It is one thing to frame a democratic constitution and it is another to implement and work the same with success. As a matter of fact, constitutions are what the operating forces make them. Democratic constitution may function undemocratically and monarchy may assume the representative character, in clear disregard to the written provisions. With the passage of time, the provisions of a written statute become a tool in the hands of politicians. This is applicable to the Indian Constitution also. Having thrown even a cursory glance at the developments of the post decade, it becomes quite evident that our institutions are not what they were in the 50s and 60s. Office of the Governor was not considered in the pre-1967 period as important as in the post-1967 period, though in case of the States it was not less turbulent even then. But the party fortunes after 1967 to a large extent changed the character of this office. Fractious with its "colonial origin, autocratic ethos and bureaucratic background" in entirely different circumstances, office of the Governor was bound to be controversial. The lack of understanding, ambiguous language of the Constitution, partisanship character of most of the Governors, in view of their previous affiliations with Congress Party, and the political considerations

1. Viewed against the background of constitutional development in independent India, it may safely be said that the prevailing circumstances have converted the cabinet government into 'Prime Ministerial Government'. Gone are the days when the Prime Minister drew legitimacy from the party. Now it is other way round.
gave further impetus to the controversy. The fact is that the "parliamentary climate" and "constitutional niceties" were so much so vitiated that the Governors in various States were characterized as "favourite boys" of the Congress and so on. This sorry state of affairs could have been avoided had the provisions pertaining to the office of the Governor been interpreted in somewhat harmonious way, in a certain set principles of constitutional law demand. The tragedy is that even the judges, in view of their background of the British jurisprudence, interpreted certain provisions in isolation. They did not care for the circumstances in which the Constitution was framed, the intention of the framers and cardinal features of the cabinet government, while expressing their opinions on various provisions.

In so far as the other gentlemen are concerned, they also did not do justice to the subject. When the coalition government came into existence in various States after the Fourth General Elections in 1967, a host of articles and research papers appeared and seminars were held in a number of universities and other institutions concerned with the constitutional study. But for want of depth, the importance of what certain gentlemen stated, disappeared before the same appeared in black and white in newspapers and journals. Despite this, they started expressing the sweeping opinions that office of the Governor was completely exploded one and as such further research was useless, "as if wisdom must be aged, like wine, to make it better".
As a matter of fact, research on the political institutions never ends. The developments create new issues and new problems. The political developments depend upon various factors, such as political culture, sub-systems, balance of forces, nature of leadership and so on. Besides, with the passage of time, these factors also are bound to assume quite a new shape. Therefore, until all the political activities come to a standstill, it would be naive to say a final word about the political institutions. Like other institutions, office of the Governor would go on assuming a new shape and as such sooner or later it would demand further inquiry.

As far as the question of their own interpretation is concerned, it seems futile to dispute that, in view of the fact that it differs from man to man. 2 Democracy may mean one thing in the U.S.A. and another in the U.S.S.R., and some other open societies. The implications of the Russian view of democracy and Abraham Lincoln's definition of the same, if strictly applied to the Indian situation, one is bound to draw conclusion that there is no democracy in India. But it is considered as the largest democracy in the world. But the difficulty is that some of the gentlemen thought "discretion" and "situational discretion" one and the same thing. Some did try irrespective

2. Even the judiciary has not been consistent in interpreting the Constitution. In 1963, the interpretation of Allahabad High Court in regard to Article 309 was immediately contrary to that of Bombay High Court. It means even the written provisions are one thing in U.P., and another in Maharashtra.
of the dissimilarity in political and socio-economic climate, to transplant the British parliamentary democracy in entirety. There is no doubt that the parliamentary democracy found its origin in Great Britain, but the fact is that there is a great difference between the parliamentary democracy of 18th and 20th centuries in the same country. It leads to its logical extension that the parliamentary democracy of India in some respects is bound to differ from that of England and also its own nature of earlier stage. The fact is that the institutions with the same formal set-up may assume a different operation and even serve "dissimilar purposes" from one part of the nation to another. Here the emphasis is not on that we should not follow the British Conventions, but on the desirability of first creating a fertile ground.

In view of the fact that the new materials are being produced in social sciences rapidly, it cannot be claimed that the present attempt would be sufficient for all times to come. Even if it is so, the earnest students of Indian parliamentary democracy would have to "adopt" themselves to the matters still in the memory of time. More than this, as Popper says, "Political Science progresses with conjectures and refutations." Here the only claim is that whatever I have in my control has been presented in a simple and clear way, after following the advice of an American Professor that "work is judged on the basis of how well the author covers what he says he has set out to cover."
So far as the approach to the subject is concerned, it is straightforward political with a legal "best." It seemed somewhat desirable and sound because even the legal luminaries confess that "legal quietness in the absence of "practical politics" are not sufficient to understand a particular political system. Besides, it has been my constant effort throughout this study to point out the danger spots where the shoe pinches and where it is likely to be so in a particular situation. To achieve the desired end, the intention of the framers, judicial decisions, implementation of various provisions and spirit and principles of parliamentary democracy have been thoroughly exhausted. A comparative study of corresponding provisions in certain other countries also found a considerable scope in case of the fact that in the very beginning even our judges found in an embarrassing position to interpret the written provisions without any peradventure. They had to seek guidance and assistance from other similar political systems.

The entire work has been divided into eight chapters. In the first chapter the evolution and growth of office has been discussed. The second examines the appointment, salary, oath or affirmation and privileges. The third deals with the relations between the Governor and the Council of Ministers. The relationship of the Governor and the Legislature has been analysed in the fourth chapter. Governor's role in the legislation finds place in the fifth chapter. In the sixth chapter the power to grant pardon has been examined upon.
Chapter seventh is concerned with the Governor and the constitutional breakdown. In the eighth and last chapter certain conclusions have been drawn. Though to some extent overlap exists between the above cited divisions, yet where it is an "interrelatedness" instead of "separateness" has been emphasized.
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