

## **Movie Review : “Ghandhi”**

The movie Gandhi (1982) is an interesting documentation and interpretation of the forces which shaped Mahatma K. Gandhi and how many events that happened in life grew into a passionate relationship with India, a continent that by then, hosted 1/5 of the world's population. Mahatma Gandhi is in the film portrayed as man of deep simplicity and passion for change.

The film starts from South Africa of 1893 where casual racism and discrimination is forcefully embedded into the culture. Unfortunately Mohandas K. Gandhi (Ben Kingsley), fresh from studies in England, is unaware of this divide as he travels on his first class train ticket. A rude awakening comes with the arrival of the guard, who unceremoniously ejects Gandhi at the very next station. Shocked beyond words by such injustice, he rails against the system to his long established compatriots. However, while they realize that trying to change the law is futile, Gandhi feels that he has no choice but to protest, a turning point that rekindles his dream for change.

In the movie Gandhi alludes much to the annoyance of General Smuts (Athol Fugard), the unyielding figurehead of South Africa, Gandhi begins to form contacts within the Indian worker minority. The Indian in South Africa get shipped over to work in the mines or tend crops, but they don't exhibit any sign of togetherness amongst them against the British, a thing that disturbs Gandhi very much and motivates him to do something about the situation of his countrymen in Africa. He starts off by organizing an open meeting of his countrymen Christians, Muslims and Hindus. Gandhi's main object to make see a sense of injustice against them. In the process, Gandhi realizes he is not good he public speaking, this though does not shutter his hopes as he resorts to direct action; he burns his identity card in front of the assembled police officers.

Gandhi small but outrageous action begins to make headlines beyond national borders. The event adds up to Gandhi's annoyance of Smuts and escalates the bad blood even further. This though surprises the British administration as Gandhi advises his colleagues and associates to use non-violent resistance at all times. The government gets confused on how to alleviate the crisis.

According to Teinre John (2008) the government comes up with an ambitious idea of imprisoning the troublemakers and introducing harsh new legislation, it initially seems workable but its prospects to sustain the resistance seem gleam. In the movie, Gandhi effort seems to be sinking as his action attracts an ally who is an international reporter, Walker (Martin Sheen) on his side. With this event the pressure on Smuts builds up, leading to the moment when he cracks and accedes to the movement's demands.

In the long run, Gandhi accepts the victory but not the spoils; instead his family returns to their homeland. What he doesn't expect though is the hero's welcome that awaits him in India, especially when India feels like a foreign land to him. When Gandhi arrived in India, he didn't anticipate being in presence of Congress Party men Mohammed Ali Jinnah (Alyque Padamsee) and Pandit Nehru (Roshan Seth), he thinks of establishing his law firm though. All does not go as he plans as events leads Gandhi to embarks on a journey both literal and metaphorical, the result of which will be the unrequested appellation of Mahatma.

Warior Shan (2000) of Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Non Violence says an exhaustive yet glancing biopic of one of this century's most influential individuals; Gandhi locates drama in the most unlikely of places. The obvious scenes of Gandhi's funeral and the Amritsar massacre are, of course, covered but it is the moments elsewhere that remain in the memory. Other occurrences such as Gandhi's notorious fasts or his first brush with injustice are where Gandhi excels much to

his surprise, he doesn't really expect to excel as he only hopes of bringing up changes in the form that has never been experienced anywhere in the world. These are the incidents which make a man.

As it happens it is in the first half of the film that the character building occurs, with Gandhi discovering that he cannot stand idly by while others suffer. In South Africa his nascent political intuition and personal charisma combine powerfully, inspiring loyalty and devotion from followers. As the second half of the film arrives, India, the country, takes Gandhi's place in the emotional centre. While somewhat more challenging in terms of identification, this switch perfectly illustrates how the histories of Gandhi and India are tightly bound together.

Teinre John (2008) says that the unyielding knot which holds Gandhi together over its many decades and differing conflicts is Kingsley. Gandhi's performance is so on-target in its honesty, emotional nuance and direction that it barely feels like a performance at all. "When Kingsley speaks the phrases that are enshrined in history, it's as if Gandhi were mouthing them for the first time. This identification stretches far beyond mere physical resemblance though; instead Kingsley seems to realize the innate power of these words and is content to act as a conduit," (Teinre John, 2008). He further said that all Kingsley needed to do in the movie was to add more details - the fiercely intelligent impression, the utterly rational and calm reaction to inflamed emotion and the unshakeable beliefs and principles did not up to the challenge of Gandhi and the acceptance and grant of freedom to India was yet another perfect slap to Kingsley. Another notable quality in the movie is the character and role of Richard Attenborough; he gives Gandhi yet another challenge that played well to serve Gandhi a test of his own medicine, resistance from his own backyard. In the Columbian movies review, the act was mentioned as remarkable act a man ever exhibited. This role can still be lauded and gives more critical and indebt

understanding of the struggle beside the belief that Gandhi had a supernatural way or was destined to a Mahatma right from the beginning of his life.

Gandhi, is not that perfect in life, he has gone through many ups and downs in life, for instance in the movie there is an occasion when Gandhi's weakness is exposed, during the coverage of the figures near to Gandhi and the wider political situation. Gandhi sought dominance by letting his allies concentrate so intensely on one him, however captivating he might have been, the context provided by and enemies is threadbare. In the cause of Gandhi's struggle against the British operation through a non-violent means, the desire of Gandhi to seek more dominance and popularity yielded fruits as the British rulers were portrayed as isolated fools rather than the successful colonizers of a continent, with figures such as Lord Irwin (John Gielgud) fatally underestimating the difference that a man in a loincloth can make.

The struggle and resistance against the British rule got more acknowledgements in the movie although Attlee almost undermined Gandhi's long struggle. The joy was however conceived when people saw Gandhi's strategy flummox the previously held perception of the struggle. Warrior Shan (2000) says that within the Congress Party both Jinnah and Nehru are sketched in very broad terms, giving little insight into their true allegiances and motivations. This brought about a rift that its cause was not immediately identified. The events seemed to have no impact but its application seemed to strengthen the Indians in their struggle for independence in the movie.

### **Conclusion**

To sum up the whole scenario in the movie, it is worthwhile noting that the non-violence means got recognition and acceptance beyond the imagination of Gandhi and the struggles majestic

portrayal of a society invasion, guided by the one man who never asked to be a leader. The movie presents a tale of trust, of non-violent co-operation and of proactive revolution.

The movie is a worth reading and referral point for its documentation of Gandhi struggle and journey to Mahatma, most of which is attributed not only to the struggle but to the non violence means against the British rule. World over in all of the British colonies, the non violence means was not practiced and where and to make it even more unique by a individual, with bleak and nothing so nice to tell about his background.

Teinre John (2008) says that in the World where "might makes right" Gandhi's efforts were a valuable message, though one marred by the messy divorce of India and Pakistan. The struggle and the means popularized the non violence approach so high but o this day the conflict still continues, fuelled by politicians for their own ends but rooted in the partition of 1947. The tragedy is that Gandhi was in some ways destroyed by the very country he helped to create. Just how varied and beautiful this domain is can be glimpsed via the gorgeous cinematography of Ronnie Taylor and Billy Williams. The enduring fact then is that Gandhi united a fractured people when such an aim appeared hopeless; what else matters?