Vidhyayana - ISSN 2454-8596

An International Multidisciplinary Peer-Reviewed E-Journal

www.j.vidhyayanaejournal.org

Indexed in: ROAD & Google Scholar

A Critique of Non-Fictional Writings of Naipaul

Dr. Paresh Jotangiya

Assistant Professor,

English Department, Surendranagar University.

Vidhyayana - ISSN 2454-8596
An International Multidisciplinary Peer-Reviewed E-Journal
www.j.vidhyayanaejournal.org
Indexed in: ROAD & Google Scholar

Abstract:

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate how Naipaul views the civilizational problem from the standpoint of invasion history. The previous difficulties had such an impact on the country that she was unable to free herself from the chains of incorrect ideals imposed during foreign rule, even after achieving independence from Britain. In order to overcome this, we have constantly struggled to develop answers to crisis situations throughout history. As Naipaul points out, the degeneration that began in the nineteenth century persisted into the twentieth.

Keywords: India, Fiction, Writing, Naipaul

Vidhyayana - ISSN 2454-8596
An International Multidisciplinary Peer-Reviewed E-Journal
www.j.vidhyayanaejournal.org
Indexed in: ROAD & Google Scholar

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to analyse Naipaul's non-fiction publications in light of Naipaul's perspectives and ideas. The concept of a flourishing state free of fear and uncertainty is referred to in India as 'Ramrajaya' (Utopia). Although it is merely an ideology, no ideal has been fully realised. Durant argues that a solid social structure is necessary for a thriving society. In a state of anarchy, human society has limited opportunity to flourish and prosper. India was already fairly courageous for a thousand years prior to invasions, allowing civilisation to grow. Regrettably, multinational oppressors used violence to remove the magnificent tree of human society. Even if they were unable to obliterate the ancient culture, they brought with them anarchy, instability, and insecurity. They stomped and robbed the country, and only anarchy prevailed.

Alienation from homeland

Naipaul felt a strong personal connection to India, particularly to Hinduism and the philosophy he introduces. Naipaul was an adherent of Western cultural norms and ideals such as individualism, scepticism, and dogmatism. It was as a result of the circumstances surrounding His childhood. Additionally, it is conceivable that his hostility for India contributes to the intricacy and originality of his worldview, which adds intrigue to the works. Psychologists have highlighted ambivalence as a source of stress; additionally, Victor J. Ramraj makes reference to it in his review of Naipaul's books,

> "It allows a more comprehensive perspective of
> human experience from a literary point of view.
> an effective means of conveying a postcolonial writer's
> sense of in-between, of being caught in the crevices."[1]

Naipaul desired to be described to as a nomadic writer, unattached to any particular country. Regrettably, when he was told of his Nobel Prize, he purposely avoided mentioning Trinidad in his statement, instead mentioning only England and India. This means that he has a stronger attachment to India and England than he does to Trinidad. Trinidad's reaction was

Vidhyayana - ISSN 2454-8596
An International Multidisciplinary Peer-Reviewed E-Journal
www.j.vidhyayanaejournal.org
Indexed in: ROAD & Google Scholar

one of shock and outrage at his ungratefulness toward the place that reared him and served as a primary source of creative inspiration. India's public reaction was one of disbelief. Growing up in Trinidad with Poverty surrounding them, he said that India from where his ancestors had Migrated to better themselves became in his imagination “a most fearful place.” In India: A Million Mutinies Now, he stated, “The first idea . . . was about the kind of country from which my ancestors had come.” (12)

Harish Trivedi commented on Naipaul's recognition of India: "It was as though, while Naipaul desired to possess us in his hour of glory, what we desired was to soon reject him." After all, he has been the uncontested world heavyweight champion in the sport of India-bashing for several decades, and we were not going to forgive him simply because he had won the major prize. He was torn between his drive to be unique and his desire to fit into Indian society. He expressed his concerns when he learned that his cultural identity, or Trinidadian Indian identity, appeared to be irrelevant in the Hindustani lands. In 1962, maybe for the first time, he began the chapter with India and expressed grave worry. He wrote these words around the closing of the novel,

> “In a year, I had not learned acceptance.
> I had learned my separateness from India
> and was content to be a colonial,
> without a past, without ancestors”.[2]

When he returned to Trinidad following a lengthy absence, he was plagued with the same worry. As he noted in The Middle Passage, "as soon as the Francisco Bobadilla made contact with the dock, ship's side against rubber bumpers, I felt every ounce of my previous horror of Trinidad." I have no desire to remain"

The relationship between the Islamic "invaders" and the Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagara was far more comprehensive than Naipaul's texts suggest, extending even to the rulers' dress. Finally, people who object to Naipaul's portrayal of the Mughals appear to have a serious issue with his two seminal works on the Islamic world, which are not about India,

Vidhyayana - ISSN 2454-8596
An International Multidisciplinary Peer-Reviewed E-Journal
www.j.vidhyayanaejournal.org
Indexed in: ROAD & Google Scholar

because he attacks history and the Islamic world with strong and harsh rhetoric. According to Naipaul, global Islamic extremism among "converted peoples" is particularly detrimental since it results in violence against history and culture, as well as linguistic and literary works.

To be fair, some of Naipaul's books about non-Muslims in Trinidad and Latin America employ the phrases "hysteria" and "fanaticism" to refer to maniacs, holy men, and reformers. V. S. Naipaul, a descendant of indentured Indian labourers who settled primarily in Trinidad in the nineteenth century, has eschewed devotion to the West Indians in favour of a search for Indian heartlands. He began writing about his forefathers' country early in his career, and he is interested in and concerned about current Indian events to this day. However, he has said that he has no intention of returning to this country or the Caribbean, asserting his status as a global citizen and permanent exile, which has elicited much suspicion in some quarters. In the foreword to India: A Wounded Civilization, he admitted his ambivalent response to India,

> "India is, for me, a complex country.
>
> It isn't my home and cannot be my home;
>
> and yet I cannot reject it or be indifferent to it;
>
> I cannot travel only for the sights.
>
> I am at once too close and too far."[3]

There is a ground to suppose that Naipaul's fiction is a continuous series, corroborated by his assertion that he is continually writing the same book. As a result, we may anticipate Willie Chandra, Naipaul's most recent fictional character, to share many of the same features as his previous Indian characters. He, like others, suffers the misery of exile, which is defined by loneliness, a search for self, and an attempt to comprehend an outside world that challenges preconceived notions acquired in a remote colonial context. Within his perspective, Naipaul seems to have found his way home through literature, the capacity to envision oneself, and the ability to write in response to his destiny. Trinidad, according to Naipaul, was unholy because it had not yet been written about, and that is the true meaning of his phrase.

Vidhyayana - ISSN 2454-8596
An International Multidisciplinary Peer-Reviewed E-Journal
www.j.vidhyayanaejournal.org
Indexed in: ROAD & Google Scholar

Nobody can settle an individual's unresolvable problems and ambiguities except through the writing process. Trinidad has never been recorded in history. As a result, it was obscene. To whom is it impermissible? It is a first step in Trinidad's rehabilitation and rewriting of its history. The colonialists who harmed and shaped Trinidad have the ability to establish sacred territory, albeit in paradoxical ways. The distinction between expressionistic European colonialism and other forms of colonialism is simple: even in its acts of desecration, European colonialism demanded a refutation, a calling into question, eloquence, and a readiness for composition, all of which succeeded in creating a space for hallowing what was previously only invisible. They establish the colonies in history, as any nineteenth-century believer in grand narratives such as Marx or Hegel would argue, and they establish the possibility of penmanship. This implies that the communities to which Naipaul refers are largely a disguised expression of his need for an undivided identity, for a hallowed place of adhering where one's personal narrative is not disrupted. Naipaul's acceptance of this notion of rupture is not motivated by a desire to commemorate the muddle it generates, as Rushdie does. According to Naipaul, postmodern hybridization would be too indiscriminate, too meek in its rejection of the urge to self-order to some level. It over-aesthetizes the world, and it's remarkable how Naipaul, despite his limits, is incapable of basic aestheticism.

Faith is rationally undermined as a technique of ignoring history. Traditional ritualism, which imbues everyday actions with a sense of purpose, is incapable of innovation and achievement and is too confined to the world to be desirable. On the other hand, Naipaul's answer is to create his own sacred and pure world through the binary oppositions that define his storey. Naipaul, on the other hand, is unlikely to be moved by the romanticism of "the world is my home." Rather than that, what binds his shattered and complicated history together is his ability to make peace with it as a writer. Everything that paved the way for his career as a writer–his English education, colonialism, the West, and his Worcestershire country garden–becomes sacred ground for Naipaul. At the very least in his imagination, Naipaul looks to have discovered his home through writing, by his ability to comprehend him, and through his having written in response to his fate.

Vidhyayana - ISSN 2454-8596
An International Multidisciplinary Peer-Reviewed E-Journal
www.j.vidhyayanaejournal.org
Indexed in: ROAD & Google Scholar

Socio-Cultural and Political Perspectives on India

Unlike other multicultural Indian writers, Naipaul's relationship with India is nuanced and impossible to describe in black-and-white terms. Critics refer to it as a love-hate connection or an ambiguous relationship because of his contradictory attitudes toward India. His attitudes toward India are a mix of affection and contempt, as well as nostalgia and denial. Naipaul's ideas and perceptions were moulded and tarnished by anxiety and disdain for himself. As a result, much of his perceptions, whether of people, places, culture, or society, are tinted with hypocrisy and dismissiveness.

As a child and when he faced. The terrible and glaring realities of India were shattered, as was the beautiful vision of India depicted in novels. When he met, his inventive ability as a child. Hunger, beggars, wandering Skeletons, poverty, and the vastness of India with its "teeming millions" were all too much for a sensitive, educated, and youthful Westerner. Naipaul's first book about India was rife with violent outbursts. Naipaul, a devout fan of India, the motherland of his forebears, despises anything that obstructs India's progress and development.

Although Naipaul's work, both fictional and nonfictional, demonstrates a strong, some might say obsessional, interest in "history," constructing a coherent narrative from his corpus is difficult. His theories are so reliant on the strength of his ideas and the dynamic settings from which they emerge that rewriting them risks becoming ludicrous. This is significant for a number of reasons: Naipaul's views defy easy summary. However, anyone contemplating Naipaul as an author faces the following difficulty. Naipaul's autobiographical significance looms larger than that of any other contemporary novelist. Whether in fiction or nonfiction, Naipaul's texts never lose sight of their author; his works, more than any other, highlight rather than eclipse the author.

As with the majority of gifted authors, Naipaul creates entire worlds, and you can be certain that in his case, it is a kingdom that he aims to govern. This adds an unexpected dimension to Naipaul's self-identity as a writer. For instance, it is unclear what Naipaul means by,

Vidhyayana - ISSN 2454-8596
An International Multidisciplinary Peer-Reviewed E-Journal
www.j.vidhyayanaejournal.org
Indexed in: ROAD & Google Scholar

"to me, situations and people are

always specific, always of themselves".[4]

After all, that indicates they're for Naipaul in a literal sense, but it's difficult to imagine they're for Naipaul, "always of themselves," rather as examples of a stylistic Dilemma he's fashioned. He confesses that during his third journey to India in the 1980s, the caste system was not as prominent as it had been previously. According to Naipaul, India began to learn about reforms and change once the British arrived, as well as how to maintain a balance with the outside world, as a result of the British's New Learning. The portrayals of the character in the book Jagan Shrinivas and Mr. Learning of Indians in the 1980s demonstrate the stark contrasts in Naipaul's attitudes of Indians. Vishwanath was an atheist who was anti-Brahmin. His travels to India greatly disillusioned him. He discovered India to be a foreboding place.

India had a long way to go before it reached civilization. He detested India's impoverishment, illiteracy, political and social ugliness, and overall underdevelopment. Indian society, he asserts, is a "wounded" culture. India is caught between two polar opposites, one of which has passed away and the other of which is yet to be born. His disillusionment is constant in his writings. His discontent persisted throughout the remainder of his professional career. "Though he has been a frequent traveller to India since the 1960s, he has arguably examined India from an arm's length distant, in some cases with great distance and subsequently with reluctant affection, and perhaps even with ungrudging affection," according to the online encyclopaedia Wikipedia. Naipaul inhabited a number of different worlds, which are reflected in his writings. His creations are inspired by his encounters with these surroundings.

Conclusion

According to Naipaul, it was a tragedy of idealism, ignorance, and imitation. He asserts that the revolution failed because the rebels lacked the analytical and sociological investigative abilities necessary for any socio-political movement. They adopted another's concept of revolution, which culminated in futility and tragedy, as they lacked original ideas and structures. He emphasised that the failure of the movement was due to another issue. The movement has deteriorated into an abhorrent religious cult. Vijay Tendulkar, a Marathi writer,

Vidhyayana - ISSN 2454-8596
An International Multidisciplinary Peer-Reviewed E-Journal
www.j.vidhyayanaejournal.org
Indexed in: ROAD & Google Scholar

argued that Naxalism had been conflated with the Kali cult, with Kali serving as a symbol of female destructiveness. When the movement grew engaged in gruesome murder rituals, it lost sight of its objective and just cause. Naipaul lamented the collapse of the movement.

References:

Naipaul, V. S.1964. An Area of Darkness. London: Picador.

Naipaul, V. S.1977. India: A Wounded Civilization. London: Picador.

Mishra, P. 2012. (Ed.) V. S Naipaul - The Writer and the World. London: Picador.

Mahanta N. R. 2004. (Ed.) V.S. Naipaul - The Indian Trilogy. New Delhi: Atlantic Publisher.

Panwar, Purabi. India in the Works of Kipling, Forster and Naipaul: Postcolonial Revaluations. Delhi: Pencraft International, 2000. Print.

Naipaul, V. S. 2011. India A Wounded Civilization. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group

Iyer, N. Sharada. 2002. "Naipaul's India – An Area of Darkness," V. S. Naipaul – Critical Essays, Vol. II.

Naipaul, V. S. 2016.The Indian Trilogy. Pan Macmillan

Jussawalla, Feroza. (ed.) 1997. Conversations with V.S. Naipaul. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

Naipaul, V. S.1998.Beyond Belief, Islamic Excursions Among the Converted People. London: Harmondsworth.

Naipaul, V. S. 1998. India: A Million Mutinies Now. London: Vintage.

Naipaul, V. S. 2016.The Indian Trilogy. Pan Macmillan

Kamra, Shashi. 1990. The Novels of V. S. Naipaul. New Delhi: Prestige.

Joshi, C. 1994. V.S. Naipaul – The Voice of Exile. Sterling Publisher.

Woodcock, George, 'V.S. Naipaul and the Politics of Fiction.' Queen's Quarterly, 87 (1980), 679-92

Naipaul, V. S. 2011. India A Wounded Civilization. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group

Chuadhari, Nirad. 1987. Thy Hand Great Anarch, Delhi: Time Book International.

Chuadhari, Nirad. C. 1971. Aut*obiography of an Unknown India,* Bombay: Jaico Books