

CHAPTER - II

AUROBINDO GHOSH'S IDEAS ON POLITICAL RESISTANCE  
AND HIS METHODS OF ACHIEVING POLITICAL FREEDOM

CHAPTER II

AUROBINDO GHOSH'S IDEAS ON POLITICAL RESISTANCE  
AND HIS METHODS OF ACHIEVING POLITICAL FREEDOM.

Shri Aurobindo Ghosh was a great nationalist. He was actively involved in the Indian national struggle for freedom from the British Imperialism. In the beginning of the 20th century he worked with Lokmanya Tilak and Lala Lajapat Rai. He gave full fledged support to the revolutionary thought of Lokmanya Tilak and Lala Lajapat Rai. His role was very crucial in the politics of the congress.

Shri Aurobindo Ghosh was not only a revolutionary national political leader but he was also a great philosopher. He was one of the Indian popular leaders involved in the Indian national movements. He was a skilfull and an eloquent public speaker. He was highly respected for his most sucessful work as a journalist. His patriotic feelings for the nation were not aggressive. Shri Aurobindo Ghosh was the great world visionary and mystic, he is one of the most profound person who predicted a spiritual humanity that the twentieth century produced.

Shri Aurobindo Ghosh believed that it is absolutely unrealistic to expect the British administration in India to be good. He was of the opinion that it is not good for the Indian people. Thus comes the idea of political resistance.

Shri Aurobindo Ghosh joined the congress in 1902-1903. He had reduced the congress policy of prayers, petitions and persuasion.

He made it crystal clear that congress could not be a society for development of good relationship with the British administration. He supported the boycott of British goods, schools and everything related to the British administration.

Shri Aurobindo Ghosh was a prominent leader who put forward his theory of political resistance. To understand Aurobindo's ideas about political resistance it is very essential to understand his views on nationalism. Aurobindo has explained his views on nationalism in his early political writings. "Aurobindo's political theory was dominated by three ideological factors [a] in India religion and politics were not different, they were one and the same, [b] India did not want to become carbon copy of west; in fact, she had a message to give to the world and [c] the political movement that was launched for India's liberation should be mass movement." (1)

In modern India the theory of political resistance was discussed elaborately only by Aurobindo. Aurobindo put forward nationalism as the religion in modern times. He put forward that to make India young again, she needed physical, moral material and spiritual power. His theory of nationalism was grounded on 'Vedanta philosophy'. The vedanta philosophy was based on the unity of man and God. He made it clear to the people of the country that national work was the work of the God. He believed that nationalism is a religious activity.

Aurobindo had faith that there is some divine purpose behind India's Independence. He wrote "We believe that divine power is behind the movement that zeitgeist the time spirit is at work to bring

about a mighty movement, which is that of resurgent Asia and resurgence of India is central part of the larger movement."(2)

According to Aurobindo nationalism being the work of God should be done in the spirit of karm yoga this is so because a perfect nationalist was perfect type of karma-yogin. The karma-yogin was who did his work in the spirit of dis-interestedness. Aurobindo got inspiration from Gita. The Gita taught us action and wanted people to follow yoga. Yoga meant evenness and freedom from fights, war i.e. dvandva. Because of yoga we get composure and calmness of mind. When we analyse Aurobindo's ideas we come to conclusion that he was involved in spiritual activities in the pursuit of nationalism. According to him the nearer step of Yoga is 'Sadhana'. He stated that Sadhana of India consists of Tapsya, Jhyan and Shakti. He further says that Tapsya is more than discipline, secondly Jhyan is more than philosophy and thirdly Shakti is more than strength.

Aurobindo's nationalism was different and higher in form. He wanted to create awareness about India's spiritual past. He wanted to lift nationalism to a lofty height, as is evident from the following extract of his speech given at Bombay on 19th January, 1908. He said, "Nationalism is not a mere political programme. Nationalism is a religion that has come from God, nationalism is a creed which you shall have to live. If you are going to be a nationalist, if you are going to assent to the religion of nationalism, you must do it in the religious spirit. You must remember that you are the instruments of God.... Nationalism is not going to be crushed. Nationalism survives in the strength of God and it is not possible to crush it,

Whatever weapons are brought against it. Nationalism is immortal...."(3)

He thus provided religious basis to Indian Nationalism. He further clarifies his views in his book 'The Ideal of the Karmayogi' as given "We say to the individual and specially to the young who are now arising to do India's work, the God's work "You cannot cherish these ideals, still less than you fulfil them, if you subject your minds to European ideals or look at life from material stand-point. Materially you are nothing, spiritually you are everything, dare everything, it is only the Indians who can believe everything, dare everything, sacrifice everything. Firstly therefore become Indians. Recover the patrimony of your fore-fathers. Recover the Aryan thoughts, the Aryan discipline, the Aryan character, the Aryan life. Recover the Vedanta, the Gita, the Yoga. Recover them not only in intellect or sentiment but in your lives. Live them and you will be great and strong, mighty, invincible, and fearless. Neither life nor death will have any terrors for you. Difficulty and impossibility will vanish from your vocabularies. For it is in the spirit that strength is eternal and you must win back the kingdom of yourselves, the inner swaraj, before you can win back your outer empire. There the Mother dwells and she waits for worship that she may give strength. Believe in Her, serve Her, lose your wills in Her's, your egoism in the greater ego of the country, your separate selfishness in the service of humanity. Recover the source of all strength in yourself and all else will be added to you, social soundness, intellectual pre-eminence, political freedom, the mastery of human thought, the hegemony of the world." This shows the

depth and study of Aurobindo in this subject.

Aurobindo claimed that nationalism was religion in modern times because power of the entire population of the country was symbolised in the nation. Thus he comes to the conclusion that national work is work of God, and the work of God means the work of the people of the world, this is so because God is always present in them. He pointed out that it is not only a political sprinkling but an instrument to save the spirit of India from lasting obscuritism and humiliation. As stated previously his theory of nationalism was based on Vedanta Philosophy which advocated the unity of man and God. Man could attain the fact by doing God's work and nationalism is nothing but God's work.

An important contribution of Aurobindo to political thought is his theory of Nationalism. According to him nationalism is not more or less an intellectual concept or a political programme, but it is a religion that has come to us from God. Nationalism serves in the strongness of God and hence it cannot be defeated. According to Aurobindo nationalism is not more or less pursuit of collective political self-interest, but it is a religion for the realization of the cosmic being through the nation.

Shri Aurobindo's main aim as a political philosopher appears to lay down the fundamental principles of the individual community life. He thought that nationalism was a necessary stage towards realization of human unity. He was also conscious of the fact that narrow nationalism and suprimism endanger human unity and peace.

Aurobindo Ghosh entered Indian politics by launching a powerful attack on the policies of the Indian congress. According to him the congress did not do much for the people even though they were capable to do so. He after joining congress rejected old congress policy and adopted for newer and stronger methods. He criticised the politicians of moderate views for taking country backwards and for failing in organizing the party on democratic lines.

No ill feelings were present in Aurobindo towards British rule because he knew that they were holding this great and precious country in subjection for their self-interest. He made it clear that the moral, material and intellectual energies of the country were destroyed by British rule. So the ultimate choice was between freedom and national decomposition and death.

British government didnot allow any individual to develop, thus British rule in India caused irreparable damage to the country. they didnot allow any one to develop into a separate organizm. It disorganised Indians into crowd with no centre of strength or means of resistance. Indian industries and trade was destroyed and agriculture desolated. British government in India was the worst type of government, by bureaucracy, centralization, despotism and motivated by domination. He made crystal clear that the spirit of India could only be liberated by complete independence from slavery. He further clarified that his movement was not against bad government but it was a protest the contribution of foreign government. He thought good government was not the substitute for self government and freedom, which was inalienable right of all human beings. The bad effects

of British rule could only be removed by over throwing it. So he criticised the men who had moderate views for minimising the growing aspirations of masses.

While explaining freedom Aurobindo has put forward a detail analysis of various factors involved in it. The freedom for the individual consists in seeking its own self-development in the same way as the formal law and purpose of a society, community or nation is to seek its own self-fulfillment. The free development of the community, society or the nation is possible only when there would be the development of the individual mankind. Aurobindo repeatedly pointed out that the ideal law of social development is one in which variety is the law, and it increases as society grows. Aurobindo Ghosh minutely worked out that all things have their own law of development and these are all interdependent in terms of the law of variation.

In nature according to Aurobindo freedom and rights are two basic forms which connect an individual to other individuals and help him to realise himself through the instrumentality of society in a process of what the ancients called 'Loksangraha'. That is the holding together of the race in its cyclic development.

Aurobindo's theory of freedom some times create great difficulties because it becomes a play of logical abstractions, while at the logical level he combines freedom with larger social aggregates.

Coming to Aurobindo's nationalism we found that he joined the new school of politics that was led by Tilak, Pal and Lala Lajpat Rai.



At that time Tilak, Bankim and Dayanand were the three pillars of Indian nationalism.

Thus we realize that the ideas of Aurobindo of nationalism play the role of basis which support his main structure of passive resistance. Aurobindo clarifies that before understanding the basic principles of political resistance we must understand that the means employed to achieve larger interests should be equally good. Thus he advised people to gather inner strength, courage and fight against imperialism. Passive resistance can only be used by the people who are ready to face great hardships and sufferings.

Aurobindo developed his theory of passive resistance in a series of articles he published in 'Bande Mataram'. He made it clear that there were three methods of political resistance :-

- i] The method of petitions and prayers.
- ii] The method of armed revolt and
- iii] The method of self-development.

The nationalist preferred the third method because self-development was not possible without swadeshi and boycott movements which strengthened the cause of self-help. Political resistance was to secure independence for India because the drain of India's wealth could only be stopped by popular democratic government and also political freedom was essential to carry out social reforms.

"The program of self development in the form of swadeshi, boycott, national education and the establishment of arbitration courts could not on its own secure political freedom for the country."(4) Aurobindo added that other methods such as armed rebellion were not unjust because violence used against the most oppressive government was approved by the general conscience of humanity. In all eventuality, he held that civil strike got transformed into war and acquired the same moral overtones.

Aurobindo wrote that where the oppression was legal and subtle in its method and respects life, liberty and property and there was still breathing time, the circumstances demand that we should make the experiments of a method of resolute but peaceful resistance, which while less bold and aggressive than other methods calls for perhaps as much heroism of a kind and certainly more universal endurance and suffering. In other methods a daring minority purchase with their blood the freedom of the millions, but for passive resistance it was necessary that all should share in the struggle and privation.

Further he held that passive resistance was the best method because firstly it would train Indians in heroic action and their moral war be boosted, secondly Indian would get an ideal opportunity for self-development which was necessary for self-development. Thirdly, it would greatly exert pressure on the British government to keep the promises it had made to the Indian people. Passive resistance was other side of self-development.

Aurobindo was of the opinion that this form of political

resistance was not practical in India because of conditions of its application did not apply to India.

Aurobindo discussed its methods and pointed out that the essential difference between passive or defensive and active or aggressive resistance was that while the method of aggressive resistance was to do something by which he could bring about passive harm to the government. The method of the passive resistance was to abstain from doing something by which he would be helping the government. The object in both the cases was similar - to force the hands of the government, only line of attack was different.

Passive resistance was other side of self development. The method of passive resistance was as legal as that of prayers, petitions and protest but it was not an essential condition of practice because occasionally the passive resistance had to break the unjust and oppressive laws which required high degree of truthfulness and courage.

Sri Aurobindo Ghose did not favour revolutionary terrorism and always advocated open political movement because he thought that through open political movements only political development of the country could be achieved.

The policy of self development would be definitely opposed by the bureaucrats and in that eventuality boycott should be the answer of the people. If the opposition to the programmes of self-development continued or more oppressive, people should opt to passive or defensive resistance to the government. It could very well

be converted into organised or active resistance.

The new movement was not primarily a protest against bad government, it was a protest against the continuance of British control, whether that control was used well or ill, justly or unjustly, was a minor and unessential consideration. It was not born of a disappointed expectation of admission to British citizenship, it was born of a conviction that time had come when India could, should and would become a great, free and united nation. It was not a negative current of destruction, but a positive constructive impulse towards the making of modern India. It was not a cry of revolt and despair, but a gospel of national faith and hope. Its true description was not Extremism but Democratic Nationalism.

At that time there were not two but three parties.  
(1) The Loyalists (2) the moderates and (3) the Nationalist.

The Loyalists would be satisfied with good government by British rulers and a limited share in the administration.

The Moderates desired self-government within the British Empire but were willing to wait for it indefinitely.

The nationalists would be satisfied with nothing less than independence whether within the Empire, if that be possible or outside it, they believed that the nation could not and ought not to wait, but must bestir itself immediately, if it was not to perish as a nation.

The policy of self-development which the New party forced the front, was itself a novel departure under those circumstances. There were three possible policies petitioning, an unprecedented way of attempt in a nation's liberty, which cannot possibly succeed except under conditions which have not yet existed among human beings, self development & self help and the old orthodox historical method of organised resistance to the existing form of Government. National development was not possible without rajasakti, organised political strength, commanding and whenever necessary compelling general allegiance and obedience.

"A caste may develop, a particular community may develop, by its own efforts supported by a strong social organisation but a nation could not."(5)

Industrially, socially, educationally there could be no genuine progress carrying the whole nation forward, unless there was a central force representing either the best thought and energy of the country or else, the majority of its citizens and able to enforce the views and decisions of the nation on all its constituent members.

"Political freedom was the life breath of a nation to attempt social reform, industrial expansion, the moral improvement of the race without aiming first and foremost at political freedom

was the very height of ignorance and fatality"(6)

It is idle to talk of self-development unless we first involve a suitable central authority or Government which was all would or must accept. We must developed a central authority, which should be a popular Government in fact though not in name. We had to establish a popular authority which would exist side by side and in rivalry with a despotic foreign bureaucracy no ordinary rough-riding despotism, but quite, pervasive and subtle one that had fastened its grip on every detail of our national life and would not easily be persuaded to let go, even in the least degree, its octopus like - hold."(7)

A moderate critic characterised it at that time as an unheroic programme but to us it seems so heroic that we frankly accept its novelty and audacity and uncertainty of success. In India it required an iron endurance, tenacity, doggedness, far above anything was needed for the more usual military revolt or sanguinary revolution. The requisite for the success of the policy of self-development against the pressure of foreign rule was that the bureaucracy would so far respect its former traditions and profession as not to interfere finally with any course of action of the popular authority which did not itself try violently to subvert the connection at the British Empire with India.

The attempt of self-development by self-help was absolutely necessary for national salvation, whether it was carried peacefully to the end or not. To recover the habit of independent motion and independent action it was the first necessity.

Organised resistance to an existing form of government can be undertaken either for the vindication of national liberty or in order to substitute one form of government for another, or to remove particular objectionable features in the existing system without any entire or radical alteration of the whole or simply for the redress of particular grievances.

There was only one remedy to cure from bad and oppressive financial system that to give the control over taxation to the people whose money pays for the needs of Government. And also there was only possible method of stopping the drain of money was to establish a popular Government which might be relied on to foster and protect Indian commerce & Indian Industry conducted by Indian capital and employing Indian labour. It was the object which the new politics, the politics of the twentieth century, placed before the people of India in their resistance to the system of Government which prevailed. It was the substitute for the autocratic bureaucracy, which misgoverned us, of a free constitutional and for the entire removal of foreign control in order to make way for perfect national liberty.

Organised resistance in subject nations which meant to live and not to die, could have no less an object than an entire and radical change of the system of government, only by becoming responsible to the people where from the authority has been drawn. The Government be turned into protector instead of an oppressor. The politicians in the nineteenth century could not realise that the slow, painful and ultra-cautious development, necessary in medieval and semimedieval conditions when no experience of a stable popular government had been gained, need not be repeated in the days of the steamship, railway and telegraph, when stable democratic systems were part of the world's secured and permanent heritage.

Passive resistance was the only effective means, except actual armed revolt by which the organised strength of the nation, gathering to a powerful central authority and guided by the principle of self-development and self-help can wrest the control of our national life from the grip of an alien bureaucracy, and therefore developing into a free popular government, naturally replacing the bureaucracy it extrudes until the process culminates in a self governed India, liberated from foreign control.

Organised national resistance to existing conditions, whether directed against the system of Government as such or against some particular feature of it, had three courses open to it. First it might attempt to make administration under existing conditions impossible by an organised passive resistance. Secondly it might attempt to



make administration under existing conditions impossible by an organised aggressive resistance in the shape of an untiring and implacable campaign of assassination and a confused warfare of riots, strikes, agrarian rising all over the country. Thirdly to an oppressed nation was that of armed revolt, which instead of bringing existing conditions to an end by making their continuance impossible sweeps them bodily out of existence. At that time circumstances in India seem to point to passive resistance as most natural & suitable weapon.

"Liberty is the life breath of the nation, and when the life is attacked, when it is sought to suppress all chances of breathing by violent pressure any and every means of self-preservation becomes right and justifiable."(8)

Sri Aurobindo says in one of his speeches that a radical opportunist like Mr. Morley refused us self-government was not that he did not believe in India's fitness for self-government but that he did believe in India's fitness for self-government, but that he did not believe in India's determination to be free, on the contrary the whole experience of the past shows that we had not been in earnest in our demand for self-government.

Defensive resistance is the sole alternative to the ordeal of sanguinary violence on both the sides. The advocates of self-development and defensive resistance were no extremists but were trying to give the country its last chance of escaping the necessity

of extremism.

The essential difference between passive or defensive and active or aggressive resistance was this that while the method of the aggressive resistance was to do something by which he could bring about positive harm to the government, the method of passive resistance is to abstain from doing something by which he would be helping the government.

The object in both the cases was the same to force the hands of the government; the line of attack was different. The passive method was especially suitable to countries where the government depended mainly for the continuance of its administration on the voluntary help and acquiescence of the subject people.

It was clear that self development and such a scheme of passive resistance were supplementary and necessary to each other.

If the people refused to supply their own needs from foreign sources, they must obviously supply them themselves. They could not have the industrial boycott without swadeshi and expansion of indigenous industries. If they declined to enter the alien courts of justice, they must have arbitration courts of their own to settle their disputes and differences. If they did not send their boys to school owned or controlled by the government they must have schools of their own in which they might receive a thorough and national education. If they do not go for protection to the executive, they

must had a system of self protection and mutual protection of their own.

Just as swadeshi was the natural accompaniment of an industrial boycott, so also arbitration stands in the same relation to a judicial boycott, national education to an educational boycott, a league of mutual defence to an executive boycott.

The refusal to pay taxes was a natural and logical result of the attitude of passive resistance. A boycott of Government schools, for example, might be successful and national schools be substituted but the administration continued to extract from the people a certain amount of revenue for the purpose of education.

No man could be legally punished for using only swadeshi articles or persuading others to follow the example or for sending the boys to a National preference to a government school, or for settling his differences with others out of court or for defending the person and property of his own or helping to defend the person and property of neighbours against criminal attacks. If the administration interferes with the people in the exercise of the legitimate rights, it invites defiance of its authority and for what might follow the rulers and not the people are responsible.

But the refusal to pay taxes was a breach of legal obligation and a direct defiance of administrative authority precisely of that kind which the administration could least afford to neglect and must

either conciliate or crush.

The moderate method of resistance was verble only prayer, petition and protest, the method which Aurobindo proposed was practical. That was boycott. He pointed out his new method though more concrete was in itself quite as legal and peaceful as the old. It was offence by law to abstain from government schools or government courts of justice or the help and protection of the fatherly executive or the use of British goods, nor was it illigal to persuade other to join in their abstention.

Passive resistance aimed at making a law unworkable by general and organised disobedience and so procuring it racall. It did not try like aggressive resistance to destroy the law by destroying the power which made and supported the law. It was therefore the first cannon of passive resistance that to break an unjust coercive law was not only justisiable but, under given circumstances a duty.

Legislation however was not only weapon in the hands of the bureacracy, but they may try, without legislation, by executive action, to bring opposition under the terms of the law and to lash of its penalties.

They had plenty of experience of both those contrivances during the course of the swadeeshi movement. To persuade an intending purchaser not to buy British cloth was no offence.

Mr. Subramaniya Aiyar had advised the people in Madras that to boycott the foreign goods and boycott those who use foreign goods.

Without this boycott of persons the boycott of things could not be effective. Without the social boycott to national authority depending purely on moral pressure could get its decrees effectively executed and without the effective boycott enforced by a strong national authority the new policy could not succeed. The only possible alternatives to the new policies were either despotism tempered by petitions or aggressive resistance.

There was a limit however to passive resistance. So long as the action of the executive was peaceful and within the rules of the fight, the passive resistance scrupulously maintains the attitude of passivity, but was not bound to do so a moment beyond.

Passive resistance could not build up a strong and great nation unless it was masculine, bold and ardent in its spirit and ready at any moment and at the slightest notice to supplement itself with active resistance.

The new politics must recognise the fact that beyond a certain point passive resistance put a strain on human endurance which our nation cannot endure. They recognised no political object of worship except the divinity in our Motherland no present object of political endeavour except liberty and no method or action as

politically good or evil except as it truly hinders our progress towards national emancipation.

In those days the Anglo-Indian papers were repeatedly referring to the Jamalpur Railway workshop as a swadeshi enterprise. The use of the word through a good deal of light on the meaning of that swadeshi which our benevolent government so professes. The Jamalpur workshop did nothing for India beyond employing a number of coolies who were ill paid and therefore underfed and staff of Bengali clerks. It added nothing appreciable to Indian wealth, on the contrary, it diminished it. All that we can say instead of taking 100% of the profits out of India, it took 90%. This was precisely the meaning of Government Swadeshi to provide a field for English capital, English skilled work in India and employed Indian labour not out of desire for India's good. It provided for the training of educated Indians so that such work as was done in Jamalpur might be executed by Indian brains and with Indian capital, as well as Indian hands. But we did not ask the Government to give us such training. It would be foolish to expect a foreign government to injure the trade of its own nation in India. They must provide for their own training themselves.

The times of India like other Anglo-Indian journals of its class loses no opportunity for discrediting the Nationalist movement in Bengal. In the issue to hand it has an appreciative leader on the New Iron Industry initiated by the late Mr.J.N.Tata & now placed

on a sound business footing as a Joint stock concern with handsome capital subscribed by the people of India. The times had been constrained to admit that India's capital was no longer shy and the spirit of enterprise was much in evidence. The Times would not be itself if it omitted to mention that the government had been doing its best to help the new industry thus giving a proof of its substantial sympathy with the true swadeshi. But the sling was in, the tail while praising the public spirit and enterprise of Bombay, it concludes with the customary sling at Bengal where agitators were absorbed in mouthing sedition in the Beadon Square.

Aurobindo pointed out that Swadeshi, national education and boycott were the means to achieve swaraj. The swaraj for Ghosh meant absolute autonomy from foreign control because every nation had a right to live its own life, by its own energies according to its own nature and ideals. Pointing out its implications he wrote, "We find a bureaucratic administration, we wish to make it democratic, we find an alien government, we wish to make it indigenous, we find a foreign control, we wish to render it Indian."

Boycott and swadeshi were not good for their own sake, but they were good for the sake of Swaraj. Swadeshi did not mean using of indigenous clothes but it was a means to attain swaraj. Swadeshi would harm foreign industries and help the Indian industries but Aurobindo hastened to add that the commercial aspects of swadeshi should not be over emphasised. Otherwise, many of our young men would go abroad, take education, start industries and

enrich themselves. But this would be a pernicious error because the main purpose of boycott was political. And it should not be misused by money minded people.

Aurobindo Ghosh further wrote, "Swadeshi meant an actualising of the national consciousness and the national will and readiness to sacrifice which would fix them in daily mind and daily life of the people." (10)

Boycott was the next principle of political agitation and its interpretation differed because by boycott the moderates meant boycott of English goods in Bengal to protest against injustice done to Bengal. For the extremists it meant boycott of the British goods all over India. Aurobindo was of the opinion that boycott was the other name of passive resistance. He held that boycott was an indispensable weapon in the hands of the people and it was chief instrument in the Parnell movement in Ireland. Boycott and swadeshi were the leading slogans of the sinn fienn movement. It was necessary for practical enforcement of national separateness, liberty and self dependence. It was an act of self-defence and aggression for self-preservation.

The Boycott movement was essentially aimed at boycotting the goods manufactured in England that would weaken British industry. The extremists widened the meaning of the term and pleaded for boycotting the goods all over India. Aurobindo further developed the concept by saying that it was in fact passive resistance of the



British rule Boycott was the beginning of such a movement.

The opponents of the new spirit have discovered that boycott was an illusion. An entire and sweeping boycott they said it was a moral and physical impossibility and their infallible economic authority. In the first days of the movement Tilak published a series of vigorous and thoughtful articles in the Kesari on Boycott as a political Yoga. He advocated the entire exclusion of British goods, the preference of swadeshi goods at a sacrifice when they were attainable, and when unattainable, the preference of any foreign goods not produced in the British Empire.

When the boycott was declared in Bengal, it was declared specially against cloth, sugar and salt, and slightly against other articles. It was therefore the imports of English-piece goods, Liverpool salt and though only to a slight extent, of foreign sugar into Bengal which have suffered. When this specific boycott had been proved effective, it might be extended to other articles. Thus the boycott might be graduated not only in its incidence on particular articles, but in its extent and range. The graduation of a specific boycott might be partly artificial and partly automatic. It is artificial when leaders of the people preach in economic Jihad against particular foreign goods and the people accept their decision. But this artificial boycott can only succeed when there was already an incipient industry in the corresponding swadeshi article or some existing means of supply however partial, which may be stimulated

The goal of national education was to impart education to Indians that was suited to the temperament and needs of the people. Aurobindo Ghosh did not like foreign control over education and wanted national education to start with past making full use of present to build a great nation. It should be on national lines and under national control. He cautioned the promoters of national education that they should jealously guard their independence in order to make self respecting and self reliant students out of it. National education was necessary to train people in the new national spirit to be the architects of liberty.

Thus taking of the consequence of political resistance, to Aurobindo it was to secure independence for India because the drain of India's wealth could only be stopped by popular democratic government and vindication of Indian Liberty Aurobindo pointed out that the difference between Active and Passive resistance is that ... "the method of the aggressive resistance is to do something by which he can bring about positive harm to the government, the method of passive resistance is to abstain from doing something by which he could be helping the government. The object in both the cases is the same, - to force hands of the Government, the line of attack is different."(11) According to Aurobindo, this method is suitable to countries where the Government depends mainly on voluntary help and acquiescence of its subject people for the continuance of its administration. This requires organised attempt, and organised refusal of assistance to the British in every form - which help the British

commerce in the exploitation of the country or the British officialdom in the administration of it, such organised resistance in the subject natures which meant to live and not to die can have no less object than the entire and radical change in the system of the government.(12) Hence according to Sri Aurobindo, Passive Resistance was the best method as it would train Indians, lead to self development and pressurise Government to live up to the promises made to Indians. To him, "its principle at present is not - no taxation no representation', but it was 'no control no assistance"(13) To do this the passive resistance should aim at 1) protecting himself from the government attack and repelling the attack 2) To press in upon and extrude the foreign agency in each field of activity and so ultimately suppliment it and 3) creation of a strong central authority to carry out the will of a nation, by a close and active organisation of villages, towns, districts and provinces. To Aurobindo for the success of Passive resistance, strong resolve and readiness of people to offer resistance to the government, a unified national political party, self development programme of Swadeshi national education and boycott, were the essentials, It may be concluded that Sri Aurobindo talked of passive resistance more in terms of boycott movement which he wished to be persued through peaceful means. But this does not mean that he totally abandoned the option of armed rebellion. But Passive Resistance was the final method of salvation or it may be only the preparation for the final 'Sadhana'(14)

REFERENCES

1. Chousalkar, A.S. 'Indian Idea of Political Resistance Aurobindo, Tilak, Gandhi and Ambedkar', Ajanta Publication, 1990, P.24.
2. Sri Aurobindo 'Bande Matram' Early Political writings -I British century Library; Vol.I, P.391.
3. Ibid : pp.652-653.
4. Chousalkar, A.S. op.cit. P.32.
5. Ibid, P.33.
6. Sri Aurobindo 'Bande Mataram' - p.85.
7. Ibid, P.85.
8. Ibid, P.98.
9. Sri Aurobindo, Karma Yogin - Early Political writings - II, British Centenary Library, Vol.II, P.126.
10. Sri Aurobindo, Bankim, Tilak and Dayanand Arya Publishing House, Calcutta, 1947, P.49.
11. Sri Aurobindo 'Bande Matram' P.101.
12. Ibid, P.92.
13. Ibid, P.106.
14. Appadorai, A. Documents on Political Thought in Modern India Vol.I, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1973, P.434.