

GANDHISM IN CRUCIBLE : RAJA RAO'S KANTHAPURA

Brahma Dutta Sharma^{*}
Susheel Kumar Sharma^{**}

Raja Rao's *Kanthapura*, gives us a glimpse of the Indian struggle for independence in a rural part of India. In this novel, Rao narrates how the inhabitants of a south Indian village fight the British under the leadership of Moorthy, a local Gandhian leader.¹ One can also read the novel to study the forms Gandhism takes in action, what its strengths and weaknesses are, and whether this is the best course of action available to the victims of injustice and oppression.

Raja Rao has confined the time of the action in the novel to a brief period around Gandhi's Dandi March ending with Gandhi's truce with the then British Viceroy of India. In the beginning of the novel the Dandi March has been reported by Moorthy to his followers in the words: " ... they go with the Mahatma to the Dandi beach to manufacture salt,"² and the truce has been reported by the narrator towards the end of the novel. (p.256) Rao confines himself to this brief period instead of describing the entire course of Indian struggle for Independence through Gandhian Struggle. because Rao depicts Gandhism to be an ineffectual weapon in the hands of the oppressed to fight the oppressor. Rather it has been shown to be a form of struggle that makes the fighter absolutely helpless and defenceless with the result that the oppressor has a

* Professor and Head, Department of English, Kumaun University (DSB Campus) Nainital-263002, India.

** Assistant Prof. of English, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., PANTNAGAR-263145, India.

free hand to subject him to any torture. In this novel Moorthy's Gandhian mode of fighting leaves his followers unprotected³ in face of their adversaries' assaults. Here is an account of one such 'fight' between the Gandhian fighters and the British police: "... old Ramanna and Dore came forward and said, 'we too are Gandhi's men, beat us as much as you like, and the policemen beat them till they were flat on the floor, mud in their mouths and mist in their eyes, and as the dawn was rising over the Kenchamma Hill, faces could be seen, and men became silent ... And the policemen twisted their arms and beat them on their knuckles, and spat into their mouths, ..." (p.122) Obviously, it is difficult to hold brief for a philosophy which makes its followers undergo such a humiliating experience.

This is not the only humiliating experience that Raja Rao gives an account of : there are a host of them more. For instance, Moorthy himself undergoes such an experience: "... as Moorthy forces himself up, Bade Khan swings round and - bang - his lathi has hit Moorthy and his hands are on Moorthy's tuft, ..." (p.85). Gandhi's women followers undergo the humiliating experience of being beaten, being spat on, being trampled on, getting gutter water forced into their mouths and being raped. The following accounts given by a woman bring the facts into light:

With the rain came the shower of lathi blows, with the rain splashing on our hair came the bang-bang of the lathis, and we began to cry and to scream, and the policemen began to beat the coolies forward, ... and the Police go to the toddy booth and come out with pots and pots in their hands, and they dip the pots in the side gutters and potfuls and potfuls of water are thrown at us, and they open our mouths and they pour it in and they lift up our saris and throw it at unnameable places, ... and with more beating and more beating and more beating we fall back one by one against the earth, ... (pp.197-200).

and

And then there is a loud cry, 'Ayoo-Ayoo', and it's Puttamma's, and we rush towards her creeping and crawling beneath the lantane bushes, and then, when we are on the path again, we see a policeman upon her, and we feel our limbs earth-like and we want to pull him up, and Puttamma is all black in her cheek and her mouth gagged, ...(p.213).

It is unmanly not only to subject but also to see women-folk being subjected to such abject humiliation and atrocities. What is generally considered to be manly is protecting womenfolk with all one's might and not letting them even be bruised. In Indian history we have the glaring example of Shivaji (the ruler of Maharashtra in the days of Aurangzeb) who saw to it that even his enemy's daughter-in-law reached her husband's home safe. So on reading the accounts given above from the text one naturally likes to ask whether it is wise for Moorthy to send women volunteers to 'fight' the police, and whether it is wise for these women, acting in accordance with the Gandhian principles, to remain Gandhians even in situations when their honour is at stake.

Getting beaten is not the only atrocity the Gandhian fighters undergo in *Kanthapura*: they even lose their lives⁴ for no gain. Chandrayya is one of the persons who loses his life as this is what the narrator suggests when she says: "... they gave him a pair of fetters again and a solitary cell, and we never saw him again'. "(p.205) No doubt, it is a proof of the bravery of these people that they go on 'fighting' inspite of all atrocities and do not surrender but one would like to know whether it is wise to expose oneself to humiliation and death for no gain.

No doubt, a victim of atrocities is often able to win some people's sympathies and some of the sympathizers sometimes also come to the help of the victim. But to expose oneself to the oppressor's atrocities with the hope that sympathizers will come to

one's help is just like leaping into the air. Such an act involves the violation of the principle of self-reliance, and indicates one's becoming unjust at least to oneself. Since no adversary, when challenged, is going to remain passive, one should either not expose oneself to an avoidable danger or defend oneself with all one's might. But the Gandhian Moorthy does not permit his followers even to raise their fingers in protest. That is why though the spirit behind Moorthy's 'fighting' even when he has no means,⁵ nay not even the permission, to defend himself is admirable, yet the wisdom behind it deserves to be doubted.

In most cases it is the fear of retaliation that restrains one from assaulting another and if one is sure that there will be no retaliation, one becomes fearlessly ruthless. This is so with Bade Khan, the policeman in *Kanthapura* Range Gowda's fear" '...when Bade Khan sees us, he will fall on us' " (p.155) is a proof of the fact that one single policeman is able to terrorize the whole village because he fears no retaliation from the followers of Gandhi. No doubt, physical fight is not the best way to fight and that intellectual fight is certainly better, but it is also one's duty to protect one's self besides worrying for one's soul as without a body a soul can do nothing. And the Gandhian Moorthy does not suggest to his followers as to what intellectual or spiritual measures they are expected to take in order to protect themselves from harm at their adversaries' hand. Moreover, Moorthy's fight is not purely spiritual or intellectual but at times physical also. For example, he tries to force his entry into the premises of the Skeffington Tea Estate.

Moorthy, like Gandhi, does not make any distinction between offensive violence and defensive violence. However, a distinction between the two does exist. For example, in the novel if Puttamma had killed the policeman who had raped her or as soon as she had realized he intended to do that, her action would have been heroic. Or if Seetharam had killed the Coffee Estate owner asking him to

'sell' him his daughter before the owner had murdered him, he would have done something laudable. But the violence of the Coffee Estate owner in order to force people to surrender their wives and daughters to him is the violence that deserves not only condemnation but also severe punishment.

No doubt, Moorthy is right when he tells Range Gowda " '...had you reasoned it out with Puttayya, may be you would have come to an agreement, and your canal water would go to your fields, and his canal water to his fields'." (p.99) But on his own part Moorthy does not reason the issue out with the British. Instead, he tries to force his entrance into the Skeffington Coffee Estate physically, makes women picket toddy shops and makes the farmers refuse to pay taxes. When the defiance is that serious, measures to defend oneself too have to be taken. But, on this count Moorthy remains-passive. As a consequence the agitators in *Kanthapura* lose their lands and have to go for shelter elsewhere. This is evident from the narrator's report: " There was only Range Gowda that ever went back to *Kanthapura*...*the Corner-Mouse was all but fallen, except for the byre, and Rangamma's house was tileless over the veranda, and Nanjamma's house doorless and roofless and the hearth stones in every corner. 'All said in a knot' he concluded, 'there's neither man nor mosquito in Kanthapura, for the men from Bombay have built houses on the Bebbur Mound,...*"(pp.258-59). The reporting signifies that the agitation led by Moorthy in accordance with the principles and tactics of Gandhi, has not only failed to deliver the goods but also has caused the agitators a lot of loss. Raja Rao also shows that several persons had their doubts about the efficacy of the Gandhian way: Range Gowda had told Moorthy: " ' Learned master, at this rate I should have to go and bow down to every pariah and butcher and,...let my son-in-law go fooling with concubine Siddi's daughter Mohini who's just come of age. No, learned master, that is not just' "(p.100); and Sadhu Narain had told Moorthy: " '...this is not just. Defend one must against evil; if not,

where is renouncement, continence, austerity, and the control of breath'. "(p.124) Nay, there has been narrated an incident that makes it evident that even Moorthy's followers lose in the Gandhian methods of fighting. It has been narrated in the following words: " 'Since the arrest of Moorthy they are afraid. They say, 'We are not all going to sit behind the cage-bars like kraaled elephants, 'and when I say, 'What does that matter, we are the Mahatma, 'they say, 'Yes, yes, learned sir, but our lands will go uncultivated, and there will be neither child nor woman to pull the weeds or direct the canal water'. "(p.154).

Raja Rao makes even Moorthy realize that the movement under his leadership on the Gandhian lines has failed. The fact comes to light when one reads Moorthy's letter in which he writes to Ratna: " 'Since I am out of prison, I met this Satyagrahi and that and we discussed many a problem, and they all say the Mahatma is a noble person, a saint, but the English will know how to cheat him, and he will let himself be cheated'. "(p. 257) since he and the other Gandhians know it for certain that the English men will know how to cheat Gandhi, and Gandhi will let himself be cheated, it is obvious that in their opinion there is no question of Gandhi attaining a success.

This points to Raja Rao's belief that Moorthy's agitation on the Gandhian lines has ended in nothing but people's losing even their land of Kanthapura signifying not only financial loss but also the loss of bread and shelter. The same meaning lies embodied in the narrator's words: " '...the Mahatma has made a truce with the Viceroy and the peasants will pay back the revenues, the young men will not boycott the toddy shops, and everything, they say, will be as before. No sister, no nothing can ever be the same again, You will say we have lost this, you will say we have lost that'. "(p.256) The truce that has been made is complete surrender as all that the government wanted is accepted by Gandhi and not even a single

demand of Gandhi has been accepted, and the narrator in the passage quoted above is rightly stressing the fact of people's losses.

The fact becomes clearer when we compare the condition of Kanthapura before the insurgence and its condition after the insurgence. The inhabitants of Kanthapura grow cardamom, rice, coffee and sugarcane and the land is fruitful. The narrator's observation: " Cart after cart groans through the roads of Kanthapura, and on many a night, before the eyes are shut, the last lights we see are those of the train of carts, and the last voice we hear is that of the cartman who sings through the hollows of the night "(p.1) signifies that it is a land of plenty and even though people have no political rights, they work hard to have enough to make both ends meet. The same impression is given by the fact that their goddess Kenchamma is bounteous and benign enough to bring rain when the crops need it and cures most of the diseased. (pp.2-4) But after the insurgence there is desolateness everywhere as Range Gowda, as has been pointed out earlier, reports: " '...there's neither man nor mosquito in Kanthapura...'" (p.259) If Moorthy had the correct idea of the repressive measures the government was going to adopt; he would not have started the insurgence in the way he does. Even C.D. Narasimhaiah who is all praise for Gandhi and Moorthy writes, " It was Gandhi's greatness that he produced hundreds of little-Gandhis throughout the country. And Cornerhouse Moorthy, *our Moorthy*, as the villagers called him, was one of them. He was in college when he felt the impact of Gandhi, and he walked out of it, a Gandhi man, "(p.x) has to acknowledge: " But is there any fulfilment at all in the novel? Thanks to police atrocities the entire village is desolate:..." (p.xv). Even the narrator says: " 'Mad we were, daughters, mad to follow Moorthy!" (p.230)

One may say that there are two gains of the insurgence: there starts a sympathy wave in favour of Moorthy and his followers and

some coolies working in the Skeffington Coffee Estate leave the Estate and come to live with the villagers, and that several toddy shops are closed as a result of picketing. No doubt both the claims are correct, because the narrator reports the coming of coolies to Kanthapura in the following words: "The next morning we woke up to find that the pariah street was filled with new huts and new fires and new faces and we knew that over three and thirty or more of the coolies of the Godavery had come to live with us "(p.201) and the closure of the toddy shops in the following words: "...and Madayya said, 'Why, I am but a servant of the toddy contractor, and why should I see the Police beat our women and men?', and he joined us, and the Blue Paper said there were four and twenty shops closed in Kanthapura hobli and we said, 'that is a great thing'." (p 206) Gains they definitely are but so far as the first gain is concerned it ends in nothing when the policemen force the coolies to go back to the Estate (p.210), the todday shops are closed chiefly because people have been persuaded into refraining from drinking and " 'there's no sale'." (p.206) Moreover, the question is whether these gains outweigh the loss, as they have been achieved after God knows how many Puttammas have been deprived of their chastity by the British rulers' policemen.

If one analyses the insurgence and tries to analyse the reasons of its failure, one finds that it fails chiefly because the sheet anchor of the leader is the hope that his adversaries' hearts will change. The fact that Moorthy and his followers want the British rulers' hearts to change comes to light in the statements like the following one: " 'Monsters, monsters, yes, they may be, but we are out to convert them, the Mahatma says we should convert them, and we shall convert them. Our will and our love will convert them'."(p.229) No doubt, one may cite the example of Gautama Buddha who succeeded in converting Angulimal into a votary of non-violence, but that does not mean that anybody can convert a monster into a human being simply by exposing oneself to the

monster's assaults. The British police, as shown by Raja Rao, is too monstrous and devilish to feel any pricks of conscience in subjecting women to humiliations. The foundation of Moorthy's hope is the belief that gods reward one for one's virtues, as he tells Range Gowda: " 'Every enemy you create is like pulling out a lantana bush in your back yard. The more you pull out, the wider you spread the seeds, the thicker becomes the lantana growth. But every friend you create is like a jasmine hedge. You plant it, and it is there and bears flowers and you offer them to the gods, and the gods give them back to you...'. "(p.99) But it is treacherous to advise the coolies of the coffee Estate to befriend the second British owner who is making their wives and daughters victims of his lust. And it is cowardice to ask these coolies not to do anything against such a man because in doing so that they will be creating an enemy.

The chief qualification of a king or a political leader is that he is able to conquer his enemies and is not conquered by them as it has said in the *Atharva Veda* that "The crown be given to one who can bring prosperity, who can conquer his enemies, whom enemies cannot conquer, one who commands a dominating position among kings, who deserves to be the head of the assembly, whose traits, actions and temperament are praise-worthy, who commands respect, who deserves to be approached even for shelter and before whom people bow down".⁶ It is on this ground that Moorthy, the Gandhian leader in the novel, fails to be qualified enough to be a political leader.

The anti-British movement in *Kanthapura* has been crushed for three more reasons: first, the agitators have only the doctrine of nonviolence to defend themselves with the result that they are unable to face police repression; secondly, the police have no sympathy with them and try to suppress the movement with a heavy hand; and thirdly, all Indians are not united. The fact that the agitators have no physical means to defend themselves is quite

obvious as they are non-violent in accordance with the teachings of Gandhi. The fact that the government resorts to repressive measures and tries to suppress the movement with a heavy hand is evidenced by the way the policemen mercilessly beat even women, spit in people's mouths and even rape women. Such descriptions are interspersed in the whole novel. Here is one of them as an illustration: "He said he had the great fever three days after he had been in prison, and they ordered him to get out as usual and grind the oil-seed, and though he said he was too weak the warders cried, 'Ass! Pig! Badmash!' and beat him with their canes and drove him to the yoke;" and there they put him to a mill and, whip in hand, they cried, 'Hoy-hoy' as though he were a bull, and made him run round and round the oil-mill until he had ground three maunds of peanut oil. Then suddenly he could run no more and gasping he fell on the floor and nothing but blood came out of his mouth, blood and nothing but blood,... ." (p.205) And the fact that all Indians are not united is evident from the fact that the policemen who beat the agitators are all Indians and when the government snatches the land from the villagers and the people who come from Bombay to take it on the conditions laid down by the government, are also Indians. (p.259) No doubt, Gandhi would not have been able to do anything to remove the second factor, and he did do something to remove the third factor, but he should have done much to remove the first weakness and should have said that it was not only one's right but also one's duty to defend oneself.

The Gandhian path of non-violent resistance gives Gandhi's followers no way, nay not even a right, to protect themselves, as this path expects them to remain non-violent" in thought, word and deed" and not to raise even a finger in protest even when they are beaten or trampled upon or even killed.⁷ One may be curious to know as to why Gandhi took this stand. Perhaps Gandhi expected truth-force to help the satyagrahis, as he wrote: "Satyagraha is literally holding on to Truth and it means, therefore, Truth- force.

Truth is soul or spirit. It is, therefore, known as soul-force."⁸ In other words "Primarily [Satyagraha] is a case of appealing to the reason and conscience of the opponent by inviting suffering on oneself. The motive is to convert the opponent and make him one's willing ally and friend. It is based on the idea that the moral appeal to the heart and conscience is, in the case of human beings, more effective than an appeal based on threat of bodily pain or violence."⁹ Similar are the views of Moorthy, the Gandhian protagonist of *Kanthapura* as he says: " 'I shall love even my enemies. The Mahatma says we should love even our enemies...'"(p.89) and argues: " '... if Truth needs a defence, God Himself would need one, for as the Mahatma says, Truth is God, and I want no soul to come between me and Truth' " (p.124), and even his followers regard him as their Mahatma (p.106).

Two more answers have been given: one, that non-violence was Gandhi's creed and that it would have been a violation of his own creed if he had permitted his followers to resort to violence; and, second, that he had faith in the British administration of justice. The first view has been explained by Romain Rolland in the following words: "As the Satyagrahis are not allowed to use violence in advancing their cause... they must rely solely on the love-force that radiates from their faith and on their willingness to accept suffering and sacrifice joyously, freely (The hardest fibre must melt in the fire of love. If it does not melt it is because it is not strong enough (March 9, 1920). Those joining the *Satyagraha* movement had to promise to disobey the laws declared by the Satyagraha Committee to be unjust, to follow in the path of truth, and to abstain from all violence against the lives, persons or property of their adversaries."¹⁰ Gandhi wrote: "I should also remind correspondents that the word *Satyagraha* is often most loosely used and is made to cover veiled violence. But as the author of the word I may be allowed to say that it excludes every form of violence, direct or indirect, veiled or unveiled, and whether in

thought, word or deed. It is break of Satyagraha to wish ill to an opponent or to say a harsh word to him or of him with the intention of harming him."¹¹ However these views of Gandhi are not the absolute truth about him for Gandhi at several other places not only advocated violence but actually participated in it., Gandhi advocates violence in his statements like: "I do believe that where is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence."¹² and "... I would ... certainly assist the Amir of Afganistan, if he waged war against the British Government."¹³ He actually participated in violence when he offered his services at time of Zulu Revolt, ¹⁴ Boer War and raised recruits in India during first World War.¹⁵ Commenting on Gandhi's participation in I World War Fritz Kraus writes: "... Gandhi came hazardously close to the doctrine of sword."¹⁶ And the second view has been advanced by Prakash Sarangi in the following words: "... Gandhi had a great deal of respect for the British administration of justice. This is evident from several instances when he pleaded guilty in the courts of law after violating laws made by the British empire."¹⁷ However, in Raja Rao's *Kanthapura* the British administrators of justice have been shown to be unjust in their ways. Here when the British owner of the Coffee Estate kills a Brahmin clerk for not agreeing to let his daughter become a victim of the British Estate owner's lust, the court not only gives him no punishment but forgives him (p.81) with the result that the British Estate owner continues making the wives and daughters of the non-Brahmin coolies victims of his lust. (pp.80-81) Raja Rao articulates people's distrust in the British administration of justice also in the following piece of conversation between Ranganna and Moorthy: "... Ranganna said, 'Judges are not for Truth, but for Law, and the English are not for the brown skin but for the white, and the Government is not with the people but with the police'. And Moorthy listened to all this and said, 'If that is so, it will have to change'."(p.123) So if Gandhi had faith in the British administration of justice, he was, as Raja Rao's version

makes evident, mistaking hot sand to be a pool of water.

Raja Rao seems to believe that Gandhi's faith in God and his not letting evil flourish led him not to do anything to protect himself and his followers. The fact comes to light when we read the following speech of Moorthy: "... let there be peace and love and order. As long as there is a God in Heaven and purity in our hearts evil cannot touch us. We hide nothing. We hurt none'." (p.120) Moorthy lays two conditions for one to remain unharmed by evil: there should be God in Heaven, and there should be purity in the man's heart. So far as the first condition is concerned, man can do nothing about it as if God is there in Heaven, there is nothing for a man to do, and if He is not there, a man cannot make Him be there. However, even if it is taken for granted that He is very much there, the second condition gives rise to a problem: there is no objective way to find out whether or not there is purity in one's heart. But one thing is certain: many of the persons who were killed are believed to have been pure at heart. They include Jesus, Socrates, Abraham Lincoln, and Martin Luther King in the West, and Lord Krishna, Maharshi Dayanand and Mahatma Gandhi in the East. However, according to Lord Krishna one is free in the domain of action, but the consequences of one's actions one cannot avoid reaping, as he says: *karamanyevadhikaraste ma phaleshu kadachana ma karmaphal heturbhurma te sangostva karmani* (*The Gita* II,47) (To action alone hast thou a right and never at all to its fruits: let not the fruits of action be thy motive: neither let there be in thee any attachment to inaction).¹⁸

If this is so it is not unlikely that a man who is pure at heart becomes a victim of violence at the hands of one indulging in misdeeds. That is the reason why it becomes essential for one - even if this one is pure at heart - to defend oneself.

Gandhi's thrust is on having faith in the enemy. Moorthy quotes him "Have faith in your enemy, he says, have faith in him

and convert him'." (p.257) If one has faith in the enemy there is no need for one to resist. Secondly, the question as to how to protect oneself from the enemy before he has been converted into a friend remains unanswered. Moreover, Raja Rao's Gandhi makes no distinction between gentle enemies and the devilish enemies and wants all of them to be loved. If this logic is adhered to, Puttanna is expected to love even the policeman who has violated her. But it would be exotic/eccentric to expect her to do so. Gandhi seems to be a non-dualist looking for divinity in every human being. But all human beings are not alike and some of them are so vicious that only mad people can talk of loving them. Lord Krishna does make a distinction between the persons on the right path and those given to vices when he says: "I incarnate myself from time to time to protect the righteous, to crush the vicious and to re-establish righteousness."¹⁹

The Gandhian approach would have stood vindicated only if the members of the ruling British community had come to side with Moorthy in his fight. The coolies' coming to Kanthapura or the shopkeepers' closing their toddy shops is no justification of the theory that non-violent resistance enables one to win the opponents' heart. In the novel it is Gandhi who has to accept all the conditions of the white rulers and make a truce with the Viceroy that "... the peasants will pay back the revenues, the young man will not boycott the toddy shops, and everything ... will be as before." (p.256) If everything has to be as before, Puttanna has lost her chastity for nothing.

The struggle which keeps the women strugglers like Puttanna hand-tied even when they are being violated cannot be regarded as the right form of struggle because even if such a struggle bears the desired fruit -- though it is very unlikely -- the price that has been paid for it is too high for any compensation. No doubt, there may be persons for whom this price is not very heavy but the arguments

of such people can give no consolation at all to a woman like Puttanna who has been subjected to the humiliation of the kind and believes "I have sinned".(p.223) and breaks into sobs.

Another question that crops up is whether one can convert one's enemies into one's friends by letting them beat, spit at, and rape one. And the answer is "Certainly not". One beats, spits at and rapes a person whom one believes to be much inferior to one, and one develops friendly relations with one whom one regards as one's equal. That is why the concept of the conversion of an enemy into a friend is based on a figment of imagination. By letting one's enemy make one weak one is going to gain nothing but contempt. One can get rid of an enemy only by rising against him with all one's might -- physical, intellectual and spiritual. Raja Rao's Bade Khan can never have friendly relations with Moorthy and his followers; for him everyone of them is beneath contempt, just as for Winston Churchill Gandhi was when he called the latter 'a half naked faqir'.

All this makes it evident that *Kanthapura* is an embodiment of Raja Rao's recoil from Gandhism. But there arises another question, namely 'which political philosophy does Raja Rao posit his belief in?' The answer to this question is got in Moorthy's letter to Ratna, where Moorthy writes: " 'Ratna things must change. The youths here say they will change it. Jawaharlal will change it. ... he says in swaraj there shall be neither the rich nor the poor. And he calls himself an 'equal - distributionist', and I am with him and his men'."(pp. 256-58) Raja Rao's making Moorthy posit his faith in the political philosophy standing for equal distribution of wealth signifies his positing his own faith in socialism, as this political philosophy regards equal distribution of wealth as its goal. The fact is reinforced by his following words" '... I have come to realize bit by bit, and bit by bit, when I was in prison, that as long as there will be iron gates and barbed wires round the Skeffington Coffee Estate, and city cars that can roll up the Bebbur Mound, and gas-lights and coolie cars,

there will always be pariahs and poverty'." (p.257) The words embody the view that the solution of the problem of poverty lies in the abolition of private property, which is again a goal of socialism.

However, in this novel Raja Rao does not go into the details of socialism and does not think over the questions whether it is just to distribute money equally among all irrespective of their merits and whether it is fair to deprive each and everybody of his private property. Nor does he directly take up the question whether the victims of the colonial rule should try to attain independence through the path adopted by socialists. However, the implication of Moorthy's preferring socialism to Gandhism is that Raja Rao likes the victims of colonial oppression to adopt the path of socialists.

REFERENCES:

1. Commenting on Gandhi's role in arousing people who in turn became leaders in their own places Romain Rolland writes: "This is the man who has stirred three hundred million people to revolt, who has shaken the foundations of British Empire..." Romain Rolland, *Mahatma Gandhi* tr. Catherine D. Groth (Publications Division, Government of India, 1968), p.2.
2. Raja Rao, *Kanthapura* (Madras: Oxford University Press, 1989 [1938]), p.169. All the subsequent quotations from the novel refer to this edition.
3. Gandhi wrote: "(The Satyagrhis) must submit to insults and worse at the hands of bigoted and yet love them, if they will change their hearts." M.K. Gandhi, 'Vyom Satyagraha', *Satyagraha*, (Ahmedabad: Navjivan Publishing House, 1958 [1951]), p.182.
4. When Gandhi was asked by his son as to what he should have done when his father was "fatally assaulted in 1908," Gandhi said, "... it was [my son's] duty to defend me even by using violence." M.K. Gandhi, 'The Doctrine of Sword', *Non-Violence In Peace and war* Vol. I (Ahmedabad: Navjivan Publishing House, 1948 [1942]), p.1.
5. For Gandhi passive resistance has always not to be passive. Gandhi wrote: "I rejected the word passive resistance because of its insufficiency and its being interpreted as a weapon of the weak. It was direct action in South Africa

which told and told so effectively that it converted General Smuts to sanity." (M.K. Gandhi, 'Neither a Saint Nor a Politician', *Satyagraha*, Op Cit., p.110). At another place Gandhi wrote about the measures a *Satyagrahi* should adopt before turning to non-violence (See M.K. Gandhi, 'Qualifications for Satyagrah', *Satyagraha* Op. Cit. p.77).

6. *Indro Jayati na para jayata, adhirajo rajasu raj yatai/charkritya eedyo vandyashchopasadyo namasyo bhavah* (*Atharvaveda Ka.6. Anu. 10, va. 98, man. 1*).
7. (a) Gandhi defined Satyagraha as the "Vindication of truth, not by infliction of suffering on the opponent but on one's own self" (M.K. Gandhi, *Speeches and Writings* [Madras: G.A. Natesan, 1933], p.501).
- (b) At another place Gandhi calls it "courage" if one allows oneself to be killed and 'cowardice' if one kills. He writes: "Where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence I advice violence'... I cultivate the quiet courage of dying without killing. But to him who does not have this courage I advise that of killing and of being killed, rather than that of shamefully fleeing from danger." - Gandhi quoted by Rolland p.34.
8. M.K. Gandhi, *Young India*, 23 March 1921.
9. Bharatan Kumarappa, 'Editor's Note', M.K. Gandhi's *Satyagraha*, Op. Cit., p.iv.
10. Romain Rolland, Op.Cit., p.38.
11. M.K. Gandhi, 'Satyagraha V. Compulsion', *Satyagraha*, Op.Cit., pp. 201-202.
12. M.K. Gandhi 'The Doctrine of the Sword', *Non-Violence : Peace and war*, Vol. 1, Op.Cit. p.1.
13. M.K. Gandhi, 'The Afgan Bogey', *Non-Violence in Peace and War*, Vol. I., p.6.
14. For those who do not consider Gandhi's raising an ambulance corps a participation in war the following words of Gandhi need attention.*"I draw no distinction between those who wield the weapons of destruction and those who do the Red Cross work. Both participate in war and advance its cause." M.K. Gandhi, 'My Attitude Towards War', *Non-Violence in Peace and War*, Vol. I., p.73.
15. M.K. Gandhi, 'Why did I Assist in the Last War', *Non-Violence in Peace and War* vol. I, p.22.
16. Fritz Kraus, 'India's Great Spirit', *Mahatma Gandhi as Germans See Him*, Heimo Rau (Ed.), (Bombay: Shakuntla, 1976), p.85.

17. 'Gandhi and Rawls on Civil Disobedience', *Indian Journal of American Studies* XIX, 1 and 2 (Winter and Summer 1989), p.74.
18. S. Radhakrishnan, *The Bhagavadita* (Bombay: George Allen and Unwin, 1971, (1948), p.119.
19. *Paritranya sadhunam vinashaya cha dushkritam/dharmasansthapanarthaya sambhavami yuge. yuge* (*The Gita* IV, 8).