Mahatma Gandhi and Conflict Resolution in *"Master Harold"… and the boys*

Mohammad Mehdi Saberi*
Samira Sasani**

Abstract:
Apartheid South Africa is a perfect example of inequality and racial discrimination in the 20th century. Athol Fugard's "Master Harold"… and the boys clearly depicts the colonialist ideology that existed during apartheid era. The aim of this study is to deal with Gandhi's ideas about conflict resolution. Mahatma Gandhi sees non-violence as a solution. Athol Fugard's *"Master Harold"… and the boys* is anti-colonialist, and this play also shows that those who have internalized their superiority and inferiority are more vulnerable to colonialist psychology. Fugard has suggested way of decolonialization is Satyagraha, which is a kind of non-violent resistance proposed by Mahatma Gandhi. Fugard's suggested kind of resistance, as shown in the play, cannot be achieved through coercion. It is achieved by means of conversion.

Keywords: Apartheid South Africa, Athol Fugard, Mahatma Gandhi, Satyagraha, "Master Harold"… and the boys, conversion

Introduction

The title of Athol Fugard's play *"Master Harold"… and the boys* shows Fugard's emphasis on those inequalities that were common in apartheid South Africa. Harold who is a seventeen-year-old white boy is Master Harold (with capital letter M), but Sam and Willie who are two black men in their late thirties are boys (with small letter b). The objective of this study is to prove that Athol Fugard suggests non-violent resistance as the best way for conflict resolution in his play *"Master Harold"… and the boys*. It looks at the play's references to Gandhi as Fugard's man of magnitude, and examines Gandhian non-violence in *"Master Harold"… and the boys*. In this study, Athol Fugard suggests a kind of resistance which was proposed by Mahatma Gandhi.

* M.A. Graduate of English Literature, Shiraz University, mmsaberi78@gmail.com
** Assistant Professor PhD, Shiraz University, Iran, corresponding author, samira.sasani21@yahoo.com

Gandhi's ideas

Gandhi was an Indian activist who believed in non-violent resistance. For Gandhi non-violence was an appropriate method to politically mobilize the colonized against the colonizer. According to Bidyut Chakrabarty, "Drawing on the Hindu, Buddhist and Jainist traditions, Gandhi seems to have arrived at an all-encompassing definition of non-violence by means of three crucial steps: (i) non-violence, in Gandhi's explanation, is compassion which is equated with love; (ii) like all other emotions, love constitutes a formidable force; and (iii) love is thus an alternative to the prevalent ideology for political mobilization" (2006: 73).

Non-violence is based on spiritual, ethical, or moral principles, or it is for tactical, strategic, or pragmatic reasons. As Thomas Weber put it, "There appear to be two approaches to nonviolence. They have been termed 'principled', where emphasis is on human harmony and a moral rejection of violence and coercion, and 'pragmatic', where conflict is seen as normal and the rejection of violence as an effective way of challenging power" (2003: 250). He goes on to argue that, "Gandhi was concerned about lifting oppression and about finding a substitute for violence; however, his reason for doing so had more to do with a perceived intrinsic – rather than merely an instrumental value in nonviolence. In short, Gandhi's nonviolence was more principled and contained strong 'other worldly' elements" (2003: 252).

Gandhi encouraged the oppressed people to win hate with love. He believed that if actions were more in tune with ethical principles, they eventually would prove to be the most practical. Thomas Weber calls Gandhi the "godfather" of non-violent activism (2003: 251).

Thomas Weber in his book *Conflict Resolution and Gandhian Ethics* mentions three forms of non-violent action that exist in Gene Sharp's typology for solving a conflict. These are: "accommodation, non-violent coercion, and conversion" (1991: 41). In accommodation the opponents do not believe in the changes that the resisters demand but nevertheless they decide to yield on the issue to achieve peace or to get out of the bad situation before it gets worse. In non-violent coercion, the opponents want to impose themselves but cannot because they do not have the sources of power and the resisters are not controlled by their repression anymore. In conversion the opponent changes inwardly and makes those changes that the non-violent actor desires (even the non-violent actor changes too) (*Ibidem*).

Satyagraha

For Gandhi Truth and non-violence are interrelated. In his book, *From Yeravda Mandir*, he notes: "Ahimsa and Truth are so intertwined that it is practically impossible to disentangle and separate them. They are like the two sides of a coin, or rather a smooth unstamped metallic disc. Who can say, which is the obverse, and which the reverse? Nevertheless, ahimsa is the means; Truth is the end" (2001: 9–10). Therefore, Gandhi believes in the connection between means and ends. Unlike Machiavelli, the author of *The Prince*, who believed in the gaining of ends by trickery and violence, Gandhi believes that the means and the ends must be pure. To Gandhi good means can achieve good ends and what is achieved by trickery and violence is not good, so Machiavelli's belief in the separation of means and ends was completely unacceptable to Gandhi.

Satyagraha is a compound of two Sanskrit nouns, i.e. satya and agraha. Satya means truth and agraha means firmness or holding firmly to. Thus, Satyagraha means holding onto truth. In other words, Satyagraha which has been given many definitions means devotion to truth, remaining firm on the truth and resisting untruth actively but non-violently, or better to say, seeking truth through love and non-violence.

Fugard's Man of Magnitude

This part of the study intends to prove that Mahatma Gandhi is Athol Fugard's man of magnitude. To support this argument, it deeply analyzes the dialogues between Sam and Harold in order to bring reasons why Fugard in *"Master Harold"… and the boys* has mentioned the name of some famous personages including: Napoleon Bonaparte, Charles Darwin, Abraham Lincoln, William Shakespeare, Leo Tolstoy, Jesus Christ, and Alexander Flemming. Not only does *"Master Harold"… and the boys* gradually and effectively deepen our understanding of Sam and Harold but it also helps us understand many things about Fugard himself. Early in the play, Sam talks with Harold about the ordeals of a black man punished in jail:

> SAM. They make you lie down on a bench. One policeman pulls your shirt over your head and holds your arms, another one pulls down your trousers and holds your ankles…
> HALLY. Thank you! That's enough.
> SAM. … and the one that gives you the strokes talks to you gently and for a long time between each one…. (Fugard, 1982: 17–18)

Harold says that this world is really an awful place that causes him to oscillate between hope and despair. However, he believes that things will change: "One day somebody is going to get up and give history a kick up the backside and get it going again" (Fugard, 1982: 18). After

Harold says that a social reformer is needed, Sam and Harold start a game to find a man of magnitude. For Harold, this man of magnitude must be an intrepid social reformer who will not be daunted by the magnitude of the task he has undertaken. He is also "somebody who benefit[s] all mankind" (Fugard, 1982: 21). Napoleon is the first social reformer that Sam thinks of him as the man of magnitude:

> SAM. (reading from the history textbook) "Napoleon and the principle of equality." Hey! This sounds interesting. "after concluding peace with Britain in 1802, Napoleon used a brief period of calm to in-sti-tute…"
> HALLY. Introduce.
> SAM. "… many reforms. Napoleon regarded all people as equal before the law and wanted them to have equal opportunities for advancement. All ves-ti-ges of the feudal system with its oppression of the poor were abolished." Vestiges, feudal system and abolished. I'm alright on oppression…. Ha! There's the social reformer we're waiting for. He sounds like a man of some magnitude.
> HALLY. I'm not so sure about that…
> SAM. He sounds pretty big to me, Hally.
> HALLY. … And what's the end of story? Battle of Waterloo, which he loses. Wasn't worth it. No, I don't know about him as a man of magnitude. (Fugard, 1982: 20–21)

The first evidence that shows Fugard's interest in seeing Gandhi as his man of magnitude is Harold's rejection of Napoleon as a great man because he lost the Battle of Waterloo. Fugard is acquainted with Gandhi's ideas and this is obvious when *"Master Harold"… and the boys* is read carefully. Gandhi published this extract from an old number of a magazine in his own journal *Young India* (Feb. 14, 1929):

> No conqueror ever gained more by wars than did Napoleon, Emperor of the French, who, beginning as a poor Corsican Lieutenant, for a little while dominated Europe, altering boundaries, upsetting thrones. Yet Napoleon knew that it was folly to rely on force. There are only two powers in the world,' he said, not after he had been defeated and exiled, but while he appeared to be at the height of his success, 'those powers are the spirit and the sword. In the long run the sword will always be conquered by the spirit.'
> But why, we may ask, did Napoleon, if he saw so plainly the uselessness of war, continue to make war? Why did he use the sword until it was wrenched out of his hand at Waterloo? Partly because Napoleon, like the rest of us, could not always practise what he preached, but partly because other kings and emperors would not let him alone. (qtd.in Bandopadhyaya, 1960: 45)

Although Napoleon Bonaparte believed that the spirit would conquer the sword, he relied on sword and finally lost the Battle of Waterloo. For a man like Gandhi who believes that strength comes from indomitable will and not from physical force, it is obvious that non-violence is superior to violence. So Athol Fugard himself rejects the

doctrine of the sword and welcomes Gandhi's policy of non-violence, which says that the spirit does triumph over the sword in both individual and national affairs.

To continue their game Sam asks who that man might be, and Harold suggests Charles Darwin, whose Theory of Evolution revolutionized science. Harold chooses Darwin because he believes that Darwin is a man who benefited all mankind:

> HALLY. To answer that we need a definition of greatness, and I suppose that would be somebody who …. Somebody who benefited all mankind.
> SAM. Right. But like who?
> HALLY. (He speaks with total conviction.) Charles Darwin. Remember him? That big book from the library, The Origin of the Species.
> SAM. Him?
> HALLY. Yes. For his Theory of Evolution…. You hardly even looked at it.
> SAM. I tried. I looked at the chapters in the beginning and I saw one called "The struggle for an existence." Ah ha, I thought. At last! But what did I get? Something called the mistiltoe which needs the apple tree and there's too many seeds and all are going to die except for one…! No, Hally. (Fugard, 1982: 21–22)

Harold's choice of Charles Darwin as a man of magnitude is not pleasant to Sam because he thinks that Darwin was not a man who benefited all mankind. Harold's reason for choosing Charles Darwin is carefully explained by Ervin Beck:

> Harold chooses Charles Darwin, author of "The Origin of the Species" (Harold's version of Darwin's title), as his main man of magnitude…. At that point in the play Harold has not yet articulated his embrace of his father's racism, which might also be grounded in his admiration of Darwin. Although Sam is disappointed in Darwin's chapter "The Struggle for an Existence", Harold may be positively impressed by Darwin's notion of the survival of the fittest, which in the South African context implies the white race and white supremacy. (2000: 111)

Sam suggests Mr. Abraham Lincoln, but Harold tells Sam: "Don't get sentimental, Sam. You've never been slave, you know. And anyway, we freed your ancestors here in South Africa long before the Americans" (Fugard, 1982: 22). Therefore, Harold's choice of Charles Darwin and rejection of Abraham Lincoln shows that he believes in colonialist ideology of white superiority.

The second evidence examined here to show that Mahatma Gandhi is Fugard's man of magnitude is Fugard's familiarity with Gndhi's idea that all men are brothers. To quote Gandhi, "Mankind is one, seeing that all are equally subject to the moral law. All men are equal in God's eyes. There are, of course, differences of race and status and the like, but the

higher the status of a man, the greater is his responsibility" (qtd. in Kripalani, 1969: 118).

Excited by their game Harold asks Sam to introduce a real genius and Sam suggests William Shakespeare. But Harold does not like Sam's man of magnitude:

> SAM. (… enjoying himself) Mr. William Shakespeare.
> HALLY. (no enthusiasm) Oh. So you're also one of them, are you. You're basing that opinion on only one play, you know. You've only read my Julius Caesar and even I don't understand half of what they're talking about. They should do what they did with the old Bible: bring the language up to date. (Fugard, 1982: 22–23)

By reading Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, perhaps Sam compares his country during apartheid era with Rome during its tumultuous period. In Shakespeare's play, Rome suffers from class divisions and senators are corrupt. In addition, the republic shows some signs of democracy but women and most of the plebeian men cannot elect representatives. Therefore, Julius Caesar, a Roman general, attempts to assume power. He is popular among people because he supports the poorer classes in Rome. According to Beck,

> Sam's enthusiasm for Shakespeare, whom he knows only through Julius Caesar**,** is more subtle. That play is relevant to Sam's own situation under apartheid, because it is a politically charged revenge tragedy with many complex, ambiguous ramifications. Cassius and Brutus rise up against Julius Caesar and assassinate him, but with ensuing social chaos and eventually a new tyranny under Mark Anthony. Perhaps the play has influenced Sam's own temptation to, but ultimate rejection of, violence in reforming an evil social order. (2000: 111)

The third evidence given here is that Fugard has mentioned the name of Shakespeare in his own play on purpose. Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* is against violence, and Fugard's *"Master Harold"… and the boys* is also against violence. Fugard is a playwright and it is possible that he has read Shakespeare's another play *The Merchant of Venice*:

> I do oppose
> My patience his fury, and am arm'd
> To suffer with a quietness of spirit,
> The very tyranny and rage of his. (Shakespeare, 2000: IV. i. 135)

That is exactly what Gandhi says. Gandhi encouraged people to be patient and invite suffering on themselves. He rejected violence and believed that it should be eschewed in all circumstances. His weapon was non-violence, and thus, he used his unique method of non-violent resistance to fight against injustice and oppression. Needless to say, Athol Fugard, like Gandhi, Prefers non-violence to violence.

Harold suggests reserving their judgment until they have checked up on a few others. Now it is Harold's turn. He suggests Leo Tolstoy as a good example of a social reformer and a literary genius.

> HALLY. My next man … and he gets the title on two scores: social reform and literary genius … is Leo Nickolaevich (mispronounces) Tolstoy.
> SAM. That Russian.
> HALLY. Correct. Remember the picture of him I showed you?
> SAM. With the long beard.
> HALLY. (trying to look like Tolstoy) And those burning, visionary eyes. My God, the face of a social prophet if ever I saw one! And remember my words when I showed it to you? Here's a man, Sam!
> SAM. Those were words, Hally.
> HALLY. Not many intellectuals are prepared to shovel manure with the peasants and then go home and write a "little book" called War and Peace…. That man freed his surfs of his own free will.
> SAM. No argument. He was a somebody alright. I accept him. (Fugard, 1982: 23–24)

Tolstoy is a famous Russian novelist. He suggested non-violence as a means for Indian people to get rid of British raj. Gandhi, who was in South Africa at that time, welcomed it and began his movement. Harold and Sam are in complete agreement about him. Now Harold asks Sam to submit his candidate for examination:

> SAM. Jesus.
> HALLY. (stopped dead in his tracks) Who?
> SAM. Jesus Christ.
> HALLY. Oh come on, Sam!
> SAM. The messiah.
> HALLY. Ja, but still…. No, Sam. Don't let's get started on religion. We'll just spend the whole afternoon arguing again. Suppose I turn around and say Mohammed?
> SAM. Alright.
> HALLY. You can't have them both on the same list!
> SAM. Why not? You like Mohammed, I like Jesus.
> HALLY. I don't like Mohammed. I never have. I was nearly being hypothetical. As far as I'm concerned, the Koran is as bad as the Bible. No. Religion is out! I'm not going to waste my time again, arguing with you about the existence of God. You know perfectly well I'm an atheist and I've got homework to do. (Fugard, 1982: 24–25)

Athol Fugard Knows that Gandhi was influenced by Tolstoy and Jesus. And this is the fourth evidence showing that Gandhi is Fugard's man of magnitude. In fact, Tolstoy's ideas on non-violent resistance had a significant impact on Gandhi. Tolstoy had spiritual awakening when he read the ethical teachings of Jesus Christ, especially his "Sermon on the Mount", and these teachings caused him to become a Christian pacifist. Similarly, Gandhi was interested in the *Bible* and Jesus's

"Sermon on the Mount". He was also an avid reader of Tolstoy's works. As Glyn Richards says, "While Gandhi's understanding of the relation between Truth and ahimsa [non-violence] springs from his own cultural and religious tradition it was strengthened and corroborated by his reading of Tolstoy's work *The Kingdom of God is Within You*" (1991: 33). Gandhi himself acknowledges his indebtedness to Leo Tolstoy, especially Tolstoy's belief in the efficacy of non-violence.

Also, Athol Fugard in the above conversation between Sam and Harold implies that his own man of magnitude is tolerant of other religions. As previously mentioned, Gandhi was a Hindu but he respected all other religions.

To find a great man of magnitude, Harold and Sam keep on their game:

> HALLY. You've got time for one more name.
> SAM. I've got one I know we'll agree on. A simple straight-forward great Man of Magnitude … And no arguments. And he really did benefit all mankind.
> HALLY. I wonder. After your last contribution, I'm beginning to doubt whether anything in the way of an intellectual agreement is possible between the two of us. Who is he?
> SAM. Guess…
> HALLY. Give me a clue.
> SAM. The letter "P" is important… and his name begins with an "F." … Think of mouldy apricot jam.
> HALLY. (after a delighted laugh) Penicillim and Sir Alexander Flemming! And the title of the book: The Microbe Hunters. (delighted) Splendid, Sam! Splendid. For once we are in total agreement. The major breakthrough in medical science in the 20th century. If it wasn't for him, we might have lost the Second World War. It's deeply gratifying, Sam, to know that I haven't been wasting my time in talking to you. (strutting around proudly) Tolstoy may have educated his peasants, but I've educated you. (Fugard, 1982: 25–26)

The fifth evidence that shows Gandhi is Fugard's man of magnitude is that Fugard's man of magnitude is one who benefits all mankind. In fact, one of Gandhi's aims was Sarvodaya, or the welfare of all. Of the books that brought about a transformation in Gandhi's life was Ruskin's *Unto This Last*, which Gandhi himself translated it later into Gujarati and entitled it *Sarvodaya* (the welfare of all). Sarvodaya is against utilitarianism, so Gandhi cannot accept the utilitarian formula of the greatest good of the greatest number. To quote Gandhi:

> I do not believe in the doctrine of the greatest good of the greatest number. It means in its nakedness that in order to achieve the supposed good of fifty-one per cent, the interest of forty-nine per cent may be, or rather, should be sacrificed. It is a heartless doctrine and has done harm to humanity. The only real, dignified, human doctrine is the greatest good of all…. (Gandhi, 1968: 188)

Thus, in Fugard's view, a man of magnitude is one who rejects the doctrine of sword, sees all men as equal, rejects violence and welcomes non-violence, respects all religions and tolerates other people's beliefs, and benefits all mankind. Doubtlessly, that man is Mahatma Gandhi. And this becomes obvious in the play when Sam talks about Gandhi and his dream:

> SAM. …. Without the dream we won't know what we're going for. And anyway, I reckon there are a few people who have got passed just dreaming about it and are trying for something real. Remember that thing we read once in the paper about the Mahatma Gandhi? Going without food to stop those riots in India?
> HALLY. You're right. He certainly was trying to teach people to get the steps right…. Our General Smuts as well, you know. (Fugard, 1982: 51)

Indeed, General Smuts was the first victim of Gandhi's non-violent method. He had control over South Africa, where Gandhi began his first peaceful campaign. Initially General Smuts used violence to silence Gandhi but gradually he came to know Gandhi and finally they became friends. General Smuts himself writes:

> For me Gandhi was a problem, and his behavior was a mystery. His fighting method was entirely new for me. He kept peaceful, he trusted me, and he even helped government and cooperated with us. And then he went and opposed the laws he considered unjust. I didn't know what to do with him. I felt angry, frustrated, and helpless. He disobeyed the law and got thousands of people to disobey it. But he did all that with utmost discipline, without any violence, with full respect and delicacy. What was I to do? A law had been broken, and I in consequence had to take measures. But I couldn't send two thousand people to jail. My duty was to prevent them from violating the law, but how could I fire against a crowd of peaceful people who faced me with smiles on their lips? At last I had to send Gandhi to jail. But that was precisely what he wanted. That was his victory and his success. What had I got by putting him in jail? Just to make a fool of myself. And that was how, in spite of my having the whole support of the police and the army, and in spite of the enormous pressure the whites put on me, not only had I to get him out of jail but I had to withdraw the laws he opposed. (qtd. in Vallés, 2012: 20)

Gandhian Non-violence

Fugard in *"Master Harold"… and the boys* compares Harold and Sam. He describes Harold in this way: "He struts around like a Hitler, ruler in hand, giving vent to his anger and frustration" (Fugard, 1982: 42). But Sam, who is Fugard's favorite character, is depicted like his own man of magnitude, i.e. Gandhi. Before moving on, it is important to stress that Hitler and Gandhi were living at about the same time. Hitler lived in Germany but Gandhi was in India. Although both of them were

popular among their fellow countrymen, they were completely different. According to George Sarton,

> The German one was a devil incarnate (he did not hide it), while the Hindu one was a saint, a saint of such a high order that he makes us think of St. Francis. The former came from hell and the latter from heaven. HITLER'S message was one of hatred and terror; he did not hesitate to commit innumerable murders (more than any other man in history, not excluding CHINGIZ KHAN and TIMUR LANG), he dreamed of destroying whole nations and he almost succeeded in destroying his own. GANDHI'S message was one of love and truth; he led his people out of bondage. (1954: 90)

In certain ways, Sam acts like Mahatma Gandhi. This is established at the beginning of the play, when he supports Hilda. He knows that Willie beats Hilda and tries to get out of his commitments towards her. So he attempts to improve their relationship and asks Willie to apologize to Hilda: "Find Hilda. Say you're sorry and promise you won't beat her again" (Fugard, 1982: 40). At the end of the play, Willie takes Sam's advice and promise not to beat her again: "Hey, Boet Sam! *(He is trying hard.)* You right. I think about it and you right. Tonight I find Hilda and say sorry. And make promise I won't beat her no more" (Fugard, 1982: 65–66).

As previously mentioned, Gandhi believes in the connection between means and ends. For him thus the means and the ends must be pure. Sam, like Gandhi, believes that what is achieved by trickery is not acceptable. This becomes obvious in the play when Harold is talking about the old days. Sam can remember their game:

> SAM. You're sitting on the floor, giving Willie a lecture about being a good loser while you get the checker board and pieces ready for a game. Then you go to Willie's bed, pull off the blankets and make him play with you first because you know you're going to win, and that gives you the second game with me.
> HALLY. And you certainly were a bad loser, Willie!
> WILLY. Haai!
> HALLY. Wasn't he, Sam? And so slow! A game with you almost took the whole afternoon. Thank God I gave up trying to teach you how to play chess.
> WILLIE. You and Sam cheated.
> HALLY. I never saw Sam cheat, and mine were mostly the mistakes of youth. (Fugard, 1982: 30)

Not only does Sam reject the separation of means and ends, but he believes that good means can achieve good ends. Similar to Gandhi, who travelled from one end of the country to the other training people, Sam tries to teach Harold a lesson about self-sacrifice:

> WILLIE. Then how is it you two aws always winning?

> HALLY. Have you ever considered the possibility, Willie, that it is because we were better than you?
> WILLIE. Everytime better?
> HALLY. Not every time. There were occasions when we deliberately let you win a game so that you would stop sulking and go on playing with us. Sam used to wink at me when you weren't looking to show me it was time to let you win.
> WILLIE. So then you two didn't play fair.
> HALLY. It was for your benefit Mr. Malopo, which is more than being fair. It was an act of self-sacrifice…. (Fugard, 1982: 30–31)

Throughout the play, Harold teaches Sam to respect him and be obedient, but Sam teaches him to make self-sacrifice. Sam also warns Harold to be careful and not to talk about his father in a disrespectful way. Even Sam tells him to love his father as he himself loves Harold and his father:

> SAM. … It was the old Jubilee days, after dinner one night. I was in my room. You came in and just stood against the wall, looking down at the ground, and only after I'd asked you what you wanted, what was wrong, I don't know how many times, did you speak and even then, so softly I almost didn't hear you. "Sam, please help me to go and fetch my dad". Remember? He was dead drunk on the floor of the Central Hotel Bar. They'd phoned for your mom, but you were the only one at home. And do you remember how we did it? You went in first, by yourself, to ask permission for me to go into the bar. Then I loaded him onto my back like a baby and carried him back to the boarding house with you following behind, carrying his crutches…. A crowded Main Street with all the people watching a little white boy following his drunk father on a nigger's back! I felt for that little boy … Master Harold. I felt for him. After that we still had to clean him up, remember. He'd messed in his trousers, so we had to clean him up and get him into bed. (Fugard, 1982: 63)

Conclusion

Gandhi believes that the force of love is more than the force of violence. According to Chandel, "Satyagraha aims at the victory of Truth, and aims at the conversion of the hearts of opponents, thereby killing the enmity for ever" (2017: 141). Sam cleans Harold's father and then makes a kite for little Hally to make him feel happy. As Gandhi aims at the conversion of the hearts of his opponents, Sam tries to change his relationship with Harold and Harold's father through suffering. Finally, Sam succeeds. As stated by Durbach, "'Master Harold' grows up to be Athol Fugard and that the play itself is an act of atonement and moral reparation to the memory of Sam and 'H. D. F' – the Black and the White fathers to whom it is dedicated" (1978: 512). Gandhi helped General Smuts to get the steps right and Sam tried to teach Willie and Harold (Athol Fugard) to get the steps right.

Athol Fugard in *"Master Harold" … and the boys* says that those black people who are living under South Africa's apartheid regime need a leader to follow, and that leader should be a great man who practices

Gandhian non-violence. At the end of the play, Willie tells Sam: "You lead, I follow" (Fugard, 1982: 66). Sam and Willie dance together, and the play ends.

REFERENCES:

Bandopadhyaya, S. K., *My Non-violence*, Ahmadabad, Navajivan, 1960.
Beck, E., Fugard's *Master Harold and the Boys*, in "The Explicator", 58, 2, 2000, p. 109–112.
Chakrabarty, B., *Social and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*, London, Routledge, 2006.
Chandel, B., *Gandhi on Non-Violence (Ahimsa)*, in « Diogenes », 61,3-4, 2017, p. 135–142.
Durbach, E., *'Master Harold'… and the boys: Athol Fugard and the Psychopathology of Apartheid*, in "Modern Drama", 30, 4, 1978, p. 505–513.
Fugard, A., "*Master Harold"… and the boys*, New York, Samuel French, 1982.
Gandhi, M. K., *The Voice of Truth*, Ahmadabad, Navajivan, 1968.
Gandhi, M. K., *From Yeravda Mandir: Ashram Observances*, trans. Valji Govindji Desai, Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 2001.
Gandhi. M. K., The Hindu Wife, in "Young India", 11, 40, 1929, p. 321-328.
Kripalani, K., *All Men are Brothers,* Lausanne, Unesco Mazmudar, 1969.
Richards, G., *The Philosophy of Gandhi: A Study of his Basic Ideas*, Richmond, Curzon Press, 1991.
Sarton, G., *Experiments with Truth by Faraday, Darwin and Gandhi*, in "Osiris", 11, 1954, p. 87–107.
Shakespeare, W., *The Merchant of Venice*, ed. Sidney Lamb, Foster city, IDG Books Worldwide, 2000.
Sharp, G., *How Nonviolent Struggle Works*, Boston, The Albert Einstein Institution, 2013.
Vallés, C. G., *Gandhi – The Alternative to Violence*, Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 2012.
Weber, T., *Conflict Resolution and Gandhian Ethics*, New Delhi, Gandhi Peace Foundation, 1991.
Weber, T., *Nonviolence is Who? Gene Sharp and Gandhi*, in "Peace and Change", 28, 2, 2003, p. 250–270.