CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSION
Although the six autobiographies analysed in this thesis have been selected while keeping a certain amount of symmetry in mind as each American autobiography is parallel in a way to its corresponding Marathi autobiography in terms of area of interest of the autobiographer and the time period covered, these six women do not lend themselves to easy generalisations. Their identities and conceptions of the Self are shaped due to different social and cultural compulsions and they express it through diverse narrative strategies. They all had different aims, origins and purpose. A comparison of their titles will help us as readers to decode why and how they undertook to write their autobiographies.

Published around the same time that Smriti Chitre was published, My Several Worlds is subtitled "A Personal Record" by Pearl S. Buck and not "Autobiography". By confessing in the first page that "this is not a complete autobiography", she shifts the focus firmly away from the Self towards history. She gives herself the role of a social commentator and this imparts to My Several Worlds a stylised documentary tone. Of all the six books, My Several Worlds is the longest and as the title suggests, its canvas is large. The whole world is her playground and she considers herself as a world citizen. At the heart of My Several Worlds lies the attempt to clarify to readers the uniqueness and at the same time the essential unity of all cultures.
The title, My Lord, What a Morning is taken from a hymn that Marian Anderson often sang in her concerts. The title is vague, perhaps deliberately so. By selecting a line from one of her songs as the title of her autobiography, Marian Anderson signals her total identification with her singing. Marian Anderson the person is inseparable from Marian Anderson the singer. Unlike Durga Khote's assertive use of the singular "I" in the title itself, this vague title shows Marian Anderson's unease with the role that was thrust upon her. She was comfortable with her identity as a well-known singer but uncomfortable with the role of "community leader" and she reiterates again and again in the autobiography that she was a "reluctant symbol". Her selection of a line from a hymn also suggests the strong influence of the Union Baptist Church in her upbringing. Marian Anderson wanted her identity as a singer to override her identity as a Black. But social compulsions and the needs of her community would not allow this. Her identity as a member of a social group ultimately was the pivot upon which her life and her autobiography revolved. The very eloquent title Outside the Magic Circle speaks of a position ("outside") that Virginia consciously adopted for herself during her long struggle for equal rights in America.

By mentioning her position in the title itself, Virginia indicates the central core of her autobiography. The whole book is written from
an insider's viewpoint. But an insider who has gone at a distance
("outside") and can therefore see things more clearly.

The title in fact points to Virginia Foster Durr's stepping out of
the "magic circle" on many levels—geographical, social and
biological. In this respect, the title pinpoints Virginia Foster Durr as a
rebel, as someone who took a deliberate position, who chose to flow
against the tide, and who proclaimed her views openly. This is very
different from the vague title of Marian Anderson's autobiography.
Marian Anderson's deliberately vague title mirrors the non-
confrontationist tone of My Lord, What a Morning and that tone in
turn reflects the acquiescing nature of Marian Anderson. The titles
are in this way faithful signifiers of the content of the books.

"Smriti-Chitre" translated literally into English means "Memory-
pictures" or more specifically, "Memoirs". This simple title gives an
indication of the simplicity of style adopted by Laxmibai Tilak to
narrate her story. It also points to the modest canvas of the book. In
this, it is completely opposite to the large canvas of Pearl S. Buck's
autobiography, indicated by the title My Several Worlds. The
difference in naming their autobiographies is indicative of the
difference in the social position of the two women. Pearl S. Buck was
already a much-published author when her autobiography came out.
She was a much-travelled person too, and was earning large amounts
of money from the sale of her books. Though Laxmibai Tilak was a woman with a poetic sensibility, she did not have several books to her credit like Pearl S. Buck. She was not financially independent either.

Memoirs are generally written by persons who have held important public posts. Laxmibai Tilak held no such post. But the unique position of Smriti Chitre in Marathi literature is due to its vivid detailing that brings alive the social conditions in early Twentieth century Maharashtra. Laxmibai Tilak wrote her memoirs at a time when the autobiographical genre in Marathi was in its infancy. She gave an invaluable lesson on how to strike a balance between objective narration and passionate involvement while writing one's own life. Hidden in the humorous, straightforward and apparently simple prose of Smriti Chitre therefore lies the important message of social, religious and gender equality for all.

Of all the six women, Durga Khote is the only one whose confident assertion of her own name in the title Mee-Durga Khote suggests her sense of ease with her celebrityhood. The bold, unitary proclamation of "I" in the title itself suggests a strong Self and a woman who "made it" in the patriarchal world. The world of Cinema gives its heroes and heroines an instant fame and exposure that is unattainable for people from any other profession. It also imparts them with a certain notoriety that makes a woman of Durga Khote's
generation defensive about her profession. Mee-Durga Khote is both an examination of the social and economic circumstances that made Durga Khote opt for this line and an examination of her own Self.

Of all the six autobiographies, Bandh-Anubandh is the one most like a classic autobiography and the one that most closely adheres to Lejeune's idea of "le pacte autobiographique". In a closely argued Introduction, the author explains why she has undertaken to write her autobiography and the feminist standpoint that she has chosen.

Kamal Padhye explains her title thus in the Introduction: "Bandh' means 'ties'. 'Anubandh' means chain, load, obstruction, worldly ties etc. Occasionally in life, some relationships turn into burdens. One cannot get rid of these burdens even if one wishes to. Even if it is imperative to throw them off, one cannot do so. So one has to carry them nevertheless. And then they become the cross one has to bear through life."

Through a bold and defiant examination of her own intimate relationships Kamal Padhye scrutinises the close, almost claustraphobic kinship ties in Indian society, that can become oppressive and place major obstacles in the search for an individual identity and autonomy. Fully conscious of the sanctity in the Indian society of the very ties that she speaks against, Kamal Padhye has
written a text that is close to being subversive in articulating literally
the feminist slogan of "The Personal is Political".

The title "Bandh-Anubandh" is as transparent as the title "My
Lord, What a Morning" is opaque. But both suggest, in their different
ways, the restlessness and unease of an individualistic self that is at
odds with social and communal demands.

The titles in this way suggest the range of approach and intent in
these life-stories and also the multiplicity and variety of styles
available to the writers. All writers in their own ways have stepped
"outside the magic circle" that society had chalked out for them. All
autobiographies in a way "break the silence". The silences still persist
but a feminist reading can make the silences speak. A chronological
examination of the autobiographies under study also reveals a change
in the extent of silence, a growing confidence parallel to the growing
influence of women in the economy. As women write
autobiographies in increasing numbers they demonstrate that they are
not merely overdetermined products of but also creative sign makers
in the economies of the century.

What Sidonie Smith says about Blacks in America and their
entry into the world of autobiography-writing can hold true of
women's autobiography-writing as well: "Without a written language
Blacks appeared deficient in memory, mature wisdom, vision and critically, history... Fixed in their essential racial difference, they were denied 'metaphysical selfhood' and relegated instead to the realm of the body as the system's 'beasts of burden'. To write the Self in history thus served as an oppositional gesture, at once 'humanising' and individualising them.²

Smriti Chitre, from the feminist viewpoint is important mainly because it broke the silence, the silence that women in a patriarchal society are programmed to observe. Sunita Deshpande in Aahe Manohar Tari... (Though it is charming...) has conveyed beautifully the importance of documenting history from a woman's viewpoint: "The wives of saints in the olden days were illiterate. They did not write their autobiographies. And their silence has gone a long way in maintaining the façade of the beauty of our culture! "³

Laxmibai Tilak too in her understated way says much the same thing in Smriti Chitre. Narrating the incident when there was nothing to eat at home and how Tilak spent the last rupee on buying an inkpot instead of some food for his hungry son and wife, she says that when she reprimanded Tilak over this, he picked up the inkpot and threw it outside the window in a fit of anger saying, "You don't understand human psychology at all." Laxmibai Tilak says in her autobiography: "Truly, I do not understand human psychology. I think Jijabai too
must not have understood it, nor must have the wife of Socrates. But if only they had written down the problems they faced in life, they would have come to the notice of people. Even if they did not understand what was going on in the minds of other people, I am sure they understood perfectly what was going on in their own minds."

It is mainly through Laxmibai Tilak's writing that we get a sense of Rev. Tilak as a theologian and philosopher, and of Laxmibai Tilak's own involvement in exploring their ideas and putting them into practice. At the same time she makes no attempt to hide like a typical bharatiya nari, a devout Indian wife, the faults of either her husband or other male relatives. But she conveys them in such a tongue-and-cheek manner and through so much humour that even this seeming transgression does not give offence. For example, in the chapter titled "Christi Dharmakade Vaatchaal" ("Progress Towards Christianity"), Laxmibai Tilak narrates how on being caught telling a lie by his wife, Rev. Tilak lost his temper and beat her to his heart's content. This valuable bit of private information about Rev. Tilak, this revelation about his domestic violence, his quick temper, his easy telling of lies, would never have come to light had Laxmibai Tilak not mentioned it in Smriti Chitre. And though this information is given diplomatically, it does form chinks in the impeccable armour of Rev. Tilak. But this incident is related in such a matter-of-fact way by
Laxmibai Tilak that it gives the impression that she took wife beating for granted, as acceptable behaviour on the part of husbands. And maybe, in the social atmosphere of that time wife beating was rampant amongst couples.

It is also possible that this understated treatment and the use of humour was an unconscious stylistic device. The use of humour in this autobiography is the only way that Laxmibai Tilak could narrate painful incidents honestly while at the same time circumventing the stricture of silence imposed upon women.

The narration of Smriti Chitre is done through various anecdotes. The anecdotal style gives it many times the appearance of a bedtime tale told by one's favourite grandmother. One thing to keep in mind while looking at the style of Smriti Chitre is the fact that it was subjected to a great deal of paternalistic editorial control. The autobiography was published by Laxmibai Tilak's son and the publishing industry was controlled completely by men. So the autobiography is neatly divided into twenty chapters which tell the story of Laxmibai Tilak's life chronologically. But even functioning within this benevolent patriarchal control Smriti Chitre manages to break free and express an independent style of its own. Smriti Chitre is replete with typical housewives' proverbs and sayings. Its easy conversational style speaks of Laxmibai Tilak's confidence in her
story-telling skill. She makes no pretensions about writing a bulky volume containing some strong social message. It is a simple tale simply told. Even within the rigidly chronological chapters, Laxmibai Tilak's imagination escapes the constraints of dates and she writes down about an associated memory from the past or about some incident that happened later on in her life. In fact, literary historians speak of Laxmibai Tilak's chatty humorous autobiography more as a work of art than as a record of a life.

But even while Laxmibai Tilak wrote Smriti Chitre, a narrative with a subliminal feminist message, she did it covertly. She was mindful of the cultural injunction of silence for women. Smriti Chitre is written ostensibly as a memoir of her life with her husband. She projects herself as his creation. He is the sculptor, she says. She calls herself her husband's faithful follower. She makes it clear that though hers was a struggle for independence, she would never have been able to reach where she did without the help of her husband. The early feminists needed the co-operation of their "masters", in this case the husband, to rise above their situation. In that sense, their struggle was not so much against patriarchy as against an unjust social system that denied women their due. Laxmibai Tilak narrates this dialogue that she had with her husband. The incident brought to her the awareness that she was an autonomous being: "Tilak had organised a debate
competition at Rajnandgaon. He went about collecting donations for the function. He then came to me and asked, 'How much donation are you giving?'

'What can I give? Whatever you have given is what I have given.'

'How can that be? If I have eaten does that mean that you have eaten too?'

'Of course not.'

'Similarly, my donation is not yours.'

'But I don't have any money.'

'There's one way out. You can volunteer to cook for the participants.'...In this way I gave my donation."5

In Laxmibai Tilak's progress towards autonomy, her husband's contribution was considerable. Rev. Tilak was a liberal who converted to Christianity as a protest against Hindu religious orthodoxy and also subconsciously as a rebellion against his father who symbolised the oppressor in his mind. His father's cruel treatment of his mother not only made Rev.Tilak look for peace in a new religion but also for a more just and non-exploitative society free of class, caste, race and gender bias. His encouragement to his wife ran parallel to the social work that he did for people of all castes and
religions. Laxmibai Tilak's awareness of herself as an autonomous being grew alongside the erosion in her mind of casteism and racism.

The transformation in Laxmibai Tilak's outlook was similar to the change that occurred in Virginia Foster Durr's outlook. She too grew up in the feudalistic South, surrounded by ideas of race, class and gender hierarchies. By the end of her life however this woman had become one of the most vocal activists for Civil rights.

The way Laxmibai Tilak and Virginia Foster Durr describe their transformation from narrow-minded, self-satisfied beings into women with liberal views is startlingly similar. Laxmibai Tilak describes in chapter 12 of Smriti Chitre the episode when Rev. Tilak made her drink water drawn by a non-Brahmin. It was a traumatic experience for Laxmibai Tilak. A lifetime of conditioning told her that she had committed a sin. But at night as she lay in bed thinking over the episode, new thoughts came into her mind. She says: "My eyes were closed at that time but suddenly I felt as though a blinding light had flashed. I am not saying this as a decorative turn of speech. I really felt exposed to a blinding flash of light. My restlessness vanished and my mind suddenly felt receptive to new ideas... Tilak's prayers were answered. The chains of religious and caste discrimination that had been strangulating my mind broke off and fell away one by one." 6
Virginia Foster Durr says that the depression of the Thirties was her first revelatory moment: "Upto this time I had been a conformist, a Southern snob. I actually thought that the only people who amounted to anything were the very small group I belonged to ... What I learned during the Depression changed all that, I saw a blinding light like Saul on the road to Damascus."

Unlike Laxmibai Tilak however, Virginia Foster Durr was not a "creation" of her husband's. A good formal education in a liberal college and her own quick intelligence made her aware of the social inequalities. In fact, she would have us believe that though both she and Cliff grew up together maturity-wise, Cliff had not changed as much on the race issue as she had, because "he had worked in Washington on a high level."(251) She says: "Cliff's family would say, 'well, you know, if he hadn't married Virginia he wouldn't have changed.' "(241)

In Outside the Magic Circle, Virginia Foster Durr stresses again and again the complete support she had from her husband, Cliff. She compares him to her sister's husband, the Supreme Court Justice, Hugo Black: "Hugo did everything in his power to make Josephine happy except give her her freedom. She was Mrs. Hugo Black. He expected her to subordinate herself to his life and his ambition. It never occurred to him otherwise." (47).
On the other hand there was Cliff, who, far from discouraging his fiery tempered and socially aware wife was a positive support to her. Virginia describes the circumstances that compelled them to leave Denver. This was during the Korean War when anti-Red hysteria was mounting. Virginia Foster Durr signed a petition, which came in the mail, opposing the extension of the war. The very next day the Denver Post's headline said: "Wife of Counsel of Farmers' Union signs Red petition." Cliff's job was in danger unless he could persuade his wife to retract. As Virginia says in her autobiography: "They wanted me to sign a statement that I was a poor, weak woman who was duped by vicious Reds." One of the most moving passages in this impassioned work is her remembrance of the moment: "I happened to look out the window and there he (Cliff) was, hobbling up the walk on his crutches. He had just undergone painful back surgery. 'What in the world are you doing home?' I asked. 'I have been fired. They called me into the office and showed me this letter that they wanted you to sign and said that you wouldn't sign it. They said you would have to sign it or I would be fired...I told them that I would never allow you to sign a letter like that.' When Cliff told me that, I fell into his arms. We had each other. That's about all we had." (235)

Like Laxmibai Tilak, Virginia Foster Durr's ideas on gender equality changed along with the change in ideas on race and class. In
India, during Laxmibai Tilak's time, the major inequalities were on religion, caste, race and gender lines. During Virginia Foster Durr's time, the major inequalities were on race, class and gender lines. Their autobiographies are testimonies of how they changed their mindset to acquire independent identities and independent thoughts, how they combated a lifetime of conditioning to work for what they thought was right and just.

At the other end of the spectrum in Marathi autobiography is Bandh-Anubandh, published four decades after Smriti Chitre. The author boldly states in the Introduction itself that her aim in writing Bandh-Anubandh is to expose the hypocritical silence of the middle-class Indian woman. Kamal Padhye's is a self confessed feminist approach. The autobiography written in Marathi by women has progressed in maturity. The silence is broken wilfully and defiantly. Kinship ties that are revered so highly in Indian society were exposed as ineffective by Laxmibai Tilak too. But the expose was delicately carried out. Kamal Padhye exposes the hollowness of these ties in a harsher light. In the process she does not spare her own self too. By exposing her own life and her intimate relationships as a subject for discussion, Kamal Padhye boldly throws herself open for attack. Her controversial remarks on several topics considered sacred by Indian society are unabashedly from a feminist viewpoint. She says: "When
a woman is given recognition only in the role of wife and mother then grave doubts start forming in my mind about the Institution of marriage… To tell the truth, tenderness and harshness are present in varying degrees in all men and women, which is the reason why I believe that the concept of Ardhnarirnateshwar is the most complete way of describing a human being. A family structure where companionship of the like of Shankar and Parvati can occur, is possible only when the old, hierarchical structure of marriage is completely eradicated. Kamal Padhye's examination of old Indian myths and folklore in the light of her feminist thinking makes the reader aware anew of how deeply she has thought on the "Woman Question".

Like Laxmibai Tilak and Virginia Foster Durr who thought of equal rights for women as part of the emancipation of all lesser privileged human beings, Kamal Padhye too worked for the upliftment of not only women but other oppressed people like the Dalits and the tribals.

Of all the six autobiographers Kamal Padhye is the only one who uses the autobiographical genre consciously as a feminist tool and as a literary text. As in the later feminist novels pioneered by Angela Carter's "magic realist" novels and the slippery, fragmented narratives of Doris Lessing and Fay Weldon, Kamal Padhye has appropriated
the autobiography to fill her own particular stylistic needs. The unusual narrative style of Bandh-Anubandh -- the future telescoped into the present, the past seen through the present, the clever use of perspective, the fracturing of a linear narration into a more flexible circularity, the extensive use of all the senses like "touch", "smell", "taste" etc. to bring alive a lifetime of experiences, the back-and-forth narration -- are all literary tricks used extensively by feminist authors.

While Laxmibai Tilak wrote of a struggle for autonomy in a framework given by the patriarchal "masters", Kamal Padhye confidently dismantled the framework to create an autobiographical form more suitable to her needs. While Smriti Chitre formed a firm foundation on which women writers could build, Bandh-Anubandh is proof of how far women's autobiography writing in Marathi has gone.

Pearl S. Buck is the only one, apart from Kamal Padhye, who uses literary devices in her autobiography. The style adopted by Pearl S. Buck in My Several Worlds is a deliberate mixture of the past, present and future. The diary-like notations on the top right-hand corner of each chapter indicates Pearl S. Buck's attempt to fuse the present with the past. She begins each chapter in the present and some sight, some sound, a taste or a smell reminds her of her other life in China. In this way she tries to bridge the gap between two countries and two cultures. She attempts to bring together in this way,
stylistically as well as thematically, two cultures in which she is both an insider and an outsider. Her story is told at many levels. Spatially as well as chronologically she fractures the narrative. In fact, except for Pearl S. Buck and Kamal Padhye, all the other authors narrate their life stories more or less chronologically. Laxmibai Tilak, because she was a neo-literate and was functioning within a strict paternalistic editorial control, did not tamper much with the framework of the autobiography as it came to her. She was one of the first women to write her autobiography in Marathi. The sequential narration of a life was a literary trend used by men before her. She did not therefore experiment with the form of the autobiography though the content of Smriti Chitre is rich in its use of a home spun language and colourful proverbs. Durga Khote too does not experiment with the form of the autobiographical genre. In fact she is painfully systematic in giving details etc. Each chapter actually begins with a date. She was a career woman who took her profession seriously and unlike Laxmibai Tilak who did not have a career, Durga Khote was answerable not only to herself for her time but also to her producers for whom time was literally money. The date-wise description of her life therefore reflects the discipline and punctuality that marked Durga Khote's life. It is this constant reference to time, dates etc. that
conveys to the readers the seriousness with which Durga Khote took her job. Her autobiography masks this ambition.

Marian Anderson's autobiography gives a strong indication of its being ghost written, though the fact is not acknowledged. Mr. Taubman of the New York Times seems to have played a significant role in the final fashioning of the book. Till chapter 16, the narration is fairly chronological and after that the narrative style gives a strong indication of being the product of a series of topic-related interviews.

The aim of My Lord, What a Morning is not to break new literary ground in the area of autobiography or to experiment with literary devices and the form of the genre. Its main aim is to chronicle the rise of a Black girl from a modest background to a singing diva of international fame. In that sense it is very much an edifying text.

Virginia Foster Durr's Outside the Magic Circle too had a specific purpose behind its inception. Its value lies in the socio-historical importance of chronicling the life of a social activist who came from the South. The intervention of the SOHP and its funding by the Rockefeller Foundation has obvious political implications. A systematic, clear and unambiguous chronicling of events in Virginia Foster Durr's life is of more importance to the interviewers and editors of Outside the Magic Circle rather than literary experimentation with the autobiographical form.
Kamal Padhye's experimentation with the autobiographical form may be a result of the literary atmosphere of her home. This literary background is shared by Laxmibai Tilak and Pearl S. Buck. Unlike Kamal Padhye however, Pearl S. Buck keeps her personal life strictly out of the scope of her book. Pearl S. Buck lived the kind of life Kamal Padhye only dreamed about. Pearl S. Buck had complete control over her life. In an era when divorce was a dirty word, she stepped into a second marriage with an already married man simply because she thought that it was right for them both. She only had her courage of conviction to sustain her. She hides this fearlessness in My Several Worlds and gives us an autobiography that is evasive, tangential and deliberately impersonal. The irony is that Kamal Padhye who regrets bitterly in Bandh-Anubandh her timidity in life that prevented her from doing what she really wanted simply because she feared social scorn, has produced an autobiography that is frank, bold and almost subversive in its openness.

Pearl S. Buck's aim in writing My Several Worlds was very different from Kamal Padhye's, who wrote a feminist critique of the middle-class Indian society while examining her Self and her intimate relationships in her autobiography. Pearl S. Buck's aim also differed from Virginia Foster Durr's, who, courtesy the SOHP, wanted to outline the growth of an activist of the Civil Rights Movement and
thus reveal through the story of an individual's life the social reality of an era. Pearl S. Buck's intention is different from Durga Khote's as well. Durga Khote chronicled in *Mee-Durga Khote* the transformation of a girl from a wealthy family to a famous heroine of the silver screen. Pearl S. Buck's aim was also different from Marian Anderson's, who attempts to make the point in *My Lord, What a Morning* that it is not difficult for a person of merit to rise to the top in America whatever the caste/colour/creed he/she may belong to.

*My Several Worlds* unlike *Bandh-Anubandh* is not the story of Pearl S. Buck's life but rather the story of the places she lived in. Pearl S. Buck was not comfortable with the autobiographical medium and its confessional, intimate nature. She has analysed her life, by her own admission, in her fictional works. In this way she has appropriated distancing devices to mask the autobiographical voice. Significantly she has used the Biography to speak *autobiographically*. Theodore F. Harris' biography of Pearl S. Buck was published by her very own publishing house, John Day, and was written in collaboration with Pearl S. Buck. What Pearl S. Buck found difficult to articulate in her autobiography, she did so indirectly in her Biography. In this way the modus operandi that Pearl S. Buck employs in writing her life-story is exactly the opposite of Kamal Padhye's. In *My Several Worlds* Pearl S. Buck explores East-West relations and through an examination of
important political events her identity is revealed to the reader. Kamal Padhye explores her own life, her intimate relationships and through this examines old customs, ancient myths, middle-class values etc. The speaking "I" in My Several Worlds is cast in the role of a spectator and a commentator on important world events. The speaking "I" in Bandh-Anubandh is cast confidently as the main actor. Society and social values are examined as they affect the individual, speaking "I".

The difference in the use of "I" in the autobiographies of Kamal Padhye and Pearl S. Buck therefore reflects the change that took place in the Women's Movement. One of the most important characteristics of modern feminism has been its capacity for continual political innovation. The Women's Lib. Movement focused like the New Left on the individual and on self-examination. The idea behind consciousness-raising was to link the Self to others. It did not always work in practice, but in theory the individual was linked in relations within society. Thus personal experience could reveal dynamically a social reality. This was a significant break. Older forms of socialism had lost sight both of the individual and of personal daily life.

As Hollinger F. Barnard says in the "Editors Note" to Outside the Magic Circle: "The importance of Virginia's story is her personal perception of the times, places and people she has known." (xvi) In
this way the Editor of *Outside the Magic Circle* makes a clear
distinction between history and literature. Actually, all
autobiographies tread the delicate line between sociology / history and
literature / psychology. Because Virginia Foster Durr's life was being
recorded by the SOHP, it was inevitable that her public life was
recorded more. There is no clear demarcation line between her public
and private lives. They are intricately enmeshed.

The autobiography where there is a clear demarcation over the
public / private theme is *Mee-Durga Khote*. Durga Khote makes a
clear separation between her public and private selves. Textually too
she splits her book between her public and private aspects. Reversing
Virginia Foster Durr's modus operandi, she describes her public life
from the standpoint of her personal life.

In fact, if one looks at the six autobiographies, one realises that
the three Marathi autobiographies are much more candid and open in
discussing the private lives of the authors than the three American
autobiographies.

Laxmibai Tilak talks about her husband as much as, if not more
than, she talks about herself. Pearl S. Buck, on the other hand, does
not even name either of her two husbands. Laxmibai Tilak talks
frequently about her children, especially her son Dattu. Pearl S. Buck
avoids the topic and talks instead extensively about adoption, parenting and children in general.

Durga Khote has written *Mee-Durga Khote* exclusively from the personal point of view. Her roles as daughter, wife, mother are what she is concerned about. Her illustrious and long career in the Film Industry is almost side tracked. Marian Anderson, on the other hand, very systematically chronicles her career graph. She discusses her personal relations only in terms of how they affected her career. She talks briefly about her husband and admits frankly that she has avoided motherhood because her career commitments would not have allowed her to be an attentive mother.

Virginia Foster Durr describes her personal life only in terms of her public life. *Her relationship with her husband she describes as uniformly good. She does not talk much about her four daughters* apart from giving us their names. The death of her young son is glossed over and the emotional response of the distressed parents is described only in terms of how their involvement in social work intensified. On the other hand there is Kamal Padhye -- an equally indefatigable social worker, who laboured tirelessly for the Tibetan refugees in Delhi, who won a seat in the Mumbai Municipal elections on a Praja Samajwadi ticket, who later carried out extensive social work for the benefit of tribals and *dalits*, who worked shoulder to
shoulder with her husband when they were in financial difficulties and helped pay the debt for the house they lived in, who was, in short, an equal partner in the Padhye marriage in all respects. In Bandh-Anubandh, however all this activism is explained in terms of how it affected her private life. Her public life is almost sidelined and she concentrates heavily instead on her marital condition, on the shattering effect her son's death had on her and on Padhye.

Kamal Padhye talks about the constant dilemma in a woman's mind about balancing work "inside" and "outside" the home. In spite of understanding well the difficulty of demarcating a "private" and a "public" life, Kamal Padhye in Bandh-Anubandh seems to draw her identity from her roles as daughter/wife/mother rather than from her role as a social worker.

By all counts, all these three autobiographers—Laxmibai Tilak, Durga Khote and Kamal Padhye—were active in the public sphere, much more active than the average Indian woman. Yet they chose to sidetrack their achievements and talked instead of their personal and intimate relationships.

Their preoccupation with their private roles may be because in a traditional society like India, for a woman, "Anatomy is Destiny". In a traditional community where family values and the communal profit is valorised over the individual good, women become the touchstone
of public morality. Kamal Padhye shows an awareness of this when she says in *Bandh-Anubandh* : "How is it that women have not realised that the custom of regarding women as the 'protectors of morality' is not a badge of honour but is instead a tool of oppression."^9

In such a situation, "modernity" acquires negative connotations and stands in opposition to family values. As Fatmagul Berktay says: "People who live under capitalism in the West might retain no memory of how suffocating life can be within the narrow confines of a traditional community which denies individuals self-determination and personal autonomy. The individual indeed, is a product of modernity....In a society dominated by communal ideology and by an all-subsuming state, it is always traditionally powerless groups such as women, ethnic minorities or political dissidents that suffer most, precisely because society regards the control exercised over them as legitimate, sometimes in the name of 'the interest of the state', sometimes in the name of 'protecting public morality and purity'. In all these cases, women's right to an autonomous existence and to individuality is the easiest to be trampled on."^10

So, the private life of a woman, even a public woman like Durga Khote, becomes a matter of concern, not only for her but for the reading public as well. Private life not in the society-column sense of her secret loves and fantasies, but in the sense of whether she was
adequately fulfilling her duties as mother, as wife, as daughter. A "good" Indian woman would prioritise her family over everything else, especially her professional success. Heading this unwritten social injunction, Durga Khote, a winner of the Padmashree, a former President of the Marathi Natya Parishad, a respected actress of the Hindi/Marathi screen, the revered boss of Durga Khote Productions, chooses to end her autobiography thus: "In my seventy-seventh year, when I look back on my life, I feel that due to God's grace I was able to surmount most of the difficulties in life. The only goal in my life was the welfare of my children... It was for them that I jumped into the maelstrom of society early in life. It is my good fortune that I lived long enough to see their prosperity with my own eyes. This is my true reward.

What remain are the wounds on a mother's heart! That sorrow will end only with my life!" 11

When one compares the endings of the six autobiographies, one sees that the three American autobiographers tend to show a greater connection with the community and society outside the confines of their homes. In short, they treat the Autobiography more as a social document. The three Marathi autobiographers, on the other hand, reveal a tendency to use the Autobiography more as a text about the
Individual, and therefore look upon the Autobiography more as a literary genre and end their books on a more personal note.

Laxmibai Tilak ends Smriti Chitre with a poetic paean to her own personal autonomy: "The ship blew the foghorn and started moving towards the deeper waters. We stood on the deck and watched as Mumbai receded away from us and the figures of our friends standing on the shore grew fainter.

Happiness brimmed over in us as we watched them. The sea was calm. Its waters occasionally changed colours. Our minds too were busy with various thoughts. Maybe not in the eyes of the world, but in our own eyes Karachi felt like England. Three women and three children were going away to spend three years in such a far-off land. There was no man with us... Freedom!" 12

Durga Khote's ending to her autobiography has already been given above.

Kamal Padhye ends Bandh-Anubandh with the regret that the purity of a Platonic man-woman relationship is difficult to be found in this flawed world. This generalised statement arises out of an analysis of her own platonic relationship with a man she does not name.

Thus all three Marathi autobiographies end with the personal touch. The autobiography is regarded by all three women as mainly a document of the Self.
The three American women, on the other hand, tend to see the autobiography as a document where they can state clearly their political stand and their views on various social and cultural problems.

Pearl S. Buck ends *My Several Worlds* thus: "I am therefore hopeful. In spite of dismaying contradictions in individuals in our national scene, I feel the controlling spirit of our people, generous, decent and sane.

In this mood of faith and hope my work goes on. A ream of fresh paper lies on my desk waiting for the next book, I am a writer and I take up my pen to write--."\(^{13}\)

She foregrounds again her identity as a writer, a scholar, rather than as a woman. She reinforces with this ending her purpose in writing *My Several Worlds* -- not to talk of her personal life as such, but taking her life as an example stating her political stand on the foreign policy of USA regarding Asia.

Marian Anderson ends *My Lord, What a Morning* thus: "Not everyone can be turned aside from meanness and hatred, but the great majority of Americans is heading in that direction. I have a great belief in the future of my people and my country."\(^{14}\) This writer too turns the attention away from the Self towards politics. The autobiography as a social document, as a text that brings about a
clearer understanding of the American society is what is more apparent here.

Virginia Foster Durr says towards the end of Outside the Magic Circle: "My Children, as they reached young adulthood, would sometimes say they wished I had stayed at home and baked brownies as other mothers did. But what good were brownies in a society that tolerated poverty and denied people the education to enable them to get out of poverty?" (337) Here again we see the tendency to prioritise the social against the personal identity.

This difference in the use of the autobiographical genre by the three Maharashtrian and the three American autobiographers seems to stem from the unique place of autobiography in their respective cultures. As Robert F. Sayre says in "Autobiography and the Making of America": "Commencing before the Revolution and continuing into our own time, America and autobiography have been peculiarly linked... An American seems to have needed to be an American first and then an autobiographer, and this places some limits on his or her achievement." 15

Sayre seems to imply that the importance of autobiography in American culture is due to the fact that America is a "new" nation with a "young" history. Therefore, American autobiography is different from the autobiographies of other nations simply in the
degree to which Americans are and are not different. Americans are immigrants. America, unlike other nations, is not only a land or a people. From the times of Columbus, Cortez and John Smith, America has been "an idea, or many ideas." In the absence of a secure culture, traditional Americans have to find their heroes in autobiographies. According to Sayre: "In America, individuality and conformity are less opposites than complements... Autobiographers are both the emulators and the emulated. All of this has made autobiography very significant in America." ¹⁶

In India, on the other hand, the significance of the Autobiography has grown in the recent past. India is both an old nation and a new nation. It is old in the sense of being an ancient civilisation and new in the sense that it has been only fifty years since India gained freedom from an Imperial power. For a traditional society where everything and everyone has been designated a place, the autobiographical genre was a difficult medium to adopt. But for a nation in transition, newly free from the bonds of a colonial power, this literature of the Self was a perfect choice. It is not surprising that some of the most well known Indian autobiographies have been written by political leaders of the freedom struggle. That these leaders, like Jawaharlal Nehru (who wrote Jawaharlal Nehru: An Autobiography) and Mahatma Gandhi (who wrote My Experiments with Truth) were Western-educated is
significant. It is also significant that they chose to write their autobiographies in English. Their intended audience was the Western world. Writing as colonial subjects struggling to seize freedom, the autobiographical genre provided them with unexpected power. They became articulate heroes, who could use the power of language and persuasion to tell their own story and use it for the liberation of other men and women. Just as the autobiography has been the major kind of literature for Blacks and most other oppressed Americans, it became the favourite literature of the freedom fighters. The person who can write his own story can rise from the status of the unknown and inarticulate and can thus relate that story to others and to the stories of others. Marginalised people need to reclaim knowledge, the right to name themselves, and the capacity to envisage a future -- all of which they have long been denied.

The contribution of women freedom fighters in the struggle for Indian Independence has gone unchronicled largely because the majority of this faceless mass of brave women was illiterate. These exceptional women therefore did not write their autobiographies. Women were the marginalised group even within the already marginalised group of colonised subjects. "Woman" was therefore doubly oppressed. She was doubly "other" -- as woman and as colonised person -- even in her own vision. It was the poor, rural
women of the countryside who were most active in the mass resistance movement. The women of the middle-classes were more hesitant. As bearers of public morality and social propriety, the middle-class woman was more deeply entrenched in the traditional role prescribed for her. Individual progress and self-preservation came ahead of political involvement and social work. Both Kamal Padhye and Durga Khote make references to this in their autobiographies. In Kamal Padhye's narration of the Freedom Movement, one senses a tone of regret on her timidity and in Durga Khote's narration, a note of escapism comes through. She seems to be making excuses for her non-participation and aloofness from the Movement.

Kamal Padhye says:

"The 1942 'Quit India' Movement was making me restless too... So I decided to join the Movement. That meant attending meetings and discussions regularly. One evening I was enthusiastically preparing to go for such a meeting. It was understood that all those who would attend this meeting would get themselves arrested. Because Padhye was so deeply involved with the Movement, I had never dreamt that he would object to my attending this meeting. But after finishing his meal and before setting off for office he said to me, 'I don't mind if you attend this meeting. But don't get yourself arrested.'

The implication of his words was clear: 'Don't get involved in the Movement.'

Going against Padhye's wishes meant adding to the tensions already existing in the home. I had become so fatigued with these tensions that I simply had no energy left to combat any additional unpleasantness.

I kept quiet and refrained from attending the meeting.
I was convinced by Gandhi's logic about the Movement. But in spite of being convinced I had to rein in my real feelings. I could not dare to go against Padhye's wishes.

Maybe that is why I have great respect for women who carry on with what is right without bothering about conventions or other people's objections.

Our house was not totally aloof from the Movement however... Many political leaders would hold meetings in our house. I had to satisfy my hunger for patriotism by merely being a good hostess to these guests of mine and maintaining secrecy about these meetings. 

Durga Khote says:

"Our family was totally indifferent to the Freedom Struggle. But we children were free to attend the political meetings addressed by important leaders. Simple Marathi women wearing traditional nine-yard saris of khadi would participate in the early-morning marches. They had babies in their arms. The police would frequently lathi-charge and arrest people. But these women would carry on undeterred. This was the time of 1919-20, when the Freedom Movement was gaining momentum. Looking at these daily scenes of patriotism, I too decided to abandon school and studies and throw myself completely into the Freedom Struggle. But there was stiff resistance to this decision of mine both from school as well as my parents... My father called me and said: 'Look Banu, if you leave Cathedral School now, you will not be taken back again. Without their Certificate, you won't be able to get admission in a good school. What will you do then without an education? Also, if you really wish to serve your country and enter the Non-co-operation Movement, go and join one of Gandhiji's ashrams and live according to their rules and regulations. You can't live at home in luxury and indulge in armchair politics.' Banu was given a month to consider her decision. In that period she had to attend school and observe all its rules... In that one month I did a lot of running around. Before taking a final decision I conducted a lot of research. I observed closely the tension-ridden lives of political leaders like Avantikabai Gokhale, Balasaheb Kher, and Sarojini Naidu. But I couldn't do any constructive work as such. Nobody gave me any idea of what my role would be. There was no guidance as to in what way students like me would practically serve the Freedom..."
Struggle after abandoning school and studies. All I could see youngsters like me doing was running errands when big political leaders arrived and then retreating quietly after their departure. There was no plan chalked out to mobilise the resources and energies of youngsters like us. I could not even see any kind of discipline. Therefore I fell into a quandary. I observed one-upmanship even amongst the workers. I saw corruption in the ranks along with selflessness. On seeing this other side of the picture my fever of patriotism cooled down considerably. Then I decided, unless there is something concrete that I can do, there is no point in quitting my education. After putting a rest to all these questions in my head, my schooling started again.18

In a traditional society, where men and women are slotted into specific roles, just trying to get out of these roles is achievement enough. If we look at the three Marathi autobiographies, we see slow but definite change in the perception of the Self within society. For Laxmibai Tilak, gaining an education and hence control over her life was a great triumph of the spirit. For Durga Khote, who got control over her life because of her financial independence at an early age, proving that she was still functioning within the parameters of society in spite of stepping out of the traditional role chalked out for her was the main purpose of her autobiography. For Kamal Padhye, who was active both "inside" and "outside" the home, being an exception to the norm was not enough. In her autobiography one senses her unhappiness with traditional norms and the social parameters that limit a woman's potential. She questions these parameters themselves. She does not portray her life as a success story, but rather as a quest
towards perfection. Her incisive analysis of man-woman relations in
Indian society are a comment on the sexual politics that are inevitably
to the disadvantage of the woman. Her impatience with the status quo
vis-à-vis man-woman relations in the Indian society is reflected in her
dismantling of the traditional framework of the autobiographical
genre. She remoulds the form to express her own stylistic needs and
in this way makes an oppositional gesture of rebellion. She has come
a long way from Laxmibai Tilak's concealed, silent feminism
expressed in Smriti Chitre.

Pearl S. Buck's unease with the autobiographical medium is
apparent in the various distancing devices used in My Several Worlds.
In fact, her clever use of novelistic techniques like flashbacks,
abundant description of the sense perceptions, the fracturing of the
narration spatially and chronologically, are used more to separate the
Self from the autobiography rather than to integrate it. Her reluctance
to highlight her success in My Several Worlds is indicative of her
times, of an era when success was the prerogative of men. Marian
Anderson's autobiography shows a clear intervention of the
patriarchal publishing industry. It was not her identity as a woman
that was of importance in the final fashioning of the book, but her
identity as a Black. It is a conservative autobiography, written to fulfil
the specific needs of a certain social group. It makes absolutely no
oppositional gestures. The conciliatory tone of the autobiography is also expressed in the traditional form adopted to narrate the sequence of events. An autobiography with such an obvious purpose has no scope for literary experimentation. Virginia Foster Durr's *Outside the Magic Circle* stands poles apart from *My Several Worlds* and *My Lord, What a Morning*. It is the story of a woman who is well entrenched in the social fabric of America. Virginia Foster Durr considers herself, self-confessedly, of the ruling class unlike Pearl S. Buck who was a pseudo-immigrant in her own country and Marian Anderson who belonged to a Black, blue-collar family. Her gesture of rebellion, apparent in the forceful title of her autobiography indicates not only her own sense of security in her position but also the changing role of women in society. The transcription of oral interviews in the case of her autobiography is an oppositional gesture too, aimed at indicating the variety of narrative strategies open for women. The gesture of transcribing oral tapes for Virginia Foster Durr's autobiography is meant to expand not only the frontiers of autobiographical study but also to question the prevailing patriarchal autobiographical framework.

It is interesting to note that while Laxmibai Tilak's lack of extensive reading lent to her autobiography an immediacy more reminiscent of the oral tradition in which women were culturally
richer, this lucidity of prose and humour was used by her more as a camouflaging device. Virginia Foster Dorr's recording of her life by the SOHP on the other hand is a deliberate act of opposition against the well-entrenched autobiographical form. The colloquialisms and the anecdotes found in Outside the Magic Circle are reflective of a past when women were particularly adept at story telling, and when the oral tradition was a significant part of women's culture. In a sense therefore, Outside the Magic Circle is going back to the past but with a clear understanding of its significance in women's culture. Smriti Chitre originates from the oral tradition but as it progresses, it moves away from it towards a more prose-oriented bookish style. While Smriti Chitre struggles to fit into the norm given by the patriarchal order, Outside the Magic Circle defiantly moves away from it. Kamal Padhye's Bandh-Anubandh is a complex, literary work, far removed from the oral tradition apparent in Smriti Chitre and Outside the Magic Circle. But it too shows a restlessness with the prevalent form and the back-and-forth narration of Bandh-Anubandh is indicative of the growing confidence of a woman autobiographer. These literary devices are used to give a more complete picture of Kamal Padhye's life and times and unlike Pearl S. Buck who uses literary devices to camouflage her Self, Kamal Padhye uses them to unveil the Self.
Thus, it is clear that conventions of representing a life vary—historically across periods, but also spatially across a culture. A chronological examination of the six autobiographies across the East-West boundary proves that the changing status of women in the socio-economic reality of today's world is clearly apparent in the autobiographies written by them. Their growing confidence in experimenting with the form of the autobiographical genre, their continuous straining against the well-defined boundaries of the genre set for them by the patriarchal masters and the ever-shortening gap in the description of their Public and Private lives, all point to the changing role of women and to their readiness to become creative sign makers in a world which is on the threshold of a new era.
NOTES

1
Kama! Padhye, Bandh-Anubandh (Mumbai : Mauj Prakashan, 1993) ix-x. All quotations from this book have been taken from this edition. My translations appear in the body of the text. The Marathi original is in the Notes Section :

"अनुवंश म्हणजे बेडी, लोडणे, अडथळा, ओझे, संसारपाश वगैरे. संसारात भाववंशाधारीही काढी काढी ओझी बनून जातात. पेकून धावू धावू महतं तरी ती पेकूले जात नाहीत. ती पेकूर्यां आवश्यक वाळतं तरीही ते जमत नाही. मग ती तशीच वाळवी लागला. आणि मग ही ओझी आपलेच चूक बनतात."

2

3
Sunita Deshpande, Aahe Manohar Tari .... (Mumbai : Mauj Prakashan, 1990) 7. My translation was given in the body of the text. The original comes in the Notes Section :

"जुन्या काठाव्या संताच्या बायक्या निरक्षर होत्या, आत्मविर्ये लिहीत नक्षत्रा. हे आपल्या संसूचीते सौंदर्य टिकटायला किती उपक्रमासा ठरते !"
Laxmibai Tilak, *Smriti-Chitre* (Mumbai: Popular Prakashan, 1958) 83. The body of the text carries my translation of the original Marathi:

"..."

5

Page 101. "टिकक मला विचारां लागले, 'दूं काय वर्गणी देतेस ? बोल.'

'भी काय देऊं? तुम्ही दिली तीन भी दिली.'

'असे कसे? मी जेवलो, की तुला जेवयता लागत नाहीं का?'

'तसे कसे होईल?'

'मग तसेच माझी वर्गणी म्हणजे तुझी वर्गणी नाही.'

'पण मजजवळ पैसे कुठे आहेत?'

'एक युक्तिआहे. आम्हाळा आचारी मिळत नाहीं. पैसे फार मागतां.'

'भी करते स्वेच्छक. मग पैसे धावे लागणार नाहींत ना?'

आणि अशा रीतीने माझी वर्गणी भी भरली.'

6

Page 192. "त्या वेळी माझे धोरे मिळवले होते, परंतु एक्षण प्रकाश पडल्यासारखा मला भास झाला. प्रकाश पडल्याने मी काही अलकनरिक भासांत सोंगत नाही. खरोखर सूर्यप्रकाशसारखा चक्क प्रकाश पडल्यासारखा मला भास"
झाला। माझी तत्काल माझी नाही झाली व पूर्वी कधी डोक्यात आले नव्हते असे विचार आता माझ्या डोक्यात शैमान घालूल लागले. … टिककाळ्या प्रारंभने उत्तर आले. माझ्या मगला जवळून टाकण्या -या जातिभेदाच्या साखऱ्या ख्यात तुटून पडल्या. ’’

7
As quoted by Studs Terkel, ” Foreword " in Outside the Magic Circle, Virginia FosterDurr (Tuskegee : University of Alabama Press, 1986 ) xi.

8
Page 244. ” स्त्रीच्या केवळ माला आणि पल्या या धूमकेतीला अजेका महत्त्व राहतं, तेचा कुर्खवसंस्करणाचा माझ्या मनात शांता निर्माण होतात... . खरे म्हणजे कोणता काय, कठोरता काय, किंवा इतर स्वभावविशेष काय, कमी अधिक प्रमाणात ते सर्व जी पूर्वांत असतात. म्हणूनच अर्थातीनदेखील हे माणसाचं 'संशोधन स्वरूप' आहे हेच सार्थ वातात. शंका - पार्श्वी सारखं सहजीवन विषय होईल अशी कुर्खवसंस्करण आमूलांग बदल जात्याशिवाय निर्माण होणार नाही. ’’

9
Page 106. ” स्त्रीच्या ‘संस्कृतीच्या रक्षणकर्त्रीं’ हे भूषणासनद नव्हे तर स्वत:ची कुर्खव्या करण्यासी सैत आहे, असा विचारसुधा तिच्या मनात येत नसेल का ? ”

10
Fatmagul Berktay, ”Looking from the ’other’ side : Is Cultural Relativism a Way Out ?, ” Women’s Studies in the 1900s , ed.

11

Durga Khote, *Mee-Durga Khote* (Mumbai: Majestic Book Stall, 1982) 188. All quotations for this book have been taken from this edition. My translations appear in the body of the text. The Marathi original is in the Notes Section: “आज वयाच्या १७ व्या वर्षी माग्याची बदून पाहिलं तर वापर, जितक्या समस्या आत्मा तंत्र तर्फ इशारांनी निवासन गेल्या. माझं एक ध्यान घेण्याने मुंगद व त्यांच्य कल्याण ... ज्यासाठी मला संसाराच्या सुरुवातीत तमाम माहिती श्रीग्रामात उढ ध्यानी लागली, त्यांच्य मित्रस्वत्वच वाणिज्यांच्या पुण्यांनी धोक्यांची पाहण्यासंग भाग्य मला लागलं! हेच माझं खरं निर्माण!”

राहता राहिले मातृभाषाची घाव! त्यांचे दुःख माझं भरोबर जायचं!”

12

Page 347. “बोटीने कर्णं पुढीकोण. ती आम्हाला पोटाच्या वाटेकडे पेऊन निघाली. आम्ही दूर सरकण्याने मुंबईकडे व तिच्या काहीवर उभया असलेल्या आम्ही मित्रमंडळी कडे आनंदाने पहाड होतो. सागर झालं होतं. पाण्याचे रंग मधून मधून बदलत होते. जगाच्या दृष्टिने नसते तरी आम्ही दृष्टिने कराची घेण्या आम्हाला ईंग्लॅंड वाहत होते. इतक्या दुर्घटना परस्कर्त शेषेसाहित केवळ तीन मुंगद व तीन बायकंगनी जाऊन तीन वर्ष काढायच्या होतो. जवळ पुरुष माणूस नाहीं. .. स्वतंत्रता!”
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14

15

16
Ibid. 151.

17
Page 95. "मैंने यह चढ़ाकित पढ़ाया कि ठरून डाकर्ले, मग सभीजा वागने जानें और अथर्नें आल्ह.

या धुर्दुल संध्याकली एक सभीता जानें होते. तिद्ध जानें महणे स्वतन्त्र अदक करून घेणे हे ठरलून होते. पाठ्ये या सर्व चढ़ाकित मानांने इतके गुंतव्य होते, की माह्या जाणवाबद्ध ते काही महणतीत असें माह्या स्वातंत्र सुध्दा आलं नक्तीं. पण जेवण ज्ञात्यांतर ऑफ़िस्टाल्ज्याक्षरी पाठ्ये मला महणाले,

‘यु संध्याकाल या सभीते मेरीस तरी हरकत्ता नाही, पण अदक करून घेऊन नक्तीं.

पाठ्यांत संध्याकाल अर्थ स्पष्ट होता, ‘यु चढ़ाकित पढू नक्तीं’

पाठ्यांच्या मनाविकृत्य जाणें महणजे आधीच असतेल्या तणावात भर घालणे.

प्रथ्या ताण असतेल्या वातावरणाच ते इतकी शक्ती गेळे होते, कि आणखी वात निर्माण करण्याची माही तयारी नक्तीं.

कुठलाच्या प्रथ्यांन न विचाराती मी गप राहिले. पण मी सभीता गेळे नाही.
साधारण सिद्ध संबंध संबंधी जीवन साधन सेवा नेतृत्व में भाग लेकर त्योहार त्योहार को लीन मूल अस्थ. पौरी स लाईमार कल्यन धर्मकुल करत. पण त्या बायकाना संक्षेप वास्तु नसे. ... ही रोज़ी दृश्य पाहून माझ मन भांवाहून जात होते. मी अस्थम त्यात होते. ... त्या वेळेचे मी ठरवलं 'मी शाळा सोडून देशसेवा करणार '... पण माझी भूमिका पाहून पण आपण मी बऱ्याच विचाराच खडलं.

एकदिवसी दोघांनी बांधूला फॅस्कॉर घेतलं. पण बऱ्याच रुप स्वरूप म्हणून, 'बांधूला, तुला खरोखरच कार्य करण्याचे आहे? तू जर देखील सोडलेलं तर तुला तिथे घर जाता येणार नाही. पूर्ण त्योहार रद्दफिकेकेटुको शिवाय तुला चांगल्या शाळेत प्रवेश मिळणार नाही. मग शिक्षणाचार्य तू काय करणार. तुला जर खरोखरच देशसेवा करण्याचे अनेक, नेनकोथीकरण च्या चकरीत पडावाच असेल तर तू गांधीजीचा कुटुंब लां आर्थिक जाऊन घरा आपण तिथं काम कर. तिथं
आश्रमांच्छा नियमांमारांमारां राज्या. इथं आरामात राहून आर्मीवार रालिटिक्सलमारां भाग
धेऊन कुणालाही त्याचा उपयोग होत नाही. '"

विचार करण्यासाठी बांधूला एक महत्वाची मुदत देण्यात आली. त्या मुदतीत
तिंने नेहमीप्रमाणे शाक्तेवत गेलं पाहिजे, शाक्तेवता सर्व नियमांचे काळक्षेत्रपणे पालन केलं
पाहिजे अशी सत्ता नाकीद देण्यात आली. ...

पाण्याच्या फर्मानामारांमारां मी त्या महत्वाची बरीच पावतीत वेली. अन्तिकारी
गोखले, बाळासाहेब खेड़े, सरोजनी नायेंदू यांच्या सामाजिक जेवढे क्षण घालवता
बेचैल तेवढे घालवते. सांख्य धक्कातील जीवन जवळून पाहिलं. पण काम असं काही
वेळं नाही. काही करता आलं नाही. काय काम करायलं असं याची मला कुणीची
कल्पनाही दिली नाही. आमच्या वाणी विद्याधर्मी शाई नोंदता नंतर त्यानी
देशावी जात करायलं पाहिजे हे कुणीच संगत नकळते. किंमान शिष्टतुळ्णा नकळती,
त्यामुळे बुधकर्कवांत पडले. तिथंही ख-याचा या कार्याची ओढ़ फसर योडळा मंडळीत
दिसती. सार्धांत्याना बरोबर अनावर ही आहे, असं चित्र मला दिसू लागलं. ते पाहून
माझी देशकार्याची धूमी बरीच असतील. मग मी ठरलं. - निश्चित पुढे काय करायलं
हे समजत्याशिवाय शाळा सोडावाची नाही. हे ठरलं चुन्नां माझा अभ्यास नेतांन सुरू
झाला. "