

(SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU, NOVEMBER 8, 1948)

The Constitution is after all some kind of legal body given to the ways of Governments and the life of a people. A Constitution if it is out of touch with the people's life, aims and aspirations, becomes rather empty: if it falls behind those aims, it drags the people down. It should be something ahead to keep people's eyes and minds up to a certain high mark.

Sir, we are on the last lap of our long journey. Nearly two years ago, we met in this hall and on that solemn occasion it was my high privilege to move a Resolution which has come to be known as the Objectives Resolution. That is rather a prosaic description of that Resolution because it embodied something more than mere objectives, although objectives are big things in the life of a nation. It tried to embody, in so far as it is possible in cold print to embody, the spirit that lay behind the Indian people at the time. It is difficult to maintain the spirit of a nation or a people at a high level all the time and I do not know if we have succeeded in doing that. Nevertheless I hope that it is in that spirit that we have to approach the framing of this Constitution and it is in that spirit that we shall consider it in detail, always using that Objectives Resolution as the yard measure with which to test every clause and phrase in this Constitution. It may be, of course, that we can improve even on that Resolution; if so, certainly we should do it, but I think that Resolution in some of its clauses laid down the fundamental and basic content of what our Constitution should be. The Constitution is after all some kind of legal body given to the ways of Governments and the life of a people. A Constitution if it is out of touch with the people's life, aims and aspirations, becomes rather empty: if it falls behind those aims, it drags the people down. It should be something ahead to keep people's eyes and minds up to a certain high mark. I think that the Objectives Resolution did that. Inevitably since then in the course of numerous discussions, passions were roused about what I would beg to say are relatively unimportant matters in this larger context of giving shape to a nation's aspirations and will. Not that they were unimportant, because each thing in a nation's life is important, but still there is a question of priority, there is a question of relative importance, there is a question also of what comes first and what comes second. After all there may be many truths, but it is important to know what is the first truth. It is important to know what in a particular context of events is the first thing to be done, to be thought of and to be put down, and

it is the test of a nation and a people to be able to distinguish between the first things and the second things. If we put the second things first, then inevitably the first and the most important things suffer a certain eclipse.

Now I have ventured with your permission, Sir, to take part in this initial debate on this Draft Constitution but it is not my intention to deal with any particular part of it, either in commendation of it or in criticism, because a great deal of that kind has already been said and will no doubt be said. But in view of that perhaps I could make some useful contribution to this debate by drawing attention to certain fundamental factors again. I had thought that I could do this even more because in recent days and weeks, I have been beyond the shores of India, have visited foreign lands, met eminent people and statesmen of other countries and had the advantage of looking at this beloved country of ours from a distance. That is some advantage. It is true that those who look from a distance do not see many things that exist in this country. But it is equally true that those who live in this country and are surrounded all the time with our numerous difficulties and problems sometimes may fail to see the picture as a whole. We have to do both; to see our problems in their intricate detail in order to understand them and also to see them in some perspective so that we may have that picture as a whole before our eyes.

Now this becomes even more important during a period of swift transition such as we have gone through. We who have lived through this period of transition with all its triumphs and glories and sorrows and bitterness, we are affected by all these changes; we are changing ourselves; we do not notice ourselves changing or the country changing so much and it is a little helpful to be out of this turmoil for a while and to look at it from a distance and to look at it also to some extent with the eyes of other people. I have had that opportunity given to me. I am glad of that opportunity, because for the moment I was rid of the tremendous burden of responsibility which all of us carried and which in a measure some of us who have to shoulder the burden of Government have to carry more. For a moment I was rid of those immediate responsibilities and with a mind somewhat free, I could look at that picture and I saw from that distance the rising Star of India far above the horizon and casting its soothing light, in spite of all that has happened, over many countries of the world, who looked up to it with hope, who considered that out of this new Free India would come various forces which would help Asia, which would help the world somewhat to right itself, which would co-operate with other similar forces elsewhere, because the world is in a bad way, because this great continent of Asia or Europe and the rest of the world are in a bad way and are faced with problems which might almost appear to be insurmountable. And sometimes one has the feeling as if we were all actors in some terrible Greek tragedy which was moving on to its inevitable climax of disaster. Yet when I looked at this picture again from a far and from here, I had a feeling of hope and optimism not merely because of India, but because also of other things

that I saw that the tragedy which seemed inevitable was not necessarily inevitable, that there were many other forces at work, that there were innumerable men and women of goodwill in the world who wanted to avoid this disaster and tragedy, and there was certainly a possibility that they will succeed in avoiding it.

But to come back to India, we have, ever since I moved this Objectives Resolution before this House—a year and eleven months ago, almost exactly—passed through strange transitions and changes. We function here far more independently than we did at that time. We function as a sovereign independent nation, but we have also gone through a great deal of sorrow and bitter grief during this period and all of us have been powerfully affected by it. The country for which we were going to frame this Constitution was partitioned and split into two. And what happened afterwards is fresh in our minds and will remain fresh with all its horrors for a very long time to come. All that has happened, and yet, in spite of all this, India has grown in strength and in freedom, and undoubtedly this growth of India, this emergence of India as a free country, is one of the significant facts of this generation, significant for us and for the vast numbers of our brothers and sisters who live in this country, significant for Asia, and significant for the world, and the world is beginning to realise—chiefly I think and I am glad to find this—that India's role in Asia and the world will be a beneficent role; sometimes it may be with a measure of apprehension, because India may play some part which some people, some countries, with other inrerests may not particularly like. All that is happening, but the main thing is this great singnificant factor that India after a long period of being dominated over has emerged as a free sovereign democratic independent country, and that is a fact which changes and is changing history. How far it would change history will depend upon us, this House in the present and other Houses like this coming in the future who represent the organised will of the Indian people.

That is a tremendous responsibility. Freedom brings responsibility; of course there is no such thing as freedom without responsibility. Irresponsibility itself means lack of freedom. Therefore we have to be conscious of this tremendous burden of responsibility which freedom has brought: the discipline of freedom and the organised way of working freedom. But, there is something even more than that. The freedom that has come to India by virtue of many things, history, tradition, resources, our geographical position, our great potential and all that, inevitably leads India to play an important part in world affairs. It is not a question of our choosing this or that; it is an inevitable consequence of what India is and what a free India must be. And, because we have to play that inevitable part in world affairs, that brings another and greater responsibility. Sometimes, with all my hope and optimism and confidence in my nation, I rather quake at the great responsibilities that are being thrust upon us, and which we cannot escape. If we get tied up in our narrow controversies, we may forget it. Whether we forget it or not, that responsibility

is there. If we forget it, we fail in that measure. Therefore, I would beg of this House to consider these great responsibilities that have been thrust upon India, and because we represent India in this as in many other spheres, on us in this House, and to work together in the framing of the Constitution or otherwise, always keeping that in view, because the eyes of the world are upon us and the hopes and aspirations of a great part of the world are also upon us. We dare not belittle; if we do so, we do an ill-service to this country of ours and to those hopes and aspirations that surround us from other countries. It is in this way that I would like this House to consider this Constitution: first of all to keep the Objectives Resolution before us and to see how far we are going to act up to it, how far we are going to build up, as we said in that Resolution, "an Independent Sovereign Republic, wherein all power and authority of the Sovereign Independent India, its constituent parts and organs of Government, are derived from the people, and wherein shall be guaranteed and secured to all of the people of India justice, social, economic and political; equality of status, of opportunity, and before the law; freedom of thought and expression, belief, faith, worship, vocation, association and action, subject to law and public morality; and this ancient land attain its rightful and honoured place in the world and make its full and willing contribution to the promotion of world peace and the welfare of mankind."

I read that last clause in particular because that brings to our mind India's duty to the world. I should like this House when it considers the various controversies—there are bound to be controversies and there should be controversies because we are a living and vital nation, and it is right that people should think differently and it is also right that, thinking differently when they come to decisions, they should act unitedly in furtherance of those decisions. There are various problems, some very important problems, on which there is very little controversy and we pass them—they are of the greatest importance—with a certain unanimity. There are other problems, important no doubt, possibly of a lesser importance, on which we spend a great deal of time and energy and passion also, and do not arrive at agreements in that spirit with which we should arrive at agreements. In the country today, reference has been made—I will mention one or two matters—to linguistic provinces and to the question of language in this Assembly and for the country. I do not propose to say much about these questions, except to say that it seems to me and it has long seemed to me inevitable that in India some kind of reorganisation should take place of provinces, etc., to fit in more with the cultural, geographical and economic condition of the people and with their desires. We have long been committed to this. I do not think it is good enough just to say linguistic provinces; that is a major factor to be considered, no doubt. But there are more important factors to be considered, and you have therefore to consider the whole picture before you proceed to break up what we have got and re-fashion it into something new. What I would like to place before the House is that, important from the point of view of our future life and governance as this question is, I would not have thought that this was a

question of that primary importance, which must be settled here and now today. It is eminently a question which should be settled in an atmosphere of good-will and calm and on a rather scholarly discussion of the various factors of the case. I find, unfortunately, it has raised a considerable degree of heat and passion and when heat and passion are there, the mind is clouded. Therefore, I would beg of this House to take these matters into consideration when it thinks fit, and to treat it as a thing which should be settled not in a hurry when passions are roused, but at a suitable moment when the time is ripe for it.

The same argument, if I may say so, applies to this question of language. Now, it is an obvious thing and a vital thing that any country, much more so a free and independent country, must function in its own language. Unfortunately, the mere fact that I am speaking to this House in a foreign language and so many of our colleagues here have to address the House in a foreign language itself shows that something is lacking. It is lacking; let us recognise it; we shall get rid of that lacuna undoubtedly. But, if in trying to press for a change, an immediate change, we get wrapped up in numerous controversies and possibly even delay the whole Constitution, I submit to this House it is not a very wise step to take. Language is and has been a vital factor in an individual's and a nation's life and because it is vital, we have to give it every thought and consideration. Because it is vital, it is also an urgent matter; and because it is vital, it is also a matter in which urgency may ill-serve our purpose. There is a slight contradiction. Because, if we proceed in an urgent matter to impose something, may be by a majority, on an unwilling minority in parts of the country or even in this House, we do not really succeed in what we have started to achieve. Powerful forces are at work in the country which will inevitably lead to the substitution of the English language by an Indian language or Indian languages in so far as the different parts of the country are concerned; but there will always be one all-India language. Powerful forces are also working at the formation of that all-India language. Language ultimately grows from the people; it is seldom that it can be imposed. Any attempt to impose a particular form of language on an unwilling people has usually met with the strongest opposition and has actually resulted in something the very reverse of what the promoters thought. I would beg this House to consider the fact and to realize, if it agrees with me, that the surest way of developing a natural all-India language is not so much to pass resolutions and laws on the subject but to work to that end in other ways. For my part I have a certain conception of what an all-India language should be. Other people's conception may not be quite the same as mine. I cannot impose my conception on this House or on the country just as any other person will not be able to impose his or her conception unless the country accepts it. But I would much rather avoid trying to impose my or anyone else's conception but to work to that end in co-operation and amity and see how, after we have settled these major things about the Constitution etc., after we have attained an even greater measure of stability, we can take up each one of these separate questions and dispose of them in a much better atmosphere.

The House will remember that when I brought that motion of the Objectives Resolution before this House, I referred to the fact that we were asking for or rather we were laying down that our Constitution should be framed for an Independent Sovereign Republic. I stated at that time and I have stated subsequently this business of our being a Republic is entirely a matter for us to determine of course. It has nothing or little to do with what relations we should have with other countries, notably the United Kingdom or the Commonwealth that used to be called the British Commonwealth of Nations. That was a question which had to be determined again by this House and by none else, independently of what our Constitution was going to be. I want to inform the House that in recent weeks when I was in the United Kingdom, whenever this subject or any allied subject came up for a private discussion—there was no public discussion or decision because the Commonwealth Conference which I attended did not consider it at all in its sessions—but inevitably there were private discussions, because it is a matter of high moment not only for us but for other countries as to what, if any, relation we should have what contacts, what links we should bear with these other countries. Therefore the matter came up in private discussion. Inevitably the first thing that I had to say in all these discussions was this that I could not as an individual—even though I had been honoured by this high office of Prime Ministership—I could not in any way or in any sense commit the country—even the Government which I have the honour to represent could not finally decide this matter. This was essentially a matter which the Constituent Assembly of India alone can decide. That I made perfectly clear. Having made that clear, I further pointed out this Objectives Resolution of this Constituent Assembly. I said it is open of course to the Constituent Assembly to vary that Resolution as it can vary anything else because it is Sovereign in this and other matters. Nevertheless that was the direction which the Constituent Assembly gave to itself and to its Drafting Committee for Constitution, and so long as it remains as it is, and I added that so far as I knew it would remain as it is—that Constitution would be in terms of that Objectives Resolution. Having made that clear, Sir, I said that it has often been said on our behalf that we desire to be associated in friendly relationship with other countries, with the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth. How in this context it can be done or it should be done is a matter for careful consideration and ultimate decision naturally on our part by the Constituent Assembly, on their part by their respective Governments or peoples. That is all I wish to say about this matter at this stage because possibly in the course of this session this matter no doubt will come up before the House in more concrete form. But in whatever form it may come up whether now or later, the point I should like to stress is this, that it is something apart from and in a sense independent of the Constitution that we are considering. We pass that Constitution for an Independent Sovereign Democratic India, for a Republic as we choose, and the second question is to be considered separately at whatever time it suits this House. It does not in any sense fetter this Constitution of ours or limit it because this Constitution coming from the people of India through their representatives represents their free will with regard to the future governance of India.

Now, May I beg again to repeat what I said earlier and that is this that destiny has cast a certain role on this country. Whether anyone of us present here can be called men or women of destiny or not I do not know. That is a big word which does not apply to average human beings, but whether we are men or women of destiny or not, India is a country of destiny and so far as we represent this great country with a great destiny stretching out in front of her, we also have to function as men and women of destiny, viewing all our problems in that long perspective of destiny and of the World and of Asia never forgetting the great responsibility that freedom, that this great destiny of our country has cast upon us, not losing ourselves in petty controversies and debates which may be useful but which will in this context be either out of place or out of tune. Vast numbers of minds and eyes look in this direction. We have to remember them. Hundreds of millions of our own people look to us and hundreds of millions of other also look to us; and remember this. That while we want this Constitution to be as solid and as permanent a structure as we can make it, nevertheless there is no permanence in Constitutions. There should be a certain flexibility. If you make anything rigid and permanent, you stop a Nation's growth, the growth of a living vital organic people. Therefore it has to be flexible. So also, when you pass this Constitution you will, and I think it is proposed, lay down a period of years—whatever that period may be—during which changes to that Constitution can be easily made without any difficult process. That is a very necessary proviso for a number of reasons. One is this: that while we, who are assembled in this House, undoubtedly represent the people of India, nevertheless I think it can be said, and truthfully, that when a new House, by whatever name it goes, is elected in terms of this Constitution, and every adult in India has the right to vote—man and woman—the House that emerges then will certainly be fully representative of every section of the Indian people. It is right that that House elected so—under this Constitution of course it will have the right to do anything—should have an easy opportunity to make such changes as it wants to. But in any event, we should not make a Constitution such as some other great countries have, which are so rigid that they do not and cannot be adapted easily to changing conditions. Today especially, when the world is in turmoil and we are passing through a very swift period of transition, what we may do today may not be wholly applicable tomorrow. Therefore, while we make a Constitution which is sound and as basic as we can, it should also be flexible and for a period we should be in a position to change it with relative facility.

May I say one word again about certain tendencies in the country which still think in terms of separatist existence or separate privileges and the like? This very Objectives Resolution set out adequate safeguards to be provided for minorities, for tribal areas, depressed and other backward classes. Of course that must be done, and it is the duty and responsibility of the majority to see that this is done and to see that they win over all minorities which may have suspicions against them, which may suffer from fear. It is right and important that we should raise the level of the backward groups in India and bring them up to the level of the rest. But it is not right that in trying to do this

we create further barriers, or even keep on existing barriers, because the ultimate objective is not separatism but building up an organic nation, not necessarily a uniform nation because we have a varied culture, and in this country ways of living differ in various parts of the country, habits differ and cultural traditions differ. I have no grievance against that. Ultimately in the modern world there is a strong tendency for the prevailing culture to influence others. That may be a natural influence. But I think the glory of India has been the way in which it has managed to keep two things going at the same time: that is, its infinite variety and at the same time its unity in that variety. Both have to be kept because if we have only variety, then that means separatism and going to pieces. If we seek to impose some kind of regimented unity that makes a living organism rather lifeless. Therefore, while it is our bounden duty to do everything we can to give full opportunity to every minority or group and to raise every backward group or class, I do not think it will be a right thing to go the way this country has gone in the past by creating barriers and by calling for protection. As a matter of fact nothing can protect such a minority or a group less than a barrier which separates it from the majority. It makes it a permanently isolated group and it prevents it from any kind of tendency to bring it closer to the other groups in the country.

I trust, Sir, that what I have ventured to submit to the House will be borne in mind when these various clauses are considered and that ultimately we shall pass this Constitution in the spirit of the solemn moment when we started this great endeavour.