Chapter-VII
Conclusion

This chapter of the thesis is devoted to summing up the various findings of the present project. It sums up the various themes, like cultural clash, dislocation, alienation, return to homeland and interpretation arrived at in the different chapters of the thesis and sketched out what has been attempted to be achieved in the previous chapters and it also sums up the conclusion arrived at through the research. It brings into sharp focus the underlying difference in the themes of both the writers. It also sums up the reason that way both the writers reject India as their homeland and what is the reason of their rejection. The remarkable traits of each phase of their literary career have been discussed and deliberated upon to highlight the distinction and paradigmatic shift discussed in the study.

This chapter gives an idea of the whole research work carried out by the researcher and it also indicates the results obtained by the researcher to have precise knowledge and information to the reader about the work done. A summary of all the previous chapters has been included in this chapter in the form of conclusion.

In the last few decades the concept of ‘themes’ of V.S. Naipaul as well as of Salman Rushdie has emerged as a popular subject for researchers and readers. It evokes the interest of scholars and researchers to explore this branch of knowledge. A number of books, articles and papers have tried to locate the themes of both these writers. The works of many writers like Amitav Ghosh, Bharti Mukherji, Rohinton Mistry and Uma Parmeswarm have been explored and analyzed by many scholars and researchers. Among the proposed writers the works of V.S. Naipaul and Salman Rushdie have been given due attention.

The first chapter of the thesis entitled ‘Introduction’ provides an outline of different themes and theories of 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. An attempt has also been made to present the factors responsible for the inculcation of the typical diasporic ambivalence in them. The definitions and interpretations of the key terms such as post-colonial, colonial, ambivalence and diaspora have been discussed in detail in this chapter.

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. 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.

**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.
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 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 only a creative observer, even an observer of genius, but one in whom the observation of others leads to analysis of self”.

Naipaul 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 segmentally: 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.

His first published novel 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.
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.

On the other hand, an 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.

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 novel was received, both in India and abroad, with enthusiastic and almost unanimous acclaim.

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.
There can be no doubt that Salman Rushdie, irrespective of background, is a cosmopolitan, an international writer. He is at home in the East and in the West, and the two profoundly different cultures have undeniably conditioned his identity and his writings. He is an outsider, a deracine. In several interviews this problematic question of identity has been mentioned. He has invariably stressed the positive and optimistic aspects of his cosmopolitan footing which enables him to broaden and differentiate his worldview, to intensify his awareness of Indian reality and, from his somewhat detached viewpoint, throw into more poignant relief the historical, the social, the political problems of his countries—one should say, namely India and Pakistan—and the human, the existential predicaments of the individual. Rushdie has invariably stressed that imbibing Western and Eastern should by no means be regarded as infidelity towards one’s own cultural heritage but as a broadening of horizons, a bridging of gaps; and he has expressed his conviction that Indo literary traditions -Anglican literature—which is, for historical reasons, a cross-cultural phenomenon anyway-can only gain in stature, scope and self-confidence by accepting its national as well as international identity.

The second chapter of the thesis entitled ‘Review of the Related Literature’ contains the related studies and previous works done in this field. To review the related literature is one of the most indispensable parts of the research project. This implies synthesizing and going into the words or researches that have already done in the field over a period of time. This helps a researcher in many ways like knowing quantum of works done in the field, knowing how to tackle his own problem and avoiding the risk involved in duplication of research. Besides, it gives an understanding of problems related to this field. Essentially, review economizes time and energy of the investigator.
The third chapter of the thesis entitled ‘**Treatment of Major Themes**’ deals with the major themes of Naipaul’s early novel ‘*The Mystic Masseur*’ (1957) and Salman Rushdie’s ‘*Midnight’s Children*’ (1981). In the novel, ‘*The Mystic Masseur*’ Naipaul concerns himself with the Political reality of Trinidad just before and after independence. Independently the novel examines different aspects of the reaction to political independence of the individual and group. The novel dramatizes a particular feature of Trinidad’s inability to go back to colonial security or to generate a national identity thus emphasizing its political insignificance. The novel is an arrested moment of reality which is not a final assessment of the situation. It discusses the politics of mutual self-deception which flourishes unhindered in a non-polemical society. Such a system gives the impression of self-sufficiency until a crisis reveals its hollowness and unreality: being isolated and self-isolating, not seeking its links through inertia.

*The Mystic Masseur* is an account of a typical aspirant to power and prestige gravitating to politics as the supreme possibility. Emphasis is on Ganesh’s qualities of personality: his assertiveness and his alertness to opportunity indicating his greater sensitivity to his environment. He dominates easily in an environment. This is lethargic and easy-going. He is the prototype for Naipaul’s instinctually successful man, the Nazruddins of the world, who know when it is time to move on; they intuitively avoid the existential trap of extreme situations when choice becomes irrelevant.

*The Mystic Masseur* is a very exact expression of the narrator’s views on the contemporary Trinidadian hero-the politician. A parody of the log cabin to while house success story, for the sense of nationhood that inspired the fathers of democracy is totally missing, misunderstood or lauded, he is essentially alone and self-involved, acting more in a world of fantasy than showing crucial awareness of vital issues. The novel is
hence as much the story of Ganesh as that of the unnamed narrator. He appears in a
dual role: as the first person existent in Ganesh’s life, a fact which proves crucial to both
of them and establishes the subjective counter thrust to the objective biography, and
the third person omniscient narrator of that biography.

The central theme of the novel deals with the disenchantment, displacement, mental
damaging effects and dynamics of the post colonial Trinidad and the Caribbean half-made
societies. This masterpiece novel demonstrates how demoralizing the effects of slavery, indentures servitude, and
colonial exploitation continue to have long lasting repercussion on generations of
West Indians.

On the other hand, Salman Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children* is a novel of
memory, history and fantasy. Part I of *Midnights Children* covers the major
events that took place in India from 1915 to 1947 i.e. Pre-Independence era of
India. Part II narrates the childhood of Saleem Sinai, the chief character of the
novel. And the last part deals with the emergency period and the related
incidents in India in those days. The novel presents the three generations of the
Sinai family. It is the story of Saleem Sinai, born with 1001 other Indian children
in the hour of midnight, 15 August, 1947. Of the 1001 children, who were born in
various parts of the country, only 581 have survived by 1957. Each of these
children possesses a superb magical power. The most powerful among these
children are Saleem and Shiva who are the arch-sivals for leadership.

Amongst the diasporic writers, the most talked about writer in English-speaking
world today is Salman Rushdie, who mainly thrives on the controversial content of his
fictional world. But the true successor to the legacy of Charles Dickens, perhaps the
greatest English novelist of all times, is V.S. Naipaul who for nearly fifty years has been
entertaining his readers all over the world with a mixed bag of writing that combines
fiction, autobiography and travelogue.
Rushdie, not unlike V.S. Naipaul, regards migration as a form of rebirth and holds that a writer can bring his new world into being by an act of pure will. Rushdie has very sensitively felt and expressed the dilemma of migrants, who have at best “Imaginary Homelands”.

Another theme that is very dear to Rushdie’s heart is the intermixing of history in fiction and he also inter-relates it with fantasy. Rushdie’s many fictional work hinges on his concept of the nature and role of socio-political materials. *Midnight’s children* and *Shame* are overtly political in their themes.

The next chapter entitled ‘Diasporic Concern and Expatriate Sensibility’ discusses the shift in novelists’ treatment of diasporic concerns and a unique expatriate sensibility. The novels discussed in this chapter are Naipaul’s The Mimic Men (1967) and Salman Rushdie’s *Shame*.

The novel ‘The Mimic Men’ is related to Trinidad, V.S. Naipaul’s childhood home. It employs the ‘island material’ as much of the Caribbean as of England. Many readers and critics place it in a postcolonial framework, but it is a negative analysis of the text’s postcoloniality. Cudjoe, a critic, argues that the protagonist’s understanding of what it means to be a colonial subject in a postcolonial society is limited, and that the choices he makes and the actions he takes in relation to his identity are meaningless (1988:100). Cudjoe has suggested that Naipaul does not say anything useful about colonialism, infect he blames the colonised for their failure to become postcolonial.

The representation in *Mimic Men* of the fractured diasporic colonised subject is a critique of the colonial project of modernization/progress that was based on ‘the metaphysics of presence/permanence’ in which the self was regarded as whole, stable and rational (Mishra, V., 1995a:24). In Mimic Men the narrative of Ralph’s alienation, rootlessness and homelessness problematises this project. Ralph is not a mimic man
playing at being a whole person as much as he is the ‘subject that had been the silent underside of the project of modernity’ (Mishra, V., 1995a:20). The discontinuous subaltern haunts the project of modernity and colonialism. This acts as a tool to bring others into modernity. Not only notions of self but ideas of culture are also challenged by the diasporic narrative.

Although *The Mimic Men* is pessimistic, yet it possesses a dimension which books like *The Suffrage of Elvira* cannot claim. *The Mimic Men* is not only about corruption but also about betrayal. Now, recognition of betrayal presupposes the existence of a moral consciousness and a scale of human values. Thus, the despair and pessimism contained *The Mimic Men* do not lead us to the conclusion that human beings on the Island of Isabella are damned or irrelevant. In fact, the novel reveals valuable truths about such a degraded society. It is true that narrator never displays any ideals as a practicing politician but, despite self-indulgence, he has a moral consciousness; and in his story he attaches moral significance to what he has seen and experiences and what he himself has done or not done. The story is thus presented to us through the sieve of a moral consciousness which recognizes a wrong when a wrong has been committed.

Salman Rushdie’s novel *Shame* is shaped by the controlling theme of shame. The characters, the action, the conflict are all so arranged and dramatized as to focus our attention on this total meaning. As the story unfolds, this theme of shame at different levels becomes more and sharply defined.

Rushdie defines shame in its original form. Not the English word shame but the Urdu word *Sharam*—“a short word, but one containing encyclopedias of nuance.” (38) At a personal or individual level, the hero Omar Khayyam Shakil continues to be affected by shame and shamelessness throughout his life even when his mothers had banned him from feeling shame at an early age. He is born of three mothers (!) and does not know who his real mother is to the end life.
Nor does he know who his father is. Though, when he enters the world of school he understands that he is an illegitimate child born of a British Officer and one of the Shakil mothers. Like Saleem in *Midnight’s Children* here too the hero is a European. The Shakil mothers do not show any feeling of dishonor when O.K. was conceived, but lock themselves up in their large mansion and remain in their self-imposed captivity till the end of the novel.

‘*Shame*’, fittingly, is the most hesitant, most ambivalent of all his fiction, and thus also luminal is being a watershed in Rushdie’s career. Finally, Rushdie also tries to negotiate the discourse of the (illusory?) border between Islam and the West that has become a backdrop for so much post-cold War cultural debate. The novel has established itself as emblematic of a subversive postcolonial mode, though subversive in a sense different from what Barbara Harlow (1987) has named “resistance literature.” Rushdie attempts in this novel a (sub) version of normative national and gendered subjectivity in the Pakistan of what for all interests and purposes are Zia-ul-Haq’s regime. It can be said to offer a subversion of Pakistan’s self-image and its sub staining gendered narrative of nationness.

As far as Naipaul and Rushdie are the products of colonized countries, they focus on the problems (mainly of identity) for citizens of colonial and neo-colonial nations. “*Mimicry*” and “*Shame*” are favorite themes of both the diasporic as well expatriate writers, in the colonial context; the colonial heritage underlines their expatriate tradition.

In the fifth chapter entitled ‘*Paradigmatic Shift in the Dominant Themes*’ the two major novels of their next phase are analyzed to trace the progressive shift in the dominant themes of Naipaul and Rushdie. The novel ‘*A House for Mr. Biswas*’ is considered to be Naipaul’s masterpiece which 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 rootlessness, alienation and
having loss of identity to a great extent. This novel primarily deals with two themes, the one being the protagonist’s struggle to establish himself in a hostile environment through the ownership of a house and the other being the decline Hindu culture under the impact of westernization. The novel mimics the concepts of home, family, faminity, masculinity, chivalry, charity and marriage. The whole contemporary cultural context is sustained by a role-playing of the past. A personal victory of Biswas has no significance for a society which is creatively non-existent. He does not succeed in leaving a mark on it.

On the other hand, Salman Rushdie’s novel *The Moor’s Last Sigh* brilliantly represents fundamentalism and hybridity as not only competing modes of expression but competing forms of historiography. In the novel, there are not one but multiple fundamentalisms, and as it turns out, all of them are contemporary, manufactured phenomena. In *‘The Moor’s Last Singh’*, Rushdie employs metaphor and association rather than allegory, thus, taking his study of Islam in a more interesting and useful direction and breaking the simple equivalence between Islam and fundamentalism. Therefore, we can enter the novel through its conspicuous of Islam.

Chapter sixth of the thesis entitled *‘Homeland and the Myth of Return’* primarily focuses on the homeland diasporic aspects. Naipaul and Rushdie stand in the forefront of contemporary diasporic writers engaged in a provocative relationship with India. Possessing strong links with India either by birth, ancestry or marriage, both have expressed their love and affection for India, and paid tribute to India as an overpowering presence. However, seeing India from their Individual viewpoint, they have felt disdain for the violence, cruelty and sheer chaos of the Indian plurality. Indian attitudes are uncountable to them, even when approached through a genuine effort of understanding. Their attitudes towards India comprising nostalgia, anger or a defiant resistance end in a realization of difference.

V.S. Naipaul and Salman Rushdie (apart from the ambivalent relationship to India) are linked by common values entering around the base-value of ‘modernity’, Both
are fact-oriented, open to new experience, reject for themselves the extended family structure and religion, and uphold democratic values and a strong individuality. Both are ironic/sceptical of Indian’s approach to gaining mastery over their own lives. Both the writers value the aesthetic and ordered life-style of the West and deplore India’s confusion.

Naipaul faces up to India as such a culture which is deep-rooted in his psyche. The ‘whole’ India he has fantasied as a boy in the West Indies shatters on his visit to India. Wherever he looks, poverty of mental attitudes accosts him. Naipaul becomes the homeless expatriate, for the deepest of his roots i.e. India. The rejection of India is more than a matter of sensibility for Naipaul. The dismissal of India is not easy and drives his being to anger, hysteria and a sense of futility.

Salman Rushdie shows himself to be free of Naipaul’s terror of being re-implicated in a tradition like India’s. Though, confessing to quite feelings about his Indian past and the inability to take to it again. Rushdie’s response is clearly differentiated from Naipaul’s trauma ridden one. He gives the most unemotional analysis of the losses and gains of expatriation from India. His ease with India can be deduced to come from a happy, stable childhood spent in the cultural plurality of Bombay (now Mumbai). For Naipaul, the unhappinesses, fears and conflicts of childhood are impaled in memory.

Rushdie has written extensively on Indian culture and political upheavals. His remarks on public affairs, political developments and cultural issues are highly provocative. He has a lot to say about India where he was born and which is obviously one of his imaginary homelands. Rushdie’s assertions on secularism, religions and other such matters are even more ambivalent. It is undoubtedly true to say that the fabric of modern Indian society is what it is on account of secularism and that any real setback to
secular values may be dangerous to India. Indian culture, as Rushdie rightly points out, is “a rich mixture of traditions”.

Both the writers, V.S. Naipaul and Salman Rushdie can be considered as writers in exile for more than one reason. Both have travelled across the sea and come to a new land, i.e. “foreign” land, and both communicate with the English language as “a home” for their words and sentences and an alien tongue. In addition, we can clearly see the operations of exile within the works of these writers. These diasporic writers deal with exile not simply as a condition of the post-colonial world, but they treat it as a central means to understand the self. The theme of diasporic ambivalence is one of the major themes of both the above said writers. 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 Lahiri, 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 life style, 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.

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 colorful 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.

After examining the major themes of both the writers, I conclude that Rushdie is at his most authentic in dealing with Islamic India, on the other hand, Naipaul with Hindu India. It is clear that both the writers excels on the ground of the reality they have experienced, and also reflect their cultural background in choice of subject and theme, though attempting to break free of communal concerns. On both the writers the effect of Indian is such that it makes them reserve judgment regarding its value. India can never be home but can never be alien either.