Chapter – 1

Introduction

The most famous novelist of Indian descent 'Sir Vidiadhar Surajprasad Naipaul' is known for his novels set in many developing countries. His well-known novels *A House for Mr. Biswas* (1961), *A Bend in the River* (1979) and *A way in the World* (1944) are famous for their pessimistic nature. He came in this world on 17 August 1932 in chaguanas, Trinidad, to parents of Indian decent. He is the son of Seepersad Naipaul, elder brother of Shiva Naipaul, uncle of Neil Bissoon dath and cousin of Vahni Capildeo. Nadira Naipaul, a former Pakistani journalist is his current wife. Naipaul was married to Englishwoman Patricia Hale for 41 years, until her death from cancer in 1996. According to an authorized biography by Patrick French, the two shared a close relationship when it come to Naipaul’s works-pat was short of unofficial editor for Naipaul- but the marriage was not a happy one in other respects. Prior to Hale’s death, Naipaul proposed to Nadira, a divorced Pakistani journalist, born Nadira Khannum Alivi. They were married two months after Hale’s death, at which point Naipaul also abruptly ended is affair with Gooding. Nadira Naipaul had worked as a journalist for the Pakistani newspaper, the Natiou, for ten years before meeting Naipaul. She was divorced twice before her marriage to Naipaul and has two children from a previous marriage, Maliha Naipaul and Nadir. She is the sister of Maj Gen (Retd) Amir Faisal Alvi, a former chief of the special service Group- Pakistan Army, who was later assassinated during the war in North-West Pakistan.

In 2001, Naipaul was awarded the Nobel Prize in literature. In awarding Naipaul the Nobel Prize in literature, the Swedish Academy praised his work “for having united perceptive narrative and in corruptible scrutiny in works that
compel us to see the presence of suppressed histories”. The Committee added, “Naipaul is a modern philosopher carrying on the tradition that started originally with Letters personas and candied. In a vigilant style, which has been deservedly admired, he transforms rage into precision and allows events to speak with their own inherent irony. The committee also noted Naipaul’s affinity with the novelist Joseph Conrad:–

Naipaul is Conrad’s heir as the annalist of the destinies of empires in the moral sense: What they do to human beings.

This authority as a narrator is grounded in the memory of

What others have forgotten the history of the vanquished?

He has been awarded numerous other literary Prizes, including the John Llewellyn Rhys Prize (1958), The Somerset Maugham Award (1960), the How thorn den Prize (1964), the WH Smith Literary Award (1968), the Booker Prize (1971), the Jerusalem Prize (1983) and the David Cohen Prize for a lifetime’s achievement in British Literature (1993). J.M. Coetzee, writing in the New York Review of books in 2001, described Naipaul as of “a master modern English Prose”. In 2008, The Times, ranked Naipaul seventh on their list of “the so greatest British writers since 1945.

His Romantic Vision of a Writer At the Outset

Naipaul recalls that from the very beginning he was determined not to accept regular employment but to take up writing as a career. For ten weeks in 1957 he did indeed take up a job with Concrete Company in London but even this job involved the writing of articles, though the articles pertained to building. This job did not really suit him, and he gave it up suddenly one day at lunch time. He tells that he began to write for no other reason than because he thought that it would be nice to be a writer. He started with a very romantic vision of the writer as a free, gifted, talented, creative person, with writing as a kind of social and cultural attribute. He visualized writing as a
great cherishing of the self—by others by himself. But soon he discovered that writing was a sign of disease, a sickness. He called it a form of anguish; he called it despair.

Settled Permanently in London

He was now living in London and in this big city he found himself confined to a smaller world than he had ever known. His life was now confined to his flat, in fact, to his desk. He has since lived in England on a permanent basis, though he has been travelling a good deal to other countries. In 1955 he had married an English woman. He looks upon himself as a man without roots: he never felt at home in Trinidad, the land of his birth; and he has been repelled by India, the land of his origin. He is also on record as having said that he never lived in any house for more than three and a half years. But he made this statement long ago, in 1962.

His rejection of the Three Alternatives Before Him

In 1958 Naipaul saw that he was faced with three alternatives but he had to reject all of the three. The first was that he should write about sex. But he found that he could not right about this subject because he did not have the necessary skill or the required experience if his writing about it was to have some variety. And then he also felt that writing about sex would embarrass him, that his friends would laugh at him, and that his mother would feel shocked. The second alternative for him was to introduce an English or American character in a novel being written by him, and to weave the story around that character. This was the device being used by British film makers who would put American characters in the most unusual setting. Naipaul felt that doing so was good business but bad art. The third alternative was to write about race and racial discrimination. But such writing, he though, gave only a certain sadistic pleasure to the white readers who derived a vicarious sense of power from reading it. He found that in the first place he had no inclination to write that kind of book and secondly that the rage issue was too complicated to be dealt with in a novel. Then it was suggested to him by some well-wishers that he should stop being a regional writer and
should write about England. He did feel like writing about England, but he found that there were insuperable difficulties in the way.

The literary assessment of his work—satiric, ironic, farce—are backed by established literary conventions applied per se to assert the richness or otherwise of his novels. This reserved response to Naipaul contrasted with the critical success of other West Indian writers rests, ironically, on the fact that he ‘relates his literature to life’; he never lets either get out of hand in his novels. His fiction and nonfiction shies away from the symbolic significance of a poem.

The critics dismiss Naipaul in generalities. They see him as a superb writer of comedy of manners, a man who writes about people as if they were “patients on the psychiatrist’s couch”¹. He can neither be described wholly as a historian, a travel writer, a journalist, a novelist or a biographer. They seek to define him negatively and can be accused of applying the same techniques of questing into the unknown of which they accuse him. And so the critics continue to attack and praise him for the same reasons: that his work, encompassing a single unhappy vision of the contemporary world, ‘let’s man down’.

They fail to realize that the failures and disillusionments of his protagonists are presented as a necessary existential despair (for it is the only point at which man today touches his reality) which may become a turning point, a cause for change, in a world that lives life as a ‘comedy of manners.’ The latter appraisal comes out of a first and cursory reading of his novels.

The only meaningful assessment of his art and vision, being without categories, can be made by divesting ourselves of literary terms and concepts and personal bias to ‘sink’ into the reality of the created world successively with the protagonist and the narrator and realize the differences between the two and their distance from Naipaul.
William Walsh in his book *V.S. Naipaul says*:-

“Coleridge’s words about Wordsworth are peculiarly appropriate to the nature of naipaul’s sensibility. He has the telescopic sight of the unattached observer, who is not not only a creative observer, even an observer of genius, but one in whom the observation of others leads to analysis of self”.

He is viewed as a satirist who “makes his characters appear unnecessarily ridiculous,” who has little sympathy with human failings, particularly those of the third world. His literary style is examined segment ally: the value of the absence or presence of a narrator in his individual works and the uses of irony and satire as distancing devices as well as expression of personal distaste. Besides, there is a tendency to interpret and justify such criticism in terms of Naipaul’s own pronouncements over a number of years without treating them as part of a body of literary thought and criticism.

**Introduction of Themes Prevalent in the Novels of V.S. Naipaul:-**

His first published work ‘*The Mystic Masseur*’ is the testimony of Naipaul’s concern for the displaced people with a drifted consciousness. It is the heart-rending story of a man’s deliberate negation of his origins in his material pursuits.

*The Mystic Masseur* narrates the fortunes and eventual “success” of Ganesh Ramsumair, a West Indian of Hindu origin. Beginning as a poor and gullible orphan, Ganesh rises to be a celebrity of Trinidad and is decorated with an M.B.E. He achieves this by consolidating and putting to use, the mixture of Western and Eastern (Indian) values and skills which he possesses, though his success as a colonial is achieved only by his betrayal of his native interests. Worldly, despite his ambitions as a writer and voracious reader, Ganesh is shown up as a fraud and a stooge of colonialism. Yet, in as much as he is self-made and has struggled to build his life, he is not judged totally
adversely—Ganesh, the con-man is at the opposite pole from Biswas who, lacking the viciousness which makes Ganesh trim to scale, his father-in-law and other opponents, retains his integrity even in failure.

The Hindu society whose structure Naipaul condemns in Biswas is here shown up more as victim than as tyrant. The society is easy material to be exploited by the British on the one hand, and religious gurus (such as Ganesh becomes). The abscess which forms has subsequently to be treated by a regular doctor and the narrator’s tone tells us that Ganesh is a quack. Yet Ganesh is important enough to be an exceptional type in his society: “...the history of Ganesh is in a way, the history of our times... Ganesh Ramsumair, masseur, mystic, and since 1953, M.B.E.” (MMR. P. 18).

Naipaul’s expatriate sensibility born of an opposition between Hindu and Western worlds traces their spilt-influences in Ganesh. Ganesh begins as a typical Naipaul protagonist in his rebellions against Hindu culture. The Indian thread ceremony is humiliating to him for it publicly exposes the contrast between the two words.

The novel abounds in autobiographical notes. Ganesh’s studies at Queen’s Royal College, the brief teaching post which he leaves when his teaching is mocked at, the ambition to write a book, the Indian friends and weddings attended, the experience of authoritarian Hindu family organization, the migratory impulse to the West and Ganesh’s reliance on Hindu metaphysic, all connect with Naipaul’s own life and the fictional characters of his other novels, like Biswas, Anand, Ralph and Indar.

The West comes to Ganesh in the shape of the “mad” Englishman Mr. Stewart, “the man who was to have a decisive influence on his life” for he asks Ganesh to write down his thoughts. Ganesh’s starting a “cultural Institute” whose aim “will be the furthering of Hindu Culture and Science of Though in Trinidad”, and his turning “seriously, dedicatedly to books” after ordering three hundred books from the Everyman catalogue, indicate the blend of elements of the East and West which attracts him.

Ganesh’s love of books makes him an outsider to his community. Wanting to write and be published by an American publisher without knowing how to set about it,
he manages to have printed a thousand copies of his thirty pages “A Hundred and one Questions and Answers on the Hindu Religions”, but not the best saleman can make the book sell. Out of this gloom of failure, he determines to set up as “Ganesh: Mystic”, and his fame spreads after curing a terrified boy of an imaginary “black cloud”. Then, growing wealthy, he is shown as a mimicking colonial bringing “improvements” to his new house which are a refrigerator, lavatory and musical toilet-paper rack. The inner world continues unchanged- “What God Told Me” and “Profitable Evacuation” are his two classics (the chord of Gandhianism is unfailingly struck by Naipaul). Ganesh brings out a paper Dharma to counteract his arch-critic Narayan’s *The Hindu*. He founds the Hindu League and topples Narayan to become President of the Hindu Association. Winning the Island elections, he triumphs where his friend Indarsingh, Bachelor of Arts from Oxford, now seeking a stake in his native land, actually loses his deposit. Ganesh’s “defence of British colonial rule is memorable” and he is rewarded with the M.B.E. The Epilogue, returns to the narrator, now at an English university, chronicling the final transformation/mimicry of Ganesh who surrenders his own and converts to G. Ramsay Muir.

Naipaul’s interest in the impact of colonialism on racial identity is evident in the portrait of Ganesh. The novel also speaks of his interest in Indian immigrant society, its attitudes, Hindu religion, India, and the life left behind in India. Hindu India is captured in the background to Ganesh’s life in “the only mango tree in the village”, a picture of Vishnu “beautiful four-armed god standing in an open lotus”, the mumbling of Hindu couplets, “a framed picture, issued by the The Gita Press of Gorakhpur…”, bathing and pooja rituals and a parcel of ancient Hindu manuscripts bound “in red cloth spattered with sandalwood paste”. Naipaul’s sensibility reverences these hallmarks of an old Hindu India for its completeness. In as much as Ganesh adapts to the practices of this tradition-bound community, his alienation is false and superficial, and never a matter which engages his being. He succeeds as Hindu, as Trinidadian and as the aspiring colonial politician, playing off whichever side of his personality fetches him money and
status. The narrator’s own experiences lead him to understand Ganesh, but Ganesh is after all the supreme insider from whom Naipaul separates himself.

Although the book is genial enough, a certain lack of sympathy on the part of the author is clearly perceptible. The hero approaches his lowest point of achievement in such scenes as the dinner at Government House where the author describes an imaginary confrontation between the most unsophisticated members of Creole and Indian society on one side and the highly civilized and sophisticated wife of the Governor on the other. All that Naipaul finds ridiculous in Creole society is brought out in this scene: the bad grammar, the lack of taste or social grace, and the struggle to behave like the white people. A black man is shown as being dressed in a blue suit with yellow gloves and a monocle which eventually falls into the soup. Several of the guests at the dinner have difficulty in using their knives and forks. Of course, we can accept such a scene as farcical and as intended to show the Creoles and the Indians following the painful and absurd road to civilization and sophistication exemplified by the Whites. But we also get the impression that Naipaul himself regards these people with more contempt than compassion and he is therefore wanting in sympathy. These are the same people whom Naipaul afterwards described in The Middle Passage as being “like monkeys pleading for evolution.” The incongruity of his position here is that, while he laughs and mocks at the Creoles who crudely imitate and ape standards of pseudo-whiteness, he can only do so by assuming these very standards himself.

Naipaul’s early fiction have been comedies born of irony, but A House for Mr. Biswas extends in full measure that sympathy in the rendering of the central character which contributes to the richness and universality of the novel. Like any great work of literature, the novel has been interpreted from several angles. For Gordon Rohlehr the novel “depicts a classic struggle for personality against a society that denies it”. While the novel stands up to all the above readings, it can be most truly understood as an exploration of the roots and antecedents of Naipaul’s own sensibility. All Biswas’ cultural dilemmas, colonial embarrassments, creative desires, interrogations and
rebellions, and above all, literary aspirations are interwoven into the texture of Naipaul’s own quality of response.

The miserable life of a laborer has been described by Naipaul in his masterpiece *A House for Mr. Biswas*. It describes the story of the search of identity of an Indian Brahmin residing in Trinidad. It is a beautiful and excellently written tragic-comedy. In it the protagonist gives an expression of root lessens, alienation and having loss of identity to a great extent. This novel primarily deals with two themes, one being the protagonist’s struggle to establish himself in a hostile environment through the ownership of a house and other being the decline Hindu culture under the impact of westernization. The novel has won praise for its Universality without raising a storm of controversy about its colonial or anti-colonial stand, as Naipaul’s other works have done. It deserves close scrutiny for, it chronicles near-autobiographically, the origins and development of Naipaul’s Hindu sensibility, and, through a rendering of the ‘adventures’ of his father-as Biswas—demonstrates the inadequacy of the halfway-house which Biswas gains. Both chronologically and thematically, the novel occupies that middle ground in the treatment of exile-the works prior to it dealing with the causes for such exile in the protagonist society, and the works following it pursuing and relentlessly probing the effects, in wider and wider ripples until it encompasses almost every nationality in the world.\(^3\)

*‘The Suffrage of Elvira’* is a dramatic account of the political awakening of the village of Elvira—remote, unconnected and dinghy. Its knowledge of the outside world is limited to the coming and going of the two American girls, Jehovah’s Witness, or the frankly money-making activities of Mr. Surajpal Harbans, P.W.D. contractor as well as proprietor of the transport company which transports the road-building materials. It is during the election campaign that it realizes the value of a printing press as a medium of communication and coercion. The political lossed and gains of the members of this community can be literally assessed in unambiguous material terms.

In *Mr. Stone and the Knights Companion* the author expresses the humanization of Mr. Stone within a society reality by subjectively rounding out an essentially that and
static character. Mr. Stone arrives at a sense of wholeness through a probing questioning and observing attitude, which releases him from the congealed state into which ‘habit’ had forced him.

In ‘Guerrillas’ and ‘A Bend in the River’ Naipaul, through the omniscient, impersonal narrator, creates the personal, individualistic, self-aware, self-centered world of subjective reality. The characters are aware of an external world, from which they are detached and free floating from a community of the fear and the lost. They communicate with others only in so far as they understand the ‘other’ in terms of themselves, forming a single gigantic world personality. The distinction between the part played by the central character and other characters in the novel serves the artistic purpose of verisimilitude and authenticity. Thematically he merges into the quality of life of the island and the town in the two novels respectively.

The Mystic Masseur (1957), The Suffrage of Elvira (1958) and Miguel Street (1959), Naipaul regarded as “an apprenticeship” to the writing craft, saying, “… and then I was ready to write Mr. Biswas.” The viewpoint of the boy-narrator in two of them (MMK and MS) show the process of Naipaul’s own separation from the petty values of the society he is growing up in. Walsh rightly sees the narrator’s and writer’s thrust as being “a protest of the wholeness of his self against the neurotic muddle of his surroundings”. The “muddle”, is a colonial one for a West Indian originating from India like Naipaul, and also seen as such by his individual temperament (the artist’s standards and demands). Part of the Hindu world of the Trinidad being satirized in these novels, one sees Naipaul in the narrator, who reaches out to the exciting adventures of the rare individuals from this society who make the movement out.

A flag on Island is similarly a collection of imaginative writing between the years 1950 and 1965. The short piece explore the imaginative, thematic and stylistic resources available to Naipaul, the locales varying from Trinidad to London to an unnamed island, presumably in the Caribbean, realizing its value only as a base for American troops during World War II. No unity is sought but the title of the novella conveys the
metaphorical suggestion that the pieces converge on the desire for identity with dignity. Many of the incidents and characters presented in isolation appear as part of a design in his later fiction.

‘Miguel Street’, in the light of his later novels, can be regarded as the brickworks of his personal literary tradition. The ‘grey dailyness of living’ as well as the frightfully superficial release such people is evoked through the metaphorical use of landscape and language as well as the experimental manipulation with points of view and the degree of the narrator’s presence in the narrative. We see in ‘Miguel Street’, in initial from his lasting concern with the sources of wholeness (unity in difference) in art. The street acquires a warm, sincere personality through the combined visions of the young fire-person narrator and his much older, philosopher friend, Hat. We acquire Hat’s world view through the narrator. Naipaul juxtaposes the inexplicable resilience of the human spirit with the meanness of life in the slim, making the narrator’s escape seem logical and reasonable.

*Miguel Street*, Naipaul’s first book—though published third—gives in the narrator a boy who while retaining his admiration for individual ‘characters’, with style and originality (though disorderly), is in the process of shedding such admiration and gaining a core of skepticism. Beginning as an innocent the boy reaches a point of strength. In the last story in the book “How I Left Miguel Street”, he is at the airport, ready to board the plane which will take him away to the life of desired order and possibility in London. The narrator rejects the drunks, wife-beaters and wastrels of his West Indian society. The men of the street lie exposed, and with their romance dead, the narrator, uneasy and chafing under his own sentiment and the desire to be quickly gone, is bid farewell to by his mother. “What else anybody can do here except drink”, he had replied to his mother’s charge that he was getting “too wild” and must therefore leave Trinidad. It is Ganesh, the masseur, who uses his influence to fix a scholarship for the narrator’s studies but (with recognizable Naipaulian honesty) the boy had told Ganesh: “I don’t want to study anything really. I just want to go away, that’s all”. (MS. P. 154). It is clear
that the Hindu narrator rejects the superstitions of Christian religion (the medallion for luck which he slips into his pocket) though he is more sensitive to the ill omens attached to Hindu superstitions. The brass jar of milk placed in the middle of the gateway, which he accidentally knocks over just before his departure, perplexes him and adds to the unease of departure. We see in him a desire to be recognized as an individual for that would be a sanction against the mediocrity he is already of being sucked into. Returning home after setting out to take the flight for it is delayed by six hours, he is surprised at his friend Hat’s “cool reception” and “disappointed”.

Though in some superficial details of his life, the first person narrator is distinct from Naipaul (“I had a narrator more in tune with the life of the street than I had been” as Naipaul says), in the quality of his ironic perspective which guides and strengthens his motivations, he overlaps. “The return to childhood” as theme in this work, is a crucial process in the definition of the expatriate sensibility. Detachment, a search for order, “the movement to the metropolis, Hindu life and values, and escape are themes already discernible in this first book where Naipaul discovered, luckily, “the trick of writing”.

In *The Suffrage of Elvira*, Naipaul presents his psychosocial understanding of the “crazily mixed up” societies of the West Indies which he is able to demonstrate in the event of Elvira’s second general election after independence, in 1950. His emphasis is on the rivalries which religions generate firstly, and then, on the unsavory (to Naipaul) materialism which supersedes even religious divisions, effecting new amalgamations. Naipaul withdraws from a society where democratic values not been even faintly recognized. Such a community is unfit to govern itself and, lacking mind, converts the electoral process into farceen-comedy and tragedy. It is from the squalor and disorder of a world where “everybody, Hindus Muslims and Christians owned a Bible [and] the Hindus and
Muslims looked on it, it anything, with greater awe”, that Naipaul had removed himself, in 1950. The only character in this book who escapes, is Lorkhoor, a Hindu, who eloping with Pundit Dhaniram’s “doolahin”, makes good as a writer for the Sentinel in Port of Spain.

In several ways, Naipaul is as enigmatic as Conrad. He eludes any specific labeling. While on the one hand, he is as serious as Conrad, on the other he is described as an excellent writer of the comedy of manners. He cannot be described absolutely as a social historian, a travel writer, a journalist, a biographer or a novelist. Many of the things that he gives expression to in writings are result of his early contact with English literature when he was a student at the University of Oxford.

Anglo-Indian author and one of the leading novelists of twentieth century Ahmed Salman Rushdie was born on June 19, 1947 in Bombay (now Mumbai), India, to a Middle class Muslim family. His father was a Cambridge educated businessman and his grandfather was an Urdu poet. At fourteen, he was sent to England for schooling, attending the Rugby School in Warwickshire. In 1964, his family, responding to the growing hostilities between Indian and Pakistan, joined many emigrating Muslim by moving to Karachi, Pakistan.

These religions and political conflicts deeply affected Rushdie, although he stayed in England to attend the King’s college in Cambridge, where he studied history. While in school, he also joined the Cambridge footlights theatre company. Following his graduation in 1968, he began working in Pakistani television. Later, he also acted with the oval House theatre group in Kennington, England, and until 1981, he wrote freelance copy for advertisers’ of ilvy and Mather and Charles Barker.
His style is often linked to magic realism, which mixes religion, fantasy and mythology into more grounded reality. He has been compared to authors such as Peter Carey, Emma Tennant and Angela Carter.

In 1975, Rushdie published his first novel *Grimus*, a science fiction story inspired by the twelfth century Sufi poem “The Conference of the Birds”, was largely ignored by both critics and the public. Rushdie’s literary fortunes changed in 1981, when the publication of his second novel, *Midnight’s children*, brought him international fame and acclaim. The book won many prestigious prizes and was considered as a literary masterpiece. The novel was received, both in India and abroad, with enthusiastic and almost unanimous acclaim.

In *Grimus*, a theory-ridden fantasy which Rushdie himself felt “in retrospect, didn’t deserve to be published”, ideas about the past, memory and exile cluster around the figure of Flapping Eagle, himself if an exile outcaste from his tribe of the Axoba. Flapping Eagle-named Joe-Sue at birth, an orphan “named ambiguously...because [his] sex was uncertain”, is ostracized by the tribe because he is white they are brown-skinned. He engages in an incestuous relationship with his sister Bird-Dog, to compensate for the lack of mother love and the tribe’s love. Already emotionally “an exile in an isolated community”, Flapping Eagle swallows the “drink for life” from a yellow bottle given by the pedlar Sispy, to become a nomad searching for his destined home.

In the interlude between leaving Axoba and coming to Calf Mountain (the nucleus for a confrontation between past and present, where Eagle tries to restore meaning and love, through a synthesis of his own being), Eagle becomes Livia Cramm’s “personal gigolo” for twenty-five years. After her suicide, he is free to set out again “for ports unknown” in her yacht, burdened with the gift of immortality which he has grown to hate.
Here, he comes face to face with the mysterious relationship of Doloreso’ Toole and Virgil Jones, which he must destroy if Virgil is to be his guide up the mountain to the town of K, where he hopes to be reunited with his sister, Flapping Eagle is a protagonist set in motion by a force of Fate/Destiny and leaves a trail of death in his wake. Rushdie develops the same theme in Saleem Sinai’s larger than life role, and Sufiya Zenobia’s frenzy of destruction in Shame. The concept of Avatar and ‘Pralay’ (cataclysric wave of destruction) are embedded in Rushdie’s fiction though they are viewed alternatively with faith, and ironical skepticism.

His third novel, ‘Shame’ (1983), was commonly regarded as a political allegory of Pakistani politics. It used a wealthy family as a metaphor for the country, and included characters based on former Prime Minister Zulifikar Ali Bhutto and General Muhammad Zia-ul-Har.

In the simplest terms, the novel is about the transformation of a country’s identity, the rise and fall of two men, the civilian leader Iskander Harrappa and the dictator-to-be-Raza Hyder, fictional parallels respectively of Bhutto and Zia, who try to control the process, and the tragic outcomes of their missions. Its raw material is the history of Pakistan. At first glance, the book’s oft-quoted description of Pakistan as “a failure of the dreaming mind.” seems mischievous and intended to provoke. But the failed dream here is an oppressive one: it is the dream of Urdu-Speaking migrants who, after partition in 1947, had to govern an essentially foreign nation, feeling compelled to impose a neat formula—‘the founding father, Mohammed Ali Jinnah’s one nation, one culture, one language’—on to a diverse, unwieldy polity. The dream disappoints because the country is to multi-ethnic and multilingual, too multidimensional for the imposition.

Muhammad Mashuq ibn Ali wrote that ‘The satanic Verses’ is a novel which
reflects identity, alienation, rootlessness, brutality, Compromise, and conformity. Timothy Brennan called the work “the most ambitious novel yet published to deal with the immigrant experience in Britain” that captures the immigrants’ dream-like disorientation and their process of “union-by-hybridization.” The book is seen as “fundamentally a study in alienation.”

Rushdie’s two major novels *Midnight’s Children* and *Shame*, explore self-consciously, the expatriate writer’s way of grasping and rendering the truth of historical reality, which dictators and arbitrary political regimes seek to muffle. Measuring his “Indian Childhood” against his “Pakistani adolescence”, Saleem Sinai, the magically gifted yet pathetically warped narrator of Midnight’s battles to reconstruct through memory, his own life, disproportionately important because it is analogous with the possibilities of freedom (in India), and those periods of history (especially in Pakistan).

It is understandable, therefore, that Saleem finds his greatest admiration pledged to those magicians of Delhi, masters of reality, who befriend him in his final phase of homelessness, before he is spotted by the Widow who has imposed the 1975 Emergency in India. Watching the magicians perform their conjuring tricks:

...Saleem Sinai learned that Picture, Singh and the magicians were people whose hold on reality was absolute; they gripped it so powerfully that they could bend it every which way in the service of their arts, but they never forget what it was. (MC.pp.475-476)
It is picture, Singh, leader of the magicians who triumphs in a show of magic at the Midnight Confidential Club and alone manages to escape from the Widow’s clutches and the hand of Death.

Recurring analogies, and the very title of the novel, point out that it is the world of magic which interests Rushdie, and serves to explain his theory about that type of truth which is achieved by setting the artistic perspective at “a slight angle to reality”. The magician juggles with reality and so does the expatriate. Yet both keep reality inviolate, unlike the dictator who destroys reality. Like the magician, Saleem Sinai presents a reality which is “so dense a commingling of the improbable and the mundane” that the novel veers between the poles of fantasy and close naturalism. Between the parameters of magic and history, Saleem recreates the lives and destinies and defeats of his family, their close acquaintances, and India, his “sub continental twin sister”, for whom he expresses “an agonizing feeling of sympathy.” (MC.P.461).

Saleem is one of the 1001 Midnight’s Children who are born on the stroke of India’s independence. He, like the others, is a child endowed with special magic, consisting of those gifts of mind and body which unleash a string of possibilities for the future of India. Hailed by newspaper headlines as “Midnight’s Child”, congratulated by the Prime Minister, Nehru, Saleem had started out by viewing himself as prophet, messiah and god-figure, to release India from the tyranny that awaits it in the shape of the Widow (Mrs. Gandhi). But “the optimism disease” rages only briefly, and Saleem realizes before his death that “…magic spells can occasionally succeed. But also fail”.

While Parvati-the –Witch (another Midnight’s Child) can transport him safely and secretly from Dacca to Delhi in her basket of invisibility, all other children of the magical hour betray their gifts, and let reality be sterilized and mutilated. With that magical hope crushed, Saleem knows that salvation must wait until “a thousand and one children have died”. He himself is destroyed; he sees the extinction of his son who is not
his son: Aadam Sinai, and he prophecies a long wait before the magic of freedom returns to the country.

He published a book of children’s in 1990, titled *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*. The book takes the form of a children’s story to convey the theme that stories are vital because they are a connection between the world of imagination to the world of reality through which one can exercise freedom and initiate change. Choosing this form allows Rushdie to utilize all the components of children’s literature to present and strengthen his theme. Rushdie also plays upon children’s unique ability to explore the real world through their imagination and view that imagined world as reality. By contrasting the real and imaginary worlds from a child’s perspective, Rushdie answer his frequently posed question “what’s the use of stories that aren’t even true? (200. Rushdie takes advantage of the writing forms associated with a children’s story and often considered simple to establish and explore the complexities of his theme.

One such form, repetition, Rushdie uses to draw the audience’s attention to important idea relating to his theme. In the novel, repetition serves the dual purpose of appealing to a child audience and alerting an audience of all ages to important ideas. Rushdie also uses repetition of incidents to show the contrasting natures of stories and lies. Rushdie portrays two different scenes of juggling that are reminiscent of each other but also very different. By repeating the act of juggling with the ambassador, Rushdie forces the reader to recall the juggling of Blabbermouth and recognize how different the two are. While examining repetitious descriptions of characters one can see an alliterative quality to Rushdie’s language. In addition of repetition, Rushdie entists the aid of word play, this is also common in children’s literature, to prove how wonderful language can be. The novel’s numerous alliterations such as “soft, silken suns” and “skinny, scrawny, measly, weaselly, snivelng” draw the readers’ attention to the
importance of what the words are describing and simply make the text enjoyable to read or hear (153)

Rushdie continues to show the important words through his careful attention to names. His choice to end the novel with an explanation of character names, origins and meanings show how essential to the story Rushdie considers names to be. He writes, “to give a thing a name .......... to rescue it from anonymity .......... that’s a way of bringing the said thing into being” (63). Though this line Rushdie convey to the reader how important names and words are. He also explores the full complexities of his theme through names. From the names and actions of the characters, Rushdie shows that neither absolute silence nor incessant talking is good.

At the conclusion of his novel Rushdie calls upon the most fundamental aspects of the children’s story, the need to believe and happy ending, to complete his theme by demonstrating the affect that the fantasy world has on the real world. Using the form of a children’s story to examine complicated themes, forces Rushdie to address both a child and adult audience. Though children might not understand some of the cultural references or political undertones, Rushdie’s work is fascinating due to its ability to convey essentially the same message to both children and adults. Through the manipulation of simple elements traditionally associated with children’s literature, both children and adults are shown that stories and language are both essential and wonderful aspects of life. Rushdie carefully calculated and beautiful use of words makes his novel successful as an enjoyable story, a portrayal as an enjoyable story, a portrayal of a complex argument, and a work of art.


‘*Fury*’ (2001), Rushdie’s eighth novel, reads like a book that was written fast, which turns out to be the case. Seeing that it was first published on April 1, 2001 in Holland, he must have written it in less than a year many British reviewers responded with negative notices. They claimed not only that it was too slapdash, but that it was all too obviously based on the circumstances of Rushdie’s life since he left London for New York in 1999. Its protagonist, Malik Solanka, is an Indian immigrant aged 55 (Rushdie was 54 in 2001) and had lived in England before moving to New York where both began an affair with an ex- Indian Younger woman (Neela/Padma Lakshmi, to whom fury is dedicated). Caroline Moore writes that fury, ‘is a very dubious combination of fiction and confession, in which apparent self-accusation slides queasily into vaunting” (13). This kind of elision allows her to accuse Rushdie of boasting about his sexual prowess when ‘The Professor, we learn, is a ‘first-class’ kisser (13).

In the novel ‘*fury*’ Rushdie employs the form of postmodernism to portray the author-figure caught in the maelstrom of the postmodern world. Unquestionable, a central theme of the novel is ‘the mechanization of the human’ (182), the idea that in postmodern America ‘the language of the heart was being lost’ (183-4).

The novel ‘*Shalimar the clown*’ which came in 2005, emphatically, states that we no longer, nor have ever lived in three worlds. ‘Everywhere was now a part of everywhere else. Russia, America, London, Kashmir. Our lives, our stories, flowed into one another’s, were no longer our own, individual discrete’ (Shalimar 47). The foundational understanding seems to be that our present, with our past, forms one entangled whole. The novel reflects on the opaque, terror-stricken present and tries to make it more intelligible. Shalimar the clown gives evidence of Rushdie’s cosmopolitanism and his international-historical consciousness. Although the focus of the novel is Kashmir, it opens outwards to multiple pasts and presents. Rushdie addresses the past to come to terms with social and political present of-not one nation-
but the entire world. The non-linearity is encrusted in both the themes and the structure of the novel. Rushdie’s genealogical novel interacts with history, incorporates history, acts as a counter-history and offers an alternative reading of the historical. His heteroglossic novel includes not only dialogue of characters, but also dialogue of genres, of historical times, of the eastern and the Western civilizations. The novel is characterized by the multiplicity and dispersion of events which characterize Foucault’s genealogical method in language, Counter-memory, practice.\footnote{12}

The novel rewrites Indian epic stories using codes of modern thrillers, adventure stories, political satires, talk stories and slapstick comedies. Rushdie deploys the 300 to 400 year old genre of Kashmiri talk to great.\footnote{13} clearly his forms of narrativization and language are not archetypal post modernist. On the contrary he deploys remarkably no-Western to great effect.

The title of the novel then has a double meaning: the down is both men, Shalimar, who turns to political violence from motives of personal revenge but also the author displaying his virtuoso skills, balancing regional commentary with global violence. Rushdie’s Shalimar seems to mark a current epistemological shift in narrative and theoretical production. The novel, like the circus, is a heterotypic space and provides an opportunity for the co-existence of multiple realities but unravels none.

**Interpretation of the Key terms:**

**Diaspora :-**

The term ‘diaspora’ comes from the ancient Greek meaning ‘scattering, sowing seeds or to spread’. Many ethnic groups had been forced or induced to leave their native land for a variety of social, political and economic reasons. This term also referred to the dispersion of Jews, canning the pain of exile and nostalgia for the ‘lost land.’

They were forced to leave their land and emigrate with their own culture and embody it in their new settlements. In the present time, diaspora refers to the study of ethnic and
racial communities living far away from their native places or homelands. Now we hear and read about the Asian, the African, the Indian, the Pakistani, the British and the American diaspora. The Indian diaspora is used by many writers in the context of ethnicity of Indians who migrated to foreign lands. No doubt that they have been living in a foreign country for so many years but still there is a notion in their mind about India and they treat India as their homeland, because of their religious faith that they have, and the cultural heritage that they possess. Rootless though they are, they still feel deep attachment and sympathy towards their home land, even after taking the citizenship of another country. They always talk about their homeland and compare that country with their motherland. This is a psychological attachment. The literature of Indian diaspora is produced by many writers who permanent overseas residents are popularly known as non-resident Indians. These writers are *Salman Rushdie*, *V.S. Naipaul*, *Jhumpa Lahri*, *Geeta Mehta*, *Vikram Seth*, *Rohinton Mistry*, *Himani Bannarji*, *Chitra Bannarji* etc. In their writings diaspora achieves the unintended purpose of celebrating marginality and embracing virtually multiculturalism and diversity. Most of these writers belong to Indian cultural heritage but are settled in London, America, United Kingdom, Canada and African countries. They treat India as their homeland but have adopted overseas lifestyle, they feel alienated. The sense of flight from the homeland, give them a psychological pain when they think of uncivilized surroundings, religious fundamentalism, absolute rituals and outdated modes of living in their homeland. The expatriate writers present authentic picture of diasporic depression and alienation. Most of the expatriate writers share the cross cultural existence, the cultural shock and the cultural encounter. It may be cross religious, cross lingual, cross racial or cross ethnic. The sense of diaspora arises out of various factors: the cultural clash between tradition and modernity and between an individual’s aspirations and environment. The intermixing of religion, colonial imperialism and the myth of the land has had a disintegrating influence and resulted in rootlessness, alienation, displacement, humiliation, dissatisfaction and chaos.
Since the post Second World War period, ‘diaspora’ as an expression and experience has expanded its terms, conditions and ramifications beyond imagination. It now signifies all migrations, settlements, journeys and movements – “voluntary or forcible” – of people and communities “from their homelands into new regions”\(^\text{14}\) across the world, both from third to the first world and vice-versa, from North to South and East to West, and from one state to another within the same nation and much more. Moreover, after the economic and political shifts following the new economic order polarizations across continents and since the spread of the recent phenomenon of globalization practically too all societies and nation states, diaspora experience has assumed newer and vibrant dimensions. The experience of wigrancy and diapora also engenders various problems and facts of journey and relocation in new lands e.g. displacement, uprootedness, unbelongingness, discrimination, marginalization, crisis in identity, cultural conflicts, yearning for home and homeland etc. One distinct feature of diaspora people is that in physical and material space, they live in one country but in imagination look across time space to another.

The theme of search for identity and expatriate sensibility are also the major themes of both the writers. V. S. Naipaul’s journey to Trinidad, England, Iran, Pakistan and India may be physical but they have mental and intellectual reflections of his moods and sensibility. He escaped to London, from the dirt and dust of Trinidad. He traveled to the West Indies, Africa and America but finally settled in England. His visits to these countries refer to his quest for order, creativity and homeland. His travel writings have established him as a critic of India and an anti Indian expatriate. He criticizes Indian customs, insignificant religious practices, hypocritical notions and meaningless spiritual ideas. In the beginning Naipaul possessed a romantic view of India in his consciousness. The India of his childhood of Hindu culture of beautiful temples and colourful festivals helped him to build up a dream homeland. He was aware of his ancestral root. He had great notions about India. He once remarked: “the particular Diaspora where my works begin, if I can use this word for the migration of my ancestors which took place just over a hundred years ago.” (The Times of India, June 21, 1994). He allows India to appear on
the canvas of his memory and imagination. But he was separated from India by two generations. Nevertheless, India had been the background of his childhood. The trinity of Indian travels received aggressive notes from Indian scholars and critics for his anti-Indian projection. In this context Naipaul remarks I am profoundly Indian in my feeling, profoundly in my sensibility—but not in my observation.

**Conclusion:**

To conclude, it can be said that the present chapter provides an outline of different themes and theories of both the writers, their position as post-colonial contemporary writers, their age, birth, parentage, influences and the literary background that shaped them as the writers with a unique expatriate sensibility. The theme of *search for identity and expatriate sensibility* are also the major themes of both the writers. Alienation, rootlessness, treatment of history and fantasy, and exile are the major themes of Salman Rushdie. On the other hand, V.S. Naipaul’s journey to Trinidad, England, Iran, Pakistan and India may be physical but they have mental and intellectual reflections of his moods and sensibility.
Objectives of the Study:-

The present study has been conducted with following objectives:-

• The present work is largely related with human nature, so it will be helpful to understand the human nature at large.

• To know how physical migration affects the mental and emotional condition of an individual.

• To show how the expatriate writers visualize India and how they nourish India in their memory and imagination.

• To compare the major themes of V.S. Naipaul and Salman Rushdie.
Delimitation of the Study:-

Keeping in view the time available and limited resources the study will be delimited to the six novels i.e. three of V.S. Naipaul and three of Salman Rushdie. The novels under study are as follows:-

1. The Mystic Masseur (1957)
3. The Mimic Men (1967)
4. The Shame (1983)
5. A House for Mr. Biswas (1961)
6. The Moor’s Last Sigh (1995)

Significance of the Research Study:-

The project that is proposed to be undertaken become significant, as it represents many themes from psychological perspective in the works of Naipaul and Rushdie. The significance of the project lies in the fact that it shall deal with the psychological, political, physical and geographical dislocation i.e. environments hostile to proper growth and development of an individual. As the South-Asian warmth compared to coldness of the East, has been reflected in different works. The study shall reflect how the physical migration affects the mental and emotional condition of an individual being, how they suffer changes, swift and fundamental, shaking events of the most basic human condition; the complexity, diversity and rapid pace of changes make them appear a stranger in their own eyes. It will also reflect how the notion of diaspora becomes problematic and nostalgic. The fragmented memory, interspersed with imagined past and nostalgia, impulse to recreate the lost world; existential angst felt by transplanted individuals in flashes; myriad emotions and complex feelings; will be captured, explored and investigated. It also intends to examine the psychological layers in the novels to uncover the universal and individual traits in the stories. This research points out, that a singular loyalty to a nation, state or single collectivity becomes
problematic. The immigrant experience is not only about identity, important though that fraught subject is. This research brings out various cultural, social and economical aspects of the various themes. It will touch several interesting areas of diasporic communities such as ethnicity, identity, transnationalism, religion, politics, gender, sexualities and hybridity among others and the emotional and mental level of diaspora.
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