

Approaches of Lokmanya Tilak and Shahu Chhatrapati of Kolhapur.

Dr. V. S. Kadam,
M.A., Ph.D.,
Reader in Maratha History
Department of History
Shivaji University
K_o_l_h_a_p_u_r.

Mr. Edwin Montague's declaration on August 20, 1917 forms an important landmark in the freedom movement of India, as it laid down 'the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to progressive realization of responsible government in India' as the policy of the British Government. It was with Montford reforms, moreover, that communal representation in Maharashtra was extended to the untouchables and 'the Marathas, etc.' The paper, therefore, deals with the development of the concept of self-government and constitution in India before and during the emergence of Shahu Chhatrapati's leadership. It is divided into :

- 1) Self-government and British Statesmen,
- 2) Growth of Indian Nationalism and Constitutional Development.
- 3) Tilak's concept of Swarajya,
- 4) Shahu's concept of Home Rule.
- 5) Communal Representation to the Untouchables, and Shahu Chhatrapati,
- 6) Communal Representation to 'Marathas etc.'

I)

SELF-GOVERNMENT AND BRITISH STATESMEN

A paper which tries to understand the role of Shahu Chhatrapati of Kolhapur (1874-1922) in the freedom movement of India must necessarily take into account not only the national scene with different facets but also the meaning of self-government as elaborated by Englishmen and Indians.

The British, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, succeeded in acquiring the British Raj in India. Though the British acquired the Raj, it must be said to the credit of some British statesmen that even in the hour of military victories and territorial acquisitions, they contemplated the cessation of their control on India. Governor-General Lord Hastings wrote in 1818: "A time, not very remote, will arrive when England will, on sound principles of policy, wish to relinquish the domination which she has gradually^a and unintentionally assumed over this country and from which she cannot at present recede."¹

Sir Thomas Munro, Governor of Madras, emphasized that the aim of the British government would be to make the people capable of governing themselves. He wrote in 1824 : "It ought undoubtedly to be our aim to raise the minds of the natives, and to take care that whenever our connection with India might cease it did not appear that the only fruit of our domination there had been to leave the people more abject and less able to

govern themselves than when we found them."² He recommended a liberal policy towards Indians so as to elevate their character.³

T. B. (later Lord) Macaulay speaking in the House of Commons on 10 July 1833 made a prophetic speech about the proudest day in English history. "It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that, having become instructed in European knowledge, they may, in some future age, demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I do not know. But never will I attempt to avert or retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history. To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to have made them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens, would indeed be a title to glory to all our men."⁴

Sir Henry Lawrence, who had served in India for thirty-four years wrote in 1844 : "We cannot expect to hold India forever. Let us conduct ourselves *such* as when the connection ceases, it may do so not with convulsions but with mutual esteem and affection, and that England may then have in India a noble ally, enlightened and brought into the scale of nations under guidance and fostering care."⁵

Though the Indian Mutiny hardened the British policy there were far-sighted English statesmen who continued the liberal policy. Sir Herbert Edwardes, after long service in India, in his speech at Manchester in 1860, said, "It may take years; it may

take a century, to fit India for self-government, but it is a thing worth doing and a thing that may be done. It is a distinct and intelligible Indian policy for England to pursue - a way for both countries out of the embarrassment of their trusted destinies."⁶

The British statesmen admittedly, like the Indian leaders, were not monolith. There were liberal, ^afor-sighted statesmen like Hastings and Edwardes and Macaulay and conservative, domineering politicians like Curzon, Minto and Chelmsford. Yet, there were British statesmen who even before the emergence of Indian nationalism had not only spoken about self-government but had also tried to elaborate its concept. They were more specific in speaking about raising the character and minds of the Indians through education, the acceptance of European institutions by the Indians and the self-government. In this respect they appear to be ^afor more sympathetic in the amelioration of the position of Indian masses than some high-class educated Indians whose definition of the Swarajya was parochial and communal.

Englishmen by introducing western means of communication including English language and by their work in Indology helped indirectly in the development of Indian nationalism. They also worked directly in the 'safety-valve' Indian National Congress which soon became the representative institution of Indian Nationalism.

Shahu Chhatrapati was historically right when he spoke at Khamgaon on 27 December 1917 that the idea of Home Rule was a British legacy and unlike Manu, the British were not opposed to the development of Indians.⁷

II) GROWTH OF INDIAN NATIONALISM AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

The Indian Councils' Acts of 1861 and 1892 and the ^{Monley - Minto} Reforms of 1909 are the major constitutional landmarks preceding Montague's Declaration (August 20, 1917) which officially established the responsible self-government as the goal of India.

The Indian Councils Act 1861 provided for legislative councils at the centre and the presidencies like Bombay and Madras. These provincial councils were to be extended by an addition of four to eight additional members all of whom were to be nominated. Out of these nominated members one half were to be non-officials who could be English or Indian. The only work of these councils was legislation; it had no right of passing motions of any significance.

Lord Dufferin intended to introduce the principle of direct and indirect election for the central Council in the Act of 1892, but it was not acceptable to the Parliament. In its place the Act of 1892 provided for nominations of members to the council. The official circles vehemently refuted the idea of representative government to India mainly on the ground of lack of homogeneity of the Indian society.

The Councils, by the Act of 1892, were in the nature of darbars and, therefore, could not meet the expectations of developing Indian nationalism, which took extremist and terrorist turn.

While the Liberals came to power in England in 1905 Dadabhai Naroji, in 1906, declared self-government as the solution of Indian ills. The Liberals who tried to tackle the Indian problem wanted to check extremist nationalism in India by providing additional scope to the moderates.

The aim of the Morely - Minto Reforms (1909) was to bring about significant change in the nature of provincial and central Councils. This was to be done by introducing the principle of election in both the Councils and the principle of non-official (nominated and elected) majority in the Provincial Councils. These Councils were given the right of discussion and passing off resolutions of public interest.

Though the aim was lofty, the actual implementation created more problems than it solved. The group system of election - the local government bodies, universities, Chamber of Commerce and landowners - was expanded. The minority communities, like the Muhammadans, were given separate electorates. The Muhammadans were not only given weightage but the Muhammadan voters only were to vote for seats reserved for the Muslims.

This provision, once accepted, was bound to appeal to other communities and castes. The acceptance of non-official majorities was in due course bound to lead to the acceptance of elected majorities. Similarly the inclusion of an Indian in both the Provincial and Viceroy's Executive Councils would lead to the Indianisation of the executive.

The reforms of 1909 were found inadequate even by the Moderates led by Gokhale. The extremists were ostensibly unhappy; there was terrorism in Bengal. The moderates in the Congress, therefore, started thinking about the next stage of constitutional development.

"It seems to me, brother delegates", said Sir S.P. Sinha in his Presidential Address (Bombay; 1915), "that the only satisfactory form of self-government to which India aspires cannot be anything short of what President Lincoln so plithly described as 'government of the people, for the people, and by the people'⁸ This was to be self-government within the British Empire, which was presented as the national goal by the All India Congress.

The beginning of the twentieth century and especially the war years, saw the rapid development of Indian nationalism. The nationalism, however, confronted the ignorance of the masses, the caste system and the communal division.

The next year the antagonism among Hindus and Muslims was bridged by the Lucknow Pact (1916) by conceding^{to} the demand

of separate electorate to the Muhammadans. It also fixed method of election to the Councils and the distribution of the seats.

The Allies facing grave difficulties in the war, uttered words like "national self-determination" and that they were fighting the war "to make the world safe for democracy".

Lloyd George's National Government under these circumstances made the declaration. The declaration was made by Mr. Montague the Secretary of State, on August 20, 1917.

"The policy of His Majesty's Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire."⁹

What was significant in this announcement was the mention of self-governing institutions and responsible government both of which were British in Origin.

When the British government, thus, declared the formation of responsible self-government in India, there could be no opposition to it in principle by any Indian. But there could be opposition to the self-government for the manner in

which it would function and the principles on which it would be based.

The concept of self-government in India was put forward as a movement for the Swarajya by Lokmanya Tilak. It would be therefore necessary to understand Tilak's concept of Swarajya, which in turn, reflects upon the nature of Shahu's opposition to it.

III) TILAK'S CONCEPT OF SWARAJYA :

N. C. Kelkar, writing after the death of Lokmanya Tilak, labelled Shahu in the editorial of Kesari (17 May, 1921) as the traitor of the Swarajya.¹⁰ The reaction to this criticism was sharply divided on social lines. While the Brahmin newspapers like Lokmanya and Loksangraha followed Kesari in criticizing Shahu, non-Brahmin newspapers like Jagruti, Vijayi Maratha and the Indian Social Reformer defended the stand taken by Shahu.¹¹ Recently, the incognito editor of the Samagra Lokmanya Tilak, a collection of speeches, articles etc. of Tilak, has continued the criticism of N. C. Kelkar. It has been pointed out in this collection that Shahu, though a reformer in social matters, was opposed to the Swarajya. Shahu, it is moreover stated, supported the British government and was opposed to Indian nationalism.¹²

As the Kesari has, thus, declared Shahu as the traitor of Tilak's Swarajya, it has become necessary to study what Tilak advocated as the Swarajya and why Shahu challenged it.

A demand for Home Rule, originally made by Ireland, was put in circulation by a couple of Bengali newspapers in 1880. Bal Gangadhar Tilak, despite the opposition of his followers, entered the All India Congress and established the Home Rule League. Tilak, however, used the title of Swarajya instead of Home Rule. In elaborating his concept of the Swarajya he delivered a number of speeches in Maharashtra and outside.

In his speech at Ahmednagar on 31 May 1916 Tilak gave the meaning of the Swarajya. Swarajya, according to Tilak, meant keeping the British Emperor and the power of the English in India intact, while the administration would come in the hands of the people.¹³

In his speech at Akola on 11 January 1917 Tilak said that the Swarajya did not mean driving the English out of India; neither did he mean that he was opposed to the British Emperor of India.¹⁴

In his speech at Bhusaval on 23 February 1918, Tilak said that only the servants (the bureaucracy) should be changed and this would not be treachery to the British Empire. He reiterated, "we want the British Empire." Tilak, thus, while defining the Swarajya was not opposed to the rule of the British and was careful in emphasizing that he was not a traitor to the British rule.¹⁵

This was perhaps the manner in which Tilak was asking for autonomy within the British Empire. Yet, he too ostensibly

professed loyalty to the British Empire and did not ask for complete independence.

These speeches given by Bal Gangadhar Tilak in elaborating the concept of the Swarajya, thus, were not anti-British in character. Tilak, however, was not alone in this. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, in April 1915 said, "It gives me the greatest pleasure to redeclare my loyalty to the British Empire."¹⁶

If the politicians asking for the self-government could declare their loyalty to the British Empire, the professed loyalty of Shahu Chhatrapati, a ruler of a tiny kingdom in Bombay Presidency, can be understood in its proper context.

Tilak wanted a change in the bureaucracy of India from Englishmen to Indians. The change, in practice, would be from Englishmen to Brahmins. The Brahmins for thousands of years had monopolised education and had scrupulously followed the policy of keeping non-Brahmins away from education. The Brahmins under such circumstances would dominate Indian administration under Tilak's Swarajya. Shahu on the other hand in order to enlist non-Brahmins in the administration started schools, colleges and boardings and made reservations for backward classes in the administration of Kolhapur State.

The concept of Swarajya, in the view of Lokmanya Tilak, was not something new ^{or} ~~of~~ western. In his speech in April 1916, Tilak described the Hindu and Muhammadan Kingdoms

prior to the rule of the British as the Swarajyas.¹⁷ These Kingdoms were very often despotic and only sometimes benevolent.

He repeatedly pointed out that the concept of Swarajya was as old as the Vedas and that it had religious connotation.¹⁸

The Swarajya as a religious concept was indicated by him in his speech at Nagpur on 6 January 1917 and further elaborated three days later at Yeotmal.

In his speech at Yeotmal on 9 January 1917 he further explained the Swarajya-tatva i.e., the principles of the Swarajya. He suggested that though the idea of election would be new, the administration of the village was run by certain families traditionally. He further said "Our law is Manusmriti" and pointed out that the Law (i.e. the Manusmriti) orders the king to administer with help of learned persons and Brahmins.¹⁹

The Manusmriti, on the one hand, offered extensive privileges to the Brahmins and on the other gave divine support to the perpetual slavery of the Untouchables. Manusmriti which was to be the law of ^{the} Swarajya according to Tilak, offered exemption from taxation,²⁰ and corporal punishment to the Brahmins²¹ and laid down that the Brahmins should be judges²² and the king's Councillors.²³

Tilak in his speech emphasized upon the continuation of village administration by traditional families and the rule

of Brahmins as the councillors of the rulers. Such ideas could not go hand in hand with a self-government in the real sense of the term.

Tilak, as a great Sanskrit scholar, could not have been ignorant of the disabilities which Manu imposed on the Shudras, a term used by Manu to denote the Scheduled castes of modern India. Manu says, "But a man of the servile class whether bought or unbought he (Brahmin) may compel to perform servile duty; because such a man was created by Self-existent for the purpose of serving Brahmins." And again, "A Sudra though emancipated by his master is not released from a state of servitude".

A State is known by the law it follows and practises rather than by its name. If Shahu Chhatrapati opposed Tilak's Swarajya with Manusmriti as its law, we in modern India, irrespective of caste and creed, must be grateful to the Chhatrapati. In this context the traitor to the Swarajya is certainly no criticism of Shahu. As a matter of fact from the angle of non-Brahmins it becomes a honorific title for Shahu.

IV) SHAHU'S CONCEPT OF HOME RULE :

It was the view of Shahu that "no sweeping political changes be made until Indians have proved by experience that they are thoroughly fitted to manage their own affairs." This opinion was expressed by Shahu even before Montague's declaration

in a letter to Wood. Shahu Chhatrapati after Montague's arrival in India began to organise deputations of the depressed Classes to wait on the Secretary of State. The views of Shahu regarding the Swarajya were to be forwarded to Montague on 12 November 1917. In his letter to J.B.Wood dated 11 November 1917 he said, "I have just received your note asking me to see the Rt.Hon'ble Mr. Montague at 12-40 tomorrow. Mr. Montague may ask me about Home Rule. You know my views and ideas about it. He may ask me what the Princes want. You know my views about it also from my leaflet. Or are we to have a formal call where such questions will be avoided?"²⁴ J. B. Wood in answer replied, "Should Mr. Montague ask Your Highness opinion on Home Rule or any other question of public importance, you will, I have no doubt, speak out your mind quite freely. That is the proper course and I am confident that your opinion will carry great weight."²⁵ In his meeting with Mr. Montague he pleaded for the continuation of Willingdon as the Governor of Bombay. "Then the conversation turned on Home Rule. Mr. Montague asked whether Home Rule would affect Native States. His Highness said it would. Princes ought, however, to be able to cope with it. It may be necessary for the Princes to give more rights to the people as Home Rule in British India will be surrounding the territories of Indian States. In order that people should understand the rights given to them, it is absolutely necessary to introduce compulsory primary education in India. It is also necessary in order that Home Rule should be successful that caste system must disappear and inter-marriages should take place, otherwise there is the fear of the development of oligarchy."²⁶

In his public speech at Nasik on 27 December 1917, Shahu said, "At present the great cry is about Home Rule. The question is whether we are fit for it. We do really wish to have Home Rule. It will give us what we may say, 'life-blood' but I may state it as my reasoned opinion that a time will come when we may have to break through the shackles of our present day caste system. I look forward to this result in the interest of our general moral and material progress. So long as we have caste feelings among ourselves, it will lead to the weakening of our cause. ~~For the present all that we have to do to attain our cause.~~ For the present all that we have to do to attain our goal is educate our people and thus prepare our minds. This is the only way to approach this important and momentous question."²⁷

In this address he reiterated an anti-caste movement. He further said, "If castes remain as they are, Home Rule in the sense in which it is meant will result in nothing but a kind of olig^aarchy. This of course does not mean, I may tell once more, that I am against Home Rule. Surely we want it. Under the present circumstances, however, we must have protection and guidance of the British Government until the evil of caste system becomes ineffective. To prevent Home Rule from culminating into oligarchy, we must have communal representation at least for ten years. It will teach us what our rights are. Once we know them, communal representation can be dispensed with."²⁸

Shahu wanted that the British rule should continue, because unlike Manusmriti and its followers, it had opened facilities for education and civil rights to all people in India

irrespective of caste. There appears a paradox in the argument of Shahu when he advocated communal representation as a training for the backward people. The paradox arises out of paradox in the Indian society itself based on shastras like Manu Smriti and perpetuated for hundreds of years on its basis.

In advocating communal representation, he, though a caste Maratha, pointed out the especial need for separate electorate to the untouchables.

In his letter to Lord Wellington on 29th December 1917, which was just two days after his Nasik speech where he demanded communal representation, Shahu wrote, "I quite understand how very busy the Secretary of State is at this time. In my interview I wanted to touch upon the question in which I have been taking very keen interest viz. the uplifting of the backward classes and especially the untouchables. --- I am strongly of opinion that these classes must all be properly represented in the reformed constitution of the Government of India that is under contemplation. In other words I favour communal representation down to the untouchables and especially for them. Your Excellency already knows what I have been doing for them in my humble way. I have been trying to raise their social and religious status."²⁹

Shahu, in other words, wanted to make an all out attack on untouchability by not only raising the social and religious status of the untouchables but also their political status in the Home Rule.

V)

COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION FOR UNTOUCHABLES AND
SHAHU CHHATRAPATI.

It was Shahu Chhatrapati who prior to the emergence of Dr. Ambedkar as the leader of the Untouchables in India took lead in representing the case of the depressed classes before Montague. R. V. Sabnis, the Diwan in his letter dated 17 October 1917 communicated to V. R. Kothare regarding the deputation of Rao Bahadur Dongare.³⁰ R. V. Sabnis wrote, "Rao Bahadur Dongare has been asked to meet you in Poona and help you in organising the conference and to form one of the deputations that will wait on the Secretary of State on behalf of the depressed classes in case Government is pleased to grant necessary permission."

The deputation accordingly waited upon Montague. Montague has left behind an account of the meeting with Dongare in the Diary. "Then we had Rai Bahadur Dongare on behalf of the Depressed classes. He was a very nice fellow, taking a great interest in the depressed classes. He is a caste Hindu, and he brought along with him two Untouchables, who struck me, although one did not speak English, by their extraordinary intelligence. He thinks that communal representation for them is necessary --." ³¹

The demand of communal representation for the untouchables, therefore, can be traced to this meeting between Montague and Dongare, but Rao Bahadur Dongare was sent by Shahu Chhatrapati.

Shahu encouraged the leadership of Dr. Ambedkar and advised the untouchables that they should have their own leader. And Dr. Ambedkar in his evidence before the Southborough Committee pleaded the case for communal representation to the untouchables. In his argument Dr. Ambedkar said that the interests of the Untouchables are to protect their persona (though not property) from confiscation and to gain basic rights of liberty and personal security. Dr. Ambedkar further said: "These are the interests of the untouchables. And as can be easily seen they can be represented by the untouchables alone. They are distinctively their own interests, and none else can truly voice them. A free trade interest can be voted by a Brahmin, a Mahomedan or a Maratha equally well. But none of these can speak for the interests of the untouchables because they are not untouchables. Untouchability constitutes a definite set of interests which the Untouchable alone can speak for. Hence it is evident that we must find the untouchables to represent their grievances which are their interests and secondly we must find them in such numbers as will constitute a force sufficient to claim redress."³²

Dr. Ambedkar on the basis of population asked for nine seats for the untouchables in a body of hundred elected members. "The total population of the Bombay Presidency by the Census of 1911 (British Districts only) is 19,626,477. Of this, untouchable population is 1,627,980 or 8 percent of the total. Assuming for the present the Bombay Legislative Council to consist

of 100 elected members, the untouchables should have 8 representatives to represent them in the Council --- But the untouchables of the Bombay Presidency may be allowed to elect nine members in all."³³ Dr. Ambedkar, thus, asked for nine percent seats for the untouchables in the Council of Bombay Presidency.

VI) COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION TO 'MARATHAS' ETC.,

Immediately following the demand of separate electorate to the untouchables, ably put forward by Dr. Ambedkar there was a demand for separate electorate for the Marathas.

The demand for separate electorate to the untouchables and the Marathas constituting the non-Brahmin section of Maharashtra was ^{also} ~~also~~ made in the Madras Presidency. In Madras the fear of the Brahmins was the main reason for asking separate electorate to the non-Brahmins. In December 1917 when Montague visited Madras he has kept on record this feeling of the non-Brahmins. "The great feature," Montague says, "about this place (i.e., Madras) is the terrific influence and the fear that everybody entertains of the Brahmins. That is the great feature in which this country differs from any I have yet visited."³⁴ Montague also wrote about "this new violent opposition of the Brahmans to the non-Brahmans has become the guiding principle of the place."³⁵

"Unfortunately, all the non-Brahmins," Montague wrote, "are so afraid of the Brahmans that they do what seems to be everybody's habit since Lord Morely gave the Muhammadans

separate representation they ask the Government for protection instead of organising themselves and fighting for it."³⁶

Montague, thus, gives the fear of Brahmins felt by the non-Brahmins and the communal representation already given to the Muhammadans as the cause of the demand for communal representation by the non-Brahmins.

Though Shahu was in favour of communal representation there had emerged a new leadership of the non-Brahmins which took leading and active part in the demand for communal representation to the non-Brahmins. Shahu in his letter to Mr. Cadell, wrote "As for the movement of the Marathas I do not know all the details. But they have got some enthusiastic men to work and there are hopes that they will be able to select suitable candidates to represent them on the new Council.

It should be remembered that Bhaskarrao Jadhav, a Satyashodhak and a follower of Shahu Chhatrapati, in his evidence before the Parliamentary Joint Committee in England, pleaded^d for separate representation to "Marathas etc."

Shahu Chhatrapati in his letter to Patil³⁷ dated 17th April 1920 and the one to Sir John Wood³⁸ dated 23rd April 1920 wrote about "the necessity of separate electorates for the Marathas etc."

Shahu Chhatrapati, therefore, did not ask for representation for the caste Marathas, but for "Marathas etc." meaning Marathas and similar castes. The Reform Commissioner

in his letter to Babasaheb Bole³⁹ dated 11 June 1920 pointed out that the eight seats for the Marathas were open to Marathas, Kunbi, Mali, Koli, Bhandari, Shimpi, Lohar, Kumbhar, Bhoi, Bari, Lonari, Devli and Shinde. The other backward castes viz. the untouchables were not included in this category.

Shahu Chhatrapati and Baskarrao Jadhav, therefore suggested communal representation to Marathas etc. and not to Marathas only. The consequences of the separate electorate were aptly described by Mr. Montague and Lord Chelmsford. "Diversion by creeds and classes," they said, "means the creation^{on} of political camps, organised against each other, and teaches men to think as partisans and not as citizens; and it is difficult to see how the change from this system to national government is ever to occur."⁴⁰ The grant of communal representation proved to be an hindrance to the development of Indian nationalism.

The demand for separate electorate to the untouchables and 'Marathas etc.' reflected upon the non-existence of Hindu religion. Yet those who propagated Hindu nationalism did not try to remove the feeling of fear of the Brahmins which caused the demand.

In his speech at Athani on 11 November 1917, Tilak used strong language and strange logic in denying position to different professional castes in the Legislative Council of Bombay Presidency.

Tilak questioned: "Would the tailors use the sewing machine, the peasants the plough and the merchants the scale of balance in the Council?"⁴¹ He thought that these castes should perform their own professions. Shahu, in criticism spoke at Nasik on 15 April 1920 that Tilak should have been ashamed of expressing such thoughts.⁴² In his speech entitled Brahman va Brahmanetar Tilak advised the untouchables not to take secondary education after primary education; he wanted them to learn the crafts of their castes.⁴³ He, thus, believed in the continuation of caste-professions for the untouchables and not in giving higher education to them.

While Edwin Montague opposed communal representation on the ground of hindrance to the development of Indian nationalism, Tilak opposed it on the basis of maintaining caste structure. While Tilak expressed his views against higher education being given to the untouchables, Shahu exerted all his power in uplifting their position.

Shahu was moreover aware that the caste Marathas should have unity with the untouchables. In his Presidential Address given before the All India Depressed Classes Conference, he advocated that the caste Marathas should be forced to break the caste restrictions to further unity in Maharashtra.⁴⁴ Shahu was also aware of the tenacity of caste patriotism but he advised that caste patriotism should be limited and channelised for the development of Indian nationalism. There should be, he said, upward movement of lower castes and downward movement of upper castes.⁴⁵

A self-government in a democratic setup to be successful has mainly two prerequisites. The people must be fairly educated to understand the issues at stake in an election and as the self-government, by and large, is a majority rule there ought to be sufficient homogeneity in society in social and economic matters. There should be, moreover, healthy conventions which could favour give - and - take in all matters. The self-government, thus, to be a success presupposes spread of education among the masses and certain minimum social and economic uniformity. Shahu Chhatrapati by his educational and social reforms, I feel, worked earnestly for the development of self-government in India. While communal representation awakened the non-Brahmins politically and gave them a feeling of participation in the self-government, Shahu's constant warning regarding caste-patriotism is still relevant for the growth of democracy in India.

N _ O _ T _ E _ S _

1. Sir Reginald Coupland, India A Re-Statement (Oxford; 1945), Document No. 2, p. 291.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 292.
5. Ibid., p. 293.
6. Ibid., p. 292
7. B. B. Jadhav (ed.), Rajarshi Shrishahu Maharajanchi Bhasane, (Kolhapur, 1971) p.3.
8. A. C. Banerjee (ed.), Indian Constitutional Documents, Vol. II; 1958-1945 (Calcutta : A. Mukherjee & Co., 1946) p. 192.
9. A. C. Banerjee, op.cit., p.20.
10. N. R. Phatak, Lokmanya (Bombay : Mouj prakashan; 1972) pp. 370-373.
11. Ibid.
12. Samagra Lokmanya Tilak, vol. VI, (pune : Kesari Publication ; 1976), p. 1201.
13. Samagra Lokmanya Tilak, vol. VI, p.471 Nagar speech 31/5/1916.
14. Samagra Lokmanya Tilak, Vol. VI, p. 512.
15. Ibid., p. 603.
16. A. C. Banerjee (ed.), op.cit., p. 194.
Gandhiji even in 1921 and 1922 refused to define Swarajya as complete independence. See Dhananjay Keer, Rajarshi Shahu Chhatrapati, p. 534.
17. Samagra Lokmanya Tilak, Vol. VI, pp. 449-450.

18. Ibid., p. 502 Speech at Nagpur.
19. Samagra Lokmanya Tilak, vol. VI, p. 505 Yeotmal speech 9 January 1917.
20. Sir William Jones (ed.), Manav Dharma sastra or the Institution of Manu (Madras ; 1863), VII, 133.
21. Ibid. VIII, 11.
22. Ibid., VII, 113.
23. Ibid., VII, 37.
24. Kolhapur Archives, Shahu Daftar, Rumal no. 30, document No. 6621, dated 11/11/1917.
25. Ibid., document no. 6619, dated 11/11/1917.
26. K. A., S.D., Rumal no. 32, document nos. 6631 and 6632.
27. A. B. Latthe, Memoris of His Higness Shahu Chhatrapati, vol. II, pp. 493-494.
28. Ibid.
29. K.A., S.D., Rumal no. 33, document no. 6859, dated 29/12/1917.
30. K.A., S.D., Rumal No.31, document no. 6414, dated 17/10/1917.
31. Edwin S. Montague, An Indian Diary, edited by Venetia Montague (London : William Heineman, 1930). p. 306.
32. Evidence taken before the Reforms Committee (Franchise) (Southborough Committee), Vol. II, Calcutta, 1919 in C. B. Khairmode's Dr. Bheemrao Ramji Ambedkar, vol. I (Bombay, Pratap Prakashan; 1978), pp. 99-100.
33. Ibid., p. 114.
34. Edwin S. Montague, op.cit., pp. 111-112.

35. Ibid., pp. 113-114.
36. Ibid.
37. K.A., S.D., Rumal No. , document no. 11662,
dated 17/4/1920.
38. Ibid., document no. 11664 of 23 April 1920.
39. Dhananjay Keer, Lokahitkarte Babasaheb Bole,
(Popular; 1978), p.115.
40. A. C. Banerjee (ed.), op.cit., p.222.
41. Madhavrao Bagal, Bahujanamasamajache Kaivari
(Poona : Thokal Prakashan; 1966), p.72.
42. B. B. Jadhav, op.cit., p. 73.
43. Samagra Lokmanya Tilak, VI, pp. 777-778.
44. B. B. Jadhav (ed.), op.cit., p. 97.
45. Ibid., pp. 121-122.