Chapter – One

Introduction
Migration denotes movement of living beings and human migration involves movement of people in space. Eisensdadt defines migration as “the physical transition of an individual or group from one society or another. This transition usually involves abandoning one social setting and entering another and different one” (19). Eisenstadt does not mention any length of time for one to be considered a migrant. Weinberg, in his definition of human migration, is a little more specific, though not definite. In his words, “Human migration is the changing of place of abode permanently or when temporarily, for an appreciable duration as e.g. in the case of seasonal workers” (19). In fact, there is no fixed duration of time over which one has to stay in a country other than the country of their origin to be conferred the status of an immigrant. Some states consider one year to be sufficient for a foreign-born national to be considered an immigrant within their territorial limits, while others fix three years as standard. In some countries, Germany for instance, any person born to foreigners living within their territory is considered immigrant. Some immigrants hold national citizenship before their entering into the country of settlement as it is the birth place of their parents living in another country, while others, as soon as they enter their new country, are recognized as citizens. Non-Israeli Jews, for instance, are recognized as citizens when they enter Israel.

Migration is older than human history. Religious mythologies recognize this aspect of human experience. Expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden can be termed as first migration. Hardly any prophet could claim the status of prophethood without migrating from one geographical and cultural location to another.

In the ancient times, people traveled over great distances to hunt for livelihood, and to secure a home. In Indian history, Aryans were the first immigrants, followed by
many tribes and races such as Yuchis, Sakas, Parthians, Kushans, Greeks, Huns, Arabs, Europeans, Chinese, Persians and so on who made this country their home.

Ever since the French Revolution, the right to leave one’s country has been considered as a natural human right, but even now there exists no corresponding right of entry. In the beginning of nineteenth century, the migration had been politicized when the modern nation-state arose and erected political-territorial borders around ethnical communities. Now migration is inextricably linked to capitalism and state formation.

For the convenience of analysis, migration can be classified into two broad categories, that is, internal and international migration. In internal migration, people migrate permanently or temporarily from point A to B within the national territory of a country for a host of reasons ranging from religious persecution to political discontent to natural calamities to even governmental ‘progressive’ policies, or because of deliberate rational choice to seek better infrastructure to meet their material wants. In the last instance, people migrate from point A to B for jobs or employment, business opportunities, or better education.

Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), a kind of forced migrants within the national boundaries, are those who, because of fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, political opinion or civil unrest and disturbances in the place of origin, are displaced from their own locality, but who do not cross international border.

In India, internal displacement figures rise alarmingly in the Kashmir Valley and in the Northeastern region as a result of continued political violence. Internal displacement can also take place as a result of natural distress, disasters or calamities. . . . Along with natural disasters, planned
development programmes have created more than 21.3 million internally displaced in India. They include displacement by building dams, mines, industrial establishments, wildlife sanctuaries and national parks. (Majumdar 215-16)

The hundreds of thousands of people living in the Narmada Valley, who have been displaced by the Government of India’s ‘progressive’ Narmada Valley Development Project, have been forced to migrate to urban areas or suburbs of the cities or other places, and very few to the rehabilitation camp.

That’s what it works out to, thirty-three million people. Displaced by Big Dams alone in the last fifty years. What about those who have been displaced by the thousands of other Development Projects? At a private lecture, N.C. Saxena, Secretary to the Planning Commission, said he thought the number was in the region of fifty million (of whom forty million were displaced by dams). (The Algebra 61)

India, being a multi-religious country, often fails to provide a hospitable environment of mutual coexistence for the believers of different religions. As a fact, though painful as well as shameful for a country like India that is hailed as the world’s largest democracy, the people are sometimes forced to migrate to a safe place of living to avoid victimization by religious extremism. “In Gujarat after the 2002 state-assisted pogrom in which an estimated 2000 Muslims were killed and 150,000 driven from their homes, 287 people have been accused under POTA” (An Ordinary Person’s Guide 217).

Earthquake in Gujarat in 2000 and in Kashmir in 2005 displaced thousands of people to the neighbouring districts and states for asylum and food. Tsunami in 2004 forced a large
number of people from Tamil Nadu to flee to safer places. The ill-educated, underprivileged and rootless people living on the streets, who have no right and respect in the organized social strata, are constantly evicted from one place to another.

In fact, internal migration in India makes its society a grand mosaic of cultures and peoples. Sudhir Kakkar cites examples of internal migration in India:

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, many cultural groups migrated to Hyderabad from other parts of the country. The trading communities of the Muslim Bohras from Gujarat and Hindu Marwaris from Rajasthan became prominent in the city’s commercial life. Then there were the Kayasthas and Khatris from North India, traditionally the backbone of many Indian state’s administration, who played a similar role in the Nizam’s affairs of state. These groups tended to cluster together in separate conclaves where they could follow their own ways of religious and community life… on the whole, the lifestyles of the various groups— their customs, mores, architectural styles, food habits—remained distinctive … shared activities and experiences in the public realm even though in private they were completely segregated…. In short, it was a multicultural coexistence rather than any merger into a single, composite culture. (12-13)

Charles Tilly categorizes migration into four types, namely, local, circular, chain and career migration:

Local migration shifts an individual or a household within a geographically contiguous market—a labor market, a land market, or
perhaps a marriage market. In local migration the distance moved is small by definition; the extent of break with the place of origin is also likely to be small. On the whole, the migrant is already quite familiar with the destination before making the move; he or she therefore has relatively little learning of a new environment to do after the move. . . . “Circular” migration takes a social unit to a destination through a set of arrangements which returns it to the origin after a well-defined interval. Seasonal work on harvests, pastoral transhumance, the sending of young people into domestic service before they married, and the circuits of Alpine villagers who served long years in the lowlands as schoolteachers, soldiers, or craftsmen before their long-planned return to the mountains with the accumulated capital all represent variants of circular migration. . . . Chain migration moves sets of related individuals or households from one place to another via a set of social arrangements in which people at the destination provide aid, information, and encouragement to new migrants. Such arrangements tend to produce a considerable proportion of experimental moves and a large backflow to the place of origin. (127-129)

H.C. Upreti’s definition of chain migration echoes that of Charles Tilly. He says: “The movement of people tends to be to those places where they have contacts and where the old migrants serve as links for the new migrants; and the chain which is thus formed is usually termed as Chain Migration.” (243). Charles Tilly defines career migration:

“Career” migration, finally, has persons or households making more or less definitive moves in response to opportunities to change position
within or among large structures: organized trades, firms, governments, mercantile networks, armies, and the like. If there is a circuit, it is based not on the social bonds at the migrant’s place of origin, but on the logic of the large structure itself. If people within the migrant mass help and encourage each other, they are generally colleagues, not neighbors or kinsmen. The migrations of scientists, technicians, military officers, priests, and bureaucrats commonly fall into this type rather than into local, circular or chain migration. (129)

Migrants during emigration, immigration, or internal migration can be classified into two categories, that is, voluntary migrants and forced or involuntary migrants. Voluntary migrants, pulled by the better facilities of the country of immigration, include migrant labourers, seasonal workers, family members of migrants and illegal migrants. Voluntary migration, related to economic factors, generally indicates the flows of migrants to the industrial areas that may be within the country of origin, or in some country. The migrant labourers, allured by monetary gain, move to the place where they can get temporary jobs. Seasonal migrants, usually for agricultural purpose, travel to a particular place or country during a particular working time in the year. “The process of family reunification brings permanently settled immigrants together with their immediate or secondary family members within the host society” (Messina and Lahav 10).

Even though the emigration of families seems always to have been a sort of permanent temptation which no doubt haunted all emigrants and was always on the minds of emigrant men, it nevertheless took almost half a century of uninterrupted emigration on the part of single men before this
‘labour emigration’ was boosted by family emigration and became ‘settler emigration’. (Sayad 70)

An illegal migrant defies the laws of the country of arrival. “An illegal or irregular immigrant is a person who either enters a country without proper documentation or formal authorization or clandestinely assumes or maintains residence there, most often for an extended period” (Messina and Lahav 10).

Forced or involuntary migration, related to systematic changes at world level, takes place under specific circumstances, when the basic survival systems collapse, and/or social and economic structures of the states fail. The forced migrants are always pushed by factors operating in country of origin. They are the victims of slavery and systems of indentured labour. Sometimes they are displaced by war and conflict. The refugees and asylum seekers, victims of slave trades, the persons transported and deported into internal exile to prison camps and to death camps, etcetera come under the category of forced migrants. The definition of ‘refugee’ has been mutable as over 300 years the term has been defined and redefined by politicians and officials several times. In the words of Anthony M. Messina and Gallya Lahav, “A refugee is someone who has left his or her country due to fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion” (10-11). They also attribute the title ‘asylum seeker’ to “a person who seeks formal protection on the same grounds but typically submits a request for asylum and residence permit upon entering the country of destination or soon thereafter. Host countries usually grant asylum and refugee status on the basis of the principle of nonrefoulement (i.e., nonreturn), which is embedded in international and constitutional law. They do so for a host of humanitarian and political
reasons” (11). “During the late 1940s the British government recruited large numbers of European Voluntary Workers (EVWs). They were forced migrants and viewed themselves as such: Kay and Miles (1992:7) comment that ‘they had a clear conception of themselves as refugees’. The government defined them officially as labour migrant but represented them in public in terms which served contingent interests” (Marfleet 13). In the age of globalization the scenario has changed and the refugee has been defined in a more liberal way. “In the twenty-first century forced migrants make claims for asylum on the basis of a right to refuge, what is usually seen as a ‘universal’ right to sanctuary” (Marfleet 97). Philip Marfleet, emphasizing the term ‘persecution’ to define refugee, cites an example from the religion of Islam. He says:

The journey of the Prophet Muhammed from Mecca to Medina, the hijra or emigration, is associated with the idea of protection from persecution, and during the Prophetic period anyone who sought protection in a mosque or among the Companions of the Prophet was assured of security. The Quran and the shari’a affirmed the practice, identifying certain places, notably the Ka’aba in Mecca, as inviolable. (97)

Labour migration is the earliest form of slave trade, the role of which in the colonial system is essentially new. In the global capital market slaves as commodities were transported over great distance by specialized traders. Early labour migration plays a pivotal role in the progress of industrialization as it provided cheap labour which was warmly welcome by the industrialists and capitalists for the profit and growth of their business. In Britain the capital obtained by the exploitation of peoples from their colonies was invested to establish commercial farming which displaced the tenant farmers, who
with artisans, losing their livelihood through the competition from new manufactures, acted as wage labours and formed a new class called “free proletarian” that was unfettered by traditional labour bonds or ownership of the means of production.

A basic question, therefore, can be put forward, and, that is, why do people migrate? That migration flows continue generally from the less developed to the more developed regions implies that people migrate in order to improve their living conditions. The factors responsible for migration can be discussed under two categories, that is, push factors, a kind of forceful factor which relates to the country the person is migrating from, and pull factor that is concerned with the country a person migrates to. While push factors which include poor medical care, scarcity of jobs, very few opportunities, political fear, fear of torture and mistreatment, inability to practice religion, loss of wealth and natural calamities and disasters such as drought, flood, earthquake, tsunami, hurricane and so on compel a person to leave their country of origin; the pull factors, like better chances of getting employment, better living standards, better education, better medical care, security, family links and so on, attract a person to settle in a country of immigration.

Economic factor, no doubt, is the most paramount and vital factor responsible for migration. The term ‘brain drain’, a highly debated issue in the current social, political and economic world, is the importation of brains, which is, scientists, doctors, engineers, teachers and so forth by the developed countries, by tempting them with handsome wages and better living and working conditions. Deutsche Bank Research refers to two important aspects:
The destination country hopes to achieve an increase in productivity as a result of the brain gain. This would at least maintain competitiveness and offer scope for wage increases. However, the country of origin would suffer a brain drain; especially the catch-up economies could lose the most creative and innovative individuals of their workforce. For the emerging markets, a wide-ranging liberalisation of the international labour market could therefore lead to the loss of valuable human resources. (International Migration 21)

A British scholar, E.G. Ravenstein tells about what the real motive behind migration of people is. He comments, “Bad or oppressive laws, heavy taxation, an unattractive climate, uncongenial social surroundings and even compulsion (slave trade, transportation) all have produced and are still producing currents of migration, but none of these currents can compare in volume with that which arises from the desire inherent in most men to “better” themselves in material aspects” (The Laws of Migration). Deutsche Bank Research suggests that most people seem to migrate for economic reasons. However, in a world increasingly ravaged by wars, famines, pestilence, and religious and ethnic conflicts and persecutions, noneconomic motivations are becoming ever more prominent. To somewhat oversimplify, people move when they perceive that they will be better off somewhere else. Moreover, they will migrate to where they believe they can achieve this end condition.

A multicultural country always attracts a larger number of people from different cultural, religious, ethnic, and social mores and traditions. In this sense, the United States, Britain, France, Sweden, Norway are multicultural countries where the cultures and
traditions of immigrants, who come under minority group, are given the equal value and treatment. A country, in which the patterns of cultural, economic, political behaviours and perspectives of the immigrants assimilate spontaneously with those of the natives into a new and somewhat different national culture, is often referred to as melting pot. The United States of America is the epitome of a melting pot society. On the contrary, the xenophobia, a serious problem of many countries such as South Africa, occurs when the cultures, religions, customs, traditions, languages and so forth of the immigrants seem alien, strange, hostile, unacceptable and threatening to the natives.

Although the main objective of multiculturalism is to assimilate different cultures into a different and new one, often a strong immigrant attachment to the ancestral homeland is observed, and it gives rise to diasporic nationalism. Although ‘diaspora’ is used negatively for the persons who have been displaced by force from their homeland, “[T]here is no linguistic law that says ‘diaspora’ must now and always refer to unwanted or forced movement whilst other words, such as ‘migration’, must be used for the welcome or intentional kind……It can be used with reference to the common human experience of dispersal, movement and migration—an experience which frequently has happy outcomes” (Hurvey and Thompson Jr. 1). Diasporas find that “some new possibilities germinated and bore fruit that would never have been imagined in the seedbed of the homeland” (Hurvey and Thompson Jr. 1).

As far as the causes of immigrants’ yearning and loyalty for homeland in a multicultural country are concerned, Prema Kurien talks primarily about immigrant religion and religious institutions: “[I]mmigrant religion has often played a very important indirect role in supporting homeland politics even when the nationalism that is
being supported is ostensibly secular” (363). Kurien also focuses on two other factors responsible for strengthening homeland affiliation of immigrants. Firstly, the personal, cultural and social dislocation caused by migration makes the immigrants nostalgic for home, which feeds into nationalist romanticism. Secondly, the relocation to a different context frees people from many social, cultural, and mental boundations they face at home and also forces the imagining and articulation of personal and group identity.

A hostile and unfriendly reception in the receiving country, a feeling of alienation and xenophobic attack, make the immigrants manifest a stronger attachment to the homeland.

Studies have shown that such a reception tends to trigger a process of ‘reactive ethnicization’ (Portes 1999: 465-6) where home country culture and traditions are reaffirmed and acquire a heightened significance as a self-defense mechanism against discrimination (Basch, Glick, Schiller, and Szanton Blanc 1994; Juergensmeyer 1979, 1988; Østergaard Nielsen 2001a:263). Thus part of the reason for the rise of nationalism among European immigrants in the United States in the early decades of the twentieth century was the xenophobia that the large scale immigration aroused among more established American groups (Handlin 1951:295-7; Hobsbawm 1987; Jacobson 1995). (Kurien 367)

The combination of the process of migration and the experience of migration “tends to lead to the development of an expatriate nationalism that attempts to rewrite the past, reconstruct the present, and reshape the future of the homeland in ways that are congruent with the religious identity of the group” (Kurien 367).
The diasporic or expatriate writers through their writings draw the sketches of their own experiences as well as the experiences of other immigrants in the alien country. Their experiences are based on mixed feelings—traumatic and happy, or in other words, economic security coincides/clashes with emotional and social insecurity in the adopted country.

Authors migrate to another country because of some socio-economic and socio-political factors; the socio-economic reasons being better job prospects, better quality of life, the lure of money, obtaining much coveted tag of foreign status are dreams which entice them to leave their home behind and choose a life of exile in the alien country. The socio-political implications include many unfavourable and adverse circumstances which push them to move to the strange country where they find less or completely no social, cultural and sexual taboos, and where they find tradition and culture less suffocating than that of their own motherland. Some want to move away from communal and ideological conflicts existing in the country of origin. To some writers such as Salman Rushdie, to stay away from home is a matter of comfort, as they escape from traditions and other dogmas of their motherland, and they find the new country favourable and conducive for creative writing. To them the act of migration is a kind of liberation.

Reality is often harsh and complex, and it is realized by the diasporic writers when they, being tempted by the apparently utopian dream, leave for the strange country where they feel a sense of dislocation, disintegration, disorientation, unbelongingness and dispossession. In a nutshell, a sense of alienation comes to prevail over their life. They are rendered psychologically, politically, existentially and metaphysically unstable in the newly adopted country. They, being uprooted from their native country, try to be
accepted by the natives of the host country, but they are utterly shocked by the incompatible culture, way of life and ill treatment and racial slurs at the hands of the inhabitants of the host country. They become the victims of racial discrimination, and gender issues (in the case of women authors of the Third World countries) in the host country. They belong to minority community which is culturally and ethnically marginalized. Most of them try to assimilate themselves with the cultures and way of life in the alien country, but very few can attain this goal, as most of them carry with themselves the cultural baggage of their motherland which exists only in their imagination. Their physical appearance, use of language, accent, way of life, ethnic prejudices betray them to be one of the migrants in the new country.

Sometimes some expatriate writers show the traditions and cultures of the country of their origin as detestable and suffocating. To escape the mental agony of their dislocation, disintegration, unbelongingness and dispossession in the adopted country, they project the cultures and traditions of their home country as hateful. It is a sort of self-defence mechanism. It provides them lots of solace and mental support, and helps them to realize that they settle in a country better than their country of origin in all aspects.

In the host country, the cultures, language and history of the homeland constitute the memory of the diasporic writers which make them nostalgic for their own country. Nostalgia compels them to look back to their sweet homeland, and they yearn to come back, but when they realize that to return to homeland is not only impossible, but also it is no more than a kind of fantasy in the mind, they become frustrated and depressed. These writers write about the confusion of their identity and traumatic experiences in the adopted country. Salman Rushdie describes the sad plight of the diasporic writers:
. . . . exiles or emigrants or expatriates are haunted by some sense of loss, some urge to reclaim, to look back, even at the risk of being mutated into pillars of salt. But if we do look back, we must also do so, in the profound knowledge—which gives rise to profound uncertainties—that our physical alienation from India almost inevitably means that we will not be capable of reclaiming precisely the thing that was lost; that we will, in short, create fictions, not actual cities or villages, but invisible ones, imaginary homelands, Indias of the mind. (The Indian Writer in England 83)

In the host country, most of the expatriate writers feel some sense of guilt, betrayal, doubt and inhabit a hallucinated nightmarish world. A few expatriate writers can cope with the problems of living in the incompatible cultures by mixing their native cultures with those of the alien country. This cross cultural communication helps them to feel a hybridized identity or double identity — native as well as alien. They acquire a power of double vision — simultaneously looking forward to the adopted country and yearning back to the homeland. Although with some hard efforts some of the immigrant writers assimilate in the new culture, they still cannot free themselves of the pangs of conscience, and it makes them realize that they are nothing but alien creatures in the alien country.

In the adopted country, they straddle the horns of dilemma, and they become nestless birds — helpless and hapless. They live on the border of native and alien country, and sit on the periphery of the past and the future. If they record the experiences of their past life in the homeland, it takes the shape of an autobiography, and if they, discarding the past experiences, are engaged in the new assimilated culture, they lose the sympathy
of the people of their homeland. So they find themselves on the borderland of the present, and do a tight rope walk keeping up a stance of double talk, coalescing the past with the present to create a future.

Some critics opine that the expatriate writers write in order to fulfill their desire in interpreting and defining the Oriental culture and way of life in the Occidental context. An expatriate writer becomes aware of his rootlessness in the alien country, and feels that he is an alien, an outsider, an exile. As a result, there is a confrontation with the other culture in West, which leads him to a discovery of his own country, of his ownself.

The relentless painful awareness of his rootlessness and the impossibility of returning to homeland make him psychologically tormented and depressed, and his experience is “the sheer tearing pain of not being able to belong to the very place where one wants to send down roots” (Shashi Brata).

However, Salman Rushdie has romanticized his experience in exile. For him an Indian writer has to face many daily problems of definition in the motherland:

What does it mean to be Indian outside India? How can culture be preserved without becoming ossified? How should we discuss the need for change within ourselves and community without seeming to play in the hands of radical enemies? What are the consequences of embracing those ideas and practices and turning away from the ones that came with us? These questions are all a single existential question. How are we to live in the world? (Imaginary Homelands 17)
In Rushdie’s opinion, the portrayal of India painted by a diasporic writer is not real one but distorted because of his writing from outside India, as he is obliged to deal in broken mirrors, some of those fragments have been irretrievably lost.

To Salman Rushdie, the act of migration of authors to Europe is a matter of literary liberation to find a suitable angle and milieu to the creation of literature: “But however ambiguous and shifting this ground may be it is not an infertile territory for a writer to occupy. If literature is in part the business of finding new angles at which to enter reality, then once again our distance, our long geographical perspective, may provide us with such angles” (Imaginary Homelands 18). He has no regret, no pain in his exilic life, and is very much contented in the new country as he himself in an interview with Peter Catapano said that New York is “the only city in the world ...where I’ve actually felt normal, or at least everybody else is abnormal in the same way” (A New York state of mind).

Salman Rushdie’s notion that a country other than the country of origin provides one to find new angles to the creation of good literature is not fully justified. He deliberately puts aside the factor of material interest for the migration of creative writers. Rushdie’s statement cannot explain the fact that the most of the great writers from developed counties such as America, Britain, France, Australia, Ireland and many more never felt or feel it necessary to migrate to the developing and under developed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America in order to find new angles for their creative writings. His statement serves as a self-defence mechanism. As far as the literary value of creative writings is concerned, a large number of regional writers residing within their national territory produce great literatures in their native languages. The regional writers such as
Mirza Ghalib, Faiz Ahmed Faiz and Allama Iqbal in Urdu, Prem Chand in Hindi, Rabindranath Tagore, Mahasweta Devi, Bankim Chatterjee, Sharat Chandra in Bengali and so on produce excellent literature. They are read with great admiration and attention. A specific language has nothing to do with literary value and quality of a piece of writing. Besides English, French, Greek and Latin languages, a number of regional writers in their own languages show their excellence. Further, a large number of Indian writers writing in English such as Rabindranath Tagore, Arundhati Roy, Kamala Das, Mulk Raj Anand, R.K.Narayan, Khuswant Singh and so on had shown their excellence in creative writings at national as well as international literary arena. They produce great literature, residing within the national territory.

Most of the South Asian women writers, being multicultural and multilingual, are more or less the victims of racial discrimination and gender bias (that is, weaker sex). Bharati Mukherjee, an Indian diaspora in North America, presents a vivid sense of dislocation, alienation, unbelongingness, disillusionment and nostalgia experienced by the immigrants in Canada and the United States. As Mukherjee herself was victimised by racism, sexism, and other form of social oppression while residing in Canada from 1966 to 1980, she invests her protagonists with same traumatic experiences she herself had gone through.

Although her experience in Canada was painful and discouraging, she was quite happy and contented in the United States, because she could assimilate with American way of life, and in this sense, she is, in her own words, an “immigrant” writer who has no regret, no lamentation with her new identity in the United States. She thinks “America is my home”, as she declared proudly at Sahitya Academy in New Delhi. She claims, “I
view myself as an American author in the tradition of other American authors whose ancestors arrived at Ellis Island” (The Immigrant Sensibility 35).

Mukherjee asserts her movement from expatriation to immigration. “The transformation as a writer and as resident of the new worlds occurred with the act of immigration to the USA. For me, it was a movement away from aloofness of expatriation to the exuberance of immigration” (Introduction: Darkness 3).

In a nutshell, Mukherjee’s movement was from alienation to assimilation. She spent a life of an expatriate in Canada with oppression and discrimination, and a life of an immigrant in the United States with freedom and openness.

Mukherjee expresses her disgust and dissatisfaction with her life in Canada, where she experienced a hostile racial discrimination and separation of minorities, through the heroines of her two novels, that is, The Tiger’s Daughter (1973) and Wife (1976). She has transferred her “own cultural dilemma to the two heroines,” (Pandit 36) Tara and Dimple respectively.

In The Tiger’s Daughter, the protagonist, Tara, is an embodiment of the author who, like Tara, experienced the same double cultural shock in Canada when she went there for higher studies, and in India as bride of a Canadian writer. Tara remains unable to adapt herself with the alien cultures in America, whereas Indian traditions and mores too seem estranged to her in the context of moral values. She is tormented by the shock of double cultural visions. Tara and her husband have not been warmly welcome to India as she marries a foreigner. When Tara comes to India for mental peace, her expectations are shattered.
For years she had dreamed of this return to India. She had believed that all hesitations, all shadowy fears of the life abroad would be erased quite magically if she could just return home to Calcutta. But so far the return had brought only wounds. First the corrosive hours on Marine Drive, then the deformed beggar in the railway station, and now the inexorable train ride steadily undid what store she had held in reverie. (The Tiger’s Daughter 25)

Bharati Mukherjee and other South Asian women writers such as Meena Alexander, Jhumpa Lahiri and Chitra Banerjee Divakaruni “react to whiteness as a hegemonic political system” (Maxey 529). Bharati Mukherjee expresses her disgust for racial discrimination through rhetorical question: “who wants pale, thin, pink flesh . . . limp, curly blond hair, when you can have lustrous browns, purple-blacks?” (The Middleman 6-7). In The Tiger’s Daughter, Tara’s European teachers are depicted as ‘ruddy’ with ‘fat foreheads’, and an American visitor Antonia Whitehead as ‘a big redhead girl’, ‘ugly’ with ‘an immense column of white flesh.’

In Wife (1976), the heroine Dimple feels isolated in New York when she realizes that to adjust to the American way of life is very difficult because of the huge cultural and social gulf between the world of New York and that of India. She tries to identify herself with the American life by entering into an illicit relationship with Milt, an American. Her living of a frustrated monotonous life and turning on the commercial shows on television, and magazines indicate her maladjustment with the American way of life. Her frustration and disappointment go to such an extent at the psychic level that
she kills her husband to feel very American somehow and justifies it by saying, “Women on television got away with murder” (Wife 213).

The utter rootlessness from the native country and inability to assimilate with American culture are Dimple’s basic problems. She is trapped between two cultures and aspires to a third imagined world. She, like Tara, is a nowhere woman, who is neither Indian nor American and is relentlessly searching for her own voice and identity in America. She feels a sense of insecurity in her apartment in New York. Like an existentialist, she constantly fears of violence, suicide and death, and even she thinks of being raped and killed in her flat.

Bharati Mukherjee expresses her own attitude about America through the protagonist Jasmine in her novel Jasmine (1990), that America is a land of promise, freedom and self-fulfillment. Her life of an immigrant in America is reflected through the life of Jasmine whom Mukherjee idealizes, and who takes her destiny in her own hands. Through Jasmine, “Mukherjee celebrates an openness to new experience, a celebration of Americanization and acclimatization of the third World in mainstream of America which is enriched by those she describes ‘new power’. Through her work she celebrates her sense of belonging to America by pushing her heroine to the edges of their Worlds and then liberating them for a new World order” (Kamal 195).

Anita Desai, like Bharati Mukherjee, is also a victim of cultural displacement, of racism and sexism because of her expatriate status. She captures the problems of socio-political, racial and communal conflicts and intolerance and the sense of xenophobia which she herself faces in England, her host country.
Desai more or less tells her own experiences in England in her novel *Bye-Bye Blackbird* (1971), dealing with the lives of the immigrants in London who stay on the periphery of two ill-assorted cultures. The conflicts arise from the protagonist’s realization of the difference between romanticism and realism, projecting the image of India and England respectively. The central figure of the novel, Adit Sen’s romantic and fantastic image of England is shattered when he experiences the reality in England. The same experience occurs to Adit’s British wife Sarah who marries him, being fascinated by Indian culture which she portrays in her imagination.

Adit’s young friend Dev, who comes to England to seek admission in the London School of Economics, becomes the victim of racism and has to put up with comments like “wogs’, “Macaulay’s bastards” and so on by the British. He feels insulted in every walk of life in England. Dev dreams of a utopia where India would rule England.

Although Adit feels that “I have got to go home and start living a real life,” (*Bye-Bye Blackbird* 204), he is quite appreciative of England and its people, because it is England that gives him economic security when he is refused a job in India, even having a foreign degree from England.

It is interesting that Dev gradually develops a sense of fascination towards England, and here lies the conflict. Now he stands at cross roads, one road leading to the homeland and the other to the strange land, that is, England. He is in a dilemma where to go. At the same time the perception of Adit also changes. Now he is nostalgic for his home, and he feels disgusted and disillusioned with his mode of existence and finally resolves to return home.
The moment when Sarah gets married to Adit, she loses her identity in her own society. She is humiliated by her colleagues, her pupils, and others. It is a kind of irony that the British colonial power was demolished, but their colonial mindset does not fade away. Sarah’s interracial marriage with an Indian is not acceptable to the British colonizers who once ruled India.

No country accepts an immigrant as its own, especially at the psychological level, though some exceptions are there. Desai’s novel *Baumgartner’s Bombay* (1988) depicts this fact through the experience of the protagonist, Hugo Baumgartner, a German by birth, who, even after spending fifty years in India is not accepted by the Indian society as their own. He feels some sense of alienation and loss in India where he comes as an escapist from Nazi Germany to protect himself from the holocaust. His sense of alienation and isolation continues till his tragic murder by another German. When he is denied to give him true love of humanity by the Indians, he ironically gets comfort and happiness from the company of the cats he looks after. “He had lived in this land for fifty years......Yet in the eyes of the people he was still strange and unfamiliar to them and all said firangi, foreigner” (*Baumgartner’s Bombay* 19).

Kamala Markandaya, an Indo-British writer, puts the experiences of immigrants in England in her novels *Possession* and *The Nowhere Man*. In *Possession*, the protagonist, Valmiki, is caught between spiritualism and materialism, when, after coming to England, he enters into a relationship with an English lady, Caroline. Valmiki, who spent his life in India in mythical and spiritual mode, is suffocated in the alien world of Europe which is full of hypocrisy and corruption based on selfish materialism. Towards the end of the novel, Valmiki leaves England for spiritual peace in India. He cannot lose
himself to the Western culture and enticement of wealth. He longs for joy and happiness which he can get only in his motherland.

The theme of dislocation, alienation and search for identity in an alien country is combined together in Kamala Markandaya’s novel *The Nowhere Man* (1972) in which she presents the problem of racism as an inalienable block for assimilation of two different cultures and psychology—Oriental and Occidental. The protagonist, Srinivas, is accepted neither by the English community nor by the Indian community. He remains a rootless and dispossessed man in both countries. Truly he is a ‘nowhere man’, an ‘unwanted man’. Shyam Asnani says: “as a nowhere man belonging to nowhere Srinivas has the painful feeling of being an immigrant with his roots attenuated in the alien country” (135). Srinivas’s neighbour Fred Fletches is the embodiment of true racist who thinks that the black people are the main culprits responsible for economic blockade. Srinivas becomes his main target. Srinivas lives thirty years in England, and still he remains a nowhere man. His isolation is the result of racial hatred. Although at the beginning Srinivas feels from his heart and soul to be an English man and England as “my country now” (*The Nowhere Man* 61), he is later tormented with the realization that he is an unwanted man in England, because he is not white in skin. After the death of his wife and son “He has become a wandering niggard, a nowhere Man” (174). He muses over his situation as “an alien whose manners, accents, voice, syntax, built way of life—all of him shrieked alien” (241). Abdul, Srinivas’s friend, is very critical and contemptuous of British who call him “black ape” (78).

Most of the South Asian writers in Europe and America are treated as ugly ducklings. “Indeed, South Asian Americans are still subjected to white racism and
incomprehension, particularly following the events of September 11th, 2001” (Maxey 540).

Meena Alexander, an Indian diaspora in the United States, tells her own story of struggle for identity in the United States in her autobiography, *Fault Lines: A Memoir* (1993). Continuously she had to face some embarrassing questions about her origin, colour of skin and profession. She writes: “In America you have to explain yourself constantly. It’s the confessional thing. Who are you? Where are you from? What do you do? I try to reply” (*Fault Lines: A Memoir* 193). Her past is vague and present is torn apart, and she becomes “the fault line, the crack that marked the dislocation” (15). She is excessively harsh to racial discrimination, because the colonialists try to make up facts about races. In *Fault Lines: A Memoir*, she wants to tear a pale, white skin that ‘cover[s] over my atmosphere, my very self’ (118).

M.G. Vassanji and V.S. Naipaul talk about Indian immigrants in East Africa who felt pangs of homelessness and yearned for returning to their imaginary homeland or India of their minds, when some unfavourable political policies were imposed upon them. For the protagonist, Salim, in M.G.Vassanji’s *Gunny Sack*, the past is the base to understand the present. So he thinks about his past life, his ancestral life and about his imaginary homeland or about India of his mind. During the 1970s, because of the political emergency, the Indians were forced to leave East Africa. Some left East Africa to settle in their countries of origin and some stayed there, but with mental injury and agony. “The physical homelessness that resulted from their policies was followed by a mental or imagined homelessness as Indians realized they were caught between two worlds” (Patel 66). To Salim, home is a distant dream. “But home was hardly a place I
could return to. Home was something in my head. It was something I had lost” (Gunny Sack 159). Salim’s friend Indar experiences the conflict of divided loyalties when he applies for the post of diplomatic service, as he mentions in his application that he is from Africa. “He, like Salim, Kala and other Indians who were born and grew up in East Africa, only possesses a home in his imagination” (Patel 67).

Some diasporic writers are so fed up with the culture and way of life in the host country that they try to keep their children away from the Western influences. The teenaged protagonist, Maya, in Vijayaraghavan’s Motherland, who is sent by her parents on a trip to Tamil Nadu from the United States in order to fritter her away from some of the undesirable influences of the West, finds the new milieu confusing, suffocating and disturbing. Maya is psychologically tormented, falling in-between two different and opposite cultures ─Eastern and Western, as she feels herself an American amongst her Indian relatives in Tamil Nadu, and an Indian amongst her white American friends.

The South Asian diasporic writers are over conscious of their suppression, oppression, subjugation, and biases against them on the basis of religion, race, culture, ethnicity and origin. They are the representatives of all the immigrants who also experience the same trauma and hostility in the alien country.

Migration is not only a physical movement of individual or group of individuals from point A to B. It involves basic and extensive alteration of perception, ideology, way of life and psychological and emotional state. The impact that migration has had over the development of cultures and civilization owes itself to this intellectual aspect of migration. Shift or movement of individuals from one geographical location to another by itself would not have influenced the growth and development of human society in any
significant way. Hence, as social phenomena, shift in perception and ideology is more important than physical movement. The phenomenon of intellectual migration assumes more importance in the case of creative writers, because their sensitivity makes them a scientific force where the intellectual and emotional undercurrents operate in a society or circumstance.

In the world of literature, there are many writers who change their themes, ideology, perceptions and forms in their writings. The list includes a number of well-known writers, namely, T.S. Eliot, G.M. Hopkins, George Orwell, Arthur Koestler, W.H. Auden, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Arundhati Roy and so on. Their migration happened at the intellectual level. In this thesis, Dostoevsky and Auden’s intellectual migration – the compulsion that forced them to shift their ideas in writings, their experiences of the migration shall be discussed in brief, and those of Arundhati Roy shall be studied in detail by explaining and analyzing her writings from her early literary outputs to the current works.

Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky’s (1821-1881) life was dominated by epileptic seizures, continuing financial disaster, addiction to gambling and evading creditors. Dostoevsky’s literary carrier can be divided into two stages— life before exile to Siberia and life after it. Dostoevsky in his early life was influenced by the socialist philosophy and he began his carrier as a socialist writer. During this period his writings were marked with socialist character. His pre-Siberian works dealt with despair, poverty and miseries of those living in big, crowded towns without proper jobs and shelters. He exposed the ugly and cruel world where there was hardly any hope for common people to live a normal life. In 1846, he published his first two books, *Poor Folk* and *The Double*. In
Poor Folk he dealt with some of the social issues of the day. During that time he had joined the group of young intellectuals called “social realists” headed by Petrashevsky who would meet and discuss current political issues, especially the idea of liberation of serfs, as well as communist pamphlets smuggled from England and Germany. That was a time of new social awareness and social unrest; a social movement was underway for rights and liberties of the masses. At a time when Dostoevsky found the Petrashevsky circle non-political he began to frequent a much more revolutionary group, known as Speshnev’s Secret Revolutionary Society.

In 1849, the members of “Petrashevsky Circle”, including Dostoevsky, were arrested, and after eight months of imprisonment, he and others were sentenced to death. At the last moment the death penalty was substituted by four years of imprisonment in Omsk maximum security prison in Siberia, and four years of forced military service in the Siberia army.

His arrest and imprisonment at the age of twenty-seven, shortly after the beginning of his literary career, was the turning point in his life. The prison life and solitary confinement in exile changed his perception and beliefs towards life that found expression in his later writings. He converted himself from a socialist to an orthodox Christian. Now he dealt with the themes of love, hope, happiness, which were possible only if men learnt to love God. He spoke about the resurrection of soul, probably from personal experience.

Here arises a basic question. What were the factors that compelled Dostoevsky to migrate from socialist to religious/spiritual mode of experience? His staged execution and the last moment pardon had the lasting impact on him and that traumatic experience
seemed a reaffirmation and strengthening of his religious beliefs. The close escape from death gave him a new appreciation of life. Another factor cannot be put aside. In prison, he had to spend his life in solitary confinement without any form of digression. The conditions in the prison were horrible. The description of his life in prison can be found in *The House of the Dead* which he wrote upon his release. However, the only one single volume that he was allowed to have was the Holy Bible which he read minutely and eagerly. The Bible in his struggling life reasserted his belief in God and in Jesus Christ. In this phase he learnt that man had the power to turn each moment into an eternity of happiness. Now he was more positive in his vision of life.

The essential theme of his later writings was struggle between Good and Evil. He inculcated in his writings the process of movement from sin and suffering to redemption. Through his later writings he conveyed his message “Accept suffering and be redeemed by it” to the readers. Dostoevsky’s remarkable literary outputs in the second phase of his life are *Crime and Punishment* (1866), *The Idiot* (1867-69), *The Possessed* (1871-72), *The Brothers Karamazov* (1879-80) and a number of short stories.

W.H. Auden (1907-73) also did not stick to a particular view, outlook and ideology. His themes underwent a sea-change from Post-Freudian psychology, Marxism and liberal democratic socialism in the early phase of his poetic career to religious-spiritual perception of external reality.

Before he immigrated to the USA in 1939, much of his writings expressed left-wing views. He started his career as a political poet who wrote about revolutionary change in terms of a “change of heart” which is in Auden’s view a transformation of a society from a closed-off psychology of fear to an open psychology of love. He said that
his inclination to left-wing politics grew in Berlin where he went in 1928. His first
published book called Poems (1930) includes his first written dramatic work, Paid on
Both Sides and thirty short poems mostly dealing with the themes of personal, social and
seasonal renewal. The dominant theme in these poems is the effect of “family ghosts”
which Auden used for the powerful, unseen psychological effects of preceding
generations on an individual. In 1932, he published The Orators: An English Study, a
book in verse and prose, with the theme of hero-worship in personal and political life. In
1933, he wrote a political extravaganza called The Dance of Death (a verse drama). In
collaboration with Christopher Isherwood, he wrote three plays: The Dog Beneath the
Skin (1935), dealing with the general idea of social transformation, and The Ascent of F6
(1937), which is an anti-imperialist satire. In the Ascent of F6, he experimented with his
role as a political poet. On the Frontier is the last play of Auden written in collaboration
with Isherwood which is an anti-war satire. Look Stranger! (1936, British edition) or On
This Island (1937, American edition) is a collection of political odes, love poems, comic
songs, meditative lyrics, and a variety of intellectually intense but emotionally accessible
verse. This is the book in which his political themes find culmination.

Auden’s disillusionment with the politics of struggle grew during his stay in Spain
for seven weeks in 1937. He found political realities to be more ambiguous and troubling
than he had imagined. In January 1939 he immigrated to America where he focused on
religious themes in his writings. His beliefs that the post-Freudian psychology, Marxism,
and liberal-socialist-democracy were based on the natural goodness of man had been
shattered after an incident in the Yorkville cinema in November 1939. His experience
there “radically shook this belief. He now became convinced that human nature was not
and never could be good. The behaviour of those members of the audience who shouted ‘Kill them!’ was indeed, as he said, ‘a denial of every humanistic value’” (Carpenter 283). He realized that liberalism had a fatal flaw; and he renewed his ‘faith in the absolute’. He started to read some books of theology. In 1940s he turned into a religious thinker under the influence of Charles Williams (especially through his book, *The Descent of the Dove*, a historical account of Christendom from its beginning to the present age), Søren Kierkegaard, a Danish Christian Philosopher, and Reinhold Neibuhr, the foremost American protestant theologian. He depicted his conversion to Anglicanism in *The Sea and the Mirror* (1944) and *For the Time Being* (1944). He first joined the Episcopalian Church in the early 1940s; then developed a more Roman Catholic-oriented interest in the later 1940s and 1950s, and finally he adopted the theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, which focused on the significance of human suffering.

After his conversion to Anglican belief, he began writing abstract verse on religious themes and then gradually he started writing more condensed, intense and concrete poems with similar themes. His mature works during this period are *The Age of Anxiety* (1946), *Nones* (1951) and so on. The poems ‘In Praise of Limestone’ and ‘Memorial for the City’ deal with the theme of “sacred importance” of human body.

Auden’s conversion was not abrupt. Auden’s paternal and maternal grandfathers were both clergy-men of English Church; his mother was a pious lady who devoted her life to religious practices. So Auden learnt and practised Christianity during his childhood. His interest in Freudian psychology and Marxism grew from his voracious study of different books available in his father’s library. So his interest in Christianity and his becoming religious thinker was a return, not a diversion. Humphrey Carpenter
remarks: “Auden’s conversion had apparently been an exclusively intellectual process rather than a spiritual experience; and this remained characteristic of his religion in the years that followed it” (Carpenter 298).

The basic difference between expatriate or diasporic writers and Arundhati Roy is that expatriate or diasporic writers immigrate to another country where they settle and produce literature, but Roy never thinks it necessary to change country to find suitable and conducive environment for writing. Unlike diasporic writers, her mind searches for mental space. She migrates from creative to non-creative, from non-creative to creative, and then again to non-creative writings. So migration of diasporic writers is physical, but Roy’s migration is intellectual.

Dostoevsky and Auden’s migration is also intellectual, but their intellectual migration is quite different from that of Roy. These two writers have particular reasons for their migration from one ideology to another. Some personal experiences stirred their life and compelled them to shift their perception about life and society. Imprisonment in Siberia was the turning point in Dostoevsky’s life in his perceptual shift from socialist practice to religious belief. A very painful incident in Yorkville cinema was the genesis of Auden’s disillusionment with socialism. The realization of futility of socialism turned him to religious ideology. But in the case of Roy, there is no such apparent reason in her intellectual migration. Her first, until date her only, novel got her not only a Booker Prize, but also a fertile market and critical interest. Roy, without trying to cash in on the tremendous success of The God of Small Things, shifted her focus to social, political and economic issues. She keeps writing, but stubbornly refuses to undertake another work of fiction. From a creative writer she metamorphosed into a thinker and activist. The lure of
money by the big publishers has never been able to turn her to write another piece of fiction. The proposed study shall strive to unravel the compulsion and the reasons for this revolutionary shift in the focus of Arundhati Roy.
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