CHAPTER VI

GANDHIJI AND HARDEKAR MANJAPPA

Of all the leaders of the Indian nationalist movement, Gandhiji (1869 – 1948) is the least susceptible to an analysis of either theory or action. Though he did not consider himself to be a philosopher, yet his ideas have permeated the political and social life of modern India. Refusing emphatically to separate thought and practice, he must be considered not only a theorist but as a man of action; indeed his ideas are best expressed by the incidents of his public career.

He was born at Porabandar in Kathiawar (Gujarat) on October 2, 1869. His father and grandfather, of the Vaisya (trading) caste, were both chief ministers in Kathiawar princely states. His mother Putlibai, was deeply religious and possessed a strong personality. Her influence, more than any other, formed his character. ¹

When 12 years old, Gandhiji was married to Kasturibai who was of the same age and by whom he had four children. He attended Alfred high school at Rajkot and matriculated at 18. Following a legal education in London, he went to South-Africa in 1893 as representative of an Indian firm. There he soon encountered those complex problems of discrimination and conflict that grew out of the relations between resident Indians and British rulers.

He took the lead in organizing the Natal Indian Congress, named after the organization in India. Propoganda was carried on to inform the world about the plight of South-African Indians and to win support for proposed reforms among the peoples of Africa, India and England. During his Natal days he engaged in various legal, political and social activities to ameliorate the conditions of his compatriots, most of whom had emigrated as indentured labourers. Perhaps his most significant experiment was the development of a technique and programme of Satyagraha, or non-violent action for the redress of wrongs. He finally left Africa in 1914, on the eve of the First World War.

After a brief stay in England, he returned to India, where he founded his famous Satyagraha Ashram at
Sabarmati; near Ahmadabad in 1915, with 25 inmates, who took a vow to observe truth, non-violence, celibacy and fearlessness; to practice self-control; to work for the removal of untouchability and for education through the mother tongue; and to wear only Khadi. They were to practise Swadeshi (using only those products produced in the home country), accepting only what was offered by their immediate neighbourhood. Thus, a code of service and humility was drawn up and compliance was required of all members. The following year, a resolution was introduced in the Imperial Legislative Council calling for an end to the indenture system for Indian labourers. Gandhiji had begun agitation against the practice in 1894, and he now led an active campaign for government action. More than two decades later, in July, 1917, this movement reached its successful end when the British Government announced the end of indentured emigration from India.  

In 1920 Gandhiji took up the Khilafat question over which the Indian Muslims were agitated. They strongly resented the terms to be imposed on Turkey by the Treaty of Severes (1920). Gandhiji proposed that a

non-cooperation movement should start on August 1, 1920 with the surrender of all British titles and honours, boycott of schools, colleges, law courts and councils. In his speeches and writings, Gandhiji was unsparing in his denunciation of the British imperialism as a "Satanic System". "Non-Cooperation", he declared, "though a religious and strictly moral movement, aims at the overthrow of the government".

It was during this time that Hardekar Manjappa came under the spell of Gandhiji. In order to spread Gandhiji's ideas among the people of Karnataka, he wrote for the first time in Kannada, a biography of Gandhiji in 1919. As Manjappa was in a princely state (Mysore), he was not directly involved in Gandhiji's non-cooperation movement. However he had devoted his paper to the spread of the ideas of Gandhiji—particularly the Khadi cult. Since Manjappa was influenced by Gandhiji's principles of Satyagraha, truth and non-violence, he thought Khadi would include both the tenets of truth and non-violence. 3 In order to implement the same he took a vow of Khadi on 1st August, 1920 by giving up the use of mill-cloth and started to popularise Khadi under the

auspices of the Jnāna Prasaraka Sangh'. Though he agreed with Gandhiji's Khadi cult, he disagreed with Gandhiji regarding bonfire of foreign cloth. When foreign cloth was consigned to bonfire at Davanagere at a public function under the presidency of Sirur Lakshmana Rao, he strongly opposed it. Manjappa held the view that 'such cloth should be given to the poor, thus supporting Andrews against Gandhiji'.

The Congress Session held at Nagapur in 1920 approved Gandhiji's non-cooperation movement programme and placed its organization at his service. From this time onwards the Congress was dominated by one single leader...... The Congress completely identified itself with Gandhiji's programme and embarked upon a policy of mass action which was beyond the most extravagant dreams of its original founders. But the Government, however, was not prepared to stand by and silently watch the beginning of a revolution, which Gandhiji had declared to be his object. With the Chauri-Chaura tragedy when a mob of rioters killed and burnt 21 policemen and watchmen, the Government acted swiftly. Gandhiji was arrested,
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When Gandhiji was sentenced to six years' imprisonment in 1922, Manjappa was not as powerfully affected as he had been in 1908 when Tilak was arrested. But Manjappa's estimation of Gandhiji was very high, and he considered March 18, 1922, as the beginning of a new era, the 'Gandhi Era'. He was inspired with a missionary zeal, and preached the gospel of Satyagraha in his own Karwar District. At Sirsi, Kumta, Honnavar, Gokarna, Ankola, Gerasoppa and Siddapur, he expounded the nine tenets of Gandhism. His search for the basic principles of religion led him to compare Gandhiji's tenets with those enshrined in Islam, Christianity and Buddhism, in his book Mahatma Gandhi Praneeta Satyagraha Dharma. He confessed that the ideal of Khadi could not be supported by any one of the scriptures. His joy knew no bounds when he discovered on a reading of Someswara Purāṇa, that the 21st injunction of his own Veerasaiva faith clearly implied support for Khadi.

The injunction in question declared that a true Lingayat
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should wear cloth woven by a true believer who does not use shuttle made of animal horn in its manufacturing!

This discovery had the added advantage of attracting the Lingayats inhabiting in large numbers in Karnataka, to the Gandhian ideal. His *Satyagraha Dharma* (1922) incorporated this idea. Though he followed the *Satyagraha Dharma* of the Mahatma, he did not agree with all the views of Gandhiji such as Hinduism, Swaraj etc. Therefore, he did not join the Congress. He sought to purge the Gandhian ideals of their political association and gave them a purely ethical and religious content. Thus he formed a 'Satyagraha Samaj' on the lines of 'Arya Samaj' in Hubli in 1922, whose membership was open to anyone, without the barriers of caste and community, who subscribed to the nine ideals that Gandhiji had formulated at Sabarmati—*Satya, Ahimsa, Brahmacharya, Asteya, Aparigraha, Aswāda, Nirbhaya, Swadeshi* and *Asprisyanivarana*. The members were required to use Khadi, to eschew untouchability, and to practice kindness to animals and men. Since its aim was not political, it was expected to attract a wide membership. 


Further, in 1923, Manjappa made efforts to found an Ashram, on the lines of Gandhiji's Satyagraha Ashram of Sabarmati, with the intention of training people who could propagate the nine principles of Satyagraha. During 1922 to 1923, on his own efforts he spread the ideals of Gandhiji, especially the Khadi ideal, all over the Karnataka parts of the then Bombay Presidency.... It was at the end of one of those lecture programmes on Gandhism that Shri Gangadhar Rao Deshpande called him the "Karnataka Gandhi".  

When Manjappa heard of the release of Gandhiji from imprisonment in March 1924, he went to Sabarmati armed with a letter of introduction from Shri Gangadhar Rao Deshpande, only to see and spend sometime with Gandhiji in his Ashram, and as well as to clarify his doubts on rebirth and Ashteya principle. Fortunately when he got a chance to talk to him (Gandhiji), he raised the issue of 'rebirth'. Speaking from the depths of his faith, Gandhiji declared, "I am as certain of rebirth as the existence of the Sabarmati river flowing here". When pressed for proof, Gandhiji could only say that his belief was not amenable to any intellectual process of argument. They also discussed the Gandhian
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principle of 'Asteya'. Gandhiji remarked that even though a thing may not be of use to its owner, it amounted to stealing, if one used it without paying for it. The discussions he had with Gandhiji helped Manjappa to strengthen his conviction that what cannot be intellectually apprehended can not be argued, and hence a belief in it cannot be rationally founded.  

When the All-India Congress Session was held under the Mahatma's presidency at Belgaum in 1924; Manjappa organized and trained a volunteer unit called 'Basaveshvar Seva Dal' for attending the session. And also on the basis of Basava Charitre (written by Manjappa), he got a short volume entitled Satyagrahi Basaveshvara written and published in Hindi and Marathi by Shri Bhide Lakshamana Rao. Manjappa distributed these pamphlets among the delegates who had attended the Session. He also successfully persuaded Gandhiji to attend a 'Veerasaiva Meeting' when Manjappa presented him a copy of Satyagrahi Basaveshvara, and explained to him that Khadi was one of the tenets of the Veerasaiva Faith.

In fact Karnataka came under the influence of Gandhian ideology and thought only after the Belgaum Congress, in a greater measure than ever before, and was, therefore, able to play a role second to none in the fight for freedom. Manjappa's contribution in this direction is immeasurable. The dissension generated between the Brahmins and non-Brahmins in Karnataka was, to a large extent, mitigated by the spread of Gandhian ideas, and a sense of national unity gradually developed. The non-Brahmin intelligentsia turned their attention to larger national issues. Indeed, the Belgaum Congress can be considered as a turning point in Karnataka's struggle for freedom, for almost all the people rallied round the Congress since that Session.

Though Manjappa, had not identified himself with the Congress, he attended the Belgaum Congress Session and was attracted by Gandhiji's speeches. He appreciated Gandhiji's programme for reconstruction of society before the attainment of Swaraj. That is why Manjappa decided to carry forward this mission in Karnataka whose aim was to fight against the social evils like untouchability, ameliorating the conditions of women, eradication of evil habits like smoking tobacco and drinking liquor and so on. Thus he
undertook an intensive tour of the country side. He toured nearly for two years and delivered number of speeches drawing heavily from Gandhiji's ideas and he also used to quote the Vañanas of Shri Basaveshvara (a social reformer and a prophet of Veerasaiva Faith). With this movement he led the people toward the path of virtue. In order to remove illiteracy and make them national minded he decided to start a school on 'Gurukula' lines. Thus the 'Almatti Vidyalaya' was started by him at Almatti on the banks of river Krishna in the Bijapur District, in 1927. He also edited from this place journals like Khādi Vijaya, Udyoga and Sharana Sandesh until he breathed his last. Through his speeches, and writings in his papers, he tried his utmost to implement the ideas of Gandhiji in respect of social reconstruction. That is why when Gandhiji undertook tour in Karnataka in 1934 to propagate removal of untouchability, Manjappa not only supported Gandhiji's mission wholeheartedly but also requested the people of Karnataka to help Gandhiji in his programme. He also collected 'Harijan Fund' and presented to Gandhiji.

Though he followed the Gandhian ideals like Satyagraha and reconstruction of society, he did not
hesitate to express his doubts about some of the Gandhian views. Hence one should necessarily study the points of dissimilarities or disagreements between them. At the outset it is essential to discuss the points of agreement or similarities, between Gandhiji and Manjappa.

1. POINTS OF AGREEMENT:

Both Gandhiji and Manjappa lived a simple and pious life, even foregoing some comforts. Both had a mission in their life. Through their millions of lectures they educated masses and created an awakening in the society. Manjappa was affectionately called the 'Mamletar of Discourses'. In the same way, both were good writers. Through their writings they attracted the masses. Both were journalists throughout their lives. To them journalism was not a profession, but a mission. Through their papers they attempted to mould the public opinion and educated the people and brought about social awakening. Both were infused with the ideas of national reconstruction. Thus Gandhiji edited Young India (1919) and Harijan (1933). Similarly Manjappa edited Dhanurdhari (1906),
Sharana Sandesh (1931), and Khadi^i.iaya (1928) which was later renamed as Udyoga (1930).

The main motive-force behind Manjappa's journalistic endeavour was, of course, nationalism. He was among the greatest nationalist editors Karnataka has produced. His journalism was characterised by selfless courage and fierce independence of mind. That is why the masthead of his paper Sharana Sandesh carried the following characteristic quotation from Shri Basaveshvarya:

"Like adamant in defence of right I am not one for deference. Having renounced the world, the saraqa Is not afraid of anyone, because He dwells within the sovereign light Of Lord Kudala Sañgama"12

Further, both have left behind their valuable experiences and ideas in their autobiographies, which are a substantial contribution to political literature deserve to on modern India and be read with profit by the posterity. Both works are in the nature of confessions of their life. The significance of their life lies in that they practiced what they preached and, therefore, their autobiographies are a true reflection of their mind and experience.

Both were nationalist and internationalist in their outlook. To Gandhiji, nationalism is not exclusive, aggressive or destructive. On the other hand, it is constructive and humanitarian. One reason why it is constructive is that the means that it employs to fulfil itself is non-violence, through conversion and not through coercion. Besides, it is inspired by the ideal of world unity rooted in the highest truth, the spiritual oneness of all mankind. It pleads for a policy of living not by exploiting others but by serving others and dying for others. As such, non-violent nationalism is the essential precondition of sound internationalism. Thus Gandhiji wrote in 1925, "...it is impossible for one to be an internationalist without being a nationalist...... It is not nationalism that is an evil, it is the narrowness, selfishness, exclusiveness which is the bane of modern nations which is evil.... Indian nationalism..... wants to organize itself or to find full self-expression for the benefit and service of humanity at large". Again he wrote, "We want freedom for our country but not at the expense or exploitation of others...... I want the freedom of my country so that other countries may learn something

from my free country, so that the resources of my country might be utilised for the benefit of mankind. Just as the cult of patriotism teaches us today, that the individual has to die for the family, the family has to die for the village, the village for the district, the district for the province, and the province for the country, even so a country has to be free in order that it may die, if necessary, for the benefit of the world. . . . My idea of nationalism is that my country may die so that the human race may live. There is no room for race-hatred there. 15

Gandhiji did not believe in the isolation of a country from the rest of the world. There cannot be an isolated independence but healthy and dignified interdependence of the various states. To quote him, "The better mind of the world desires today not absolutely independent states warring one against another but a federation of friendly interdependent states". The non-violent would try to live on the friendliest terms with his neighbours and not desire their territory. 16

Manjappa's views on nationalism are in full conformity with Gandhiji's view of nationalism. Manjappa
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examined the concept of nationalism in his book, *Bharatiyara Deshabhakti*. First of all Manjappa held, not merely as a political expedient but as a principle, that national interest must prevail against any partial or fragmentary interest. He was a vigorous critic of all fissifarious tendencies that tended to weaken national unity. Concretely he recognised nationalism as a historical fact. This meant that each nation was the product of an evolving, historical process, and this process went on in accordance with its inner law, the "Rāshtriya Dharma". A nation worth the name must evolve its own language and its specific ethos. But this does not mean that a nation should shut its windows against the world. Far from it, one should be selective in assimilating alien influences.  

His nationalism was neither monistic nor chauvinistic. On the one hand, it did not require the repression of group life within, but it merely required that group life and individual life should not be pursued as ideals at the cost of national integration. On the other hand, his nationalism was not aggressive. It did not imply a narrow-minded love of one's own nation. Manjappa too had the vision of a world state,  

though he did not work out its details or examine its practical implications. Manjappa was well aware that the ideal of nationalism was not indigenous to India, and that the problem of sustaining this imported ideal had to be tackled with greater determination.

Both Gandhiji and Manjappa were great champions of individual freedom. Gandhiji never accepted the theory of freedom as arbitrariness or license. Freedom results in self-denial for the sake of society; license means the desire to enjoy exclusive privileges even by a resort to violence. To Gandhiji freedom was a whole. Moral freedom as emancipation from slavery to passions; national freedom as emancipation from the bondage of alien rulers and exploiters, and spiritual freedom as emancipation and realization of truth were all essential phases of freedom. Thus Gandhiji stood for individual liberty and was opposed to exploitation of any kind. The individual is given an important place in Gandhian thought. Gandhiji spoke highly of the importance of liberty and equality. While revolting non-violently against the British government, Gandhiji revealed himself as a champion of the underdog. While he bore no ill-will to the British King, the Prince of Wales,
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the Viceroy and Governors as individuals, he stood against them as they represented a system of imperialist exploitation which degraded man and brought poverty to India. Thus, 'Gandhian politics gave a place under the sun to the poor and his cause.' Similarly, Manjappa also advocated the need for individual freedom. Though Manjappa believed that excessive attachment to the individual self is the root-cause of national downfall, he never minimised individual freedom. He was, like Gandhiji, a libertarian in his out-look. He himself refused to surrender his right to free thinking to any person or institution. That is why he did not become a member of any institution. Though he was a genuine disciple of Shri Basaveshvara, he did not hesitate to express his honest doubts about him. None could have held Gandhiji in high esteem or practised his ideals with greater sincerity than himself, yet Manjappa did not hesitate to express his disagreement with him. This was essence of the principle of tolerance. He felt that no achievement is worth its while unless it is backed up by a genuine personal conviction. His social ideal obviously considered the individual as a basic value. Moreover, the Gandhian philosophy to which he subscribed gave the individual an important place.

In the social sphere both Gandhiji and Manjappa held similar views on the status of women, the problem of the untouchables and so on. Both pleaded for the emancipation and uplift of women, because they believed that this section of our population had been exploited for centuries. Like Auguste Comte, the founder of positivism, the condition of women powerfully impressed Manjappa as well as Gandhiji. Thus Manjappa wrote in the preface to his book Sthree Neethi Sangraha (Ethical Maxims for women), "Women are mothers of the Nation. Their morale alone can bring peace and happiness to the mankind. The main duty of the people who aspire happiness of mankind is to make them literate and by that strengthen their morale".22 Both Manjappa and Gandhiji argued that man has dominated woman from ages past; she has therefore developed an inferiority complex. She has been trained in such a way that she could get salvation only by sacrificing her life for her husband's appetites and values. In this connection, Manjappa like Gandhiji, seems to be determined rebel. Thus he stated in the same book, "Men and women are the two branches of human race. Further, men and women are the two wheels of the chariot of the nation. If this is the case who is superior and who is inferior? In these two, if any

one feels as superior and the other one as inferior; both have to lead a miserable life. So, those who intend to uplift the entire nation, they should not treat women as their slaves. If they do so, all their trials will certainly become futile...." The same opinion is expressed by Gandhiji in his essay on the 'Role of Women in Society'. He took what may be called a conservative view; that there is a natural division of spheres of work between man and woman. The duty of motherhood, which the majority of women will always undertake, requires qualities which man need not possess. She is passive, he is active. She is the keeper and distributor of the bread. She is the caretaker in every sense of the term. The art of bringing up the future citizens of the state is her special and sole prerogative. Without her care, the race must become extinct.24 Thus, 'equal status but different vocations for man and woman' may be considered to be the gist of Gandhiji's view on the subject, a view, one wishes were more widely known.

Further, Gandhiji and Manjappa worked for the upliftment of women through their speeches and writings. Both denounced child marraiges and condemned the dowry system.
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They went even to the extent of approving widow marriage and stoutly opposed forced widowhood. To them child widows are not widows in the real sense of the term.

Both were vehemently opposed to the practice of 'untouchability', that was prevailing in a virulent form in India. Gandhiji was deeply concerned with the pitiable conditions of the so-called untouchables whom he called the 'Harijans', and it became his life's mission to raise their status in society. When the British wanted to separate the Harijans from the Hindus by proposing the system of separate electorate for them, he undertook the historic fast and succeeded in bringing pressure on the British. He made it a part of his mission to work for the social and economic uplift of the Harijans. He undertook an extensive tour and collected money for the 'Harijan Fund'. He also started a weekly paper Harijan. Gandhiji wrote in it:

"Untouchability as it is practiced in Hinduism today is, in my opinion, a sin against God and man and is, therefore, like poison slowly eating into the very vitals of Hinduism. In my opinion, it has no sanction whatsoever in the Hindu Shastras taken as a whole..... It has degraded both the untouchables and the caste Hindus.... They are denied even the ordinary amenities of life."
The sooner, therefore, it is ended the better for Hinduism, the better for India, and perhaps better for mankind in general. He further said, social equality demands removal of untouchability which is a denial of the spiritual unity of all men and the law of Varna. Gandhiji held that if untouchability lived, Hinduism and with it India would die. So he appealed to the people of India and the Hindu society to uplift these down-trodden people without any more delay.

Similarly, Manjappa was also interested in the eradication of untouchables. He whole-heartedly accepted all the programmes of Gandhiji in this regard. Like Gandhiji, he advocated that the untouchables should be allowed to draw water from public wells, enter temples, like the caste Hindus. He pleaded that they should be provided equal rights to mingle with others in places of public resort like educational institutions, public meetings and other public places. Manjappa in one of his speeches declared: "...... that it was more beneficial to the country to worship untouchables, instead of a Brahmin or a Jangama". But it was Manjappa's humble view that it was wrong to call them 'Harijan' as was

done by Gandhiji and it is more appropriate to call them as 'Adijan' (aboriginal). He was of the opinion that the word 'Harijan' (Devotee of God Vishnu) would introduce a communal element. So he argued that it is better to call them as 'Adijan'. It was for this reason that he wrote and published a book *Adijana Sudharane* (The Reform of the untouchables); wherein he advocated immediate emancipation of the untouchables and called upon the authorities to work for the upliftment of these downtrodden people who were severally named in various parts of the country.

Both Manjappa and Gandhiji advocated and worked for the prohibition of the sale and use of intoxicating liquor. When Manjappa advocates prohibition, he does so not because it constitutes morality in itself, but because it is an hindrance to good life. The prohibition of the sale of intoxicating drinks aims at removing from the environment such detrimental factors which stand in the way of the well being of its citizens. Prohibition is not a case of compelling to be moral. It is merely a case of removing hindrances. "Drink", says Gandhiji, "is more a disease than a vice". Again he writes:
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"Diseased persons have got to be helped against themselves." In the same way Manjappa used to advise people to abstain from drinking habit. In his lifetime he saw many youths ruined by evil habits, like drinking. So in the year 1925 he took a tour along with Shri Banthanal Swamiji in the Bijapur District. The main task was to wean away the people from this drink habit. Gandhiji also raised a campaign against the drink evil. His view was that wine is more dangerous than poison because it reduces man to the level of an animal as he looses his sense of right and wrong. Gandhiji regarded the revenue derived from liquor as "Sin". He did not like the idea of imparting education out of the cost of the people who are victims to the drink evil. To him, it was like robbing Peters to pay Pauls. So he advocated abolition of revenue based on drink, and in order to make up the loss he suggested reduction in the military expenditure and economy in other spheres.

Both of them held similar views on education. Gandhiji attached greater importance to education as a means of social regeneration and suggested that education should be free and compulsory during the primary stage from the age of 7 to 14. Incidentally, it may be

mentioned here that this suggestion of his has been provided for in the constitution of free India as a Directive Principle of State Policy (Article 45). He drew up a new plan of self-supporting primary education. Gandhiji called his scheme of education as 'basic education' because it stood for 'the art of living'.

He defined education as "an around drawing out of the best in child and man.....body, mind and spirit. Literacy is not the end of education nor even the beginning. It is only one of the means whereby men and women can be educated". In order to satisfy his ideal of education he considered handicrafts to be essential together with physical drill, drawing and music. Education in handicrafts taught the dignity of labour and combines learning and doing. A chief requirement of Gandhiji's scheme of basic education is that it should be economically self-supporting, the children earning their tuition through handicrafts. The running expenses of this education should come from the educational process itself. This must not mean that basic education be self-supporting from the very beginning, but during the entire period of seven years, covered by
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the basic education plan, income and expenditure must balance. We have in Bentham also a similar idea of self-sufficiency applied to education in his scheme of 'Cherstomathia'. The very word Cherstomathia means 'Conducive to useful learning'. It is on the ground of utility that he preferred scientific teaching; and he further classified sciences on the consideration of their relative utility.

Manjappa also agreed with this Gandhian scheme of basic education. To Manjappa, education which was not conducive to self-reliance and comfortable living does not deserve to be called education. So he said, let us not remain content with the existing system of education which makes us fit only for subordination and servitude. He advised, on the other hand, thousands of our youth should go to the advanced countries of the West to receive education in industrial technology; and after their return they must help to augment the national wealth. The work of educating the people is the responsibility of the educated few. Further, education is conceived by Manjappa as the harmonious development of the whole personality of the individual.
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He, therefore, laid stress upon technical and religious education. By technical education he meant that education should provide a sense of self-security. The aim of education should be to provide employment. Thus he himself established a school at Almatti in 1927; just to provide education to boys on the lines suggested by Gandhiji. The school was completely craft-oriented and sought to bring education closer to life.\(^3^3\)

In the economic sphere both Manjappa and Gandhiji stood for the total abolition of exploitation of poverty and for a kind of equality which even radicals considered rather extreme and impracticable. Their concept of trusteeship was not a compromise with this ideal but a device, so novel that it made sense to very few, to bring about socialization of private property without depriving society of its wealth. Since change of ownership does not lead to a change of the system nor does the abolition of private property abolish the difference between the truly superior and the rest, it was a device, too, of ensuring that the superior did not perpetuate their superiority. Their plea for village industries, and stress on the spinning

wheel as their symbol, was not a plea for a return to primitiveness. It was the only practical method available then for checking the drain of wealth and skill from the villages to the towns, preventing the growing social, cultural and economic hiatus between the two providing, without any governmental help, desperately needed partial employment to the vast under-employed and under-productive rural masses, relieving the incredibly abysmal poverty of the villages and thereby injecting some dynamism into an utterly stagnant economy.

2. DIFFERENCES OF OPINION:

Gandhiji and Manjappa were born under different circumstances. Gandhiji was born as the son of a rich family while Manjappa was born in a poor family. Further, Gandhiji had the benefit of all higher and western education. On the other hand, Manjappa was denied the benefit of higher education because he was born in a poor family. So when he completed his Mahila (7th standard) examination in 1903, he was forced to seek employment for his livelihood. Luckily, he was appointed as a primary school teacher in his own school.
at Sirsi, where he completed his education. Again Gandhiji was married at a very early age; but Manjappa remained a bachelor throughout his life. He was of the opinion that marriage would come in the way of his public service, as he was drawn to public activities from 1906. Thus he made up of his mind at the age of 25 to give up the idea of marriage and thereafter made radical modifications in his personal and food habits, which helped him to lead a life of celibacy.\(^\text{34}\)

Gandhiji led the Indian National Movement under the banner of the Indian National Congress. But Manjappa did not lead any such movement nor did he join the Congress party. In his book 'Satyagraha Dharma' he wrote as to why he had not joined the Congress, as follows:

"Political or social or similar conferences or organizations function on the principle of majority opinion. Majority vote is their breath. But, for those who follow the principles of Satyagraha, truth is their breath. Therefore, a true follower of Satyagraha cannot join such meetings or organizations, and follow their injunctions. But he may join them only in so far as they do not conflict with his honest opinions, and help to run them. It seems necessary to me that, those who want to follow faithfully the
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principles of Satyagraha, must refrain from associating themselves with such bodies initially".35

Further, Manjappa writes in the same book: "It is my impression that Gandhiji has fully captured the Congress, and he does not simply follow it. He is not the man to follow the majority opinion. He acts according to the dictates of his conscience; the majority may or may not follow him, but it matters little to him."36 Though Manjappa sounds arrogant, but he was a man with a courage of his convictions which prevented him from formally identifying himself with any organization. He considered it a perfectly legitimate activity to criticise freely the activities of even an institution like the Congress, and the views of such a great person as the Mahatma if a criticism is warranted. He had his own justification for not joining the Congress and playing the role of at least an adviser. To participate in organization like the Congress Party great leadership quality is required. Inspite of so many drawbacks, such as communal barriers, linguistic divisions, regional loyalties; Gandhiji emerged as the nationalist

leader and he was acknowledged as such throughout the whole world. But Manjappa did not have that experience of leadership. He preferred to be aloof from the Congress. Therefore, Manjappa did not emerge even as a provincial political leader though many admired him for his constructive work and forthright views on politics and society. It is very easy to preach but difficult to practice. Further, the hold of Gandhiji on Indian National Congress and masses was tremendous and Manjappa cannot be compared with Gandhiji in this respect. Gandhiji was essentially the leader of the masses and the Congress party and could plunge the whole nation into action. Even Manjappa himself acknowledged 'Gandhiji a better leader of the mass than Subhas Chandra Bose', or anybody else of that time. Thus Gandhiji was an all India figure who could lead the Indian nation. But Manjappa was just a thinker, a critique and a constructive worker. His main interest was writing and Journalism. He thought and wrote in Kannada language only and were not even read by Indians outside Karnataka.

Manjappa as a person keenly interested in public affairs of the day sat in judgment over the

Indian National Congress and the Mahatma. He was both an admirer and critic of Gandhiji. He supported Gandhiji's nationalistic activities against the British. At the same time he criticised Gandhiji whenever he felt that wrong decisions were taken in Indian politics.

For instance, when the Congress met in 1934 in Bombay, he did not hesitate to criticise severely its communal policy, and he did it again in 1937 when it first accepted office. Again, Manjappa was against the resignation of Congress ministry in the year 1939.38

When the Second World War broke out in September, 1939 India was immediately declared a belligerent country by the British Government without consulting the people of India. The Congress Working Committee strongly protested against this action of the British Government. They called upon the British Government to declare their war aims in clear-cut terms. They asked whether the war aims of the Government included "the treatment of India as a free nation whose policy will be guided in accordance with the wishes of the people". They firmly declared that "the committee cannot associate themselves or offer any co-operation in a war which is

conducted on imperialistic lines and which is meant to consolidate imperialism in India and elsewhere).

The British Government refused to give the assurance demanded by the Congress. It made merely vague promises to the effect that at the end of the war the British Government would be willing to consult the various interests in India to make such modifications in the Act of 1935 as might seem desirable. The result was that the Congress decided to non-cooperate with the British Government. The Congress High Command called the Congress Ministries in eight provinces to resign and they did resign accordingly in October 1939. The administration of those eight provinces was taken over by the Governors. Only the three non-Congress Ministries of Sind, Punjab and Bengal remained in office.

Mr. V.P. Menon has criticised this action of the Congress in these words:

"Had it (the Congress) not resigned from its position of vantage in the provinces the course of Indian history might have been very different. By resigning, it showed a lamentable lack of foresight and political wisdom. There was little chance of its being put out of office, the British Government would surely have hesitated to incur the odium of dismissing ministries which had the overwhelming support of the people. Nor could it have
resisted a unanimous demand for a change at the centre, a demand which would have been all the more irresistible after the entry of Japan into the war. In any case, it is clear that, but for the resignation of the Congress, Jinnah and the Muslim League would never have attained the position they did".39

Manjappa also considered that step as the greatest blunder of the Congress party. He seems to be correct because during war time, when Congress was out of power and was also suppressed by the Britishers, it helped the Muslim League into prominence and the way was prepared ultimately for the partition of the country itself.

Further, Manjappa did not join the Gandhian Movement of Civil Disobedience as it did not seem to him to be based on any rational principle. Thus he wrote in his autobiography as follows:

"......it is one thing to court prison when one acts according to what one regards as truth. But to act so deliberately in order to go to the prison is an altogether different thing. The Gandhian call to break the law falls under the second category. Hence I could not associate myself with it. It was merely a matter of political strategy, and not related to any principle or truth. If

this is not the case, then there are so many unjust laws under the British Government that if we broke all of them we should never be out of the prisons. In the beginning I thought Gandhiji had started his Satyagraha as a matter of principle like Prahlada (the mythological character) and would end his life in the prison. Only later I came to realise that it was part of his political strategy".40

Both were interested in the liberation of the country from foreign bondage. In other words, they were interested in the attainment of Swaraj from the British. But they differed in the method of achieving it. "The word Swaraj", says Gandhiji, "is a sacred word, a Vedic word, meaning self-rule and self-restraint, and not freedom from all restraint which independence often means".41 Thus Swaraj is infinitely greater than and includes independence.42 But self-government is the primary and essential requirement. That is why Gandhiji looked at the English rule in India thus: "Personally .......I long for freedom from the English yoke...... I would pay any price for it. I would accept chaos in exchange for it....... This satanic rule has well-nigh ruined this fair land, materially, morally and spiritually".43 Therefore he held that there would be

41. Young India, March 19, 1931.
42. Young India, Vol. III, p.547.
43. Young India, Vol. III, p.548
no justification for the rule of one country over another—
no justification for making any discrimination on grounds
of racial or religious distinction.\textsuperscript{44} Gandhiji defended
self-government not merely because it would enhance
'the greatest good of the greatest number' but mainly
because he believed in the spiritual democracy of man-
kind.\textsuperscript{45} But he said, Swaraj must be achieved through
non-violence. So to Gandhiji the problem of the
technique of non-violence included in itself the problem
of the institutional form of Swaraj. "For me", he
repeatedly said, "Ahimsa comes before Swaraj".\textsuperscript{46} "The
Swaraj of my conception", writes Gandhiji, "will come
only when all of us are firmly persuaded that our Swaraj
has got to be won, worked and maintained through truth
and Ahimsa alone". True democracy or Swaraj of the
masses can never come through untruthful and violent
means, for the simple reason that the natural corollary
to their use would be to remove all opposition through
the suppression or experimentation of the antagonists.
Though Manjappa had faith in Gandhiji's truth and non-
vioence, yet he had his own doubt regarding India

\textsuperscript{44} S.B. Sharma, \textit{Gandhi as a Political Thinker}, p.95.
\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{46} Gopinath Dhawan, \textit{The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi}, Navajivan Publishing House,
Ahmedabad, 1957, p.281.
getting Swaraj or independence from the British through 
truth and non-violence alone. That is why in the 
later years of his life Manjappa began to admire 
Veera Savarkar and the Hindu Mahasabha ideology. This 
was a clear indication of the transformation that took 
place in his political view. He was prepared for 
securing India's independence by any means—violent or 
non-violent. In this regard the end justified the 
means. Thus he also supported Subhas Chandra Bose 
against Gandhiji.

Though both Gandhiji and Manjappa had faith 
in democracy they differed widely on its modus operandi. 
Gandhiji's conception of democracy was different from 
the meaning attached to the term in treatises on 
political systems. He interpreted it as mainly signi-
fying the 'Swaraj of the masses'. As in every other 
sphere, here too he assigned prime importance to the 
individual, and he visualized a democracy which should 
grow from the grassroots level rather than being imposed 
from above. To Gandhiji, true democracy can not be 
worked by twenty men sitting at the centre. It has to 
be worked from below by the people of every village. 
The ideal of Gandhiji was stateless democracy where 
social life was self-regulated. To quote him, "In such
a state every one is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour. In the ideal state, therefore, there is no political power because there is no state. The ideal democracy was to be a federation of Satyagrahi village communities. "Society based on non-violence can only be of groups settled in villages in which voluntary cooperation is the condition of dignified and peaceful existence." The federation and the groups were to be organized on a voluntary basis. Gandhiji said that society was to be decentralised and equality was to prevail in every sphere of life. Thus Gandhiji thought, inspired of the mistakes, masses must be given a chance of self-rule. Manjappa also liked the institution of democracy, but he did not like Gandhiji's interpretation of democracy as 'Swaraj of the masses'. But he rather preferred presidential democracy of America, to the stateless democracy of Gandhiji. Though he liked the presidential democracy of America, he was also aware of its defects like centralization of nation's wealth in few hands. Thus he stood for the good of the people and social and economic justice.

47. V.D. Mahajan, op. cit., p.543.
48. Ibid.
49. Manjappa Hardekar, Ecchatta Hindusthan, p.63.
Unfortunately he did not write a comprehensive book on the contents of social justice of his vision. Hence it is difficult to categorise him as a socialist or a capitalist. It is wrong to dub him as a fascist; just because he happened to support Hindu Mahasabha in the later years of his life. He was not committed to a particular political ideology and he decided issues on the basis of the merits of each case. This point may be illustrated thus. When there was a contest to the presidency of the Indian National Congress in 1941, between Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya and Shri Subhas Chandra Bose; the latter got elected as president with a thumping majority support. But Gandhiji had sponsored and supported Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, probably because he believed that he (Gandhiji) could control Congress through Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya and not through Subhas Chandra Bose who would not listen to him, and if Bose were to become the President great damage would be done to the cause of nationalism in India. Perhaps Gandhiji's decision otherwise could have altered the course of Indian history. Eventually Subhas Chandra Bose was forced to resign. As a believer in democracy, Manjappa supported the election of Subhas Chandra Bose as the Congress President. Thus Manjappa in certain respect was more democratic than Gandhiji.

50. Sharana Sandesh, 13.3.1939.
In the social sphere Manjappa differed with Gandhiji's four-fold caste hierarchy. Gandhiji accepted in toto the four-fold caste hierarchy from Bhagavad Gita. Lord Krishna says in the Gita: all Varnas have been created by me, "Chatur Varnam maya Srishtam. The law of Varna is nothing, if not by birth".\(^{51}\) Gandhiji defined the law of Varna thus: "The law of Varna means that every one shall follow as a matter of Dharma—duty—the hereditary calling of his forefathers so far as it is not inconsistent with fundamental ethics. He will earn his livelihood by following that calling. He may not hoard riches, but devote the balance for the good of the people".\(^{52}\) Gandhiji laid stress on functions being hereditary, watertight division. Thus, to him, Varna was intimately, but not indissolubly, connected with birth. Gandhiji further stated: "Varna is not caste, it is class..... I believe that every man is born in the world with certain definite limitations which he can not overcome. From a careful observation of those limitations the law of Varna was deduced. It establishes certain spheres of action for certain people with certain tendencies.

---

This avoided all unworthy competition. While recognising limitations, the law of Varna admitted of no distinctions of high and low; on the one hand it guaranteed to each the fruits of his labours and on the other it prevented him from pressing upon his neighbour. This great law has been degraded and fallen into disrepute. But my conviction is that an ideal social order will only be evolved when the implications of this law are fully understood and given effect to.53 But Manjappa did not accept Gandhiji's views on the four-fold caste hierarchy. Thus he wrote; "I do not approve of the four-fold caste classification expounded in the Bhagavad Gita".54 Manjappa said that the four Varnas or castes, based on the accident of birth, must disappear, and this would facilitate inter-marriage among the main castes.55 He opined that it was a great achievement of Shri Basaveshwara who attempted to eradicate caste, root and branch. That is why he considered the following Vaćana of Shri Basaveshwara as crucial to our social problems, and immortal in its message:

53. B.S. Sharma, Gandhi as a Political Thinker, p.121.
"Chennayya, the cobbler, is my sire;
Kakkayya: the tanner, my uncle is;
Chikkayya is my grandsire, lo!
My elder brother is
Bommayya the lutanist.
Then, why, Kūḍala Saṅgama, do you not
Take cognisance of me?" 56

Manjappa thus supported whole heartedly Gandhiji in his programme of upliftment of untouchables. It may be recalled here that he differed with Gandhiji calling untouchables, as 'Harijans'. More correctly they should be called 'Adijan' (aboriginal). He was of the opinion that the word Harijan would create a communal feeling among the people. So he argued with Gandhiji better they should be called as Adijan.57 It was then that he wrote and published Adijana Sudharane; wherein he advocated for the early emancipation of untouchables. To call the untouchables as 'Harijan', as Gandhiji did introduce an element of theology. Whereas Manjappa preferred to call them as 'Adijan' which is more scientific based on sociological and anthropological material available in history. Gandhiji was sentimental while Manjappa was rational in this respect.

In the economic sphere Manjappa differed with Gandhiji in bonfiring foreign cloth; though he supported wholeheartedly Gandhiji's Khadi cult. He held the view that such cloth should be given to the poor, thus supporting Andrews against Gandhiji.58

To conclude, there is a striking similarity between the ideas of Gandhiji and Manjappa. Both of them denounced modern civilization as based on force and exploitation. Both of them were opposed to violent methods of fighting evil. Both laid stress on the reform of the individual. Both advocated an ascetic morality and preached extreme simplicity of life, bread-labour and virtual celibacy. Further, both stood for high ideals, such as, honesty, dedication and a spirit of service and sacrifice. Both were democratic and trying to mould public opinion in their favour. Unfortunately Gandhiji was murdered for his convictions. However there were few differences between the two. Manjappa did not agree with Gandhiji on the question of bonfire of foreign cloth and supported Andrews stand that it should be distributed freely among the poor. He also did not agree with Gandhiji regarding Swarajya as the only goal of the Congress. He had sharp differences

with Gandhiji on the nature of Hinduism. He expressed his dissatisfaction with Gandhiji's term 'Harijans' for the untouchables, and preferred 'Adi Jana'. Even then Manjappa considered Gandhiji a better leader of the masses than Subhas Chandra Bose. It is because of this he became the chief follower and propagator of Gandhian ideals in Karnataka and insisted on their adoption by his own people. Of course, Gandhiji was for more pragmatic than Manjappa. He was essentially a man of compromise in the case of non-essentials. He was always ready to adopt his actions to the demands of the changing world.

Manjappa was nearer to Plato because he was also a visionary and idealist, and Gandhiji was nearer to Aristotle because he was a practical idealist. Thus Manjappa was not a blind follower of Gandhiji though he had the greatest admiration for him as a true leader of the masses and a great nationalist and patriot. While expressing his differences with Gandhiji, Manjappa exhibited clear and free thinking on his part. He was highly individualistic in his approach to several problems. He looked at them without any inhibitions. He thought freely and wrote fearlessly irrespective of party and such other considerations. It is this freedom that he cherished more than anything else.