(Ted Runions)

CULTURE, EDUCATION AND THE IDENTITY OF INDIAN MUSLIMS

CULTURE, EDUCATION AND THE IDENTITY OF INDIAN MUSLIMS

An Indian Approach to Cultural Unity - Humayun Kabir

Ted Runions   Master of Arts
Institute of Islamic Studies   April 1970

ABSTRACT

The contribution of this thesis to knowledge is that it is a test case of the Indian ideal 'unity in diversity' as proposed by an Indian Muslim, Humayun Kabir, to solve the problem of cultural identity of Indian Muslims in a secular democratic state.

This study of Kabir's proposal suggests that the ideal is neither an actuality nor a possibility. It is not an actuality because Kabir consistently in his historical, philosophical, educational and political essays fails to attain the ideal. It is not a possibility because Kabir's proposal underestimates the importance and power of traditional religion inherent in the cultural identity of Indians, Muslim and Hindu and overestimates the appeal of a rational religion to command either audience or credence let alone stimulus for integration among most Indians, Muslim and Hindu. In other words, Kabir's proposal is a rational secular solution to an emotional religious problem.

CULTURE, EDUCATION AND THE IDENTITY OF INDIAN MUSLIMS

An Indian Approach to Cultural Unity - Humayun Kabir

by

Ted Runions

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Institute of Islamic Studies,
McGill University.   April 1970.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The partition of India in 1947 involved
the partition of its Muslim community.

This fact shocked that community. The Indian
Muslims had fought for Pakistan on the grounds that
the Indian Muslim community was one, and therefore
advocated a separate existence as a corollary for the
continued unique existence of that community. Success
was not without loss. The creation of Pakistan led
to the fact that there are now two Muslim communities
in India.

This thesis is a critical study of a modern
rational proposal by an Indian Muslim, Humayun Kabir
(1906-1969), to solve what partition did not -- the
integration of the Muslim community into the Indian
community. After 1947 this meant the integration of
the Muslim community, which opted to remain in India
as a cultural and religious minority, into a secular
democratic State in which the majority culture was
religiously Hindu.

After the exodus of many Muslim intelligentsia to Pakistan in 1947, Humayun Kabir was one of the few remaining who took the lead and faced the immediate and major question of a synthesis within Indian culture in which Islamic culture would function integrally.[1] The question was asked to what degree and in what forms and with what ideological basis would Indian Muslims set themselves to working for the welfare of the whole Indian community? Humayun Kabir sought the answer to this question by proposing a philosophy of culture which would form the basis of a political and educational commitment to Indian unity. Kabir was totally committed to being an Indian in a secular way.

The conceptual key that best epitomizes this Indian philosophy of culture is the concept 'unity in diversity'. This concept has been formulated by many Indian writers, Hindu and Muslim, including such well-known Indians as J. Nehru,[2] R. Tagore,[3] K. Azad,[4] Z. Husain,[5] and A. Husain.[6] Kabir, discussing the basic aims of The Indian Philosophy of Education, in 1961 stated the concept this way.

> . . . this has been the aim of the Indian outlook throughout the ages. Even when practice fell far short of profession, the Indian ideal recognised the right of the

individual to go his own way in every sphere
of life. Not merely toleration but acceptance
of differences has been one of the most
significant characteristics of the Indian
attitude to the real. Indian thought has
always accepted that there are degrees of
truth and degrees of reality. It has there-
fore sought to achieve unity in the midst of
diversity rather than impose a dead uniformity
in which all differences are wiped out.
Indian thought has been synoptic and Indian
society and polity federal. It is therefore
not an accident that India should be one of
the strongest supporters of the co-existence
of different social ideals, economic forms
and political principles in the modern world.
India survived the vicissitudes of history
because of her capacity to reconcile
differences and evolve a framework within which
the widest diversities could co-exist.[7]

Kabir approached 'unity in diversity' in a
secular way. In cultural terms, unity in diversity
meant the broadening of one's vision, a rational,
moral and social orientation to modern living in
service to all men and their individual potential.
Culture is not Islamic but human, Indian, international.
In like manner religion is not Islam, a narrowing of
one's adherence to a specific ideology, a closed
system, but the search for truth, right relationship,
social justice, a unity of man rooted in the important
values of Muslim culture which are common to other
religious cultures; a moral commitment to the
universality of spiritual values which may be attained

in a variety of ways. Education was also an agent
of cultural unity. It was charged with transmitting
a modern orientation to life, with transforming the
human personality and its environment in which every
aspect of life plays a part. By modern orientation
is meant a recognition of the existence of values in
one's past which are attuned to the present and its
realities. Consequently, one neither denies the past
nor ignores the future. From the resources of the
past, the exigencies and the insights of the present
and the hopes of the future, one attempts to understand
and fulfill his present responsibilities.

In political terms 'unity in diversity'
demanded that a majority culture recognize the
importance and right of the minority culture to exist
as an individual and autonomous entity. At the same
time, it demanded that a minority culture realize
that the right to remain individual was not only a
right to solve one's own problems but a responsibility
to solve the provlems of others, to participate for
the welfare of the majority.

'Unity in diversity' is obviously an ideal.
Kabir's proposal is very important.
The effectiveness of his proposal whether

as an ideal or his historical, intellectual,
educational, political application of that ideal is
a test case for the effectiveness of the secular
ideal in modern India. In other words, the effective-
ness of the secular ideal in India which attempts to
maintain national unity while recognizing the importance
of the diverse cultural components in that unity to
retain their identity depends largely on the effective-
ness of the men who espouse such an ideal to live as
if it were realizable. Only in this way can the
majority of the people be convinced that such an ideal
is possible and thereby be committed to support and
realize it themselves.

The hypothesis of this thesis is that Kabir's
proposal failed in that the ideal 'unity in diversity'
was neither an actuality or a possibility. The
inconsistency between the ideal and the application
of that ideal in Kabir's historical, philosophical,
educational and political essays demonstrates the
fact that the ideal is intellectually and pragmatically
unrealizable. In other words, 'unity in diversity' is
basically a paradox and as such is based on maintaining
a tenuous balance between two opposing forces, unity
and diversity. Kabir failed in that he was unable to

maintain that necessary balance and in the end achieved neither unity nor 'unity in diversity'.

Kabir consistently emphasized the necessity of unity at all cost, even the cost of diversity. This consistency is evident even though his understanding of the problem of Indian disunity changes and his defence of that problem varies.

Before 1955 Kabir maintained that the cause of disunity was on the level of material interests, the vested interests of the groups vying for power in India, British, Muslim and Hindu.[8] Kabir then wrote a history of Muslim politics in India and a cultural history of India's heritage to prove that this unity existed and always had existed, and formulated a modern philosophy of culture to show that unity does exist between East and West, traditional and modern culture in India. Between 1955 and 1963 Kabir maintained that disunity was deeper than just vested interest. There was a lack of intellectual synthesis that was caused by the existence of three different educational systems in India -- Hindu, Muslim and British.[9] He formulated a philosophy of national education, with the same emphasis found in his historical and philosophical essays, unity,that

would create the intellectual synthesis between Hindu, Muslim and Western cultures without causing conflict. From 1963 until his death in 1969, Kabir became involved in the rights of minorities and although he emphasized the need for recognition by the majority of a special status for minorities in order to solve the problem of Indian unity, this was a political solution based on the earlier solutions of economics and education and integration of the minorities. Kabir's ideal, then, was not an actuality because of the inconsistencies between his ideal and the application of that ideal, and the inconsistencies in his defense of this application.

Kabir also failed because he proposed a rational solution to an emotional religious problem.

Kabir was consistent in that religion was not included as a basis for solving the problem of Indian unity. Rather, he sought an intellectual, educational and political-economic solution. However, he underestimated the importance and power of traditional religion inherent in the cultural identity of Indian Muslims and Hindus and overestimated the appeal of a rational religion to command either audience or credence let alone stimulus for integration

among most of the Indian Muslims or Hindus.

That an ideal is unrealized, even for the moment unrealizable, is not in itself disruptive. It is when the ideal seems to become meaningless, the dream insignificant or obstructive, even impossible, that failure is imminent. Kabir's ideal was neither an actuality or a possibility and his thought and approach to cultural unity is the best witness to its failure. The fact that Kabir failed is the importance of this study.

The importance of understanding a modern rational approach to the problem of cultural pluralism in a Nation State and its failure to solve the question of religious identity and therefore the failure to create national integration is not without modern consequences and necessity of thorough re-examination. Kabir's case history is an opportunity to make such a re-examination.

Before examining the obstacles confronting Kabir's proposal and his solutions, it will be helpful to pinpoint Kabir historically in the drama of twentieth century India. By emphasizing certain biographical facts, the reason why Kabir adopted a rational approach to an emotional religious problem will become obvious -- Western education and

association with "Indian" nationalism. These bio-
graphical facts will also give a greater perspective
and general understanding of the historical context
that stimulated his writings, the active involvement
in educational, cultural and political Indian life.

Born at the turn of the century on February
12, 1906, in Bengal, ironically the same year as the
inception of the Muslim League, later his political
arch-rival in the struggle for Indian Independence,
Kabir professes an illustrious parentage of non-
conformity.[10] His family moved with ease in the
cross-cultural milieu of Bengal accepting and growing
out of a synthesis of Hindu, Muslim, and Western
culture. Kabir followed the tradition of his father
who was "one of the most intellectual and emancipated
Indians of his day and won the admiration of Indians
and Europeans with whom he came into contact by his
liberalism and fearlessness."[11] While yet in his
teens, Kabir achieved province-wide fame as a
brilliant student and young poet of promise. His
reputation proceeded him to the Presidency College,
Calcutta, where he soon became one of its most
prominent figures. Literature and poetry, the first
passion of Bengali youth seemed to be his forte.

Through his poetry Kabir gave early expression of his
commitment to India and to serve the universality of
man in all his diverse expressions as well as the
beginning of a life association with R. Tagore.[12]

Kabir's academic prowess won him a scholarship
for study at Oxford in 1927, where he pursued the second
passion of Bengali youth, politics, with his study
of philosophy, economics and politics. Along with
his later educational experience in India these three
areas of interest formed the content and method of
his proposal for the integration of the minority
culture into India. For example, his political party
affiliation both with the Krishak Praja Party and
the Lok Dal espoused a political platform of
educational and economic reform along non-communal
lines.[13] The Oxford imprint was also evident in
Kabir's adopting a western rational approach to
the problem of cultural unity rather than a traditionally
religious one.

Once again, Kabir's imprint on university
life did not go unnoticed as he championed India's
cause as one of the Union's keenest debaters.[14] This
imprint was complemented by a first in schools and
office at the Union. Such an impressive record made

many of his contemporaries think of him as a representative of a new India if not its future leader.

> But the power behind us all was Humayan Kabir, one of the greaters products of modern Oxford. . . . I remember Kabir that night at the Majlis dinner. Seldom have I seen anyone speak with such sincerity. It was the soul of India that was pouring out of the mouth of Humayan Kabir - the soul of the new India, my India, his India, the India of those like us who are young and unafraid.[15]

Kabir returned to India in 1932 armed with "the western method" and began a life association with education as a teacher, administrator and policy maker. This association put his newly acquired Western education to the test of the Indian educational scene where a general demise of national education at all levels, institutional and personal, existed. This challenge found practical focus in the Gandhian Wardha Scheme of National Education which reinforced Kabir's adherence to R. Tagore's educational principles. The influence of these two men along with Kabir's own western orientation formed the basis of his India philosophy of education. It was not until after 1948, while K. Azad's educational advisor in the Ministry of Education 1948-1956 that education

became one of the basic tools for Kabir's approach
to cultural unity. Here he set about building a new
India on the basis of 'unity in diversity' a fusion of
old traditions and new values. As Chairman of the
University Grants Commission in 1955-56, Kabir was
given the opportunity to direct the application of
some of these principles.

Between 1958-1963 when he was Minister of
Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs, his zeal for
cultural unity gained international as well as national
respect. It was due to his initiative that the first
Asian Congress of Orientalists was held in India and the
International Congress of Orientalists met on Asian soil
for the first time. Although the Indian Council of
Cultural Relations was founded several years before, it
was during Kabir's term of office that it became a live
instrument for the projection of Indian culture
abroad and the presentation of the culture of other
countries to the Indian people. His energy gave new
vitality to the program of Sahitya Akademi, the
Sangeet Natak Akademi, and the Lalit Kala Akademi
and initiated a program of internal cultural exchange
enabling different cultures in different regions to
have first hand experience of each other's

contribution to the Indian scene. Perhaps one of the most important policies at this time was that of encouraging the development of all modern Indian languages. Till he took over this ministry, the Union government had concerned itself mainly with the development of Hindi. Kabir pointed out that in a country as large as India and with so many different languages and cultures, national unity could only be achieved by encouraging the development of all constituent entities. The policy he initiated of translating one Indian language into another, marked the beginning of a national evolution of a common literary heritage. His efforts for science were recognized when the Indian Science Congress elected him as General President, the first time that a student of humanities was accorded this single honour.[16]

This range of sympathies explains why Kabir was able to project India abroad in such a favourable way. It is interesting that since Independence, the two India programs which have made a great impact on the International scene for the imagination and human sensitivity were the International Gandhian Seminar organized to discuss the application of Gandhian methods to the problems of war and peace, and the

Tagore Centenary Program which projected Indian ideals throughout the world. It is not by accident that both of these programs were conceived and carried out by Kabir.[17] It is with this service to India and mankind in mind that Rene Meheu, The Director-General of UNESCO, a close associate, pays this tribute:

> I have long wondered what was the more remarkable aspect of Kabir's fascinating personality. Was it his grasp of the world, with his instinctive feeling for the differences and infinite diversities in culture, in levels of social and economic development, in political and religious attitudes, in philosophies, habits of thought and ways of life? Or was it his ability to continue in effective harmony his own diversity, his manifold qualities of head and heart and varied responsibilities and vocations? I have since come to realize that his most distinctive and truly admirable characteristic is precisely his dual and equal mastery of his many gifts and talents, simultaneously and indivisibly directed towards the inside and the outside. In my view, so rare an achievement goes far beyond those gifts themselves, superb as they are, and all the conquests and accomplishments in which they have found expression. For it bears witness to a readiness, a longing and an ability to identify oneself with all men, which carry one straight to the very essence of man. It is these qualities which I believe form the core of Humayan Kabir's personality and which give to his life its truest and loftiest significance.[18]

Kabir was able to project his own Indian image devoid of any specific religious identify, like being a Muslim.

As hinted earlier in the biography, education and the international community were not the only fields to be cultivated for Indian unity. Kabir's life at Oxford reinforced by frequent travels throughout the West, introduced him to the glaring realities of economic and political inequalities between the East and the West and between the minority and the majority cultures of India.

The fight for Independence and for the rights of minorities involved more than just political nationalism. It involved economic and social freedom as well.[19] Before Independence in 1947, Kabir played a leading role from 1937-1945 in the Kirshak Praja Party and its espousal of a united India based on economic reform and peasant involvement.[20] Through this political arm Kabir attacked both the ill-hatched Muslim League with its platform of first separate electorate, then in 1940 a separate state, Pakistan, and the middleclass interests of the Congress Party.[21] After Independence, with some proding, Kabir acquiesced to accepting a position in the Union Government to work with K. Azad and J. Nehru in rebuilding the Indian nation along educational and economic lines.[22]

After the death of K. Azad (1963) and by
the death of Nehru (1964), Kabir's early enthusiasm
began to dwindle and turned to eventual disenchant-
ment with the Union Government's lip service to
Gandhian ideals of cultural unity, the rights of the
minority and a strong economic policy. This dis-
illusionment led to Kabir's exit from the Union
Government in 1966 to join the Bangla Congress Party
on whose ticket he brought defeat of the Union
Government in Bengal in 1967. However, this compromise
in a party of Union Government dissenters soon
dissipated its energies into vested interests and
jealousies. Kabir left to found his own party, LOK
DAL in 1968 which set into action again the relentless
search for solving the economic, political and
educational inequalities of the minorities.[23] Un-
fortunately Kabir died the following year without a
test of this renewed energy.

Kabir met with more success in the labour
movement[24] and in times of crisis[25] when a neutral
leader could command more easily the united efforts
of dissident groups involved in solving common
problems -- poverty and disaster.

And yet certain historical facts suggest a

sad denouement to this impressive record of service
to humanity and cultural unity. Pakistan was
created, the Union Government failed to allay the
fears of the minority and Kabir died, a leader of his
own party struggling for survival in provincial
politics in Bengal.

Both Kabir's universalism and rational
approach were rejected by the very people he served,
Hindu and Muslim Indians.

His appeal had always been to reason and
not to passion except when writing history in the
forties.[26] His leadership was constructive and human
and not without imagination, but underestimated the
inherent power of traditional religion in the cultural
identity of Indians. Even the fact that communal
passions often hurt the minorities more than the
majorities did not act as a deterrent to conflict.
Kabir ruled out communal political parties from the
beginning,[27] but was unable to give a meaningful
religious substitute in economics, reason,
education. In pre-independent India he shared the failure
with many greater men of underestimating the power of
traditional India and the impact of the West. But
Kabir failed to learn from this tragic lesson and
proposed basically the same solution after Indian

Independence when neither the strength of religion
or the fact of disunity disappeared.[28] Consequently,
Kabir was rejected. Communal elements among the
Hindus rejected him because he was Muslim. Communal
Muslims rejected him because he was too Indian,
having sympathy with Hindu philosophy and outlook.
Politicians often said that he was too academic and
scholars said he was too much of a politician.[29]
Kabir's emphasis on unity and his ineffectiveness were
as much a praise of his relentless energy as a
witness to a possible confusion in his own identity
between Muslim, Hindu and Western rather than synthesis.

This consequent negative response of the
Indian community forced him to fluctuate unhappily
between two unsatisfactory positions, emphasis on
unity at all costs -- even that of diversity, and
after 1963 an emphasis on unity at all costs but a
special status for the minorities. The first
position was unacceptable to the minority and the
second position unacceptable to the majority.

Therefore Kabir was left pining after an
illusive ideal -- 'a unity in diversity'.

This pattern of consistency in search for
unity at all cost even that of diversity and the

subsequent failure to achieve unity or 'unity in
diversity' is evident in what scholars have said
about Kabir. In his own writings the failure is
also evident in the change in understanding of the
problem and the inconsistencies found in the defense
of this change.

Only two books have been written about Kabir,
both before his death. The first is a commemorative
volume of essays presented to Kabir on his sixty-
second birthday in 1968, titled <u>Science, Philosophy
and Culture</u>.[30] The purpose of this volume is to
project and honour Kabir's Indian image as well as
his rationalization of religion. This purpose is
clearly presented in the preface where Kabir is
described as

> Heir of the best Islamic tradition, Kabir
> appropriated likewise the Hindu perspective,
> while his studies at Oxford and frequent
> travels in Europe and America have enabled
> him to understand and appreciate the Western
> mind. Perhaps his creed may be summed up
> in the words of Ibnal-Arabi: 'My heart can
> take different shapes; a cloister of
> Christian monks, a temple for idols, a
> meadow for gazelles, the Kaaba of the
> pilgrims, the tables of Torah and the
> Quran. . . . Love is my credo and my faith.'
> Yet it must be said that though Kabir is
> cosmopolitan in his outlook and approach, his
> admiration for Indian culture, which,
> according to him, is the oldest living

culture with an unsurpassed vitality and
continuity, and his love of this great land
which, he says, has discovered a way of
reconciling the diversities in its national
life, are unexcelled. India's capacity to
assimilate various races and synthesize different
ways of living and thinking and create a unity
out of diversity, with a tolerance based on the
recognition that truth has many facets, has
been described with lyric fervour in many of
his writings. Kabir's life could be described
as an endeavour to practise Saadi's precept
that as all men are created from one essence
and are all members of the same body, he who
is indifferent to the suffering of others is
not human. Religion, said Saadi, is nothing
but service of the people, it does not depend
on rosaries, prayer carpets or tatered
garments.[31]

Kabir is praised for creating unity <u>out</u> of
diversity, not <u>in</u> diversity.

This very descriptive praise succinctly
summarizes the secular spirit of Kabir's Indian
approach to cultural unity -- an approach which attempts
an identification of one man with all men and a life
committed wholly to finding the universality of man
in each specific human being and human situation.

Since the purpose of this book is to praise
Kabir's admirable efforts in order to example the
Indian approach to cultural unity it is not critical
of how inconsistent his approach is with the ideal,
'unity in diversity'. Some of the contributors,
however, do suggest that Kabir's efforts were not

without frustration. N. K. Devavja, professor of
Indian Civilization and Culture, at Banares Hindu
University, gives this gloomy analysis of the
prospects of Indian secularism:

> In a country like India, where higher
> education is attainable only by a tiny
> majority, where scientific habits of thought
> and rational approach are rare even among
> the educated, and where thought and conduct
> are largely rooted in religious tradition,
> it is not possible either for the Government
> or for a few enlightened leaders to secure a
> quick large scale or even reorientation of
> the national mind. Apart from this the Indian
> Government, during the last seventeen years,
> has been too preoccupied with urgent
> political and economic problems to have found
> it possible to pay greater attention to the
> question of the cultural reorientation and
> education of the people particularly the rising
> generation.[32]

Indian educationist, A. R. Dawood, also suggests
Kabir was not without problems in his educational
philosophy:

> One wonders how many of those who are planning
> to relate education to productivity and
> educational development to manpower requirements
> in our country would agree with Humayan Kabir's
> views. These views, however, have been expressed
> by him at different times and are found in several
> of his essays and addresses. As a scholar and
> an intellectual Kabir has no patience with
> people - and their number in India is on the
> increase - who condemn all educational courses
> if the knowledge imparted through them cannot
> be turned into immediate practical use.[33]

Finally, the conclusion of P. Tagore on
Kabir's political career which has already been

referred to in the biographical sketch throws some
doubt on Kabir's political effectiveness.[34] But
these comments do not mean that he failed, but only
that he had his problems like any other secular
modernist in India.

The second book by D. Datta, <u>Humayun Kabir
A Political Biography</u>,[35] is even less critical,
written with the added purpose of justifying the
founding of another political party in Bengal, the
Lok Dal and of promoting Kabir's leadership of Bengal
as the founding leader of that party.[36] D. Datta,
consequently is not critical of the way Kabir applied
his ideal 'unity in diversity'; and certainly not
intending to defeat his own argument by suggesting
any possible frustration, let alone failure, on the
part of Kabir or his party to realize the aims of that
party.

However, D. Datta does give a more colorful
and provincial flavour to Kabir's life style by
claiming and describing him more as a son of Bengal
than of India. The very fact that neither of these
volumes discusses the meaning of Islam or Muslim
identity for Kabir is indicative of his Indian
imprint in a secular way.

The purpose of this thesis then is to present a critical analysis of Kabir's proposal in his English writings in order to understand his historical, philosophical, educational, and political application of 'unity in diversity' and to understand the role of Islam in this proposal and its application for meaningful cultural identity of Indian Muslims in a secular democratic state.

I have chosen an internal method of argument, that is a critical analysis of what Kabir has said himself about what he proposes and about how he attempts to achieve it and why. This method is necessary simply because there is little written about him and what is, as I have already indicated, is very uncritical. The scarcity of the material written about Kabir, who was a leading Indian educationalist, a politician instrumental in the Union Government policy, is difficult to explain. What is known is that Kabir's recent death has not provided enough time to lapse for an objective and comprehensive study. This internal method of argument is facilitated by the fact that Kabir was a scholar and able to develop his argument with clarity and repetition, thus allowing the possibility to criticize its development more carefully.

Because of this method of criticism, it is necessary often to quote Kabir's own argument in full, therefore, I ask the reader's patience for the length of some quotes.

The following annotated survey of Kabir's English writings examples his academic awareness and literary scope as historian, philosopher, educationist and politician. I have listed his essays chronologically. This arrangement is to indicate the key essays involved in his analysis of the problem of Indian unity, the change in understanding of this problem in 1955 and again in 1963. There is also a practical reason. Kabir's books consist of collected essays and often the dates do not correspond with the date of publication of the books. In fact the essays often present different points of view opposing not only each other[37] but the purpose for publishing the essays.[38]

The following list is a detailed survey of essays (numbered) and books (underlined) written in English by Kabir. His poetical works have been omitted because they are of little value for the study of his argument.

1935   critical translation of <u>KANT'S ON PHILOSOPHY</u>
  <u>IN GENERAL</u>

1937 (1) Politics and Muslim Students - Presidential
  Address at the All Indian Muslim Students
  Conference.

1937 (2) Two Speeches delivered in Bengal Legislative
  Council.

1943 (3) Muslim Politics 1906-1942 - political and
  historical analysis of Muslim League.

1944 (4) Freedom, Authority, and Imagination.

1946 (5) Essay written just before the British Cabinet
  Mission came to India.
  <u>THE INDIAN HERITAGE</u>

1947 (6) Muslim Politics 1942-47 - political and
  historical analysis of events before Partition.

  (7) The Rights of Man.

1948 (8) Epilogue to Muslim Politics 1906-47.

1949 (9) The Concepts of Democracy.

1950 (10) The Study of Philosophy.

1952 (11) The East and the Problem of Education.

1953 (12) Reflections on Gandhian Thought and Practice.

  (13) The Theory and Practice of Basic Education.

1954 (14) The Welfare State.

  (15) Student Indiscipline.

1954 (16) The Role of Education.

(17) Indian Muslims.

SCIENCE, DEMOCRACY, AND ISLAM

1955 EDUCATION IN NEW INDIA

(18) Reconstruction of Secondary Education.

(19) Concepts of Social Education.

(20) On Indian Universities.

(21) The Study of English.

(22) Cultural activities and the State.

(23) The Role of Higher Education.

(24) Education and Society.

1956 (25) Education and Community Life.

(26) Indian Philosophy of Education - Ancient Ideals.

(27) Indian Philosophy of Education - The Continuity of Tradition.

1956 (28) Education and Planned Development.

1958 (29) The Basis of National Unity.

(30) Education and One World.

(31) Crisis of Youth.

(32) Universities and National Unity.

1959 (33) Universities in the Future.

(34) Knowledge and National Unity.

(35) India and Federalism.

1960 (36) Intellectual Status and National Progress.

(37) The Challenge of a New Age.

(38) Indian Philosophy of Education at the Cross-roads.

(39) Indian Philosophy of Education and National Development.

1961   R. TAGORE

INDIAN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

(40) Communal Conflicts and Religion.

1963 (41) Minorities in a Democracy.

1966 (42) Towards a South Asian Confederation.

1968   MINORITIES IN A DEMOCRACY

(43) Plural Society and Group Conflicts.

(44) Communal Conflicts - Causes and Remedy.

(45) Adivasi of India.

SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE a book written about Kabir.

1967   DATTA, HUMAYUN KABIR, A POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY -
MUSLIM POLITICS 1906-47 AND OTHER ESSAYS
EDUCATION FOR TOMORROW
INDIAN ECONOMIC MALAISE, CAUSE AND CURE

A short discussion of Kabir's books will show his intended use of these essays and in which volumes they are collected together.

KANT'S ON PHILOSOPHY IN GENERAL[39] was
translated and critically evaluated to expound the
importance of science for man's adaptation to the
modern world and its limitation in understanding meta-
physics.[40] Much of the material in this analysis
forms the basis of Kabir's concept of the Welfare
State and his own personal philosophy of rationalism.

THE INDIAN HERITAGE[41] is a cultural history
of India's affinity for unity and synthesis,
reconciliation and development, a perfect fusion of
old traditions and new values. The 1946 edition was
dedicated to K. Azad and J. Nehru who were symbols
of that synthesis, unity and growth. This book forms
the basis for Kabir's philosophy of culture as well
as his later book an INDIAN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION.
A post-script was added in the 1955 edition which
suggests a continued process of unrest and dis-
integration since Independence and is less convincing
than the earlier editions of a continuous spirit of
India synthesis.

SCIENCE, DEMOCRACY AND ISLAM[42] is a
collection of eight essays (4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14)
and an essay with the same title as the book,
appealing to the International community to search

for a basis of unity in all the problems of modern living as India has in order to create a greater meeting of East and West.

EDUCATION IN NEW INDIA,[43] dedicated to K. Azad who with R. Tagore and M. Gandhi helped to shape a national system of education for India, is a collection of essays (13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22) introduced by a bird's eye view of the reconstruction of education from Independence to 1955. These essays are devoted to a discussion of the experiments Indian education has attempted in order to integrate and reconstruct a viable nation. It is hoped that they will also impress on the International community some idea of the vigour, vitality and variety of India's educational effort. The influence of both the West and the East in solving the problem of education is very evident.

R. TAGORE[44] is a very impressionistic study of a very impressive India. This study of Tagore as poet, humanist, modernist and internationalist, educationist and economist, epitomizes Kabir's life style to such an extent that one wonders if it was not perhaps an attempt at an autobiography of his own search for a unity in diversity. Tagore is certainly

a role model for Kabir.

AN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION is an
analysis of the philosophy that underlies the
experiments in EDUCATION IN NEW INDIA based on
Kabir's philosophy of culture expounded in THE
INDIAN HERITAGE. The collection of essays presented
(23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36,
37, 38, 39) also defends his thesis that the aim of
education is to create the spirit of democracy,
scientific enquiry and philosophical toleration in
order to transmute and fuse old and new values without
violent upheaval and clash. In other words these
essays show how education, ancient and modern, East
and West, can serve as the major instrument for
social mobility and progress in India.

MINORITIES IN A DEMOCRACY[45] is a collection
of six essays (35, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45) restating
Kabir's position towards communal politics on a
religious basis and the need for the Muslims to accept
Hindus as "People of the Book" and therefore facilitate
greater social intercourse between the two communities.
The essay on federalism is from an earlier position
recommending the federal approach, politically and
culturally as a means to solving the problem of group

conflicts. The final essay in the book is very
interesting because it is one of the few statements
in English by Kabir on the platform of the LOK DAL
assuring the autonomy and full development of
ADIVASIS and every other minority group.

SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE and HUMAYUN
KABIR, A POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY have been referred to
earlier in the Introduction suggesting a favourable
and uncritical presentation of the Indian secular
approach to cultural unity as best represented by Humayun
Kabir. The essays which have specific relevance to
Kabir's "Indian Image" are "Modernity and the Major
Religions", "Bengale Writings of Humayun Kabir",
"Humayun Kabir as an Educationist", "Prospects of
Indian Secularisn: A Philosopher's Viewpoint", "Kabir's
English Writings", "The Philosophy of Humayun Kabir",
and "Humayun Kabir as a Politician".

DATTA's Political biography also contains
material relevant for understanding the importance of
Kabir's leadership in Bengal's politics and the nature
of his political program to solve the economic problems
of the peasants.

MUSLIM POLITICS 1906-1947 AND OTHER ESSAYS[46]
is a collection of seven essays (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 17,

42).The first five written earlier in Kabir's career at a very emotional time of national crisis, 1937-48; the sixth written in 1954 being a synopsis of the role of Indian Muslims in Indian history and the divisive tactics of the British towards both Hindus and Muslims and the seventh written in 1966 a proposal for a South Asian Confederation. The publication of these particular essays in one volume is to present the experience and suffering of the older generation so that the new generation may not follow the lessons of their failure. It is interesting that Kabir himself had not learned from his own failure and suggested a new solution.

EDUCATION FOR TOMORROW[47] is a series of lectures expounding some of the views expressed in EDUCATION IN NEW INDIA and INDIAN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION with particular emphasis on the role of education in reconstructing a modern nation. The only difference in the views expressed here from the earlier volumes is a different audience, the United Arab Republic.

INDIA'S ECONOMIC MALAISE.. CAUSES AND CURES[48] is a pamphlet edited by Humayun Kabir including different theories about Indian economics. It is an

abortive effort because only a few of the many
political parties solicited for a written evaluation
of Indian economics responded. However, Kabir
includes the economic solution offered by his
political party, Lok Dal.

The historical, political, education and
cultural issues are repeated throughout his literary
career but a change in the understanding of the
cause of Indian disunity is found in 1955 and again
in 1963 with some inconsistency resulting in the
defence of this change.

One could question the use of only Kabir's
English material since he wrote an equal amount in
Bengali. However, as pointed out in the commemorative
volume in an essay on Kabir's Bengali writings by
Professor B. M. Chaudhury, Head of the Department of
Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of
Technology, Kharagapur, the same philosophical,
educational and political themes are expressed and
given the same emphasis as those in the English
writings.[49] The main difference in material would
be the greater amount of poetical literature available
in Bengali[50] but this does not limit the value of the

English works for the purpose of this thesis.

This does not mean that there are no limitations to this study. This study can hope at best to be a beginning to the understanding of a man, his thought and actions moulded in a dynamic and divisive cultural heritage in which I neither have a personal experience of the language necessary to attempt any comprehensive and sensitive evaluation. When more is written by both Muslim and Hindu Indians (modern and traditional), a more definitive study and evaluation of Kabir's approach to cultural unity can follow.

A beginning is necessary. Kabir is representative of a modern problem of cultural identity, a problem that is peculiarly Indian[51] and modern. The effectiveness of his approach offers lessons for both India and the world.

Kabir was faced with many obstacles.

The paramount feelings usually associated with minority identity are formidable enough that no political or social system to accommodate satisfactorily such minority feelings has yet been devised. This minority insecurity in India is compounded by the fact that no intellectual rapproachment has taken place, historically or in recent times, between the

Muslim minority and Hindu majority to form a basis
for some mutual understanding necessary for
integration. Moreover, the very inactivity of the
ruling Congress Party, the majority, to show any
serious attempt at reconciling the complaints of the
minority about economic, political and educational
inequalities further discourages integration.
Finally, the very nature of Indian society, the fact
that traditional religion and culture permeates the
whole basis of cultural identity and marks and
defines the area of attitudes and beliefs which makes
possible the minority's adjustment to change and
living in a pluralistic society, tends to emphasize
the separateness of the individual cultural components
as well as maintain an emotional level of involvement
in Indian life. This fact also means that custom, not
reason, is still king in the greater part of India.

Humayun Kabir sought to remedy this explosive
situation and allay the fears of the Muslim minority
by creating conditions favourable to the harmonious
living or co-existence of different communities
inhabiting the Indian sub-continent; in other words,
by creating a 'unity in diversity'.

He sought a solution to the existing

intellectual void in the creation of a mental
orientation towards unity, a psychological sense of
unity, which necessitated the rewriting of Indian
cultural history with a moral purpose. In positive
terms, this meant writing a national history from
ancient times to the present which would witness to
the pattern of unity in Indian cultural growth, thus
demonstrating the Indian commitment to a harmonious
unity among its diverse cultural components. In
negative terms, this rewriting of history meant a
violent attack on all divisive elements which for
Kabir meant an attack on the Muslim League which was
the political progenitor of the Indian Muslim's existing
malaise.

In reaction to the ruling Congress Party's
ineptitude to address itself to the economic,
political and educational plight of the minorities,
Kubir, while a member of that party, proposed a plan
of national education that sought to elevate the
status of the minority to enable them to co-exist
rather than subsist with the majority. In this way
it was hoped that both the minority and the majority
cultures would be stimulated towards integration on
a satisfactory basis. However, the fact that the

Congress Party was hesitant to enact the necessary
educational changes and was recalcitrate about its
economic policies towards the minorities, led Kabir
eventually to found his own political party, the LOK
DAL, with a platform for correcting these educational
and economic injustices hindering national integration.

The third problem facing Kabir, which proved
to be the most difficult to solve in a rational way,
was the most important -- the relationship of
religious identity, of being a Muslim, to the
national identity, of being a citizen in a secular
democratic state in which the majority of the other
citizens were Hindu. Kabir, an intellectual educated
in the western liberal tradition, sought a rational
solution to an emotional fact. He identified the
theoretical principles of Islam with the theoretical
principles of the Indian Constitution and not with
the actual practice of either theory. This
theoretical identification necessitated a change in
the basis of authority commanding community allegiance;
a change from revelation to reason. In this way he
hoped to broaden the base of religion in order to
incorporate all of India's diverse religious
expressions and commit them to a common purpose -
'unity in diversity'. A religion then that was

scientific in temper, democratic in spirit and
humanitarian in devotion would act as a rational
agent of cultural unity rather than a traditional
religion that was orientated to only one cultural
expression, one historical interpretation, and one
religious devotion and therefore an emotional agent
of disunity.

This explanation of a rational approach to
solve the problem of religious identity of the
Indian Muslims in a secular democratic state is
necessary for understanding the meaning of Islam and
secularism. The reason for the deliberate choice of
the subtitle of this thesis, <u>An Indian Approach to
Cultural Unity</u>, will elucidate further this understanding.

Substituting "Islamic" or "Muslim" for Indian
would misrepresent Kabir's intention because Islam or
being a Muslim was not central to his ideal or its
political and educational application. Islam
essentially played but a supporting role and in its
traditional form no role at all. In other words,
traditional religion forms neither the content of
nor the stimulus for intellectual or emotional
cultural expression in Kabir's approach to cultural
unity. Basically religion for Kabir was that which

aspires to the universality of spiritual values
which may be attained in a variety of ways -- a
rational belief in the important values of Islamic
culture which are common to other religious cultures.
In terms of political action in a secular state this
meant that Islam supported the principles of the
constitution of India as well as Kabir's credo of a
rational approach to cultural unity. For Kabir,
all three, the principles of Islam, the Indian
Constitution and his own personal philosophy of culture
were synonymous. Therefore to substitute Islamic or
Muslim for Indian would not only be misleading but
suggest the exact opposite, that Islam was an identity-
factor and a motivating force for Kabir's approach
to cultural unity.

To call Kabir's approach "secular" would
be equally misleading. The word "secular" conjures
up emotional images such as anti-religious, a-
religious, religious indifference etc. for both
Western and traditional thinkers. Kabir's approach
was secular as suggested earlier in the Introduction,
but it was secular in an Indian way, a religious way.
It is neither anti-religious or a-religious. This
seemingly paradoxical phenomenon expresses a common

Indian phenomenon in which religion permeates the
total experience of every day life and reflection,
even the most secular.[52] Indian secularism is all-
inclusive based on the universality of spiritual
values common to all religious cultures. Even the
fact that Kabir must face the religious question,
what it means to be a Muslim in a secular state, in
order to define what it means to be Indian is
indicative of the importance of the question. The
role of traditional religion is questionable but the
question of some sort of religion be it rational,
secular or just imagination must be faced for meaningful
participation in the Indian secular state by modernist
and traditionalist.

After reading the above discussion
discouraging the use of "Islamic" or "secular" in the
place of "Indian" in the subtitle one could legitimately
ask why a more vague term like "liberal" was not used
especially since Western liberal education also
influenced the rational mind of India. But to
emphasize liberal would suggest a transplant of
British liberal ideals without any cultural rejection
and thus negate the equally strong influence of the
nationalist movement and its ideology on Kabir's thought.

The choice of "Indian", then, is very
deliberate and important because it designates a
particular human response to a particular human
environment -- a response of an Indian who inherited
a Muslim culture, who was educated in the Western
liberal tradition and who was embroiled in the national
struggle for Indian Independence and the rebuilding
of a new India along political-economic and educational
lines. Therefore "Indian" is more inclusive than
either "Islamic" or "secular" and more exclusive than
"liberal". "Indian" is rational, religious, secular
and national.

The hypothesis of this thesis is that Kabir's
ideal 'unity in diversity' was neither an actuality
or a possibility. It was not an actuality because of
the inconsistencies between the ideal and Kabir's
application of that ideal in his historical,
philosophical, educational and political essays.
Kabir consistently emphasized unity at all cost even
that of diversity. He consistently emphasized unity
even though his understanding of the problem of Indian
unity changed from a position of vested interests of
Muslim League, Congress Party and British, to a
position after 1955 to include the lack of intellectual

synthesis between Hindus and Muslims and after 1963

the attitude of the majority toward minority rights.

This development in understanding caused further

inconsistencies in Kabir's defence of unity but not

in his goal of unity.

Kabir's ideal was not a possibility because

he proposed a rational secular solution to an

emotional religious problem. He underestimated the

importance and the strength of traditional religion

inherent in the cultural identity of Indian Muslims

and Hindus and overestimated the appeal of a

rational secular religion to command either audience

or credence let alone stimulus for integration among

most of the Indian Muslims or Hindus.

In retrospect, the relationship between a

man's thought and social action is difficult to

determine. Did the thought initiate the social

action or grow out of the social action? Perhaps

the safest reflection on Kabir's thought and social

action is that they were reciprocal. Kabir had a life

association with philosophy, education, politics

and economics and literature and to accept a causal

relation between thought and action would be difficult.

For purposes of analysis I have devoted an

individual chapter to each -- his historical, philosophical,

educational and political essays. All these are
interrelated historically and intellectually in
that they repeat the same theme, the necessity of
unity even at the cost of diversity. However, some
essays are written in response to Kabir's change in
understanding of the cause of Indian disunity which
I designated earlier as three stages, before 1955,
between 1955-1963 and from 1963-1969, and therefore
show some variation in their response. For example,
Kabir's historical essays and philosophy of culture
fall in the period before 1955 and emphasize that
most of the cause of disunity is at the level of
material interests, the educational essays are in
the period between 1955 and 1963 and emphasize that
disunity is at the intellectual level supported by
three different systems of education. The political
papers on minority rights and Lok Dal after 1963
emphasize that the majority must change their complacent
attitude toward the rights of the minority.

There is one important point to remember.
In the end Kabir proposed the same solution after the
creation of Pakistan as that before which leads one
to suggest that he never accepted the fact of diversity
except as a part of unity. Consequently the changes

in 1955 and 1963 of the understanding of the problem
were literary facts dated according to writing not
thought and, therefore, not necessarily separate
stages in the development of his thought. This
consistency of emphasizing unity on the part of Kabir
along with the failure of the Indian National move-
ment to prevent the creation of Pakistan, the failure
of the Union Government to even begin to solve the
plight of the minorities and the failure of one party,
Lok Dal, to find support on a national basis indicates
a failure on the part of Kabir himself to face the
incompatibility of his dream with the facts of Indian
life.

There is a definite relationship between the
historical writing and Kabir's philosophy of culture
but I have separated the two because the historical
writing sets out to show the historical cultural
unity between Hindus and Muslims and the division
created by the vested interests of the Muslim League,
the British and the Congress Party. The philosophy
essays set out to show that a modern intellectual unity
exists between the old traditions and new values, Hindu,
Muslim and Western. There is a definite relationship
between the historical and philosophical essays and

the educational essays in that education was given
the task of transmitting the truths of this history
and philosophy, that unity can and has existed.
There is ao dividing point in that Kabir's under-
standing of the problem includes the fact that an
intellectual synthesis did not take place between
Hindu and Muslim andthe West because of the three
separate educational systems. Therefore national
education was given the task of integrating these
three divisive forces. After 1963 the source of the
problem of disunity included the complacent attitude
of the majority towards the minority and Kabir saw a
system of national education and a political-economic
solution similar to that before 1947 as the method of
approach to this problem.

These are all related also by the fact that
religion is consistently rationalized and made un-
palatable to the tastes of the traditional majority
of Hindus or Muslims.

Obviously a chapter division of a man's life
style is superficial and overlapping and without
spirit. It can be purposeful, however, in that it
serves to emphasize the variety and versatility that
were a distinguishing mark of Kabir's talents as well

as a certain restless energy committed to the search
for the universality of man and its human frustration
-- a truly Indian approach to cultural unity.

CHAPTER I

AN HISTORICAL APPLICATION OF 'UNITY IN DIVERSITY'

The relevant essays for Kabir's historical application of 'unity in diversity' are chronologically, "Muslim Politics 1906-1942", "The Indian Heritage" 1946, "Muslim Politics 1942-47", "Epilogue to Muslim Politics" 1948, and "Indian Muslims" 1954.

Kabir's historical application of 'unity in diversity' was inconsistent with the ideal in that he wrote his history of a 'unity in diversity' with a moral purpose, the purpose of demonstrating the unity and continuity in Indian history. Consequently, he gave more emphasis to unity and continuity than diversity. In fact diversity is superficial except at a level of the material. Since these essays were written before 1955 they also contain Kabir's analysis of the cause of disunity being the vested interests of the British, Muslim League and the Congress Party not the incompatibility of these respective cultures

47

in India. This compatibility between Islam and
Hindus is exampled by the way in which Islam in its
historical perspective was at first a religion of
militant democracy, liberal rationalism and an
uncompromising monotheism that at times verged on
iconoclasm and intolerance. Then Islam's Indian
experience, the reconciliation of Hindus and Muslims,
tempered this initial double edge sword of renewed
religious activity in India and exclusiveness so that
Islam became an Indian religion emphasizing the
universality of Truth found in all its diverse Indian
expressions, including Hinduism.

In Kabir's historical analysis of India's
cultural heritage he gives an understanding of what
he means by culture and the nature of its development.

For Kabir the very quintessence of a people's
history, past and present, was its culture, a culture
characterized by unity and continuity which sprung
from a tolerance for and acceptance of diversity.[1]

However Kabir confused unity with uniformity
and continuity with conformity and neither sprung
from a sincere tolerance for and acceptance of diversity.
Unity was more like universality which had dominated
and unified all manifestations of outward differences.

The relationship of unity to unversality is important

for understanding Kabir's understanding of 'unity in

diversity', in cultural terms and his failure to

maintain the balance of a unity in diversity. There-

fore, I have quoted his statement in full.

> Throughout the changes of Indian history, we
> therefore find a spirit of underlying unity
> which informs the diverse expressions of its
> life. But the unity was never a dead uniformity.
> A living unity never is. Universality carries
> with it the demand for variety and particularity.
> Whatever is universal cannot be exhausted in
> any one particular form. This is so in the
> case of even abstract truth. The same truth
> reveals itself differently in different
> contexts. To deny this is to deny the
> possibility of communication. In the realm of
> empirical fact, the same event is experienced
> and expressed differently by different persons.
> In the case of concrete reality this is still
> more the case. Whatever seeks to be universal
> can have only a categorical form. The content
> must differ with different people in different
> ages and different climes. The unity of Indian
> culture has been based on a real universality.
> Differences and divergences have never been
> alien to it. On the contrary, it has dominated
> and unified all manifestations of outward
> differences.[2]

Not only the manifestation of outward differences have

been dominated and unified but also the inward

differences. In discussing the medieval Hindu/

Muslim reconciliation Kabir likened it to two living

organisms uniting. Their separate contribution could

hardly be distinguishable. The uniqueness of the

unity was not unity in diversity but a new organism

and a new synthesis in which no element could remain

unchanged.[3]

This new synthesis, organism was supported

by India's historical affinity for continuity, for a

tolerance evolving cautiously[4] rather than for

conflict and revolution. Such phrases as "composite

culture"[5] which springs from a co-operative growth[6]

give further lip service to "unity in diversity".

However, in more personal terms culture for Kabir

is converted into commitment to universality, aspiring

toward human ideals common to all cultures --

commitment to India and the world.[7]

Culture, then, is basically rational, an

intellectual orientation toward serving unity,

freedom from the problems of disunity.

In his only specific discussion about the

nature of culture[8] Kabir drew a comparison between

civilization and culture concluding that culture was

the efflorescence of civilization, a liberation from

the urgency of the problem of existence while

civilization was the organization of society, the form of

machinery which creates the conditions for such

achievement and liberty.

Writing at a time when the urgency of the problem of cultural existence was very acute, it is almost with the intention of instilling hope in the crisis of the forties that Kabir proudly stated as a conclusion to his comparison: "It is not surprising that culture should be less pervasive and widespread than the machinery of civilization. What is surprising is that India should seem to offer an example where culture is almost as extensive as civilization itself."[9]

With this intellectual understanding of culture it is equally not surprising that Kabir conceived of history as a search for patterns of unity and continuity, for examples of cultural synthesis in the historical development of Indian culture, a search for uniformity and universality.

His intention or historical method was clearly stated in the preface to his The Indian Heritage.

> It is my conviction that the picture of Indian culture I have attempted to draw is by and large truer to the facts than the story of the conflicts of a few political personalities which so often passes as Indian history. What matters in Indian history is not the story of the clash and conflict of prince and princeling but the silent and massive flow of the life of the people which has built and is building up in India a common humanity out of a diversity of races, clans, religions, languages, customs and creeds.[10]

As mentioned earlier, this book was written at a time when the emotional call to unity was foremost in the mind of the Indian Nationalists. Consequently writing with a moral purpose was in vogue as well as advocating unity at all cost, including the cost of diversity. If Kabir seriously took his ideal 'unity in diversity' to its logical conclusion rather than following a course of unity as uniformity, he would have been morally concerned with how to unite the Indian Nation with all differences intact. Unity in diversity does not evolve unless the diverse elements, the Muslims in this case, the minorities in general later, can unite from a position of strength rather than weakness. Logically this meant the right of the Muslims to remain separate until guaranteed of a position of strength or the possibility to be equals in education, dignity and status. Kabir followed this logic almost to its conclusion when fighting for the rights of minorities later. Then union would not be a false union based on poverty and minority status. However, the right to remain separate, the right to Pakistan was an emotional issue as much as a logical conclusion, therefore impossible.

Using a source unavailable to this author, his Mohini Lectures, <u>The Lessons of History</u> 1961[11] B. V. Kishan in an essay on Kabir's philosophy in <u>Science, Philosophy and Culture</u> drew a similar conclusion about Kabir's historical method which suggests that Kabir's historical approach did not change before 1961.

> The assessment of historical events must have to be done from a broader outlook in order to understand their worth and significance.
>
> The ideas which set the pace of historical process giving it the initial momentum speak of the basic affinities of human nature. The differences of country and race do not really divide mankind, and all attempts to accentuate the differences are futile. Kabir thinks that ideas have no colour of nationality or creed. Ideas are above the geographical or historical limitations. Human thought is useful when it tends to share the quality of universality; for then only that it can boost the intrinsic value of the historical events. Ultimately ideas which are universal are the prime movers behind the historical process and the events of history will be mirroring the nature and value of the underlying ideas believed by man. Great ideologies are the legacy of the entire mankind, for the human spirit is instinct with their content and significance.
>
> The evidence provided by the historical events demonstrates that progress in the right direction is possible when diversities are reconciled and not glorified. Kabir finds in the Indian society the predominant tendency of reconciling the diversities and contradictions.[12]

The search for historical patterns of unity
and continuity is as valid as that of any other
pattern but becomes equivocal when one pattern is
established above all others as the only valid and
purposeful pattern. Kabir's approach is equivocal
and aggressive. He even attacks those who would
suggest another interpretation other than the pattern
of unity and synthesis. In fact, he claimed their
false interpretation was directly responsible for a
great deal of the communal bitterness in Indian
society.[13] The tenacity of this attack was directly
related to the fact that Kabir was convinced that
the very past glory and future of India was at stake
and the pattern of unity and continuity must not be
broken.[14] Surely one is more positive and more
justified in a world of tension and confusion to
write about and promote cultural harmony? And yet
the dangers of the naivety of writing with moral
commitment are not imaginary. Kabir was often led in
his witchhunt of diversity to gloss over factors of
disunity and whitewash them as factors of unity, for
example Indian political vicissitudes.

> Even the darkest clouds have a silver lining.
> The political vicissitudes of India have also
> had redeeming features. An attitude of
> toleration has fostered simultaneous development

of different strands. As we have already
indicated, this forms one of the most
significant characteristics of Indian
culture. Political vicissitudes have
contributed to the growth of the many-
sidedness of life. The waves of foreign
races and tribes who poured into India
from the earliest times led to constant changes
in the structure and distribution of political
power. The break-up of the country into many
principalities of differing importance was
another immediate consequence. The existence
of many kingdoms and the constant shift in
their power made people less aggressive and
intolerant. It also induced in the people
an attitude of toleration and acceptance of
the foreigner.[15]

The fact that Kabir remained consistent
about his solution to the problem of disunity even
though his understanding changed, suggests he followed
the same whitewash of his own political vicissitudes.
It is interesting that in 1968 when Kabir wrote a
preface to Muslim Politics 1906-1947 he conceded that
there were as many lessons to be learned from patterns
of disunity as from unity and therefore the common
struggle should not be slighted over.[16] Kabir, by
this time had founded his own political party, LOK
DAL, and was directly involved in the difficult
struggle for minority rights. But his lack of change
in his solution to the problem suggests the lessons
were for the youth not the old.

One must not underestimate the positive merits

of writing history with a moral purpose as long as
one understands it as such and not as objective
scholarship. Kabir confused stimulating hypotheses
with researched fact.[17]

Before the arrival of the British, then, we
are left with two cultural patterns. Arya-Dravidian
synthesis and Hindu/Muslim reconciliation. An
examination of these two patterns will shed some
light on Indian 'unity in diversity' and the impression
of unity rather than diversity in Kabir.

The continuous pattern of marauding invasion
or wandering immigration had fostered the necessity
of a very adaptable and colourful Indian philosophy
of life.[18]

This complexity of Indian life was added to
by India's geography which demanded a unity of her
history because her relative isolation from the main-
stream of other developing cultures, a seclusion which
in turn created a consistent desire for internal
political unity.[19]

This physical orientation was in turn
supported by the permeation of an idyllic agricultural
way of life which created one basic economy, one
mental orientation -- man's knowledge and under-
standing of reality became dynamic rather than static.[20]

Kabir posits the institution of caste[21] as
one of the best examples of the Aryan-Dravidian
synthesis at a social and institutional level. It
is also a good example of Kabir's obsession with
positing unity in every factor of India's growth
even that which was most divisive as he suggests
later.[22]

The consequent attitude of toleration,
flexibility engendered by Indian history, geography,
society produced a very practical philosophy accepting
the world as a unity of reality expressing itself in
many different forms. Religion was viewed as a
unity of truth expressing itself in many different
creeds. Both truth and reality were manifestations
of the all-pervasive principle of unity in diversity.[23]

It is with gentle rebuke that Kabir praised
the Indian approach. "The Indian genius for
synthesis has rightly evoked the admiration of the
entire world, but the weakness inherent in its
acceptance or tolerance of every thing without
discrimination has not always been noticed."[24]

The Aryan-Dravidian synthesis jelled at all
levels of activity and thought. The thoughts of
Tagore on religion are a reminder of the persistent

continuity of this idyllic synthesis to the twentieth
century and the close association between Tagore's
and Kabir's thought.[25]

> In a spiritual sense India said one day that
> ignorance is bondage, knowledge is deliverance
> and we free ourselves by attaining truth.
> What is untruth? It is to know oneself as
> integrally separate. To realize one's unity
> with the entire universe, to merge the individual
> soul into the universal soul, is to know truth.
> We cannot even conceive today how wonderful it
> was for the ancient Indian to bring so great
> a truth to the reach of human mind.
>
> Fundamentally similar to the deliverance sought
> by ancient India in the spiritual sphere is the
> deliverance that modern Europe is trying to
> attain in the material sphere. Here too,
> ignorance is bondage and knowledge deliverance.
> The truths of science are leading the human
> mind from isolation to universality and linking
> individual power to universal power.

Kabir follows his same pattern of indiscriminating
acceptance of opposing forces when he attempted to
reconcile the meeting of Islam and Hinduism in India.
The initial impact of Islam seemed to geld this new
synthesis but it was only an initial shock.

> For the first time in recorded history, Indian
> religious and social systems were faced with
> a system which was equally well-formulated
> and definite. The clash between them was
> accentuated by the contrast between their
> outlooks. Hinduism had in it an ascetic and
> other-worldly phase. In the concentration
> upon the Absolute, it relegated the affairs of
> the world to a position of insignificance.
> This was the aspect which Islam found dominant
> when it appeared on the Indian scene. Islam on
> the other hand was non-ascetic and centred upon

this world is a conception of life which was vital, organic and social. The younger faith challenged the assumptions of the old and shook its social structure to the very foundation.

Out of the conflict and contrast between the two outlooks arose problems which it was the task of Indian culture to resolve. At first sight the present struggle between Hindus and Muslims suggests that the solution has not been complete. When we consider the volume of the population and the many points at which their lives impinge, what is surprising is not that perfect fusion has not yet been achieved but that there should have been the degree of synthesis which has actually been realized.[26]

Reconciliation prevailed! Kabir reminds us in his essay "The Indian Muslims" that "In order to understand the Indian Muslim and his place in Indian history one must remember two factors that have contributed to his mental evolution and make up. On the one hand, there has been the influence of Islam and the philosophy of life represented by it. On the other hand, there has been the pervasive influence of Indian culture and civilization. These two forces have acted steadily throughout the centuries and shaped his life and character."[27] Kabir gave more emphasis to the influence of the Indian philosophy, integration, the Aryan-Dravidian synthesis as the ideal culture than the specific impact of Islam and its diversity.[28] Kabir was impressed by the socialization

of the caste system and the intellectual synthesis
represented by Sankara[29] and Akbar[30] not the
religious enthusiasm for Islam represented by
Aurangzeb[31] who caused the decline of the Great
Mughal Empire. Islam's historical purpose was
judged on the extent to which it became Indianized
which meant in the extent it was reconciled to the
Aryan-Dravidian synthesis.

By the end of the sixteenth century a modus
vivendi between the different Indian communities had
been created. Any conflicts that existed were generated
on the plane of material interest and the introduction
of religious or cultural elements is fortuitous and
accidental.[32] This fact was further evidenced by
the political activity of the British, Muslim League
and the Congress Party in the struggle for Indian
Independence which was based on vested interests
not incompatibility.

With the intrusion of a new element, the
West, a process of disassociation ignited between the
two communities and competition replaced co-operation,
eroding a common culture that had grown up over a
millenium.

This decline in good relationship was

accelerated by the Muslim reaction of no co-operation

with the new rulers, the British, which resulted in

non-participation in the fruits of the new tools of

British civilization; science, industry and education.

This pattern was supported by the British who looked

with more favour on the Hindu Indian who was willing

to accept the challenge. However, benevolent rule

was not without its problems. The period between 1886

and 1906 which foreshadows the birth of the Muslim

League was one of indecision or the wrong decision.

> British policy was hesitant, divided and
> uncertain. The old fear of the Muslims
> continued even though the basis of the Muslim
> threat had been destroyed. The old habit of
> utilising the new Hindu middle classes could
> not be totally given up, even though from 1886
> the more discerning among the British began to
> sense that the main challenge to their power
> was bound to come from these classes. After
> almost twenty years' hesitation, the British
> decided to transfer their patronage from the
> Hindu middle classes to their counterparts
> among the Muslims. The Muslim League was thus
> born under British patronage and devoted itself
> to a re-establishment of the position of the
> community by a dual policy of courting the
> favour of the rulers and challenging the position
> of the non-Muslims.[33]

Kabir's attitude towards the subsequent

triangular struggle based on the vested interests of

the British, Muslim and Hindus, not their cultural

incompatibility; his emphasis on the negative aspects

of diversity, its effectiveness and cause of dis-
unity and therefore need of eradication for the sake
of unity; his associating diversity with reactionary,
conservative elements and the use of religion as a
tool for mass emotional appeal, is one of the best
examples of Kabir writing history with a purpose that
is inconsistent with his ideal 'unity in diversity'.

It is interesting to note first that when
writing in 1958 Kabir disclosed that although the
British were a divisive force their strength was
relative to the inherent weaknesses in the Hindu-
Muslim reconciliation which was based largely on
practical considerations and emotional urges.[34] The
resolution was again integration, conformity of
diversity to national unity.

Back to the struggle.

The British were only irritants of a
situation when compared with the Muslim League
whose vicissitudes Kabir charts as a process of
disintegration.[35] The Muslim League was not only
unimportant like any other diverse element, but its
whole development was cancerous, unjustified and
parasitical with no purpose but its own selfish ends --
disunity which it eventually achieved.

Kabir began his moral history by commenting
on the Muslim League's innocuous and ignomious beginning.

> Founded in 1906 by a group of well-to-do
> and aristocratic Mussalmans, it was
> intended to keep the Moslem intelligentsia
> and middle classes away from the dangerous
> politics into which the Indian National Congress
> was just then embarking. It raised the cry
> of special Moslem interests and pleaded that
> these could not be safeguarded except by co-
> operation with the British, as in its opinion,
> Mussalmans were as yet educationally,
> economically and politically incapable of
> defending their own interests. Hardly more
> than a dignified debating club, it pursued the
> even tenor of its politics till 1916 when it
> entered into a formal alliance with the Congress
> which also had by this time reverted to the
> path of respectable constitutional politics.[36]

This was the beginning of a long pattern of vested

interests.

Although involved in launching the admirable
struggle of the non-cooperation movement, it was

> by its character and composition incapable of
> taking part in direct action. . . . Many of
> its members sought and found government
> patronage and basked in the official favour
> extended to those who cooperated with the
> Indian Reforms Act of 1919.[37]

With the failure of the non-cooperation
movement in the early twenties and subsequent
frittering away of nationalist energy in communal
frictions, Kabir found cause to criticize the in-
effectiveness of both the Muslim League and Congress
but for different reasons. Kabir's criticism of the

Congress Party's lack of emphasis on economics to solve the problem of Indian unity continues throughout his career and was one of the main reasons for his leaving the Congress Party in 1966 and the eventual founding of his own party in 1968.

> Relations with the Congress were restored and there were attempts to frame a future constitution for India acceptable to all parties. There were, however, basic differences, for the Congress was beginning to think in terms of complete independence while the League still clung to the idea of British wardenship. The Congress conception of independence also suffered from lack of clarity and definiteness. It thought in terms of a homogeneity of interests which did not exist, and it overlooked economic and geographical differences that were fundamental and served as the basis of cultural differences as well.[38]

The Civil Disobedience movement of 1930 supervened and the League went into voluntary retirement. With the rise of the Moslem Conference as a rival in 1932 the League sulked into its lowest ebb. It did not even have an official representative at the Round Table Conference held in London to discuss the constitutional future of India.[39]

At this point the person of Jinnah and his role in the Muslim League is subjected to severe criticism as a "reactionary leader of a reactionary movement."

> Mr. Jinnah was originally violently opposed
> to the League, but in 1913 he joined it and
> gradually came to be regarded as its major
> spokesman. He had been invited to the first
> Round Table Conference in London but was not
> invited to its latest sessions. The real
> reason was Mr. Jinnah's demand for transfer
> of all power to Indian hands, but the ostensible
> ground advanced by British politicians was that
> Mr. Jinnah was unrepresentative and had no
> following in the community. Even at the time
> of the first Round Table Conference, the
> LONDON TIMES wrote that Mr. Jinnah's was the
> only discordant voice. Nor was this
> surprising, for the Conference was boycotted
> by the Congress most of whose leaders were in
> jail. The delegates were moderates and by
> contrast, Mr. Jinnah seemed to be a red-hot
> revolutionary![40]

One must not consider the Muslim League the only focus or even an important focus of Indian Muslim interest. Three very competitive groups were vying for their allegiance -- one whose vested interest was in supporting the British for their power and prestige, another which supported Congress Party's nationalism and a third, in which Kabir gave his political allegiance, which "sympathized with the political aspirations of Congress but looked at its economic program as halting and half-hearted."[41]

There is no need to ask to which group the League belonged. Both the League and Jinnah were misfits.

The Muslim League seemed to be nowhere in the
picture and after a few attempts at revivifying
it, Mr. Jinnah decided to retire from Indian
politics and devote himself to legal practice
in England. This was not surprising in the
circumstances, for Mr. Jinnah was at this time
playing almost a lone hand. He could not fit
in with the Moslem moderates, for politically
he was too much influenced by Congress ideology.
Nor could he merge with the Progressives among
Muslims, for with his orthodox and conservative
economic views, they seemed to him rank
revolutionaries.[42]

Only Fate could revive a shadow by causing a sudden

epidemic of deaths among Muslim leaders of an all

India Stature.[43]

The act of Fate led Jinnah, the opportunist,

to revive the Muslim League. The initial and

immediate test of his success was the 1937 elections.

Both the character of Jinnah and the existing

provincial situation prophesizes only failure.

The Muslim League decided to fight the
elections and under his leadership adopted a
forward programme and policy. He is however
conservative by nature and temperament, and
hence what appeared forward to him could not
satisfy the progressive elements among the
Moslems. Nor did he sympathise with the changes
in Indian political consciousness in the last
twenty years. The innate conservatism of a
lawyer made him averse to accept any radical
change. In the Muslim majority provinces the
majority of Moslems belong to the rank of have-
nots. Their only hope lies in a reconstruction
of society which would secure to them a more
human standard of life. Thus in Bengal, the

conflict between the League and the Praja
party centred round the question of abolition
of Permanent Settlement. The main plank of
the Praja party was the abolition of land-
lordism while the League which shuddered at
anything that savoured of expropriation
stood for maintenance of the status quo. It
was not surprising that the politically conscious
and progressive section among the Bengal
Moslems should shun Mr. Jinnah and his League.
It was otherwise in the minority provinces. In
Bihar or the United Provinces, Moslems are a
minority but on the whole they are better off
than the Hindu majority. To them the
maintenance of the status quo had an appeal
which it could not possibly have to the Moslems
of the majority provinces. It was therefore
natural that except in provinces like Bihar or
the United Provinces, the progressive elements
shunned the League. It was equally natural
that everywhere its membership was drawn mainly
from the groups representing vested interests.[44]

Kabir's attack was levelled from the podium
as well as the pen. In his presidential address in
1937 before the All-India Muslim Student Conference
the "old" leader of the Muslim League received a
similar analysis.[45]

The indecision of the Congress Party to take
office following the 1937 General Elections allowed
Fate to intervene for a second time and give the
reactionary element time to re-organize after their
sounding defeat.[46]

The League, however, did not accept the role
of a good loser and found communal ammunition in the

inexperience of the Congress minister.[47]

Kabir admitted to the discontent being real but most of the reasons[48] were superficial compared to the vested interests based on the question of ratio in services and representation.

> In the circumstances of the foundation of British power in India, Hindus naturally received larger patronage in both governmental and commercial establishments. They soon achieved in this way an economic and political superiority which Moslems have been challenging ever since they took to English education. The de-industrialisation of the country further enhanced the importance of services and to-day ratio in services has become a veritable apple of discord among the communities. Larger representation in the legislatures is desired because of the power it gives to control ratios in service and influence political and economic policy, so that the communal conflict in India is ultimately seen as a struggle between the middle classes of the two communities to share in the good things of life.[49]

These vested interests are the same complaints of the minorities after Independence which Kabir felt were more justified and in need of an immediate solution before Indian unity could be obtained. However, then Kabir was the champion of the rights of the minorities.

Kabir accepted this discontent in a naive way at this time suggesting that the causes of friction would automatically disappear when the problem of power meets everyone's satisfaction.[50]

It was the ineptitude of the Congress
Party, which in this case was lack of appeal to the
newly awakened class consciousness, not the League's
ability, that enhanced the status of the League.
It was emotion, radicalism that propelled the League
into prominence which was as distasteful to Kabir as
conservatism.

> From a highly respectable and somewhat sedate
> body of aristocratic and well connected
> gentlemen for whom politics was a polite
> diversion from the urgencies of official or
> professional life, the League has changed
> into a proletarian gathering of impassioned
> and fervent men who throw balance and
> moderation to the winds for what they regard
> to be a righteous cause.[51]

We have witnessed in the space of thirty
years the phenomenal growth of the League from a
patronage motivated club to a strong radical movement.
What is even more phenomenal is the fact that its rise
was not from either its own ability or initiative and
that it was lead by an equally ineffective arch-
conservative. Kabir refused to see the growth as a
possible positive force or the importance of religion
in this force.

> The irony of the situation lies in the role
> of Mr. Jinnah who retired from the Congress
> during the Non-cooperation days when that
> body adopted a programme of direct and if

necessary unconstitutional action just when
the Congress seemed to be sliding back to
respectability and constitutionalism. But
Mr. Jinnah is essentially a lawyer, and like
all lawyers essentially conservative. Given
a constitutional forum, he delights in exploiting
every advantage that opportunity gives and his
ingenuity creates.[52]

One way in which the League did differ from

the Congress Party was its interpretation of an

independent federated India. Congress aimed at a

federation of autonomous units in which defence,

external affairs, communications and customs were to

be subject to the unitary control of the federation.

The League, on the other hand, pictured the federation

as a confederacy of two federations where also these

were to be subject to the control of each of the

federations but there was to be no single directing

agency over them.[53] The reasons for the League's plan

or lack of planning was rooted again in its own

vested interests.

   Apprehensions of cultural submergence
supply the plausible ground for the League's
plea of two federations, but the real motive
must be sought in its unhappy experience in
the squabble for power which resulted from the
introduction of provincial autonomy. The
apprehensions however derive colour from the
militant Hinduism of a considerable section of
Hindus who tend to identify Indian renascence
with Hindu revivalism. As a corrective against
such domineering centralism, the League's plea

for two federations is intelligible, but it has hardly any value on merits. It is for one thing no remedy at all, for under it, just as at present, Hindus will remain minorities in certain areas and Moslems in others. If a federal state cannot solve the problem of minority safeguards within its component autonomous units, what guarantee is there that two independent federations will succeed any better in solving them? On the contrary, with powerful minorities in each, the risk of constant friction between the two federations cannot be ruled out. This is bound not only to lead to undesirable repercussions within each of the two federations but also to provide cause to powerful foreign States for intervention in the internal affairs of the federations as well as their component units.

That India shall be a federated state composed of autonomous republican units must seem inevitable to anybody who approaches the question with intellectual detachment and honesty. The agreement disappears when we try to define the basis of the units and the nature and functions of the federation or confederacy. The policy of the League is un-defined and vague on both these points.[54]

It is interesting to note at this juncture that when Kabir wrote in 1966, his "penultimate" essay "Towards a South Asian Confederation" his plan for unity, a confederation of self autonomous federal units based on equality of status and community of interests[55] appears closer to that of the Muslim League. For practical purposes it is equally un-defined and vague. The existence of Pakistan did not mean the end of a search for unity but only the failure of one political means to achieve it outside of India.

As Kabir points out from the experience of
the last forty years, talk of a federation between
Pakistan and India is obviously immature.[56] He did
not draw the same negative conclusion about a federal
culture inside India.[57] However, when Kabir presented
his political plan in more detail in the platform of
the LOK DAL it was obvious that although a change in
emphasis, the rights of the minority, the plan for
political unity had not really changed. It was still
integration and conformity to the needs of the nation
first.[58] Both the LOK DAL platform and proposal for
the South Asian Confederation are similar in that
they require a change of heart by the majority. In
the proposed Confederation it is India's responsibility
to take the initiative to guarantee the equality of
all and to satisfy her neighbours of the sincerity
of her intentions rather than her neighbours fighting
for their rights as a minority.[59] The political
platform demands the majority to guarantee enough
work and education to upgrade their status.[60] The
duty of the majority not the rights of the minority
are to be questioned. What was a threat before 1947
becomes a right. Back to the disintegration of the
Muslim League.

The League's assumption that all who belong
to a religious group must because of their common
religious faith hold the same political opinion was
absurd.[61] The existence of a great number of parties
vying specifically for Indian Muslim allegiance dis-
credited that religious agreement was accompanied by
political, social and economic agreement.[62] In fact
there were so many parties and some large enough that
if united they would surpass the number of the
League's adherents. The Krishak Praja Party was a
typical example of a divergent political, social and
economic outlook from that of the League, that
emphasized the right attitude for Indian unity. It
was also a good example because of Kabir's allegiance
to it from 1937-1945 . A discussion of its aims will
prove beneficial for a comparison later with those of
his own party LOK DAL,[63] in order to show that his
aims for political unity before 1947 and after had
changed little.

The League had failed to face the demands
of the masses:

> The power of the League is directed towards the
> advancement of the interests of the Moslem
> aristocracy and the middle classes, and even
> the incursion of the masses into its fold in
> recent years has been under the hegemony of
> these interests. The religious appeal has

been successful in preventing attention being
directed to the specific demands and grievances
of the proletariat and the peasantry, but the
demand of adult franchise for the constituent
assembly might easily raise such issues and
thus destroy the very basis of the power of
the League.[64]

It appealed to the emotional demands of the

Muslims but that is not a basis for political action.

On the other hand, the Krishak Praja party was mass-

centred politically, socially, and economically and

therefore the party of the future.

> Though non-communal in aim and objective, the
> party is dominantly Moslem in composition and
> leadership and is continually trying to
> organise the masses on the basis of an
> economic programme. The conviction that
> political democracy cannot be made real and
> effective without a fundamental reconstruction
> in the economic framework of society serves
> as the cornerstone of the Krishak Praja
> movement and organisation. Aiming at agrarian
> revolution through parliamentary and
> constitutional methods, it has grown out of
> the peasantry's fight for rights and is bound
> to increase in strength with the growth of
> political consciousness among the masses.[65]

A federated India in which the federating

units as well as the federal centre must be republics

organized and controlled by the workers and peasants

of India[66] conforms to Kabir's socialist orientation.[67]

The Krishak Praja party's platform was aimed at

correcting both the Muslim League and Congress Party

appeal to sentiment rather than organization, to

middle class allegiance rather than awakened mass consciousness.[68] Its appeal was mass-oriented, almost Gandhian. In the election of 1937 it is not surprising that the League and the Krishak Praja party confronted each other in Bengal over the abolition of landlordism. Kabir was a socialist of the same style as Nehru under whose leadership he accepted a Union Government position in 1948.

> I am convinced that the only key to the solution of the world's problems and of India's problems lies in socialism, and, when I use this word, I do so not in a vague humanitarian way but in the scientific, economic sense. Socialism is, however, something even more than an economic doctrine; it is a philosophy of life, and as such also it appeals to me. I see no way of ending the poverty, the vast unemployment, the degradation and the subjection of the Indian people except through socialism. That involves vast and revolutionary changes in our political and social structure, the ending of vested interests in land and industry, as well as the feudal and autocratic Indian states system. That means the ending of private property, except in a restricted sense, and the replacement of the present profit system by a higher ideal of co-operative service. It means ultimately a change in our instincts and habits and desires. In short, it means a new civilization, radically different from the present capitalist order.

> Socialism is thus for me not merely an economic doctrine which I favor; it is a vital creed which I hold with all my head and heart. I work for Indian independence because the nationalist in me cannot tolerate alien domination; I work for it even more because for me it is the inevitable step to social and economic change.[69]

When Nehru died in 1964 and Congress had
not moved along the necessary revolutionary lines
even under his leadership, it was not long before
Kabir took another course to enact such a revolution.

The War Years were the shadow years of the
League. The League at every step followed the Congress
in its program and decision, though with a time lag
and for different reasons.[70] Like a parasite feeding
on its host but with a different appetite! This fence
sitting was not without adverse effects,

> Such diplomatic pusillanimity has
> however caused a permanent injury to the
> Indian Moslems. Constant harping on their
> numerical weakness has created in many an
> attitude of dependence on the British power.
> Emphasis on the sharp difference of their
> interests from those of other Indians has
> tended to alienate feelings between the
> communities and simultaneously created in
> Moslem minds a defence-reaction that is
> inimical to the free expansion of the mind
> and its energies. The gravest charge
> against Mr. Jinnah's leadership -- when the
> time for an impartial historical survey
> comes -- will be that he tried to instil
> into the minds of ninety millions of Moslems
> a weakness and inferiority that, had he
> succeeded, would have made them unable to
> maintain themselves on equal terms against
> the competition of other communities and
> groups.[71]

However, Kabir harped on the same differences
after 1963 hoping to change the complacency of the

majority not alienate the minority. The decision

of the League in 1940 to opt for Pakistan was its

most disastrous move and a direct affront on 'unity

in diversity'.

> No race or people has ever prospered by
> seeking to conserve itself. Nations as
> well as individuals have triumphed only
> when they have sought to expand themselves
> in all directions. Cultures live by
> expansion. The attempt to withdraw within
> narrow shelters and maintain purity or
> integrity has invariably resulted in decay
> and death. Indian Moslems can also survive
> only by a spirit of expansion and growth.[72]

Even at the height of the League's greatest strength

Kabir prophesized a process of internal disintegration

that would silence its litany of hate.[73] It was

impossible for diversity to not lead to disunity!

There was one positive factor in this story of the

League's cancerous activity. It had shaken the

complacency of the Congress Party toward the problem

of the minorities.[74] Even eventual separation, how-

ever, was not enough to cause action. Kabir's own

disenchantment with Congress' handling of the

minorities after 1947 forced him to play a similar

role as that of the League although not as startling

or as divisive.

However, the interests of the League were

far from those of Kabir in 1963. But nothing can
whitewash the true character of the League or Jinnah.

> There has been a further deterioration
> in the Indian political scene after the death
> of Sir Sikander and the cowardly murder of
> Mr. Allah Bakhsh. Political morality seems
> to have touched a new depth perhaps unequalled
> since the days of the decline and fall of the
> Roman Empire. There has also been a revolting
> transformation in the programme and policy of
> the League. It has thrown off all pretence of
> working for the welfare of Indian Moslems or
> the independence of India and stands revealed
> as a coterie of vested interests who are
> prepared to serve the behests of British
> Imperialism for personal or party gains.
> Provincial Governors have been exhibiting an
> unseemly anxiety for installing League
> ministers into office in the Muslim majority
> provinces that cannot be explained on any
> hypothesis other than a secret understanding
> between the bureaucracy and the League. The
> change in Mr. Jinnah's political role has
> come as an unpleasant surprise, for till now
> even non-Leaguers regarded him as an honest
> of misdirected worker in the cause of India's
> freedom.[75]

The vicissitudes of the Muslim League were
charted from 1942-1947 in another essay on Muslim
Politics written at the time of Independence.

For the third time Fate and not the League's
competence or appeal decided its fortunes. Two of
Jinnah's strongest opponents, Sir Sikanda Hayat
Khan and Omar Allah Bukhsh suddenly exit from the
political scene.[76] Moreover, the Muslims in the
Indian Civil Service gave a supporting hand to the

League for similar vested interests as those of the
League.[77] From 1942-45 Jinnah was described as
shadow boxing with the Congress Party and success was
concomitant with the Congress Party being in office.[78]

And yet in this later sequence, 1943-47,
of Kabir's history of the Muslim League, one senses
a more sympathetic view towards the League and perhaps
even justification for their demands because of the
Congress' constant miscalculations and own vested
interests.

> The Congress leaders could not make up their
> mind about Mr. Jinnah and at times treated him
> in a cavalier fashion. The sweeping victory
> of the Congress in 1937 had led many Congress
> leaders to believe that the League could be
> fought on a purely economic programme. This
> was the essence of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's
> movement for mass contact among the Muslims
> but it overlooked the fact that however
> important economic factors may be, men are not
> governed by economic considerations alone.
> The only result of this movement was to harden
> the attitude of the leaders of the League who
> resented the Congress attempt to wean away the
> Muslim masses from their influence. Until
> 1937, many of Mr. Jinnah's demands were
> consistent with Indian nationalism, but even
> his legitimate claims were either ignored or
> treated casually. This infuriated him and
> turned him from a critic to an enemy of the
> Congress.[79]

Placing the blame on Congress for the League's
response also conflicts with the evaluation of the

1937 General Elections already referred to earlier.[80]

This does not mean that the League has increased in

Kabir's favour, but rather that Congress is falling

out of favour. Kabir never changed his attitude toward

the politics of the Muslim League. When Kabir

decided to publish in 1969 his 1942-1947 history he

made only one correction and that was factual not

personal.

> I still think that the policies he followed
> between 1937 and 1947 were disastrous for
> India and Indian Muslims, but there can be no
> question of his integrity, courage and
> tenacity. It is also an irony of history that
> Mr. Jinnah -- who was a staunch believer in a
> multiple-society, except for one fatal decade,
> and returned tó his earlier faith after August
> 1947 -- should turn out to be the founder of a
> unitary society in an age when unitary
> societies have been rendered obsolete through
> the advances of science.[81]

Also in 1968 in an article on the Adivasis Kabir

expresses his same contempt for separation.[82]

Kabir's criticism of Nehru's economic inter-

pretation of communal disunity is very important

because it causes one to question the very basis of

the Krishak Praja Party, Kabir's acceptance of a

government position under Nehru's leadership, Kabir's

economic solution for minority rights in 1963[83] and

the basis of his own LOK DAL platform in 1968.[84]

Kabir did not seem to ask these questions about his own course of political action although in 1969 he did indicate that economics only solve part of the problem.[85]

There was no indecision on the part of the British this time as at the end of the nineteenth century, to carry out the same purpose, its own vested interests.

> The role of the British in this period
> was frankly partisan. When the Congress refused
> to cooperate with the British war effort, the
> authorities decided that the power and influence
> of the Congress must be curbed at any cost. They
> did not like Mr. Jinnah who often criticised the
> British in sharper language than any used by
> the Congress. Not only so, he even insulted
> British dignitaries but with their unflinching
> sense of realism and their determination to
> protect British interests at any cost, the
> British authorities in India did not allow any
> personal considerations to stand in their way
> of utilizing Mr. Jinnah and the League against
> the Congress. When in August 1942, the Congress
> passed the Quit India Resolution, the British
> were confirmed in their view that no cooperation
> with the Congress was possible and the League
> must be encouraged to become its rival on the
> all-India scene.[86]

Even Gandhi played into the hand of Fate and was party to the rise of the League's power by transforming Jinnah from "a man of straw who would eat his words if it saved a clash with Government . . ." to a man held up before the Muslim masses as "the Muslim leader with whom Congress was anxious to come to terms."[87] All these factors, internal and external

confirm again the League's inability to direct its
own fortunes, the British vested interests and the
desire of some to find unity even at the cost of
diversity.

There is no need to record the denouement
of the frustrated and heated struggle in this
political triangle except to record that Nehru made
one of the crucial mistakes,[88] and legal definition
cannot satisfy fears for cultural identity.

> A purely legalistic approach never solves
> large political problems. This was perhaps the
> major defect in the situation, for lawyers were
> in command in both the Congress and the League.
> They looked at all questions in a purely
> legalistic way with the result that the scope
> for compromise and accomodation was greatly
> reduced. Lawyers have great respect for
> the written word and want to write down every-
> thing in unequivocal terms. Power on the
> other hand cannot be transferred by legal
> documents. It can be secured only through
> the exercise of power. The fact that neither
> Mr. Jinnah, nor Pandit Nehru nor Sardar Patel
> nor Maulana Azad had at any time exercised
> effective administrative power was at least in
> part responsible for their failure to grasp
> the substance instead of straining after the
> shadow.[89]

The cause of disunity was a human failure not cultural.

In an emotional epilogue, written in 1948
after the death of Jinnah, Kabir reveals the impact
of partition on 'unity in diversity' and subsequent
disillusionment.[90]

Partition left only one lesson for Kabir at this time -- diversity is left to its own ends. Only martyrdom saved Gandhi's life from an unhappy ending. But Jinnah died a very unhappy man. Kabir concluded his analysis of the Muslim League with this sad epitaph.

> From all accounts, Mr. Jinnah was also an unhappy man after the attainment of Pakistan. Immediately after the achievement of Pakistan, he had declared that religious conflicts must be left behind and men of all communities co-operate for the prosperity and welfare of the land. He had been an ardent nationalist except for the last ten years of his life, and even then he had acted more in anger and sorrow than in a deliberate repudiation of all that he had stood for in his earlier years. Perhaps he had hoped that after the establishment of Pakistan, he could return to his earlier nationalism, but with the background in which Pakistan had been created, this was an almost impossible hope. In any case, Mr. Jinnah was soon disillusioned and it added to his disappointment when he found that the reins were slipping out of his hands. Within a few months of Gandhiji's death, he was also stricken with mortal illness and in September 1948, he died. Muslim League politics had been one of reaction against Congress policies. Mr. Jinnah had built himself up as a counterfoil to Gandhiji. When Gandhiji disappeared from the Indian politican scene, Mr. Jinnah lingered for a while but he was like the memory of a shadow bereft of substantial reality.[91]

Unity and continuity were the patterns of India's history and disunity was only on the level of material interests -- the vested interest of the

British, the middle classes of the Muslim League and
Congress Party. Disunity grew because of the
negative situation not because of its own positive
force, or the incompatibility between Muslim, Hindu
and Western culture. Since this history of the Muslim
League was written at the same time as The Indian
Heritage, the same moral purpose comes through in
unity at all cost even at the cost of diversity.
Perhaps it was not until 1955[92] that Kabir saw the
lesson of Pakistan, the fact that there was no
intellectual basis for unity between Hindus and
Muslims. However, it is not until 1963 when he wrote
about the role of minorities that he included the
possibility that diversity really has a role to play
in unity. And yet, writing his philosophical essays
before 1955 cultural incompatibility is impossible
because a new India has been created out of a perfect
fusion of old traditions and new values.[93] To
philosophy was given the task of guaranteeing the
defense of unity and the rationalization of Islam.
History failed.

CHAPTER II

A PHILOSOPHICAL APPLICATION OF 'UNITY IN DIVERSITY'

Since Kabir's philosophical essays are
related to his historical writings, it is not surprising
to find a similar inconsistency between his ideal 'unity
in diversity' and its philosophical application as well
as a rationalizing of the nature of Islam in order to
make it more palatable to the Indian and modern context.
It will again be seen that Kabir de-emphasized the
importance of diversity in order to guarantee that
it is not a threat to unity, that diversity is only
apparent on a superficial level, material. The most
important essays for this analysis of Kabir's
philosophical application of 'unity in diversity'
are chronologically "Freedom, Authority, and
Imagination" (1944), "The Concept of Democracy" (1949),
"The Study of Philosophy" (1950), "The Welfare State"
(1954), "Science, Democracy and Islam" (1954).

The purpose of Kabir's discussion of philosophy is
to establish a modern understanding of culture, past
and present, in which neither the historical patterns
of the past, unity, continuity, or the present
realities, science, democracy, reason, are denied and
both patterns form the basis of future commitment to
a modern and united India. In other words the East
and West are compatible.

It was the role of the philosopher not the
historian to discover and understand the underlying
problems of cultural unity.[1] Kabir portrayed himself
more as a philosopher than an historian which is
fortunate for his scholarly prestige. Facing the
fact of disunity in 1947, Kabir proposed a solution
because "man must in such a situation think out the
implications of his attitudes and habits of thought
and action, and find a justification for them in a
reasoned view of experience. If he fails to do so,
the clash of conflicting ideologies destroys the
buttress of faith which sustains his life."[2]

Abid Husain, who along with Kabir was one
of the first to work out a secular approach to the
problem of Muslim identity after 1947, has the same
faith in the philosopher to solve the problem.[3]

Philosophy for Kabir acted as a critical agent of
cultural synthesis because it examined the postulates
of existing beliefs which were necessary to make the
right synthesis. Philosophy was committed to search
for the basic ideals that Indian culture had un-
ravelled from its inception. However, like the
pattern of that culture and its continuous history,
this was a commitment to search for uniformity not
'unity in diversity'. Philosophy guarantees
uniformity of conduct and thought which is necessary
to control emotion and instinct.

> Philosophy thus brings to consciousness what
> is unconsciously implied in our attitudes
> and actions. The need for such analysis is
> obvious if we consider the nature of human
> activity. Where action results from feelings,
> there can be no guarantee of uniformity or
> universality, as feelings are essentially
> private. Conduct or attitude based on feeling
> would thus tend to disrupt the structure of
> society. Where action is based on instinct,
> we can be sure of the uniformity of response
> among different individuals. The difficulty
> with instinct, however, is that it tends to
> the same pattern of action in the same
> situation. Where the situation changes,
> instincts are unreliable as guides to action.
> In the modern world, with its complexity and
> change, instincts cannot, therefore, offer
> any guarantee of uniformity of conduct or
> thought.[4]

Philosophy, then, is a rational agent of unity to
safeguard against the emotional discharge of diversity.

Kabir's understanding of culture, history and
philosophy evolves from a commitment to universality,
a sincere and arduous search for unity in a variety
of ways, except 'unity in diversity'.

The content and method of Kabir's philosophy
of culture would lead one to suggest that Kabir's
ideal 'unity in diversity' was not existent or
believed capable of achievement even by him. His
admission later[5] to the existence of diversity and
its relative importance in compartmentalizing
thought adds suspicion to his moral purpose. The
mistake that Kabir made was to confuse the ideal with
the real, to confuse unity in diversity with uniformity,
universality, before 1955, and to confuse unity in
diversity with an integrated natural system of
education after 1955, and the integration of minorities
in the sixties. Perhaps Kabir confused the imagery
of his poetry with the facts of history. Perhaps
the first passion of Bengali youth is deeper than the
second.

This confusion between the ideal and his
application is at the very basis of his attempt to
exact a synthesis between science, democracy and
Islam, a modern philosophy of culture.

Philosophically Kabir saw the problem of 'unity in diversity' as the problem of the relationship between the universal and the particular.[6] In science this meant the problem of the relationship of the unity of nature to the particular individual incidence. In democracy it becomes the problem of the relationship of the individual to society. For religion it refers to the problem of the relationship of one religion Islam to the many in India, in particular the Hindu religion. The synthesis of old traditions and these new values was achieved by following the same emphasis, unity over diversity. This meant that the particular incidence conformed to the demands of the unity of nature, the individual to the needs of society and Islam to the pattern of a common religion, universalism or Indian-ness. In this way uniformity and continuity was maintained between traditional and modern culture but not 'unity in diversity'.

The modern age has often been heralded as the 'Age of Science'. It is an age in which the promise of unity and the threat of disunity have played a high scoring game. Science can offer that promise of unity if it adheres to its most basic principle,

the unity of nature, the denial of any distinction between the natural and supernatural and the recognition of the value of the individual.[7]

This unity of nature is rooted in the earliest expressions of religious faith and the evolution of the concept of One God which hypothesized the concept of one universe, one law.[8] After this religious pronouncement the distinction between natural and supernatural received little acceptance and the task of the particular individual experience from which general laws are formulated replaced revelation.[9] The test of the individual seems very important. Without its verification as to what is true, science remains aloft in the rarified air of theory.[10] Moreover, science can pose man's greatest threat when it divorces theoretical reason from the practical.[11] Although the particular incidence in theory could pose a threat to the underlying basis of unity in science, Kabir safeguarded this by assuring that although the necessity of the particular incidence is apparent, the kind of particular incidence must conform to the other two conditions necessary for science to be an agent of unity -- the unity of nature and the natural and supernatural.[12]

The necessity of unity becomes the final arbiter.

> Belief in the unfailing uniformity of
> nature is thus an essential condition
> of the growth of science. Science does
> not, therefore, permit the incursion of
> the individual to break the chain of
> causality. . . . the unity of nature,
> therefore, must apply not only to the
> entire world but also to the world
> which is yet unknown.[13]

Kabir, however, was not convinced that science was able to control the threat of disunity because the particular incidence relegates it to the phenomenal world and therefore limits its potential over emotion. Following his analysis of Kant, Kabir, while recognizing the importance of science, realizes its limitations beyond the phenomenal world. Once again more faith is put in the philosopher who is more oriented to the values of the spirit and, therefore, better equipped to control emotion.[14]

Not only has the modern age experienced the impact of science but it has also witnessed to the greatest advance in democratic ideals which suggests some affinity between these two modern values.

> The parallelism between the progress of
> science and democracy is not accidental.
> From-the homogeneity and unity of the
> world follows the universal application of
> moral and political laws. From the uniformity
> of the laws of nature follows the equality of
> all before the law. From the emphasis on the
> particular instance follows the recognition
> of the dignity of the individual human being.[15]

There is also a certain affinity between the way in which Kabir solves the problem of the relationship of the unity of nature to the particular incidence and the problem of the relationship of the society to the individual.

> The constant appeal to verification in
> Science is an appeal to the individual or the
> particular instance. It is an assertion of
> the status of the particular against the claim
> of the general law. In democracy the claim of
> the individual to liberty is equally an
> assertion of his importance against the dictates
> of the community. The homogeneity in the
> nature of the universe demands that there can
> be no preferential treatment for any group or
> individual. Applied to the realm of human
> conduct, this gives us democracy in which all
> men are equal in the eyes of the law. What
> appeared as scientific temper in the sphere of
> thought, appeared as the democratic spirit in
> the world of politics.[16]

Kabir maintained that it was custom, which grows through the imposition of uniformity with the emphasis on repetition of authority and sanction of status that inhibits the individual.[17] The paradox in democracy between the will of society and the will of the individual, on the other hand, is only apparent, and does not inhibit the individual.

One seeming paradox of democracy
requires to be explained. One of the basic
concepts of democracy is the assertion of
the dignity of the individual. Another
equally basic concept is, however, the triumph
of the will of the majority over the will of
the individual. The contradiction is, however,
only apparent. The second concept is a
logical development of the first. If all
individuals are equal before the law and enjoy
equal dignity, it is obvious that no single
will can as such prevail over any other will.
In case of difference between different wills,
the claim of any individual will to qualitative
superiority is ruled out. The only possible
alternative is to decide action in terms of
quantity, i.e. in accordance with the dictates
of the majority of individual wills.[18]

However, what is apparent is the fact that

the individual will must conform to the will of the

majority. To confuse the quality of the individual

will with the quantity of individual wills justified

by the fact that all individuals are equal before the

law and enjoy equal dignity, is to confuse an ideal

with a paradoxical reality or to solve a paradox

on a big "if". This confusion is extended to Kabir's

concept of the Welfare State which like democracy is

based on the dignity of the individual,[19] and yet

restricts that individuality for the sake of the

majority.

It is significant that the concept of the
Welfare State emerged only as a further
development of the concept of democracy.
Democracy was at first only a political
concept and sought to regard all individuals
as equal in the eye of law. For purposes of

political decisions, it laid down that each
one must count as one and no one as more
than one. It was however soon discovered
that this equality would remain illusory
unless backed by equality in other fields.
This led, on the one hand, to restrictions
on the individual's right to exploit others
as seen in labour and social legislation.
On the other, it made the State provide on
an increasing scale the welfare services
which equalize opportunity for all citizens.

The dependence of the concept of the
Welfare State on democracy is obscured because
of such State's emphasis on centralized
planning. At first sight it may seem that
planning is incompatible with democracy.
Democracy depends on individual freedom and
initiative while planning must impose curbs
on both. As already indicated, the opposition
is not absolute. Democracy limits the
individual's freedom in the interest of the
freedom of others. A citizen has the right
to act as he chooses so long as his activities
do not infringe the liberty and welfare of
others. Planning on the other hand need not
necessarily be imposed arbitrarily from above.
Just as the political decisions of a democracy
are the result of the interplay of the
inclinations, wills and decisions of a
multiplicity of individuals, the planning of
the Welfare State can be the result of the
interplay of the wishes, desires and hopes of
all its citizens. The fact that society and
the State are organisms in which the individual
members act and react on one another and
determine the nature and direction of their
development makes such democratic planning not
only possible but the only form of planning that
can serve the real interests of the individual
and the community.[20]

The state becomes the extension of the
majority will to ensure by planning that the will of
the individual is concomitant with the will of the
majority. This whole argument has been quoted

because after 1963 decentralization and special

status for the minority compete with the benevolent

Welfare State.

In the writings of I. Kant and M. Gandhi,

Kabir finds the guidelines to bring about this unity,

uniformity. Along Kantian lines it is the welfare

of others that seems to protect the dignity of the

individual.

> In his conception of the Categorical
> Imperative, Kant has distinguished three
> moments which may together offer a philosophical
> justification of the Welfare State. When
> Kant insists that every man should so act
> that the principle of his action may become a
> universal law, he is pointing out that the
> individual must make no special claims for
> himself.
>
> If Kant's first formulation emphasizes
> individual equality and the universality of
> law, his second formulation draws pointed
> attention to the dignity of the individual.
> No man -- whatever be his position or
> performance -- is to be treated as a mere
> means. . . . In the Welfare State, each
> individual must serve the needs of society
> and advance the interests of all, but this
> demand on his services is conditioned by the
> recognition that he is an end in himself
> and due regard must be paid to his personality.
>
> The concept of the Welfare State is
> carried a stage further in Kant's third
> formulation where he declares that the
> individual must regard himself as a member
> of the kingdom of ends. If the first
> formulation defines the equality and the
> second the dignity of the individual, the third
> brings out clearly the element of social co-
> operation which is essential for the survival
> and welfare of both the individual and the
> community.

> The individual can find satisfaction and
> happiness only if he behaves as a member of
> a society in which each regards the good of
> each of his fellows as of equal value with
> his own. The individual is thus both means
> and ends and realizes his own good only in
> promoting that of others. The Welfare State
> therefore imposes limitations on the individual
> only in the interests of the community, and
> since the community is the totality of all the
> individuals, ultimately in his own interest.[21]

The dignity of the individual is accorded some protection

but it is protection only within the context of a

universal application, the welfare of all whether the

individual is a means or an end. Once again the quantity

of individuals supersedes the quality of an individual,

unity supersedes diversity.

The same conclusion is drawn by Gandhi but

from a different point of view. The dignity of the

individual is conceived of as first a duty to serve the

majority and second as a right to be individual.[22] The

concept of society as an organism is very basic to both

Kabir[23] and Gandhi. The new organism, synthesis, that

evolved in the Hindu/Muslim reconciliation exhibits the

same symbiotic qualities as the Welfare State.

> Gandhi's concept of the Welfare State is
> therefore based on a deep and immediate
> perception of society as an organism. In
> such an organism, each members must act for
> and in the interest of others. The concern
> for the good of society is neither an
> imposition upon nor contrary to the interests
> of the individual. Because of mutual give

and take, the ends are determined by consent
and planning is the result of the co-
operative effort of all. In his own words,
'Realization of Truth is impossible without
a complete merging of oneself in, and
identification with, this limitless ocean
of life. Hence, for me, there is no escape
from social service, there is no happiness
on earth beyond or apart from it. Social
Service must be taken to include every
department of life. In this scheme there
is nothing low, nothing high. For all is
one, though we seem to be many.'[24]

As well, like Tagore's concept of religion,
continuity is maintained with the Aryan-Dravidian
synthesis. Old traditions and new values are compatible.
The Welfare State then is based on the welfare of the
majority out of which the individual takes his dignity
in proportion to his service to that majority.

The challenge to democracy for Kabir then
is first to establish the equality of rights and
duties for all members of a community and second to
make rights and duties as coincident as possible.[25]
Unfortunately because of the intransigence of the
individual[26] and the social forces at work in society,[27]
the second challenge, to make rights and duties as co-
incident as possible, came first and meant that social
security came before freedom of the individual.
Humanity is the ultimate end and the individual has to
further this end to fulfill his own human purpose.

Unity is the goal of society, of the individual, of Kabir, but it is unity in the sense of uniformity, conformity, integration, not 'unity in diversity'.

The social forces at play in society Kabir categorizes as two -- social order and social content which are conveniently defined by him:

> Social order may be defined as the pattern of relations that has grown through the interplay of the forces with which the different units in the social organism are charged. It rests on the distinction of the interests of the different social elements and constitutes an attempt to achieve a harmony among the conflicting interests. Social content may be defined as the sum total of the desires and anticipations, experiences and aspirations, interests and allegiances of the mass of individuals who constitute society. At its best, the order achieved by any society is a precarious harmony that the slightest re-distribution of emphasis among the different interests might upset. At its worst, the order represents the tyranny of one predominant interest, secure only as long as it can keep in check the balance of growing forces arrayed against it.28

The disharmony between social order and social content is the motive force behind all social change and conflicts. There must be unity between social order and social content because only then can in politics the system of rights be co-extensive with that of duties. In the field of morality and religion, such a harmony would allay the conflict of interests within the individual till they coincide with the balance achieved

by the social organism as a whole. It is responsible in
the sphere of social relations for the continuous
adjustments that are required for maintaining the
dynamic equilibrium of society against the stresses which
particular interests impose upon it.[29] But this harmony
is only an ideal for Kabir and serves only to prescribe
the end towards which social activity ought to be
directed,[30] a prescription that is far from a healthy
unity in diversity. The more complete the harmony
between social order and social content the more complete
the fusion of the conflicting interests involved and
the more easily society can respond to change. Change
for Kabir is evolutionary, maintaining continuity, unity
and therefore anti-revolutionary.[31] Even the nature
of social change must conform to the dictates of the
pattern of social evolution -- the cultural history of
unity and continuity. Both the individual and the
social forces must bow to the universal and as the
particular incidence have value as a function of the
universal or be permeated totally by it. Without
contributing to the whole, a particular instance cannot
be a separate entity and without doing his duty first,
an individual cannot find freedom. All these solutions
are in agreement with the Indian identity of the one

with the many which grew out of the idyllic Aryan-Dravidian synthesis. Unity must be achieved at all costs, even that of diversity.

Writing in 1963 in an essay about the rights of minorities in a democracy, the stubborn intransigence of the individual and the unstable disharmony between social form and content take on a new, almost revolutionary perspective. The individual, the minority are necessary agents for a needed revolutionary change -- to shake the complacent welfare of the majority and to decentralize the state for its own safety.

> Many think that the diversity of India and consequent multiplicity of centres of power is a source of weakness for the country. I have always held the contrary view. I feel that the greater the number of centres of power in a people -- provided the centres of power are held in some kind of a balance with one another, and there is harmony among them -- the stronger the country. Where you have a completely homogeneous, monolithic society, the chances of survival of that society or community are always less than those of a heterogeneous society in which there are many centres of power, many ways of expression. The reason for this is easy to understand. Since society is changing, circumstances are changing, a monolithic society may not be able to react to a new situation with complete success. But if there is a heterogeneous society, one element or other in that heterogeneous society may respond to the new situation, and help to preserve the community

as a whole. Diversity of response and
distribution of power are therefore sources
of strength, not causes of weakness.[32]

Kabir may have always held a contrary view about
the importance of diversity, but his emphasis before 1955
in writing history and philosophy suggest difficulty in
resolving the relationship between unity and diversity.
Perhaps his rationalization of Islam can solve the
relationship between the universal and the particular.
Both science and democracy in order to survive in a
world threatened with disunity must be forces of unity
and protect the unity from the threat of the particular
incidence, the individual. In like manner Islam must
be a champion of Indian unity, become modern, rational,
be committed to universalism.

The modern values of science and democracy
are in consonance with those of Islam. Democracy
owes its rise to various factors but one in particular
was the religious element of the value of the soul out
of which grew the uniqueness and invaluability of the
individual.[33] Religion, like science, also proclaimed
the unity of God and broke down the distinction between
the natural and the supernatural.[34] Therefore, this
scientific temper and democratic spirit of Islam
committed it to the universality of reason.[35] If one

were bold enough they could conclude that the rise of science and democracy was concomitant with the rise of Islam.[36] One could conclude also that Islam is more a modern value than an old tradition. This relationship to democracy and science also means that Islam must face the same paradox and the same solution of uniformity. What Kabir meant by the universality of reason being integral to the universality of Islam will indicate further the persistence and consistency of his argument about a rational and Indian faith.

The uniqueness of the Prophet was his use of reason as is the uniqueness of Islam.

> Muhammad's precedence over others came not so much from any authority based on Revelation as from the quality of intelligence applied to the solution of the problems of life.

> Reason is the same for all and insistence upon the universality of spiritual laws was only the obverse of the insistence on the unity of reason. Faith in an ultimate revelation through Mohammed for the spiritual uplift of the whole human race tended to intensify missionary zeal. Islam thus recognised no limitation whatsoever to the application of its laws of spiritual life. The new faith in unitary reason would, therefore, allow of neither exception nor qualification. Truth was one and unique and anything which differed from the True must, therefore, be false. Consciousness of the value of Truth was, therefore, matched with the repudiation of whatever differed from it. It was inevitable that in such circumstances, the religious zeal of Islam should, in the application of its relentless logic, develop into iconoclasm and beget, at times and specially in some of its earlier phases, narrowness and intolerance.[37]

But this reasoning lead to two different conclusions.
The Muslim rationalist concluded that with the
establishment of religious faith in reason and not
revelation, the scope of variation was ruled out. They
argued that reason from its very nature is universal,
and therefore, what is once accepted by reason as
true must always be true. With the shift of emphasis
to reason, Islam had, therefore, done away with the
need of repeated rediscovery of Truth by a succession
of prophets.[38] The uniqueness of Islam is that it is
the harbinger of "The" Truth.

But for Kabir another reasonable conclusion
must be drawn. The uniqueness of Islam is that it is
based on reason. This is essential but not the end of
"The" Truth.

> By the very logic which demanded repeated
> enunciation of the Truth before the advent of
> the prophet of Islam, new formulations will
> be necessary even after his time. His shift
> of the emphasis from faith to reason has, however,
> effected one profound change. Prophets of the
> past depended upon appeal to supernatural
> manifestations of power and based their authority
> on revelation which was beyond the reach of our
> reason. The prophet of Islam laid down that
> religion must be based on reason, not authority.
> The assertion that he would be followed by
> reformers but not prophets can thus be explained
> as a recognition of this new achievement of the
> human mind. The age of miracles of faith was
> over. The age of the triumph of Science had
> begun.[39]

How does Kabir arrive at an opposite position? Writing in <u>Indian Muslims</u> in 1954 he points to the fact that Islam's Indian experience demanded a new definition of Truth, one that evinced the synthesis of the Hindu/Muslim encounter.[40] The first conclusion refers to pristine Islam when it first arrived, a half-truth, whereas Kabir's conclusion is based on the fact that this universality of reason came in contact with the Indian universality of Truth achieved in a variety of ways.[41] Kabir following a more Indian approach espoused a rational Islam which found uniqueness in what was common with other religions not what was thought different. To be modern Islam had to be universal, that is, based on reason and accept the universality of reason. However, the Muslim temper towards democracy and the Indian temper towards comprehensiveness did not create the necessary force to enact a spirit of equality among all religions. The intransigence of the individual was as stubborn as ever and both the Muslim and the Hindu religious toleration stumbled back into exclusiveness.

Writing about "Communal Conflicts and Religion" in 1961, Kabir gives this different analysis of the problem: "The root cause for Hindu-Muslim

conflicts in India therefore derives from this attitude
of exclusiveness. Because of this Muslims look upon
Hindus as Kafirs and Hindus return the compliment by
looking upon Muslims as mlechlas."[42] The naivety of
the appeal of a rational religion to an emotional
problem is as naive as the rational and insipid
solution Kabir recommends:

"Once therefore it is accepted that Hindus
are Ahl-e-Kitab or people of the Book, it would remove
one of the major psychological barriers between the two
communities."[43] This solution is made on the assumption
that the influence of caste system will disappear in
the Hindu orientation.[44] The impression one receives
from this solution is that Kabir was either insensitive
to the religiosity of cultural identity in India or
superficially examined a complex problem -- or just
did not care. The universality of reason then, was
incapable of meeting the challenge of religious
emotion inherent in cultural identity of Muslims and
Hindus. Speaking at a more personal level in 1958, it
seems that reason alone was incapable of meeting
Kabir's own needs.

> One thing alone is certain. Mankind cannot
> survive without ideals. Loss of faith is a
> more insidious disease than the worst of
> physical maladies. . . . If the modern

world is to survive, we must work for a rival
of faith in values. . . .
The bewildering complexity of the modern age
demands a faith that is rational in nature
and universal in content. . . .[45]

But

Rationality and toleration are necessary but
by themselves are not sufficient for the
solution of the contemporary predicament. Our
faith must be enriched by understanding and
compassion if we are to go beyond the negative
absence of evil to the positive realisation of
good. The increase of knowledge in the modern
age has been accompanied by a decrease in the
scope of imagination. This has led to abstract
and intellectual judgment of men and affairs.
Mere intellectual allegiance cannot however
stand up against emotional upheavals. The
unity of the human race is no longer open to
question; but in spite of intellectual
recognition of this fact, our emotional
identification does not extend beyond the
limits of our family or, at most, our nation.
This explains why modern man has so often
failed in moments of crisis in spite of his
professions of loyalty to truth and justice.
Imaginative identification based on compassion
and understanding of our fellow men .-- and
this is the essence of religion -- can alone
build in us the strength to resist the pull
of parochial or sectional interests. . . .
Our faith can no longer be based on revelation
or mystery, but neither can it deny the
mystery that is in the heart of things. In
any case, it must transcend the limitations of
the self and seek individual salvation through
the service of man. A rational understanding
of the nature of the external world and of
the human personality, toleration for divergent
points of view and imaginative identification
with our fellow men through understanding and
compassion are the essential ingredients of a
faith which alone can sustain our hopes in the
troubled and complex world of today.[46]

Kabir was more confident about reason in the forties.[47]

Just as science was subject to the phenomenal world and the scrutiny of philosophy, so reason was subject to the external world and the insight of imagination which reveals other significant aspects of reality. Imagination and philosophy are too intellectual to meet the test of emotion. A faith that is rational in nature and universal in content in order to be an agent of unity is one which sacrifices the uniqueness of Islam, the diversity on which unity is to be based.

The synthesis of old traditions and new values is achieved by Kabir in his solution of the problem of the relationship of the universal to the particular. The solution is to realize that a balance is not possible between the universal and the particular, unity and diversity and therefore make a decision for one or the other. Kabir chose unity. In doing this, Kabir himself becomes a paradox or in-decisive. He aspires to a concept of unity in diversity, an ideal, but maintains unity at all costs, even that of diversity, the particular, the individual,- and later after 1963 appears to almost reverse his position to maintain diversity at all costs but not the

cost of unity. This philosophical approach is supposedly supported by a rational faith which necessitates a great deal of imagination, awareness of the emotional in man. Kabir failed to solve the problem of the emotional in man or realize the strength of emotion positively or negatively in man's intransigence and his social action. It is not surprising that Kabir's religion that was rational in nature and universal in content did not appeal to the individual, the uniqueness, the diversity on which unity was to be based.

In the 1955 edition of The Indian Heritage, in an essay on "Indian Universities", 1955 and repeated in his Indian Philosophy of Education, Kabir discloses that it was not only the vested interests of the British, the Muslim League and the Congress Party that divided India but the very lack of intellectual synthesis between Hindus and Muslims. The persistence of diversity,

> I mentioned earlier that three systems of education have continued side by side in India. Even to this day there is no indication that the three systems were completely closed and self-contained, it would not have mattered so much. Individuals belonging to each system would have operated within their own orbits. This, however, is not the case. Products of the three systems of education live in the same country, feel the same type of needs, and must meet the same challenge of

the modern age. The existence of parallel
and at times incompatible beliefs and ideas
among the different communities has had an
adverse effect on the individual mind. Lack
of proper integration of different systems
of beliefs has by a curious development led
to the creation of parallel systems within
the individual mind, and thus a man lives
simultaneously in many ages. We have
examples of Indian scientists who are in
touch with the latest movements of scientific
thought and are at the same time immersed
emotionally in customs which defy all reason.
Compartmentalism of the communities has by an
inexorable logic led to compartmentalism
within the individual mind.[48]

So there was not only need for a philosopher
to analyze the basis of Indian culture, an historian
to describe that basis, but a philosophy of Indian
national Education that would establish that basis --
'unity in diversity'. Although not intended for 1955
but as a conclusion of his essays on "Science,
Democracy and Islam", I feel this conclusion anticipates
more the next stages -- "which must be regarded as a
common movement of human thought in which the impulse
towards generalization and unity was matched by the
increasing realization of the importance of the
particular and the individual. But as far as Kabir's
Indian approach is concerned, it was a realization only
not an acceptance of the importance of the particular.

CHAPTER III

AN EDUCATIONAL APPLICATION OF 'UNITY IN DIVERSITY'

As the survey points out in the Introduction, Kabir wrote mostly on education. This was probably due to the fact of his long association with education, especially the Ministry of Education from 1948-56 when the rebuilding of a nation along educational lines was begun. There was needed also much convincing of the value of the intellectual development along with the material development of India. More important, Kabir felt that education was the key to a united India. Most of his ideas were written between 1955-1963 and collected in two books: Education in New India and Indian Philosophy of Education. As already indicated, in this period Kabir indicated the fact that Hindus and Muslims were separate entities and the medieval reconciliation did not work but at a superficial level. Kabir felt, in

fact, that there were three distinct societies in India supported by three distinct systems of education, Hindu, Muslim and Western. A national philosophy of education would be necessary to bring about a national synthesis but it was not the synthesis of unity in diversity, the ideal. Kabir once again contemplated a synthesis that meant uniformity to one pattern -- an integrated national secular system of education. Therefore the same purpose is given to education, to unify the present, that was given to history -- to unify the past. Education was also to fuse old traditions and new values without violent upheaval. Consequently, it is not surprising to find in The Indian Heritage and Science, Democracy and Islam, some background for Kabir's philosophy of education as was found for his philosophy of culture. Once again his application of unity in diversity, which failed the historical and philosophical tests, fails the educational test by failing to maintain the balance between unity and diversity, and eventually establish unity at all cost, even that of diversity. The method was integration of three systems of education into one national system and the content was aimed at integrating the individual into society, "the organic society", identify the

cultural identity of the individual with the "Indian"
national identity, a common culture. The two pillars
to integrate the Indian Muslims were economics and
education since the nineteenth century disenchantment
with and disassociation from the British. Kabir may
have switched his allegiance from the majority to the
minorities, from Union Government to the Lok Dal after
1963, but this switch did not bring a switch in his
solution to their problems: total integration
educationally and economically. In other words, after
1963 when Kabir gave a new emphasis to his approach to
the problem of Indian disunity, the fight for the rights
of the minority rather than the will of the majority,
the emphasis did not affect the educational solution
any more than it did the political or economic
solutions. The identity of the minorities was still
as citizens of India, better citizens educationally
and economically but full citizens. This was the
same sop given to the Indian Muslims before
1947.

What is meant by a philosophy of education?
Kabir defined it this way:

By a philosophy of education we mean the under-
lying ideas and principles which influence and
shape the educational policy of a country.
Perhaps the phrase 'educational policy' is
itself an overstatement. Except in
comparatively recent times, hardly any country
had a definite or articulated educational
policy as such. There were educational
practices and even these were more often
than not dependent on the attitudes and
beliefs of individuals or groups. Never-
theless, there were certain general require-
ments which such practices had to fulfil.
No society tolerates a type of education that
undermines its own stability.

The system of belief -- perhaps not
explicitly formulated in all cases -- which
underlies the educational practice of a
community may therefore be regarded as its
basic educational philosophy. The simplest
definition of education one can offer is
that it is the process by which individuals
and communities enrich their own experience
by drawing upon the experiences of others in
present and past generations. The capacity
to broaden experience consciously is perhaps
the most distinctive character of man. It
liberates him from the bondage of the environment
without destroying his connections with it.
It enables him to view the present in the light
of the past and plan the future in the light
of the present. He can however do so only if
he has some purpose or principle to explain
and unify past, and organise future experience.
A philosophy of education is the search for
this purpose or principle. Since the object
of education is to give the individual
knowledge of himself, his fellows and his
environment and since he cannot live except
as member of a social group, the aim of

education is simultaneously to help him to become a better member of the community. A national system of education is thus the reflection of a national system of ideals. Different societies have placed before themselves different objectives and these have naturally coloured their educational outlook and practice.

If therefore we are to find out what is the educational philosophy of a people, we must find out what are the ideals which it has placed before itself. In a word, the educational philosophy of a people will depend on its concept of man and the values which it considers worthy of human pursuit.[1]

By reconciling the claims of self and society and combining the values of stability and change, education enables man to achieve a harmony within himself and the world outside. Unity in diversity in educational terms means an integrated individual in an integrated society.[2] A national system of education is the reflection of a national system of ideals -- Indian and secular. Education, therefore, is an agent of cultural synthesis built on old traditions, unity and continuity, and modern values, science, democracy and reason.

Education in India must create this spirit of democracy, scientific enquiry and philosophic toleration. A scientific temper means essentially an attitude of search for the truth regardless of consequences. It connotes a critical and inquiring spirit in which nothing is taken for granted, but nothing rejected till it has been definitely disproved. It connotes an experimental, questing attitude

which is not afraid of the new nor of the old.
Whatever stands the test of reason is accepted
regardless of how it affects our personal likes
or dislikes. Truth is no one's monopoly and
there is in the scientific temper a respect for
the opinion of others and. an attitude of
toleration for differences. What we call the
scientific temper is in fact also the spirit of
philosophy in which intellectual humility
flourishes side by side with intellectual daring.
It is the basis on which alone democracy can
flourish, for democracy is nothing if not equal
regard for all individuals. Thus alone can we
be the rightful inheritors of the glorious
traditions which have been built in this
country in the past. Thus alone can we claim
to take our share in the modern heritage which
seeks to combine the contributions of peoples
throughout the world. Modern India is a
crucible where old values and new are being
transmuted and fused. Education is a
catalytic agent which can make this fusion
possible without violent upheaval or clash.[3]

Kabir's approach is essentially rational seeking
to build up a system of education which would be secular,
scientific and empirical in its approach but would not
repudiate the spiritual values which are common to all
religions. Education, therefore, creates the
conditions for and serves as the medium of co-
operation between the existing cultures of India. The
aims of Indian education cannot be achieved without a
correct appraisal of the factors that are obstructing
the growth of a truly national outlook and a clear
understanding of the goals and objectives to be
achieved. What are the obstacles to be overcome?

The history of India does manifest patterns of assimilation and synthesis but these were not on the level of conscious thought. The synthesis has been largely instinctive and based on the urges derived from feelings and emotions.[4] Consequently, there exist in India parallel societies and cultures living side by side and integration and consolidation has failed to take place except at a superficial level.

One of the clearest examples of this phenomenon is the existence in India of three systems of education in parallel streams evolving from ancient India, medieval India and the impact of the West.[5]

After an initial phase of free philosophical inquiring in which such admirable values as comprehensiveness, liberation of the individual from the bondage of ignorance, tolerance for diversity, and an awareness of self and others[6] ancient Indian education became academic, literary and largely tradition.

> It developed an authoritarian temper which
> was perhaps inevitable in a society where only
> a minority had access to learning. These
> fortunate few alone had access to India's vast
> intellectual riches. Some fragments of their
> knowledge reached the masses through legends
> and stories, and the moral discourses of
> saints and religious teachers. It was however
> only a fraction of what the initiated knew.

> Society thus developed a bipolarity in which
> knowledge and wisdom were concentrated in a
> small minority at one pole while at the other
> pole the vast majority remained steeped in
> ignorance and superstition. It is not
> surprising that inelastic dogma and the iron
> law of tradition and custom should soon
> dominate the temper of such society.[7]

This description does <u>not</u> remind one of the idyllic
Aryan-Dravidian synthesis.

The arrival of Islam on the Indian scene did
not lead to any marked change in the educational thought
or practice.[8] Although in theory the bias of education
was changed from theological to secular interests and
open to all members of the community, the achievement
of Akbar,[9] in practice the duration of the course was
so long and the syllabus so difficult as to dissuade
all but a few devote students. The end result was
similar to that of the ancient Indian education --
authoritarian and dogmatic. Unfortunately, except in
the case of a few rare individuals Muslim education
developed independently of and almost in opposition to
the indigenous Indian system.[10] Aurangzeb's (1658-1707)
now famous outburst against his teacher depicts the
deficiencies of both systems just before the impact of
the West.

> Was it not the duty of my teacher to make me
> acquainted with the characteristic features of
> the nations of the world, their resources and
> strength, their modes of warfare, their manners,

> religions, forms of dogma, and major
> interests, and by a regular course of
> historical reading to give me knowledge of
> the origin of States, their progress, and
> decline; the events, the accidents, or the
> errors on account of which social changes or
> mighty revolutions have taken place? . . .
> If you had taught me that philosophy which
> inclines the mind to reason and will not let
> it rest satisfied with anything short of the
> most valid arguments; if you had given me
> lessons which elevate the soul, fortify it
> against the buffets of fortune, and produce
> that fortitude and equanimity which is neither
> elated by prosperity nor depressed by adversity;
> if you had made me understand the nature of man,
> taught me always to refer to first principles, and
> given me an understanding of the nature of the
> universe and of the order and regular motions of
> its parts; if such had been the nature of the
> philosophy I had learnt under your tuition, I
> would have been more indebted to you than
> Alexander to Aristotle.[11]

Kabir's comment at the end of this quote is equally important
for the strong influence Indian education had on his mind.

The advent of the British presented a new
challenge but not perceptive change in the division of
intellect because of the failure to take into account
the different intellectual and cultural backgrounds of
India and Europe which in turn did not bring about
any attempt to combine the heritage of the ancient,
medieval and modern system.[12] The medium became
the message, the medium of instruction became
the end of education.[13] In an essay on "The Study
of English",[14] written in 1955, Kabir gives both

the credit and debit sides of the balance sheet of the
Western impact which began with Macauly's minute in
1835 establishing English as the language of
instruction. It is interesting to note that Kabir's
sympathetic understanding of the Western influence is
more in consonance with that of R. Tagore's and K.
Azad's not M. Gandhi's.[15] Although he accepted a lot
of Gandhi's ideas, he did not accept his anti-
Westernism.

> The study of English brought India within the
> orbit of Western civilization. It introduced
> Indians to the ideas of political democracy
> and liberty and a new consciousness of human
> dignity and rights. It opened the doors of
> opportunity to new sections of the people who
> had till then been under the domination of
> the privileged classes. It brought about a
> political awakening and helped to develop a
> sense of political unity among the people.
> And most important of all, it opened up new
> horizons of knowledge and enlightenment which
> undermined the old authoritarian temper of
> Indian society and led to the development of
> the spirit of scientific enquiry so
> characteristic of the modern age. These are
> the great blessings of the introduction of
> English education in India.[16]

> Not all were blessings. The increased pre-
> occupation of Indians with English led to the
> neglect of the study of the mother-tongue and
> the Indian classics, the alienation of the
> educated classes from the rest of the people,
> the restriction of job openings to those who
> had proficiency in English and the tendency
> among many to look at the world through
> English eyes.[17]

In fact Kabir's position on the use of English in education
perpetuates the Western veneer -- the need for an Indian

elite to continue an understanding of and inspiration
from the West.[18] His own education was instrumental
in his rational approach to the status of English
education as in his analysis of the problem of cultural
disunity and the importance of the intellect to solve
it or at least control the emotion at the root of it.

Referring to the lack of intellectual synthesis
Kabir draws this conclusion:

> These approximations in belief and conduct
> were of great value in affairs of daily life.
> One may even describe such approximation as a
> synthesis, but it was a synthesis on the level
> of practice, emotion and intuition. Without
> the support of critical and careful thought,
> it shared in the weakness common to all
> instictive attitudes: it could only hold so
> long as it was not challenged by a contrary
> instinct. Based on the urges derived from
> feelings and emotions, the synthesis has also
> lacked the solidity which intellectual
> articulation alone can give.[19]

The development of these three parallel systems is
directly related to the existence of parallel
societies, the growth of compartmentalism.

> Much that is unsatisfactory in modern
> Indian life is due to this segregation of
> different groups in different compartments.
> Even today we have people whose education is
> influenced solely by the ideals and modes
> prescribed in ancient India. Time for them
> came to a stop some fifteen hundred years ago.
> There is another group versed in Arabic and
> Persian but innocent of the traditions of
> Sanskrit learning and the modern knowledge of
> the West. University men, on the other hand,
> are often ignorant of Sanskrit, Arabic and

Persian. Universities and other organs of
higher education have thus failed to reflect
the synthesis which saints and poets, reformers
and preachers and even simple men and women of
little or no learning have achieved on the
planes of religion, ethics and art.

Men and women living together can never
be segregated completely. Groups isolated
intellectually have, therefore, established
contacts in the fields of feeling and
behaviour. This lack of integration between
intellect and feeling has, by a curious reaction,
led to a growth of compartmentalism in the
individual mind. A man who accepts western
science intellectually is steeped emotionally in
traditions of ancient or medieval India. The
latest fashion of thought exists side by side
with a primitive mode of behaviour and feeling.
Even if we dismiss such cases as aberrations --
and their number is too great to justify easy
dismissal -- there is no denying that the co-
existence of three independent systems has
impoverished the intellectual life of a majority
of educated men and women of modern India.

The absence of a common system of national
education has been one of the main reasons why
so many Indians exhibit even today a regional,
linguistic, or communal outlook.[20]

A national system of education must have its

roots in the Indian soil, a synthesis of ancient,

medieval and modern nutrients. Discovery of the West

must lead to a re-discovery of the East. It is not

surprising, therefore, that Kabir regards R. Tagore as

the greatest pioneer India has produced in recent

times and did a complete study of his life.[21] Tagore

represented the best of the West and the East in his

educational approach. Two aspects of Tagore's philosophy stand out in particular -- synthesis and the importance of economics. As mentioned earlier, these are the pillars for Kabir's solution for the minorities.

In his essay, "An Eastern University", he has restated the conditions needed to make education fruitful and creative. He has referred to the ancient tradition of Indian education. Its main function was to make the common man conscious of the sanctity of social relationship and teach him to perform the various duties to which he is called as a member of the community. Education in modern India, he held, must be rooted in this tradition, but be richer and deeper in order to conform to the contemporary culture of India, which is a complex of elements derived from ancient and medieval India, the culture of the Orient and the civilisation of the modern West. It must not only cater to the intellectual needs of the individual but must also help to develop his personality through contact with art and the life current of the people.

In Tagore's own words, "Economic life covers the whole width of the fundamental basis of society, because its necessities are the simplest and the most universal. Educational institutions, in order to obtain their fulness of truth, must have close association with this economic life. The highest mission of education is to help us to realise the inner principle of the unity of all knowledge and all the activities of our social and spiritual being. Society in its early stage was held together by its economic cooperation, when all its members felt in unison a natural interest in their right to live. The idea of such economic cooperation should be made the basis of our university. It must not only instruct, but live; not only think, but produce."

Tagore concluded, "Our centre of culture should
not only be the centre of intellectual life of
India but the centre of our economic life also.
It must cooperate with the villages round it,
cultivate land, breed cattle, spin clothes,
press oil from oil-seeds; it must produce all
the necessaries, devising the best means,
using the best materials, and calling science
to its aid. Its very existence should depend
upon the success of its industrial activities
carried out on the cooperative principle, which
will unite the teachers and students and
villagers of the neighbourhood in a living and
active bond of necessity."[22]

The poetic idealism of both Tagore and Kabir

is aptly summed up in one compound Sanskrit word

Saccidānanda;

The first unit of the compound (sat) expresses
the real as fact: it is simply a fact that
things are and are united to one another through
the relationship of common existence. The
second phase of reality is cit (consciousness):
we not only are but are also conscious beings
and are related to all things through the
relationship of knowledge. The third phase
of the real is ānanda. We not only are and
know but also enjoy our experience which unites
us with all things through the relationship of
love. For Tagore, the highest purpose of life
is not merely to live in the world but to know
it and to realise the self through sympathy
with all things. The purpose of education is
to develop this sense of unity with all nature
and all life. It is thus and thus alone that
one can develop as a fully integrated human
personality.[23]

Like the ancient Indian seer, Tagore and Kabir seek to

build up an educational philosophy in which

comprehensiveness and a feeling for the whole would

be reconciled with a proper appreciation of the value

and dignity of the individual, a unity in diversity.
But integration is the key to the problem of the
relationship of the universal to the particular, total
integration, unity, not diversity even at a personal
level. Kabir sums up this Indian-Western approach to
education.

> To sum up: the essence of Tagore's
> educational philosophy may be expressed in
> the following statements. Education must be
> inspired by a philosophy which seeks fulfilment
> through harmony with all things. It must
> develop in the student the capacity to be
> natural with nature and human with society. It
> must combine the introspective vision of the
> universal soul with the spirit of its outward
> expression in service. Tagore held that such
> introspective vision can be best realised in the
> solitude of the mind and has been by and large a
> distinctive feature of the Indian approach to
> the real. By contrast, the West has expressed
> itself more in its active service for human
> welfare and the assertion of the primacy of the
> human will. A new philosophy of education in
> India must combine these values. Tagore also
> insisted that learning and teaching are two
> aspects of the same process of education, and
> that education so conceived is a permanent
> feature of the adventure of life. He declared
> that the mission of all education is to lead
> beyond the present and achieve a point of view
> which includes the past and the future as
> integral parts of the present.[24]

After Tagore, the Indian thinker whose
educational philosophy had made the deepest impress
on Kabir's mind and national education was M. Gandhi.
The most systematic and sustained attempt to modify

the content, the curriculum, and the methods to meet

the requirements of the community has been under

Gandhi's leadership.[25]   Tagore and Gandhi and Kabir had

fundamentally the same approach to education in its

relation to social commitment and economics differing

only in emphasis.   Education was the basis of the

psychology of the Welfare State.   In his own way

Gandhi said:

> I hold that true education of the intellect
> can only come through a proper exercise and
> training of the bodily organs. . . .   In
> other words an intelligent use of the bodily
> organs in a child provides the best and quickest
> way of developing his intellect.   But unless
> the development of the mind and body goes hand
> in hand with a corresponding awakening of the
> soul, the former alone would prove to be a poor
> lop-sided affair.   By spiritual training I
> mean education of the heart.   A proper and all-
> round development of the mind, therefore, can
> take place only when it proceeds pari passu with
> the education of the physical and spiritual
> faculties of the child.   They constitute an
> indivisible whole.   According to this theory,
> therefore, it would be a gross fallacy to suppose
> that they can be developed piecemeal or
> independent of one another. . . .
>
> A proper and harmonious combination of all
> three is required for the making of the whole
> man and constitute the true economics of
> education.[26]

Both Tagore and Gandhi believed in the all-

round development of the individual and held that the

individual could so develop only in harmony with his
fellows and nature. But, Tagore was more of an idealist
than Gandhi and more willing to welcome Western
influence. Both Kabir and Tagore were poets first.[27]
For Gandi, then, education is not only merely a means
to preserve the old.values of Indian philosophy and
culture, it is also an instrument for bringing about
a social revolution which would lead to the establish-
ment of a co-operative commonwealth of men.[28] The
spirit behind the economics of education in Gandhi's
theory of work is best expounded by Z. Husain when he
said:

> All work is not educative. It is educative
> only when it is preceded by mental effort. You
> have first to plan the work in your mind, then
> to think out the ways and means of doing it,
> then to perform it actually and finally to
> assess the results and compare them with the
> guiding plan. But even when all these four
> steps have been gone through, it does not
> follow that work would prove educative. It
> would certainly give some skill, mental or
> manual, but skill by itself is not education.
> . . . Only that work is genuinely educative
> which serves some value, higher than our
> selfish ends, and to which we are devoted. He
> who works for his own ends may become skilled;
> he does not become educated. In the service
> of values, man does not seek his own enjoyment
> but strives to achieve perfection in his work,
> to improve his character and to become a real
> human being. . . . This educative quality can
> be found in handwork as well as in mental work
> -- and both can be devoid of it! The real
> 'school of work' trains children to think
> before they take up an activity and to test
> and assess results when it has been completed,

> so that they acquire the habit of doing their
> very best whether engaged in manual or mental
> work. Let those who wish to make work the
> medium of education remember that work is not
> purposeless, that it is not content with any
> results that may follow. Work does not mean
> the passing of time by doing any haphazard
> things; it is not amusement; it is not play;
> it is work; it is purposeful striving. Work
> sits in judgment on itself with the strictness
> of an enemy and, when it passes the test, it
> yields joy, unparalleled and unsurpassed.
> Work is worship.[29]

Gandhi's approach is not without criticism.
In an essay on "Theory and Practice of Basic
Education",[30] Kabir condemns concentration on a single
craft, like spinning and weaving, to the exclusion of
all other crafts found in the community. He also
cautions against over-emphasis on production, which
carries with it the risk that the school might turn
into a factory exploiting child labour. This essay was
written in 1953 and in the modified program of basic
education to-day the absurdities pointed out above
probably do not exist. But when an authority like
Dr. Z. Husain has expressed the view that basic
education, as practiced in several parts of India, is a
fraud, one wonders how many institutions imparting this
kind of education fulfil the idea so enthusiastically
propounded by Kabir.[31] Moreover, one wonders if the
fears of Muslims about the Basic Education at its

inception are unfounded or Kabir's education solution

possible to allay the fears of the minority.

> The Wardha scheme of education sponsored
> by Congress governments under the inspiration
> of Mahatma Gandhi was another source of Moslem
> resentment. Intrinsically, there is nothing
> wrong in the scheme and it must be remembered
> that its details were worked out by a committee
> presided over by a well-known Moslem educationist,
> while an Indian Christian played an almost
> equally important part in giving final shape to
> its recommendations. It also exhibits striking
> similarities with the scheme of education
> drawn up by the late Dr. Iqbal. It sought to
> combine manual with mental training and shift the
> emphasis from mere literacy to vocational
> efficiency. As such it pointed the way to a
> necessary educational reform and it was un-
> fortunate that confusion between renaissance and
> revivalism -- which is rampant in the Indian
> mind today -- should mar a scheme which otherwise
> had many things to recommend it. Some Hindu
> supporters tried to give the scheme a religious
> tone and this the Moslems vehemently opposed.
> They objected, and rightly, to the introduction
> of a religious colouring into educational
> institutions. In the prevalent state of
> development of this country and the general
> outlook of the people, it was inevitable that
> if religious associations are once allowed,
> they are bound to reflect the tone and temper
> of the majority community. It thus seemed a
> surrepitious attempt to impose the peculiarities
> in the culture of one community on members of
> the other and as such it provoked blind
> opposition. The result was that the Moslems lost
> sight of even the real merits of the scheme and
> along with the bathwater wanted to throw out the
> baby as well. In a state composed of different
> religious denominations, education can best
> thrive by secularising it. The necessary
> corollary to the demand for separation of
> politics and religion is to keep public education
> free from the religious setting of any
> community.[32]

Education then, for Kabir, was to be as secular in the fifties and sixties as in the forties. However, once again Kabir has not faced the importance of traditional religion to the cultural identity of Indian Muslims. Religion is meaningful in emotional as well as rational terms. The rational essence of spirituality liberates the integrated man from his tradition rather than make his tradition a more viable force.[33] Modern education by being secular in Kabir's terms, makes the same mistake as Western education made -- not recognizing the realities of the Indian situation, the existence of two very important traditions, two educational and psychological religious frameworks. Thus, one veneer, Western, is replaced by another, Nationalist, speaking in the same language. He attacks the very essence of traditional society with very little success. Education broadens man's vision and makes him aware, but by itself cannot commit man to action.

Kabir's philosophy of education is spiritual in the same sense as his philosophy -- rational, imaginative and the identity of man with all men. A. Husain's approach to secular education is perhaps more realistic, although similar. He points out that a

common religious education would fail in any attempt
to integrate one culture into another unless it wiped
out from the minds of every child the teaching of his
own tradition. This is not the goal of secularism,
'unity in diversity', in India or modern culture.
This is only interference with the fundamental rights
of citizens of a democratic secular state. There is
no doubt, however, that a common religious education
could foster the spirit of national brotherhood but
this must be supported by the individual traditions in
a true religious spirit laying stress in their own
teaching on spiritual and moral values common to all
religions and being examples of this commitment.[34]

Kabir's rational fear of emotion leads him to
saddle education as the agent of intellectual synthesis.
The rational principle behind this philosophy found
support from K. Azad with whom Kabir worked from
1948-56. "Conflict originates in the mind of man and
consequently it is in the minds of man that the
bastions of peace must be built."[35] Kabir's philosophy
of culture and education and political involvement
rests on the two pillars of feeding the starvation of
the mind and the stomach, but fails to reach the heart.
Since conflict originates in the mind "the primary aim

of any system of education is to create balanced minds
which cannot be mislead. We must be strong mentally
before we can think of building a nation."[36] Only a
re-education of man can create a sense of psychological
unity and common citizenship which the technological
unity achieved by the advance of modern science
requires of man.[37]

Ideally, then, if children are trained to
think in terms of unity and brotherhood, when they
grow up they may espouse an attitude of mind in which
the present conflicts will become unreal.[38] Like
Tagore and Kabir, Azad was also an idealist. The
creation of a new type of humanity, a new India was
essentially an educational enterprise. An education
that would create an integrated man out of an integrated
system committed to an integrated society. Kabir
followed the Indian tradition, the ancient inheritance
transmitted through Tagore and Gandhi. He also
followed the Western tradition, the new values necessary
for a modern society, science, democracy and reason.
However, the synthesis of both these traditions had
not been able to de-compartmentalize the Indian identity[39]
or encourage Indian Muslim participating for meaningful
cultural identity in a secular state. The West had not

been able to re-discover the East because its tools
are Western. Even the search for synthesis is an
intellectual question, a fact of being liberated from
one's own culture and religion. This question is not
posed where custom is king, that is within 80 percent
of India's boundaries -- Hindu and Muslim. A man can
never live unless his reach exceeds his grasp. He
must yearn and strive for something that transcends
his self. 'Unity in diversity' seems to have transcended
Kabir again. Perhaps education is not enough? This
brings us to the last phase, after 1963 when Kabir
resorts to all his previous efforts in order to fight
for the rights of the minorities to shake the
complacency of the majority. Education, economics,
political activity even the founding of his own party
combine to make a final effort to guarantee the
rights of the minorities and to guarantee them
integration, their identity with the nation, the
preservation of unity. It is in this fight that Kabir
most closely approximates the real with the ideal in
political terms. He demands that a majority culture
recognize the importance and right of the minority
culture to exist as an individual and autonomous entity.
At the same time, he demands that a minority culture

realize that the right to remain individual is not
only a right to solve one's own problems, but a
responsibility to solve the problems of others, to
participate for the welfare of all. However, in
cultural terms this meant for Kabir either the
separation of religion and state or complete identity
with the state. Both of these alternatives were
repugnant to a traditional Muslim.

The last phase is important.

Kabir was always involved in politics,
education and writing, expressing his thoughts and to
the end they only differ in the different orientation.
The same end and inconsistency with the ideal, unity
of the Indian nation at all costs, is evident. Kabir
was also consistent in his rationalization of the
religious identity of Indian Muslims, that the
introduction of religious or cultural elements to the
identity in a secular state is fortuitous and
accidental and not necessary.

CHAPTER IV

A POLITICAL APPLICATION OF UNITY IN DIVERSITY

The impulse towards unity was more than
matched by the increasing dissatisfaction of the rights
of the minority. The solution was not to recognize
the minorities on a communal basis, but to recognize
that the political plight was based on economic and
educational inequalities and that the majority must
set about to correct this immediately. This is not
an analysis of Indian politics or a political biography
of Kabir. It is an analysis of Kabir's failure to live
up to his ideal 'unity in diversity' in his political
activity and to underestimate the power of religion in
his rational solution to cultural identity. This
Chapter is also important because it draws to a
conclusion the inconsistency in his defense of unity
due to the change in his understanding of the cause
of Indian disunity. This inconsistency is most
obvious between his position before 1955 and after 1963.
When he defends the rights of the minorities and

suggests his own plan for a South Asian Confederation,
he uses similar arguments the Muslim League did
against the Congress Party. But what were vested
interests before 1947 became rights of the minorities
after 1963. Also, what Kabir says about the role of
the minorities in democracy is opposite to what he
said about the nature of the Welfare State, democracy,
centralization before 1955. The important political
essays to examine these consistencies and inconsistencies
are chronologically before 1955, "Politics and Muslim
Students", 1937, "Two Speeches Delivered in Bengal
Legislature" 1939, "Freedom, Authority, and
Imagination", 1944, "British Cabinet Commission", 1946,
"Concepts of Democracy", 1949, "The Welfare State",
1954; after 1963, "Minorities in a Democracy", 1963,
"Towards a South Asian Confederation", 1966, "Plural
Society and Group Conflicts", 1968, "Communal Conflicts,
Causes and Remedy", 1968, "Adivasis of India", 1968.

Minorities are essentially a phenomenon of
democracy and in fact are essential to the very
existence of India.[1]

This view is further substantiated by the
fact that the monorities are a 'protestant group'.

> Every minority is in a sense a protestant
> group, a dissident group. Every minority is a
> heretical group when compared to the majority.
> It is not an exaggeration to say that the

> dissidents are the salt of the earth, provided
> they remember that they are dissidents in terms
> of quality and not dissidents merely because of
> birth. The existence of minorities is thus
> necessary in a democracy. In fact I would say
> it is a condition for the survival of democracy.
> It may be a political minority, but it is
> always the political minority which makes for
> progress and change. If we can create conditions
> where minorities based on birth are steadily
> converted into minorities based on intellect,
> based on politics, based on economics, based on
> cultural interest, we will ensure the
> preservation of all the minorities, and also
> assure the progress of democracy in our country.[2]

The minority consequently plays an activist role in pressing for the diffusion of the majority's group consciousness.[3] How these democratic rights are incorporated into Kabir's earlier concept of a Welfare State which champions duties over rights is not discernible, perhaps not desirable. It certainly is not questioned by Kabir. In an essay "The Basis of National Unity"[4] written in 1958, as has already been pointed out, Kabir realized that diversity is here to stay. He also suggested that one of the basic causes of a minority fighting integration is the fear of its loss of identity, fear of the attitude of the majority.

> If we accept without any mental
> reservation the fact that India is and will
> remain diverse, one of the main obstacles
> to the national and emotional integration of
> the people will be removed. Religious,
> linguistic or regional groups at times seem to
> oppose such integration but if we carefully
> analyse their attitudes, we will find that
> what they oppose is not integration but the

loss of their identity. Minorities are
generally more sensitive about the retention
of their separate character. Majorities do not
generally insist on such retention, because
they know that greater uniformity is likely to
lead to the acceptance of their way of life by
the minority rather than vice versa. This is
one of the main reasons why religious minorities
are so anxious to preserve their special
traditions and characteristic culture even at
the cost of estranging the majority. The same
fear is behind the passion exhibited in recent
times over the question of languages of India.

It is easy for the majority to press its
own point of view under the guise of national
interest and dismiss the fears of the minority
groups as parochial. One may certainly argue that
the larger national interest should always
prevail over the interest of a section or group.
Unfortunately, however, the majority has often
a tendency of identifying the national interest
with its own interest. There need not be any
dishonesty or hypocrisy in such identification,
for it is a common human failing -- in India
and elsewhere -- to regard one's own point of
view as the only correct and right point of
view. Why should one adopt a view unless one
regards it as right? As against this, we have
to remember that some of the greatest values
of life have been preserved or created only because
a minority stood out against the dictate of the
majority.[5]

It was not until 1966, however, that Kabir stood out

politically against the dictate of the majority. One

must not underestimate the paranoid feelings of minorities

and the fact that no political or social system to

accommodate satisfactorily minority insecurities has

yet been devised. But the fear, according to Kabir, is

still based on vested interests no matter what kind of

minority group it is. Absence of confidence in social

justice not emotion or religious identity is at the
base of this fear.

As mentioned earlier, the more intense
loyalty to a smaller unit arises out of its
fear of submergence in the larger group. It
expresses itself in different ways in different
countries and with different groups. Funda-
mentally, such fear may be regarded as an
absence of confidence in social justice. When
a group demands separate electorate or
reservation of a percentage of posts, it has
in the background of its mind the fear that
without such support it may not receive its
legitimate dues. The emphasis on caste or
community or language or province is intended
to buttress its claims against stronger
rivals. It is interesting to note that each
group uses a different plea in support of
its own position. A highly educated minority
may plead that academic and intellectual
attainment alone should be the criterion for
entry into public service. An educationally
and socially backward group will on the other
hand advance linguistic or regional con-
siderations in support of its position.
Whatever be the plea that is advanced, it
invariably arises out of the fact of lack of
confidence. Nor are such fears altogether
without justification. Caste and community
bonds in India have been so strong in the
past that even today highly placed men are at
times ready to give special treatment to the
claim of persons belonging to their family,
caste, community or State. This applies not
only to employment but also to various
facilities in trade, industry and commerce
that are now in the gift of the State. If
all men and women, regardless of language,
religion, community or State, could be sure of
equal treatment, one of the major causes for
group loyalty and the consequent fissiparous
tendencies would disappear.

. . . I am myself convinced that what is often
described as linguism or casteism or communalism
is basically the expression of the fear of a
weaker group that it may not receive what is

due to it. To concentrate on these different
expressions is therefore to treat the symptoms
without eradicating the cause. The cause can
be removed only when justice becomes not only
in theory but also in practice the guiding
principle of society and the State.[6]

Indian Muslims must put their confidence in the secular

state. This should not be difficult because the basis

of a modern state is the basis of a modern Islam.

Kabir seeks a solution to this fear by

identifying the pride of one's group culture with the

pride in the achievements of one's Nation.[7] By way of

example, Kabir compares the achievement of Islam with

that of the Indian constitution, the State.

I should like to say a special word in
respect of Indian Muslims and their contribution
to the evolution of new India. The basic
tenets of Islam may perhaps be reduced to four
general principles which are common to other
great world religions as well. Nevertheless,
they received an emphasis in the Islamic
formulation which has been significant and
creative in man's history. Islam proclaimed
the unity of Godhead in a way which has few
parallels in the religious history of the world.
Its passionate belief in the brotherhood of man
has made it perhaps the most effective social
democracy that the world has ever seen. Its
regard for equality and justice has led to the
formulation of special laws of Zakat, inheritance
and Baitulmal which minimise inequalities and
offer opportunities to all members of the
community. Its passionate rationalism was
responsible for a liberation of the intellect
from the bonds of custom, superstition and
prejudice and led to one of the greatest
intellectual efforts of man during the first
few centuries of the Islamic age.

If we analyse the basic concepts of the
Indian Constitution, we shall find that except
the principle of the unity of God, all the other
three Islamic values have been incorporated in
it. The acceptance of democratice republicanism
is an open admission of the equality and brotherhood
of all Indians. Much of the social legislation
in independent India has adhered to the principles
and formulations of Islamic law. India's
emphasis on universal education for all her
citizens is also in conformity with Islam's
insistence on the liberation of the intellect.
Not that these values are unknown in the other
great religious traditions of the world, but
Indian Muslims can take some pride in the fact
that the impact of Islam on all aspects of
Indian life is one of the major factors in the
evolution of the rational, democratic and
humanist outlook of modern India.[8]

However much this may appeal to a modern
rational secular thinking Muslim or the Indian
philosophy of life which accepts diversity only as a
part of unity, the deletion of the unity of God would
be abhorrent to any other Muslim and not easily
rationalized. From what Kabir has said about science
and democracy, the unity of God should be one of the
first principles of the Constitution if one follows
logical reasoning.

> A real communalist is one who can subordinate
> his own selfish interest to the interests of
> his community. A real communalist is one who
> can identify himself with a community or a
> group, and in this way abandon and sacrifice
> his own personal interests and ambitions for
> the interests of a larger whole.[9]

The interests of the large whole then were in 1937 and
in 1963 the interests of the State, a united State.

Religion is not opposed to the state, it is just not an identity factor.

> A man is an Indian in the context of his nation-hood. He is the adherent of a religion, what-ever may be the name of the faith, in the context of his relationship to God or the Absolute. To ask whether one is first an Indian or a member of a religious group is like asking the question whether a man is tall or hairy. Unless economic or political interests are mixed up with a man's faith, there is no reason why there should be a clash between his religious and his national loyalties.[10]

But compartmentalizing man's life into two worlds does not satisfy the traditional framework either. This reasoning is similar to other Indian Muslim intellectuals, i.e. Abid Husain,[11] A. H. Faruqi.[12]

Although this approach gives recognition to every contributing element in India's history, it does not give a specific cultural identity in truly religious terms which is the focus of the masses. It is too rational, and out of the emotional context of everyday life of the majority of the Indian people. The approach is subject to the same criticism levelled by Kabir on K. Azad's failure to stir emotional following:

> He is the man who gave a new orientation to Muslim politics in India but he is by nature a savant and recluse who avoids the turmoils of party and partisan politics. He was far in advance of the community and preached a message for which the mind of the average Muslim was not yet prepared. He looked too far ahead for the average man. His erudition and scholarship separated him sharply from the rank and file of

Indian Moslems. A band of able lieutenants
might have served as a connecting link between
him and the masses, but this also was denied to
him. For various reasons, the Congress was not
able to attract the Muslim intelligentsia who
alone could have supplied such a band of
lieutenants. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad therefore
remained distant from the masses and his
revolutionary appeal could not stir their
consciousness.[13]

Kabir's historical search for the origins of

secularism is also naive reminding one of his lack of

extensive research in his historical method to

evaluate evolving historical patterns.[14]

One then cannot help feel Kabir is more Hindu

than Muslim in his attempt to solve the diversity in

the unity. Writing in 1959 about the principle of

Federalism, he explains the impress of the Indian

environment on opposing theories of federalism which

is reminiscent of the idyllic Aryan-Dravidian synthesis.[15]

Kabir seems to substantiate this preference further when,

after 1963, he suggests that Muslim political thought

has not provided for the Indian situation.

But Muslim political thought had not provided
for the situation which has developed in India
today, the situation in which Muslims are
citizens in a secular State. In this situation,
they are neither the sole rulers nor merely
the ruled. We can put it in another way and
say that they are rulers and ruled simultaneously.
As a citizen of India, a Muslim shares in the
sovereignty of the people. As a citizen of India,
he is subject to the laws of the State like any
other citizen professing any religion. In a
democratic State, every citizen has a share

> in sovereignty and therefore we have in India
> today this unique situation, a situation which
> has never before faced Muslim people anywhere
> in the world. They are not merely ruled, but
> neither are they merely rulers. They are rulers
> by themselves, they are rulers in association
> with people of many different religions.[16]

How Kabir felt that this solution would allay

the fear of the cultural minority and give confidence

for meaningful participation in a secular state is not

clear. What was clear, however, was the rejection by

the minorities of the conditions for conformity. The

pattern of minority vote in General Elections since 1957

showed a decline in minority support for the Union

Government and is very indicative of this failure.[17]

The findings of a special committee in 1957[18] offered

some reason for minorities' disenchantment with Congress.

The question of the ratio in services and representation

once again looms forth, but not as vested interests of

the minority but as their rights from the majority.[19]

These findings should have been enough to set the

Government into reform action, but the insidious

disease of every civil service, red tape, frittered

away any sincere intention.[20] Consequently, the findings

were as valid in 1967 as in 1957[21] as in 1937 and the

Union Government was losing needed minority support

throughout India. The only hope for change was

Nehru's leadership of the Cabinet[22] but even that failed to prevent the suspension of the Commission's enquiries because it was felt that its continued activity might create too much hope and encourage fissiparous tendencies among different minorities by making them wish to stress their distinctive character in order to secure special rights.[23] This criticism indicates that the majority was even more entrenched after 1947 in its own problems.[24]

This decision by the Government was unacceptable to Kabir who propounded his own revolution in education and economics in order to insure the rights of minorities.[25] As in Bengal's politics in 1937 the majority must give special status, incentives to the minority[26] this time it is in education and economics for a specific period of time so that the minority can make its "proper" contribution to national progress. This benevolence on the part of the majority would ensure against the formation of any communal parties on an All Indian Scale.[27] The necessity of the majority to be conscious of the needs of others is also a corollary for the creation of a South Asian Confederation.[28] It is interesting that this essay is included with his pre-1947 papers

as a lesson to be learned from the past. Why the
majority would be more different in 1967 than it was
before 1947 when the same threat, disunity, loomed is
not understandable particularly since the Congress
Party had known the conditions of failure then, Pakistan,
and the condition of failure now, defeat of Union
Government on a provincial basis. Moreover, Kabir is
still following the same analysis that religion is
not important for the identity of the minority in a
secular state. The form and content of education for
integration has already been discussed in Chapter III
of this thesis.

The role of economics as a solution to the
problems of minorities finds continuity in the aims of
both Krishak Praja Party and Lok Dal. However, before
this serious practical suggestion is considered, it is
necessary to just mention Kabir's other 'ideals', such
as fraternization[29] and the creation of a meritocracy.[30]
All this is to be supported by a revival of strict
application of law and order and enforcing individuals
to live up to their responsibilities when in office.[31]
All these are admirable suggestions, but impossible
when the difference between the minorities and the
majority is one of religious culture as well as

economics and education.

Kabir's exit from Congress in 1966 was
inevitable.[32] The death of Nehru, the failure of the
majority to heed the warning of the minority, the
creation of Pakistan, the Commission of Inquiry in
1957, led Kabir to find solace in his own party Lok
Dal.

The study of Lok Dal by D. Datta which is
a justification of the existence of Lok Dal and the
need for Kabir's leadership in Bengal, is very biased.[33]
The other source is Kabir himself writing a more
concise analysis in 1968 appealing to the maligned
Adivasis of India to join Lok Dal[34] and in 1969 editing
a collection of essays on economic problems and
solutions for India in which he included Lok Dal's
economic formula.[35] The second source is the most
informative for our purposes.

> It is a basic philosophy of the Lok Dal
> to assure full autonomy and development to
> every minority group whether cultural or
> linguistic, religious or racial. The Lok Dal
> has accepted democracy and decentralization
> as the twin pillars on which the party ideology
> is built. In economic matters, the party has
> placed the greatest emphasis on total employment,
> even if this leads to the adoption of a
> comparatively less advanced technology.[36]

What becomes obvious from this formula is its similarity to that of the Krishak Praja Party,[37] except for the emphasis on decentralization, which indicates it is also obvious that Kabir failed to learn from the mistakes of the Congress Party in seeking to solve a problem of cultural disunity with economics.[38] Although Kabir realized that diversity is a source of strength[39] and the complaints of the minority about their ratio in services and representation and the necessity of decentralization to give local autonomy for the solving of local problems, his solution is the same as proposed by the Krishak Praja Party before the creation of Pakistan. Decentralization

> envisages a political system where there will be a powerful but limited Union government to deal only with subjects that have international implications. The constituent States of the Union should have larger functions and powers but must in turn delegate functions and powers to autonomous regions within each State.[40]

Politically, Kabir follows the Union Government plan but from the point of view of the minority. Moreover, although the minorities are given local autonomy they must participate in India's problems not as a minority but as members of a recognized political party, in this case the Lok Dal.[41] They must integrate and conform

to the needs of the whole nation. This was equally
true before 1947 when separate identity did not mean
separate electorals.[42] The same solution for the
minorities is for the Indian Muslim

> The recognition of local autonomy and the
> reconciliation of local interests in the
> larger national interest offer the only
> solution to the problems of all smaller
> ethnic, religious, linguistic and cultural
> groups including Adivasis. In this way alone,
> they can be assured their full rights while
> at the same time advancing the interests of
> the Indian nation as a whole.[43]

Kabir's political solution, based on
economics and education, is as consistent as his
emphasis on guaranteeing the unity of India at all
costs. The only concession after 1963 is that the
cost is a little more expensive, greater concessions
on the part of the majority but <u>not</u> as expensive as to
include separation. But once again the missing link
to greater participation was not economics, politics,
education, the "right" history, the right mental
orientation, but emotion which is the basis of
commitment. Culture and the strength of religion in
the identity of the minorities cause them to fight
and would be the cause to unite if possible. Kabir
realized all along that economics satisfied only the

broad issue not the existential question.[44]   But the

fear of emotion to the rational mind did not permit

him to be sensitive to the lesson of Pakistan, the

lesson of a complacent majority, the lesson of his own

insensitivity to a very emotional problem. The search

for unity between men, and the universal in man, was a

search undaunted by diversity or failure. But this

consistent search by Kabir, although admirable, was

vulnerable, was inconsistent with the ideal 'unity in

diversity' and caused some inconsistencies in his

defense of that ideal.

All this along with his unwillingness to accept

the different lessons of Indian history witnessed to

the fact that Kabir failed to live an ideal as if it

were realized or at least possible. A solution to the

problem of the relationship of the universal to the

particular was yet to be worked out. One man is not

the measure of an ideal, but is very important to an

ideal that has yet few followers in India where custom

is king.[45]

CONCLUSION

The hypothesis of this thesis is that Kabir's
ideal 'unity in diversity' was neither an actuality
nor a possibility.

It was not an actuality because of the
inconsistency between his ideal and his application of
that ideal in his historical, philosophical,
educational and political essays. Kabir consistently
emphasized unity, uniformity, integration, at all cost,
even that of diversity. In his historical essays, he
accepted only one interpretation, one historical
pattern, that of the Aryan-Dravidian synthesis, unity
out of diversity. He gave credence to the Indian under-
standing of unity, the many as an expression of the
one and having identity only as part of the one. With
the arrival of Islam the diversity challenged the idyllic
synthesis of ancient India and finally found fruition
in the creation of Pakistan, the destruction of Indian
unity, physically and emotionally. In his philosophical

149

essays Kabir continues his theme of unity considering
the creation of Pakistan an enactment of vested
interests not cultural incompatibility. A modern
secular India was a philosophical possibility because
it was a synthesis of old traditions, unity and
continuity and new values, science, democracy and
reason. Even Islam was modern enough to be part of
this synthesis. But synthesis again meant a solution
of the relationship of universal to the particular in
favour of the universal. The particular incidence of
science, the individual in democracy and the unique-
ness of Islam, reason, must conform to and be continuous
with the pattern of unity that underlies the spiritual
essence of these modern values. In order to be agents
of cultural synthesis these values must guarantee that
the particular, the intransigence of the individual,
the disharmony between social order and social content,
will not offset the balance between the old tradition
and new values. History and philosophy established
what the basis of Indian culture, old and new was but
it was to education, politics and economics that the
responsibility of social action was given. Social
action meant the application of unity at all cost,
even the cost of diversity. Education attempted to

integrate the compartmentalized life of Indians,
intellectually and socially by creating one ideal,
Indian, through a national system of education.
Politics and economics sought to integrate the
minorities into the majority in better terms but the
same end -- better citizens of the state. A common
history, a common philosophy, a common education, a
common Indian political identity were to create a
common and harmonious existence for both minority and
majority in India. Kabir consistently emphasized unity
even though his understanding of the problem of disunity
changed from being at the level of material interests,
the vested interests of the British and Hindu/
Muslim middle classes to include the lack of
intellectual synthesis between the British, Hindu and
Muslim and the complacency of the majority towards the
minority. The changes did cause some embarrassment to
his earlier historical patterns, the centralization of
the welfare state and the concept of federalism but did
not deter the consistency in unity at all cost. In the
end Kabir proposed basically the same platform for
cultural identity as he espoused before 1947 to suggest
that the historic fact of Pakistan, the ineptitude of
the Union Government to attend to the needs of the

minorities, the attempt of one party, Lok Dal, to channel the needs of all minorities on a provincial basis, failed to impress on the mind of Kabir the possibility of another solution, or his failure.

Kabir's ideal 'unity in diversity' is not a possibility because he proposed a rational secular solution to an emotional religious problem. He proposed a common religion, common culture, to elicit the support of a religiously diverse tradition. For Kabir, meaningful cultural identity meant Indianization of the particular religious tradition which in turn meant the secularization of Islam in order to be attuned to the modern secular constitution of India, But Kabir underestimated the power of religion in the cultural identity of the Hindus and Muslims. Since the rational deals with the emotional in the same way as Kabir dealt with diversity, by suppression, the persistence of both emotion and diversity continually frustrated Kabir's efforts for unity either on the side of the majority or as champion of the rights of the minorities. Kabir overestimated the appeal of the rational to command serious commitment if any at all among the majority of the Hindus or Muslims in India.

Unity in diversity is a paradox and as such

is a tenuous balance between unity and diversity. Why
Kabir was not forced to change his solution is not
clear, except that he was _totally_ committed to the
Indian ideal in a secular way. What does appear
certain is that Kabir failed to maintain the balance
between unity and diversity. That was not the only
mistake!

The realities of India's history and the
present crisis, a continual struggle for cultural
identity, minority rights and national unity, suggests
no simple solution, rational or otherwise. This
necessitates being aware of all patterns of development
not just the desired one. Kabir realized this writing
in 1968.[1] Kabir, like most ardent idealists,
considered his course of action historically,
philosophically, educationally and politically, the
right course of action. There is nothing wrong with
being convinced of your own conviction, even to the
extent of founding your own party, but to assume that
it is a majority view when the fruits of one's efforts
indicate the opposite, is questionable. The very act
of assuming that one particular possibility will
prevail also implies that the knowledge such observers
command is adequate to interpret the complexity of the

Indian situation. This attitude for all its ostentatious objectivity is naive and suggests the dangers of trusting solely to the intelligence, which Kabir obviously did. Moreover, it seems inconsistent with the search for truth in a variety of ways.

Kabir is an idealist in that he continually held up the ideal 'unity in diversity' while pursuing one of the opposite courses, unity. He reminds one of the dreamer of an Age, the modern Age which R. Tagore aptly describes:

> Each age reveals its personality as dreamer in its great expressions that carry it across surging centuries to the continental plateau of permanent human history. These expressions may not be consciously religious, but indirectly they belong to man's religion. For they are the outcome of the consciousness of the greater Man in the individual men of the race. This consciousness finds its manifestation in science, philosophy and the arts, in social ethics, in all things that carry their ultimate value in themselves. These are truly spiritual and they should all be consciously co-ordinated in one great religion of Man, representing his ceaseless endeavour to reach the perfect in great thoughts and deeds and dreams in immortal symbols of art, revealing his aspiration for rising in dignity of being.[2]

The struggle for cultural identity in India is rooted in the very existence of a separate religious consciousness and act of worship as well as the modern

maxim of constant change. Renaissance and revivalism
wear the same clothing, dance to the same music in
India. Religion, for the modernist, to reach beyond an
official capacity must be flexible, true to its
cultural principles and true to the universality of the
search for truth in a variety of ways.--in other
words, seriously considering the inherent value of
the separate tradition as well as the universal. In
this way, religion plays an important role for modern
man in facing his existence in all its dimensions,
cosmic, human, and historical.

However, Kabir's religious affiliation tends
toward the superficial because reason, not emotion, is
the relating factor. His religion is far removed from
the traditional context out of which the majority of
Indian Muslims think out their action. It was too
easy, simple, for Kabir to dismiss the absence of the
unity of God in his comparison of the pride of one's
culture with pride in the achievements of the nation.
Islam is not central to his actions. It is a scientific,
democratic and rational Islam that finds harmony with
modern values. Even the search for the universality
of truth seems more rational, if not Indian, than that
of the diverse expressions. The ideal of 'unity in

diversity' for Kabir is rooted in the Aryan-Dravidian synthesis not the Hindu-Muslim reconciliation. The Islamic heritage is found outside of India and comes from outside to contest the Aryan-Dravidian synthesis, and eventually demands a separate existence, Pakistan, outside of India. Because Kabir's solution is rational culturally, religiously and educationally, it will always remain theoretical just as science without the test of individual experience. Or when tested it will fail as Kabir's did.

How effective an ideal can be is related to the extent of its conversion into a driving force, its practical application. Economics offers only half of the solution, the first half. To education Kabir commits the other half, the important half. But it is basically an intellectual answer to a non-intellectual problem -- a rational approach to an emotional problem, cultural integration. The aims of education, Kabir propounds, like reason, become a new mystic, a new doctrine, which in turn creates a new hierarchy. What he proposes is the importance of education itself as means and end which legitimizes existing social and economic distinctions using number of years at school, a certificate rather than the birth or station as the

basis of distinction -- a basis which is the honoured experience of eighty percent of Indian people for whom custom is king. Kabir saw the problem but did not accept their same rejection of reason. Reason supplants English as the new authority over the old authorities in a country which is rooted in the old authorities, neither being rational nor English. Education justifies the position of the educated minority -- the middle class, the teaching order, and conformity, and therefore teaching that those who are not educated must of necessity remain second-class citizens. Why not a pluralistic educational system? The lack of intellectual integration was not just an error but a reality of cultural identity. Modern education sets in competition the city and the village today just as it did Hindu and Muslim in the nineteenth century. The appeal of education saddled with the responsibilities of moral and mental revolution, reconstruction of Indian society, falls short of the pressing problems of a hungry stomach. The ideal is doomed by an economic practicality, supply and demand in both human and material resources. Quite naturally, the Western system of education became the supplier of the technicians to run the machines,

government and factory and dished out the food. The
traditional system of education, both Hindu and
Muslim supplied the moral guidelines. It marks and
defines the area of attitudes and belief which make
possible the individual's life adjustment to the
totality of existence -- past and present. The
traditional system holds out the message of masterful
independence of man not dependent on a machine. A
course in common citizenship would be both superficial
and uninspiring for cultural identity which reaches
back into distant history and deep emotion. It is
easier for the masses to follow authority, revelation
than reason, especially when the majority of the
people do not have the tools, the education, to
question such direction. Kabir questioned but did not
find an answer either.

The fact that intellectual, political, and
educational action of many Indian secular modernists
has not effected the desired change, a unity in
diversity, leads one to wonder about the reality of
the secular ideal in India. Kabir's failure does point
to some guidelines for cultural unity. One must have
a vision of unity before an enactment of unity in
diversity can take place. One hopes that human

culture by nature is symbiotic, a mutually helpful
living together of many different kinds of cultures
within a common milieu. Unity in diversity is not a
glib idea but a sensitivity to a peculiar Indian
context, a pluralistically religious society under a
secular ideal. It is necessary, and if it were easy
it would hardly be necessary. Religion must play an
important role in cultural identity but it must also
be a unifying force. This may mean religion
broadening its perspective by broadening its
perspective of truth.

> Maintaining that all men share in the same
> limitations which separate them from truth,
> and in the same potentialities to be brought
> into relationship with truth, the religious
> thought of the future will be forced to
> openly or tacitly recognise the manifold and
> diverse awareness of truth which has resulted
> from man's universal potentiality for
> religious and intellectual insight of truth.[3]

But broadening of one's religion does not mean total
rationalization of it as Kabir did.

This broadening of culture and religion is a
fact of living in a modern culture in which the timeless
transcendent truths, values of traditional culture and
religion need be applied to the realities of modern
existence. There need be a rapprochment between
revelation and reason not just reason.

It is clearly apparent that each of the
majority religions has to-day a cultural
heritage, primary and yet varied in nature,
that it cannot ignore. It is equally
apparent that the winds of modernity are
demanding a conscious and continuing effort
toward transcendence of that heritage at the
same time the values of that inheritance must
be retained.[4]

Education is important and can transmit these
values and possibly translate them into realities of
human culture. But education is also dependent upon
the "intransigence of the individual". That economics
are basic to the existential question, no one could
deny -- especially in a country that has known only
poverty.

Kabir accepted the implications and
responsibilities of what it means to live with others
as equals, not without frustration. He truly aspired
towards Indianness.[5] Kabir must have died an unhappy
man, a poet faced with the incompatibility of his
dreams with the reality of Indian life, pining for an
ever-elusive ideal. The experiment is incomplete
but the implications are legion.

One can still conclude that: "An Indian
Muslim is both an Indian and a Muslim. The desperate
attempt to deny or reject this duality has failed. An
attempt to integrate the two has hardly yet been

seriously put forward. Some individuals have, of
course, succeeded in being both, and some have
prospered. But the meaning of Islamic faith in the
life of an Indian as a modern secular minority democrat
has yet to be construed and expressed."[6]

Kabir has construed such a faith and
expressed it, but it is not satisfactory for meaningful
identity of the Indian Muslim in an Indian secular
state. Kabir proposed a modern Indian approach to the
problem of cultural unity but neither the minority,
the Muslim or the majority, the Hindu, could accept
its secular implications as an actuality or a
possibility.

FOOTNOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. W. C. Smith, _Islam in Modern History_, 286.

2. J. Nehru, _The Discovery of India_, 31.

3. R. Tagore, _Toward Universal Man_, 62, 131-132.

4. K. Saiyidain, _The Humanist Tradition in Indian Educational Thought_, 6.

5. Z. Husain, _The Dynamic University_, 20.

6. A. Husain, _National Culture_, xiii.

7. Humayun Kabir, _Indian Philosophy of Education_, 238.

8. Humayun Kabir, _The Indian Heritage_, 93.

9. Humayun Kabir, _Science, Democracy and Islam_, 109.

10. D. Datta, _Humayun Kabir: A Political Biography_, 30-32.

11. Ibid., 30.

12. S. Vahiduddin and K. S. Murty ed., _Science, Philosophy and Culture_, 49.

13. See Chapter III and Chapter IV of thesis.

14. Datta, op. cit. 8.

15. Ibid., 9.

16. Vahiduddin and Murty ed., op. cit., 271.

17. Ibid., 273.

18. Ibid., preface, vii.

19. Humayun Kabir, <u>Muslim Politics 1906-1947 and Other
    Essays</u>, 78.

20. Ibid., 37.

21. See Chapter I of thesis. Cf. <u>Muslim Politics
    1906-1942</u>.

22. Vahiduddin and Murty, eds., op. cit., 271.

23. Humayun Kabir, <u>Minorities in a Democracy</u>, 90.

24. Vahiduddin and Murty, eds., op. cit., 267.

25. Ibid., 268.

26. See Chapter I of thesis.

27. Kabir, <u>Muslim Politics . . .</u>, 83-84.

28. Chapter IV of thesis.

29. Vahiduddin and Murty, eds., op. cit., 273.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid., preface xv-xvi.

32. Ibid., 73-74.

33. Ibid., 71.

34. Ibid., 273.

35. Datta, op. cit.

36. Ibid., 66.

37. Kabir, <u>Muslim Politics . . .</u>, 118.

38. Kabir, <u>Minorities . . .</u>, 62-71.

39. <u>Kant's on Philosophy in General</u>.

40. Vahiduddin and Murty, eds., op. cit., 56-58.

41. Kabir, The Indian . . .

42. Vahiduddin and Murty, eds., op. cit.

43. Humayun Kabir, Education in New India.

44. Humayun Kabir, Rabindranath Tagore.

45. Kabir, Minorities . . .

46. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . .

47. Humayun Kabir, Education for Tomorrow.

48. Humayun Kabir, ed., India's Economic Malaise: Cause
    and Cure.

49. Vahiduddin and Murty, eds., op. cit., 54.

50. Ibid., 46.

51. Kabir, Minorities . . ., 79.

52. B. E. Meland, The Secularization of Modern Culture,
    p. 5. Cf. Vahiduddin and Murty, op. cit.,
    84-85. Cf. D. E. Smith, South Asian Politics
    and Religion, p. 149.

CHAPTER I

1. Kabir, <u>The Indian . . .</u>, 47, 112.

2. Ibid., 43-44.

3. Ibid., 109-110.

4. Kabir, <u>Indian Philosophy . . .</u>, 102.

5. Kabir, <u>The Indian . . .</u>, 130.

6. Kabir, <u>Indian Philosophy . . .</u>, 89.

7. Kabir, <u>The Indian . . .</u>, viii.

8. Ibid., 44-45.

9. Ibid., 45.

10. Ibid., preface IX-X.

11. Vahiduddin and Murty, op. cit., 132-133.

12. Ibid., 155.

13. Kabir, <u>The Indian . . .</u>, 79-81. Cf. Abid Husain, <u>National Culture</u>, 204.

14. Ibid., 73.

15. Ibid., 53.

16. Kabir, <u>Muslim Politics . . .</u>, viii.

17. Vahiduddin and Murty, op. cit., 59.

18. Kabir, <u>The Indian . . .</u>, 41.

19. Ibid., 40-50.

20. Ibid., 54.

21. Ibid., 60-61.

22. Kabir, <u>Minorities . . .</u>, 66.

23. Kabir, The Indian . . ., 73.

24. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . ., 3.

25. R. Tagore, Toward Universal Man, 184-185.

26. Kabir, The Indian . . ., 75-76.

27. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . ., 1.

28. Ibid., 6.

29. Kabir, The Indian . . ., 87-88.

30. Ibid., 24.

31. Ibid., 23.

32. Ibid., 93.

33. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . ., 16; cf. 87.

34. Kabir, Indian Philosophy . . ., 61-63.

35. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . ., 18.

36. Ibid., 18.

37. Ibid., 19.

38. Ibid., 19.

39. Ibid., 20.

40. Ibid., 20.

41. Ibid., 20-22.

42. Ibid., 23.

43. Ibid., 23-24.

44. Ibid., 25.

45. Ibid., 80.

46. Ibid., 27.

47. Ibid., 27.

48. Ibid., 28-30.

49. Ibid., 30.

50. Ibid., 31.

51. Ibid., 32.

52. Ibid., 32-33.

53. Ibid., 33.

54. Ibid., 34.

55. Ibid., 124.

56. Ibid., 124.

57. Kabir, _Minorities . . ._, 79-80.

58. Ibid., 80.

59. Kabir, _Muslim Politics . . ._, 126.

60. Kabir, _Minorities . . ._, 48-49.

61. Kabir, _Muslim Politics . . ._, 35.

62. Ibid., 35-38.

63. See Chapter IV of thesis.

64. _Muslim Politics . . ._, 35-36.

65. Ibid., 37-38.

66. Ibid., 34.

67. Vahiduddin and Murty, op. cit., 273.

68. Kabir, _Muslim Politics . . ._, 22-23.

69. Norman, D. J. Nehru, _The First Sixty Years_, Vol. 1 400-401. Cf. Kabir, _The Indian . . ._, 138.

70. Kabir, _Muslim Politics . . ._, 46.

71. Ibid., 47.

72. Ibid., 48.

73. Ibid., 49.

74. Ibid., 49-50.

75. Ibid., 51-52.

76. Ibid., 54.

77. Ibid., 54.

78. Ibid., 57.

79. Ibid., 55-56.

80. Ibid., 27.

81. Ibid., 60.

82. Kabir, _Minorities . . ._, 91.

83. Ibid., 49-50.

84. Ibid., 89-94.

85. Kabir, _Education . . ._, 67.

86. Kabir, _Muslim Politics . . ._, 55.

87. Ibid., 59.

88. Ibid., 66.

89. Ibid., 65.

90. Ibid., 74.

91. Ibid., 76-77.

92. Kabir, _Education in . . ._, 106.

93. Kabir, _The Indian . . ._, 39.

CHAPTER II

1. Kabir, Science . . ., 82.

2. Ibid., 82.

3. Abid Husain, <u>National Culture</u>, preface vii.

4. Kabir, <u>Science . . .</u> 83.

5. Kabir, <u>Education in . . .</u>, 105.

6. Kabir, <u>Science . . .</u>, 23.

7. Ibid., 7.

8. Ibid., 7.

9. Ibid., 8-9.

10. Ibid., 9.

11. Ibid., 74.

12. Ibid., 72.

13. Ibid., 9.

14. Ibid., 90.

15. Ibid., 11.

16. Ibid., 14.

17. Ibid., 11.

18. Ibid., 12-13.

19. Ibid., 55.

20. Ibid., 55-56.

21. Ibid., 57-58.

22. Ibid., 58.

23. Ibid., 61.

24. Ibid., 59.

25. Ibid., 27-28.

26. Ibid., 72.

27. Ibid., 66.

28. Ibid., 66.

29. Ibid., 67-68.

30. Ibid., 70.

31. Ibid., 70.

32. Kabir, Minorities . . ., 9.

33. Kabir, Science . . ., 56.

34. Ibid., 16.

35. Ibid., 17.

36. Ibid., 15.

37. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . ., 2-3.

38. Kabir, Science . . ., 19.

39. Ibid., 19-20.

40. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . ., 1.

41. Ibid., 3.

42. Kabir, Minorities . . ., 66.

43. Ibid., 67.

44. Ibid., 66.

45. Kabir, Indian Philosophy . . ., 163.

46. Ibid., 164-165.

47. Kabir, The Indian . . ., 145.

48. Kabir, Indian Philosophy . . ., 209.

CHAPTER III

1. Kabir, <u>Indian Philosophy . . .</u>, 167-169. Cf. 238-
       239; Vahiduddin and Murty, op. cit., 158-159;
       Kabir, <u>Education in . . .</u>, 208.

2. Kabir, <u>Education for . . .</u>, 13.

3. Kabir, <u>Indian Philosophy . . .</u>, 22-23.

4. Kabir, <u>Education in . . .</u>, 106.

5. Kabir, <u>Indian Philosophy . . .</u>, 188.

6. Ibid., 170-186.

7. Kabir, <u>Education in . . .</u>, 107.

8. Kabir, <u>Indian Philosophy . . .</u>, 189.

9. Ibid., 191.

10. Kabir, <u>Education in . . .</u>, 108.

11. Kabir, <u>Indian Philosophy . . .</u>, 192.

12. Ibid., 196.

13. Ibid., 197.

14. Kabir, <u>Education in . . .</u>, 116-165.

15. Kabir, <u>Indian Philosophy . . .</u>, 202.

16. Kabir, <u>Education in . . .</u>, 122-125.

17. Ibid., 125-126.

18. Ibid., 128-129.

19. Ibid., 109.

20. Ibid., 109-110.

21. Kabir, <u>Rabindranath Tagore.</u>

22. Kabir, Indian Philosophy . . ., 27-28.

23. Ibid., 199.

24. Ibid., 200.

25. Ibid., 37. Cf. Kabir, Science . . ., 109-125.

26. M. Gandhi, Toward National Education, 42-44.

27. Kabir, Indian Philosophy . . ., 202-203.

28. Ibid., 201.

29. K. G. Saiyidain, op. cit., 192.

30. Kabir, Education in . . ., 22-38.

31. Vahiduddin and Murty, op. cit., 67.

32. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . ., 28-29.

33. Kabir, Indian Philosophy . . ., 238-239.

34. A. Husain, The Destiny of Indian Muslims, 11-12.

35. K. Azad, Educational Addresses, 149.

36. Humayun Kabir, ed., Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, 104.

37. K. Azad, op. cit., 153.

38. Ibid., 150.

39. Kabir, Indian Philosophy . . ., 209. Cf. E. Shils,
    Intellectual between Tradition and Modernity,
    61.

CHAPTER IV

1. Kabir, _Minorities . . ._, 33; Cf. 3-4.

2. Ibid., 18.

3. Ibid., 10-11; cf. 16-17.

4. Kabir, _Indian Philosophy . . ._, 64-68.

5. Ibid., 64-65.

6. Ibid., 67-68.

7. Kabir, _Minorities . . ._, 89.

8. Kabir, _Indian Philosophy . . ._, 110.

9. Kabir, _Muslim Politics . . ._, 96.

10. Kabir, _Indian Philosophy . . ._, 69.

11. Husain, op. cit., 164.

12. D. E. Smith, _South Asian Politics and Religion_, 149.

13. Kabir, _Muslim Politics . . ._, 24.

14. Kabir, _Minorities . . ._, 20-22.

15. Ibid., 87-88.

16. Ibid., 27; cf. 38.

17. Ibid., 40.

18. Ibid., 41.

19. Ibid., 40-42.

20. Ibid., 42-43.

21. Ibid., 43.

22. Ibid., 43.

23. Ibid., 46.

24. Vahiduddin and Murty, op. cit., 73-74.

25. Kabir, Minorities . . ., 43.

26. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . ., 101.

27. Kabir, Minorities . . ., 54.

28. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . ., 119.

29. Kabir, Minorities . . ., 44.

30. Ibid., 45.

31. Ibid., 55-60.

32. Datta, op. cit., 14.

33. See Introduction of thesis.

34. Kabir, Minorities . . ., 89-94.

35. Kabir, ed., India's . . ., 14-16.

36. Kabir, Minorities . . ., 90.

37. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . ., 37.

38. Kabir, Minorities . . ., 91-92.

39. Ibid., 90.

40. Ibid., 91.

41. Ibid., 93.

42. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . ., 98; cf. 101-103.

43. Kabir, Minorities . . ., 94; cf. 91.

44. Kabir, Muslim Politics . . ., 56; cf. Datta, op. cit., 67.

45. Kabir, Education in . . ., 129.

CONCLUSION

1. Kabir, <u>Muslim Politics . . .</u>, preface viii.

2. R. Tagore, <u>The Religion of Man</u>, 36-37.

3. Vahiduddin and Murty, op. cit., 12.

4. Ibid., 19-20.

5. Smith, op. cit., 272.

6. Ibid., 290.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Datta, D. Humayun Kabir, A Political Biography.   Bombay:
Asia Publishing House 1969.

Kabir, H. The Indian Heritage.   Bombay: Asia Publishing
House 1955.

_____. Science, Democracy and Islam.   London: George
Allen and Unwin, 1955.

_____. Education in New India.   London: George Allen
and Unwin, 1955.

_____. editor, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.   London:
Asia Publishing House, 1959.

_____. Indian Philosophy of Education.   London:
Asia Publishing House, 1961.

_____. Rabindranath Tagore.   London: Luzac and Co.,
1962.

_____. Minorities in a Democracy.   Calcutta: F.
Mukhopudhyay, 1968.

_____. Muslim Politics 1906-47 and Other Essays.
Calcutta: F. Mukhopadhyay, 1969.

_____. Education for Tomorrow.   Calcutta: F.
Mukhopadhyay, 1969.

_____. editor, India's Economic Malaise: Cause and
Cure. Calcutta, 1969.

Vahiduddin, S.; Murty, K. S., editors. <u>Science, Philosophy and Culture</u>. London: Asia Publishing House, 1968.

<u>Secondary Sources</u>

Ahmad, A. <u>Studies in Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment</u>. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

_____. <u>Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan 1857-1964</u>. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

_____. <u>Religious and Cultural History of Islamic India and Pakistan</u>. Edinburgh: University Press, 1969.

Azad, K. <u>Educational Addresses 1947-1955</u>. New Delhi: Government of India, Publications Division, 1956.

_____. <u>India Wins Freedom</u>. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1960.

Brecher, M. <u>Nehru, A Political Biography</u>. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Chand, T. <u>Influence of Islam on Indian Culture</u>. Allahbad: India Press, 1954.

Das, S. K. <u>The Educational System of Ancient Hindus</u>. Calcutta: Mitra Press, 1930.

Gandhi, M. K. <u>Towards National Education</u>, ed. Bharatan Kumarappa. Ahmedabad: Navajivan, 1956.

_____. <u>An Autobiography</u>. Boston: Beacon Press, 1957.

_____. <u>Basic Education</u>. Ahmedabad: Navajivan, 1962.

Griffiths, P. <u>Modern India</u>. London: F. Benn Limited, 1957.

Husain, A. <u>The National Culture of India</u>. Bombay: Jaico, 1956.

Husain, A. The Way of Gandhi and Nehru. New York:
     Asia Publishing House, 1959.

_____. Indian Culture. Bombay: Asia Publishing
     House, 1963.

_____. The Destiny of Indian Muslims. London:
     Asia Publishing House, 1965.

Husain, Z. Educational Reconstruction in India. Delhi:
     Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,
     Government of India, 1959.

_____. The Dynamic University. Bombay: Asia
     Publishing House, 1965.

James, H. R. Education and Statesmanship in India.
     London: Longmans, 1917.

Karunakaran, K. Modern Indian Political Tradition.
     New Delhi: Allied Publishers, 1962.

Keay, F. F. Ancient Indian Education. London:
     Oxford University Press, 1918.

Majumdar, R. C. History of the Freedom Movement in
     India. Vol. III. Calcutta: Firma K. L.
     Mukhopadhyay, 1963.

Mayhew, A. The Education of India. London: Faber
     & Gwyer, 1926.

McCully, B. T. English Education and the Origins of
     Indian Nationalism. Gloucester, Mass: Peter
     Smith, 1966.

Meland, B. E. The Secularization of Modern Cultures.
     New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Mujeeb, M. The Indian Muslims. Montreal: McGill
     University Press, 1967.

Nehru, J. Independence and After. Delhi: Ministry
     of Information and Broadcasting, Government
     of India, 1949.

Nehru, J.   The Discovery of India.   New York:
     Doubleday and Co., 1960.

_____.   Toward Freedom.   Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Norman, D. J.   Nehru The First Sixty Years.   New York:
     John Day Co., 1965.   Vol. I and Vol. II.

Nurullah, S., Naik, J. P.   A History of Education in
     India.   London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd., 1951.

O'Mallay, L. S. S., ed.   Modern India and the West.
     London: Oxford University Press, 1941.

Phillipps, G. H., editor, Historians of India,
     Pakistan and Ceylon.   London: Oxford
     University Press, 1961.

Rahman, F.   Islam.   London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson,
     1966.

Rawat, P.   History of Indian Education.   Agra: Ram
     Prasad, 1964.

Saiyidain, K. G.   Problems of Educational Reconstruction.
     Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1950.

_____.   Education, Culture and the Social Order.
     Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1952.

_____.   Iqbal's Educational Philosophy.   Lahore:
     Ashraf, 1954.

_____.   Education and the Art of Living.   New York:
     Columbia Teachers College, 1958.

_____.   The Faith of an Educationist: a plea for
     human values.   Bombay: Asia Publishing
     House, 1965.

_____.   The Humanist Tradition in Indian Educational
     Thought.   London: Asia Publishing House,
     1966.

Schapiro, J. S.   Liberalism, Its meaning and History.
     New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1958.

Shils, E.   The Intellectual Between Tradition and
            Modernity, The Indian Situation.   The Hague:
            Mouton, 1961.

Smith, D. E.   India as a Secular State.   Princeton,
            N.J.:   Princeton University Press, 1963.

_____.   South Asian Politics and Religion.   Princeton,
            N.J.:   Princeton University Press, 1966.

Smith, W. C.   Modern Islam in India.   London: Victor
            Gollancz Ltd., 1946.

_____.   Islam in Modern History.   New York: New
            American Library, 1957.

_____.   The Meaning and End of Religion.   Toronto:
            New American Library, 1962.

Spear, P.   A History of India, Vol. 2.   London:
            Penguin Books Inc., 1965.

Tagore, R.   Toward Universal Man.   New York: Oxford
            University Press, 1961.

_____.   The Religion of Man.   London: George Allen
            & Unwin, 1967.

Thapar, R.   A History of India, Vol. 1.   London:
            Penguin Books Inc., 1966.