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Diasporic and Expatriate Sensibility

The term “Diaspora” means, the dispersion of any people from their traditional homeland. On the other hand “Expatriate” refers to a person who lives outside their native country. The term seems to be synonymous, as it refers to the forced separation, or dispersion due to unavoidable circumstances, from the native land. This sensibility gets echoed in the works of post colonial writers, and in most of the travelogue writers and especially in the writings of V.S. Naipaul. Stuart Hall expresses his views about this active position of diasporic and expatriate experiences and states:

The process of forced and ‘free’ migration... have become a global phenomenon of the so called ‘post-colonial’ world. Though they seem to invoke an origin in a historical past with which they continue to correspond, actually identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being not “who we are” or ‘where we came from”, so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves: not the so-called return to roots but a coming to terms with our ‘routes’ (4)

In such condition, a person, who has to face this increasingly complex, culturally diverse and ambiguous world, his identity sways like a cradle, where he has to continuously negotiate with the new, construct and create a fresh. At this juncture we need to understand the basic concept of Diaspora and Expatriate. Expatriate literature is the literature written by persons who are living as alien in a foreign country. After the world war II there was an emergence of expatriate literature, especially in twentieth century. Migration and Diaspora are common
features of the twentieth century and literature written by the expatriates depicting the predicament of such people is a distinguishing feature of the twentieth century life.

If we seek the dictionary meaning of an expatriate, it states that it is a person living outside one’s country; he is an alien there, having emigrated from the land of his birth. He is an outsider, and lives in a state of exile, self imposed, or circumstantial. The word ‘patria’ which is a Latin world means country and it would therefore follow that, an expatriate is one, who is expelled from ‘patria’ or it may be voluntary effort determined by circumstances.

An expatriate emigrates to an alien country from his ‘patria’ for multiple reasons — lure of money, opportunities of education, employment, religious persecution, political asylum, cultural perspective. Ages ago, it was the lure of gold, which set off a chain of sailors and explorers from the west, like Columbus, Sir Walter Raleigh in search of India and the West Indies. An expatriate may live abroad without acquiring citizenship there, like a resident alien, as Aldous Huxley did in USA. He may experience the social and cultural vacuum of an exile; inspite of acquiring the status of citizenship in an alien country. V.S. Naipaul who has lived in England for 46 years still belongs to this category. Inspite of his prolonged stay and his marriage to a English lady, he is an expatriate and thus a feeling of rootlessness persists with him, which gets echoed in his travelogues.

In several books of Naipaul he has expressed his alienated sensation. Describing his stay in England, he admits that like an outsider, he is unable to utilize his immediate environment for a creative purpose. London remains his base, the land of his physical stay but it is his journeys to various countries and to Trinidad and Tobago, the land of his birth, which gives him stuff for his creative work. In Naipaul’s novel *Half a Life*, we see his sentiments, as he feels as an outsider. In this novel we get the illusion of Diasporic and Expatriate sensibility, as he focuses especially on the problems of man’s loss, placelessness,
isolation and alienation. Through the character of Willie Somerset Chandran, Naipaul masterfully paints colonial predicament, his anxiety and dislocation.

Willie in the book is struck between the conflict of being born to a Brahmin father and mother from an untouchable class. His middle name was Somerset, which was given to him by his father, after the name of English writer Somerset Maugham, who visited Willie’s town before Independence. This second name Somerset was given with the intention that his son may ‘mimic’ the whites. By this incident Naipaul clearly illustrates the gap between the colonizer, a colonial’s mimicry, and his desire to construct himself in a chaotic world. He is aware of his paradoxical nature of mimicry. As a matter of fact he cannot possess Western identity simply by possessing a western name. We can say, identifying with the Western Name dismantling his Indian name symbolizes the loss of original culture and trying to make a space within the western culture, this is what we can say is the diasporic and expatriate sensibility. Naipaul very vividly expressed the sentiments and turmoils of the colonial, the exiled, the immigrant the marginal and the uprooted, who are in the state of indefinite suspension. Such people neither identify with his homeland, nor with the new world, he is put in. Willie’s state of mind, clearly proves our points, when he feels:

He was unanchored, with no idea of what lay ahead. He still had no idea of the scale of things, no idea of historical time or even of distance ... He began to understand, that he was free to Present himself as he wished … he could remake himself and his past, his ancestry ... (60)

Naipaul clearly illustrates, by the position of Willie in Half of Life, the sensibility of immigrants, who not only loose their cultural heritage, but also their sense of place, just as Willie, who identifies neither with his homeland, an old world, nor with the new world he desires. Further, diasporic and expatriate conditions need to develop an attitude to negotiate with the new, construct or create a fresh identity with the new environment. It needs the
travelling towards self identity. Willie in search of self - identity develops temporary confidence and marries Ana who is of mixed Portugese - African descent. He goes with her to her estate in one of Portugal’s East African outpost, with an intention for a new beginning, and construct his own identity. Inspite of his effort, he remains a stranger and outsider in this country, just as in India and London, and this position makes him suffer an even greater sense of alienation. This position is quite synonym of Naipaul’s position himself, thus he could very lively portray Willie’s character perhaps Naipaul pours out his heart, through Willie’s caricature and anguishes: “I don’t want to stay here long. I don’t know where I am. I don’t think I can pick my way back. I don’t even want this view to become familiar I must not unpack. I must never behave as though I am staying.” (162)

This is the mental condition which the immigrants pass through. These exiled, immigrant actually pass through a sense of loss, disorientation and dereliction. We can furthermore put that they develop a sense of non belonging in a new and alien world on account of loss of their native place.

An expatriate writer, in totality and particularly Naipaul, has a dual existence; living simultaneously in two worlds. The one to which he cannot and does not wish to return and the other, the land of his actual stay, which he cannot or dare not leave. The hold of the country or place of his stay exerts a strong pull and glues him to it and the lure of his name remains a distant dream. Thus he is juxtaposed between two tension exerting forces, and this is how the expatriate sensibility is generated.

The expatriate sensibility thus generated results in a feeling of displacement and homelessness. At the heart of an expatriate is a growing restlessness which makes him launch on temporary journeys, which perhaps had lead to many travelogues and also the travel writings of V.S. Naipaul. We can say, these temporary journeys or a move from one place, to another, which has arisen due to feeling of restlessness or homelessness among the expatriate
can be called as flights or escapes, which are a common feature of an expatriate. This feeling of temporariness, rootlessness, nowhereness, initiates him for a flight or escape. V.S. Naipaul as a child, wanted to escape from the barren environment of Trinidad. We all know that journey form a basic part of his life. He made journey from Trinidad to London, and from London, he made temporary visits to various parts, i.e. to West Indies, India, Africa, Islamic countries, and America, the account of which he gives in his travel writings. This is to specify that this has been a common experience of several other writers from the Caribbean island; who also emigrated to London.

We all believe that language is a part of man’s identity. The expatriate due to a constant separation from one’s land gets distant from his language. If he is lucky enough, he can get assistance from other expatriate to keep his language alive, at least in form of conversation. While few, who are exiled from the home land from the childhood, may have only stray memories of the language, losing one’s original language entails the loss of one’s original culture and indigenous identity. While in a foreign land an expatriate has to communicate in the language of the place. He finds himself in a turmoil, as he loses grip over his language and he is unable to expertise himself, in the language of the alien land, so as to communicate fluently. Thus loss of original language is a part of expatriate sensibility. His position is that of a confused man. An expatriate so as to survive in an alien land needs to learn and converse in the language of the land, but at the same time an immigrant needs to preserve one’s original language, one’s mother tongue. This particularly expatriate feeling gets expressed in these lines, in the creation Two worlds, by Naipaul:

The world outside existed in a kind of darkness; and we inquired about nothing. I was just old enough to have some idea of the Indian epics, the Ramayan in particular. The children who came five years or so after me in our extended family didn’t have this luck. No one taught us Hindi. Sometime
someone wrote out the alphabet for us to learn, and that was that; we were expected to do the rest ourselves. So as English penetrated, we began to lose our language. (483)

Similarly these lines from the *Half of Life* by Naipaul, echoes the trauma of loosing one’s grip over mother tongue and on the other side the forcible acquisition of an alien language reflects one’s anguish as he is left with no proper language;

He thought about the new language, he would have to learn. He wondered whether he would be able to hold on to his own language. He wondered whether he would forget his English [...].Willie was trying to deal with the knowledge that had come to him on the ship that his home language had almost gone, that his English was going, that he had no proper language, left no gift of expression. (132)

An expatriate or Diasporic dispersal does not only have a narrow, gloomy experience. It does not only symbolize the restriction of one’s boundry of acceptability. An expatriate or a Diaspora, may have sentimental attachment towards its roots, but on the other hand, its constant varied exposure to the alien land and environment develops a broader outlook and wider sense of acceptability for others. They develop a global vision and awareness. They are the people and citizen of non restricted area rather a citizen of the world, as he no more belongs to any single country. Hence, he is released from the boundaries of restriction; he enjoys true freedom. Perhaps that’s why the Nobel Laureate Derek Walcott remarks about expatriate, “To have loved one horizon in insularity; it blindfolds vision. It narrows experience” (44)

Before looking into the deeper sense or privileges of expatriate and diasporic experiences, we need to peep down to the actual meaning of Diaspora. The world “Diaspora” has been taken from the Greek word which means dispersion or scatter. Historically the word
came into existence, after the settling of scattered Colonies of Jews outside Palestine, after the Babylonian exile. This scatter or dispersion may be the result of economic, political, sociological, military upheavals or pressures. On the other hand imperialism and colonialism have also resulted in diasporic movement and creations. New country, new situation has always lead to inner conflict and tension in the case of a diasporic or expatriate, which has already been studied in the previous part of the chapter. Apart from it, this dispersion or change, also accounts for striking new identities, cancelling out the old ones. Here I would like to quote Edward to support my point:

…new alignments across borders, types, nations and essences are rapidly coming into view and it is this new alignment that now provoke and challenge the fundamental static notion of identity that has been the core of cultural thought ... (28)

The new ground, the new cultural thoughts, new challenges, really appeals the diasporic and expatriate and its reflections can be seen in their creative works. However, they also had to face the ill consequence of racism, nationality colour, apart from climatic, differentiation. We know, a person is shaped by the nation, he belongs to; the tradition that builds him up remains an unbroken factor for him. But on the other part, human beings are caught in a tendency of assimilation, heterogeneous, metamorphosis and a tendency of international human heritage. All these concepts are developing faster than imagined. Today at all levels a tendency of hybrid, a mix culture is growing up. Today, on economic level too, the markets are open worldwide: due to globalization. Thus intermixing is a common factor. At such an instance diaspora and expatriate find themselves at ease. Here I would again like to quote Edward to strengthen my point: “… all the empire, all cultures are involved with one another, none is single, pure, all are hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinary, differentiated and unmonolithic.” (29)
Initially, to define a diasporic, or the position of an expatriate, we used to use words like fragmentation and rootlessness, but now one has tried to come in terms with the situation. Today diaspora is associated with assimilation. Thus one experiences two situations or pulls, i.e. its ground, its real identity, is subjectivity and on the other hand, it faces collision of cultures, people, society, environment and thus being grounded by such circumstances, one speak of its experience in a diasporic or expatriate literature. Uprooting and dispersion has been the tendency since history for varied reasons, but at times mass migration takes place, leaving a void in a place. In this aspect how K. Bhabha, accurately says that the nation fills the void left by the uprooting of communities and kin and turns that loss into the language of metaphor, in a language of expression.

Apart from using language, and expression, to fill up the gaps formed from uprooting, the diasporas or expatriate develops an art of invisibleness. In a new environment, with no one to recognize their identity they get lost in the crowd, i.e. they become invisible. It ironically illustrates the position of the diaspora. Perhaps that’s why Ralph Ellison, writes about *The invisible Man*. It shows the sad position, of the diasporas, in which they have to thrive and survive. In being invisible, they pretend not to exist in the eyes of the people of the newland. In doing so, they also escape the gaze of the new environment, which do not at once accept an intruder and share their part of possession. This particular type of sensibility can be found in expatriate and diasporic writings. The lines written by a black female poet, brings out the pathos:

We arrived in the Northern Hemisphere when Summer was set in its way running from the flames that lit the sky over the plantations were a struggle bunch of immigrants in a lily white landscape.

One day I learnt a secret art invisibleness it was called.

I think it worked as or now you look but never see me …
Only my eyes will remain to watch and to haunt and to turn your dreams to chaos.

The poem reveals the disturbed stability of the Diasporas. It echoes that their image, their identity becomes a problem for them, hence they drape the attire of invisibleness, as they lack the sensibility of national belongingness in the new country. This is the question of national belongingness in the new country. This question of national belonging surfaces or is remarkably reflected in the literature of the diaspora. The diasporic displacement and identity crisis are linked with each other. They take a lot of time getting assimilated with the new cultural forms, overcome colour neurosis and mannerism. Though this assimilation takes time, but with time links are made between the migrants and the residents, between the colonizer and the colonized, between the expatriate and the new environment. All these results in the formation of a hybrid linkage, hybrid people, who are yoked together either forcibly, or due to circumstances or at times willingly. We so often come to the examples of Black-British, British-Asian, Anglo-Indian, Indo-Caribbean, African-American etc. All these hybrid combinations were formed at different times, due to different situations. This fanning of people in different directions due to need, motivation and force, is being found in people belonging to all professions.

Now lets study this diasporic or expatriate sensibility as reflected in the literature with main focus in the works of Naipaul. Writers of all the diasporas, have recorded the manner in which they have chosen and adopted to their new environment and how they have experienced both identification, nostalgia, loss of their old homelands and acquiring a new homeland. This bonding of culture, religion, literature, history which resulted in a new pattern of ethics. This identity gets reflected in the literature of the diasporas. Among the famous diasporic writing we can name Naipaul and David Dabydeen who writes from the West Indian diaspora, Bharati Mukherjee represents the US diaspora. Rushdie and Dhondy
write from the UK diaspora, whereas Rohinton Mistry comes from the Canadian diaspora and so on.

Now let's trace Naipaul's position as a diasporic and expatriate writer. To trace Naipaul's location, we have to trace Caribbean history. Let's start with quoting Naipaul himself:

I had grown up thinking of cruelty as something always in the background. There was an ancient, and not so ancient cruelty in the language of the streets; casual threats, man and parents to children, of punishments and degradation...

There was the cruelty of extended family life. The cruelty of the Indian countryside and the African town (20)

The history of Caribbean is violent, bloody, as from the time of its discovery in the fifteenth century, it was seen as objects to be exploited, rather than colonies to be settled, which ultimately led to the intervention of European power i.e. France, Spain, England and the fierce naval rivalry between them. It was not until the end of the Napoleonic wars, when Caribbean Sea was no longer of strategic importance to Europe, that the islands attained a measure of stability, though lethal damage was already done at the economic level. Naipaul, with a Caribbean background had drawn up the map of the Caribbean chaos, heterogeneity of races, cultures, dialects, lack of educational opportunities, very vividly in *The Middle Passage*. After the war, Caribbean faced rising unemployment, poverty imperial restriction. On the other hand a sense of pride in the history and culture of the Caribbean generated, which in turn gave way to creative expression. Many West Indian writers such as Lamming, John Hearne, Neville Dawes, profoundly belonged to this category.

We all are aware of the ancestry of Naipaul. He is a Trinidad born English author, who is of Indian parentage. His grandfather had emigrated from Banaras in Uttar Pradesh. Trinidad is one of the islands which together are called the West Indies. It became an
independent country in 1962. Naipaul left Trinidad to study at Oxford at the age of eighteen. 

*In The Middle Passage* Naipaul gives the account of his leaving Trinidad for England. Naipaul was disillusioned by the Tropical atmosphere of Trinidad. It was a nightmare to him as he writes: “In Trinidad, from seven or eight in the morning to five in the afternoon, the heat was great, to be out of doors was to be stung, to feel the heat and discomfort.” (27)

Trinidad is reminded by V.S. Naipaul, in many of his works, as the stray memories of one’s homeland which is quite difficult to erase. *In the Mystic Masseur*, he tells the story of a man called Ganesh Ramsumair belonging to Trinidad. The author describes an imaginary confrontation between the members of Creole and Indian society on one side and the sophisticated and civilized wife of the governor. He ridicules the creole society for their lack of aptitude, social grace. In the *Middle Passage* too he describes these people as being “like monkeys pleading for evolution”.

Naipaul, an expatriate and a diasporic writer, remembers Trinidad in many of his travelogues. In *The Suffrage of Elvira*, he deals with a successful campaign by Mr. Harbans, a Trinidadian Hindu, to win election from Elvira (a place in Trinidad). Here he portrays the basic selfishness and hypocrisy of the common residents. The book depicts Elvira as a destitute society without history and without achievement.

Naipaul’s *A House for Mr Biswas* is also set in Trinidad, the place where he is born. Trinidad is an island in the Caribbean sea, which became independent country in 1962. Naipaul saw the tragic condition of the Indian laboures who were imported into Trinidad. The story of the novel is Mr. Biswas’s struggle to get a house of his own. Another dimension of the story is that Mr Biswas finds himself misfit in Tulsi family, where he marries. They remain like two islands in the Caribbean Sea. They became emotionally uprooted. The novel highlights the problem of geopolitical uprooting of people and the consequences of socio-
cultural hybridity. The sense of uprooting, weakens the traditional forces. Mr Biswas’s desire to own a house symbolizes an individual’s strong impulse to protect his identity.

A migrant always remembers his home, he fantasies to be back at home, but seldom he does so. This sentiments is echoed in these lines from the novel:

> Despite the solidity of the establishment, the Tulsi, had never considered themselves settled in Arwacab or even Trinidad. It was not longer than a stage in the journey that had begun when Pundit Tulsi left India. Only the death of Pundit Tulsi had prevented them from going back to India; - ever since they had talked (210)

The expatriate or a diasporic sensibility shows concern for a home of one’s own. The intense aspiration for a home, which symbolizes its quest for roots, for stability and order, is the universal quest of a diaspora. A home is not only a cement and concrete structure, but it is a metaphor of one’s identity. To acquire a plot of one’s own to construct a home, may became the major objective of an expatriate’s life. This objective or quest is accurately painted by Naipaul in his novel *A House for Mr. Biswas*. In this novel, Naipaul had used expression such as “I envy those who have a house of their own / who can say their feet Rest I on what is their’s alone” (350) This is the juggling, an ongoing and continuous process, in securing a stability, a house of one’s own, that is reinforced, at every minute in the midst of his loneliness, sufferings and humiliation in the country of his stay.

An expatriate or a diasporic person has a complex existence and a complex personality. At times, he may appear sound, but on other times, he may protrude out his fractured sensibility. This dual paradoxical nature cannot only be observed in Naipaul’s travelogues, but also in his life and behaviour To support our point, here I would like to quote Sudha Rai’s view about Naipaul:
Naipaul responds both as an Indian in India and as a Westerner in India.

Naipaul’s joy and exultation come from his former self. His anger and negativity from the latter self. His flight from India punctuated by his brief returns - the pattern of venture and withdrawal express perfectly the dilemma of the expatriate self. (27)

If we ponder on the other side of the expatriate or diasporic sensibility, i.e. rather seek its positive and constructive approach, we see that the stay of these people in foreign countries can be a powerful instrument of attitudinal changes. The expatriate, with his complexities, paradoxes and nostalgia gradually becomes acceptable in the foreign country and the foreign country itself becomes quite receptive and acceptable. This is the process of globalization. Naipaul’s life and work, itself illustrates such a process of assimilation in a foreign land. Like all expatriate, Naipaul arrived England with an “enigma”, but he carved out a place for his own creativity and moulded it to a shape successfully; the process has been so successful that today, not only has he become acceptable but has also been laden with numerous prizes for literature from England. He has acquired an international status and has become a part of the fast growing acceptable expatriate in literature. They are now not the citizens of a country but of the world. This is the striking feature of the twentieth century, where the world had shrunked into a small place, the demarcation and the gaps had vanished and this is the sensibility that colours the travelogues of the time and of Naipaul.

Naipaul travelled to England from Trinidad and settled down there as an expatriate, yet the distant lands continued to enchant him for various reasons He visited all the countries of the Third world, i.e. British Guiana, Surinam, Martinique and Jamaica. It seems, he took to these flights, to be away from the creatively sterile land, to gain more creative freshness. An Area of Darkness (1964) is Naipaul’s second travelogue, which was based on his visit to India. Although, Naipaul before visiting India, he was filled up with romantic thoughts and
vision about India which was as a result of notions and stories, on which he was fed in the West Indies, by his immigrant relatives. He had also been brought up as a “Hindu” and his visit to India was also perhaps motivated by his desire to explore his roots and redefine his position with India. He wishes to examine quietly whether, he could find his roots in India. Naipaul though born in Trinidad, belonged to an Indian immigrant family, which captured his mind since his early age. The ‘flight’ which characterizes the life of an expatriate as well the sense of alienation started in Naipaul’s life at a very early stage. Travels, for Naipaul seemed to be an optimistic solution to the problem. But his intention of travels were not always fulfilled, because when the travelled to West Indies, he went there, not so much as a Hindu, but as a product of Queen’s Royal college and Oxford University. We already know, as previously mentioned, that the outcome of this travel was his travel book *The Middle Passage* (1962). Similarly, later when he travelled to India, he found himself as a in westernized misfit there. He returned to India again in 1975 once again in 1980s which enabled him to write the famous Trinity of Indian travels i.e. *An Area of Darken* (1965), *India a wounded civilization* (1975) and *India a Million Mutinies Now* (1990).

Naipaul’s childhood was caricatured by fantasy about India. He remembers, that even the house that was built by his grandfather, in Trinidad, resembled their ancestral house of Uttar Pradesh in India. He had longed a dream of settling down in India, as he wanted to return back to his roots. On the basis of this romantic picture, that was embedded deep in his consciousness, he had built, up a picture of a dream India which could be a home for him. He visited India with some expectation, i.e. he expected to see an India, that was revitalized, rejuvenated but simultaneously preserving the ancient culture. But his visit to India gave him a different picture, that shattered his long built dream. He found that Indians like the West Indies people mimic the British. For Naipaul, this came as a shock and confusion. He found that his double alienation was complete the alienation from Trinidad and the one from India.
He expresses his sentiments in *An Area of Darkness*. “It was a journey that ought not to have made, it had broken my life into two ... The Journey was in a way, a futile one, it did not succeed in exercising anything.” 27)

This shows Naipaul’s disillusionment on visiting India. He had dreamt of settling down in India, but he returned to England shattered. Naipaul came to India with expectation and also with a sense of humiliation, as his ancestors had to leave the motherland as indentured labourers. When he visited India, he had both the feeling of an insider and as well as an outsider; a type of sensibility that is common with an expatriate or a diasporic person. In *An Area of Darkness*, thus he expresses, India as an area of darkness and he had come there with the intention of discovering India. He explains the background from where he came. India, was a dream land for him since his childhood. He had known India through his ancestors, by the language he spoke at home, by the immigrant Indians among whom he had lived and the books he had read. He expresses his vision about India as such:

… a country out; in the void beyond the dot of Trinidad... It was a country suspended in time, it could not be related to the country discovered later... now though time has widened, though space has contracted and I have travelled lucidly over that area, which was to me the area of darkness, something of darkness, in those attitudes, those ways of thinking and seeing which are no longer mine. (30)

It was with such a background that Naipaul travelled India. He was feeling rootless and was in search of roots. As he travelled through India, he discovered that the India he had known was only a land of his imagination. Naipaul’s predicament in India is very peculiar. In Trinidad and in London, Naipaul had learnt to have a distinctive existence. He cannot adjust with the idea of living without any distinctiveness, as it was a part of his being. In Trinidad he felt distinctive due to his intellectual superiority and in England, he was different due to his
background and race. He discovered, that in India where he was expecting to find his roots, he was different. This feeling came as a agony to him, both Trinidad and India were British colonies. In Trinidad, every child was brought up with the fact that it was only a dot in the map, and thus it had to lead a life anchored to British, so as to survive. But in India, he found that India and England lived side by side, creating ‘a comic mixture of costumes and the wide spread use of an imperfectly understood language’ (190)

Naipaul’s tragic situation of rootlessness and alienation gets echoed when he writes “I had learned my separateness from India, and was content to be a colonial, without a past, without ancestors” (252)

In his book India: A Wounded Civilization, Naipaul, an expatriate and a diasporic, pens down his experience and sensibility about India, when he visited it for the second time in 1975. In this book, he expresses, that the initial shock to his imaginative, romantic image of India and the acute sense of shame, because of his ancestors had to leave the country as indentured labourers had now receded a bit. But his personal history still remains the foundation on which he builds his book. The book evolves out some encounters and random interviews with people he does not know enough. He also expresses, his turmoil, about the language, he would communicate with the people of India, as being left out of any contact with his roots he is quite unaware of their dialect. The India he visited in 1975 was the India of emergency. His purpose of visit India was an expatriate inquiry about his home land. Thus he observes: “An inquiry about India, even an inquiry about the emergency has quickly to go beyond the political. It has to be an inquiry about Indian attitudes; it has to be an inquiry about the civilization itself.” (9)

Here he is engaged in searching the very foundation of Indian culture and civilization. Naipaul feels hurt, to find his dream land, his root country, which has suffered many foreign assaults, has resulted in a number of wounds which had left the country to be a wounded
civilization. He was shattered to see the pile of ruins, which was the result of number of foreign attacks and demolisions. Naipaul’s comment on India in the travelogues, shows his prejudices. Though, a sharp reaction had come up to his comment on India from scholars and critics. Nissim Ezekiel writes that Naipaul, argues too exclusively from revulsion and anger Naipaul’s obsession, keeps him away from reconciliation with his roots and his alienation further broadens and gives him the status of a homeless person. Furthermore Naipaul’s inability to accept any country as his home, inspite of his struggle to do so is due to his lack of need for a deeper exploration and understanding. It seems he has developed a congenial relationship with expatriacy. He had also developed a complex sensibility, which was due to his prolonged outstay from roots, i.e. his stay in Trinidad as an immigrant, then in London again as an immigrant. He lived in Trinidad as an immigrant with a strong nostalgic Hindu foundation; he lives in England as an expatriate and when he comes to India, his ‘expatriate sensibility’ is that of a person twice removed from the country of his origin. He came here as an outsider, and as an individual influenced by western culture. During his visit in India, he likes and appreciates only those things, which confirm to the notion of Hindu life, customs and beliefs which confirm to the memories retained in his mind through his childhood days. He criticizes those things which he do not conform to his ideas his mind. Not being in touch with the country for years, he has not realized the historical and technological changes and developments that have taken place in India. The western self in him is critical of several things in India. In totality we can say, that Naipaul’s attitude towards India is the consequence of a delicate balance of insider and outsider perspectives in him i.e. his special expatriate vision.

Naipaul’s searching for his roots, drenched in a sense of alienation and being shattered after his visit to India, where he found his inability to rejoin with his roots, comes back to England. An expatriate returns back to his temporary shelter, after his failure to find a
stable ground. For the next decade, England became his home, from where he travelled to distant countries. London became his commercial centre, the centre of his literary activity. Several expatriate writers have made London their home as Naipaul did. Naipaul despite an outsider, in London and suffering from rootlessness, has made an alternative effort to find a root in London, though on a literary and cultural level. London is his literary and commercial home. He has created new roots for himself. His feeling about his new root, that he made for himself, gets echoed in the lines, from the interview, after he was awarded Knighthood by the Queen in England. Naipaul remarks:

I am touched by it. Without London, without the generosity of the people in London, of critics and editors one would have been trying to write in wilderness, without any sort of tradition behind oneself. It would have been an important occupation. So that has mattered to me. (987-988)

Similar experience had been endured by numerous expatriate writers, who took refuge in the land of London and settled there, as city of London has the great capacity to generate creativity and absorb new talent from strange roots. London today has become the home and centre of new internationalism, where people from diverse stream, flow towards it, making it a new abode or new root for the twentieth century diaspora.

After completing his travel and exploration of the Indian subcontinent, Naipaul travelled to the Islamic countries. The fruit of this journey is Among the Believers (1981), in which he as an unbelieving observer, was among the believers. Before travelling to the Islamic land he states that he hardly had any knowledge of Muslims or their religion and he was never interested in religious rituals. The idea of travelling to Islamic countries came to him during the Iranian Revolution when he was in U.S.A. After the revolution, the Shah was overthrown in 1979. He went to Iran at a time when most of the people were leaving the country. He travelled to several Islamic countries - Iran, Pakistan, Malaysia and Indonesia.
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He studies the Islamic civilization, and consequences of rise of Islamic fundamentalism.

Naipaul gives an account of the planned and chance meetings and encounters with hotel staff, guides, interpreters, important personalities and newspaper officials. The main issue that he examines is the rise of Islamic fundamentalism Naipaul’s roots does not lie in Islamic country, thus his feelings was just like an outsider, who was introspecting an alien country. When he visited Islamic country, his position was that of an expatriate or a diasporic visiting another alien land. Thus the sensibility of an expatriate does not get reflected here. He specifically focuses on the divided mind of the people in the Islamic country, which he reason for the revolution. For example, by one character Parvez, a believer Shia, he illustrates that at one hand, he sided Islamic faith and opposed to all that stood outside it. While his other mind too recognized the world outside, so he sends his son to USA to pursue his future. Though Naipaul had again to face adverse criticism for his views and remarks on that he illustrates in the book.

Next Naipaul visits the South American countries, which turns out to be a revision of his old idea about that country. The account of his travel to South American countries is reflected in his book A Turn in the South, 1989. This book turned out to be a reflection of his past, his childhood and ancestors, as it speaks about the black people, and how these black people in South America have learnt to adapt to the sweeping changes that came over the country. He narrates as to how the black and the whites live together. These lines from the book, shows how the Black and the Whites live intermingled with each other: “Black people, there, Black people there, White people there, Black people, black people, white people, All this side black people, all this side white people. White people, white people, black people, white” (10)

Naipaul, a diasporic and an expatriate, is drenched by the peculiar sensibility seeing the condition of intermingling of whites and black in South America. He also remembers his
own childhood and adulthood in a black and white country which serves as a linking factor and as uniting factor. He encounters some black inhabitants and also white settlements. His attempts to understand the slavery question is complete here, and he compares South America with slavery in Trinidad and Tobago. Naipaul reflects over the slavery in the south. He notes that long after slavery was abolished in the British island, it had persisted in the South America, in an ugly form. Thus with anguish he exclaims: “A slave is a slave; a master need not think of humiliating or tormenting him. In the hundred years after the end of slavery, the black man was tormented in the South, in ways that I never knew about, until I began to travel in the region.” (119)

Naipaul, born in the environment, where people were labourers, slaves, migrants, was touched upon by the slavery. He in this book, radiates compassion for the slaves everywhere and thus makes a movement in favour for them.

Naipaul, after travelling to South American countries, once again turned to India. He visited the country between 1988-1990 and the result was his another travelogue based, on India i.e. *India : A Million Mutines Now*. This travelogue came out after a gap of thirteen years. This was his revisit to India, or in a way a revision about his attitudes, which showed a changed from in this book. He had shown a realization of his own earlier inadequacies. By this time his own perception and the scenario of India had changed. It was the post independent India, and Naipaul as an observant, could very perceptibly catch these changes as though he was looking through a very sensitive lens. Now Naipaul meets a large member of Indians from various regions and sections of society. Naipaul’s views seems to be turning from pessimism to optimism. Now he seemed to get attached to his roots, which had created a void in his life. His previous journeys to his ancestral land had failed to reconcile him emotionally to his roots. But this journey seem to be different. According to Naipaul, this was a return journey, “shading my Indian nerves, abolishing the darkness that separated from my
ancestral past” (121). This journey, had wiped off the darkness, from an expatriate, slowly, layer by layer and there was a streak of a new light. He admits, that previous books, was due to his limitation of accepting, when he was blinded by shame and humiliation by the remembrance of the fact that his ancestors had to migrate from India to Trinidad as indentured labourers. During this third journey, he had changed his attitudes, shed off his prejudices, and more intense communication with the local people, help him to restore his sentiments towards his land of imagination i.e. India. These lines from the travelogues brings out his emotions: “… a wish not to intrude but also perhaps derived from the idea of the writer that I had inherited - the idea of the writer as a man with internal life, a man drawing it out of his own entrails, magically reading the externals of things.” (511).

Naipaul, suffering from alienation, rootlessness, finds India in darkness in his first visit. In his second visit he could visualize the layers and layers of wounds inflicted on Indian civilization and during his third visit, during post independence India, he finds it a place stirring energetically. The energy, which remained dormant, due to foreign rule, due to the disturbance of the million mutinies had come up to the surface now. Moreover, Naipaul also learns how gradually the Indians had cast off their shocks of slavery, as a result different cross sections of the society were pulsating with life. One striking thing that Naipaul notices is that Indians had the attitude to hold on to small ideas; they found their stability in the smaller groupings of religion, class, caste and family. He with an expatriate sensibility, that had taken roots since childhood; he who had grown up hearing various stories about India, had face to face encounter with the communal problems, political interference, the women’s question, but after self indulgence with the situation, Naipaul comes up with a positive view as such

…there was in India new, what didn’t exist 100 years before; a central will, a central intellect, a national idea. The Indian union was greater than the sum of
its parts the states were a part of the beginning of a new way for many million, part of India’s growth, part of restoration. (511)

This passage reveals a clear optimistic vision of an expatriate about his root country. He also clears off his prejudices, which he had developed due to the migration of his ancestors.

Naipaul is a product of the “Diaspora”. He has a Hindu immigrant background, upbringing in Trinidad and he lived as an immigrant in London. Though London remained the centre of his creative activity, he had to go back either to Trinidad or his home at India for stimulus. If the migration, the compulsion of living in an alien country, that develops expatriate sensibility. It is this sensibility of rootlessness, alienation, tendency for flight, an attitude to rejoin with the roots, that is expressed in his travelogues. Moreover, he had developed an attitude of exploration, and thus he remains, not being confined to the citizen of a country, but the citizen of the world. He is a global persona, an international traveler whose life views gets reflected in his works.

Expatriatism or diasporism had arised due to forced or circumstantial displacement from the homeland. Their emotions, their sensibility is being expressed in their literature. The expatriate with his complexities, paradoxes, predicament and nostalgia gradually tries to make himself assimilate to the alien country. This process of reception and assimilation takes a longer time, but the expatriate puts his all effort. This acceptance of a diaspora, and an expatriate in an alien land leads to globalization. Today we can see, Naipaul, has been well accepted in England, and also is laden with numerous honours and prizes by that alien land.

The expatriate or a diasporic person also shows the sensibility or tendency of clinging to its past or roots. The loss of one’s homeland haunts them, and thus they feel alienated. This loss of home, turns their flow towards creative writing, and thus an individual gets strengthened even being living away from home. He creates his imaginary homeland in his
creations. His physical separation from the place gets compensated in his writings. Thus, we can see Naipaul too visited his root country and wrote about it in trilogy.

Naipaul’s merit lies in the fact that he could balance between home and abroad. He observes things both as an insider and an outsider, as he does in his trilogy of travelogues about India. Naipaul is a fine example of how a writer, carries with him a whole burden of race, history, language, a personal ambition, though he may be a diasporic and an expatriate. He strived for his roots though he could not assimilate with it at first, due to long separation, but later, he found his own roots in an alien land. Today an expatriate Naipaul, with a history of migrant ancestors is accepted respectively in his land of creativity i.e. London and also in his root country India. Today Naipaul had assimilated with his roots and the country too adores and accepts him, perhaps that’s why, in the occasion of First international festival of Indian literature, Indian Prime Minister accolades Naipaul and says: “…Though one may or may not agree with your description of India as a land of a million mutinies, I do know this nation of one billion people celebrated your winning the Noble Prize as a proud event.” (1)
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