A Conclusion?

Analyzing the early modern Kannada literature has helped us in establishing that the existing theoretical literature on colonialism and nationalism in India is inadequate and needs to be nuanced to understand the encounter of cultures, as witnessed through the writings and translations of B.M. Srikantia. In this chapter, I will summarize the differences this analysis has shown between the situation that existed in Princely Mysore and that described by the theoretical literature on colonialism and nationalism in India, and make a few tentative theoretical arguments.

If we look at the characteristics of cultural nationalism as manifested in Kannada literature, analysed in the preceding chapters, we see the presence of both Kannada nationalism as well as Indian nationalism. The relationship between these two nationalisms has varied over time. In Chapter Two where I have documented the various modes of negotiation carried out by the elite to come to terms with the anxiety of lacking certain cultural forms in the colonized culture viz., tragedy, we see that the characteristics of the discourse informing the negotiation, in a way, forms part of pan-Indian nationalism. There seems to be a construction of an Indian self, drawing certain aspects of the orientalist discourse and accepting many a premise of their construction of "India", as the Other. The English educated elite tries to change certain aspects in the orientalist discourse to suit a certain politics, but this was not a smooth operation and was imbued with certain tensions; what I have called "genre politics" and the debate around it exemplifies one such area. When the English educated elite couldn't change certain aspects of the orientalist discourse, which were not in accordance with their own perception of "self, they tried to come to terms with those aspects of the orientalist discourse. In "genre politics", this drama of western construction of Sanskrit tradition, the nationalist's acceptance of the same and the resultant anxiety and an attempt by the elite to overcome that anxiety was played out. In
this analysis, we see that there is not much difference between an English educated elite writing in Kannada/Princely Mysore and someone writing in other regions. This phenomenon in Kannada literature can be accounted for easily within the framework developed by Partha Chatterjee, by dividing the discourse into thematic and problematic, to which I have referred to in the introductory chapter. The response and the strategies of negotiation adopted by the nationalist elite, though varying over time and across individuals/groups/communities falls well within Chatterjee's framework.

The debate is actually around the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit theatre tradition. But the debate is carried out in Kannada. Here the Kannada elite is trying to come to terms with the orientalist construction of Sanskrit tradition and the arguments that they propose or the translations they undertake is on behalf of the Sanskrit tradition, but in the name of Indian tradition. Consequently Sanskrit tradition/Indian tradition becomes part of the discourse available in Kannada. In that sense the elite in Princely Mysore actively participates in this pan-Indian discussion, but for a language-region-specific audience.

In T.N. Srikantia's discussion of "Indian Poetics", the Kannada elite is up to something else. Though he is writing a history of Sanskrit poetics, T.N. Srikantia titles it as "Bharatiya Kavya Mimamse" (Indian poetics). Is this act of stretching the narrow identity of Sanskrit towards the broader umbrella term India similar to the orientalists' indiscriminate equation of Sanskrit. Hindu and Indian traditions or is it something else? I would say that it is much more than the simple equation made by the orientalists. Kannada literature didn't have any work related to poetics in its own. So the Kannada elite, if they believed that poetics is a must for any literature, had to have a poetics for their literature. In this process of owning a poetics Sanskrit poetics came to stand for Indian poetics so as to be part of a common pool, from which even Kannada literature could draw some elements for its own cultural politics. Thus the Kannada elite operated with a sense of Indian tradition being something more than Kannada tradition.
If we take up the pre-conditions enunciated by Anderson for a nationalism to emerge, then all those pre-conditions did exist in Princely Mysore/Karnataka and a community called Kannadigas was being imagined, as shown elaborately in Chapter Three. But at the same time we also see examples like the above in Kannada literature, where in the context of cultural nationalism a certain kind of pan-Indian community is also being imagined. So there were two communities being imagined, each one claiming to be a nation.

Sudipta Kaviraj refers to a similar situation in Bengal of the 19th century. In Bengal, according to Kaviraj, this Bengali identity which he calls "regional", was later subsumed by the larger national identity. He accounts for this "gerrymandering of the boundaries of selfhood or collective identity" thus:

If the Bengali jati (nation) is an unlikely candidate for successful struggle against the might of British imperialism, the search for a viable nation has to look in other directions. Bengalis did not constitute the stuff of a good nation not because they were lacking in sentiments of solidarity, but because they could not provide a credible opposition to the British empire... (Kaviraj. 1997: 318, italics in original and the words in parenthesis are mine).

But in Karnataka, the Kannada identity was more vocal and did not get easily subsumed under a pan-Indian national identity. The question of need for devising a credible opposition to the British Empire did not arise at all in Princely Mysore. Even when it arose, with the visibility of pan-Indian nationalism in Karnataka, that is after the 1930s, talk of Kannada nationalism continued to exist alongside Indian nationalism. This led to repeated clarifications from Alur Venkatarao, the prominent leader of Karnataka nationalism regarding the relationship between Kannada nationalism, which he calls "Karnatakatwa" (Karnatakism) or "Karnataka Rashtriyate" (Karnataka nationalism) and the Indian national...
movement launched by the Congress. The kind and range of imagery used to define this relationship is very interesting:

Karnataka is a lens through which we look at India and the world...
Indian culture is internalized in Kannada culture and Kannada culture is internalized in Indian culture. Karnataka is a living part of an organic India, Karnataka devi (the goddess of Karnataka) is the daughter of Bharata devi (the goddess of India)...
Indian culture is also Karnataka culture...
Karnataka culture has been nourishing Indian culture since ages and it is a unique culture...
Karnatakism is not against nationalism and nationalism that is against Karnatakism is not nationalism...
The feeling that I am first Indian and then a Karnataka is wrong. There is no question of first and second in this, they are not two opposing things...
Karnataka is the first to save India from the danger of a foreign rule and for it India should be grateful to Karnataka forever...
Kannada language and land is our inner courtyard and India is our outer courtyard in the map of the World...
Bharati devi is the utsavamurthy of the world and Karnataka devi is the utsavamurthy of Bharati devi... (Venkatarao, 1999: 190-199).

While looking at the above description of the relationship between Karnataka and India by Venkatarao, we have to keep in mind that it was written as “Karnatakakatwada Sootragalu” (formulas of Karnatakatwa) in 1957 after independence and the formation of Karnataka state with the unification of Kannada speaking regions. So it can be argued that it was inevitable for Alur Venkatarao to accept the existing political formation and assert Kannada
nationalism within it and also define the relationship in such a way that it doesn't question the existing accepted political order. But even earlier he was not against the Indian national movement. He did participate in the non-cooperation movement launched by Gandhi; he did serve as the vice-president of the local Congress committee but resigned by stating that he didn't share the views of Gandhi opposing the insertion of social reforms into political struggles against the British (Venkatarao. 1974: 166-167).

What is interesting in the above quote and in his formula of **Karnatakatwa** is that he presents a system invoking three concentric circles in his mind: one is a global order, the other is India and then Karnataka. But he is not setting up a hierarchy here. For him they are concentric: Karnataka is in the middle, surrounded by India and then the world. It is only by firmly locating oneself in **Karnatakatwa** that a Kannadiga can look at India and the world. **Karnatakatwa** is the lens through which we can realize the essence of India and the world. The concrete realization of a world order happens only through India and one encounters India only through **Karnatakatwa**. In one of his English letters written in 1929 he defines Kamatakatwa like this:

From my experience of public life in Karnataka (sic) and also from my experience in other fields. I have come to the conclusion that no movement political or otherwise is possible unless there is this Kamatakatwa in us. By **Karnatakatwa**, I mean the sum total of all our feelings and duties towards Karnataka (like Hindutwa). So it is that from the political field, I turned to this less ambitious but more solid work. My **Karnatakatwa** is somewhat different from ‘**Pravincialism**’ (sic) (Venkatarao. 1999: 9, words in parenthesis are in original).
He clearly defines Karnatakatwa as a commitment to the land and its people and compares it with Hindutwa. He dismisses the idea that it is provincialism or regionalism. For him it is a religion on which the Kannada nation should be built.

This becomes clearer if we look at how he defines the essence of the world and India in particular. His notion of the essence of the world and India is quite interesting:

The World culture is Sanatana culture that defies any dating, a ubiquitous culture. It has two forms: one is its general form and the other is a specific form. Our Great saints have promoted both the forms and both are found in our India. India, that gave space to all castes, religions, sects, races and nationalities without any discrimination, is the sign of this general form. ...Our saints have molded this general essence into a specific form by establishing a specific religion, tradition and system of rituals. It is the responsibility of all Indians to protect this specific form of India. This specific form is a model that the whole world can follow. ... Only those who don't accept the general form are our enemies. Those who don't accept this specific form are not our enemies. This specific form can be termed Hindutwa or Hinditwa, the name is not important but the meaning is (Venkatarao, 1999: 190-191).

His problem with Indian nationalists in Karnataka was that some of them did not support his Karnatakatwa and they thought that it was against the Indian national struggle. He further says that if they had not fought for Karnatakatwa and the reunification of Kannada-speaking regions during the colonial period, then there would have been no Karnataka in post-independent India (Venkatarao, 1999: 12-13). This statement, though coming from the vantage point of the post-reunification of Karnataka in 1957, clearly shows the commitment to Kannada nationalism that certain elite groups had during the colonial period.
He gives an important place to literature in the task of evolving Kannada nationalism:

> Literature is the life-force that sustains the nation. Literature is not just a discourse. ... Unless there is an awakened consciousness about the language there can be no awakened consciousness about the land. (Venkatarao, 1999: 198).

For him it is not just enough to have a political reunification of the Kannada-speaking regions, the pre-condition is cultural unification. This task of cultural reunification can be best carried out by literature. To support literature new institutions are needed. So he supported the formation of Mysore University, and attempted to have a University for entire Karnataka. He also played a key role in the activities of Vidyavardhaka Sangha of Dharwad and the Kannada Sahitya Parishat. He resigned from Kannada Sahitya Parishat in 1938 protesting against the attitude of the members of Princely Mysore who he felt were not heeding to the voice of the members of North Karnataka.

As we witness in Chapter Four, literature and litterateurs, especially B.M. Srikantia, played a key role in Kannada cultural nationalism. But there is a difference between Alur Venkatarao who hails from the erstwhile Bombay-presidency i.e., today's North Karnataka and the litterateurs of Princely Mysore region in their conception of Kannada nationalism. In Princely Mysore, people like B.M. Srikantia who contributed much through their writings and activities towards cultural nationalism were not so comfortable with political reunification. This brings us to the question of the then existing political entities and their relationship with the choices made by different social groups.

In Princely Mysore, which was a modern state (nation) in all practical senses in spite of a monarchy and the high handedness of the Madras presidency headed by
the British, people like B.M. Srikantia couldn't think of a state without the King of Mysore. Their loyalty to the King was unquestionable and in fact B.M. Srikantia is often remembered by his title *Rajasevasakta* (An ardent server of the King). Though people like B.M. Srikantia were for cultural nationalism, the political reunification of Kannada-speaking regions posed a challenge to them, as it meant either bringing Princely Mysore under a new political entity called Karnataka either under colonial rule or as a sovereign nation without a monarch. The people of North Karnataka, like Alur Venkatarao, who were for both cultural and political reunification of Karnataka were ready for either option - bringing Kannada regions under a single colonial administration or fighting against the colonial rule for a sovereign nation called Karnataka. The former choice would have brought about the reunification of Karnataka, a task that might have continued to become a struggle for freedom from colonial rule. The latter choice would have brought both reunification and freedom together. People like B.M. Srikantia would have agreed with the idea of a political reunification under the rule of the King of Mysore. But this was not acceptable to the Kannada nationalists of North Karnataka who were simultaneously engaged in the struggle against British, by aligning with the Indian National Congress.

But litterateurs like D.V. Gundappa, after the 1920s became more vocal about the demand for responsible government in Princely Mysore, although this demand did not gain much force then. Even the Congress did not demand the removal of the King, but expected that the King be more lenient towards the Congress. It was because of this that, as mentioned earlier, they never felt the direct impact of colonial rule, nor did they feel that the ruler was oppressive, though the King was expected by the colonial state in Madras Presidency to curb the national movement in Mysore. But this national movement itself was very mild. The demand for responsible government in Princely Mysore acquired currency only on the eve of the independence of India.
The Backward Class movement in Princely Mysore also sought to distance itself from the Indian National Congress dubbing it as a Brahmin lobby. They were loyal to the King of Mysore as he implemented reservations in public sector as demanded by the Backward Class movement, though the Brahmins opposed this move. The implementation of reservation was along the lines recommended by the Miller Committee appointed by the King. Thus the King had the support of this Backward Class movement till the 1940s, when the movement and the political party carved out of it merged with the Indian National Congress. This Backward Class movement was not so particularly interested in the reunification of Karnataka, and was certainly looking at Congress with suspicion. When it came to cultural nationalism none of these groups hesitated to be a part of both the imagined communities - Kannada and Indian, but sans the political dimension of these imagined communities, as these groups wanted to stay well within their existing political order or the one that they desired.

Thus though there was a notion of a community called 'India' operating in Kannada literature it was limited only to cultural nationalism and did not, at least in Princely Mysore region, translate into a political one. As noted earlier, the Kannada elite strategically needed a certain common cultural pool for enriching Kannada cultural nationalism vis-a-vis the West and it necessitated being part of the imagined community of India too. The increasing number of translations from Sanskrit during this period indicates this. 19th century is full of not only translations from English, but also from Sanskrit.

The kind of relationship that Kannada and Sanskrit had earlier was also re-mapped with the encounter of Kannada with colonialism. It is said that in the pre-colonial period, the relation between Kannada and Sanskrit was one of dominance of one culture (Sanskrit) over the other (Kannada). And Kannada tried to negotiate with it by appropriating Sanskrit cultural elements, not through direct translations but through adaptations from Sanskrit, so as not to acknowledge the debt to Sanskrit. It is appropriate to probe what is meant by Kannada here. The
appropriation of Sanskrit texts or emergence of literature in Kannada in the 9th century is not simply a story of Kannada v/s Sanskrit but one of Jaina religion trying to reach out to the aristocracy and mercantile class of the Kannada speaking regions. One of the strategies adopted by these writers was to borrow from Vedic / Sanskrit literature and change it to suit either the needs of their religion or the needs of their own time. Similarly in the 12th century Veerashaiva religion used Kannada to reach out to the artisan class in an oral form. But later since the 15th century. Brahmans have also used Kannada effectively to propagate both Bhakti traditions and Vedic traditions. So the pre-colonial relationship between Kannada and Sanskrit is not a simple case of Kannada v/s Sanskrit, where the latter was hegemonic and the former was challenging that hegemony. The relationship between Sanskrit and Kannada again undergoes a change in the colonial period. As seen in Chapter Three. B.M. Srikantia and others believed that Sanskrit was the language of our ancestors, the Aryans. Even Alur Venkatarao subscribes to this view; for him "Sanskrit is our sacred language" and "it should become the language of our scholars" (Venkatarao, 1999: 198). Thus the Kannada elite who was trying to challenge the hegemony of Sanskrit till then, though for various religious reasons, on encountering colonialism stops seeing Sanskrit as a hegemonic language: it becomes their own language, the mother of Kannada language. So we find an attempt to strike an alliance with Sanskrit and a pan-Indian community to face the challenge posed by the colonial culture. This alliance comes to be imagined through images drawn from family, and through the use of kinship terms.

It is not only the question of having a strategic alliance with an Indian community and Sanskrit that gave a fillip to the notion of an Indian community. Translations from other language texts that were part of the Indian nationalist discourse also helped put that discourse into circulation. Since the beginning of the 20th century we witness pan-Indian nationalist texts getting translated into Kannada, mainly from Bengali and Marathi. Texts such as Bankimchandra’s novel and novels from Marathi got translated into Kannada. Though there was a political necessity for
these texts in North Karnataka, these texts were also read in other regions. Thus a new subject **position**, that of a pan-Indian subject, also gained currency.

To make a few tentative remarks on the relationship between Kannada nationalism and Indian nationalism, let us define the concept of nationalism. I would agree with the formulation of Anderson that nation is an imagined community. But I would further **qualify** it thus: since nationalism strives to achieve the **nation**, a geographical region with marked boundaries by claiming that the region has "a specific culture" since ages, it needs its own modern political entity called the nation-state. The basis for constructing a specific culture with a history for it could be different: if it is mainly language in Europe, it could be different in different places. As Partha Chatterjee would **argue**, nationalism in India is driven primarily by colonialism. Or it could be religion in the case of the formation of Pakistan, apart from colonialism. The question is, though the imagined communities based on languages evolved in **India**, why did not a full-fledged **nationalism**, which eventually could claim a nation and a nation-state for a particular linguistic region that it claimed as its own, evolve in India? **Sanskrit**, which was a dead language or had a limited use in the present context, was associated with the notion of the Indian nation. And an alien language like English fused the elites of different linguistic regions, though they constituted a marginal group in terms of numbers. This is quite contrary to the principle that Anderson states; it is the standardization of vernacular languages and emergence of literature in those languages coupled with the development of print capitalism that sowed the seeds of nationalism in Europe. In that sense it was a popular move, which shaped the imagination of the population. But in India it was either a "dead language" like Sanskrit or an alien language (that too the language of the colonizer) that played a key role in Indian nationalism. Though Hindi came to be associated with Indian nationalism that was only in the 1930s, and till **now** that language too is contested as the national language. It was the English-knowing elite who spearheaded nationalism and mediated between the
masses and the nation that was emerging. Sudipta Kaviraj has discussed this diglossia that prevailed in the colonial period (Kaviraj, 1998).

The explanation provided by Sudipta Kaviraj in the context of 19th century Bengal, that for a viable alternative it was necessary for the Bengali elite to forge a larger identity to oppose the mighty colonizer, doesn't satisfactorily explain the situation in Karnataka. First of all what happens in Karnataka is not a gerrymandering of the boundaries of self. For the Bengali elite there was not much of a difference between a Bengali self and an Indian self, only the boundaries used to change but the content remained the same. But our analysis has shown that in Karnataka, the boundaries of Kannada and India are clearly demarcated and are two distinct identities though they perceive a relationship between the two in terms of kinship. The task of imagining a Kannada self was carried out alongside a construction of the Indian self, and the task was far from over even in the middle of 20th century. But in Bengal the question seems to have been resolved in the 19th century itself.

By looking at the context of Karnataka, mainly Princely Mysore, and Kannada literature. I would say that Kannada nationalism, though it emerged and succeeded in imagining a Kannada community, could not articulate itself in terms of a nation or a nation-state for the geographic region, which it identified as its own. It was due to the historical-political situation in which the region was caught up and the influence of political entities that the Kannadigas inhabited on the choices they could make or the choices that were thrown up to them, as I have explained earlier. Thus the peculiar situation in which the region claimed by Kannada nationalism as its own was caught up during the colonial period constrained the articulation of Kannada nationalism. It could never articulate a nation-state of its own. In that sense I would tentatively call Kannada nationalism in the colonial context a "retarded nationalism".
This point of similarity, difference and relationship between Kannada nationalism and Indian nationalism, which were imagining Kannada and Indian communities respectively, begs another question that I have pointed out in Chapter Three. If there were other communities, apart from Kannada and Indian, being imagined, or if old communities were re-imagining themselves in the context of modernity, then what kind of relationship did these communities have with Kannada nationalism and with Indian nationalism? Though I have not taken up this question for examination, and although I am not competent to elaborate on this issue, I wish to make a few tentative remarks.

As discussed in Chapter Three, certain pre-colonial communities like the Lingayats were trying to reshape the community in the context of modernity. I am not suggesting here that this happened because these communities were enumerated by the colonial state. Though it was the new historical challenge/opportunity thrown up by the rapidly changing socio-political scenario brought about by colonialism and modernity that might have been the driving force behind the new imagination that was reshaping the community, it is not simply one of the colonial state apparatus enumerating the existing caste/communities. Though I would agree that these communities did try to align with the new power (colonial state) that was emerging, it is not simply a case of collaboration. I would rather see it as a community trying to re-imagine itself in the context of the changed socio-economic scenario. Any community in order to survive has to reinvent its boundaries, content and symbols in order to keep pace with the challenges thrown from outside it. Moreover, a community might change itself because of the dynamics of contradictions that exist within it or as a response to the changes happening outside its fold. Many a times the reshaping of the communities would be the result of both these forces i.e., internal dynamics as well as external changes.

In the case of new communities, it is not just language and nation-based communities that were emerging; other communities like the Backward Classes
were also emerging at this point of time. In Princely Mysore with the changed socio-economic scenario, certain castes and religions like Vokkaligas, Lingayats, Kuruba and Muslim, formed a kind of alliance which in turn gave rise to this new community - the Backward Classes, at least in the political sphere, to push themselves towards modernity. In order to pressurize the state in Princely Mysore they formed a broad political base. There may not have been any significant corresponding cultural homogenization that occurred with this political alliance of these castes and religion. But anyhow we can say that at least this group behaved like a political community for all practical purposes in its relation vis-a-vis the state and also vis-a-vis the Brahmans, who had garnered a majority of the positions in the state machinery and the new institutions that were coming up in the context of the modernization of Princely Mysore.

It would be interesting to see what kind of relationship these other communities which did not mark a geographical region as their own and claim ownership of it, had with the communities that were marking a specific geographical region as their own and claiming its ownership, such as the Kannada community and the Indian community. As mentioned earlier the Backward Class movement did not favorably look upon the Indian national movement led by Congress, as it suspected it to be a part of "Brahmin conspiracy". With regard to Kannada nationalism, which was led mainly by the literati, the Backward Classes had no role to play, though they were not hostile to the ideals of Kannada nationalism. Here we are discussing as if these communities are clearly demarcated from each other. But in reality it is not so; the Kannada community would encompass Backward Classes and others within its fold. Indian community too would encompass Backward Classes in its fold at least in definition. Or an individual of the Backward Class, though the movement looked at the Congress with suspicion for all practical purposes, might believe in the discourse of Indian nationalism or Kannada nationalism. So these communities were not mutually exclusive but mutually coexisting.
The Lingayat community, which was initially cold to the Indian national movement and the Kannada movement, later on started participating in both the movements. Likewise the Backward Class movement later on towards the end of the 1930s merged with the Indian National Congress and actively participated in the struggle for responsible government in Princely Mysore. Can we say then that the discourse of nationalism (both Kannada and Indian) hegemonised other discourses that were challenging it earlier? Or is it that these communities thought that their entry into the nationalist movement would alter the discourse and tilt it towards them?

If we look at how Kannada nationalism and Indian nationalism responded to these communities, then that might also give us some hint about the kind of relationship that they might have had. As I tried to show while analyzing the canonization of B.M. Srikantia's *English Geetagalu* in Chapter Four, the English educated elite which was in the forefront of the nationalist movement successfully tried to co-opt others into the movement by negotiating with these communities through a discourse of Kannada literature and tradition, that would accommodate them. This brings us to the question of what was the Other that this dominant discourse constructed for itself, to fashion the nationalist self? Let me here also look at the question of the Other as discussed in some of the writings on colonialism and nationalism in India.

We have seen in Chapter Two that the West tried to fashion its self when it encountered what it perceived as "Indian culture". In that process it constructed an Other, "the Indian", in a manner which is well identified now as orientalist discourse. While doing so it not only drew sustenance from the resources that were available within Anglo-Saxon culture but also drew from Greco-Roman resources as I tried to show in Chapter Two. And in the same way, we have seen how the nationalist elite in Princely Mysore drew not only from the resources available in Kannada but also from Sanskrit by casting it as Indian and keeping the West as the Other. But for construction of a self, the Other need not be a
single one. A Self gets fashioned when h encounters what it perceives as other cultures and it need not always be a unitary culture that it encounters. Scholars have also talked about how for the nationalist self in India it was not just the West that was the Other but also Muslims and so on.

Javed Alam tries to show by reading the late 19th century Bengali texts of Bankimachandra and Vivekananda that for the modern Indian self, which was based on religion, the Other became Islam as representing non-West, while they tried to prove that Hindu religion was modern in its tenets (Alam, 1999). While analyzing the poems of B.M. Srikantia we have seen, how he hails Queen Britannia, the elder sister of India, who came on request to rescue the nation which was dominated by the "Muslima Kula" (the clan of Muslim) by winning over them and uniting the nation. Thus in the Mysore context also, though not as overtly as in northern India, the nationalist discourse had Muslims as the Other. Not to mention the translations of Galaganatha from Marathi in North Karnataka, which explicitly depict Muslims as villains. In feet it is part of a common narrative that existed in the nationalist writing in India to depict Muslim rule as an alien rule. Sudipta Kaviraj, while talking about the depiction of Muslims as villains in Bankimachandra's fiction and Hindu kings as heroes fighting them says, “These episodes can also be taken symbolically, non-literally, in which case, of course, when he (Bankimachandra) pointed his finger at the Muslim he may have actually meant the British" (Kaviraj, 1995: 319). Javed Alam refuses to read this as a stylistic device of Bankimachandra or as a symbolic representation of the British and says “with the extended history of domination (extending to the pre-colonial period), the foreigner now becomes not only the British but also those, like Muslims, who had made India their home” and sees it as the construction of the Muslim as the Other in nationalist discourse (Alam, 1999: 104). In B.M. Srikantia, as we have seen, it is the Muslim who is treated as an enemy and strangely the colonizer is seen as an ally who helps in getting rid of this enemy. This is not to suggest that the discourse fashioned by B.M. Srikantia, Kannada nationalist discourse doesn’t have "West" as the Other, but what I am trying to
suggest here is that this discourse has multiple Others. This point will become clearer as we explore its implications further.

Sudipta Kaviraj talks about an external Other and an internal Other of modernity. He says that the external other was the colonizer and the internal other was the metropolitan proletariat, while talking about the understanding of the colonizer in the second stage of nationalism (Kaviraj, 1995: 326). He also talks about a distinction emerging between high and low culture. He is quick to point out that this distinction "was no new thing in Indian History; but the new distinction was not between high and low in the same register; rather, it became two incommensurable registers resisting mutual translation" (Kaviraj, 1995: 322). He further argues that Gandhi tried to articulate his resistance in such a manner that it was intelligible in both the registers though he did not "become the creator of a culture of mutual translation". As we see in Chapter Three, where we have looked at the standardization of language, a distinction between language of the people and the language of the elite emerges within Kannada. And also we see in Chapter Four, while discussing the notion of modern Kannada literature as conceived by B.M. Srikantia, that a similar distinction is posited between popularly read/listened (folk) texts and the new literature that was emerging. So the modern self that was being fashioned then, not only had the colonizer and also the Muslim as the Other, but also other groups as the Other. What we see here are multiple Others. Partha Chatterjee calls this aspect of nationalism as elitist in its approach and calls the groups that get constituted as internal Others as fragments left out of the nation, when it arrived. It would be easy to reach the same conclusion here that the self that was fashioned in Kannada literature did not include non-elite groups and they were relegated to being fragments of the nation. But I wouldn't subscribe to this fully in the context of Princely Mysore.

For example the Backward Class was able to enter the institutions of the modern state that were then emerging through a popular movement. So they can never be considered mere fragments of a nation. But I was not able to fully demonstrate
this aspect here as there is no powerful representation of this movement in Kannada literature. If I had taken up for study the discourse of the Backward Class movement in Karnataka, I would have been able to demonstrate it, but now I can only fall back on the work of other scholars. M.S.S. Pandian, who has worked on a similar context in Tamil Nadu, where anti-Brahmin movement led by E.V. Ramaswamy was prominent during the colonial period, says:

Freed from the nationalist binary of nationalism versus colonialism, anchored in history and rationality as progress troubled all the time about notions of citizenship. E.V. Ramaswamy’s concept of nation denied its origin in an invented ‘classical’ Indian/Tamil past and envisaged it fully in the anticipatory. More importantly, it constantly violated any certitude about boundaries, identities and political agency; and also represented itself as not constrained by the rigid territoriality of the nation-space (Pandian, 1999: 286).

The movement fashioned by Ramaswamy was seeking equality, a more democratic notion of citizenship than inventing a classical past, which is why it was looking for a golden age in the future. Perhaps the Backward Class movement in Mysore was also working towards a similar goal and that is why we don’t find them taking recourse to literature to construct a glorious past.

Further while talking about the programmes of E.V. Ramaswamy like demanding reservation for backward castes, satyagraha in front of a temple demanding entry for the lower castes into the temple and opposing separate dining system for Brahmins and non-Brahmins in a Gurukulam Pandian says:

...These moves by E.V. Ramaswamy refused the possibility of national subjects being constituted within the delimiting binary of nationalism versus colonialism or through the mere process of Othering the colonizers. Instead his attempt was to stage a
contestatory dialogue among different subject positions ...already inscribed by power and powerlessness. within the nation-space. In other words for him, the community of national subjects could not be a non-negotiated given from above, but had to be negotiated from below ( Pandian, 1999: 288-289).

Further Pandian says that EVR "implicated both colonialism and the indigenous as upholders of Manu Dhanna instead of full fledged Manitha Dhanna" and EVR "implicated British as unwilling modernists" (p. 293-294). We see here that the Backward Class movement was not interested in fashioning the self vis-a-vis the colonizer but was trying to fashion its self as modern citizens vis-a-vis Brahmins, who were trying to posit an elite discourse of nationalism.

Here it would be appropriate to mention the text by Swami Dhanna Theertha, History of Hindu Imperialism (1941), where he also constructs a nationalist discourse that presents Brahmins as the Other. So I wouldn't consider these groups which were left out of the discourse of nationalism, evident in Kannada literature, as mere fragments of a nation or as subaltern groups without any voice. I would say that they had an active agency, which tried to configure the nation and the state in a way that was different from the way the Brahmin elite was configuring it. The context is not simply one of the colonizer versus the colonized, as Pandian warns us; it is the context of multiple discourses each having multiple Others. Here I would reiterate my earlier point that the discourses produced by other non-nationalist or nationalist-non elite groups are also translations of the colonial discourse, but as they have a different politics to perform and a different subject position to offer to their subscribers, translate into a discourse different from their elitist counterpart's. But what finally became a hegemonic discourse is a different issue and what happened to these alternate voices is a matter of further investigation.
The question of why the Backward Class movement receded with the ascendancy of Kannada nationalism is a matter for future research. Is it just a coincidence or is there a relationship between the two phenomena, is yet to be ascertained. Other questions that are yet to be answered are: Why did the political party carved out of the Backward Class movement merge with the Indian National Congress? Is it merely a case of the sway of the hegemonic Indian nationalist discourse over these groups? Was there any active agency that prompted Backward Class leaders to take up the subject position offered by the nationalist discourse?

The point that using the simple binary of colonizer and colonized doesn't work in analyzing the cultural transactions of the colonial period is demonstrated through analyzing two moments in the history of translation and debate around the notion of translation in Princely Mysore in Chapter Five. In the same chapter I have tried to show how the caste system which was a pre-colonial social institution had to shed its old significations, and acquire new ones by ascribing new caste distinctions to the genres in the colonial context in Princely Mysore. The larger issue that gets indicated, through the analysis of the two moments in the history of translation activity in Princely Mysore, is that aspects of modernity get appropriated by different groups/communities for different politics.

The non-hegemonic versions of modernity that is not visible in mainstream Kannada literature are in a way contestatory, though articulated in a different period. The emergence of Bandaya and Dalit literature in the 1970s and 1980s in Kannada literature seem to have challenged the hegemonic notion of the nationalist self and the Kannada self that were configured in the colonial period, and have tried to reconfigure them in a different way. But this aspect needs to be further investigated. Here I have limited myself to analyzing Kannada literature of the colonial period.

Thus the question of colonialism, nationalism and "English" in Princely Mysore as evident in Kannada literature is a very complex one and different from the way
these questions have been articulated in other places. In this dissertation I have hinted at the specific way questions of colonialism and nationalism arose in Princely Mysore. The theoretical remarks that I have made are tentative in nature in the absence of already formulated theoretical models and tools to explain such a situation.

One more caution about my formulations in this concluding chapter: I have used non-literary events and texts to understand colonialism and nationalism in Princely Mysore only as a background to highlight the significations of the analysis of literary/translated texts that I was examining. Instead, if I had made a comparative study of these non-literary activities and the literary/translation activity, I feel that it would have made my claims stronger. If I had taken up literary personalities like K.V. Puttappa, who hails from the Vokkaliga community, that at least to some extent might have shown a different configuration of modernity. I have limited myself to the period upto the 1940s, partly because after this period we find a different kind of politics. After 1940s the pan-Indian national struggle put the question of Kannada nationalism on the backburner until the 1950s when Kannada nationalism strongly reappeared. Further, looking at D.V. Gundappa's non-literary writings might have helped me in tackling the post 1940s scenario, as he played a key role in articulating the demand for responsible government not only in Princely Mysore but also tried to fashion similar demands in other princely states. The demand for responsible government indicates the move from monarchy to democracy, which was similar to the demands made by the Indian National Congress in the context of colonial India. This further indicates the waning of the legitimacy of princely states vis-à-vis the Indian National Congress. As my intention was to demonstrate the difference between the pan-Indian situation and Princely Mysore situation in terms of questions of colonialism and nationalism, I focussed on the pre-1940s period leaving the question of other dimensions of the process of hegemony of pan-Indian nationalist discourse over the Kannada nationalist discourse to future research.