



---

# Indian Society And Politics Post Independence

**Dr. Mohd Abass Itoo**

---

## **Preface**

The division of India in 1947 was the change of political boundaries and the division of other resources that accompanied the disbanding of the British Raj in the subcontinent of India and the foundation of two autonomous dominions in South Asia: India and Pakistan. The condition of India instantly after 1947 was disturbed. There was a lot of progress that was required in terms of the government, financial system, and livelihood conditions of the dispossessed, cultivation, and social impartiality. In addition to that, there was no unison among residents of the different states.

## **Introduction**

Long years ago, we made a assignation with future, and now the time comes when we shall convert our vow, not entirely or in full measure, but very significantly. At the blow of the midnight hour, when the whole humanity sleeps, India will awake to life and independence. A moment comes, which comes out infrequently in record, when we move out from the old to the new, when an era ends, and when the essence of a state, long dormant, finds expression. The prospect of India is not one of effortlessness or quiescent but of persistent striving so that we might accomplish the pledges we have so frequently taken and the one we shall take at present. The service of India means the service of the millions who bear. It means the ending of scarcity and unawareness and disease and inequality of opportunity. The aim of the greatest man of our ages Mahatma Gandhi has been to smear every tear from every eye. That may be afar us but as long as there are tears and distress; our efforts will not be over.

## **Background**

India became a liberated land in 1947 through what is recognized as 'the transfer of power'. Nevertheless a great deal of what we see in sovereign India can be accredited to 'legacies' of one kind or another. Was sovereign India a break with the history or in continuity? Did India, as Nehru claimed, 'step out of the old to the new'? These are the queries that puzzle historians given the apparent continuities in terms of not only establishments of authority, but also the standards that notify these establishments. Was the transform that India saw subsequent to decolonization merely aesthetic then? There is also the argument that the influences of around 200 years of colonialism appear to have been well-established in Indian society, financial system and political system merely because of its stretched period. Therefore it was nearly unfeasible for those who presided over destiny of India at the premature phases of its nationhood to absolutely do away with the established structure of governance, so decisive for the British administration.

Besides the structure of governance, political laissez-faire of the British assortment remained a noteworthy ideological power even after the departure of colonial government on 15 August 1947. Though 'a new age', as Nehru excitedly pigeonholed it, had arrived when 'the spirit of a state ... finds utterance', the language had barely changed merely because of its expression in the orthodox liberal shape. Those who lingered outside the Congress crease did not support of progressing the colonial structure of administration, but Nehru and his men had possibly no choice but to admit the colonial management, which productively dealt with the communal sadism that broke out in Bengal and Punjab following the announcement of sovereignty by the British. It was conceivably the only choice available to the nationalists, at a crucial stage of Indian history when the government that the British left was constructive for the original ruling power in India. Hence it was an ideological preference that the nationalists applied possibly on version of the requirements of the situations, which more or less ruled out the hunt for substitutes. The year of 1947 cannot therefore be seen as 'marking a whole disjuncture involving the colonial and post-colonial regimes'<sup>1</sup>. What administered the nationalist preference for instruments of colonial government were possibly the distinctive conditions of communal uprisings in which these gadgets of supremacy became constructive to the rulers of India who had barely any familiarity of supervising the country. Given the well-established governmental bequest of the British government, the post-colonial state in India is barely a break with its instant past. Three foremost ideological influences appear to have been significant in the politics of India: colonialism, nationalism and democracy<sup>2</sup>. The colonial, nationalist and democratic expression of 'the political' remains consequently the vital in realizing the politics of India even after decolonization. Two points require being reserved in mind. Firstly, even though colonialism and nationalism are certainly opposed to each other there is no uncertainty that the earlier aggravated conditions in which nationalism appeared as a potent ideology to eloquent the voices of the colonized. Secondly, colonialism also led to a sluggish procedure of democratization by steadily connecting people who were positively inclined towards the unfamiliar government. The colonial state had endorsed some channels of representation to vigilantly selected interests of India. However it had also guaranteed that 'the country had constantly operated at a stage separated from the society which it governed'. The British were admittedly prejudiced by their own 'theories of laissez-faire and self-government'<sup>3</sup>. Throughout an assortment of motivations that incorporated 'self welfare and ideological commitments', the colonial management established the doctrines of representation, suitable for its rule, into the colonial government. The British majestic attitudes in India appear to be 'exceedingly ambiguous' ensuing from their hard work to negotiate their moderate regard for self rule as the paramount form of administration and their vested interests in being majestic masters<sup>4</sup>.

### **Changing Nature of Indian Politics Post-Independence**

The making of liberated constitution of India by the Constituent Assembly over a period of little more than three years is contemplative of the hard work that the founding fathers undertook to transform the nationalist and democratic ambitions of an sovereign political

system following decolonization<sup>5</sup>. In addition, although the Constitution is a permanence at least in structural and bureaucratic terms, it was also a apparent break with the history, since the 1950 Constitution drew on the principles that required to ascertain a liberal autonomous polity following the departure of colonialism. There can be no better proof of the pledge to constitutionalism and rule of law on the part of the founding fathers than the Constitution that they framed regardless of stern complications due to partition. The pledge to liberal independent values, as the Constituent Assembly proceedings put forward, remained supreme in the framing of the Constitution. For instance, however the constitution-framers valorized the design of popular independence, they redefined it and adopted the liberal representative standard to form 'a Nehruvian statist political order'<sup>6</sup>.

The political system of India needs to be gripped sociologically. There is no uncertainty that the political structure that India inherited after decolonization was mostly based on the Westminster model<sup>7</sup>. However it undergo momentous changes that barely had any similarity to the British structure of governance. Herein lies the significance of the socio-economic practices that fashioned the political growth to be evidently dissimilar in terms of both expression and articulation. It was not therefore astonishing that three diverse languages of political affairs, namely, modern, traditional and virtuous seem pertinent in Indian political system<sup>8</sup>. The prime argument that this study thus makes revolves around the changing complexities of the politics, which is entangled in similarly intricate socio-economic and cultural conditions. Indian political system is the study of traditionally evolved contexts. What is exceptional about this study is its spotlight on the dialectical inter-connection between culture and government over a historical period of time. Distinct to the conservative studies, the current exercise also dwells on those socio-political and financial variables that have impacted on the development of 'the political' in its most multifaceted expression purely because the Indian background is both impulsive and meditative. The primary point that this study seeks to depict out is also anxious with the emergence and consolidation of a independent political system out of colonialism, patriotism and democratization. These three forces appear to have provided 'the introductory values' on which the political is beached<sup>9</sup>. There is no uncertainty that colonialism distorted the progress of India, which followed neither the pure capitalist course of development nor any directions that do not depict on capitalism. However, colonialism, inter alia, contributes to a significant space for forces that are contrasting to colonialism and enthused by patriotism and democratization. Likewise, patriotism of the Indian range barely matches up to its European counterpart in spite of being plagiaristic at least in the early stages. As anti-colonialism achieved momentum, patriotism extended as a philosophy that was understood differently by diverse groups concerned in its expression. Whereas Gandhi was pinched to patriotism for politically bringing together the fictional society, Jinnah, convinced by its traditional form, fortified 'two nation theory' on the source of 'homogenizing' separatist principles underplaying the intrinsic divisions even amongst the Muslims due to a strange progress of Islam in the subcontinent<sup>10</sup>. However, patriotism not only unleashed self-governing forces but also strengthened them in the course of efforts for independence. Post-colonial India is therefore not precisely a

rupture with the history because of the institutional and ideational legacies. While the earlier is expressed in the permanence of the systems of governance, the second was also introspective of the autonomist revelation, enthused by values of social and financial impartiality, political parity and an admiration for diversity, particularly for the marginalized sections of humanity. Given the strange social background and its uniformly strange evolution in the repercussion of decolonization, India is certainly a distinctive replica that is hypothetically pioneering owing to the noticeable pragmatic background in which it has evolved. My purpose is to sketch on the processes that are crucial in 'imagining' and also 're-imagining' India since freedom in 1947<sup>11</sup>. Formed in 1946, the Constituent Assembly provided a roadmap for the new state that was barely ample as it progressively became far more composite. The study seeks to afford an interpretative explanation of changing political affairs of India and also of the factors that remained crucial in the complete course. There is conversely a reminder of carefulness. The reinvention that is taking place in existing India is diverse from the one which took place in the Constituent Assembly. It is not a measured practice, as in the Constituent Assembly, but one of 'contestation and negotiation'<sup>12</sup>. It is, thus, tricky to realize 'the marvel that is India' in one degree. Hence the study seeks to offer 'a appropriate explanation' of Indian political affairs by drawing on the processes in which philosophy seems to be significant as well.

## **Conclusion**

In concluding lines we can analyze that India is a matchless political veracity that by and large challenges some of the well recognized hypothetical propositions, drawn on moderate independent experiments elsewhere. With the collapse of the Congress Party to understand the varying social texture of Indian political affairs, numerous splinter groups that later became political parties came jointly motivated to offer a feasible choice which was undeniably suggestive of a new development that fully flourished in 1999 with the structure of the NDA-led constant alliance government<sup>13</sup>. Distinct to Kerala, the West Bengal Marxists appear to have redefined their philosophy in the transformed atmosphere of an perceptible ascendance of universal capital. The new design that the Left Front research shows is one of 'corporatized Marxism'<sup>14</sup>. Underlining the emergent significance of political alignment regardless of ideology.

## **References**

1 Jawaharlal Nehru's 'Tryst with destiny' speech, delivered at the dawn of independence in India in 1947 – quoted from B. Shiva Rao (ed.), *The Framing of India's Constitution: Select Documents*, Vol. 1, New Delhi: Universal Law Publishing Co., 2004 (reprint), pp. 558–9.

2 Ian Copland, 'The imprint of the past: reflections on regime change with particular reference to "middle India", c. 1947–50', in Dipesh Chakrabarty and Rochna Majumdar (eds), *From the Colonial to the Post-colonial: India and Pakistan in Transition*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2007, p. 303.

3 Rajnarayan Chandravarkar, 'Customs of governance: colonialism and democracy in the twentieth century India', *Modern Asian Studies*, 41 (3), 2007, p. 448.

4 Dipesh Chakrabarty, 'In the name of politics: democracy and the power of the multitude in India', in Dipesh Chakrabarty and Rochna Majumdar (eds), *From the Colonial to the Post-colonial: India and Pakistan in Transition*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2007, p. 36.

5 D. A. Low, *Britain and Indian Nationalism: The Imprint of Ambiguity, 1929–1942*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

6 Subrata Mitra, 'Constitutional design, democratic vote counting and India's fortuitous multiculturalism', Working Paper, November 2004, South Asia Institute, Heidelberg University, pp. 29–34.

7 Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989 (reprint).

8 Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy*, pp. 10–11.

9 W. H. Morris-Jones, *The Government and Politics of India*, New Delhi: BI Publications, 1974 (reprint), pp. 15–48.

10 Ramchandra Guha, *India after Gandhi: The History of the World's Largest Democracy*, London: Picador, 2007, p. 756.

11 Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999.

12 Guha, *India after Gandhi*, p. 757.

13 Subrata Mitra, 'Constitutional design', p. 29.

14 Sarbani Sen, *Popular Sovereignty and Democratic Transformations: The Constitution of India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2007, p. 112