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EVALUATION

Co-ordination of Thought and Action

Undoubtedly Radhakrishnan was primarily a man of thought, but he felt that what was theoretically realised should be practically realised within, should be practically/ outside. Monastic virtue was not good unless and until it was translated into good deeds.

He had studied original religious works and had firm faith in them, but while he was attached to the principles, he was prepared to be generous in their application in the changing circumstances. Thus he asserted in the Asian Relations Conference in 1946, "It is impossible for us to have any kind of spiritual life or development while our bodily health is so weak and when society is so unhealthy. Unless all ordinary men and women are given fundamental rights, it will be impossible for us to have any kind of spiritual development". The change that came over him from the stage he wrote "Hindu View of Life" (1926) to the stage of "Religion and Society" (1942) will make this abundantly clear. This is detailed in Chapter III.

He was a man of religion as well as philosophy but by training and profession he was more a philosopher. While he had firm faith in intuition it is also true that what he saw through intuition he expounded with the help of reason. In
other words, the philosopher in him served to eliminate the religious man in him.

In the earlier years he undoubtedly was more critical of the West. Having studied Tagore he was influenced by Tagore's views and criticised the materialism of the West. Radhakrishnan saw two world wars, the rise of communism, the rise and fall of fascism and the decline of imperialism. His views on different subjects give ample evidence of his criticism of the West. But he did not agree that political and economic solutions of these social problems, suggested in the West, were adequate. He emphasised the human and moral aspects of these problems and the remaking of man. As years rolled on he became more and more aware of the weakness in our society and thought of remedies.

It is thus abundantly clear that originally a man of thought Radhakrishnan had an urge that the ideals set forth in the religious scriptures have got to be put into practice in the society as a whole. In short he wanted a fair co-ordination of thought and action.

Academician

Long before he entered the political field, Radhakrishnan was reputed as a great scholar, philosopher and academician. His volumes on Indian philosophy as also the series of lectures he delivered at different Universities (which were later on brought out in Book form), have gone
a long way in acquainting the western world with the basic ideas of Indian Philosophy and the foundations on which Indian culture has thrived. He is considered to be the most lucid interpreter of Indian Philosophical thought which many others have found very difficult to expound.

Diplomat

Diplomacy is often defined as the art of reducing to the minimum the scope of conflict. This is done through intelligent conversation, prudence and tact. A diplomat has to be circumspect. He has to weigh his words before he uses them. He has always to look into the future and estimate the possible repercussions of his utterances.

Radhakrishnan was a master of expression. He had the rare capacity to take a decision and stick to it firmly, yet politely. This was a rare skill with which he worked during the tenure of his different political appointments.

Ambassador

Radhakrishnan’s tenure as ambassador in Moscow was memorable indeed. He was recognised as a person far above the usual run of politicians and diplomats. His wisdom and grace seemed to remove the suspicion that had fallen on the relations between India and the Soviet Union. Whereas our previous ambassador was cold-shouldered, Radhakrishnan was quite amiable and hence was received cordially more than once. He spoke with Stalin on a level of easy equality that no
politician in his place could possibly imagine. It is on the record that as Radhakrishnan left Stalin he wished him well and tapped him gently on the shoulder. This was a gesture which the all-powerful Stalin had not perhaps experienced for a long stretch of years. It almost brought tears to the eyes of the reputed man of steel.

In a way Radhakrishnan built up the foundation on which the future cordiality in Indo-Soviet relations was based.

Vice-President

When Radhakrishnan was elected Vice-President in 1952 his election was welcomed by all sections and political parties mainly because he belonged to no political party as such. One of the essential duties of the Indian Vice-President is to preside over the Rajya Sabha. Radhakrishnan proved by his fair conduct, the belief which all the members had in him. He conducted the proceedings of the House with fairness and justice. He could maintain discipline in the House as he had the rare skill to settle disputes with a humourous note. No one felt any rancour or partiality in what he decided. He had the right insight into legislative process with which he was instrumental in getting some important legislative measures passed urgently by the House.

Another important assignment that is usually given to the Vice-President is to act as a roving ambassador of the nation. Radhakrishnan visited several countries during his tenure as Vice-President and successfully carried India's
message of peace and good-will. It is understood that Nehru depended on Radhakrishnan for this purpose as it was Radhakrishnan alone who could aptly explain India's stand on the various political issues in international affairs at that time.

Radhakrishnan was highly successful as Vice-President. Even Mr. Bunker, the American Ambassador was so impressed that he had told Mr. Lyndon Johnson, the then Vice-President of the United States who was on a visit to India, that Johnson should model himself on Radhakrishnan.

President

In evaluating Radhakrishnan's role as President of India, it is essential to bear in mind the limitations of this office. The Constituent Assembly wanted to pattern India's parliamentary democracy after the British model. It therefore placed the Prime Minister in the centre of the picture. The role of the President was similar to that of the British monarch. The President was to be elected by the elected members of the Parliament and the State Assemblies. He was to invite the leader of the largest party in the Parliament to form the government and to accept his recommendations in appointing ministers.

The only power he had in the matter of legislation was that he could return a legislative measure to Parliament for reconsideration and withhold his assent meanwhile. He had
no right of discussion on matters within the perview of the cabinet.

This does not, however, mean that the President is only a dummy or a figurehead. He has a right "to be consulted, to encourage and to warn". Power, however, is one thing and influence another and much would depend on the influence he could bring to bear on different matters to be decided. The first President Dr. Rajendra Prasad did exercise such an influence in the matter of the Hindu Code Bill and India's policy towards Pakistan, for Dr. Rajendra Prasad was an active Congress leader from the beginning and continued to have his hold on the organisation and its Working Committee. Radhakrishnan was comparatively an outsider and he came to office at a much later stage. He could not therefore be expected to wield political influence.

There is another factor namely the personality of the Prime Minister. Nehru was also an active Congress leader. He had taken a leading part in the freedom struggle. He was the political heir of Mahatma Gandhi and was always accepted as the spokesman of the nation. Radhakrishnan had little chance to influence Nehru, but it is also true that he had his own ways of compromising with Nehru if he had any differences. Actually he had fewer differences with Nehru and almost always played the popular role of interpreter of India's policy (Nehru's policy) at home and abroad.
In the course of his speeches he emphasised truth and non-violence, the need for international understanding and world peace, people's consent, role of reason and consensus. While he favoured the strengthening of our defences he cautioned against retaliatory measures against Pakistan. He even went to the extent of saying, "We have been adopting for centuries the retaliatory attitude: wickedness for the wicked. But Gandhiji displaced this attitude with that of love even for the enemy. Are we doing it? We call Gandhiji the Father of the Nation. But what have we acquired from him?"

On the Kashmir question he emphasised the need of the satisfaction of the people of Kashmir. Before Tashkent he advised Shastri that he should try to bring people together and not break away. Yet he emphasised that the nation's self-respect should not be bartered.

His role at the time of the Chinese invasion deserves a special mention. Though the Constitutional Head of the State Radhakrishnan took the initiative in some of the important decisions such as the dismissal of V.K. Krishna Menon as the Minister for Defence. He had also warned that appointing Gen. Kaul, as the Commander of the new corps, would be a costly error. Radhakrishnan was fearless enough to criticise the government for its credulity and unpreparedness with regard to the border defences. At the same time he had a generous outlook which saw beyond the dust and din of the battle field and expressed his satisfaction at the growing world-consciousness.
As the highest holder of the office in the country, Radhakrishnan expressed his views on several outstanding problems before the country and before the ministry. He was forthright in his criticism of our national weaknesses. In his broadcast to the Nation on 15th August 1965, he referred to food adulteration and condemned it as the most heinous of anti-social practices. He condemned the profiteers, the black-marketeers and the speculators as the worst enemies of the nation and said they must be dealt with sternly, however, well-placed, important and influential they may be. He warned that these anti-social elements flourished with our misplaced kindness and indifference to wrong doings. He also emphasised that we must not use other people as tools for implementing our desires. Artificially imposed barriers should be removed and doors of self-development should be kept open for all individuals. The problem of the hungry, neglected, poor and the down-trodden should always be kept before our mind. The extremes of colossal affluence and grinding poverty should both be avoided. But the economic and social revolution should be effected through consent and not coercion.

In a similar way he frankly criticised the wide-spread incompetence and gross mismanagement of our resources. He also spoke of the growing cult of violence, civil commotions and disorders as acts of indiscipline which hindered smooth progress. His warning to the political leaders to look beyond their individual comfort and survival and to have a clear vision of the future of the country, stands out as the best
example of unselfish admonition by a person in the highest office. His is probably a unique example in modern democracy.

**Philosopher**

Radhakrishnan started his career as a student of philosophy and studied Indian as well as Western philosophy. He studied Indian philosophy from original works and clothed the contents in a language, lucid enough to convey the sense directly to Western (as well as Indian) readers. His role as a representative interpreter of Indian philosophy is wellknown and highly significant. He brought about a concord between the East and the West. He instituted several comparisons between Indian and Western philosophy. In the beginning he was inclined to prove the superiority of Indian thought. But as years passed on he also discovered the gap between ancient Indian thought and practice and became apologetic for our faults and even suggested methods of improving our traditional institutions.

As a philosopher he tried to point out the inadequacies in the various schools of Western philosophy like pragmatism, idealism and intuition and also suggested that a more comprehensive outlook was needed at the present stage.

Similarly, regarding Indian philosophical thought and regarding India's religious institutions, Radhakrishnan gives a new interpretation in the light of the need of the day. He has advised to give up spiritual arrogance and to respect the new spirit of science.
Radhakrishnan emphasises the role of Hinduism in realising his dream of a world religion which according to him should not be a single religion but a brotherhood of religions in which each creed guides others and develops in its own way.

Religion is a living organism and it must develop and grow like living beings. Hence Radhakrishnan has throughout maintained that religion must keep pace with the changing society; it should not be static and must not become out-of-date.

Social Thinker

Radhakrishnan had received instruction at the hands of Christian missionaries and his mind was awakened to the modern trends of Western civilisation. At the same time his mind was also spurred on to the study of ancient classics in Indian Philosophy with a view to learning their distinct contribution. As Professor of Philosophy in Calcutta University he was exposed to both the influences viz. the company of learned Pandits on the one hand and of modern reformers on the other. His work on Tagore reveals influences of both the trends. Even in his later career these two trends are seen to have influenced his works. His Hindu View of Life represents the phase of admiration and glorification of the Hindu traditional institutions while his later lectures on Religion and Society represent his critical appraisal of these institutions.

Radhakrishnan's views on society have humanism as their basis. All his social philosophy therefore is founded
on the principle that there is nothing higher than man. He
looks towards scientific and technical development also from
the humanistic point of view and tries to find a compromise
between the new advancement of science and the ancient
cultural values.

Radhakrishnan reinterprets the caste system, the four
Ashramas and the four Purusharthas in the light of the modern
trends of thought. According to him the rise of the caste
system was due to the demand for specialisation of functions
needed in social life. There was also another factor. The
higher a person was in the social scale the greater were his
duties and obligations and the fewer his rights. Manu said
that all men were born Sudras and became Brahmins by
regeneration. The Mahabharata stated the reverse position
also. It said, "By evil deeds a twice-born fell from his
position." Thus a higher or lower position in society would
appear to depend on one's work and deeds. After the advent
of the Muslim rule society became more rigid and less mobile
and the possibility of change dwindled. In other words with
the loss of political freedom social initiative disappeared
and customs became fetishes. As a result national solidarity
suffered. The bhakti cult, however, gives evidence of the
survival of the liberal spirit even amidst such conditions.
As late as the twelfth century even the low born Alvars were
respected as saints.

The caste system, however, enabled the Hindu Society
to admit, absorb and integrate different social elements in
course of time. Radhakrishnan presented the caste-system in his Hindu View of Life as a form of spiritual democracy. The later phase in his thoughts is represented by 'Religion and Society' in which he pointed out the abuses and weaknesses in the caste system. The substitution of the principle of birth gave rise to the proliferation of sub-castes, the evil influences of the caste and the domination and the gradual stiffening of the caste system. He ultimately comes to the conclusion that "It is a vehicle of reaction, an instrument of degradation, ally of ignorance and excuse for oppression". Caste generates intolerance and promotes perpetual inequality. Untouchability is the extreme form of the degradation of the caste system wherein a human being is not treated as a human being. Radhakrishnan therefore wants that both these evils must go. It is thus seen that from a stage of admiration and appreciation of the caste system, Radhakrishnan shifts to the stage of criticism and condemnation. This was inevitable with the social and political changes through which India was passing. Free India has criticised caste and untouchability in her constitution and has made removal of untouchability a must. She has recognised social equality as a fundamental right.

As regards his views on the role of women in society, Radhakrishnan tries to strike a golden mean between orthodox traditions and modern permissiveness. He advocates complete equality to women in all walks of life. Yet he rightly wants that the woman should not forget her modesty and her duty to her children and family for she alone can make the home.
Radhakrishnan was one of the pioneers in the field of education who have thought deeply on the basic problems of education in general and those pertaining to India in particular. His views have rightly been applauded all over the world. He has stressed that the development of an integrated personality should be the aim of education and has therefore emphasised the importance of philosophy, literature and humanities along with science and technology. He also urges that any pattern of education must strive to imbibe the greatness of Indian culture. This may sound a bit idealistic in the present circumstances for a backward country like India, because for a rapid advance we must build up the facilities for training in science and technology in as wide a field as possible and that too very quickly.

Though Radhakrishnan has expressed his concurrence with Gandhi's idea of basic education, he has suggested through the recommendations of the University Education Commission a voluntary social service as a prerequisite of any graduate. What is, however, required is that such a service should be made compulsory in order to carry out the programme of adult education and village uplift rapidly. For, Radhakrishnan believed that education should help a person to emancipate not only his own personality and that of his kith and kin but should develop in him a broader vision of the welfare of the whole humanity. He desired that education should make
a person's outlook liberal and he should be able to look upon
life as an opportunity of social service.

According to Radhakrishnan education must qualify us
to get rid of the inhibitions created by custom and religious
orthodoxy. But at the same time, we should not forget the
basic tenets which are more or less common to all religions.

Radhakrishnan also emphasises the need of women's
education which is much neglected although it is a fact that
half the population of India is of women.

Radhakrishnan's emphasis on retaining the Indian
culture and on the development of integrated personality and
his emphasis on social service by the undergraduates, are his
important contributions in the field of education.

The report of the University Education Commission is
criticised for its undue emphasis on agriculture. This country
badly needs the development of middle order technology which
is expected to go a long way in overcoming the problem of
unemployment among those educated under the present system of
education. It is, however, necessary to note that the
University Education Commission's report has also recognised
the need for finding a place for science and technology in
modern India's education. As this report was made immediately
after the attainment of independence, the increasing
insistence on science and technology could not clearly be
reflected in it.
Civilisation

Human civilisation seeks to work out a solution for the problem of living in society. Radhakrishnan has critically analysed the different problems of the present day civilisation. He believes that these problems are made up of the moral conceptions, religious ideals and social outlook. He has rightly put his finger on the defects of the human society viz. the growing atheism and destruction of family life. He also points out that in the modern society economic success is the only ideal and people strive all the while for the satisfaction of physical desires. He has thus correctly diagnosed the ills of the society. He was of the view that man has not been able to perceive the basic identity of science and religion. He therefore appealed that even in this age in which science has advanced by leaps and bounds there should be a proper blending of morality, religion and science, so that we should be able to assimilate properly the gains of science. A proper education of the basic unity of the human civilisation and culture, thought he, would enable the future society to achieve peace and progress. Radhakrishnan's keenness in his desire that international relations should be based on religious idealism also brings out the high place he accorded to religion and morality.

His criticism of the aggressive character of nationalism and imperialism is an echo of Tagore's views on Western imperialism.
His attitude towards science seems to have undergone modification after he came in contact with Nehru. Similarly his views on secularism also underwent a modification in conformity with the modern age.

Radhakrishnan had published his views on civilisation and culture twenty years before he became the President of India. The views he had expressed therein had naturally to undergo a change in tune with the time. These are the natural restrictions on a thinker and philosopher which even Plato could not avoid.

Democracy

Radhakrishnan is an example of a thinker who not only explains the characteristics and requisites of democracy but also pleads for a change in the scale of values which is needed for transition from traditional to modern society.

Though a philosopher he has not remained an orthodox thinker. He has a remarkable capacity to imbibe the concept of democracy in its true spirit and to bring it in line with the basic ideas of Hindu and Buddhist philosophy. Even with this, he does not remain a conservative democrat harping on individual liberty at the cost of social justice. Though he is uncompromising with regard to the basic principles of democracy, he is equally firm that individual freedom should not be allowed to be turned into a licence. He affirms that democracy will be incomplete until it is able to win social
justice for all. In this way he has gradually transformed himself into a social democrat.

Tolerance which is the basis of democracy appears to be natural to Radhakrishnan's general outlook. His deep study of Hindu, Buddhist and Jain scriptures is primarily responsible for this broad outlook. It helped him to become a thorough democrat in both national and international fields.

Communism

Radhakrishnan is a critic of Marx but is not his opponent. He has a balanced approach. He values Marx's concern for the poor and lowly, his call for an equitable distribution of wealth and opportunity as also his appreciation of racial equality. Radhakrishnan has nobly sympathised with the masses having to "toil without cease for a scanty subsistence" and has a pronounced anathema on "a society which is acquisitive in its nature, unhealthy in its pleasures, - a murderous machine without a conscience". Radhakrishnan, however, does not approve Marxian atheism, his naturalistic view of man and his disregard of sacredness of personality.

The Marxist emphasis on economic conditions is correct but they are not exclusive determinants of history. The demand for more productive economic arrangements and fair distribution is acceptable because it entitles every man to an opportunity for free development but the method for bringing it about, bloodshed and revolution, is not acceptable.
With all his sympathy for the social and economic programmes of communism, Radhakrishnan holds that it cannot be accepted as a way of life, the main reason for this being that communism is intellectually inadequate. Even the revised version of dialectical materialism is found by him to be unsatisfactory. The Marxist belief in the inevitability of progress is equally unacceptable because history is full of examples of decay and retrogression and hence history cannot be regarded as a continuous development through conflict.

Radhakrishnan admits that civil liberties and the political democracy in the Communist states is not at all compatible with what these doctrines generally imply. The Communists do not believe in free speech. Where they are in power they suppress it. They ban all other political parties. Nationalist sentiments are suppressed in Communist lands. Insistence on subservience to Soviet Russia in non-Russian Communist countries hurts the pride of those people.

There is one more reason for this attitude. Radhakrishnan is also under the influence of Gandhi who emphasised the purity of means and essential similarity between means and ends. Radhakrishnan recognises the need for a new social order with basic economic justice, and favours egalitarian society which he thinks to be consistent with highest religious education.

Later, however, Radhakrishnan looks to communism with a balanced outlook and finds that though all the points
stated above are distinctly to the discredit of Communist
theory and practice, the Communist parties spring up and
thrive in different parts of the world because the doctrine
satisfies certain basic human needs. Communism spreads
among the people who have suffered in a capitalist society.
Radhakrishnan observes "We need a new type of society whose
basic concern will be the welfare of the people as a whole.
We must transform the community to give to it a new social
vision. The most effective way of overcoming the social and
economic dangers which Communism threatens will be to set up
a world reconstruction fund for the removal of social and
economic ills in large parts of the world, for the spreading
up of the struggle for world betterment. This is to make the
world "safe for democracy".

During the last few years there is a still greater
change in Radhakrishnan's views. He believes that co-existence
of both the democratic and communist states is not only
feasible but also desirable. He does not at all agree with
Prof. Northrop's view that co-existence between Marxist
Communism and the traditional French and Anglo-American
democracy is impossible. He considers that many doctrines
which seem opposite may on closer examination turn out to be
compatible with each other. He also feels that suppression
of human rights in the Communist States is a passing phase
and these nations are bound to relax the undue restrictions
on civil liberties in the not too distant future.
UNESCO

As regards internationalism and world peace it was inevitable that a thinker who was alive to the contemporary situation and had seen two world wars should actively think about the future of humanity in a constructive way. As H.G. Wells pointed out in his essay 'A Probable Future of Mankind', in his book, 'The Salvaging of Society', "The urgent need of a great creative effort has become current in the affairs of mankind". Radhakrishnan's work as a member of the International Committee for Intellectual Co-operation in the League of Nations had justified his claim to be associated with a broader and more fundamental effort like the organisation of UNESCO. His speeches on various occasions in the UNESCO have emphasised the building of an international mind. As the preamble of UNESCO says, "The roots of wars are in the minds of men and it is in the minds of men that the citadels of peace are built". He warned that though the allies won the second World War on account of their massive destructive power, a victory through violence could not last long. A real victory should induce trust and love and should disarm suspicions. His approach is that of a philosopher and an educator. He therefore always lays stress on the building up of international mind, on the building up of racial equality, on spread of education among the underdeveloped nations, on building up of cultural institutions, on subordination of nationalism to world loyalty, rejection of military methods and reduction of bigotry and narrow-mindedness,
of egoism and arrogance of the Western powers. He emphasises the development of new human relationship fostering intellectual solidarity and promoting moral unity.

Radhakrishnan's admonition of the Government of India at the time of the Chinese aggression for their being unprepared need not be considered to be inconsistent with the views he expressed all these years. For he had never advocated the surrender of national sovereignty to compromise with an aggressor. What he was advocating during this period was the development of an international authority and an international mind. But till the time this aim was achieved, nations had to keep their powder dry for thwarting a potential aggressor. It was in this light that he firmly advised the Prime Minister Shri Nehru to dismiss V.K. Krishna Menon and while presenting the Gita to the new Defence Minister Shri Chavan, told him that he would find victory if he had the wisdom of Shrikrishna and the efficiency of Arjuna.

In a world rampant with political and economic conflicts, and torn asunder by racial and psychological tensions, Radhakrishnan boldly asserted that the basic truths taught by religions should be restated and reinforced so as to realise humanity as a large family. He had been beckoning the prosperous nations like those in Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries and the technically advanced nations to contribute generously to bring up the underdeveloped nations of the world to remove their ignorance and poverty.
Internationalism and World Peace

Right since the inception of the League of Nations, Radhakrishnan was in close touch with the problems of the emerging world of the twentieth century after the first world war. It is amply clear to any objective thinker that with the advance of science and technology the world community has come closer together particularly with the progress in the means of communication. The newer armaments have tremendous power to destroy what generations of men have created. He has therefore become an ardent internationalist and an advocate of an international commonwealth. He envisages that the emerging new world should develop a system in which international disputes should be settled through mutual negotiation and arbitration and not through war which he describes as nothing short of mass murder. He is alive to the fact that peace will be temporary if there is wide economic disparity and has observed that the advanced nations as well as those which have been gifted with natural resources and have therefore become rich should come forward to help in the development of their less fortunate brethren. His internationalism is the result of his deep study of human civilisation and of ancient and modern history of the world. He therefore looks to the international problems with a tolerance characteristic of a broadminded Hindu Philosopher.

Radhakrishnan is outspoken in his emphasis on the setting up of social democracies, elimination of colonialism
and racial equality. He proposes that all the nations of the world should equally participate in this gigantic task without colour, creed or political system.

Radhakrishnan may appear to be rather idealistic in his emphasis on a new world community as a whole. His demand for the establishment of an international Police force, Customs Union and common currency might sound like pious hopes of the future world. For, in the world as it stands today nationalism is still a force to be reckoned with and one cannot conceive of a new world community which completely ignores nationalism. There is, however, no doubt that such a community is the only answer for the problems of the future. It is significant in this respect that the countries in western Europe have already established a Customs Union among themselves and formed the European Common Market. They are also contemplating a European Assembly in the political field. Some of the South East Asian countries are also negotiating for the establishment of a common market under the name ASIAN.

Radhakrishnan describes the dream of the seers and prophets of all ages and of all nations: "It is to understand one another, to live together, to build a great society on earth and to turn the world into a kingdom of righteousness". He then goes on: "This cherished goal of humanity is being materialised by the progress of science and technology, by the development of modern means of speedy communications and by new contacts of races and cultures. Opposite interests
are being linked up and customs and forms of life are being made uniform”.

Radhakrishnan, however, correctly notes that the realisation of this dream is going on very slowly. He points out that the main obstacles which prevent the development of a true human community are twofold: (i) Man has firm faith in the superiority of his own race. For example, many races believe that they are direct descendants of God. (ii) Secondly, people believe that each nation is destined to fulfil some mission. For example, Britain at one time carried the "white man's burden" of civilising the backward peoples.

Radhakrishnan therefore urges that we should overcome as early as we can, these obstacles of racial and national superiority and try to realise our dream of one religion, one church, one God and one government.

Third World

When Radhakrishnan entered Political Life, his attention was more and more occupied by the social and political problems facing India. In the early years of Independence, as he came into direct contact with the newly freed nations of Asia and Africa, he became confirmed in his belief that there was a need to understand a Third World and that India would be the most appropriate and representative leader of the Third World countries.
Radhakrishnan stresses the religious-sum-cultural ties among the countries of the Third World. He also emphasises the common problems of many countries of Asia and Africa. These problems consist of illiteracy, poverty, unemployment, development of resources, improvement in production and integration of racial and linguistic groups. Lastly, he pays no less attention to the need for economic development than to cultural development.

Radhakrishnan wanted to make the people of developing countries realise that they are comrades in a common quest for human welfare. He stresses the need that such developing countries should come together as a non-aligned group and concludes that non-alignment is the only solution to this problem. He notes with satisfaction that these countries occupy a major portion of the world and also have a majority of world population. If they continued to keep away from war (including the cold war) and from the Communist and non-Communist blocs, they can play an effective role to bring about a change in the outlook of the big powers towards them. They would thus be in a position to save the world from a catastrophe.

After a detailed analysis of Radhakrishnan's Social and Political thought, it is seen that humanism is the main thread which is common to his views in the various fields of social and political life. Thus, though he was brought up in a strictly religious and orthodox atmosphere, his outlook
became more and more broad-based and tolerant. He did not find any difficulty to mould his opinions according to the modern trends. Particularly his thoughts regarding the caste system in the social field and communism in the political field have gradually undergone a change but these changes do not appear to be inconsistent as they are still based on humanism and the natural rights of man in a new society.