CHAPTER-II

ROLE OF GENDER IN AUTOBIOGRAPHY

2.1 HISTORY

To begin with the tradition of writing autobiography is not entirely novel. It has been with us for quite some time. Though, as a genre, it became popular much later. Plato in the 4th century B.C. wrote Seventh Epistile, which was known as his letter. Montaigne in the latter half of the 16th century wrote Essays. Till then the genre existed in its loose form, it was only towards the end of the 18th century that the word autobiography was coined. It is made up of three Greek elements “Self (auto) – Life (bio) – Writing (graphy)” (Olney: 6). Prior to that, it existed under the names such as memoirs and confessions. Thus, autobiography as a literary phenomenon is new to literature.

There is the dual, paradoxical fact that autobiography is often something considerately less than literature and that it is always something rather more than literature (Olney:24).

The first autobiography – The autobiography of a Dissenting Minister – was written in 1834 by W.P.Scargill. It was only after World War II that autobiography gained attention as a literary genre. As the two major works before World War I are Goerge Misch’s History of Autobiography in Antiquity (1907) and Anna Burr’s Autobiography a critical and comparative study (1909).

As we have discussed in the preceding chapter, like most genres, autobiography too was men’s monopoly. Since men established the tradition of autobiographical writing, not many important women autobiographies are known to have existed before World War I.
Women writers did express their feelings. But, it was mainly in the form of diaries, memoirs or journals such as Agrippina’s *Memoirs* and Teresia Constantia Philip’s *Life* (1562-65). As shumaker’s *English Autobiography* (1954) mention, 18th and 19th century saw few women writers. Before 1965, only white powerful rich man was eligible for writing autobiography. It was only during seventies that women stepped into the field of autobiography writing. The critical literatures on autobiography began in 1956. For classic critic like Gusdorf, autobiography is a genre that belongs to men, and women are denied entrance to this writing. Like any other genre of literature, Autobiography was also not considered to be fit for women writers. The same patriarchal mindset works behind it. It was strongly believed that his genre as meant only for men, and that too successful men. Since, it requires a great amount of self-esteem, confidence and pride to write an autobiography. Georges Gusdorf, often identified as the ‘dean of autobiographical studies’, asserts in his essay “Conditions and Limits of Autobiography” that “autobiography is not possible in a cultural landscape where consciousness of self does not, properly speaking, exist” (1956:30).

The cultural precondition for autobiography, Gusdorf argues, is a pervasive concept of individualism. However, the individual concept of the autobiographical self that is established by the male tradition raises serious theoretical problems for critics who recognize that the self, self-creation, and self-consciousness are profoundly different for women, minorities and many non-western people. This establishes a critical bias that leads to the misreading and marginalization of autobiographies by women and minorities. Women's autobiographies display quite a different orientation towards the self and the others from the typical orientation to be found in the autobiographies by men. Women narrate their inner life in autobiography and, as Patricia Meyer Spacks notes, they, “define for themselves and their readers, Woman as she is and as she dreams” (1980:17).

2.2 MEN’S MONOPOLY

According to the critics, an autobiography is a story of success and therefore it has to focus more on the professional part of one's life, whereas
women, on the other hand, writes about their personal life and experiences, which does not suit the criteria of this genre. Both the genders think differently and thus the expression has to be different.

Showalter believed that woman's ability as a writer cannot be judged by applying male critical theory to their work because male critical theory is a concept of creativity, literary history or literary interpretation based entirely on male experience and put forward as universal. Offering solution to the problem, Showalter coined the term Gynocritique. The programme of Gynocritique is to construct a female framework for the analysis of women's literature to develop new models based on the study of female experiences rather than to adopt male models and their theories. Gynocritics believe that women's writing differs to that of men due to four major reasons: biological, linguistic, psychoanalytic and cultural.

As Showalter puts it:

Linguistic and textual theories of women's writings ask whether men and women use language differently, whether sex differences in language can be theorized in terms of biology, socialization or culture; Whether women can create new languages of their own, and whether speaking, reading and writing are all gender marked. (Showalter, 1981: 190)

Interestingly, Luce Irigary interprets the nuances of language in women writing in terms of the physical organs.

The labia, those two lips which embrace each other continuously, and which ensures that every woman is 'in touch with herself, by herself and in herself' In somatic terms, the definition of feminine sexuality, therefore is, 'that sex which is not one': the labia
make it 'always twofold at least' and therefore "Plural as well'. The consequence of this (in Caroline Burke's summary) is that women's language will be plural, autoerotic, defused and undefinable within the familiar rules of (masculine) logic. (Ruthven: 100)

Along with the language, the subject also is indicative of their psyche. Women are always comfortable when they are connected to the people around them as their basic feminine self is connected. Their writings reflect this aspect too. It is surprising how many spinster writers there have been: Jane Austen, Charlotte Mew, Steve Smith. Anne Stevenson, in Writing as a Woman, says:

These women may have -suffered, but they suffered as women who attempted neither to fight male domination nor compromise themselves to suit it. There was a narrow independence, even a selfish one, but it was real. It was bought at the price of what use to be called 'womanliness' - Sex, marriage, children and the socially acceptable position of wife. (Stevenson: 163)

Whatever women writers achieved, they did at the cost of their personal lives. And this is one of the reasons why we have fewer women writers. The subjects around which their writing revolves, too, were depression, humiliation, suffering and to a certain extent, self-hatred.

Thus, under patriarchal order women are oppressed in their very psychology of femininity. One needs to note here that critics/ theorists Irigarary, Cixous, Heilburn, Showalter, Benstock, Robowutham, Chodorow, and Kakar are all contemporary intellectuals. The 'outdated', 'essentialist, concept of binary opposition of sexes originally introduced by Freud and his followers, which was rejected absolutely in the 60's and 70's starts again getting
accepted by the modern day intellectuals mentioned above in an era of ‘feminist thinking’ which upholds “difference” as the key-term. It

Defining the unique difference of women’s writing, as Irigaray and Cixous have warned, must present a slippery and demanding task. Is this difference a matter of style? Genre? Experience? Or is it produced by the reading process as some textual critics would maintain? Spacks calls the difference of women’s writing a “delicate divergency”, testifying to the subtle and elusive nature of the feminine practice of writing. According to Showalter, the theories of women’s writing presently make use of four models of difference: biological, linguistic, psychoanalytic and cultural. Each is a gynocentric effort to define and differentiate the qualities of the women writer and the woman’s text from that of a man. Let’s now try to sort out the various terminologies and assumptions of these four models of difference and evaluate their usefulness.

2.3 BODY AND GENDER

Organic or biological criticism is the most extreme statement of gender difference, of a text indelibly marked by the body: anatomy is textual. Biological criticism is also one of the most sibylline and perplexing theoretical formulations of feminist criticism. Simply to invoke anatomy risks a return to the crude essentialism, the phallic and ovarian theories of art that oppressed women in the past. Victorian physicians believed that women’s physiological functions diverted out twenty percent of their creative energy from brain activity. Victorian anthropologists believed that the frontal lobes of the male brain were heavier and more developed than female lobes and thus women were inferior in intelligence.

While feminist criticism rejects the attribution of literal biological inferiority, some theorists seem to have accepted the metaphorical implications of female biological difference in writing. In *The Madwoman in the Attic* (1979), for example, Gilbert and Gubar structure their analysis of
women's writing around literary paternity. “In patriarchal Western culture”, they maintain: They say:

... the text’s author is a father, a progenitor, a procreator, an aesthetic patriarch whose pen is an instrument of generative power like his penis. Lacking phallic authority, they go on to suggest, women’s writing is profoundly marked by the anxieties of this difference: “If the pen is a metaphorical penis, from what organ can females generate texts?” (1979:6)

Gillbert and Gubar offer no answer to this rhetorical question. It is a serious question of much feminist theoretical discourse. Elaine Showalter, protesting the fundamental analogy replies that women generate texts from the brain or that the word processor of the near future, with its compactly coded microchips, its inputs and outputs, is a metaphorical womb. She further adds that the process of literary creation is analogically much more similar to gestation, labour and delivery than it is to insemination: “if to write is metaphorically to give birth, from what organ can males generate texts?” (1981: 188).

Some radical feminist critics insist that we must read these metaphors as more than playful. They argue that women’s writing proceeds from the body, that their sexual differentiation is also the root. In Of Woman Born (1977), Rich explains her belief saying:

Female biology ... has far more radical implications than we have yet come to appreciate. Patriarchal thought has limited female biology to its own narrow specifications. The feminist vision has recoiled from female biology for these reasons; it will, I believe, come to view our physicality as a resource rather than a destiny. (Rich: 15)
Feminist criticism written in the biological perspective stresses the importance of the body as a source of imagery. Alicia Ostriker, in her essay, “Body Language: Imagery of the Body in Women’s Poetry” (1980) notes that contemporary American women poets use a frank, more pervasive anatomical imagery than their male counterparts. According to Miller, however, it is dangerous to place the body at the center of a search for a female identity. The study of biological imagery in women’s writing is useful and important as long as we understand that factors other than anatomy are involved in it. Ideas about the body are the fundamental in understanding how women conceptualize their situation in society; but there can be no expression of the body which is unmediated by linguistic, social, and literary structures. The difference of women’s writing, therefore, in the words of Miller, must be sought in “the body of her writing and not the writing of her body” (1980:271).

2.4 LANGUAGE AND GENDER

Linguistic and textual theories of woman’s writing ask whether man and woman use language differently; whether sex differences in language use can be theorized in terms of biology, socialization, or culture; whether women can create a new language of their own; and whether speaking, reading and writing are all gender marked. American, British, and French feminist critics have all drawn attention to the philosophical, linguistic and practical problems of women’s use of language. The debate over language is one of the most exciting areas in gynocriticism. Poets and writers have lead the attack on what Rich calls “the oppressor’s language”, a language sometimes criticized as sexist, sometimes as abstract.

Annie Lectere, in *Parole de femme* (1985), calls upon women, “to invent a language that is not oppressive, a language that does not leave speechless but that loosens the tongue” (179). Another feminist critic Mary Jacobus, in her *Women’s Writing and Writing about Women* (1979) proposes that we need a women’s writing that works within the male discourse but
works “ceaselessly to deconstruct it: to write what can not be written” (1979:12). The advocacy of women’s language is thus a political gesture that also carries tremendous emotional force. But despite its unifying appeal, the concept of a woman language is riddled with difficulties. Unlike Swahili, Weloh or Breton, that is language of minority or colonized groups, there is no mother tongue, no gender-lect spoken by the female population in a society, which differs significantly from the dominant language. In the 1970s a growing number of empirical studies related sexual difference to language use.

Andrea Nye, in her Feminist Theory and the Philosophies of Man (1981) and Robin Lackoff in Woman’s Language (1989) both argue and establish that women speak less and less often than man. Women are more careful than man to use correct grammar, are more conservative when it comes to stylistic innovation. They use adjectives of emotion rather than pace and form conflicting, ambivalent, rather than stereotypic metaphors. Women also show a preference for modal structure such as ‘might have been’, indicating uncertainty and indecision. Other, empirically less well established but observed, differences are women’s use of ‘empty’ adjectives such as ‘charming’ or ‘lovely’, or of tag questions to dull assertive force, in addition to women’s tendency to be more polite and more responsive. In some cultures the ‘abnormality’ of female speech is institutionalized, or built into phonological structure. Women may use different dialects than men, or write in a vernacular while men write a more formal language. These specific differences in male and female speech, intonation and writing, however cannot be explained in terms of “two separate sex-specific languages” but need to be considered “instead in terms of styles, strategies and contexts of linguistic performance” (1981:193). According to Showalter, the problem is not that language is insufficient to express women’s consciousness but that women have been denied the full resources of language and have been forced into silence, euphemism or circumlocution.

2.5 PSYCHE AND GENDER

Psychoanalytically oriented feminist criticism locates the difference of women’s writing in the author’s psyche and in the relation of gender to the
creative process. It incorporates the biological and linguistic models of gender difference in the theory of the female psyche or self, shaped by the body, by the development of language, and by sex-role socialization. Penis envy, the castration complex, and the oedipal phase have become the Freudian coordinates defining women’s relationship to language, fantasy and culture.

Currently, the French psychoanalytic school dominated by Lacanian theory has extended castration to a total metaphor for female literary and linguistic disadvantages. Lacan theorises that the acquisition of language and the entry into its symbolic order occurs at the Oedipal phase in which the child accepts his or her gender identity. This stage requires an acceptance of the phallus as a privileged signification and a consequent female displacement, as Cora Kaplan has explained,

The phallus as a signifier has a central, crucial position in language, for if language embodies the patriarchal law of culture, its basic meanings refer to the recurring process by which sexual difference and subjectively are required . . . thus the little girl’s access to the symbolic, i.e. of language and its laws, is always negative and/or mediated by intro-subjective relation to a third term, for it is characterized by an identification with lack. (Kaplan, 1991:22)

In psychoanalytic terms, “lack” has traditionally been associated with the feminine. Feminist criticism based on Freudian and post-Freudian psychoanalysis continually struggles with the problem of feminine disadvantage and lack. There has also been some interesting feminist literary criticism based on alternatives to Freudian psychoanalytic theory like Annis Pratt’s Jungian History of Female Archetypes (1976), Barbara Rigney’s Laingian Study of the Divided Self in Women’s Fiction (1970), and Ann Douglas’ Eriksonian Analysis of Inner Space in Nineteenth Century Women’s Writing (1979). For the past few years, critics have been thinking about the
possibilities of a new feminist psychoanalysis that does not revise Freud but instead emphasize the development and construction of gender identities.

Although, psychoanalytically based models of feminist criticism can now offer us remarkable and persuasive readings of individual text can highlight extraordinary similarities between women writing in a variety of cultural circumstances, they cannot explain historical change, ethnic difference or the shaping force of generic or economic factors. To consider these issues, we must go beyond psychoanalysis to a more flexible and comprehensive model of women’s writing which places it in the maximum context of culture.

2.6 CULTURE & GENDER

A theory of culture incorporates ideas about women’s body, language and psyche but interprets them in relation to the social contexts in which they occur. The ways in which women conceptualize their bodies and their sexual and reproductive functions are intricately linked to their cultural environments. The female psyche can be studied as the product of construction of cultural forces. Language too, comes back into the picture as we consider the social dimensions and determinants of language use, the shaping of linguistic behavior by cultural ideals.

A cultural theory acknowledges that there are important differences between women as writers: class, race, nationality, and history are literary determinants as significant as gender. Nonetheless women’s culture forms a collective experience within the cultural whole. As women’s psyche is relational psyche.

Hypothesis of women’s culture have been developed over the last decade primarily by anthropologists, sociologists, and social historians in order to get away from masculine systems, hierarchies, and values and to get
at the primary and self-defined nature of female cultural experience. In the field of women’s history the

Furthermore, according to feminist critics, the relationship between male speech and female silence is not a simple binary but rather a cultural context in which the enforced silence of women can be read as the norm even when women manage to speak, write, publish and achieve influence. Thus the linguistic relationship is dominated by socio-cultural limitations.

The socio-cultural taboos, thus, make it difficult for women to transform their private ambition into public record. There is a special relation between women and convention. The socio-cultural set-up demands from women to apologetic, dependent, timid, and confused; in short to be ‘feminine’.

2.7 BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF THE AUTOBIOGRAPHERS

A brief introduction of the chosen four autobiographers, namely, Bhutto, Mead, Phoolan and Slade is the main content of this section. In order to make it more lively, the investigator has included the photos of these omen with their near and dear ones, the pictures tell their story more vividly.

2.8 BENAZIR BHUTTO
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- Benazir was born on 21st June 1953
- She went to Harvard for higher education in 1969-1971
- Benazir’s father was assassinated in 4th April, 1979
- She was detained for six months after father’s death for three years
- She got married with Asif Zardari
- Happiest moment when her daughter was born
- Her brother Shah Nawaz died in 1985
- She became first woman prime minister of Pakistan in 1988
- In 2007 she returned to Pakistan.
- She was shot dead on 27th Dec. 2007

Benazir Bhutto, was born in 1953 in Pakistan, a country known for its strong conventional approach towards women. Born with a silver spoon in mouth in one of the country’s richest families, Benazir almost achieved the status of that of a royal princess. She was not only beautiful and charismatic but also very tough and strong willed. Her life had always been full of drama. Being a daughter of the Pakistan’s most popular leaders, She had inherited the leadership qualities, and getting international education at Howard and Oxford had widen her perspective in world politics.

Right from her childhood, she had a dream of following her father's footsteps. Time and again she got the inspiration and guidance from her father. She was utterly focused, and that was her biggest strength. Her father's assassination in did not stop her from achieving her good, on the contrary it made her stronger and more tolerant. After the death of her father and brother, Shah, she had become emotionally weak, but she had the courage to fight back. In spite of facing all the hardships, she succeeded in her aim. She chose the career she always wanted to.

Marriage to a perfect stranger was something that she was not very sure of. But soon after couple of meetings with Asif, she made up her mind for it. She waited for a while before starting a family, though she always wanted to be a mother. She had three children, but childbirth was never a barrier for her
in her political career. She felt blessed with birth of her daughter. She was lucky to have the unconditional love and support of her family.

She was the trend-setter as she was elected both the youngest and the first woman prime minister in 1988 in Pakistan. She herself was surprised when she got this post, as she was very much aware of the typical patriarchal mentality of her countrymen. Initially, she was little conscious, but she proved herself in the field of politics by being a successful Prime Minister. Her golden era came to an end after two terms. After that, she was stripped of her power, in another example of the male dominant socio-political culture. She kept her promise, which she had made to her father to serve her people. Ultimately, Benazir, the queen of PPP, was shot dead. And thus she met with an unfortunate end just like her father. But till date she is remembered as a woman of substance, one of the most powerful women, not only in Pakistan but also across the globe.

2.9 PHOOLAN DEVI

- Born on 10th August 1963
- In a rural Uttarpradesh
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- In a Mallah or Boatmen caste
- Was married at the age of 11
- Was exploited by the Police in a lock-up in her teens
- Was kidnapped by the decoits
- Became Bandit Queen with the help of Vikram
- Was gang-raped by Thakurs in 1980
- Became gangleader after Vikram's murder
- Killed 22 Rajput men in Behami
- Surrendered in 1983
- Became MP twice
- In 2001 she was shot dead

Phoolan's was born on the festival of flowers, and therefore she was named 'Phoolan'. Her life was like a roller coaster ride as she saw a huge amount of ups and downs in her life. From the oppressed to the oppressor, from the victim to the criminal, and from a bandit queen to an MP. Her life has always been a kind of attraction to the media. A Bollywood film has also been made on the life of Phoolan Devi named 'BANDIT QUEEN'.

In her teens, she was forced to get married to a much older man called Puttilal. She was terribly tortured by him. She never forgot the trauma she had been through. She somehow managed to go back to her father's house. In the fight over a piece of land with her cousin, she had to go to the jail. Once again she was victimized by the Police. She lost her faith in the law and order. She then was kidnapped by a gang of decoits. The gang leader Baboo Gujjar wanted to use Phoolan for mere physical pleasure. With another gang member Vikram Mallah, she was able to save herself from Baboo. Vikram not only killed Baboo, but also proposed Phoolan for marriage.

Phoolan's happiness came to a sudden end with Vikram's murder. She, once again was exploited by the upper caste Thakurs. This time it was a nightmare as she was gang raped by several men in the Behami village for days together. She was shattered and shuddered. Phoolan, being a survivor, recovered from the physical and mental pain and decided to take revenge on
those blood thirsty hounds. She with the help of other men set her own gang. This time as a leader, she was stronger than ever. She killed 22 Thakurs in Behami village.

In 1983, she surrendered. In 1994 she was free from her punishment. She was elected an MP twice from Uttarpradesh. In 2001, she had to pay the price of her ugly past. She was shot dead in her official house in New Delhi by a former rival bandit.

MARGARET MEAD
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- Born on 16th Dec. 1901
- Got B.A. Degree from Barnard College in 1923
- Did M.A. from Columbia Uni. in 1924
- Did Ph.D from Columbia Uni. in 1929
- First marriage with Luther 1923-1928
- Second marriage with Reo 1928-1935
- Third marriage with Gregory 1936-1950
- Daughter Mary as born in 1939
- Got Kalinga Prize in 1970
- Died on 15th Nov. 1978
Mead was one of the most outstanding anthropologists of her time. She was the first of five children. Her father, Edward Mead, was a professor. Her mother Emily was a sociologist. Her sister Katherine died at the age of nine months. That was the most traumatic experience. After having the degrees of B.A. and M.A, she chose to become an anthropologist because of her professor Franz Boas and Ruth Benedict ay Columbia Uni.

From 1939 onwards, she was a figure of prominent importance in such fields as education, ecology, the women’s movement, student apprising, and was also actively involved in contemporary social and political issues. She maintained a firm base in science and anthropology, but always with the notion of relating these disciplines to concepts the typical persons could understand. She was an intellectual and a scientist with a mission – to yoke science, the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake with purpose.

It was precisely this amalgamation of knowledge joined with action that distinguished Mead from so many of her colleagues. Her talents, particularly in the latter part of her life, covered a wide gamut of fields. She was an academician, a teacher, and an education movement are very much relevant and, as useful today as they were when written five decades ago. She served various presidents as a diplomat without portfolio on international commissions devoted to matters of ecology, nutrition, and the role of science and technology in the modern world. As a scientist, she held numerous official posts and contributed enormously to specialized areas such as cross-cultural studies and the role of a scientist in the modern world.

Mead was an epitome of boundless enthusiasm. She rushed across oceans and continents, time zones and networks and disciplines, knocking down barriers and redefining boundaries. She had three marriages, a child, and innumerable intense friendships. She made a new friend of importance, she once claimed, every two or three months, without ever losing any of her old ones.

Her power over others was tremendous. She didn’t merely study people; she changed their lives, mixing up in new ways, pushing them into
new arrangements persuading them that they could transcend their limits. Mead's work in cultural anthropology called the world's attention to her profession. She became a powerful opinion-maker as she helped to developed ideas about sex, culture, education and child rearing that influenced several generations and laid, some think, to an era of permissiveness. She was the subject of impassioned debate both in anthropology and in lay circles. She was still making front-page headlines years after her death in 1978. Involved in all the large issues of her time, she wrote 34 books, made 10 films, was given 28 honorary degrees and won awards and headlines all her life.

MADELIENE SLADE
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- Was born in 1892 on 22nd November
- In a family of British Admiral
- Had one elder sister
- Spent most of her childhood with maternal grand parents
- Arrived in Ahmedabad in 1925
- Was imprisoned during 1932-33
- In 1944 saw Mahadevbhai and Kasturba passed away
- Got the biggest shock of her life with Bapu's death
- She returned to England in 1959
- She was awarded highest civilian honor, the Padma Vibhushan in 1981
- She died in 1982

Madeline Slade, was a daughter of a British admiral. She was born in an aristocrat family. Her father Sir Edmond Slade was an officer in the Royal Navy. She spent her childhood with her maternal grandfather, that was the reason of her closeness to him. Her grandfather was her best friend.

Slade was extremely interested in Beethoven. She had never heard of Mahatma Gandhi till the time Romaine Rolland told her. He described Gandhi as ‘a modern Christ’

She asked Gandhi if she could be his disciple and stay with him in the Ashram. She was a British woman who left England to work with Mahatma Gandhi. Slade also changed her identity to Miraben, after the name of Mirabai, a great devotee of lord Krishna. Her devotion and dedication towards Bapu was remarkable as even after his assassination she could not imagine her life without him. She admitted that, so closely had Bapu been interwoven in all the thoughts and actions of her daily life that at every turn she had to pull herself up and Remember that Bapu in flash was no longer there.

She selflessly served the people of India as a true devotee of Bapu. In the process, she changed herself completely. She opted for vegetarianism too. Slade took up to khadi clothes and a simple life of ashram. She also learnt Hindi.

In 1932-33 she as imprisoned with Mahatma Gandhi. She took part in the biggest freedom movement of India. The biggest shock of her life was Bapu’s assassination. She was unable to digest the fact that Gandhiji, was killed. She continued to work in India even after her ‘guru’s death.
In 1959 she returned to England and spent 22 years in Vienna, till the time she died in 1982. During the long life-span of 90 years, she served humanity. As a result of it, she was awarded the highest civilian honor, Padma Vibhushan in 1981. She will always be remembered as Mahatma Gandhi’s true disciple ‘Miraben’.

These four autobiographers are women of substance. They all have proved themselves in their own respective fields. They have fought against all odds of life, and come out as winners. The most interesting thing is that, they all belong to different socio-cultural backgrounds and the only common feature among them is their ‘Gender’. Keeping their gender in mind, the investigator will bring out some common characteristics in their autobiographies. In the following chapters, the investigator will discuss how their gender affects their thoughts as well as expression in their self-life-writing.