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CHAPTER IV

Hopeful Humanism

The acceptance of man as the centre of our thinking, feeling and activity, and the service of man for the greater good of all humanity, in the material world, under the sanctions of imagination, reason and creative democracy ... to evolve individual’s potentially equal and free ......

1

Humanism is the Renaissance doctrine which means love of man, the whole man with all his weaknesses, instincts and impulses. A revival of Greek and Roman thought, it may be defined as the system of movement in which human interests, values and dignities are held dominant thus implying devotion to the concerns of mankind. It is also an attitude of mind attaching prime importance to the human beings that concentrates on the activities of man rather than on the supernatural world and the world of nature which was often regarded as the central theme of Renaissance civilization. The word humanism has been applied to a variety of beliefs, methods and philosophies that place central emphasis on the human realm. It derives from the 15th century *studia humanitatis* which is based on the Latin *humanitas* – an educational and political ideal which was the intellectual basis of the entire movement. Having taken a firm root in the early Middle Ages and given a new vigour in the 12th century, it has remained a vital ingredient of Western thought. But in the 18th century Enlightenment, Humanist Rationalism, Individualism and Secularism were given a new dimension by their association with political and scientific outlook. Not until the late 19th and 20th centuries, in response to the
dominant role of science and in reaction against the growth of naturalism did humanism reappear as an articulate movement.

Subject to a wide publicity of expression, humanism is basically a philosophical outlook centered on the autonomy of the human being as a dignified, rational being, possessing the source of truth and right. A European phenomenon, which was more secular and anthropocentric that sought to dignify and enable man, and thereby stressing the essential worth, and greatness of man as contrasted with the older view that man was wicked, worthless and doomed to destruction both in this life and the life to come. Renaissance humanists came to believe that man is capable of living a life of reason, dignity, morality and even happiness. In their extreme forms, the humanistic attitudes regarded man as the crown of creation. Arthur Hazard Dakin, speaking about the Greek Philosopher Protagoras in *Man The Measure: An Essay on Humanism as Religion* (1939) states that “for sophists generally, as for protagoras in particular, the proper study of mankind was man – the measure of all things, in the sense that anything beyond his immediate concern and common grasp was a matter of indifference.” It also refers to a set of attitudes that accompanied the end of the middle ages and was represented at different periods by the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Industrial Revolution and the struggle for Democracy. These include “release from the ecclesiastical authority, the liberation of the intellect, faith in progress, and the belief that man himself can improve his own conditions without supernatural help and, indeed has a duty to do so.” Humanism helped to civilize man, to make him realize his potential powers and gifts, and to reduce discrepancy between potentiality and attainment.
Placing 'Man as the measure of all things', as the keynote of humanism, the humanists has faith in man's intellectual and spiritual resources to bring knowledge and understanding to the world. Thus in its wider connotation, the philosophy of humanism has influenced the Indian thought specially the famous Indo Anglian novelist of the 1970s. Mulk Raj Anand, who was a representative of the Renaissance tradition, is basically a humanist writer. He upholds humanism as his philosophy of life and considers his fictional creations as instruments of humanism. India was under the British imperialistic rule when Anand was born. There was chaos and people had lost their moorings; old values were crumbling and new ones were yet to be articulated. Religion had become a matter of meaningless ritual and arid ceremony. Fatalism and superstition dominated the minds of the poor masses. Neither the alien rulers thought of the necessity of integrating the aspirations of the natives nor did the education imparted in the British Indian schools have vital links with the genuine needs and interests of the ruled. In fact, it failed to enable the Indians either to acquire a clear understanding of his own culture or to get a correct appreciation of the European culture. Poverty, cruelty and hypocrisy of the Indian feudal life with its caste, creed and practices engulfed every aspect of life and people lived in a labyrinth of fear, despair and distrust.

Anand knew that the old world was dead and the European Renaissance had become a spent force. The rapid growth of science and the consequent Industrial Revolution had resulted in colonialism and imperialism. Simple values like love and beauty had receded to the background. He found the postulates of religion and the discoveries of science fundamentally antagonistic, and lost faith in organized
religion. In the midst of these tribulations, Anand came to realize that humanism with its respect for man and the message of ‘live and let live’ and compassion could restore peace and harmony to the war torn world. For he believed that:

..... behind the weakest of the weak, the poorest of the poor, in the wretchedness beyond the wretchedness, there is the human being who retains some part of his primeval innocence and wishes to evolve a higher consciousness.  

Mulk Raj Anand does not have a radically new concept of humanism. His humanism is characterized by the basic ambivalence of his creative mind. He admits that his humanism is the mingling of European Hellenism and the Renaissance ideals of all round development; the faith, in the possibility of achieving a better world order through science and international integration. The unresolved dialectic of the East and the West, which remains integral to his intellectual and aesthetic make up, as tends to create an inner dualism in his humanist view of life which manifests itself in a variety of ways. Referring to his Oriental and Occidental influences, Anand writes:

I am conscious that much of my insistence on the role of man in this universe derives from European Hellenism - for, the traditional attitude of India in this regard is essentially none-human, superhuman. This Atman (the vital essence in Man) is the same in the ant, the same in the gnat, the same in the elephant, the same in these three words..... the same in the whole universe.  

To examine the social disintegration of contemporary India and to discover the causes of the mental and material chaos in the world, Anand enquires into the meaning and the role of man and compares the European tradition and the culture with the Indian inhumane attitudes. He made the assertion that in human beings, and in the whole of mankind of humanism, man is the most important factor. In
conceiving man as the centre of the universe, assigning great importance to reason,
laying faith in the capacity of man to decide his destiny as well as the world’s and
rejecting the ecclesiastical interpretation of life, Anand’s humanism appears
fundamentally akin to the western conception. He himself testifies to the European
basis of his humanism in *Apology for Heroism (1946)*, when he points out that:

> The humanism which I prefer does not rest on a Devine Sanction, as does the mystical humanism of Gandhi or Tagore, for instance, but puts its faith in the creative imagination of man, in his capacity to transform himself, in the tireless mental and physical energy with which he can, often in the face of great odds, raise himself to the tremendous heights of dignity and redeem the world from its misery and pain, taking man towards the universal man.\(^6\)

Nevertheless, this assertion of the non-Indian basis of his humanism cannot preclude the fact that he relies considerably on the parameters of Indian humanist values too. For instance, in *Is There A Contemporary Indian Civilization (1963)*, Anand identifies a distinct Indian humanist tradition, the surviving values of which according to him, are ‘Universalism’, ‘Intolerant-tolerance’ and ‘Compassion’ in the light of India’s past and present.

While basing himself in the European humanist tradition of scientific materialism, Anand confessed that he is influenced by the Oriental ideas and attitudes and attempts to extend and redefine his own concept by discarding the supernatural and worldliness and by means of accepting various Asiatic traditions as represented by the teachings of Buddha, the message of human brotherhood of Islam, the teachings of medieval Hindu Saints and the anti-caste, anti-sectarian teachings of Guru Nanak and the religion of Sikhism. He also accepts the
Renaissance thinking of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, the later Renaissance leaders of Indian enlightenment and the radical humanism of M. N. Roy which based on Gandhi’s championship of the Untouchables repudiated en-mass by society and finally Nehru’s affirmation of peaceful co-existence.

Anand insisted on the dignity of man irrespective of caste, creed and wealth. He stressed upon the practice of compassion as a sole value in his conception of the whole man. He attached great importance to art and poetry for developing the masses, his crusade was against superstition, feudalism and imperialism; and emphasis of his brand of humanism. For:

He firmly believes in a new conception of the role of man, an emphasis on the importance of a human being as such, a profound respect for man, love for him and faith in his capacity to straighten his back and look at the stars.7

He declares his immense faith in the protogorean dictum “Man is the measure of all things”, for example the measure of all values and all actions related to the personality and potentiality of human beings. He firmly believes that man is capable of rising from the lower passions to magnificent heights of splendors and that he has in him, enough creative energy and imagination to transform and raise himself to glorious pinnacles of dignity and to rid himself of the unspeakable misery and pain inflicted on him by mankind, through his tireless physical and mental energy. It is to enable man to achieve these conditions which will help the emergence of a new ideal of the role of man in the vast universe that Anand fervently pleads for in his Apology for Heroism (1946) and Prolegomena to A New Humanism (1958).
The main task of this humanism is to present as consistent and intelligible a doctrine comprising some of the implications of a possible Indian scientific socialism and to make the synthesis of reality and aspiration in the minds and actions of living men. The final chapter of *Contemporary Indian Civilization (1963)* lists the chief tenets of Anand’s humanistic creed in detail:

Anand’s humanism places man in the centre of all things and it struggles against all those forces of class, caste and race, which stands in the way of the emergence of human beings in their full dignity.

Matter proceeds in mind in any metaphysical attitudes towards the universe. All forms of supernatural thoughts are myths and legends woven to justify the aspiration of man in the face of the nature gods. The whole of nature presents the reality of being and this cosmos is a constantly changing and intricate system of relations of matter and energy, which have existed long before human consciousness arose. Man has to achieve harmony with nature rather than merely fight it in every direction. Man is, and becomes, what he wants by transforming nature.

This humanism believes that man is an evolutionary product of the matter of which he is a part. The discoveries of human genius, with its many laws and facts, have revealed that mind is indivisibly conjoined with the functioning of the body. And that the unity of body and personality is indivisible, having no conscious survival after death.

Humanism puts man in the centre of the universe, and believes that human beings possess the potential power to understand through imagination, reason and scientific method his problems, if he has the courage to face the truth without pride and prejudice.

In opposition to all the theories of fatalistic acceptance of God, predestination and determinism, human beings, conditioned by man’s history, possess genuine freedom of creative choice and action within certain limits, set by objective circumstances.
The highest human ethic is the conquest of pain and the realization of social and economic freedom, and mental and emotional awareness in order to gain wholeness. This is the highest goal of mankind, irrespective of nation, race or creed.

The individual attains full manhood by integrating his personal satisfactions and creative self development through significant creative work which contributes to man’s renewal, to the welfare of the community and express the love of life, the awareness of death and thus, balance the essentially unstable and the maladjusted human personality, involved in the inevitable conflicts of existence in this universe.

The widest and deepest possible development of creative art and the awareness of beauty is the humanism which considers the transformation of nature, through the human imagination, to be the core of aesthetic experience and it places poetry and creative art as a pervasive reality in the lives of men, in order to help the emergence of integrated personalities through the experience of words, colour, sound and sensitive realization of the undertones of inner worlds of faculty and experience.

The humanism believes in the brotherhood of man through the affirmations of love. The achievement of peace through the settlement of disputes by discussion and negotiation becomes the most important ideal of our time. The application of new creative techniques to achieve a basic standard of living will be the instrument for a future economic order, both national and international as against the self indulgence and ease of the rich. And genuine democracy will be realized by the ‘withering away of the state’, gradually and progressively, at the time when men have learnt to rule themselves and grown to the status of integrated individuals.

Humanism believes in the application of imagination, reason and scientific method in all human undertakings, making room for the understanding of different instincts and emotions. It encourages the democratic procedure, including full freedom of expression and civil liberty, in all political, economic and cultural life.
There should be a constant questioning of the basic assumptions and convictions of inventive science, employing, throughout, human tests based on moral values. In this sense, this humanism does not wish to be dogmatic by asserting reason on the one extreme and postulating intuition on the other extreme. Instead, this humanism remains a developing philosophy; open to experiment and testing its thesis in the light of newly discovered facts, fresh insights and greater understanding.

It should connect itself to international humanism, so that, in spite of differences, a comprehensive universalist outlook may prevail on the basic issues common to mankind, and co-existence may be established and compassion for the failings of men engendered.8

This humanism of Anand does not promise anything in this super natural world but it does make room for the various aspects of human nature and seeks to restore love as a living value among men. It puts its faith in the creative imagination and unconquerable spirit of man which can be achieve through socialism, for socialism alone can restore economic and political freedom and thus help the growth of a full man. He suggests:

.... the deepest socialism is the only basis for perfecting the deepest human personality that the two should be mutually inclusive, and that it is only by combining the two that a richer and more stable civilization will arise .... for socialism alone can restore dignity and a real freedom to every man, because it ensures him economic freedom, i.e. real democracy.9

Anand believes that only his vision of humanism can restore order and decency in the world and that, his faith in it made him optimistic about the future of mankind. Nevertheless, it sets up an imagination and reason as a final arbiter of value in human life, and gives hope for the emotional and institutional side of man by insisting on the creative art as the method for achieving the truth, goodness and beauty.
Keeping the humanistic prospective in mind, Anand in most of his novels set up a character whose role is to be the repository of 'wisdom' for which the novel is a vehicle. They are the episodes of the heart in the sense that through them, Anand's philosophy of humanism can be seen taking its final shape as it relates to the compassionate potentialities of man giving hope to the future of mankind. Although reason most oftenly follows the emotion and lends itself to egoism but it can be humanized if both emotion and reason are made to serve altruistic ends. It is this concept which claims to maintain the relationship of loving service and constitutes the wholeness of Anand's ideal man.

It is clearly pointed out, in The Untouchable (1935) while the cumulative effects of successive humiliating events made Bakha feel homeless and lonely, the frustration of being untouchability seems to have reached a breaking point. Towards the end of the novel, as Bakha stood with three alternatives proposed to his problem, none of the events including the Gandhi's rally and Mahatma's speech open up the possibilities for Bakha's deliverance. But with the arrival of the poet, the spokesman figure, Bakha's fatalistic viewpoint is almost eclipsed as the poet talks about mechanizing the mode of the disposal of garbage which will ultimately eradicate caste.

Iqbal Nath Sarsar, a young poet and a man of progressive views and the editor of Nau Jawan, has a vision of the future which is, however, inspired by the impulse which tries to create a new harmony among the people based on the
propositions that Indians have a genius to accept things; that their six thousand years old race consciousness enable them to see life wholly and know its secret flow.

The poet, locked in a conversation with an anglicized Barrister, lectures on the meaning of Gandhism and reverses Gandhi 'as the greatest liberating force of our age.' He also said that the heredity and environment changed the people though they are born in different castes with different potentialities but among these millions of people; there is only one saint:

'The heredity and environment of different people varies', ..., 'some of us born with big heads, some with small, some with more potential physical strength, some with less. There is one saint to a hundred million people, perhaps one great man to a whole lot of mediocrities.'

While taking about the equality among men, he continues to speak that caste does not depend on the philosophical idea of Karma which means that birth and rebirth in this universe is governed by good or bad deeds in the past life but it is an intellectual aristocracy based on the conceits of the pundits. He said that the high caste judge eats freely with the coolie of his caste, and this inequality can easily be destroyed. The old mechanical and stereotyped system of lives should give place to a dynamic formula because man's greatness is baulked particularly at this juncture of the world's history by such adverse circumstances which emphasize the need for a reverend attitude towards the last members of the society, towards the weak and the fallen and the underprivileged everywhere.
Notwithstanding the caste barrier, he speaks again of untouchability that is rooted in a caste system and it is very much essential to remove it. Hence, he suggests that untouchability can be eradicated completely if only India chooses to adopt the machine that cleans the dung — the flush system and help to remove the stigma of untouchability:

‘Well, we must destroy caste; we must destroy the inequalities of birth and unalterable vocations. We must recognize an equality of rights, privileges and opportunities for everyone. The Mahatma didn’t say so, but the legal and social basis of castes having been broken down by the British Indian penal code, which recognizes the rights of every man before a court. Caste is now mainly governed by profession. When the sweepers change their profession, they will no longer remain untouchables. And they can do that soon, for the first thing we will do when we accept the machine will be to introduce the machine which clears dung without anyone having to handle it — the flush system. Then the sweepers can be free from the stigma of untouchability and assume the dignity of status that is their right as useful members of a casteless and classless society.’

Though the narratives suggest only a choice of possibilities, the end of the novel shows a clear thesis, a distinct prophecy which is projected through the spokesman figure. The novel thus ends with the intimation of a new enlightenment. While the tragedy and hopelessness pervades in the life, the note of hope and triumph is inducted at the end. Both these emanate from the humanist vision of Anand - a compassionate spirit that comprehends tragedy in its essence as well as an idealistic zeal to reform which has the nature of a poetic dream. Bakha began to move thinking of everything he had heard though he could not understand the meaning of the lectures given by Gandhi and the poet. Walking along with the conflict in his soul,
torn between his enthusiasm for Gandhi and the poet he precedes homeward thinking whether he shall ever be able to leave the latrines.

Humanism, with its compassionate understanding, finds the mode of liberating the untouchables in *The Road* (1963). The liberation is brought not through the initiative and creative dynamism but through a radical reorientation of the attitudes and approaches of the upper castes. Premilla Paul in *The Novels of Mulk Raj Anand: A Thematic Study* (1983) writes:

.... the novel stresses the need for shaking the high castes out of their complacency in order that they might reorder their attitudes towards the untouchables.\(^\text{12}\)

The novel examines the ways by which the untouchables achieve emancipation. Lambardar Dhooli Singh, an upper caste becomes the vanguard of liberation in the novel. The role played by him acquires a pronounced significance because of his being caste in the mould of a social reformer. Dhooli Singh, however, appears convincing as a real human being. Though he is a rebel against the immemorial pattern of life of all its shams and conventions, his rebellion calls for extreme sacrifices and fearlessness for it is Dhooli Singh who made a strong intervention on behalf of Bhikhu when Sajnu and his comrades attack him for the simple fault of trying to gain an entry into the temple with his mother. Again as he sees the brutal act of burning down the huts of the untouchables and their consequent sufferings, it is Dhooli Singh again who gives them shelter and clothes in his house. It is to his credit that he unhesitatingly identifies himself with the untouchables and makes the laudable gesture of offering to pay indemnity for the loss sustained in the fire:
'Come then', he said, suddenly impetuously, 'Come into the house'... come. The woman of God is gone to her proper place, the temple! And I shall be an outcaste for ever.... so the house is yours. Come, my sons and daughters.'

In fraternizing with the outcastes and in compensating the loss suffered by them, Dhooli Singh appears as a liberal humanist undaunted by sneering attitude of the fellow members of the high castes. Thus embodying his own humanist compassion for the untouchables and insistence on the need for a radical change, he becomes a 'declassed' Lambardar. His largeness of the heart on the part of the high caste is therefore, the real key to the liberation of the untouchables. Dhooli Singh, however, emphasizes again that: empty hands always make brave gestures, but hands with the hammers break up the whole mountains. Hence working on the road for fewer wages is a test for them which is not of a mere physical strength but one of a moral strength to hurl aside the hurdles laid by the orthodox caste Hindus and paved the way for modernity. While talking about the economic condition, he clarifies that the improvement of the economic situation of the place depends solely on the road that links the village with the modern world because "it is only roads, and roads and more roads and electricity that will bring prosperity". No one can enter a small door sitting on a camel likewise; one cannot become simply wafted into the realm of modernity for orthodoxy has grown to ridiculous heights and that one has to come down and endeavor to progress. One can not simply expect for the salvation to descend on him rather he has to work hard to achieve it.

The novel thus draws an attention to Dhooli Singh being able to overcome the reservations as exemplified by his concern with his daughter’s marriage as a result of
Lachman’s puerile incendiarism. It may be regarded as a kind of shattering seizure which he experiences – an experience which confronts him with an agonizing existential choice. Such a drastic incident is essential to disentangle completely from the shackles of orthodoxy. These episodes, however, appear sensational as the road to progress puts an end to the isolation of the village and bring it to the main stream of national life. It also becomes meaningful only with the true emancipation of the untouchables since the deprivation and dispossession of a large section of society cannot co-exist with the emancipation of the whole society that is sought to be realized.

While Untouchable (1935) and The Road (1963) ends with the hope of emancipation through machine and the road, humanity reveals the remarkable potentiality of man in Coolie (1936). Anand stressed that mechanization is not the only ultimate solution to the existing problems of a man but human tenderness is the key to panacea for these problems. It is man who should cease to regard coolie as a cheap and useful machine, an uncomplaining target for abuses and indignities. The man made barriers is to be pulled down to promote love and good will among men.

Though casteism has lost its prominence, evil still exists in various forms like caste, class, communalism and racism. At this juncture, man must cultivate genuine concern for others and should possess a big heart that cherishes equality, human tenderness and religious tolerance:

‘No, no trouble at all’, began the old man. ‘I wouldn’t be my mother’s son if I didn’t offer hospitality to you. I have lived forty years, and I know that if you can’t do
a good deed by which people may remember you, you haven’t lived’.\textsuperscript{15}

Behind every egoism, there is an altruistic end and behind every problem, there is a hope of a new future which can be achieved through humanism.

The motto of every man should be thus to change the inhuman pattern of society. The introduction of Mohan is therefore, a didactic device through whom Anand announces and declares the thesis of the novel. Mohan does not merely elaborate Anand’s solution but demonstrates it too. Though high born English educated and hails from a high class family, he comes down to the level of the working class people and understand their needs and requirements. Mohan became a coolie to escape the rude Sarkar, to promote the revolution and to become a man among men. To the dispossess coolies he suggests:

\begin{quote}
Then come with me, and we shall kill the landlord one day, and get you your land, . . . . It is my object to make you people realizes that if you work, you should have a share in the things that you produce with the sweat of your brow.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

Mohan’s conversation with Munoo and the other coolies reveals the culture of the Britishers living in India. He points out that the English have a more rigid caste system than the Indians. Any woman whose husband earns more will not leave his cart at the house of a woman whose husband earns less and they amuse themselves spending the money over the meetings with different people. The rich and the high class never socialize with each other. The women sweat wearing fur clothes and the men wear uncomfortable tight trousers and flirt around with other men’s wives. They feel good and elated if they can get to drink tea at Davico’s while the coolies starve.
He then carries on with his speech saying that the British dance is a kind of love game in which the genuine love does not exist. It only keeps them warm as they go on kissing and tittering in the corner of a place and go to bed together. But the Indians need not dance to go to bed with a woman. In this sense, though the coolies are driving the rickshaws of the colonels and generals, the Indians are more superior to the British.

Mohan’s lifting of the sick Munoo, carrying him back to bungalow and looking after him in the hour of the need when Munoo is put in a segregated room, comes from his tenderness of the heart. Thus at the end of the novel, clutching the hands of Mohan by the dying Munoo suggests a message of hope of a new humanistic future which Anand endorses in his novels:

........ helpless, clinging to him as if the mere touch of his friend’s body would give him life ...... Munoo clutched at Mohan’s hand and felt the warm blood in his veins like a tide reach out to distances to which it had never gone before.17

Yet again in another novel Two Leaves and A Bud (1937), Anand fares better with De La Havre, through whom the philosophy of brotherhood and revolution is articulated more fully than Mohan, Iqbal Nath Sarsar and Dhooli Singh. Intellectual and well qualified, he does most of the theorizing while the peasants experience most of the suffering. De La Havre’s brooding sensitivity and intellectual anguish his inexpedient attempt to rally the coolies and his sacrifices of personal happiness are indicative of the suffering and failure attendant upon the putting into practice the philosophy of human betterment. He is a different Englishman presented as a
compassionate revolutionary who teaches the coolies to shed their fatalistic passivity and get ready for revolutionary action taking the lead in the march of the coolies, De La Havre made theoretical speeches:

‘... take courage, all of you’, he said. ‘Get together and go and tell the Burra Sahib the story. And tell him you wouldn’t work till he gives you justice. And tell him I sent you. I will talk to him myself later’.18

He has a clear and scientific understanding of the depravity caused by imperialism on all fronts and summarizes the dehumanizing role of the British in India. Through De La Havre’s journal, one gets into most of the sociological data and opinion on which the view of life of the peasants in the plantation is based. He says:

The black coolies clear the forests, plant the fields, toil and garner the harvest while all the money grubbing, slave driving, soulless managers and directors draw their salaries and dividends and build up monopolies. There lies the necessity of revolution in this country. On the one hand, the vast masses, prisoners of so many chains, bearing the physical signs of grief, of lassitude, even of death, and on the other hand, the supercilious rich, wrapped up in their self-assurance and complacency, never once questioning the ideals of glory and power and wealth.19

He made an interesting documentation of some of the intellectual crisis particularly the dismay at society’s moral impotence which plague the modern mind. It is thus his programme of sympathy in human relations and a simple Marxist humanitarian which offers a solution to the problem of India. India is a country an old decayed civilization where the sordid side of tragic existence is all too evident and fate has conspired with the seasons to obliterate everything capriciously. A country retarded by a poor education system and a narrow professional vision where people are
reduced to economic slavery and where their chance of justice and redresses are non-existent.

In this impolite, hypocritical, secretive and insidious society, De La Havre's humanistic sympathies and altruism is indeed a noble exception. He is not a merely compassionate doctor who helped Gangu during the cremation of his wife but a spokesman of the whole coolies, a person who puts Christian compassion into practice. He, however, reaches out for a humanist belief in the whole man which have a close affinity with Anand's humanism. Thus, the contemplation of the cells by De La Havre, when compared to Anand's *Apology For Heroism (1946)*, attempts to justify Marx with scientific premises:

> …… admit the fact of the transformation of energy, the organic cell and evolution, and then the Marxian hypothesis makes things fairly easy to understand. For, if reality be material, evolutionary and incomplete; if man and the mind of man be the products of this reality; if there be a constant interaction between the mind and the reality of which it forms a part, resulting in knowledge; if, further, this knowledge be achieved through action; and if, finally, ever new aspects of reality be always brought within the range of human action and human knowledge, then the range of knowledge inevitable to the socio-historical process is limitless and the fallibility of man as an indubitable fact.\(^{20}\)

With the poetic temperament that verges on the romantic idealism, De La Havre does indeed present a contrast to the other Britishers. His distinction lies in his capacity to manifest a humanitarian attitude towards the coolies which implies a vision of hope in the midst of inhuman imperialism when the men who toil has been degraded to slavery and parasitism of an iniquitous political and economic system. There is hope
in him to pitch the moral strength of the coolies against the social forces of darkness. There is hope in the integrity of the peasants and also in the ultimate triumph of human understanding.

Anand further attempts to present the way of Marxist liberation of the peasants in *The Sword and The Sickle (1942)*. Indeed Lal Singh of the last book of the trilogy becomes an increasingly confident as man, a world spokesman. He makes frequent references to war experiences in order to demonstrate that an understanding of the historical interconnections between Europe and India must make Indians more revolutionary conscious.

Lalu's return to a land of poverty, overcrowded and blighted villages to a place of depravity, class conflict, brutality, bloated landlordism and government tyranny is like a nightmare journey. He observes that the rich and powerful enslave the underprivileged and the poor. With these feelings within his soul, he senses a vague kind of dialectical necessity. He sees the need for a new social direction while being unsure of the objective and the means of reaching it. However, the objective turns out to be revolution and the means Marxist humanism:

And Lalu felt a certain impatient for final victory in his wild, enthusiastic nature; he thought of freedom which was said to be the national ideal, and he hoped for Revolution, not knowing precisely what these ideals meant, but enthralled by the sound of the words and the vague things associated with them, the clearing out of the Sarkar and the seizing of land from the landlords by the peasantry ...... Occasionally the violence and the land hunger of the peasants in him made the seizing of land by killing Mulk Raj Anand the landlords the most exciting vision, the thing, he felt,
Lalu throbs with compassion for the common men in his suffering and identifies himself with the invigorating upsurge among the peasantry of a rebelliousness which is gradually replacing former taciturnity and fatalism. In his help to organize the peasantry is often abortive and results in bloody clashes with the authorities.

Nevertheless, it leads Lalu to 'a new ideal of thought and beauty' which gives him an exalted sense of mission whereby he will help to banish all the lies of religion and to break the narrow wall which separate man from man. *The Sword And The Sickle* (1942) is concerned with real problem and the achievement of real liberties. Thus the lesson that Anand seems bent on teaching Lalu from the practical experience is that the achievement of freedom, self-mastery and human dignity depend on man's capacity to evolve the perfection of oneself and of the universe in which one lives through deepest socialism. Anand himself says in *Apology for Heroism* (1946):

Since it short life that man lives, life becomes the dearest possession of man, the most sacred thing, a gift not to be wasted so that the perfection of oneself and of the universe in which one lives, becomes the highest value: the greatest achievement of man consisting in his capacity to say to himself at the end of his career, in the words of a great philosopher of the new world, 'All my life and all my strength were given to the finest cause in the world - the liberation of mankind.'

What Lalu seems to be looking for, is not the totalitarian control of equalitarian man, but a system, based on economic and social justice which ensures the moral development of the whole man. This seems to be borne out in the light of Lalu's new
state of mind where the main emphasis is on Reason instead of the irrational. He seems to have evolved from self-love to social love. It is this enlargement of his imagination, the widening of his sympathies, the ability to merge the personal into the larger social self that makes Lalu a memorable character.

Indeed, from the dark night of the soul in *Across The Black waters (1940)* to the awakening of the noble ideal of Revolution in *The Sword And The Sickle (1942)*, marks a considerable transition in Lal Singh’s character, and he merges as a fully fledged modern protagonist on the threshold of selfhood, an isolated modern mind tortuously finding its way out of hell towards a reconciliation of inner truth and outer purposes. From the beginning, he acts and thinks from the instincts and the heart and his progress towards maturity is a series of initiatives into the mysteries of the god of Reason until at the end he has begun to master his destiny, to acquire self-discipline, and to comprehend the Revolution as a rational order in which the whole man can express himself as a being in whom reason, emotion and imagination are harmoniously integrated. This represents a development from animal to perfected man. His brave words at the end show this feeling:

> Now is the time to learn the ways of struggle, my love
> now is the time to live in and through the struggle....
> .... Now is the time to change the world, to fight for life and happiness; now is the time to sing, comrade, brave songs of struggle.23

The development of Lalu’s character is thus intended to signify the way to salvation of a modern man. Thus, towards the end of trilogy, Lalu realizes that the struggle is based on conscious control of the irrational human order of love in helping to
achieve an impersonal social order of love and that one must learn to sacrifice for the
brotherhood of all.

Finally, the trilogy ends not with a sense of historical meaninglessness and
despair but with fruitful understanding and hope. Lalu learns to contemplate his past
with detachment and self-understanding and to envisage the future direction of
India’s epic struggle; and it is the birth of a son to Lalu which signifies that the
struggle will continue with a glow of hope and a future dream of liberation.

*The Private Life of an Indian Prince (1953)*, as a powerful indictment of a
feudal order provides, through its narrator Dr. Hari Shankar, the Maharaja’s
personal physician, a true picture of the ruthless exploitation and oppression that has
become the order of the day under Victor’s reign. In the beginning of the novel,
Shankar narrates that things are rotten in the state of Shampur and that, under the
formidable influences of his mistress Ganga Dasi, who is the real power behind the
throne, Victor is resorting to illegal extortion from the poor peasants. There are
revolts in several parts of the state in consequence, but oppression becomes stronger
when the resistance grows stronger and victor, a typical feudal autocrat, lets loose
oppression against the people in all possible ways. Even the army maneuvers
arranged by the Raja to demonstrate the might of the independent state becomes a
curse to the peasants. The peasants are requisitioned to do forced labour and are
mercilessly exploited:

Apart from this, he began to extort money from the
people of the state by various illegal means in order to
build up a fortune for her. The Diwan Chaudhri Ramji
Das tried to dissuade His Highness from adopting such methods of obtaining money. But it was Ganga Dasi who was the real power behind the throne, and the illegal exactions continued. There were revolts in several parts of the state in consequence. These were suppressed by the State police with bloody violence and through a series of mass asserts and detentions.

The Palace of the Maharaja is an incredible nauseating seat of moral depravity and degeneration. Knowing Ganga Dasi's infidelity, Victor has constant quarrels with her which makes him to go to a number of women, and the outcome is not a single rupee was safe in his realm during his period. The situation takes a turn for the worst as time passes by until at last the Prince ends up as a perfect lunatic in the asylum.

The narrator Dr. Shankar is a well qualified, Prince's physician who embodies a loyalty to the Maharaja and a loyalty to the democratic struggles waged against the feudal order. In fact, Dr. Shankar embodies the antithetical loyalties in his humanism – his humanist rejection of the feudal order and endorsement of a new life, on the one hand, and his compassion for the feudal Raja as a man, on the other. Therefore, Dr. Shankar is to be considered as the rational side of the author analyzing the irrational side as seen in the Prince. He does not merely portray the private life of a person fairly remote from ordinary experiences but also gives an account of the various stages of Victor's interior derangement as the Prince confides in him, seeks his views and makes him the repository of his confession.

Shankar has a clearly defined objective, compassionate and Freudian role both as a character and narrator; thus, when the doctor refers to the Prince as 'an important case history for my files', he is speaking as a physician and narrator.
simultaneously. Anand allows Shankar considerable liberty to make observations, report, and comment and explicate. Shankar’s credentials of intimacy are expressive as he is always in Victor’s company, except when the Prince is in bed with his mistress, Ganga Dasi. He is an embarrassed but adept eaves dropper. In part one, Shankar provides important background information about the Prince through colloquy and synopsis. And he is at all times free to interrupt the story to provide the reader with data relevant to an understanding of the situation or person under discussion, or to respond to the action by way of expiation or mental peregrination. Through the narrative analysis, Victor’s condition can be simplified in two basic categories of observations: Clinical or Freudian, and sociological and humanistic. Clinically, Shankar dwells on the unconscious, instinctual, biological, sexual and oedipal origins of Victor’s neurosis. He encourages his patient in the psycho-analytic procedural of tracking the surface emotions to the ultimate motivation. Thus, the narrative reads at times like a psychiatric text-book, though Shankar feels a little ridiculous when he speaks such jargon as the uncoiling of the ego from the libido and mortido tensions. Sociologically Shankar diagnoses Victor as the victim of unfortunate historical and environmental circumstances.

Shankar as a kind of Poe narrator who is the custodian of another soul and witnesses to its Empedoclean destruction; in whom there is something of the secret sharer intimacy of the Conradian narrator. However, it is Anand’s intention to balance his horrific darkness with the passage of humanistic illumination. Shankar’s fragmentary discourses fill the narrative vacuum at the end of the novel. He advocates Anand’s doctrine of humanistic vitalism and revolution conceived as a
product of historical necessity and as a therapeutic solution to Victor’s and society’s afflictions. Shankar defines the modern humanist as a new kind of human being who is like a point of life and a universalist in his vision, and is saved by his positive approach to life from the schizophrenia that affects Victor, similarly, Shankar’s criticism of non attachment and mysticism, his dismissal of the crude distinction between a spiritual East and the materialistic West, his plea for the recognition of over responsibilities, his belief in man as a homogeneity and as the final fact of the universe are all attitudes which are exactly parallel in Anand’s humanism.

Shankar, the embodied voice of reason and sanity, in the novel is also a divided man, with conflicting allegiances. His inner dualism seems to operate between a loyalty to the Raja and a loyalty to the anti-feudal struggle between an awareness of the need for Revolution and reluctance to be involved in any form of action. Like Lalu and Ananta, he too is tormented by his own doubts, fears and regrets, which binds him inseparably to the Prince and keeps him away from any positive action:

For a moment, I sought to be kind to myself with that natural kindness for oneself that always makes one accept one’s own bad smells more easily than those of others. I told myself for the thousandth times that I had no reason to feel guilty because I had owed money to the Maharaja and had to work off my debt by service. But then I realized that I could have walked off from the court at one stage or another when I felt intense revulsions against continuing, without any moral scruples about the debt which had ultimately came from money derived from the dumb peasants, and that I could have gone and serve the state as a doctor more usefully in some village dispensary and thus appeased my conscience about what I owed to Victor. And I decided that if I did not feel guilty, I ought to feel
guilty. I wanted to rebel, to rage and to fight against the whole system which had enveloped me in its poisonous, fungus growth and kept me rooted in the shadowy, bestial world of tyranny, cowardice, ennui and sloth.25

Haunted by a gnawing sense of guilty and remorse, he feels that he should have left the Prince earlier and begun to lead a purposeful life. And like Lal, he realizes at the end of the novel that true heroism resides in a life of service for others which shows his idea of revolution and decides to start a dispensary in a small village in Sham Pur:

I began vaguely to feel that I must do something to help these people which might make me a little more useful that I had been to them while I was in the pay of the Maharaja. Only in healing the poor could I live an intrinsic life, which had been dead in me which I had been living only for the gratification of my five senses. Something for myself but also something for other people, as they said. I would go and start a dispensary in a small village in Sham Pur state. I had a little money saved up and I would start just like that, simply.26

Echoing the novelist human leftism, Shankar speaks of the past independent democratic rulers opening up the backward areas to investments by the big monopolists, of the American Imperialist’s military designs in Sham Pur, of the corrupt social system, that spreads neurosis everywhere of the exploited peasants, loaded with all the burden of debts and disease, of the bourgeois society that ignores the creative aspect of man-woman relationship in marriage, of India as a kind of lunatic asylum and of western civilization in decay. At the same time, he projects the novelist’s universal historical humanism, by emphasizing the Hellenistic view of man, irrespective of class or creed, as supreme among all creation. This dualism in Shankar’s words and behaviour fits in well with the basic dualism of the novel. The
conviction which he is going to make for the sake of his people against the deeds he
has done before, gives a meaningful bright future for the people of Sham Pur:

\[ ...... . . \text{thus I may come through the portals of dread to real life for my people. And to hope for them and myself. There was still tenderness in me and faith in the search for an ideal, inspite of all the clogging shortcomings. And, being a seeking human, I would return again and again to the sources of strength in this tenderness.}^{27} \]

A deep humanistic yearning for revolutionary social change, but a constant hesitation about positive revolutionary action; a didactically motivated affirmation of revolutionary struggles, but a continual retreat from all purposeful action: this pattern of Contraries marks the development of Anand’s revolutionary hero and reaches its consummation in Ananta, the protagonist of *The Big Heart (1945)*, Ananta marks the culmination of Anand’s fictional representations of the revolutionary hero and becomes a typical creation by embodying the author’s ambivalent humanism.

As a veritable incarnation of Anand’s humanism, Ananta embodies the profound compassion and his passion for the renewal of a dead culture through the acceptance of western modernity. He is indeed a true proponent of the mature attitude to the problems of life and emerges as a spokesman of modernity through humanism. Ananta who has the nobility of the heart and the moral strength of overcome the new fate is destroyed by the person who channelizes the evil carnage. His noble stature devices mainly from the qualities of the heart and Anand thus allegories the need for what he refers to in *Apology For Heroism (1946)*:
So what is needed is the big heartedness, the understanding, the generous, the wise heart, informed by passion and schooled by a knowledge born of love. Ananta is a rebel who does not believe in God but he combines fury with the dignity and exudes warmth, generous manner, the open, frank and hearty speech which endeared him to those who impulses were yet free from all restraint. He is an innocent roguish Adam whose generous character is evident in his favorite saying: “There is no lack of money, brother: one must have a big heart.” Ananta is a crusader against all sorts of inequalities, injustice, superstitious and empty rituals prevailing in the society. He emerges as a man of scientific outlook and asks his community men to develop a big heart, so “the young man who know him to be a man of heart, inspite of all the rogueries and deviltries attributed to him, echo after him.”

The poet however, sees in Ananta the real foundation of the new man and it is the poet himself who articulates the humanism which the hero enacts:

I believe in the restoration of man if he is to control machinery at the present time. I believe, in fact, if we can have any religious faith, morality or code at all today, it must arise from the reassertion of man’s dignity, a pure love for man in all his strength and weakness. Limitless compassion for man, unbounded love, especially for the poor and the downtrodden; so that, those who have been left to rot on the dusty road can be raised and given the izzat which is theirs by the miracle of their birth in this world.

Thus Ananta embodies those qualities of the heart and create a new Adam of Anand’s new society. Despite the poet’s passionate faith and his belief that evil people will drown in the whirlpools of their own devilish intrigues, it can not be
claimed that *The Big Heart (1945)* resolves in a new way the fundamental problem of evil. On the one hand, the poet acknowledges the deep groves that were cut in one soul by the hardness, the cruelty of Satan's hooves, the marks of the beast from which people never recovered; yet on the other hand, he dismisses original sin both from the Christian and Hindu standpoint:

...... men were not born evil, as the followers of Yessuh Messih say, or as say those in our country who believe that men earn a higher or a lower caste for their good or bad deed in the previous life.22

Nevertheless, his metaphysical inconsistency apart, the poet's faith that the dignity of man can be achieved through reason, forgiveness and love commands respect.

Ananta stands for the new life, for modernity and progress. He is aware of the magnitude of harm the new factor has done to the men of his community. As he sees how the factory has ruthlessly deprived most of his people of their traditional employment, his compassion knew no bounds. His heart bleeds for the poverty and misery of the people. He feels that the modernity which is being ushered can be used to their best advantage, provided they learn to master the machines and the only way to tackle the problems is that they should unite into a powerful trade union to safeguard their interests, that togetherness is a condition for revolutionary action and that true heroism inevitably entails self surrender. He is a man with a blending of love and nobility, of conviction and dedication, of compassion and fortitude that when he dies in the end in the hands of the Ralia it comes down to the people with a tremendous force. The poet gives expression to the significance of Ananta's martyrdom in his words of consolation to Janki:
Perhaps the life of Ananta -- I mean the way he lived -- may be a greater example for them than any words he could have spoken.... For what can be more persuasive than the death of a man who love them.\textsuperscript{33}

The author's ambivalence again expresses itself in his attempt to being together the potentialities of the heart and the materialist concepts of social change. Himself an epitome of love, fellow feeling, compassion, devotion and faith, Ananta can not conceive a Revolution divorced from moral values. In fact, the flowering of a love of Revolution, within him was due to the disgust he felt for the selfishness of his youth. He calls upon the tharthiars to unite because, without togetherness, there is no possibility of any meaningful Revolution, particularly in the Machine Age in which each man is for himself, till he learns to unite with the others. And Revolution is not just mass struggle fought randomly but it requires devotion and thought. Ananta says that it is only by suffering that one is purified and learns anything in the world. Hence, he tells his fellowmen that Revolution will aim to create love and to keep faith because it is the truth that triumphs at last. This view of Revolution which seeks to lay emphasis on both the world of action and the world of values, the world of material struggles, and the world of spiritual attainments, points to Anand's simultaneous allegiance to the materialist and spiritual values of life and his concept of the 'Destination Man' who is to emerge through the struggle for illumination, exercised through the will.

In fact, the tendentious passion that emanates from the will of the heart shapes and decides the fable content of the narrative which tends to provide a significant turn to the tragedy through a romantic projection of hope at the end and
the finale of the novel which presents the martyrdom of Ananta thus emphasizes Anand’s own optimism that the struggle will continue.

Another embodiment of Anand’s humanism is Maqbool Sherwani of *Death of a hero* (1963) who becomes a scarlet symbol of the concept of heroism. A young Kashmiri poet, faced with a potentially tragic and dangerous situation that develops in the wake of the hostilities between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. Following the forcible occupation of Baramula by the Pathan invaders, Maqbool flees to Srinagar but ordered by his leaders to return to hometown to rally the people. Braving the perils and risking his own life, he returns to Baramula, where he finds that he can not convince any of his friends. Finally, in the course of his escapade, he is betrayed, pursued by the aggressor, captured and executed. Thus through his act of self-sacrifice for the cause of freedom, Maqbool became a martyr. The situation in the novel provoke a strong sense of moral passion and produces a hero of the big generous heart who, in both vision and practice, opposes evil and inhumanity and love his fellowmen.

His heroism becomes a sublime expression of his national urges, his protest against poverty and fatalism, his struggle against religious fanaticism, his love of his fellowmen and his capacity for suffering. His return to Baramula to organize the people, regardless of the risks involved, is itself a kind of protest against the occupation of Baramula by the raiders. He is not prepared to accept the religious view point that the action by the raiders is an ‘act of God’, but he rather thinks it a planned brutality to cow people down to submit, and resistance to it was the only
virtue. Himself an atheist, he does not believe in the existence of Allah, but he has respect for Christ because he was the real person and suffered for mankind. Maqbool accepts the reality of Christ for the very human attributes he represents not his divinity. As against this, there is false religiosity of the barbarians who have no qualms of conscience in killing the innocent and in perpetuating fresh act of carnal outrage and plunder. Their prayer before the Almighty with automatic gestures and nuances has absolutely no meaning. His convictions are so ardent and strong that he stands up firmly against Ahmed Shah and Khurshid Anwar and challenges them in their face. In the midst of the heated conversation in Ghulam Jilani's house, when Khurshid Anwar tries to cow him down, he shows his real mettle by challenging him for which he has to pay dearly and eventually he becomes a martyr. In this sense, Maqbool knows that his death is certain, and he walks to it as a hero; his inner urge for freedom makes him accept death. Hence he tells Begum Mehtab Jillani:

.... when death is opposed to his life then must oppose death .... I know there will be much bloodshed, and ruin in this way, but the urge for freedom can not be suppressed .......  

He has a clear comprehension of what precisely ails the society in Kashmir. He not only opposes the hard, communal line with all the resources at his command; but also asserts his burning patriotism. He know that the freedom is basically a question of faith: "It is a question of faith, or belief in ourselves and in the struggle ...."  The struggle therefore, will have to continue which means suffering and keeps on saying that we all will all have to suffer to become mature and to become man among men. Thus, in his convictions, words and attitudes, Maqbool shows himself to be a true exponent of Anand's own basic position as a humanist.
Through his martyrdom, which is the culmination of his heroism, Maqbool emerges as a Christ figure; his self sacrifice is raised to a symbolic act of universal significance, reminiscent of martyrdom of Christ. The letter addressed to his sister, Noor, which the Indian soldiers discovered in his pocket, is a passionate document that reveals his humanist fervour and the glittering essence of his heroism. Maqbool writes:

\[
\ldots \ldots \text{I have never been anything but an aspirant to poetry. All my dreams will remain unfulfilled, because I am going to face death. But here, in our country, the most splendid deeds have been done by people, not because they were great in spirit, but because they could not suffer the tyrant's yoke and they learn to obey their conscience. And conscience, howsoever dim, is a great force, and is a real source of poetry. For, from the obedience to one's conscience, to pity, is but a small step. And poetry is poetry and poetry is pity.} \]

Maqbool’s heroism with its aspiration to poetry, its adherence to the voice of conscience and its identification of poetry with pity and pity with poetry, reflects Anand’s heroism. The martyrdom of the poet-hero is thus dramatized with haunting inwardness and evoked with universal significance which touches the level of the sublime. His heroic death has a political and metaphysical meaning. Politically, it denotes the glorious culmination of his struggle waged out of nationalist and secularist aspirations. At the same time, it embodies a metaphysical view of death itself – death as a source of renewal of life. Maqbool, in his letter addressed to Noor written in the face of death, thinks that “with the certainty of death before me, I can renew my faith in life” and he hopes that his sister’s child “will grow up and work
for our lovely land, and through him or her, my spirit will be working for the new life in our country.  

If Anand’s naturalism and humanism is viewed properly, then the evitable third term arises: the relation between the two. For Anand, the third term is the Integrating Factor or what he calls it Bhakti, the relation of personal, efficacious love, between the members of the units of society, family, community, nation or the world. He suggest in his *Contemporary Indian Civilization (1963)*:

> But if there is no war, from deep within the orbit of the Indian tradition of individualism, shown of its religious sanction, may grow the gradual limitation of power of the state. Except that the old individualism will also have to shed its egoism and concern for personal salvation and take on the *Bhakti-yoga*, devotion through works which integrates the individual into community.  

The new religion, the new system supplanting superstition, personal devotion to God by rational devotion to man are the values which Anand proposes to his countrymen. The traditional religion, he maintains, made men indifferent to the ills on this earth yet the new religion of Bhakti, required impassioned, practical efforts to remove not only external signs of ill, filth, poverty, pain, disease, hunger and ignorance but also the evils which are deeply rooted in social, political and economic institutions.

Humanism is, then is Anand’s faith with India as its proposed laboratory and hope; democratic socialism, as its political context while *Bhakti-Yoga* is its characteristic which is dynamic and excellence. According to Swami Vivekananda *Bhakti – Yoga* implies Divine Love experienced through the sublimation of energies
and Vinoba Bhave while attributing compassion to the *Bhakti* or Devotional school of Hinduism favours the term sarvodaya to Bhakti but Anand’s Bhakti is centered on the Aitereya *Brahmana*, traditionally means personal devotion to God in a context of philanthropic benevolence and of ministration to holy men. This concept well exemplified the lives and works of Kabir, Nanak and Tukaram. He then defines the term a ‘personal selfless devotion and service to all human beings.’

Whatever the terminology, 19th and 20th century Indian social reformers associate religious devotion with social service. Thus, Vivekananda exhorts that suffering be the object of worship, “the illiterate mass be the object of reverential service to man and pray to Lord Vishnu for selfless love for all things.” Gandhi, on the other hand stressed that man should endeavor to see God through service of humanity, for God was neither in heaven nor down below, but everywhere. Vinoba Bhave declared that service of the people takes the place of idol worship. One should look upon all men and women as so many images of God, because, God and man indeed fuse in popular notions of *Dardyanarayan* - lower castes as the lowest incarnations of God and *harijans* - outcasts as the sons of God. Devotion and *Bhakti* towards such persons is seen as the equivalent of direct service to God.

Anand traces his first interest in *Bhakti* to his Sikh maternal grandfather. He said that he did not take to mysticism but *Bhakti*, which was personal devotion to human beings – a doctrine which has been emphasized by all our medieval saints from Nanak, Kabir and Tukaram to Gandhi. The second influence, however, comes from B. R. Puri, a philosopher lecturer in Amritsar. Puri’s absorption in religious
mysticism under a Sikh guru impressed Anand less than his doctrine of Bhakti, devotional worship and the service to others as a way of living. Then in the Christian emphasis on development of personality through unselfish service, Anand saw a confirmation of the Hindu doctrine of Bhakti, devotion through works. In Contemporary Indian Civilization (1963) Anand discussed three traditional Hindu values which is related to the practice of Bhakti: universalism, tolerance, and compassion:

they are not operative values in the completest sense. But because of the great weight of the past on the Indian conscience, they play some part in moulding our people, especially the vast illiterate population, which has inherited the past in the form of customs and conventions.\(^\text{39}\)

Of all the wise characters, in Anand’s novel, it is Purun Singh, the poet of The Big Heart (1945), who clearly voices Anand’s most mature conception of value in human life. Bhakti dedicated personal service of the individual and society, a doctrine and a way of action that the past called a religion.

Having been a yogi myself, I believe that some faith is necessary. If man trust in themselves and in the other men with whom they live together, and they are dedicated to building and creating something by breaking down dead habits and evil customs and shams, I think that there are can emerge a new kind of brotherhood, a new sense of devotion, like the Bhakti which our saint Kabir preached and practiced. I have seen glimpses of this religion already in my travels.\(^\text{40}\)

Purun’s dedication is chiefly carried out in the dharamsala Sant Harnam Das, a charity house overlooking Amritsar Golden Temple. The conversation and speeches made between Ananta and Purun Singh develops Anand’s conception of Bhakti, an ideal lived out unto death by Ananta. Bhakti is in fact, the keystone of Anand’s
socialist and humanist views. It is concerned with personal, individual happiness and fulfillment and with the building up of more satisfactory social institutions. Purun Singh deplores the loss of compassion for individual man and insists that the new community of socialism must be achieved with dignified individuals as its base. Even the murderous deeds of infuriated workers, denounced by the widowed Janki, only emit from his compassionate forgiveness. Purun’s tolerance again extents even to love of the English people, though he deplores their tyrannical Sarkar. The dedicated, universal compassion and tolerance of the Bhakti, at the cost of personal renunciation and sacrifice, is seen in the novels of Mulk Raj Anand.

Though Lal, Dholi Singh, Janki and Shankar review the futility of their past careers and seek redemption in dedicated, personal service to others – especially in the conquest of pain in nursing and medical careers, the best executed of Anand’s Bhakti character is Ananta in his martyrdom, and his devotion inspires Janki to live wholly for others. That is the only way in which we shall learn to become new men and women for according to Anand, outside Bhakti there is no other world, and if men are to find it at all, they must find its happiness here. The condition for human progress implies the fullest possible freedom and equality for all; Bhakti strives towards such condition is the touchstone of Mulk Raj Anand’s brand of humanism.
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