## Chapter Six: Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1. Findings: The Convergence of the Theory and the Text</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2. Contribution to Knowledge</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3. The Pedagogical Implications</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4. Limitations and Suggestions</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5. Notes and References</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1. Findings: The Convergence of the Theory and the Text

As far as the relationship between the selected works and literary globalization – as one of the aims of this study – is concerned, it can be claimed that these four works by Mishra and Kundera can be considered as narratives of globalization, albeit in different degrees. They are deemed part of literature of globalization, as far as we think of literature outside the fabric of national literatures. The comprehensive and descriptive analysis done in this study best shows that while Pankaj Mishra’s selected works mainly convey globalization as being thematized within the text, Milan Kundera’s selected novels do not show direct or explicit signs of the phenomenon of globalization. In the meantime, whether purposely or just inadvertently, both Mishra and Kundera observe certain prescriptions or formulas which, in turn, shape a greater readership for their works and eventually provide them more globality.

All four texts under study can be considered as narratives capable of signifying globalization in ways that can make it meaningful more explicitly in Mishra’s case and rather implicitly in Kundera’s case. This is to say that while Mishra’s works reflect contemporary matters and crises of globalization more directly, Kundera’s novels signify elements like identity, culture, transition, migration, nation-state etc, which mostly relate to the dominant mainstreams in debates of literary globalization as well as social, cultural and political spheres. Accordingly, the theory of the existence of any relation between globality, globalization and the selected texts converges here. However, as these attempts find association with disciplines like comparative literature, world literature, modern and postmodern literary studies, and translation studies, then they add more to the globality of Mishra’s and Kundera’s selected works, as well.

Talking of Mishra, the selected texts are observed as bearing the reflections of some dimensions and effects of globalization within their events; indeed, globalization becomes more directly traceable when it is thematized within his texts. While focusing on one major love story in The Romantics and on the travels around the subcontinent in Butter Chicken in Ludhiana: Travels in Small Town India, Pankaj Mishra develops an incessant critique of the effects of the new era and globalization.
in India. In order to form an appropriate basis for developing the topic of globalization in *The Romantics*, the writer mainly uses various devices such as characterization, narration, setting, and thematic patterns. In *Butter Chicken in Ludhiana: Travels in Small Town India*, where Pankaj Mishra describes the social and cultural changes in India in the new context of globalization, the main instruments for achieving the aim of thematizing globalization include the practice of writing in the genre of travelogue or travel novel, the setting (and writer’s focus on small towns), factual scenes, ironical tone of the writer, and thematic patterns.

Talking about Kundera, it is confirmed by the evidences gathered in this study that some parts of his selected novels (and their relevant critical issues) are developed into platforms which evoke, support and interpret various social, political, cultural, and literary aspects within and relevant to the realm of globalization (e.g. world literature, postmodernism and translation studies). Due to his attempts, Kundera is currently celebrated around the globe as the writer who has succeeded in communicating the East European experience of life under totalitarian communism to a large worldwide public. Once the thematic structure of the selected novels and the self-standing reflections and digressions (authorial intrusion) formulated by the characters or the narrator become useful instruments at the service of the novels’ structural design. Also, the major technique of polyphonic narration employed in both novels *The Joke* and *The Unbearable Lightness of Being* prepare an appropriate ground for a better contemplation on topics like identity, culture, and transition, which all make association with the mainstream discussions of globalization. Moreover, the practice of polyphony technique itself reminds the urge in the modern era for a polyphonic society, where through multi-perspective attitudes different voices can be heard.

*The Joke* expressively manifests Kundera’s ideology on the existence of the novel as an art which does not aim to display preplanned certitudes; instead shattering those long-established thoughts and attitudes already accepted by the public becomes the main purpose of such an art. In *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, we do not generally locate round characters, a concrete milieu, or a well-jointed plot, then it becomes much easier to see this piece of fiction as a postmodern novel which, in the meantime, is full of extended passages of straightforward philosophical and political
speculations. Though the evident settings of these two novels refer to a definite world made by the writer, their regional or local qualities are relatively erased by Kundera in order to universalize his stories. This is sensibly what Ernst Grabovszki means by posing the definition of globalization as “the intensification of literary relations and of communication including that of artistic, i.e., literary communication and production,” or what Shashi Deshpande refers to as removing the unexplainables and stumbling blocks. Kundera quite skillfully puts these theorems into practice.

The observations attained through the prism of Grabovszki-Deshpande-Israel reveal various assessments which are closely related to certain disciplines referred to by these three scholars. In addition, the results or outcomes arrived at this level support the making of a viewpoint about how the selected works ascend to the grand level of globality. As far as the theoretical framework of the study is concerned, such disciplines are, in turn, at the service of the main approach of the study and become operational here through applying certain parameters. The parameters exerted in the eclectic approach have been considered as similar as possible for both writers, in order to achieve more homogeneous results (e.g. a parameter like narrative structure has been taken into consideration while examining all four texts). Furthermore, some of these disciplines are also in close connection or even overlapping with mediums such as media, literary institutions, English language, and translation.

As it has become evident through this study, Kundera and Mishra, by and large, avail themselves of the four mediums abovementioned, since these tools seem inevitable components of the modern methods of literary communications. What’s more, this mechanism has played a significant role in the expansion of the capacity of their readership, as well. Quite expectedly, this has not been an identical process for both writers, though they share such tools.

To a large extent, the global literary flows of our time are assisted (and sometimes generated or directed) by mass media empires that rely on powerful communication technologies to broadcast their messages. Accordingly, both writers have been in close contact with this medium (and its new electronic forms) as they are quite well-informed about the capabilities lying there. For Kundera, mass media have brought both success and burden; indeed mass media have introduced Kundera
through various sources of interviews, audio-visual facilities, reviews, internet homepages and so on. But at the same time, it has then made him to take a negative (even hostile) pose against media, as Kundera is very concerned about issues like fair interpretations and reviews of his works or issues related to the privacy of an author. This may be a good reason why he always shies away from media. Despite this, Kundera has always been liable to constant accusations, particularly on political grounds. However, with the new models of literary communication, on which Ernst Grabovszki partially highlights, and with his discussion on the new possibilities for authors, readers and publishers, it might be claimed that one day such troubles would lessen for Kundera.

The role of media has been quite different for Mishra and his writing. It can be claimed that, with the exception of some controversies, mass media have mostly played a major role in Mishra’s success. As a young brilliant Indian author, he has gathered good experiences from his encounters with different people, cultures and attitudes in and outside his country. Mishra has been working with some famous global journals and magazines. Such experiences have brought him interactions with various people around the world and even in some cases his involvements and appearances in global issues have been focused upon by mass media. This is not the only way that media assist Mishra to attain reputation. His favorite topics as well as the major themes and motifs in his books have always been at the center of attention for media. In addition, for the time being, he is a professional columnist with Guardian.co.uk and writes literary and political essays. All these, together with his good knowledge of the function of media put him in an active position. Of course, for the same reasons he is quite cautious and selective in his interactions with media. In this regard, shying away from media is obviously the common trait for both Mishra and Kundera.

Literary institutions play a vital role in both Mishra’s and Kundera’s career, too. However the beginnings might seem different. While Mishra has the experience of working as an editor for Harper Collins India or Picador publication, Kundera encounters tough times in his interactions with publishers (e.g. he is shocked when faced with distorted first version of The Joke, published by Macdonald in1969 in London). The rest of the way in dealing with the publishers seems relatively similar.
(albeit with many ups and downs for Kundera) as in later experiences both writers prefer to co-operate with Western-based agents and publishers. This seems as an example of Deshpande’s assertion of a must for books to become global. Most of Mishra’s books have been published by Picador, and Gallimard has become the publisher for most of Kundera’s recent works. Whether in traditional format of printed books or in electronic formats, for both writers literary institutions remain a major factor in the circulation and distribution of the knowledge about their works.

The medium of English language shall be considered as a pivotal tool for conveying Mishra’s message to the readers inside India and beyond borders. Had he written his works in any other language, he would have not got such a great readership so fast. Mishra uses this lingua franca competently to express and share his imaginations and experiences inside a global market. Since his selected works contain, to some extent, an analysis of the Indian realities and Indian characters, then an insider view-point seems to be matched with a foreign one in his writing in English language. Indeed, writing in English removes other limitations such as those with translations. In addition, though the selected works of Mishra enjoy a good vocabulary of English, there is no difficulty as that with idioms, and yet you feel the liveliness with the language; as a matter of fact, Mishra succeeds in transferring his points. However, for Milan Kundera the factor of language is significantly defined from a different perspective and in relation to another principle that is translation. At least one great shift is obvious in his career; while once he wrote his two selected novels in Czech, today he adopts to write in another global or world language, namely French.

The last important medium is translation which has played a more vital role for Kundera than Mishra, even if today Kundera stops writing in French and turns back to writing in Czech language. This point generally goes back to the prolonged debates about the history of the translation of Kundera’s works. In fact, around fifty-six editions (mostly differing) of Kundera’s six novels (including *The Joke* and *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*), may be taken as a good evidence and reason for the vastness of Kundera’s obsession with translating, rewriting and reassessing his work. However, aside from various controversial issues around Kundera and his serious comments upon translators and translations of his works, it shall be noted that
translation has a key role in the circulation of reliable knowledge about Kundera’s works. This should not be mixed with the general function of translation when writers like Mishra and Kundera just become introduced to or popular with other societies or cultures through the translation of their books. Quite admittedly, translation is a central medium in making Kundera and Mishra’s works more global. Rather, when there is a discussion about the centrality of translation for understanding Kundera, we should not forget that editorial stage which combines with the translatorial one in his literary career. As an important practice by Kundera, it is well-known that in the mid 1980s, Kundera revises all the French translations of the novels written in Czech and declares these, rather than the Czech versions, to be the authentic and definitive versions of the novels. In other words the translations become the originals. Accordingly, translation turns to a central common point for a complex involvement that is personally, culturally and textually bound.

Undoubtedly, adhering to the abovementioned mediums in reasonably different degrees or measures, indeed, makes the selected works’ of Kundera and Mishra more global. This could be interpreted as either a premeditated conduct by these two writers or just a routine constituent part of their natural mannerism and style of writing. Whichever the construal, and no matter even if Kundera and Mishra really use certain passwords to logon to the global literary market, at least, it can be claimed that both know about the promising future available in such a milieu. Both writers are quite knowledgeable about the rules of the game inside the global literary market, though they have attempted to play it according to their own style. They best know that this is a give-and-take deal: “Local markets for literary fiction remain underdeveloped; the metropolis often holds out the only real possibility of a professional writing career. The metropolitan west, however, has its own expectations from non-western fiction,”¹ Mishra maintains. Of course, quite expectedly, such transactions will bring about their consequent limitations or hazards. In his Winternachten lecture in 2007, Pankaj Mishra refers to the inadequacies, inequalities and shortcomings which have been imposed on global literature because of being a part of an uneven world market system created in the 19th century. Mishra truly asserts that the forces of capitalism, that produce economic inequality globally, would also affect cultural balance on a global scale and therefore there would be no equal access to literature for people in different regions around the world. He also warns
about the growing danger of McLiterature, of standardization and homogenization. Nevertheless, Mishra tries to see the positive aspects as he points out that “Globalization, the quickening of communication and commerce, has meant that texts move across frontiers with relative ease.”2 What’s more, he also states: “But I hope I have made clear how it is a form of globalized literature that has enriched imaginatively and intellectually my own life and the lives of millions of readers; how it helped us transcend the inherited prejudices of nation, religion, class and race that could have imprisoned us.”3

In fact, from another perspective which is yet related to Mishra’s point, it can be claimed that whatever difficulty, deficiency and complication is experienced regarding globalization, they are imposed from other divisions such as political, economic, social or cultural into the realm of literary globalization. What we observe as the major challenges of every other division of globalization is fairly different from what is happening in literary globalization. Even if any writer takes benefit from some economic parameters or if through his own method and style he makes impact on the above-mentioned mediums, this does not necessarily mean that he is applying the economic or political models or patterns of globalization to the literary sphere. This is mostly justified on the interdisciplinary nature of the studies of globalization.

Such interrelationship among different aspects of globalization, as partially mentioned in this survey, is also related to some of the critical results of this study: Apart from negative or positive effects of various branches of globalization, the province of challenges in literary globalization is mostly a zone of diligence and rivalry; the main concern here is about a speculation of survival of the fittest. This means that as writers who construct parts of building blocks for the world or global literature, both Kundera and Mishra take part in a competition. They enter a contest, a demanding struggle which needs much talent and energy. Here they present their works which bear certain qualities. When these works have excellence of form and expression, and when they show qualities of permanency, universality and all-inclusiveness regarding human problems, then they remain in the contest as these are some of the features needed for a piece of literature to remain in the literary scene for ages.
Literary globalization also may be considered as a zone of imbalances or inequalities. Yes it is true but such discriminatory status bears a quite different nature from what we experience in, for example, economic or political globalization. In fact, those threatening factors which cause major disparities remain outside the realm of the creation process of the interpretative literature. Within this process only two relevant entities clarify the final distinction for us. First, it is through features like uniqueness of form and expression or universality and permanency that works of writers like Mishra and Kundera become distinguished and remain on the stage. The second entity which is mostly the consequence of the previous features is the readership of the works. In fact, it is readers who are the ultimate judging forces in this contest. Here readers are the only superpowers who decide which works of literature remain on the scene and which shall leave. Even forces from other divisions of globalization cannot maintain a permanent position for a work of literature for a long time.

The presence of various writers like Mishra and Kundera with two different backgrounds or cultures in the scene of global or world literature is also indicative of another important point. The center/periphery model for the study of globalization in the economic, political or social sphere – one that sees power, commodities, and influence flowing from urban centers in the West to a peripheral developing world – is not essentially applicable to literary side of globalization. The presence of both Kundera and Mishra in the literary scene itself is a proof that there exists a new model in which different new names can arrive on the red carpet from around the world. There is no center like before; European and American metropolitan centers are no longer the sole valid hubs in literary sphere. This process of decentralization has been improving on an ascending scale thanks to the innovations in information technology. Writers can be from every continent and they may write from wherever possible. It makes no difference whether Mishra is writing his essays at Simla or London, whether Kundera remains in France or goes back to Czech and continues writing there. Readers’ judgments are not limited to borders any more. Thus, in short, the major findings of this study are as follows:

1. The four selected works of Mishra and Kundera can be considered as narratives of globalization, of course in different degrees for the two writers. It is shown that
while Pankaj Mishra’s selected works mainly convey globalization as being thematized within the text, Milan Kundera’s selected novels do not show direct or explicit signs of the phenomenon of globalization. Accordingly, the theory of the existence of a relation between globality, globalization and the selected texts also converges here.

2. Both Mishra and Kundera, observe certain prescriptions or formulas which, in turn, shape a greater readership for their works and eventually provide them more globality. Kundera and Mishra, by and large, avail themselves of the four mediums of mass media, literary institutions, English language, and translation for expanding the capacity of their readership.

3. The province of challenges in literary globalization is mostly a zone of diligence and rivalry; the main concern here is about a speculation of survival of the fittest. This means that both Kundera and Mishra take part in a sort of competition – with many other competing writers from all over the world. In this great contest, they present their works which bear certain high qualities of form and expression.

4. The presence of Milan Kundera and Pankaj Mishra in the scene of global literature proves that the center/periphery model for the study of globalization in the economic, political or social sphere is not essentially applicable to literary dimension of globalization.

6.2. Contribution to Knowledge

Since Pankaj Mishra is a young writer and nearly at the beginning of his writing career, consequently there exist few rare reviews and critiques on his works particularly first ones. Accordingly this research can be taken as an original one making a relatively thorough survey on Pankaj Mishra’s selected works.

A majority of the reviews and commentaries done on Milan Kundera’s works have focused on the social and political aspects of his works. In this study, other
aspects of his acceptance and readership and his specific status in the world literature are examined.

The originality of this research could also be counted on its attempt to examine the selected texts from the perspective of cultural studies. This is viewed in the prospect that, through its interdisciplinary nature, the present study tries to transcend the confines of a particular discipline such as literary criticism or history. Moreover, it also takes into account the means of production of the selected texts along with analyzing them.

6.3. The Pedagogical Implications

This study has tried to review a portion of the literary productions made by two writers from different continents, as seen in the greater perspective of world literature. As an attempt to explore the relationship between globalization and literature, this study has tried to analyze the composite picture of the transnational (global) turn in literature. Indeed, understanding the nature of such a tendency towards global literature has been a major concern for many academic circles in recent years. The works selected for this purpose, on the surface, represent definite nations but, on the other hand, they belong to the larger scope of global literature. The ways the selected texts in this study, implicitly or explicitly, embody some aspects of literary globalization, and the mechanisms which assist these texts to go globe-trotting can best provide for other scholars the ground for a contemplative discussion or critical treatment of the link among literature, globalization and globality. Moreover, through its interdisciplinary nature, this study has attempted to highlight the importance of principles such as translation, English language, literary institutions and mass media in strengthening the ties in the relationship between globalization and literature. Further, the arguments regarding form and content of the selected texts in this study can partially provide a base for more classroom discussions on the topic of the genre, novel and its sub-category, travel novel as well.
6.4. Limitations and Suggestions

As both writers shy away from mass media, then getting original updated and current news about them seems impossible. Though both writers have already made some formal interviews available, such cases do not seem enough, as with a much-debated writer like Milan Kundera or with a promising young writer like Pankaj Mishra. The paucity of reliable reviews and criticism on Mishra’s works has been a serious limitation in this study. If emails sent to him by the researcher were responded, it could have helped, to a great extent, to insert his recent feedbacks in the study as well.

Most critics and reviewers of Milan Kundera have been focusing on the socio-political aspects of his selected works. Few evaluations have been done on the basis of moral, philosophical and psychological approaches to his works. Tracing the subject matters and themes from their debut works to the last and evaluating their historical developments in both writers Mishra and Kundera could have become the topic of an in-depth study.

Another appropriate topic for further study could be found in Ernst Grabovszki’s contributions on the relationship between globalization and literature particularly the roles defined and assigned to the author, text, and reader in the light of the new media – specially the internet and World Wide Web – which highly influence the recent model of literary communications around the globe. Also Grabovszki’s discussion on the abundance of literary production because of the impact of new media, and his assertion on the democratization of literary production and distribution may be considered as a good starting point for another future study.
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