PREFACE
The first question which faces the student of the political philosophy of the Indian national movement is this: has modern India made any original contribution to political philosophy? Unlike in the West, in modern India, political philosophy was not recognized as a distinct field of knowledge and it had not created an extensive literature. One is, therefore, tempted to answer this question in the negative. Such an answer is correct only as far as the contribution of political scientists is concerned and not that of the leaders of the national movement. (1) As the evolution of the national consciousness in India was different from that of other countries, the Indian leaders were called upon to lead a unique political movement and they reacted to it in a unique way. Their legacy to modern India in the ideological field is the political philosophy of the national movement. As this has not attracted as much attention of the students and scholars

(1) In this connection the following observation made by an Indian political scientist is worth noting: "Political Science studies in India present the picture of a rootless growth. Although it is only about thirty years since this branch of the social sciences started attracting the attention of Indian universities, the literature produced so far does not provide any indication of the objectives of these studies. Nor can they be said to have any substantial effect on the shaping of events and ideas which have significantly influenced the life of the Indian people." S. V. Kogekar and A. Appadorai, Political Science in India (Delhi, 1953) 1-2.
as other branches of modern India's political history have done, this is a fertile field for study.

The leaders of modern India were primarily men of action and they did not work out a systematic philosophy. This fact as such does not reduce the importance of the study of their philosophy. "The absence of a systematic approach to political philosophy and the limited framework within which political ideas were expressed are not in themselves evidences of a lack of substance or of perception. Many of the greatest contributions to political theory are unsystematic and biased." (2) The contribution of Edmund Burke is a typical instance. As Sabine observes in his book, A History of Political Theory, "It is perhaps stretching a point to say that Burke had a political philosophy at all. His ideas are scattered through his speeches and pamphlets, all called out by the stress of events, though they have the consistency that is the stamp of a powerful intelligence and settled moral convictions. Certainly he had no philosophy other than his own reaction to the events in which he took part and little knowledge of the history of philosophy." (3) This is true of many leaders of modern India also. Their ideas are scattered through many speeches and writings and the resolution of the

(2) Norman D. Palmer, "India and Western Political Thought," The American Political Science Review, 49 (September 1955) 757.

organizations they led and all of them were called out by the stress of events. But they not only reacted to the political events but moulded some of them too. The strategy and tactics of the national movement were completely worked out by them and in this respect they were more original than a political thinker who only reacted to events.

Another question which we have to answer before we proceed with this study is this: What is meant by the term "political philosophy?" As the differences of view among many authorities indicate, it is difficult to arrive at a precise definition of the term but not to describe its form and substance. The author of the book, Politics and Vision notes: "Turning ... to the subject-matter of political philosophy, even the most cursory examination of the masterpieces of political literature discloses the continual reappearance of certain problem topics. Many examples could be listed, but here we need mention only a few such as the power relationships between rulers and ruled, the nature of authority, the problems posed by social conflict, the status of certain goals or purposes as objectives of political action, and the character of political knowledge. No political philosopher has been interested in all of these problems to the same degree, yet there has been a sufficiently widespread consensus about the identity of problems to warrant the belief that a continuity of preoccupations has existed." (4) It is in this broad

sense that the term political philosophy is used in this study.

As we are concerned with the political philosophy of the national movement, the goals or purposes accepted by it as objectives of political action become an important part of the study. These objectives were of a limited character and primarily concerned with such matters as the spreading of the concept that India was a nation, the extension of political rights of the people and achievement of freedom of the country. In the period we are surveying there was not much discussion in India in many other fundamental questions of political philosophy. The field of study of the political philosophy of the Indian national movement is, therefore, not wide, but it is complex because the leaders of the movement, as we noted earlier, being primarily men of action rather than of thought, had given expression to their ideas not always in a consistent and systematic manner.

Moreover, some of them were faced with the fact that even the politically conscious people of India in the nineteenth century and the early twentieth did not have any specific conceptual framework within which political ideas were expressed. They had to create one and the attempt to create it itself led to a great controversy in the country. The debate around the question whether India was a nation or not was a typical example of this kind of controversy.
According to one scholar nationalism itself is a political philosophy. In this sense one can say that one important feature of the political philosophy of many of the modern Indian leaders was nationalism itself.

It is difficult to give a single definition of the word "nationalism" which is acceptable to all. The following definitions of the terms "nation," "nationality" and "nationalism" given by various scholars are reproduced here because they throw much light on their meaning and indirectly on the nature and scope of the study. An author who has made a deep study of the march of many Asian countries from their position of dependencies to that of independent nations observes: "The nation is a community of people who feel that they belong together in the double sense that they share deeply significant elements of a common heritage and that they have a common destiny for the future." The same author adds: "Since the state is in modern times the most significant form of organization of men and embodies the greatest concentration of power, it is inevitable that there should have been, and should still be, a great and revolutionary struggle to secure a coincidence between state and nation. The nation seeks to take over the

(5) "One of the most explosive political philosophies is nationalism. It is also one of the greatest forces of civilization." Flicks Green, ed., European Ideologies (New York, 1948) 541.

(6) Rupert Emerson, From Empire to Nation (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1960) 95.
state as the political instrument through which it can protect
and assert itself." (7) J. H. Carlton, who devoted most of
his adult life to the study of nationalism, writes: "Nationalism
is now obviously a world-wide phenomenon, vitally affecting
both the material and intellectual development of modern
civilization. It tends more and more to influence the economic
and spiritual as well as the political relationships of
mankind." (8)

According to J. S. Mill, "A portion of mankind may be
said to constitute a Nationality if they are united among
themselves by common sympathies which do not exist between
them and any other which make them co-operate with each other
more willingly than with other people, desire to be under the
same government, and desire that it should be government by
themselves or a portion of themselves exclusively." (9)

One aspect of nation and nationalism which is stressed by the
two authors quoted above is the desire of the people concerned
to have a government of their own which would be more or less
exclusively controlled by them. The Indian national movement
was the outward expression of this desire of many people of
the country.

(7) Ibid., 96.

(8) J. H. Hayes Carlton, Nationalism: A Religion

(9) J. S. Mill, On Liberty and Considerations on
The period chosen for this study is 1905-1921. Its importance lies in the fact that almost all the main trends of the national movement are reflected in it. Some of the early leaders of the Indian national movement like Dadabhai Naoroji and Surendranath Banerji were very influential in the first decade of the twentieth century and Gopal Krishna Gokhale, another leader, championed their view, for a greater part of this period. Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Bepin Chandra Pal, Lajpat Rai and Aurobindo Ghose entered the political scene during 1905-1908 as the exponents of a new political philosophy. Among the Indian Muslims one can see the influence of various individuals like the Aga Khan, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, Maulana Muhammad Ali and Abul Kalam Azad, each with his own distinct political views. M. K. Gandhi emerged as a national leader towards the end of the period and broke fresh ground in Indian politics. Ideas such as socialism, internationalism and Asian resurgence which found favour with Indian politicians later appeared on the Indian horizon during 1918-1920. A study of the Indian national movement during 1905-1921, therefore, touches, though it does not cover, the major elements in its political philosophy.

As the national movement of this period is influenced by many developments of an earlier period we begin our study with a background chapter. It discusses, among other things, the political impact of the British administrative system, the constitutional developments and the political significance
of the social and religious reform movements. The next chapter gives an account of the impact of liberalism on the early phase of the Indian national movement. The third chapter is a study of the political philosophy of "Extremism" which emerged as a new factor in Indian politics at the beginning of the twentieth century. In contrast with it was the moderate approach of the early leaders of national movement. The fourth chapter is concerned with religion as a factor in the political thinking of a large section of the people during this period. The fifth chapter explains the emergence of Gandhi as the national leader of the country and the philosophical basis of the non-cooperation movement he led against the British Government during 1920-1921. The concluding chapter makes an assessment of the various schools of political thought which dominated the national movement during 1905-1921 and notes the new ideas which appeared in the Indian political horizon towards the end of that period.
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