

CHAPTER – II

Political Condition of India and Role of Gokhale

A. Political Condition of India : Early Congress

1. *Nature :*

The Congress, 'a safety valve' which was founded by A.O. Hume; generally at the first stage was made by highly Elitist group and who were satisfied themselves by enjoying and getting all types of facilities from the British. Actually, the early Congress followed the policy of 'mendicancy', moreover, were tried out in a rather inter militant manner. They organized generally 'three days meeting which generally called – Three-days show', plus one or two secretaries and also pass resolutions on some immediate grievances.

2. *Nature of demands :*

Actually this early Congressmen were generally highly successful men in their professions and also supported by the British officials. But this Congress, also created demand on the British in generally on economic, social and administrative measures. The political demand of this early Congress leaders was reform of Supreme and Local Legislative Councils, to give them greater powers and to make them representative by including some members elected by local bodies, Chamber of Commerce and Universities.

Their administrative demands were to take the I.C.S. examination both in India and England, separation of judiciary, extension of trial by jury, repeal of the Arms Act, higher jobs in army for Indians etc.

The early Congress leaders were very conscious about their economic problem and also create pressure on them. They realised the economic drain policy of the British government and also protest for cutting the Home Charges, minimization of military expenditure, more funds for technical education for promoting the Indian industries and an end to unfair tariffs and excise duties.

3. *Shortcomings of early Congress :*

At first stage i.e., till 1872, this early Congress generally dominated by Hume. Collection of funds and collecting and conducting with Muslims were the main plan of the early Congressmen. These Congressmen at first failed to contact with the common people. Hume personally tried to bring up the Muslim by connecting himself with Badrauddin Tyabji. Moreover, two popular pamphlets translated no less than twelve regional Congress, also circulated by him to get support from the common people i.e., peasants.

4. *Result of the work of Congress :*

Such efforts also because finally fruitless because it failed to make it understand to the Muslims. As a result, the Congress turned into 'microscopic minority' due to sudden fall in number of Muslim delegates. Hume himself tried to improve the condition but finally he became frustrated and returned to England.

Till 1890, the conditions of Moderates were very poor. The decision generally was taken only by two or three important leaders due to the reluctance of Indian leaders. Hume stayed as General Secretary of Congress. These were the years, when failures in India led to a shift in emphasis almost entirely to campaigning in England through the

British Committee of the Congress – headed by Wedderburn, Hume, Naoroji with its journal 'India'. The bulk of the fairly paltry Congress funds were sent over to London. As a result of some works Naoroji unseated in 1895 elections. Meanwhile, interest in the Congress in India was wanting due to the rising proportion of local delegates. But, these bodies were also going to dominating condition, which was marked in late 1890's. But, these early Congressmen also protest against the land reform. In 1899 session, R.C. Datta presided and passed a resolution clearly demanded to both Parliaments about the fixation of revenue in *raiyatwari* areas and ceiling on zamindar's rent.

Thus, the Moderates, though prayer, petitions, as described as the policy of 'mendicancy', sought to protect the interests but failed to make any contact with common people and even with Muslims. As a result, finally it needed such 'provocative policy' which had done by Carzon and as a result, it gave birth of a new leader, with his assets of an alternative personality, youth and undaunted self sacrifice and devotion to full time in public work was Gopal Krishna Gokhale.

B. Genesis of the Moderates and their Policy

The early Congressmen were determined to follow those methods of peaceful and Constitutional agitation which had proved so successful in Britain.¹ They had faith in the efficacy of Constitutional agitation and in the sense of justice of the British rulers Dadabhai Naoroji used to tell English audiences that, "We Indian people believe that although John Bull is a little thick-headed man we can penetrate through his head into his brain that a certain thing is right, you may be quite sure that it will be done."² They had a belief that following the policy of bloodless manner; it would be more effective than others.

Gokhale and other moderates asked the Indians to be preserving and reminded them that in self governing England may a cause had to be agitated for long before success was achieved.³ The struggle for the emancipation of the Catholics and the repeal of the Test Acts, the fight of Bright and Cobden for the repeal of the Corn Laws, the agitation for

the reform of Parliaments and the movement for the enactment of improved factory laws had been protracted and arduous.”⁴

5. *Reasons for Prayer and Petitions :*

When in the middle of the first decade of the twentieth century there came into existence a party of extremists, who were dissatisfied with the rate of political progress that the moderate methods of agitation had secured. Dadabhai Naoroji argued that Indians had not been able to realise the political aims not because they had petitioned or agitated too much but because they had agitated too little.”⁵ In his Congress Presidential address, he said : “Agitation is the life and soul of the whole political, social and industrial history of England ... Agitation is the civilized, peaceful weapon of moral fray and infinitely preferable to brute physical force ... Agitate over the whole length and breath of India.”⁶ Referring to this appeal the Bengalese asked “Could any commandment be more solemn, sacred or binding ?”⁷ The whole life of England everyday was all agitation. Dadabhai Naoroji continued by saying that “You do not open your paper in the morning but read from beginning to end it is all agitation, Congress and conferences, meetings and resolutions without end for a thousand and one movements, local and national. From the Prime Minister to the humblest politician, his occupation is agitation for every thing he wants to accomplish. The whole Parliament, press and platform is simply all agitation”.⁸

Difference with England :

The term liberalism was commonly known by the British people. Because Parliamentary System and Constitutional Rule was present in England. If there is necessary for any kind of change in Constitution or placing the demands the British people knew the policy of peaceful manner. But in India had some problems. India had not such democratic Constitution, which was already in England. The moderates in India were now willing to follow the policy of peaceful protest, which the people of England already enjoyed.

Influence of British :

Some have described this period as the springtime of Indian nationalism.⁹ Even, it should be noted that, there was a great change in the nature of nationalism. In May 1941, Rabindranath Tagore, who lost the faith in the liberal instincts of the British people, looked back to this period and said : “At heart we had not lost faith in the generosity of the English race. This belief was so firmly rooted in the sentiments of our leaders as to lead them to hope that the victor would of his own grace pave the path of freedom for the vanquished. This belief was based upon the fact that England at that time provided a shelter to all those who had to flee from persecution in their own country. About this time I was a boy in England and had the opportunity of listening to the speeches of John Bright both in and outside Parliament. The large-hearted radical liberalism of these speeches, overflowing all narrow national bounds, had made so deep an impression on my mind that something of it lingers even today, even in these days of heartless disillusionment”.¹⁰

C) Plan of Making Congress a Representative Institution and Influence of the British on the Policy.

It is generally held that nationalism in India grew out of a negative attitude towards foreign rule. The Indians were willing to follow the policy of representation through peaceful manner. Thus actually, the Britishers were also making a plan to give some facilities to the Indians. The policy, which was making by the British, was nothing but the policy of benevolent despotism and the profounder of this theory were James Mill and Thomas Babington Macauley.

In 1832, before a Parliamentary Committee, James Mill, the great advocate of representative institution was asked : “Do you consider in the present states in India anything approaching to representation as entirely out of question” ? I conceive wholly so, “he replied.¹¹ Next year Macauley said, “If the question was what is the best mode of securing good government in Europe, the merest smattered in politics would answer,

representative institutions. In India you cannot have representative institutions. Of all the innumerable speculators who have offered their suggestions on Indian politics not a single one as far as I know however democratic his opinion may be, has ever maintained the possibility of giving at the present time, such institutions to India ... The light of political science and history are withdrawn. We are walking in darkness.”^{11(a)}

Nature of the Indian Britishers :

Actually, the British who came in India mostly they were conservative and they had no intention to do something for Indians. Moreover they were unwilling to give the facility of representative government to the Indians. Their view was aptly expressed by Sir Charles Wood who said in 1861 : “All experience teaches us that where a dominant race rules another, the mildest form of government is despotism. It was so in the case of the democratic republics of Greece, and the mere aristocratic or autocratic sway of Rome.”¹²

Change of Indian Attitude :

But the educated Indians realised the value of representative institution. In the first manifesto of the Indian National Congress in 1885, Hume stated that “indirectly, this Conference (namely Congress) will form the germ of a Native Parliament and if properly conducted, will in a few years constitute an unanswerable reply to the assertion that India is unfit for any form of representative institution.”¹³

W.C. Banerjee, the first President of Indian National Congress declared, “Political minded Indians wanted to be governed according to the ideals of government prevalent in Europe.”¹⁴ In a speech at the Second Congress in 1886, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya asked, “What is an English man without representative institutions ? ... Representative institutions are as much a part of the true Briton, as his language and his literature ... “¹⁵

Surendranath Banerjee, another prominent leader of Congress expressed his view in Third Session by saying, "The great words 'Representative Institutions', were written in characters of gold in the banner that the Congress unfurled."¹⁶

Bishan Narayan Dhar said in the same Congress, "England has moved us from our ancient anchorage. She has cast us adrift, against our will, upon the wide waters of a seething proletariat, and we turn back to England, and ask her to grant us that compass of representative institutions by which amid a thousand storms, she has steered her prosperous course to the same haven of regulated political freedom."¹⁷ The most interesting thing is that though the Indian leaders were very willing accepts such representative institution form of government, but the political leaders of England generally did not show any desire to give any such guidance.

Need of Representation :

But, the British statesmen, such as Burke considered representative institutions as "something peculiarly British, as an inherited national privilege."¹⁸ and it was proved failure that any nation could not boast for existence of representative institution. It was proved failure in the American and French revolution, where the people of those states realised the value of it. So, in 1890 Gladstone, the Liberal leader said, "In the adoption of that system (the system of representative institution) we long stood alone, but one after another great countries of the world have come in, and the nations sprung from our loins have given further countenance and currency to our example, and now the man would be deemed mad who should denounce the system of popular representation."¹⁹

Feeling of Indian leaders to make Congress as a representative body :

The Indian leaders generally at first welcomed this policy. Once Surendranath asked England to practice the gospel of "Political Christianity that Gladstone preached."²⁰ He said : "Representative institution are a consecrated possession which in the counsels of providence has been entrusted to the English people, to guard that possession, to spread

it and not to make it the property of this or that people, but the heritage of mankind at large.”²¹ In third Congress session Surendranath Banerjee again said about the importance of representative govt. According to him, “Impossible to think of a domestic grievances or ... Complaints which would not be remedied” if Legislative Councils were reformed and made more representative.^{21 (a)} It was also praised by saying that it was prove one of the important practical steps toward the improvement of the poor class.

Ambika Charan Majumdar said that the connection between poverty and the absence of representative institutions appeared to him as “some what remote.”²² Not only, that to eradicate all of the social backwardness such as backwardness of agriculture, lack of industrialization over population etc. it was necessary to say to the govt. through a representative institution. Surendranath Banerjee thus said, “the wider employment of natives of India, the encouragement of indigenous trade and manufactures are among the circumstances which, along with the introduction of representative institution, would palliate the poverty of the masses.”²³

The Congress was a political organization. It could only point out that an important political reform – the introduction of more representative institutions – through which it could easily remove the suffering of the common people.

Real Objects of British :

But the British rulers did not like it. They were reluctant to give this type of facility to the Indians. They are in the opinion that India will govern by us by applying the policy of despotism. For example, Lord Dufferin, a Governor-General described the Congressmen by saying ‘microscopic minority’ and he continued by saying that “a representative body or bodies in which the official element shall be in a minority, who shall have what is called the power of the purse, and who through this instrumentality shall be able to bring the British Executive into subjection to their will.”²⁴ and he also said that this was not the Congress demand. The Indian Mirror commented that Dufferin

“attempted to delude his audience, unintentionally but ignorantly, by saying that Congress wanted to snatch the reign of power”^{24(a)} and the Bengalees which supported Congress policies, wrote that at that time nationalist India wanted a Consultative Council and not representative government²⁵

Protest of the Moderates :

Seeing the unwillingness of the Britishers the early Congress leader like Surendranath Banerjee protested against it. On behalf of the Indian National Congress he said in 1890 “Let me say on behalf of Indian National Congress, that we do not wish to see installed in our midst any thing like democratic form of government. We do not think India stripe for it gets nor do we want Home Rule ... We want something much less than an English House of Commons.”²⁶ In 1890, Pheroj Shah Mehta in his Presidential address to the Congress declared that Congressmen were not so ignorant of history as to demand the immediate and wholesale importation into India of the Parliamentary institutions that Britain had evolved through the discipline of centuries. Theodore Beck claimed in *The Pioneer* in 1888, “Parliament is what the promoters of this (the Congress) movement had as their goals and the assurance that the only object is a re-constitution of the Legislative Councils to the language of diplomacy.”²⁷

Though the Moderates realized all the situation, they created pressure on government. They did not press for immediate application in India. Surendranath Banerjee in 1895, thus said that, “We know, act and it cannot deal with principles in the destruct,”^{27(a)} and in this connection he followed the policy of Burke. Because, Burke said, “Nothing universal can be rationally affirmed on any moral or any political question, metaphysical abstraction does not belong to these matters. They admit of exceptions and modifications are not made by the process of logic, but by the rules of prudence. Prudence is not only the first in rank of the virtue of political and moral but she is the dictator, the regulator, the standard of them all.”²⁸

Views of Moderates :

The moderates were practical men and never spoke of no abstract equality but of the equality as promised in the “queen’s proclamation”. They always criticised the government but they did not ask for the immediate termination of that rule. Actually, they used the concept of liberty and nationality and they realised that the national consciousness, upto the end of the 19th century was weak and it was the duty to the moderates to improve it. In 1890. Pheroj Shah Mehta declared that, “I have no fears that British statesmanship will ultimately respond to the call. I have unbounded faith in the living and fertilizing principles of English culture and English civilization.”^{28(a)} In 1892, in Madras Congress he again said, “The educated classes are the friends and not the foes of England – her natural and necessary allies in the great work that lies before her.”²⁹

The moderates preached the ideas of patriotism and nationalism to their countrymen but asked them to discard violence of all kinds. Surendranath said : “It is not indeed necessary for us to have recourse to violence in order to obtain the redress of our grievances. Constitutional agitation will secure for us those rights and privileges which in less favoured countries are obtained by sterner means.”³⁰

Belief of Moderates :

The moderates believed a gradualism and they condemned terroristic activities. Describing the terrorist as an anarchist, S.N. Banerjee said, “Anarchism has wrecked the prospects of Russian freedom, an emasculated Duma was the reply of the Czar to Russian anarchism.”³¹

Moreover, English revolutions were bloodless and the English political philosopher also condemned the horrors of bloody revolutions. The Indian liberals (moderates) also followed the principles of the British. They did also not like the policy, which will create huge flood of blood. They developed and retained the English feeling of opposition to direct action and aggressive policies.

185925



22 MAR 2006

Causes of this Policy :

This moderates also liked the prayer and petition and protested against the British, taking the policy of non-violence. There were lot of reasons behind these policies :

Firstly, in the 18th century in India, we found generally the two groups of people. One group of people was cosmopolitan and tried to assimilate the good aspects of other religion and culture and through which they wanted to remove the darkest period of history. The other group of people was willing to revive the Indian culture and Brahma Samaj and Arya Samaj movement did these hard tasks respectively. These social-religious movements representing a combination of revivalism and reformation. "None of these spiritual movements had any direct political aims, but they brought together men who were seeking fresh interpretation of old faiths and who naturally passed thence into state affairs."³² Thus Brahma Samaj became intellectual progenitor of the Moderates.

Secondly, spread of women education by different Samaj like Brahma Samaj, Arya Samaj growing contact with outside the world, a strong will to revive of the cultural treasures of the past, the desire to reform all aspects of life, and speculations about the problems weal and establishment of Asiatic Society increased the sense of pride and self-confidence in the mind of the Indians.

Thirdly, the economic policy of the British government, had sharp impact on it because the trade and industry, to some extent, which was done by the British, was only helpful for them. As a result, indigenous agriculture and also industry suffered a disastrous blow. Dadabhai Naoroji as, 'Economic Drain' explained the plan of the British government.

Fourthly, the rapid growth unemployment problem due to speedy progress of higher education; led to the frustration and discontent among the educated people of India. The people who born within 1840 and 1850; failed to seek the job by civil service and last of

all bound to join in Law or Journalism. These groups were the elitist class; provided the leadership of early Congress and formulated the policies and programmes.

Fifthly, the rapid growth vernacular process, communication, gave meaning the words “India” and “Indian”.

Thus, the mass base of early Congress movement began from narrow circle, specially based by westernised intellectuals who had faith in the British since of justice and fair play; and a passion of Constitutional agitation. Their political aim was western-concept of self-government and to attain it, they first follow the policy of “first deserve and then desire.”^{32(a)} The moderates sought to preach and practice a secular type of nationalism in India, which was based on the imitation of the western idea of the nation. The moderates have been described as the counterparts of the English Liberals in India. They thought that for the development of the country it was essential to liberalise the Indian society.

Raja Ram Mohan Ray, who was the founder of Brahma Samaj, can also be described as the first constitutional agitator. Naoroji asserted that the purpose of agitation was to suggest improvements, which could be adopted by the authorities.

In the very first Congress, W.C. Banerjee, the president, declared that politically minded Indians wanted to be governed according to the ideals of government which prevalent in Europe. Surendranath Banerjee said in Third Congress Session “The great words Representative Institutions were written in characters of gold in the banner that the Congress unfurled.” On the whole, their approach was reform but not to destroy. They followed the policy of evolution, not of revolution. As a result of this policy, they wanted to improve the economic condition of the country. Naoroji in his words, “To millions of Indians, life is simply half-feeding or starvation, or famine and disease.”³³ Thus, the major demands of the Moderates were for lowering taxes on land and salt and for spending in India the funds collected in India. These demands effected upon the British to realise the actual problems of Indian. If helped, the Indians to accumulate

their wealth. It also advocated the development of indigenous industry and gradual capitalist transformation of agriculture. But most of the efforts and warnings of the Moderates were ignored by the British Government.

Moderates and Social Reform : Political Philosophy :

To Liberate Country :

The moderates wanted to reform the existing administration but they were not willing to replace it. The moderates at first wanted to liberalize the country. They generally considered that without liberalizing the country was not possible for development and in this point of view there were some difference between Moderates and Extremists.

The Moderates knew very well that it was not an easy task for early Congress to take up questions relating to social reform. In the Second Congress Sessions, Naoroji in his presidential speech said "Congress being a political body could not take part in social reforms. He asked: "How can this gathering of all classes discuss social reforms ? what do any of us know of internal home life, of the traditions, customs, feelings, prejudices of any class but his own ? ... A national Congress must confine itself to questions in which the entire nation has a direct participation, and it must have the social adjustment of social reforms and other class questions, to class Congress."³⁴ But Dadabhai added that all the delegates present were as deeply 'nay, in many cases far more deeply – interested in social as in political questions."³⁵ Moderates like Gokhale believed that without liberalization of Indian social life, it was not possible to make any political progress. In a speech at a social conference in 1903, Gokhale attacked the inequality inherent in the institution of caste system and it was quite different with western countries. "The classes of the west," are perfectly elastic institutions, and not rigid or cast-iron like out caste ... "³⁶ Gokhale advised his countrymen to accept the modern concept of social equality and discard all ideas of "privilege and exclusiveness, which were the root ideas of the old world." Gokhale bluntly state that Indians could not

complain of discrimination by Europeans in South Africa or elsewhere unless they leased to discriminate against their own low-caste countrymen.”³⁷

Not only the Moderates, the British bureaucrats also praised the social reforms policy of the Moderates. Sir Auckland Colvin, Lieutenant-Governor of North Western Provinces, in a letter to Hume said : “What, I think, people have objected to, is not so much that the Congress does not deal with social questions, as that with social questions so urgently requiring to be dealt with, a body having for its main objects political changes, should have thrust itself access the path of reforms. They fear that the people of India will find it infinitely more agreeable to clamour for place and power; ... to scramble for the loaves and drive for the fishes them to impose upon themselves. The rigorous discipline of social reform.”³⁸ Colvin also continued by saying that western political forms could not be adopted in India unless Indian society was radically altered and he claimed that the Indians were “as much out of harmony with political atmosphere breathed by us of English birth ... as an elephant would be out of his element in selfish mists, or a banyan tree in Parliament Street.”³⁹ Hume replied criticizing those who were ‘fabulous enough to urge it as a reproach that the Congress does not directly meddle with social questions” and said that anyone “who should endeavour to work out the delicate and intricate questions of social reform by the end of the rough-and-ready engine of the National Political Congress would be as foolish as someone who sought to use a plough as a vehicle of transportation.”⁴⁰

Different Views of Moderates :

Some of the Moderates also criticised their policy. Among them Telang did not like the policy of social reform instead of political reform by Moderates. Telang in his famous speech in 1886, “Must Social Reform Precede Political Reform in India?”⁴¹ He compared the Indian social system with the social system of England. Compared with England he said, “there are still social evils, huge and serious social evils, awaiting remedy” to which “attention is not directed with anything like the force and energy bestowed on political affairs.”⁴² He also said “If we compare the government and the

Hindu population to two forts facing the army of reforms can there be any doubt that the Wisest Course for that army is to turn its energies first towards the fort represented by the government, where we have numerous and powerful friends among the garrison ... As to the other fort, the case is as far as possible from being one of *veni, vidi, vici*. The soldiers of the old garrison are not in the least ready to 'give up' ...⁴³. Nor only that he forced and also requested to people by saying, "Let us then all devote the bulk of our energies to political reform."⁴⁴

These Moderates were also facing a problem from their groups and also from others regarding the support of the British bureaucrats. They are in the opinion that the British bureaucrats were seeking to divert educated Indians from political agitation to social reform activities and to generate in them a feeling of moral superiority from their countrymen so that they may not lead them into political agitation. S.P. Ramaswami Aiyer thus said in 1890 that the British wanted educated Indians to espouse the cause of social reform and to wear a "moral top hat, just as they did a physical top hat."⁴⁵

Views of Extremists :

Taking the question of social reform at first they were also criticised by the Extremists. Tilakal and other extremist thought that social reformation weaker the political movement. Aurobindo said, "Political freedom is the life breath of a nation; to attempt social reforms, educational reforms, industrial expansion, the moral improvement of the race without aiming first and foremost at political freedom, is the very height of ignorance and futility."⁴⁶

Blessing of the British :

The most important was that they were not to slavish imitator of the British. Their main intention was to make some change in the society and in this question they praised the British government because from them, they learnt many things, specially western

education i.e., science, rationality etc. It was the essence of the traditional culture with the values and ideas necessary for creating a modern nation.

Moderates and relation with the Masses :

Though the number of the early Congress were known as a 'microscopic minority' and it was organized with highly elitist class; the other people rather than they thought that they had no relation with common people. But this theme was not true fully. It was true that some of them were admitted as aristocrats but most of them had a tendency to look after the condition of India and wanted to improve the condition of the masses.

They were liberals and carefully studied the problems of the Indian economy, particularly those of agrarian India. Ranade laid the foundation of Indian Economics; Gokhale and G.V. Joshi carefully examined various aspects of the country's economic development. They studied the root cause of 'drainage of wealth' and 'economic exploitation' of the country. To know all these, the countrymen misunderstood by saying that the moderates were urbanized intellectuals with no knowledge of rural India. Actually these moderate groups wanted to minimise the dependency upon import goods and wanted to improve the condition of agriculture.

For this reason, Sivaswami Aiyer made a powerful plan for the extension of technical education. He also emphasized the importance of making available western works in the regional languages and tries to use technical terms also in vernacular language, to maintain the prestige of nationalism. Mass politics was not only gradually emerging at the close of the nineteenth century but the historical situation does not explain the reluctance of the moderates to cast themselves in the role of mass leaders. Moderate nationalism put an account on the power of the printed word, the press and platform, Council debates and exercising influence at strategic levels of government. To promote nationalism, the country needed the selfless service of countless men and women who could work for the country with undivided loyalty. Thus, the nationalism of the

Moderates sought to 'spiritualise' politics by recruiting the best people who will devote themselves for selfless duties.

Thus, in the conclusion we can say that though the moderate groups were highly elitist group; not only engaged themselves in them. They tried to mix with common people and wanted to run the Congress with the help of the common people. They realised the social problem and without eradication of it, political freedom was not possible and thus they supported the British rule and only demand for self-government within British administration and had a full rely on this government. They made only 'prayer and petitions' and tried to create pressure through agitations; which gave birth a new group in the Congress, which was known as "Extremists."

Rise of Extremist in Congress : Split in the Congress :

The most important thing happened in 1907, 27th December when the difference of opinion reached at final state, which bound to split the Congress – the Moderates and the Extremists. Henry Nevinson, the correspondent of Manchester Guardian, described the seen thus : "Suddenly something flew through the air-a-shoe ! - A Maratha Shoe ! – Reddish leather, pointed toe, sole studded with lead. It struck Surendranath Banerjee on the checks it cannoned off up Sir Pheroz Shah Mehta. It flow, it fell and, assist a given signal, while waves of turbanded men surged up the escarpment pat form. Leaping, climbing, hissing the breath of fury brandishing long sticks, then came, striking at any head that looked to them moderate and in another moment, between brown legs standing upon the green-baize table. I caught glimpse of the Indian National Congress dissolving in chaos."⁴⁷

Actually what were the reasons behind the rise of Extremism in 1907, this question was very interesting of this period. There were various opinions for the rise of Extremism in India.

a) *Inspiration of Mazzini :*

Some of them thought that Mazzini inspired Indians (Extremists), Lajpat Rai published a Life of Mazzini and said in his autobiography : "I determined that all my life I would follow the teachings of Mazzini and my nation. I made Mazzini my *Guru* and so he continues to be to this day ... I read Mazzini's biography from cover to cover and I was moved by it far more intensely than I had been several years before by Babu Surendranath Banerjee's speech about Mazzini. The profound nationalism of the great Italians his troubles and tribulations, his moral superiority, his broad humanitarian sympathise, enthralled me."⁴⁸ Though Surendranath Banerjee first translate the works of Mazzini into Bengali, being a moderate, S.N. Banerjee asked the countrymen not to decoding everything but to follow a combine policy of Mazzini and the Liberal Policy of Burke.

b) *Influence of European Literatures :*

Secondly, the study of European literature also inspired the countrymen. They studied the history of Italian unification and gathered the knowledge of the story how the Italians had driven the Austrian out of their land. It gave the militant nationalism a new conception and a new ideal of complete independence. Self-government under British paramountcy had been the goal of the moderate school but the extremists' goal was the complete autonomy and elimination of all foreign control.

c) *Recollection of the Past History :*

Thirdly, another important factor was also played for the rise of extremism was the recollection of the Maratha History and particularly of the days of Great Rebellion of 1857-1858. Not only those, Tilak's methods and approach were completely different from those of the westernised moderates. He wanted rouse the patriotic pride of Maharashtrians by organising Shivaji Festivals, and began to popularise the worship of the Hindu god Ganesh and to encourage the holding the ceremonies in memory of the

Maharashtrian hero Shivaji. He appealed both to the religion and the patriotism of many Hindus. He was supporting the agitation against the killing of cows, which the Arya-Samajists had started with the leadership of Dadabhai Swarasati.

c) *Against the Three 'P's :*

Lastly, Tilak and other extremists supported and advocated the policy of Non-Co Operation with the British government. Tilak, showing the examples of Ireland, Japan and Russia ridiculed towards the moderate's policy of three 'P's – Pray, Please and Protest. He also criticised by saying that the policies, which were taken by the Moderates, would never be succeeded. The most interesting thing is this, that by following this policy Tilak directly came to the against of Moderates. Thus foreign elements, foreign literatures and the recollections of the past history of Indians help to recognize some people to know the actual short-comings of the other groups who followed the policy of pray and petition. Actually, the rise of extremism in India was the result of western education, which was spreaded by the British, and the result was that by learning this thing; these Indians (extremists) were willing to eliminate them.

II. Political thoughts of different Extremists :

Actually, the extremists always demanded 'Swaraj' or 'Self Government' and taking this question i.e. difference of opinion started in Congress. There was no reason behind the division of Congress unless Curzon partitioned Bengal. It was clear to the extremists that what will be the result of 'threats'.

Thus, during the anti-partition agitation Tilak wrote : The time has come to demand 'Swaraj' or 'Self Government'. No piece meal reform will do. The system of the present administration is ruinous to the country. It must mind or end".⁴⁹ According to him, Swaraj was the birthright of every Indian. Though the word Swaraj is an old, Vedic term, Tilak borrowed this term from the Hindu Shastras.

Meaning of Swaraj :

Really, another extremist leader Bipin Chandra Paul also explained what was the meaning of Swaraj. He said, "The term (Swaraj) is used in the Vedanta to indicate the highest spiritual state, wherein the individual having realized his identity with the universal, is not merely free from all else in the world."⁵⁰ From this view, we can say Swaraj was not a merely a political but primarily a morel concept. This state of Swaraj was not merely a political but primarily a moral concept. This state of Swaraj was distinguished from the English word freedom. Bipin Chandra Pal again said that, "The corresponding term in our language is not non-subjection which would be a literal rendering of the English word of independence but self subjection which is a positive concept. Self subjection means ... complete identification of the individual with the universal."⁵¹

Thus Tilak encouraged militant method in politics. He wrote in Kesari to attract the attention to the Government. During the period (1905) Tilak and other extremist leaders preached a policy of direct action and passive resistance and they denounced "the political mendicancy" of the moderates and they did not like this situation. Tilak through the interpretation of *Geeta*, requested the people to make the direct action towards the people.

Another extremist leader, Aurobindo Ghosh spoke of the ideal of Swaraj. He was one of the most remarkable man because he had, from the beginning was a highly westernised educated and on the other hand he was a great exponent of Indian nationalism. Aurobindo believed in Swaraj. According to him, "we of the new school would not pitch our ideal one inch lower than absolute Swaraj-Self government as it exists in the United Kingdom."⁵² He also added by saying, "we reject the claim of aliens to force upon us a civilization inferior to our own or keep us out of our inheritance on the untenable ground of a superior fitness."⁵³

Another leader of the extremist movement in Bengal was Bipin Chandra Pal (1858-1932). Pal had started his political life as a moderate, but after 1904 he began to give expression to his militant views in *New India*, whose striving articles did much to stimulate the demand for Swaraj.

During the period from 1904-1908 Pal, he was the chief exponent of extremism. He at first did not believe the old ideas of Imperial Federation in the place of Swaraj. But after his visit to England, he asserted that there was no necessary contradiction between the ideas of nationalism and a liberal and enlightened imperialism and that the same could be harmonized. In the longer life of some Federal Empire or by the formation of "a Pan-Indian Federation, the United States of India." There he also came in contact with socialist thought and realised that there was no different between the egalitarian idea of the ancient Hindu *Rishis* and the socialist thought. Thus he spoke of "Hindu Socialism."^{53 (a)}

Another prominent extremist on these days was Lala Lajpat Rai (1865-1928). Lala started his carrier by joining himself in social work and put himself as a social reformer. He pointed in 1882 in *Arya Samaj*, where he got an ample scope of social reform. He was not Hindu revivalist. Referring to Tilak, he used to say, "He was a *Pucca Sanatanist*; I was an *Arya Samajist*." Thus, in the case of social, he was nearer to the moderates but in politics he was extremist and supported Swdeshi, boycott and a programme of national education. Like Bipin Chandra Pal, Lajpat Rai also visited England and the United States and also came in contact with socialist ideas. But he was not converted to it. He thought that the invest of the working class of Britain and India were bound to be different. Like other extremist Lala Lajpat Rai believed that Indians had an inalienable right to freedom and also stressed by saying that Indians must rule India because freedom was their birthright.

Political thoughts of the Extremists :

Attitude of the British :

The extremists clearly understood that whatever may be the rule of the British government, whether it will be liberalize and improved; it could never be beneficial for the Indians. Their attitude was explained by Irish Sinn Fein Leader Arthur Griffith, “[In] the British liberals as in the British Tory we see our enemy, and in these who talk of ending British mis-government we see the helots. It is not British mis-government, but British government in Ireland, good or bad, we stand opposed to.”⁵⁴

Necessity of Freedom :

Lala Lajpat Rai believed that there were a number of divisions among the politicians of any free nation such as liberals or conservatives, evolutionaries or revolutionaries, royalists or republicans, democrats or anti-politics of freedom but one thing is to be similar i.e., either politics should be regain freedom or to make a country free from any politics. Every national of a subject country had first and foremost be a nationalist; if he was a nationalist, it did not matter whether he believed in democracy or autocracy. Gandhiji being a moderate thing are of opinion that, “anarchy under home-rule was better than even orderly foreign rule.” And he therefore, asked the British to leave India to God or Anarchy.”⁵⁵

Realization of actual nation of British :

The moderates only supported the liberalism. They sought to make the provincial legislatures more representative and to increase the Indian in the Civil Service. They had a profound faith in the British administrations. But they got a great blow when Lord Curzon, the Viceroy of India partitioned India in 1905. As a protest against it the nationalists planned to boycott the British goods. They were disappointed when they heard that the partition was a settle fact. But they refused to accept it. There was a rouse

of bitter feelings in the minds of the moderates against the government, which should be compared with the Irishmen. The extremists wanted this type of situation, which was roused in the mind of moderates.

Need of Partition of Bengal :

In 1907 Bipin Chandra Pal said that Curzon was a better Viceroy than Ripon and he made the paradoxical statement that the “Viceroyalty of Lord Curzon ... had been one of the most beneficent if not decided by the most beneficent Viceroyalty India ever had.”⁵⁶

Help to rise the national feeling :

Bipin Chandra Pal preferred the policy of Curzon to that of Ripon, because while Ripon satisfied educated Indians with political concessions, Curzon, by his unpopular policies, made them so discontented that they demanded self-government with greater determination than before.

Blessing of Curzon :

Aurobindo openly declared that he considered the partition of Bengal to be a most beneficial measure because it helped to rise the national feeling in the minds of Indians. He became very sorry that the British government made Indians as an emasculate animal and everybody ridiculed over them by saying, “to the condition of sheep and fatted calves.”⁵⁷ Under the British rule the ordinary man devoted his energies to money making and thoughtful man spent his time by writing or admiring Shelley and Swinburne. This tendency of degeneration and denationalisation was interrupted by “the disguised blessings of Lord Curzon’s errors.”⁵⁸

Criticism of three 'P's :

Tilak and other extremists advocated a policy of non-cooperation with the established government. He ridiculed to see the policy of the Moderates and criticised their three 'P's – Pray, Please and Protest. He knew very well that their policy would never be affected. He said on 7th June 1906 : “Look the examples of Ireland, Japan and Russia and follow their methods.”⁵⁹

Oppose of Tilak :

One of the interesting thing was that though Tilak supported the policy of Ireland or Japan but he did not openly advocated the use of violent methods. Tilak opposed the adoption of violence on grounds of expediency. He used to say that if there were even a fifty percent chance of the success of an armed rebellion he would have restored to it.

The extremist Pal said that in the disarmed and disorganized condition of the people any violent uprising could easily be checked and controlled by the government. Similarly Aurobindo admitted that the physical strength of the country belonged largely to the established authority and he warned the people not to come into any violent conflict with that authority. In January 1907, Tilak declared : “We are no armed and there is no necessity of arms either we have a strong weapon, a political weapon in boycott.”⁶⁰ Tilak said : When you prefer to accept *Swadeshi*, you must boycott *Videshi* (foreign) goods. Without boycott *Swadeshi* cannot flourish.”⁶¹ According to Tilak no boycott was not a merely an economic weapon; it was more important than a weapon of political warfare.^{61(a)}

Tilak said, “The Congress agitation based on the so called ‘Constitutional method’ is sheer waste of him.”^{61(b)} He urged to the people that this constitutional agitation was appropriate in England but not in India. Criticising Gokhale and the other moderates, Tilak in his paper *Kesari* on 12 February 1907 said, “In all seriousness, one can suggest that what Mr. Gokhale called the India’s Constitution is really the Indian Penal Code. If

he and his moderate friends suggest that our agitation should be within the four corners of that Code we can appreciate the argument – then it will mean that it should be legal and legitimate – but it is futile and misleading to call it Constitutional.”⁶²

Tilak sought to alternate method of passive resistance for the method of Constitutional agitation. In 1902 he said : ”Though downtrodden and neglected, you must be conscious of your power of making the administration impossible if you but choose to make it so.”⁶³ In a public lecture at Calcutta in 1907 Tilak said, “Your future rests entirely in your hands. If you mean to be free, you can be free; ... If you have not the power of active resistance, have you not the power of self-denial ... so as not to assist this foreign government ... ? This is boycott, and ... boycott is a political weapon. We shall not give them our assistants to collect revenue and keep the peace ... We shall not assist them in carrying on the administration of justice. We shall have our own courts, and when the time comes we shall not pay taxes. Can you do that ? If you can you are free from tomorrow.”⁶⁴ Tilak also continued by saying that “We thought that everything that the rulers did was for our good and that this government has descended from the clouds to save us from the invasions of Tamerlane and Chengis Khan ... We felt happy for a time but it soon came to light that the peace which was established in his country did this, as Mr. Has said ... that we are prevented from going at each other throats, so that a foreigner might go at the throat of us all ... we believed in the benevolent intentions of the government, but in politics there is no benevolence. Benevolence is used to sugar-coat the declarations of self Interests.”⁶⁵

Poor economic condition for the British Policy :

The causes of poverty were mainly responsible for the British rule. Their theory of draining of Indian wealth as described by Naoroji; condemned the British rule. For these reasons, Tilak went England and there he explained the nature of the British government in India and what they were usually doing with the Indians. But the result was nil. He returned from there with empty hand and full of disappointment and he also

assured that Gokhale who is the supporter of the British; will also become disappointed like Dadabhai.

Tilak asked the people not to rely on any such illusion as the British sense of justice. He said, "There is no empire lost by a free grant of concession by the rulers to the ruled. History does not record any such event."⁶⁶

Aurobindo, Tilak and Pal asked the people not to cooperate with the government. They knew very well that it was impossible for the British to stay or run the administration without the cooperation of the Indians.

Opinions of the Extremists about the British :

Bipin Chandra Pal argued that this riddle could be explained by the fact that the people were under the spell of *maya* (illusion), which prevented them from perceiving the reality of the Indian situation. "The people had been hypnotized to believe that, though they were hundred millions in number, they were weak and that their rulers were strong."⁶⁷ The Indians were regarded as uncivilized people and they had no capability to manage their own affair. They (English) made an illusion in the mind of the Indians that they came in India to civilize the Indians and to teach them about the art of western democratic self-government. But the Indians really forget that their main intention only to increase their trade and commerce in India. In other words, their main aim was commercial and economic and to promote their prosperity in England. They (the British) created such a situation that the Indians had a great faith towards the British and they looked the British as rulers, "as more than human and little less, if less at all, than god."^{67(a)}

Opinion of Bipin Chandra Pal about the duties of the Government :

Bipin Chandra Pal wanted to restrict the activities of the government within the possible limits. He wanted to make the government responsible only for maintaining the internal

and external security of the state i.e., the 'Laissez-faire' policy. This theory was a liberal theory and Pal advocated this theory. He also said that the moderates, who were generally advocated the policy liberal, actually they should not be regarded as a true liberal because, unlike the most liberals of western countries, they did not believe in Laissez-faire but wanted to increase the powers and functions of the state.

Advocate of Passive Resistance :

Like Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal advocated a policy of passive resistance and not the adoption of violent means. Pal said, "No one out of Lunatic asylum will ever think of or counsel any violent or unlawful methods in India, in her present helplessness, for the attainment of her civil freedom."^{67(b)} Pal believed that the method of passive resistance would be no less effective. He said : "If we may not oppose physical force by physical force, we may yet make the administration in India absolutely impossible by simply taking our hands off the machine of the state."⁶⁸

Lala Lajpat Rai similarly advocated the policy of passive resistance and he denounced both terroristic method of resort to violence as also the moderate method of praying to and petitioning the British rulers. He said, "Personally I am a believer in the efficacy of prayer, as an instrument of religious discipline ... [But] prayers to the ruling nation may be useful to you in proving the uselessness of appealing to the higher sense of man in matters political ... "⁶⁹

Lala Lajpat Rai advised the people not to believe in the secret words. Promises, which was made by the British. He supported the *Swadeshi* movement and this *Swadeshi* movement was to be strengthened by the adoption of the method of passive resistance and not violence. He said that "To think of physical force in the existing conditions and circumstances is fully." But short of physical force, Lajpat was prepared to use any method against the British rulers including Civil Disobedience."⁷⁰

Policy of Non-Cooperation :

The extremists claimed that it was not possible for the British government to stay in India permanently if the Indians non-cooperated with the British. Thus, to do it, it was necessary for Indians to non-cooperate or followed the policy of civil disobedience.

Congress Middle Class Organisation :

In a series of articles for the *Indu Prakash* in 1893 under the title “New Camps for Old,” Aurobindo attacked the method of the Moderators. He characterized the Congress as a middle class organization which was “selfish and disingenuous in its public action” and which was only playing with baubles. He denied all talk about the function of the British. He condemned the blessings of British rule. He charged that the Congress had made no attempt to be a popular body. The great masses of the people have not been appreciably touched.”^{70(a)} He characterised the moderates as political mendicants. He said that “merely by spending the ink of the journalist and petition-framer and the breath of the orator.”⁷¹ It was not possible for India to get complete freedom by applying the policy of violence. In his *Essays on the Gita* he supported the ideal of *dharmayuddha*. In an article, called, “The morality of Boycott”, he said “The *Gita* is the best answer to those who shrink from battle as a sin ... “ He also claimed “Politics is the realm of the *Kshatriya* ... (and) to impose in politics *Brahmanical* duty of saintly sacrifice’s to preach *Varnasankara*.”⁷²

Aurobindo supported the policy of non-violence and the policy of passive resistance. He observed that armed revolt is common to oppressed nation. But he observed that, “It is the common habit of established governments and especially those which are themselves oppressors, to brand all violent methods in subject peoples and communities as criminal and wicked ... But no nation yet has listened to the cant of the oppressor ... the morality of war is different from morality of peace. To shrink from bloodshed and violence under such circumstance does weakness deserve as severe a rebuke as Srikrishna addressed to Arjuna when he shrank from slaughter on the field of

Kurukshetra. Liberty, is the life-breath of a nation, and when the life is attacked ... any and every means of self preservation becomes right and justifiable ... where, as in Russia, the denial of liberty is enforced by legalized murder and outrage or as in Ireland formerly, by brutal Coercion, the answer of violence to violence is justified and inevitable.”⁷³

Aurobindo always remained in close touch with the secret revolutionary societies of Bengal. His brother Barin Ghosh recorded that, “Sri Aurobindo not only made organized efforts ... to win *Swaraj* through *Swadeshi* and boycott of foreign goods and practice of passive resistance ... but he organized all secret societies all over Bengal to violently oust the imperial power through armed resistance and murder of British officers and judiciary ... Except the C.I.D. ..., none in the country knew that Sri Aurobindo as, “the poet of patriotism, as the prophet of nationalism and lover of humanity.”⁷⁴

At the time of partition of Bengal Aurobindo said, “No Control, No Cooperation.” He also said, “If the Indians no longer consented to teach in government schools or work in the government offices, or serve the alien as police, the administration could not continue for a day.”⁷⁵ He preached the policy of non-cooperation.

He requested the people not only the boycott the British goods but also boycott the government office also, he said, “We would not only buy our own goods, but boycott British goods; not only organize our leave of defence, but have nothing to do with bureaucratic executive except when we cannot avoid it.”⁷⁶

Aurobindo preached a doctrine of undiluted passive resistance.

Actually, the extremists sought to follow the Irish method. Because, the Irish followed the policy of absolute non-cooperation with the administration of Ireland and set almost all things for themselves.

Rash Behari Ghosh described the policy of the extremists in 1907, in Congress Presidential Address. He said, "Like the Sinn Fein Party in Ireland, it has lost all faith in Constitutional Movements ... All its hopes are centered in passive resistance of a most comprehensive kind, derived, I presume, from the modern history of Hungary, the pacific boycott of all things English."^{76(a)} Thus in 1906 Congress passed a resolution to set up educational institutions "on national lines and under national control." Rabindranath Tagore, the poet, though he was not extremist also asked the Indians to rely only on their own strength and not to hope for any sympathy from the foreign rulers. He said that, "It would not be wise for Indians to think that merely by producing good arguments in support of the cause of Indian political reform they would be able to induce the British rulers to grant them larger political rights."⁷⁷ He also continued by saying, "A government was not a mechanical moral machine unerringly and unceasingly applied moral principles to the governance of a country and that, accordingly, it will be futile on the part of Indians to rely on the British sense of justice."⁷⁸

Religious Nationalism; the Political Thought of Extremism :

Religion was the main basis of movement :

Indian culture generally was based on religion. As a result of it, what the Indian people make it understand; understand only through religious terms and if any thing, which was totally based on political, not religion, would not appeal to the Indian people. The religious appeal and fervour is well described in the writings of Aurobindo i.e. Bhwani Mandir. In Bhwani Mandir he said, "India cannot perish, our race cannot become extinct, because among all the decisions of mankind it is to India that is reserved the highest and most splendid destiny, the most essential to the future of the human race. It is she who must send forth from her rely the future religion of the entire world, the eternal religion which is to harmonise all religions, science and philosophies and make mankind one soul. It is for this that Sri Ramkrishna came and Vivekananda preached.

He also said that, “you will be helping to create a nation, to consolidate an age to Organize a world.”⁷⁹

Theme of Vivekananda :

“Extremists and cultural nationalists felt that it was futile to emerge as a nation or to win political freedom if India was to remain in the end enslaved at heart by purely material ends, which was supposed to be the end of European civilization, and that a national movement had no real justification if no new manifestation of Indian genius relating to the real things of life took place. Vivekananda said that “India would be immortal if she persisted in the search for God, but she gave it up for politics then she would perish.”^{79(a)}

Vivekananda’s teaching greatly influenced the India’s nationalists. Their political nationalism became strengthened. It was very interesting that Vivekananda was not himself a political agitator or he wanted to preach politics. But his teaching greatly influences Aurobindo who was actively participated in political work in the first decade of the twentieth century.

Though, Aurobindo was political agitator he realized to start the nationalist movement on the spiritual basis. The extremist believed that the national movement which was led by the moderates, generally on western lines. But they really forget that the movement of the western country was bit different with the nationalist movement of India. In western countries, religion was separated from politics, but in India, politics must derive with the support of it.

Tilak blamed the moderates by saying that they were too much westernised. Tilak revived the Maratha politico-religious tradition.

Role of Tilak :

He wanted to bring energy in the Indian freedom struggle by attaching religion and for this reason he planned to celebrate the festival to encourage the people. He in 1896 on 8th September wrote in the *Keshari* that, “the educated people can achieve results through these national festivals which it would be impossible for the Congress to achieve. Why should you not give the shape of huge mass meetings to the bigger *Jatras* ? Will it not be possible for political activities to enter the humblest cottages of the villages through these festivals.”⁸⁰

Importance of Religion :

By studying the Greek history, Tilak was very much impressed and encouraged himself for observing the *Ganapati* and *Shivaji* festivals. Though the western thought reject the idol worship, Bankim Chandra Chatterjee gave a mystical significance to the idea of the motherland by interpreting the Goddess *Durga* in her different manifestations as symbolic of national evolution.

The poet like Hemchandra, Nabin Chandra followed the policy of Bankim Chandra. Bankim Chandra through his writings wanted to rouse nationalism in the minds of the people. His *Anandamatha*, based on the story of ‘*Sannyasi Rebellion*’ in Bengal of the 1770.

Another extremist leader Aurobindo Ghosh had also no faith on the British liberalism and the strength of the moderates by which they will able to crush the British power. For this reason he thought that it was the only option to the moderates to believe on god, who was stronger than any other earthly power.

In 1907, at a meeting at Bombay, Aurobindo spoke that, “There is a creed in India today which calls itself Nationalism, a creed which has come to you from Bengal ... In Bengal, Nationalism has come to the people as a religion ... and this religion they [the

British rulers] are trying with all the weapons at their command to crush ... Nationalism survives in the strength of god ... Nationalism is immortal, - because it is no human thing, it is God who is working in Bengal. God cannot be killed, God cannot be sent to jail.”⁸¹

What is Nationalism :

Aurobindo explained the speech about the definition of nationalism “I spoke once before given with the force in me and I said then that is movement is not a political movement and that nationalism is not politics but a religion, a creed, a faith, I say it again today but I put it in another way. I say no longer that nationalism is a creed, a religion, a faith, I say that it is the *Sanatana Dharma* which for us the nationalism.”⁸²

Synthesis Between East and West :

Like Raja Rammohan, Aurobindo also suggested the Indian also suggested the Indian to accept the best of the Western culture. He warned that by imitating India could never become exactly like the Europe because India had a separate identity. But if Indians will try to imitate the European culture complete, it will harmful for Indians. Because. Indian will lost their separate individuality like culture etc. In the words *Gita*. Aurobindo declared : “Better the law of one’s own being though it be badly done than an alien *dharma* (way to life) well followed.”⁸³

Aurobindo was also not completely supporting the intellectual influence of western countries. He said “It has been driven home to us by experience, that not in the strength of a raw unmoralized European enthusiasm shall we conquer, It is the *Yogin* who must stand behind the political leader or manifest within him. Ramdas must be born in one body with Shivaji, Mazzini mingle with Caviar. The intellect and spirit, strength and purity may help a European revolution, but by a European strength we shall not conquer”⁸⁴ Aurobindo understood the real cause of defect of the Indian nationalism. According to him Indian nationalism in the previous years were mainly based on

European theme and was too intellectual. Moreover, the Indian nationalism had been the Indian in sentiment and aspiration, European in practice and actuality.

Demand for Complete Swaraj :

Like Aurobindo, Pal and other extremists also thought that India should be free from the hands of the British and the Indians should be lived in the free India. They criticised the moderate policies by saying that the political philosophy of the moderates was foreign in character and spirit. They said that they wanted *Swaraj* not a colonial form of self government because they did not want to remain, an outlying province of the British Europe or a dependent adjunct of European civilization.”⁸⁵

Way to reach the Goal :

Aurobindo said that, “we don’t believe that our political salvation can be attained by enlargement of Councils, introduction of the elective principle, Colonial Self Government or any other formula of European Politics.” Aurobindo believed that the government generally depended upon (good or bad) the individual so, if the government was not functioning well, the important thing was to change individuals and to bring about their spiritual transformation.

Indians are Imitating Race :

The most interesting point was that the Indians were the imitating race and they were now imitating the west. By introducing inter-caste marriage inter-dining and numerous other social changes, Indians would not create a good society in India. Aurobindo thought that the European generally gave stress of value on social Institutions and paid little energy for the improvement of human character. He also criticized the base of European society and he was not also satisfied with Indian society. According to him, when every man realized in his life the essential truth of the *Sanatan Dharma* i.e., the unity of all men because of their identity with God. He argued that there was great

similarity between the ideas of Mazzini and Aurobindo himself. Both of them believed that faith in God was the basis of morality and the politics was based on morality. Thus, according to Aurobindo, *Sanatan Dharma* was the best religion and it helped for rising the nation.

Observing Festivals :

The extremist had also another philosophy, which helped to rouse the national sentiment to the Indians. By observing the different festivals, they wanted to do it. In 1894, during the time of *Ganapati* festivals, the extremists engaged the Hindus to rise up in arms against the alien British rule, as Shivaji had done against the Muslim Rule. They asked : “This is called Hindusthan, how is it that the English rule here ?” They advised the people to kill the English ...”

The *Sholapur Samachar* wrote : “It is really a misfortune that honour, religion and the modesty of women which was safe even under the rule of the Mughals, should be violated under the rule of the Mughals, should be violated under the enlightened English Government.”⁸⁶ The extremists generally believer of the *Gita*. Because, the *Bhagavad Gita* was represented has having given sanction to assassination-murder was said to be in accordance with ‘*Mayer Lila*’ or the inscrutable ways of divine mother of the universe. Thus Barin Ghosh said : Forget the *Vedas*, the *Vedanta* and the *Upanishads* and free the motherland with your blood.”⁸⁷ Thus, in conclusion, we can say that the Philosophy of the Extremist was not only based ‘*Sanatan Religion*’, observing festive occasions their main intention was not only following or imitating the western culture. Sometimes, they applied the violence policy, but they also realised the value of non-cooperation or non-violence. And thus, in last, the hope of revolutionaries of liberating India was dashed to pieces. Their policy only accelerated the flow of national movement.

(3) Difference Between Moderate and Extremists : Rise of the Groups in the Congress

Difference of opinion :

The differences of opinion gave ultimately rise to the two parties in the Congress – (a) Moderates i.e., the early Congressmen who were generally highly elitists class and consisted as a small educated minority greatly influenced by western education and culture, loyal to the Rule, with its zeal for social uplift and other (b) the new group later was known as extremists.

Demand of Extremists' :

As regards the goal, the ideal set up by the Congress was defined in 1905 as 'Colonial form of Self-Government,' but new groups' ideal was another. They demanded the absolute autonomy free from foreign control. Naoroji, the President of 1906 Congress session said, 'Self government or *Swaraj* like that of the United Kingdom or the colonies.'⁸⁸ Not only that the Congress i.e., the Moderates had already took the resolution that their demand only the Colonial forms of self-government. But the extremists had another view regarding the meaning of '*Swaraj*'. They interpreted the term *Swaraj* as the complete freedom or without any dependence on the British rule.

As their (the extremists) motto to gain complete freedom, their method of obtaining their goal also different with the moderates.

According to Aurobindo, "Political freedom, the life breath of a nation, to attempt educational reform, industrial expansions, the moral improvement of the race without aiming first and foremost at political freedom, is the very height of ignorance and futility."⁸⁹ He continued by saying "of the three possible lines of policy for the attainment of the goal, the New Party rejected 'petitioning as mad and fantastic.'⁹⁰ According to Aurobindo, it is not the human nature that one people would sacrifice their

interest for the sake of another. He criticised by saying that the policy, which was adopted by the moderates, were not so adequate to regain the power from the British. Thus, it was possible, if the countrymen applied the policy of 'passive resistance, through which they can snatch the power from the hands of alien bureaucracy. Aurobindo wrote a series of article on "Passive Resistance" in the '*Bandemataram*.'

Actually, the passive register means to abstain for doing something by which he would help the government. Thus, in short the passive resister means to create such a situation where it was not possible for the government to continue or expand the trade and commerce. Boycott the British goods organization and make everything paralyse to the British government. We the people, were bound to follow the policy because the government failed to launch any good economic and fiscal policy, failed to control the chronic famine. Moreover, continuous drainage of capital from India, gradually detoriate the economic condition of India. Thus, this was a ripe time for us to condemn the British policy by an organized and select less boycott of British and tried to stop the economic exploitation.

Dissatisfaction in Educational System :

The people of India were also dissatisfied with the educational condition of India. Their system of education helped Indian only to discourage in patriotism and made them anti-nationalism. Thus, when it was clear for Indian, they refused to send their children to government school or the government aided school.

Dissatisfaction in Judicial System :

The extremists were also dissatisfied the judicial administration of the British. The Indians did not get the real justice. Thus, it was good for the Indians to boycott the judiciary system of the British government.

Finally, the extremists 'disapproved the executive administration, its arbitrariness, its dual character in the field of judiciary, its undue inference in the Indian affairs, its thoroughness of regression towards the Indians, and the misuse of police force towards Indians. The extremists also planned to boycott the executive because our most important motto only to stop the undue inference of the British Executive in Indian affairs. We also planned to boycott to pay the taxes to the British which was known as passive resistance."⁹¹

Aurobindo also explained the theory of 'Passive Resistance' in his famous book 'An Open Letter to my Countrymen' in *Karmayogin* of 31 July, 1909. In this book he said, "our methods are those of self help and passive resistance. The policy of Passive Resistance was evolved faulty as the necessary complement of self-help partly a means of putting pressure on government. The essence of this policy is the refusal of co-operation so long we are not admitted to a substantial share and an effective control in legislation, finance and administration. Just as 'no representation, no taxation', was the watchword American Constitutional agitation in the eighteenth century so 'No control, no cooperation,' should be the watchword of our lawful agitation – for constitution we have none – in the twentieth. We sum up this refusal of cooperation in the convenient word 'Boycott', refusal of cooperation in the industrial exploitation of our country in educating in government, in judicial administration, in the details of official intercourses."⁹²

Views of Chintamani :

Shri Chintamani also explained the term 'Passive Resistance'. According to him, "To realize this ideal they propose as effective methods the boycott of foreign goods, of paid and honorary officers under Government, and of the Indian universities and the colleges and schools affiliated to them, the formation of trade unions and the promotion of strikes, so as I presume, or being to a deadlock British industries planted in India and paralyse British trade and commerce – in a word obstruction is their method. This is the term of passive resistance which is in favour with them."⁹³

Views of Gokhale :

But Gokhale, a moderate was in different opinion. He criticized the method of the extremist. He said, "The new party condemned all faith in the British Government as Childish and all hope of any real progress under it as vain. Petitioning or a respectful representation of grievances to authorities was denounced as mere mendicancy. Boycott was to them the new weapon and its universal adoption was to bring us the realization of all our dreams."⁹⁴ One thing was important that Gokhale, accepted the other part of the programme of the extremists i.e. 'Love of the country should be ruling principle of our lives, we should rejoice in making sacrifices for her sake, and that we should rely, whenever we could, on our own exertion.'⁹⁵

The moderates condemned the policy of the extremists. According to the Moderates the future progress of the Indians depends only under the British rule and the main reason of this was the incapability of the Indians and thus C.Y. Chintamani observed, "the weakest links in the chain are our incapacity and our disunion. With patriotism unknown to, and unrecognised as a virtue by, perhaps 99,999 people out of a lakh, with education so little spreads with the ideas and ideals of the people so time worn and anachronistic, with so many racial and provincial differences still luxuriantly thriving, with the almost entire womanhood of the country living in a world apart as it were, and knowing so little of, and carrying so much less for, country and nation, with six crores of low castes not recognized as a part of the body politic, with the myriad of sub-castes into which the Hindus are divided and with the complicated and almost hope killing Hindu Mohammedan problem logging the wheels of progress at every step ..."⁹⁶

View of Gokhale and his support to Modernisms :

Gokhale with the same view of C.Y. Chintamani said the same thing, "Only mad men outside lunatic asylums could think or talk of independence ... "⁹⁷ Gokhale also continued by saying, "some have gone so far as to talk of independence as an object of practical pursuit. We owe it to the best interests of the country to resist the propaganda

with all our reasons. It means to sure destruction, or at any rate, the indefinite postponement of all these opportunities for slow but peaceful progress, which are at present within our reach. There is no alternative to the British rule, not only now but for a long time to come and any attempts made to disturb it, directly or indirectly, are bound to recoil on our own heads. But the attainment of a democratic form of government is bound to be a slow and weary affair – it must depend upon the average strength in character and capacity of our people taken as a whole – and our average today is far below the English average. The most important work before us therefore now is to endeavour to raise that average.”⁹⁸

Another moderate leader Dadabhai Naoroji also supported the view of Gokhale and said, “petitioning is not begging for any more than the conventional “Your obedient servant”, in letters makes a man an obedient servant. It is the conventional way of approaching higher authorities.

View of Naoroji :

The petitions are claims for rights or for justice or for reforms – to influence and put pressure on Parliament by showing how the public regard any particular matter. The fact that we have more or less failed hitherto is not because we have petitioned too much, but that we have petitioned too little.”⁹⁹

The moderates criticised the policy and the method of the extremists. They said that the policy, which they had taken now need not exhaust the political activities of the Indians. Their motto only the acquisition of ‘political reform’ and their weapons were the debate and deliberation, finding eventual expression in the shape of resolutions.

Reason behind the Modernism the their thought :

Not only that, C.Y. Chintamani also supported the view of the moderates. He said, “As the Hon’ble Mr. Gokhale has expressively put it there can not be graduated boycott as there is a graduated income tax. Boycott means complete and sudden cessation of

commercial intercourse with the country the use of whose products is forbidden; it is in effect a declaration of commercial war.”¹⁰⁰ He continued by saying, “Now what is the position today ? After eighteen months of boycott agitation with patriotism at fever-heat, we import a larger quantity of cotton goods and of sugar, the two articles against which the boycott is principally directed, than or did at the commencement of the agitation. In the birth place of the boycott agitation, I mean the province of Bengal they have not succeeded in keeping out even an article of luxury, which is further productive of harm, foreign cigarettes, in spite of patriotic vows innumerable, self-denying Ordinances many.”¹⁰¹ Some of them were of the opinion of the idea of boycott were not possible in India.

Demerits of Boycott and Extremists :

The moderates never follow the process, which was applied by the extremists. According to the moderates, the policy which was taken by the extremists, the result of this movement was nil. The government, imposed 30 percent tax on import, the people who boycott the government offices, the government was willing to fill up the posts through new appointment. This boycott movement also affected the educational system of India. The moderates also pointed out the weak condition of the trade unions and they also showed the excuse that the time, which had gained, by the Congress is not enough for a nation. The trade unions at that time really had failed to understand the good sense of the British government. In the case of the educational institution, due to the boycott movement, the people deprived from facilities. Because the new institutions which may or may not of a more improved character.

But, the extremists criticised the policy of the moderates. Mr. Khaparde on 22nd April 1905 delivered an address as President and Berar said that, “I feel that we ought all to feel exceeding grateful to government for its attitude of complete toleration and neutrality towards movements of this kind ...”¹⁰²

Difference of opinions as suggested by Moderates and Extremists :

It is said that continuous agitation and discussion for 20 years in the Congress has led to no appreciable results, and therefore, there must be something radically wrong with our methods ... ¹⁰³ All this and much more, that may be added, need not discourage us. Constitutional methods are always dilatory in their operations even in Great Britain, much more are they, therefore likely to be dilatory in India.”¹⁰⁴ The moderates were not satisfied and also criticised the methods of the extremists. Thus Shri Bhal Chandra Krishna said, “They (moderates) are sensible that extreme demands never be granted and will only retard our progress. They see that present temper of the British government in England and India is favourable to our advancement, and they are therefore anxious that the cause of the country should not be spoilt by any unworkable or disagreeable claims. The so called progressive, on the other hand, would rather not have any concessions granted, and would of set purpose pitch their demands to the utmost extent, so as to make their refusal certain from making any demands whatever. Their professed object is to abstain from making any demand what ever. Their professed object is to embarrass the government and to heighten its unpopularity by making it appear that it refuses to make popular concession.

Difference of opinions between the Moderates and Extremists :

It is difficult to see what possible good they hope to attain by such tactics.”¹⁰⁵

Actually, the moderators were rational and logical. But the extremists believed on “power of faith and will which neither counts obstacles nor measures time.” As a result, they had belief on god i.e., Supreme Power.

Views of Aurobindo :

According to Aurobindo patriotism was a form of devotion, he said,” The Indians should approach the political questions : their prime duty was to save the motherland. It was for them to rush head long to achieve this goal without passing to think of its

probable success or failure.” In the same way Lala Lajpat Rai also said, “The National outlook, the Great need of the situation.” Aurobindo realized the root problem of Indian social system. He thought that, “the first step of the political leader, then, consists in our educating the people in a school of true politics, of our initiating them into a religion of true patriotism with a creed of Nationality, liberty and unity, to be believed and striven after with all the sincerity of heart and devotion, worthy of the oriental mind.”¹⁰⁶

Views of Tilak :

Another extremist leader Mr. Tilak advised to the people to make the work of administration on the present lines impossible by passive resistance. According to him, “I say, that is only possible by training the people to a habit of suffering for principles, i.e., to dare and to risk; and by infusing in them a spirit of defiance wherever a question of principle is involved. The way is to be shown by personal example and not by percept alone. There is the old truth ‘no risk no gain.’¹⁰⁷

Emphasis on Education :

According to them simple petitions, simple resolution will not give them complete freedom. Not only that they are repentance for wasting the times of 22 years on only political agitation. The country has so far failed to produce a class of men whose chief and prime business in life will be political agitation and political education. They also sorrow about thinking that the country failed to produce any man who will devotee, able, earnest class, freedom loving etc. Thus, the extremists did not like the policy of the moderates. Aurobindo in his speech said, “There are some, who fear to use the word, “there are some, who fear to use the word ‘freedom,’ but I always used the word because it has been the *mantra* of my life to aspire towards the freedom of my nation.”¹⁰⁸ Again he said, “Our ideal is that of *Swaraj* or absolute autonomy free from foreign control.

Dual Policy of the British :

We claim the right of every nation to live its own life by its own energies according to its own nature and ideals.”¹⁰⁹ The extremists always wanted to improve the national strength of our country. They never thought that they are weak in comparison to the British. But the main defect of moderate politics was that they are saying that ‘we’ are weak. But this think was wrong. According to extremists the Indians are never weak, they really understood what was the actual policy of the British. They really understood that the British played here the dual policy. For example once Morley in his book ‘On Compromise’ said frankly against the extremists – “that those who are not satisfied with small concessions and asked for more and more, “really cry for the Moon”. Again Morley supported the policy of Morley and said against the policy of moderates that “A small and temporary improvement may really be the worst enemy of a great and permanent improvement ... “¹¹⁰ Thus, by realising actual motives of the British, the extremists thought that it was our first duty to inspire the national thinking in the minds of Indian and to unite the Indians and to develop our national strength. From a speech of Naoroji in Calcutta Congress, the editor of the “Modern Review”, Ramananda Chatterjee said, “After a half century of struggle and disappointment, Mr. Naoroji still hopes that “the British conscience will assert itself.”¹¹¹ But whatever the think of a national strength, we have to consist on our effective policy. According to the extremists, the boycott was not the effective methods, which was already started in Bengal. The extremists thus believed on Home Rule and to insists on the way it was for the first time to increase Home Trade, make trade unions through which they may demand for high thing.

Views of Western Philosophers : The extremists clearly understood that some of the British intellectuals did not like the autocratic colonial policy of the British government like Burke, Macaulay, Fawcett and others were sympathetic to the political aspirations of India and John Page Hopes in his book “Home Rule for India” clearly described the cry of Indians. They also in anxious that the ruling class had hardly followed or to keep

the word, what the Indians had demanded. So, it was the time only for Congress i.e. extremists to create *Swadeshi* for achieving the ultimate goal and they also got the full support from these intellectual also.

The difference opinions had come out clearly between the moderates and extremists taking the various aspects, such education self-government etc.

Previously the matter have already discussed in the chapter. The difference of opinion, which was roused in the minds of both of the parties. Foundation of National Council of Education, which was founded by the extremists, were sympathetically accepted by the moderates but not whole-heartedly supported and in the same time they opposed the idea of boycotting the schools and colleges under the Calcutta University. The moderates described the extremists as traitors to the country.

Differences of Opinions :

The differences of opinions were again found in the question of self-government and it was clear in Varanasi Congress of 1905 when Gokhale was clearly declared, "Self-Government within the empire as the goal of India."¹¹² He made highly appreciative references to the partition agitation as a landmark in the history of our national progress. He justified the boycott as a political weapon to be used only at the last extremity, and with strong popular feeling behind it Gokhale also said about the *Swadeshi*. He said, "The devotion to Motherland, which is enshrined in the highest *Swadeshi*, is an influence so profound and so passionate that its very thought thrills and its actual touch lifts one out of oneself India needs to-day above everything else that the gospel of this devotion should be preached to high and low, to prince and to peasant, to town and in hamlet, till the service of Motherland becomes with us as overmastering a passion as it is in Japan."¹¹³ Not only Surendranath Banerjee, other provinces of India protested strongly against the partition of Bengal.

But the extremists and moderates will also supported the boycott movement. The moderates will not willing to do it as because it was against their policy of prayer and petition. The moderates faced a great blow when the Bengal delegates oppose in the proposal of the moderates about the welcome to their Royal Highness the Prince of Princes of Wales during their forthcoming visit to India. The delegates opposed it on the ground that Bengalees could not receive the Prince with a smiling face. Not only that these delegates agreed to leave the pandel before the resolution moved. This case was beyond of imagination for the moderates. Thus, seeing this political situation, the moderates were willing to support the boycott indirectly and agreed to the following resolution :

“That this Congress records its earnest and emphasis protest against the repressive measures which have been adopted by the authorities in Bengal after the people there had been compelled to resort the boycott of foreign goods as a last protest, and perhaps the only Constitutional and effective means left to them of drawing the attention of the British public to the action of the government of India in persisting in their determination to partition of Bengal, in utter disregard of the universal prayers and protests of the people.”¹⁴

Influence of the Extremists :

After this incident, it was proved that the Nationalist party (extremists) had a great influence on the mass of India and also in the Congress. They left the policy of “mendicancy” or “petition” and boldly adapted the policy of Boycott. Not only that, they believed in “Passive Resistance” i.e., “Withdrawal of all kinds of cooperation from the British rulers in every sphere of administrative and public activity.” B.C. Pal and Tilak went on lecture tour to various places of India where they preached on the new theme of the party. They tried always to preach and make it understand to the people of India that by supplanting the Europeans by Indian agency will not make for self-government in this country. They also said that it was impossible for boycotting all the government offices. But it was possible to create a situation by the Indians, by making a

situation impossible to run it or by applying the policy of social boycott towards the British officials.

Thus, this extremist policy had a great influence upon the Indians, specially for the younger generations.

Mainly two factors i.e., the victory of Japan over Russia and also the victory of liberal party in England inspired both the moderates and the extremists to prove their personal superiority in the Congress which had given a birth of the differentiation of the two parties.

Taking the question of self-government and avoiding the policy of prayer and petition the extremists had already far in advance in popularity in comparison to the moderates. On the other sides, the moderates had great faith upon Morley who was the student of Burke, disciple of Mill and the friend and biographer of Gladstone.

The extremists gained their position due to the existing of Lala Lajpat Rai, Tilak and Pal, they also inspired by the articles of Aurobindo Ghosh (*Bandemataram*).

Difference between the two groups :

The difference of opinion started in different sessions of the Congress and the moderates tried to spread scandal by the extremists for minimize their prestige. For example, the moderates strongly asserted that the causes of troubles in the various places in Pandel by the extremists because among the extremist delegates, most of them were gymnastic teachers, workmen from factories, fitters and oilmen etc. Clearing two type of blaming about the visitors by the moderates, the extremists tried to solve this problem but the moderates were not willing to hear anything. Instead of it they circulated the inflammatory leaflet against Tilak. In the case of through shoe towards Surendranath Banerjee and Pheroz Shah Mehta by Tilak was not true. The C.I.D. Report proved it. According to the C.I.D. Report, the shoe that struck Surendranath Banerjee and Mehta were really violent throw at Tilak and not only that the circulation

of the inflammatory leaflets in Gujrat showed the evidence and to teach a lesson to the Maratha leader Tilak which were distributed widely in the city of Surat and even in the Congress Pandel itself.

Moreover, it was proved further from the statement of M.R. Jayakar that the shoe was violently throw at Tilak and it was supported by a number of people that the shoe was actually throw by a Poona follower of Gokhale. G.K. Khaparde in his diary clearly wrote "A Moderate, I think Ambalak threw a chair at Tilak. This enraged all our party. A shoe thrown by a moderate at Tilak struck Surendrababu on the back and Sir Pheroze Shah Mehta on the cheek."¹¹⁵

After all the facts, the extremists tried to solve all these political troubles and wanted to make a favourable situation forgetting past things. For this reason, Tilak, on 28th December made an attempt for compromise and gave a writing assurance that he and his party were prepared to leave their opposition to the election of Rash Bihari Ghosh as President on condition that the nationalist i.e. the extremists followed the policy of *Swaraj* and *Swadeshi*, Boycott and National education and the omission of the offensive words which were against the policy of the extremists.

But all of the attempts of Tilak were failed. The moderates does not willing to come any compromise with the extremists and come in the conclusion that they were not allow any extremists in any session, even in future they decided to have no connection with this extremist.

One of the most important and wonderful facts was that the resolution, which placed, by the extremists was considered by the moderates. This was a great achievement of the extremists that though there was a long gap or breach taking the various issues of questions, the extremists were bound to think about their resolution by the moderates. But what was the reason ? Some of them may think that the influence of Morley Minto i.e., the British had played an important role for it.

The British government was to some extent influenced by the moderates' policy. The British government responsible the extremists for their work and activities. They (the extremists) were mainly responsible and obstacles for developmental work of them (the British) and these factors were acknowledged by Morley to Minto by writing a letter on 2nd August 1906. The British was pleased by seeing the activities of Gokhale. They thought that, the problems, which were now facing by them, would remove and it should be cleared by Gokhale that the goal of attaining the states of self-governing colony as given by them and that was the reason why the moderates supported the British government. The extremists did not believe this fact and this was the basic difference between the extremists and the moderates.

But what was the political difference between the extremists and the moderates, the extremists, particularly Tilak, tried hard and fast to re-unite the Congress. But the moderates became furious and was regarded the extremists as a traitor of the country. The moderates' press expressed their views : "Tilak had been feeding the flames which have burnt the Congress to ashes. He is not a patriot, but a traitor to the country, and has blackened himself. May God save us from such patriots."¹¹⁶ Seeing and reading this, Tilak continued to make appeals for re-union and in his paper *Keshari*, he wrote : "It is a mistake to suppose that a difference of opinion as to ultimate ideals should prevent Indians from cooperating with one another for gaining common end ..."¹¹⁷ Tilak wanted to re-unite the Congress and worked unitedly to reach the common end. But Tilak failed to do it. Actually, the words of Tilak were not reach in the ears of the moderates. Because the moderates were not dreaming of the boon promised by Morley. So, they (Moderates) were not interested to listen anything about the words of Tilak or any extremists. Not only that the moderates were willing to pacify the Morley-Minto group by avoiding the extremists.

Contribution of Tilak : Failure to re-unite the Congress :

Thus, after all incidences, when Tilak was totally failed to make it understand the moderate groups, he organized the extremists in Bombay. By founding Taluk

Associations all over the district of Poona, he convened the First District Conference, where he at first passed the resolution of *Swadeshi* and Boycott, which was against the moderates. They also passed another resolution, appealing for the unity of the various parties.

Tilak was received a great honour at the Annual Provincial Conference of Bombay held at Dhulia and passed a resolution demanding full autonomous status for India and in this case the moderates were lagging behind the extremists in the field of popularity. The Extremist Press was furious against the extremists. But it was not influenced by Tilak. He was roaming here and there and at every meeting, at every function, that he attended he gave slogan : “*Swaraj is my birth right, I will have it.*”¹¹⁸

Thus, the partition of Congress in 1907 at Surat was not an uncommon factor in front of the Congressmen.

End of the Conflict : Their mutual relationship :

Taking the question of boycott and *Swadeshi* and the complete independence instead of self-government were the two major issues of the extremists, which differentiate them from the moderates. One thing was very interesting that both of them wanted to reach in the common end i.e., Freedom. But their way was different. Tilak was trying his best to re-unite Congress but he failed.

Arrival of Gokhale :

This was also for the time of the moderates, who were came in the field. Taking something submissive mind, accepting the proposal of boycotting, he, to some extent, became the prominent figure among the extremists and the moderates. For this reason, he (Gokhale) was also criticised by his friend circle but he still tried to do it, what his friend Tilak wanted to do. He never going to do anything what was against the British

government but his had no illusion on this government. His aim was, to get something from the government, then to follow this after independence.

But Morley criticised the role of Gokhale. According to Morley, when partition of Congress was going to inevitable and there was no question for it's save; the role of Gokhale was not so much remarkable. In a letter to Minto Morley said, "I have often thought during the twelve months that Gokhale, as a party manager, is a baby. A party manager or for that matter any politician aspiring to be leader, should never whine. Gokhale is always whining ... Now, if I were in Gokhale's shoe's – if he wears shoes, I forget, I should insist on quietly making terms with the bureaucracy on the basis of order please Reforms. If he would have the sense to see what is to be gained by this line, the "split" when it comes should do him no harm, because it would set him free to fix his aims on reasonable things, where he might get out of us. Sixty or seventy percent of what he might ask for ."¹¹⁹

In such a political scenario Modern Indian History recorded a name who, being a moderate, played or acted like the extremists. He supported the British rule, but also criticized and protests against it. The name was nothing but Gopal Krishna Gokhale; whose formative period social ideas and his political ideas were more interesting and beneficial for our country, to liberate from the hands of the British and to prove, how being a moderate, what was his role !

Notes and References

1. Congress Presidential Address, First Series, p. 25.
2. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by S. Ghosh, p. 10.
3. Dadabhai Naoroji's Speech in 1893 Congress Presidential Address, First Series, pp. 126-127.
4. Speeches and writings of Rash Bihari Ghosh, p. 20-21.
5. Congress Presidential Address, First Series, p. 739.
6. Ibid. pp. 738-739.
7. The Bengalee, 27 December 1906.
8. Political Ideas and Movements in India by Sankar Ghosh, p. 11.
9. India and Democracy by Guy and Schuster, p. 9.
10. Political Ideas and Movements in India by Sankar Ghosh. p. 11.
11. Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the East India Company, 1832, p. 49.
- 11(a) McCauley : Speeches with his Minute on Indian Education, Selected by G.M. Young, pp. 125-26.
12. Speeches and Documents on Indian Policy, ed. Prof. A. Berriadole Keith, Vol. II, P.C.C. xxii.
13. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 13.
14. Congress Presidential Address, First Series, p. 4, and The Tribune, 5 Jan, 1887.
15. Report of the Second National Congress, pp. 106-7.
16. Report of the Third Indian National Congress, p. 83.
17. Ibid. pp. 95-96.
18. National Self-Government (London), 1919) – Ramsay Muir, p. 34.

19. Report of the Sixth Indian National Congress, p. 18, quoted by Pandit Malaviya in the 1890 Congress. Malaviya said, "No one who was not mad or who had not become degenerated by contact with the worst phases of oriental thought would refuse to admit the soundness of the representative principle".
20. Report of the Sixth Indian National Congress, p. 18.
- 21(a) Democracy not suited to India – by Raja of Bhinga, p. 38.
21. Report of the Second Indian National Congress, p. 67.
22. Ibid., p. 66.
23. Speeches Delivered in India, by Lord Duffrin, pp. 238-239.
- 23(a) The Indian Mirror, 6th December 1888 and The Tribune, 8th December 1888.
24. The Bengalee, 15th December 1888, The Bengalee 8th December 1888.
25. Eminent Indians on Indian Politics, ed. by C.L. Parekh, p. 96.
26. Beck's letter "In What Will it End?" The Pioneer Mail, 16th May 1888.
- 26(a) Report of the Eleventh Indian National Congress, p. 23.
27. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 16.
28. Indian Political Traditions – H.H. Das, P.S.N. Patra, p. 104.
29. Ibid, p. 104.
30. Speeches and Writings of Hon. Surendranath Banerjee, pp. 227-31.
31. Report of the Twenty-Seven Indian National Congress – p. 39.
32. Indian Political Traditions – H.H. Das, P.S.N. Patra, p. 104.
- 32 (a) Ibid, p. 100.
33. Ibid, p. 102.
34. Political Ideas and Movements in India by S. Ghosh, p. 21.
35. Indian Politics Part II, p. 89.
36. Political Ideas and Movements in India by S. Ghosh, p. 21.
37. Speeches of the Honourable Mr. G.K. Gokhale, pp. 740-7.
38. A.O. Hume and A. Colvin, Audi Alteram Partem, London, 1988, p. 20.
39. Ibid. p. 22.
40. A Speech on the Indian National Congress, its Origin, Aims and Objects etc., Calcutta, 1988 by A.O. Hume, p. 3.

41. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, pp. 21-22.
42. Talang Selected Writings and Speeches, Vol. I, p. 284.
43. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 22.
44. Talang, Selected Writings and Speeches, Vol. I, pp. 288-89.
45. Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform, 1964 – Sir C.P. Ramaswami Aiyer said this to Charles H. Heimsath, author, p. 227.
46. The Doctrine of Passive Resistance, 1952 – Aurobindo Ghosh, p. 3.
47. The New Spirit in India – Henry Nevinson, pp. 257-258.
48. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 29.
49. Ibid, pp. 31-32.
50. The Spirit of Indian Nationalism, B.C. Pal, p. 46.
51. Nationality and Empire 1916, B.C. Pal, p. 34.
52. The Doctrine of Passive Resistance by Aurobindo Ghosh, pp. 69-70.
53. Aurobindo Ghosh, Speeches, Calcutta 1922, p. 173-74.
- 53 (a) Nationality and Empire, B.C. Pal, p. 28.
54. The Sinn Fein Policy, Arthur Griffith, p. 34.
55. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 34.
56. Speeches of B.C. Pal, p. 6.
57. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 35.
58. The New Spirit in India, Henry W. Nevinson, p. 222.
59. Tilak's Masterpiece: Being a Verbatim Report of His Address to the Jury, p. 51.
60. B.G. Tilak : His Writings and Speeches, p. 64.
61. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 38.
- 61(a) Lokmanya Tilak, 1956 – D.V. Tanmankar, p. 107.
- 61(b) Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 38.
62. Ibid., p. 39.
63. B.G. Tilak : His Writings and Speeches, p. 77.
64. Ibid., p. 65.
65. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 39.

66. Ibid., p. 39.
67. The Spirit of Indian Nationalism – B.C. Pal, p. 42.
B.G. Tilak : His Writings and Speeches, p. 65.
- 67(a) Speeches of B.C. Pal, p. 121.
- 67(b) *Swadeshi*, the Goal and the Ways – B.C. Pal, p. 23.
68. Ibid., p. 24.
69. The Political Future of India – Lala Lajpat Rai, p. 210.
70. Lajpat Rai, *Ideals of Non-cooperation*, Madras, 1924, p. 98.
- 70 (a) Sri Aurobindo's Political Thought – Haridas and Uma Mukherjee, pp. 67-68.
71. The Doctrine of Passive Resistance – Aurobindo Ghosh, p. 71.
72. Ibid., pp. 81-83.
73. Ibid., pp. 29-31.
74. Life and Times of C.R. Das, pp. 59-64.
75. The Doctrine of Passive Resistance – Aurobindo Ghosh, p. 38.
76. Ibid., p. 74.
- 76 (a) The Congress Presidential addresses, First Series, p. 772.
77. Samuba – Rabindranath Tagore, pp. 56-58.
78. Ibid., pp. 59-61.
79. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 45.
- 79 (a) Lectures from Colombo to Almora – Vivekananda, p. 8.
80. Lokmanya Tilak, London, 1956 – D.V. Tanmankar, pp. 77-78.
81. Aurobindo Ghosh – Speeches, pp. 7-9.
82. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 51.
83. The Ideal of the *Karmayogin* – Aurobindo Ghosh, p. 39.
84. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 51.
85. The Ideal of the *Karmayogin* – Aurobindo Ghosh, p. 7.
86. Political Ideas and Movements in India – by Sankar Ghosh, p. 55.
87. Ibid., p. 63.

88. History of the Freedom Movement – V-II by R.C. Majumdar, Firma K.L.M. Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1988, p. 175.
89. Ibid., p. 176.
90. Ibid., p. 176.
91. 'The Doctrine of Passive Resistance' by (Arya Publishing House, 1948) published in the form of booklet.
92. History of the Freedom Movement – V – II by R.C. Majumdar, Firma K.L.M. Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1988, p. 179.
93. Ibid., p. 179.
94. Ibid., p. 179.
95. Gokhale's Speeches : 1148 (Ibid – 179).
96. History of the Freedom Movement – V – II by R.C. Majumdar, Firma K.L.M. Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1988, p. 180.
97. Ibid., p. 180.
98. Ibid., p. 181 (Gokhale's Speeches – p. 1148).
99. History of the Freedom Movement – V – II by R.C. Majumdar, Firma K.L.M. Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1988, p. 181.
100. Ibid., p. 182.
101. Ibid., p. 182.
102. Ibid., p. 185.
103. Ibid., p. 185.
104. Ibid., p. 185.
105. Ibid., p. 186.
106. Ibid., p. 188.
107. Ibid., p. 178.
108. Ibid., p. 180.
109. 'An Open Letter to my Countrymen' Ibid., p. 180.
110. Ibid., p. 181.
111. Ibid., p. 182.

112. Ibid., p. 188.
113. Ibid., p. 188.
114. Ibid., p. 189.
115. Ibid., p. 202.
116. Ibid., p. 206.
117. Ibid., p. 207.
118. For Tilak's statement and activities – Ram Gopal, op.cit., pp. 279-83.
119. Indian Political Associations and Reforms of Legislature (1818-1917) – B.B. Majumdar, pp. 161-62.