

Editor, *Journal of Asian Studies*:

Mr. Dennis Dalton's rather passionate defence of Professor Hugh Tinker's *India and Pakistan: A Political Analysis*, which was reviewed in the *Journal* (November 1963), will not stand up to serious examination, for the following reasons.

The reference to Professor Tinker's having belonged to the ranks of the "Heaven born Guardians" of the British Raj was intended purely for introductory purposes. Although Mr. Dalton has "easily [and quite mistakenly] deduce[d] the indictment that follows," Professor Tinker's brief connection with the Indian Civil Service has some relevance to his interest in the subcontinent, scholarly and otherwise. This connection is mentioned on the dust cover of the book, and the adjective "Heaven born" can be found in the book itself (p. 160). I did not make any inference, direct or implicit, from this to the effect that "Professor Tinker had not yet liberated himself from the evil influences of English imperialism." This is a product of Mr. Dalton's imagination.

Mr. Dalton's second criticism of the review, regarding as a howler my interpretation of Professor Tinker's thinking on Indian democracy and his tendency to measure it against the nineteenth-century Western liberal yardstick, completely misses the point. Mr. Dalton perhaps has a much greater familiarity with Professor Tinker's thought than those who have only his written works to rely upon. In the book under review, at any rate, there is no explicit reference to the inapplicability of Western concepts or institutions to the Asian context. It does seem quite clear from a reading of the whole book and a perusal of the bibliography that Professor Tinker has relied heavily on Western concepts of democracy as norms—especially the nineteenth-century liberal conception of democracy. All of the three books on India which Professor Tinker has referred to as "outstanding" in his bibliography have as their foundation such a concep-

tion of democracy. I have drawn attention to this point in the review, although Mr. Dalton is silent about it. That Professor Tinker follows the general line of approach of Masani, Harrison, and Woodruff in his analysis can be illustrated by drawing attention to numerous allusions, comparisons, and *obiter dicta*. Thus, on page 203 there is the rather inappropriate comparison between Mr. Nehru on the one hand, and Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Churchill on the other; on page 201, he expresses the view that "should another major step be taken away from an electoral system based on 'one man, one vote,' towards a 'communitarian society,' it will mean abandoning one of the fundamental features of Western liberal democracy"; and, on page 207 Professor Tinker has expressed the nostalgic hope that Western European political ideals might rub off on future generations of educated Indians and Pakistanis—to cite only three instances.

In his anxiety to prove that the reviewer's "assessments of Professor Tinker's preconceptions" are wrong, Mr. Dalton accuses me of having failed to see "the full significance of Professor Tinker's deep commitment . . . to the political thought of Jaya Prakash Narayan, a commitment which deserves serious consideration." A careful reading of Professor Tinker's book and articles would suggest, as I have pointed out in the review, that his interest in the political philosophy of Jaya Prakash, particularly his extension of Gandhian ideology, is a more than casual one (see especially, pp. 114–118). It is, however, difficult to see how anyone can reach the conclusion from this that Professor Tinker has "a deep commitment" to Jaya Prakash's political thought. Mr. Dalton himself provides the anti-climax to his hasty conclusion by pointing out that few political theorists have taken Jaya Prakash's ideas seriously. If Professor Tinker were deeply influenced by Jaya Prakash's ideals, surely he, as a political scientist, would have given them a more detailed treatment than a few incidental remarks. Jaya Prakash's *Plea for Recon-*

*struction of Indian Polity* does not even find an unasterisked place in Professor Tinker's Guide to Further Reading at the end of the book.

Thus, no preconceptions have been attributed to the author which do not seem reasonable from a study of his writings and which have not been substantiated adequately in the review. Errors of fact, logic, and interpretation into which Mr. Dalton has fallen might easily have been avoided if he had been less impetuous and more inclined to take the review at its face value. He would have saved the author

embarrassment, and the reviewer the added labour of refutation.

T. V. SATHYAMURTHY  
*University of Singapore*

Editor, *Journal of Asian Studies*:

With reference to my review of Ssu-ma Lu's *Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai chuan* which appeared in the May 1964 issue of the *Journal* (XXIII, 3, pages 469-471), I regret that the name of the author was changed by the *Journal* editors. Ssu-ma is the surname, not Lu.

LI YU-NING  
*Columbia University*

LI YU-NING