CHAPTER – VII

Constructing the Hindu Nationality as against Indian Nationality

The absence of Tilak from *Mahratta* did not alter the editorial policy, N.C. Kelkar and K.P. Khadilkar kept the momentum created by Tilak alive by supporting self-assertive neo-Hinduism and opposing social reform. On the political front *Mahratta* opposed the demands made by the Muslim league and began to attack Gokhale for being silent on Tilak’s arrest, trial and deportation.¹ *Mahratta* called Gokhale an extremist during his secretarship of Poona *Sarvajanik Sabha* who had incurred the wrath of the Bombay government, but remained loyal to the government during the *Swadeshi* movement.² In an open letter to Gokhale³ by a “humble member of the community to which you no doubt think it a privilege to represent”, questioned Gokhale’s position as a leader of the people “what have you done to educate them in the political affairs of the country... as you remain most of the times out side the province... you have never been known to move amongst the masses and to organize their movements”. The writer also attacked Gokhale for “not expressing generosity of sympathy when Tilak fought constitutional battles”. In the letter Gokhale was also attacked that “in your anxiety to please the Mahomedans, you have forgotten to perform your duty to the Hindu Community”. The writer called for an explanation from Gokhale for his actions. Attack on Gokhale did not

---


³ *Mahratta*, Apr 18 1909, p.188, 189, An open letter to the Hon’ble Mr. G.K. Gokhale CIE.
confine to print, but spilled over to the streets in the songs sung during the Ganapati festival. ⁴

1. The Construction of Hindu Nationality

_Mahratta_ attacked Gokhale’s liberal construction of Indian nationhood in a three editorial series. Gokhale held the view that,

Nationalism differed from Liberalism only in its externals, while essentially both the isms did not materially differ...nationalism had the disadvantage of appearing to be externally concerned with the hatred of the foreigner, this was inevitable, because injustice done by foreigners was an added feature of the situation in India. But true nationalism would oppose tyranny and injustice by even native tyrants with the same vehemence as injustice by foreigners. Humanitarianism, which was the logical conclusion of liberalism, may present a wider front, the patriotism which was the logical conclusion of nationalism, but there was no reason there to say that one was better than the other... The Congress movement is a national movement, because it has fostered the consciousness of a political entity between the different nationalities in India. ⁵

_Mahratta_ argued that though,

nationalities recognised the right of every being to freedom of thought and action... his mind averts both to the strong points and the inherent frailty and weaknesses of human nature, and believes that what man may fail to achieve by individual initiative or effort he may achieve by throwing in his lot with those who, rather than others, may be best fitted for co-operation with him and recognises the necessity of the surrender of the rights of individuals to communities. ⁶

---


*Mahrratta* argued that nationalism was not about recognising innate goodness of human nature but,

the recognition of the limitations and defects of human nature alone leads to an efficient economy of the energy in man... for the purpose of effective practical action the universal benevolence is useless. The man who seeks to embrace humanity is nearly off his feet and fails to get or maintain a foothold".\(^7\)

*Mahratta* accepted that both the liberalism and nationalism originated in Europe after the French revolution. But held the view that,

insurrections and revolts were provoked by particular wrongs and the argument against the tyranny of kings was not the natural right of man but fidelity to the ancient laws supposed to be promulgated in a golden age in the past.\(^8\)

*Mahratta* suggested that the French revolution brought into prominence,

the doctrine of Rousseau the unpractical apotheosis of liberalism and the revolution itself worked in a spirit contrary to the hypothesis underlying the theory of nationality; for along with the Sovereign and the clergy it swept away the state as well as past traditions of the community in search of the Eldorado where this apotheosis could be realized. but the brain fever of the revolution soon abated...(as a) reaction against revolution, Bonaparte was born and began to attack Nationality in Russia and Italy by dethroning and degrading the representatives of old national dynasties and establishing a system of administration – which was essentially foreign in spirit. The people resisted change...this resistance was mainly popular and spontaneous. And its promoters were as much opposed to autocracy as to revolution, began to assert national rights.\(^9\)

*Mahratta* asserted that nationalism owed its existence firstly to the regeneration of a particular race or community in particular territory than to the general principles of liberalism and secondly to the hatred of the

\(^{7}\) ibid.

\(^{8}\) ibid.

\(^{9}\) *Mahratta*, July 25 1909, p.354.
It's analysis of the French revolution and the rise and fall of Napoleon on the basis of these two principles, devoid of its economic and social implications is simplistic. Yet, as a logical continuation of Tilak's ideas on Swaraj and national education, Mahratta's understanding of the concept of Nationalism based on fidelity to the ancient laws promulgated in the golden age, the regeneration of a community and the hatred of foreigners and foreign institution sums up the nationalistic ideology of Tilak.

The construction of Hindu nationality as against Indian nationality therefore implied that the non-Hindus were excluded completely as they did not share the same loyalty to the same set of ancient laws. In the nineties and during the Swadeshi movement Tilak argued that the Muslims formed a separate nationality and the Muslim co-operation could be sought only to the extent of opposing the colonial government as it was alien to both of them. So when the Muslim league asked for electoral concessions from the government. Mahratta criticised it as "unjust as Hindus are the race of the soil, so can easily raise the cry of making India a Hindu nation". Mahratta's criticism coming at a time when the understanding between the two communities was fast deteriorating adversely affected it. Gokhale attempted to bring both the communities together by accepting the communal representation. Congressmen and the liberal Muslims were not the only ones, who attempted it. Both the orthodox Hindu and Muslim

10 Mahratta, Aug 1 1909, p.366, 367. Liberalism and Nationalism III.Editorial
11 William Doyle in the Origins of the French Revolution (New York, 1990), explains that there were four revolutions between 1787-1789 not one as popularly believed. The first took place as the aristocracy sought to regain pre-eminence, they rebelled against the monarchy. The second was by the bourgeoisie against the aristocracy, the third was popular, anti-monarchy and aristocracy and the fourth a peasant revolution against feudalism. So French Revolution was essentially a liberating revolt against ancient institutions and not as Mahratta argued to preserve them.
12 Mahratta, Jan 17 1909, p.29. The Muslim League and the National Congress, Editorial.
leaders tried to bring about a general understanding between the two communities. In the meantime, communally sensitive Punjab witnessed riots, which according to *Mahratta* exhibited “the wanton nature of Muslims”.\(^{14}\) Gokhale alarmed by this proposed a dialogue between the leaders of both the communities. In January 1911 conference of Hindu and Muslim leaders was held at Allahabad which was presided over by William Wedderburn.\(^{15}\) The conference was attended by the orthodox Hindu leaders like Madam Mohan Malaviya, the Maharaja of Darbhanga, Congressmen like Surendranath Banerjee and Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Muslim orthodox leaders like Nawab Syed Ahmand and Nawab Abdul Majeed, liberal Muslim leaders like Raffiuddin Ahmed and Mian Muhamad Safi. The conference, a true representative of all shades of Indian opinion decided to abolish firstly, the system of boycott against each other, and the system of keeping each other out in government and departments of state. Secondly, recognition on both the sides, the religious institutions of both communities were to be promoted. Thirdly, propagation of National education and the propaganda of the *Arya Samaj* were to be sidelined and finally, the conference accepted the communal electorate and called upon both the communities to come to an understanding regarding the cow killing and the music before the Mosque.\(^{16}\)

*Mahratta* commented that it was “woe to India if talents like these in combination do not succeed in giving us something better than the fruit of the labours of Aesop’s mountain”, and saw in the agreement “the hand of fire-eating aggressive Mahomendan partisans. Who were responsible for the present acute condition of Hindu Mahomedan feelings”.\(^{17}\) *Mahratta*

---

\(^{14}\) *Mahratta*, Apr 17, 1910, p.189, The Peshawar Riots.

\(^{15}\) *Mahratta*, Jan 8 1911, p.17, The Hindu-Mahomedan Entente Editorial.

\(^{16}\) ibid

\(^{17}\) ibid.
considered the Mahomedan demand for communal representation as unjust.\footnote{Maharatta, Jan 15 1911, p.29, The Mahomedan claim Editorial.} Maharatta demanded to know,

what is the meaning of political importance? Is it meant to say that the Mahomendans should be treated with special favour because they conquered a portion of the Hindustan at one time? Now in the first place the reason does not hold good because the Hindu being Aryans... originally inhabitants of the North Pole... conquered... and held the land for thousands and thousands of years; the Mahomedans could not hold it over six or seven centuries.\footnote{Maharatta, Jan 15 1911, p.29.}

The editorial went on to argue as to how difficult it was for the Muslims to conquer and how the Marathas weakened the Mughal empire—a totally irrelevant argument which could only rise tempers. In the next editorial Maharatta discussing the medieval history claimed “in our last article we demonstrated how hollow is the claim of Mahomedans to political importance, we shall take up the subject again today”\footnote{Maharatta, Jan 22 1911, p.41, Mahomedan claim Examined Editorial.} and discussed how the Hindu ministers helped the Muslim kings in running the administration Maharatta declared that,

in supporting the separate electorate Gokhale was moved by the patriotic impulse of serving the country as an Indian rather than a Hindu.\footnote{Ibid.}

Though the conference was attended and the Muslim claims were endorsed by the Maharaja of Darbhanga and Madan Mohan Malviya the two political associates of Tilak, Maharatta singled out Gokhale for accepting the demands.\footnote{Maharatta, Feb 5 1911, p.61, EdN.}
Gokhale, who stood for a logical separation of politics from religion did not whole-heartedly support separate electorate, but reacted differently. In accordance with the separate electorate, the Bombay presidency had to send four members to the Viceroy’s council – one to be returned by landlords, one by the Mohamedan members of the Bombay legislative council and the remaining two by all the non-official members of the Bombay Council, including the Mahomedan members. The landlord’s member was to be returned alternatively by Sindh and by the presidency proper to ensure the return of a Mohammedan and a Hindu by turn and the Muslim member was to be elected by the Bombay council by their own separate vote. The two members were to be returned by all non-official members of the local council which consisted of twenty one elected and seven nominated by government each with two votes. So to win a seat a contestant had to secure nineteen votes, the nominated members had fourteen votes and if he could succeed in getting four votes from the two European members and manage one more vote a third Muslim member could be elected. So virtually three out of four members elected to the viceroy’s council could be Muslims in the Bombay presidency when the total Muslim population was only one fifth of the population of the presidency.  

Gokhale admitted that under the existing arrangement of separate electorate the Muslim community was over represented throughout the country and Lord Minto wanted to convey the impression that the Muslim Community was more important than the Hindu community. However, he said “you cannot take away from the Muslim community what you gave them yesterday”. The only solution was to see to it that the Muslim representatives were elected and not appointed by the

---

officials. Gokhale considered that the Indian interest was safe in the hands of elected representatives. So the efforts of consolidating the Hindu nationality and the attempt to bring both the communities together was going on simultaneously. Lala Lajpat Rai writing in the Urdu magazine *Zamana* of Kanpur, asked both the communities to have “mutual regard for each other’s religious feelings and the Hindu ordinarily ought to stop playing music when passing in front of the Mosque at the time of Namaz”. Lajpat Rai suggested to the Muslim leaders “to dissuade their co-religionists who live in villages where Hindus are a majority from sacrificing cows or at least do so at some distance from the village”. Lajpat Rai discussing the Hindi-Urdu controversy, reservations in the Council seats and the government jobs and the aggressive propaganda of the *Arya Samaj* stated that “in his opinion no community has a right to level any charge against another without committing a social and moral sin”. Besides these individual endeavours, efforts were also going on, on behalf of the congress to prevail upon the Muslim league to join hands with the Congress. Mohamad Ali Jinnah and Mazarul Haque attended the Muslim league sessions in 1911 at Lucknow and began negotiations with the Muslim league leaders and both decided to bring the parties together. With this the relations between the Hindu and Muslims entered an era of understanding and co-operation.

Though *Mahratta* continued to advocate the ‘discriminating’ education, it appreciated the efforts of the Maharaja Gaikwad of Baroda’s efforts in bringing about free and compulsory education. It also

---

24 *Mahratta*, Feb 5 1911, p.70-71, Gokhale’s speech on Council resolution.
appreciated Gokhale’s efforts though unsuccessful in the Bombay legislative council to get the primary education bill passed. The attitude towards the larger social issues remained the same. *Mahratta* reported the establishment of the All India Hindu Association, “whose raison d’etre is solely to promote the interests of the Hindus”. *Mahratta* expressed concern regarding the absence of “the representatives of the Pandits” in the organization, “who are the natural heads of the Hindus and hoped that the defect would be soon rectified”. However the personal and vindictive attack on the reformers ceased during this period. The sessions of the *Maratha* Educational Conference, the speeches of Keshaurao Pawar and the speeches of R.K. Bhandarkar and R.P. Paranjpe were reported in a nonchalant way. *Mahratta* also reported of a circular signed by N.G. Chandavarkar on behalf of an organization called the Aryan Brotherhood, which *Mahratta* called an anti-caste organization but abstained from bitter criticisms.

The long absence of Tilak, the militant assertion of the Hindu nationality in the light of self-assertion of non-Brahmin movement made Tilakites to feel isolated. So a conscious attempt was made to bring various Hindu sects together. The Special Marriage Amendment Bill gave an opportunity to achieve this. The regeneration of the Hindu community as a logical continuation of the fidelity to the ancient laws was antagonistic to one another. Fidelity to the ancient laws expected an unquestionable acceptance of the nineteenth century Hinduism in its entirety, where as the Hindu regeneration that was taking place in the country like the *Arya*...

---

29 *Mahratta*, July 30 1911, p.367, 368.
30 *Mahratta*, June 1911, p.277. EdN.
Samaj movement necessitated a certain amount of questioning of these laws and rejecting many of them. Tilak did not accept the Arya Samagists as Hindus even during Swadeshi movement. The Arya Samajists could not be sidelined, as it was they who were the strongest and most militant supporters of the Hindu nationalism and not the Sanatana Dharmis or the traditionalists. So a compromise was necessary to bring various Hindu denominations together. In 1911 a debate was going on regarding the amendments to the Hindu Marriage Bill. 32 The Bill was introduced in the imperial legislature by Bupendra Nath Basu. Mahratta stated that it was with an intention

to obtain liberty of action in the matter of marriage for those who, while observing Hindu customs of one sort or another, believe that there may be room for extension and growth in consonance with Hindu ideals, that such growth and expansion may be secured not by secession from the Hindu community but by reversion to what made it great in times gone by.

Mahratta suggested that the “Brahmos as a church have failed, but they have a sort of power in Bengal” as the Brahmos did not preach “religious lawlessness”, hence the “Hindu nation” was to take a benevolent stand. The argument was that even the “orthodox Hindus” had “unconsciously departed from the tenets of the Shartras” and the conditions of the Hindus was “like the sand on the riverbed, we are all drifting and drifting very slowly”. Mahratta strongly supported the inclusion of the Brahmos who appeared “too logical from one point of view too romantic from another but their non-conformity was never mischievously destructive”. The Brahmos had earlier refused to be considered Hindus. 33 Mahratta considered this “less as a blow aimed at their nationality than as

33 ibid.
a peace offering to the orthodox people of all nationalities... in order to remove difficulties in the way of a reasonable legislation”. Mahratta argued that “much water had flown under the bridge of Hindu conservatism and if the orthodox had no difficulty in accepting the Shaktas who under the thin cover of orthodoxy have introduced into the life of the society practices which are monstrous and ethically untenable” the Brahmos should also be acceptable as Hindus. The suggestion was opposed by a lawyer who emphasized that the regeneration was to take place by “eliminating of pollution by touch and try to help non-Dwaja castes and spread from our temples, Maths, melas and jatras the noblest truth of Hinduism”. He also suggested “inter-dining and marriages among various subcastes”, but opposed the Brahmos and other agnostics claim to Hinduism by stating that, it would lead to the stretching of the word Hindu to include Parsis, Moslems and Europeans who might adopt Brahmoism. He concluded that the only ‘body deserves to be included is Arya Samaj’. However, Mahratta did not fully agree with the view and supported the inclusion of Brahmos and other reformers into Hindu fold. Mahratta regarded that on account of the bill “the margin between the orthodox Hinduism and the men of new ideas could be adjusted and a reconciliation was made possible. The act “provided for liberty of action in matters pertaining to marriage, saved the Hindu community from disastrous dismemberment”. Mahratta appealed to the orthodoxy that “true social liberalism means faith in the collective wisdom of a community... How can the Brahmos who holds aloft the banner of Vedic mono-theism, be


35 Mahratta, July 30 1911, p.367.
denied the title of a Hindu”.\(^{36}\) This has been the earliest attempt by the Mahratta to understand the reformers.

This understanding was necessitated by the provisions of the act of 1909, which introduced separate communal electorate. In order to have better representation of Hindus in the elected bodies, it was essential to unify various Hindu reformist groups with the orthodox Hinduism. The Brahmos in Bengal and the Arya Samagists in Punjab consisted of educated and influential sections who would fill the seats in the elected bodies. If they remained outside the purview of Hinduism, the latter would become a minority. The 1911 census was also a contributory factor in bringing the anti reformers closer to reformers. The colonial government laid down a ten-point test to determine whether those who called themselves Hindus were actually Hindus or not. The list included whether the castes or groups accepted the supremacy of Brahmins, Vedas, Brahmin gurus, pollution by touch, reverence for cows, whether they were allowed to enter temples, bury or burn the dead. The report concluded that “according to this in the province of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa fifty-nine castes, of which seven are over a million strong do not confirm to all the tests. In the Central Province and Berar one quarter of the total number of Hindus deny the supremacy of the Brahmins and the authority of the Vedas”.\(^{37}\) This alarmed the Hindu leaders, who quickly began to support every move to bring together various groups under the banner of Hinduism.

Tilak was released from prison in June 1913, and immediately began the task of reconciliation in the political arena with the Congressmen and in the socio-cultural arena with the reformers and various Hindu sects.

\(^{36}\) Mahratta, April 23 1911, pp.197-198. Editorial.

Mahratta published two articles on the origin and the genesis of Nationalism in India. Hitherto nationalism was referred to as Hindu Nationalism but now nationalism came to be referred to as Indian Nationalism. Mahratta also declared M.G. Ranade "as the outstanding personality of the last century" and traced the origin of Indian Nationalism to "these men (western educated reformers) who had extraordinary intelligence, enthusiasm and love for their country". Mahratta accepted the reformer's opinion that the nationalism was a product of Europe, which came to India after the Mutiny of 1857. Mahratta declared that there was "the idea of nationality in the Vijayanagar kingdom in the south, the Mahratta empire in the west, the Sikh domination in the north, and the exploits of Pratapaditya of Bengal in the East", but, we need not go so far back as the mutiny of 1857 to find the germs of the new movement. The mutiny was not the outcome of this force or any force resembling this one in purity or disinterestedness or self-sacrifice. The leaders of the mutiny were actuated more by personal motives of ambition, gain or spite than by the highest sentiments of self-less patriotism or pure religion. The followers again were more the dupes of fanaticism or lovers of adventure than the conscious fellow-workers in the noble service of emancipating their country much less in its inspiration, inception, spread or operation was the mutiny the expression of the highest sentiments of the whole nation. It was only a personal and provincial affair though of a very serious character, and the people had no sympathy with its objects or methods and that is one of the reason why it failed.

38 Mahratta, Dec 14 1913, p.385. Future of Indian Nationalism I.
39 ibid.
41 Mahratta, Dec 14 1913, p.385.
Mahratta explained that the period between the end of the Mutiny and seventies of the nineteenth century was characterised by the introduction of,

new and strange things by the British... people who were tired of the pre-British political chaos willingly welcomed the government, which guaranteed them protection and peace. The intellectuals among them were simply dazzled by the European literary and scientific enlightenment... Those among them, however, who had extraordinary intelligence, enthusiasm and love for their country, tried to engraft the European culture and religion upon our own and their efforts materialized themselves in the different religious Samajas. The Samajas were the beginnings of Indian nationalism – which in its early years expressed itself in the religious spheres in destroying the old national religion... though they could not love the religion or customs of their country as they existed in their times; they loved the country ideally and made strenuous efforts to transform what they considered the ugly real into the refined ideal.42

The next stage in the origin of nationalism, argued Mahratta, was dominated by the Arya Samaj which fostered self respect of Indians, by pointing to their glorious past when religion was pure and elevated as one desired. The Arya Samaj asked Hindus to love their country and their religion, in spite of the ugly realities, which, it said, were only adventitious and remediable. It gave the Hindus a past of which they could be proud and promised them a future which they could reach.43

Mahratta argued that the third stage in development of nationalism was the focus of the intellectuals like Justice Ranade on the economic and political matters and the realization that,

the so-called economic benefits resulting from the British policy, were many of them of dubious value and some of them actually detrimental to the real and permanent interests of the country44

42 ibid.  
43 ibid.  
44 Mahratta, Dec 28 1913, p.401. The Future of Indian Nationalism II.
when it imagined itself threatened with ruin, religiously, politically and culturally, if we may use the term, and this consciousness or prevision of an all sided attack on its very existence as a distinct organism—however well or ill founded on facts—it was the cause of rousing it out of its stupor and propelling it to make desperate and frantic effort in self-defense.\(^{45}\)

The two articles on nationalism basically conveyed the same ideas that Tilak held during the *Swadeshi* movement except in two aspects. Firstly, it substituted the term *Hindu* by *Indian* and secondly, it gave recognition to the efforts of the reformers in the nation building. By accepting these three stages *Mahratta* voluntarily accepted its failure in influencing the development of nationalism in India. *Mahratta* accepted that only reformers and reformist organizations initiated the process of nation building. Except for these two changes nationalism in all its essentials remained the same. Nationalism was based on loyalty to the ancient institutions and the hatred of foreigners and foreign institutions as *Mahratta* opposed the “undenominational teaching” and expected “the state should attempt to impose uniformity of religious beliefs”\(^{46}\).

The loyalty to the ancient laws and the hatred of foreigners and foreign institutions necessitated a basic unity, geographical, linguistic and religious, which India lacked in the beginning of the twentieth century. Unity could be achieved by eliminating the difference and not by accentuating it, a formula which Tilak had employed all along. The superficial unity which was emphasised during the Shivaji and Ganapati festivals and the *Swadeshi* movement based on the individual self-interest of opposing colonial rule could not be sustained for long. On the one hand emphasizing the caste disabilities and supporting it articulately and on the

\(^{45}\) *ibid.*, p.402.

\(^{46}\) *Mahratta*, June 15 1913, p.185. The Problem of Religious Education.
other hand attempting to unite the people against the colonial rule was contradictory. As a result Mahratta failed to develop a consistent bases of Hindu unity. Discussing the fundamental basis of Indian unity, Mahratta referred to Radha Kumud Mookerji’s History of Indian Shipping.\textsuperscript{47} Mahratta quoted Mookerji’s notion that Bharatavarsha referred to the whole of India and the ancient India possessed cultural unity as the names of the rivers and the mountains recited by the Hindus emphasized not only the “intellectual grasp of the geographical unity of India... but also embracing the whole of India as his country”.\textsuperscript{48} So Mahratta argued that the Hindus felt the whole of India as their country long before the British rule and this sense of unity was primarily religious. So this religious unity was to form the basis of the modern unity in the struggle against the colonial rule.

Loyalty to the ancient laws necessitated that there existed a set of ancient laws. Hinduism had them in abundance ranging from Vedantic humanism to ritualistic Dharmasastras and above all the Manusmriti, which insisted on Varnashrama as the true and sole characteristic’s of Brahminism and was held by Tilak as next only to the Vedas.\textsuperscript{49} The Vedas and thereby Vedantic humanism could not be made available to the majority of the Hindu population as there was Shastric injunction against it for example, during the Swadeshi movement a reader in Mahratta\textsuperscript{50} had suggested “Mantrapushpa’ a Vedic hymn be adopted as an Aryan national song or Anthem”. The letter translated “Yagnena Yagnam ayajanta deva tani Dharmani prathamamasyam” which actually meant as “the sacrifice

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{47} Mahratta, July 5 1914, pp.- 209-210. Fundamental Unity of India.
\textsuperscript{48} ibid.
\textsuperscript{49} Mahratta, Oct 30 1887. p.2. The Institutes of Manu,
\textsuperscript{50} Mahratta, Jan 25 1903, p.43, Letter to the Editor.
\end{flushright}
originated from god who was the first to perform it". This simple hymn was given a nationalistic flavour and translated into 'om, the Gods (wisemen) performed a (national) sacrifice by a (self) sacrifice; and that was their first (national) duty". Tilak agreed with him and suggested to the writer that "he should put the words of the text in the form of a dignified popular tune, which may be regarded as classical by the acknowledged master of Indian music of the present day. And this for a double reason. First, because it is regarded as unauthorized for non-Brahmins to repeat a Vedic mantra and secondly because the rendering of the text to a tune would make it universally popular". After that nothing was reported in Mahratta of it and there were no more attempts to give Hindu nationalism a Vedic back up.

As the definition of Hindu nationalism on the basis of loyalty to the ancient laws was to be explained, Tilak selected Gita as a logical continuation of his ideas on caste and society. Gita being an orthodox text for a long time supported Manu's thereby Tilak's view of caste as the basis of the society. The Gita is the episode comprising the chapters XXIII-XL of the Sixth book entitled Bhishma Parva of the Mahabharata. It is one of the three fold authority (Prasthana- traya) of Hinduism, the other two being the Upanishads and the Brahmastras. Tilak selected Gita to be the text to support new found assertiveness of Hinduism because Gita contained an effort to synthesize various philosophic - religious trends. The spirit of toleration and the call for unity among the various sects of

---

51 Mahratta, Jan 25 1903, p.44.
52 Mahratta Aug. 11. 1895, p.1 Tilak explained what the Bible is to the Christian, the Gita is to the Hindus.
Hindus by Tilak, and the scriptural sanction for it in *Gita* enabled Tilak to appeal to all. The orthodox accepted *Gita* as it supported caste system and Sankara had written a commentary\(^5\) and the western educated elite were impressed as Aurobindo had written an equally powerful commentary and Anne Besant had translated *Gita* into English. M.K. Gandhi read Besant’s English translation of *Gita* in London and was so immensely impressed by it, he decided to use it as a kind of Hindu Bible in his political struggle.\(^5\)

Tilak wrote his commentary on the *Gita* during his imprisonment in Mandley prison which questioned the basis of earlier interpretation by Sankaracharya, Madhvacharya and Janeshwara and called his interpretation on *Gita* as the *Karma yoga sastra*,\(^7\) (desireless action) and declared that there is no other work in the whole of Sanskrit literature which explains the principles of Hinduism.\(^8\) This supported his claim that the ultimate authority in politics and ethics is religion and since *Gita* as a treatise on Hinduism substantiated his approach to the ethical flexibility in the observance of the truth,\(^9\) Tilak held that,

telling a lie has been found, after mature deliberations, to be much better than speaking the truth.\(^6\)

---


58. ibid. p.2.


60. B.G. Tilak, (1936), p.47.
This point of view was for removed from that of Vivekananda’s *Vedantism* and Aurobindo’s Integral Yoga.\(^{61}\) Both were influenced by the Upanishads, which advocated intellectual freedom and a high degree of morality. Tilak on the other hand advocated freedom under *Dharma*\(^{62}\) and the *Dharma* was *Varnashrama Dharma* or the caste duties.\(^{63}\) Tilak argued that,

if a man is not faithful to his *Dharma* in discharging his worldly responsibilities (*Karma*) he would be unsuccessful in realizing *Loksamgraha* or Universal welfare.\(^{64}\)

The universal welfare according to Tilak was,

* giving to other people a living example of how one can perform desirelessly all the various activities (*Karma*) which are allotted to one according to the arrangements of the four castes.\(^{65}\)

He said that Manu also used the word *Loksamgraha* as the welfare of the nation.\(^{66}\) The universal welfare achieved through performing one’s own *Dharma* as a dynamic social philosophy as all actions are in one way or the other related to man’s social life and man has no escape from his *Dharma* towards society.\(^{67}\)

This *Dharma* or duty towards society elevated a man to the position of *Karmayogin*. Traditionally *Karmayogin* (the one who followed the path of action) was someone who fulfilled the ritual duties in accordance with


\(^{64}\) ibid. p.659 and p.927.

\(^{65}\) ibid. p.462.

\(^{66}\) ibid. p.456.

\(^{67}\) ibid. p.927.
the scripture.\textsuperscript{68} So in the context of the assertiveness of Hinduism, the term Karmayogin was the one who fulfilled the sacred duty of defending Hinduism against the colonial rule. Aurobindo used the term in this context. This interpretation was not devoid of significance given to devotion and knowledge. Aurobindo criticized Tilak’s interpretation for subordinating knowledge and devotion to action.\textsuperscript{69} Tilak has also been criticized for his unconventional interpretation on metaphysical points.\textsuperscript{70} Tilak’s insistence of the meaning of the term Dharma to mean only the caste duties, though presented in a vedantic language betrayed the anti-reformist leaning. His interpretation of the Gita and the Mahratta writings on the issues concerning the position of women, women’s education, the condition of peasants and the criticism of non-Brahmin assertion, clearly stated that neither the editorial policy of the Mahratta nor the ideas of Tilak had undergone any change during the thirty three years of public life.

In the political field by the time Tilak was released the ground reality had changed. The partition of Bengal was undone, the capital was shifted from educated, urban, thereby seditious, anti-colonial Calcutta to Delhi, whose sole claims to prominence was that it was the capital of medieval kings and less developed in terms of agitational politics. The changes also had taken place within the extremist party, the important leader of the Swadeshi movement in Bengal Aurobindo Ghosh had
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abandoned politics for spiritual pursuit and Bipin Chandra Pal continued only his social service activities.\textsuperscript{71}

2. The Home Rule League movement and non-Brahmin Opposition:

The Tilakites were without an organization and leadership. Soon after his release Tilak attempted to mend his ways half heartedly with the Congressmen by declaring that

\begin{quote}
we have no desire to rake up the old quarrels; but it cannot be denied that since the withdrawal of the Indian nationalists the Congress has ceased to be fully representative of Indian aspirations in all their phases... Congress must be a body open to all, provided the goal of self-government within the empire to be attained by constitutional agitation is accepted.\textsuperscript{72}
\end{quote}

\textit{Mahratta} argued that ‘since the Indians had thrown aside their grievances against the British (in assisting them in war efforts) can they not throw aside their grievances against each other?\textsuperscript{73} Both Besant and Subba Rao, who was the secretary of the Congress, took the initiative and visited Bombay presidency to clear up the misunderstanding between the nationalists and the Congressmen.\textsuperscript{74} Subba Rao held discussions with Tilak and concluded that “Tilak had learnt nothing and unlearnt nothing during all these years” and conveyed the same message to Besant. In the mean time the leaders in Bengal proposed the constitution of a committee consisting of representatives of all shades of opinion\textsuperscript{75} as a step towards unity. Motilal Ghosh of \textit{Anand Bazar Patrika} urging unity declared that

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Mahratta}, Oct 25 1914, The Coming Congress at Madras, p.329.
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Mahratta}, Nov 1 1914, p.339.
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Mahratta}, Dec 13 1914, p.385, Joint Congress at Madras.
\textsuperscript{75} Stanley Wolpert, (1962), p.269.
"we must have an united Congress or none at all". But the refusal of Gokhale and the Bombay Congressmen prevented Tilak from being admitted into the Congress. Gokhale feared that "Tilak would capture Congress the way he did the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha and destroyed its usefulness in less than twelve months". Mahratta criticized the Congressmen as those,

who will keep within respectable distance even from the limits of liberty allowed to them and will not push their constitutional agitation. If it be calculated to offend in any way the power And declared by their act,

the Congress (had been) brought down from national to sectional platform... parliament of a nation to a conventionalist club

Tilak wrote a letter to Babu Bhupendranath Basu stating that - "Gokhale had stabbed him in the dark". Mahratta mounted its criticism even further. Besant came to the rescue of Gokhale, blamed Tilak for the failure of a compromise. Gokhale, old and bedridden for a long time pained by the controversy wrote a letter to the editor of Mahratta explaining his stand and blamed Tilak for wrecking the Congress. Tilak

77 Mahratta, Dec 20 1914, p.394.
78 Mahratta Dec. 20, 1914, p.393. Failure of Congress Compromise who to blame?
82 Source material II, p.227.
83 Mahratta Jan 10, 1915, p.13 Prof Kale on a United Congress Jan 24, 1915, p.29 The Congress Compromise: How it failed? Ibid., p.35: A letter by a Bombay Nationalist questioned "how the moderates supported Mahatma Gandhi when the latter was breaking the law because it was immoral"
countered Gokhale’s accusations. The controversy came to an end soon, as Gokhale died within ten days, and was soon followed by the death of Pheroz Shah Mehta. This opened the way for Tilak's entry into the Congress. The Bombay Congressmen still resisted Tilak's entry by refusing to allow Tilak to be elected in a public meeting for the Calcutta session of the Congress.

Anne Besant, having failed to unite the Congressmen and the Tilakites and obtain a formal approval for the agitation began the Home Rule League to demand Home Rule for India, approached Tilak, who seeing that this presented a means whereby he could return to active public life with dignity and ostentation promised her support. Besant soon realised that Tilak's entry into the Home Rule League "would prejudice her chances of success," issued a notification that "there would be no admission to the League until the political leaders of the Congress and the Muslim League, whom she had invited, met a day prior to the Congress session discussed her proposals and frame rules for submission for the approval of Dadabhai Naoroji and Subramanya Iyer. This action naturally excluded Tilak. Tilak began a separate Home Rule League. Besant, a relative new comer in Indian polities could weld together a more national organisation than Tilak who was a veteran by now in Indian polities. Bombay had two Home Rule Leagues, one under the leadership of Tilak
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and Joseph Baptista and the other led by the Congressmen, Tilak begun an active campaign for Home Rule in western India.

As a Home Rule League leader, Tilak attended the Lucknow secession of the Congress. The efforts of Hindu-Muslim unity which was started in 1911 was being consolidated due to the British policy towards Turkey. When the First World War started in 1914, Turkey entered the war on the side of Germany against Britain. The Indian Muslims, who had a sentimental attachment towards Turkey, realised that they should join in a common front with the Indian National Congress against the British Rule. In 1915, both the Congress and the Muslim League decided to hold the next secession in Lucknow. Both the parties worked out a scheme where in the Congress accepted the communal representation and the league accepted the principle of responsible government. Tilak had begun to support the understanding between the two communities when he started the Home Rule League, but at the same time criticized the communal representation. The government of the United province passed the new municipal act in 1916 which "deprived the Hindus of 3/5 of the number of sets on the municipal Board of Allahabad". Mahratta argued that,

the Hindu never tried to appropriate what belongs to the Mahomedan friends. But there is no reason on earth why the Hindu should be stripped of their wearing apparel to enlarge the waist-coat of Mahomedans... It is simply intolerable and no self-respecting Hindu will assent to it.

---

93 Source Material II, pp.244-249.
Mahratta called on the Hindus of Allahabad not to enter the municipal board again unless the matters are set-right by the authorities.\(^96\)

Mahratta argued that the government of the United Province "was strangely unresponsive as regards to the Hindu Community". So the only way left for them now was seceding from the municipal boards throughout the province and putting in protests again and again against the injustice done to them. It is no use to take injustice lying down for fear of offending Mahomedan sentiments.\(^97\)

Mahratta stated that the Hindu should fight for their cause.

In our opinion if the Hindu Community learns to stand for justice, sensible Mahomedans will exert themselves to bring their community in line with it. The Hindus by themselves are, in our opinion numerous enough to secure Home Rule for India, if their numbers are well organised for a campaign of justice as self confidence is a virtue we must cultivate.\(^98\)

So Mahratta's articles on Hindu assertion negated the importance of the Lucknow pact and the Muslims remained aloof from the Home Rule League movement. The non-Brahmin movement, which had lost its momentum after the end of the Vedokta controversy slowly, began to assert itself. The Satya Shodaks held non-Brahmin conference every year from 1911 onwards in various towns of western India.\(^99\) In the same year the Satya Shodak Samaj published its three guiding principles, they were equal treatment of all human beings, removal of mediator between man and god and equal importance to the education of boys and girls.\(^100\) The immediate

\(^96\) Mahratta, July 23, 1916, p.349, 350 The Restive, U.P.
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\(^98\) ibid. p.377, 378.

\(^99\) Gail Omvedt, Cultural Revolt, (Bombay, 1976) p.143.

\(^100\) T.L. Joshi, Jyotirao Phule, (New Delhi, 1992), p.25.
challenge to Tilak's leadership came not the Muslims but from non-
Brahmins. The non-Brahmin movement acquired a militant phase during
this period. Mukundrao Patil published "Hindu Ani Brahmin criticized the
Brahmins as aliens to the land.\textsuperscript{101} \textit{Mahratta} defended the contribution of
Maharashtrian Brahmins and \textit{Peshwas} to the history of Maharashtra as,

they were no less responsible for the warlike glory of the \textit{Maratha}
Kingdom than the \textit{Mahratta}'s themselves.\textsuperscript{102}

The \textit{Mahratta} considered that the,

non-Brahmin attack was a result of the reformer's attack on, the
time honoured social institution with brutal indifference to
consequence.\textsuperscript{103}

So as a result there was no unity between the Brahmins and non-Brahmins.
\textit{Mahratta} argued that

the division of into castes is a natural process of social evolution
and the caste system as we find it today is not the consequence of
social differentiation merely, but an outcome of various forces
social, economic political and intellectual.\textsuperscript{104}

In 1915, All India Hindu \textit{Sabha} was established. \textit{Mahratta}
appriciated the starting of the \textit{Sabha} and hoped that,

the meetings of the \textit{Sabha} will be attended by all Hindus of light
and leading and that they will exert their influence in solving the
great problems pressing for solution... We believe that the present
Hindu community has been put on quite a wrong * by
concentrating its attention on the differences of caste. Differences
there are no doubt, but our community would be committing a
great blunder if in discussing the delicate question of caste it
aroused irritating and never ending *. The more you try to

\textsuperscript{101} Gail Omvdt, (1976), p.156.

\textsuperscript{102} \textit{Mahratta}, Nov. 22, 1914, p.363, The \textit{Mahratta} Brahmin.
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\textsuperscript{104} \textit{Mahratta}, April 11, 1915, p.119, 120, Scourge of Maharashtra.

329
suppress caste the greater will be the acerbity of feeling which alone is a great measure is the originator of class and caste distinctions.

Mahrratta was of the opinion that the attack on caste and Brahmins had led to the launching of an all India Hindu Conference. And hoped that it would bring together various sects by accepting the prohibition of child marriage. At this stage, bringing together various Hindu sects to counter the growing non-Brahmin assertion was a far-fetched idea. Tilak realised the futility of opposing the efforts of non-Brahmins in organising themselves educationally and socio-politically. This period witnessed division in the non-Brahmin movement. Bhaskarao Jadhav, the founder of the Maratha Education Conference in 1907, who later revived Satya Shodak Samaj in 1914 opposed, the Home Rule League Movement so also A.B. Latte who started the Deccan Ryot, an English weekly to defend the interest of the non-Brahmins. Mahrratta criticised the starting of the journal as the name as misleading.

Deccan Ryot obviously includes the Brahmins, Muslims Christians, Parses, Jains and others, still the publishers don't, it seems, intend to plead the cause of all of them. They want only to protect the interests of what are called the submerged or backward or the untouchable classes and no other in particular... we are afraid that these monopolists of wisdom will not succeed in their new venture, with abuse and venom in every page of their paper.

Tilak's attempt to involve non-Brahmins in the Home Rule League was often countered by the articles and letters that Mahrratta carried in its

---

105 Mahrratta, Dec. 12, 1915, p.399, The All India Hindu Sabha.
In January 1916 it carried a letter which declared that the goal of the movement was “Varnashrama Dharma and federal Home Rule”. He argued that “Varnashrama Dharma is the best synthesis of Hindu Religion, Sociology and Politics and Federalism is the keynote”. He criticised Tilak for being lenient on the Varnashrama Dharma and urged him to ask for “separate representation for the followers of orthodox Hinduism” and “not let the orthodox Hinduism suffer by the Home Rule movement. The defenders of the Varnashrama Dharma suggested that in the post war reformed legislature, the issues concerning socio-religious sphere were to be excluded. The demand by the orthodox Brahmans for separate representation further alienated Tilak’s Home Rule League. At this crucial juncture, help to Tilak came from V.R. Shinde. He was not a radical Satya Shodak but came from the Prarthana Samaj. Shinde brought a large number of non-Brahmins into the Home Rule League. By 1918 Tilak’s league consisted of 42% Brahmins, 43% non-Brahmins and 2% Muslims. Shinde formed the Nationalist Maratha League to encourage the non-Brahmins to join the League. However, non-Brahmins as a whole did not support the movement. The protective discrimination practiced by the colonial government in favour of the Muslims inspired the non-Brahmins to ask for a separate electorate. The South Indian Liberal Federation, a non-Brahmin association in Madras, opposed the Home Rule League demand. The manifesto of the organisation stated that limiting the British

110 Richard Cashman is of the opinion that Mahratta supported the Non-Brahmin demand for separate electorate where as Tilak took an ambiguous stand, (1975) p.201.
112 Mahratta Sep. 23, 1917, p.456 An Appeal to the Orthodox Hindus.
influence by the Home Rule would lead to a situation wherein "if a class oppresses another, there will be no way open for the oppressed class to get justice". *Mahratta* explained that it was contrary to the idea of Home Rule and hoped that the natural suspicion of Indians by Indians would be discouraged by the wise leaders of all communities and explained at length in the new system i.e., the Home Rule a number of legislators and administrators would come from the backward classes. *Mahratta* said that

we are anxious to see all unnecessary disharmony at an end we suggest that prominent Madrasi Brahmins should confer with leading non-Brahmins of manifesto camp and amicably exchange their view in respected meetings. That will help in our opinion to bring about and promote harmony. We request, therefore, that our suggestion may be accepted and an attempt made to remove all discords.

Countering the idea of the non-Brahmin manifesto that India was not a nation, *Mahratta* argued that,

Yes, India was a nation. Interested persons have lured us into the belief that we are not and could not possibly be a nation. Bharatas were one people and therefore, one nation... (for) 4000 years we spoke one language.

*Mahratta* following the orientalist construction of Hinduism attempted to explain Hindu as a coherent religious group with a homogeneous culture as against the diversity and disharmony emphasised by the agitating non-Brahmins whose plea against cultural exploitation of Brahmins was also a direct attack on the orientalist construction of Hinduism. Tilak had accepted the orientalist discourse only to the extent of

---

115 Sekhar Bandyopadhyay (1994) dealing with the Namasudra Movement endorses the same argument, pp.90-115


its construction of Hinduism as a monolithic structure but not its liberal interpretation of the Hindu sacred texts. It was more to do with finding a tool to defend some of his ideas than accepting it as an ideology. Besant on the other hand was silent on caste disabilities as in her romantic construct of Hinduism there existed no caste. So as a theosophist, caste did not or rather should not exist.

To Tilak on the other hand, a strong defender of caste disabilities orientalists construct of a harmonious past was simply a convenient rallying point to represent a notion of unified Hinduism to the non-Brahmins and the Muslims. *Mahratta*'s call to the Brahmins and the non-Brahmins to come to an understanding was simply a change of tactics rather than the change of heart. This is evident from the fact that Tilak's Home Rule speeches delivered at Belgaum and Ahmadnagar\(^{119}\) did not mention the caste system, as the possibility of antagonising the powerful non-Brahmin groups was strong. At Kanpur which had no record of non-Brahmin movement, Tilak explained as to why Indians had to ask for Home Rule,

> what I consider is that Chatur Varna divides the whole society into so many departments of life and in every one of these departments you have been a loser every year... I want you to realise the fact that although you may claim the blood of a Kshatriya, although you may claim the blood of a Brahmin, you do not claim that polity, those qualifications, which the Sudras are enjoying which should have been yours at this movement.\(^{120}\)

---


120 ibid. Speech at Kanpur, pp.311-315, Jan., 1, 1917.
So it is clear that the idea of monolithic Hinduism was a convenient weapon to defend the self-interest. Speaking at the same city after a week, Tilak emphasised the importance of *varnashrama Dharma*. 121

Today Brahmins are not Brahmins, Kshatriya are not Kshatriya, nor Vaishya, Vaishya. The true Shudra is he who is unqualified for any higher rank then that of unintelligent labour. He has his place in the national family. But the true Vaishya has a higher place. And the true Brahmin stands, highest, while the Kshatriya comes next to the Brahmin in the ideal hierarchy. We have need today - and there always is if a nation is to prosper continuously of ripe scholarship, undaunted bravery, sagacious enterprise - as well as tough and sturdy muscle. These are severally the distinguished mark of the true representative of the four cantos which constitute the ideal Chaturvarna. Whatever the future of the Caste-system, it is obvious that if members of the four main castes (which include all the sub-divisions) develop the excellent qualities which tradition gives their forefathers the credit of having possessed in happy abundance much good will be done to the national cause. 122

Besant on the other hand logically explained the reason for demanding the Home Rule. Firstly, there was a need for legislation on certain vital matters the importance of which the British had not comprehended. Secondly, the economic conditions of the country had to be improved and thirdly, there is a historical justification for the self-government for all colonised people. 123 Because the relation between the individual to his motherland was same as the relation between the individual self with the universal self. 124 Tilak on the other hand considered that the decay of the *Chaturvarna* system was traceable to foreign rule, 125 hence foreign rule should be removed. For Tilak, the primary reason for

agitation for the Home Rule was to defend the caste system. The caste system was not just the bases of the Hindu Society but also the Indian nation. Though in the same speech he asked the people to do away with "the touch me not notion" yet it was abundantly clear as to what would Home Rule mean under his leadership. *Mahratta* reported the speech of the Maharaja of Durbanga which stated that,

> the body politic must be composed of individuals in various stages of evolution performing their specific functions and yet free within so far as their selfhood was concerned. ¹²⁶

*Mahratta* called it a "sanest view of Varnashrama Dharma, which was "ordered progression and progressive evolution" and appreciated the Maharaja as he had "very ably shown the necessity of maintaining the Varnashrama Dharma on lines preached by our ancient seers". ¹²⁷

As the ideas of Tilak on caste system remained the same since the beginning of his political career, so also the reasons for the self-rule, which clearly lacked the anti-colonial content of extremist leaders like Lajpat Rai and Bipin Chandra Pal. Though Tilak declared that,

> Swadeshi and boycott are means to an end, so is Swaraj a means to an end. The end is high self-development of the members of the Indian Society. ¹²⁸

The reasons to fight for it were quite mundane. Speaking at Belgaum Tilak emphasised that the question was not whether the colonial rule was,

> good or bad, the question is not about those who are to rule over us (but) according to whose leadership, by whose orders and under whose guidance that rule is to be exercised. ¹²⁹

¹²⁷ *Mahratta*, Jan. 21, 1917, p.34.
India needed self rule because,

our Kulkarni Watan has been taken away, Zulem has been exercised upon us in connection with the Forest department. Liquor has spread more in connection with the Abkari department, also we do not receive that sort of education which we ought to get.\textsuperscript{130}

These were the issues, which Tilak was fighting throughout his political career. These region specific and caste specific issues were not successfully modified to suit for an all India agitation. The issues remained parochial, so also the solutions. In the same speech Tilak explained how the self rule would benefit the people.

If you get the powers to select your collector it cannot be said with certainty that he would do any more work than the present collector. Perhaps he may not do. He may even do badly. I admit this. But the difference between this and that is this; this one is selected by us, he is our man, he sees how we remain pleased.\textsuperscript{131}

So, Tilak's understanding of colonialism as a loss of privilege and his inability to speak as an Indian or at least speak on behalf of the Hindu community as a whole had political disadvantage. In Bombay for example, Tilak's Home Rule League was less prominent than Besant's Home Rule League which had Mohamad Ali Jinnah, Kanji Dwarkadas, Umar Sobhani, Shankarlal Banker\textsuperscript{132}. The preoccupation of Tilak with the caste-class interests, oblivious to all other socio-economic developments relegated him to the position of a landed Chitpavan leader. However, his attempt to speak on behalf of the entire Hindu Community, in the light of the non-Brahmin movement, antagonised the non-Brahmins even further. So political
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survival for Tilak was dependent upon his ability to appease the non-Brahmin agitation for separate representation, in as reasonable terms as possible.

Tilak declared in 1917 that,

> anyone who falters from demanding Swaraj is not a Hindu and has not understood Hinduism.\(^{133}\)

In addition to his emphasis on *Varnashrama Dharma*, there was precious little he explained as to what he meant by Hinduism. He made no attempts to bring the Hindus from across the British India into the Home Rule agitation, as accepting the orthodox brahmanical hegemony was a sufficient qualification to be considered as a Hindu. On the other hand the newly established All India Hindu *Sabha*,\(^{134}\) however, historically inaccurate, attempted to tackle the root of the problem. Towards giving an identity to Hindus, it tried to explore the definition of the term Hindu, locating it in an "ancient puran Brihannandi which stated Himalayam samarbhya Yavadbindu sarouaram Hindustan Mitikhyatam adyantakshara, Yogatah". According to the text "the word Hindu has been framed from Himalaya Bindu". So, "no ignominy, therefore attaches to the word Hindu which has moreover become a uniting word for sounding a clarion call to all those who follow any religion of Indian origin whether they descended from the Aryan Drvidian, Mangolian, Assyrian or any other race domiciled in India".\(^{135}\) The term "arya" which was popularised by the orientalists was rejected as "it had the disadvantage of being applicable to the non-Hindu

---
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and non-Indian people". The all India Hindu Sabha started constructing Hindu identity by locating its sources within India whereas Tilak adhered to the Orientalist notion of Aryan migration into India. The Hindu Sabha by extending the term of Hindu to include within Aryan fold all the races and religion like Sikhism, Buddhism, Jainism in India was able firstly to foster a greater sense of unity against the religion like Islam and Christianity, and secondly, minimize the internal contradictions of caste and region. For Tilak on the other hand Hinduism meant ritualistic Brahminism in all its entirety. So Tilak's region specific and caste specific nationalism faced challenge from the very same sources.

Countering its own ideology of monolithic Hinduism which Tilak emphasised during the Swadeshi and Home Rule agitation Mahratta argued that,

non-Brahmins and the untouchables were not homogeneous sections. The idea of superiority and inferiority existed among them. There was no caste among the Hindus who did not consider some other caste inferior to them. As to the superiority of the Brahmins, Mahratta argued that the Maratha Brahmins wielded political power for the better part of the 18th century, but for centuries before that political power, trades and industries were almost exclusively in the hands of non-Brahmins. How then have the Brahmins been allowed to keep their place for centuries?

This was because questioning "what right has a Brahmin to be a Brahmin' meant 'what right a Kshatriya has to be a Kshatriya? and so on". The questioning that was taking place was due ideals of new age suggested that and the cry of down with Brahmins should be replaced with down with
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ignorance. *Mahratta* blamed the colonial government for perpetuating ignorance by not making education compulsory.\textsuperscript{139} *Mahratta* explained that the "Brahmins are not unmitigated devils... the backwardness of Brahmins in social and religious reform is not the result of any hate, but of honest religiosity".\textsuperscript{140} *Mahratta* accepted in principles that the non-Brahmin Hindus should get separate representation like Muslims.\textsuperscript{141}

The separate representation for non-Brahmins which was started in the Madras presidency by C. Shankaran Nair\textsuperscript{142} soon spread to other provinces. In western India Lingayats, *Marathas* and Jains began to demand separate representation.\textsuperscript{143} They also expressed lack of faith in the Home Rule League leaders of the province.\textsuperscript{144} *Maratha* criticised the agitation for a non-Brahmin combine against the Congress-League scheme and called the non-Brahmins who demanded separate representation as 'fools or knaves'. A suggestion was made in the article that the non-Brahmins should concentrate on education and not look to the English civilians as their best friend.\textsuperscript{145} *Mahratta* welcomed the caste representation under the Congress-League leadership, as the Muslims had already been given separate representation and it was too late in the day to deny the same to the non-Brahmins.\textsuperscript{146}
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Tilak's nominal appeasement to non-Brahmins and acceptance of the separate electorate for non-Brahmins was vehemently opposed by the orthodox Brahmins. In an article published\(^{147}\) in *Maharatta* by the Ramaswami Aiya and Orthodox Brahmin from Nagapatam of Tanjore District of Modern Presidency, the writer identified himself as "the honorary organizing secretary of the All India *Varnashrama Dharma* and Orthodox Hindu Mission. He stated that,

I hold that extreme orthodox Hinduism with its single and prepuberty marriage ideal for girls, hereditary caste system interdining and intermarriage restrictions, prohibition of foreign travel and of conversion from other religion and insistence on samskaras is alone consistent with Home Role and national progress.... for Varnashrama Dharma is the highest embodiment of federalism in religion, sociology and politics, while Home Rule is but an application of it to politics alone.\(^{148}\)

The writer argued that the Home Rule movement was under the influence of Theosophy, who along with the social reformer(s) anti-Brahmin Panchama(s) heterodox Hindu, non-Hindu and Anti-Hindu Home Rule friends - who all abuse Varnashrama Dharma and orthodox Hinduism in the most violent and vile terms possible. The Orthodox Hindu will have a bad time of it under our Home Rule.

He called "*Maharatta* of Poona - the journal of the Poona Home Rule leader equally anti-*Varnashramite* and anti-orthodox Hindu". So "The orthodox Hindu would be quite justified in refusing to have them as their representation in our Home Rule". He called upon the educated orthodox Hindu, Orthodox Hindu organisation, journals and heads of the Hindu
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Maths to safeguard the interest of the orthodox Hindus by asking separate representation. 149

In another article by the President of the Asthika Sabha, 150 anxiety was expressed for the protection of the ancient Indian Dharma and support to the All India Varnashrama Dharma and Orthodox Hindu Mission was extended. The writer of the article called on the British government to maintain religious neutrality and "all questions affecting Hindu Social Custom and religious law should be all together excluded from the scope of the reformed legislative councils and decisions regarding them should not be arrived at by the will of majorities." The article also called upon all India Congress Committee to make due provision to protect their interests. 151

In continuation of the demand for separate caste representation a meeting of Marathi speaking backward classes was held in Bombay and Poona and the Bombay meeting adopted a resolution demanding a proper share of communal representation in the final scheme of post-war reforms. Mahratta stated that,

the ability to take a decent part in provincial and imperial affairs and even the affairs of a district or a smaller area comes with education..... If a caste is to be represented by a man of the caste, chosen by an electorate consisting exclusively of his caste men then pretty long time to come public affairs will suffer. The deliberative ability of caste electorate councillors will, in the case of many castes, be very small. 152
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So an argument was put forward that the British officials would be successful in exercising more powers in the councils also the "inefficient" use of the powers given to the Indian would enable the British government to postpone the next installment of substantial reforms.\textsuperscript{153}

The Poona meeting was held in the Peshwa's Poona palace and presided over by Vitthal Ramji Shinde, the leader of the Depressed class mission. Shinde opposed the separate electorate for the backward classes. He called on the people not to make "a disreputable show of disunion" and opinioned that the educated classes of India should be given a chance to manage the affairs only if they fail to deliver the goods, then the backward classes can ask for a caste representation. Tilak who attended the meeting supported Shinde's suggestion.\textsuperscript{154}

Shinde's support to Tilak at this stage was crucial as the orthodox Brahmins and the non-Brahmins articulately began to demand separate electorates and the Congress leaders in western India, associated with Besant's league continued to pose threat to Tilak's leadership. Though all the important Congress leaders of Bombay presidency had died by 1918,\textsuperscript{155} the political leadership did not pass on to Tilak.\textsuperscript{156} Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, a new comer to Indian polities, a political legacy of Tilak's archrival G.K. Gokhale began to take the centre stage. Gandhi supported the Home Rule league of both Besant and Tilak without identifying himself with either completely. He traveled throughout India speaking to the
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students, peasants, Hindus, Muslims and whoever else cared to invite him, about Home Rule, ethics and morality in politics, and public life. He emphasised that impersonal selfless and highly motivated duty of public servants.\textsuperscript{157} His speeches reported in \textit{Mahratta} emphasised ethics and morality rather than politics. Gandhi's audience was from diverse background so he was able to reach out to the people more easily. For Tilak the audience even during the Home Rule League movement remained same the as in 1880s, consisting of landed Brahmins and traditional Business communities. Tilak had opposed Gandhi's election as a delegate to the 1916 Congress session at Lucknow and Gandhi was able to attend the session only after the Congress president nominated him directly.\textsuperscript{158} Gandhi's extensive travel and insistence on ethical superiority over practical politics made him a mass leader by 1919. Gandhi's rise in Indian politics was phenomenal, by mid 1919 even \textit{Mahratta} began to refer Gandhi as Mahatma.\textsuperscript{159}

Tilak attended the second All India Depressed Classes Mission Conference at Bombay which was presided over by the Maharaja of Baroda and declared that both untouchability and the stigma attached to untouchability should go.\textsuperscript{160} N.G. Chandavarkar, an old political rival of Tilak had presided over the first secession in 1917. Chandavarkar declared that one sixth of Indians\textsuperscript{161} were treated "as worse than filth" and as a result a sense of nationalism could never spring in their hearts. So for national
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self-respect, it was essential to remove untouchability.\(^{162}\) *Mahrratta* supported Chandavarkar by stating that "uplift of depressed brethren of ours" is possible by giving franchise to men and women of the depressed classes. *Mahrratta* suggested the removal of untouchability by emulating the Japanese way of abolishing Eta and Hinin by royal edit\(^{163}\) *Mahrratta* reported that "Tilak had made a definite pronouncement on the subject eleven years ago in a Ganapati festival, all along he had sympathised with this movement".\(^{164}\)

The involvement of Tilak and *Mahrratta* in the non-Brahmin movement did not yield expected results. G.D. Naik\(^{165}\) and Anna Babaji Latte,\(^{166}\) the leaders of the backward classes, opposed Tilak's Home Rule League. Sankaran Nair, the South Indian articulate non-Brahmin leader, refused to be influenced by the Congress League Scheme,\(^{167}\) led his own delegation to England to negotiate with the government for separate electorate. Tilak himself left for England to fight Valentine Chirol case in September 1918.\(^{168}\) With the departure of Tilak, the Home Rule League was relegated to the background as the new controversies arose in the fields of politics, religion and society. Tilak visited England to fight a defamation case against Valentine Chirol who had called him the Father of Indian Unrest. The case reopened the Shivaji and Afzalkhan controversy. Valentine Chirol had considered that Tilak's defence of Afzalkhan's
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murder as an act of self-defence acted, as a cauistical apology for political assassination in general. *Mahratta* argued that “Tilak was of the opinion that Grant Duff, the historian of the *Marathas* was wrong in imputing treacherous motives to Shivaji”.¹⁶⁹ *Mahratta* quoted Kincaid’s History of the *Maratha* People to prove Tilak was right and Afzal Khan had first assaulted Shivaji.¹⁷⁰ Tilak lost the case and returned to India in 1919.

3. National Education:

Unlike the *Swadeshi* and Boycott, which ended in western India with Tilak’s arrest in 1908, the concept of National Education received a wide coverage by *Mahratta*. In continuation of Tilak’s ideals of religious and technical education as national education, *Mahratta* discussed at length the problems facing the colonial education system. *Mahratta* called for a meeting of leaders to discuss various ways of implementing National Education. It suggested that the leaders should work in district and moffusils to enlighten the people in the basic tenet of national education.¹⁷¹ *Mahratta* suggested that the *Gita*, which contained a “great and inexhaustible repositories of moral teaching based on a spiritual foundation”, should form the basis of National education.¹⁷² It expressed concern that, “the present system of training Gurus does not seem to be quite satisfactory with the intending Gurus it is very largely a question of passing a test rather than of a firm grasp of principles and practice of education” and suggested that, “education department should be placed
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under an education board who would decide both the syllabus to be taught in schools and educational administration". 173 Controlling the syllabi and the expansion of education facilities, which formed the core of Tilak’s scheme both during his early political career and the Swadeshi movement continued to dominate the education scheme, discussed in the columns of Mahratta. Discussing the recommendations of the Baroda Education Commission, which appreciated the expansion of educational infrastructure in Baroda. Mahratta repeated Tilak’s earlier statement that “the element of compulsion with education is an idea entirely novel to India”. 174 In Baroda, Maharaja Sayajirao Gaikwad vigorously pursued the expansion of primary education within the princely state and extended assistance to educational activities in the Bombay presidency. 175 As a result by 1911, 79.6 percent of boys of school going age and 47.6 percent of girls of school going age were in schools as compared to 21.5 percent of boys and 4 percent of girls in Bombay Presidency. 176 To improve the condition of education and make knowledge attractive, Mahratta suggested “the appointment of a music master to play music in public and arrange slide shows of Hindu religious places to attract people who would in turn send their children to schools”. 177

More concrete suggestion for compulsory education Bill came from Gokhale who insisted that compulsion alone had been proved effective in spreading education. Gokhale suggested that “the cost of compulsory education was to be shared equally by both the central government and
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local bodies”. He considered that the material condition of the masses could be improved only with universalising the elementary education. In order to influence the colonial government, Elementary Education leagues were set up in Madras and Punjab. Lajpat Rai, “ridiculed the fear of those who opposed to bill on the ground that it would lead to dearth of servant’s and labourers and said none had the right to deprive his brother of the light of knowledge or to hinder his progress”. The Maratha Education Conference expressed that “though the education that was given may not be perfect of its kind, but it was certainly better than no education”. R.G. Bhandarkar and R.P. Paranjpye expressed similar sentiments.

The second important element of the Home Rule league was National Education. A national education society had been established with Rash Bihari Ghosh as the president, Anne Besant as the chairman and Rabindranath Tagore as the chancellor, Tilak along with Sarojini Naidu were in the governing body. Tilak’s insistence on a system of national education entirely dominated by religion along with a fair amount of applied science to encourage self-sufficiency in the industrial field continued to dominate. This was opposed by Ernest Wood a fellow theosophist of Besant who had earlier written a fitting reply to Katherine Mayo’s mother India called “An English man defends Mother India”. As an Orientalist and a Theosophist, Wood insisted on a system of National education based on Indian culture along with modern sciences and social sciences. Wood insisted that national education should produce youngmen
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“full of a spirit of comradeship and patriotism, who know how to make up their minds, how to decide how to act and how to endure”. Wood visited Poona in 1917 and spoke at a meeting presided by Tilak. Wood argued that national education was necessary to transform a young man into a good citizen and that there was a necessity of training in self-government is introduced into the school goers’ lives as early as possible to facilitate the demand for Home Rule. Tilak concluding the meeting mentioned that “only in the national schools independent of Government control; adequate education in making good citizen can be given”. Wood criticised “the colonial education that produced only passivity and dependency”. "Maharatta" did not agree with Wood and Besant. The debate took place without mentioning each others name to continue the unity forged between Besant and Tilak for the Home Rule movement. G.S. Khaparde defending Tilak’s national education insisted “that the scheme devised should be adapted to the history and genius of the people concerned”. Discussing the theory of karma and the existence of God. Khaparde insisted that it is very necessary to teach religion to Indian children... with our time honoured methods of teaching religion, nothing appears to be more practicable: that method is found in our Puranas.

Khaparde’s syllabi consisted of the tenets that Tilak had elaborately expounded during the Swadeshi movement. Khaparde also opposed the buildings, benches, desks, caps, coats, and even examinations. The education at the primary level was to consist of
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religious teaching which should be mostly oral and instruction in
three R’s. This should be all. During the early years the teacher
should carefully find out the boy’s inclinations, his talents in any
specific directions; and so in the next stage should help the boy to
learn the things which would be both of interest and of use to him.\textsuperscript{186}

Tilak and Tilakites insistence on selective education for selective
students as a pre-requisite for constructing Hindu nationality, continued
unaltered for almost four decades betrayed the class interests. The only
difference between Tilak’s earlier scheme and Khaparde’s scheme was that
under Tilak’s scheme the syllabi was to be controlled by local boards
where as Khaparde completely did away with the local boards as under the
changed political conditions the non-Brahmins would be a definite
majority in the local boards.

\textbf{4.Tilak’s Legacy}

Tilak’s continued insistence on removing the feeling of superiority
and inferiority while retaining the caste structure intact even during the
Home Rule movement was influenced by a strong support from the non-
Brahmins and radical Congressmen like N.G. Chandavarkar and R.P
Paranjpe. Tilak’s modified \textit{Varnashrama Dharma} had few takers among
them as his inner circle continued to be dominated by landed interests who
had a long association with him. Joseph Baptista was the only exception.
However, \textit{Maharatta} carried very little of Baptista’s activities during the
Home rule movement though he was the president of Tilak’s Home rule
League where as, the activities of R.P. Karandikar, G.S. Khaparde, N.C.
Kelkar, SM Paranjpe, J.S. Karandikar were mentioned quite regularly.

\textsuperscript{186} \textit{Maharatta}, April 14, 1918, p.179.
Tilak’s and Mahratta’s reaction to Patel’s bill on the Hindu marriage further testified his flinching faith in caste.

The intercaste marriage Bill or popularly know as Patel’s bill was introduced by V.J. Patel in the Viceregal Council in October 1918. The bill proposed to remove restrictions on marriage between various castes and subcastes. Tilak and Mahratta opposed the bill. Tilak writing to G.S. Khaparde stated that there are two kinds of inter marriages, one between the subcastes which is allowed and the other between castes e.g. Brahmin and the Shudra. This marriage is invalid according to the Hindu law... In such cases the couples must form a new stock of inheritance by themselves, neither they, nor anyone through them should be allowed to inherit by non-testimony succession property belonging to the relations who have not like them abandoned caste rules. I shall develop on this view in the next Kesari.

Soon after this Tilak left for England. Mahratta immediately took up the issue. A series of public meeting were organised under the presidentship of N.C. Kelkar. Mahratta called on “the Dharmagarus not to shirk from their responsibility towards the society” and argued that,

India is a religious nation and hope for India’s Salvation can come only through religion... (so issues like Patel’s bill) cannot be legitimately introduced in the Council as they are vitally connected with our religious system. Such questions ought to be taken up by our Dharmagurus and decided by them undogmatically on modern method... On the lines of legislative councils they must form religious councils to discuss and decide all questions relating to religious customs or social reforms.
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The reformers argument that since the caste system was the cause of national degeneration and the bill would assist in national awakening, was regarded as "evil felt by a few is strangely magnified as a national calamity." *Mahratta* criticised the reformers view that national liberty was nothing but liberty for each individual and equated individualism with thorough political subjugation.\(^{191}\) *Mahratta* stated that,

> reformers wanted to bound the people by the thick bond of blood if possible – it (the bill) hopes to do away with internal causes of dispute and to pave way for an equal distribution of national good... the bill does not boldly sound the national bugle to assemble the Hindu nation under a single flag... (but) raise the question of national amalgamation by intermixture of castes. As a consequence, the question arises whether the original institution of caste system, which was meant to be a convenient arrangement for social welfare does really strengthen or weaken national solidarity.\(^{192}\)

*Mahratta* condemned

> The audacity of the person who can see nothing but caste-system as the cause of political subjugation for his want of historical insight and prejudicial judgement.\(^{193}\)

So inspite of the acceptance of separate electorate for non-Brahmins, *Mahratta* still treated caste as a non-negotiable aspect of Hinduism. The third important aspect of Home Rule Movement was defeated. This resulted in a major shift in the political field, the non-Brahmins at large expressed confidence in M.K. Gandhi, a new entrant in Indian politics and a non-Mahrashtrian. The *Maratha* Conference expressed support to the Congress and Gandhi's Satyagraha and not Tilak's
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Home Rule League, whereas the opinion of Tilakites was divided over *Satyagraha*. Though Gandhi was able to elicit initial support he ran into opposition the very next moment. The confusion continued due to Tilak’s absence and Moonje and Khaparde were unable to take a stand either completely supporting Gandhi’s *Satyagraha* or oppose it. They had two reasons to oppose it. Firstly, Gandhi’s ethical purity was antagonistic to Tilak’s “all is fair in politics” attitude. Secondly, they had serious reservation about the participation of Muslims. However, against the rising tide of Gandhian politics they were helpless.

Tilak in London faced failures. He lost the defamation suit against Chirol and was not selected for Paris peace conference as demanded by *Mahratta*. Tilak and Kelkar arrived back in Poona in Dec. 1919. *Mahratta* reported that they were greeted by “flag bearers who held Bhagua zanda of the Marathas and the Home Rule banners and the people assembled out numbered the Brahmins. The Poona Municipality decided to present an address on behalf of the citizens on Poona. It was opposed by Keshavrao Marutirao Jedhe a non-Brahmin leader who said that the address should be by the friends and admirers of Tilak and not the citizens of Poona. Tilak was so shocked by it he wrote a lengthy letter in the
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Times of India expressing pain and defending his position on socio-political issues of his entire political career denying all the allegations of opposing the social reforms, supporting the caste restrictions and promoting orthodox Brahminism. All biographers have accepted this view and have totally ignored the social and economic realities of Maharashtra and Tilak’s opinions on them and have concentrated only on his Swadeshi and Home Rule agitations.

Tilak soon realised, that he had lost all that he had achieved during the Home Rule movement. Firstly, the Muslims would no more trust him in the light of Shivaji and Afzalkhan episode and Gandhi’s direct appeal to the Muslim sentiments in the Khilafat agitation. Secondly, his continued exposition of the restricted national education and opposition to woman’s education alienated the liberal Brahmins and other upper classes. Thirdly, the stand taken regarding the Patel bill and insistence on caste, alienated the non-Brahmins even further. Tilak in an attempt to elicit support addressed the non-Brahmins by stating that “one man like myself cannot remove the caste distinctions” and declared that “the dichotomous division, Brahman and non-Brahman, is unnatural and purely artificial and is brought up by some interested factious men”. Tilak called for unity and minimize the differences by stating that every important leader like Lajpat Rai, Mahatma Gandhi, C.R.Das, Jinnah and Dinshow Wcha were non-Brahmins, and
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the need of the hour is ‘Swarajya’ and not ‘interdining with Brahmins’... the non-Brahmins should remember that the abolition of caste was once tried by Buddhists but they failed in it we therefore cannot hang our problem of self-government on this peg of the abolition of caste.\textsuperscript{206}

Tilak’s appeal failed to elicit positive response and the non-Brahmin leaders supported N.G. Chandavarkar and M.K. Gandhi. Tilak’s failure either to accept the concept of Indian nationality or develop Hindu nationality on solid foundation had cost him dearly. The greatest loss was the leadership in western India and antagonism with Bipin Pal and Anne Besant. \textit{Mahratta} continued to blame the moderates for the failures faced by Tilak,\textsuperscript{207} though virtually no moderates existed by then. Tilak stood isolated in the political field. In April 1920 Bombay provincial conference was held at Sholapur which was “attended by a record no of 3229 persons.... to receive first hand, from Mr. Tilak, the needed guidance”.\textsuperscript{208} However, the conference turned out to be a show of strength between the Tilakites and the Congressmen. The article called Anne Besant a moderate and “had been thirsting for revenge for the treatment she had naturally received at Amritsar”\textsuperscript{209} at the hands of the Tilikites. N.Chandavarkar, the organizer of the depressed classes supported Besant in her struggle against Tilak.\textsuperscript{210} \textit{Mahratta} criticized\textsuperscript{211} ‘the moderates’ for having ‘aristocratic spirit’ and not having ‘democratic spirit’ and as a result the moderates had,
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a contempt for the masses and felt a kind of pollution in coming into contact with the proletariat and also with Tilak who was their leader... The moderates abused Mr. Tilak as if he was the archenemy of all democratic progress and on the first day of the conference Walchand Kothari, a non-Brahmin leader the captain of the moderates, organized people to march in a body to disrupt the proceedings and resorted along with the moderates to throwing stones at the volunteer who were trying to control the crowd.212

The description of the events and incidents occurred at the conference had its closest resemblance to the pandemonium that took place during the Congress split in 1907. Mahratta which in the beginning of the article stated that the crowd of 3229 people had assembled to hear Tilak, contradicted itself by stating that “the crowd included those elected by the Deccan Sabha consisting of some known minors and people of doubtful credentials and suspicious character”.213 By the time the conference ended, it was clear that Tilak had lost the ‘show of Strength’ Tilak stood alone, unlike in 1907 when he was supported by strong and charismatic leaders like Aurobindo Gosh, Bipin Chandra Pal and Lajpat Rai. Mahratta dejected by the developments decided to “to leave the judgement between them and the moderates to the arbitrament of the nation”.214

Losing the battle in the Bombay provincial Conference made it clear to Tilak that for the 1920 Indian National Congress secession he would not even be a delegate. So Tilak immediately started the new party called the Congress Democratic Party and issued the manifesto.215 Bipin Chandra Pal and Anne Besant opposed the move and Kesari immediately called Pal a
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mad man *Bikshipa*. Kelkar criticised Pal, Lajpat Rai and Mahatma Gandhi as a group and as individuals. Pal was called *Ekharde Killedar* for opposing Tilak. Kelkar also opposed M.K. Gandhi’s non-cooperation movement and announced that the Congress Democratic Party would contest the elections and enter the councils. Soon after this Tilak died on the first of August 1920 it was also the day that Gandhi had set the date for inaugurating India’s first Satyagraha movement. The day was the end of an era and the beginning of a new one.

There has been consensus among the biographers of Tilak regarding what course Tilak would have taken had he been alive during Gandhi’s non co-operation movement. Wolpert suggests that Tilak “being a big enough man to rise above the mediore level of so many of his disciples” would have followed Gandhi. Richard Cashman considered that Tilak being “a pragmatic and flexible politician would have come to terms with Gandhi.” Cashman makes a distinction between older Tilakites who opposed Gandhi and the younger Tilakites who joined Gandhi to prove that Tilak would have followed Gandhi. Cashman’s category of older Tilakites like G.S. Khaparde, B.S. Moonje, and N.C. Kelkar were infact closest to Tilak since his formative period, where as the younger Tilakites like Gangadharrao Deshpande of Belgaum S.M. Paranjpe, the former editor of *Kal*, and an active organiser of Boycott of foreign goods during *Swadeshi* movement and D.D. Satye had joined Tilak in his agitation against the British rule and

---

216 *Maharatta*, July 25 1920, Mr. Pal and Myself, Kelkar p.337.
217 ibid. p.338.
220 ibid.
were not upholders of his ideology in its entirety. Their relation to Tilak was very close to the one shared by Bipin Chandra Pal and Aurobindo during *Swadeshi* movement and Joseph Baptista, during the Home Rule agitation. Their association was political so it was easy for them to follow Gandhi, even when Tilak was alive. They joined Gandhi during the Rowlatt *Satyagraha*, where as Moonje, Khaparde and Kelkar who shared Tilak's ideological commitment to the Hindu Nation opposed Gandhi’s non-co-operation.

Dr. Balkrishna Shivram Moonje had organised *Rashtriya Mandal* at Nagpur. He was not a member of the Congress party but a member of the Hindu *Sabha*. He joined Khaparde with a large contingent of followers with him at Surat to support Tilak in 1907. Later he established *Akhdas* or Gymnastic clubs to train the youth in militant nationalism. When Tilak started the Home Rule League Moonje established branches of Home Rule league for Tilak and joined the Congress along with his Rashtriya Mandal. In April 1921, all India Hindu *Sabha* was changed into all India Hindu *Maha Sabha*. Moonje was actively involved with it. Moonje was in the working Committee and presided over its Patna secession in 1927. Moonje on behalf of the Hindu Maha *Sabha* attended the Round Table conference and visited Italy and met Mussolini. Moonje was impressed
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with the Italian dictator and wanted to establish a National Militia on the lines of Mussolini’s Militia.\footnote{Christophe Jefferlot, “The Idea of Hindu Race in the writings of Hindu Nationalists ideologues in the 1920s and 1930s: A concept between two cultures” in Peter Robb (ed.) The Concept of Race in South Asia (Delhi, 1995), p.336.}

Moonje’s Swaraj, like Tilak’s Swaraj was based on Hindu Dharma Shastras, which provided for the standardisation of Hinduism throughout India. Moonje also idealised that “the struggle for Swaraj would be headed by a Hindu dictator like Shivaji of old or Mussolini or Hitler of the present day”.\footnote{Moonje Papers, NMML, R.No.2.} Moonje was intimately associated with the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh as the founder of the RSS Dr. Hedgewar was brought up in his own house by Moonje.\footnote{B.V. Deshpande and S.R. Ramaswamy Dr. Headgewar the Epoch, Maker, (Bangalore, 1981), p.14.} They together attended meetings and conferences of the RSS and its allied organizations.\footnote{Moonje Papers, R.No.2.}

N.C. Kelkar, Tilak’s most trusted lieutenant and inheritor of Tilak’s legacy,\footnote{Richard Cashman, (1975), pp.205-206.} joined the Hindu Maha Sabha and thrice presided over the sessions of the All India Hindu Maha Sabha at Kanpur 1925, Jabalpur 1928 and Delhi 1935.\footnote{Samagra Tilak, vol.-7, p.1102.} He as an editor of Kesari for twentyfive years and Mahratta for twenty years,\footnote{ibid. p.1101.} had a clear understanding of Tilak’s ideology single handedly kept it alive after Tilak’s death as he inherited the Journals. During this period Kesari and Mahratta published articles appreciating the achievements of Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussosini\footnote{Kesari, Jan 17 1928, July 17 1928, Aug 13 1929.} and the rise of militant assertion of Hindu nationality by the Hindu Maha Sabha and the
RSS. So the speculation that, had Tilak been alive he would have followed Gandhi’s non-cooperation movement does not hold good.

Tilak failed to develop a comprehensive ideology of militant Hinduism as he based his orientation entirely on caste-class privileges, yet he was ideologically closer to the organisations propagating Hindutva. Tilak’s insistence on allegiance to the ancient laws like the caste rigidity, selective education to women and non-Brahmins and denying Indian Nationality to the Muslims and an intense hatred of foreigners, were the cornerstones on which the later day Hindutva ideology stood. In the first and the second decade of the twentieth century Hindutva and Hindu Nationality was not very articulately propagated, as the socio-political scenario kept on changing due to non-Brahmin movement and opposition by liberal Brahmins which necessitated Tilak to even extend the hand of friendship to the Muslims. So in a fluid socio-political situation Hindutva could not assert itself in as clear terms as by the later day Hindutva leaders. Tilak’s ideological cornerstone Hindu Nationality which was against the Indian nationality whose aim was to establish a Hindu Swaraj or Hindu Nation though not expressed in such clear terms, nevertheless was the precursor to the Hindutva ideology. Similarly Tilak’s close associates and Mahratta itself became protagonists of Hindu nationalism and the Hindu Maha Sabha.