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Much of the body of theory produced in the wake of the process of decolonisation has been successful in obliterating the vestiges of intellectual liberty of the once colonised world. A major body of this esoteric theory mass-manufactured in the universities of metropolis of the west is self-directed, often aimed at retaining the myths of its intellectual superiority and its deep-rooted faith in these myths. Primarily, this is the result of the mass production of socially-sanctioned mandate for the continuation of the project of imperialism. Like nineteenth and early twentieth century production of the discourses of hegemony, cultural theory is ideology-driven and may be understood as having been devised as the European cultural texts. The acts and strategies of theory production are self-representational in principle and essence. Attempts to appropriate them can prove counterproductive and self-destructive to the so called Third World, once so comprehensively colonised. The colonial literature along with other modes of cultural production played a decisive and definitive role shaping and reinforcing the project of colonialism. Political decolonisation of the ‘Third World’ has not apparently changed the ways in which the persistence of inequalities in the entire world is theorised.
Postcolonial studies are the most eclectic and divergent of theories that have come to dominate the Western and non-Western academics of our times. These studies cover a wide and immense range of materials. Because of the postcolonial studies’ dependence on a score of theories there are gamut of ideological postures that inform these studies. Postcolonial theory can be and very often is traced to have originated from Edward Said and to have arrived at its destination with Homi Bhabha. The mapping of this theory’s progression from the former to the latter is fairly easy and does not seem to require any tortuous discerning tools to come to grips with. Terry Eagleton says the following about the emergence of postcolonial theory:

*Post-colonial theory is not only the product of multiculturalism and decolonization. It also reflects an historic shift from revolutionary nationalism in the Third World, which faltered in the 1970s, to a 'post-revolutionary' condition in which the power of the transnational corporations seems unbreakable. Accordingly, much post-colonial writing fits well enough with postmodern suspicions of organized mass politics, turning instead to cultural matters. Culture is on any estimate important in a neo-colonial world; but it is hardly what is finally decisive. It is not in the end questions of language, skin colour or identity, but of commodity prices, raw materials, labour markets, military alliances and political forces, which shape the relations between rich and poor nations.*
In the West, especially in the United States, questions of ethnicity have at once enriched a radical politics narrowly fixated on social class, and, in their own narrow fixation on difference, helped to obscure the vital material conditions which different ethnic groups have in common. Post-colonialism, in short, has been among other things one instance of a rampant 'culturalism' which has recently swept across Western cultural theory, over-emphasizing the cultural dimension of human life in understandable overreaction to a previous biologism, humanism or economism. Such cultural relativism is for the most part simply imperial dominion stood on its head. (205)

Theory production has come to comfortably replace, as Aijaz Ahmad argues, radical political activism in all its possible forms. Political and cultural hegemonic structures, with an unparalleled acumen, have always reinvented themselves that has constantly led to the proliferation of specious genres of discourses. Yet, the West finds it progressively impossible to concede the fact that it own procedures of theorisation are intrinsically different from that of the non-West. As Gramsci argues the prevalent categories of ‘East’ and ‘West’ are historic-cultural constructions that never cease to be real. Our ideological negotiations with the historical process of colonialism are often determined by our present geographic location and cultural associations-a fact that has been rendered miraculously invisible by
the postcolonial theories produced on the American soil. The avalanche of cultural and literary theories that continues to assail us comes down heavily upon the gullible subjects with murderous political and ideological agendas riveted to it. It takes extraordinary or even supernatural powers to ferret out the ideological schemes woven into these first-world manufactured theories. The best first line of self-defence against them is to know our orientation vis-a-vis the overpowering Western intellectual traditions that threaten to stunt our faculties. The breach in and intrusion upon the psyche and consciousness of the once colonised world has manifested itself in different self-destructive cultural and intellectual reactions the fragile post-independent societies have been guilty of reproducing. The deceptive myths that are churned out in the West and disseminated in the ‘other’ hemisphere very often intend to perpetuate the structures of unequal economic relations. The ideas of the global village and the predestined convergence of the interests of the ‘contrived’ category of humankind are part of the propaganda generated by surrogate economic imperialists.

It must be admitted, however, that they are as wide apart from each other in terms of their intellectual agendas as any two theorists of two diametrically opposite ideological orientations could be. The thorniest issue that continues to haunt postcolonial studies is the question regarding the possibility of the disappearance of the demarcating line between the colonial
and postcolonial worlds. This view has its origin in the conviction that the
histories, concerns, preoccupations, and destinies of the so called Third World
cannot be divorced from the question of coloniality. The fact that certain parts
of our world have been colonised at certain junctures of their histories
determines their political and cultural identities. Said argues that even when
certain European powers had no colonial ambitions in certain parts of the
‘Third World’ their knowledge and perceptions of this world did not vary
fairly significantly from the Orientalism of those European powers which
had an express agenda of colonising the non-West.

We, the non-Euro-American communities, are not privy to the
motives that underlie the spawning of divergent theories in the institutions of
the developed world. No amount of scepticism is sufficient enough to retain a
wholesome attitude to the intellectual material mass produced by the west.
There are likely to be more fascinating and innocuous ways of handling this
‘lethal stuff’, which unfortunately the present researcher is ignorant of and
consequently, intends to deal with ‘it’ with a great measure of wariness and a
befitting decorum. There is a baulk line of theorisation beyond which it is
counterproductive to venture and the researcher does not mean to move
beyond it.
This is to argue, in Said’s view, European Orientalism was not so much shaped by its economic ambitions as by a monolithic psychological outlook that bred a particular set of supercilious attitudes to non-Europe. This complicates the question that is central to postcolonial theory: is coloniality the defining issue of postcolonial studies? and, if one were to believe Said, it is not. If one were to move beyond Said to look for the reasons one would be adequately rewarded by choosing to believe that colonialism, in its all manifestations, originated from a self-promotional political ideology. This overwhelmingly powerful ideology always seems to structure the mental make-up of the colonialist. Closely related to this aspect of colonialism is the question of the true nature of the driving force that powers colonialism. Is it nationalism or transnational (globalising) capitalist interest that drives colonialism? This view of colonialism as being propelled by either nationalist or globalising ambitions is overreductive in its outlook as it seems to underplay the greed motive of capitalism in its full-blooded operations. There is an increasing tendency in the former colonies---now full-fledged nations---to become a part of the global village, a suicidal instinct that is overpoweringly irrational. Rumina Sethi says about this self-destructive predisposition:

As decolonization struggles began with the culmination of the Second World War, postcolonial nations revelled in the end of European
subjugation. Today, however, especially in the contemporary debates on liberalization, it is clear that none of these new states are inclined to be left out of the ‘rapidly shrinking global village’. What we are now confronting is a transitional nation-state, one in which the desire to hold on to traditional lifestyles and customs struggles against the urge to join the ‘new world order’ or the era of globalization. As the erstwhile empire of the west endeavours to come to terms with new political possibilities after long-drawn-out liberation struggles involving the subversion of inherited language structures and the reassertion of native ethnic values, we paradoxically witness the obsessive determination of former colonies to participate in the mechanisms of a ‘global cultural economy’. (30)

Yet, the dissertation draws its basic premises from certain theoretical and ideological discourses that have come to inform our understanding of reality and its representation. In a sense this thesis is about the politics of representation and its ideological implications. At turns the same factors make representation of a given ‘world’ possible and impossible. The problem of representation and the question of the legitimacy of representation are found to be very vexing in so far as the relationship between the ‘native informant’ and the represented is concerned. The explosion of postcolonial theories renders the problem of the representation of the colonised unprecedentedly confusing. Colonial expansionism is a much
complex phenomenon that requires to be explicated with the help of more subtly nuanced discourses of political economy rather than merely in terms of psychic inadequacies and of steadily crumbling European self. Colonialism has always fundamentally been an economic and materialist project driven by the need to buttress the imploding western self. The process of colonisation is much more than an expression of the West’s psychic fragmentation. The focus on postcolonial perspective to understanding our present and our histories has been felt to be the point of origin for any form of radicalising the contemporary political activities. Although it is necessary to candidly admit the limitations of theory being able to shape the body politics, it is a well-proven point that the ideologies that drive the political movements remain impervious to breakthroughs in the spheres of knowledge production. Rumina Sethi elucidates this view to theory:

The prioritizing of global capitalism over praxis corresponds to the waning of Marxism and Marxist studies. While there are obvious limits to what literary studies can accomplish in relation to changing the new economic and political realities, the prescriptions of the latter have been imposed, consciously or unconsciously, and hegemonically, through the global pressure to fashion a university curriculum that blunts postcolonial sensibilities. If social, economic and political concerns are to remain at the heart of postcolonial studies, it will need to struggle
continuously against the crises introduced by rapidly changing teaching practices as much as by the rising cosmopolitanism of the world.

It has been long accepted that the origin of colonialism has its roots in the continental crises. The acceptance of the theory of colonialism as a stage in the development of capitalism militates against the theories that trace the origins of imperialism in the psychic inadequacies and moral depravations of the native. Some of these theories are sinisterly dangerous variations of “white man’s burden theory”. Postcolonialism—in so far as it allows to be informed by postmodernism--- maps out the seeds of emancipatory politics in the ideologies of the coloniser. The biggest concern of the non-Western intellectual is the ever expanding purview of the postcolonial situation. The concept has been constantly revised to include the entire world that claims to be collectively postcolonial. The problem of the non-definitive and indeterminate definition of the conceptual corpus of postcolonialism has a substantial measure of grounding in the way more and more geographical climes and cultural communities demand to be regarded as having been the victims of unjust and aggressive forces of history.

Postcolonial theory comprises a variety of practices that are performed within a range of fields in different institutional locations around the globe. Some of these practices antedate the period that is dubbed as
postcolonial and as such postcolonial studies have since been argued to be conceptually integrated with postcolonial modes of cultural analysis. A courageous history of postcolonialism must not be wary of covering a wide range of colonial theorists hailing from different corners of the world and of admitting the indispensability of their work to the body of postcolonial theory. This history of postcolonial theory is bound to be complex and is likely to entail a polyphonic narrational mode of theorisation with dialectical processes of mutual influences being constantly at work.

However, the thesis aims to read the works of R.K.Narayan in combination with postcolonial line of arguments without succumbing to temptation to fetishize either the cultural or the textual. Postcolonial theories depend on the dominant notions of modernity for their strength and legitimacy. This dimension of postcolonialism has struck a blow to the radical credentials of postcolonial theories. The postcolonial theory is full of tell-tale signs of its misadventurous honeymooning with postmodern thinking. Most of the metropolitan postcolonial theorists argue that the emergence of postcolonialism is a direct result of the West’s attempt to assimilate the essentially disruptive colonised other into its fold. Postmodernism is argued to contain in its fold the spirit of all anti-colonial resistance and the energy of all liberation movements including postcolonialism. Postcolonialism’s
hobnobbing with linguistics-based theories has robbed it of its radical potential.

The metropolitan postcolonialism seeks approval from the native community. The political ramifications of the conflation of poststructuralism with postcolonialism are wasted on the metropolitan postcolonialist. The primacy accorded by postmodernism to the indeterminacy of subjectivity is potentially detrimental to the radical view that the nature of resistance to colonialism was determined by history and culture. The glorification of the indeterminate subject obliterates the singularity of factors involved in the process of subject formation. The extension of this line of theory very often leads to the arbitrary construction of the binary of nationalism and metropolitanism.

While postcolonial theory has had a long and complex history outside Europe and America, its arrival on the horizon of the Western academy was understandably belated and severely painstaking one. Postcolonialism was considered a separate category of knowledge by cultural theorists until very recently. The reconsideration of the putative crisis in English studies that prevailed in the Western academia was not in the least informed by postcolonial concerns and modes of criticism. The works of the 1980s that dealt with literary theories found space to address cluster of
interests now identified with colonial discourse analysis and postcolonial literatures in English. In spite of its short history as a practice in the Western academy postcolonial criticism has had a major impact upon current modes of cultural analysis and brought to the forefront the issues of race, nation, empire, migration and ethnicity. The note of dissent that is vociferously raised against the futility of postcolonial theories points out their failure to make any marked changes the ways in which the politics at the global plane unfolds. Rumina Sethi says:

As has been argued, it is postcolonial studies that is often accused of failing to make an intervention in the real politics of the people as a result of its academic methodologies focused on modes of textual interpretation. The discipline is undoubtedly derived from movements against colonialism, yet its relationship with poststructuralism and postmodernism is most often used to highlight its apolitical nature. Postcolonial studies are thus faulted for being excessively textual and ‘thin’. Not only should postcolonial studies not disregard third-world national liberation movements, it should also depend more judiciously on western theory so that its excessive reliance on simulacra and anti-essentialism can be kept at bay. (27)

Postcolonial criticism has been increasingly preoccupied in investigating the complicity of Western culture in the attitudes and values
nourishing the process of expansion overseas. The writers who argued to constitute this league of complicity are both overt and subtle supporters of expansionism. Postcolonial perspective has shaped many of the new interpretations of the Renaissance period and has been a force of influence in producing new interpretations of Romantic literature. Postcolonial criticism has in association with different critical discourses such as feminism and deconstruction, radicalised the modes of analysis. Postcolonial theories insist upon the importance of studying literature in tandem with history, politics, sociology and other disciplines. The primary focus has come to be on the multiple material and intellectual contexts which determine its production and reception of a given text. Postcolonial theories have challenged the prevailing notions of the aesthetic autonomy and have replaced its supposed singularity of determination with the view that it is culture that mediates relations of power.

The dissertation intends to self-consciously move away from the non-materialist discourses that inform many postcolonial theories. Very often the dissertation steers off-course from the established course of postcolonial theory influenced by Said’s works. The thesis proposes to locate the shifts in the contemporary cultural discourses and theories. It is essential to construct a materialist postcolonial theory.
Postcolonial theorists have striven hard to collapse the arbitrarily-drawn boundaries between text and context with the objective of demonstrating the continuities between modes of representation of the ruled and the material practices of colonial rule. The postcolonial theory has disintegrated the dichotomy between high and popular culture. Postcolonial theorists have questioned the discontinuity between literature and oral narratives.

The elasticity of the concept of postcolonial theory is even feared to be running the danger of collapsing under its own weight. The real problem springs from the fact that the concept has been so variously applied to such different kinds of historical moment, geographical region, cultural identities, political predicaments and affiliations. This has led to the emergence of the questions of legitimacy with respect to the appropriation of the term postcolonial with reference certain regions, periods, and experiences. However, it would be a mistake to assume that postcolonial theory is now necessarily as securely established cultural analysis like feminism, psychoanalytic criticism or post-structuralism. Since there are different degrees, forms and histories of colonization there are bound to be differences of theorisation as to the true nature of postcoloniality. Some theorists find this rivalry to prove bona fides one’s abject oppression fairly unwholesome.
Postcolonial theory may be seen as distinct set of reading practices that challenge or reflect upon the relations of domination and subordination. Postcolonial theory has not adequately been recognized as an important or even distinct mode of cultural analysis within the Euro-American academy. For many cultural theorists of the West postcolonialism has not arrived yet as a self-contained discipline. It must be admitted that the analysis of colonial systems of representation and cultural description long predates Said’s intervention in the field of postcolonialism. Said begins a mode of analysis from within a set of systematic paradigms drawn from contemporary continental European cultural theories. It has been argued that postcolonialism is centred on the celebration of the ‘other’, which is said to weaken its theoretical strength. Eagleton has the following to say about this weakness:

Like any other theory, then, post-colonial discourse has its limits and blind-spots. It has sometimes involved a romantic idealization of the ‘other’, along with a simplistic politics which regards the reduction of the ‘other’ to the ‘same’ as the root of all political evil. This particular postmodern theme, of otherness and self-identity, is by now itself threatening to become drearily self-identical. An alternative brand of post-colonial thought, in deconstructing any too rigid opposition between colonizing self and colonized other, ends up stressing their mutual implication and so risks blunting the political cutting-edge of an anti-
colonialist critique. For all its emphasis on difference, post-colonial theory has sometimes too quickly conflated very different societies under the same 'Third World' category; and its language has too often betrayed a portentous obscurantism incongruously remote from the peoples it champions. Some of the theory has been genuinely path-breaking, while some of it has done little more than reflect the guilty self-loathing of a Western liberalism which would rather, in these hard political times, be absolutely anything but itself. (205-206)

The incompatibility between postcolonialism and poststructuralism springs from the latter’s dismissive attitude to the materialist explanation of colonialism as a stage in the development of capitalism. It is evident that these two theoretical movements are ideologically at variance with each other. Yet, there are a few theorists who swear by the ideological inseparability of the two. Postmodernism, which believes in collapsing the graded binaries or inverting them, is likely to play into the hands of anti-colonial politics. The vestures of colonialism is easier to grapple with in terms of dialectical binary between the coloniser and the colonised.

The ‘insights’ of psychoanalysis are argued to lend a new dimension to postcolonial theory, and the most important of these ‘inventions’ is the concept of the subject in flux. The putative autonomy of the colonised subject in the process of political transformation is central to the
points of contact between psychoanalysis and postcolonialism. The interdisciplinary is grounded in Freudian and Lacanian notions of the formation of the subject in perpetual process. The act of taking the dialectical colonial conflict to the plane of psychoanalysis is disastrous for the process of the formation of the politically-informed postcolonial subject. But the constant in the relationship between the colonising subject and the colonised subject is gallantly argued to be conditioned by the operations of the unconscious.

The most valid line of criticism of postcolonialism has come from Aijaz Ahmad who sees postcolonial theory not as politically radical or even correct but as deeply conservative in its ideas and effects. He even goes to the extent of clearly indicating that postcolonial theory is a reconfigured ideological apparatus employed by the authority of the West to reassert its clasp over the formerly colonised world. Ahmad sees the whole postcolonial project as an extremely intelligent strategy of the West to retain its self-arrogated intellectual supremacy. Ahmad explores the implications of the institutional location and affiliations of the postcolonial theorists. He sees postcolonial theory as the intellectual praxis of a privileged and dislocated class far removed from the material realities of the developing world. Ahmad argues that anti-colonial resistance movements are commodified and
circulated as an intellectual product in the Western academy. Ahmad further says:

A notable feature of Orientalism is that it examines the history of Western textualities about the non-West quite in isolation from how these textualities might have been received, accepted, modified, challenged, overthrown or reproduced by the intelligentsias of the colonized countries: not as an undifferentiated mass but as situated social agents impelled by our own conflicts, contradictions, distinct soci-al and political locations, of class, gender, region, religious affiliation, and so on- hence a peculiar disjuncture in the architecture of the book. One of its major complaints is that from Aeschylus onwards the West has never permitted the Orient to represent itself; it has represented the Orient. I shall discuss that peculiar vision of human history below. But what is remarkable is that with the exception of Said’s own voice, the only voices we encounter in the book are precisely those of the very Western canonicity which, Said complains, has always silenced the Orient. Who is silencing whom, who is refusing to permit a historicized encounter between the voice of the so-called 'Orientalist' and the many voices that 'Orientalism' is said so utterly to suppress, is a question that is very hard to determine as we read this book. It sometimes appears that one is transfixed by the power of the very voice that one debunks.(172-173)
Postcolonial theorists legitimate the practices aimed at reproducing international division of labour produced and perpetuated by global capitalism. In his view, the cultural raw material exported to the West by the native suppliers is turned into finished products by the metropolitan centres. This theory industry caters to the needs of the Western academy. It is the same rehashed theory which is exported to the Third World. Ahmad thinks that thus the Orient has become reduced to the status of a mere career for both metropolitan and formerly colonial intelligentsia. Some critics point out that postcolonial theory relegates other forms of postcolonial criticism that are not informed by the continental high theory to a secondary status and as such are considered to be unmindful of their epistemological origins and orientations. Postcolonial theorists are often accused of appropriating the subversive potentiality of the anti-colonial resistance movements to reinforce the radicalism of their own reading strategies. This reading for textual resistance concerns itself with negotiating the contradictions discernible within the textual spaces, thus dislocating the site of subversive agency from ‘colonised or post-colonial subjects and resituated within the textual work of the institutionalised western literary critic’.

The formal process of decolonisation did not end the economic relationship between the colonising and the colonised societies. Imperialism assumed more refined forms. The notion of global village is an illusion that
flourishes in sharp contrast to the reality of an unequal distribution of capital and international labour. The newer forms of imperialist control of the formerly colonised nations have often questioned the propriety of the use of the term postcolonialism. The assumption of the attainment of a postcolonial state of affairs in the world has been called a hoax. Metropolitan theories often draw a line between the colonial and the postcolonial phases, refusing to perceive a continuum between them.

Postcolonial theory often overstates the problematics of the Third World nations. Ahmad finds a particular problem with postcolonial theory's approach to the works of metropolitan-based writers whose hostile representation of women, minorities, servants, and others is often ignored by it. He argues that Postcolonialism’s methodological procedures derive from contemporary Euro-American theories which are politically regressive and insidious in a number of ways. Western cultural criticism has come to be divorced from concrete political activism or struggles. Most of these Western-bred theories celebrate the textual engagement of the structures of the ruling order by replacing material forms of activism. The hegemony of postcolonial theory can be traced to the rise of poststructuralist theory which itself reached the summit of its influence at the most orthodox historical and cultural phase governed by Reagan and Thatcher. Yet, differences between the metropolitan centres and the periphery, as Couze Venn says, persist:
We know too that when we divert attention from the ‘big picture’, we have to recognize the enormous differences that exist if we were to contrast the everyday lives of people in a village, say, in the Sindh province of Pakistan with what happens in a village in England, or in a town in the Midwest of the USA or in Brazil. Indeed, the difference between the same Pakistani village and Karachi is just as striking at the level of technology, customs, laws, the spatial disposition of the material world and the temporal flow of daily life. However, in postcolonial times, all have come under the scrutiny of the new surveillance, intensifying the gaze of the multitude of organizations – governments, NGOs, transnational corporations, experts and researchers – that have for some time taken these places to be the object of their interest. In the ‘informational turn’ of regulatory bodies like the International Monetary Fund, they figure in reports about economic development, health, demographic composition, education, technology, crime, poverty, natural resources, and so on that are used in the strategic calculations of disciplinary forces. (4-5)

In Ahmad's view, the Western canon is privileged over the formerly colonised cultures, shifting the focus of attention from noxious neo-colonial practices of the metropolitan spaces to the frozen cultural texts trapped in time warp. The texts chosen by the postcolonial theory are often produced by
the Third World elite and intelligentsia working in the western canonical traditions, which can be hardly said to represent the authentic voices of the native societies. These elitist texts may profitably be located within the politically dominant class of their respective societies. His argument runs along the lines that postcolonial theory of the recent times has come to legitimate and privilege the texts produced in English as the authentic sources of the native knowledge and to see the ‘products of the English-writing intelligentsia of the cosmopolitan cities as the central documents' of the national literature of the postcolonial nations. This theoretical idealisation of elitist literature results in marginalisation of the native cultures which are self-consciously free from metropolitan influences. This process of marginalisation ensures that new cultural production of the postcolonial world is rendered invisible, unconsciously reproducing the operations of colonial ideologies.

Closely related to these issues are the ideas of nation and nationalism. Yet, we cannot deny the fact that they are imbued with certain structuring European ideological elements. The matter of fact is the nationalist narratives are arbitrated by the colonising master narratives. However, this thesis prefers to stay away from the crude nativist revivalism that ignites some of the non-metropolitan solipsistic theoretical writings. Anthony Appaiah is one of the most fervent theorists who argues for the case
of nativism as opposed to nationalism. Critics like Robert Young are censorious of this revivalist line of theorisation. Benita Parry, while referring to his critical view of native revivalism, says the following about the intrinsic value of nativism:

Mindful of Robert Young’s caution that the search for a nativist alternative may simply represent ‘the narcissistic desire to find an other that will reflect western assumptions of selfhood’), I will argue that something quite different animates those modes of postcolonial critique concerned to reconstruct a story from tales, legends and idioms which are themselves transcriptions and improvisations of dissent that was never formally narrativized, and to produce an uncensorious but critical interrogation of colonial resistance when they were. It will be evident that the interest of such readings is to retain in the discussion that realm of imaginary freedom which these histories prefigured or configured, as well as to register decolonizing struggles as an emancipatory project despite the egregious failures these brought in their wake. Although the assumption here is that the discourses or discursive retracings of past dissidence come to us already encoded with the elements of a counter-narrative (which diminishes the critics’ claim to be performing the insurgent act), it is we who by appropriating it to our theoretical purposes alter the material, in the process making visible its erasures,
suppressions and marginalizations, evident for example in the foregrounding of male figures of praxis and authority. (42)

Nationalism has played a decisively progressive role in colonial history. The consolidation of a strong anti-colonial resistance movement in the former colonies was, to a greater degree, was driven by the western notions of nationalism. The thesis attempts to deal with the radical issues related to different modes of embedding national narratives in Narayan. Relocation of the traditional narratives in new contexts need not always be subversive. Narayan chose to write in a language that was an extended apparatus employed to consolidate the colonial rule. This move by Narayan is often seen as radical: he chose to write in English which was seen by the majority of the Indians as an alien element. There has not been much difference in the view held by the Indian readership regarding the Indian-English writers. Indian writing in English has come to be privileged as representing an authentic Indian culture, though the use of these terms in singular is in itself extremely problematic.

The dissertation proposes to delve into all these issues referred to in the above at some length. The thesis is divided into five chapters with a very succinct conclusion that does not feign any claim of scholarship, but intends to drive home the point it is capable of making with a very few
words. The First Chapter, titled **Postcolonial Theory** discusses the various theoretical positions that could be appropriated to have a meaningful understanding of postcolonial writing. It also deals with the intrinsic pitfalls of aligning with Eurocentric theories. The Chapter attempts to orient our present realities with reference to the huge mass of postcolonial theory. The Second Chapter of the thesis is entitled **Narayan and His World** and tries to locate Narayan’s fiction in the larger body of writing that goes by the name postcolonial writing. It also focuses on the sticky issues regarding the question of authenticity of Indian writing in English. This Chapter titled as it is derives its sustenance from Spivak’s notion of ‘native informant’ and tries to posit Narayan as an Indian writer catering to the voyeuristically gratificatory impulses of the West. The title of the Third Chapter is **Burden of a Nation** which is about Narayan’s pre-independent novels and how they are weighed down by the profound burden of Indian history with its hang-ups. **Hindu Theatre of Karma** is the name of the Fourth Chapter which intends to trace the Bramhinic influences on Narayan’s writing. **Moral Bewilderment of Free India** is the heading of the Fifth Chapter; it attempts to map the moral confusion that pervades the latter novels of Narayan.
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