Modern Indian thinkers and leaders took the concept of Swaraj from Vedas and reinterpreted it in accordance with the requirements of the time. They talked about Swaraj both in terms of an individual (moral and spiritual freedom) and the nation (self-government). Further they insisted that there was a connection between the process by which an individual attains swaraj or self-rule and the process by which a nation attains swaraj or self-government.

Aurobindo stressed that according to Vedanta, every individual was an expression of the Universal and his aim was to realise his identity with the Universal. According to him, “Swaraj emphasises the idea of self-sufficiency and insists on it. It mitigates against the idea of there being any limit to our expansion. We must be full, we must be perfect, we are the divinity in embryo and when fully developed we shall be co-existensive with God himself. This is what Swaraj unmistakably means. It at once embodies the ideals of independence, unity, liberty.”¹

Vedanata, according to Aurobindo regarded Swaraj as the object to be pursued by the individuals. Aurobindo moved further and talked of Swaraj in terms of national freedom. He said, “If this is the object of an individual

life, the nation should set its heart on the same ideal. The nation should try to know itself, to work out its potentialities, to realise its mightiness and identify with the Universal.”

Aurobindo took the idea that man was inalienably free and bondage was an illusion from the *Upanishads* and reinterpreted it in terms of national *swaraj*. He referred to the *Upanishads*, which hold that so long as man enjoyed the sweets of this world, he seemed to be enslaved by the *Maya* of the world. It was by coming across bitter experiences that that *Maya* was dispelled and man became conscious of his real self. He realised that he was free by realising the *Paramatma* who was his ‘own highest self’.

Aurobindo applied this argument relating to individual *Swaraj* to national *swaraj*. He argued “We in India fell under the influence of the foreigners *Maya* which completely possessed our souls. It was the *Maya* of the alien rule, the alien civilisation, the powers and capacities of the alien people who happened to rule over us. These were as if so many shackles that put our physical, intellectual and moral life into bondage.”

According to him the foreigners *Maya* would be dispelled through the repression of the Britishers, and Indians would find *Swaraj* within themselves.

---


Tilak also talked of *Swaraj* both in the terms of individual freedom and national freedom. He interpreted the *Vedantic* idea of *Swaraj* (spiritual freedom) in terms of national freedom and self-government. He said “What is called ‘Swarajya’ or the spiritual bliss is not at all different from the ‘Swarajya’ or the people’s government or kingdom for which we are all striving today... Our aim ought not to be the attainment of only one of these kingdoms, we must secure both.”

Similarly Gandhi also laid stress on the interrelationship between *Swaraj* of individual and that of the nation. He argued “The first step to *Swaraj* lies in the individual. The truth: ‘As with the individual, so with the universe’, is applicable here as elsewhere.” Hence, freedom for a society or a nation can only be the result of the freedom of all the individuals composing it. He insisted that “*Swaraj* of a people means the sum total of the *Swaraj* of individuals.” Political self-government of the people, therefore, could not be external, but could only be the result of the inward moral freedom of all the individuals. Gandhi prescribed rigorous self-control, discipline, moral exercise and patient suffering for the winning of *Swaraj*.

The revival of the old religious tradition as a bulwark against the encroachment of an alien western system of civilization has been very

---
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pronounced in the thoughts of some of the prominent leaders of Indian freedom movement. These leaders tried to inspire Indians and motivated them to struggle for the attainment of swaraj for their country by stressing that India had much to learn from its own history than from the history of the West.

As Dayananda Sarswati asserted that at least in matters of religion and the domain of philosophy the best modern European thought did not come up to the level of the best ancient Hindu thought. He initiated a process of 'confidence building' within the Indians. The Vedas which represent the great heritage of India, inspired him to think in terms of a 'Vedic India' and 'Vedic Swaraj' and not 'Westernised India' or 'Westernised Swaraj'.

Bipin Chandra Pal idealized and glamourized Indian institutions. He claimed that Indian nationalism was different from the materialistic and imperialistic nationalism of Europe. He claimed that such, "selfish ... patriotism was never developed in ancient India." Every nation, Pal felt, had a particular world idea of its own, and he claimed that the fundamental conception of the Vedanta philosophy – the unity of all life – was the world – idea of the new Indian nation.

---
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Swami Vivekananda felt that the future greatness of the nation could be built only on the foundations of its past greatness. To be unmindful of the past was tantamount to the negation of the very being of the nation. It meant almost the repudiation of its existence. Hence, Indian nationalism had to be built on the stable foundation of its past historical heritage.

Aurobindo also stressed the superiority of Indian civilisation and argued that the aliens had no right to impose an inferior civilisation on the Indians. According to him, “That is the true way of awakening sympathy, — by showing ourselves to the nations a people with a great past and ancient civilisation who still possess something of the genius and character of our fore-fathers, have still something to give the world and therefore, deserve freedom – by proof of our manliness and fitness.” He added “India is the guru of the nations, the physicians of the human soul in its profounder maladies; she is destined once more to new-mould the life of the world and restore the peace of the human spirit. But Swaraj is the necessary condition of her work and before she can do the work, she must fulfil the condition.”

Similarly Tilak and Gandhi did not want to reconstruct India in the image of the West. They wanted to reform Indian society, but condemned
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the efforts to remark India in the image of the West. They were proud of Indian culture and were inspired by the Indian culture and the spiritual basis of Indian life. They tried to regenerate the sleeping spirit of Indians for the attainment of Swaraj by reminding them of their glorious past.

Thus Tilak argued that in the former times, Indians were never in a state of anarchy. They were ruled by capable Hindu and Mohammedan administrators. Gandhi also argued, "that the civilization India has evolved is not to be beaten in the world. Nothing can equal the seeds sown by our ancestors. Rome went, Greece shared the same fate; the might of the Pharaohs was broken; Japan has become westernized; of China nothing can be said; but India is still, somehow or other, sound at the foundation."  

Thus many leaders of the Indian national movement were inspired by the ancient Indian civilisation and they demanded Swaraj or self-government for their country by pointing out the fact that the people having such a glorious past could not remain like slaves under the subjugation of the alien rule.

Since their country was under foreign subjection, many modern Indian thinkers and leaders felt concerned about it and talked about Swaraj in political sense as self-rule of the nation. The term Swaraj meant different things to different leaders, but there was no doubt that to all of them it

---

meant some degree of independence from the foreign control. A difference in political aim or goal — between self-government as in the colonies and complete independence — has been used to define the basic political difference between the early nationalists or moderates and the extremists or the militant nationalists.

Swami Dayananda Saraswati was the first modern Indian thinker to talk of ‘Swaraj’ in political sense. He was uncompromising in his opinion and never cherished the idea of a dominion status for India. Realising the political and economic slavery of Indians under British Raj, he gave a call that India should belong to Indians. Dayananda, who had witnessed the atrocities perpetrated by the British rulers during the rebellion of 1857, declared, “Say what you will, the indigenous native rule is by far the best.” According to him, the Indians had no independence or free and fearless government of their own. He stressed that however good others might do, self-government was the best government.

The moderate leaders such as Surendranath Bannerjea, Dadabhai Naoroji, Madan Mohan Malaviya, Gopal Krishna Gokhale had great faith in the English liberals and in the British sense of justice. They clung to the ideal of colonial self-government or Dominion status. They sought self-government within the empire and believed that Indians could achieve their political aims only through a long and laborious period of apprenticeship in
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the principles and practices of representative government. Therefore, the goal which the early leadership had placed before the nation was not the glamorous, unattainable independence from British rule, which they could not conceive of as being achieved even in a distant future. Their ideal was 'good-government' and 'a modified type of self-government.'

Surendranath Banerjea promulgated the idea of self-government. In his terminology self-government was never synonymous with independence, in the sense of India becoming a sovereign state. On the contrary, he could only envisage that when India would eventually attain a status of self-government comparable to that of the self-governing dominions, this stage would mark the perpetual union between England and India. He explicitly stated "it is not severance that we are looking forward to, but unification, permanent embodiment as an integral part of that great Empire which has given the rest of the world the models of free institutions."\(^\text{16}\)

Dadabhai Naoroji called upon Congressmen to strive towards self-government within the Empire. In 1893, he said to a British audience, "we hope to enjoy the same freedom, the same strong institutions which you in this country enjoy. We claim them as our birthright as British subjects."\(^\text{17}\) In the twenty second session of the Congress, held in Calcutta in December

---


1906, he demanded self-government or _swaraj_ like that of United Kingdom or Colonies. This was the first time that the demand for _swaraj_ was formulated officially from the Congress platform.

Gopal Krishna Gokhale wanted self-government in which the people of India and Britain would enjoy equal rights under the British rule. He presided over the 1905 Congress. The most important declaration in his presidential address was, "The goal of the Congress is that India should be governed in the interests of the Indians themselves, and that in the course of time a form of Government should be attained in this country similar to what exists in the self-governing colonies of the British Empire." In August 1906, Gokhale told Morley that the aim of the Congress was the attainment of self-government within the Empire.

Lalalajpat Rai was immensely impressed by the declaration of Dadabhai Naoroji that the goal of the Congress was to seek 'self-government or _Swaraj_ like that of the United Kingdom or the colonies'. Regarding _Swaraj_ he said, "the aim of all our efforts and the object of all our agitation, has been placed before us in clear, unambiguous and unmistakable terms. In a happy and inspired moment Mr. Naoroji struck upon that noble word —

---

18 Daniel Argov, _Moderates and Extremists in the Indian Nationalist Movement (1883-1920)_ , p. 112.
‘Swaraj’, which sums up all our political aspiration. Henceforth, ‘Swaraj’ is our war cry, our all-inspiring and all-absorbing aim in life.”\(^{19}\)

In 1928, Rai changed his demand for swaraj from colonial form of self-government to the demand for full dominion status. He believed that Dominion status would make India not independent at once, but fulfill a feasible goal, whether achieved immediately or after a few years.

On the other hand, the extremist leaders such as Bipin Chandra Pal and Sri Aurobindo rejected the aim of colonial self-government of moderate leaders. For them, the conciliation between Indian patriotism and loyalty to the Empire was anathema, and the ideal of self-governing India within the Empire a contradiction between two incompatible entities.\(^{20}\)

Bipin Chandra Pal denied the feasibility of a self-governing India within the Empire on the ground that India constituted the pillar of the Empire and therefore could exert effective self-government only if the Empire itself ceased to exist. He advocated swaraj in terms of “autonomous Government, absolutely free from British control.”\(^{21}\) After his visit to Britain in 1908, Pal came to believe in some form of imperial federation. After being converted to the ideal of imperial federation Pal explained that to rouse national consciousness it was essential that in the early years the goal of

---


complete *swaraj* should have been emphasized, but as the nationalist sentiment had been strengthened the people could now be told that the ideal of exclusive national sovereignty was an incomplete ideal, and that the empire-idea was nobler than the nation idea. He however, made it clear that India could associate with Britain in a cooperative imperial federation only if she became self-governing as any other British dominion.  

Sri-Aurobindo gave the clearest exposition of *swaraj* by declaring it synonymous with independence – “a free national Government unhampered even in the least degree by foreign control.” He insisted on absolute autonomy for India, free from British control.

Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose also had strong belief that *swaraj* or complete independence should be primary objective of each and every nation. Nehru said, “If India has a message to give to the world, it is clear that she can do so more effectively as an independent country than as a member of the British group.” Similarly, Bose in his famous book *The Indian Struggle* mentioned that the aim and objective of Forward Bloc
formed in 1939 was complete political and economic liberation of Indian people.²⁵

Tilak had a passionate love for India’s independence. However, being a shrewd politician of his time, he talked of swaraj under British sovereignty. Preaching of complete autonomy at that time could bring a person under the famous Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code, whereas the colonial formula could take shelter under the protecting wings of the High Court of Calcutta which had pronounced through Mr. Fletcher and Mr. Mitter that the above-mentioned aspiration and the preaching of it were perfectly legitimate for an Indian subject of His Majesty.²⁶ Tilak used the term swaraj to mean self-government within the British empire. He explained self-government as the possession of Indian control over the administrative machinery, but he by no means advocated the severance of India from the British Empire.

Gandhi during the first world war had asked the Indians to support the British government with the hope that the government would take progressive steps in the direction of political reforms. But the Government of India Act of 1919 and other repressive measures adopted by the government disillusioned him. He lost all faith in the justice and fair play of the British government and became a champion of Swaraj in 1920. In 1928, Gandhi was content with dominion status provided it was granted within one year.
But in 1929, he blessed the Congress proposal for *Purna Swaraj* or complete independence.

The political aspect of *swaraj* or self-rule, which thinkers like Tilak and Gandhi advocated did not merely mean the absence of alien bondage. *Swaraj* or self-government in the sense of transfer of power from one set of rulers to another set did not satisfy them. According to them *swaraj* also meant a well-governed state, promoting the well-being of the people. Further it implied rule of law and justice. It also meant that administration should be conducted in conformity with the wishes of people.

They gave a democratic orientation to the concept of *swaraj*. The key point of their concept of *swaraj* was that power must belong to the people. Tilak supported the right of the people to participate in the government of their country. He endorsed the slogan which Dadabhai Naoroji had given at the Calcutta Congress of 1906, namely that the thirst for self-government (*swarajya*) could not be assuaged by good government (*surajya*). According to Tilak, a democratic government, by its very nature, was bound to promote people’s welfare.

Gandhi’s vision of *swaraj* roams far beyond decolonization and the installation of an all-Indian government voted into office by Indians. For Gandhi, any independence worthy of its name must be comprehensive: not
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only must the Indian nation be self-governing but so must each of its members.

Like Tilak, Gandhi too had a democratic conception of Swaraj. He said, "I want the rule of and for the masses of India. Lokamanya has taught us that Home Rule or Swaraj is their birthright." However, Gandhi's democracy is not primarily about a set of procedures or institutions but about sites of self-conscious action. Gandhi's theory offers guidance in transforming what he called the 'nominal democracy' of the modern western type into a truer democracy, which is referred to as purna swaraj.

Gandhi further expanded the concept of swaraj by talking about Gram-Swaraj. It was to be a participatory democracy. He insisted that democracy would be impossible until all share the power. Gandhi's swaraj would come only when individuals learn to rule themselves, individually and collectively.

However, these thinkers did not claim Swaraj or self-government for the sake of political self-assertion. According to Aurobindo, "Swaraj as a sort of European ideal, political liberty for the sake of political self-assertion will not awaken India. Swaraj as the fulfilment of the ancient life of India under modern conditions, the return of the Satyayuga of national greatness, the
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resumption by her of her great role of teacher and guide, self-liberation of the people for the final fulfilment of the Vedantic ideal in politics, this is the true Swaraj for India."³⁰

Tilak argued, "We demand Swaraj, as it is the foundation and not the height of our future prosperity."³¹ He believed that the real spirit was to make the country their family instead of working only for their own. The step beyond it was to serve humanity and the next step was to serve God.³²

Similarly Gandhi had earnest faith in the ideal of one world but that he believed could only be attained when all nations became free, when the smallest nation could feel as tall as the tallest. Thus Gandhi's conception of Swaraj did not amount to the isolated independence but called for a dignified scheme of interdependence. In his view patriotism should not only teach that the individual should die for the country, "even a country may die, if necessary, for the benefit of the world."³³

In fact, Aurobindo, Tilak and Gandhi used the word Swaraj in a wider sense. To Tilak swaraj meant individual freedom, moral freedom and spiritual freedom besides political freedom and self government of the

country. According to Aurobindo "Swaraj is the direct revelation of God to this people, not mere political freedom but a freedom vast and entire, freedom of the individual, freedom of the community, freedom of the nation, spiritual freedom, social freedom and political freedom.

However, while talking about the external connotation of swaraj both Aurobindo and Tilak gave more importance to political freedom as compared to social and economic freedom. In an article entitled 'The one thing needful', published in Bande Mataram on 25th April 1908, Aurobindo Ghosh made the important point that no effective reform in social affairs, education and economic development was possible until there was swaraj or self-government. The first want of a subject people, according to him, was the possession of political freedom, without which they could neither be socially sound nor intellectually great. He said "The Nationalist has been putting the main stress on the necessity of political freedom almost to the exclusion of the other needs of the nation, not because he is not alive to the vital importance of those needs of economic renovation, of education, of social transformation, but because he knows that in order that his ideal of equality
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may be brought to its fullest fruition, he must first bring about the political freedom.”

Similarly Tilak had contended that the lack of political freedom was the root of all evils in the country. He therefore decided to pursue the difficult path of politics to the exclusion of everything else. He is reported to have told his friends (of course in a lighter vein) that he would arrange for the remarriage of a thousand widows on the day India would gain political independence. He said, “I don’t hold that social reconstruction must be undertaken prior to political emancipation. I attach greater importance to the latter. Without the power to shape our destiny, our national regeneration, in a large sense, cannot in my opinion, be effected and I have throughout my career tried to preach and emphasize this view.”

Thus, both Aurobindo and Tilak believed that there could be no real social or economic progress, without the achievement of swaraj or self-government. Not that they did not believe in social reform, but that they thought that social prejudices died hard and it would be long before the masses could be won over to the side of social reform. In the mean time swaraj or self-government must be achieved which would in turn facilitate the achievement of social emancipation.
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However, Gandhi realised that social evils impeded India's march to unity and swaraj. The fact that he did not wait for political freedom and worked simultaneously for the reordering of society shows that he did not consider the purely political aspect of nationalist struggle exclusively significant.

He wrote, "My work of social reform was in no way less or subordinate to political work. The fact is, when I saw that to a certain extent my social work would be impossible without the help of political work, I took to the latter and only to the extent that it helped the former. I must, therefore, confess that work of social reform or self-purification of this nature is a hundred times dearer to me than what is called purely political work." 40

Infact Gandhi further expanded the concept of Swaraj by talking about its economic and social dimensions. He repeatedly insisted that the country must rid itself not only of British rule but also traditional forms of domination, such as untouchability, as well as tame the forces of modernity and modernization which, he believed left millions of individuals unemployed and destitute. 41

For Gandhi, Swaraj worthy of its name must be comprehensive. It had political, economic and social connotations and it stood for a system

wherein there will be social equality, economic uplift of the masses and elimination of foreign political control. But at a deeper level, it meant much more than political, economic and social freedom. Gandhi understood Swaraj to be also a moral and spiritual notion. It meant the inner conquest of passions and lust. It signified the control of inner Atman over baser instincts.

To quote him, “Let there be no mistake about my conception of Swaraj. It is complete independence of alien control and complete economic independence. So at one end you have political independence, at the other the economic. It has two other ends. One of them is moral and social, the corresponding end is Dharma, i.e. religion in the highest sense of the term... Let us call this the square of Swaraj, which will be out of shape if any of its angles is untrue.”

In their conception of Swaraj, Aurobindo, Tilak and Gandhi made a distinction between “inner” and “outer” forms of freedom. Tilak gave more importance to Swaraj understood as the outer, external form of freedom. To quote him, “it is my thesis, that Swaraj in the life to come cannot be the reward of a people who have not enjoyed it in this world.”

---
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However, Aurobindo gave priority to the attainment of inner swaraj. He argued that the true freedom lies within and one can really be free by realising that "free within in free without." He said, "It is the spirit that saves, and only by becoming great and free in heart can we become socially and politically great and free." However, even Aurobindo expressed the opinion that it was very difficult to attain spiritual swaraj without outer swaraj. Thus he said, "Spiritual freedom can never be the lot of many in a land of slaves. A few may follow the path of the Yogin and rise above their surroundings, but the mass of man cannot ever take the first step towards spiritual salvation... And for those who have not the strength, spiritual freedom in political servitude is a sheer impossibility."

Gandhi argued, until the end of his life not only before Indian independence but also in the months after - that swaraj must remain hollow and meaningless without the acquisition of "inward freedom" and for this a course of action should be followed through which Indians might gain sovereignty over themselves as well as over their nation. Gandhi's conception of swaraj can be stated to be a synthesis of the natural right of
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the individual to attain political liberty as well as moral and spiritual freedom. Thus he did not maintain any sharp separation between the inner moral and spiritual swaraj and the outer swaraj. Inner swaraj was bound to consummate also in external swaraj from the unjustified restraints of society, state and government because a man who obtained freedom over his passions would not tolerate social, economic and political exploitation.

Modern Indian thinkers and leaders not only deliberated on various connotations of the concept of swaraj, but also devised the methods or techniques to be used to attain swaraj or freedom from the clutches of foreign government.

The early phase of the Indian National Congress was dominated by the moderate leaders like Dadabhai Naoroji, Pherojeshah Mehta, Surendranath Banerjea, Anand Charlu, Vijairaghavachariar, Badruddin Tyabji, Madan Mohan Malaviya, Anand Mohan Bose and Gopal Krishna Gokhale. The moderate leaders did not assign an important role to the masses or to mass struggle in their work. They assumed that for the time being political activity was to be confined to the stratum of the educated or to the 'educated classes', as they put it. In part, behind this assumption lay the belief that political action by this narrow social stratum would suffice. But even more, they believed such a limitation to be objectively inevitable. Even when they saw in abstract the need for active participation by the masses, they lacked confidence in the capacity of the Indian masses to take part in modern politics for long time to come. When they looked at the Indian
masses they only saw their apathy and ignorance, their very real social, cultural and political backwardness, and not their energy, tenacity, and capacity to make sacrifices and to fight heroically. As Sri Pherozshah Mehta in 1900 said in his Congress speech, “if the masses were capable of giving articulate expression to definite political demands, then the time would have arrived not for consultative councils but representative institutions... it is because they are unable to do so that the function and the duty devolve upon their educated and enlightened compatriots to feel, to understand and to interpret their grievances.” It would be correct to portray the leadership of the early Congress as an alliance of the educated and bourgeoisie, in which the former wielded the more preponderant influence. However, there were more compelling reasons why the Congress leadership decided against mobilising groups which were in acute social distress. A major constraint was the fear that such a strategy would offend the colonial authorities and could bring retaliatory action which could even destroy the infant nationalist organisation.

The year 1905 was notable among other things for the emergence of a new leadership in the Indian National Congress represented by Lajpat Rai,
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Bipin Chandra Pal and Bal Gangadar Tilak, or Lal-Bal-Pal as they were known. Aurobindo was also enlisted in this category. Extremists as they were called, differed from the moderates on a number of issues. Extremists charged that the moderates had failed to enlist mass support as a basis to negotiate with the British. They had infinite faith in the power of the masses and in the Indian people's capacity to bear the strain of a prolonged political struggle against imperialism. They believed that suppression by the Government would not throttle the mass movement. It would, instead, educate the people, arouse them further, strengthen their resolve to overthrow imperialism, and lead to a heightened political struggle. They therefore advocated the organisation of a mass struggle against imperialism and as a first step the taking of politics to the masses.

Aurobindo's strongest indictment of the Congress, dominated by moderates, was the charge that instead of evoking and organising the support of the vast Indian masses it remained a closely restricted middle-class organisation. His clear recognition of the vital necessity of converting the national movement into a mass movement incorporating the Indian masses is well illustrated in the following extract from his early writings, which reflects the prime necessity of mass awakening and participation in the national movement:

Mr. Pherozshah, in the generous heat of his temperate and carefully restricted patriotism, assures us after his genial manner that the awakening of the masses from their ignorance and misery is entirely unimportant and any expenditure of energy in that direction is entirely premature ... But with that distressed and ignorant proletariat – now that the middle class
has proved deficient in sincerity, power and judgement – with that proletariat resides, whether we like it or not, our sole assurance of hope, our sole chance in the future ... Theorist and trifler though I may be called, I again assert as our first and holiest duty the elevation and enlightenment of the proletariat. 51

Tilak held before the people the vision of the great ideal – Swaraj. He carried the message of swaraj to the smallest and the most distant part of Maharashtra. He opened the eyes of the people to their terrible condition, stark poverty and utter bondage. He called upon them to work hard and sacrifice their very best for the attainment of swaraj. He accustomed them to look back to the past and draw inspiration from it for the work of the present. He taught them to watch the administration of the day with vigilance and trained them up in organised opposition against the foreign rule and showed by personal example how to suffer for one's convictions and one's country.

Tilak awakened the slumbering masses of India from the state of ignorance, lethargy and helplessness and infused in them a sense of struggle for swaraj. He introduced Ganesh festival and Shivaji festival to unite the people and instill in them a sense of self-pride. Through social organisations and festivals, he tried to inculcate the feeling of nationalism among Indians. Thus, through a skilful marriage of religion, history and politics, Tilak had by the mid-nineties emerged as the most powerful politician in Maharashtra,
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enjoying a degree of popular following unmatched by any of his moderate rivals.  

Gandhi played an instrumental role in taking the message of swaraj to villages and the common man. The dominant objective of Gandhi's political activities was the achievement of swaraj and it was this objective, which brought forth the favourable response of a large section of the people to his appeals to participate in the political struggle. His contribution lies in the fact that through his social reform programme he could bring together larger sections of the population to the main current of India's struggle for swaraj, including Harijans, peasants and women. He inspired people to make sacrifice for the furtherance of cause of swaraj and made common man familiar with the ideology of swaraj. The political campaign led by Gandhi opened a new chapter in the history of the national movement by making the spirit of resistance to authority an important factor in public life. By the inauguration of the non-cooperation movement of 1920-22 the Indian National Congress reached the point of no return as far as its march towards the ultimate objective of swaraj or self-rule of the country was concerned.

Moderates believed in British fair play and justice and argued that the interests of India and England were allied rather than antagonistic. They believed that British rule was a safeguard against chaos and disintegration. They had great appreciation of the political and administrative unity which
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British dominion had brought to India. They sincerely hoped for British
guidance, and believed that the Englishmen, when they were apprised of the
real facts of Indian governmental systems, would do justice to the Indian
people, and great freedom fighters as they were, would introduce free
institutions in this country as well. It was this feeling which prompted
'loyalty to the British masters'. They had implicit faith in the value of
representative institutions and it was for the establishment of these that
they sought the benevolence of the English people. As Surendranath
Banerjea proclaimed, "To England we look for inspiration and guidance. To
England we look for sympathy in the struggle. From England must come the
crowning mandate which will enfranchise our people. England is our
political guide and moral preceptor."

Dadabhai Naroroji believed that prior to the establishment of British
supremacy in India, their country suffered from a perpetual state of political
anarchy. He said, "Let us speak out like men and proclaim that we are loyal
to the backbone, that we understand the benefits English rule has conferred
upon us, that we thoroughly appreciate the education that has been given to
us, the new light which has been poured upon us, turning us from darkness
into light and teaching us the new lesson that kings are made for the people
and not the people for their kings; and the new lesson we have learned

---

amidst the darkness of despotism only by the light of free English civilization.”

Similarly Gokhale also accepted the British rule over India as blessing in disguise “The western type of administrative machinery has been substituted in place of what once we had”, said Gokhale in 1905. “The country enjoys now uninterrupted peace and order. Justice, though costly, is fairly dispensed, as between Indian and Indian... Then you have introduced western education, with freedom of speech and freedom of writing. These are all things that stand to your credit.”

Moderates were not unaware of the deepening poverty due to the increasing economic exploitation of the British rule. Dadabhai Naoroji, Justice M.G. Ranade, G.V. Joshi and R.C. Dutt etc. had contributed in this field in their own manner. They, however did not feel any need of despair. The moderates believed in the British sense of Justice, they felt that the material injury was the result of lack of proper understanding of the Indian situation on the part of the British authorities. The moderates hoped that if properly approached and correctly briefed, the British rulers and the British people would correct their path and make the necessary modifications. They thus hoped to reconcile their faith in the providential character of the British

---
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rule with their experience that the alien rule had been materially injurious to India.

On the other hand Extremists believed that India's connection with England was perfidious rather than providential. They differed from moderates and criticized them for their belief that the regeneration and advancement of India depended on the continuance of the British rule. Bipin Chandra Pal summed up his views on the social and political ideas of the moderates in the following words:

There was scarcely any sense of political wrongs. On the contrary, there was a general impression that the British have established peace where there was turmoil, and a settled government where there was anarchy. Nor was there yet any perception of the ruinous economic conflict between Great Britain and India. Consequently, the desire for political freedom was very weak; and it did not go beyond getting higher appointments in the administration, and some share in the shaping of the laws of the land. The old patriotism, therefore, simply represented an awakening of the educated classes to a consciousness of their inferior position in the modern world, and a revival of the memories of the past glories of their race.

Lajpat Rai also criticised the role of the earlier leaders of the Congress and distinguishing them from the latter leadership said, "The founders of the Indian National Congress began their movement under inspiration of government and under the shadow of the high offices they held or aspired to


under that government, but the founders and inspirers of the National Movement started their propaganda by boycotting government and government patronage... The former appealed to the British government and the British nation, the latter appealed to their own people and to their God.”

Tilak was of the opinion that it was not by their purpose, but by their methods that they had earned the name 'Extremists'. He explained:

The immediate question for us is how we are to bring pressure on bureaucracy, in which we have no effective representation, but are debarred from all except subordinate positions. It is only in our answer to that question that we differ from the so-called Moderates. They still hope to influence public opinion in England by sending deputations, supporting a newspaper, and pleading the justice of our cause. Both parties, of course, have long ago given up all hope of influencing Anglo-Indian opinion here... We Extremists have determined on other methods... Our motto is self-reliance, not mendicancy– Besides the Swadeshi movement, we work by boycott and passive resistance.

Moderates generally believed in the adoption of constitutional methods for the attainment of self-government or swaraj. In a speech at Allahabad on 4th February 1907, Gokhale defined constitutional agitation as agitation by methods which people were entitled to adopt to bring about the changes they desired through the action of constituted authorities. Petitions, appeals to
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justice, resolutions passed by elected legislatures (when later constituted) and even non-payment of taxes would be constitutional, though some of these steps might not be wise or expedient.  

However moderates programme of prayers and petitions lost its hold in the wake of government’s refusal to meet the political and economic demands of the Congress. The repressive measures of the government against the growing nationalist movement induced extremists to advocate greater radicalism in the Congress. Extremists rejected the policy of mendicancy of the moderates. Aurobindo and Tilak advocated that self-reliance and faith in strength in their own spirit was essential for the attainment of swaraj. They stressed on the adoption of swadeshi, boycott and passive resistance for attaining swaraj. This programme was whole heartedly supported by B.C. Pal and Lajpat Rai. 

The twin ideas of Swadeshi and Boycott were largely supplementary, as one could not succeed without the other. The boycott of foreign goods required that their supply should be met by those produced in the country. The Swadeshi or promotion of indigenous industry could not succeed when Indian industry was at its nascent stage, unless people deliberately eschewed foreign and purchased native goods even at a pecuniary loss and sacrifice of comfort. But though the two ideas were organically connected there can be
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hardly any doubt that it was the idea of Boycott which first animated the people, and that of Swadeshi came later in its train.\footnote{R.C. Majumdar, \textit{Struggle for Freedom} (Bombay: Bhartiya Vidya Bhawan, 1969), p. 58.}

A section of the moderates school of political thought was, however, definitely against the idea of boycott of foreign goods, though it welcomed Swadeshi to which it gave birth. In the first place, they ignored the historic origin of this Boycott. Even Gokhale felt sure that “most of those who spoke of the Boycott, mean by it only the use, as far as possible, of Swadeshi articles in preference to foreign articles.”\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 59.} He argued that Boycott had a sinister meaning – it implied a vindictive desire to injure another. Gokhale therefore recommended that it would do well to use only the expression Swadeshi to describe the present movement, leaving alone the word ‘Boycott’ which created unnecessary ill-will against themselves.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}} This typical moderate attitude ignored the great historical fact that the extremists adopted the boycott as a deliberate means to injure British interests. Gokhale backed up his view by the argument that as a strict boycott of foreign goods was not at all practicable in the then industrial condition. They would only make themselves ridiculous by talking of a resolution which they could not enforce. However, he talked about swadeshi and observed in 1907:

\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}
I have said more than once, but I think the idea bears repetition, that *Swadeshism* at its highest is not merely an industrial movement but that it affects the whole life of the nation - that *Swadeshism* at its highest is a deep, passionate, fervent, all-embracing love of the motherland, and that this love seeks to show itself, not in one sphere of activity only, but in all; it involves the whole man and it will not rest until it has raised the whole man. My own personal conviction is that in this movement we shall ultimately find the true salvation of India."⁶⁶

On the other hand extremists emphasised that boycott and *swadeshi* were complementary to each-other. As Bipin Chandra Pal said, "this Swadeshism or boycott is not a mere economic movement. No economic movement is purely economic. Politics and economics are indissolubly bound up together in every country, as it is in India... Swadeshism must associate itself with politics and when Swadeshism associates itself with politics, it becomes boycott, and this boycott is a movement of passive resistance. It is a movement of the determination of the people not only to save the industries of the nation but also to create those forces in the community which by passive methods work out the problem of Swaraj."⁶⁷

Aurobindo saw in the boycott movement a potent weapon whereby it might be possible for India to shake off British rule without a bloody revolution. To quote him, "We must always remember in this connection that alien absolutism in this country depends helplessly on the cooperation of our own people. Let that co-operation be withdrawn and bureaucratic
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absolutism tumbles in like a house of cards. A very old discovery this, but it is only now that India seems to be within a measurable distance of actively grasping its significance. And it is this necessity of indigenous help that renders a bloodless passage to liberty in India perhaps possible.\textsuperscript{68}

The logical corollary of boycott was swadeshi, the manufacture in one's own country of all the goods that the people required. This obviously could not be done overnight, in fact it was a long and slow process, but the ideal of economic self-sufficiency was an essential counterpart to the theory of boycott. As Aurobindo put it, "if we refuse to supply our needs from foreign sources, we must obviously supply them ourselves; we cannot have the industrial boycott without swadeshi and the expansion of indigenous industries."\textsuperscript{69}

Tilak also regarded swadeshi and boycott essential for the attainment of swaraj. He stressed the fact that swadeshi was impossible without boycott. According to him, effort should be made by the Indians to adopt swadeshi or indigenous goods and boycott the foreign made goods. He stressed that boycott was a strong political weapon. He said, "we are not armed, and there is no necessity for arms either. We have a stronger weapon, a political weapon, in boycott... So many of you need not like arms; but if you have not the power of active resistance, have you not the power of self-denial and self-abstinence in such a way as not to assist this foreign

\textsuperscript{68} Karan Singh, \textit{Prophet of Indian Nationalism}, pp. 123-124.
\textsuperscript{69} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 124.
Government to rule over you? This is boycott and this is what is meant when we say, boycott is a political weapon.\(^{70}\)

Opposing the view of the British administrators that the *swadeshi* campaign must be divorced from politics, he said, “If the Indian government dissociates itself from the commercial aspirations of the British nation, then it will be time for Swadeshi workers to consider the question of dissociating their movement from politics. But so long as politics and commerce are blended together, in this policy of the Government of India, it will be a blunder to dissociate Swadeshi from politics. In fact Swadeshism is a large term which includes politics and to be a true Swadeshi one must look on all lines – whether political or industrial or economical – which converge our people towards the status of a civilised nation.”\(^{71}\)

These ideas of boycott and *Swadeshi* advocated by Tilak were later on developed by Gandhi into a potent weapon to strike the roots of British rule in India. These very ideas formed the basis of Gandhi’s non-cooperation movement in 1920-22 and the civil disobedience movement of 1930-32. Expressing his views on boycott, Gandhi argued, that their (Indians) voluntary cooperation was more responsible for their subjection rather than British guns. Like Tilak, Gandhi believed that boycott was not possible without *Swadeshi*. However, he preached the gospel of *Swadeshi* on a wider


\(^{71}\) K.P. Karunakaran, *Indian Politics from Dadabhai Naoroji to Gandhi*, p. 83.
scale and tried to take it to the masses by introducing *charkha* and *khaddar*. *Swadeshi* according to Gandhi was a political and economic method to improve the condition of Indian people.

The extremists substituted the use of Passive Resistance in place of means, hitherto used by the moderate leadership in India's struggle for *Swaraj*. As Pal believed that the method of passive resistance would be no less effective. He said:

If we may not oppose physical force by physical force, we may yet make the administration in India absolutely impossible by simply taking our hands off the machine of the state...By refusing to accept it [the government] as our own... a refusal which is in nowise criminal, we can, we believe, bring this Government down on its knees far more effectively by absolutely peaceful means than we may ever hope to do by any violent measures. Our ideal is freedom, which means absence of all foreign control... Our method is passive-resistance, which means organized determination to refuse to render any voluntary or honorary service to the government.  

Similarly, Lala Lajpat Rai believed that the people had to be educated in a school of politics and initiated into a religion of true patriotism and for this the adoption of the political method of passive resistance was "perfectly legitimate, perfectly constitutional and perfectly justifiable."  

Sri Aurobindo also advocated the technique of passive resistance, which he thought to be the most natural and suitable weapon under the circumstances. The method of passive resister was to abstain from doing
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anything by which he would be helping the government thus making British administration ineffective. Similarly Tilak argued "Though down-trodden and neglected, you must be conscious of your power of making the administration impossible if you but choose to make it so." \[74\]

The extremists discerned that British rule over India was based on co-operation of Indian people and held the view that they could make the foreign administration impossible by withdrawing their support. Thinkers like Thoreau and Tolstoy had developed the idea of passive-resistance. Extremists advised the people to put it into practice. They regarded boycott and *Swadeshi* as the techniques of passive resistance. This passive resistance to unjust and oppressive authority, was later extensively used by Gandhi.

Gandhi's method of *Satyagraha* was closer to Tilak's policy of passive resistance as compared to Gokhale's constitutional methods. Infact in the early days Gandhi himself called his movement as passive resistance and his workers as passive resisters. However, later he started using the term *Satyagraha*.

However, there were two differences between the Gandhian *Satyagraha* and the passive resistance advocated by extremist leaders like Tilak and Aurobindo. Firstly, to extremist leaders, passive resistance was a political technique of limited application. Sometimes it meant only *Swadeshi*.

\[74\] B.G. Tilak, *His Writings and Speeches*, p. 77.
and boycott, while sometimes by Aurobindo in his articles on "The Doctrine of Passive resistance" it was extended to cover even disobedience of unjust laws and decrees. But the Gandhian Satyagraha included a more comprehensive set of technics and methods than even this extended concept of passive-resistance of Aurobindo. Passive resistance is mainly contemplated at a political level. Satyagraha can be practiced at all levels – domestic, social and political. Secondly, Tilak and Aurobindo did not condemn violence on moral grounds. Gandhi on the other hand accepted the absolutism of Ahimsa.

Thus according to Gandhi, "Satyagraha differs from Passive Resistance as the North Pole from the South. The later has been conceived as a weapon of the weak and does not exclude the use of physical force or violence for the purpose of gaining one's end, whereas the former has been conceived as a weapon of the strongest and excludes the use of violence in any shape or form."  

Tilak did not believe in non-violence as a creed or dogma. Further, Tilak considered Gandhi's adherence to absolute non-violence to be in keeping only with Jain and not with the Hindu religion. Referring to his differences with Gandhi, Tilak said, "I was under the impression that Gandhi was a Jain, because all his opinions and teachings savour of the Jain religion, non-violence, satyagraha, fasting etc. All these are more in keeping
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with the Jain teachings than the Hindu religion. But these means are of no use in politics... Exalted religious principles or abstract doctrines about truth are not of much value in the present political game.” He considered that it may not be possible to avoid a certain element of violence or bloodshed when there was a mass movement in support of a hartal or other form of passive resistance. He said, “I do not think that satyagraha and fasting will have the least effect upon the mind of our rulers who are adepts in political warfare. We must use against them the same means as they use against us and as their tactics change so must ours.”

Gandhi himself was acutely conscious of his differences with Tilak. In answer to an anonymous letter where Gandhi, the civil resister, had been charged with being a hypocrite in claiming to be a disciple of Gokhale, the constitutionalist, Gandhi wrote in the Young India in July 1921: “But I am conscious that my method is not Tilak’s method. And that is why I have still difficulty with some of the Maharashtra leaders. But I sincerely think that Tilak did not disbelieve in my method. I enjoyed the privilege of his confidence. And his last word to me in the presence of several friends was, just a fortnight before his death, that mine was an excellent method if people could be persuaded to take to it. But he said he had doubts. I know no other
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method. I can only hope, that when the final test comes, the country will be proved to have assimilated the method of non-violent non-cooperation.”

Gandhi wanted, like Gokhale – his political Guru, spiritualisation of politics. Gokhale stressed incorporating of moral values in politics. Gandhi also wished to be guided by that message. For him politics was the pathway to the service of God. But Gandhi’s attachment to the concept of non-violence was far deeper and more extensive than that of Gokhale.

According to Tilak, true non-violence was an eternal moral ideal, but in actual practice it was very difficult to stick to it under all situations. The problem, as Tilak saw it was that in an imperfect world it was not possible to practice absolute non-violence or non-retaliation. It was a common experience that in spite of one’s best efforts sometimes one had to come into clash with others just because of the immoral and unreasonable behaviour of the latter. Tilak argued that there would be chaos in society if evil was not resisted by force to ensure safety of the citizen’s life and honour. According to Tilak, the Gita supported righteous killing. This was evident from the fact that Lord Krishna encouraged Arjuna to kill his enemies as a matter of duty. If duty demanded killings, it had to be performed without any hesitation, but without any personal motive either.
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Gandhi believed in the ethical principles (e.g. truth and non-violence) as absolute and invariable under all circumstances. He did not recognise any exception to them. Gandhi recognised solely unilateral obligation for ethical conduct irrespective of the plan and policy the other party might follow, he would in no case initiate or support any untruthful or violent action in retaliation even in self-defence. He followed and recommended only non-violent action involving suffering by oneself even unto death.  

According to Gandhi, The *Gita*, symbolized a moral battle that continually went on in the heart of man between the forces of good and evil. The physical warfare described in the *Mahabharata* was only symbolic, not necessarily real. Gandhi argued that the author of the *Mahabharata* “has not established the necessity of a physical warfare; on the contrary, has proved its futility.”

He adopted the well known Buddhist tenet 'Ahimsa paramo dharma'.

Tilak's emphasis on the principle of political realism was in sharp contradiction to Gandhi's insistence on ethical consistency. Tilak used religion as a psychological force to mobilise the masses on a common platform for the attainment of *Swaraj* of the country. Contrarily, Gandhi believed religion to be an integral part of politics.
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He began the discussion with a brief criticism of Tilak's view of politics: "L. Tilak represents a definite school of thought of which he makes no secret. He considers that everything is fair in politics. We have joined issue with him in that conception of political life... we believe that nothing but the strictest adherence to honesty, fair play and charity can advance the true interests of the country." Tilak immediately took issue with the remark and, in a letter to Young India, replied, "I am sorry to see that in your article on 'Reform Resolution' in the last issue, you have represented me as holding that I considered 'everything fair in politics'. I write this to you to say that my view is not correctly represented herein. Politics is a game of worldly people, and not of Sadhus and instead of the maxim 'akkhodhenajine kkhodham' as preached by Buddha, I prefer to rely on the maxim of Sri Krishna 'ye gatthaa mam parapadyamethe thamsthatthaiva bhajaamyaham'. That explains the whole difference and also the meaning of my phrase 'responsive co-operation'. Both methods are equally honest and righteous but the one is more suited to this world than the other." Gandhi answered:

I naturally feel the greatest diffidence about joining issue with the Lokamanya in matters involving questions of interpretation of religious works. But there are things in or about which
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instinct transcends even interpretation. For me there is no conflict between the two texts quoted by the Lokamanya. The Buddhist text lays down an eternal principle. The text from the Bhagavad Gita shows to me how the principle of conquering hate by love, untruth by truth, can and must be applied. If it be true that God metes out the same measure to us that we mete out to others, it follows that if we would escape condign punishment, we may out-return anger for anger but gentleness even against anger. And this is the law not for the unwordly but essentially for the worldly. With deference to the Lokamanya, I venture to say that it betray mental laziness to think that the world is not for Sadhus. The epitome of all religions is to promote Purushartha, and Purushartha is nothing but a desperate attempt to become Sadhus, i.e., to become gentleman in every sense of the term.

He added, "Finally, when I wrote the sentence about 'everything being fair in politics' according to the Lokamanya's creed, I had in mind his oft-repeated quotation 'shaddham prathi shaddhyam' [Tit for Tat]. To me it enunciates bad law... In any case, I pit the experience of a third of a century against the doctrine underlying 'shaddham prathi shaddhyam'. The true law is 'shaddham pratyapi satyam' [Do only that which is truthful].

Thus it is observed that though there was much in common between Tilak and Gandhi in their perception of Swaraj, they differed to a certain extent in their views as regards the methods to be used for the attainment of Swaraj.
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An Evaluation

Tilak was a scholar, a teacher and an awakener, Gandhi a seeker, a man of the people and an inspirer. Tilak was the Lokamanya, Gandhi was the Mahatma. Each fulfilled the obligations of his swadharma. Both leader communicated directly with the people because each lived a life related to the classical values and seeking the purpose of life which the people understood. Both made the attainment of Swaraj the goal of their life.

Tilak and Gandhi taught the classical message of perfect yourself, dedicate yourself to the highest aspiration of man, live in Truth, live in your true Nature, strive for the fulfilment of the purpose of life. Self-reliance, courage and willingness to sacrifice motivated each man and was a part of their message to all men. The willingness to act, to meet the challenges of the world and to make of the world a better place in which to live guided each man and was a part of the message of each. They each relied upon the people, their wisdom and their willingness to act, to bring about their common goal.

Tilak and Gandhi devoted their whole lives for the attainment of swaraj. Both of them analysed and discussed various connotations of swaraj. Tilak stressed on the spiritual, moral and political connotations of swaraj. However; it can be argued that since their country was under foreign domination at that time, he laid more stress on the attainment of swaraj in the political sense.
A word may here be said about a criticism levelled against Tilak that he neglected the important issue of social reform. It is true that he did not lay very much emphasis upon this aspect of public life which has now assumed so much significance, but this was not because he considered social reforms unimportant. It was rather because he was convinced of the primary necessity of securing political swaraj before a really effective scheme of social reform could be attempted with any hope of success. He recognised the importance of such reform, but felt that it could not precede political swaraj. To attempt social reform before becoming independent would not only be to put the cart before the horse, but also to fritter away energies that could more usefully be yoked to the national movement itself. It was this view, and not any aversion to social reform per se, that led Tilak to attack the moderate leadership for their obsession with social problems.

Gandhi's greatest legacy to the nation is swaraj and the attainment of political swaraj was the first step. However, he was realistic enough to visualise that India's political integration would be weak and she would be exposed to foreign invaders unless political swaraj was supplemented with economic swaraj, social swaraj and moral swaraj. He wanted the consolidation of a social and political system in this country which would claim the moral and emotional allegiance and loyalty of all citizens. Thus Gandhi's concept of swaraj was much more broader in nature than that which was conceived by Tilak.
It was Tilak and the nationalists who first envisaged swaraj, not mere acceptance of alien domination, not administrative reforms, not evolving colonial government, not an imitation of nineteenth century utilitarian European political philosophy, not an emerging European-inspired nationalism, but swaraj in the classical Indian value system as India’s birthright. Swaraj was India’s goal and it was the legacy of the Lokamanya. It was the foundation of new ‘right ordering’ of the Indian political community. Swaraj was the fulfilment and the beginning, it was the embodiment of the traditional values of the Bharatdharma. It was the political ideal that called up the life ideal of the Indian civilization.

Gandhi’s leadership of the movement of Indian Nationalist independence from 1920 to 1947 was a momentus struggle for the assertion of the political right of swaraj. He could not tolerate any attack on the political rights of Indians. While his leadership of the satyagraha in South Africa was based on his fearless advocacy of the cause of civil rights, the Indian theatre witnessed an extension of his activities in quest of political right of swaraj. In India, he had to fight the unchallenged sway of an arrogant imperialism. With eminent courage and devotion he fought for the attainment of swaraj.

Tilak and Gandhi explicitly played a dominant role in the furtherance of the feeling and awareness of self-rule or swaraj amongst the general populace. Both of them vehemently advocated swaraj as the only alternative
for the amelioration and emancipation of the country. The general masses were overwhelmed by their efforts for the attainment of swaraj.

However, the political connotation of swaraj meant to Tilak and Gandhi not only the end of the foreign rule. It was much more comprehensive in nature. It envisaged that form of governmental system in which interests of the people would be protected. They argued that the government existed for the welfare and development of the people. According to them Swaraj also implied good government, which satisfied the growing aspirations of the masses and they were of the view that the public affairs should be carried out in accordance with the wishes of the people. Thus Tilak and Gandhi can be credited for democratising the government system. According to them, swaraj could be attained if true democracy did not depend merely on the protection of rights of the strong in society but on the solid defence of the weaker sections of the society. It was not an ideology or a government which permitted the privileged few to represent the hopes and aspirations of common men and women.

Tilak and Gandhi were persons of a great vision. It can be added to their contribution that even at that time when their country was under foreign rule they were able to visualise that without proper participation of the masses in the government system, swaraj in its real sense could not be attained. As Tilak asserted that swaraj meant representative government and in that type of government, wishes of the people would be respected and acted upon. That means people's participation in the public affairs was a
must. He also believed in decentralisation of power to attain *swaraj*. He spread the message among masses that authority should be in the hands of the people and believed in government which was for the people and not only by the people. According to him that to give authority into people's hands was the best principle of administration.

Gandhi's *swaraj* was also in effect based upon his idea of decentralisation of economic and political powers. He further developed the concept of decentralisation of power and took it to the local and village level. He introduced the concept of *Gram swaraj*.

However, it can be argued that today democracy has lost its real sense and has become a mockery in the hands of politicians, businessman and bureaucrats. It is observed that in present time power has remained concentrated in their hands. The persisting tendency towards concentration or centralisation of power, power without a sense of dedicated service, political and economic corruption, degeneration of the representatives of the sovereign people have all infused a sense of urgency and relevance to the Tilak’s and Gandhi’s democratic and participatory conception of *swaraj*.

The remedies to these problems, according to Tilak’s and Gandhi’s views are based on effective participation of the people in the socio-economic and political systems. Political power should eventually be vested in the hands of the weaker and under-privileged sections of the society. In any event, the powerful sections of the society will have to share power with the backward and less fortunate sections of the society. Democratic society
should achieve an ideal condition in which every individual will have
opportunity to develop his personality to the highest possible level, only then
the *swaraj* of Tilak’s and Gandhi’s conception can be attained.

It can be argued that the 73rd and the 74th Constitutional Amendment
Acts are in consonance with Tilak’s and Gandhi’s ideas. The 73rd
Constitutional Amendment Act is an effort to achieve the democratic
decentralisation in the country. The Amendment Act has emphasised the
role of the *gram* panchayat (i.e. the panchayat located at village level) and
considered it an important level and a device to decentralise powers,
responsibilities and authority so that this institution may become enough
empowered to utilise its capacity to discharge responsibilities essential in
making it a real level of local self-government at village level.\(^1\) Similarly the
74th constitution amendment act is meant to bring in genuine urban local
self-governance through decentralisation of powers from the state to the local
level, and also transparency, accountability and people’s participation in
urban governance.\(^2\)

Moreover, Gandhi’s concern for local government particularly for
village panchayats has been considered responsible for including Article 40
in the constitution of India. A large number of laws have been enacted to
implement the directive of Art. 40 to organise village panchayats and endow


them with powers of self-government. Though the constitution and functions of the panchayats vary according to the terms of the different State Acts, generally speaking, the panchayats, elected by the entire adult population in the villages, have been endowed with powers of civic administration such as medical relief, maintenance of village roads, streets, tanks and wells, provision of primary education, sanitation and the like.

However, Tilak and Gandhi were mainly preoccupied with the elaboration of the political dimension of the concept of swaraj in the sense of self-rule or freedom from alien rule. This was in accordance with the requirements of time, since their country was under foreign subjection.

It is the contribution of Tilak and Gandhi that they taught the people that they need not humbly submit to alien conceptions of either the purpose of life or the right ordering of life. They reminded the nation of its history and its heritage and the people learned that by following their own civilization, they might better face the challenges of an alien civilization and create for themselves a meaningful life on the foundations of their own philosophy of life. This pride in history and in classical values allowed a self-reliant India to grow strong and to take action to bring about a better way of life in accordance with India's own vision of life and the world.

Thus the factor in their thought which helped to revitalize the spirit of India was their profound reappraisal of the true springs of Indian culture, of the true greatness of her spiritual heritage. This helped to break the myth of British cultural superiority so assiduously fostered by the foreign rulers.
To Tilak and Gandhi, India seemed to have a character, a tradition, a personality. What mattered to them was the preservation of those ways of living which were peculiar to India, through which alone, they said, she could rediscover her soul, her strength and attain her swaraj. While talking about the glorious past of India, Tilak and Gandhi knew that once the spiritual and religious springs of India's great past were revitalized, the greatness and glory of Her future were assured.

Though they led India in the struggle for its survival, they were never dogmatists. Though they rejected imitation of the West for the sake of imitation, they constantly advocated that India should learn from the West. Though they were fearless fighters against the British bureaucracy, they respected Britain for all that was noble, kind and progressive in the British way of life. Though they suffered in the struggle for the attainment of swaraj, they suffered willingly and never engendered hatred or a desire for revenge.

Tilak and Gandhi left a monumental legacy to the independence movement for the attainment of swaraj. The independence movement largely through their work, had been victorious over stagnation, the spirit of orthodoxy that was negative, that compartmented rather than unified, and that could not rise to accept the challenges of the twentieth century. Tilak freed the nation from lethargy and stagnation, and in awakening the people inspired them with a promise of awakening India, an India united, strong and capable of action, self-reliant and on the road to the attainment of
It can be argued that Tilak was one of the first Indian leaders to recognise the absolute necessity of generating mass enthusiasm and participation in the national cause, of getting the support of all the varied constituents of the Indian body politics, in other words, of democratising the whole movement. Thus Tilak's fight for swaraj, crusade against injustice, oppression and tyranny, his endeavour to create an effective public opinion through newspapers like Kesari and Maratha, his emphasis on mass education, his concern for the peasants, workers, tillers and the downtrodden, his identification with the masses, and his call for national awakening in India made him a symbol of nationalism in India.

Tilak trenchantly criticised the Congress for remaining a confined and narrow organisation without any mass support. He was thus one of the earliest true democrats in the modern Indian sense. He changed the Congress from a debating and petition presenting body into the vanguard of a vast united nationalist movement. He laid the foundation for the Congress becoming the greatest and largest voluntary political organisation in the history of India. He prepared the way for Gandhi and Sardar Patel to teach the people the disciplined non-violent way of action which led Indians to eventual attainment of swaraj. When Tilak appeared on the scene, Indian politics was a diversion of the leisured classes. When he left it, it was broad based on the participation of the common people.

The task initiated by Tilak was completed by Gandhi. The political campaign led by Gandhi opened a new chapter in the history of the national
movement by making the spirit of resistance to authority an important factor in public life. Non-cooperation movement was an effective means for creating political consciousness in a country that had been groaning under oppression for centuries. It gave to the unarmed masses a powerful weapon to resist the militarily superior ruler.

Before Gandhi's appearance on the Indian political scene, the Nationalists led by Tilak, Pal, Aurobindo etc. followed this technique, though their outlook was different from that of Gandhi. However, by the inauguration of the non-cooperation movement of 1920-22 the Indian National Congress reached the point of no return as far as its march towards the ultimate objective of swaraj or self-rule of the country was concerned. Thus it is observed that during the freedom struggle Gandhi led the masses of India into an upsurge the like of which was not witnessed in the whole history of India.

When he launched the non-cooperation movement he asked the students to boycott the schools and colleges and plunge into the struggle. There was an overwhelming response to this call and the students in thousands boycotted the schools and colleges and took out processions to protest against the British rule. Similarly when he gave a call to the Indian lawmen to boycott the British courts, leading legal luminaries like Patel, Motilal Nehru and Rajendra Prasad, who had roaring legal practice, did just that. Under the swadeshi movement there went up a call for the people to
discard the foreign made clothes and to adopt *khadi*. In response to this call people made bonfire of their foreign clothes and started wearing *khaddar*.

Tilak and Gandhi tried to mobilize people for the attainment of *Swaraj* by appealing to their religious sentiments. It goes to the credit of Tilak that he spoke the idiom of the masses, of the majority, explaining the significance of political action in Hindu philosophical terms, as a sacred *dharma* ordained by God to fight the alien ruler for the attainment of *swaraj*. Using mass belief systems and political myths, Tilak communicated by the use of popular religious symbols, his message to the masses more successfully than the liberal tradition had done. No wonder Tilak was dubbed as the ‘father of Indian unrest’ and he owned it proudly, while he unsuccessfully sued the libellous journalist, Sir Valentine Chirol, for damages. Tilak did much more than germinate unrest in the minds of his countrymen, he made it vocal, he gave it shape, he directed it into constructive channels.

Gandhian parameters of the study and use of religion for mass mobilisation for the attainment of *swaraj* have been markedly different from all the traditional and modern typologies. According to him, a religious life meant a purified and chastened life and such a life was bound to have immense social and political impact. Religions were meant to tame our savage nature. They aimed to suppress the beastly in man and to enshrine his spiritual and moral will. For Gandhi religion was an essential element and inherent aspect of politics and for him there was no dichotomy between them.
Gandhi, with his traditional bearings envisioned a moral order in a world shattered by man's selfishness, and intolerance, where poverty reigned supreme with injustice inflicting all nooks and corners of humanity. It can be added to his contribution that during the entire Gandhian era, the political leadership, by the use of the religious Hindu idioms, exhibited moral courage, integrity, and faith in means as well as in ends. A blending of mass agitational methods, inspiring courage to face force, but not use counter force, together with a willingness to play the game of constitutionalism whenever that was required, gave the Gandhian era a peculiar strength and created a suitable niche for both the agitator and the polished debator in the wide spectrum of the national freedom struggle for attaining swaraj.

Gandhi strove for Hindu-Muslim unity, convinced that ultimately both religions were true and valid and were complementary to each-other. Like Gokhale, he was opposed to considering politics as pastime. He taught the lesson that politics was the pathway to the service of God. He wanted the religious spirit to flourish which means a recovery of divine faith and the consequent purification of motives and conduct. The central principle of Gandhian conception of swaraj is that the fundamental religious ethic common to all great religions has to be made concrete in individual, social and political life. It is, hence, opposed to regarding political action as the sphere of the non-moral.

However, it has been argued that many of Tilak's and Gandhi's beliefs and practices were rooted in revivalism and some of the words like
Ramarajya, Purna swaraj, suraj, dharma, karma, etc., to which they tried to give currency, aroused suspicion in the minds of Muslims. This fact was also partly responsible for the failure of both Tilak and Gandhi to evolve a social philosophy that could unite all Indian communities into one nation despite their interpretation of the Vedanta in correspondence with this end, for the non-Hindus always regarded the Vedanta as a part of Hindu religion. The use of Hindu religious terms by Hindu leaders for social and political ends kept the non-Hindus away from them.

The concept of swaraj of Tilak and Gandhi bears a theological look since it revolves round the old theological concepts such as Brahman, God, Karma, moksha, etc., which restrict the scope of their philosophy and obstructs their efforts to develop a universal and consistent social philosophy.

It has been further argued that the social and political philosophy of Tilak and Gandhi in general and the concept of swaraj in particular acquired some degree of revivalistic colour at least so far as the masses were concerned, since it was mostly concerned with the interpretation of old beliefs and doctrines. It is not denied that they have filled old ideals with new meanings consistent with the aspirations and needs of the modern age but the masses rarely catch such subtleties of the modern age and are moved by names and forms. This situation gave a revivalistic colour to the struggle for swaraj led by them.
Thus Nehru complained that inspite of the fact that Gandhi's religion was not dogmatic, his religious outlook on life imparted a revivalistic character to his movement so far as the masses were concerned. This can be said more about the national movement led by Aurobindo, Bipin Chandra Pal and Tilak.

Tilak has been criticised for dividing Hindu-Muslims by starting Ganesh and Shivaji festivals in Maharashtra. The report of the Sedition Committee, presided over by Rowlatt, stressed the anti-Muslim character of the festival. The idea of starting Ganesh festival first found expression in a private talk between Tilak, Namjoshi and others who had gathered after the Hindu-Muslim riots in 1893 to concert measures against those riots and to express the real Hindu opinion about them. In this meeting it was suggested that the individual celebration of this festival by some of those present, should be expanded to embrace a larger number of people and reach farther afield. According to the report:

The idea appears to have been to make the procession in which the God is carried to his final resting-place in the water as offensive as possible to Mohammedans by framing them upon the same lines as the procession at the Muharram festival... During the 10 days' celebration of the festival bands of young men paraded the streets of Poona singing verses calculated to intensify the feelings against Mohammedans and government... Ganapati processions were naturally followed by disturbances. On one occasion the police came in conflict with a mela estimated at from 50 to 70 men which deliberately provoked

---

disorder by passing on procession a mosque in which a Mohammedan religious gathering was assembled.

However, it can be argued that the Rowlatt Committee's Report was not aimed at being an objective study but was meant to strengthen the foundations of an alien imperialism trying to implement the maxim of 'divide and rule'. So greatly prejudiced was its starting-point that it had never cared to differentiate between anti-Moslemism and Hindu solidarity. A more reliable and authentic interpretation of the Ganapati festival has been given by Bipin Chandra Pal. He compared the word gana to the Greek word demos. According to him the Ganapati festival had a democratic implication to the extent that all sections of the population, from the Brahmins to the Sudras could participate in it. Every community could bring its own Ganapati to the procession and thus it became an experiment in democracy.

Similarly Tilak's attempt to initiate Shivaji festival has been criticised. It has been argued that the festival became an annual observance at which stirring speeches were delivered recalling the powers of the leaders who revolted against the foreign domination of the Mohammedans. Thus in the eyes of the foreign critics, journalists and observers, whatever was calculated to strengthen the Hindu solidarity smacked of racial hatred both against the Muslims and the British.

---

Gandhi has also been criticised for uniting and awakening Muslims, for making much of the Khilafat wrongs and laying too much stress on the religious and spiritual side of the non-cooperation movement. All this, it has been argued, led to revivalism and Hindu-Muslim conflicts. It must be remembered that Muslim masses would have been roused in any case because of the Khilafat agitation. What Gandhi did was to speed up the process and give it direction. His object was to make the Muslims anti-British and lead them to promote the struggle for attaining swaraj by stirring their religious consciousness. In this he was greatly successful. Taking into consideration the objective conditions existing in India, there was nothing wrong in exploiting religion for political ends and rousing the people from their slumber. This has been done in the past in India and elsewhere and is being done even today in states which are secular and even anti-religious. The mistake Gandhi made was, that he made a fetish of religion and regarded it not merely as a means but also an end in itself.

However, Tilak's and Gandhi's concept of swaraj or self-government of the nation never descended into narrow chauvinism. It was constantly placed in a broader international context. Tilak foresaw India's role in the world as a messenger of the world reawakening, or a world rediscovery of spiritual values. He knew and loved the philosophy of life of his civilization. He knew the Sanatana Dharma was not solely India's possession but that it belonged to the world, that it was eternal and that that which was eternal was universal, and he saw in it the answer to the prayers of mankind for
guidance, for peace and for justice. According to him, after swaraj, free India, living in peace and advancing to meet her destiny, guided by the eternal and universal philosophy of life, would be the greatest positive force in the world.

Gandhi had the vision to interpret the struggle for the attainment of swaraj as the process of the liberation of Asia. Through his leadership of the Indian freedom movement, indirectly, he had helped the revitalization of Asian political consciousness. He was proud of being born in Asia, because it was in ancient Asia that all the great religious teachers and prophets flourished. To the members of the white race proud of their so-called 'white man's burden', Gandhi appeared as the quintessence of the new defiant spirit of modern Asia. He gave to the world the message of peace, unity, love and brotherhood. He was an inspiration for several icons like Nelson Mandela, Martin Luther King Jr and John F Kennedy.

Another facet of Tilak's and Gandhi's thought which enabled them to impart fresh spirit into the national movement was their stress on suffering and sacrifice to achieve swaraj. Their flaming advocacy of India's right to swaraj swept aside the more modest goals of the moderates and cut them off from the main stream of public support. Tilak and Gandhi were among those rare thinkers whose thought was not confined only to the theoretical implications of a problem but who descended into the area of life and tested their theories against the actual demands of practical politics.
Tilak and the early Nationalists must be given credit for leaving a legacy of the technique of struggle which resulted in the final attainment of swaraj. In India it were the Nationalists who first presented the nation with the programme of action which was the precursor to the non-cooperation movement of Gandhi. The Nationalists also first instructed the nation in non-violent passive-resistance as the technique of successful struggle. And this was the precursor to the non-violent civil disobedience of the later independence struggle.

However, Gandhi resynthesized this programme and these techniques within the framework of his own ethical system and refined them to meet the specific needs of the later independence movement under specific conditions. But in large measure, the later Congress must always be indebted to the early Nationalists who first initiated and first applied these weapons in the battle with the British bureaucracy on Indian soil.

It goes to the credit of Tilak and Gandhi for imparting the message that Indians should not let themselves to be exploited by the alien government. They regarded it as dharma of the Indian people to strive for the attainment of swaraj and to gradually undermine the legitimacy of the unjust British government. They adopted different methods like boycott, passive-resistance, non-cooperation, swadeshi, civil disobedience movement etc. to express their resentment against the foreign oppressive government. These methods prescribed by Tilak and Gandhi proved quite effective in the attainment of swaraj. By adopting these means they were able to put
pressure on British government to get their demands fulfilled and at the same time they educated the people that by willingly supporting the foreign government they were strengthening the roots of the alien rule in India.

They recommended these methods as viable weapons to uproot the government by withdrawing their support to it. These methods, proved most appropriate for the unarmed common masses. Moreover, by adopting these methods people gained strength and courage to oppose the oppression of the British rule and became self-reliant. Thus it can be argued that the methods adopted by Tilak and Gandhi helped a lot in weakening the roots of foreign rule in India and thus facilitated in the attainment of Swaraj.

The techniques devised by Tilak and Gandhi, to oppose oppression appear to be relevant even today. They made people familiar with the idea that they could be oppressed or exploited only by willing to do so and by becoming a party to it. By not cooperating with the oppressor they could say no to any form of oppression. It is observed that though, India has attained independence but exploitation is still manifest in many walks of life. These ideas of Tilak and Gandhi can help people to fight against any form of exploitation or oppression.

Tilak and Gandhi can also be credited for realising the importance of swadeshi and adopting it as a method for the attainment of swaraj. Through swadeshi, both of them tried to make the people of India self-sufficient and self-reliant. Tilak's ideas on swadeshi which were based on self-help and self-reliance assumed great importance. Through the swadeshi movement,
Tilak encouraged Indians to establish industries which would in turn limit the import of foreign goods and he held that through the method of *swadeshi* Indians could rejuvenate the economy of the country. *Swadeshi* was the first great encouragement to industrial development in India. However its importance was not limited only to the economic sphere. There certainly could be self-help in all walks of life. It goes to the contribution of Tilak that he made *swadeshi* movement a political movement. *Swadeshi* was an economic weapon used for political purpose.

Gandhi can be credited for further developing the concept and even linking it with the final emancipation of the human soul in spiritual sense. He regarded it *swadharma* and considered the adoption of *swadeshi* movement essential for the attainment of *swaraj* by becoming self-reliant and self-sufficient. Gandhi gave the message that the economic good of all laid in adopting the principle of *swadeshi* or self-sufficiency. Though he used the principle of *swadeshi* earlier as a political weapon to boycott the foreign goods, particularly of the British, it actually acquired economic overtones gradually. It would be noted that the concept of *swadeshi* inculcated gradually in the minds of Indians the imperative and the value of self-sufficiency both at the national and at local village level. He later used this concept along with the other economic idea viz., decentralisation, as a technique of building an economic system which was purely Indian and massbased.
Gandhi's belief that India lived in villages led him to propound the concept of village *swaraj* which, among other things, envisaged village self-sufficiency. Thus Gandhi contributed to spread the message of *swadeshi* to the village level. By the adoption of *swadeshi* Tilak and Gandhi were able to incorporate the lower strata and alienated sections of the society in the struggle for the attainment of *swaraj*. They spread the message of *swaraj* to the distant parts of the rural areas and elicited involvement of rural populace through adoption of *swadeshi* in the struggle for the attainment of *swaraj*.

It can be further stated that by adopting *swadeshi*, people started becoming self-reliant and less dependent on the foreign government and the element of self-reliance and self-confidence through the adoption of it made them courageous enough to demand *swaraj*. Thus at the turn of the century Indian National Movement took a major leap forward and that one of the major objective and function of the movement was to promote the growing unity of Indian people through a common programme like *swadeshi* against colonialism. In sum, the efforts of both Tilak and Gandhi with their multifaceted programme and adoption of *swadeshi* were able to draw for the first time large section of society into active participation in nationalist politics. The social base and mass mobilization was gradually enhanced and the idea of *swaraj* flourished and this was one on which the later national movement was to draw heavily.
Tilak's and Gandhi's ideas on *swadeshi* appear to be quite relevant even today in the present era of globalization. Globalization is a process by which rich and industrialized countries along with their trans-national corporations (TNC/MNC) have free entry into the poor and developing countries, all around the world. MNCs are determined to grab our markets.

At present, the indigenous products face an unequal competition. Demand for local equivalents of electric and other capital machinery has diminished and many industries have been closed contributing to recession wave. Consumer and luxury goods are flooding the market with foreign cars, soaps, clothes, domestic appliances, T.V. sets, audio sets with aggressive marketing through advertisement, allurements and appeal to the ego of the middle class population. Agricultural sector is also affected by imported sugar, and edible oils, discouraging self-sufficiency.

The state under the threat of globalization is being forced by the logic of the development process to impose anti-people policies and exploitative policies on its people. Under the process of globalization developing countries in fact have lost their freedom to manage their country as per own legislation in favour of their own people and their livelihoods. Globalization has forced almost all international and most of the intra-national economic developments to be controlled by International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (WB) and World Trade Organisation (WTO). The richer nations have overwhelming power to control these institutions. Thus, globalization is a form of neo-imperialism. However, Tilak and Gandhi were opposed to every
form of imperialism. They regarded *swadeshi* as a weapon against imperialism. Infact, *swadeshi* can also be used to combat the evils of globalization. In short, the answer to globalized exploitation, poverty and inequality, is not more globalization, but less of it, and its eventual elimination. In this context, Tilak's and Gandhi's ideas on *swadeshi* assume importance. The third world must reject western models of development, and should redefine development in terms of basic necessities of life and lay higher emphasis on cultural and intellectual growth.

In the present context, small-scale and indigenized industries that are built upon national self-reliance and self-sufficiency with minimum surpluses, will lead to devolution and decentralization of economic productivity. Such productivity will accordingly reduce science-technology to the level suitable to small-scale industries, will reduce the need for raw materials, energy and pollution, and will promote employment and reduce poverty and inequality.

The Indian state apparatus, is now increasingly under pressure by the dialectics of neo-imperialism to thrust on its people developmental strategies, public policies, and models of growth that aim at improving the economic, social and political interests of the West at the cost of the present and the future of its own people. The full implications of this process are becoming fully evident only now. Such is the intensity of the globalization's inexorable advance that communities are losing their inalienable rights to live and subsist the way they have been traditionally doing for centuries. The state
under the threat of globalization is being forced by the logic of the development process to impose anti-people policies and exploitative policies on its people.

In this context we should look at *swadeshi* in a wider conspectus. Thus *swadeshi* should include the right of choosing what should be the sustainable development for us, the fight for *swadeshi* should include the struggle for maintaining our resources, ecological processes and the worth of our human and artistic and creative resources. It should also question what are the gains that we are making, if at all by the development strategy which is paradigmatically an exact replica of the West. *Swadeshi* should harp on not only providing for indigenous technology but also on how the fruits of development should not be usurped by the West, or the members of the ruling class in India should not be allowed to further their personal fortunes at the expense of the poor. We should also be cautious in seeing to it that the economic development should not be accompanied with ecological and environmental losses which are non-renewable, nor should the gains be merely of a short-term and ephemeral nature.

Today *swadeshi* has come to mean taking effective steps to save our people from the onslaughts of the predatory protectionist overtures of the West along with our state to protect our intellectual cultural and resource heritage. A very concerted approach and organization of the masses is required for this. Thus Tilak's and Gandhi views on *swadeshi* assume importance even in the context of the present day society.
Though their was much similarity between the conception of swaraj of these two personalities, however, they differed to a certain extent regarding their recommendation of the means to attain swaraj. For Tilak, the goal of swaraj was most important and he did not stress much on the morality of means for the attainment of swaraj. In this respect Tilak differed from Gandhi who was uncompromising in regard to the purity of means for the attainment of swaraj.

Nevertheless, the concept of subjective morality as preached by Tilak involves certain dangers. The awareness of Tilak's selfless motive raises the individual above the consequences of his action. Tilak was of the view that according to the Gita, if actions are performed with unattached mind, then their defects cannot touch the performer. This point of view tends to make all actions non-moral since their character depends upon the motive of the performer. Tilak justified Shivaji's action of killing Afzal Khan on this ground. This view is further attested by his interpretation of the standards of morality laid down by the Gita.

The terrorists in India also justified their activities of killing the British officers on this ground. Moreover, extremism in the present context has manifested and perverted into terrorism of extreme nature and has been interpreted and justified on the basis of religion. Jihad is an explicit example in which violence has been made weapon for conversion of society to certain rigid principles. It is, therefore, likely that a person in his enthusiasm for realising an ideal, which, according to him serves the good of society, may
pay scant attention to the nature of means he adopts and, thus, may unconsciously accord approval to the principle that end justified the means. The concept of morality that takes into account only the motive behind an action and totally disregards the consequences that follow from it, raises certain social and political problems of great magnitude. We may throw overboard, in our enthusiasm for change, all those moral principles that have been evolved by mankind after centuries of striving and suffering. War, violence and treachery may receive our approval without compunction.

On the other hand Gandhi's doctrine of the purity of means for the attainment of good ends signifies departure from the concept of morality that relies on the motive of the doer alone. His insistence on the adoption of non-violence as the only right method for settling disputes implies that it is not motive behind an action but the means employed for the realisation of an end that determines the nature of action. In this respect he sharply differed from Tilak.

Gandhi seems to have been among the rare thinkers who refuse to recognise a dichotomy between ends and means. His keen sense of moral perception and predilection towards the spiritual made him concerned solely with the means, and consider the ends to be of secondary importance only.

Gandhi taught the lesson to the present world that our progress towards the goal would be in exact proportion to the purity of our means. This implied the rejection of war, espionage and crooked diplomacy even if they are adopted for the so-called noble ends of defending one's country,
religion or humanity. Non-violence is the very central tenet of Gandhi's philosophy and way of life. Gandhi conceded individual's right to effect social change in the light of truth as he perceived. But the truth was to be realised through non-violence. He said that the experience showed that success of violence had been short-lived. The social change, brought about by non-violence, would be lasting and durable. His message that ends do no justify means is relevant even today.

The principle of non-violence coupled with his theory of the means being as important as the end led Gandhi inevitably to his creed of satyagraha. He taught the lesson of satyagraha by stressing that it was non-violent but not inactive, it was passive but resisted positively, it implied readiness to suffer but only for a cause one held to be just and right. No wonder satyagraha proved to be a sovereign remedy for the supreme evil of the exploitation of a mass of humanity by a conquering race.

However, there are critics who declare that non-violent satyagraha had nothing to do with the attainment of swaraj. There are others who go further and declare that but for Gandhi and his non-violence, swaraj would have been achieved much earlier. Both these types of critics tend to forget some important things. First, terrorist activities alone could never have achieved swaraj, for, the British Government would have easily suppressed them. The number of active terrorists could not, and would not, have been large since terrorist activities had not been popular in India at any time, second, the terrorists would not have won the sympathy of the world outside
as Gandhi's non-violent movement did, third, even if the terrorists were to succeed, they would have required at least the moral backing of the masses who, before Gandhi had no sense of national consciousness at all, fourth, a non-violent movement of four hundred millions, dumb and half-starved though they were, was a more frightening spectacle to the oppressor than a few thousand terrorists.

In addition, Gandhi recommended *satyagraha* as a substitute for military action. As against war, the essence of *satyagraha* is that it seeks to liquidate antagonism but not the antagonist. *Satyagraha* as substitute of war implies the idea of non-violent society and national freedom. It, therefore, aims at the elimination of exploitation, imperialism and fascism. Thus Gandhian technique of *satyagraha*, with in essential conditions, is a prescription for mental health, and it is a formula for the effective maintenance of world peace. Faith, reason and persuasion – the triple virtues of Gandhian *satyagraha* are the foundations on which lasting peace can be built, and from which, a non-violent world order devoted to truth, justice and freedom can emerge.