

There are some rules regulating our conduct at this meeting. One of the rules is that I speak and you listen to me with attention. If in contravention of this rule, you start conversing with one another or addressing the gathering at the same time, then there will be disorder; our work will not progress; the meeting will not be sustained. It can be said that you have not observed your *Dharma*. Thus it is our *Dharma* that we observe the rules by which the meeting proceeds smoothly. But this rule is applicable only as long as this meeting lasts. If the meeting is over and you do not speak even after reaching home, a different problem will crop up. Your family might have to call in a doctor. It is essential to observe the rules of the home once you reach there. The complete treatise on the rules in general, and their philosophical basis, constitute what we mean by *Dharma*. These rules cannot be arbitrary. They should be such as to sustain and further the existence and progress of the entity which they serve. At the same time, they should be in agreement with, and supplementary to, the larger framework of *Dharma*, of which they form a part. For instance, when we form a registered society, we have the right to frame the rules and regulations, but these cannot be contradictory to the constitution of the society. The constitution itself cannot violate the Societies Registration Act. The Act has to be within the provision of the constitution of the country. In other words, the constitution of the country is a fundamental document which governs the formulation of all acts in the country. In Germany, the constitution is known as the 'Basic Law'.

Constitution Cannot Be Arbitrary

Is the constitution too, not subject to some principles of a more fundamental nature? Or is it a product of any arbitrary decisions of a Constituent Assembly? On serious consideration, it will be clear that even the constitution has to follow certain basic principles of Nature. The constitution is for sustaining the Nation. Instead, if it is instrumental in its deterioration, then it must be pronounced improper. It must be amended. The amendment is also not solely dependent on majority opinion. Nowadays, the majority is much talked of. Is the majority capable of doing anything and everything? Is the action of the majority always just and proper? No. In the West, the king used to be the sovereign. Thereafter, when royalty was deprived of its so-called divine rights, sovereignty was proclaimed to be with the people. Here in our country, neither the kings, nor the people, nor the parliament have had absolute sovereignty. Parliament cannot legislate arbitrarily.