# STRATEGIES OF PROTEST: GANDHI IN CONTEMPORARY CARTOONS

Christel R Devadawson
Department of English
*University of Delhi*, India

STRATEGIES OF PROTEST: GANDHI IN CONTEMPORARY CARTOONS

***Abstract:*** Pictorial satire in twenty-first century India often redraws Gandhi to protest contemporary corruption in public life, the marginalisation of the common people and the fragility of the nation-state. Such contemporary reconstructions of the Gandhi icon suggest the resilience of the popular imagination, its ability to use comedy as a weapon of dissent, and the capacity of ordinary peoples to resist and interrogate the pressures of political and economic power. They also indicate however, the uneasy complicity between structures of power and their representation. When do strategies of protest inscribe their own containment? The work of R K Laxman and Ajit Ninan opens up the paradoxes --- sometimes funny, sometimes heart wrenching --- as these develop within the heart of resistance movements such as Naxalbari, Gandhigiri, and Anna Hazare's crusade. This paper studies the complexities of the relationship between state power and popular protest as political caricature reconfigures these through its compulsive redrawing of Gandhi.
***Keywords:*** Gandhi, pictorial satire, protest movements

## INTRODUCTION

The defining quality of pictorial satire is its ability to construct parables of protest by redrawing icons of the past to respond to present-day political crisis. My inquiry focuses on the way in which --- in late twentieth and early twenty-first century India --- this genre repeatedly reworks the image of Gandhi to develop strategies of protest that interrogate state formation, the marginalisation of the masses, and emergent capitalisms. This exercise requires us as readers to follow simultaneously at least two lines of inquiry. To begin with, we need to be able to recapitulate the genealogy of the issues at stake. Following from this, we need to be willing to speculate on possible consequences of this kind of reconstruction. In other words, we must recognise both continuities and ruptures as the present returns to the past to articulate its concerns and to shape the future. In common with other emergent democracies, postindependent India --- at moments of critical importance --- often replays history with a difference to intervene in contemporary issues and analyze or change them as it sees fit. Its political caricature in particular revisits and reshapes the Gandhi icon to signal its anger with things as they are. More importantly, pictorial dissent reminds us, to "refuse to accept the idea that the "isness" of man's present nature makes him morally incapable of reaching up for the eternal "oughtness" that forever confronts him (King 1964)"

This is, however, to get ahead of the field. I need to begin by establishing the history of the use of the Gandhi icon as a strategy of protest in itself and as a critical prism through which to examine allied modes of dissent: their strengths and their limitations. In this connection, I will first focus on the construction of the gandhian icon and the relationships that involve the icon in the early phase of the development of the nation. After this prequel, I will analyse the troubled legacy of gandhian protest in postindependent India with particular emphasis on the material and the symbolic strengths and constraints that develop. Finally, I will indicate the sequel: the way in which this movement seems to set up a complicated kinship with other kinds of revolution. While I will try to discuss the issues that arise out of this treatment in their historical sequence, I will not necessarily do the same by the cartoonists, since I wish to lay out the field in terms of theme rather than in terms of chronology.

**Prequel to Protest**

Interestingly, British cartoonists --- especially Illingworth and David Low --- were among the earliest to use the Gandhi icon to indicate their sense of the difficulties involved in the construction of a new nation. It is easy to dismiss their dismay at his leadership of the freedom movement as being the natural outcome of their support of Empire. In fact, however, this is incorrect. Both Illingworth and Low were unsparing in their attacks on the cost of imperialism for both the colony and the colonial power, and in their concern over the fragility and volatility of the nascent Indian state as well. In consequence, their representations of Gandhi draw the attention of their readers to the tenuous nature both of British governance of India during the long twilight of the Raj and of the hold Gandhi and the freedom struggle exerted on the peoples of India.

*Iconisation and loneliness*

In this context, the first point that pictorial satire makes is that there are large sections of Indian opinion that do not share either the plans of the British government, or even Gandhi's plans, for an emergent nation. To depict the failure of the Simon Commission Low constructs a composite figure of a failed conjuror, and places this figure at the center of the panel (Low 1927). The figure wears the costume of Gandhi, but occupies the position of Sir John Simon, who came out to India to negotiate a scheme for the transfer of power that failed. The ease with which Low constructs this composite figure shows us two kinds of isolation. We might expect the British representative to be alienated from the masses, but with

the perfect afterglow of hindsight, we might not expect Gandhi to share a similar fate. Low's conflation of two figures of leadership shows us equally Gandhi's inability to persuade multiple minority communities of the peoples of India to share his vision for the future. Low's central figure as conjuror bemusedly seeks to bring different sections of society --- the humble cultivators, the aloof Parsis, the proud Sikhs, and the self-satisfied traders --- to come up as volunteers to make the "Indian Hope Trick" work. He fails. The various communities --- their headgear enables the above classification --- unite in one thing alone. They turn their backs on the central figure. Low's protagonist is a magician who has come without a stooge and cannot coax even a single member of his audience to step up and help him pull off his exploit. It is easy to dismiss Low's sketch as just another orientalist gesture meant to remind its readers that India will accept no leader other than Britain. Nonetheless, Low's representation makes not so much for derision as it does for pathos. It is a telling reminder of the fact that at the heart of a protest movement --- even in one as massive as the birth of a nation --- the leader waits at the center in a circle of loneliness. It also encodes within it the disturbing suggestion that --- from the perspective of the masses --- one leader is interchangeable with another. Unlike those who crusade for freedom or those who seek to contain it, the masses of India are as untouched by the Simon Commission sent out by the Raj as they are by the freedom struggle. Protest seems to impinge upon them as little as collaboration.

*The Repetitiveness of Failure*

A protest icon who is paradoxically alone at the head of a crusade encounters the same problems, as does the administration that is the subject of the protest. The difference is that such a leader is unlikely to have anything approaching the level of official support that the administration enjoys. A good example is Illingworth's representation of the way in which the departing British government delightedly hands over its central problem --- that of religious fundamentalism --- to the Congress and the Muslim League. The new representation of wildlife, or what he calls, 'the new elephant house," is every whit as much part of the jungle as its predecessor. The idiom of the Raj persists into independent India. The people are hapless if undiscerning animals who --- without a common enemy --- do not ally with each other. They obstinately sit back to back, each facing in the opposite direction. Illingworth casts the leadership --- in the interim stage it comprises both Viceroy and Indian nationalists such as Nehru and Gandhi --- in the position of amateurish hunters who perch themselves thoughtlessly on a platform directly above the

warring pachyderms. Two curious features develop. There is the obvious caveat concerning protest: namely, that it is just one step from the jungle to the zoo. Indian nationalists now share a platform --- literally and otherwise --- with their former antagonists, the British government. However, they are as isolated and apart from the peoples of India as were their predecessors. They are also as foolishly predatory and hostile. Structures of power --- a later generation might call this regime change --- do not necessarily alter with their leadership. The second warning that Illingworth encodes in his representation is that the same danger --- fundamentalism --- that befalls one government is likely to menace its successor.

A similar piece by Low reinforces the fact that a protest movement --- in this case that of Indian nationalism --- may not always assess its enemies correctly. Gandhi --- and Low does not hesitate to cast him as the saint --- reads lessons on the value of martyrdom to the tiger of communal ferocity (Low 1933). Notice how naturally Low's tiger wears his stripes, and how naturally Low's calligraphy uses these stripes to brand the animal. History is witness to the enormity of the tragedy that follows this misreading. However, it is worth observing again how graphic dissent suggests not so much the limitations of an agitation but more importantly the way in which the subject of the protest, and the protestors themselves, share common areas of collapse, whether or not they recognise the repetitiveness of failure. Traditionally, political thought in India inclines to place renunciation of power at the center of any crisis in leadership: "the task of [social] conversion must lie only with charismatic figures, who have shunned political power, who are gifted with the 'grace of god,' and are prepared for martyrdom in pursuit of a noble cause (Baxi 1990)." Equally, however, such a configuration is usually fraught with danger for the individual and for the body politic. This becomes clear when we move from a study of the icon to an examination of the relationship between the icon and political strategy.

*Iconisation and protest strategies*

Such warning signals raise the question: what exactly is the relationship between an iconic figure leading a protest, and the larger concept of protest as a whole? This is a tough question to answer, and pictorial dissent makes a canny response. It uses a generic shift from caricature to portraiture to draw the attention of the reader to the complexities inherent within the icon. Nandlal Bose's 1930 sketch of Gandhi --- intended by this artist as a full-length profile --- survives most notably on an Indian stamp today because

of its close resemblance to caricature. Many attributes of the Gandhi icon --- the circular spectacles, the long staff, the forward thrust of the skinny shoulders and the impatient stride --- that become central in subsequent representations, make their first appearance here. Conversely, R K Laxman's 1940 drawing of Gandhi --- his earliest caricature of the Mahatma --- comes across as being surprisingly painterly in its emphasis on the benign, if specifically Hindu, sage, who is impossibly old and wise. As though to warn its readers against an all-too easy and misleading iconisation, artists deliberately experiment with different modes of representation thus bringing out the fact that Gandhi as a protest leader must not be summed up in a simplistic formula. Incidentally, the crossover effect in which portraiture and caricature seem to do duty for each other also suggests the way in which the popular imagination --- even at the height of a protest movement --- has sufficient space and tensile strength to construct not just hagiography, but comedy as well. These twin attributes are a useful reminder of the relationship that can develop among peoples, their leaders and a continuing movement as we move from this prequel to examine the evolution of protest.

**Evolution of Protest**

How exactly do its inheritors treat the gandhian icon that they use? The continuing legacy of protest, so to speak, is a theme that pictorial satire handles in at least two ways. To begin with, the genre gives its readers a detailed account of the material incongruities between the bequest that the icon leaves behind, and the ever-changing world that the bequest challenges. It goes on to offer a glimpse of the symbolic values behind the materiality of this troubling and troubled legacy. The assessment that graphic dissent enables its readers to make, and the black comedy through which it facilitates this critique arise from the continuous traffic between the material and the symbolic that it seeks to sustain. In the process, it also opens up a space for a conversation that runs on parallel tracks. The first is that which takes place between an icon of an increasingly distant past and a world that spins on in a state of continuous flux. The second is that which develops between repeated attempts to refashion the icon, and the world that engages in such redrawing. We might begin our analysis of the legacy of protest by examining the issue of material incongruity between the world that originally gives rise to the gandhian icon and the world that comes into this inheritance.

*"New" materialisms*

The gandhian world of the self-sufficient rural economy and a political order that derives its mandate from its will to serve the masses seems to tip directly into farce when it comes up against the new material and moral order of postindependent India. Laxman's representation of the world of the nineteen-sixties draws the attention of the reader to many disquieting realities. To begin with, the party that claims to inherit the gandhian legacy insists on claiming it in terms of conspicuous consumption rather than in terms of unobtrusive service. The flaunting tagline spoken by the grossly overweight politician in the rear seat insists on this claim as a matter of right rather than as a matter of duty. "Of course I am following in his footsteps, (Ketkar 71)" is a ludicrous travesty that Laxman visualises in terms of a stark contrast. The vanishing footprints of the Mahatma lead out of the panel, while the crassly opulent convertible drives in to occupy the central position. Laxman's visualising of this paradigm-shift is important. First, the representative of the ruling party occupies --- not the lumbering Morris Oxford model (locally called the Ambassador) in which government officials routinely drive --- but an imported vehicle that Laxman usually assigns relics of the princely states. Even the chauffeur wears his turban with a regal flourish. Next, he identifies the party by inscribing its name as a banner across the chest of the lone passenger. This identification is important in terms of the medium because as a rule Laxman limits verbal text to a tagline. It is also important politically because Gandhi held the view that in postindependent India the Congress should give up office because the objective behind its formation, namely Indian independence, was now in position. Moreover, Laxman's Common Man --- the unsung hero of most of his work – now occupies the position usually held by the Mahatma in his customary loincloth. The torch of protest, as it were, seems to be passing from the icon to the average, unknown citizen. Finally, it is clear that the gandhian message concerning the need to interrogate power is lost on those who now hold it. A new kind of agitation seems essential, now that one ruling class seems to be replacing its predecessor. The fact that the convertible flies the Indian flag is the most painfully ironic detail because it demonstrates that government --- whether British or Indian --- is equally remote from the suffering masses.

*The ambivalence of protest strategies*

This brings us necessarily to the way in which subsequent protests translate or respond to the gandhian ideal of revolution through non-violence. The Naxalbari movement bases its self-avowedly Maoist ideology on redistributionist economics, to bring down appallingly high levels of rural indebtedness and

land alienation across the central and eastern states. Despite its commitment to violence as a means to achieve its ends, in the nineteen-seventies it found a supporter in Jayaprakash Narayan, a former gandhian socialist. JP supported the passion and commitment that he believed the Naxals showed toward the disenfranchised rural masses comprising often the voiceless and faceless indigenous peoples of the subcontinent. Laxman's tagline --- that he has JP speak --- commends the Naxal movement for their work: "I have every sympathy for the naxalites because they are doing something for the people" (Kumar 61).Laxman opens up the brutal contradiction that lies at the heart of JP's message by setting up the figure of a sandwich-board man. This allows his JP to express opposing messages simultaneously. Looking at the front face, he gives us JP as one who wears the saintly and hallowed portrait of the Mahatma in his heart, where he believes only non-violence should abide. From the rear however, Laxman shows us that his JP carries the vicious portrait of a hooligan who commits himself to indiscriminate violent action. Clearly, this is the gandhian message with a critical twist. The commitment to social uplift remains, but the method of non-violence does not survive its original prophet.

*The drift to mortality*

If this is how the gandhian legacy of protest unwinds itself, it is surely a legitimate question to ask whether --- once all its inheritors end their mortal or political lives --- differences erase themselves. Vijayan's moment in the mortuary represents both Gandhi and JP as similar subjects of state and individual persecution. The tagline extrapolates a line from a very different kind of revolutionary agenda --- that of Jesus of Nazareth --- to read "Rejoice and be exceeding glad for so persecuted they the prophets before you. (Vijayan 46)" The emphasis on persecution and mortality as common denominators seems to suggest the shared end of all protest movements and their leaders: derided in life and exalted in death. On what terms however, can we read this visionary triumphalism as a reward? Clearly, we need to speculate not just on whether the message encoded within the protest strategy outlives the prophet in question but also on the extent to which the assurance of future beatitude compensates for present-day failure.

*Reliance on symbolism*

This difference between promise and fulfilment is perhaps the major reason for strategies of protest to construct iconographies of dissent that depend on synecdoche and symbol. Vijayan's representation of the gandhian message in terms of the spinning wheel (Vijayan 102), and Ranga's variations of a rear-facing

Gandhi in outline (Ranga 2001) are examples of this method. These representations carry a high charge of emotional and ideological identification. They do so however, at a very high price. Vijayan's wheel, for instance, is no longer just the symbol of self-dependence and cottage industry that Gandhi advocated as a means of resistance to British rule. It is also the symbol of government and state formation in independent India as it forms part of the national flag and the national emblem. Similarly, Ranga's compulsive return to the Gandhi icon encodes its own brand of ambiguity. He gives his readers a Gandhi without a face, so to speak, as an indication perhaps that individual accidents of personality are less important than the broad outlines of the message. This might well be the distinctive quality of strength that of the gandhian iconology that he constructs. Unsurprisingly he undertakes this work to commemorate a gandhian anniversary, in this case the one hundred and thirty-second anniversary of Gandhi's birth. Moreover, Ranga's insistence on a rear-facing Gandhi suggests that the protest figure wishes to turn his back on an unresponsive nation that no longer heeds his call. Indeed Ranga's Gandhi is very much a textbook illustration of the power of graphic protest in which "the abbreviated style gains its own significance, as if the artist were to say to us: 'See, this great man is nothing but a lot of lines; I can grasp his personality in a few strokes (Gombrich 1938).'" Simultaneously however, we have to accept that this reductionism may facilitate solidarity at the expense of sophistication. The finer points of the message may well be lost in the broad strong lines that carry no shades of grey to them. We may sometimes find ourselves asking whether this draws attention to the elemental or the elementary component in the evolution of strategies of protest. The cartoonist leaves nothing to chance. The tagline literally spells out what he believes to be the gandhian message. Readers however may consider this a reduction to formulaic simplification that the artist achieves by erasing complexity.

The dangers consequent upon this kind of symbolism become painfully evident when we turn to study applications of the principle. Vijayan's double panel is a telling example. In the first --- again, a commemorative exercise, this time of the one hundred and eighteenth anniversary of Gandhi's birth --- we meet three quite different areas of crisis in the now-established nation. The economic stagnation of the early nineteen-eighties, the ecological devastation of the nineteen-seventies and eighties, and the threat of nuclear capability seem to the artist a travesty of the idea of true gandhian progress. The wheel, once a symbol of rewarding protest against imperialism, seems less successful against the socialistic excesses of

self-government. The caption of the first panel, “the wheel comes full circle (Ramanathaiyer 259)” ironically testifies to this disappointment. In the second panel, the caption, “the changing Indian image in Sri Lanka (Vijayan 111)” indicates Vijayan’s response to what he sees as the progressive deterioration of India’s presence in the region. Vijayan recalls earlier landmarks in the relationship between the countries. He reminds his readers of a goodwill mission in 2 BCE led by Mahendra and Sanghamitra from the court of Ashoka in India to that of Devanampiya Tissa in Sri Lanka. As a token of peace and wisdom, Sanghamitra carried a branch of the tree in Gaya under which Buddha attained enlightenment. The wheel of course symbolises the gandhian message of peace and progress. In contrast, Vijayan indicates his disgust with the time of the cartoon in which he believes the government of Rajiv Gandhi concludes a deeply corrupt arms deal with Sweden. As always, the gandhian symbol is both a touchstone of moral values and a condemnation of the degradation of the India of the nineteen-eighties.

At the same time, how helpful is it to convict a government of ineptitude against a single relic of a movement? The nature of the nation-state and the demands of its peoples continue to reinvent themselves. In contrast, the symbol --- based as it is on synecdoche --- may capture a part that is less than the whole. When this happens, we may well believe that we are looking at the conversion of a popular movement into a national monument that does not change, even when the nation around it is in perpetual flux. We may censure the unresponsiveness of such protest legacies, without realising that the strategy of selective symbolic extrapolation is at least as responsible for the apparent inapplicability that annoys us. Pictorial satire is quick to represent Gandhi walking out quietly into the sunset. With him, decency and decorum also seem to leave public life. However, we need to think about whether the icon is perhaps a little too quick to accept dismissal. Should legacies of protest not stay the course, particularly when a vitiated public sphere seeks to obliterate them? Does the world not need them the most when it seems to want them the least?

**Sequel to protest**

This becomes clear when we look at the latter-day re-emergence of gandhian iconography. As the third wave of economic liberalization washes over the end of twentieth century, popular culture seems to turn again to Gandhi in quest not just of a standard of values in public life but also of a new and more

fulfilling way of life. A crucial difference, however, seems to emerge. Hitherto the gandhian message has seemed to signal either a nostalgic return to the public morality of a forgotten past, or a stern reminder of the widening chasm between the real or the ideal. The value of the icon in both cases concerns the negotiation of a relationship between the past and the present. In this contemporary phase, we begin to see that graphic dissent reworks the Gandhi icon and message to open up their potential for leading the way to a new kind of future that responds to a very different dynamic. During this period, graphic satire also brings the icon into conversation with a range of movements within and outside the country. This allows us as readers to understand the terms on which the gandhian icon and message translate across multiple media and across multiple protest movements in the contemporary world. We can also think about whether these strategies of protest --- encoded within pictorial dissent --- face toward the past or the future.

*Redefinitions of protest*

One of the most vivid responses to the gandhian message in recent times comes from mainstream Bollywood cinema. Rajkumar Hirani's 2003 comedy *Munnabhai MBBS* and its sequel *Lage raho Munnabhai* set up a group of lovable hoodlums who construct an alternative response to all forms of tyranny that they call "gandhigiri." This involves comic persuasion through the pressure of repeated acts of goodness in the face of evil so that it becomes impossible --- beyond a point --- for malevolence to continue unchecked. A cartoon by Ajit Ninan twists the tale a little further. In a single panel that uses color and collage to make its point, Ninan shows us how an officious security guard refuses to let Gandhi enter the cinema screening the film because his long staff seems to be a threatening weapon. Ninan's irony works on different levels (Ninan 122). The historical Gandhi is quite enthusiastic about the makeover that mainstream cinema gives his image, and queues up to watch himself on screen. He even brandishes a currency note, like everyone else, to pay for his ticket. However, no one else recognises him, although they too are eager to watch a film that became famous because of its popularisation of his way of life. The film deals with the Mumbai underworld and the security guard in the cinema flaunts a revolver in its holster. In such a context, Gandhi alone stands forth as a security threat. This comedy of failed recognition reminds the reader that even as people seem to fall over themselves to watch a retelling of the gandhian message, they cannot recognise Gandhi except as a danger to themselves. Gandhi is

indeed a threat to this world, but not in the way it imagines. His presence and values show up the vice and folly of those who are unable to see him for what he is. Ninan's panel also raises disturbing issues. What are the consequences of performing protest in this way? Does protest have a performativity quotient, so to speak, and in that case, is it possible to choreograph and rehearse protest?

*Replaying protest*

These questions become particularly important with regard to an ongoing crusade against dishonesty in public life. Led by Anna Hazare who repeatedly affirms his commitment to Gandhian ethics, the movement gathered momentum from August 2011. It demands that an ombudsman monitor and punish corruption --- often thought to be endemic in Indian political life --- from the highest public office down to the lowest. "Team Anna," comprising Hazare, Arvind Kejriwal and Kiran Bedi led the mass rallies in Delhi. A meticulously crafted campaign accompanied it in print and television journalism, as did an articulate presence on social media networks. In Navare's color panel, Gandhi wears a T-shirt that --- like its prototype "I love NY," --- delightedly proclaims his loyalty by saying unabashedly, "I love Anna (Navare 2011)" An interesting turnaround seems to take place here. Hazare never fails to state his allegiance to the Gandhian way of life, but Navare gives us a Gandhi who is happy to announce his support of Hazare's movement. Navare's Gandhi continues to be excited about history appearing to repeat itself over three generations after his death. The present does not merely claim the moral support of the past. The past comes out to support the present. This is not just a fulfilment of the fear expressed by Illingworth and Low in British India that any government was likely to lose touch with the people. It is also an anticipation that the spectacular value of contemporary protest gains incrementally from such visualisations that replay history.

**CONCLUSION**

Replaying history, however, is not a concept that anyone can take lightly. When Navare's Gandhi travels out of his time, we might reasonably ask whether he travels out of his depth as well. Navare's Gandhi looks on bemusedly as the Obama figure adjures him to use his staff as a weapon of offence rather than as a means of support. There is something of the easy laugh of the comic strip, born out of amused recognition, rather than out of intellectual assent. For as readers, we do not only see Navare's characters in conversation with each other. We also see the many crises in the form of torn and ragged newspaper

banner headlines that lie at their feet. The death of Osama bin Laden, the Arab spring and the Libyan emergency form are some of the issues that appear. The ideological underpinnings of these events, their compulsions and courses are sometimes so completely different as to make us wonder whether we gain anything by bracketing them together in this way. How can we give up the responsibility of engaging with these issues in exchange for seats that allow us to watch as spectators while circus heroes erase the differences that characterise a host of movements?

The question of individual responsibility for public dissent --- whether pictorial or otherwise --- becomes particularly important when we consider some of the larger consequences of such parables of protest. If it is possible, as this essay suggests, to track the trajectory of dissent, we need to ask whether the recycling of a particular icon also has implications for the rehearsal, performance, and afterlife of protest movements. If this is so, we have to admit that protest does not necessarily prioritise spontaneity. It appears, instead, to require careful choreography and practice. It also appears that protest movements construct generic rather than specific targets. Whether this ensures the greater longevity of a protest movement, or hastens its demise, remains to be seen.

*Can protest die?*

This brings us to perhaps the last major issue: do protest movements sound their own death knell? Bill Mauldin's Gandhi offers a robustly conventional if heroic assurance to Martin Luther King when he says, 'The odd thing about assassins, Dr King, is that they think they can kill you. (Mauldin 1968)" The most enduring strategy of protest is perhaps an insistence on networking with multiple causes and movements of dissent. Common ground provides uncommon strength. At the same time, we need to study the principles on which an icon, a campaign and ultimately a war operate in a way that allows us to respect and value areas of difference. Nor is this a matter of intellectual slovenliness alone. It is necessary to understand the specificity of a cause or a crusade if we are to think or act meaningfully. "Acts of seeing and knowing, by which persons constitute their identities and construct meaning from their world, make them active participants in shaping their societies and scrutinising their nation-states" (Freitag 166)' Otherwise, as Navare's concluding panel seems to suggest, the single-stroke squiggle that suggests Gandhi's spectacles can equally slide downwards to suggest the currency sign of the Indian rupee. A struggle against a colonial government cannot collapse into a campaign against capitalism as the last

coloniser. We must pick our battles. Otherwise, we run the risk of losing not just our icons but also more seriously, our own selves.

REFERENCES

Baxi, Upendra (1990). 'The recovery of fire: Nehru and legitimation of power in India,' *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 25, no. 2, January 13, 107-112, 111.

Freitag, Sandra B (2003) 'The realm of the visual: Agency and modern civil society,' in Sumathi Ramaswamy (ed) *Beyond Appearances?: Visual Practices and Ideologies in Modern India*, Delhi: Sage, 365-397.

Gombrich, Ernst (with Ernst Kris) (1938)'The Principles of Caricature,' *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, Vol 17, 319-42 [Trapp no.1938A.1].

Ketkar, Kumar (1998). (ed.) *Fifty years of independence through the eyes of R K Laxman*: Mumbai: TOI,.

King, Martin Luther (1964) Acceptance speech, on the occasion of the award of the Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo, December 10, 1964 http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1964/king acceptance_en.html/03/14/2013

Low, David. (1927-1933) retrieved http://t2.gstatic.com /17/03/2013.

Navare, Shreyas (2011). 'Dabs and Jabs,' retrieved hindustantimes.com, 03/17/2013.

Ramanathaiyer, Sundar & Nancy Hudson-Rodd (eds) *Tragic Idiom: O V Vijayan's Cartoons and Notes on India*, (2006) Kottayam: D C Books & Current Books,

Ranga, V (2001), 'Gandhi,' retrieved http://1.bp.blogspot.com/03/17/2013.

Suraiya, Jug & Ajit Ninan (2007), *Like That Only*, Delhi: Bennett, Coleman & Co.

Vijayan, O V (2002) *A Cartoonist Remembers*, Delhi: Rupa.

Word count: 5,627 words