following words, "The view that in a normal society there are no class antagonisms is as much to be rejected as the Marxist view that in such societies—at least up to the present—the class struggle has been increasingly and equally bitter and ferocious. A picture of our (American) old south, for instance, which sees contented, well-fed slaves, prosperous artisans and traders with no dislike for their gentle manly patrons, a serene plantation aristocracy nobly patriarchal, is plain nonsense ; but so, too, is one which sees smouldering discontent among the slaves, envy and hatred among poor whites, pride and fear among the planters. Men in Western societies have never been free, equal and brothers ; there has always been political, social and economic inequality among groups within these societies, groups we commonly call classes."

No doubt, an Imperial Government which believes that it has a higher moral duty imposed upon it than the mere exploitation of its colonial subjects has much to commend itself. But in its actual operation there may be little difference between such a Government and a Government of the exploiting type. For, some of the conditions which in the field of private law compel a Trustee to fulfil the obligations created by the Trust are absent in the field of public law.

In the first place, the duties of the imperial government as a trustee are not precisely defined in any public law of trusts. They are only self-imposed obligations and rest for their efficacy on the strength of the moral conviction with which they are held. In the second place there are in the field of private law courts of justice to which a reference can be made whenever the parties affected by the trust feel that it is not being properly administered. But what international court is there to see that the political trustee in a dependent country or colony is managing its trust-property on just and proper lines ? It is in this context that one has to estimate the [illegible] that is attached by the Indian Nationalists to the points at issue between them and the British being referred to a court of arbitration. In private law, again a trust can be terminated when the purpose for which it is created has been fulfilled and there are courts to decide the question. But there is no possibility of a political trust being so terminated. It has either to be voluntarily relinquished by the Trustee, which has so far never happened in the history of the world anywhere, or taken away by the use of force. As a matter of fact, the trust theory was more effective in the history of the relations between England and India in the days of the East India Company ; for at that time the trust was subject to private law and the Home Government saw to it that the Company discharged satisfactorily its obligations. It was subject to control and supervision by the British Parliament. But all this disappeared when the Government of India passed into the hands of the Crown.

It was features like these that provoked the late Pandit Motilal Nehru—one of the foremost publicists of modern India—to make the following observations in the course of a debate in the Imperial Legislative Assembly when the Government spokesman referred to this theory of trusteeship. He said : "I have often wondered as a lawyer as to what that (Trust) may mean. Who is the author of this Trust ? Where is the appointment of Trustees ?.....Is it a legal trust ? Is it a moral trust ?.....But let us for a moment take it that it is a trust. The whole question is, what is the best and the most honest manner of discharging the trust at this particular moment ? The manner I have suggested in my amendment is that the Trustees should hand over the Trust property to the *Cestui que trust*, and that is the most honest thing in the world to do. That is the only way of terminating the Trust honourable to both the parties, and in a manner which cannot be taken exception to."

Students of political science need not be reminded that this Trust theory of Government obtained prominence in the field of political thought owing to its having occupied a central place in the essay of Locke on Civil Government. It was he who first enunciated it in clear terms and gave it the wide popularity with which it spread over a large part of the Western World. But it should be noted that Locke was also the upholder of the people's right to revolution. According to him they (and not the rulers) are the judges as to whether the rulers are properly discharging their duties or not ; and they have a right to rebel if they feel convinced that the rulers failed in the discharge of their obligations. It was quite alien to his ideas to make the rulers themselves the judges as to whether they managed the trust properly. In the theory of imperial trusteeship as expounded by modern scholars like Sir Earnest Barker this point is forgotten. The theory of political trusteeship implies a theory of revolution as an integral part of it, unless a date is arbitrarily fixed—as a particular age is fixed in the case of individuals to indicate that on attaining it they cease to be minors—when the trust should automatically terminate.

The Marxian Analogy.

Here, again if we go a little deep into the matter we will find an analogy between the theory of imperial trusteeship and the Marxian theory of the Communist or the Proletarian dictatorship. According to the Marxists, class conflict has been the characteristic of all societies until the present day and the ideal to be aimed at is a classless society. The first step in this transformation is the transfer of political control over society from the hands of the *bourgeoise* into the hands of the communist party and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. This dictatorship will hold power during a period of transition and use that power to liquidate the *bourgeoise* and with it the capitalist order for which they stand. But the essential point is that no time limit can be imposed in advance to this period of transition. It may last for a short or for a long period. It should, however, last until the classless society comes into existence when there will be no more need for the State. The State will thus automatically wither away.

This is just the principle underlying the theory of imperial trusteeship as conceived by Munro Macaulay and even Sir Earnest

Barker. According to them, Society is plural in countries like India. There are only social groups markedly divided from one another. There is no common or general will among them. What is ultimately required is the creation of such a will. It is to achieve this that imperial rule and trusteeship are needed. It will be the task of such a rule to put an end to communal conflicts and create a homogeneous people capable of having a general will. But all this cannot be accomplished within a short period. The transition is bound to be fairly long ; but there is the certainty that at the end of the period of transition imperial trusteeship will wither away.

Hobbes, Karl Marx and the theorists of imperialism—all these have very much in common. All these are advocates of dictatorship.

Conclusion on the Political Issue.

We are thus led to the conclusion that there are serious flaws in the picture of India and of Indian Society and people as drawn by the British and it is these flaws that are responsible for the view entertained by them that the status of India cannot under the present circumstances go beyond that of a Protectorate. Even the announcement made by the Secretary of State for India on 4th December, 1945 refers only to India speedily attaining her full and rightful position as an independent partner State in the British Commonwealth. There is no grant of complete independence here and now, which is the objective of large sections of the politically conscious people in the country. If these sections refuse to modify their views and if the British feel that they cannot concede anything more there is no knowing when the political issue in the deadlock will be settled. The conflict is between the theory of Trusteeship and the theory of India's inherent right to freedom.

II

It is now time to turn our attention to the Constitutional Issue.

Elements in the Constitutional Issue.

There are may elements in this issue and they bear on subjects like the nature of the Constitution-making body, the division of the country into Pakistan and Hindustan, the conditions under which the states should join the Union, the structure of the Legislature and the Executive and their mutual relations, the incorporation of a set of Fundamental Rights in the Constitution etc.

Neither time nor space is available here to deal with any of these subjects and much less with all of them. In my Memorandum submitted to the Sapru Conciliation Committee I dealt with most of these. Moreover, there is no need to deal with them in detail if our purpose is merely to understand the essential nature of the constitutional issue—the issue is to the basis of the structure of the constitution of a Free India. For almost all differences of opinion existing on this issue today are ultimately traceable to two different conceptions of the state entertained by the leading public men in the country ; and an analysis of these conceptions will help us in getting an insight into the constitutional issue even without any of the subjects referred to above being gone through in detail.

Two Conceptions of the State.

The two conceptions of the State may be styled the Communalist and the Humanist conceptions. The Communalist conception starts with the several communities into which the people of the country are divided as the Units on the basis of which the State is an Association of these Communities. As such, the structure of the State must be an exact photograph of the structure of society and the communities into which it is divided. The Humanist conception, on the other hand, regards the State as an Association of Individuals organized for the satisfaction of some of their essential needs which cannot be satisfied through the communities to which they belong and that its structure must be such as will enable the individuals to get these needs satisfied in the most effective and economic manner The unit, tharefore, on the basis of which the future state in India should be built is the individual man or woman. It is because of this that this conception is termed the Humanist conception. It may also be styled the Individualist conception, but as the term "Individualist" provokes a certain amount of prejudice in the minds of some because of certain historical ideas that have gathered around it, the term "Humanist" is preferable.

The controversy in India to-day is really a controversy between these two conceptions of the State. The communalist may be a racial communalist like the European and the Anglo Indian ; a religous communalist like a member of the Muslim League , or a social communalist like a member of the Scheduled Castes Federation. But all of them stand for this view—of the State. It is mainly from their

ranks that supporters come for creation of Pakistan, for the extension of the system of communal representation not only into Legislatures but also into the Executive, the Judiciary, the Army, and the Civil Services of all grades and levels and into all other public institutions. They are also the advocates of coalition and composite cabinets, of weightage and parity, of a Confederation instead of a Federation and of a constitution-making body based on communal grouping. Those, on the other hand, who are opposed to all these arrangements and who stand for territorial and joint electorates and for the introduction into India of democracy as democracy is ordinarily and traditionally understood in countries where it has been practised for the longest periods in modern times—these belong to the Humanist School in the main. They are the advocates of a Constituent Assembly elected on the basis of adult suffrage, of an All-India Federation and of the ordinary form of Parliamentary government. For them the State has to deal with individual men and women and not with communities as such.

In their own country the British are very strong believers in the Humanist conception and they built their State on that basis. They are proud of it and they are also delighted to see it being successfully worked in all the Dominions of the British Commonwealth, in the United States and in many countries of Europe like Switzerland, France, Belgium and the Scandinavian. It is also their desire that it should be introduced into the countries of Central, Eastern and Southern Europe which have not as yet taken completely to it. But in India they have become the champions of the communalist conception—while arguing all along against it—and it is their championship of it, more than anything else, that is responsible for the strength with which it is held to-day in certain political quarters in the country.

The Communalist Conception.

In India, as in almost all the other countries of the world, there are to be found a large number of groups some consciously organized and some having evolved out of the force of circumstances. There are racial groups like the Europeans and the Anglo-Indians ; religious groups like the Hindus, the Muslims, the Sikhs and the Indian Christians ; caste groups ; occupational groups ; and economic groups. This variety of group-life is really the outcome of the flexibility which always characterised Indian society and also of the perfect tolerance

with which the emergence of new religious and cultural groups was welcomed. The process is still going on.

There is nothing peculiar or unique in this phenomenon if it is objectively and scientifically looked at. For it is the nature of society everywhere. As Sir Earnest Barker observes : "Each society is also a plurality. It is a rich web of contained groups—religious and educational ; professional and occupational ; some for pleasure and some for profit ; some based on neighbourhood and some on some other affinity."

European observer of these groups in India gave them the name "Communities" and they look upon India as a land of communities. They unscientifically apply this term to each and every kind of group whether the bond which makes it a group is racial, religious, social or occupational.

In the view of the communalist the political order should merely reflect the social order with all its merits and defects. It has no individual existence of its own. It must reflect in its structure all the communities that are to be found in society. Each community is regarded as having certain interests of its own and the opinion is held that the primary purpose of the State is, and ought to be, the promotion of these interests whatever else it may or may not do and that such a purpose cannot be achieved unless every community is represented on each of its organs. Just as the United States or Australia is referred to as a Federation of territiorial units called States, the State to be formed in India should be a Federation of various communities.

Assumptions, Arguments and Corollaries.

Associated with this conception is the doctrine that to an Indian only one kind of group-life is desirable and possible and that it is the life in the community to which he belongs. Between the members of the same community there is and there ought to be a complete identity of interests not only in matters which bind them together into that community but also in economic, cultural, moral, political and other matters. He should look to it for guidance, support and direction in all activities of his life—whatever be the sphere to which they belong. Those who are members of other communities should be looked upon as rivals in all spheres of life although the rivalry may be hidden in several cases; and there cannot be anything like a real common

interest between community and community.

The argument usually put forward in support of this conception is that India consists of a majority community namely the Hindu Community and a number of minority communities like Muslims, Anglo-Indians, Christians, etc, and that if democracy with its principle of "one man, one vote" is introduced, all power will fall into the hands of the Hindu majority and it will lead to the tyranny of this majority over other communities. This is based on the assumption that the Hindu majority is what is termed a "determinate" Majority and that the minorities are also determinate. They are 'determinate' in the sense that they do not undergo a change as the result of an election. They are permanent. The only way, therefore, by which this majority tyranny can be averted is by making the State a Federation of Communities in which the minorities secure weightage and the majority loses it so that a sort of balance or parity is brought into existence.

Many corollaries follow from this conception. Each community should be regarded as a homogeneous unit—whatever be the economic and other differences that may prevail among its members—and should be represented as such on all organs of government. Each community should be treated like the units in a territorial federation and given, if possible, equality of representation. It would be still better if this principle of representation is carried further into administrative services of all grades and kinds, into the Army and into the Civil services, so that in selecting recruits to them the community to which the candidates belong is given the first consideration.

The matter need not be pursued further as all those who have studied and observed the evolution of Indian politics during the late forty years are very well acquainted with the communalist doctrine in the several forms in which it has been manifesting itself.

Defects in the Communalist Conception.

But this evolution also shows the nature of the defects in the communalist conception. In the first place it is not possible to draw up a list of communities which have to be recognized as of significance for purposes of political representation. Originally the Muslims were the only community to which that significance was attached.

But, as time went on, other communities put forward their claims and they too were given a similar recognition, so that under the Government of India Act of 1935 there are seventeen communal groups into which the electorate is divided for purposes of representation on the provincial legislatures. More are coming forward making a similar demand. It will be difficult to resist their demands as the system is not based on any recognized logical principle. Any criterion according to which a distinction is drawn between communities deserving and not deserving recognition is bound to be arbitrary. It will be as difficult to discover reasonable criteria for this purpose as for the purpose of limiting the right to franchise comes in the case of individuals. Demands for recognition will go on until all castes, sub-castes and communities are given recognition just as the demand for the extension of franchise comes to an end only with the introduction of universal franchise. But such a recognition will make the State and its Government highly complicated and unworkable.

There is equal difficulty in deciding what weight should be given to each community in any scheme of political representation. There is no equitable principle which may be taken as a guide. Past services to the British Empire or the historic importance of the community—criteria which were adopted in some cases in the past—are irrelevant in a free India. Parity seems to be the only logical course. And it should be parity not merely between the Muslim and the caste Hindu but also between all the communities. Already the scheduled classes are claiming parity with the caste Hindus and there is no reason why in the communalist conception of the State their claim should be rejected. One community cannot represent another and no grouping of communities can be accepted as vaild.

But such a logical procedure of equal weightage and parity results in undue privilege to individuals belonging to certain communities—especially those which are numerically weak—and in the imposition of undeserved disabilities on those belonging to other communities. The so-called communal justice results, when properly examined, in injustice to individuals—in some individuals being sacrificed for the sake of others. It leads to the treatment of equals as unequals and of unequals as equals.

It is not to safeguard the interest of communities that the State exists. The state itself, as will be pointed out later, is a community and has its own separate interests of security, order, etc., and its

primary purpose is to safeguard these interests of its own. The promotion of communal interests can never be its objective and the communalist structure is thoroughly alien to its true character.

The communalist organization of the State also perpetuates the defects found in the social and religious system of the country by giving an unnecessarily long lease of life to institutions which deserve to disappear and which will tend to disappear if no political recognition is given to them. The institution of caste, for instance, is of this character. But when on communities and therefore on institutions like these a political function like that of voting is imposed, they are given an artificial strength which prolongs there existence and therefore keeps up all the social evils for which they are the cause.

It is for students of political science to consider how far in the light of considerations like these it is desirable to accept the view that the political order should be a copy of the social order.

Majority Tyranny a Myth.

There is also no force in the contention that majorities and minorities in India are 'determinate' and non-flexible. If they appear to be 'determinate' to-day, it is really due to the existence of communal electorates. So long as such electorates exist no parties based on economic and political issues can easily emerge. One has to reap what one sows. To give indirect approval to communal representation and to regret, as Professor Coupland does, the emergence of communal parties is a most unreasonable attitude. But there is also more serious flaw in the contention. The Hindu majority in India is like the Protestant majority in England and the Catholic majority in France. It is only a religious majoriry which, as far as one can see into the future, can never disappear. It is not however a politically determinate majority in the sense that on all political issues all Hindus will vote alike as a single unit and that in every election only the same politlcal party will be returned in a majority. Even as a religious group there is no homogeneity among the Hindus. They are divided into numerous sects with acute theological and ceremonial differences among them. They are also divided into numerous castes and sub-castes. Nothing is more illogical than to say in one breath that there is nothing parallel in any other country in the world to the cleavages that prevail in Hindu society and to argue in the same breath and also to conclude that they will always act as a single unit in all political

issues and tyrannise over the other minority communities. They did not do so in the past. Even to-day they are divided into numerous political parties and in some of them many non-Hindus are members. And among the Hindus are found several advocates of Pakistan. The fact that at present almost all Hindus are thinking alike and acting alike on the issue of the political freedom of the country goes only to show that that is the one dominating issue in the current Indian politics and that on such a vital issue there cannot be any difference of opinion at all. The issue of political freedom can never become a party issue. It is just like the whole British (or any other people, for that matter) suspending the party system of government in a time of war and working as a single unit. It does not, however, follow from this that when the struggle for freedom is over and when the new State in India begins to function in a normal atmosphere and takes on itself the duty of solving the thousand and one social and economic problems which are awaiting solution political parties will not be formed among the Hindus. On the other hand the existence even to-day of the Kisan, the Socialistic and the Communistic parties is a clear indication that the issues that will emerge will be political and economic issues and that they will be issues on which Hindus will become divided. The same thing will happen in the case of minorities also. There is no room for thinking that there is anything like "determinate" majorities and minorities in the country. It is only a fabric of the imagination. It is to confuse what will tend to appear in a normal period with what tends to appear in an abnormal revolutionary period as is the case with India. We have to draw a distinction between a period of transition and a period of stability which comes after the transition.

The expression the "Tyranny of the Majority" has become a sort of parrot cry in the country to-day. It is a slogan that comes to be repeated from every plateform advocating sectional and vested interests. For ages the world was subject to minority rule and tyranny. It is only during the last one century that democratic governments were introduced into some of the countries and freedom from minority rule was secured. It was from that time onwards that the cry of majority tyranny came to be raised by all those who were really hostile to democracy and who equated it with such tyranny without caring to analyse how in a democracy where there is complete freedom of discussion and where opposition parties are freely allowed to function without any restriction there cannot be really such

tyranny. It is unfortunate that even a writer like Mill fell to some extent into this error and gave much vogue to this fallacy of majority tyranny. Those who repeat it to-day in season and out of season seem to think that minorities alone have rights, that the state and the majority parties exist only to safeguard these rights and that the majority has no rights at all. It is time that this cry is stopped and that the minorities are made to realise that the majority community also has rights. Of course, the whole fallacy has its origin in attributing rights to communites, while the truth is rights as such belong only to individuals and not to groups at all. But more will be said a little later on this aspect.

The following observations of Professor Born deserve to be noted in this connection : "Minorities are apt to be arrogant. Majorities it is true, are not always humble, but minorities are inclined to think that because they are different from the majority, they are superior, and because they are superior, they have the right to remain such as they are. They rather look upon the majority as a rabble. Why should they discuss their own birthright with a rabble they despise ? They stand for their own interests and they are not willing to let their own interests be trampled down in the interests of the majority they despise. It is this arrogant attitude of the minorities towards the majority—whom they also despise as unwar-like, cowardly and priest-ridden—that is responsible for the constitutional deadlock to-day and the communalist conception of the State is its outcome.

The Humanist Conception.

The Humanist Conception approaches the State from the point of view of the essential humanity common to all men as men instead of from the point of view of the differences that exist among them. In its view the political order exists to satisfy the needs they have as Muslims, Hindus, Scheduled classes, Europeans, Anglo-Indians, etc. There is nothing novel in this conception and it is a doctrine with which all students of political science are familiar, And it may even be construed as an impertinence to place an elementary proposition like this before a gathering of learned scholars. But there is some excuse for doing so and it is this that in the political discussions now carried on in the country some of the elementary truths bearing on the subject are being completely ignored and we will be rendering a real service to those engaged in resolving the deadlock by recalling to their minds some of these elementary truths.

The Central Importance of the Individual.

The most elementary of these truths is that the individual man is at the centre of the whole social organization. He alone has a personality to develop and all rights are rights that belong to him as necessary for the development of his personality. Happiness, misery, suffering, pain, pleasure, good, bad, justice and injustice have a meaning only in reference to him and to him alone. Expressions like communal rights or communal justice have really no meaning at all. As C. Delisle Burns put it : "The source of all energy is the individual ; and if we are to think adequately of the larger political issues we must consider the feelings of single men, women, and children. We shall be lost in a fog of vague phrases if we discuss the state without continual reference to actual human beings who have certain definite desires and thoughts. For states and churches and trade unions and financial companies are secondary in importance to men, women and children even if, as Plato said, 'we are only unfeathered bipeds with gregarious habits.' Sir Earnest Barker has also observed : "In our human world the individual personality of man alone has intrinsic and ultimate worth, and having also the capacity of development has also an intrinsic and ultimate claim to the essential conditions of its development." The same view is expressed by Alfred Cobban when he says that, "ultimately all rights are the rights of individuals, that all values are values for individuals, and that human society does not have any value in itself apart from the individuals of which it is composed. The ends of society are to be understood only in terms of actual men and women." We in India should, therefore, remember that it is with the needs, the happiness and the sufferings of the four hundered millions of individual men, women and children that the state has to concern itself and apart from this there are no needs or interests of communities—Hindus or Muslims, etc.

Instrumental Value of Groups.

Another truth emphasized in the Humanist Conception is that Groups, Communities, Associations and Institutions have only an instrumental value. They are merely orderly social arrangements and serve as channels through which the energy of the individual secures an outlet. They have no final value or values in themselves. There is nothing sacrosanct about any of them—a caste, a church or Trade Union. They deserve to exist only so long as they contribute to the

happiness and the good life of the individual ; and when they cease to do so they ought to disappear and their disappearance in such a case need not be regretted. This is the case with all kinds of communal organizations. Alfred Cobban may again be quoted in this connection. He observes : "Positive laws and institutions are not good or bad in themselves, but only in accordance with their results for individuals. This principle has important implications. It means political and economic problems are not problems concerning ends, for these are laid down by natural law. They are simply questions of social technique."

Freedom of Association.

A third truth in the Humanist conception is that as individual men and women have a large variety of needs and so no individual can satisfy any of his needs, except through association with other individuals having the same need, the tendency is for individuals to combine themselves into as many associations as they have needs. And even associations like caste, the church, etc, into which individuals are born have their origin in the same principle. The point to be noted here is that the individual should be free to choose the persons with whom he wants to associate himself for satisfying any of his needs. There is no reason to say that those with whom he associates himself for satisfying one of his needs should also be the persons with whom he should associate for satisfying some other needs of his. If in the matters religious he associates himself with one set of individuals, it ought not to follow that he should choose the same set when he wants to secure the satisfaction of his cultural or economic or artistic needs. If he is restricted in this choice he loses to that extent his freedom of association which is one of his fundamental rights and it is possible that through such restriction he is unable to satisfy his wants in the most effective and economical manner.

In the communalist approach to politics it is this right to freedom of association that is denied to the individual. And its denial results in the community to which a man belongs exercising complete control over all aspects of his life which is totalitarianism. The cry "All Hindus must be united" or "All Muslims must be united" and work as one, meaning irrespective of the particular purpose for which they should be united, leads to totalitarian tyranny. The essence of totalitarianism is not merely the control of the whole life of the individual by the State as is the case under Communist or Fascist dictatorship.

Such a control even when exercised by a church. or by any other religious association or League is nothing but totalitarianism. It has to be as strongly condemned as the totalitarianism of the State.

The State as a territorial Association.

The fourth truth contained in the Humanist Conception—and it is also an elementary truth which is now being ignored—is that there are a number of essential needs of the individual—needs like security, peace, order, economic freedom, etc.,—which form a class by themselves and which can be easily distinguished from his other needs—religious, cultural, etc.,—and these needs can be satisfied only through his association with other individuals having the same needs and it is to such an association that the name "State" is given. All these needs have one characteristic in common. They arise primarily out of the fact that an individual is a more or less permanent resident of some piece of territory. In other words, they may be spoken of as his territorial needs. They are also the needs which other individuals living alongside of him in the same territory have in common with him. And what is more natural than that, to secure the satisfaetion of such needs the right sort of individuals with whom he should associate are his co-residents in the same territory irrespective of what they talk or what religion they profess ? Nor that language or religion has no importance in life. They have, but they are not important—they have no relevance whatever in the sphere of his territorial needs. It will be impossible for him to secure their satisfaction if, instead of associating with his co-residents he tries to avoid them and prefers to use the community to which he belongs as the best instrument for the purpose. In this realm his neighbours are and ought to be his associates and they are as much his brothers in the field of religion or language. It is this catholicity of outlook, this extension of the idea of brotherhood that is the core of the Humanist conception of the State.

The political trouble in India has arisen out of the failure to recognize the importance of this simple but essential truth. It is at the bottom of the view that because one is a muslim and another is a Hindu, they have and cannot have common territorial needs even though they happen to live in the same area and that these labels Muslims and Hindu—have so much intrinsic importance about them that they should be made to stand in the way of their working together to satisfy the needs resulting from their living together. It

does not matter very much whether the label is given a religious significance or whether in consequence of this it is also given a 'national' significance and the contention is put forward that because the Hindus are one nation and the Muslims another, there can be no common basis of citizenship and political life for them. It may be that they are two different nations but what does it matter politically if in spite of this they happen to be living side by side, interspersed in the midst of each other in such a manner that complete territorial separation, even if large scale transfers of population are carried out, becomes impossible. Is it not a more rational course to accept the Humanist conception and see how desirable it is for members of different communities—different from some other point of view—to become citizens of the same State ? Too much of sentimentalism and emotional excitement are usually introduced into constitutional discussions and no room is left for reason and sanity to prevail.

The State an Associotion of Individuals.

All Associations are ultimately associations of individuals. So also is the State. Its structure should, therefore, be based on the individual and his territorial needs. Representation, therefore, on the organs of the State must be the representation of individuals in their capacity as citizens and not in the their capacity as members of other groups or Communities. The intrusion of these communities into the field of politics which is not their realm complicates the issue and prevents the State from being true to itself. As Professor Catlin observes : "There is then no one group which can satisfactorily give representation to other groups ; each group has certain distinguishing characteristics or functions, and its institutions are to be understood in terms of these functions. An institution such as Parliament may well be reorganized until it is best advised about, and most efficiently able to take into account the legitimate interests of groups. But its members must remain functionaries of an institution which is an institution for giving effect to the will of the State-group and not of any other group." It is a similar view to which Profesfor Harold W. Stoke gives expression when he says that "it must never be forgotten that the State must occupy itself primarily with the protection and development of that which is common to all of us rather than that which is peculiar to each of us. Nor is representative government any more free than any other system tc ignore this basic fact." The system of communal electorates not

only deprives the individual to choose his political associates, but also ignores the principle referred to by Professor Stoke.

A Democratic Conception.

This Humanist approach to our constitutional problems is all the more urgent as it is a democratic state that we wish to build in a free India. But what is the essence of democracy ? As Leonard Woolf points out : "The essence of a democratic system of government is that it treats every one politically merely as an individual and as an equal political unit ; non-democratic systems treat people not as individuals but as members of different classes and give them different political rights because they are born in dlfferent classes, pursue different occupations or hold different political views". No communalist conception of the state with its insistence on weightage for members belonging to certain communities or on the parity of all communities irrespective of their numerical strength can ever be democratic.

Differentiation between Community and State.

It is the mistake committed by the communalist not to differentiate the State and its institutions from communities and their institutions. His object is to superimpose the communities on the State. And this will prove fatal to the effective functioning of the state by introducing into its structure wheels within wheels and making all movement impossible. Composite legislatures and composite cabinets which are integral to this conception will make government too weak to accomplish anything of significance and confirm the truth contained in the view of Professor Stoke that the chief danger of modern democratic government is not disruption as older writers feared, but paralysis. The only corrective to this is the Humanist conception whose central doctrine is the differentiation of the State from society.

Back to the age of Enlightenment.

The Humanist conception is also the only conception of the State which is in harmony with the liberal political thought of the 17th and the 18th centuries, the thought which through the English, the American and the French Revolutions laid the foundation of the modern democratic State with its emphasis on the political equality of all men and women. It is rather unfortunate that a reaction set

itself against this thought in the course of the 19th and 20th centuries, a reaction which lost sight of man as man and regarded him merely as a member of this or that class as the Marxists have done, or of this or that nation or of this or that race. All these are sectional approaches to the problems of politics and are responsible for the growth of all kinds of totalitarian dictatorships in the form of the imperialism of the white over the coloured races, the Communist dictatorship of the Proletariat over the other classes, Fascist dictatorship of aggressive nationalism and the theocratic dictatorship with which India is threatened to-day. All these have one thing in common. They believe in the Communalist conception of the State, deny personality to the individual and merge him completely either in Race, or in Nation, or class or the religious community. What we, therefore, need at present is a real going back to the eighteenth century philosophy of the Rights of Man with modifications in it appropriate to the conditions of today, modifications to which it has been already subjected by the exponents of 'new individualism." The eighteenth century was really an age of enlightenment. It was the age of cosmopolitanism or true humanitarianism in the field of thought. Only like all Prophets, the prophets of the Age of Reason were two centuries in advance of their times. It is only today when peoples in different parts of the world have become so closely knitted together in consequence of the conquest of space and of time through scientific invention and the whole human race is becoming a single group for the satisfaction of territorial needs that we are realising the truth and the worth of that philosophy. It is the philosophy that is behind the idea of a World State and World Federation.

One India.

If it is thought to be within the realm of practical politics for the different peoples of Europe and of even the world as a whole—peoples not belonging to the same race or speaking the same language or professing the same faith—to become citizens of a single World State, it passes beyond reason why the people belonging to different communities in India cannot live together as citizens of a single State. What is needed is a more balanced and a saner view of politics and the part it plays in the life of the individual.

We, therefore, come to the conclusion that the constitutional deadlock in the country is the outcome of a wrong and mistaken conception of the State. That conception has to be abandoned and

it has to be replaced by the only correct conception of the State—the Humanist conception. It holds the key to the solution not only of the political and the constitutional problem of India but also similar issues elsewhere. It is, for instance, the right basis for settling the status of the Indian settlers in Ceylon, Malaya, Burma, South Africa and East Africa. The humanity which they share in common with the natives and with the European settlers in these areas gives them the right to be regarded as citizens against whom there is no justification for any kind of discrimination being made.

The greatest service which we as students of Political Science can render to our country to-day, is to spread the truth contained in the Humanist conception. It is the one political conception that can bring peace not only to India but to the whole world, the peace without which it is not merely civilisation but humanity itself that is in danger of facing destruction.

Let us all make up our minds to spread this truth and this message of peace and solve our constitutional problems on their basis. Then alone will the constitutional deadlook come to an end.

———

PROFESSOR D. N. BANERJEE

9

RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION FOR INDIA

(*The Ninth Conference held at Delhi in December, 1946*)

The demand for the partition of India is a perversion of the principle of self-determination. This Wilsonian theory has been much misunderstood and misused. It has produced many unhappy consequences in India. There cannot be an absolute and unqualified right of self-determination. This could be used in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned. It must operate within the limtis prescribed by its author, President Wilson. However, the post-first world war conditions proved that this right could be applied with due regard to circumstances. Critics like Lansing pointed out the impractablility of this doctrine. G. Hardy Characterises it as "even more disastrous" than the principle of "Universal Democracy". This principle could be applied to a conntry as a whole, and not to a section of its population on its demand. Even in Soviet Union, where this right is supposed to have been conceded to the various nationalities, centralisation has taken place. Economic policy and national security have deprived the nationalities of the right of self-determination. In the case of India this can be applied only to the country as a whole and not to any part of it. If this right is granted on the basis of religion, there will be many claims from different religious groups and it may lead to country's disintegration. The cabinet mission proposals providing for an Indian federation are most welcome. They insure the unity of the couutry. Leaders of the political parties must give a correct lead to the people. We should aim at the achievement of freedom and prosperity, moral and intellectual development. Let us respect each others religion, language and sentiments and in doing so build a new India.

I must first of all offer my grateful thanks to the members of the

Indian Political Science Association for having done me the great honour of electing me President of this Ninth Session of the Indian Political Science Conference. I sincerely hope and trust that I shall receieve from you all your genuine sympathy, goodwill, and co-operation in the performance of my duties as Persident of this Session.

As a student of Political Science and Comparative Politics and as one who has devoted practically the last twenty-five years of his life to the study of the Indian problem, I may be permitted to take this opportunity of making a few observations on the present situation in this country, It is quite true that we are principally theoretical students of Political Science. But that should not prevent any person from giving a due consideration to our views. The reasons are obvious. Theory has its utility also in the realm of practice, and Political Theory in particular is to a large extent "a philosophy of history." Moreover, by our training and mental discipline we can perhaps take a little more detached view of things than the average politician who cannot always afford to tell the truth even when he discerns it, lest he should lose his popularity among his followers, or his position in the party to which he belongs.

Right of Self-Determination.

As I was preparing this address, I was hearing reports of assassins being busy with their daggers in streets of Dacca and its environs, incendiaries with the work of arson, and of refugees pouring into areas considered safe, for shelter, food, and protection. I was also hearing reports of more or less similar things occurring in some other parts of the country. And very often mischief-makers were heard to utter highly exciting political slogans and war-cries. On a little reflection it appeared to me that these unfortunate and heart-breaking happenings amongst those who had got to live together, were largely a visible and tangible outcome, *either directly or by way of reaction and repercussion*, of a perversion of the principle of self-determination, on which principle, it may be remembered, the demand for the partition of India into two or more sovereign, independent States had been based. Indeed, this Wilsonian theory of self-determination has, as was rightly apprehended by many of its critics when it was first proclaimed in 1918 and also afterwards, been much misunderstood and misused. And, as a result, it has, so far as this country is concerned, already produced many unhappy consequences.

What really did President Wilson say and mean when he proclaimed the theory of self-determination ? In the course of an address delivered on 11th February, 1918, before a joint session of the two Houses of Congress, in reply to the addresses of the Imperial German Chancellor and the Austro-Hungarian Minister for Foreign Affairs at that time, President Wilson first declared :—

"What is at stake now is the peace of the world. What we are striving for is a new international order based upon broad and universal principles of right and justice,—no mere peace of shreds and patches...National aspirations must be respected ; peoples may now be dominated and governed only by their own consent. 'Self-determination' is not a mere phrase. It is an imperative principle of action, which statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril."

He then laid down without stopping here the following four principles the "foundations" on which "a general peace" could be "erected" and a new international order based :—

(1) "Each part of the final settlement must be based upon the essential justice of that particular case and upon such adjustments as are most likely to bring a peace that will be permanent."

(2) "People and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game, even the great game, now forever discredited, of the balance of power."

(3) "Every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as a part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claim amongst rival states."

(4) "All well defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism."

It is evident from these principles that the right of self-determination was not to be, even according to President Wilson, its chief protagonist, an absolute and unqualified right. It is particularly to be noticed that he laid down that *peoples* and provinces were not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game ; that every territorial settlement must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the *populations*

concerned ; and that all well defined national aspirations were to be accorded the utmost satisfaction that could be accorded them *without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism.* People often forget these limitations imposed on the right of self-determination by President Wilson himself when they talk about this right, or base any claim on it. It need hardly point out that these limitations have, as I shall have an occasion to show later on, a direct bearing on our communal problem, particularly as it exists, for instance, in Bengal and the Punjab.

Insuperable practical difficulties were experienced by the victorious Allies after the first World War in the application of the principle of self-determination to Europe. After all, they were not, as it has been rightly said, dealing with "a blank map of Europe." As Dr. Alfred Cobban has observed in his illuminating work *National Self-Determination*, it is undeniable that in practice President Wilson's ideas "led him into a long series of inconsistencies and contradictions in which he finally became inextricably entangled. The vastness of the practical issues he was raising was perhaps hardly realized by him at first". And, according to the same writer, Wilson "confessed later, in weariness of heart, to the Committee of Foreign Relations of the (U. S. A.) Senate, that 'when I gave utterance to those words ('that all nations had a right to self-determination'), I said them without the knowledge that nationalities existed, which are coming to us day after day.....you do not know and cannot appreciate the anxieties that I have experienced as a result of many millions of people having their hopes raised by what I have said." This was natural and inevitable. It is almost impossible, as it was fully realized by the Allied and Associated Powers at the Peace Conference of Paris after the first World War, to alter the frontiers of states or to establish new states without creating new problems of minorities. Thus, practically every one among the treaty-makers at Paris, including Wilson himself, adds Dr. Cobban, "recognized that self-determination could only be applied with due regard to circumstances." Besides, there is the great difficulty of finding a generally accepted definition of the conditions which a people should satisfy before it can legitimately claim the right of self-determination. As Professor Harold Temperley of the University of Cambridge has stated in his Epilogue to the Sixth Volume of the *History of the Peace Conference of Paris* edited by him, the objection to the principle of self-determination "is the difficulty of knowing what constitutes a unit of self-

determination." "That the principle," he continues, "is a disruptive, as well as a cohesive force goes without saying. The difficulty of deciding how large an area or a population must be before it has a right to self-determination seems fundamental.....If self-determination is pushed far enough not only every town, but every hamlet, has the right to vote itself out of a state of which it may have been a part for five centuries." It is not, therefore, a matter for surprise that there was, as Dr. Cobban has shown, a sharp difference of opinion even among the members of the American Delegation to the Peace Conference of Paris on the question of self-determination ; that President Wilson's own Secretary of State, Mr. Robert Lansing, was strongly opposed to the principle of self-determination ; and that Mr. Lansing described the phrase as "loaded with dynamite," and said, "it will raise hopes which can never be realized. It will, I fear, cost thousands of lives. In the end it is bound to be discredited, to be called the dream of an idealist who failed to realize the danger until too late to check those who attempt to put the principle in force. What a calamity that the phrase was ever uttered ! What misery it will cause !" Mr. Lansing further pointed out, and very rightly, that both Canada and the United States had only continued to exist because of their denial of the principle of self-determination ; that if this principle had been accepted, the Southern States (of the U.S.A.) would have been allowed to secede and French Canada would have formed an independent state ; and that considerations of national safety, historic rights and economic interests, which would be overridden by it, should all have preference over the principle of self-determination. Apart from these considerations, there are many practical difficulties in the way of holding proper plebiscites necessarily implied in the theory of self-determination—particularly in countries where the masses are still steeped in ignorance, superstition and prejudice, and where, therefore, their worst passions can be easily overstimulated and inflamed by emotional appeals and skilfully directed propaganda.

The principle of self-determination, therefore, is not such a simple thing as some people imagine it to be. Mr. Gathorne Hardy who regards this principle as "even more disastrous" than the principle of "universal democracy" without any reference to historical traditions and political experience, is perfectly right when he observes in his *Short History of International Affairs* that "it is sound enough when not carried too far ;" that it cannot be accepted as "an

infallible, universal panacea ;" and that its "cardinal inherent vice lies in the fact that to apply it in practice inevitably involves its violation.". The principle may be applied to a country as a whole, and not to any section of its population on its demand. Otherwise, there will be a complete disintegration of the country. Moreover, if the principle of self-determination is unwisely applied to sections of the population of a country on a religious basis, then the minorities in the areas affected, who may be opposed to the majorities in them, may also legitimately claim the right of self determination on the same ground. Logic, reason, and equity would, therefore, require that there should be more or less parallel governments, over the same territories, for majorities and minorities. Thus there would be created an absurd position. Indeed, the right of self-determination is, as Lord Curzon once pointed out, like a two-edged sword and can be admitted only with reservations. Dr. Pearce Higgins, Whewell Professor of International Law in the University of Cambridge, hardly exaggerates when he observes, by way of a comment on this right, in his Edition of Hall's celebrated *Treatise on International Law* :—

"The phrase (self-determination) is one of dangerous vagueness as encouraging inordinate nationalist claims, and its application, in ignoring economic conditions, has led to some disastrous results."

It may, perhaps, not be out of place to refer here to the Aaland Island dispute and to a certain view of the Committee of International Jurists, appointed in 1920 by the Council of the League of Nations to give an advisory opinion in this connexion. The case is important as it led to the laying down of some important principles regarding the practice of self-determination. The dispute "was one concerning certain islands which lie midway between Finland and Sweden inhabited almost exclusively by people of the Swedish race, but which historically and geographically had always formed a part of Finland." The Finnish Government "declared that the Aalands were geographically part of Finland, and that it was strategically impossible for Finland to surrender them." The Swedish Government complained that the Finns were refusing "to allow the Aalanders the right of self-determination." As a matter of fact, by plebiscites, held in 1918 and again in 1919, the people of the Aalands islands, says Professor Garner, an American authority on Internatiannl Law, "had voted almost unanimously in favour of separation" from Finland. The Committee of Jurists, however, declared its opinion, continues

Professor Garner, "that there was no rule of positive international law which recognized the right of fractions of peoples as such to separate themselves by a simple act of their own will from a definitely established state of which they form a part, any more than it recognizes the rights of other states to demand such separation.....It added that the recognition of the right of self-determination in the form asserted by the inhabitants of the Aaland Islands would amount to an infringement upon the sovereignty of existing states would lead to destruction of the stability which the very word "state" implies and would endanger the interests of the international community."

In June, 1921, the Council of the League of Nations decided to recognize Finnish sovereignty over the Aaland Islands, practically accepting the recommendation of a political Commission previously appointed by it. And in October, 1921, this decision was accepted by the League of Nations "under the condition that autonomous rights should be granted to the population of the Islands. This incident has a valuable lesson for us, and I should like to invite the attention of our leaders to it. "The basic difficulty, if we open the door to a limited extent," observes Dr. Cobban, "is to prevent it from being flung wide open...If self-determination means this kind of thing, where, and with what unit, can the process possibly stop ?"

Reference has often been made by some people in justification of the application of the principle of self-determination to the solution of our communal problem, to the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (the U. S. S. R.) and to the right of secession enjoyed under it by each Constituent Republic of the Union. With due deference to these people, I am constrained to say, in the first place, that they do not appear to have properly understood the Constitution of the Union—particularly the nature of the relation of the Union to its Constituent Republics in respect of their respective jurisdictions. Secondly, they do not seem to have properly realized the position of the All Union Communist Party in relation to the actual working of the Constitution of the Soviet Union. As is well-known, this "essentially unitary" Communist party, with its "ubiquitous guidance and persuasion," is the only lawful, political party in the country, and holds the key position in the administration of the state." And that means practically everything that really matters in the government of a country. As Sidney and Beatrice Webb have pointed out in their *Soviet Communism : A New Civilisation* (Chap.

VI), Admittedly, the administration is controlled to an extent which it is imposible to measure, but which it would be hard to exaggerate, by the Communist Party, with its two or three millions of members," which "frankly accept the designation of 'keeper of the conscience of the proletariat'. They have also quoted Josef Stalin to have said, "In the Soviet Union, in the land where the dictatorship of the proletariat is in force, no important political or organisational problem is ever decided by our Soviets and other mass organisations, without directives from our Party. In this sense, we may say that the dictatorship of the proletariat is substantially the dictatorship of the Party, as the force which effectively guides the proletariat." Nor should we forget in this connexion the peculiar position formerly occupied by Lenin, and, since his death, by Stalin, in the Communist Party, and also "the deliberate exploitation by the governing junta of the emotion of hero-worship, of the traditional reverence of the Russian people for a personal autocrat." After his death, Lenin was elevated by the Russian people, say the Webbs, "to the status of saint or prophet," and his "works have become 'Holy Writ', which may be interpreted, but which it is impermissible to confute." And after his death, "some new personality," the Webbs continue, "had to be produced for the hundred and sixty millions to revere. There presently ensued a tacit understanding among the junta that Stalin should be "boosted" as the supreme leader of the proletariat, the Party, and the state. His portrait and his bust were accordingly distributed by tens of thousands, and they are now everywhere publicly displayed along with those of Marx and Lenin. Scarcely a speech is made, or a conference held, without a naive—some would say a fulsome—reference to 'Comrade Stalin' as the great leader of the people." It is not surprizing, therefore, that Stalin is "the most influential" person today, "both within the Kremlin and without". I have referred to these things as they have a bearing upon the working of the Soviet Constitution.

Thirdly, we should not forget here the position and importance of one of the Constituent Republics in the Soviet Union, namely, The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, i. e., Russia Proper, which comprizes, according to one authority about "90 percent" of the area of the Union and a little over half of its total population.

Regard being had to all aspects of the Constitution of the Soviet Union and also to the forces that operate from behind to make it work, it will not be far from wrong to say that the Union is a

"voluntary union" only in name, and that the right of secession granted to each Constituent Republic in it is in fact only a *paper* right. This does not mean, however, that I at all minimise the importance of the policy of cultural and regional autonomy which the framers of the Soviet Constitution have deliberately and wholeheartedly adopted for the solution of the problem of nationalities in the Soviet Union. And if the right of self-determination means only cultural and regional autonomy of this type, I would certainly advocate a concession of this right to every important cultural or religious group in this country. But it should be borne in mind in this connexion that the framers of the Soviet Constitution have not in reality sacrificed, as the Webbs have pointed out, the principle of the unity of the whole and the centralisation of authority in essential matters of state, to their policy of cultural and regional autonomy for minorities. "The state as a whole", the Webbs have said, "maintains its unity unimpaired, and has even, like other federal states, increased its centralisation of authority." This centralisation of authority, however, "involves no lessening of the cultural autonomy of the minorities, and even occurs concomitantly with the strengthening of the various regional cultures". What the framers of the Soviet Constitution have actually done is that they have definitely abandoned—and very rightly the policy of compulsory "Russification" of "all the national minorities within the Empire" aimed at by the previous Tzarist regime.

The view of the Soviet Constitution I have taken above is also supported by Dr. Alfred Cobban. After a survey of "nationl self-determination in the theory and practice of the Soviet Union", he observes in his work *National Self-determination*, "The Communist government...was forced to recognize that as a practical policy national self-determination, or the right of secession, was incompatible with the military and economic interests of Soviet Russia. At the same time the right of secession was too useful a weapon against the great capitalist empires to be abandoned in principle...but it is difficult to deny that so far as the Soviet state was concerned the right of secession had become a mere form of words...However it was defined, the truth was that the right of secession was a theoretical right and no more. If it retained any value, apart from propaganda purposes, it was solely as a sop to the *amourpropre* of the nationalities in the Soviet Union." Further, he says that in the event of a sharp cleavage of interests between the Russian Soviet Republic

and any other of the Union Republics—such a cleavage as developed between North and South in the Great American Union—the right of secession might become a provocation towards civil war ; but that in fact the preponderance of the R. S. F. S. R. (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) over the other republics, taken separately or together, is so great that such a danger seems remote.

Finally, Dr. Cobban remarks that 'throughout the history of Soviet Russia, it may safely be said, both the right of self-determination, and any measure of national cultural autonomy, have invariably been subordinated to the economic policy and the military security of the Union ;" that "it is clear that for the nationalities now included in the Soviet Union the right of self-determination, if it means a right of secession, is a formula devoid of meaning ;" that the 'control of the main strings of economic and political power is kept firmly in the hands of the Soviet authorities ;" that communism as a generally accepted ideal for the progress of the whole Union is a spiritual bond uniting all its peoples ; and that "economic and military inter-dependence from above, local self-government, cultural autonomy and national eqality from below—this is the ideal scheme...which the U.S.S.R. seems to be striving to achieve".

There is really, hardly anything in this ideal to which one cannot agree so far as our country is concerned.

The Cabinet Delegation Scheme.

I have dealt above, at some length, with the question of self-determination as it has a direct bearing on the Indian problem. The implications of what I have said are I believe clear, although for obvious reasons I do not propose to go into them on this occasion. I should like to repeat, however, what I have already stated, namely, that this right of self-determination, if it means a right to independent statehood, can only be applied to a country as a whole which is geographically, economically, and strategically a single unit, and not to any part of it or to any particular portion of its population. Otherwise there will arise many insuperable difficulties in a country like India. If, to take a single instance, 24 per cent of the population of India claims the right of self-determination in the sense of independent statehood, because it professes a particular religion, and if that claim is conceded, then certainly 45 per cent of the population of Bengal, 66 per cent of the population of Assam and 48 per cent of the combined population of Assam and Bengal, who may profess a

different religion or religions, have a far greater right to self-determination so far as their form of government is concerned. And once this process of concession on the ground of religion is started, there will be many more claims of an irresistible character and our problem will become absolutely, insoluble unless we should be prepared to face a total disintegration of the country. I trust that none of our leaders really wants this, or even contemplates this with equanimity.

I, therefore, heartily welcome the solution of our constitutional problem as recommended by the British Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy in their statement of 16th May last, in so far as it is based on the principle of federalism for the whole of India and thus preserves, to quote the words of the Viceroy, "the essential unity of India" which was unfortunately threatened by the dispute between its two major political parties. And I should certainly take this opportunity of paying my tribute of praise and respect to the patriotism, foresight, and statesmanship of our leaders belonging to different political parties, for their concurrence in the proposed solution. It is true that there are yet some difficulties : let us pray and hope that they will soon pass away. But although I welcome this solution for its basic principle, I do not approve of all the features of the constitution-making scheme as embodied in the aforesaid statement of 16th May last. The reason is that the scheme suffers from some serious defects. Perhaps it could not be avoided, in spite of much "hard work", "earnest study", "anxious thought" as well as "goodwill and sincerity" on the part of its authors. For, after all, the scheme was based on compromises between conflicting views and, therefore, conceived in a spirit of mutual accommodation. Time will not permit me to discuss the defects of the scheme here. I should like however, to make one or two observations here in regard to what appears to be a glaring anomaly in the scheme. It seems to me, after a very careful study of the scheme, that in drawing it up its authors have, as it were, put the cart before the horse. Let me explain my point.

According to the scheme, (i) "there should be a Union of India, embracing both British India and the (Indian) States, which should deal with the following subjects : Foreign Affairs, Defence, and Communications ; and should have the powers necessary to raise the finances required for the above subjects ;" (ii) the Union "should have an Executive and a Legislature constituted from British Indian

and States representatives ;" and (iii) "all subjects and all residuary powers should vest in the Provinces." The scheme also lays down that (i) the representatives chosen for the proposed Union Constituent Assembly "shall meet at New Delhi as soon as possible ;" (ii) that "a preliminary meeting will be held at which the general order of business will be decided, a Chairman and other officers elected, and an Advisory Committee" (for fundamental rights) set up : (iii) that "there-after the provincial representatives will divide up into" three sections ; (iv) that "these sections shall proceed to settle the Provincial Constitutions for the Provinces included in each section, and shall also decide whether any Group Constitution shall be set up for those Provinces and, if so, with what provincial subjects the group should deal ; and (v) that "the representatives of the Sections and the Indian States shall *reassemble* for the purpose of settling the Union Constitution."

It is evident from the above that, according to the scheme proposed, the framing of the Constitutions of the provinces and also of the Groups (if any), is to precede the "settling" of the Union Constitution (i. e., the Constitution of the Central-Government of India). Now the question is : How can the Provincial and Group Constitutions be *properly* framed at all unless the Union Constitution is *first settled* and an agreement is reached among all parties on the structure, *powers* and *functions of the* Union (i. e., Central) Government of India as a whole. The framing of the Provincial and Group Constitutions will automatically involve the question of the definition of the *powers* to be vested in the Provinces and the Groups. The Constitution of a country, I need hardly point it out before this learned assembly, does not mean only the structure of its Government but also the *powers* to be exercised by this Government. As Professor Dealey has stated, the Constitution of a State means "that fundamental law or body of laws, written or unwritten, in which may be found (a) the form of the organization of the state, (b) the extent of power entrusted to the various agencies of the state, and (c) the manner in which these powers are to be exercised." It, therefore, follows from what has been shown above that the definition, as far as humanly possible at this stage, of the *powers* and *functions* of the Centre (i. e., the Union Government) must precede the settlement of the Provincial and Group Constitutions. That is to say, the Union Constitution must be "settled" first before the question of framing the Constitutions of Provinces and Groups (if any) can be taken up.

This is a prerequisite constitutional necessity for framing a federal form of government like the one proposed for India by the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy, and we cannot avoid it.

It may be argued against this point of view that the constitution-making scheme embodied in the statement of 16 May last has expressly and specifically enumerated the powers to be vested in the Centre (i. e, the Union Government). To this my reply is that therein lies the crux of the whole question. What exactly are meant by the proposed Union (i. e., central) matters, namely, "Foreign Affairs, Defence, and Communications," and "the powers necessary to raise the finances required for the above subjects" ? What are the exact implications of these "subjects" and "powers" in terms, for instance, of foreign trade, commercial treaties, import and export duties, excise duties, income-tax, basic industries, inter-unit communication-facilities, inter-unit river systems, currency, coinage, banking and grave internal disorder and lawlessness ? Those who naively say that the powers of the Centre (i. e., the Union Government) have been expressly limited to only four subjects, do not appear to have rightly understood the whole question. Or perhaps they only indulge in what may be regarded as wishful thinking. As every student of federal constitutional law and practice knows, powers specifically or expressly conferred upon any authority in a Federal State automatically involves, under the doctrine of implied powers, such other powers as are "necessary and proper for the effective exercise" of the powers specifically or expressly given. This is the "doctrine of construction" which has, according to Professor Willoughby (*Constitutional Law of the United States*), been accepted by the Supreme Court of the United States from the very beginning. And Chief Justice Marshall has been quoted by him to have declared long ago in the great case of *McCulloch v. Maryland* : "The government which has a right to do an act, and has imposed on it the duty of performing that act, must according to the dictates of reason, be allowed to select the means... Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional." Judge Cooley also observes in his well-known *Treatise on the Constitutional Limitations*, "The implications from the provisions of a constitution are sometimes exceedingly important, and have large influence upon its construction...where a general power is conferred or duty enjoined.

every particular power necessary for the exercise of the one or the performance of the other is also conferred." Further, we find in a famous judgment of the Supreme Court of Illinois (*ibid*) :—"That other powers than those expressly granted may be and often are, conferred by implication, is too well settled to be doubted. Under every constitution the doctrine of implication must be resorted to, in order to carry out the general grants of power. And what applies to the Federation of the United States of America will equally apply, under the Principles of construction, to our proposed Federation—the use of the term Union in reference to it cannot conceal its federal character.

It is quite likely that the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy intentionally avoided going into details in regard to the actual powers of the Union (i. e., the Central) Government. Perhaps they thought that it would be unwise to do so at this stage. But the members of the Union Constituent Assembly should not be blind to realities : they must face facts. And if they are to succeed in their endeavours properly to frame a Constitution for India as a whole, they must first agree, as far as humanly possible, on both the *express* and *implied* powers to be vested in the Centre before they should proceed to draw up the Constitutions of the Provinces and Groups (if any). Otherwise, the question of residuary powers for the constituent units of the proposed Union of India cannot have any real meaning. Any attempt to act in a different way, that is to say, any attempt to draw up the Provincial and Group Constitutions first before the Union Constitution is properly "settled", will really be like putting the cart before the horse. Any such attempt is very likely to fail. And those who will make it are sure to be confronted with insuperable difficulties almost at every stage of their progress. The proposal of the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy in this regard appears, therefore, to be seriously defective. It is sincerely hoped that the defect will be rectified by Union Constituent Assembly itself on its own intiative.

Another important point at which I have already hinted, emerges in connexion with the question of the powers of the Union Government. It is this. What would happen in case of a grave internal disorder or lawlessness breaking out in any part of India, which either the Local Government concerned cannot effectively suppress, or to suppress which the Local Government does not, for one reason or another, intentionally adopt vigorous measures ? Certainly, in any such event the Union Government should not be

allowed simply to look on supinely : it must be vested with constitutional authority to intervene either at the request of the Local Government, or even, if necessary, on its own initiative. There should, therefore, be a provision in our future Constitution corresponding to Article 16 of the present Swiss Constitution taken along with Clauses 3, 10 and 11 of Article 102 of the same Constitution. As it is well-known, under these provisions of the Swiss Constitution, the Federal Council (i. e., the Swiss Fedral Executive) is empowered to ensure, if necessary on its own initiative, the internal safety of Switzerland and the maintenance of peace and order in case of a grave disorder, or a serious threat to that peace, from within. The primary object of the state is "the preservation of law and order, and the maintenance of the social fabric" against civil war and anarchy. The common people want peace and are not much concerned with constitutional niceties. And this peace must be ensured to them. Hence arises the imperative necessity of such a provision in our future Constitution as I have suggested above. This is not at all a communal question. After what has happened in Bengal, Bihar, and in some other parts of India since August last, not to go further back, such a provision is particularly necessary for the protection of minorities both in Muslim-majority units and in Hindu-majority units of the proposed Union of India. I sincerely hope and trust that there will be no difference of opinion on this point among the framers of our future Constitution, who should also provide for a statutory coalition (or composite) executive, representative, as in Switzerland, of all important parties in the legislature, both at the Centre and in the provinces (and Groups, if any), preferably, together with ministerial responsibility on the British pattern. If, however, it is held that the proposed Union subject of "Defence" means not merely defence of India against foreign aggression, but also defence against internal disorder, lawlessness or anarchy, then that point should be made definitely clear by inserting suitable provisions in our future Constitution so that there might not arise any occasion for any misunderstanding later on.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, I should like to address, in a spirit of humility, a word of appeal to the leaders of different political parties in this country. I would tell them in all earnestness :—"We have been passing through a grave crisis in our national life. Kindly give us a correct lead. Do not, for Heaven's sake, sow by any further word or deed of yours, any seeds of dissension amongst us. There are today

bitterness and estrangement between those who have been and should be good neighbours and friends. Heal their wounds please, and reunite them : They are disunited today ! Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has brought together the adherents of different religious faiths into this country, and *nolens volens* we have got to live side by side, depending upon mutual help and co-operation. Our political parties, we must not forget, are mere means. Our end should be the attainment of the political freedom, economic prosperity, and the moral and intellectual greatness of our common Motharland, so that we, too, may contribute our share to the advancement of civilization and the progress of humanity. We have perhaps all of us been more or less guilty of errors of judgement in the past. Let us bury along with the dead past these errors of judgement and the misunderstandings and misgivings that arose from them, forgive one another and join hands ; and then work together for the realization of our common goal. As leaders of the country, you are not merely concerned with the problems of your own communities, but also with those of the whole of India, and statesmanship cannot ask for a nobler and a greater field of exercise. Let us all by our joint efforts build up a New India on the foundations of charity, goodwill, sincerity, mutual compromise, and mutual toleration and love. Let us show to the world that in spite of our religious differences we have built up a common and synthetic civilization of our own and can live in perfect peace and amity, and that there may be a genuine unity in essentials even in the midst of diversity. Let us no more say or do anything which may create bitterness and strife now, or may pass on a legacy of such bitterness and strife to posterity. If Switzerland, Canada, South Africa, and the United State of America have all been able to solve their constitutional problems and flourish as single and undivided political entities, I do not see any valid reason why, given mutual goodwill, a spirit of compromise, charity, toleration, and forbearance, and with a deepening sense of the fundamental unity of India's political and economic life and with a growing appreciation of the complexity of her military problem and of her strategic requirements, we should fail to build up a strong, free and united India, composed of autonomous units, joined together in a federal union, with adequate statutory safeguards for all racial, religious, or cultural minorities in respect of their language, religion, culture, traditions, and other legitimate rights and privileges."

DR. J. N. KHOSLA

10

CIVIL SERVICES IN INDEPENDENT INDIA

(The Tenth Conference held in January, 1948)

India's independence will be an outstanding event of mid 20th centery. Administrative efficiency must be improved to meet the new challenges. An adjustment between highly developed science and conservativeness of mind and institutions must be brought about. The country is facing economic, social and moral problems created by the second world war. The old system of administration must be replaced witb a new one. The Civil Service must be reorganised and our personnel policies must be radically changed. A system of fair, impartial and merit based system of recruitment must be established. The method and content of competitive examinations must be over hauled. The promotion system must inspire the confidence of the rank and file. Political considerations must be kept out in the matter of promotion. The efficiency of administration will primarily depend on honesty, efficiency and progressive outlook of civil servants. A good and sound system of training is a pre-requisite for good administration. Pre-entry training should be left to the Universities and post-entry training should be the responsibility of the Government. Highly developed training institutes particularly some staff colleges would be of great help. The need for an institute i. e. Institute of Public Administration, devoted to the study of the practice and science of Public Administration cannot be overemphasised. Such an institute will be useful for all i. e. Government, civil servants and the people. The government must give facilities for establishing an institute of this type. Foreign experiments in this field have been highly beneficial.

The attainment of freedom and real self-government by India will be one of the outstanding events of the middle 20th Century. There

will be many other liberations in the wake of this one. The winning of Indian freedom will bring a ray of hope to all the exploited peoples and the onward march of Free India will be watched with anxious hope by all the nations, the coloured ones in particular.

Those at the helm of our government will have to use all their energies and their wisdom to the supreme task of government—the task of administrative efficiency.

The Problems.

The problems facing us are of a double nature—universal and particular.

The universal problem, that is, the problem India shares with the rest of the boundries, is the adjustment and fitting of society and its institutions to solve satisfactorily the new issues presented by the tremendous scientific and material advances. The travail of the world is the product of this mighty question. We have the means of flying higher and faster than any bird, of diving deeper and travelling more swiftly than any fish ; on earth, too, our speed exceeds that of any other living creature. To add to these achievements we have at our command means of destruction exceeding even our imagination. In construction too we are progressing at a tremendous pace. All these miracles of science and material progress, gratifying as they are to our vanity, are presenting terrible problems to our intelligence. New ways of doing many things are supplanting old ones so fast that we are feeling quite bewildered. The mind of man has not yet grasped the full significance and implication of the new things. Our knowledge has grown but wisdom still lingers—far, far behind. Too often we are wise after the event, and it is in the twilight that the owl of Minerva takes its flight. Social adjustment is thus a vital problem, and on its success depends the very life of man, for its failure will spell his death. How is this adjustment to be brought about between the fast changing command over nature, and the slow conservativeness of the mind and institutions of the people ?

This is the universal problem—the problem India shares with the rest of the world.

Particular Problems

1. *Heritage of War*

Then there are two particular problems, the problems that are special to us.

First of these is the heritage of the last World War. Apart from the economic and social upset the war has brought about a problem moral in its nature and socio-economic in its immediate consequences. Black-marketeering, profiteering, bribery and corruption were rampant during the war and their trail still continues. Seldom has India experienced the vitiation of its morals on such a colossal scale. The public services which should have been the bul-warks against such anti-social forces are themselves not unoften accused of corruption, inefficiency and dereliction of duty. And red-tape ties the hands of those who would like to do something. It was fondly hoped that with the oncoming of *Swaraj* things would be radically different. But the new popular governments have brought their own additional problems. There are widespread complaints of favouritism, provincialism and nepotism and there is more than a hint of the 'Spoil System' being at work.

2. *Old Administration*

Superimposed on this problem is the second one of the urgency of radical alteration of the old system of administration by a new one more in consonance with the newly-won freedom.

It is a truism to say that the type of administration in vogue during the British regime will not suit the new regime of freedom. New wine in old bottles cannot but burst the bottles. The old and slow machinery meant to safeguard the imperial interests cannot well serve the new and urgent national interests.

The Challenge of these Problems.

On our success in meeting the challenge of these problems will depend our fate. Our immediate future, to say nothing of the remote one, hangs in the balance. It is no exaggeration to say that the solution of these problems depends almost wholly on the government. The magnitude of the problems, the newness of many of the questions, and the ignorance and the inertia of our masses, the failure of laissez-fair policy, all these necessiate governmental action. Government must take the lead, and even if some problems are to be solved by the individuals or by groups, government must educate the people to take up their responsibilities. Too long have the people been left to flounder by themselves in the morass of an unprecedented situation. The success of government will depend on two inter-acting factors :—

1. The equality and workability of our democratic plans.

2. The successful evolution of a new type of administration to implement these plans.

We must have both these factors working together, one helping the other. The nobility of our plans will be a hollow mockery if the system of administration is not suited to carrying them out. Better administration will fail of its purpose if our plans are not stamped with nobility and marked with workability.

New Type of Administration.

We are fortunate in having leaders endowed with wisdom and with the spirit of practicability. They will plan sanely and will keep the best democratic interests in view.

Now remains the problem of administration. This, again, depends on two factors :—

1. The system of administration, that is the integration of the various parts of the administrative machinery to each other, and

2. The personnel of administration.

In this address I am mainly concerned with the factor of personnel which perhaps is more important of the two. For, a good personnel, *i, e.*, a personnel well-selected and fired by national ideas may work successfully even a faulty system, whereas a system of administration, however good may founder completely on the rock of faulty personnel.

The subject is wide, and to do justice to it, it would not only take up more than the time at my disposal, but also requires the combined contribution of a number of experts. There are moreover, my own handicaps of which I am fully conscious, in that I have never been closely associated with any administrative service.

The ramifications of this problem have never been the subject of a comprehensive inquiry. Rowland Committee Report is perhaps the only official report in India which attempted (though merely for Bengal and only to a limited extent) a survey of the machinery of government. Other published reports which abound in number had always some specific or limited purpose in view, and were produced under the aegis of a government having different aims and perspective than ours.

To-day we are faced with the big task of replenishing our services which have been greatly depleted by many premature retirements, or transfers to Pakistan as a consequence of Independence and Partition. The Indian Civil Service alone has lost 400 officers, three-fourth of whom had put in more than 10 years of service. We have also to recruit staff for expanding our nation-building departments at the centre and in the provinces. The government complains of paucity of suitable candidates. Some of us remain unconvinced with this admission of defeat which may partly be attributed to the narrow official outlook.

I have already explained that the old-time methods of selection of the Civil Services, and the old-time qualifications expected of the officers, are not suited to our new requirements.

Qualities Desired.

The qualities we should search for in public servants are: initiative and enterprise, planning and organising capacity, efficiency, honesty, loyalty, political neutrality, width of social outlook, and a spirit of social service. These qualities in turn will depend upon methods of selection and promotion, spirit of service and training.

Recruitment.

The method of selection to the various posts in the public services is a matter of the utmost importance for, unless the right man is discovered and then fitted into the right job the whole administration is bound to deteriorate, both in its tone and efficiency. The present day methods are :—

1. Selection by Public Service Commissions.
2. Competitions.
3. Selection by those in authority.

The last is to be condemned outright because it not only leads to favouritism and nepotism, but also because it destroys the confidence of the public and gives legitimate ground for complaint. The selection by Public Service Commission, as worked in India to-day, does not guarantee the right choice. Most Public Service Commissions have, so far been constituted on communal grounds, and therefore, cannot inspire confidence even if they are impartial. In some cases, the provincial governments ignored the recommendations of their Commissions, perhaps because these were impartial. Even appoint-

ments to the Commissions themselves were made not on considerations of fitness of the appointees but also rewards for loyal services rendered elsewhere. Actually we had the spectacle of matriculates and of people ignorant of the official language, sitting in judgement on their betters. Yet the Commission method, purged of its defects can be a very valuable means of recruitment.

Competitive System.

The second method of recruitment—through competitive system —is also full of serious defects, For one thing it puts a premium on cramming. And, for another, it fails to judge the qualities requisite for executive posts in particular. The successful candidates have not infrequently lacked personality, grit, initiative and leadership. It was at one time thought that the addition of *viva voce* to the Competitive System would rid it of some of its defects. But experience has shown otherwise. It is too brief and superficial to adjudge the personality, intelligence and character of a candidate and is often marred by the whims and prejudices of the interviewers.

Personnel Selection Board Method.

Therefore, for proper assessment and honest selection, we must try some other methods. One such method can be found in Personnel Selection Boards. Under this system the selection is made by a highly trained staff consisting of a President, and team of 5 or 6 officers including one Psychologist and one Psychatrist. Technical interviewers are included when necessary. Not only the past record of the candidate and his academic achievements are taken into consideration but he is subjected to psychological and psychaiatic tests and interviews spread over a number of days. During the tests, the candidate lives in an atmosphere in which he would be expected to live in service. The Board does not try to find faults in a hurry, but tries to discover the real worth of the individual and, therefore, is always prepared to provide alternative tests. The object of these tests is to discover :—

(*a*) who has the aptitudes, right behaviours and the needed latent qualities of a candidate ;

(*b*) who can react well under abnormal, and out the ordinary and even complicated situations ;

(*c*) who has quick flexible, analytical mind ;

(*d*) who can secure confidence of his superiors and win respect of his subordinates ;

(*e*) who has the requisite qualities of leadership, character, drive and energy.

Personality judged on the basis of questionnaries and psychological tests provides the basis of later personal interviews by the psychiatrist.

This system has worked beautifully in the United States and Germany for many years, but it was tried in England and India only under the stress of War. In England it was greatly appreciated. But in India it met with a qualified success. This was due to the fact that the experts who conducted these were mostly trained under system and conditions foreign to India, and, therefore, their interpretations of the reactions and responses of Indians could not always be reliable. It is hoped, however, that we shall be able to train our own experts in India and remove the existing defects. The charge of morbidity against the psychiatrist-tests based largely on ignorance as it is, should not stand in the way of a useful innovation in the recruitment of our Civil Service. In any case our experience of the Board Method is too short to warrant any generalisations and, therefore, I would suggest that it should be tried side by side with the system of recruitment by open competition for at least ten years. A service record of all candidates selected by the two methods should be carefully maintained to find out which provided better administrators. The problem of the Selection Boards and their relation with the Federal Services will be a difficult one. To eliminate political consideration, it would be better on the whole, to work out the system under the aegis of the Federal Public Service Commission.

Psychological and Psychiatric Tests for F.P.S.C.

But before the Board System has been properly adapted to Indian conditions and given fuller trial, it may be used to supplement the competitive system. The *viva-voce* in the latter system may with advantage, be reinforced by Psychological and Psychiatric tests for an accurate grading of the human material.

Subjects for F.P.S. Examinations.

As the system of competitive examination is to be kept up, there should be a thorough overhaul of the subjects included in them.

There has been considerable amount of discussion whether a mind trained in classics and literature is better fitted to deal with administrative problems or a mind with general educational background but equipped with a special knowledge of the theory and practice of administration. Recent trends favour the latter type. Therefore greater importance must be given to subjects like Political Theory, Public Administration, Public Finance, Economics, Psychology, Sociology, and Modern Sciences. Universities in the foreign countries are giving greater attention to the teaching of and research in these subjects, so that a proper background of the technique and the science of Public Administration may be available to the graduates seeking admission to the Public Services. In their examinations, however, the Government of India has been giving a step-motherly treatment to the social sciences in general and political science (including public administration) in particular. When some years back, on behalf of the Indian Political Science Association, I approached the then Chairman of the Public Service Commission to give greater prominence to Political Science, his reply was that Political Science was not a suitable subject to be included in the examination for Indian Audit and Accounts Service. There may have been some political reasons, in the past for discouraging political science. There need be no ground now for the government to feel shy of the subject, and the matter should be immediately reviewed and the previous mistake rectified. Social sciences have to play as important a part in reconstrucing the world as the pure sciences.

There is one other point to be noticed. At present the choice of subjects is limited and the combinations unsuitable. To enable the competitors to show their best ability, it is imperative that these subjects be multiplied and a greater range of choice be given to candidates.

An Alternative Competitive Examination.

At present the Administrative Services in India are open only to graduates under 24 years of age. In view of the shortage of officers, and an increasing demand for technical skill, we must try to recruit suitable persons from provincial services as well as from teachers, lawyers, journalists, businessmen and engineers endowed with ability and experience—at present debarred from joining the services as a matter of course. During the last war when the scope of administration suddenly widened in India and the new departments like Food Supply, Information and Braodcasting, Civil Defence and

Labour, along with many other semi-technical Boards came into existence, the provincial and the central governments felt that the civil servants, schooled in police-functions, could not efficiently run the social service departments requiring different technique and knowledge. The government was consequently obliged to suspend the age bar, and the usual method of recruitment. Hundreds of administrative officials were appointed from outside and many more were given Emergency Commissions in the Army. It is now an open secret that this new experience proved very encouraging. Even in the post war period the Ministries of Education, Information and Broadcasting, Health, Power, and Mines, Labour, Communications, Food, Agriculture, Development and Planning, Defence, and External Affairs need the services of experts having postgradute and specialised knowledge. So, in the context of the changing character and scope of the Indian Administration, it is essential that in addition to the usual Federal Public Service Examination, a parallel examination should be held to recruit the latter type. Women, being handicapped for various reasons from taking the competitive examination at an early age. may also find this a suitable method of entry to Public Services and prove their natural genius and capacity for social work. This alternative form of competition will, of course, give rise to questions of initial grading, subsequent promotions, and the ultimate pensions of the senior recruits, but such an adjustment will not be difficult.

It would not be out of place to refer to the suggestion that civil service should not be a closed caste, and a civil servant should be able to join business and then return again to civil service and *vice versa*. Personally, I do not favour such frequent interchangeability because the moral standards of the two vocations differ. Moreover, the profit motive may not be good training for the civil servant.

Promotion.

The problem of promotion in any gigantic and far-flung administration is a difficult one. Should it depend on seniority or on merit ?

As long as the principle of equal opportunities for all is assured in the initial selection, promotion to higher service ceases to be the right of the individual and can be granted in the interest of the service as a whole. Promotion by seniority, doubtless, a humanitarian method, can, therefore, be a guiding principle, in the lower grades of service. But for superior grades, dealing with the direction

and formulation of policy, outstanding ability or merit should be the main consideration. That is, with a rising scale of responsibility, the ratio of seniority to ability must be inverted. Fitness to higher posts, however, should not be determined solely on one's past record, but also on his general capacity and aptitude to discharge duties and bear the responsibility of higher post for which he is a potential candidate, in addition to his ability to control his subordinates. There is a danger of abuse and arbitrariness and in order to ensure a fair field to merit without favour, a Promotion Committee should be set up with the Establishment Officer as its Chairman. The members of the Committee should be some of the senior officers of known integrity, free from all bias, personal or political. To protect themselves against political pressure and against the suspicion of political motives, the Ministers as a rule, should have nothing to do with appointments, promotions, postings or transfers of administrative officers. Ministerial neutrality is absolutely essential for creating fair conditions of service and raising the morale of the officers. Unfortunately, the ideal conditions do not prevail either at the Centre or in the Provinces. There is growing resentment in the services and in the public against the objectionable method of issuing ministerial chits or indiscreet exercise of pressure by political leaders. Indian politicians must realise that this race for nepotism and spoils in the very wake of our freedom will utterly mar the prospects of building up any wholesome services traditions. The growing menace of extraneous influence is giving rise to unhealthy traits of careerism which, if not checked immediately, will end all hopes of building up an efficient and democratic administrative structure.

In the appointment of Secretaries of the Departments, it may be emphasised that only persons of great administrative and organising ability, imagination and initiative with capacity for planning and co-ordination, should be selected, preferably from amongst those having experience either of the same department or that of an allied one by a Committee of Secretaries as at present. The recommendations of the Committee should ordinarily be given effect to unless the Cabinet as a whole has some serious objection to a particular appointment.

On the vital question of the tenure of a secretary, the Wheeler Committee on the organisation of the Secretariat was divided. The Chairman favoured a fixed 5 year tenure, but the other two members suggested permanency which alone could ensure conti-

nuity of departmental experience and the required independence of judgement with changing ministries. A change in the secretaryship, they added, would mean risks of discontinuity as some dislocation was inevitable with a new incumbent. In England the post is permanent. I strongly feel that while a secretary must never be appointed for a temporary or a short period, too long a tenure, however brilliant he may be, tends to make the department activity stale and stereotyped. Five years period with eligibility to re-appointment for two or three years should be the maximum. A civil servant must retire thereafter. This may mean premature retirement, but that cannot be helped. At present Secretaryships go in India to rather younger civil servants with the result that they may have a period of as mach as 12 to 15 years—too long a span for useful activity without being stale or creating a vested interest in the department.

Honesty.

Before dealing with the problem of training, I must make at least a passing reference to three other factors : honesty, efficiency and a new and progresive outlook amongst public services.

One cannot over emphasise the need for honesty and integrity in public administration. And yet, it is not easy, in practice, to punish the dishonest. The difficulty of detection, the pernicious virus of communalism, unhealthy political pressure, the natural tendency to deal with one's subordinates leniently, favouritism, nepotism and—what is most serious—ineffective law and procedure, and inadequacy of penalty account for this. The war has aggravated the situation by vitiating moral values. The remedy is both legal and psychological. The law must be amended on the lines of the United Kingdom Prevention of Corruption Act, 1906, to severely punish the giver as well as the taker of bribes. But even more important is the necessity of educating public opinion and raising of moral standards. People in fact must be associated more closely with the administration to check corruption. Advisory Committees of the public for each department would be a useful device, provided such committees act with restraint and not become merely inquisitionary in their temper.

Efficiency.

Efficiency in service depends on training, promotion as incentive to merit, organisational structure and procedure, mobility, condi-

tions of service and the process of purging the inefficient. The question of promotion has been dealt with and that of training will follow presently. Organisational structure and procedure must eliminate excessive and unnecessary noting and inappropriate technique in inter-departmental consultation. The higher staff must be relieved of the routine work which can be handled efficiently by the lower grade staff.

Mobility, whether from one department to another, or from the centre to the provinces and *vice versa*, increases efficiency by giving greater experience, a freshness of mind and a sense of reality, and, therefore, must be systematised.

Regarding conditions of service, one need only point out that while security is necessary to infuse confidence and spirit of independence in the public servant, *absolute* security produces careless disregard of public duty and inertia.

Factors which have stood in the way of purging inefficiency are largely the same as those mentioned in respect of dishonesty. A drastic process is required. At present adverse report on the Character Roll is not treated as disqualifying an officer from passing an efficiency bar, still less as ground for withholding an annual increment. Indeed we have seen a statement to the effect that "mere inefficiency is no bar to crossing the efficiency bar." This is absurd. Crossing of efficiency bar must depend only on positive evidence.

A New Outlook.

Above all we must create a new spirit in our services. They must not only be efficient, but also conscious that they are there to serve and not to rule. Dealing with human beings, mechanical efficiency is not enough. One cannot ride rough-shod over human material, nor be meticulously uniform in treatment. For long the Indian Civil Service was neither truly Indian, nor civil, nor service. The civilian frustrated public expectation by his exclusiveness and his snobbery, sometimes verging on discourtesy. But Indianisation by itself is not enough. The civil servant must stand for new ideas and identify himself with the interests of the masses, who pay for him. Already, a change in his attiude is noticeable, but the next remedy lies in democratising our educational system. The preliminary training for the higher services is so expensive that caeer

is not really open to talent.

Training of the Civil Servants.

1. *The Role of Universities.*

Now the problem of training—pre-entry and post-entry. The pre-entry training is mainly the concern of the universities, and post-entry, that of the governments.

Few Universities provide specialised study for public administration, but liberal education provided by the universities, is important to get over the "don't rock the boat" attitude, typical of most bureaucracies. In a dynamic society there must be a closer understanding of political action and nature of political institutions. This the Universties must promote.

In three other ways the Universities can help training our potential civil servants :

1. By drafting and promoting schemes for democratising education, and thus enabling the tapping of unlimited reservoir of ability, intelligence, initiative, latent in the millions of common people of our country.
2. By becoming the vehicle of new education which would inculcate in the educated mind the habit to think independently, progressively and objectively. They must place greater emphasis on social sciences, which today are being overshadowed by technical and scientific education.
3. By organising research in public administration. This would require close relation between the public services and the Universities.

2. *Post-entry Training.*

As efficiency in administration depends upon the efficiency of its supervisory staff, post-entry training, occupies a central position in the personnel programme and policy of a country. In the U.S.A., this traning has been made popular by the 'Training Within Industry' (T. W. I.) movement. In England the beginning has been made by the British Training and Educational Division of the Treasury. Unfortunately, a scientific post-entry training in India was neglected by previous governments. Now that we have to work out administration in the context of a new social order, it is imperative that the civilian should be given a systematic training which comprises "job relations", besides "induction" and

"apprenticeship." The basic idea is rationalization of administrative functions. Job analysis, which implies scientific division of labour, consists in splitting the job into various processes and demonstrating them to the operatives. Job Management includes constant valuation of the different processes, so that old processes can be scrapped and new ones introduced. It also embraces mechanical appliances which can be used whenever possible to save human energy and to make conditions of work as congenial as possible. Job Relations comprise the technique of acquiring an intimate day-to-day knowledge of human relationships and the psychological and economic conditions under which the operatives live and work in order to improve them and to create the necessary urge to be more efficient.

Staff College.

But the training, I have just referred to, will not be enough for those who have shown extraordinary genius for administration and are expected to reach the highest posts.

It is a pity that the institution of a Staff College which has proved invaluable to the army for nearly two generations has not so far been tried on the civil side. Even in England a staff college for training in business management and administration was not set up till three months ago.

We have no arrangement for the training of our superior staff. The result is that they do not always realise the significance of the political, economic, and social background in which they work, or of their administrative capacity in relation to national and international forces. They lack the spirit of innovation and inquiry into new technique of administration. If selcted from technicians, they may have little conception of social sciences or principles of administration.

At present the only college for administrative training is the one for the training of the new entrants to the Indian Administrative Service. A Staff College should be added as a post-graduate section to this institution. Incidentally, this would enrich the seminar work of the young entrants by contact with those having experience.

The course should be for six months. The Principal of this College should be a civilian of marked ability, character and imagination but should not hold office for more than three years. The instructional staff may be drawn from the services, the public, and the Universities and should hold office for a similar term, but

should be re-eligible for appointment for one more year. A short term tenure would ensure freshness of outlook, and contact with up-to-date experience.

The curriculum should include :—

1. The science of higher administration.
2. The study of current economic, social and political developments.
3. Visit to various administrative departments—commercial and governmental—to give sense of objectivity.
4. Lecturing to the new entrants to the Administrative Service.

A six months course, some may object, is too short. Perhaps it is. But a longer course may tend to give the students a bit too much of detail than would be good for them. The course however, may be supplemented by a six months to a year, travel abroad, on study leave. This would give larger outlook and wider experience. Recently, there was a suggestion to exchange officers with France. Such an exchange would certainly mean dislocation of work, inconvenience and lot of expense to the government, but the returns will be invaluable, not only by giving the officer a truer perspective but also by equipping him for planning effective administration. Routine and narrow sphere of action limits one's vision and makes an officer, however brilliant, stale. Exchange will give him a fresh stimulus and tone up his mental make up. Impact with other systems will rouse in him spirit of inquiry and the will to understand and to accept methods to which he is not used.

In England the opposition to the idea of the Staff College was mainly based on the difficulty of selection of officers. This would indeed present a serious problem but it is by no means insurmountable. We must decide a method of selection based on fairness and merit. Even after coming out of the staff College, one should not be entitled to promotion merely on that account. Similarly, a really able man should not be denied it for not having been at the Staff College. There may grow, otherwise, antagonism within the service against this select minority. In any case to derive maximum amount of advantage, the officers must be carefully selected not only for their receptivity of mind and general ability, but also from departments which can reap greatest advantage, such as the departments of Communications, Health and so on.

Institute of Public Administration.

I now come to my last proposal : that for the creation of an Institute of Public Administration which would be a voluntary organisation of those interested in the study of the practice and science of administration. The need for an Institute of Public Administration is obvious.

The background of many entrants to the civil service is too limited. They may never have studied at the Universities the much needed Social Sciences. Or else, through excessive departmental specialisation they may have lost their width of outlook, freshness of mind and the desire to plan ahead. Their association with an Institute of the kind suggested will be invaluable. The Institute would provide those concerned with practical administration, opportunities for exchange of views and for pooling of experiences. It would promote the study of the science of administration, organised research in the technique of government; establish contact between the civil servant and the public for better understanding of each other's point of view; plan a programme of adminlstrative reform, not only to meet present day problems but to anticipate any change in the future; provide a common meeting ground for the theoretician and the expert to the advantage of both. Through publications, lectures and discussions, the institute could educate and even create public opinion as to the duties, aims and utility of public services, and also instil professional spirit in the civil servant who often regards his post merely as a means of earning his living.

To be useful and independent the Institute must be non-government. But it will need the active co-operation, particularly of the senior and experienced administrators who have so far maintained a superior aloofness.

The government must allow its employees to join the Institute, contribute papers and participate in the discussions. The anonymity of the civil servant is commendable but it must not be a fad. This contact will enrich their knowledge about principles of administration and make them more efficient.

Such institutes have done very useful work in England, U.S.A., Australia and other countries. The England Institute, founded in 1923, has a Journal of Administration, which is the best of its kind in the English language.

In the new India too, where traditions of real public spirit and efficient discharge of duty have to be re-established and reaffirmed, the setting up of an Institute of Public Administration is a matter of urgency, The national government must be approached to give facilities, and adequate financial support to enable the Institute to start its work.

Foreign Experiments.

Before I conclude, it would not be inappropriate to refer to some experiments in the science and practice of administration which are being carried on in many foreign countries, notably the United States. Much of the effort comes from big business, which set up schools and associations for post-entry training for their staff. This movement received real impetus when in 1924 Czechoslovakia convened the first International Congress of Scientific Management to promote the movement for education and training of technical administrative personnel, and to rationalise capitalist industry with a view to fit it into a democratic set up. Several countries have, now, National Institutes affiliated to the Congress whose meeting last summer was attended by over 1,500 delegates, including many public servants.

There is another analogous organisation : The International Congress of Administrative Services. It also has corresponding National Institutes as a rule non-governmental, affiliated to it. These institutes are more concerned with efficiency in administration and disemination of information and literature on this subject. At the Berne Conference in July 1947 many public servants were also present.

Mr. Stone, Head of the Bureau of the Bugdet in Washington has made an interesting but a more effective proposal. He wants the UNESCO to improve the efficiency of administration in various countries as owing to the varying standards of efficiency of member countries decision taken at International Conferences can not be properly implemented. He advocates an inter-change of personnel to promote better understanding between officials of different countries and to act as a medium of exchange of information. The functions of government are growing and many of the national problems are assuming international importance making international co-operation essential. The beginning of exchange of officers has already been made. American missions and experts for instance have been to Brazil, China and other countries. India and many other countries have also sent out officers for training and observa-

tion. The results are encouraging but more effective method of exchange is needed. UNESCO, says Mr. Stone, should give the lead.

In conclusion I have only to emphasise that our public services must be adjusted to our new requirements. We must improve our methods of recruitment and training, build up new traditions of service, and promote better understanding between the public and the public servant. The Government will do well to appoint a Commission to inquire into the whole problem of machinery of government. This Commission should include adequate representation of those who have made it their profession to study the problems of administration.

Please forgive me for taxing your patience so long, as I did so, hoping to rouse public interest in a very vital problem which has not so far received the attention it deserves in our country.