

National movements and
Constitutional Developments.

V4/SID/2.N4
H7
048106

BH. VENKATARATNA
Economics at the Madras University
Relations Conference.

21st Joint of the Asian

*This paper has been submitted to the Asian Relations Conference by the author.
The author alone is responsible for statements of fact or opinion in this paper.*

March—April 1947

NATIONAL MOVEMENTS
AND CONSTITUTIONAL
DEVELOPMENTS

GROUP A: NATIONAL MOVEMENTS
TOPIC I: NATIONAL MOVEMENTS FOR FREEDOM

INDIAN COUNCIL OF WORLD AFFAIRS
NEW DELHI

FREEDOM MOVEMENTS & CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS IN ASIAN COUNTRIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Politically, Asian countries exhibit varying degrees of self-government. But in effect, all the Asian countries are, in one way or another, under the influence of one or the other of European powers with the exception of Japan (before the World War II) and Saudi Arabia. Each European power has created a sphere of influence of its own either by holding the countries as colonies, mandates or dependencies, or through economic penetration by investing capital in these countries. Thus Britain exercises her influence and/or power over Egypt, Palestine, Transjordan, India, Ceylon, Burma, Siam and Malaya; France over Syria, Lebanon, Siam and Indo-China; and Holland over the East Indies. In view of the strategic position of Iraq and Iran in the Middle East these countries are largely subject to British and French influences though they are politically independent; and recently America has also come on to the scene. In Saudi Arabia, American interests have been established with the granting of rights of oil-operation to an American company by King Ibn Saud, the ruler of the country. China, though politically independent, is subject to economic influences from England and America. In the context of such a pattern of subjection to foreign powers in Asia, the desire to be independent of foreign subjection, to be free to follow a policy aimed at raising their own status, political and economic, and enjoy freedom, is strong in all the Asian countries. It is against the background of such conditions that we have to study the progress of national movements in these countries. The varying degree of independence enjoyed by the different countries and the different kinds of subjection to foreign powers will naturally lead to different types of national movements with varying objects.

Strictly speaking, attention should be devoted to the study of national movements in those countries which are under political tutelage to foreign powers, though it may not give a correct picture of European influence in Asian countries. The main aim of all political movements in Asian countries is to secure full independence—i. e. exercise internal and external sovereignty, the latter being modified by the exigencies of international co-operation and relationship. So in the study of this topic it is necessary first to have an idea of what the movements in all these countries aim at; and secondly what is the political status of these countries and how far their exercise of internal or external sovereignty as independent countries has been limited by the controlling authority exercised by foreign powers. So the progress of the movements for freedom in relation to constitutional development will be relevant for our

purpose instead of going into details of party organisations and internal politics of each of these countries. In this memorandum, therefore, the national movements are studied as attempts to free the countries from undue foreign influences and as such, it will give us an idea as to the common features of freedom movements in all these countries and the causes for varying degrees of success in the different countries bearing in mind the special local conditions. In the following sections only those countries wherein there is *political subjection*, in one form or other to a foreign power, is dealt with.

2. AIM OF NATIONAL MOVEMENTS

It is necessary to consider the object of freedom movements before considering the actual process of realisation of the goal. What does the word 'freedom' imply in the context of Asian countries? In view of the control exercised by foreign powers on the political freedom of most Asian countries, naturally, the aim of all these movements is achievement of complete independence from foreign subjection. Especially with the growth of the idea of Nation State in the West, the desire for all countries of Asia is to be free to pursue their own economic policies and to resist the exploitation of their countries for the benefit of the metropolitan powers, has also become more manifest. In the growth of freedom movements the influence of Western ideas is strongly felt. The education of many orientals in western universities and in democratic traditions has led to the rise of a new class in Asian countries who could organise political movements on western lines and fight for the ideals for which the western democracies stand for. In this connection the example of the freedom movement in India and the rise of Chinese nationalism have contributed not a little to the beginning of similar movements in the rest of Asia. Especially with the immigration of educated classes from India and China, like doctors and lawyers, to the South-East Asian countries, a fillip was given to such movements. The rise of Japan during this century as an important world power offering successful competition with the European powers in the markets of Asian countries has given confidence to the people of Asia as to their potentialities to stand on an equal footing with European nations.

When colonies move towards self-government generally two ideas need to be considered in the definition of goal of freedom movements, namely, complete independence and 'dominion status'. In those countries where freedom movements have made good progress we find a change in the definition of the goal of the movement from 'dominion status' to complete independence. In general, all Imperialist powers (perhaps with the exception of France) declare that their object is to help their colonies to progressively realise self-government and take a place within the commonwealth of the Empire as a free member. The idea of dominion status was first developed in England as she was the first country faced with the problem of according equal status as herself to those colonies where her own nationals have settled and developed the new settlements like Canada,

Australia, New Zealand and the Union of South Africa. When political organisations in these countries are developed on the lines of those in the mother country, the idea that these countries should be treated not as subject countries to the metropolitan power but as equals to such a power has developed and finally was accorded legal recognition by the enactment of the Statute of Westminster. These countries are termed as Dominions which are autonomous communities within the Commonwealth equal in status, in no way subordinate to one another in any respect of their domestic or external affairs. By this enactment, no political rights are conferred on the countries ; it is only a recognition of the status which these countries of the British Empire have attained. What this status means, is clearly explained by Mr. Amery : -

‘Commonwealth status is not one of independence minus certain rights and privileges but of independence plus rights and privileges and the practical advantages accruing from a worldwide free partnership. It is, in fact, the status of this (England) country.’ In effect, Dominion status means sovereignty but not separation, independence as also interdependence.

This idea of free partnership in the commonwealth is of advantage to the Dominions which have closer ties with the mother country other than previous political subjection. In these Dominions because the majority of the population belong to the same race as that of the mother country they stand to gain by maintaining connections with the home country. They are mainly organised with an idea of extending the economic frontiers of the mother country and since most of them are new settlements opened up for exploitation by the European immigrants, the production is organised with reference to the natural advantages which those regions offer ; and generally speaking, since these regions do not support huge populations it is possible to maintain high material standards living on the organisation of an agricultural economy. Extensive cultivation has been undertaken ; the dairy industry has been developed on a large scale in some countries, and economy on an export basis is built up. Wherever there are opportunities for industrial development no serious check is exercised by the mother country. Under such circumstances these Dominions gain much by being members of the Commonwealth so that they can reap the advantages accruing from the system of natural preference for products of the Empire in the home country. Economic, political, social, cultural and religious ties with the mother country make such a relation of immense value to the Dominions.

But the position of Asian countries is different. For one thing, the foreigners who invested capital in these countries and developed the economies have no idea of settling permanently. They are only interested in the business aspect, namely, reaping maximum advantage out of their investment of capital. These countries are regions of heavy local populations and rich natural resources but lacking seriously in capital resources to develop their economies. The

superior western industrialism has been able to subdue the backward countries of Asia and the political stagnation and internecine quarrels in Asian countries at that time, gave full opportunities to the European countries to establish their sway over Asian countries 'The western world has been superimposed upon the native society and the latter has been forced to make the adjustments which would enable it to serve the western purposes.'¹ If the native population have derived any benefit it is only incidental. These countries are made to move along lines which are determined by these colonial powers who are guided by imperial interests. They are guided by policies which are of great importance from their point of view without any regard to development of these countries with reference to their own national requirements or potentialities for allround development. So the general apprehension of Asian countries is that whatever may be the degree of self-government that these colonial countries of Asia enjoy, as long as they are members of a commonwealth of the colonial power, that power may try to influence the policy of these countries in its own favour. Moreover the reorganisation of the economies of Asian countries should be on a different basis from the existing structure and the more thoroughly and the more quickly can it be done if a country is completely independent rather than be under an obligation to the colonial power which is in control of the colony for a long time. It may be argued that Dominion Status is *de facto* independence and as the position of Eire in the present war has shown, the Dominion is free to pursue its own policy and at the same time may get the advantages of partnership in a greater organisation of nations. But the nationalist movements of Asian countries seem to regard that for a full right of national self-determination, complete independence of these countries should be recognised. Perhaps a reorganisation of the economies of these countries may make such partnership of commonwealth more a hindrance than an advantage in that these countries in their new position may find it to their advantage to co-operate with other Asian countries and the rest of the world instead of being members of a commonwealth of a European power. Perhaps there will be greater necessity and better reason for Asian countries to have closer contacts among them. Again when regional organisations for cultural, social and economic purposes are much in the air, what use will it be to have additional allegiance to a commonwealth? Another significant question that is asked is: If 'Dominion Status' means virtual recognition of complete independence, why should the colonial powers define the goal of progress of self-government in colonies as attainment of 'dominion status' and not complete independence? These and similar queries are raised by nationalists.

The general purpose of a commonwealth is to form one unit with a basic economic motive. This idea of closer relations between countries of a commonwealth is the answer of Empire countries to the development of autarky or national

¹Miller and Thompson : *Government and Nationalism in S.E. Asia*, p 10

self-sufficiency by non-Empire countries. This idea of closer co-operation in the economic field will work well so long as the economies of the countries composing the commonwealth are more complementary than competitive. But once the economic structure of colonial countries, which have progressed along lines of political independence, is reorganised on a national basis with reference to the potential resources of the country, then perhaps the resultant economy of these countries may be more competitive than complementary to the colonial power in which case it is clearly of no use to form such a commonwealth. The present stage of economic development in the Asian countries and the economic structure of colonial powers indicate that when the Asian countries develop their economies primarily with national requirement in view, the resultant economic structure of the now colonial countries will be more competitive to that of colonial powers. Such a position indicates the desirability of having a federation of such a kind with other countries and not with the 'home' country. The formation of regional co-operation organisation for the Asian countries may be more rational than a partnership of any country in the commonwealth of the Empire nation. The co-prosperity scheme of pre-war Japan was as much imperialistic and as much directed to achieve self-sufficiency by extending economic frontiers as was the conception of commonwealth of Empire countries of the West. But the idea of a pan-Asian Federation will be on surer ground. Any federation of powers in future should be for non political purposes so long as there is an effective world organisation. Co-operation among the Asian countries is bound to be more successful due to many social and cultural affinities among them and in the field of economic development such co-operation will be advantageous to all the countries. This presupposes political independence of the countries co-operating. Under the conditions prevailing in Asian countries the definition of the goal of freedom movements as 'complete independence' appears to be more rational and relevant than aiming at 'Dominion Status' and membership in the commonwealth of the Empire to which the colony now belongs.

3. POSITION IN 1939

With 'complete independence' in view as the goal of all freedom movements in Asia, the strength of the movement in any particular country depends upon the extent of political freedom enjoyed by the natives by way of participation in the actual government of the country. So before estimating the position and strength of freedom movements at the beginning of the World War II (1939) a classification of Asian countries on the basis of their political status will be of great use.

Asian countries exhibit a wide range in the extent of native participation in government. On the one hand there were the colonial countries like Ceylon, Netherlands East Indies and Indo-China where the Imperial power controlled the government of the country and only beginnings were made in allowing

the native population to take part in the governance of the country ; while on the other there were fully independent countries free from all kinds of control, political and economic, exercising full sovereignty like Japan and Saudi Arabia in 1939. The rest of Asian countries occupied intermediary positions between the above two categories. For the purpose of our study the Asian countries can be conveniently grouped as under :—

- (i) Colonies : Ceylon, Malaya, Netherlands East Indies and Indo-China.
- (ii) Other dependencies : India, Burma and Philippines.
- (iii) Mandates : Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Transjordan.
- (iv) Countries subject to restrictions on external sovereignty in matters of defence : Egypt, Iraq.
- (v) Independent countries but subject to economic and/or political influences of foreign powers : China, Iran, and Siam.
- (vi) Completely independent countries : Japan, Saudi Arabia.

(i) *Colonies* : Under this head can be mentioned Ceylon, Malaya, Netherlands Indies, Indo-China. The extent of control by the Imperial power was marked in these countries. In fact the degree of self-government enjoyed in these countries varied according to the subjection under different European powers. The colonies under Britain enjoyed a greater measure of self-government than that under Dutch rule (N.E.I.) ; and Indo-China under French domination enjoyed the least measure of freedom among colonies. Though both British and Dutch policy has been based on the principle that it is for the colonial powers to determine the speed of advance of colonies towards self-government, perhaps it can be said that the granting of self-government in British colonies was by comparatively larger instalments than in Dutch colonies. But the development of colonial self-governments has no place in French policy.....the intention has been that the dependency should be drawn progressively closer to France as an integral part of a closely-knit empire dominated by the mother country.¹

Though all the four countries are termed colonies, there were differences in the actual political set up.

Of these colonies, *Ceylon* enjoyed the largest amount of self-government. After successive reforms in 1910, 1920 and 1923, finally in 1927 an all-party commission under the chairmanship of the Earl of Donoughmore was appointed to investigate the working of the constitution. The constitution based on the Commission's proposals provided adult franchise, abolition of communal representation and establishment of government by seven Executive Committee to be elected by the State Council from among their members. The portfolios

¹*Government and Nationalism in S. E. Asia*, p. 108

held by Ministers were: Home Affairs, Agriculture and Lands, Communications and Works, Health, Labour, Industry, Local Administration, and Education.

The Ministers had no collective responsibility except as a finance committee. The first elections under this new Constitution were held in 1931 and soon the difficulties of having a representative government in spheres which are entrusted to natives, were apparent because of absence of an organised party system and collective responsibility. In the second election of 1936, the Ceylon National Congress to achieve collective responsibility of the Executive secured full congress membership of the Board of Ministers.

The system of government in *Malaya* was complex. There were distinctly three groups in British Malaya, viz., Straits Settlements, Federated Malay States and Unfederated Malay States. The control of colonial power was more marked in British Malaya than in Ceylon. The Straits Settlements had an Executive Council of 12 members and Legislative Council of 27 members both presided over by the Governor and there was an official majority in the Legislative Council. For the Federated Malay States there was a Federal Council to legislate on matters of federal importance besides a State Council in each of the four Federated States (*viz.*, Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang) presided over by the Rulers. There was a British Resident in each of these States. The rulers had no powers except on matters relating to Malayan custom and religion. The political power was centralised and even after the introduction of decentralisation measures in 1936, the whole constitution worked more as a Union than as a Federation. In the unfederated States (namely, Johore and the four States transferred by Siam in 1909—Kelantan, Terengganu, Kedah and Perlis), the Sultans had greater powers and were unwilling to join the Federation though such power as was exercised by the Sultans was not of great consequence. This system of indirect rule carried on in Malaya facilitated the exercise of greater control by the Colonial power without any serious challenge from the people.

Netherlands Indies, in spite of insistent demand for independence from nationalist parties in the country, did not progress much on the road to self-government. Besides a constitutional change in 1918, no further reforms aimed at the progressive conferment of self-government were initiated. The Volksraad, as it was called, was constituted in 1918 to give a share to native population in the legislative and administrative activities of the Government. The election to that body was both indirect and communal. There was a large block of nominated members. In effect, the body as constituted was of meagre significance as a full representation of public opinion! Of a House of 60, 25 were Dutch. While it may criticise the actions of the Executive, it had no power to control it and the wide powers exercised by the Governor reduced the whole set up to a farce. Subsequent revisions in 1925 and 1929 and 1938 did not in any way substantially change the constitution.

Like Malaya, *Indo-China* was made up of five states annexed by France to her Empire over a long period. Cochin-China was governed directly by France as a colony while indirect rule (like the one that was prevailing in Federated Malay States) prevailed in Cambodia, Annam, Tonkin and Laos. Cochin China was under the rule of a Governor, who was assisted by a Privy Council and a Colonial Council. The other kingdoms, which were protectorates, were governed by Residents assisted by Protectorate Councils and native Consultative Council. Though the king of each protectorate could make ordinances, for their validity, the Chief Resident must sign them. The whole Colony of Indo-China was governed by a Governor-General with extensive powers of control and general supervision over provincial governments. The powers of the local legislature were far more restricted than was the case in the other colonies and another feature of the legislation was that many laws were enacted by the French Parliament for the colony or were extended by a Presidential decree.

(ii) *India, Burma and Philippines* are also strictly colonies but in view of progress at a quicker pace towards realisation of self-government, they can be differentiated in political status from the other colonies of Asia. The continuance of Burma as part of India till its separation in 1937 accelerated her progress towards self-government since whatever was applicable to the rest of India was applicable to this part which was then a province of Burma. The Minto-Morley Reforms of 1909 for the first time introduced non-official majorities in provincial councils. The Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms which were embodied in the Government of India Act, 1919, for the first time declared the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government as the goal of British policy in India. According to this Act, the central legislature was made bicameral with a majority of elected members in each House. Dyarchy, under which the executive powers were divided into the reserve half and transferred half, was introduced in the provinces. The next constitutional advance was embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935 and in 1939, while the Central Government was based on the Act of 1919, the provincial governments were working under the Act of 1935. The whole of the country was under the rule of a Governor-General who was responsible to the Secretary of State and through him to the Parliament. The central subjects were administered by him; and the Indian Legislative Assembly while it had power to pass legislation on certain subjects and criticise the work of the Executive and the Governor-General, who was assisted by an Executive Council in his work, had powers to certify legislation which he thought important for the peace, tranquillity and good government of the country. In the provinces, the system of dyarchy was abolished and all subjects were transferred to the control of popular representatives with the reservation of certain powers to the Governor of the province. Popular Governments were set up in the provinces in 1937 and the 1935 Act and were in power in 1939. With the formation of Burma as a separate country besides the powers of provincial legislatures in India, some

central subjects on which the Central Legislative Assembly in India had power to legislate were also transferred to popular representatives.

The Philippines is a colony under the USA. American colonial policy offers a contrast to the policy pursued by other Imperial powers. The American policy had been the granting of 'complete independence' to the colony in the quickest possible time and it was clearly acknowledged as the duty of the colonial power to help the colony to attain complete independence in as short a time as possible. Such a policy was given effect to by laying special emphasis on education in the Philippines. While the first Legislative Assembly was introduced in 1907, by the Jones Act of 1916 wide powers have been given to legislature and Filipinos were given control over legislation, taxation and expenditure while the American Government retained control over the executive through the Governor-General. But the political leaders were able to control to some extent the Executive through the establishment of a Council of State. Under the Tydings—Mcduffie Act of 1934, known as Independence Act, a convention drafted the constitution for the Commonwealth of Philippines which was certified by President Roosevelt and ratified by a plebiscite of the Philippine people; elections under the new Act were held and the new Commonwealth Government was inaugurated in November 1935; 'while broadly autonomous in internal affairs, this Commonwealth government was restricted by important reservations of authority to the United States.'³ The USA retained direct supervision and control over foreign affairs, and legislation touching currency, coinage, imports, exports and immigration must be approved by the President of the US. The Philippines is to attain independence on July 4, 1946.

In all colonies the outward symbol of political subjection is the holding of key offices of State by members of the ruling power. Progressive nativisation of services, not only of the subordinate but higher posts, depends on the progress of self-government. On this basis, also we can find that the major part of the key posts were held by aliens in the less advanced colonies on the road of freedom. In the Philippines except a few posts, all the key positions were held by Filipinos. The extent of higher posts held by natives in India, or Burma was greater than those held by natives in Malaya, Indo-China or Netherlands Indies.

National Movement in Colonies :

The position of national movements for freedom at the outbreak of the World War II needs consideration to understand how far the system of government in the country was acceptable to the natives. Here we are concerned only with the general trend of development of movements and as such there is no need to go into party policies in each of these countries. Whatever may be the internal differences and points of view held by different parties in a country, no

³J.A. Bisson : *America's Far Eastern Policy*, p. 53.

nationalist part was against the achievement of complete freedom for the country from foreign subjection.

Nationalism in the colonies has been a development of the past four decades. Perhaps India is the first country among the colonies to organise a movement aimed at the progressive realisation of self-government. In the beginning these national movements were organised with a view to achieve freedom by constitutional methods and when progress by such methods was more halting than a movement towards greater freedom, the tendency for these movements had been to assert the right of freedom and go beyond the limits set by constitutional framework in demanding self-government. Especially during the inter-war period, the movements in colonies progressed quickly and soon the concessions made by the colonial powers fell far short of the demands. 'Nationalism has run ahead of reforms granted by the authorities. The increasing concessions, fairly grudgingly made, no longer keep pace with the demand and because even these concessions represent a compromise, they are essentially dangerous to the governing power.'

The pace and strength of the movement differed from colony to colony according to differences in local conditions and the system of government. The freedom movements in the colonies where indirect rule by the colonial power was the rule seem to have made least progress and the movement itself was started very late. In *Malaya* there was the beginning of a movement only in 1939 and even then it was not so much a movement of the people against the colonial power as the desire of the rulers to obtain greater freedom from the concentration of powers in the Federation. The fact that there was a native ruler immediately over the people made the organisation of a movement for freedom from foreign domination difficult. The situation was similar in the Native States of India. In French *Indo-China* only in two provinces, Tonkin and Annam, where Chinese influence was marked, was there marked progress in the freedom movement. Chinese nationalism had helped the development of the nationalist Annam Party and the progress of the movement compelled the French Government to concede some rights like the organisation of an Annamite army, the release of political prisoners, and the all-elective membership in Grand Economic Council but these measures were 'too tardy and too inadequate to counteract the results of half a century of cultivation of disunity and distrust among the native intellectuals.' There were sporadic outbreaks of violence against foreign government but never were they forcible and strong enough to challenge the supremacy of the colonial power because of the greater resources, better organisation and ruthless measures taken by the Government. *Burmese* nationalism had economic roots and as such we find a rapid progress of the movement since the depression years of 1930's. With the separation of Burma and the establishment of popular government, the party organisations developed intense national spirit and this aggressive nationalism was, to some extent, directed against the foreign nationals in the country. This was due to the

economic causes which dominate the national movement in Burma. In *Netherlands East Indies* the movement first started with the object of training natives to take a lead in working for the economic and educational advancement of the masses. But a popular movement had its beginning only in 1912, and in 1917 the goal of national movement was clearly laid down as attainment of independence. As in Indo-China there were violent outbreaks but were suppressed and the leaders were imprisoned but the movement gathered strength and followed broadly the methods and pattern of Indian National Movement. 'The influence of the nationalist movement in India upon the movement in the East Indies is not inconsiderable. Two institutions borrowed from India were congresses and non-co-operation. The Indonesian movement tore another leaf out of the Indian nationalist book by adapting a program of Swadeshi.'⁴ The movement in *Ceylon* was more constitutional than in any other colony of Asia. The agitation for reform was started and though there were riots in the beginning (in 1915), the progress of the movement was achieved more by working the constitution than by non-co-operation. The parties presented a united demand for reforms and the Ceylon National Congress represents the main trend of movement in the country. At the time of the outbreak of the War the political leaders were working the constitution.

Even in *India* where the beginning of the national movement was first made to achieve freedom from foreign domination it was only in 1907 that the Indian National Congress defined as its objective, the 'attainment by the people of India of a system of government similar to that enjoyed by the self-governing members of the British Empire', and only as late as 1929 did it define the goal as *Purna Swaraj* or complete independence. The freedom movement had gathered momentum and strength and the representatives were working the provincial governments in 1939 though the organisations in the country have not given up the goal of complete independence for the country. The government's attitude towards the movement alternated between repression, and negotiation, the general process being negotiation, breakdown, agitation, arrests and repression, freedom and again negotiations. But with every act of repression, the movement made further progress and became more vocal in the demand for independence.

So a general survey of position of national movements for freedom in Colonial Asian countries in 1939 shows that there was considerable awakening among Asian countries and ideas of nationalism had spread and movements were afoot aimed at achieving independence. The depression and the consequent economic distress that was widespread among these mainly agricultural countries strengthened the position of the movements. The doctrine of national self-determination took shape in the twenties but found adequate expression in the thirties.

⁴Amvy Vanderbosch : *Dutch East Indies*, p. 332.

The methods used by national movements vary from country to country. While in a colony like Ceylon the national parties were trying to work towards the goal through constitutional channels, and some colonies like India and Indonesia used the weapon of non-co-operation for achieving political ends, violence was not ruled out altogether as a method in the national movements. But national movements were at a great disadvantage in using violence because the colonial powers had better equipment and resources to meet violence with ruthlessness. Resort to violence by nationalist parties gave rise to more reactionary policy on the part of governing powers and so long as the government was under the strong control of the foreign power, violent outbreaks could never be sufficient enough to challenge the supremacy of the imperial power though for a short period, (only days) a temporary advantage might have been gained by the nationalist parties. That was the experience of violent outbreaks in Indo-China, Netherlands East-Indies and Burma. Imperialist powers exhibit similarity in the technique used to meet nationalism—oppression, extension of secret service, internment of leaders, refinements and amendments to Criminal Law and a slight constitutional advance.

But India had by this time made a distinct contribution to the freedom movements of colonial countries, thanks to the leadership of Mahatama Gandhi. The movement had added another weapon to the armoury at the disposal of nationalist parties in their freedom struggle. It had clearly demonstrated how it was still possible for people completely disarmed to follow the fight in as effective a manner as with arms. The great doctrine of 'non-violent non-co-operation' had shown that the pursuit of that line was more effective in achieving results in the context of conditions prevailing in Asian colonial countries. This principle of 'non-co-operation' was adopted by the Indonesians in their freedom struggle.

An extension of democratic systems of election would make the estimate of the strength of nationalist movement possible. It was found that the greater the extension of the democratic system, the greater were the demands put forward by nationalist parties. But it is wrong to think that a little concession makes the nationalist movements to press more and more for quicker progress and greater measure of freedom. The little concessions are not the spur for greater demands. On the other hand, the demands of nationalist movements were there and nationalist sentiment was already widespread. Only an extension of franchise and democratic methods of government would bring to evidence the existence of such nationalist sentiment. It would make possible to present the national demands in an organised way through the building up of a party system in the country. In the absence of conditions which made the canalisation and expression of nationalist sentiment through party channels possible, the discontent among the native population and growth of nationalism make themselves felt through occasional outbursts of violence. In those countries where the wide use of democratic methods was not made it had been found difficult by nationalist leaders to keep the members loyal to an organisation and it was not unnatural,

under such circumstances, to find the decline of existing parties and the rise of new parties very frequently. This condition gives us a key to the varying strength of organised nationalist movements in the different colonies in 1939. Of all colonies, the Philippines enjoyed the largest measure of democratic system of elections; next came India, Burma and Ceylon; thirdly, Indonesia may be mentioned as having some sort of an elective legislature, in Indo-China and Malaya, the official majorities predominated. In general it can be said that the democratic systems of election in South-East Asia are conspicuous by their absence. Under such circumstances, the growth and strength of organised freedom movements is directly correlated with the existence of democratic methods. The import of strong Chinese nationalism, communist ideals, and influence of Kuomintang have made possible for aggressive nationalism that was in evidence in Annam and Tonkin though democratic methods have been least introduced in Indo-China. In Indonesia the movement made rapid progress and was strong because of the inspiration the movement derived from Indian nationalism and the constructive activities undertaken by the political parties in the field of education and economic uplift of the masses.

This was, in general outline, the progress made by national movements for freedom in colonial Asia by 1939.

(iii) *Mandates.*

'The political system set up by the Peace treaties of 1919-20 may be described as a simple two-power pattern—two vast spheres of control labelled 'mandates', one French, one British: carefully separated from each other by frontiers and passport, visas and custom barriers, each divided again into distinct states with their own barriers, behind which local nationalism inevitably developed—and all this within what had hitherto been a politically undifferentiated Turkish-controlled Arab world This elaborate system rested on a foundation of confused and conflicting pledges, from the McMahon correspondence of 1915 to the Sykes-Picot agreement of 1916 and the Balfour declaration of 1917, and to the later Hogarth Statement of 1918.⁵

In accordance with the principle of non-annexation, enunciated by the victorious powers, it was decided after the Great War of 1914-18, that the colonies and territories of the defeated powers should not be divided among the victorious powers and appropriated as colonies. But the principle of 'non-annexation' envisaged only the negative aspect of the problem, while the principle of self-determination could scarcely be applied automatically to peoples which had not yet attained an adequate degree of political maturity'⁶ To meet this situation the mandates system was introduced in the Covenant of the

⁵'Henricus': Patterns of Power in the Arab Middle East; *Political Quarterly* Vol. XVII, No. 2 (April-June 1946) P. 96.

⁶League of Nations : *Mandates System : Origin, Principles, Application.* P. 14.

League of Nations according to which the authority, control or administration of these territories was to be vested in the League of Nations. But these functions were to be administered not by the international authority direct but through the nomination of a particular State to act for and on behalf of it. The territories which formed part of the Ottoman Empire were classed as 'A' mandates. It was felt that these communities had reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations could be provisionally recognised subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they were able to stand alone.⁷ According to the Covenant, the mission of the Mandatories in 'A' mandates was to consist mainly 'in developing their capacity to govern themselves and other in establishing their economic systems and social and other institutions on a more secure footing in order to fit them to take their position as independent nations.'⁸

The countries which were included in 'A' mandates were: Syria, Lebanon Palestine, Transjordan and Iraq. The supreme Council of the Allied Powers designated as Mandatory for the first two countries and Britain for the rest, and was approved by the Council of League of Nations in July 1922.

Generally, the external relations are controlled by mandatory powers and the mandatory power is responsible to see that complete freedom of conscience and free exercise of all forms of worship are ensured to all. The Mandatory is expressly required to encourage local autonomy.

The Mandate for *Palestine* contains the Balfour declaration by which the Mandatory Power is required to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine. This was bitterly opposed by the Arabs who demanded an immediate grant of self-government. The constitution promulgated by the Mandatory provided for a High Commissioner who is invested with highest executive powers. There was to be an Executive Council to assist him and the composition of the Council was to be in such a manner as may be directed by H. M. G. from time to time. The Legislative Council was to consist of 22 members of whom 10 were official. All laws passed by the Legislative Council required the assent of the High Commissioner. The elections held under this Constitution were boycotted by the Arabs and the High Commissioner suspended the constitution and the Advisory Council was reinstated in the place of Legislative Council. Though an 'A' Mandate, it resembled of 'B' Mandate in the provision that all powers of legislation and administration were to be invested in the Mandatory Power'. In effect, Palestine was placed on the level of a British colony and the Colonial services were freely used in filling up all the posts in the country. To facilitate Jewish immigration into the country a Jewish Agency was organised.

⁷*Ibid*, p. 22.

⁸*Ibid*, p. 27.

But Arab nationalism was against Jewish immigration and in 1928 the Arab Congress demanded the immediate stoppage of the Jewish immigration and the grant of full self-government. But the question of Jewish immigration was at the base of all outbreaks of violence in the subsequent years. A modified proposal for a Legislative Council put forward in 1935 was summarily rejected. There was revolt and the Peel Commission was appointed to go into the question. The Report shows that the causes were the same as in those of 1920, 1921, 1929 and 1933, namely, Jewish immigration, gradual transfer of land from the hands of the Arabs to Jews, the fervent nationalism of the Arabs accentuated by the granting of independence to Iraq in 1932. The Commission proposed a division of Palestine but such proposal was strongly opposed by Arabs. The Woodhead Commission which was required to prepare a plan for partitioning Palestine rejected the idea of partition both on financial and political grounds. The Jews and the Arabs were invited to discussions by the British Government and in the absence of any decisions arrived at by the Conference, the British Government issued a White Paper in 1939 on its own responsibility which rejected the idea of partition, provided for regulation of immigration at 10,000 per year for five years after which no further Jewish Immigration was to be permitted unless the Arabs were prepared to acquiesce in it. The Paper also stated that the object of H. M. G. was the establishment within ten years of an *independent* Palestine State in such treaty relations with the UK as will provide satisfactorily for the commercial and strategic requirements of both the countries in the future. The pre-occupation of Arab nationalists and Zionists alike on the problem of Jewish immigration made to some extent the insistence on progress of self-government of secondary importance because for either of them democratic representative self-government hinged on the settlement of this immigration problem. Arab nationalism made rapid strides during this period especially with westernisation and the attainment of independence by the neighbouring States.

The position of the mandatory administration of France was even worse. France virtually suspended the constitution of *Syria*, by dividing the country into three or four subdivisions, tried to weaken the strength of the national movement and had definitely treated, by concentration of administrative and legislative powers in the High Commissioner, as a colony. There were a number of insurrections which were suppressed by force. A large standing army was maintained in the country to maintain peace. In 1928, a Syrian National Constitutional Assembly was set up to draft the constitution but in the later stage due to differences between the Assembly and the French High Commissioner the Assembly was dissolved and a new Constitution was drafted after inclusion of obligations of Syria as a mandate, and elections were held under this constitution in 1932 but when the Legislature rejected the treaty put forward by the French High Commissioner in 1933 which gave complete control over Syria to France, the Legislature was suspended. In 1936 there was a general rising

in the country when France was compelled to promise certain rights to Syria. Negotiations were carried on and in December of that year a Franco-Syrian Treaty of Friendship and Alliance was signed. The treaty was drafted on the lines of the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty of 1930. Though the Syrian Parliament ratified it, the French Government hesitated to do it and contrary to the declarations, the French Foreign Minister did not bring the treaty before the chamber and this led to a crisis in Syria and the High Commissioner suspended the Constitution; national leaders were arrested and imprisoned in 1939. So the French administration of the mandate was one record of suppression of civil liberties and rights of Syrians, military administration and implementation of colonial rule by force with utter disregard to the requirements of the mandate.

The course of movement in *Lebanon* also closely followed that of Syria. Throughout the French administration tried to keep the nationalist movement in this country away from the Syrian movement. Since the upsurge always took place first in Syria, to prevent the spreading of insurgence the French used to concede a more liberal Constitution to the Lebanese, Lebanon became an independent and separate State in 1926 but not sovereign and the mandate continued as an integral part of the Constitution and the French High Commissioner had the right to veto or annul the laws if in his opinion they conflicted with the fulfilment of the mandate. So the Arabs non-co-operated. The French Government modified the Constitution in October whereby the powers of the Executive were increased and a unicameral legislature was established. With every fresh outbreak of insurgence in Syria, the Lebanese constitution was modified a bit. In 1929 again, the powers of the President of the Lebanese Republic were increased. When the Franco-Syrian Treaty was signed, Lebanon also signed a similar treaty with France. The Lebanese national movement was also as aggressive and as forceful as Syrian nationalism. The early emergency of Iraq from a mandate to that of an independent sovereign state gave a fillip to the national movements in the other mandates and the force of the movement was still further accelerated by the conclusion of the Anglo-Egyptian treaty in 1936.

Transjordan, of all the mandates, seems to have a fairly peaceful progress towards independence. A government with Emir Abdullah as the ruler was set up in 1921. A treaty was signed between England and Transjordan in 1928 after which a constitutional Government was set up. British imperial interests were secured by the treaty. Further powers were granted to the ruler by the modification of the Treaty in 1934 by which the right of appointing consular representatives in the neighbouring states was given to the king. This is the only mandate where the mandatory power has given the right of internal autonomy to the State so that the country can develop towards full self-government.

Thus in the mandates nationalism and national movements seem to be more aggressive and more alive to the rapid achievement of freedom than in the

colonies. This is due to the fact that these countries were enjoying a degree of autonomy previously and they are recognised under the Mandate System as independent nations and the mandatory powers were expressly put in charge of these countries to quicken their progress towards full independence. On the other hand, the Mandatory powers essentially treated them as colonies by extending full control, both internal and external, and tried to exploit these countries since they are of immense strategic importance to the mandatories. This explains why Arab national movements were very strong.

The mandate for *Iraq* was of a special character. The people expressed their desire to have a national government under an Arab ruler and so the principles of mandate were embodied in a treaty concluded in October 1922 between Great Britain and King of Iraq and the mandate was terminated in 1932. During the period of the mandate there was insistent demand from nationalist quarters for complete independence. Though Iraq became a sovereign State after the termination of the mandate, British influence is still exercised and the essential benefits are enjoyed by Britain under the treaty of Alliance signed on the termination of the mandate. The treaty was to be in force for 25 years. The oil-interests of Britain were safeguarded and the strategic importance to the country to Britain is retained through a clause by which all facilities, and assistance including use of railways, rivers, ports, aerodromes and means of communications is to be given by the King in the event of necessity.

When Turkey entered the last war (1914-18) on the side of Germany, the British Government in order to avoid the problem of divided allegiance, declared *Egypt* as a protectorate under Great Britain in 1914. During the War, Egypt was made the base for British military operations. But by 1917 violent agitations were carried on throughout the country for national self-determination.

After the war when the British government refused permission to the Egyptian Prime Minister and the National Committee to proceed to London to place their case before them, violent disturbances broke out. A commission sent out by British reported in 1920 emphasising the necessity for a bilateral agreement for any future settlement of the Egyptian problem. It had become clear by 1922 that no settlement short of complete independence, would be acceptable to the Egyptians. So in 1922 the British Government announced the termination of the Protectorate and pending final settlement, the security of communications of the British Empire in Egypt, the defence of Egypt, and the Sudan and foreign interests in Egypt were reserved to the discretion of H.M.G. Subject to these restrictions, Egypt was declared an independent sovereign state. From now onwards treaty negotiations were carried on, one party putting up a draft treaty, the other party rejecting it and presenting a counter-draft which in turn was rejected by the other. With every change in the ministry in Egypt fresh negotiations were started only to be rejected after some consideration. But

it was evident that the British Government was yielding more and more to the demands of the Egyptians. By 1930, the main points which led the Wafdist Cabinet to reject the treaty were that it did not recognise Egyptian sovereignty over Sudan and not permit unrestricted immigration of Egyptians into Sudan. The British Government was interfering in the internal politics of the country during the course of these years through one or the other of the rights reserved for it. In 1930 the whole Constitution of 1923 was thoroughly altered on the advice of Sidky Pasha by which no popular party could command a majority in the Legislature and the powers of the King were increased and government was carried on in spite of much popular opposition for 4 years under this new Constitution. In 1934 the Constitution of 1930 was abolished and for nearly two years personal government of the King with the aid of ministers was carried on. Due to these changes in internal politics, the question of the Treaty was for sometime in the background. Again with the restoration of 1923 Constitution treaty negotiations were started and especially because of the Abyssinian War both Egypt and Great Britain were eager to conclude a Treaty. Finally the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty was signed on August 26, 1936 under which Great Britain agreed to support Egypt for membership to League of Nations, to station troops only in the Canal Zone with a proviso that even these will be withdrawn after 20 years if Egypt is able to protect the zone by that time; agreed to fix the maximum number of troops that may be stationed at any time. Egypt agreed to help Britain in the event of war and there was to be an Anglo-Egyptian control over Sudan. The treaty also provided for opening of negotiations after 10 years for a revision if both parties agree; otherwise the revision is to be after 20 years. That was the position at the beginning of the war.

In territorial sovereignty and complete power over the subjects residing within the territorial jurisdiction of a State are fundamental to the complete independence of a State, restrictions upon the exercise of such rights are a limitation on the independence of any country. In this sense, *China* was not a completely independent sovereign state. The restrictions arose because of some rights enjoyed by other powers in China through such methods as leased territories, spheres of influence and of interest, demilitarised zones and foreign armed forces, concessions and settlements, and extra-territorial powers. In doing away with these restrictions it was more a question of settlement as between governments and vigorous protests at international conferences backed by solid public opinion in the country and we cannot talk of national movement to eliminate foreign influence in the same way as in a colony or a mandate. But yet since it is an attempt of a country to eliminate undesirable foreign domination and influence by such methods this problem is touched here.

Almost all the Western powers, in one way or other, acquired influence in China. Under the balance of power argument, one by one, all the European powers acquired leased territories along the coast of China. China's territorial

sovereignty was restricted during the period of lease in these territories. These territories constitute a virtual *Imperium in imperio* and when China appealed for the return of leased territories only Great Britain promised to return Weihaiwai and a treaty of Rendition of Weihaiwai was signed in 1920.

Another aspect of the limitation of territorial sovereignty was the setting apart of a part of urban areas for residence of aliens and in such areas such sovereign rights as the right of plenary jurisdiction over her own subjects in such areas, the right of passage of troops, and the administration of local councils have been denied to the Chinese Government. The Nationalist party of China was most vocal in vigorously renouncing such rights and almost all the countries have renounced such rights.

Under the Nine Power treaty of 1922, the contracting powers agreed not to support any agreements by their respective nationals designed to create spheres of influence in China.

The extra-territorial jurisdiction of foreign powers in China was created by treaty provisions, on the ground of fundamental difference between Chinese and foreign laws and the imperfection of the Chinese judicial machinery. In spite of repeated protests from China, the interested powers did not take any step to satisfy China's aspirations to full independence. The abolition of extraterritoriality was one of the basic features of foreign policies of the Nationalist Party since its coming into power in 1928. The interested powers took refuge under the plea that China had not carried out the recommendations of the Extra-territorial Commission of 1926. The break-out of the Sino-Japanese War at the time when the National Government was about to take drastic steps postponed the matter indefinitely. Since 1936, Chinese nationalism had to fight against Japanese aggression.

In Siam also the nationals of treaty powers were governed by the laws of their own countries. Besides these extraterritorial rights, Siam's freedom of action was restricted by the incorporation of such clauses as fixation of maximum rate of import duties etc. in the treaties. The Siamese felt such privileged treatment of certain foreigners as irksome and after the introduction of Constitutional regime when new agreements were negotiated with these powers in 1907 and 1938, the last vestiges of the extra-territorial system disappeared.

Siam and Iran, though they are politically independent, economically, their freedom was such restricted by the presence of foreign interests. But such influence has to be controlled and finally eliminated by following a careful policy by the governments concerned. In Siam, for example, with the establishment of a democratic government after the Revolution of 1932 and especially after the coming into power of Field Marshal Laung Pibul Songgram in 1938, a policy of restricting foreign economic influence was followed. But here we are concerned

with political movements and so the consideration of these countries need not detain us.

Among the other countries of Asia, Japan and Saudi Arabia enjoyed complete freedom and so their question need not be considered here because the problem of freedom movement to fight foreign domination does not arise in their case.

4. WARTIME DEVELOPMENTS

During the World War II significant progress was made by the national movements in Asia. In almost all the countries, the movements made rapid progress towards greater insistence for freedom and organisation to that end. The characterisation of the War as the fight for democracy by the Allies and the right of national self-determination asserted in the speeches of Allied leaders from time to time roused the national leaders of Asian countries to demand such rights for these countries also. The entry of Japan into the war and the subsequent occupation of South-East Asia by Japan accelerated the pace of freedom movements. Though Japan had also imperialistic designs and used these countries to subserve her own interests 'under Japanese occupation the natives in those areas (Burma, Indo-China, Java), as well as in Malaya, were given greater executive authority than they had ever exercised under the white man who was subjected to every conceivable indignity and 'loss of face.'⁹ But while these countries were temporarily out of the Imperialist fold of the past, they were now subjected to the control of a new Imperialist power, Japan. So, soon the national movements began to show their heads up against Japanese imperialism. Before the war, in so far as the nationalist movements were suppressed and so worked underground—like the Anti-Fascist Organisation parties and Communist party in Burma, and the strong underground movement in Indo-China—these national movements in South-East Asian Countries hoped to gain independence with the help of Japan. That a certain section of Indian nationalists under the leadership of Subhas Chandra Bose also believed in this method was made evident during the war period. Also the Japanese propaganda directed towards 'Asiatism' was not a little responsible for making this nationalism far stronger and deeper than ever.

Perhaps *India* is the first country in Asia to insist that she should have the right to participate in the Global war, as a free independent nation, of its own choice and not dragged into it as a subject country to England; The failure of the British Government to unequivocally declare the war aims and the future of India's status led to the resignation of Congress ministries which were then in power in eight provinces. The declaration of war by Japan and her conquest

⁹Gerald Samson : *The West is on Trial in the East : Fortnightly January 1946*, P. 42.

of South-East Asian countries which showed clearly to the Imperial powers the importance of support of native population for success led to some assurance of concessions in constitutional advance in post-war era and negotiations which at one stage appeared to end in agreement. failed in 1942 (Cripps Mission). The Indian nationalists became more restive and the Indian National Congress passed the famous 'Quit India' resolution in August 1942 and the precipitate action of Government in arresting all the leaders of Congress led to widespread disturbances all over the country. Congress was declared an illegal organisation and the absence of leaders and suppression of the organisation for sometime made it appear that the nationalist movement had weakened. But it was only to appear later with greater strength and vigour demanding complete independence of the country. The other political parties of the country, though they supported the government's war effort, were no less vocal about the demand for independence. Only their methods differed ; and the British Government found it to its advantage to postpone the question of independence by exploiting the attitude of the different major parties in the country. But the wartime struggle of the national movement in India had made it quite clear that the Imperial power could no longer try to keep itself in power by sheer force.

In the development of the national movement for freedom, there appeared a wider and wider rift between the two major political parties in India—the Congress on the one hand organised on a national basis, and the Muslim League on the other organised on a communal basis as an authoritative organisation of Muslim opinion. It is more and more evident that while the Congress demanded independence on the basis of a unitary India, the Muslim League based its achievement of independence on a division of India into two sections, Pakistan and Hindustan. The Muslim League claimed that it stands not only for freedom from foreign subjection, but more important, for freedom from the 'tyranny of Hindu majority'. The Lahore Resolution of the Muslim League (1940) for the first time stated that 'the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern Zones of India should be grouped to so constitute 'Independent States' in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and Sovereign.' It is not our purpose to trace the internal politics of the country. Sincere efforts were made by the parties to come to an agreement but so far have failed. These internal differences have been taken advantage of by the ruling power to postpone further constitutional advance of the country.

In *Ceylon*, where the nationalist movement was progressing more on constitutional lines, the insistence for a greater measure of self-government was no less evident though the popular government was in power. The danger with which the island was threatened with the Japanese occupation of Burma led to a Declaration, by the British Government, in May 1943, on post-war constitutional reform which envisaged the grant of full responsible government under the

crown in all matters of internal civil administration. Accordingly the Ceylon ministers were asked to frame a constitution for the island only to be withdrawn in February 1944 due to some disagreement with British Government. In pursuance of the Declaration, a Royal Commission was appointed to report on the matter. The Commission visited Ceylon from December 1943 to April 1944.

As pointed out earlier, the Japanese occupation of South-East Asia led definitely to a greater participation of nationals in the executive government of their respective countries. During the early period of occupation in *Burma*, Japan showed her intention to exercise full control over Burma for her own advantage. Soon the national leaders were disillusioned and they began to secretly contact British to drive the Japanese out of Burma. There was a part of the army, the Burmese army, ready to fight against Japan if sufficient help was forthcoming from allies. The position of the Indonesian national movement was also similar to that in Burma. The Dutch Government in *Indonesia* surrendered in March 1942. The Japanese treatment of the Indonesians soon led to resistance. 'Tyrannical Japanese rule could neither curb nor stamp out the growth of Indonesian nationalism; in fact, it was instrumental in fostering the growth of self-respect and patriotism among the masses, and in arousing the desire to be rid of Japanese as well as all other forms of foreign domination'.¹⁰ The anxiety of the Imperial Government to have the colony after the war under her protection was evident from Queen Wilhelmina's declaration in December 1942 by which equality of status for the component parts of the Netherlands Empire was assured. As a further step to regain control of Indies after the war, a provisional government of Netherlands East Indies was created in September 1944 by Royal decree with its seat in Australia and with Dr. Van Mook at its head.

In *Indo-China* also the nationalist movement was gaining strength during the war period and the Japanese even set up an 'independent Empire of Annam,' of course, though purported to strive for her expansion as an independent nation, primarily meant to facilitate the attainment of the objects of Japan by bringing the country, as a member nation, within the scope of co-existence and the co-prosperity sphere of Great East Asia which Japan was dreaming of. Here again, though the Imperial power, France, by her utter neglect of the colony during the time of the invasion forfeited the right to claim it back after the war, the Committee of National Liberation stated in December 1943 that the French mean to give a new political status by which within the French community and within the framework of the federal organisation, the different countries of the Union will enjoy a more liberal constitution. The nationalist movement was against the Japanese domination. The communists led an armed insurrection in 1940 against pro-Japanese elements but were ruthlessly put down, but they still

¹⁰Central Committee of Indonesian Independence : *Republic of Indonesia*, p. 9.

never gave up their sabotage activities. The League of Independence of the Viet Nam was formed in the same year which was a fighting alliance of the major political parties of the country. Since the declaration of adherence of the nationalist parties to the principles of the United Nations in 1944, the Vietnamese under the able direction of Dr. Ho Chi Minh started guerilla warfare and even before the surrender of the Japanese, in August 1945, a Provisional Government of Viet Nam was proclaimed with Dr. Ho Chi Minh as the President.

The manifestation of nationalism was no less evident in the countries of the Middle East. During the war, the Arabs co-operated with the Allies in the conduct of operations. This region of Asia was vital from the point of view of strategy and resources to the Allies. So the countries were brought under the Allied military control during the war. Iraq when Rashid Ali tried to overthrow the pro-Allied regime and establish pro-Axis government with the aid of Germany, the Allies took prompt measures to suppress the movement and military administration was extended to that country also. At Tehran (in December 1943) Allied leaders declared that the Governments of USA, USSR and UK are at one with the Government of Iran in their desire for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iran. In accordance with the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936, Egypt gave unreserved support to the Allies during their military operations in Libya and in general acceded to the Allies using the country as an operational base.

In *Palestine*, with the hope of attaining complete independence after the War, the Arabs supported the Allies. England passed in 1940 legislation delineating zones where sales of land by the Arabs to the Jews was either prohibited or restricted as put down in the White Paper of 1939. The restrictions proposed by the White Paper on further Jewish immigration into Palestine were also applied. From this time onwards, Zionist nationalism took the initiative and started the agitation for the establishment of a Jewish State. Then Biltmore Programme of Zionist Conference (May 1942) included the demand for unlimited immigration, the creation of a Jewish Army and the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth. In 1942 there were a series of bank robberies and the failure of the Bermuda Conferences in 1943 to produce any variation in the policy as laid down in the White Paper of 1939 led to a more direct attack on the British officials in 1944 in order to force a change of policy. President Truman favoured Jewish immigration which was strongly protested by the Arab countries. Finally an Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry was appointed in November 1945 to report on the situation. In a Statement in the House of Commons, Mr. Bevin observed: 'The problem of Palestine is itself a difficult one. The Mandate for Palestine required the Mandatory to facilitate Jewish immigration and to encourage close settlement by Jews on the land, while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the

population are not prejudiced thereby. The lack of any clear definition of this dual obligation has been the main cause of the trouble which has been experienced in Palestine during the last 25 years.'

In Transjordan because of the assurance of complete independence after the war there was no upheaval or agitation in the country.

In the French mandates, the defeat of France by Germany led to a new situation. In 1941, on behalf of the Free French Government, Catroux declared: 'France declares you independent . . . your (Syria and Lebanon) status of independence and sovereignty will be guaranteed by a treaty in which our relations will be defined. Pending its conclusions our mutual situation will be that of allies.' General de Gualle while affirming the above declaration observed that 'nothing could affect the judicial situation as established by the mandate; this situation could in fact only be changed with the consent of the Council of League of Nations.' In the elections that were held in Syria and Lebanon, nationalists were returned with overwhelming majorities. In Syria in the next two years a number of important powers were transferred to the national government without raising any objection.

But the position in Lebanon was not so peaceful. The new Parliament voted for a revision of the Constitution in which the question of Mandate was completely ignored. The French reaction was 'not only swift but more brutal than anything done hitherto by France in Lebanon'. The President of the Republic, the Premier and the Ministers were removed and imprisoned; the Parliament was dissolved, and the Constitution was suspended. This crisis led to widespread agitations and demonstrations in the country. The situation was quickly going out of control and French authorities realised that no compromise was possible under the circumstances. The prisoners were released and the Parliament was restored. So the nationalist movement was able to assert itself and during the rest of war period there was no serious agitation in the country.

Besides the development of national movements in each of the middle east countries, there was a clear development of a spirit of Arab unity fostered in order to combat all foreign influences in the Middle East and in particular to prevent further zionist developments in Palestine. After a series of informal meetings and conferences among the Arab countries, the protocol was signed in October 1944 by Egypt, Syria, Transjordan, Iraq and Lebanon at Alexandria; Saudi Arabia and Yemen signed the protocol in January 1945. The purpose of the Arab League was defined to be to 'execute agreements reached between member States; to organise periodical meetings to re-affirm their relations and co-ordinate their political programmes with a view to effecting co-operation between them so as to safeguard their independence and sovereignty against any aggression; and to concern itself with the general interests of the Arab countries.' The Charter of the Arab League was signed by these countries in March 1945. The pact made specific reference to the Palestine problem

and stated that 'the Committee considers that Palestine forms an important and integral part of the Arab countries and the right of the Arabs there cannot be infringed without danger to the peace and security of the Arab world.'

The close association of China during the war with the Allies led to a modification of the attitude of the western countries especially England and USA. The brave fight that China put up against Japanese aggression since 1936 had made the nation more conscious of its vast resources and creative ability and led to a greater determination to make the best use of them for the good of the nation. As a gesture of friendship early in 1943, USA and UK surrendered their rights of extra-territoriality in China and new treaties were entered into with these countries by China. But England had not surrendered Hongkong.

To sum up the position of the national movements at the end of war: In every country the movement took rapid strides and the demand for independence was more vocal. The failure of the Western powers to defend the colonies and their anxiety to get back their possessions and with them their power of control over them led to statements by the Imperial powers assuring a greater degree of self-government. Perhaps they did not realise that the pace of progress was far greater than they imagined it to be and the constitutional advance they promised might have met the demands of nationalists in 1939 and not at the end of the war. It was also more and more apparent that the national movements in many colonies, especially of South-East Asia are bound to take in future a more aggressive form. These countries which were under the Japanese occupation had the advantage of some military experience and especially the younger generations of these countries were convinced that freedom cannot be achieved unless they are prepared to use force and violence, if necessary. The desire for freedom and establishment of self-rule in the colonial countries of South-East Asia received an impetus from the organisation of the Indian Freedom Movement in war years by Subhas Chandra Bose in these countries.

5. POST-WAR POSITION

As observed already, the war has left behind it a strong, genuine and irrepressible desire of all subject countries to be independent and a seething national consciousness has developed. In the countries of East Asia, when the Japanese surrendered they handed over authority to the nationals of the country and the nationals took possession of the arms and ammunition left behind by the Japanese. The lag between the Japanese surrender and the actual landing of the imperial powers in their respective colonies had given time to the national parties to organise and establish independent governments in their respective countries. Naturally when people are accustomed to enjoy a greater measure of self-government and especially when they are able

to establish an independent government, they resent subjection to the colonial powers who have not established a good reputation in their conduct of administration.

The main feature, in the political field, in the post-war period, which attracts attention is the series of constitutional proposals put forward by the colonial powers to pacify the nationalists in the colonies. Mention has already been made in the previous section about the declarations by France, Netherlands and England with regard to their attitude towards their possessions in Asia. So the constitutional proposals put forward by the governing powers and the reaction of the national movements to such proposals will be dealt with in this section.

The Report of the Royal Commission on Constitutional Reforms presided over by Lord Soulbury was made the basis for constitutional reform in *Ceylon*. The British Government offered the constitution by the end of October 1945. Under the new constitution, two houses of legislature are to be established, the lower house to be elected by universal suffrage and the upper house to consist of nominated members (half the number) and members elected by lower house by proportional representation. The system of executive committees is to be abolished and instead a cabinet responsible to legislature is to be established. The subjects reserved to the Governor are External affairs and defence. First, the publication of the proposals raised objections from all quarters since they fell short of according dominion status to the colony. But finally the national parties, though not fully satisfied, have decided to work the new Constitution. The Ceylonese State Council accepted the proposals in November 1945 and the new Constitution came into force on May 15, 1946. The Secretary of State while observing that the new Constitution is an important landmark in the British colonial history remarked that this is the 'first instance of a British colonial territory with an almost entirely *non-European* electorate reaching the threshold of Dominion Status.

The proposals of the British Government, regarding the constitutional development in *Malaya*, envisaged the achievement in due course of self-government within the British Empire. The proposals published in October 1945 provided for the creation of a Malayan Union of the 9 Malayan State (Johore, Kelantan, Kedah, Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Perlis, Selangor, Trengannu) and the British territories of Penang (with the province of Wellesley) and Malacca, the constitution of Singapore as a separate Colony and the creation of a Malayan Union citizenship. Sir Harold MacMichael was appointed to arrange agreements among the Malayan rulers. The rulers of the non-federated States were not willing to join the Union especially with the instance of the position of rulers of the Federated Malay States before them. There was widespread agitation by the nationalist parties for the creation of a united and self-governing Malaya and

the movement gathered momentum. But the whole movement has not yet gained sufficient strength to assert itself. The British Government at this stage held negotiations with the Sultans and the Unionist Malay Nationalist Organisation and the proposals acceptable to all of them were drawn up. A sort of indirect rule by the British, by the Sultans occupying an intermediary position between the people on the one hand and the Imperial power on the other, has always made the position of the nationalist organisations a bit difficult and the Imperial power was quick to take advantage of this situation. The present constitutional set up is more aimed at unifying the country and strengthening Imperial hold rather than facilitate the growth of self-government. The Freedom movement of the country has yet to fight a long way before it can achieve its object—the establishment of a truly national government in the country.

But the struggle of the national movements in Indonesia and Viet Nam is not so passive as in Malaya. They were not only more determined to set up free governments but were able to resist successfully the Imperialist powers against imposing their pre-war colonial rule in their countries. Immediately after the Japanese surrender, in *Indonesia* on August 17, 1945, a 'Provisional Indonesian Republican Government' was formed by Dr. Soekarno to achieve independence and end the Dutch rule. The allies landed in Java only in September and the arrival of Dr. Van Mook complicated the situation. The Dutch Government refused to recognise Dr. Soekarno's Government on the ground of his collaboration with the Japanese. There were sudden outbreak of extremists and Van Mook declared in November that 'Indonesia will become a full partner in the Kingdom organised as a commonwealth of the participating territories.' But the Dutch Government took objection to this statement. Matters were brought to a head by General Mausergh's ultimatum. The possession by the nationalist parties of the arms and ammunition left by the Japanese gave them the capacity to resist Dutch military occupation. Dr. Sjahrir formed the Government in November which is to be responsible to the Working Committee of the Indonesian Republican Party pending election of a National Assembly. In February 1946 the Dutch Government made some constitutional proposals to Dr. Sjahrir imbibing the right of 'complete self-determination'. But after protracted negotiations, in June 1946, Dr. Sjahrir put in counterproposals which included, *inter alia*, a conclusion of a treaty according *de facto* recognition to the Government of Indonesian Republic; Netherlands guarantee of co-operation in establishing an Indonesian Free State; and the participation of outer provinces in the negotiations. At a Conference of the Indies held in July 1946, a resolution was passed which demanded the setting up a 'United States of Indonesia' consisting of Borneo, Java, Sumatra and Great East territories; and the duration of stay within the Netherlands Commonwealth and the relations between the Dutch Government and this Federated Indonesian State are to be laid down in a statute. In October the Indonesian Cabinet was reformed on a broader basis to carry on the fight for freedom more effectively. Finally, pending the

adoption of a Constitution for the Free Indonesian Republic, the Indonesian Provisional Government, called the Preparatory Committee for Independence of Indonesia, with an elected President and a Vice-President, was formed and a national Committee was also set up to help in the government of the country. Still some extremists were carrying on operations in certain parts of the country on a minor scale. But by end of 1946, the attainment of independence has almost become an accomplished fact. From November 1946, the President handed over the responsibility for laying down policies to a Cabinet headed by the Premier.

The outline of constitutional proposals by the French Government was broadcast by the Colonial Minister on March 25, 1945. The proposals envisaged the creation of *Indo-Chinese* Federation with five constituent parts. Annam, Tonkin, Cambodia, Cochin-China and Laos—the constitution of a Council of State under the presidency of the Governor-General, and also an Assembly, the organisation of the Indo-Chinese army, navy and air force which would be 'part of the general system of defence of the French Union'. France reserved for herself the direction of foreign relations. But the people were already working a democratic nationalist government in Viet Nam and so these proposals were rejected by the nationalists. In September the French started the offensive to regain control over the country but soon the nationalist forces were able to corner them and this ended in a truce only to be violated by France when she received reinforcements. But the Viet Nameese carried on the struggle. In the other two provinces of Indo-China, the struggle was not so violent and France concluded separate treaties with them. According to the treaty with Cambodia, France recognised it as an autonomous unit of the Indo-Chinese Union, France being represented by a Commissioner. A similar treaty was concluded with Laos.

Regarding Viet Nam (provinces of Tonkin, Annam and Cochin-China), France followed a very dubious policy according to her military disposition and strength in the country. France signed an agreement on March 6, 1946 recognising Viet Nam as a free State with its own legislature, army and finance and the Union of the three provinces is to be decided by a referendum. But contrary to the agreement, France recognised Republic of Cochin-China as an independent state of the Indo-Chinese Federation within the Union Francaise on June 1, 1946. This led to an outbreak of hostilities between the nationalists and the French again. The head of the puppet Government committed suicide in November 9, 1946. Negotiations are being conducted again regarding the status of Cochin-China and also the position of Viet Nam (Tonkin, Annam and Cochin-China) in the new Indo-Chinese Union.

The national leaders in *Burma* were very much disappointed with the *White Paper* of May 17, 1945 issued by the British Government. They wanted complete independence for *Burma*. But the *White Paper* provided for the re-establishment

of the 1937 Constitution in 1948. The immediate re-establishment of the government as was in existence in 1941 was considered to be not possible till the reconstruction of economy and the restoration of normal life. Hence till December 1948 the Governor is to carry on administration under Section 139 of the 1935 Act. The ultimate aim was laid down as the drawing up of a constitution by the representatives of Burmese people. Negotiations on the basis of this White Paper, between the Governor and the Burma Patriotic Front which helped the Allies to reconquer Burma and which was led by Major-General Aung San and other important leaders failed and an Executive Council without that Party was formed on November 1, 1945. There was agitation in the country on a large scale and the Anti-Facist People's League led by U Aung San even asked the Governor for passage facilities so that they can represent their point of view to the British Government but this was refused. The party passed a resolution reiterating the goal of Burmese as 'complete independence'. In May, U Saw, leader of the Myochit Party, demanded an unequivocal declaration as to the time limit within which Dominion Status will be granted to Burma and also the re-constitution of the Executive Council according to the 1935 Act. There were countrywide strikes and the Governor declared his intention to reform the Executive Council on a broader basis with the same powers as the pre-war Ministry. Then in September, the national parties having agreed to come into the Executive Council, a coalition Executive Council was formed. The continued insistence for progress towards self-government has led to the leaders being invited to London for a Conference and the talks have just concluded in which constitutional progress on the lines of Indian development was assured. Soon a Constituent Assembly is to be set up to draft the Constitution of Independent Burma. The extremists in the country are dissatisfied since the Delegation could not secure all the demands.

In *India* also the leaders of the Congress who were imprisoned were set free and the talks between the leaders and the Viceroy were held to arrive at an agreement even before the war with Japan was not over. The British Government reiterated the Cripps offer of 1942 which gave the right to frame a Constitution by Indians after the war. Pending the framing of such a Constitution and to facilitate the work, the British Government proposed the reconstitution of the Executive Council of the Governor General, and the portfolio of External Affairs is to be placed in charge of an Indian member. The appointment of a British High Commissioner in India was also proposed. But due to lack of agreement between the political parties the Conference failed and the deadlock continued. But the national consciousness of the masses has increased and no longer could the Government keep quiet. The elections to provincial and central legislatures were announced so that the pre-war constitution can be worked in the provinces. And by the first quarter of 1946 the popular ministries were in power in all the provinces. In February 1946, the Prime Minister of England announced the sending of a Mission of Cabinet Ministers to discuss and

formulate the method for framing a Constitution for India with the Indian leaders. After a series of discussions, the Mission issued the famous statement of May 16, 1946, which laid down the procedure for the formation of a Constitution-making body. The Mission rejected the idea of Pakistan as impracticable and undesirable. On the other hand, it laid down a three-tier constitution for the country based upon provinces, regional groupings and an All-India Union at the top. The procedure for setting up a Constitution-making body also was detailed and in view of the difficulty of securing agreement between the two major parties of the country in regard to setting up an Interim Government, the Viceroy was authorised to conduct further negotiations in that matter. The long term part of the Mission's statement was accepted by the parties. But later the Muslim League rejected it. After a number of discussions and failures to reach agreement, finally the Viceroy asked Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to form an Interim Government which was sworn in on September 2, 1946. Soon the Muslim League also entered the Interim Government. The Constituent Assembly has started on the work of framing a Constitution on December 9, 1946 with the Muslim League keeping out of the Assembly in terms of its earlier reversion of its first acceptance.

In the Middle East, the mandates under France, and Transjordan have attained independence. There was strong protest from *Syria and Lebanon* in March 1945 when the French troops began to land without their consent which was treated as a serious infringement of their sovereignty. There was a breakdown in the negotiations for a new treaty regularising the political status of Syria and Lebanon with reference to French rights in the area. Matters were brought to a head and fighting broke out in Damascus. The British intervened to restore order. Then an agreement was reached by which the British and the French military delegations agreed to evacuate troops from Syria which is to begin on March 11, 1946 and end by April 30. In Lebanon, British troops are to be evacuated by the end of June 1946 and French troops by April 1, 1947. The sovereign status of these countries was recognised by their being invited to attend the San Francisco Conference as sovereign states.

In consonance with the assurance of complete independence by the British Government, a treaty of alliance and friendship was signed between Great Britain and *Transjordan* on March 22, 1946 by which Britain recognised the full independence of the country. This treaty is to be in force for 25 years. Under the terms of the Constitution, the *Philippines* also became an independent country from July 4, 1946.

But due to the problem of Jewish immigration and the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine, the question of independence of *Palestine* is being postponed. The Anglo-American Committee recommended the immediate grant of 100,000 certificates for Jewish immigration, and laid down that the principle should be 'Jew shall not dominate Arab, Arab shall not dominate

Jew'. The Committee stated that Palestine should be neither a Jewish state nor an Arab state and finally laid down that until hostility disappears, the Government of Palestine should continue under the mandate execution of a trusteeship agreement under the United Nations. These recommendations raised a storm of protest from the Arab countries. In December 1945, the Arab League admitted the Arab community of Palestine to its membership. On the other hand, the Zionist Conference in its resolution in August 1945 stated: 'There can be no solution to the inseparable twin problems of the Jewish people and Palestine except by constituting Palestine undivided and undiminished as a Jewish State in accordance with the purpose of the Balfour declaration'. Britain proposed a federal plan for Palestine (July 1946) which is to consist of four units: An Arab province, a Jewish province, the district of Jerusalem and the district of Negeb. The federal government is to be in charge of the following subjects: defence, foreign relations, customs and excise and initially to administer law and order also. Britain invited the Arab countries and the Arab and the Jewish communities of Palestine for a Round Table discussion. The Conference that opened on September 9, was attended only by the Arab League and the representatives of other Arab states, the Jewish Agency and the Arab Higher Committee of Palestine having rejected the invitations. At the Conference, the Arab Delegation presented counterproposals according to which Palestine is to be independent by end of 1948; a Constituent Assembly is to be set up; the provisional government should present a draft constitution embodying a unitary constitution. The Conference was postponed to December for further consideration of the proposals. Meanwhile, President Truman supported the Jewish Agency's solution of 'creating a viable Jewish state'. It has more and more become clear that America is also as much interested in the Palestinian problem as Britain and perhaps this will form one of the important issues at the forthcoming elections for Presidency in America if the problem is not settled by then. The Conference has again opened in London; this time the Arabs of Palestine are also participating. Finally, it has been decided to refer the issue to UNO as no agreement could be reached by the parties during the course of the discussion.

In *Egypt*, movement was set on foot pressing for the revision of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936 so as to remove restrictions on the country's independence and for the withdrawal of foreign troops. Under the terms of the treaty a revision can take place at the end of 10 years if both the parties agree and so a formal request for revision of the treaty was made on December 20, 1945. On May 7, 1946 Britain announced its intention to withdraw troops by agreement regarding the stages and the dates by which such withdrawal is to be effected. Negotiations for the revision of the treaty commenced on May 9, 1946 and were carried on for quite a long time, and the country became more restless and demonstrations were held. In November there was a split in the Egyptian treaty Delegation, the Premier acceding to the treaty. The main issue was the Sudan

problem. The British contemplated no change in the present position of Sudan on the ground that it may impair the right of the Sudanese people ultimately to decide their own future. Serious riots broke out in the country and there was a demand to break off the negotiations. But the negotiations were continued and the final draft treaty provided for evacuation of British troops in 2 years 9 months and also a clause to secure the unity of Nile Valley was inserted. But a certain section of nationals started passive resistance and advocated general strike as a protest against the proposed treaty. There were demonstrations all over the country and with the change of Government, further negotiations were set on foot regarding the Sudan issue and because no agreement could be reached, Egypt has decided to put her case before the UNO.

In *China*, with the defeat of Japan, the fight against aggression has also ceased. Moreover in the footsteps of England and USA followed the other countries of Europe in giving up their rights of extra-territoriality. Belgium and Norway gave up their rights even in 1943. The other countries which relinquished their rights formally are : Netherlands, Canada, Sweden, Denmark and France. Negotiations are carried on to enter into fresh treaties with these countries. A new Constitution was also framed for the country and brought into force from February 12, 1947.

Since the defeat of *Japan*, the Allies started 'educating' the Japanese in the democratic principles of government. A new constitution was announced in March 1946, which provides for a limited constitutional monarchy, contains a 'Bill of Rights' and provides for a Cabinet responsible to the Diet. Elections were held under the new Constitution and on the results of the election a Liberal-Progressive-Non-party Coalition Cabinet was formed headed by the Liberal leader, Shigern Yashida. The government is under the general control and supervision of General MacArthur. The country is to advance on democratic lines of self-government.

This in general, is the outline of political conditions in the Asian countries. The resurgent nationalism of the Asian countries are sure to carry on their struggle against the Imperial powers till they attain complete independence. The attainment of independence by one Asian country only adds to the enthusiasm and determination of the national movements in the other non-self-governing countries of the continent to pursue their struggle to a successful close. Every country in Asia is not only anxious to establish self-government for itself but is equally anxious to see its neighbours also enjoy such independence. One prominent instance of such a tendency is the support of the Arab countries for an independent Palestinian State. Though many Asian countries are not in a position to help each other in their struggle for freedom materially, a common bond in the form of their struggle for a common object unites them and keeps up the morale. Due to differences in the local conditions and degree of progress, the attainment of independence by these countries will vary from the point of time, from country to country. The freedom movement in one

country derives its inspiration from the progress of a similar movement in the neighbouring country. So the politically advanced countries on the road to independence have so far served as sources of inspiration for the less advanced countries. A study of the progress of movements also shows that the democratic nature or otherwise of the existing form of government ; and the progress of the freedom movement is to a certain extent dependent on this factor. The existence of a democratic form of government will regulate the movement and canalise the forces into constitutional channels while absolute government of colonial power will besides hindering the organisations of national parties drive the whole movement underground. Though the freedom movement in the country cannot be rooted out the suppression by the ruling power only prevents a gradual development of self-government and gives place for periodical resurrections, more revolutionary and violent, by nationalist forces to establish and assert their independence. Again the chances of quickening the pace of progress towards independence seem to be greater where there is a direct form of government by the colonial power. An indirect form of government, for example, Malaya, only delays the birth of nationalism because the Imperial power exercises power through the native rulers and so unless the rulers themselves organise a movement to attain independence from foreign subjection, it is difficult to organise effective freedom struggle.

The study also reveals a similarity in the technique employed by the Imperial powers to suppress the national movements for freedom. The methods of repression employed the ruthlessness with which they are employed, the policy of creating as many dissensions within the country as possible to prevent a united nationalist movement by subtle methods of playing one section on the other—all these bear close resemblance as between the Imperial powers.

6. ASIA AND THE UNO

Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations deals with the declaration regarding non-self-governing territories. This Chapter applies to all dependent territories of members of the United Nations under which the members accept the obligation to promote the well being of the inhabitants as a 'sacred trust'. To this end they accept the obligation in the political field to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its people and their varying stages of advancement. (Article 73 b). Further there is a formal commitment by these States to submit regularly statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social and educational conditions in their respective 'dependent' territories (Article 73 e). In spite of the good intentions that have been expressed in this

Chapter, the only specific obligation is in Article 73 (e). Otherwise, there is no provision for enforcement of these lofty ideals set forth in case any colonial power acts in contravention of the above Article 73 (b). It stands on the backing of public opinion and international opinion on the matter. The next two chapters deal with International Trusteeship system, the territories which come within the scope of this system being,

- (a) territories now held under mandate ;
- (b) territories which may be detached from enemy State as a result of the Second World War ; and
- (c) territories voluntarily placed under the system by States responsible for their administration. (Article 73) This system is an improvement on the Mandates system in that the new system not only make possible the transfer of colonies to international trusteeship by voluntary action of the colonial powers but places more emphasis on the positive promotion of the welfare of the inhabitants of the trust territories. After all, experience in the administration of the mandated territories has shown that in order to make the trustee power to adhere to the terms of trusteeship there should be a strong supervisory international authority which should pay periodic visits and conduct enquiries to judge the progress made and this has been provided in the Charter.

The initial conflict among the authors of the Charter as to the definition of goal of progress of non-self-governing territories reveals that the colonial powers still have an idea of keeping these colonies under their control. The use of 'self-government' deliberately in preference to 'independence' in defining the goal of political development in these dependent territories necessarily leads to the interpretation of 'self-government' as merely the right of the colonial peoples to govern themselves under the tutelage and protection of the metropolitan powers. Subsequent statements by the colonial powers regarding the constitutional advance of their colonies in Asia and their behaviour towards the national movements in Asian countries only confirm this interpretation of 'self-government'. Under such circumstances it is natural for the freedom movements of these colonial countries to be suspicious of the designs of colonial powers and these national parties basing their demands on the right of national self-determination will not accept the proposals put forward with such a limited scope for development of their countries. If national parties are to be enlisted in the cause of more gradual but definite constitutional progress then the ruling powers should unequivocally state that the ultimate goal to be reached by colonies is 'independence'. If the International Organisation is to work for the peace, security and prosperity of the world, it should make it no less clear that the ultimate goal envisaged by the International Organisation is complete independence for all countries. Of course, such dependent territories after attaining independence can, if they so choose, remain

as members of the Commonwealth of the Empire in which they were members before attaining independence. Moreover, in view of the dissatisfaction expressed by the nationalist parties at the constitutional proposal put forward by these colonial powers for further advance of colonies, instead of each country, after a series of negotiations with the colonial power with inevitable breakdown in the end, appealing to the UNO with dubious chances of being properly heard, the International Organisation can institute a Commission of experts who will visit these colonies and after a thorough enquiry into the political conditions and strength of nationalist parties, can recommend a constitution appropriate to the present conditions in each of these territories and also suggest the pace of development towards independence. The colonial powers also can prove their sincerity in regard to their intentions by accepting the recommendations of such an International Commission.

Of all the Asian countries, now, the Philippines, China, India, Afghanistan, Syria, Lebanon, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Egypt are members of the UNO while the other countries are represented by their ruling powers in the UNO. In such a context the view that will always be heard in the International Organisation is that of the ruling power and not that of the colony. It is quite possible that the interests of these Asian countries may not be fully represented in the International Organisation and judged by their economic resources, population and strategic situation, these countries should be given a better representation in the International Organisation. In considering their case, the International Organisation should no longer think in terms of the pre-war conditions of these countries. There is a marked change in the political outlook and development of nationalism in these countries. Is it too much to ask for a better representation of these countries in the International Organisation than is the case at present?

Printed at the
Cambridge Printing Works
Delhi.