CHAPTER – VI

Constructing the Hindu Nationality as against Indian Nationality: Phase I: The Swadeshi Movement

The turn of the century marked both in Bengal and Bombay Presidency, the growth of militant nationalism, whose twin emphasis on anti-colonialism and the assertion of neo-Hinduism set a new trend in the body politic of the country. The nationalism, which grew in both the presidencies, shared certain aspects and differed in many things. Of the things shared, the neo-Vedantic language occupies a predominant place. The anti-colonialism whether mild or rabid, until the beginning of the twentieth century was articulated on the basis of facts and figures like the percentage of import duty to be imposed on manufactured products, or draining of India’s wealth, de-industrialization of India or an act like the vernacular press act which adversely affected the Indian interests.1 The new trend of explaining the relation between the colonizer and the colonized in terms of body and soul, universal and particular actually began with Bankim Chandra Chatterji’s Anand Math (1882) and Krishna Charita (1886) and was taken to its idealistic heights by Aurobindo Ghosh in the early twentieth century. Aurobindo considered patriotism as pure Shakti2 and suggested that the perfect sense of self-abandonment which Chaitanya felt for Hari must be felt by Bengal for the mother (India).3 Bipin Chandra Pal called anti-colonial struggle a spiritual movement.4 This
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spiritualism was considered essential by Aurobindo Ghosh as the Indians were forming themselves into a nation and it was essential to keep this nation forming from the gross taint of western materialism.

The spiritual nationalism which was advocated by Bipin Chandra Pal and Aurobindo with its strong moorings in Hinduism acquired a militant phase after the partition of Bengal. The partition led to a widespread agitation in Bengal presidency. Committees were formed throughout Bengal to propagate and execute the concepts of *swadeshi*, Boycott, *Swaraj* and National Education. Tilak immediately extended support as he considered that "the partition had touched the heart of Bengal nation." The Bengal extremists formed a working alliance with Tilak and they began to propagate each other's ideas in their respective papers. *Maharatta* published articles on the movement for *swadeshi* and boycott taking place in Bengal and Aurobindo wrote on Tilak's ideas on Hindu religion. The alliance thus formed posed a threat to the existing Congress leadership of that time, as Surendra Nath Banerjee a moderate Congress leader hardly proved himself less extreme than Bipinchandra Pal or

---
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Aurobindo Ghosh.\textsuperscript{12} So the mantle of Congress leadership fell on the leaders of western India like G.K. Gokhale and Phiroz Shah Mehta.

Though the Bengal Swadeshi movement leaders and Tilak formed a working alliance and were successful in getting the Congress adopt swadeshi, boycott, Swaraj and national education at the Calcutta Congress session in 1906,\textsuperscript{13} they differed widely from each other in interpreting these concepts. Pal’s nationalism had its strong moorings in Brahmo philosophy due to his association during his younger days.\textsuperscript{14} Pal considered that,

\begin{quote}
 nation building is possible... we desire, everyone of us to whatever school of political and religious thought we may belong to build up a powerful Indian nation which will be able to enter, in its own right and on terms of perfect equality with other the federation of modern humanity.\textsuperscript{15}
\end{quote}

As a social and political activist he had opposed child marriage and when he visited the Unites States in the early part of the twentieth century, he compared the conditions of African-Americans with that of “our Pariah living in separate quarters.”\textsuperscript{16} Pal had earlier refuted Tilak’s argument of achieving political reform before social reform, as an essential prerequisite of nation building by questioning, “what would happen to a Pariah in a representative government? Are they to suffer legal and political disabilities for the terrible sin of birth or are they not?” He gave an example of a town called Rampur in Bengal where a butcher was put forward as a candidate for municipal honours. The Hindus threatened to resign but reconciled. Pal warned that,

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
such ugly questions will arise in thousand places and in thousand forms, with the progress of municipal and local self-government in the country, so long as political progress goes ahead of social reforms. I condemn that political agitation which makes me a patriot before a man, which instead of generating love and charity breeds hatred and strife.\textsuperscript{17}

Pal’s idealism \textit{Swadhinata} or independence had a definite Hindu bias, as he talked of the glory of Arya civilization\textsuperscript{18} and the “darkest days of Mohammedan rule”.\textsuperscript{19} He also talked of his neighbour Muslim \textit{Zamindar} family’s closeness with his own and the contributions of Islam.\textsuperscript{20} He declared that a Hindu agriculturist had no problem with a Muslim agriculturist, the actual conflict was for the government posts carefully created by the British.\textsuperscript{21} He categorically declared that the Indian nation was not Hindu nation,

\begin{center}
when I talked of Swaraj, when I was talking of Indian nationality, I did not, I beg to assure you talk of either Hindu or Mahomedan nationality, it comprised of all, Buddhist, Christian and Parsi.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{center}

So when Pal talked of \textit{Sagunam} (concrete universal) and \textit{Nirgunam} (abstract universal) ideas of Upanishad in terms of nationalism,\textsuperscript{23} he was speaking for Indian nationality as against any sectarian nationality.
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Aurobindo Ghosh, on the other hand, entered the anti colonial struggle at the time of partition of Bengal as a result expressed less on the social reform and more on the radical approach to nation building. His writings of that period in the daily Bande Mataram deal with the reconstruction of the Hindu society and the spiritual nationalism. Aurobindo recommended the reconstruction of the Hindu society by 'removing false beliefs, false ideals, old prepossessions from the minds of the people.' He believed that the Indian society could not be reformed until the common man's thoughts purged and purified by giving him free and impartial education instead of loyalty ridden colonial educational system. Aurobindo after his return from England worked in Baroda and wrote his critique on the Congress movement in the reformist Indu Prakash in 1893-94 and not in the anti-reformist Mahratta. At that time Tilak was also critical of the working of Congress and both could have joined hands. The fact that Aurobindo chose Indu Prakash and Tilak did not report about these articles shows that both were aware of each others stand regarding social reform. The involvement in Swadeshi movement necessitated Aurobindo to accept support from and extend support to Tilak. Though Aurobindo come to Calcutta in 1905 and interacted closely with Tilak, he extended an enthusiastic support to Tilak only in 1907 when,

The Bengali reports Tilak to have made a definite pronouncement on the caste system. The prevailing idea of social inequality is working immense evil says the nationalist leader from the Deccan.

Aurobindo thought that,

---
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The ideal of Nationalism which India will set before the world, there will be an essentially equality between man and man, between caste and caste between class and class, all being, as Mr. Tilak has pointed out different but equal and united parts of the Virat Purush as realised in the nation.  

Aurobindo opposed caste system and declared that,

we insist on reorganising the nation into a democratic unity politically ... no monopoly, racial or hereditary can form part of the nationalist's scheme of the future, his dream of the day for the advent of which he is struggling.

Aurobindo argued that,

a nationalist intended to transform individual and or class-autocracy into... self-rule or Swaraj of the nation and of the fixed hereditary anti-democratic caste organization into the pliable self-adopting democratic distribution of function at which socialism aims.

Aurobindo in his opposition to the caste system invoked the names of “Chokha Mela, the Mahratta Pariah who became the guru of Brahmins who are proud of caste purity, Buddha, Chaitanya, Nanak, Kabir and the Saint poets of Maharashtra formed a part of his concept of political and spiritual freedom. Aurobindo’s spiritual nationalism was essentially Hindu, he talked of the identity of Bengali Hindu without being offensive to other communities. Aurobindo considered that the nationalism was not a political programme but a religion, which had come from god.
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1. Tilak’s Concept of Swaraj

Tilak’s concept of Swaraj differed fundamentally from that of Bipin Chandra Pal and Aurobindo Ghosh. To Pal and Ghosh, Indian nation was to be constructed essentially on the basis of Hindu culture by removing certain social disabilities like caste. Whereas the nationality that Tilak aimed to construct was to be based on the institution of caste. Tilak’s understanding of colonialism centered around the question, whether the British government was a willing party in enforcing caste privileges and caste restrictions or not. Discussing whether the British rule in India was permanent, Tilak argued that every,

good government (which intended to rule) satisfies the conditions of the happiness and contentment of its subjects, and has the capacity of providing for their growing requirements ... the present-government has not created any Inam nor does it look favourably upon the Inams granted by the previous government.\(^\text{34}\)

Since the colonial government was not willing to enforce the caste privileges and caste restrictions, it had to go. The earliest argument in favour of Swaraj came when the Age of Consent was passed. Tilak declared that the reformers formed a separate nationality, they were no longer Hindus,\(^\text{35}\) and that the institutions controlled by them were to be taken over by the Hindu who should work towards Swaraj or self-rule.\(^\text{36}\)

Tilak considered the caste system as a non-negotiable aspect of Hindu religion.\(^\text{37}\) Hindu religion meant Sanatana Dharma which was Varnashrama Dharma.\(^\text{38}\) It was to be protected, even if it meant, seeking
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the help of the colonial government for that purpose. Tilak speaking at the second Industrial conference criticized the government for,

having refrained from interfering with caste questions from a desire to let them alone. But I believe that the non-interference of government in such cases, is itself an interference ... negative in its form. 39

So Tilak suggested that “we should ask for legislation to enforce caste penalties”. 40 Tilak’s argument of placing political reform before social reform and criticism of reformer’s efforts in seeking colonial government’s assistance in enacting the Age of Consent Bill is inconsistent in the light of this request of his own, just eight months after the passing of the Age of Consent Act. Tilak considered that the duty of a government was to respect the existing customs and norms. 41 Protection and elevation of orthodox Brahminism constituted the formation of national identity. Tilak welcomed the establishment of the Bharat Dharma Mahamandala in 1892 at Benaras and suggested that it may be called a Hindu Religious Congress and explained the difficulties that would arise in its propagation of religion. 42 Tilak explained that,

the ancient social and religious organisations in the country are fast tumbling down or have already fallen into desuetude; and unless a new controlling force is created to make the recalcitrant few follow the dictates of the vast majority.

One of the difficulties being its acceptability throughout the country by the people belonging to various sects, the second difficulty was enforcing the resolutions passed by the Mandal in its annual Conferences.
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Tilak stated that "the Pundits and the Rajas were partly unacquainted and partly unfitted" for the methods and procedure that must be adopted to achieve any tangible results", like electrifying ... the whole mind of a people".\(^{43}\) Mahamandala declared that its intention was to "arrest the deterioration of the Hindu religion" and issued guidelines to the priests of Hindu temples and establishment of provincial Dharmamandalas and send Upadeshikas to preach Santana Dharma throughout the country.\(^{44}\) Mahratta reported that by 1900 the Mahamandala had established seven hundred sabhas and started a high school and a Sanskrit Pathashala.\(^{45}\)

Tilak's apprehensions regarding the acceptability of the Mahamandal by other religious sects proved to be correct. Lala Munshiram and Dev Dutta Vishveshwaranand of Arya Samaj challenged the Mahamandal for a public debate, which was not taken up by the latter as "the Arya Samaj had invited all classes of people and allowed them to ask questions". The Arya Samajists openly clashed with the delegates of the Mahamandal in Delhi.\(^{46}\) The Arya Samaj Jalsa or festival was more successful than that of the Mahamandal. The differences of opinion existed not only among the revivalist organisations and the defenders of Sanatan Dharma but also among the Sanatan Dharmis' themselves. Raja Sheo Prasad the Maharaja of Benaras himself an orthodox Brahmin,\(^{47}\) ruling the seat of orthodoxy, opposed the Congress and led an anti-Congress campaign\(^{48}\) He imposed tax on Hindu temples and not on Churches and Mosques. The resolution to that
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effect was passed by the municipality with a Hindu majority and was carried on to its logical conclusion by the Hindu commissioner.49

The earliest article on the construction of nationality appeared in *Mahratta* in 1896, which described the countrymen as having,

Sunk in the deepest abyss of misery, starved to death by the cruel hand of fate, degenerated in the eyes of others, debased in his own – yet can even such a miserable being often find a moment of interest ... (as he finds) joy in communion with the glorious past, the misery of the present is forgotten in the enthusiastic admiration of the past. The glorious days of old stand boldly before us.50

The article called upon “we that have became unworthy of Aryan birth, of our Aryan blood” to be “ready for self-sacrifice” as “the country was passing through a tremendous crisis.” The article argued that “our mother has fallen but not degenerated” Shivaji the national hero was “shedding tears from his heavenly home” and he was “hiding his valiant face and sobbing like a child” so we should sacrifice our bodies and souls for rising the country to former glory. The possession of the Aryans of India was “the noblest past, the most glorious history and the grandest tradition” reviving all the three was to be the cornerstone of nationality. This revival based on religion and intense patriotism and “a call by the voices of our noble dead” was to awaken the country and reach a state,

It is sweet to be the possessor of heaps of gold and mines of diamonds, it is sweeter to be able to wield the most absolute power. It is sweeter still to receive the homage of the lowly. But sweetest of all is to be able to cry with the heart full of joy – “my mother-country. The land of my birth”.51

49 *Mahratta*, Dec. 18, 1892.
50 ibid.
No where in this article the well being of all is stated or even hinted. There is no construction of nationality on the basis of people inhabiting the country. The construction is entirely based on ‘a shared past’ and undemocratic principle of absolute power. The four important possessions of a man is “wealth, absolute power, homage of the lowly and the mother country” as mentioned in the opening line of the article explains the inherent foundation of Tilak’s construct of nationality.

Tilak considered that the religious revival was essential to form the Hindu Nationality. His efforts of Ganapati and Shivaji festival, his arguments for celebrating these festivals as National festivals failed to unify various castes to form a single religious entity as he continued to insist on caste restrictions. Tilak criticised,

all those who go from India call themselves Hindu when they are on the soil of America. He may be a Parsi, a Mahomedan, a Jew or a gentile. When he goes to foreign countries, he prides himself upon being recognized and called a Hindu. To a real Hindu this is rather insulting.\textsuperscript{52}

In the same article, Tilak criticized the non-Brahmins passing off as Brahmins when they are abroad and gave an example of “a Modaliyar of the Madras presidency passing off as a Brahmin in Hong Kong before the French and German Scholars”. Tilak held the reformers responsible for encouraging such behaviour among the people.

Since the days of late Mr. Vishnoo Shastri we have been doing our duty of teaching the people their state as it is and the surroundings which make their progress in matters which affect the interests of the ruling class, so very different. Our conviction differs from those who preceded us and whose duller satellites are designated by the term reformers. Their (reformer’s) work is that of destruction, their first and foremost attempt was to dispel through

\textsuperscript{52} Mahrratta, April 26 1896, p.1 Notes on the Present Activity
the land any reverence that might be felt for the Brahmins: their next sally was against and the time honoured institutions, customs and manners of the Brahmins and the Hindus generally". The late R.B. Deshmukh and the late Jotirao Fulley may be cited instances of such reformers.53

Tilak’s insistence on Hindu nationality and caste privileges and restrictions were mutually contradictory. If the Hindus were to form nationality, then it was essential that they try to bring various castes, religious denominations together as done by Aurobindo Ghosh and Bipin Chandra Pal in Bengal. Tilak’s restrictive nationalism failed to bloom due to these inherent contradictions. Tilak was able to speak about nationalism in a convincing way only after his release from the second jail sentence in 1899.

After his release, Tilak traveled to Madras to attend the annual Congress session, interacted with the Congressmen from other provinces, visited and lectured at several places. Tilak appears to have developed a certain idea of nationality, much advanced than his pre-Madras session days. Tilak began to view India both in religious and geographical terms. Tilak, began to speak of the common factor binding the Hindus of various provinces as Hindutva or Hinduness.54 However, this construct did not exclude the earlier notions on caste, commenting on Ranade’s speech at the social conference, Tilak stated that “Ranade suggested wholesale and indiscriminate fusion of castes, misinterpreted the ancient texts to prove that the distinction between the Brahmins and Kshtriyas was not known.” Tilak argued that such interpretation had led to serious mischief by the reformers.55 Tilak began to explain various means of retaining the core of
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Varmashrama Dharma and bring the Hindu of various provinces together against the twin threat from the colonial rule and the reformers.

By 1900 Mahratta began to publish articles on definite issues of nationality. Tilak extolled the formation of nationality in Japan.\textsuperscript{56} He admired the ability of the Japanese who had thoroughly reorganized all the institutions to suit the modern requirements.\textsuperscript{57} The curriculum of the Japanese colleges,\textsuperscript{58} the political situation, the economic regeneration\textsuperscript{59} was also discussed. What was more extensively discussed was the Japanese society.\textsuperscript{60} Tilak made a comparative study of Indian and the Japanese societies. The division of the Japanese society into six classes, Samurai, cultivator, priest, artisans, shopkeeper and Etas, was compared to the Chaturvarna system in India. The position of the priests in the third place, the existence of intermarriages between the first five classes, the position of Etas to that of Pariah was also discussed.\textsuperscript{61} What fascinated Tilak was a Samurai by name Shibusawa, who went to England at the age of twenty-seven, learnt the European ways of life and returned back to Japan and undertook an extensive financial reform and became a big businessman.\textsuperscript{62} Tilak compared him to Tata of India and hoped that there would be many more Shibusawas of India.\textsuperscript{63} When Japan won a decisive victory over Russia in 1905 Tilak declared that,
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patriotism and self-sacrifice enabled Japanese to win the war we advisedly name the two words because we far one believe that the apparent Japanese hatred of conservatism and love of western institution are not included in this character.64

Tilak argued, that inspite of the fact that the Japanese society was divided into various sections, patriotism and self-sacrifice had united the people. He called Japanese patriotism was a part of the Japanese society and admired men who led pure and simple life, where men thought it was an honour to die for the feudal lord and women who had no time to think of liberties like western women, produced heros.65

The pragmatic nationalism, of the kind experimented in Japan continued to co-exist with the issues related to caste and Hindu revivalism in Mahratta.66 Tilak criticised M.G. Ranade's speech in the Indian Social Conference. Tilak stated that "Ranade advocated inter-marriages between different castes and sub-castes and a wholesale and indiscriminate fusion of caste".67 Tilak also criticized Gangaram Bhau Maske for starting the Maratha educational society at Kolhapur, as "a racial act and stated that it was in continuation of Ranade's intention of unifying all castes".68 Mahratta expressed concern for declining interest among the educated to maintain the Hindu religion. Religious neutrality maintained by the colonial government along with the Brahmo Samaj, Prarthana Samaj, and
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Arya Samaj were cited as the causes of religious nihilism developing in India. Tilak questioned,

How many university Brahmins say their prayers twice or even once everyday, how many of them, wear their sacred cloths, at the dinner time? With every advance in school and college life, old rituals, old beliefs drop at every turn. A race of agnostics, sceptics, and atheists has grown up, which it ought to be the efforts of all responsible persons to efface. ⁶⁹

Tilak considered that Hindu revivalism was essential, to counter this nihilism. Tilak welcomed various individual efforts to revive Hinduism. ⁷⁰ Vivekananda’s efforts in this direction were widely welcomed by Tilak. Vivekananda stayed with Tilak ⁷¹ and Tilak supported the latter’s missionary zeal but not his pragmatic approach to Hinduism. Tilak considered him “not as ascetic of the old type to whom world is nothing, but a sanyasin of the new type of the Bhagwad Gita, to whom the world is everything and his own country and people more dear than all the world put together”. Vivekananda’s militant Hinduism did not support the orthodox beliefs. He stated that “I would rather see every one of you rank atheists than superstitious fools, for the atheist is alive. You can make something out of him, he is not dead. But if superstition enters, the brain is gone, the brain has softened; degradation has seized upon the life”. ⁷² Vivekananda also had pronounced anti-caste ideas as he had called upon the Brahmins to “remember that the days of exclusive privileges and exclusive claims are over” and advised the non-Brahmins “to elevate themselves to the Brahminhood instead of dragging the Brahmins down to

⁶⁹ — Mahratta, March 17 1901, p.4.
⁷⁰ — ibid.
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their own level. Vivekananda though claiming himself to be a Vedantin there by an advaitist, appreciated the sympathies of Ramanuja for the downtrodden. Tilak appreciated Vivekananda for his ability to silence the western critics of Hinduism, for “taking the campaign of aggressive Vedantism into the hearts of the Europeans and Americans”. Tilak welcomed Vivekananda for converting Margaret Nobel into Hinduism as it did immense good to the self-respect of the colonized.

We may have gone down politically here is a field which offers ample scope for the highest ambition a Hindu can entertain in his heart, an ambition no other than that of educating the western world in the high religious philosophy of the Hindus and dispelling the crude notions that are now entertained by the Christian missionaries, about the fitness of Christianity to become a universal religion.

Regeneration of Hinduism was to be carried on two distinct fronts, the articulate expression of Vedantic idioms was to silence the missionaries and the western critics of Hinduism and emphasis on the ritual observance of Brahmanism was to silence the agnostic reformers. The battle on these two fronts required different skills. Elaborating on this Tilak said the preachers like Swami Hans Swarup, a preacher of Sanatan Hindu Dharma, “did not possess knowledge of western philosophy and physical science, critical and logical mind and a grandeur of Vedanta” which could impress the western mind, but possessed ability to “sway the
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minds of the multitude as an eloquent dogmatiser, and a ready-witted speaker”, so he would create enthusiasm among the people. To achieve these twin objectives, Tilak was willing to support those who defended Hinduism without accepting their ideas in totality. Mahratta favourably reviewed a book by Lala Baijnath on ‘Comparative Hinduism’. Lala Baijnath was a reformer and was the president of the Lucknow session of the Social Conference, the reason enough for Tilak to oppose him. Baijnath advocated fusion of subscastes, strict observance of certain Samskras or legitimate duties, ancient ideals, study of Sanskrit, avoidance of foreign food and dress along with the removal of barriers regarding caste. Lala Baijnath advocated Hindu revivalism along with social reform. Similarly, when N.G. Walinkar spoke on Hindu revivalism, at the Aryan Social Union in the hall of the Aryan Samaj, Tilak supported him though Tilak had not accepted the Aryan Samajists as Hindus at that time. So by 1903, Tilak was willing to accept the idea that Hinduism was above caste and the Hinduism was not determined by the behaviour or beliefs of any particular groups, but continued scathing attack on the agenda of contemporary reform.

Tilak’s willingness to accommodate all those who spoke for the Hindu revivalism represented in his speeches too. Tilak spoke of need for unity among the various Hindu sects to defend itself from the constant attack by the reformers. Tilak regarded the Christianity and science as
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the twin forces undermining the importance of Hinduism and to counter it he advised the educated Hindus to take it as a duty to defend their religion, as it was the only common factor among the inhabitants of different provinces. In order to achieve it Tilak advised that it was essential to accept a common revealed book and a common religious philosophy. Tilak advised the Bharat Dharma Mahamandal “to coordinate different sections and parts of Hinduism (as) – in the absence of unity India cannot claim its place among the nations of the world”. This unity was to be forged at the elite level in the form of adopting common calendar for religious purposes along with common revealed book and common religious philosophy and at the layman’s level, a common language for India and a common script for all the Indian language was to be adopted. Tilak suggested to the Nagari Pracharini Sabha (society for the spread of Devnagari character) to appoint a committee to finalize a common script and

we shall have to go to government and urge upon its attention the necessity of introducing in the vernacular school books of each province few lessons in this standard character, so that the next generation may become familiar with it.

Tilak asked the people to “give up provincial prejudices and promote unity, Swami Dayanand and others have been working but we
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have been very idle” and hoped that the day would come when “instead of Christians preaching Christianity, we shall see our preachers preaching *Sanatana Dharma*”.\(^{94}\)

Tilak found that it was essential to support revivalism in order to inculcate a strong sense of identity among the Hindus. The revivalists were aggressively propagating a common Hindu identity and had understood the intensity of colonial oppression and the necessity of a self-rule or *Swaraj*. On the other hand the frontal organizations of conservative Brahmanism like the *Sanatan Dharma Sabha* of Lahore regarded not the colonial rule, but the Theosophical society as the greatest enemy of Hinduism\(^{95}\) and the *Bharat Dharma Mahamandal* considered the *Arya Samaj* as their biggest adversary.\(^{96}\) Tilak himself was opposed to revivalism and the *Arya Samaj*. He criticized M.G. Ranade’s lecture on reviving ancient Aryan religion, *Mahratta* wrote, “The attempt to dig lower and lower into the strata of the Hindu society still continues; it is to be seen what fossil forms of ancient Aryan moral and religion can still be revived, with them may also revive other monstrous beings of the same period whose presence may shake the framers of the boldest *samajas*”.\(^{97}\)

Tilak however showed remarkable understanding towards the Theosophical society.\(^{98}\) Theosophy did not attack the caste system and superstitious practices of the nineteenth century Hinduism. Instead, it regarded Vedanta as a source for day today existence of Hinduism and a
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sole point of reference for all questions regarding Hinduism. At the metaphysical level, theosophy countered the attack upon Hinduism by the Christian missionaries, but at the practical level avoided direct confrontation with the beliefs and practices of Hinduism which were inconsistent with the Vedanta. In the logical continuation of this policy, the Theosophists did not recognize caste distinction, but did not attack it in their regular discourse. Similarly, Besant viewed the Age of Consent issue in a very romantic way. Besant believed that “the Hindu girl-child essentially had a sheltered happy life ... (where she was) betrothed very early as among the European royalty and is educated in accordance with the wishes of the family that is to be hers in the future”. She admired the protection that a girl child received in the Hindu household from birth to death and considered that the fate of child widows as depicted by reformers as more of an exception than a rule. Besant quoted Manu to emphasize that women in the Hindu household had a high respect. Tilak regarded that the Theosophy “tried to bring about consummation, devoutly to be wished, not by destroying but by constructing the materials at present existing in India.” This early understanding led to a later day cooperation between Tilak and Anne Besant during the Swadeshi and the Home Rule League Movements, though personal differences persisted between them. Tilak criticised whenever Besant supported social reforms. Tilak accused Besant that she was,

... ready to help though not initiate suicidal reform and this is sufficiently born out by her recent utterances at Lahore and Benaras regarding womanhood, female education, child marriage

---


100 *Mahratta*, Jan 22 1882. Christianity or Theosophy which?
and other cognate subjects... Theosophists are mere visionaries and theosophy is not a fruitful or practical teaching\textsuperscript{101}.

However, Tilak defended their contribution to revivalism and nation building and her “noble service in asking Hindus to open their eyes and to seek a model not in countries who have obtained civilization second hand but in the History of Ancient India\textsuperscript{102}.” On the other hand the reformers opposed the religious construct of nationality. They argued that overemphasis of one community would alienate others in the national reconstruction. Tilak quoted an article published in \textit{Times of India}, which was—

Evidently penned by one whose mind is steeped in the essence of militant social reform, and an attempt was made therein to suggest that the wave of reaction and revivalism now advancing upon the people of this country is likely to injure the idea of an Indian Nationality that is slowly developing. The fear was expressed that if revivalism were allowed to progress at its present rate the lines of cleavages between the several sub-nationalities in India would be deepened and the cause of united action for the amelioration of the political condition would suffer\textsuperscript{103}.

Tilak called it “a darkened vision of the writer” and defined revivalism,

as a tendency to restore those of our religious customs and institutions which were in existence once, and a conviction as to the utility of which has successfully pleaded with their reintroduction\textsuperscript{104}.

Tilak criticised reformist construct of nationality by stating that,

The fact that so many religious nationalities being brought under one political head as in the case of India, is a mere accident, and it

\textsuperscript{101} \textit{Mahratta}, Jan 13 1901, p.4. Twenty Five Years of Theosophy

\textsuperscript{102} \textit{Mahratta}, Jan 5 1896, p.5. Mrs. Anne Besant and Her Opponents

\textsuperscript{103} \textit{Mahratta}, Oct 19 1902, p.497, Revivalism and Nationality, Editorial

\textsuperscript{104} ibid.
is simply the height of narrow-mindedness in them who suggest that the inductive method of regenerating and perfecting parts before the regeneration of the whole, should be given up in favour of one in which the regeneration of the whole is to be attempted before that of its parts\(^\text{105}\).

In continuation of this argument Tilak stated that all those organisation which stood for Hindu revival were to be supported, the “Arya Samagists who have taken a most decided step in revivalism by basing their religious reform on the sacrificial system may or may not be wrong” but they were to be supported if attacked by the members of the other religions. Tilak appreciated the efforts of Lala Lajpat Rai’s appeal to introduce religious education along with the secular education in the Dayananda Anglo Vedic college\(^\text{106}\). The revivalism pursued by the Arya Samaj gave the Vedic rites to the non-Brahmins and education to women and a kind of general equality to all members of caste was not acceptable to Tilak. However, the Arya Samaj’s belief in the golden age, insistence on religious education along with secular education, the attempt to negate the pluralistic traditions within Hinduism and the emphasis on monolithic Hinduism coincided with Tilak’s own ideas on religion and society, Tilak realised the need for uniting the conservatives and revivalists to forge ahead a strong Hindu identity in the light of growing unity among the Muslims\(^\text{107}\) which resulted in their demand for a greater share in the elected bodies and the administrative posts\(^\text{108}\). The culmination of this understanding extended to all revivalist groups was his speech at the Bharat Dharma Mahamandala where he called upon the Mahamandala to

\(^{105}\) ibid.

\(^{106}\) Mahrrata, April 30 1905, p.207.

\(^{107}\) Mahrrata, Oct 19 1902, p.497.

accept all these different sects as branches of the Vedic religion...
But you all know no branch can stand by itself. Hindu religion as a whole is made up of different parts co-related to each other as so many sons and daughters of one great religion.\textsuperscript{109}

Tilak advised that “so long as one section does not recognise its affinity with another, you cannot hope to rise as Hindus” and suggested the \textit{Mahamandal} to provide a common platform to all the sects.\textsuperscript{110} Tilak’s appeal had limited effect. In the following session of the \textit{Mahamandala}, the Maharaja of Darbhanga acknowledged the necessity of unity among the various sects of Hindus and declared that the “object of the \textit{Mahamandal} (was) to make the Hindu society all over India a compact body, united by a religion which however divergent in details in its various branches, is essentially one and it seeks to store discipline in the Hindu society by the recognition of local \textit{samaj-paties} or social leaders”.\textsuperscript{111} However the Mahamandal did not pass any resolution to give effect to the ideas voiced by both Tilak and the Maharaja of Darbhanga.\textsuperscript{112}

Tilak’s efforts at nation building during the Swaraj movement days centered around uniting various sects at a superficial level without accepting and respecting the reformist tendencies in these revivalist sects. Tilak unlike Aurobindo and Bipin Chandra Pal had not negotiated through his caste identity to develop clear ideas on nationalism and Hindu nationality. Though Tilak used the term \textit{Hindutva},\textsuperscript{113} \textit{Mahratta} described

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{109} V. Grover (Ed) \textit{Political Thinkers of Modern India Bal Gangadhar Tilak}, New Delhi, 1990), pp.174 -175 Tilak’s Speech at the Bharat Dharma Mahamandala Benaras 1906.

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Mahratta}, Jan 14, 1906.*

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Mahratta}, Jan 6 1907, p.11, Bharat Dharma Mahamanda.

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Mahratta}, Feb 4, 1906. The B.D. Mahamandal. It goes without saying that no one not even these organisers looked forward to any great decisive and immediate results from a gathering like this. V. Grover (Ed.), (1990), p.167.

\textsuperscript{113} Kesari , Jan 12 1904. Hindutva and Social reform.
\end{flushleft}
the crowd that had assembled at Calcutta for receiving Tilak in 1906 as consisting of "Hindus, Mahrattas, Marwaris and Musalmans", and the reception given to him "as given to a representative of the Marathi nation for sympathies and services rendered to words the Bengali race". He continued to "call Marathas as a Nation" even as late as 1907.

In comparison to Tilak, Anne Besant had developed very definite ideas on the question of nationality. Besant emphasised that the Hindus along with the Jains, Sikhs, Mohamedans, Parsis and Christians were to be "welded into a nation" by accepting spiritual unity of all religions. To the question how shall the Indian nation be born? She replied "by sentiments also". Besant considered that feeling of motherland was essential she advised the Hindus to be proud of Akbar and the Mahomedans of Shivaji so that "the history would lose its bitterness, as of foe against foe and become the story of the common motherland in the making... thus shall separateness and hatred pass and patriotism and love grow".

The differences between the Bengal extremists and Tilak, did not deter them from working consistently together, in fact the entire support for Tilak to assert during the Surat split came from Nagpur and the Bengal delegation. The ideological differences were constantly bridged either by the leaders themselves as in the case of Tilak and Anne Besant or by the well meaning patriots like the article in 'Bengali' on Tilak. Aurobindo

114 Mahrratta, June 10 1906, p.273.

115 Mahrratta, June 23 1907, p.294. The Mahratta and their Rule, a Reply III.


117 Mahrratta, Jan 5 1908, pp.7-10.
based his understanding of Tilak’s ideas on caste as the basis of this article.\textsuperscript{118}

Tilak’s appeal to “the Hindus to rise superior to their caste prejudices” was welcomed by \textit{Tribune} in Punjab. It called Tilak as “one of the prominent leaders of the present Hindu revival”, who as an authority of Sanskrit” declared that there is no \textit{Vedic} sanction to the doctrine of social inequality and the idea of superior and inferior castes is foreign to the Hindu religion”.\textsuperscript{119} The \textit{Tribune} expressed optimism that “the time is not very distant when the iron walls of class prejudice that now part one class from another and one section from another will dissolve into sand, with the sanction of the Hindu scriptures”.\textsuperscript{120} The enthusiasm for Tilak’s opinion on caste as stated in his speech during the \textit{Ganapati} festival of 1907, was not shared by all. The \textit{Telegraph} explained to the readers that what Tilak meant was that “they should treat each other as brothers, and not intermarriage and disappearance of all social distinctions”. What Tilak meant, the \textit{Telegraph} explained, was that “social inequality is working immense evil, capital is made out of the ideas of inequality and class is set against class...due to the pernicious system of education”.\textsuperscript{121} So it was imperative “not to treat any caste with contempt”, however the voluntary respect that is paid to certain functions in preference to others is not interdicted and the Brahmin votary of learning and holy life will always command higher regard than the man whose life is directed on a more material level”.\textsuperscript{122} So in the absence of clarity of thought, the nationalist press interpreted Tilak’s

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{118} Sri Aurobindo on Nationalism (1965), p.15.
\item \textsuperscript{119} \textit{Mahratta}, Sep 29 1907, Mr. Tilak on Caste article from Tribune, p.465.
\item \textsuperscript{120} ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{121} \textit{Mahratta}, Oct 13 1907, A True view of Caste article from Telegraph, pp.490-91.
\item \textsuperscript{122} ibid.
\end{itemize}
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opinion on caste according to its own convenience, which helped them to form strong unity at Surat.

2. National Education

Differences existed between the Bengal extremists and Tilak in the field of national education too. Tilak considered Christianity and science as the twin threats to the existence of orthodox Hinduism. By science, Tilak meant reason and western knowledge and they along with Christianity were to be kept away from the schools. Tilak considered that the greatest defect of colonial education system was the lack of importance given to the moral and religious instruction. Tilak wrote that,

the political tendency of the system of Education in use in India we remarked that the postponement of the calamity of native independence is possible, nay probable or if you like certain, And how? By encouraging the spread of English Education among the natives. This will bring down their caste system, their religion, their ideas of native government et hoc genus omne. In a word English education will beget in the native mind contempt for everything.\textsuperscript{123}

So to counter the de-nationalizing effect of English education Tilak proposed national education, which removed these defects.

We shall not be content with only moral basis being established for education; we are positively of opinion that religious education must form an integral portion of the education of our school and college boys. The proficiency of the school and college boys in the subject of religion should affect the merit of the general results of the students.\textsuperscript{124}

Tilak emphasised that,

much of the religious instruction should consist of dogma pure and simple. The schoolboys will have to be told dogmatically that

\textsuperscript{123} Mahratta, Aug 21 1881.
\textsuperscript{124} Mahratta, July 5 1903, p.318. Religious Education in Schools and Colleges.
there is God ... of course, the schoolboy who wants an ocular proof of the existence of God will have to be caned into silence.\textsuperscript{125}

Tilak argued that,

just as the existence of god is a matter which is not made the subject of discussion and argumentation in the school room, so the other fundamental idea of .. Hinduism (like) the belief in avatars and in the Vedas as being the true revelation is to be gradually inculcated in the minds of the schoolboys without much fuss being made about it being vulnerable or invulnerable to the shafts of logic and reason. The primer of Sanatan Dharma compiled by the authorities of the Central Hindu College should be the textbook in these schools.\textsuperscript{126}

In these schools Hindu philosophy was not to be taught as,

religion is for all\textsuperscript{127}...it is not profitable to study Hindu philosophy as a preparation for the study of the Hindu religion. Philosophy is meant for intellectual prodigies and geniuses\textsuperscript{128}

Tilak suggested that the Syllabi should include “the history of the Sanatan Dharma and a little attention should also be paid to comparative study of religion” to prove the greatness of Hinduism, because “it will be necessary to give a little into the tenets of Christianity and Mahomedanism (as they) maintain that Christ and Mahomad respectively, was the only human incarnation of god-head. Hinduism on the contrary takes a very broad and liberal view of the matter.\textsuperscript{129}

Tilak argued that such an education based on religious dogma promoted nationality and without such an education the learned people of

\begin{footnotes}
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the nation do not become leaders and such a nation does not deserve to prosper.\textsuperscript{130} He declared, 

\begin{quote}
The prosperity, which we want, must come about by means of a Hindu state.\textsuperscript{131}
\end{quote}

Tilak opposed the secular education as he considered that it had severed the ties between education, morality and religious devotion\textsuperscript{132} and the religious education was essential "as the study of high principles keeps us away from evil pursuits. Tilak speaking on national education in 1908 emphasised the scheme which consisted of four important principles. Firstly, the religious education, secondly, lightening the load of the study of foreign languages or removing English, thirdly, introduction of technical education for the industrial development and finally, educating the people in politics\textsuperscript{133}. So in Tilak's National Education, subjects like philosophy sciences, literature along with the English were absent. Tilak's concept of that, which gives us a knowledge of the experience of our ancestors is called education\textsuperscript{134}. 

was not accepted by all. \textit{Mahratta} published an article by S.K. Damle on national education which accepted the elimination of subjects like English, literature and philosophy which would "never fit him (a young man) fight strenuously the battle of life and to come out triumphantly through the
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struggle for existence”\textsuperscript{135} but opposed “the initiation into the daily religious observances ordained in the Shastras… (as) such crude ideas do more harm than good to the national cause and they must be promptly knocked on the head”\textsuperscript{136} He suggested that the national system of education should concentrate on only industrial and technical education.\textsuperscript{137}

The national education propagated by Tilak was Brahmanical and differed from the national education propagated in Bengal. Aurobindo and Pal did not include religious education in primary and secondary level. At this level children were to be taught subjects like arithmetic, chemistry, Sanskrit or Arabic and vernacular.\textsuperscript{138} At the secondary level, subjects like German, French, Physics, Mathematics, Biology, Geology and Agriculture were to be taught.\textsuperscript{139} At the collegiate level the students could opt for philosophy either Hindu or Islamic besides subjects like History, Economics, Political Science, classical languages, English literature and Comparative Philology in the Humanities section and Physics, Medicine, Engineering were to be in the science section.\textsuperscript{140} The History taught in the scheme of national education was to include the History of all countries including the History of Islam.\textsuperscript{141} The list of historical personalities to be studied did not include a single Indian personality. The list consisted of personalities like George Washington, Napoleon, Fredrick the great and
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Chengiz Khan. This rational and scientific education was called National education because the medium of instruction was vernacular as against English and the method of instruction was to be entirely Indian. The National Council of Education was organized in 1906 in Calcutta and set up under it the Bengal National College and School with Aurobindo Ghosh as the first principal.

Aurobindo enthusiastically supported the universal education and suggested that the country must be covered with a network of new primary schools on national lines as education alone gave necessary training of mind and character for self-government. The aim of this education was, to remove false beliefs and false ideals and old prepossessions from the minds of the people...aim to remove faith in bureaucracy as a necessary instrument of constructing nationality. The national education should inculcate self-help even among the lowest class of our population.

So national education propagated by the Bengal leaders aimed to consolidate the nationalistic tendencies and not force ritualistic Brahmanism on the students.

3. The Formation of Muslim League

The Swadeshi movement in Bengal was guided by parallel schools of thought. The one was represented by Swadeshi Bandhav Samiti which sustained on the cooperation of both Hindu and Muslim communities, the other being the Anushilan samiti which excluded the Muslims and maintained a strict orthodox Hindu bias. In the initial stages Muslims,
extensively participated in the Swadeshi movement. The aggressive Hindu imagery and ritual worship of Kali alienated Muslims from the movement. During this period the Muslim community itself was undergoing transformation. The Aligarh College, which was the citadel of anti-Congress rhetoric for twenty years, witnessed a surge of pro-Congress younger leaders. In 1905, the young Aligarh Muslims such as Tufail Ahmed and Hasrat Mohani attended the Congress at Benaras. In May 1906, the Aligarh College student union took an alarming line when it began to advocate joint action by Hindu and Muslims in politics. The emerging new Muslim leaders coming from middle class, professional background advocated greater cooperation between the communities and was fairly successful in their endeavour. This threatened the aristocratic and landed elite who stood to lose their pre-eminence and leadership in the Muslim society. The communal clashes in 1906 at various places in east Bengal and its subsequent reporting both in the Bengali and Urdu Press provided an immediate opportunity to regain the lost ground. In East Bengal, it was Nawab Salimulla’s separatist party, which captured the effective leadership of the Muslim community. The colonial government that capitalized on the cleavage encouraged the aristocratic Muslims to organize them and send deputation for certain privileges.

Tilak failed to understand the changes taking place within the Muslim community, in the context of the aggressive Hindu nationalist campaign, as well as the support extended by the colonial government.

---

149 Mahratta June 16, 1907, p.284.
151 Mahratta Nov. 20, 1904.
When the Muslim deputation was received by the viceroy at Shimla, Tilak commented that "we are not inclined to attach any exaggerated importance to the fact of the deputation... We for one think that it will not be long remembered". Tilak advised the Muslim, if the deputation could not get the autonomy on the colonial basis...

if it is a question of getting one member more or less in the municipalities and local boards or even in the legislative councils, they have nothing substantial to gain and they should therefore give up the policy of treason to their own country. If our advise were not in danger of appearing to be interested we might even suggest that the grand experiment of the deputation having failed, the Mohamedans should reconsider the question of their political methods by joining the Congress.

Tilak's political prediction that the deputation would soon be forgotten proved to be short lived. The reception that the viceroy extended to the deputation and the new found assertiveness on the part of the Muslims, forced Tilak to rethink on the strategy. In January 1907 Tilak wrote that,

the Kesari of Poona voicing the sentiments of the Hindu of the Bombay presidency clearly says that the Hindu will never feel jealous to any gain that fall to the lot of the Mohammedan...compares the political agitation to the storming operations against a strong and inaccessible citadel.

153 ibid.
154 The newfound confidence expressed itself in two important fields, firstly in the field of Islamic cultural superiority and secondly in the organised efforts at obtaining political concessions. In the cultural field, Syed Amir Ali the ex-judge of Calcutta high court emphasised that "much of what was best in modern Europe is due directly or indirectly to Saracenic influences". Amir Ali emphasised on the liberal Arab rule in the North Africa which became a heaven in the medieval ages for the "European victims of Gothic and Papal oppression". Mahratta Aug 5. 1906, pp.365-66. Asiatic Rule in Europe The secular government which was introduced by the Arabs in Spain was later copied by the Christian rulers. Mahratha agreed with the idea because "what one of the foremost European nations did in the nineteenth century had been accomplished already in the ninth century by an eastern nation" , Mahratta March 5, 1905, p.109 Mahomedans and the Civilisation, EdN.
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Tilak compared various political parties in India as various,
battalions of one and the same besieging army and if one battalion
succeeds in making a breach in the rampart sooner than the other,
well the army as a whole shares the credit for it without feeling
any envy for the good fortune of one section of it.

Tilak argued then,

the impediments to Mohammedan progress have never come from
the jealousy of the Hindu so much on from the want of active
benevolence of Government themselves.  

By 1907, it was certain to Tilak that Muslims would not participate
in any Congress sponsored movement. Mahratta expressed the doubt that,

the Mohomedans may or may not join the Congress in a body; they
may ever complain through their deputation that after all the larger
share of the loaves and fishes of honorary stipendiary offices in
the government services and in the councils of administration falls
to the lot of their Hindu compatriots. But it would be
 shortsightedness to deny that with every claim, which they then
advance of political progress, they carry their country with them a
step further in the same line.  

Tilak insisted that the Hindus did not feel jealous of
good fortune of the Mahomedans; only let them realise it. We
shall forget the injustice of the rulers to the Hindus; only let the
Mahomedans realise it.  

Tilak called the Mahomedans as “a fine martial race and demonstration of
political aspiration a national asset for India”.  

---
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Gokhale reacted to the continued alienation of the Muslim community in a different way. He began a tour of northern India appealing to both the communities to treat each other with respect and consideration. *Mahratta* reported the visits and speeches and hoped that "the cordial reception, that Mr. Gokhale received... ought really to go a great way towards the cementing of the friendly relations between the two great communities." Gokhale observed that the Hindu Mahomedan problem required tactful and unbiased considerations at the hands of both the communities and suggested to both the communities to regard India as the mother land and heartily participate in all national activities. Gokhale emphasised that "the basis of India's future lay not in religion but national growth." He specially "asked the Hindus to make more scarifies while working for their Mahomedan brethren, consistent with self-respect and faith that this course would serve the interests of both." After his tour of Lucknow and Aligarh, Gokhale visited Lahore and addressed the Muslim League. *Mahratta* reported that Gokhale lectured under the auspices of the Muslim League and his sight elicited loud applause and shouts of Bande Mataram from one and all. Here Gokhale spoke of the ills affecting India as a whole. He spoke of ignorance, illiteracy, and the state's apathy in introducing compulsory education, the impossible barrier of caste system and appreciated the positive qualities imbibed in both religions. Gokhale invoked the names of the Mughal emperors Akbar, Jahangir and Shahjahan and the exchange of ideas in the medieval period. Gokhale hoped that both the communities would genuinely attempt to rekindle the confidence in each other.

---
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Hindus was greater than the Muslims as they had educational advantage and appealed to the Hindus to show greater forbearance than the Mahomedans. Efforts at individual level would reflect ultimately at the national level. If a Hindu doctor devotes himself to serve the Mahomedans within 10 years a fair advance towards the goal will be achieved.\footnote{Mahratta, March 3, 1907, p.105.} Gokhale's call "to serve our motherland as men, as human beings" had limited effect. The Muslim support to the Partition and the British support to the Muslim delegation which was received by the viceroy,\footnote{Mahratta, Jan 20, 1907, p.32.} further enhanced the cleavages. Tilak failed to understand their historical significance, his belief that since the Muslims were also the subject people\footnote{Mahratta, Feb 17, 1907, p.73.} like the Hindu and hence shared the same predicament of a ruled nation proved wrong.

4. Swadeshi and Boycott

In spite of his ideological differences with the Bengal extremists Tilak extended his support to the Swadesi agitation in Bengal and in other provinces too.\footnote{Mahratta, Aug 6, 1905, p.377. Editorial.} \textit{Mahratta} argued that, the extraordinary act of unsympathetic high handedness on the part of the government in partitioning Bengal was to be met with an equally extraordinary act of retaliation on the part of the people.\footnote{Mahratta, July 16, 1905, p.338.} The final plan on the partition of Bengal come to the public notices only on July 8, 1905, which evoked tremendous counter response by the people. Surendra Nath Banerjee took the first practical step towards passive resistance when he suggested the use
of boycott at a meeting on the 17 July. A meeting was held on 7 August in which boycot was inaugurated with the support of the district leaders, an act which formally marked the beginning of the *Swadeshi* movement. In Bengal itself, daily meetings in Calcutta and the cities and towns in the moffusils followed up this resolution. In Dacca, the *Anushilan Samiti* which was established in 1902, and with which Aurobindo was associated since 1903 took up revolutionary underground activity. The Samiti's strict religious vows at initiation, ruled out the development of the Samiti into a broad-based organisation. The members of the Samiti came from smaller landed gentry of East Bengal. On the other hand, the *Swadeshi Bandhab Samiti* of Barisal was an open mass organization which elected Abdul Rasul as the President of the Barisal Conference. He regarded that the *Swadeshi* actually helped Muslim weavers all over the country. Barisal was the stronghold of *Swadeshism* from the very beginning, Aswini Kumar Dutt who hailed from Barisal commanded respect of both the Hindus and Muslims. So when the District Magistrate of Barisal fined Surendra Nath Banerjee, a Muslim merchant came forward to pay the entire sum. Tilak declared that the Muslims were firmly behind the *Swadeshi* movement and warned the colonial government that it would not succeed in separating them.

---

173 Haridas and Uma Mukherjee, (1958) p.111.
Mahrratta explained to its readers the relevance of Swadeshi, and national education and closely followed the agitation-taking place in Bengal and Madras Presidency. Mahrratta articles concerning Bengal consisted of various instances of Muslim support to the anti-partition agitation. Mahrratta along with its extensive coverage of Swadeshi movement in Bengal, reported the Swadeshi movement under the leadership of Anne Besant in Madras. During this period the Bengal extremist leaders and Anne Besant toured throughout their respective provinces to popularise the concepts of Swaraj, Swadeshi, national education and obtain the support of the people for the programme of boycott. Though Tilak by now had declared 'boycott' as a legitimate political weapon, Mahrratta did not report Tilak touring western India to popularise the Swadeshi movement nor any reported speeches exist of this period. Instead, Tilak continued to speak on issues related to religion and was very closely involved with the temperance movement. Tilak's preoccupation with the religious and local issues was guided by three important factors. Firstly, Bombay presidency was politically far less discontented than Bengal, hence it was difficult to mobilise large sections of the society for an agitation against the partition of Bengal, which was geographically, and a far removed place from the minds of the
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184 Mahrratta, Sep 29 1907 p.462 (Speech on Purushasukta), Mahrratta April 12 1908, p.169, Temperance Movement, Mahrratta April 19 1908, Poona Temperature Agitation, p.185. (Editorial.)
people. In Bombay, the enthusiasm was limited. The Congress leaders supported the Swadeshi movement without supporting the Boycott.\textsuperscript{185} For example Gujarati, the reformist newspaper argued that "economically, the boycott movement would fail due to logical reasons, the majority of the people would buy what suits their pockets and convenience. India imported cotton goods worth Rs.31 crores and exported cotton yarn worth 11½ crores, so it was almost impossible to bridge the gap between the British imports and the home production and the movement was bound to fail. On the other hand the Swadeshi movement which aimed at increasing the production of Indian goods would benefit India in the long run by meeting the Indian demands for goods within the country".\textsuperscript{186} Secondly, the rank and file of the Indian national Congress in western India in general and of Bombay in particular remained firmly behind the leadership of Pheroz Shah Mehta and G.K. Gokhale.\textsuperscript{187} So the responsibility of propagating the ideals of Swaraj, Swadeshi, boycott and National education fell on Tilak and his associates. Thirdly, the individual initiatives like the one by Vijaparkar's National School entered into difficulties with the government of the Maharaja of Kolhapur, who raided and closed it down.

In Bengal on the other hand, nationalist leaders worked along with Congress leaders. Aurobindo called for an economic Jehad, Surendranath Banerjee supported him with equal enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{188} They along with the local bodies like Anushilam Samiti posed a formidable threat to the

\textsuperscript{185} This enthusiasm generated in Bengal was not shared by other parts of India. Bombay and Madras Presidencies supported Swadeshi movement without supporting boycott. Elsewhere there was outright hostility. Sarendra Nath Babnerje visited Bhagalpur in Bihar to propagate the movement which divided the people, Hindus and Muslims of Bihar on the one hand and Bengalis on the other hand. Gordon Johnson "Partition, Agitation and Congress". Bengal 1904-1908 Modern Asian Studies, 7, 2 (1973) p. 554.
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local bodies like *Anushilam Samiti* posed a formidable threat to the colonial government. Surendranath Banerjee visited Bombay and speaking at the *Swadeshi Vastu Pracharini Sabha* appealed to the Bombay mill owners to lower the prices to facilitate *Swadeshi* movement, instead of raising the prices as was done by the mill owner owing to greater demand for *Swadeshi* goods. He asked “the Gajrathis, Mahomedans, *Mahrattas* and Bhatias no matter what your political differences may be gather together under the comprehensive banner of swadeshism”.

Tilak hoped for such an understanding with Gokhale in western India too. *Mahratta* repeatedly insisted that the concepts of *Swadeshi*, *Swaraj* and National education was first propounded by Gokhale and hence Gokhale was as extremist as Tilak himself. *Mahratta* printed a circular issued and signed by Gokhale, when he was the secretary of the Poona *Sarvajanic Sabha* in 1894. At that time, Gokhale called for a meeting to protest against the government policy of excluding foreign textile goods from duty. Gokhale called this 'selfish' act of the government as unjust and very harmful to the people. Gokhale along with Nilkhant Janardhan Kirtane, Vishnu Mareshwar Bhide and Abaji Vishnu Kathwate took oath to use only *Swadeshi* cloth for themselves and their families. So Tilak argued that Gokhale actually began the *Swadeshi* movement in western India and approved most of the things done in the name of boycott but he would not recommend the use of that ominous and harsh word. *Mahratta* quoted Gokhale's speech at Allahabad session to prove that he was fully behind the extremist programme, but only disapproved boycott as a political weapon, while he supported the cause of *Swadeshi* and National

---
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Education. Gokhale defined Swadeshi as deep and all embracing love for the motherland and urged for seeking protection for hand-made industries. Mahratta stated that we are not in love with the word boycott and if Gokhale suggests anything equally effective we shall accept it. Mahratta discussed at length, the opinions of both Gokhale and Tilak on thirty-nine issues and concluded that they differed only on three issues, all concerning boycott. Gokhale did not approve of the use of the word boycott and use it as a vindictive weapon and expressed that patience was needed to solve the issues relating to larger national interest. Tilak considered these issues open for discussion.

The similarities and the differences between the Congressmen and the Tilakite's as expressed by Mahratta was accepted by the Congressmen who stressed that the political faith of all educated Indian was one and unmistakable but differed only in matters of detail. Gokhale considered that there could be no happiness except within the orbit of law and the basis of constructing the nationality was love and not hate as "hatred never ceases by hatred, hatred ceases by love". What the Congressmen objected to was the Tilakite's propaganda that the moderate party was the official party. Mahratta failed to appreciate it as it believed that alien rule was a sufficient ground for the Congressmen to join hands with the Tilakite's as it happened in Bengal where both the parties were
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Having failed to elicit support from Gokhale and Mehta and thereby the entire rank and file of the Congress in Western India, Tilak suggested to the Congressmen that “if they want to be known as friends of government they must declare themselves more specifically than they have done”. So in the absence of co-operation from the Congressmen Tilak and his associates had to depend on individual effort to carry on the agitation for Swaraj.

The individual initiative for organising the Swadeshi movement and pursuing Gokhale to join the agitation was going on simultaneously. Tilak visited Bombay requested Dinshaw Watcha to influence the mill owners to supply goods at reasonable prices. From the business point of view it was a loss-making project and most of them declined to help Tilak. Tilak returned to Poona without addressing any meeting there. Poona remained the heart of the Swadeshi movement as Shivram Mahadev Parnjape, the editor of Kal, an enthusiastic Swadeshi supporter organised a bonfire of foreign cloths and articles. Tilak attended the meeting and urged the people about 5000 persons mostly Brahmins who had assembled to resolve to buy only Swadeshi goods. Swadeshi exhibitions were held at Bombay, Pandharapur, Swantwadi, Dharwar, and Ahmadabad. Mahratta Published supplements containing information about the manufacture of household articles. School children at Amraoti, Gokak and Kolhapur refused to use foreign article. Tilak established Swadeshi Vastu Pracharini Sabha, society to promote the use of Swadeshi goods and Swadeshi co-operative
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stores. The *Swadeshi Vastu Pracharini Sabha* organised an exhibition of *Swadeshi* goods, organised lectures, and gave prizes to best essays and the best *Ganapati mela* using *Swadeshi* attire. The enthusiasm generated for *Swadeshi* goods created a favourable wider market for Indian goods in the long run, but failed to secure any political advantage. As Tilak’s idea of protest was more towards sensationalising the issue than towards positive construction of an ideology. Along with the Congress leaders, Gujaratis and Parsis and non-Brahmins remained aloof from the movement. The non-participation of Gujaratis and Parsis denied the much-needed capital for starting new *Swadeshi* venture. The non-Brahmins attacked Tilak in their newspaper and even demolished the dais erected to welcome Tilak for his *Swadeshi* speech in Belgaum.

5. The Bombay textile mills strike and the Surat split.

As the enthusiasm generated for *Swadeshi* movement in Bombay failed to match Bengal movement, Tilak turned his attention towards the industrial labour force of Bombay, who due to highly exploitative conditions of work were already discontented and were ready for a movement. Tilak's understanding of Industrial labour hitherto was from the point of view of the Mill owners. When the factory act was passed in 1881,
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Tilak criticised it as an attempt by the Manchester manufacturers to undermine the growth of Indian Industries. The textile workers suffered from long hours of work and low wages. The first attempt at organising the workers was by a Satya Shodak, NM Lokhande whose Bombay mill hands association made efforts to improve the condition of workers. Phule also addressed the textile workers of Bombay. He also urged the colonial government to enact laws to curb the exploitation of workers, as a result the government brought about the Factories Act Amendment Bill. The bill reduced the number of working hours to women and children and the minimum age of children was raised. Mahratta did not agree that long hours of work for young children and women meant exploitation. It argued that "to curtail hours of work is to curtail their power of earning" and refused to believe that children were over worked.

The children, are taken to the factories by their own parents and are not likely to be overworked. It is necessary that they should learn some trade or art as early as possible in order to assist their poor parents. By raising the limit by two years they will be condemned to an idle and useless life for that period.

However, Tilak supported efforts at improving the condition of labourers in the Tea gardens of Assam as Europeans mostly owned them. Tilak argued for the protection of industries but opposed the protection of labour interests.
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The turn of the century witnessed the electrification of textile industry in Bombay, which resulted in the extended hours of labour for the workers. *The Times of India* and the *Maratha Aikya Icchu Sabha* (Society for the Promotion of unity among the Marattas) began a campaign to reduce the number of working hours to twelve. *Mahrratta* opposed the demand by stating that the slavery suffered by the Indians at the hands of alien rule was far greater than the so-called slavery suffered by the workers at the hands of the mill owners. 216 *Mahrratta* stated that the workers worked only fourteen and half-hours a day and not fifteen as stated by the Anglo Indian press and the wages earned by the skilled and unskilled labourers was pretty satisfactory. 217 A letter to editor questioned the actual productivity of the workers by stating that,

the workers repeatedly leave the work and return to it throughout the day take frequent intervals, they waste employers time while resorting to the smoking shed, to the drinking water tanks. No amount of discipline can check the habit. Labourers fly every year to his village for rest and recuperation. 218

The writer also argued that late working hours actually solved the law and order problem and,

the police will testify that in the neighbourhood, of mills working at night is free from rowdyism 219.

Even the Congressmen shared Mahratta’s apathy for the plight of the workers. The reformist newspaper *Induprakash* conducted a survey on the working condition of the worker and its report stated that any legislative interference on behalf of the workers would be “lunacy” as “the

---
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lesser hour meant more rest but certainly not more comfort". The report also stated that the workers strike in October 1905 "was due to the working of malicious men". And expressed satisfaction that "far from favouring the idea of legislation in his favour he (the worker) has faith in private effort and especially in Swadeshi movement which may result in mill owners granting more wages to their servants".

Though Mahratta found the working condition of workers as satisfactory, the Indian factory commission came to a different conclusion. The discontent existed is evident from the fact that sporadic strikes started in the beginning of 1905 continued until 1911 when the legislation reduced the number of working hours in 1911. So the industrial discontent was in the air which remained unorganized during this period. Tilak addressed a meeting of five thousand mill hands, sympathized with their plight and urged them to understand Swadeshism,

we shall have sufficient food only when the profit derived from railways, steamers goes into our pockets and not into that of European Companies.

Tilak explained that there were two lakh labourers in Bombay, who had to leave their native places in search of jobs due to the destruction of rural industries by the British rule. This simple but true genesis of Bombay industrial labour was close to the heart of the workers, which drew them towards him. Tilak also explained that there was no sufficient food for all because the government exported food grains and declared that "our prayer
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to the government is that it should provide us sufficient food".225 Since the colonial government failed to comply, Swadeshism was the only remedy as the object of Swadeshism is to provide us all with food. Tilak called on the workers not to fear the government,226 and advised the jobbers to form local committees and organise labour for propagating Swadeshism among them.227 Tilak’s efforts brought forth a tremendous response from the workers.

Tilak's appeal to the industrial workers coincided with Mahratta’s anticipation of “the trial of strength between the Congressmen and the Tilakites in the coming session of the Congress”.228 In shifting of the venue from the Tilakite’s stronghold, Nagpur, to relatively non-political Surat and the election of Rash Behari Ghose instead of Lajpat Rai as demanded by the Tilakites, Pheroz Shah Mehta had according to Mahratta, "out Curzoned Curzon".229 Tilak declared at Surat during his pre session speech that he did not want a secession from the Congress or a separate Congress but he was anxious and determined to see that the Congress did not go back from the position taken by it in previous years.230 However, the failure to reach a compromise between the Congressmen and the Nationalists resulted in the split in Congress on ideological ground. Mahratta alleged that the Congressmen had used goondas to prevent the Tilakite’s from entering the meeting that took place at Pheroz Shah Mehta's residence after
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the split\textsuperscript{231}, yet appealed to "both the parties not to fight over the points where they differed, but make joint efforts on points on which they agreed that work should be conducted.\textsuperscript{232} Mahratta argued that "the break up of the Congress and the desire for the reunion were almost simultaneous".\textsuperscript{233} The Congressmen were reluctant to admit the Tilakites. A Committee consisting of Rash Behari Ghose, G.K. Gokhale and WC Wacha were selected to draft a constitution, which was adopted later in the Allahabad conference in April 1908. The constitution emphasised "the constitutional means" to attain self-government.\textsuperscript{234} This sealed the fate of the Tilakites from entering the Congress, disappointed Tilak declared that, the need of the hour is the determination to be ready to go to jail by intentionally breaking the tyrannical laws of government when you have the determination to do this whether it is done moderately or extremely on that day we shall be saved. Otherwise, slavery is written on our foreheads.\textsuperscript{235}

The Tilakites initiative towards reunion remained unanswered as the Congressmen in western India refused to have any understanding with Tilak and his associates. Gokhale's insistence on Indian nationality and Tilak's assertion of Hindu nationality was ideologically contradictory. The Surat split was much more than the desire to elect Lajpatrai as the president and control the organization. It was a conflict of two value systems, monolithic militant tradition as against pluralistic bhakti tradition. Tilak representing the militant tradition was confident that given a chance he would change the pluralistic tradition into a monolithic one. Gokhale
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knowing Tilak's power and confidence was willing to end his political career than to let the pluralistic tradition die a violent death at the hands of the militant tradition. This was essential to keep Indian nationality alive and consolidate itself in the long run. This period witnessed escalation in extremism in Bengal in the form of a series of bomb blasts, which killed several Europeans.\footnote{Mahratta expected that Gokhale would make use of Muzafarpur bombings to drive home the point to the British public the oppressive character of colonial rule. Gokhale refused to toe the line and continued his negotiation with the colonial government for constitutional reforms. Mahratta published a series of articles on the bombings and compared it to the "mutinies and revolts of the nihilists in Russia" and considered that the bombers "were not driven by self interest", and the situation was the result of "autocratic, unrestricted and irresponsible white bureaucracy in India". And insisted that "the Bengalis were not anarchists but they have brought into use the weapon of the anarchists". Mahratta had for some time admired the activities of the Russian anarchists. It had reproduced the manifesto of the revolutionary committee to represent peasants and supported the political assassinations in Russia as an act done in "a fit of delirious fear as an entire generation was moved down by czar's despotism".}

The colonial government's repression took the form of a series of arrests of the Tilakite leaders. The first to be arrested was S.M. Paranjape
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the editor of Kal from Poona on the 11th June 1908. Paranjape was a close associate of Tilak who had taken part in the Swadeshi movement very enthusiastically by organising a large scale burning of foreign goods in Poona. Tilak reached Bombay to assist him in his defence. Paranjape was convicted by the Bombay High Court and sentenced to nineteen months imprisonment on the 8th July, 1908. Tilak made use of this time in Bombay by attending a function held by mill hands at Victoria Road and addressed the mill hands and advised the jobbers and head jobbers to form committees to organize the workers. Tilak himself was arrested on 24th June for the articles published in Kesari and Mahratta. The proceedings of the trial began on July 13 and lasted until July 22. Tilak made his own defence and brilliantly defended the freedom of press. However, Tilak was sentenced to deportation for six years. During the trial, the mill hands in twenty-eight of the eighty-five mills of the city went on strike. Bombay also witnessed sporadic violence. The day after Tilak was sentenced to imprisonment, Bombay came to a stand still, work stopped in a number of Mills, businessmen closed their shops and the streets were decorated with black bunting.

Bombay’s response to Tilak’s arrest and prosecution has been hailed by the Soviet historians, who entirely based their assumption on the articles in Mahratta as quoted by the Times of India as objectively responsible in awakening the class consciousness of the Indian proletariat. Their ideas were facilitated by Lenin's declaration of the Bombay textile strike as an example of the development of consciousness by the proletariat for
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political mass struggle. Their unfamiliarity with the internal contradiction in colonial India is evident in their analysis of the success of the strikes. According to them "the Tilakite's went to work as plain millhands. The response to their appeal was all the greater because many Tilakite's, as Tilak himself were Brahmins who were highly respected by the lower castes to which most of the millhands belonged". The workers response to Tilak's arrest and the subsequent deportation was sentimental, they having suffered for long and Tilak being the only leader to have addressed them in times of their need resulted in a series of strikes. Even Mahratta, analyzed the Bombay textile strike on the lines of sentimental response to Tilak's arrest. Mahratta argued that

these disturbances have a history which may be divided into three parts. In the initial stages, they were a mere passive expression of their sorrow at the sufferings of Mr. Tilak on the part of the toiling thousands in the industrial field of Bombay who, though not educated, had acquaintance enough with Mr. Tilak's name and his personality to feel for him in the hour of his trouble. The passive expression of sorrow took the same form which similar expressions take in nearly every other case viz., temporary secession of work: If these men were allowed to do so there would have been no trouble... there was a counter movement for forcing it (work) to go on". In the third stage, the government called in troops to restore order.

So according to Mahratta, the response of the worker to Tilak's arrest was an expression of sympathy. This fact is further strengthened by a series of textile strikes that continued until the legislation for the twelve-hour per working day was enacted in 1911.
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247 ibid., p.62.
248 ibid., p.588-589
249 Mahratta, Aug. 2, 1908, p.361.
250 Mahratta, Aug. 30, 1908, p.411.
The arrest and transportation of Tilak ended the era of aggressive assertion of militant Hinduism in Western India. Though Tilak’s associates kept up the campaign for national education by going to the districts and mofusils the campaign for boycott, Swadeshi and Swaraj ended with Tilak’s deportation. The growth of religious militant nationalism in Bengal provided an opportunity to Tilak to articulate his version of religious militant nationalism. While Aurobindo and Bipin Chandra Pal attempted to broaden the scope and sphere of Hindu identity encompassing the entire Hindu Population, Tilak’s insistence on the caste system as the cornerstone of his version of Swaraj, failed to bring Hindus together under his leadership. There was a determined opposition to the Swadeshi movement by both the reformers and Non-Brahmin leaders. Similarly, Tilak’s national education which consisted of instructions in ritualistic Brahmanism and technical knowledge, as against Bengal’s version of scientific education in local languages elicited little enthusiasm in Bombay Presidency. Similarly Swadeshi and boycott too failed as the mill owners in Bombay declined to cooperate with Tilak. The formation of the Muslim league and the Muslim deputation to the colonial government, which Tilak considered would not be remembered for long, actually changed the nature of politics in India. The separate communal electorate, which was the direct outcome of this deputation, altered the nature of legislature in India. Tilak failed to anticipate this. As a result of the alienation that took place during the Swadeshi movement and Tilak’s insistence that the two communities formed two separate nationalities, legitimised the already existing cleavages.
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