

Endowments of Indian Political System

Hanumanthappa D G

How to cite this article:

Hanumanthappa D G/Endowments of Indian Political System/International Journal of Political Science 2023;9(2):61-64.

Abstract

Several legacies of the Indian political system have been addressed in this study. Legacies are defined as a political system's prior historical legacy. There are both official and informal political legacies. Government, Federal Structure, Diarchy, and Centralized Bureaucracy are examples of formal legacies, whereas non-formal legacies include Bandhs, Hartals, Satyagrahas, Hunger Strikes, and fast-unto-death. This study examines the historical evolution of all of these legacies. As a result, this article examines the legacies of the Indian political system in depth.

Keywords: The British political system; Centralised bureaucracy; Diarchy; Legacies; and Non-formal legacies.

INTRODUCTION

The Indian political system, like all political systems, has historical roots. A liberated revolutionary movement cannot construct a wholly indigenous political structure that borrows nothing from the past. No revolutionary movement, no matter how radical, can overnight overturn the entire network of political institutions. As a result,

studying the legacies of the Indian political system is critical. Every civilisation arises from the womb of preceding civilizations. For two hundred years, India was ruled by the British.

This lengthy period of English dominance had a significant impact on the Indian political structure. After India was free of the foreign yoke, it chose to be a democracy and selected the Parliamentary model. It would be a stretch to claim that we had democratic administrations in the past, but the democratic tradition has persisted, dating back to ancient times. Ancient India allowed for a great deal of supposition.

It goes without saying that, in addition to the six orthodox philosophical systems, charismatic and heterodox schools of thought existed freely, and differences in metaphysics and theology were mirrored to some extent in the domain of political ideas. Indian political theory was pre occupied with the moral obligations of both the King and the subjects, which included equal moral rights. The

Authors Affiliation: ¹Assistant Professor, Department of Studies and Research in Political Science, Rani Channamma University, Vidy Sangama, Belagavi 591156, Karnataka, India.

Corresponding Author: Hanumanthappa D G, Assistant Professor, Department of Studies and Research in Political Science, Rani Channamma University, Vidy Sangama, Belagavi 591156, Karnataka, India.

Email: hanumanthappa.dg@gmail.com

Received on: 18.04.2023

Accepted on: 03.05.2023

Monarch has a moral obligation to govern on the basis of protection and delighting the people.

The government envisioned by ancient Indian political thinkers is harsh and paternalistic, yet it provides for the moral and material well-being of all its people. It is not a democracy, but it allows for free expression and travel, and the concept of government, via debate, is not entirely absent. Finally, government is not a means to an end. There is only one ultimate goal for which all legitimate human effort should serve as a means: each individual's attainment of inner peace.

With gaining independence, India acquired a number of British political legacies. W.H. Morris Jones categorises the legacies of the Indian political system as follows: government, movement, mediating institutions, and problems and processes. The following are some of these legacies:

Government

It was the British government which strengthened the notion of Government in India. During the British period, the rule of government reached every nook and corner of the country. No doubt, the sphere of government was very narrow because its control did not reach the rural areas. As Morris Jones writes, there was only a Headman and a Patwari in every village, who in these capacities represented the British government. The government activities were more numerous in the urban areas than in the rural areas. The increase in the government activity increased the role of the government in the day-to-day life of the people.

The British administration was responsible for strengthening the concept of governance in India. The rule of government touched every nook and cranny of the land during the British period. Without a doubt, the realm of authority was quite limited since its jurisdiction did not extend to the rural areas. According to Morris Jones, each village had just a Headman and a Patwari who represented the British administration in these capacities. Government operations were more prevalent in metropolitan regions than in rural areas. The increased government activities expanded the government's influence in the people's daily lives.

This notion of having a government was undoubtedly a British legacy. But, it was not very extensive, genuine, or popular as of today. It was narrower, strange, and less expansive. Government was associated with tax or Revenue Collector at the village level. Though the current administration of India is not the same as its

predecessor, it shares several characteristics with it. This psychological element of Indian political life was widely demonstrated during deliberations in the Constituent Assembly from 1947 to 1949. It was influential in the preparation of the new constitution, for example, in the rejection of proportional representation, the inclusion of emergency measures, and the limitations connected to the Fundamental Rights. The government was in high demand since the entire process had to revolve around it. Some characteristics of government, such as diarchy, centralised bureaucracy, and a federal form of government, were also inherited by the Indian political system.

Federal System

India's constitution is federal in nature, yet it has a number of unitary elements. Nevertheless, the word "federal" appears nowhere in the constitution. It is possible that her assumption that the constitution she inherited in 1947 was unitary but with considerable federal characteristics was incorrect. The Government of India Act of 1935 pointed squarely in the direction of federalism. It failed for the first time under the federal system. Without a doubt, the Act of 1935 failed to establish any meaningful level of Provincial Autonomy, rendering the notion of federalism a sham. Yet, it set the stage for the eventual formation of federalism.

In reality, the current Indian constitution, this was enacted by the Constituent Assembly on November 26, 1949 and went into effect on January 26, 1950, heavily adopted federal aspects from the Government of India Act, 1935. It is also worth noting that the current constitution contains several provisions that give the Central Government more powers, such as emergency provisions under Articles 352, 356, and 360, deployment of armed forces in the States, dismissal of State Governments under Article 356, and inclusion of any subject in the State list based on Rajya Sabha recommendations.

Diarchy

The Montford Reforms of 1919 were primarily responsible for the establishment of diarchy. These Reforms called for the establishment of responsible governments in the provinces. The administration themes were to be separated into two categories: central and provincial. The Central topics were those that were to be kept solely under the supervision of the Central Government. Provincial subjects were further classified as Transferred and Residuary. The Governor and his Executive

Council were to govern the reserved topics without any accountability to the Legislature. Although the terms of dual governance are not reflected in the current Indian Constitution, several clauses are comparable. As a result, the federal system is an essential aspect of the heritage of governance.

Centralized Bureaucracy

Today's centralised bureaucracy is a British heritage. The British government established a massive bureaucracy to manage the government, with districts serving as administrative entities. For different reasons, bureaucrats were given exceptional privileges throughout the British government's dictatorship. They had to deal with any crisis that arose as a result of civil disobedience campaigns. The foreign nature of the government was clearly one cause for the civil officials' broad powers. The majority of the Indian Civil Service employees were fiercely devoted to the British administration, and the government had complete trust in them. As a result, it was up to them to manage the government.

The government was hierarchical, from the Governor General of India to Tehsildars at the village level. Its hierarchy featured numerous authorities such as the State's Governor or Lieutenant-Governor, Commissioners, Collectors, Tehsildars, and village Headmen. The Indian civil service was the first, senior, and most outstanding service. Being a member of the ICS was more than just a guarantee of a good and fascinating work; it was also a calling and an honour. Members of the Indian Civil Service were appointed not only as District Collectors, but also to the Governor Executive General's Council.

Members of the Indian Civil Service were recruited through a competitive examination, which was previously only available in England through the Civil Service Commissioners. Some Indians achieved freedom to a degree. Yet, no political party has been able to totally erase backwardness, poverty, and other issues in India. As a result, the public have condemned every political party that has come to power.

Extra Constitutional Measures

The British Indian political system left a legacy of extra constitutional actions such as Bandhs, Hartals, Satyagrahas, Hunger strikes, and fastunto death. Satyagraha, which takes the form of fasting, strikes, bandhs, and dharnas, is the legacy of Mahatma Gandhi's national movement. Yet, it is

not universally recognised that all of the above mentioned extra constitutional initiatives are truly Gandhian in spirit. Not even those, who join in these activities, argue that these extra constitutional actions have become justified in the Indian context, most possibly because of the fact, that the government against whom they are often directed, itself was a party to similar tactics against the British Raj.

Throughout the Indian Political System, there have been several similar movements. Morarji Desai's role in dissolving Gujarat Vidhan Sabha in 1975 and J.P.'s effort in Bihar (1974-75) for the dissolution of Bihar Legislative Assembly are two noteworthy examples. It is quite difficult to state that all the Satyagrahas which have occurred after the independence are not fully of Gandhian type. According to Rajni Kothari, the length and continuity of both the nationalist struggle and Hindu civilisation contributed significantly to the unification of the new India, imparting modernist design, depth, flexibility, and manoeuvrability.

CONCLUSION

The outcry was the result of a constant interaction and interplay between a rich and malleable heritage on the one hand and the new framework of democratic institutions and principles on the other. The behavioural and attitudinal under pinnings of both tolerance and dissent, legitimacy of the new elite devoted to free institutions, and absorption of all main stances of social structure and thinking looked to mix well, giving rise to a synthesis that was both traditional and contemporary. Such a deep synthesis would not have existed if the national movement had been short in duration or shallow in its penetration. Therefore the Indian political system received numerous legacies from its predecessor, namely the British Indian political system, which significantly influenced the formation of our Republic and our constitution.

REFERENCES

1. Austin, Granville, Working of a Democratic Constitution: The Indian Experience, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1999.
2. Durga Das Basu, Introduction to the Indian Constitution-New Delhi: Wadhwa and Company Law Publishers, 2002.
3. P.M. Bakshi, The Indian Constitution-Universal Law Publications, Delhi, 2002.

4. Shibankar Chaube, Constituent Assembly of India, Manohar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, 2000.
5. Arvind P. Datar, On the Indian Constitution-Agra: Wadhwa and Co., 2001.
6. Hasan, Zoya, and E.Sridharan and others (eds.)- Permanent Black, Delhi, 2002.
7. Subhash C. Jain, The Constitution of India: Some Problems and Views, Taxman Publications, New Delhi, 2000.
8. Kagzi, M.C. Jain, The Constitution of India, Vols. 1 and 2, India Law House, New Delhi, 2001.

