Chapter VII
Books on India

Throughout his writing career, Naipaul has tried to understand India. His books about India are spread over three decades: these include *An Area of Darkness* (1964); *India: A Wounded Civilization* (1977), *India: A Million Mutinies Now* (1990) and a series of short articles and interviews in various papers and magazines since 1990. His life works as a primary source of material in all his works, and his Indian books are full of autobiographical detail. Naipaul’s connection with the Indian cultural heritage has added interest to these works.

*An Area of Darkness* is Naipaul’s account of his first sojourn in India. Naipaul appears as an observer. This book traces the progress of his grandfather’s migration from India to Trinidad. His family denied the culture of the adopted country and recreated an image in miniature of his lost Indian world. India functioned for Naipaul as a “resting place for the imagination.” His family circle was enclosed in a community which did not accept the custom of the adopted country. This book describes the acceptance and breaking up of the seemingly complete world of Trinidad’s little India. To quote Naipaul:

It was the country from which my grandfather came, a country never physically described and therefore never real, a country out in the void beyond the dot of Trinidad.¹

Naipaul imagines India as shrouded in darkness. He explains that though darkness surrounds a hut at evening, yet there remains a little light
around the hut. Naipaul feels that his position, being cut off from the land of his ancestors is just like an orphan. He realizes that he can find India by looking within himself, but after his journey to India he feels disappointment and asserts that India appears as mysterious and unknown. To quote Naipaul:

To me as a child the India that had produced so many of the persons and things around me was featureless, and I thought of the time when the transference was made as a period of darkness, darkness which also extended to the land, as darkness surrounds a hut at evening, though for a little way around the hut there is still light. The light was the area of my experience, in time and place. And even now, though time has widened, though space has contracted and I have travelled lucidly over that area which was to me the area of darkness, something of darkness remains, in those attitudes, those ways of thinking and seeing, which are no longer mine.²

*An Area of Darkness* presents Naipaul’s unfulfilled expectations. Naipaul fails to discover in India the ancestral homeland he had imagined it to be. In a year, he had realized his separateness from India and he was satisfied with his position as a colonial and without a past and ancestors. To Quote Naipaul:

India had not worked its magic on me. It remained the land of my childhood, an area of darkness; like the Himalayan passes, it was closing up again, as fast as I withdrew from it, into a land of myth; it seemed to exist in just the timelessness which I had imagined as a child,
into which, for all that I walked on Indian earth, I knew I could not penetrate.  

Naipaul discovers that when he meets people, they pay no attention to his Indian identity, for them identity is defined in terms of region or caste. To quote Naipaul:

A colonial, in the double sense of one who had grown up in a Crown colony and who had been cut off from the metropolis, be it either England or India, I came to India expecting to find metropolitan attitudes. I had imagined that in some ways the largeness of the land would be reflected in the attitudes of people. I have found, as I have said, the psychology of the cell and the hive. And I have surprised by similarities. In India, as in tiny Trinidad, I have found the feeling that the metropolis is elsewhere, in Europe or America. Where I had expected largeness, rootedness and confidence, I have found all the colonial attitudes of self-distress.

Such attitudes of people add to Naipaul’s disappointment. Naipaul visits India to continue his process of cultural analysis. Naipaul had his view of the New World that was based on his reminiscences of the Hindu Trinidad of his childhood, his encounter with England and Englishness and his visit in Caribbean and South American countries had given him an idea of the New World. Naipaul realized that the New World had no cultural past and heritage and the former colonizers and neo-colonists gave them aspirations which were imitated by the people of the New World. Thus, the New World is a mimic culture, and the West is
mimicked. When Naipaul visits India, he wants to make this point clear. In *An Area of Darkness*, he finds evidence of this imitation and mimicry everywhere in India. This mimicry he finds in the complex bureaucratic procedures through which the writer goes in search of a liquor license and in the westernized business executives and their lifestyles. He finds this mimicry present everywhere when he meets people and is shocked by the manner in which he is treated and this he notes in his relationship with people during a longish sojourn in Kashmir. He notes this play-acting in the alienated and lonely and occasionally violent Sikh he meets in the train. But in India he finds a different kind of mimicry—different from what he has noticed in Trinidad and the New World. To quote Naipaul:

> The outer and inner worlds do not have the physical separateness which they had for us in Trinidad. They coexist; the society only pretends to be colonial; and for this reason its absurdities are at once apparent. Its mimicry is both less and more than a colonial mimicry. It is the special mimicry of an old country which has been without a native aristocracy for a thousand years and has learned to make room for outsiders, but only at the top. The mimicry changes, the inner world remains constant: this is the secret of survival. And so it happens that, to one whole area of India, a late seventeenth-century traveller like Ovington remains in many ways a reliable guide. Yesterday the mimicry was Mogul; tomorrow it might be Russian or American; today it is English.⁵

According to Naipaul, in India, mimicry is based on a concept: rejection of all religious and moral principles. Indian people try to negate
something that is linked to a pre-colonial India and that is essentially Indian. They try to supersede the essentially Indian past but they fail for the essential Indian quality remains at the bottom and mimicry at the top. Thus even after independence, Indians are living a double standard life. They are chasing which does not belong to them, they lead false life.

When Naipaul compares Trinidad to India, he finds Trinidad comparatively better and simpler than India. To quote Naipaul:

Colonial India I could not link with colonial Trinidad. Trinidad was a British colony; but every child knew that we were only a dot on the map of the world and it was therefore important to be British: that at least anchored us within a wider system. It was a system which we did not feel to be oppressive; and though British, in institutions and education as well as in political fact, we were in the New World, our population was greatly mixed, English people were few and kept themselves to themselves, and England was as a result only one of the countries of which we were aware.  

According to Naipaul, Trinidadians are better than Indian, for they do not follow the mimicry of the West, but they have accepted the importance of being British. They do not find the British Empire oppressive and through British institutions and education, they are able to survive in the New World. The difference in the outlook of Indians and Trinidadians forms a major part in An Area of Darkness. In An Area of Darkness, Naipaul describes the different shade of colonial mimicry and its effects. Naipaul finds out that Indians are unable to understand their
Indian ness as a whole, but they are satisfied to see themselves in the smallest regional or communal alignments and this is the cause of the defeat of the Old World. Naipaul analyses the nation-building role of Gandhi and Nehru. Both had acquired their sense of the wholeness of India. Naipaul takes the lack of historical sense amongst Indians as another cause for defeat of Old India. To quote Naipaul:

It is well that Indians are unable to look at their country directly, for the distress they would see would drive them mad. And it is well that they have no sense of history, for how then would they be able to continue to squat amid their ruins, and which Indian would be able to read the history of his country for the last thousand years without anger and pain? It is better to retreat into fantasy and fatalism.?

Naipaul is now satisfied to disconnect himself from his ancestors’ India and feels relief that he has enjoyed a colonial Trinidadian past. He feels himself comfortable that he has made his home in England. Thus in *An Area of Darkness*, Naipaul analyses the colonial mimicry and its effects and he concludes that the notion of an essential old world India is defeated and self-negative, yet it underlies all that mimicry, which survives despite its experiences of colonization. In an essay entitled ‘A Second Visit’, he states:

Every discipline, skill and proclaimed ideal of the modern Indian state is a copy of something which is known to exist in its true form somewhere else. The student of cabinet government looks to Westminster as to the answers at the back of a book. The journals of protest look, even for
their typography, to the New Statesman. So Indians, the holy men included, have continually to look outside India for approval. Fragmentation and dependence are complete. Local judgement is valueless. It is even as if, without the foreign chit, Indians can have no confirmation of their own reality.

But India though not a country, is unique. To its problems imported ideas no longer answer. The result is frenzy.  

When Naipaul stays with Mrs. Mahindra in Delhi as a paying guest, he notices her craze for foreign. It may be noticed that Naipaul’s criticisms of India are in some measure contradictory. On the one hand Naipaul finds India’s modernity as purely superficial and wants that western methods of inquiry and assessment should be introduced to the Indian situation. These form the basis of the contrast between Indian and western thought which he tries to establish:

When caste and family simplify relationships, and the sanctity of the laws cannot be doubted, when magic buttresses the laws, and the epics and legends satisfy the imagination, and astrologers know the future anyway, men cannot easily begin to observe and analyze. And how, it might be asked, can Indians face reality without some filter of faith or magic? How often in India – at every level – rational conversation about the country's problems trails away into talk of magic, of the successful prophecies of astrologers, of the wisdom of the auspicious hours, of telepathic communications, and actions taken in response to some inner voice! It is always there, this knowledge of the other, regulated world,
undermining, or balancing, intellect and the beginnings of painful perception.9

On the one hand Naipaul accuses Indians of a confusion of values: The mimicry changes, the inner world remains constant: this is the secret of survival...

Mimicry might be too harsh a word for what appears so comprehensive and profound… Schizophrenia might better explain the scientist who, before taking up his appointment, consults the astrologer for an auspicious day.10

Naipaul dismisses the notion that there was ever a time when India was complete and inviolate. He thinks that culture is ever developing like language and there is no standard of purity from which there is fall. He thinks that an indigenous culture is being burlesqued with cultural synthesis. To quote Naipaul:

With one part of myself I felt the coming together of England and India as a violation; with the other I saw it as ridiculous, resulting in a comic mixture of costumes and the widespread use of an imperfectly understood language. But there was something else, something at which the architecture of the Raj hinted: those collectorates, in whose vaults lay the fruits of an immense endeavour, those clubs, those circuit houses, those inspection houses, those first-class railway waiting rooms. Their grounds were a little too spacious;

their ceilings a little too high, their columns and arches and pediments a little too rhetorical; they were neither of England nor India; they were a
little too grand for their purpose, too grand for the puniness, poverty and defeat in which they were set.\footnote{11}

Naipaul notes the impact of England on architecture in India. He cites two kinds of colonial architecture – Fort St George in Madras, Clive’s house in Calcutta. He observes that the more hybridized and alive architecture of the Raj is different from English architecture. This also makes a negative impression.

It is questioned that Naipaul’s connection with the Indian cultural heritage has assisted or impeded his understanding of India. To quote Naipaul:

\textit{India is for me a difficult country. It isn’t my home and cannot be my home; and yet I cannot reject it or be indifferent to it; I cannot travel only for the sights. I am at once too close and too far.}\footnote{12}

Naipaul realizes that he can base his investigation of the society on the traces of India he carries within his memories. Naipaul realizes that he cannot be indifferent to India and feels a kind of closeness. He has his old connection with India. Although Naipaul grows up in the community, which his ancestors established in Trinidad, yet he feels closeness with India. When Naipaul visits India for the first time in 1962, he realizes that his attitude is somewhat different from the attitude of the Indians. He does not feel at home in India. India seems different to Naipaul for the period of hundred years had washed him clean of many Indian religious attitudes and he has now developed as a member of a small and remote community in the New World. To quote Naipaul:
And though in India I am a stranger, the starting point of this inquiry—more than might appear in these pages—has been myself, like the split-second images of infancy which some of us carry, these survive, from the family rituals that lasted into my childhood, phantasmal memories of old India which for me outline a whole vanished world.¹³

Naipaul notes that in this book there is an inquiry about India and Indian attitudes, and it becomes an inquiry about the civilization itself. Naipaul feels that he has been the starting point of this inquiry because he has fancied visions of old India which outline his disappointed world.

When Naipaul visits India he feels that here he is a stranger but he realizes that the memories of that India with which he grew up in Trinidad are like trapdoors into a baseless past. Still he has split-second images of infancy which survive from the family rituals. Naipaul bases his observation of India on subjective and internal material. He also emphasizes on the objective examination of empirical data. Naipaul explains and criticizes this tendency which he finds in Indians. To quote Naipaul:

With independence and growth, chaos and a loss of faith, India was awakening to its distress and the cruelties that had always lain below its apparent stability, its capacity simply for going on. Not everyone now was content simply to have his being. The old equilibrium had gone, and at the moment all was chaos. But out of this chaos, out of the crumbling of the old Hindu system, and the spirit of rejection, India was learning new ways of seeing and feeling.¹⁴
Naipaul feels that after Independence there is growth, but there is chaos and a loss of faith also. India has to face its distress and cruelties. These cruelties are not new but they were always latent behind its visible stability and its capacity for going on. Indians were now not satisfied simply to have his being. The culture of India is known for its satisfaction, peace and balance of mind, but now there were chaos all around and the total decay of the old Hindu system. People had developed a spirit of rejection and they were learning new ways of seeing and feeling. In Bombay, Naipaul meets a journalist, who touches the subject of identity. According to him, ‘Indian’ was a word that was now without a meaning. Naipaul notes:

His idea of India was one in which India couldn’t be accommodated. It was an idea of India which, for all its seeming largeness, only answered a personal need: the need, in spite of the mess of India, to be Indian, to belong to an established country with an established past. And the journalist was insecure. As an Indian he was not yet secure enough to think of Indian identity as something dynamic, something that could incorporate the millions on the move, the corrupters of the cities.

For the journalist – though he was an economist and had travelled, and was professionally concerned with development and change – Indian identity was not something developing or changing but something fixed, an idealization of his own background, the past he felt he had just lost. Identity was related to a set of beliefs and rituals, a knowledge of the gods, a code, an entire civilization.\(^{15}\)
The journalist feels that Indian identity is not developing or changing with time. It is related to a set of beliefs and knowledge of the gods, an entire civilization. If a person rejects his past, it means that the loss of that civilization, and the loss of a fundamental idea of India and for a nationalist-minded man, this is the loss of a motive for action. This is responsible for the feeling of purposelessness which many Indians felt. This problem of identity belonged to only middle-class. In the chawls and the squatters’ settlement of the city, needs of food, shelter, water, a latrine, was more elemental. There was no problem of identity. In Naipaul’s descriptions, people are reduced to the status of animals or objects. To quote Naipaul:

Like the squatters in the ruins outside the living Vijaynagar temple, slipping in and out of the decayed stone facades like brightly coloured insects, screeching and unimportantly active on this afternoon of rain.¹⁶

Naipaul has adopted this process of dehumanization simply to reflect the attitudes of a society in which the existence of an individual has no importance for others. Naipaul notes that to know India, most people look inward and depends on subjective material but there should be objective examination of the past. Naipaul realizes that India is definitely old but all the disciplines and skills that Indians want to exercise are borrowed. Even the idea of the achievements of their civilization which Indian has is given by European scholars in the nineteenth century. Its past is reflected in the rituals, the laws, the magic
and the complex instinctive life that wraps up response and denies even the idea of inquiry.

The agenda of *India: A Wounded Civilization* is to explore the essential India underlying the mimicry. The thesis of this book is twofold: that the old world India is purely Hindu and that a typically Hindu psyche and Hindu attitudes to life are spread through in modern India. Naipaul notes that the integral and purely Hindu India was conquered and ruled first by Islam and later by the British. This has made the intellectual development and creativity of India ineffectual. Naipaul notes that the longer period of Islamic rule has been past-looking and damaging for Hindu India and the British time, a period of bitter subjection was a period of intellectual recruitment for India. Naipaul finds the British period inadequate to the needs of modern India. The book tries to reflect the omnipresence of the Hindu psyche and attitude to life in every aspect of India and also reflect that this is depleted, uncreative, passive and intellectually poor after centuries of colonial rule.

In this book, his political antipathies turn to Islamic rule. Naipaul notes that there is no creative impact of Islam on India. He has not noticed that despite communal conflict, there was fruitful Hindu-Muslim cultural mixing and constructive economic co-existence and during the British colonial period, but there was total lack of such atmosphere in Indo-British contact. Naipaul suggests that the Partition and the formation of Pakistan is also a proof of the foreignness of Islam. But it may be argued that a large number of Muslims are still living in India. When
Naipaul expresses his views on Islam in the context of India, his views seem insensitive.

In this book his political sympathies turns to the Shiv Sena, a regional party in the state of Maharashtra. He estimates it as the ultra-right organization with cultural essential agendas. Naipaul notes that the Shiv Sena has hatred for strangers and it wants to retain the land of Marathas only for Maharashtrians. He finds a link between the Shivaji cult and the Shiv Sena. Shivaji was a Maharashtrian Hindu leader, who fought against the Mughals. Naipaul implies that the Sena is largely conservative Hindu in character and finds that there is some link between the untouchable Buddhists and the Shiv sena. To quote Naipaul:

The Sena ‘army’ is xenophobic. It says that Maharashtra, the land of the Marathas, is for the Maharashtrians. It has won a concession from the government that eighty per cent of jobs shall be held by Maharashtrians. The government feels that anyone who has lived in Bombay or Maharashtra for fifteen years ought to be considered a Maharashtrian. But the Sena says no: a Maharashtrian is someone born of Maharashtrian parents. Because of its xenophobia, its persecution in its early days of south Indian settlers in Bombay, and because of the theatricality of its leader, a failed cartoonist who is said to admire Hitler, the Sena is often described as ‘fascist’.

But it is an easy, imported word. The Shiv Sena has its own Indian antecedents. In this part of India, in the early, pre-Gandhi days of the Independence movement, there was a cult of Shivaji. After
Independence, among the untouchables, there were mass conversions to Buddhism. The assertion of pride, a contracting out, a regrouping: it is the pattern of such movements among the dispossessed or humiliated.

The Shiv Sena, as it is today, is of India, independent India, and it is of industrial Bombay. The Sena, like other recent movements in India, though more positive than most-infinitely more positive, for instance, than the Anand Marg. The Way of Peace, now banned, which preached caste, Hindu spirituality, and power through violence, all of this mingled with ritual murder and mutilation and with homosexuality (desirable recruits were sometimes persuaded that they had been girls in previous lives) - the Sena is a great contracting out, not from India, but from a Hindu system, which, in the conditions of today, in the conditions of industrial Bombay, has at last been felt to be inadequate. It is in part a reworking of the Hindu system. Men do not accept chaos: they ceaselessly seek to remake their world: they reach out for such ideas as are accessible and fit their need.17

Naipaul notes that though the Sena is responsible for executing a larger scale of violence, yet the Sena is more positive than the Anand Margis. Naipaul asserts that Fascism is a political concept, it incorporates any attempt to define a nation or state in terms of racial, communal and cultural purity and in that sense the Sena can be designated 'fascist'. It can be seen as positive only from a fascist point of view. Naipaul associates the Shiv Sena with the dispossessed and the humiliated, with the industrial Bombay, with independent India and sees this as positive.
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consists of change and finds interest to see that people strive to change their lives for the better. In 1962, Naipaul was humiliated by his colonial past in Trinidad and for this he blamed on India. He thought that its own internal weaknesses are responsible for its defeat. Indian civilization had been one of the world’s great civilizations, but its development stopped and it became backward and inward. Its fragmented nature was responsible for its defeat. Indians were superstitious, passive and impoverished and they were sent abroad as indentured labour. In 1962, Naipaul returned India to find his cultural home, but he found that he did not belong to the local clans and he was not part of the family he had thought. After national independence, he found no renewal but poverty, feudal caste attitudes, lack of rational views and was disappointed to see the lack of future vision. But when he visits India in 1991, Naipaul finds signs of vitality and renewal. At this time there is a new wealth and a new national economy which is controlled by Indians. People are striving to improve their condition. Indians are now conscious of freedom and self-assertion.

Naipaul notes that before independence, India was invaded by Muslim explorers and divided among various groups, who because of personal interest and local politics had supported foreign invaders. The British rule brought unity and promoted education which developed a sense of national identity. This sense of national identity inspired people to organize the nationalist movement and get independence. Now they are developing the notion of freedom and there is growth in economic
conditions. There is vital energy among Indians which characterize the present. To quote Naipaul:

To awaken to history was to cease to live instinctively. It was to begin to see oneself and one's group the way the outside world saw one; and it was to know a kind of rage. India was now full of this rage. There had been a general awakening. But everyone awakened first to his own group or community; every group thought itself unique in its awakening; and every group sought to separate its rage from the rage of other groups.\textsuperscript{18}

Naipaul thinks that an older generation of nationalist tried to find a usable past and folk tradition against the culture of their colonizers, but after independence such traditionalism became an absurd humiliation. Thus Naipaul explores the paradoxes of freedom which is suitable for the postcolonial world as well as a further stage in the process of decolonization. He notes that British imperialism has contributed in the creation of a modern India and finds the utility of European ideas in contemporary multicultural societies. Naipaul is satisfied to see the cultural achievements, the increased wealth and development in transportation and communication in recent decades. Thus Naipaul's books on India are a record of such changes and he analyses these changes. To quote Naipaul:

Cruelty, yes it was in the nature of Indian family life. The clan that gave protection and identity, and saved people from the void, was itself a little state, and it could be a hard place, full of politics, full of hatred,
and changing alliances and moral denunciations. It was the kind of family life I had known for much of my childhood: an early introduction to the ways of the world, and the nature of cruelty. It had given me....... a taste for the other kind of life, the solitary or less crowded life, where one had space around oneself.19

This book portrays India as more prosperous and confident. There is economic and social development, the society is presented as dynamic rather than static or tending to decay. Many of the people have achieved undreamt heights. Naipaul is hopeful to observe the confidence among untouchable. To quote Naipaul:

There had also come the group sense and political consciousness. They had ceased to be abstractions. They had begun to do things for themselves. They had become people stressing their own particularity, just as better-off groups in India stressed their particularities.20

This book forms a contrast with other Indian books. Naipaul does not satirize his interviews, but listens to them attentively. He is considerably more sympathetic to the founder of the Dalit Panthers than he was towards the Black Panther movement on which they were modelled. This book presents that there is a change in Naipaul's attitudes towards India and his method of depicting India has changed. Whatever he has condemned in past, now he is ready to accept it.

Naipaul describes fundamentalist rage not as evidence of irrationality and of an impending chaos but as something which helps Indians in self-understanding and self-assertion. It seems that Naipaul
wants to compensate for the offence caused by his earlier books. Thus Naipaul refrains from judging his interviews and thus he is far away from his conception of artistic responsibility, formulated early on in his career. A similar view is stated in the following note that:

The artist who, for political or humanitarian reasons, seeks only to record abandons half his responsibility. He becomes a participant; he becomes anonymous. He does not impose a vision on the world. He accepts; he might even make romantic; but he invariably ends by assessing men at their own valuation.\textsuperscript{21}

The main body of this book does not confirm Naipaul’s conclusion that India is held together by a central will, a central intellect and a national idea. Naipaul attempts to unite the differences in attitudes, in his perception of unity. Naipaul notes that the existence of this central secular state may be endangered by the communal conflicts. To quote Naipaul:

What was unexpected in Gurtej’s account of his life and beliefs was how much he took for granted. The constitution, the law, the centers of education, the civil service with its high idea of its role as guardian of the people’s rights and improver of their condition, the investment over four decades in industrial and agricultural change – in Gurtej’s account, these things, which distinguished India from many of its neighbours, were just there. There was no acknowledgement that generations of reformers and wise men- refusing to yield to desperate conditions – had created those things that had supported Gurtej in his rise from the village.
With his pastoral memories, his dream of Sikh glory, there was also the idea of religious purity. He applied this idea to the affairs of men, and rejected what he found. Like Papu the Jain stock-broker in Bombay, who lived on the edge of the great slum of Dharavi and was tormented by the idea of social upheaval, Gutrej had a vision of chaos about to come. Papu had turned to millenarian politics. It had happened with other religions when they turned fundamentalist; it threatened to bring the chaos Gutrej feared.22

In India: A Million Mutinies Now, there is a reconciliatory tone. But Naipaul does not try to withdraw any of his already expressed cultural essential views, but he tries to confirm his already familiar understanding of India. He sees signs of prosperity and confidence in India and appreciates their efforts. He knows that these efforts and their results depend on caste or group stability which does not come from any nation-building effort. In this book, Naipaul makes a survey of caste and group stability and new identities. His perception of caste and group stability and new identities is interlinked. The concept of new identities rejuvenates what has been seen as intellectual old world values. Naipaul wants to note old world values as playing a determinative regenerative role in modern developments.

Naipaul has expressed his support of Hindu communalist movements and organizations which have caused large scale violence. In the 18 July 1993 Times of India interview with Padgaonkar he favours the destruction of the Babri Masjid and described the communal violence
as a sign of regeneration of a historically indifferent Hindu India which has remained insulted for a thousand years. He shows his favour for the Shiv Sena and the BJP when these parties won the elections in Maharashtra in 1995. In the 23/24 January 1998 Times of India interview with Rahul Singh, he repeats the same points about the Ayodhya issue and the rise of the BJP:

I don't think the people of India have been able to terms with that wrecking [of the Islamic invasion around AD 1000]. I don't think they understand what really happened. It's too painful. And I think this BJP movement and that masjid business is part of a new sense of history, a new idea of what happened. It might be misguided. It might be wrong to misuse it politically, but I think it is part of a historical process. And to abuse it as Fascist is to fail to understand why it finds an answer in so many hearts in India.  

On the whole, Naipaul's books on India present the complexities and diversities of India in an impressive manner. Naipaul has dealt with a wide variety of interlinked issues: the complexities of specific racial groups, religious communities and nationalities, the broader concerns of human spiritual needs, intellectual life. Naipaul has overlooked the large-scale violence, performed on behalf of Hindu communalist organizations and directed against Muslim. Thus, he has created the sense of insecurity among more than 110 million Muslims. Naipaul has supported fundamentalist and semi-fascist Hindu communal ideologies in India and thinks that such ideologies are needed for the happiness and security of
Indian people now and in future. It may be said that he wrote his books on India to release the tensions caused by his personal and ancestral connection with the country.
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