

New India

— FORTNIGHTLY —

FOUNDED BY DR. ANNIE BESANT IN 1914

EDITORIAL BOARD

N. SRI RAM: JAMSHED NUSSERWANJI: ROHIT MEHTA
Managing Editor: G. R. VENKATRAM

Vol. I. No. 12

1 APRIL 1947

FOUR ANNAS

Asia is one. We rise or sink together. The freedom and well-being of any one country in Asia are just as much China's concern as China's of theirs. But let us not forget another fact: the world is also one. While we work for peace and prosperity for the Asian peoples, we should also use all our united strength and influence to bring about, through goodwill and understanding, the reign of peace and harmony throughout the world. It is our fervent hope that this Inter-Asian Relations Conference will be a means towards this end.—CHENG YIN FUN.

(Leader of the Chinese Delegation to the Inter-Asian Relations Conference).

DEFENCE PROBLEMS OF FREE INDIA

BY PROF. D. S. NAG, M. A., B. COM.

Govindram Seksaria College of Commerce, Wardha

India is entering the portals of Freedom. The people's representatives shall, for the first time, draft a constitution for free India. The constitution framed by the Constituent Assembly shall determine the future pattern of national life and the type of administration under which our country shall be governed. It does not require any elaboration that peace and progress of a country largely depend upon its sound policy and arrangement for defence and internal security. Hon. Sardar Baldev Singh, Defence Member of the Interim Government, remarked in his broadcast talk on last October 9: 'All progress and stability depend ultimately on security. The guardians of that security and freedom are the armed forces of the country.' Hence the need at this juncture for giving serious consideration to our defence and army problems. Defence has so far been a reserved subject, and for the first time it has come under an Indian Defence Member. We have now an opportunity to examine our defence problems from a national point of view and reconstruct the national defence policy on new lines. But before a future policy is chalked out, we must take stock of the past which has left many a scar on the present and is likely to influence the speed of our progress.

PAST LEGACY

Right from the days of the 1857 Independence Battle, defence and army have been a guarded secret against Indians. We were not given any share either in framing its broad policy or matters of detail. The 'fear complex' created among the British army officers by the 1857 Mutiny has ruled the minds of successive commanders-in-chief. Although the Afghan wars and other Imperialist Expeditions compelled the British army officers to seek more cooperation of Indian soldiers and officers, the mainstay of the British army policy was the 'exclusion' of Indians from all key positions in the army. The Peel

Commission of 1858-59 recommended that Europeans alone should, as far as possible, be employed in the scientific branch of the services. A typical example of the evidences given before the said Commission is worth quoting: 'I agree with those who think that it is not judicious to train any natives of India to the use of guns. They make excellent artillery men and they attach great value and importance to guns; but these very considerations make it dangerous to place them in their hands.' (Lord Elphinstone, the then Governor of Bombay). The effect of such policy of exclusion was clear. Indians were excluded from the mechanised wings of the armies and were mainly confined to the infantry and cavalry. Since then Indian army policy has passed through various stages—martial and non-martial races; superiority of the British section; slow Indianisation; cautious mechanisation; emergency and the so-called voluntary recruitment. Each of the stages has left its own legacy in our army personnel. We shall have to liquidate the bad legacies before we launch on reconstructing our defence and army policy.

NEED OF RE-ORIENTATION

The political circumstances of the country and the international situation are so changed that our defence problem should be considered in new setting and should be viewed with new vision. Our armies—land, naval and air—should remain no more a wing of the British Imperial armies. The defence of India is our right and our responsibility. The British Crown should cease to think Indian defence as its 'sacred' duty. It is a different thing that we may agree to participate in a joint Indo-British control of a particular region. But our armies should henceforth function as forces of a free sovereign state and not a wing under the tutelage of the British Empire. As pointed out by the Defence Member in his recent broadcast talk, 'the supreme task before the Indian armed forces is to cooperate in the achieve-

ment (and preservation) of full freedom of 400 million people of India, so that they may advance in peace and security'. India does not seek dominion over others. Our national leaders believe 'might is indeed righteous when it is conserved to the care of the weak and protection of one's homeland'. Free India shall maintain forces for two purposes: firstly to protect the country against any external invasion, and secondly to help the civil police in maintaining law and order in the country. The strength of our armies for guarding against any foreign aggression shall largely be determined by the exigencies of international situation. Although the U. N. O. has come into existence, the germs of the third world war are sprouting in many parts of the world. The gulf between the Big Powers who could organize a durable world peace is widening. The situation, as developing around us, necessitates the maintenance of large and effective defence arrangements. We can hardly make our country as the playfield of Power Politics. In order to guard against such danger, we must create and develop a strong national army equipped with most up-to-date weapons of war. Again the transference of power from the British to the Indian hands will not be a smooth affair. All reactionary forces are bound to raise their heads against the resurgent Indian nationalism. The communal tension is already assuming grave dimensions. The East Bengal orgy must warn us against any complacency about internal situation. The civil police is no doubt primarily responsible for internal security. But in cases of emergency the aid of army may become indispensable for restoring peace in the disturbed areas. Thus we shall need for the interim period as well as permanently a large army of strictly non-communal character for internal purposes.

BASIC REQUIREMENTS OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

The corner-stone of national defence is the creation and development of a national army—land, navy and air. Unlike the past our army men should be first-rate patriots, ready to lay down their lives for the nation. The mercenary character which defamed our armies for such a long time should be removed root and branch. Patriotism should no longer remain a taboo in the army. Our forces should henceforth owe allegiance to the sovereign state of the Union of Independent India. Even if we decide to remain in the British Commonwealth of Nations, we shall not follow the example of the Dominions. In the Dominions the King is, constitutionally speaking, the titular head of all the armed forces. As for example, the command of the naval and the military forces of the Commonwealth of Australia is, under Sec. 68 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, vested in the Governor-General as Representative of the British Crown. Contrary to this, we should make it clear, like the Irish Free State, that the command of the forces shall vest in the 'Executive Council which shall exercise it through the Minister for Defence who may or may not bear the title of Commander-in-Chief.' In brief our army should be national in character, owing allegiance to the nation and functioning for the defence of the country.

The second *sine qua non* of sound defence policy for India would be to treat India as one organized unit in the South-East Asia sector. Her land frontiers, mountain walls, coastlines and natural resources naturally mark her out as a self-contained region not only to defend herself but also to act as a base—air as well as naval—for the defence of the South-East Asiatic countries. Any attempt to disturb this compactness and unity of India would simply bring disaster on the country. We quote the British Cabinet Mission

on this point: 'The case for a united defence is even strong. The Indian armed forces have been built up as a whole for the defence of India as a whole, and to break them into two would inflict a deadly blow on the long traditions and high degree of efficiency of the Indian army and would entail the gravest dangers. The Indian navy and air forces would become much less effective. The two sections of the suggested Pakistan contain the two most vulnerable frontiers in India and for a successful defence in depth the area of Pakistan would be insufficient'. The Sapru Committee sums up its opinion in one sentence: 'It is unnecessary to point out the grave risk to the defence of the country that partition would involve'. It is a matter of no mean significance that even Sir Reginald Coupland has himself felt compelled, by the logic of facts, to say, 'that the greatest difficulty of Pakistan and its gravest risk lie in defence'. It would not be out of place to quote Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who has spent a number of years to the study of Pakistan demand from a dispassionate angle: 'It would be flying in the face of world forces to reduce the size and strength of India... This will make India a house divided against itself and exposed to intrigues by foreign powers. As a result, all its component independent states will be weak, unable to protect themselves against foreign aggression and liable to be played against each other'. As far as defence is concerned, the case against partition is proved to the hilt. In future, our policy should therefore be to maintain and develop a unified India strong enough to defend herself as one nation.

In the peculiar circumstances of our country today, the necessity of developing non-communal spirit in our forces can hardly be over-emphasized. The theory of martial and non-martial races, preservation of counter-poise between areas and races and territorial recruitment have kept alive provincial, class and race separatism in the Army. This was done to avoid the repetition of the 1857 Rebellion against the British. The separatist tendencies could not raise their heads as the armies remained so far under the alien rule. But with transference of sovereign power, the venom may spread and paralyze the administration. Immediate steps should, therefore, be taken to ensure that defence and security are not allowed to be influenced by any communal considerations nor the efficiency of our defence forces sacrificed at the altar of communal representation.

TRANSITIONAL PERIOD

Our country will have to pass through a transitional period before her armies attain the modern standards of efficiency and equipment. Some arrangements regarding defence will have to be made with Britain on certain matters arising out of the complete transference of power to Indian hands. It does not require any explanation that India occupies an important strategic position in the Eastern hemisphere. The United Nations Security Council may deem it necessary to station some British troops in India for maintaining peace in Asia. In view of these facts, India may enter into some sort of agreement with Britain on defence matters. Sardar K. M. Panikkar in his recent book, *A Basis of Indo-British Treaty*, has discussed the details of such a treaty and the area of its operation. But certain things must be specifically mentioned in the proposed treaty. Firstly, India's independent sovereign status, equal to that of any free country of the world, should form the basis of the treaty. No Imperial troops will remain in the country without the consent of her people. The British Government will no more be responsible either for internal or external security of India. Secondly,

(Continued on p. 4)

New India

Benares City

1 April 1947

Let us magnify our great agreement, and minimize our differences.—ANNIE BESANT.

A Right of Self-Determination

According to *The Hindu's* New Delhi correspondent, "when Pandit Nehru starts conversations with the Muslim League, they will be on the basis of a divided Punjab and a divided Bengal". In normal circumstances such a division would have been met by all the elements concerned with a raging, tearing opposition; but the recent events in these Provinces have so inflamed the differences between the Muslims and the non-Muslims—the Hindus and the Sikhs stand together in the Punjab—that the latter would now rather be ruled, where they can, by a Government of their choice than submit for the sake of a sentimental unity to Muslim authority in the areas where the Muslims are not in a majority. It is not possible under any canon of logic or fairness to deny them this right of self-determination, if they demand it, in those extensive Divisions of the Punjab and Bengal where they are in a majority. These include, of course, the City and port of Calcutta. The Proposed division is good in our opinion, whether the Divisions dominated by the Muslims choose to remain within the Indian Union, enjoying the largest possible Provincial autonomy, or decide to play with an unknown fate and set themselves up as separate independent entities amidst the restrictions and turmoil of their respective situations. When later—we contemplate an optimistic "when" instead of "if"—the general advance of education and modern ideas bring common-sense to the foreground, putting communal distinctions into the shade, the sundered parts can re-unite if they then wish to do so. We have had a taste of Pakistan in action already under the guise of Provincial autonomy. Those who do not appreciate its blessings ought to be allowed, if they live in a compact area forming a majority therein, the freedom to forego them and constitute themselves into separate political units. Mr. Jinnah and his League will of course fight tooth and nail against this move; but they will have no legs to stand upon, in denying to the Non-Muslims of these areas the very right which they demand for the Muslims of the Punjab and Bengal as these Provinces stand at present.

—N. S. R.

A Diagnosis

In his recent speech on India in the House of Commons, Mr. Attlee, the British Prime Minister, made the important point that "political advances would have been easier if undertaken earlier. There has been too much delay, too much hesitation, too much fear to go forward. But having reached the present stage we cannot go back and cannot remain as we are."

Unfortunately, wisdom dawned too late on the powers that be. The Freedom movement began in India in 1914 and obtained a grip on the administration in 1920. The British Government ought to have turned its waters even in those early years into constructive channels, which would have vitalized both the administration and political life of India, and turned them into a productive garden. Instead, patriotism, denied its due honour, tended to become

increasingly hot-blooded and was allowed to turn into a fever and produce distempers for which at last the treatment now adopted is to "quit India" quickly. As late as 1935, if action had been taken with a firm hand on the lines envisaged in the Government of India Act of that year, there would neither have been the cry of Pakistan and all the consequent strife, nor the move to break the connection with British and her Commonwealth of Nations. But the then Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, did not possess the necessary earnestness and drive, and the officials who had his ear were averse to change that would undermine their authority. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick", and the sickness is now so pronounced that it has given rise to a general degeneracy with attendant convulsions and spasms.

—N. S. R.

Real Freedom

We make no apology for extracting the following observations of H. E. Sir Archibald Nye, Governor of Madras, from his reply to an address recently presented to him by the Chittoor Municipal Council:

"Your address refers to the fact, that in a few short months the British Government will be handing over power in India. This transfer of power will give to India material freedom, freedom from any form of control by any external authority... Freedom, of course, is much more than merely material freedom. It includes spiritual freedom as well, and spiritual freedom is something which the British Government cannot give to India. It is something which every nation and every individual must win for himself. It is an attitude of mind and not a material thing. It is the will to govern oneself and this will apply just as much to nations as it does to individuals. We must all, whether as a nation or as individuals, be prepared to control ourselves, to exercise self-control for the sake of the common good. When applied to a nation this means that every citizen must be prepared to play his part in the Government of his country, to try to see the point of view of others and to pursue the good of the country as a whole and not merely his own selfish interest.

"I would appeal to each one of you most earnestly to do all in your power to help your country in the great task on which she is about to enter—the task of assuming full, complete and unfettered control over her own destiny. It rests with you to turn the gift of material freedom which is the last and only gift which the British Government can give you into real freedom by adding to it the concept of spiritual freedom of which I have spoken".

We Indians are given to pride ourselves on our spiritual tradition. But unfortunately, that tradition in actual life has become so flat and ineffective that it amounts but to a vague reminiscence, faintly illuminating the border of the ugly tale of our present pursuits. The word "Freedom" or even "Independence" will not work a miracle, even when it is paraphrased into a legislative Act. Freedom must be built up from below by self-discipline in the exercise of public spirit and the placing of the common good in every little matter before personal, party, or communal advantage.

—N. S. R.

Transcending Communalism

There is a proposal among the Muslims of Bihar that there should be established pockets in which they can live together and protect themselves, instead of remaining scattered and defenceless in villages far apart from one another. It is a scheme which it would be impossible to carry out on any scale adequate to solve the minority problem in India without causing untold suffering to the millions (of Hindus

as well as Muslims) who will have to be uprooted from their properties, connections and livelihood, and cast elsewhere. The transplantation of populations was one of Hitler's ideas. Need we import the Hitlerian methods or the Hitlerian spirit to solve our problem in India? A far better method would be for all Indian leaders to place a concerted moratorium for a period of years on any kind of talk or action in favour of one community against another, so that during this period we all learn to regard ourselves as Indians and not as Hindus or Muslims except for strictly religious purposes. We may find at the end of the period that we have forgotten these distinctions for good, and ceased to have any accounts to settle with each other. Let first of all the communal electorates go; and simultaneously the idea of communal States. If there is to be a Pakistan, let the whole of India be Pakistan. Let Hindus vote in joint electorates by preference for worthy Musalmans, and let the Muslims vie with them in voting for broad-minded Hindus. Let there be a convention that all the big non-expert political appointments should be given in rotation to all the communities, if we must still think of communities. A Cabinet composed entirely of Musalmans in whom the Hindus have placed their trust would be a far better protection for Hindus and vice versa. It would even be more truly representative than a Cabinet composed of Hindus and Muslims whose loyalties are separate and discordant and who are extremists in their respective camps. Is this dream too far removed from the realities of our waking state ever to come true? —N.S.R.

Building A White South Africa

Field-Marshal Smuts is very eager to strengthen the European population in South Africa with the refugee and stricken elements now teeming in Europe, and anxiously lifting their eyes to any sign of a clearing on their horizon beyond which may be sought both livelihood and oblivion of their present miseries. He said, in a debate on the Immigration policy of the Union in the Union Assembly on

January 29th, that the recent census results were "disturbing". "There had been only a small increase in the white population and an expansion on a big scale of the other sections of the population. This was a clear danger sign. Unless measures were taken, the small white population—white civilization—was in danger." There was the difficulty of housing the immigrants, along with other difficulties. But the Field-Marshal intends to house the immigrants in camps. "How can we talk of a white South Africa", he exclaimed, "if we let a chance like this go by?" There is talk of a white South Africa, only because the whites there have monopolized the power and refuse to share it with the other inhabitants of the country. South Africa is as a matter of physical fact a white cum brown cum dark land. We have no objection to South Africa affording a home to some of the uprooted men and women of Europe. But when a matter like Immigration is considered, is it to be supposed that the Indians and the Natives (the original inhabitants of the land) have no needs and wishes, affecting the consideration? Why white South Africa at all? Is it so axiomatic that South Africa must be white in the future? Are there any grounds for assuming that there is a Divine ordinance to this effect? We have seen "white civilization" without its veneer and in the logical climax of its tendencies during the recent war. Other civilizations have, of course, their sear and muddy aspects. But by contrast the white does not appear immaculate. The less the colour of the skin and culture are identified with each other, the better shall we be able to deal with the problems relating to both. Field-Marshal Smuts's angle of vision on the outstanding aspect of the situation in his country does not forebode fair weather for a future in which this aspect will have to be settled fairly and squarely once for all. He has not yet advanced, despite being a philosopher of sorts, to "the one world" ideal, in which there must be the same primary rights for every human being, be he white, brown, yellow or dark. —N. S. R.

(Defence Problems of Free India: From p. 2.)

if India participates in any scheme of regional security she will do so as an independent and full-fledged autonomous state and she will have full right of exercising unfettered discretion in matters of strategic operations. Thirdly, the Indian Union, if she retains British army units, shall enter into an agreement with British regarding the terms and conditions of employment of the retained British units.

PROBLEMS BEFORE THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

As announced by the Viceroy and accepted by the various political parties, the Constituent Assembly shall work on the lines and fundamentals laid down by the British Cabinet Mission. For Defence, the Mission Proposals provide: 'There should be a Union of India embracing both British India and the 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'. Thus the Centre shall be responsible for the country; and for that it has been empowered to raise finances sufficient to discharge this responsibility. But defence is not merely a matter of guns and swords in modern times. Its requirements and the scope of its operation are of an all-embracing nature. Defence preparations involve regulation and control of the entire economic machinery including material resources and manpower of the country. Specially in war time it implies total efforts. The Mission Plan is silent on

the scope of Defence. The Constituent Assembly will have to define in the Constitution the powers and responsibilities of the Centre in respect of Defence. A schedule will have to be drawn up specifying the subjects under Defence in normal and emergency times. As regards the defence expenditure, the Mission Plan is vague. It is not clear whether the Centre will get finance through subventions from the units or will have the powers to collect it by means of taxes on Provinces and States. In case of the former method, the Centre will have to depend on the units and therefore ultimately the subventions from the units will determine the strength and the equipment of our forces. The Constituent Assembly should allocate certain federal taxes to the Centre and further empower it to demand subventions from the units in cases of emergency or deficit year. Our new constitution must also provide against the danger of parallel armies of the compulsorily grouped Provinces envisaged by the Plan. As the responsibility of internal security shall remain with the units and they will be maintaining police force for it, there is a danger of Groups revolting against the Union. The Constituent Assembly should make effective provisions against such disruption of the Indian Union. The problem of Indian States may also give headache to our constitution-makers. As the States shall cede the defence to the Union, the Command of the States Forces should automatically pass to the Union. It would mean further curtailment of Princes' sovereign powers and therefore may not be liked by the princely

order. Yet it is essential in the interest of internal security to vest the command of the States Forces in the Centre. There is a danger of an internecine war among the princes themselves in case the command of the armies is left in their hands. The manner in which the Princes shall share the defence expenditure must also be clarified either in the constitution or a separate convention to be signed by the Princes and the Union. It will be too much to expect that the Princes will allow the Centre to raise finances through taxes on the states' people. It may mean infringement of their sovereignty in the economic sphere too. Something like a mixture of subventions and taxes may solve the problem.

WHAT THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT CAN DO

Besides the fundamental issues discussed above, there are certain urgent matters which the Interim Government should tackle immediately. All exhibitions of communal and racial prejudices should be sternly removed from army ranks. The recruitment and promotions on communal basis should immediately be stopped. The efficiency of the soldier should be the sole criterion of army recruitment and organization. An energetic educational propaganda for developing non-communal spirit should be started forthwith among the armed forces. The I. N. A. men who have imbibed the spirit of national service and national unity may be deputed to develop the same feeling of national unity in the army ranks. Our army-men must be brought closer to the people, their leaders and ideals of the country. 'The armed forces can not be cut off from the people, for they exist for their security'—thus remarked our first Defence Member, Sardar Baldev Singh in his broadcast talk recently.

As the war is over, all British officers who do not belong to the Indian army and are not required any longer should be reverted back to the British army. All direct recruitment of British officers to our forces should be stopped immediately. At present there is

racial discrimination in pay and allowances and other comforts between an Indian and the British soldier. This must go as soon as possible as its removal will create national consciousness and pride in our forces.

The allegiance which its armies owe determines the sovereignty of a nation. The Viceroy in his broadcast talk announcing the establishment of Interim Government said: 'The constitutional position of armed forces is in no way changed. They still owe allegiance in accordance to their oath to the King-Emperor to whom and to the Parliament I am still responsible'. Constitutionally speaking, the Dominion armies also owe allegiance to the King. But Prof. A. B. Keith writes in his book *The Dominions as sovereign States*: 'Whatever the extent of the prerogative of the Crown in matters of defence, the matter of government of armed forces now rests on statute which may be taken to have rendered obsolete any prerogative powers'. Our Interim Government which has been promised the status of a Dominion Government should negative in practice the King's prerogative represented by the Viceroy. During this interim period, the National Government should give least possible chance to the Viceroy to act as the King's Representative wielding power over the Indian forces.

The army and its problems should henceforth be vitally national in character. A change in the outlook is now essential to usher in a new era in our forces. Army questions should be given the publicity they require. The public should be taken into confidence before any vital decisions are taken on national defence. 'It would seem necessary', as the Sapru Committee suggested, 'that a Defence Policy and Requirements Committee including leaders of Indian opinion should be immediately set up for the purpose of carrying out a comprehensive examination of all problems connected with Indian defence and the organization of India's armed forces'.

SPARKS FROM OUR ANVIL

Independence and Unity

Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, the Dewan of Travancore State, has made the important announcement that "just as in 1795, when Travancore was an independent Kingdom dealing with the British Government on equal terms and entering into a treaty with them, so in June 1948 she would be an independent Kingdom entitled to hold dealings either with the outside world or any Government of the world". This statement follows of course from the British Government's declaration of February 20, that its paramountcy so long wielded over the Indian States will cease to exist from the date when it transfers its control over British India to the Indian people. Sir C. P. realizes, however, that "India is one country" and must remain "integrally united". He added: "I have always pleaded for the unity of Indian administration. How that unity is to be secured is a matter for a treaty and not for dictation."

No one who loves India would like to see her split up into a number of independent States, whether these are States ruled by the Indian Princes or States carved out of British India. For that would conduce neither to her security from external aggression nor to her internal peace nor to such co-ordination, economically, socially and politically, as would best promote the welfare of the Indian people, nor to the gaining of that weight and respect in the rest of the world, which India and Indians can achieve only if India remains "integrally united", able to speak with one voice and maintain in matters of international

import a single all-India policy. The unity of the Indian administration is a precious heritage of the British rule which it would be wanton folly for us to disregard and dissipate. From this point of view it would have been far better for India if political events had so shaped as to result in a scheme of Federation such as that envisaged in 1935, shorn of its objectionable features. It would have been far easier to give the unity which had been created a different form which would have satisfied the people than to scrap that unity and call on the sundered parts—the loose independent States—to forge it for themselves anew, if they can. However, we have to take things as they are. Let us hope that at this critical time common-sense and a larger patriotism will prevail, and India will not be allowed to turn into a motley picture, styled "Independence" bristling with a diversity of pennons and standards, all waving challengingly in the air and proclaiming the twin-theme of the disunity of India and the short-sightedness of her leaders.

—N. S. R.

A Necessary Convention

Viscount Simon, in a letter to the *Daily Telegraph* of London, has criticised the Secretary of State's view that the Viceroy, by means of a convention, could refrain from interfering with the Interim Government's administration and policies. The argument of the ex-Lord Chancellor, who, if we remember rightly, was tried for a short time as Minister for foreign Affairs and found deplorably wanting, shows him to be what he is, namely a lawyer who could

not become a statesman. He has laid stress on those provisions of the Government of India Act which invest the Viceroy with power to over-ride and act independently of his Government in order to enable him to fulfil certain responsibilities, notably for the protection of minorities, placed upon him. What are the practical limitations to which both by underlying theory and in the present circumstances the exercise of that power is subject is a question with which Viscount Simon does not seem to have troubled himself. Reasoning from the whole basis of Britain's declaration and policy towards India in the matter of Indian Self-Government, the day must come when these responsibilities must be definitely handed over to representative Indians. Morally speaking she cannot and ought not to so hand over until she can feel certain that these responsibilities will be discharged as well as she herself is able to discharge them through her own agents in India. When and if she entertains that view, there is nothing wrong in her permitting that change to take place at once by convention in advance of a statute to that effect. Viscount Simon is not going to look after the minorities in India after June next year. How is he going to help them by insisting now on a policy which has so far only kept the minorities apart from the majorities and has been thus a contributory cause to the contentions between them? The King of England has powers—and arguably therefore responsibilities—which by convention he has delegated to his Ministers. Viscount Simon has not objected to that delegation.

—N. S. R.

The Duty of the Strong

The declaration of President Truman that the United States will aid and support Greece and Turkey to preserve their freedom has fallen as a bomb-shell on the international public. It is of momentous interest as showing the determination of the U. S. to play the role, cast for her by the circumstances of the war, in matters affecting world-peace and national freedoms. The announcement has been met with angry protests from supporters of the Soviet Government's policies because of course both Greece

and Turkey are *non persona grata* with that Government.

Behind this latest move on the international chess-board lies the whole difficulty in the way of a happy after-the-war adjustment between the United States and Russia. The difficulty exists not only because they have different political mentalities and problems; they have emerged from the war as the two dominant Powers, both conscious of their war-achievements and strength. While all States have their parts to play and find their proper places in the post-war settlement, the United States and Russia (along with Britain) are making the leading moves which will determine the nature of the immediate future. The onlooker cannot but be impressed with the fact that these moves have been and are to some extent moves against each other.

However, there is this difference between the attitude which Russia has created in unbiassed observers and that with which the U. S. is viewed by them. There is no State in the world which really feels menaced by the might of the U. S., despite the fact that she has (so far as the world is aware) the atom bomb in her exclusive possession; but there are a number of States in different parts of the globe which do not view with similar trust the designs of the Russian Government. This is unfortunate but inevitable, if only because the Soviet authorities are so addicted to secrecy, and their methods for the attainment of their peace aims are exactly similar to those which they practised so successfully in the war in dealing with their enemies.

It is time for Russia and all others concerned to renounce the methods that belong to the war-mentality; for it is really impossible to achieve any kind of a peace worth the name with the weapons of cunning, manoeuvre, feints, surprises, threats and violence.

The world can never feel safe until the game of power-politics is put an end to once for all, a goal which is implicit in the plans of the U. N. O. Till that day dawns—we must all do what we can to hasten its advent—the strong have the duty of protecting the weak.

—N. S. R.

SHAPE OF INDIA'S NEW CONSTITUTION

Constituent Assembly Questionnaire

What should be the designation of the Head of the Indian Union? How should he be chosen? What should be his functions of office? Should the Union Executive be of the British type (parliamentary) or the American type (non-parliamentary) or the Swiss type (mixed) or any other type? How should the Union Legislature be constituted? What provisions should be made for the adequate representation of different communities and interests?

These and many other similar questions, bearing on the salient features of the new Constitution form the subject-matter of an elaborate questionnaire addressed by the Constitutional Adviser to all members of the Central and Provincial Legislatures throughout the country.

This is being done to facilitate the work of framing a new Constitution before June 1948, the intention being to collate the answers and make the material available to members of the Constituent Assembly at its next session. In order to help members of the Legislatures to answer the questions a brief explanatory note has been inserted under each question.

The following are some typical questions:—

Should the office (Head of the Union) rotate among the different communities in turn? If so, how?

Should the President be liable to removal? If so, in what manner.

Should provision be made to secure representation of different communities on the Executive? If so, how?

How should joint responsibility or co-ordination be secured?

How should the members of the Executive be chosen?

What provisions should be made for the removal of the Executive?

Should the Union Legislature have a Single Chamber or two Chambers?

If bicameral, how should the two Houses be constituted?

What provisions should be made for the adequate representation of different communities and interests?

What should be (a) composition, (b) franchise, (c) electorate, (d) constituencies, (e) methods of election and (f) allocation of seats in respect of the Union Legislature?

If bicameral, what should be the relative powers of the two Houses? What provision should be made to resolve deadlocks?

INDIA SHOULD RESUME LEADERSHIP OF THE WORLD

BY SACHIVOTTAMA SIR C. P. RAMASWAMI AIYAR

Presiding over the twenty-first session of the Indian Philosophical Congress held at New Delhi, Sachivottama Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Dewan of Travancore, stressed the necessity of founding a newly orientated school of critical research which would bend its energies towards the compilation of a great "History of Indian Thought". He added that, for this purpose, all available talent must be enlisted and a co-ordinating organisation constituted, not merely for cumulative editorial work but for advancing independent research work in Indological learning.

The Sachivottama also announced an endowment of Rs. 25,000, towards the foundation of an Indological scholarship which sum, he hoped, would constitute the nucleus of a general fund for the purpose of allying Indianization with internationalization for the advancement of Indological Research. The following are extracts from his address :

History has shown that increased vigour in cultural activity goes hand in hand with the heightening of the rhythm of political events; and that when the latter takes place on the morrow of great and destructive wars, the former expresses itself as a large-scale effort of reconstruction—reconstruction implying not merely restoration of the *status quo ante*, but renovation. Our present period is no exception to this rule, and the mental ravages of the war from which we have emerged make cultural reconstruction in many respects appear a dominant necessity.

Some advance over previous instances of building up again, after cataclysms, can be registered in the fact that we no longer see each nation singly trudging the uphill road; we discover the beginnings of a rational system of mutual assistance and joining of resources, where each nation contributes her particular best to the common pool.

India has suffered comparatively little from material destruction of cultural property, but her rate of advancement in some lines has been retarded by the long seclusion from the normal channels of exchange. She has much to receive in the line of new scientific devices, she has much to give in the line of spiritual culture. Moreover, what she has to give is unique, there being no alternative to her performing this specific task: only she can effect in the world the revival of her own mental inheritance.

In most cases, cultural reconstruction faces only problems of acute quantitative shortage—easily made up by the pooling system where it concerns material implements such as books, but by no means so easy to be remedied where there have been serious losses in the ranks of cultural workers and scholars. In most cases, the genuine seeds of regeneration are extant everywhere and require only intenser cultivation.

But in the case of India these seeds, scanty and sterile in a progressively alienated soil, no longer hold spontaneous force of renewal. Not only a branch of learning, but the knowledge of spiritual forms of life inherent in its possession, is threatened with extinction at large, a prospective loss not for the receiving sphere of culture alone but also for the giving, which may thereby lose its hold on many minds and become separated by a growing rift from a large part of thinking mankind.

SPIRITUAL HERITAGE

In fact, the spiritualizing influence of Indian elements of thought still operating in pre-war Western culture, though hardly perceptible on its surface, kept up at least a partial counterbalance to the imported trends of materialistic culture that took hold in the last century of Indian intellectual life. Our influence abroad did much to enliven our sense of our own values; *nemo propheta in patria*, and the immeasurably beneficial effects of the activity of

Swami Vivekananda would not have had such strength in India without the response his teaching called forth in the West. These must not be allowed to become things of the past.

Our present, fortunately, has not been without its dynamic messengers of the Indian spiritual outlook to foreign lands; but the indigenous resonator in those lands has of late become impoverished to the extreme. It can be built up anew only from within, by a process congruous to the newly prevailing disposition, which, once again and more than ever, is to test and probe and investigate new values offered.

THE TASK AHEAD

As a reaction to the slogan-ridden war and pre-war years, the thinking Western mind has become impervious to thought elements which it has not thoroughly understood of its own accord. To achieve assimilation of the renewed mental message, it needs to retrace the shortcut of single impacts and allow the imagination to be swayed by the slow winding path of inquiry: it needs to follow up the mastertouch of the philosopher and sage with the ancillary job of the philologist. Once again, it needs the patent light of research for a constant guide; and this it is our task to rekindle.

INDIA'S DUTY

Founded in her live past of a great spiritual culture,—one of the only two which produced philosophical thinking, and on either of which the later developments of human thought were based—India is manifestly called upon to preserve the knowledge and foster the true understanding of that ancient culture in the world.

Especially at this historical juncture, when India is resuming her rightful place in the community of nations, it is our patent duty to take the lead in reconstructing the studies of our proudest inheritance by co-ordinating the potentialities of enhanced research work at home and imparting new impulse to research abroad, including it in the orbit of such co-ordination on the uniform basis of a rational outlook, truly adequate to its subject and genuinely Indian.

COMPREHENSIVE HISTORY OF INDIAN THOUGHT

The introduction of intrinsic understanding by Indian scholarship in international Indological research—the establishment of the intellectual leadership of India in the philological and historical study of the documents—will do much to restore the spiritual leadership of Indian ideas of which the world stands in great need. But mere intellectual leadership in the approach is not all. Ours is a time for leadership in attainment. What we need is a comprehensive History of Ancient Indian Thought, based exclusively on its original documents, but fully based on complete

evidence obtainable from all its documents—a work to supersede the antiquated Western “Hand-books” (in which Indian conceptions are *a priori* functionally sub-ordinated to classical “Indo-Aryan” viewpoints), and which at the same time would give us one vast survey covering in all its parts, a monumental standard work of the insight of our age, fully acquainted with its magnificent roots in the remotest past, fully aware of its historical relations with the same. This doubtless is an immense and complex task, a task for a whole generation of Indologists, but also one capable of welding a whole generation in a common effort.

But to cover in this fashion a field of such dimensions, individual effort is patently insufficient. Even in a lifetime of devoted and strenuous work, an isolated scholar can at best cover a field circumscribed to single aspects, periods and problems—when his investigation is conducted on an entirely new basis, and the basis itself has to be worked out by preliminary investigation. When we are faced with the postulate to cover so vast a field in a uniform manner, doing justice to the whole range of its aspects, not in a conglomerate of loosely connected studies, but in one well-knit survey whose every part is organically related to every other and closely integrated in the whole, this is where the need of concerted teamwork becomes imperative. But this is also where such teamwork is realizable, if anywhere—the unity of method providing spontaneously the common bases that form the common denominator for the variety of contributions....

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION

If such a monumental enterprise is to be achieved not only by the labour but also as the legitimate fruition of the work of the present generation of Indologists—if it is to be completed, within, let us say, ten years—the work cannot be confined to a more or less limited group of scholars: all the available talent must be enlisted for the purpose. There is every reason why we should welcome the collaboration of foreign scholars, offering them full and equal opportunities of work. It is the sure way of popularizing and furthering in Europe the new outlook on Indological matters which we intend to establish throughout, and to consolidate India's leadership in major enterprises in Indology. We can expect to find suitable response since, as I have already remarked, modern Indological research in the West has, in its last halcyon days before the war, given evidence of turning away from its obsolete methods of “Western” persuasion and awakening to the need of reorientation towards intrinsicness of inquiry the same need which to us defines the criterion of truly adequate, truly critical and historical research, so that the progressive elements of Western scholarship are bound to meet us on common ground, which is at last genuinely Indian ground.

There will be further advantage to reap from such international co-operation. While securing all the best forces for the success of our *opus magnum* answering our first object, this universalistic policy will resuscitate, in the countries of the collaborating foreign scholars, the awareness of the present day importance and vitality of Indological studies, thus eventually furthering the second object modern India is called upon to fulfil in this line—reconstruction and revivification of Indology at large.

NEED FOR CO-ORDINATION

The co-ordinating organization which we shall

constitute for the needs of our cumulative editorial enterprise will also render service to the advancement of independent individual research work. Co-ordination is a labour-saving device, favouring celerity, width and fruitfulness of results....

A co-ordinating body of the kind suggested will enable all the research workers on common Indological subjects to give and receive, severally, current information on the work pursued by every one of them. Information would be informally supplied in connexion with the meetings, personally or by correspondence, and diffused through the Bulletin—exactly the amount of information that each worker would be disposed to volunteer at the provisional more or less advanced, or final stage of his research; yet in every case sufficient to facilitate and bring about the desired contacts. When I say all scholars I mean all. From these facilities of co-ordination, no one should be excluded, and it will actually fulfil its scope only if everyone on principle is included. In other words, the co-ordinating information service must be more even than all-Indian: Indian in its centre, in its radius universal.

ENCOURAGE ENTERPRISE

So far about the objects to be achieved in and for the present generation. Our third main object is to assure the survival and encourage the development in the coming generation of Indological studies at large, the danger of their disappearance tomorrow is a problem vitally solved only today. The number of chairs at European Universities which are still filled is appallingly diminished and the little extant cohort keeps rapidly dwindling. In proportion, the primary incentive for taking up these studies is reduced; young men and women joining the Universities have less and less opportunity to hear about our culture. Where such chances still exist, the enthusiastic beginner is deprived of the secondary and durable incentive to persevere—of the hope to make good to complete his studies and specialized training, to achieve a scholarly career. Only two of the countries once prominent in these studies still have any libraries left. Everywhere else the wreckage is total or nearly so. The incipient scholar's expectation of crowning the period of his apprenticeship in India, or to lay the foundations of his life's work is now an unattainable mirage.

It may be that States and various national and private foundations will institute scholarships for this purpose when our aforementioned aim is attained and the contemporary importance of Indian studies is realized in those countries. But this will give the requisite chances only to the students who will start after a decade or thereabouts.

Our purpose is therefore to bridge over this gap. We want the promising student-adepts of the present generation to be able to study Indian culture with the guidance of modern, genuinely Indian methods, and possibly to study it in India, in direct touch with the monuments, of this culture, with original documentary evidence, in daily inspiring intercourse with our outstanding pandits and scholars, to imbue themselves with the Sanskrit language and the living tradition of indigenous scholarship; and this will produce in record time a crop of sound research work and a vigorous vanguard of up-to-date Indological learning in the West, making up with a vengeance for the present decline.

—*Travancore Information and Listener*, March 1947.