CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION: HUMANISM

7.1.0 With the failure of the foreign and the Indian writers to present a 'total India' in their writings since they become either imaginative or autobiographical and in any case fragmentary, we have undertaken to study select works of Gandhi, Nehru and Chaudhuri, the three observers of contemporary India to see its three faces, spiritual, secular and iconoclastic respectively. Their autobiographies were considered as condensed versions of their vision of India. As a spiritualist, Gandhi has accepted religion, while Nehru, as a secularist could not do so. Whereas, the iconoclastic Chaudhuri has rejected religion outright. In the matter of Politics, Gandhi was eager to mix it with religion. But Nehru was strongly opposed to it. As an outsider from the Indian political scene, Chaudhuri has only ridiculed it. Similarly, Gandhi and Nehru were against the social stratification in India, but Chaudhuri strongly advocates it. The three authors are again divided in their diagnosis of the institution of family and sex.

7.1.1 The three autobiographies not only reveal the public and private sides of their personality but they also
present the picture of the three different faces of India respectively: spiritual, secular and iconoclastic. Apart from the self-revelation, their national character, too, has exercised a great influence. Their views on matters like religion, politics, society, family and sex are also coloured by their temperament. We were able to derive the different aspects of the same issue while comparing their views.

7.1.2 Deeply religious, Gandhi believed that all religions are true. But Nehru had a certain distaste for vague speculations on religion. But Chaudhuri is anti-religious and criticizes Hindu Gods who were created in the image of earthly kings. Gandhi tried to change the nature of Indian politics by spiritualizing it. Nehru, on the other hand, was strongly opposed to the use of religion in Indian politics. He firmly believed that if religion entered the political sphere, it would create only a negative effect. While Gandhi and Nehru were against social stratifications, Chaudhuri strongly advocates caste system. If Gandhi employed rural method, Nehru was urban in his approach to society. Though Gandhi and Chaudhuri are poles apart, in the matter of society, Chaudhuri's ideas are similar to those of Gandhi. He too severely criticizes Nehru's zeal for industrialization which may modernize the
aboriginals but will destroy their culture. Gandhi and Nehru made no distinction between men and women. They were social reformers, who advocated for the cause of women uplift. Although, Chaudhuri sympathises with the plight of miserable women in India, he does not seem to tolerate the emergence of working women. Gandhi believed that any union was a crime when the desire of progeny was absent. But Nehru could not understand this puritanical attitude of Gandhi, regarding sex. He considered that such an attitude would only create mental distress between husband and wife. Chaudhuri shows how procreation, the primary goal of ancient marriage, has become secondary in modern matrimonial world.

7.2.0 As the three writers differ greatly in their outlook, the style with which they try to depict the image of India, also varies accordingly. Gandhi's prose style is lucid, clear, transparent and idiomatic; Nehru's prose style is suffused with sensitivity and emotional quality; but Chaudhuri's prose style is pedantic, argumentative, matter-of-fact and lacks in simplicity and clarity which are the underlying characteristics of the styles of Gandhi and Nehru.

7.2.1.0 To Gandhi, language is nothing but a means of communicating his ideas. Writing is, therefore, not an end
in itself, but an effort to concretize ideals and a blueprint for practical realisation. All his writings reveal his transparent honesty and they are also a mine of stimulating ideas on different issues.

7.2.1.1 Gandhi is not only a great activist but also a great writer. Fortunately, almost all his writings are readily available having gone into several editions. No one has used words with such intense longing both to be at once down to earth and reach the stars. However, Gandhi very modestly says:

The readers have no idea of the restraint I have to exercise in the choice of topics and my vocabulary. It is a training for me. It enables me to peep into myself and to make discoveries of my weakness. Often my vanity dictates a smart expression or an angry or harsh adjective. It is a terrible ordeal but a fine exercise to remove these words. (CW IV: 212).

Gandhi writes on a variety of subjects. His writings, speeches and letters cover the period 1884-1948 - almost sixty years of very active public life. Gandhi wrote nearly two million words in English. Most of the works appeared in
Young India, the weekly journal he founded in 1919. There was Navajivan, the Gujarati weekly, besides this, which was a counterpart of Young India. Harijan was started in 1933, which was also a weekly. It was issued in English and in several regional languages. It continued its publications even after Gandhi's death.

7.2.1.2 Gandhi's autobiography, The Story of My Experiments with Truth stands as a great monument of the author's transparent honesty. This was supplemented by a companion volume Satyagraha in South Africa. Hind Swaraj was completed on board a ship during his return journey from England to South Africa. It has been acclaimed as the manifesto of Gandhian Revolution. There is also the slim volume of Key to Health which has been listed among Gandhi's basic books.

7.2.1.3 Gandhi's long practice as a lawyer strengthened his faculty for condensed expression which is predominant in his autobiography and other writings. Gandhi's prose style is simple, easy, graceful and forcible. He expresses himself in plain, distinct and impressive manner and imparts to his readers the same views and feelings as he himself has. L.S.R. Krishna Sastry says: "It is as though there is a direct link of communication established between the reader
and the author (Gandhi), and the reader has a sense of spontaneous emotional participation in the event described" (Sastry 1989: 15). The saying "style is the man" is applicable to Gandhi's prose style. He is sincere in his thoughts, words and deeds. In contrast to the opulent rhetorical style of great stalwarts like Surendranath Banerjee and Pherozshah Metha, Gandhi uses simple, transparent and energetic style which touches the masses as an arrow hitting the mark. Terseness of expression is a great virtue of Gandhi's prose style. His autobiography, articles and speeches are the best specimen of lucid and succinct prose. He also employs similies, metaphors and other figures of speech to express his thoughts.

7.2.1.4 Gandhi's writings are a mine of stimulating thought on political, social, economic, cultural and spiritual issues. He is not a great scholar, by no means a great thinker, nor a brilliant theoretician. But as K.R.Srinivasa Iyengar points out:

... he merely wrote or spoke straight on, and when we read them today the words seem to be often insipid or anaemic, with no straining after emphasis, no colour, no irradiating brilliance, yet they are Gandhi's words, and their very
bareness constitute their strength (Iyengar 1984: 252).

7.2.2.0 Nehru ranks as a superb writer in English. He has a chaste expression and flowery style. His works are indubitable masterpieces whose richness increases with each new reading. His choice of words is excellent.

7.2.2.1 Nehru's place as a writer is indeed very high. His literary genius has been highly appreciated even by foreign critics. John Gunther, a renowned journalist thinks that "... hardly a dozen men alive write English as well as Nehru" (Gunther 1934: 451-452). Walter Crocker remarks that Nehru "wrote better English than most of us born to that language" (Crocker 1966:65). As a prose writer, Nehru writes a varied kind of prose which evinces his skill in historical writings as in The Glimpses of World History and The Discovery of India; personal and autobiographical writing in An Autobiography; epistolary writing in A Bunch of old letters and Letters from a Father to His Daughter and his multifarious interests are revealed in his speeches, essays and press statements which have even published in 20 volumes of the selected works.

7.2.2.2. The Glimpses of World History is epical in scope and it is an interesting and engaging survey of world
history from the beginning of civilization to nineteen thirties. C.D. Narasimhaiah rightly remarks: "Indeed, it is Nehru's poetic vision of history and literary graces which abound in the Glimpses that invite the attention of the literary critic" (Narasimhaiah 1960: 206). The Discovery of India, written during his imprisonment, following the Quit India movement records the glorious culture of India with vividness and sensitivity. The style, with alternating argument and introspection, is highly personal and the descriptions of landscapes and personalities have a peculiar poetic touch. Nehru's An Autobiography ranks very high not only in Indian English literature but in the literature of the world.

7.2.2.3 Nehru's choice of words is apt. He chooses highly expressive and suggestive words from a rich treasure. Concreteness and vividness characterise his diction. His prose style is perfect and flawless. His wide learning and love for poetry also influence his style. His prose style is versatile and is admirably suited to the variety of subject matter, but it is always simple, straightforward, direct and lucid. How suggestive, vivid and vigorous is the description of the varying pictures of Mother India:

When I think of India, I think of many things; of broad fields dotted with innumerable small
villages; of towns and cities I have visited; of the magic of the rainy season which pours life into the dry parched up land and converts it suddenly into a glistening expanse of beauty and greenery . . . (DI: 62-62).

Such descriptions are plentiful in Nehru's prose.

7.2.2.4 Nehru's prose style abounds in quotations from English poets who influenced both his thoughts and writings. Directness and simplicity, force and strength constitute the main charm of his style. He carefully avoids the use of high-flown phrases and well known cliches. Summing up the characteristics of Nehru's style, M.K. Naik writes:

Nehru's prose is just reflection of the man- sincere and idealistic, urbane and cultured, vigorous yet graceful - a man endowed with clear and sharp mind. His prose steers clear of their Latinized diction, their deliberately balanced and complex sentence structure, and their magniloquence (Naik 1982: 130-131).

7.2.3.0 Chaudhuri is one of the greatest writers in Indo-Anglian literature. In spite of the contradictory responses
of the readers towards his writing, Chaudhuri simply cannot be neglected as he is a man of keen perception and thinking, with a language marked by concreteness of diction.

7.2.3.1 Of all the Indo-English non-fiction writers, Chaudhuri is perhaps the best because of his robust thinking and clarity of style. In spite of having started his writing career rather late in his life, he has written extensively and has achieved an international reputation. He has also expressed his views boldly and not only incurred the wrath of many but also earned the admiration of a few.

7.2.3.2 In spite of the contradictory responses of the readers towards his writing, Chaudhuri's place in Indo-Anglian literature simply cannot be neglected. Even Chaudhuri's very bitter critic admit that "he has wit and learning and a style that is unique" (Murthy 1971: 143). However, one may disagree with what Chaudhuri says, one cannot but admire the way he says it. He himself says about his way of writing:

After writing a book, I go very carefully over it, examining the diction and vocabulary, and if I find that I have used some fashionable words and jargon, I weed them out, unless there is some
special reason to keep them. As a rule I remove all words which have not been good English for at least two hundred years. (II: 79).

7.2.3.4 One of the striking features of Chaudhuri's prose is his scholarly style. The use of non-English words, phrases and sentences is a conspicuous aspect of his writing. It is really an evidence of his extraordinary wide reading. His vast knowledge finds expression in numerous references and allusions to different literatures. The two languages Chaudhuri quotes most profusely from, and even makes use of in between his English sentences, are Sanskrit and French. His love and passion for learning makes Chaudhuri use, so profusely, lexical expressions from foreign languages. His vocabulary is equally rich in poetic words. M.K.Naik observes: "His (Chaudhuri's) learning, a mark of his insatiable intellectual curiosity, is almost encyclopaedic. He seems to take 'all knowledge' for his province, and the breath of his interests, reminiscent of Renaissance humanists, has few parallels in an age of specialization, where a scholar appears to try to know more and more about less and less " (Naik 1982: 269)

7.2.3.5 Chaudhuri's imagery is a curious amalgam of similies and metaphors. He also employs some very unusual
and out of the way images which are rather curious and interesting. For instance, "To send off a wife to her father's house, as it is customary to do in Hindu society, may be like sending a car for periodic overhaul to a garage" (TLNTL: 184). Tara Sinha observes that "A marked change and development takes place in Chaudhuri's prose style as he moves to his later books, The Intellectual in India and To Live or Not to Live. Serenity, composure and balance replace the earlier bitterness, hatred and anger as he emerges from a number of complexities and vicissitudes of life as evident from social maladies of his earlier books" (Sinha 1981: 207).

7.2.3.6 Chaudhuri's satire is mild and subdued, its aim being not to hit hard but to make us see our follies. Women seem to provoke Chaudhuri to make some very witty and humorous remarks: "... elderly women are as noisy as parrots, the young women as mynahs, and the girls as sparrows" (TLNTL: 85).

7.2.3.7 There are many Indian critics who deliberately exaggerate the negative side of his style. Whereas one group of them accuses him of using the pedantic style, the other group dubs his style as merely journalistic. There is another set of critics who complain that Chaudhuri uses not
English but Greco-Roman style. Robert de Souza says that "the style of the book smacks of a mixture of the Greco-Latin and the Indian - a result of outgrown dump of a bookworm. And surely the Gouns know not such a language which its author calls English" (Robert de Souza 1973:96). But whatever style is used by Chaudhuri, it is the natural style of an Indian who has learnt his English through dictionaries and Indian teachers and who has not de-Indianised and Anglicised himself to use the snobbist style. K.R.Srinivasa Iyengar says:

When all caveats have been made, however, Nirad Chaudhuri remains the Grand Solitary, the master of a prose style that has often a fascinating spidery quality, a writer and thinker and a universal Momus who stands apart from the muddy mainstream (Iyengar 1984: 601)

7.3.0 In spite of the differences in their worldly outlook and in their style of expression, the underlying concern of the three writers is humanism. Humanism is often attributed to the intellectual but man-centred movement that arose with the Renaissance in the west. It is really no exaggeration to say that the present age is an age of humanism. S. Radhakrishnan observes: "The modes and customs
of all men are now a part of the consciousness of all men. Man has become the spectator of man. A new humanism is on the horizon. But, this time it embraces the whole of mankind" (Radhakrishnan 1948: 49). We have had several forms of humanism -- The Deweyan form, which is naturalistic; the communist form, given to it by the Marxians, based on economics and class struggle; the form given to it by Schiller, which is evolutionary and pragmatistic; another form given to it by Julian Huxley, which is revolutionary and scientific, the theological forms like that of Maritain based on catholic thought and existential forms, which are of various kinds, ranging from the theological, like that of Mercier, to the atheistic, like that of Satre.

7.3.1 There is a common trend in all these 'Humanism' as the emphasis is on the man and his value. In short, man cannot be ignored by any philosophy. Philosophy, if it is true to itself, has to be a philosophy of life, not of one part of life but of the whole. This life is the life of man and he wants a theory of life as his guide. In the final analysis, we come to the old advice of Socrates, "Know Thyself". Pope declared that the proper study of mankind is man himself. The Upanishads also decalred, "Know Thyself". Confucius in China made the same appeal that all thoughts
and all theories of human activity are to be based on a proper understanding of man. In modern times, the whole world is coming together more intimately and consciously than ever before and the problems of each have become the problems of all and it would be interesting and useful to know and to appreciate how man, his nature, his ideals and values are understood by each tradition and culture.

7.3.2 In the west, humanism was an intellectual movement, which characterized Renaissance. It also represented the attitude of mind which is characteristic of this movement. Humanism represented an open break with many of the standard ideas of Middle Ages. It emphasized the dignity of man and his perfectability. It considered this world as a legitimate object of interest and love, and it tended to place reason above revelation. It also stressed education both for men and women. The languages, literature and thoughts of ancient Greece and Rome occupied a control position in the thinking of the humanists.

7.3.3 Humanism began to develop in Italy in the 14th century and spread all over Europe in the 15th and 16th centuries. The famous English humanist was Sir Thomas More, whose Utopia is famous. In the west, Humanism is regarded as a philosophy which champions the cause of man's freedom
and individuality against a theological world view. The
Renaissance humanists like Erasmus and the 18th century
humanists like Herder were opposed to the claims of the
Bible, the Papacy and the protagonists of the theists and
ecclesiastical orientation. The humanism of Ludwig
Fewerback and Karl Marx in their earlier writings was
frankly materialistic in its assumptions. Due to the impact
of scientific thought, sometimes, it has been assumed that
there is an anti-thesis between belief in the religious
world-view and the adherence of humanism. It is often
argued that humanism is opposed to the theocentric and
transcendental world-view.

7.3.4 Marx received from the scientific rationalism of
the Enlightenment movement in France and Germany, the belief
in the stupendous powers of reason to create a better
society and a happier man. To this extent, Marx was a
product of the Renaissance spirit. He was a child of the
scientific technological civilization of the capitalistic
west. But Marxism in the name of equality often tends to
curb individual freedom.

7.4.0 According to Gandhi, the real individual is an
immortal spiritual entity. He has a sense of spiritual
consciousness and moral internality. Being essentially
spirit, he can rise superior to evil. Gandhi's humanism is rooted in the realization and spiritual experience of his whole being that all life is one and that life is the manifestation and reflection of the reality itself.

7.4.1 Gandhi, a great devotee of God, has immense faith in man. There is no anti-thesis between his humanism and his belief in divine province. He says: "My faith is in God and therefore in the people" (CW III: 45). God is originally bound up with mankind and all living beings. Therefore love for man leads to the realization of God. Gandhi is a humanist in two sense -- first, for what he does for the downtrodden to emancipate them and secondly for his faith in the redemption and regeneration of man.

7.4.2 It is very interesting to note that Gandhi firmly believes that his life belongs to the whole humanity and he wants to do as much good for the humanity at large as he could and he wants to be thoroughly and usefully used up for mankind, before he passes away. Gandhi is a product of Indian culture, civilization and philosophy and so he interprets every activity of human beings in terms of spirituality. His conception of man is not materialistic, but spiritualistic, since he considers that in each and every being, there is a divine spark. In short, his
humanism is not materialistic humanism, but spiritual and moral, based on the principle of oneness of life, as well as the basic goodness of man. According to him, the best form of worship is service to humanity. He is a great humanist, since he believes in the bright and glorious future for mankind and also works for the betterment and upliftment of the poor and the downtrodden. Above all, his humanism is practical since he extends the humanistic and spiritual ideology in all fields of human activities. His principle of trusteeship is also based on his spiritualistic and humanistic approach to the problems of economics.

7.4.3 His principle of 'Sarvodaya' is not merely an economic principle but also humanistic. Gandhi introduces the principle of the welfare of all, on the basis of his philosophical humanism and rejects the utilitarian doctrine, the greatest good of the greatest number of people. His humanism is so strong and deep that when there were religious conflicts and tensions in many parts of India, Gandhi remarked:

You may not lose faith in humanity. Humanity is just like a big ocean. If a few drops of the ocean are dirty, the ocean itself does not become dirty. (CW IV: 67).
7.4.4 The suffering of the Indian peasants brings forth all the agonies of his soul. Hence, he tries to identify himself with the meek and the humblest. He cries: "It is the greatest tragedy I know of those men and women - our brothers and sisters - dying a slow, torturing death. There is an eternal conflict in their lives and they seem to mock us with the life they live" (CW VI: 112-113). In his deep concern for the poor and the downtrodden he names them as 'Đaridranarayan' - 'God of the poor' or 'God appearing in the hearts of the poor'. His overflowing love for the suffering and exploited humanity reveals his intense humanity.

7.4.5 Gandhi's humanism is the pivot of all the different aspects of his personality. His humanism means his utter devotion to the human interests -- welfare of the individual men and women of the human race. According to him, the highest service to man will be our sincere endeavour for drawing out the divine nature in man. To gain this end, we have to be in communion with God and to worship him as the source of all our noble virtues.

7.4.6 Gandhi's humanism is practical. He invariably puts everything into practice before he preaches them. He does not hesitate to risk his life even to serve the
suffering humanity. In the words of Jayantaniya, "His (Gandhi's) humanity is one of the profoundest things that history has ever seen" (Jayantaniya 1969: 112). Once when there was an outbreak of plague in Bombay, he came forward unhesitatingly to work as the Chief organiser of the committee constituted for the purpose of taking preventive measures to the people threatened by that deadly disease. During the times of the first World War, Gandhi offered his services for nursing the wounded soldiers although he did not support any welfare.

7.4.7 Gandhi's humanism admitted no hatred or enmity to anybody. He pardoned his assailant in South Africa and would not allow any action to be taken against him. He gave up all luxuries voluntarily, to live the life of the poor. He used the cheapest and the simplest fare for his mean and travelled third class, to realise the sorrow and suffering of the poor. He led a simple life to identify himself with the starving millions. He dedicated his life fully to the service of humanity and all his works were marked by amazing selflessness permeated by the deepest love for man. Gandhi once declared "I claim the love of the semi-starved paupers of India and Swaraj means the emancipation of these million skeletons" (CW IV: 212).
7.4.8 During the day of communal troubles, following in the wake of partition of India, Gandhi's heart bled for the unfortunate people of India who were subjected to unspeakable violence and suffering. In those days, his humanism reached its zenith when he resorted to 21 days fast at Delhi for securing the right place for them. He went about wandering in remote villages at Noakhali for wiping out the tears or sorrow from the eyes of the suffering people and for establishing peace.

7.4.9 Although he loved all human beings, he was relentless in adhering firmly to his spiritual ideal and he did not relax the principles of his high ideals even in cases of his near and dear ones. This firmness was due to his deep love for them. He wanted to save them from the moral lapses even at the risk of incurring their displeasure. Thus, he could be stern even to his wife or to Miraben, whom he considered as his own daughter. He could even rebuke Mahadev Desai, his most intimate disciple, when he found him at fault. Yet he loved them all so dearly. Although Gandhi's firm adherence to his principles towards the realization of his spiritual ideal brought forth the many distinctive features of his extraordinary personality and wonderful genius, yet his humanism or love of humanity was the cardinal point of his unique personality.
7.5.0 Nehru has deep faith in the goodness of man's nature in spite of the existence of evil in him. He retains his love for his countrymen and feels that the human hearts hold the final key to all social and political dynamics.

7.5.1 In his endeavour to boost the image of India, Nehru is ready even to overstrain himself. He says:

There is one ambition left in me that in the few years left to me, I should throw myself with all the strength and energy left in me, into the work of building up India. I want to do it to the uttermost, till I am exhausted and thrown away as on the scrap-heap. I am not interested in what you or anybody think of me afterwards. It is enough for me that I have exhausted myself, my strength and energy in India's task.

(SW VI: 114-115)

To serve man in his distress, in his poverty, in his illness and in his sorrows, to wipe out the tears from his eyes — constitute the real humanism and Nehru is truly the representative of this genuine type of humanism. P. Marudanayagam in his article "Poet as statesman": Nehru's Humanism", observes: "Nehru's faith in and love for man is
unlimited. His reading of history is that it has taught us of growth and progress and of the possibility of an infinite advance for man" (Marudanayagam 1990: 15).

7.5.2 Nehru believes in the creative possibilities of human nature. Like Turgot, Conforce and Lenin, he has faith in human progress. He accepts the concept of scientific humanism. No other humanist would have cherished so much faith in science. He states in The Discovery of India, that Tagore is the greatest humanist (DI: 204). But while Tagore's humanism is based on the philosophical acceptance of the "universal immanence of the super-spirit" (Patil 1987: 74), Nehru's agnosticism makes him think only of man as an empirical subject. Nehru's humanism stems from his sensitive and deep reactions to pain and misery. Wandering amongst the poor farmers of Uttar Pradesh, "a new picture of India seemed to rise before "him" naked starving, crushed and utterly miserable" (AA: 48).

7.5.3 Through all his struggles and personal worries, Nehru retains his love for man and his hope in the creative destiny of man's endeavour. He is more of a humanist than anything else. He is much concerned for human life and individual well being. Therefore, he is worried more about
human life on earth and in this world rather than life after death.

7.5.4 Nehru's faith in and love for man is unlimited. Tribal people attracts him greatly. This is not out of mere curiosity or a sense of charity. "I was attracted to them simply because I felt happy and at home with them" (SW VI: 312). The first tribes he met were the Gonds, Santhals and Phils. He is quite often disturbed by people who wants to change the tribal way of life. "We are welcome to our own way of living, but why impose it on others?" (SW VI: 416). Again and again he declares that political freedom is simply an opportunity to build a better life for the people. His rare affection for the Indian mob is evident in all his speeches and writings.

7.5.5. A man in public office can find no surer guide than Nehru. At times he gets irritated when he finds people at fault. When a group of half-starved pensioners came to him to complain that they had not received their pension for four years, Nehru was furious. He sent for the District Magistrate of the city to which they belonged, and gave him a thorough dressing-down. The hungry old men at last got their pension. But Nehru was so upset by the incident that it was some time before he would talk to anyone.
7.6.0 Chaudhuri is an atheistic humanist. He attacks the Indians for the discordance between their principles and practice in a scathing fashion and exhibits the Swiftian anger. It is his deep love for his countrymen which makes him highly satirical.

7.6.1 Chaudhuri seems to be a little Marxian. Marx was a child of the scientific technological civilization of the capitalistic West. He propounded the use of mechanized power for catering to the needs, not for a selfish group, but for the entire proletarian collectivity. He also hoped that with the increasing perfection of the socialistic society, human nature would undergo a transformation and there would be the consequent emergence of a new type of socialized man -- the man rid of religious superstitions and egoistic characteristics who would be interested in a programme of fraternity and comradeship. It is this atheistic humanism of Chaudhuri that often makes him an anti-Indian or anti-Hindu.

7.6.2 Chaudhuri whips his fellow Indians into new consciousness of the matters and issues that are normally taken for granted and shocks them by disturbing their lethargy, puritanism, smugness and snobbery. A robust intellectual as he is, he never shies away from the ugly,
the sham, the indecent, the private and the snobbish, but, on the contrary, has the courage to look them into the face and discuss and analyse them with a scientist's detachment. Chaudhuri is a man lacerated by the present, pushed to the verge of despair by the misery, poverty, degradation, the disorder which is to be seen everywhere in contemporary society.

7.6.3 Marx thought that the advance of science and technology would create the conditions for removing the painful toil and drudgery from the lives of the workers. He thought only in terms of group and not of the individual. He is enamoured of proletarian solidarity and he never appreciated the humanist demand of the enlightenment for individual liberty. In all his programmes, there is emphasis on nationalization of the means of production. But he has absolutely failed to appreciate the significance of individual conscience. Chaudhuri, differs from Marx in this sense and he is deeply interested in the well-being of each and every individual in India. As he strives for the perfect equality between man and man, he is dead against any kind of authoritarianism. In spite of the little intellectual work that is going on in India because of the western impact, there is no growth of the rationalistic intellectualism. Chaudhuri says, "It is the authoritarian
and intuitionist leaning of the Hindu mind which makes it unintellectual and sometimes positively anti-intellectual" (II: 46).

7.6.4 Chaudhuri has a deep faith in redemption and regeneration of educated young men in India. The Indian universities which are supposed to provide the highest kind of intellectual training or orientation have miserably failed in the task. He painfully remarks:

They are intellectually stagnant. The Indian academic world is laden with a deep somnolence without the justification of deep positions: it is a mental vacuum, and not vintage port, which produces the abstracted air on the faces of the professors (II: 64).

He suggests that young Indian writers should try to write in natural English and not affect the artificial one. He warns that "... the self-conscious, showy and ultra-fashionable English which many young writers of English in India affect will fall completely flat" (II: 78).

7.6.5 Chaudhuri's humanism is reflected in each and every page of his book, To Live or not to Live. Of course,
there are some comments and remarks one may not feel inclined to agree with, but one certainly cannot remain untouched and unimpressed by the sincerity of his purpose; that is, to teach his people the way of living a happy life. He wants to share with his fellowmen his mature wisdom and knowledge of life. It is not hate but love for his country and countrymen, no doubt, inspires him throughout his writings. He himself admits that he has learned that "the first requisite for getting happiness in the company of others is to learn to love unselfishly" (TLNTL: 197) and "to make others happy is the surest way of getting happiness for ourselves" (TLNTL: 197).

7.7.0 The three authors, Gandhi, Nehru and Chaudhuri differ greatly in their outlook, yet it is their humanism which brings them together. Born in a particular milieu, without succumbing to it, they considerably exert their influence on it to change it in the manner they would like it to be. In a way they are revolutionaries with a passion for the change of man and woman for the better. It is this concern for humanity which brings these diverse authors together on the same plane -- Gandhi being a spiritualist humanist, Nehru, a secular or scientific humanist and Chaudhuri, an a atheistic humanist. And in revealing the three different faces of India in their writings, they
become representative of the contemporary India -- Gandhi and Chaudhuri remaining as polar opposites and Nehru marking the continuum between the two extremes. And their versions of India, though different, are not mutually exclusive of each other but contributing to the formation of a composite images of India.

7.8.0 This comparative study of the three great personalities of India is rewarding in the sense that it gives expressions to the different facets of Indian life. With the insight we got from the comparative study of the autobiographies of Gandhi, Nehru and Chaudhuri, we can examine similar autobiographies written in the first half of the twentieth century by eminent Indians like Tagore and Radhakrishnan and get fresh insights into Indiann autobiographical writings. Gandhi and Nehru had a large number of admirers in India and abroad and a few political leaders followed in their foot steps. Rajagopalachari and Vinoba Bhave, for example, not only accepted Gandhi's political ideology but also wrote their articles on politics and religion, employing a style, which is Gandhian in simplicity and clarity. Nehru, with his aristocratic upbringing and Cambridge background is a unique personality. A man of action and a poet at once, he forged for himself a style that is forceful and poetic. The other political
leaders who succeeded him could not successfully imitate his style. Yet they followed his ideology. Krishna Menon, who had a similar background and shared Nehru's faith in Marxist ideology was a great revolutionary, who could employ a forceful style, though devoid of poetic beauty. Nehru had many admirers in the Communist Party of India but even they could not be considered great writers because their interest were confined to partisan politics. Chaudhuri does not seem to have had any Indian admirers or followers; perhaps the one writer writing on Indian subjects comparable to Chaudhuri is V.S. Naipaul. May be this unknown Indian must have inspired at least a few unknown writers, which has to be explored. Unlike Gandhi and Nehru, Chaudhuri cannot be credited with any homogeneous political ideology though he had his views on politics. And his influence on the Indian writers may therefore be confined to the literary sphere alone. Because of their roles in the struggle for independence and their writing and speeches on a variety of subjects, Gandhi and Nehru must have inspired a number of writers in various regional languages in India. A very perspective study of the impact of Gandhi on Indian literature will reveal how it was responsible for a major breakthrough in those literatures. Nehru's personality and ideology as they manifest themselves in various novels and poems in the regional languages may also prove fruitful
subjects for research. Along with them, the works of Sri Aurobindo, Tagore, Swami Vivekananda, Gokhale, Ranade will also lend themselves to equally fruitful research undertaking. And the Indian prose writers may be classified as spiritual, secular and iconoclastic and compared with the trio, Gandhi, Nehru and Chaudhuri to find their influence on or their concurrence with them, which is a fruitful area for further research.