# Mapping Nationalism: Gandhi and Tilak

**Prof. Prem Anand Mishra**

The paper explores the nationalist legacies of two prominent figures in the Indian independence movement, Mahatma Gandhi and Lokmanya Tilak, within the framework of contemporary perspectives.

This paper is set within the broader discursive colonial context in which Gandhi and Tilak formulated their nationalism, and it is divided into four sections. The first section examines Tilak's nationalism, his concept of Swaraj, and his views on the nation. Tilak's nationalism is analyzed through both a universalistic and contextual lens.

The second section examines Gandhi's views on nationalism, particularly about his programme of national regeneration, which is approached from both universalistic and particularistic perspectives, similar to those of Tilak. The third section examines the personal nature of the relationship between Gandhi and Tilak. The fourth section reflects on the enduring legacy of both Gandhi and Tilak regarding nationalism, offering lessons relevant to the present context.

## I

To begin with, it is important to emphasize three critical aspects central to understanding the differing visions of nationalism advocated by Gandhi and Tilak.

First, in academic discussions, there are two distinct ways to interpret Gandhi's and Tilak's approaches to nationalism. The first is a universal or absolute mode, where their views on nationalism are read straightforwardly and uncritically, often taking their writings at face value. This approach assumes that their ideas about nationalism are universally applicable without considering the historical or social

context in which these ideas were formulated. The second mode is a contextual or particularistic approach, which involves reading their views on nationalism within the historical, political, and ideological context of their time. This requires a close examination of the events, processes, and actions these leaders took with nationalism, acknowledging the complexities and dynamics of their era. This paper primarily focuses on the second, contextual approach, although it also touches upon the first, universalistic mode of interpretation.

Second, it is essential to recognize that when Gandhi and Tilak addressed the question of Indian nationalism, India was not yet a unified nation-state as we understand it today. During their time, India was in the process of becoming a nation. It was an idea — an idea shaped by conflicting visions of its past, present, and future — but not yet a concrete political reality. India was under colonial subjugation, and its identity as a nation was still emerging. Therefore, any post-colonial analysis of their ideas on nationalism must take this historical condition into account. Additionally, Indian nationalism during the period of Gandhi and Tilak was itself a process marked by competition and conflict, shaped by the complex political and social realities of the time. It was not a neat, definable concept but rather a dynamic, evolving phenomenon that emerged from the lived experiences of the people.

Third, when discussing Gandhi and Tilak's nationalism, we must also be mindful that their views were formulated in response to two significant colonial discourses about Indian nationalism that were prevalent in the early decades of the twentieth century. To better understand their positions, it is important to examine how the British colonial rulers viewed Indian nationalism. These colonial perspectives were deeply influential in shaping the debates and responses of Indian leaders, including Gandhi and Tilak, and must be considered when

analyzing their respective ideas on nationalism.

The first colonial discourse to which Gandhi and Tilak responded was articulated by G.K. Chesterton (1874-1936), who critiqued the prevailing Indian nationalism of the time as "imitative" and "not truly national." Chesterton argued that Indian nationalism lacked a distinct, indigenous character and was merely mimicry of Western ideas, which he considered foreign and unsuitable for Indian society. He specifically criticized the adoption of Western philosophies, such as that of Herbert Spencer, which, according to him, had no relevance to India's traditions or needs. In his writings, Chesterton questioned the validity of an Indian national spirit that borrowed so heavily from Western intellectuals. He expressed his concerns about the influence of ideas like Spencer's philosophy on Indian youth, warning against the "pollution" of Indian villages and homes through the introduction of foreign ideas. He famously wrote,

"They talk about Herbert Spencer's philosophy and other similar matters. What is the good of Indian national spirit if they cannot protect themselves from Herbert Spencer? ... One of their papers is called The Indian Sociologist. Do the Indian youths want to pollute their ancient villages and poison their kindly homes by introducing Spencer's philosophy into them? ... But Herbert Spencer is not Indian; his philosophy is not Indian philosophy; all this clatter about the science of education and other things is not Indian. I often wish it were not English either. But this is our first difficulty, that the Indian nationalist is not national."[1]

Gandhi, in particular, responded to this colonial critique by rejecting the idea that Indian nationalism should be a mere imitation of Western models. He quoted Chesterton's article, albeit with some approval, in his journal Indian Opinion as a means of underscoring the

colonial view that Indian nationalism lacked authenticity. However, Gandhi used this critique not as a basis for accepting Chesterton's judgment but as a point of reflection on how to develop a form of nationalism that was genuinely Indian, rooted in the country's cultural, spiritual, and social traditions.

Gandhi's response to Chesterton's critique was to emphasize the need for a nationalism that was distinct from Western models, one that drew from the indigenous values of India. This led him to develop the concept of nonviolent nationalism or inclusive nationalism, later described by commentators as composite nationalism. Gandhi argued that India's nationalism could not be defined by the adoption of Western ideologies or foreign philosophies but by a return to its own traditional values — values rooted in non-violence, self-reliance (*Swadeshi*), and spiritual renewal. For Gandhi, true Indian nationalism would involve an inclusive, non-violent movement for independence, one that could unite the diverse religious, cultural, and social communities of India under a shared vision of freedom and self-rule.

In this context, Gandhi sought to offer an "authentic" form of nationalism — one that was rooted in the Indian way of life, distinct from the Western intellectual and political frameworks that Chesterton critiqued. This nationalism was not merely a political ideology but a way of life, one that could bring about social and moral transformation, not only political independence.

Thus, Gandhi's response to the colonial discourse of figures like Chesterton was not simply to defend Indian nationalism but to redefine it in ways that reflected India's own history, culture, and values. Through this process, he sought to craft a form of nationalism that was both rooted in the Indian experience and capable of addressing the colonial critique that it was "imitative." Gandhi's vision of

nationalism, therefore, was not just a rejection of Western ideas but an attempt to forge a new, indigenous path for the Indian nation — a path that was both political and moral and that would ultimately serve as a model of nonviolent resistance and inclusive nation-building.

The second significant colonial discourse on Indian nationalism was articulated by Valentine Chirol (1852-1929), a British journalist and author who critically examined the state of Indian nationalism in his book Indian Unrest.[2] Chirol's analysis of Indian nationalism was notably dismissive, and he referred to it as "illusory nationalism." His critique was rooted in the perception that the nationalist movements of the time were not truly based on a unified, rational vision of national identity but rather driven by emotional, reactionary forces that lacked substance. In Indian Unrest, Chirol devoted considerable attention to what he saw as the increasing Hindu revivalism in India, which he believed was playing a major role in the nationalist agitation. In Chapter 3, titled Hindu Revival, Chirol observed that the revivalist spirit was deeply intertwined with the political climate of the time, particularly in the context of rising anti-colonial sentiment. He wrote, "...endless forms to this revival of Hinduism—as endless as Hinduism itself—but what it is perhaps most important for us to note is that, wherever political agitation assumes the most virulent character, there the Hindu revival also assumes the most extravagant shapes..."[3]

Chirol argued that the revival of Hinduism, particularly in its more extreme forms, was directly linked to the growing political unrest and nationalist agitation. He viewed this religious revivalism as a symptom of the broader social and political tensions in India, suggesting that it was becoming increasingly radicalized as a response to British colonialism. This Hindu revival, according to Chirol, was a

form of nationalism, but one that was inherently divisive and unproductive, fuelled more by religious fervour than by any coherent or rational political vision.

In his critique, Chirol also pointed to the specific figures and symbols that were central to the revivalist movement, including the veneration of Kali, the goddess of destruction, and the celebration of Shivaji, the Maratha king who had famously resisted Mughal rule. He noted, "The fashion of the day is for religious 'revivals', in which the worship of Kali, the sanguinary goddess of destruction, or the cult of Shivaji-Maharaj, the Maratha chieftain who humbled in his day the pride of the alien conquerors of Hindustan, plays an appropriately conspicuous part." [4]

For Chirol, these religious figures represented a dangerous form of nationalism, one that was rooted in an idealized, often violent, conception of India's past rather than in any forward-looking vision of progress. He saw the glorification of Hindu deities like Kali and heroes like Shivaji as a form of reactionary nationalism that was designed to stoke communal tensions and reinforce religious divisions.

Furthermore, Chirol critiqued the role of Brahmanism in Indian society, which he believed was playing a prominent role in this religious revival. He observed, "The part played by Brahmanism in Indian unrest is far more conspicuous in some parts of India than in others, and for reasons which are generally not far to seek. Wherever it has been most active, it connotes perhaps more than anything else the reactionary side of that unrest. Though there have been and still are many enlightened Brahmans who have cordially responded to the best influences of Western education, and have worked with admirable zeal and courage to bridge the gulf between Indian and European civilization, Brahmanism as a system represents the antipodes of all

that British rule must stand for in India, and Brahmanism has from times immemorial dominated Hindu society—dominated it, according to the Hindu Nationalists, for its salvation." [5]

Chirol's portrayal of Brahmanism was highly critical, as he saw it as a reactionary force that stood in opposition to British rule and Western values. He argued that Brahmanism, as a system of social and religious hierarchy, had long dominated Indian society and was now being used to fuel nationalist sentiments. While he acknowledged that some enlightened Brahmins had embraced Western education and worked toward bridging the divide between Indian and European civilizations, Chirol believed that, on the whole, Brahmanism represented an obstacle to India's progress and a dangerous force in the context of Indian nationalism. In this light, Chirol saw Tilak, a prominent leader of the nationalist movement, as symbolizing this Hindu revivalist spirit. Tilak's promotion of Hindu religious symbols and figures, such as the celebration of Shivaji and Ganesh Chaturthi, was viewed by Chirol as an attempt to use religious revivalism as a political tool in the struggle against British colonial rule. For Chirol, Tilak's nationalism was not based on rational political principles but on a form of cultural and religious revival that he considered divisive and retrogressive.

Thus, Chirol's critique of Indian nationalism framed it as an "illusory" nationalism, one that was based on exaggerated, idealized versions of India's past and was heavily influenced by religious and cultural revivalism. He argued that this form of nationalism lacked the practical foundation necessary to create a cohesive, modern nation-state and was instead a reactionary force that resisted the modernization and progress brought by British rule. In his view, Indian nationalism, as embodied by figures like Tilak, was a form of political agitation that

was more about asserting religious identity than about creating a united, rational, and progressive nation.

For Gandhi, however, the critique of "illusory" nationalism represented a challenge to define a nationalism that was both rooted in India's traditions and capable of uniting its diverse peoples in the struggle for independence. Gandhi's response to this discourse, as previously noted, was to offer an “inclusive nationalism” that could transcend religious divisions and unite people across different communities while also promoting nonviolence and self-reliance.

The paper contends that Tilak's nationalism emerged from the conflict between Hinduism (or Brahmanism) and British rule, while Gandhi's nationalism was shaped by the tension between Indian civilization and Western modernity. To illustrate these arguments, I will draw on two key works: Chirol's Indian Unrest and Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj*.

Let us begin with the case of Tilak. V. Chirol describes the rise of Tilak's nationalism in the following way. “It was a Hindu gentleman and a Brahman who told me that if I wanted to study the psychology of Indian unrest, I should begin by studying Tilak's career." Chirol goes on to outline the key elements of Tilak's nationalist movement, “His opposition in Poona to Ranade, his alliances with conservative orthodox groups, his appeals to popular superstition through the Ganpati celebrations, his advocacy for racial fanaticism in the 'Anti-Cow Killing Movement,' and his cultivation of Maratha sentiment through the cult of Shivaji. Additionally, Tilak's active outreach to schoolboys and students, his promotion of physical training through gymnastic societies, and his control over the press—along with the personal violence he infused into newspaper polemics—represent the progressive stages of a highly organized campaign. This campaign,

Chirol notes, became a model for nationalist movements throughout India.[6]

On the other hand, Gandhi's views on nationalism can be understood through his text *Hind Swaraj* (1909). In the preface to *Hind Swaraj*, Gandhi writes:

*"But I must frankly confess that I am not so much concerned about the stability of the Empire as I am about the stability of the ancient civilization of India, which, in my opinion, represents the best that the world has ever seen. The British Government in India constitutes a struggle between Modern Civilization, which is the Kingdom of Satan, and Ancient Civilization, which is the Kingdom of God. One is the God of War, and the other is the God of Love. My countrymen impute the evils of modern civilization to the English people and, therefore, believe that the English people are bad and not the civilization they represent. My countrymen, therefore, believe that they should adopt modern civilization and modern methods of violence to drive out the English".*[7]

In this passage, Gandhi contrasts modern Western civilization, which he associates with violence and war, with the ancient Indian civilization, which he views as embodying peace and love. Gandhi critiques the belief that the British people themselves are the source of India's troubles, instead pointing to the destructive nature of the civilization they bring.

Later, Gandhi remarked, "I felt that violence was no remedy for India's ills and that her civilization required the use of a different and higher weapon for self-protection."[8]

This statement reflects a central aspect of Gandhi's philosophy. He consistently asserted that India's civilization was not only distinct from but, in fact, superior to Western modernity. According to Gandhi, India's civilization required a higher form of self-defense—one that

was moral and spiritual. It is on this basis that he introduced the concept of *Satyagraha*—a non-violent method of resistance—as the key weapon for the Indian nationalist movement. Gandhi's vision of nationalism was thus rooted in the belief that India's cultural and moral values, far from being outdated, represented a higher standard of human life and could serve as a powerful tool for self-liberation.

## II

Bal Gangadhar Tilak (1856–1920) was one of the most significant and dominant political figures in early 20th-century India. He played a crucial role in awakening the consciousness of *Swaraj* (self-rule) among the Indian people, making it a central demand of the nationalist movement. Tilak is especially revered for his direct and radical approach to opposing British colonial rule.

In the context of the nationalism of his time, Tilak articulated an extremist vision of independence, in stark contrast to the moderate approach of leaders like Gopal Krishna Gokhale (1866–1915) and M.G. Ranade (1842–1901). While moderates sought gradual reforms within the British system, Tilak called for a more confrontational stance, emphasizing mass mobilization based on nationalist and, at times, communal identity.

To Tilak, *Swaraj* was not just about political autonomy but about establishing "people's rule" rather than a bureaucratic system controlled by the British. He defined *Swaraj* as "Home Rule" or self-government, viewing it as a fundamental right of the Indian people. He famously stated, “We demand *Swaraj*, as it is the foundation and not the height of our prosperity”.[9] This quotation underscores his belief that self-rule was the essential foundation for India's future growth and prosperity rather than a mere political concession from the British.

Although Bal Gangadhar Tilak was a great nationalist, it is

important to recognize that his views on nationalism were contextual and situational. On the surface, his primary goal was the political emancipation of India, or political *Swaraj*. Tilak was pragmatic and realistic in his political thought. He was not an idealist thinker like Plato, Hegel, Rousseau, or even Mahatma Gandhi. Tilak never envisioned an ideal state or society but instead focused on the practical goal of achieving self-rule for India.

Tilak was also a revivalist in the sense that he sought to reconnect with India's rich cultural and civilizational past. He did not advocate for a complete break from the past, as some reformers did. Instead, he believed that India could find strength and inspiration in its history and traditions. He critiqued the blind imitation of the West, which he saw as a misguided tendency among Indian moderates, and he worked to revive and celebrate Indian culture.

One of Tilak's most notable efforts in this regard was the organization of public celebrations of Hindu festivals, such as the Ganesh Puja and Shivaji Jayanti. It was under his leadership that the first Shivaji festival was celebrated at the Raigad Fort on 15th April 1896. Regarding the Shivaji festival, Tilak observed:

*"We should be ever grateful to those heroes who upheld the honour and dignity of our nation. Shivaji was our national hero who established Swarajya and liberated the people. The celebration of the Shivaji festival is an occasion for expressing our gratitude to him. If we cherish the memories of our national heroes, we can promote in ourselves a nationalist attitude. For promoting the sense of nationality, it is necessary to have national heroes whom people can worship as idols."*[10]

This quote highlights Tilak's belief in the importance of remembering and honoring national heroes like Shivaji to foster a sense

of unity and nationalism. Through such celebrations, he sought to instill a sense of pride and national identity among the Indian people, emphasizing the significance of cultural revival in the broader struggle for independence.

Tilak's concept of nationalism is closely linked to his views on *Swaraj*. He outlined four key aspects of *Swaraj*: (i) *Swaraj* meant that both the rulers and the ruled should be part of the same group or nation, (ii) It referred to the rule of law, with the State being governed by laws, (iii) The government must be elected by the people and held accountable to them, and (iv) *Swaraj* meant that the State should work towards the overall development of individuals.

Despite Tilak's significant influence on the popular Indian consciousness, famously stating "Swaraj is my birthright," academically, there are two different approaches to understanding his nationalism.

The first approach to Tilak's nationalism is often presented in an absolute and highly favorable manner, justifying his ideas by considering the context and circumstances in which he worked. This approach frequently refers to the debate between moderate and extremist factions, with Tilak's role being highlighted in the advancement of Indian nationalism.

However, there is another perspective that argues that Tilak's form of nationalism defended the most conservative and orthodox elements of Brahmanical society and, in doing so, hindered progressive social movements, especially those related to gender equality and the anti-caste movement. Now, let's explore the first approach, the "absolute" view of Tilak's nationalism. For Tilak, nationalism was fundamentally a secular concept. His idea of nationalism emerged from his analysis of the prevailing political and social conditions in India. As

Nevinson (1908) noted, "To Tilak, nationalism was mainly a political agent, a means of material improvement".[11] Tilak argued that nationalism would not have arisen in human history had no nation suffered foreign subjugation or faced existential threats.

Though Tilak was often categorized as an extremist leader, it's important to recognize that there were differing views on nationalism even among the extremists. Unlike some of his contemporaries, Tilak did not regard nationalism as a spiritual or metaphysical phenomenon. He did not offer a spiritual or philosophical explanation for nationalism, setting him apart from leaders like Aurobindo Ghose and other Bengal-based extremists. Furthermore, Tilak's approach to nationalism was not romanticized or emotional. He did not see the nation as an "Eternal Entity," nor did he engage in poetic or flowery language about national pride. For Tilak, the idea of national glory was inherently tied to the practical welfare of the people.

Tilak's views on nationalism lead us to consider his perspective on the concept of the nation itself. He saw the nation as 'one form of secular social organization' among many others. According to Tilak, various social organizations exist in a hierarchical structure, akin to concentric circles, with each circle representing a different level of influence and importance. These circles are nested, with the nation being one of the larger circles but still just one among many other forms of social groups.

For Tilak, nationalism represented a stage between these smaller, more localized social organizations and the ultimate goal of universal unity. Nationalism, in his view, was not an end in itself but a transitional phase that could help unite people within a broader, secular social framework while still acknowledging the existence of other social bonds and affiliations.

Tilak's views on nationalism were closely linked to his understanding of brotherhood and universal unity, concepts rooted in the idea of *Vishwa Bandhutva* (universal brotherhood). He argued that the desire to work for the welfare of one's nation, beyond the immediate concerns of family, indicates the broadening of one's mind. For Tilak, this national loyalty was a step toward a higher goal: the welfare of humanity as a whole. The ultimate aim of human life, in his view, was the realization of the Ultimate Truth, or Brahma.

In cases of conflict between duties to one's family, nation, and humanity, Tilak suggested that one should prioritize the higher ideals. Loyalty to humanity should take precedence over loyalty to smaller, more immediate groups like family or nation. He also emphasized the importance of giving ascending priorities to these loyalties—recognizing that personal and national responsibilities were stepping stones toward a broader sense of global human responsibility.

Tilak viewed nationalism as both a secular and evolving concept. He believed that the awareness of national identity often arises in response to political challenges, such as foreign subjugation. This sense of identity was not just about a group of people occupying a defined territory. For Tilak, a nation emerges when people share a sense of unity and common affinity, which could be religious, social, or political. He argued, "No people or community of people could be eligible to be called a nation unless they possess an element of some sort of religious, social, or political affinity, and unless they reflect some common binding characteristics which distinguish them from other communities."[12]

Moreover, Tilak advocated for recognizing and honoring the cultural distinctiveness of different groups within a nation. He did not favor imposing uniformity from above. Instead, he believed that

retaining separate cultural identities would serve to strengthen the nation as a whole. This is reflected in his support for a federal political system for culturally diverse countries like India, modeled after the political setups of Canada and the U.S.A., where regional identities were preserved while maintaining national unity.

The second approach to understanding Tilak's nationalism, often referred to as the 'contextual reading approach, presents a critical view of his ideology. This approach argues that Tilak's brand of nationalism actually defended the most conservative and orthodox elements of Brahmanical society, and in doing so, it hindered the progress of several social movements, particularly those focused on gender equality and anti-caste reforms.

A recent book titled *Foundation of Tilak's Nationalism: Discrimination, Education, and Hindutva* by Parimala V. Rao highlights this perspective. Rao contends that in the favour of nationalist sentiment, the complexities and consequences of Tilak's ideas on society are often overlooked. Her central argument is that Tilak's persona as a nationalist leader has been constructed through a "nationalist hysteria" without a deeper examination of his thoughts and actions. Rao argues that Tilak viewed social reforms as an unwarranted interference by the colonial state in religious matters. For Tilak, the primary focus should have been on political activism for independence, not on the reformers' critiques of India's own cultural traditions and values. In this sense, Tilak's political thought represented a deliberate opposition to social reforms, as he believed they distracted from the greater nationalist cause of opposing colonial rule. Rao's work portrays Tilak as an orthodox Brahmin leader, cloaking his conservatism in nationalist rhetoric.

To support this view, Rao provides historical context, showing

that Maharashtra, during Tilak's time, was a hub for radical social reform movements led by figures like Jyotiba Phule, Gopal Krishna Ranade, and Mahadev Govind Ranade. These reformers challenged various social injustices, including caste discrimination and gender inequality. However, Tilak consistently opposed these reform movements, arguing that they represented a harmful colonial intervention into India's religious and cultural affairs.

Rao further argues that Tilak's stance was often in favor of the conservative elements of society. For example, he defended the interests of moneylenders and opposed pro-peasant legislation and other measures designed to empower marginalized groups. This alignment with the status quo is presented as evidence that Tilak's nationalism, while influential in opposing colonialism, may have also perpetuated certain regressive elements in Indian society.

Rao's critical reading of Tilak's nationalism is based on a thorough historical analysis of his journal, Maratha. According to Rao, the pages of Maratha reveal Tilak as a staunch conservative, a defender of the *Varnashrama* system (the caste-based social order), and a proponent of Brahmanical supremacy. She argues that Tilak was a consistent opponent of the lower caste aspirations, which were championed by reformers like Mahatma Jyotiba Phule and his *Satyashodak Samaj*. Phule worked for the upliftment of the marginalized castes and their access to education, whereas Tilak resisted these efforts, aligning himself against reformist leaders such as Justice M.G. Ranade, G.K. Gokhale, B.M. Malabari, and Pandita Ramabai.

Rao further contends that Tilak supported the interests of conservative groups like *Khots* (local chiefs), *Inamdars* (landowners), and moneylenders, whom he referred to as the "gods of peasants." Tilak,

she argues, used this rhetoric to deflect blame for rural indebtedness onto the colonial government rather than addressing the social and economic hierarchies that perpetuated exploitation in rural India.

Tilak's stance on social reforms, particularly concerning women and the lower classes, also came under scrutiny. Rao points out that Tilak opposed initiatives aimed at empowering women and providing access to education. For example, in 1888, Tilak opposed coeducation and advocated for a separate curriculum for girls. Moreover, in 1891 and 1918, when the Age of Consent Bill (which sought to raise the legal age of marriage for girls) was debated, Tilak took a negative stance, resisting any efforts to improve the legal standing of women.

Rao also highlights that Tilak's brand of *Hindutva*, which centered on Brahminical values, aligned with certain political groups of the time, even though some of these groups sought to broaden their appeal beyond the Brahmin community. In her analysis, Rao raises several uncomfortable questions about Tilak's nationalism, particularly his resistance to social reforms and his close ties to conservative, Brahmanical ideals. Through her reading of Maratha, she challenges the dominant narrative of Tilak as a nationalist icon, suggesting that his vision of nationalism may have reinforced rather than dismantled existing social hierarchies.

As previously discussed, Chirol (1910) provides a detailed analysis of Tilak's role in the national question, which Rao highlights in her critique of Tilak's nationalism. Chirol notes:

*When Tilak entered upon public life in the early eighties, the Brahmans of the Deccan were divided into two camps, one of which, headed at first by the late Mr. Justice Ranade, consisted of a small intellectual élite, who held, without forgoing their right to criticize British*

*administrators or to promote political reforms by constitutional methods, that Indians of all creeds, including the Hindus, should begin by reforming their own social institutions, and bring them into greater harmony with Western standards. Tilak, a Chitpavan Brahman of considerable erudition, who had graduated with honours at Bombay, had, however, inherited his full share of Chitpavan hostility to British ascendency. He was also by temperament and ambition impatient of all restraint and jealous of the commanding authority which a man like Ranade owed quite as much to the nobility of his character as to his social position and force of intellect. In opposition to Ranade, with whom he had at first co-operated as an educationist, Tilak drifted rapidly into the reactionary camp. The battle was first engaged over the control of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha and the Education Society, two progressive associations which, though mainly composed of Brahmans, included a sprinkling of Mahomedans and of non-Brahman Hindus. Tilak had thrown himself into journalism, and after the repeal of the Indian Press Law on the return of a Liberal Administration to the office at home in 1881, he had been amongst the first to revive the incendiary methods that it had temporarily and very successfully checked. His first onslaught upon Ranade's position, however, failed, and instead of supplanting him, it was he who was compelled in 1890 to sever his connection with the Education Society.*[13]

Chirol's account emphasizes the growing ideological rift between Tilak and Ranade, highlighting Tilak's shift towards a more reactionary stance as he distanced himself from reform movements and leaned into a more assertive form of nationalism.

Tilak's role can also be understood from the introduction of the Age of Consent Bill in 1890, which was designed to mitigate the evils of Hindu child marriage. It gave Tilak a fresh opening. Ranade,

discouraged and alarmed by the violence of the Tilak party, had by this time retired from the forefront of the fray, but in Dr. Bhandarkar, Mr. Justice Tilang, Mr. A.K. Nulkar, Mr. (now Sir N.G.) Chandavarkar, and other courageous Hindu reformers, with whom Mr.Gokhale was always ready to co-operate against the forces of religious superstition, he had left disciples ready to carry on the good fight. Chirol observes,

*Tilak raised against them a storm of passion and prejudice. In the columns of the Kesari, of which he had become sole proprietor, he denounced every Hindu who supported the measure as a renegade and a traitor to the cause of Hinduism, and thus won the support of conservative orthodoxy, which had hitherto viewed with alarm some of his literary excursions into the field of Vedantic exegesis. With the help of the brothers Natu, who were the recognized leaders of Hindu orthodoxy, he carried his propaganda into the schools and colleges in the teeth of the Moderate party, and, proclaiming that unless they learnt to employ force the Hindus must expect to be impotent witnesses of the gradual downfall of all their ancient institutions, he proceeded to organize gymnastic societies in which physical training and the use of more or less primitive weapons were taught to develop the martial instincts of the rising generation.*[14]

It was on the occasion of the Shivaji "coronation festivities" that the right- nay, the duty- to murder for political purposes was first publicly expounded. On this occasion, Tilak was in the chair. He spoke on methods of his nationalism.

*Great men are above the common principles of morality. Such principles do not reach to the pedestal of a great man. Did Shivaji sin by killing Afzul Khan? The answer to this question can be found in the Mahabharata itself. The Divine Krishna teaching in the Gita tells us we may kill even our teachers and our kinsmen, and no blame attaches if*

*we are not actuated by selfish desires. Shivaji did nothing from a desire to fill his belly. It was in a praiseworthy object that he murdered Afzul Khan for the good of others. If thieves enter our house and we have not the strength to drive them out, should we not without hesitation shut them in and burn them alive? God has conferred on the mlencchas (foreigners) no grant of Hindustan inscribed on imperishable brass. Shivaji strove to drive them forth out of the land of his birth, but he was guiltless of the sin of covetousness. Do not circumscribe your vision like frogs in a well. Rise above the Penal Code into the rarefied atmosphere of the sacred Bhaghavad Gita and consider the action of great men.*[15]

## III

Let us first discuss the universalistic or absolute reading of Gandhi's nationalism. Gandhi's nationalism was "larger than the struggle for independence." He envisioned a tolerant and unified state that would embrace all communities within a "Mother India." On the surface, Gandhi's nationalism might seem straightforward: his desire for an independent Indian nation-state and freedom from British colonial rule. However, in reality, his nationalism was grounded in a complex and sophisticated moral philosophy. Gandhi's concept of *Swaraj* was central to his idea of the Indian state and nation. Unlike Tilak, whose *Swaraj* was primarily a political ideal, Gandhi's *Swaraj* encompassed more than just political autonomy—it was about enlightened self-control and self-development, which would lead to harmony and tolerance among all communities in the new India. His vision of nationalism aimed not only at the end of colonial rule but also at the moral regeneration of the nation.

Prof. Bhikhu Parekh provides an insightful analysis of Gandhi's view on British imperialism. He explains that for Gandhi, British imperialism dominated India at three interrelated levels. The first was

the 'political level', where the colonial government oppressed the Indian people and denied them the right to govern themselves. The second was the 'economic level', where British imperialism exploited and impoverished the Indian population, destroyed indigenous industries, and subordinated Indian interests to the needs of the British economy. Gandhi believed that this economic exploitation was even more disturbing than political oppression, as it could continue even after India gained independence. The third and most disturbing level for Gandhi was the 'cultural and moral' impact of British imperialism. He felt that British colonial rule had eroded the identity and integrity of Indian civilization, turning Indians into "Brown Englishmen." Gandhi feared that even after the British government ceased ruling India, the influence of British civilization would continue to dominate Indian society.

Thus, for Gandhi, British imperialism was unacceptable not only because of its political and economic consequences but also because of its moral and cultural impacts. Gandhi's struggle, therefore, was not just against British rule at the political or economic level; it was primarily a fight against the cultural and moral consequences of colonialism. As Prof. Parekh argues,

*For Gandhi, at the cultural level, the anti-imperialist struggle had to be fought on two fronts simultaneously. First, British civilization, which so infatuated and blinded the Indians to the moral enormity of foreign rule and legitimized their economic and political domination, must be subjected to a thorough-going critique. Second, the basic structure of Indian civilization, which they largely saw through the biased British perspective, must be sensitively teased out and defended.*[16]

Gandhi argued that political independence was essential not only as an expression of India's pride and as a means to end its economic

exploitation but also to preserve its civilization. For Gandhi, India's civilization was the cornerstone of its identity, and without it, political independence would be fragile. He believed that the economic exploitation of India by the British had to be stopped not just to sustain Indian independence and improve the people's living conditions but also to preserve the social and economic foundations of India's civilization.

In contrast to Tilak, Gandhi emphasized India's 'self-regeneration' as the most vital task. He argued that even if India gained political independence from the British, it would be fragile unless the internal condition of the country was transformed. Without regeneration, India would be beset by internal unrest, dissensions, and external aggression. Gandhi believed that India should not attain full independence until significant progress had been made in the task of national regeneration. Thus, Gandhi's nationalism was inherently linked to a 'Gandhian programme for national regeneration', which was highly complex and involved a range of interconnected strategies, such as the *swadeshi* spirit, *satyagraha*, and the Constructive Programme. The *Swadeshi* movement was central to Gandhian nationalism, and though it had existed before Gandhi's involvement in the freedom struggle, it was he who made it widely respected and followed. Gandhi not only popularized *Swadeshi* but also redefined it in the context of his broader vision of self-reliance and national pride. In addition to this broader framework of nationalism based on national regeneration, Gandhi directly addressed the issue of nationalism in his own words. In his writings, Gandhi stated, "I want the freedom of my country so that other countries may learn something from my free country, so that the resources of my country may be utilized for the benefit of mankind."[17]

This statement underscores Gandhi's vision of freedom—not

merely as a political objective but as a moral and spiritual mission, where India's freedom would serve as a beacon for the rest of the world and contribute to the betterment of all humankind.

Gandhi's vision of nationalism is clearly articulated in the quote:

*Just as the cult of patriotism teaches us today that the individual has to die for the family, the family has to die for the village, the village for the district, the district for the province, and the province for the country, even so, country has to be free so that it may die, if necessary, for the benefit of the world. My love, therefore, of nationalism or my idea of nationalism is that my country may become free, that if need be the whole of the country may die, so that the human race may live. There is no room for racial hatred there. Let that be our nationalism."*[18]

This passage highlights Gandhi's unique concept of nationalism. His idea was not rooted in blind patriotism or racial superiority but in the belief that India's freedom was essential not only for its well-being but for the welfare of humanity as a whole. Gandhi's nationalism did not prioritize the nation-state at the expense of others; rather, he saw India's struggle for independence as a part of a greater, universal mission for peace and justice. This selfless, universalistic nationalism called for a freedom that transcended national borders and sought the betterment of all people, reflecting his profound commitment to nonviolence, human dignity, and global harmony.

Gandhi's view on nationalism and internationalism is expressed in the following passage:

*"It is impossible for one to be an internationalist without being a nationalist. Internationalism is possible only when nationalism becomes a fact, i.e., when people belonging to different countries have organized themselves and can act as one man. It is not nationalism that is evil; it is the narrowness, selfishness, and exclusiveness that is the*

*bane of modern nations that is evil. Each wants to profit at the expense of and rise on the ruin of the other. Indian nationalism has struck a different path. It wants to organize itself or to find full self-expression for the benefit and service of humanity at large… God, having cast my lot among the people of India, I should be untrue to my Maker if I failed to serve them. If I do not know how to serve them, I shall never know how to serve humanity. And I cannot possibly go wrong so long as I do not harm other nations in the act of serving my country".*[19]

This passage highlights Gandhi's belief in the inter-connectedness of nationalism and internationalism, where true nationalism aims to serve humanity as a whole and does not cause harm to others. His vision of Indian nationalism was not one of exclusivity but of service, rooted in selflessness and respect for all nations.

The second approach, the contextual approach to Gandhi's nationalism, emphasizes the strategic and ideological significance of his ideas in the context of the political landscape of his time. As Prof. Bhikhu Parekh notes, Gandhi's nationalism was not merely a moral philosophy; it had a strategic and practical role in navigating the complex political dynamics of India under British colonial rule. Gandhi bypassed the dominant nationalist vocabulary that was emerging at the time, particularly the language used by the moderates and the extremists. Parekh observes, "He more or less completely bypassed the dominant nationalist vocabulary and showed that it was possible to articulate and defend the case for independence in a very different language. He showed that not every independence movement is national, not every national struggle is nationalist, and that not every nationalist movement need articulate itself in the language of European rather than homegrown theories of nationalism."[20]

This insight highlights that Gandhi's nationalism was distinct

from the more traditional European theories of nationalism, especially those that were being adopted by Indian political leaders. Gandhi's approach was grounded in India's cultural and spiritual traditions rather than in the European ideologies of nationhood and statecraft.

However, a more critical and nuanced interpretation of Gandhi's nationalism has emerged from post-structuralist and subaltern studies scholars. These scholars critique Gandhi's vision, arguing that his nationalism, while revolutionary in its methods, was also exclusionary and, in some cases, a reinforcement of dominant social structures, especially in terms of caste and gender. Gandhi's focus on moral regeneration and self-reliance, for instance, has been viewed as failing to fully address the social inequalities and struggles of the marginalized groups in India, particularly lower castes and women.

Thus, the contextual approach not only focuses on the historical and ideological uniqueness of Gandhi's nationalism but also critically examines its limitations, especially from the perspectives of those who were excluded or marginalized within his framework of thought.

The post-structuralist critique of Gandhi's nationalism highlights the tensions inherent in his thought, particularly in the way he constructed Indian civilization in opposition to Western civilization. Gandhi's views on civilization were deeply informed by the binary opposition between what he saw as the moral purity of ancient Indian civilization and the immorality of modern Western civilization. This opposition, as critics argue, led to a process of 'othering' and exclusion, where Western civilization was portrayed as inherently inferior and morally corrupt.

One of the key texts for understanding Gandhi's perspective is *Hind Swaraj*, where he outlines his critique of modern civilization and

his vision for India's future. Gandhi writes, “The tendency of Indian civilization is to elevate the moral being, that of Western civilization is to propagate immorality. The latter is godless; the former is based on a belief in God. So understanding and so believing, it behaves every lover of India to cling to the old Indian civilization even as a child clings to its mother's breast." Furthermore, Gandhi asserts," Ancient Indian civilization represents the best the world has ever seen," and "India has nothing to learn from anybody else."

In these statements, Gandhi places ancient Indian civilization on a pedestal, positioning it as morally and spiritually superior to the modern West. He advocates for India's return to this "pure" tradition, which he sees as the path to moral salvation. According to this worldview, anything outside of this ancient Indian framework, especially Western civilization, is inherently flawed and inferior. Gandhi's nationalism, therefore, is shaped by the rejection of modernity and the glorification of a pre-colonial, idealized vision of India. Post-structuralist critiques, particularly by scholars like Mishra,[21] argue that this conceptualization of civilization involves a kind of "conceptual violence." Mishra defines this as the process of "..the drawing of invidious comparison, the construction of hostile antagonism, the fostering of polarizing attitudes, the de-moralization of 'enemies', and the creation of exclusivist images."

In Gandhi's case, the "othering" of Western civilization leads to its moral devaluation, portraying it as "evil" and "satanic," while elevating ancient Indian civilization as the morally superior alternative. This binary construction creates a stark dichotomy between the "good" Indian civilization and the "bad" Western civilization, resulting in an exclusionary nationalist ideology. The West is portrayed as morally ignorant and in need of moral instruction, a dynamic that risks

reinforcing the very structures of cultural superiority that Gandhi opposed in colonialism.

The critique suggests that Gandhi's nationalism, despite its moral and philosophical aspirations, inadvertently constructs an exclusive identity for India, one that denies the complexity and diversity of both Indian and Western civilizations. It risks creating a rigid and polarized world view in which moral purity is reserved only for those who adhere to the idealized vision of ancient India, leaving little room for engagement with other cultures or the more modern and pluralistic ideas emerging from the West.

G. Aloysius offers a significant critique of Gandhi's nationalism, focusing on Gandhi's technique of political mobilization, which he terms the "Gandhi event." Aloysius argues that Gandhi's approach to mass mobilization was not aimed at bringing the masses into politics to shape their future but rather to divert them from their political agendas. According to Aloysius, Gandhi's mobilization strategy was not a genuine attempt to empower the masses; instead, it was designed to serve the interests of local elites. He writes, "Gandhian mobilization was an attempt not to bring the masses into politics but to divert them from their own autonomous or semi-autonomous political agenda."[22] He further argues that Gandhi's nationalism "never approached masses directly but through local elites",[23] suggesting that the political mobilization was more beneficial to the local elite than to the people at large. This process helped solidify the control of local elites, while the exploited masses remained largely under the control of the existing social order. Gandhi's movement, in this view, did not aim to solve the problems of the masses but to gain legitimacy for Congress politics. Thus, the mobilization reinforced traditional structures rather than challenging them.

Aloysius also highlights Gandhi's perception of the masses as "dumb millions" who were incapable of recognizing their own interests. Gandhi's view of the people was that they were incapable of deciding their future for themselves, which reflects his top-down approach to leadership. According to Aloysius, Gandhi's nationalism operated within a "superior framework of religion or ethics," which differentiated between people whose interests had already been divided and whose political agendas were in conflict. He argues, "Gandhi's political conduct or nationalism within the so-called superior framework of religion or ethics operated differentially on people whose interests had already bifurcated and who had contradictory political agendas."[24]

Aloysius critiques Gandhi's rhetoric of mass mobilization for national independence, suggesting that the movement, despite its professed goal of overthrowing British rule, was in practice "transforming itself into another Raj." In this view, Gandhi's movement was less about achieving true liberation for the masses and more about consolidating power in ways that ultimately reinforced existing power structures.

One of the most thought-provoking aspects of Aloysius's critique relates to Gandhi's vision of self-sufficient villages, political and economic decentralization, and cottage industries. While these ideas were presented as solutions to India's economic and political problems, Aloysius argues that they were not intended to bring about a radically new social order. Instead, Gandhi's economic and political decentralization was constrained by the traditional social structure of *Varnashrama Dharma*, the Hindu caste system. Aloysius contends, "What is not said is this economic administrative decentralization is to be situated and severely circumscribed within the traditional political

ideological order *Varnashrama Dharma*."[25]

In other words, Gandhi's calls for decentralization and self-sufficiency were not meant to challenge the deeply entrenched social hierarchies but were instead framed within a traditional ideological framework that perpetuated those very hierarchies. This critique suggests that Gandhi's vision for a decentralized, self-sufficient India was not as transformative as it appeared and failed to address the fundamental issues of social inequality and exploitation within Indian society.

While some of Aloysius's arguments can be contested—especially his portrayal of Gandhi's relationship with the masses and the exact nature of Gandhi's intentions—his critique remains valuable in raising important questions about the limitations of Gandhi's nationalism, particularly concerning social and economic reform.

## IV

Tilak's version of nationalism, as highlighted in the text, was indeed contextual and politically focused, centering on national independence and *Swaraj*. However, it lacked the spiritual foundation seen in the nationalism of figures like Aurobindo and Bipin Chandra Pal, whose nationalism was infused with a more profound, spiritual, or cultural ideal. Despite this, Tilak's nationalism could still be considered revivalist in spirit. This revivalism, however, held potential dangers, particularly in terms of how it could evolve into a more exclusive or narrow form of Hindu nationalism.

Gandhi, in his work *Hind Swaraj* (1909), distances himself from the Extremist faction, including Tilak, despite his respect for Tilak's nationalist work and personal qualities. Gandhi recognized the dangers of Tilak's approach, which was defined by the idea of *Swaraj* as

complete sovereignty achieved by any means necessary, including violence if needed. In contrast to the Moderates, the Extremists, represented by Tilak and others like Aurobindo Ghose, advocated for a more direct, sometimes militant, path to independence.

**As Parel (1997) notes,**

*The Extremists stood for swaraj, defined as complete sovereignty achieved through constitutional means if possible, but through other means if necessary. In contrast to the Moderates, no Extremist is mentioned by name in Hind Swaraj, an indication of Gandhi's distance from them. In other words, Tilak and Aurobindo Ghose, their distinguished leaders, are passed over in silence. Gandhi was aware of what they were writing in their newspapers, the Kesari, the Mahratta, and the Bande Mataram. Tilak's revival of the Ganapathi festival and the memory of Shivaji (1627–80), the hammer of the Mughals, did not help the cause of a composite Indian nationalism that Gandhi was trying to promote. Neither would Aurobindo Ghose's appeal to Shakti (power) in its creative but violent forms, mythologized by Durga, Bhavani, and Kali, have been more reassuring to the Mahatma."* [26]

Gandhi's critique of Tilak's nationalism stems from the fact that it seemed to prioritize Hindu identity in a way that excluded others and encouraged potentially divisive, violent methods. Gandhi's vision of nationalism was broader, promoting a composite Indian nationalism that embraced all communities and transcended religious or ethnic divides. This is where his difference from the Extremists becomes clear.

The type of Hindu nationalism that Tilak and Aurobindo espoused was potentially exclusionary and could easily evolve into a form of majoritarianism, which Gandhi feared would not be conducive to the unity and harmony he envisioned for India. Thus, while Tilak's

nationalism was crucial in the struggle for political *Swaraj*, Gandhi's critique reflects a deeper concern about the direction nationalism could take, particularly in terms of its potential to become divisive and to foster an exclusionary, and at times violent, form of identity politics.

Here's the revised text with the quotations included, 'This tension between Gandhi's and Tilak's approaches to nationalism is further evident even after the publication of *Hind Swaraj*. In a letter to Tilak written on 27 July 1915, Gandhi remarks, "The conversations between us were private and must remain so. I simply came as a friend and admirer and for friends." He continues, "I hope you will respect my wish not to be drawn into a newspaper controversy and that you will in no case publish the interview."[27] Gandhi's desire to maintain the privacy of their discussions shows the personal nature of their relationship despite their differing political stances.

Furthermore, in a letter to Tilak on 25 August 1918, Gandhi elaborated on the differences between his methods and those of both the Moderates and the Extremists, which includes Tilak. Gandhi writes about how Tilak perceives *Satyagraha*, his own method of nonviolent resistance, as "only a weapon of the weak."[28] In the same letter, Gandhi expresses his thoughts on the ongoing division between the Moderates and Extremists, stating, "That the Moderates and the Extremists should each abandon some minor positions and come together is a thing repugnant to me. There are two wings in the country. I do not believe that it will do any harm to make the positions of both clear to the Government and the people. I do not at all like the attempt to bring together the Extremists and the Moderates. It will do much good if both the parties boldly proclaim their respective positions before the Government and the people. May God help you in your undertaking."[29] Again, on 31 May 1919, Gandhi made his differences with Tilak clear

in a public meeting. The meeting was held to express appreciation for the services rendered by Mr. Tilak to India and to call upon his countrymen to contribute to the expenses incurred by him in his case against Sir Valentine Chirol. Gandhi spoke, "The goal of every thinking Indian must be the same, though the methods for its attainment may be different, and it is a matter known to all that my ways differ from Mr. Tilak's."[30] This statement made it clear that while their ultimate goal of Indian independence was shared, their approaches were fundamentally different. After Tilak's death, Gandhi paid a high tribute to him, focusing more on his personal qualities rather than his political project. This obituary appeared on the first page of Young India on 4 August 1920. Gandhi wrote,

*A giant among men has fallen. The voice of the lion is hushed... His patriotism was a passion with him. He knew no religion but love of his country. He was a born democrat. He believed in the rule of the majority with an intensity that fairly frightened me. But that gave him his hold. He had an iron will, which he used for his country. His life was an open book. His tastes were simple. His private life was spotlessly clean. He had dedicated his wonderful talents to his country. No man preached the gospel of swaraj with the consistency and the insistence of Lokamanya. His countrymen, therefore, implicitly believed in him. His courage never failed him. His optimism was irrepressible. He had hoped to see swaraj fully established during his lifetime. If he failed, it was not his fault. He certainly brought it nearer by many a year..."*[31]

Gandhi's praise of Tilak, despite their political differences, can be seen as part of his strategy to capture the national space. By acknowledging Tilak's contributions in such glowing terms, Gandhi sought to maintain unity in the broader nationalist movement, even as he distanced himself from Tilak's methods and political stance. This

approach allowed Gandhi to present himself as a unifying figure who respected the contributions of all national leaders while still advocating for his vision of nonviolent resistance and moral regeneration.

The legacy of Gandhi and Tilak on the issue of nationalism is multifaceted, and both figures offer valuable lessons for us today. First, it is important to recognize that there is no single, standard version of nationalism to be pursued. Nationalism can take many forms within a nation at a given time, and different nationalists may cherish and develop varying conceptions of the nation. These versions of nationalism can differ and even conflict, but they do not necessarily pose a problem for the nation. This insight is particularly relevant in today's context, where a particular brand of nationalism—an amalgamation of 'Hindutva' and 'neo-liberalism'—is being promoted as the one true version of nationalism. Gandhi's and Tilak's approaches remind us that nationalism can have multiple expressions and that these can coexist without fragmenting a nation.

The nationalism of Gandhi and Tilak also teaches us how two distinct forms of nationalism can share a common national space. Their correspondence highlights the importance of respecting differing views, a fundamental principle in any democratic system. In today's increasingly intolerant political climate, where political and ideological 'others' are marginalized, Gandhi's respect for Tilak and Tilak's acceptance of Gandhi offer a valuable moral lesson for contemporary politicians. This respect for ideological diversity is essential for the health of a democracy.

As Parimala Rao's analysis[32] in Section 1 suggests, nationalist hysteria can suppress important social issues within a nation. This insight is especially relevant today. As many celebrate national achievements like surgical strikes or demonetization in the name of

nationalism and patriotism, critical questions regarding the rights of citizens and the functioning of democratic systems are often sidelined. While revivalism, as seen in Tilak's nationalism, may offer short-term political gains, it is not a sustainable principle for long-term governance. Revivalism can lead to exclusion and division within society, as it often elevates one identity over others.

In contrast, Gandhi's nationalism was inclusive. It was not limited to political emancipation; rather, it encompassed the regeneration of India in such a way that it remained consistent with the ideals of humanity as a whole. Gandhi's vision sought to lift India while simultaneously fostering a sense of responsibility to the world. His approach to nationalism was rooted in nonviolence, truth, and moral regeneration, offering a path to independence that embraced the welfare of all people, both within India and beyond.

The legacy of both Tilak and Gandhi on nationalism shows the dangers and possibilities that lie ahead for India. Tilak's emphasis on cultural nationalism points to the importance of a strong cultural identity. At the same time, Gandhi's focus on national culture highlights the importance of an inclusive, humanistic approach to nation-building. Together, their contributions help us understand the balance between cultural pride and global solidarity, showing that nationalism, when rooted in inclusive values, can serve both the nation and humanity at large.

## *References*


1. The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi (CWMG Electronic book), Vol.- 9, Publications Division, Government of India, New Delhi, pp. 425-427
2. Chirol, V.I., *Indian Unrest,* Macmillan, London, 1910.

3. Ibid, p. 22
4. Ibid, p. 21
5. Ibid, p. 24
6. Ibid, p. 28
7. Parel, Anthony, *Hind Swaraj And Other Writings*. New Delhi: Foundation Books, 1997. p. 7
8. The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi (CWMG Electronic book), Vol.-9, Publications Division, Government of India. New Delhi, pp. 508-510
9. Vishnoo Bhagwan, *Indian Political Thinkers*, Atma Ram & Sons, Delhi, 2002. pp. 148
10. Tiak. B.G. *Tilak, Speeches & Writings,* The Cambridge Press, Madras, 1919, pp. 216
11. Nevinson, Henry W.*New Spirit of India*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1908, pp. 226
12. Tilak. B.G.*Samagra Lokmanya Tilak*, Vol-5, Kesari Prakashan, Poona, 1974. pp. 693
13. Chirol, V.I., *Indian Unrest,* Macmillan, London, 1910. pp. 27
14. Ibid, pp. 28
15. Ibid, pp. 30
16. Parekh, Bhikhu, *Gandhi's political philosophy: A Critical Examination*, Macmillan, Basingstoke, 1989. pp. 5
17. Rao, U.R. and R.K Prabhu**,** *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi,* Navjivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 2002.
18. Ibid.
19. Gandhi, Mohandas, *Young India*, 18-6-1925, pp. 211
20. Parekh, Bhikhu.*Gandhi's political philosophy: A Critical Examination*, Macmillan, Basingstoke, 1989. pp. 3
21. Mishra, Prem A., *Hind Swaraj: A deconstructive Reading*,

Abhijeet, New Delhi, 2012.

22. Aloysius, G., *Nationalism without Nation in India,* Oxford University Press, Calcutta, 1997, pp. 220
23. Ibid, pp. 221
24. Ibid, pp. 198
25. Ibid, pp. 225
26. Parel, Anthony, *Hind Swaraj And Other Writings*, Foundation Books, New Delhi, 1997, pp. xxx-xxxi
27. The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi (CWMG Electronic book), Vol.-13, Publications Division, Government of India, New Delhi, 1964, pp. 121
28. The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi (CWMG Electronic book), Vol.-15, Publications Division, Government of India, New Delhi, 1965, pp. 31
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid. pp. 336
31. The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi (CWMG Electronic book), Vol.-17, Publications Division, Government of India, New Delhi, 1965, pp. 110
32. Rao, Parimala V., *Foundation of Tilak's nationalism: Discrimination, Education, and Hindutva,* Orient Blackswan, New Delhi, 2010.

**Professor of History**
Department of Gandhian Studies
Gujarat Vidyapith, Ahmedabad, Gujarat