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GOPALRAO AS A SOCIAL AND POLITICAL THINKER

An attempt has been made in the foregoing chapters to present the social and political thought of Gopalrao in a systematic manner, in four parts.

The first part provides the background against which Gopalrao's social and political thoughts are to be studied. The first chapter deals with the historical background, beginning from the advent of British rule in India and summarises its aims as well as its social, political, and cultural effects. The second chapter presents a biographical sketch of Gopalrao pointing out his role in various social and political activities of his time.

The second part, 'Social thought of Gopalrao', begins with chapter three which throws the search light on the social institutions of the Hindus in order to account for the loss of independence, and forms the foundation of his further analysis. The four succeeding chapters develop this line of thought. Chapter four critically examines the Brahmin leadership which has worked as a reactionary force
in the social and intellectual advancement. Chapter five
explains his views on knowledge or enlightenment as an instru-
ment of social change and the impediments in intellectual
development resulting from absence of books and neglect of
historiography and language. Chapter six brings out his
views on marriage, examines the distinctive role of women
and suggests marriage reforms. Chapter seven explains his
views on religion in general, and Hindu religion in parti-
cular, based mainly on materialistic foundation.

Part three deals with political and economic ideas
of Gopalrao. Chapter eight, the introductory chapter of his
political ideas, brings out his views on the political imper-
fections of the social order which led to its defeat and
distinguishes British rule from the earlier regimes, under-
lining its liberalism. Chapter nine, the principal motive
of Gopalrao's writings, evaluates British rule and suggests
specific measures of bringing British rule to an end. Chapter
ten contains theoretical analysis of the political situation
and practical solutions in the form of political reforms such
as local self-government and a parliamentary form of govern-
ment for India. Chapter eleven devoted to Gopalrao's economic
thought examines the root causes of India's poverty and
pin-points its responsibility on the alien rule and suggests
radical economic solutions like Swadeshi and boycott.

Part four, the present chapter, is an attempt to eva-
luate Gopalrao as a social and political thinker.
With the lapse of more than a century, it is now possible to evaluate Gopalrao's thought dispassionately and to establish its relevance to current developments clearly, without any prejudice.

Almost all the events of the nineteenth century appeared to be evolutionary in character, but each of them contained a revolutionary nucleus. They were evolutionary because they arose out of actions and reactions of several social and political forces, and revolutionary because they fundamentally changed the fate of India. It was during this period that, on account of our association with British people, all our ideas were put in a crucible out of which emerged entirely new trends of thought, which pervaded almost all the multifarious spheres — social, political, economic, religious and educational. With this metamorphosis, India passed from the 'medieval' to the 'modern' age.

The outcome of the battle of Plassey turned the scales for Bengal which fell to the British but therefore got the first opportunity to come under the influence of western civilization. The Sun of renaissance in India cast its first rays on Bengal, and Raja Ram Mohan Roy, the herald of the new dawn launched reformist movements. The British conquest of Western India, though a later development brought in its wake in Maharashtra the major social and political movements which were destined to change the fate of India within a very short period of time.
As for Maharashtra, Bombay and Poona were the two leading centres. Bombay, on account of its cosmopolitan character, had developed some flexibility in the social stratification; Poona, on the other hand, being a seat of the Brahmin leadership, was conservative and regarded any sort of reform as an infringement upon their religion. The Brahmins were temperamentally opposed to any reform as such.

It was in this orthodox atmosphere that Gopalrao, the subject of this thesis, was born in 1823.

The latter half of the nineteenth century was characterized by two antithetical schools of thought: The first believing that social imperfections were responsible for our political subjection. As the protagonists of this school of thought held social causes responsible for our degeneration, they naturally concluded that, in order to consolidate our position, we should first introduce social reforms in order to qualify ourselves for political emancipation. Almost all the thinkers in the first half of the century held this view and subsequently Ranade, Agarkar and Gokhale also subscribed to it. The other school, however, believed that political independence would solve all social problems, political power being the prime mover of social dynamics. Lokamanya Tilak was the leader of this school of thought. Their mutual antagonism gradually intensified and reached a climax at the close of the century.
way tried to seek the solution for the problem visualised by Gopalrao a century ago.

Gopalrao favoured the historical method rather than deductive method. With penetrating historical insight he analysed the social system of Hindus, and underlined our failure in studying history. However, he wanted to study history not for the glorification of the past or narration of events, but for deriving conclusions from it which could serve as guidelines for the future, and for investigating the right path of progress. His insight into history is reflected in several books he wrote on history. Though some of them appear at first sight as translations, they have greater relevance because of the annotations supplied by him, which throw valuable light on the originality of his thought. He had specifically written a 'History of Lanka' in order to remove peoples' misconceptions about it. He also wanted to use history for fostering the feeling of unity in the neighbouring parts of the country. Rightly, P. V. Pote has pointed out that in literature on history, Gopalrao was the only noteworthy writer of his time.  

Gopalrao’s thought reminds us of Burke who viewed society as an organic growth, as a partnership of the past, the present and the future generations.

It would not be an exaggeration to call Gopalrao as one of the earliest of the modern Indian thinkers to use the historical method and the first one of this type in Maharashtra.
Like John Stuart Mill, Gopalrao was opposed to the subjection of women and the consequent weaknesses generated in the social system. He advocated reforms and worked ceaselessly for emancipation of women. It is significant that he advocated the reforms at a stage when it was a news-item even in Bombay that husband and wife together went out for seeing the mint in the afternoon." According to the reporter, that was the first instance of the kind (in Indian society) in Bombay. While giving significant position to women, Gopalrao said that the fate of posterity lay in their own hands. Instead of giving equal place to them, he, in fact, underlined their special significance in the social system. He wanted to give fair treatment to women not out of compassion, but in recognition of their right. But as contemporary society was not likely to listen to the voice of reason, he had to appeal to it on the grounds of compassion as well. His views on marriage and marriage reforms based on equality of status to women are revolutionary for his generation. He not only advocated widow remarriage, but actively supported the first widow remarriage of his time. Of course, as pointed out earlier, he was criticized for betraying the cause, but the criticism was based upon mis-information. He had also advocated enhancement of women's age at marriage. Optimistically, he said that women after getting education would solve their own problems. However, the first honour of starting a school for women goes to Jotiba Phule.
In order to realise his ideals, Gopalrao, along with others, made institutional efforts in Maharashtra as the widows received inhuman and humiliating treatment from the orthodox Hindu society, which made the life of the widows utterly miserable. Inspired by noble cause of bettering their position, on the principle of equality, he said that husbands should not expect loyalty from their wives without reciprocal devotion.

Gradually, the equality of women with men has been accepted in all the spheres. The age of marriage has gone up and unequal marriages are frowned upon. Sub-castes and even castes have no longer remained an impediment in marriage, and the opposition of the Brahmin orthodoxy to such types of marriages has been dissolved. Women are today shouldering equal responsibility with men in almost all walks of life.

He had clearly seen that society was divided by dogmatic religion especially at a time when no line of demarcation was found between social and religious ideas. His thoughts on religion were revolutionary. He wanted to resuscitate a positive outlook which would accommodate materialism. What he advocated was religion to promote happiness (Sukhekeri Dharma), because he wanted it to play a significant role in promoting happiness of the people. His idea of religion was not narrow. It was on the lines of universal religion. He believed that the principles of religion were introduced
on the basis of equality. He actively participated in the movement for reforming Hindu religion by associating himself with Prarthana Samaj and Arya Samaj. In fact, both the Samajas held diametrically opposite views, but in order to strengthen the cause of reforms and accelerate their pace, he participated in both the movements. As a humanist, he based his concept of religion on the principles of extending benevolence to the weak and downtrodden people. Instead of outward manifestations of behaviour and rituals, he advocated intrinsic faith in morality. As a champion of equality, he advocated mitigation of caste-differences. On the whole, he was a rationalist, because he tried to rationalise human institutions. At the same time, aware of the limitations of the contemporary society, while advocating reforms he tried to justify them by citing scriptural references. Such leaning on religious tradition was inevitable and understandable in the Indian context. Even Raja Ram Mohan Roy took the Upanishads as the basis of reforms, and rationalists such Gopal Ganesha Agarkar who disregarded consideration of religious sanction altogether failed to exert desired influence upon Society. Gopaldeo, in his thought on religion covered the four basic elements of a sound serious religion: traditional, moral, emotional, and rational. He very aptly and prudently recommended equal treatment for all religions by introducing uniform legislation for all the religions alike, which unfortunately has not been considered by the government till today despite continuous demand by the Hindu Society.
As Gopalrao had not developed social myopia, he, together with social analysis, also considered the political causes of our subjection. Jotiba Phule, on the other hand, while emphasizing social reforms went to the extreme by saying that any political discussion was forbidden from 'Satyashodhak Samaj'. Nevertheless, the new manifesto published on the occasion of the centenary of the Samaj has amplified that Satyashodhak Samaj should not enter politics means it should not work as a new political party.

For Gopalrao, the British conquest was not merely a change in dynastic rule. The subjection was a political phenomenon, resulting from our social imperfections. It is significant that Karl Marx too arrived at a similar conclusion. In political deficiencies of Hindus, Gopalrao included misrule, autocratic political organization, inferior weapons, as against the superior weapons used by the British conquerors, as the causes of our subjection. While underlining the importance of knowledge, he did not belittle the significance of force in politics. D.V. Potdar made a similar observation that we failed to accept the new thoughts and new sciences. Instead, we fought with the British people with the weapons purchased from them. Consequent defeat was inevitable. With superior weapons the British overwhelmed our society already rendered powerless by social evils from within. However as he regarded society as a complex organism, the social and political causes explained by him are overlapping.
While examining the causes of our subjection, he also adduced the will of God as one of the factors. In fact, his dynamic idea of progress and belief in divine Providence appear astonishingly antithetical. But we must not judge earlier thinkers by present day criteria. This idea of Divine Will, can be found in almost all the social and political thinkers of the nineteenth century. Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Dadabhai Naoroji, Sir Phirozeeshah Mehta, Justice Tengan and Justice Ranade also believed in the divine nature of British rule. Gopalrao was one of the earliest exponents of the idea.

The implications of the providential nature of British rule need careful consideration as it created an impression that Gopalrao was a votary of British rule. His belief in the will of God sprang from the belief in British rule. Here, he wanted to suggest that the British conquest had given us an opportunity and time to rebuild, repair and renovate our social and economic structure before we regain freedom. He believed that the will of God is always beneficial to the human beings just as Burke suggested that God, working through men had made it what it was. Of course, it is not a 'Scientific' explanation, but further events leading to India's independence can be viewed as an outcome of divine will.

While attributing all the events to the will of God he did not underestimate the part played by human efforts.
In effect, the concept of divine will and of progress through human efforts might appear antithetical. But probably he wanted to achieve harmony between the two with the belief that social and political order though it formed a more or less coherent whole and was the product of human activities was yet not the deliberate creation of man.

This, however, did not mean that Gopalrao was opposed to India's freedom. Being one of the champions of India's independence, he held that with the improvement of the society, the British people would return to their country. Jotiba Phule also held that British rule was God-sent, but his conclusion was different: he did not want British rule to end. His views were circumscribed by social thought at the cost of political thought.

Even Lokamanya Tilak specifically after 1914 began to hold a similar view and seemed to appreciate the British rule. Tilak in his declaration said: "In British rule, not only an account of a developed political system but on account of the homogeneity created by it in the different castes and people in India, in course of time United Hindu Rule is likely to be evolved, as such, those who say that on account of British rule, India is deriving innumerable benefit, are perfectly correct."17

Gopalrao thoroughly examined British rule, and not only appreciated social and political institutions brought
about by it, but also frankly pointed out its defects. His comparison of British rule with the native rule gave a clear picture of the strong and weak points of both. He welcomed British rule, but did not want it to be a permanent feature. He warned the British people not to return before we had fully achieved our enlightenment. He realised the part played by patronage in working out of social, economic and political conflicts which are inevitable in every society desirous of advancement. He rightly calculated that the strength of British rule lay in the social and political institutions of the rulers, which were the result of their efforts.

Gopalbdeo's praise of British rule might not appear surprising like that of all the liberals, but even the extremist leader, Lokamanya Tilak enumerated the benefits from British rule as: peace, establishment of law and order, punishment to the miscreant, public health, prosperity of trade, agricultural reforms, development of minerals and natural resources, incomparable educational facilities, bureaucracy having faith in Swaraj, freedom of writing, acquaintances with machinery and a favourable disposition towards Swaraj.

So close were the contacts between India and England and so obvious were the benefits derived by India there from that even after Independence, India had decided to remain a member of the British Commonwealth.
It is noteworthy that Gopalrao was not a blind admirer of British rule. He wanted to end it after our people attained due qualifications.

It required tremendous foresight and courage to visualise the end of the rule by a Government servant especially at a stage when British rule was being consolidated. He was very confident that India would regain freedom, but being fully convinced that the process of social dynamics could not be hastened, he calculated the period required to achieve Independence at 200 years. He made this remark in 1849 when there was no institutional life in Maharashtra and when the British people were leading on all the fronts—social, economic and even political. The outbreak of the two World Wars and other national and international events in the twentieth century which brought the independence nearer, were not likely to be visualised at that stage.

Gopalrao was a constitutionalist like Sir Phirozeeshah Mehta, Dadabhai Naoroji and Justice Ranade. His suggestion of petitioning the Queen was prior to that of British Indian Association in Calcutta.

Very significantly, he demanded Parliament for India and also enumerated a scheme of organising parliament. He boldly warned the British people that if they failed to meet our demands, what happened in America would be repeated here. He demanded parliament thirty seven years prior to the
establishment of the Indian National Congress which for the first time had placed a political goal before the Indians.

The political reforms suggested by Gopalrao were equally radical.

In the course of his discussion of political problems, he also provided theoretical analysis of problems like the origin of the State and the need of a ruler on the lines of Hobbes, and pointed out that people get the Government they deserve.

In fact, as early as 1865, and even before the Resolution of Lord Ripon in 1882, Gopalrao advocated local self-government. After the declaration of the Resolution, he appealed to his countrymen to avail of the opportunity afforded by Lord Ripon in his scheme of local self-government. He favoured the revival of the age-old system of village organisation. Gopalrao's thought has found acceptance in the Directive Principles of State Policy and a large number of laws have been enacted to implement the Directive in Article 40 of the Constitution to organise village panchayats.

Gopalrao had a passionate love for individual liberty. As for the limits of state interference, he said in 1880 that any law was encroachment upon the liberty of the people. Though himself a champion of social reforms, he did not favour the idea of the alien government effecting social
reforms. He preferred late introduction of social reforms to state-intervention in them. For him, the key to the smooth working of the Government was "The less the government rules, the better it is." In principle, stateless society was the ideal one for him, but he discarded the idea as impracticable.

Gopalrao presented the charter of duties of the government exhaustively, which in effect was the charter of the rights of the people. He went ahead and warned that if the government failed to afford the rights to the people, people themselves would bring about the reforms by revolution. He stressed that the government should make special provisions to promote education especially by opening educational institutions and workshops. He also recommended prevention of consumption of intoxicating drinks, by the government. Its recognition can be found in the Directive Principles of State Policy, incorporated in Part IV of the Constitution, Article 47. The duties of the government as pointed out by Gopalrao have found expression in the Fundamental Rights included in the Constitution.

Gopalrao was a democrat and his insistence upon securing a Parliament for India stemmed from his belief in democracy: not a direct, but an indirect or parliamentary democracy. The principle of representation he advocated was based upon equality. He knew different forms of democracy. After
comparing the forms of government in England and America, in 1848, he concluded that the best form of government existed in America (U.S.A.). Thereby he favoured a democratic republic. Almost after a century when the Constitution of India was drafted, its preamble stated that the people of India solemnly resolve to constitute India into a Sovereign Democratic Republic.

For other countries like Turkey, Iran, and China, he prophesied emergence of despotic rule on account of the ignorance of the people.

He analysed the word 'Revolution' in its wider concept and instead of restricting its meaning to the outburst of violence, broadly used it to mean bringing about different types of reforms or desired changes by popular will.

The native rulers on whom Gopalrao made a special attack have, after the enactment of the Constitution, gradually acceded to the Union and the latest amendments have also taken away their privy purses and special privileges.

Gopalrao is generally recognised as a social thinker, much less as political thinker, and the least as an economic thinker. In fact his social and economic thoughts are politically motivated. Unfortunately, his contribution in the realm of economic thought too has remained neglected. In fact, his economic thought would reveal that the seeds of
economic nationalism were sown by him much before Dadabhai Naoroji and Justice Ranade. Though not substantiated by statistical evidence, Gopalrao, as early as in 1849 pointed out that India was being exploited under British rule and thereby showed perfect understanding of the imperialistic economic exploitation when he said that the British Government was not likely to take any steps to boost our trade at the cost of their trade. Very significantly he advocated protection to Indian industries by pointing out that as no tax was levied on foreign imports, that our markets were being captured by them and that, as a result, we had to close down our industries. This reference he made as early as 1876. Friedrich List (1789-1846) had also advocated tariff protection to stimulate national industrial development. Gopalrao also invited attention of the rulers to the deteriorating condition of the agriculturist under British rule.

Even before Vishnushastri Chiplunkar, Gopalrao formulated and presented a theoretical analysis of wealth. In this elementary discussion, however, Gopalrao does not appear to have gone beyond the physiocratic concept of wealth, but his identity between savings and investment is a flight in modern direction. Moreover, he presented such a conceptual analysis for the edification of the Marathi readers for the first time and at so early a stage.
In his socio-economic analysis, Gopalrao pointed out the economic disadvantages of the joint family system which was in vogue, and advocated the individual family without disregarding its favourable social effects.

Fully aware of the implications of the industrial civilization and industrialization of England, he wanted India to take to industrialization rapidly. He was aware of the impediment of British imperialism in the path of our industrialization. He therefore, propounded a novel idea: a drastic remedy of Swadeshi and boycott, another facet of his economic nationalism. It is significant that he advocated Swadeshi even before Sarvajanik Kaka (C.V. Joshi) gave an institutional form to it, and boycott even before Lokamanya Tilak and Mahatma Gandhi accepted it as a political weapon. The Swadeshi movement in fact originated in Maharashtra and was advocated by Gopalrao in 1849, much before Sarvajanik Kaka (C.V. Joshi). Simultaneously Gopalrao had advocated boycott about forty to fifty years before Lokamanya Tilak adopted it. L.R. Pengerkar has designated Gopalrao as a pioneer of Swadeshi.²¹ Lokamanya Tilak’s philosophy, based upon the four principles, viz. Swaraj, Swadeshi, boycott and national education, in a way, was modification of Gopalrao’s thought.

Inviting attention to the rural population, Gopalrao pointed out that it was in the grip of money lenders. In course of time, nevertheless the Government passed Agriculturist Debtors Relief Acts.
According to him the principal obstacles in capital formation and industrialization in India were: lavishness, the joint family system and use of savings for non-productive purposes, such as ornaments. He advocated the individual family system and diversion of wealth from ornaments to investment in industries. With a surprisingly modern outlook he advised curtailment of expenditure over religious ceremonies and social functions. He pointed out that in a country like India which lagged behind in industrialisation, economy was absolutely essential. He favoured promotion of joint stock companies. Gradually, the first cotton mill started functioning in 1853 in Bombay and the number went on increasing and the production acquired a significant dimension. Besides, further industrialisation and growth of cities gave a death-blow to the joint family system.

The Five Year Plans launched by the Government have recognized the need of industrialisation. The government has shown awareness of misuse of gold and enacted Gold Control Rules. Economy on all fronts is being advocated by the Government. This in a way is an indirect recognition of the principles underlined by Gopalrao. Side by side, agricultural development is also being undertaken.

His remark in 1876 that in future, America would surpass England in the industrial sphere and relegate England to the background has come true.
Gopalrao appreciated the importance of cattle in an agricultural country like India, and argued for prohibiting cow-slaughter not on religious consideration, but on pragmatic economic grounds. Its acceptance can be found in Article 48 of the Constitution which states that the state shall strive to prevent slaughter of useful cattle i.e. cows, calves and other milk and draught cattle.

It is very difficult to estimate Gopalrao's influence upon his contemporaries and the subsequent thinkers. Vishnusastri believed that Jotiba Phule and Baba Padmanjee were indebted to Gopalrao for their criticism of Brahmins. As for Justice Ranade, it is still difficult to say who influenced whom, but it is a fact that in several respects Gopalrao anticipated Ranade.

As for Gopalrao's critics in the latter part of his life, like Vishnusastri Chiplunker and Lokamanya Tilak, they principally accepted Gopalrao's remedial measures.

Though Gopalrao and Lokamanya Tilak held antithetical views, there appears to be implicit understanding between them. It is remarkable that Gopalrao's personal library was shifted to Gaikwad Sada on the advice of Lokamanya Tilak. Further, except on very few occasions, Lokamanya Tilak had not explicitly criticised Gopalrao.

Raja Ram Mohan Roy was the herald of the new dawn of renaissance in India, while in Maharashtra, Gopalrao was the
pioneer. No doubt, prior to him Pal Gangadharshestri Jambhekar pioneered certain reforms, but as pointed out earlier, Gopalrao’s thoughts were more broadbased.

Raja Ram Mohan Roy’s ideas can, however, be favourably compared with Gopalrao. Both were religious in spirit and well versed in ancient lore, both were influenced by Western institutions, and ascribed the downfall of India to social condition. Both realised the interdependence of social, political, economic and educational spheres. Both regarded British rule in India as divine. In these respects, therefore, the Raja and Gopalrao belonged to the same school of thought, and Gopalrao carried further the work begun by the noble Raja.

As seen before, Gopalrao’s thought can be favourably compared with Western thinkers as well. While pointing out certain similarities between the thoughts expressed by Western thinkers and those of Gopalrao, it is not suggested that his thoughts could be traced to the western thinkers. In fact, there was no likelihood of any direct or indirect communications between them in the absence of efficient means of transport and communication before the opening of the Suez Canal. Raja Ram Mohan Roy, however, could avail of the opportunity of establishing intimate contacts with the Western thinkers.
Criticism

Gopalrao's philosophy of social reforms invited two types of criticism upon him. The first was ideological, while the second was personal. As for the former, it can be said that Gopalrao was much ahead of his time and was incomprehensible to his contemporaries who were then under the influence of the medieval conception of society. The latter criticism, however, has different facets. The principal criticism of this kind being the inconsistency in his thought and action. He was also blamed for not standing firmly behind the principles which he very rigorously advocated in his writings and speech. As for widow remarriage, as pointed out earlier, the criticism was based upon misunderstanding. Further he declined the offer of the government to go to England and though himself a social reformer, underwent the rite of expiation on several occasions. This last instance does not however mean that he accepted in principle whatever was inflicted upon him by the Brahmin orthodoxy and deviated from his previous stand. In fact, it was a gesture of reconciliation and adjustment and not a sign of abrogation of principle. He wanted social reforms, but would not advocate rebellion or martyrdom for bringing them about. Moreover, as a social reformer, he did not desire to introduce the reforms by remaining outside the society, nor did he want to form a separate caste of the reformers. Of course, for this he had to compromise two antithetical tendencies which appeared inconsistent to others - e.g. his association with the Prarthana Samaj and the Arya Samaj.
Gopalrao, however, appears to be aware of the inconsistency in life itself, and he justified it by quoting the example of Kamalakarbhatta, the author of 'Nirnayaesindhu', and other books. Once Kamalakarbhatta was writing the significance of morning bath before bathing himself. A visitor asked him to explain the inconsistency. He thereupon remarked that there are two types of duties: one for ourselves to follow, and the other to instigate others to follow; Since I am doing the latter by writing this book, it would not matter much even if I do not perform the first.\textsuperscript{23}

Some interested persons also cast aspersions upon his personal life by hitting below the belt and saying that while an Inam Commission, he betrayed his caste fellows for securing benefits for his children. In fact, his children were quite intelligent and, therefore, for raising them, recourse to such means was hardly necessary and hence out of question.

The question of Gopalrao's language and style, in fact, lies beyond the purview of this thesis, but a passing reference to it will not be out of place because he has been criticised for using rough, slipshod and undecorative language in his writings. If, however, it is borne in mind that essay, as a form of Marathi literature was still to develop at that time and that the language was also in a developing stage,\textsuperscript{24} this criticism can hardly be justified.
Besides, the deep rooted ignorance and apathy of the contemporary society might have made him indignant and bitter.

Gopalrao was not a prophet, nor did he pose as one, but many of his prophecies have come true. He was instrumental in augmenting what may be called as 'intellectual revolution' of his time.

Gopalrao had studied Sanskrit and English, wrote extensively and independently on various subjects such as history, religion, politics, humanities, biographies, territorial history, economics, mechanics, sociology which bear testimony to his independent thinking. He created the ideological background for social and religious reforms by helping Prarthana Samaj and Arya Samaj. He encouraged journalism, libraries and publication of books, the instruments of social education. He revolved against traditionalism throughout his life.

Thus, Gopalrao had an encyclopaedic mind, and critical grasp of dominant trend of Indian history, society, and politics. He was one of the creators of national consciousness in India. In the opinion of S.D. Jawdekar, Gopalrao was the first person to place before Marathi readers, such views about democracy and revolution and his views on India's independence were more progressive than those of the contemporary Bengali reformers.
If the distinctive characteristics of Asian nationalism are considered, Gopalrao deserves to be considered as one of the earliest exponents of Indian nationalism.

Thus, Gopalrao had something to contribute to every aspect of human life and thought and particularly to social and political thought.

He studied social institution with the historical perspective and emphasised the need for studying it as a guide to the future.

In the social order, he advocated equality and justice, and distinctly demonstrated the quest for true awareness of injustice and yearning for better deal with the weaker section, and severely criticised those had failed in giving such a lead.

In the political order, he expressed gratitude for the political ideology of the British and cherished the hope that India would regain her freedom. At the same time, he criticised the working of the British Indian political system itself.

In the economic order, as one of the earliest exponents of economic nationalism, he drew attention to the drain of wealth from India, and showed awareness of the British colonialism. He tried to seek economic remedies for political liberation.
As a champion of self-government, he advocated parliamentary form and gave primacy of social over political factors.

On account of absence of institutional life in Maharashtra in his time, his thoughts remained only as individual expression.

Evaluation of Gopalrao's work suffered from prejudice. As his thoughts were rather ahead of his times for the people to appreciate him, and as such, the criticism on him was unduly severe or hyperbolic. No doubt inconsistency in his thought and action diminished his significance, but what he contributed is of permanent value and acceptability.

His influence on later thought and individuals has been facilitated by the political movements which in the beginning was ignored by the extremists' criticism. Gopalrao's contribution to social thought might have given encouragement to a study of his work. Since 1920, however, the antagonism between social and political factors disappeared and revaluation and rehabilitation of valuations of Justice Ranade, Dadabhai Naoroji, Phirozeshah Mehta and Gokhale made it possible to re-study the achievements of Gopalrao and to give him his proper place in the social and political perspective.

Gopalrao was not a genius, yet he was far above the average, had well organised mind whose insight could
penetrate deep into the future. His writings evince a logical mind, and he deserves to be considered as one of the leading social and political thinkers not only in Maharashtra but in Western India in particular and in India in general.
1. Plamenatz writes:

"According to Turgot, given man's natural capacities and the nature of the world in which he lives, all societies, as they change, tend to pass through the same stage, though from a variety of causes peculiar to this or that society, all societies do not pass through these stages at the same speed, some make progress more quickly than others and some stagnate and there are also other differences between them due to their different circumstances. But where there is progress, the order of it is determined in a general way by two factors: by human nature and by what is broadly similar in man's natural environment in all parts of the world."


20. This reminds us of the equality of savings and investment propounded by Lord Keynes.

26. Palmer and Perkins have given the five distinctive characteristics of Asian Nationalism:-

1. It had more social and cultural overtones.

2. It had strong negative aspect, in origin it was a reaction against foreign rule and against colonialism.

3. With certain exceptions sought to avoid some worst tendencies of Western nationalism.

4. It is linked much more closely with movements for economic and social reform.

5. It is generally consistent with cosmopolitanism, humanism, peace etc.
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