

I. Introduction

Kiran Desai wrote the novel, *The Inheritance of Loss* approximately six decades after the independence of India. Though she has highlighted the sufferings of the people living in abject poverty struggling to find their own identities, she still appears to be hypnotized by the British colonial history of India and South Asia. In this novel, she has not only demoralized Indo-Nepalese of Kalimpong and their liberation movement that they carried out under the name of “Gorkha National Liberation Front”, but also valorized the legacy of Anglophile attributes that are deeply inherited in so-called aristocratic India. In a true sense, her novel disapproves the people and nationality of Indo-Nepal, Zanzibar, and even India – where she seems to be highly inspired from colonialism; the legacy of her upbringing in colonial countries like England and America. Her mastery over English, instead of being an effective weapon to write against the colonial history of the region, appears in her novel to have become a tool for demoralizing the non-westerners and their tales, especially of Indo-Nepalese and Indians. Inheriting colonizer's perspective, Kiran Desai amplifies and eroticizes the poverty and backwardness of the South Asian people.

Similarly, *The Inheritance of Loss* exhibits the agitation of Gorkhaland and its consequences that cause instability in the Northern part of India especially in Kalimpong and its surrounding areas but it fails to understand many undercurrent dynamisms of the movement. It traces its root to the annexation of Sikkim into the Indian territory and also the spreading insurgencies in the north-east India. However, facts are wrongly presented which only reflect the fact that she did not do proper homework prior to her writing. Ethnic discontentment in Darjeeling started long before the country saw its independence- around 1907 if not earlier. There were no instances of any kind of political harassments from the side of Gorkhas earlier. It was largely a united struggle against the age old state repression. At rare cases, however, resident Bengalis were privileged as agents of state and the ruling elites, whom Gorkhas hated the most then. By misinterpreting the political scenario of this region without a deep study of political undercurrents that caused political instability, asserting that

her political knowledge is accurate, clearly exhibits that Desai still wants to continue the British colonial legacy of demoralizing certain race that is different to her origin.

This Booker's Prize winning novel produces a strange effect. It is a big novel that stretches from India to New York; an ambitious novel that reaches into the lives of the middle classes and the very poor; an energetically written novel that mixes colloquial and more literary styles; and yet it communicates nothing so much as how impossible it is to live a big, ambitious, cheerful life. Everything about it dramatizes the fact that although the characters like Judge, Sai, and even Gyan and Biju live in this mixed-up, messy surrounding, based on a deep desire for security, they never get perfection in their life.

Kiran Desai's this novel follows the life of its characters who reside in, or once resided in, Kalimpong at the foothills of the Himalayas; it is mostly set in the town of Kalimpong in Northeast India, close to the Nepal border. There lives an old retired judge, Jemubhai Patel, with his cook and a dog, Mutt. Soon his orphaned granddaughter, Sai, joins the judge in his decrepit mansion. Cut off as they are from much of the world, the three lead a tightly knit life with Sai getting an occasional distraction when she spends time with a pair of Anglophile sisters down the road or with her math tutor, Gyan. The central character is Sai, an orphaned young girl who shows up at the doorstep of her grandfather, a judge, to live with him. The story studies her life, the judge's, the cook's and his son, Biju who is an illegal immigrant working in a restaurant in New York City; and there are various other characters who live near them in the small village town.

Sai's arrival sets the judge down the memory lane and he remembers making his journey to England as a young lad leaving his hometown of Pilphit in the Western Indian state of Gujarat. The judge's introverted character combined with his extreme shyness is so intense that he soon evolves into a totally self-centered, cynical person: "He envied the English. He loathed Indians. He worked at being English with the passion of hatred and for what he would become, he would be despised by absolutely everyone, English and Indians, both (208)", Desai writes. Nevertheless he strikes up a

tentative attachment to his granddaughter perhaps because she is a lot like him, a Westernized Indian, an "estranged Indian living in India" (210).

Sai, the central character falls in love with her mathematics tutor, Gyan. But Gyan soon joins a Nepalese insurgent movement that demands its own homeland. As conflicting ideologies, circumstance and delusions pull them apart, Sai's love affair with Gyan breaks down.

In two parallel strands (which eventually collide), the narrative follows Sai's life in Kalimpong and that of the cook's son, Biju, who has been sent to America by his father. Sai and the slightly older tutor, Gyan, engage in a brief crush. Soon however, the political movement envelops the relationship. Gyan ends up being transported by history and finds himself bonding for the cause of fellow Nepali Indians who seek to have their own country or at least their own state. In India, during the 1980s, the Gorkha National Liberation Front (GNLF) led a movement that sometimes turned very violent, seeking a Nepali state. Desai's book captures some of this history well.

The novel is set around the time that the local Nepalese are seeking a separate state in India and traces their village as it goes from peaceful and ideal to absolute unspeakable chaos and violence.

Perhaps Desai wanted it that way, because her novel is really more than just about the people and the plot in and of itself but about the issues that the people of India have suffered with post-colonialism. She explains quite well the different ways that colonialism has affected the people in different social classes and age groups. It is quite appreciable from her side that she has tried to make Biju's storyline worth-reading mentioning what it was like to be an illegal immigrant in NYC struggling to make it through.

Unquestionably, the most beautiful portions of the book are the sections in which Desai portrays the life of cook's son Biju who under-goes on the barest of bare from one minimum wage job to the other in New York City. "In the Gandhi cafe, the lights were kept low, in order to hide the

stains. It was a long journey from here to the fusion trend, the goat cheese and basil samosa, the mango margarita. This was the real thing, generic Indian, and it could be ordered complete, one stop on the subway line or even on the phone: gilt and red chairs, plastic roses on the table with synthetic dewdrops” (145). Desai writes when she describes one of the Indian restaurants Biju works at.

Desai's writing is indolent and beautiful with delightful turns of phrase. Even the forests of Kalimpong with their mists and darkness come alive in her writing. However, some of her character portrayals seem somewhat intentional as their actions and methods seem too rigid and predetermined, not organic. For example the judge remains a somewhat mysterious character till the very end. It is not satisfyingly clear why he became the person like that or why he eventually abandoned both his wife and daughter.

The portions where Desai does shine however, are not just in detailing of Biju's life alone but in subtly contrasting his life with that of his father's. While seemingly different, their anxious burdens of poverty and class are beautifully portrayed. Desai is at her best when showing how even globalization cannot solve the trappings of class. A character in the book paints the act of immigration as an act of cowardice:

Immigration, so often presented as a heroic act, could just as easily be the opposite: that it was cowardice that led many to America: fear marked the journey, not bravery: a cockroachy desire to scuttle to where you never saw poverty, not really, never had to suffer a tug to our conscience: where you never heard the demands of servants, beggars, bankrupt relatives, and where your generosity would never be openly claimed: where by merely looking after your own wife-child-dog-yard you could feel virtuous. Experience the relief of being an unknown transplant to the locals and hide the perspective granted by journey.(299)

Biju, the cook's son, might not agree with the up mentioned assessment due to his series of unpredictable sufferings that he underwent while being an immigrant in America.

Biju is an illegal immigrant in New York and works in one hellish kitchen after another, exploited, poor and terribly lonely and homesick. The sections of the novel that deal with Biju's life in New York are the most powerful- and the most acutely observed. Here is Biju on a restaurant called the Stars and Stripes Diner: "All American flag on top, all Guatemalan flag below. Plus one Indian flag when Biju arrived"(21).

As the days-usurped by exhaustion and hunger and ill treatment – go by, Biju comes to realize this truth: "Biju walked back to the Gandhi Café thinking he was emptying out" (268).

Review of Literature:

The flawless manner in which Desai captures the rhythm of life in the small Indian hill town- some of its residents caught in a colonial time warp, others dreaming of the changes through a political upheaval- cannot be overemphasized. Her characters are finely imagined and persuasive. But above all, this is a novel about dislocation. The way in which Desai communicates the immigrant's daily despair, his desire to only connect, the imaginary homeland-shaped hole at the heart of his foreign experience gives it its unique bleakness and compassion. *The inheritance of Loss*, in fine, is about a family whose son goes to America for study and suffers from social discrimination over there, and eventually returns India for a relatively obscure life on the one hand and in a true sense is about heightening the colonial culture of "Othering" to those who are different in origin on other hand. The novel bagged the prestigious Booker Prize for 2006 and since then many scholars and critics have hailed the novel for its depiction of the minute details of life as well as human concern for the downtrodden. For example, there have been criticisms for the novel from some major journals.

New York Times registers its compliment to the novel thus: "Kiran Desai's new novel manages to explore, with intimacy and insight, just about every contemporary international issue: globalization, economic inequality, fundamentalism and terrorist violence. Despite being set in the mind-1980s, it seems the best kind of post-9/11 novel".

Similarly, *Publishers Weekly* also emphasizes the issue of exile and ambiguities of post colonialism in the novel: "Stunning...alternately comical and contemplative...(Desai) deftly shuttles between first and third worlds, illuminating the pains of exile, the ambiguities of post-colonialism and the blinding desire for a "better life," when one person's wealth means another's poverty".

Another criticism by Mandira Sen for the novel reads:

Desai points to the complexities of race and ethnicity in both places with their undercurrent of antagonism and incomprehension. Class, too, intrudes, as educated richer Indians try hard to differentiate themselves from the poor and the underclass. (27)

Pankaj Mishra finds an "uncanny flexibility and poise" in Desai's prose. But another critic Champa Bilwakesh notes that the novel is not able to provide adequate answers to the questions it raises:

The novel raises several large, important questions. What about the dividends from globalization? What about the celebration of hybridity, the global citizen, and the spawning of new ideas? At what point does colonialism become an excuse for corrupt government? Desai answers them in a quiet voice and not all answers are complete. (13)

Hence, intention of the thesis is to examine the novel for its alleged involvement of the western colonial discourse, colonialism as such that has been used to demoralize the eastern people especially Indians and Indo-Nepalese.

Outline of the Thesis:

This thesis is divided into four main chapters: introduction, discussion of tools, textual analysis, and conclusion. The first chapter presents a brief introduction to the novel as a document of the clouded perspective of a west-brought up Indian who tends to depict the political situation of northern India where the residents of Nepali nationality are the backbone of the socio-economic

structure. The ways in which this thesis would be different from others and the relevance of this research are also briefly hinted in the first chapter.

The second chapter discusses the critical concepts which would be employed in analyzing the novel. In particular, the terms colonialism and post colonialism, New Historicism, discourse and subaltern are clarified so as to facilitate the study of the text drawing upon the insights provided by these theoretical tools. The ideas and insights generated by scholars such as Edward William Said, Aijaz Ahmed and Michel Foucault would be touched upon here.

The third chapter elaborates the arguments of the thesis supporting them with the textual excerpts in their relevant context. In the main, this chapter shows how the novel, in line with the tradition of the colonial way of writing on the native or non western people, has dehumanized and debased the people of Nepali origin.

The fourth chapter concludes the thesis with a brief recapitulation of the starting premise of the thesis and asserting how that has been proved by the end of the research work.

II. Discourse: Interconnection with Colonialism and Post-colonialism:

Simply, discourse is a unit of language, whether spoken, written or gesticulated. Previously, it was meant a long written dissertation on any subject. This notion of discourse in general and in linguistic studies was drastically reformulated and given a new import recently by the French poststructuralist theorist/thinker Michael Foucault (1926-84). The Foucauldian concept of discourse has nothing to do with the traditional theory of discourse. For him, it is a system of statements which makes the world (material reality) known to us. Discourse informs us of the state of affairs, so it is informative or misinformative. Discourse also tells us of the propriety or impropriety, rightness or wrongness, of something and consequently influences our attitude, opinion and behavior. Therefore, it is directive too. In his essay "Truth and Power" Foucault universalized discourse as a medium of establishing truth in which he justifies discourse as the kind of statements associated with particular institutions and their ways of establishing truths or reality in a given society. So he asserts, "Truth is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of the statements" (qtd. in Adams.1145).

Discourse is present and operative every where, in any field of human activity, interaction, and knowledge --or mis-knowledge. While establishing a discourse even falsities come to occupy the position of truth by the mere virtue of repetition. This unquestionably indicates that truth is nothing in itself; it does not exist outside human interest. What we call truth is an effect of language; it is a discursive formation, a truth-effect produced, sustained, and propagated by language.

Discourse theory is greatly shaped by the Whorfian notion of language. As Benjamin Lee Whorf so famously puts, "we dissect nature along lines laid down by our language." What he is saying is that our understanding of the world is helped, obstructed, or affected by our language, the range of vocabulary we have. The modern theory of language as 'constitutive' also underlines this creative and distorting power of language. The world is not simply there; it is brought into existence by language (which, by extension, is discourse here in our context).

As Foucault writes in *History of Sexuality*, “Indeed, it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together”. (100). To see how statements can generate realities or at least truth effects which ultimately get metamorphosed into a tradition of knowledge, let’s cite a statement.

Speaking as recently as 1945 at the University of Chicago, delivering his Haskell Lectures on “Modern Trends in Islam”, P. R. Gibb opened his speech with the following comment, emphasizing the point how the Arab mind is intrinsically opposed to, alien to, and abhorrent to rationality and clear thinking:

The student of Arabic civilization is constantly brought up against the striking contrast between the imaginative power displayed, for example, in certain branches of Arabic literature and the literalism, the pedantry, displayed in reasoning and exposition, even when it is devoted to these same productions. It is true that there have been great philosophers among the Muslim people and that some of them were Arabs, but they were rare exceptions. The Arab mind, whether in relation to the outer world or in relation to the processes of thought, cannot throw off its intense feeling for the separateness and the individuality of the concrete events. This is, I believe, one of the main factors lying behind that ‘lack of a sense of law’ which Professor Macdonald regarded as the characteristic difference in the Oriental. It is this, too, which explains-what is so difficult for the western student to grasp until it is explained to him by the orientalist --the aversion of the Muslims from the thought-process of rationalism.... The rejection of rationalist modes of thought and of the utilitarian ethic which is inseparable from them has its roots, therefore, not in the so-called ‘obscurantism’ of the Muslim theologians but in the atomism amid discreteness of the Arab imagination. (qtd. in Said 437-38)

In his classic text *Orientalism*, which traces origin and development of the discursive practice of describing the east from the westerners’ viewpoint, Said states:

The Orient is not only adjacent to Europe; it is also the place of European's greatest and richest and oldest colonies, the source of its deepest and most recurring images of the Other. In addition, the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, experience... The Orient is an integral part of European material civilization and culture. Orientalism expresses and represents that culturally and even ideologically as a mode of discourse with supporting institutions, vocabulary, scholarship, imagery, doctrines, even colonial bureaucracies and colonial styles. (2)

As this reference of Said clarifies, the discourse of orientalism got prosperity by dissociating and misinterpreting the easterners by using various imageries in the westerner's discourse as: they lack the volition to express themselves, they cannot understand the world and themselves, therefore they are to be described by somebody else. Such a concept treats the Orientals as mere objects, objects of study. The subject, of course, is the west armed with rationality and intellect.

Discourse, as a set of inter-connected statements on a field of knowledge, shapes our ideas and opinions. Apparently, then, it valorizes some beliefs and ideas as knowledge or truth, and consigns the rest as useless or untrue. For example, the justifiability and necessary of the practice of colonialism is always at the heart of colonial discourse, central to which is the assumption that European values --such as rationality, science, civilization, high seriousness of literature – are not to be found in other societies.

It is in the capacity of discourse to create truth effects or realities. Discourse creates or modifies them as and when it befits the interest of the dominant stakeholder in the power-politics of the times of its production and circulation. There lies the power and importance of discourse. It can easily mislead the people under its reach into believing as true what in reality may be a lie; or, conversely, it may effectively falsify what is true. Creating concrete realities out of imagination or

deliberate and purposeful manipulation of language and information has always been at the heart of the task of discourse.

Generally, colonial discourse rests upon a dichotomy: the West versus the East. The West (us) is always possessed of all the human virtues that are extolled universally, whereas the colonized (them) is irrational and uncivilized. Hence, the colonizers had to take up their burden to civilize the other. They had to go to the colonial outposts to teach the natives the decent way of life, of government or religion. And in doing so, the colonizer had to become rude even, at times. Of course, colonial discourse never ever questions the motives behind colonial expansion: to gain control over the global market. Was it really to civilize the backward people living in the non-western-lands? The fact is that these resources --both human and natural--were exploited to the extent irrevocable by the colonizing powers is never mentioned in colonial discourse.

Postcolonial criticism, licensed with the awareness of the insights imparted by the cultural discourse suspicion on the part of colonized people, seeks to undermine imperial subjects and themes. It has forcefully produced parallel discourses which have questioned and even subverted the since long cherished stereotypes and myths about the other. By this, westerners have become, as Said puts it as aware that what they have to say about the history and the cultures of 'subordinate' people is challengeable by the people themselves who a few years back were aptly incorporated, culture, and, history and all into the great western empires and their disciplinary discourses.

The adjective 'postcolonial' is more useful as an awakened state of consciousness of the colonized people rather than as a strict periodization. Thus, a text written in the then historical colonial time can be called postcolonial in so far as it goes against the prevalent colonial discursive practices of demeaning and dehumanizing the colonized subject. Here, if a text opposes the inhuman practices of colonialism; if it exposes its vices and dangers; it is postcolonial. The term has also been used in its hyphenated forms (post-colonial, post-colonialism etc.) to stress the time

frames and practices that came after colonialism. In any event, it is a disputation of the legacies of colonialism though the presence of the prefix 'post' presupposes the perpetuation of colonialism, or its effects, right into the present era.

To understand the significance and need of postcolonial criticism in its full import, one may refer to Chinua Achebe's much debated, appreciated and talked of essay "Colonialist Criticism" (1975). As Achebe has fairly successfully shown in this provocative analysis, what the West/Europe conceives and celebrates as universal is merely European and nothing more, and therefore quite unacceptable to other cultures:

Does it ever occur to these universalists to try out their game of changing names of characters and places in an American novel, say, a Philip Roth or an Updike, and slotting in African names just to see how it works? But of course it would not occur to them. It would never occur to them. It would never occur to them to doubt the universality of their own literature. In the nature of things the work of Western writer is automatically informed by universality. It is only others who must strain to achieve it. So-and-so's work is universal; he has truly arrived! As though Universality were some distant bend in the road which you may take it if you travel out far enough in the direction of Europe or America, if you put adequate distance between yourself and your home. I should like to see the word "universal" banned altogether from discussions of African literature until such a time as people cease to use it as a synonym for the narrow, self-serving parochialism of Europe, until their horizon extends to include the entire world. (1193-94)

A postcolonial reading of the texts --whether they are written in the colonial era or merely in the colonial tradition --subverts all such colonial institutions. Post colonialism as Promod K. Nayer opines in the preface of his book *Postcolonial Literature* "subsumes multiple heterogeneous discourses and practices of none western world". Hence, what was formerly seen and lauded as classic now

becomes merely Eurocentric and ethnocentric; whatever was valorized as having been informed by universalism is now brought to its real status as parochial and blinded by the supremacist illusion of racism. The novel questions many assumptions long accepted and cherished by the majority of the rulers and the ruled. In this sense the novel can be said to have been bolstered up by postcolonial awareness and critical insight.

Discursive Power: Shaping the Mind:

Discourse, as discussed, creates truths, negates the existing ones, or modifies them as and when it befits the interest of the dominant stakeholders in the power-politics of the times of its production and circulation. There lies the power and importance of discourse. It can easily mislead the people under its reach into believing as true which in reality may be a lie; or, conversely, it may effectively falsify what is true. Creating concrete realities out of imagination or deliberate and purposeful manipulation of language and information has always been at the heart of the task of discourse. The colonialist or the Eurocentric discourse --Eurocentric, for all the colonial powers were from Europe -- which Edward Said designates as 'Orientalism' in his book of the same title, has always tried to create an inferior image of the Orient or the East in comparison to that of the west. A brief concept of orientalism along with its history and function is therefore due here.

One of the definitions of orientalism provided by Said maintains that it is a "western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the orient"(3). For Said, orientalism is a style of thought, a corporate project, a system of texts --of history, sociology, anthropology-- that differentiates between the West(us) and the Orient (them). It was not an act of imaginative significance only; it had and still has an immense political significance for, as Said contends "European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self"(3). Said also makes it clear that orientalism is not just a pack of lies or fantasies. Had it been so, it would not have endured from the ancient times down to the present. What accounts for the durability of orientalism is the fact that there has been a

considerable material investment in the theory and practice of orientalism which has now been consolidated as knowledge. Moreover, Said's division of orientalism into latent and manifest makes it clear how this knowledge has been absorbed even into the unconscious or deeper psychic level. Without being conscious that we are upholding the western superiority over the eastern barbarity, even we, the Orientals, will be doing so --this all because of the constant imbibing of the orientalist notions. The same is its effect on the western mind. Consequently, even people with a wide and informed state of intellect can hardly escape from being somehow indoctrinated into the divisive politics of orientalism. Some sort of fear, resentment or distrust is always present in the westerners' psyche though they may not have come across any such experience of treachery or savagery at the hands of the Orientals.

Orientalism has always been a distinction between the west and the east. The ontological difference is based on their geographical location: the orient lying to the east of the west, and the west lying to the west of the east. This ontological difference then leads to an epistemological difference whereby the orient becomes the object of knowledge --it is to be understood, captured, and dominated while the knower and the controller is the west, occupying the subject position. Thus, the relations between the east and the west are "a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony"(Said 5). The Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci first used the term hegemony to mean "rule by consent". Now, it is not only the orientalists or the westerners who are informed by the orientalist (mis)knowledge; it is the easterners too who uncritically accept as true whatever is assigned the status of truth by the discourse of orientalism. The Orientals or easterners feel proud in following western style of thought, language, literature – lifestyle, in short -- because they feel that in doing so their status their own society is uplifted. Orientalism then is a sort of hegemony: the Orientals agree to follow as superior the ways of the westerners, thereby hoping to appear more civilized than their own kinds who are not so receptive of the western influences.

The detrimental impact of orientalism in the psyche of both the easterners and westerners is massive. What is really irritating is the fact that, now, more acutely than ever before owing to quick and exaggerating machinery of information technology, news and information bits are pre-selected and annotated so that they suit the material or cultural interest of those involved in circulating the information. This premeditated dissemination of information prepares a mass ready to accept as the given as the truth and that they are accustomed to being fed as the same. The centuries of literary and political representations of the east as incapable of rationality, logic and restraint have actually gone deep in acquiring the consent of the so designated people.

Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Reading:

The justifiability and necessary of the practice of colonialism is always at the heart of colonial discourse, central to which is the assumption that European values --such as rationality, science, civilization, high seriousness of literature -- are superior to the values espoused by the non-European peoples. In literature, this takes the form of exaggeration where the unbearability of nonwestern climate, presence of fatal insects; and dark, uninhibited or only-beast-inhibited lands are presented as posing threat to the westerners who go there from cool, lenient climates.

The heat, sand and dust can be taken as other contributing factors that help to the bulk of texts to portray the non-European or non-western land as hostile to the civilized, artistic sensibility. The vast stretches of land of simmering dust and wind become another metaphor for the degenerate idle life of the Indian people. The filthy and squalid cities become the synecdoche of the whole Indian subcontinent, corrupt and inclement to the refined people from the land of prosperity, cool and calm.

Colonial discourse rests upon a dichotomy: the West versus the East. The West (us) is always possessed of all the human virtues that are adorned universally, whereas the colonized (them) is irrational and uncivilized. Hence, the colonizers had to take up their burden to civilize the other. They had to go to the colonial outposts to teach the natives the decent way of life, of

government, of religion. And in doing so, the colonizer had to become rude even, at times. Of course, colonial discourse never ever questions the motives behind colonial expansion: to gain control over the global market. Was it really to civilize the backward people living in the non-western-lands? The fact is that their resources --both human and natural -- were exploited to the extent irrevocable by the colonizing powers is never mentioned in colonial discourse.

Post-colonial studies imply the critical analysis of literature and even the history, culture, and modes of discourse that are specific to former colonies of England, Spain, France and other imperial powers of Europe. It also analyzes the literary and cultural representation of the Third World Countries like Asia, and Africa by critiquing the westerners' perspective to view non western world in their literature.

Post colonial criticism, licensed with the awareness of the insights imparted by the cultural discourse, suspicion on the part of colonized people, seeks to undermine imperial subjects and themes. It has forcefully produced parallel discourses which have questioned and even subverted the since long cherished stereotypes and myths about the other. In a sense, post- colonial studies proposes a counter canonicity of studying and analyzing the literature, culture and history of nonwestern world in which the values and norms of so called master narrative of western metropolis are subverted; the stories of marginalized and subordinated are valorized in order to replace aged long misinterpretation of Non Western world in western canonicity. Hence, Said puts it, "aware that what they (westerners) have to say about the history and the cultures of 'subordinate' people is challengeable by the people themselves who a few years back were aptly incorporated, culture, and, history and all into the great western empires and their disciplinary discourses" (235). What is being said here is that the power and authority of western colonial representations have been questioned and challenged by the discourses produced by the supposed-to-be-subordinate people. These postcolonial writers and critics have turned the table and presented the colonial history from the perspective of colonized people's experience. By doing this, they revealed what the

colonial authority had done to them in the name of progress, science and civilization. As a result, westerners, for the first time, according to Said, “have been required to confront themselves not simply as representatives of a culture and even of races accused of crimes--crimes of violence, crimes of suppression" and 'crime of violence' (235). Such a subversion of colonial perspective by the postcolonial critics like Said and Fanon has given birth to many other postcolonial critics.

Frantz Fanon, one of the eminent postcolonial writers and critics, seems to be more radical on this issue as Said in his *Culture and Imperialism* writes that Fanon “reverses the hitherto accepted paradigm by which Europe gave the colonies their modernity and argues instead that only we are 'the well being and the progress Europe built up with the sweat and the dead bodies of Negros, Arabs, Indians and the yellow races' but Europe is literally the creation of the third world” (237). Commenting on post colonial criticism, Homi K. Bhabha also presents a bit less radical view on his famous essay “Postcolonial Criticism”:

Postcolonial criticism bears witness to the unequal and uneven forces of cultural representation involved in the contest for political and social authority within the modern world order. Post colonial perspectives emerge from the colonial testimony of Third World countries and the discourses of minorities within the geopolitical division of the east and the west. They intervene in those ideological discourses of modernity that attempt to give a hegemonic normality to the uneven development and the differential, often disadvantaged, histories of nations, races, communities, people. (437)

In this sense, postcolonial studies proposes a counter canonicity of studying and analyzing the culture, history, and literary products of the non-western world in which the values and norms of so called master narrative of western imperialism is subverted.

The adjective 'postcolonial' is more useful as an awakened state of consciousness of the colonized people rather than as a strict periodization. Thus, a text written in the then historical colonial time can be called postcolonial in so far as it goes against the prevalent colonial discursive practices of demeaning and dehumanizing the colonized subject. If a text opposes the inhuman practices of colonialism; if it exposes its vices and dangers; it is postcolonial. The term has also been used in its hyphenated forms (post-colonial, post-colonialism etc.) to stress the time frames and practices that came after colonialism. In any event, it is a disputation of the legacies of colonialism though the presence of the prefix 'post' presupposes the perpetuation of colonialism, or its effects, right into the present era.

As defined by M. H. Abrams, "The postcolonial agenda is to disestablish Eurocentric norms of literary and artistic values and to expand the literary cannon to include colonial and postcolonial writers" (237).

Therefore a postcolonial reading of the texts, whether they are written in the colonial era or merely in the colonial tradition --subverts all such colonial institutions. What was formerly seen and lauded as classic now becomes merely Eurocentric and ethnocentric; whatever was valorized as having been informed of universalism is now brought to its real status as parochial and blinded by the supremacist illusion of racism. A typical postcolonial critique of our text would maintain that the novel is too unbalanced, too selective, in its specific details to represent the Nepali reality in India. The complicity of the novel with orientalist perspective is too apparent to require any further explanation. So, the next chapter will try to provide some textual evidences to prove that the novelist has been a colonial rather than a postcolonial writer despite the fact her lineage goes back to India.

III. Writing from Outside: Imperfect Vision

A writer whose roots go back to the formerly colonized land can never hope to be free of the intricate love-hate attitude s/he enjoys as regards her relation with the country of her ancestral origin. Disillusioned, therefore critical of their present plight in a metropolis where they are still somehow or other treated, despite their best allegiance toward the newly adopted country, treated as the second rate citizens. They are often reminded of their homelands which have by now become imaginary since they are virtually out of contact with it save in family sagas and recounting of odd tale by the elder inmates about the bygone good days of the past. This dilemma, the penchant for the ancestral homeland, but the unwillingness to overtly go to settle there or even to align oneself to the source as more than a fantasizer is what characterizes a colonial mindset in the first place. It may sound a bit harsh, but as Aijaj Ahmad also has stated so succinctly, the self-exiled intellectuals, the experts on the east, from the east who are now safely stationed in the western metropolis and academia, have no justifiable ground to claim the position of minority, and the subsequent privilege appertaining thereunto. Neither can they claim any commentary privilege, a writer of history of the natives back at home while themselves in the cozy parlors of the world centers. Despite this, many quack westerners, who are easterners really, whose black skins can never be sufficiently whitewashed, deploy the cheap marketplace trick of emotional blackmailing. They appear as if they are sorry to be away from their country and people, who suffered the yoke of colonialism for centuries, and pretend to invest their time and energy writing on the deserted country and its unfortunate citizens. But it does never occur to them to practically revisit and resettle their homelands. The homeland, if ever it is taken as one, would always remain a much overvalued and exoticized but never so much cared or loved as to require the writer to understand its ground reality, turn out, as the orient did in the high western colonial era, to be a veritable mine for extracting odd bits of travelogues, politically shallow tracts and mythologized anthropological documentaries. No

self-exiled worth their capacity as a writer dares to come to the ground reality of the nooks and corners of the once colonized, now politically, technically independent, but mentally colonized land.

One characteristic of the exiled writers is their self-professed veteran expertise in analyzing the political turmoil in their ancestral country. Kiran Desai does not lag behind in doing the same for India. She appears to have grasped the root or as we say the 'bone of contention' of the separatist movements gaining strength in Punjab, Jharkhand, Assam, Sikkim and many other states of India. What she does is ultimately slings some lumps of mud to her politically unfavored party or some neighboring country for a mere surmised conclusion that they have been shelters to the insurgents. Desai's novel is stuffed with such childish and pat accusations against the Nepalis who are time and again referred to as the 'Neps', a derogatory abbreviation; Kathmandu, the capital city of Nepal, is described as the breeding bed of the northern Indian insurgent movements. The weapons as the novel records are bought and sold in the "Kathmandu black-market", easily forgetting that it is in metropolises like Bombay where hundreds of people are robbed and shot dead in the broad daylight. The anti-Nepali vehemence of Desai regarding to Nepal and Nepales is beyond the comprehension of any sane reader. The distrust, it seems, stems from the fact that she in the first place has never adequately resided in India so as to feel her relation with the neighboring countries. Secondly, she has adopted named swallowed, hook, line and sinker, whatever knowledge she gathered from the British and American archives regarding the political facets of the South Asian region. She inherits a legacy of loss; one founded on the once blooming colonial expansionist enterprise, but now comes in the more subtle forms of consumer market economy and hypnotism of cultural icons such as Hollywood stars and American Idol. "They had come through the forest on foot, in leather jackets from, the Kathmandu black market, khaki pants, bandanas—universal guerilla fashion. One of the boys carried a gun" (4). Such murky descriptions as this holds no water; not one but thousands of gangsters and killers roam around the Indian big cities with an intent to commit arson, murder, robbery and kidnapping for ransom money. If an unsuspecting Nepali visits these

crime beds, s/he is not likely to come back safe. But when the long downtrodden people organize some rebellion, it is downright condemned as mere rebellion. Desai spares an opportunity to slight and vilify the movement by presenting it in bits of scornful scenes:

“Say, *Jai Gorkha*,’ they said to the judge. ‘Gorkhaland for Gorkhas.’

‘*Jai Gorkha*.

Say, ‘I am fool.’

Loudly. Can’t hear you, *huzoor*. Say it louder.

He said it in the same empty voice.” (7)

Instead of going into the roots of the trouble and discontents, Desai’s novel makes a farfetched surmise, turns an omniscient, and assumes an attitude of the preacher to tell the reader so lightly about such issues as the annexation of Sikkim to India, the dispute over Kalimpong and Darjeeling, the complex hate-love relationship between Nepal and India, and the much more sensitive issue of Indians of Nepali origin who are still treated more as Nepalis than as Indian citizens. The scene is one of uproars and uncertainties; the fear of abrupt conflagration of racial hatred becoming darker each moment:

In Kalimpong, high in the northeastern Himalayas where they lived—the retired judge and his cook, Sai, and Mutt—there was a report of new dissatisfaction in the hills, gathering insurgency, men and guns. It was the Indian-Nepalese this time, fed up with being treated like the minority in a place where they were the majority. They wanted their own affairs. Here, where India blurred into Bhutan and Sikkim, and the army did pull-ups and push-ups, maintaining their tanks with khaki paint in case the Chinese grew hungry for more territory than Tibet, it had always been a messy map. The papers sounded resigned. A great amount of warring, betraying, bartering had occurred; between Nepal, England, Tibet India, Sikkim, Bhutan;

Darjeeling stolen from here, Kalimpong plucked from there—despite, ah, despite the mist charging down like a dragon, dissolving, undoing, making ridiculous the drawing of borders. (9)

That the northern part of India, owing to the cool temperate, climate where the colonizers, the Britishers were in tune with, became an attraction; hence showing their presence in this physically drugged and difficult area. There are edifices, constructions and houses built for the use of the officers and commoners from the colonial enterprise. How even an insignificant structure gains significance because it has been discoursed, is evident from the citation below:

The house had been built long ago by a Scotsman, passionate reader of the accounts of that period: *the Indian Alaps and How We Crossed Them*, by A Lady Pioneer. *Land of the Lama. The Phantom Rickshaw. My Mercara Home. Black Panther of Singrauli*. His true spirit had called to him, then, informed him that it, too, was wild and bare, and refused to be denied the right to adventure. As always, the price for such romance had been high and paid for by others. Porters had carried boulders from the riverbed –legs growing bandy, ribs curving into caves, backs into U’s, faces being bent slowly to look always at the ground –up to this site chosen for a view that could raise the human heart to spiritual heights.(12)

The house in itself is one of numerous such houses. It is not worthwhile spending pages describing them. But the writer thought it would illuminate the issue and she painted it verbally; may be in reality there never was one with such features. But anyway we accept the house was there. So what? What does the novel want to prove? To prove that by settling at the remote hilly parts of India, the colonizers contributed to education and other modern facilities there? It would be like burning down one’s house and rejoicing that no one can get some sacks of coal to sell from the debris! But the real thrust of the paper is to show how easily the writers forget the reality and comes to eroticize the exquisiteness, marvel and spirituality of such a practically impossible hilly life. But

what about the fact that the establishment of transport system, even education in India was primarily intended not at uplifting the life standards of the natives but for expanding the colonial trade and producing the required work force for the maintenance of this enterprise in such a vast sub-continent.

Among the numerous dehumanizing portraits and references pertaining to Nepalis, the one below is about a caretaker at the house of Noni and Lola. The very illustration of the guard is one of vilification. The word 'Budhoo' translates in English as 'fool' or a 'blockhead'. As other discussions in the novel on Nepalis too indicate, the novel because of the jaundiced perspective of its author is marred with anti-Nepal sentiment without any palpable reasons. Nepalis are depicted as slow in brain, fit for carrying heavy loads and all sorts of manual jobs, not those which require mental skill .It is ascribed to their having much rice two times a day. The same slant against Nepalis gets expression here in the naming of the guard: "Budhoo? But he's Nepali. Who can trust him now? It's always the watchman in a case of robbery" (43). They pass on the information and share the spoils, and they talk about certain Mrs. Thondup who used to have that Nepali fellow, and who, on returning from Calcutta one year, found the house wiped clean, clean of cups, plates, beds, chairs, wiring, light fixtures, every single thing – even the chains and floats in the toilets. One of the men had tried to steal the cables along the road and they found him electrocuted. Every bamboo had been cut and sold; every tree was off the tree. Holes had been bored into their water pipes so every hut on the hillside was drawing water from their supply—and no sign of the watchman, of course. "Quick across the border, he'd disappeared back into Nepal" (44). So they once think of telling Budhoo to go away from them.

Thus, the yet bitterer accusation comes with calling in question the integrity, honesty of the entire nationals. Because one reported Nepali caretaker allowed the robbery in the same house he was supposed to be guard of, and then he too fled to Nepal; the sisters wonder whether their guard would not do the same with their property. The Nepalis are all alike, so Budhoo cannot be relied

upon. Supposing even if a particular caretaker — maybe he was not treated well, or was not paid for years or something like that, which tried his patience — had robbed the house, it cannot be applied to each and all Nepali workers in India to prove their disloyalty and treachery. Their divided fear of retaining his service and firing him from it gets an acrid form of anti-Nepal sloganeerism:

But they had trusted Budhoo for no reason whatsoever. He might murder them in their eighties—

“But if we dismiss him,” said Noni, “then he’ll be angry and twice as likely to do something.”

“I tell you, these Neps can’t be trusted. And they don’t just rob. They think absolutely nothing of murdering, as well.” (45)

Nepalis are not only infidel; they are insensitive too to such an extent that they can come to coldheartedly murdering somebody at the slightest provocation or displeasure. This anti-Nepali streak in the overall formation of the novel sounds morbid and unhealthy.

When the judge hires a tutor for his granddaughter Sai, they expected it to be Bengali or somebody like that. Because it would not occur to them to think that a Nepali can be a tutor, an intellectual person even if it is just a school level.

"It is strange the tutor is Nepali," the cook remarked to Sai when he had left. A bit later he said, "I thought he would be Bengali."

"Hm?" asked Sai. How had she looked? She was thinking. How had she appeared to the tutor? The tutor himself had the aspect, she thought, of intense intelligence. His eyes were serious expression, and his hair was curly and stood up in a way that made him look comic. This seriousness combined with the comic she found compelling. (73)

Nepalis, the honest Himalayan people, are thought to be simpletons, but not innocent, as this conversation indicates. Why cannot a Nepali be an intellectual? Does it require one to be sea-faring people to be wise? The cook comes up with his declaration that the Bengalis, being coastal people eat fish and are much cleverer as are the Malayalis and Tamils. He goes on deliberating on the psychosomatic effect of food habits on people: "Inland they eat too much grain, and it slows the digestion—especially millet—forms a big heavy ball. The blood goes to the stomach and not to the head. Nepalis make good soldiers, coolies, but they are not so bright at their studies. Not their fault, poor things" (73). Such grossly disparaging statements are not pardonable with the excuse that they are made by the characters, not by the writer. But who created and put these statements in the mouth of the characters? It is the writer. So the significance of such dictums reaches far, beyond the textual and the imaginative aspect of the novel, into the political. Decidedly, the mindset that works on the basis of we / them, self / other dichotomy, deserves severe denouncement and refusal from an intellectual grounding.

Climbing perpendicular to the sky, arriving breathless at the top of Ringkingpong hills, you'd see "LIBERATION!" scrawled across the water. Still, for a while nobody knew which way it would go, and it was dismissed as nothing more serious than the usual handful of students and agitators. But then one day fifty boys, members of the youth wing of the GNLF, gathered to swear an oath at Mahakaldara to fight to the death for the formation of a homeland, Gorkhaland. Then they marched down the streets of Darjeeling, took a turn around the market and the mall. Now the war cry becomes audible everywhere:

"Gorkhaland for Gorkhas. We are the liberation army." They were watched by the pony men and their poise, by the proprietors of souvenir shops, by the waiters of Glenary's, the Planter's Club, the Gymkhana, and the Windamere as they waved their unsheathed kukris, sliced the fierce blades through the tender mist under the watery sun. Quite suddenly, everyone was using the word *insurgency*. (126)

The novel's attempt at commenting upon this phenomenon of insurgency takes the form of dialogue between the two sisters Lola and Noni who, as it seems know nothing of deep importance about the issue than the apprehension that every Nepali guard in those areas is thinking of murdering his masters and fleeing across the border into Nepal to enjoy the loot at Kathmandu. One cannot help asking if the novelist did not have a personal embittering experience with Kathmandu, though it is most probable she has never got an opportunity of visiting this valley. What she writes about Nepal and of Kathmandu is all based on what she has read and heard from the filtration process of Indian media which is, as an inhabitant of this region well knows, unjustifiably biased against other countries in the neighborhood. Noni seems to find some justifying reason behind this uprising, but Lola says it is just their pretext for clearing up the Bengalis:

“They have a point,” said Noni, “maybe not their whole point, but I'd say half to three-quarters for their point.”

“Nonsense.” Lola waved her sister's opinion away. “Those Neps will be after all outsiders now, but especially us Bongs. They've been plotting this a long while. Dream come true. All kinds of atrocities will go on – then they can skip merrily over the border to hide in Nepal. Very convenient”. (127)

In her mind she pictured their watchman, Budhoo, with her BBC radio and her silver cake knife, living it up in Kathmandu along with various other Kanchas and Kanchis with their “respective loot” (127). This simple suspicion arises not so much from the heart of Lola as from the failure of Kiran Desai the expatriate writer, writing in the west for the western readership in an exotic vein for mere hype, but who has no grasp of the ground reality of the politics in India, Nepal and the troubled area of north-eastern India comprising several formerly independent smaller countries now brought under Indian jurisdiction. Despite this fact, the novelist is not at all ill at ease for her incompetence; rather she readily provides a formula to her mouthpiece characters to explain an event by ascribing it to the Nepalis, their aspiration for liberty and their murderous inclination.

The novel tries to give an account of how the Nepalis came to settle in Indian territory the north in search of better job and work opportunity. In this case it is Gyan's family history which goes like this:

In the 1800s his ancestors had left their village in Nepal and arrived in Darjeeling, lured by promises of work on a tea plantation. There, in a small hamlet bordering one of the remoter tea estates, they had owned a buffalo renowned for its astonishingly creamy milk. By and by along came the Imperial Army, measuring potential soldiers in villages all over the hills with a measuring tape and ruler, and they had happened upon the impressive shoulders of Gyan's great-grandfather, who had grown so strong on the milk of their buffalo that he had beaten the village sweet-seller's son in a wrestling match, an exceptionally glossy and healthy boy.

(141)

The picture here is once again created to give the impression that Nepali youths are suitable for the profession of fighting since they have strong build and courage. But this banal conclusion every opportunity the novelist arrives at is rather disgusting. It seems as if the so called 'Neps' are there only for serving others, either it is the British or the Indians, in war.

Despite their historical engagement in all the national and international exploits, whither in supporting the British Raj, or after the Indians independence, in keeping the sovereignty of the Indian nation intact, the Nepalis are treated as people of a foreign land. They have become the minority among the minorities. This issue is raised by this agitating GNLFF movement in the speeches and pamphlets:

"Except us. The Nepalis of India. At that time, in April of 1947, the Communist Party of India demanded a Gookhasthan, but the request was ignored.... We are laborers on the tea plantations, coolies dragging heavy loads, soldiers. And are we allowed to become doctors and government workers, owners of the tea plantations? No! We are kept at the level of servants. We fought in World War One. We went to east

Africa, to Egypt, to the Persian Gulf. We were moved from here to there as it suited them. We fought in World War Two. In Europe, Syria, Persia, Malaya, and Burma. Where would they be without the courage of our people? We are still fighting for them. We are soldiers, loyal, brave. India or England, they never had cause to doubt our loyalty. In the wars with Pakistan we fought our former comrades on the other side of the border. How our spirit cried. But we are Gorkhas. We are soldiers. Our character has never been in doubt. And have we been rewarded?? Have we been given compensation?? Are we given respect? (158)

The question put here is compelling; are the Gorkhas recognized at all for their contribution they made for the survival of the Raj and then of the nation? Instead, they have been marginalized, humiliated, obliterated from all public affairs of the state. So the agitation of the Nepalis in Darjeeling, Assam and Sikkim sprouted:

“Jai Gorkha! Jai Gorkha! Jai Gorkha!” the crowd screamed, their own blood thrumming, pulsing, surging forth at the sight of the speech giver’s hand. Thirty supporters stepped forward and also drew blood from their thumbs with their kukris to write a poster demanding Gorkhaland, in blood” (159).

What we see here is the attempt of the novelist to capture the sentiment and reality of the agitators in coming to a critical stand against the Indian mainstream politics which is discriminatory. Since the thrust of this thesis is to reveal the danger involved in exposing the story of other by an elitist writer, it can be better to quote a relevant citation to drive the idea to the topic as to what is being touched upon here. In a provoking article entitled “Can the subaltern speak?” Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak expresses her doubt whether the marginal have the power to articulate their dissenting voice. More specifically, she seems to be saying that even if the subalterns speak, their voice will not be heard and heeded by the dominant group(s). Or, the hegemony of the previously politically dominant party will continue. In this regard, one can turn to what Ranjit Guha writes:

The historiography of Indian nationalism has for a long time been dominated by elitism—colonialist elitism and bourgeois-nationalist elitism...shar[ing] the prejudice of that the making of the Indian nation and the development of the consciousness – nationalism which confirmed this process were exclusively or predominantly elite achievements. In the colonialist and neo-colonialist historiographies these achievements are credited to British colonial rulers, administrators, policies, institutions, and culture: in the nationalist and neo-nationalist writings – to Indian elite personalities, institutions, activities and ideas. (Qted in Spivak. Guha 1982)

Thus, even after the Indian independence the elitist discourse remains a faithful supporter of the colonial discourse. This is to say that the mainstream historiography fails to take into account the contribution of the commoners in the making of a nation. The same applies to the present story of the liberation movement launched by GNLF. Desia's attempt fails to depict it in the light of the suppression suffered by the Nepali-Indians. She tried to make a novel on the theme of Gurkha agitation but ended up with making it look like a gangster agitation and cheap sloganeerism.

Gyan takes interest, as it befits an educated youth, to claim the superiority of the first climber to Everest. In his comment the novelist also shows agreement:

“He was the real hero, Tenzing,” Gyan had said. “Hilary couldn't have made it without Sherpas carrying his bags.” Everyone around had agreed. Tenzing was certainly first, or else he was made to wait with the bags so Hilary could take the first step on behalf of that colonial enterprise of sticking your flag on what was not yours. (155)

Sai had wondered, should humans conquer the mountain or should they wish for the mountain to possess them? Sherpas went up and down, ten times, fifteen times in some cases, without glory, without claim of ownership, and there were those who said it was sacred and shouldn't be sullied at all.

The West as Dreamland:

How much enchanted the Orientals, the Indians are from the west, especially America? When the policemen come for rummaging the shack of the cook to see if he had been in any way helping the insurgents, the cook starts impressing them with his son's being in the USA for work. The policemen too are dazed at least from the appearance. As the novel puts it, maybe they were thinking of growing relation with this old man could be of much help in their getting to the land of plenty.

Angrezi khana. The cook had thought of ham roll ejected from a can and fried in thick ruddy slices, of tuna fish soufflé's, khari biscuit pie, and was sure that since his son was cooking English food, he had a higher position than if he were cooking Indian.

The police seemed intrigued by the first letter they had read and embarked on the others. To find what? Any sign of hanky panky? Money from the sale of guns? Or were they wondering about how to get to America themselves? (17)

But it is a too flat presentation. Personally any one can have enchantment for the west. But to portray in-duty personnel too are dreaming of making connection through a cook—it is too much. Kiran Desai is, it seems, giving out her account of the American dream: any how you land in the wonderful land, and then your life is what it should be like or what you desire it to will be like. This is westernophilia ,pure and moronic, of which the novel, rather the novelist, cannot so easily be absolved.

For the easterners, or the non-westerners, the west holds an especial appeal, whatever is the reality. Once an easterner enters U.K. or the U. S. A., the society looks upon the outsider as undeservedly lucky person. As if the very fact that one has entered the much hyped land of opportunities, one's life is sure to be on the rise for ever. This stems from the colonial mentality which denigrates the native everything and valorizes the western everything in lump sum.

But the life there is not all golden; it can be and is mostly rodent existence for the poor from India as well the less fortunate ones from Africa. Mincing no words, one can justifiably conclude that there is deep difference between appearance, the promises and the reality. A smart fellow named Saeed too has to go through a series of disgusting work experience, as he tries to settle in the USA. His first job in America had been at the Ninety-sixth Street mosque, where the Imam hired him to do the dawn call to prayer, since he did a fine rooster crow, but before he arrived at work, he took to stopping at the nightclubs along the way, it seeming a natural enough progression time-wise. Disposable camera in his pocket, he stood at the door waiting to have snapshots of him taken with the rich and famous: "Mike Tyson, yes! He's my brother. Naomi Campbell, she's my girl. Hey, Bruce (Springsteen)! I am Saeed Saeed from Africa. But don't worry, man, we don't eat white people anymore" (78). Fortunately for him, he is an exceptionally smart person, so much so that he can give hoodwinks to the officers at the embassy and make them think he a right type of person to inhabit America. Given below is an account of what he thought of Amerciaca; and his response to the expectation of the nation:

Saeed, he relished the whole game, the way the country flexed his wits and rewarded him; he charmed it, cajoled it, felt great tenderness and loyalty toward it. When it came time, he who had jigged open every back door, he who had, with photocopier, White-Out, and paper cutter, spectacularly sabotaged the system (one skilled person at the photocopy machine, he assured Biju, could bring America to its knees), he would pledge emotional allegiance to the flag with tears in his eyes and conviction in his voice. The country recognized something in Saeed, he in it, and it was a mutual love affair. Ups and downs, sometimes more sour tan sweet, may be, but nonetheless, beyond anything the INS could imagine, it was an old-fashioned romance. (79)

Unaware of the ratty existence and rodent secrets his son was living in the USA, back at home in Kalimpong, the cook was writing numerous letters on behalf of the villagers and city dwellers, assuming the importance of one as if he were their destiny maker. The Metal Box watchman had paid him a formal visit to tell the cook about his son; big enough now to get a job, but there were no jobs. Could Biju help him across to America? The boy would be willing to start at a menial level but of course a job in an office would be best. Italy would also be all right, he had added for good measure. A man from his village had gone to Italy and was making a good living as a tandoori cook (80).

And Biju, ashamed, would write some vague replies, changes of his job, American food, new environment, doing pretty well, and what not. Only the readers, the novelist, and the characters in the American drama know what it is like to be unrespectable, meaning non-white and poor, in the west. Biju could not help but feels a flash of anger at his father for sending him alone to this country, but he knew he wouldn't have forgiven his father for not trying to send him, either. (82) This eagerness to get to America has by now gone sour for Biju. He is thinking of getting back home. The price is taxing, heavy. Finally it breaks all the hopes and stamina that Biju initially had and makes him fly home without the least of the desire to ever get back to the dream land.

Demeaning the Native: Colonial Legacy:

The west-born or raised writers feel pleased to be able to address the native from an exalted position. They take up the line adopted by the colonial writers and write in a demeaning way concerning the natives. When Desai writes about the native's business, efforts to get to the west and what not, she seems amused at their ignorance, shamelessness, and promiscuity even. Also, she shows how important the natives feel it to have connection to the west by some means. But all these indicate, as already contended by this thesis, that the personal prejudices of the novelist come into play, revealing the mindset of an expatriate Indian who is now neither fish nor flesh, meaning she has lost the real contact with India, and is not a westerner proper either. So, what is left to her is

to weave bizarre tale of adventure, romance, and revolution so as to make her writing saleable in the west:

The cook folded up the letter and put it in his shirt pocket. Feeling joyful, he descended steeply into the *haat*, pushing his way between bent and bowed Nepali ladies with golden nose rings dangling and Tibetan women with braids and prayer beads, between those who had walked from faraway villages to sell muddy mushrooms covered with brackish leaves or greenery, already half cooked in the sun. Powers, oils, and ganglions of roots were proffered by Lepcha medicine men; other stalls offered yak hair, untidy and rough as the hair of demons, and sacks of miniature dried shrimp with oversized whiskers; there were smuggled with foreign goods from Nepal, perfumes, jean jackets, electronics; there were kukri sickles, sheets of plastic reproofing, and false teeth. (83-4)

The sundry items listed here are for creating an exotic effect in the readers, and secondly to ridicule the cooks' simplicity that his son would be an interesting topic for the inhabitants. But nobody here would be interested in the cook's son. At the Snow Lion Travel Agency, the cook waited to claim the manager's attention. Tashi was busy chatting up a tourist- he was famous for "charming the Patagonia pants off foreign women and giving them an opportunity to write home with the requisite tale of amorous adventure with a Sherpa" (84). All around were brochures for the monastery trips Tashi organized, photographs of hotels built in the traditional style, furnished with antiques, many of which had been taken from the monasteries themselves. Of course he omitted the fact that the centuries-old structures were all being modernized with concrete, fluorescent lighting, and bathroom tiling.

The Indians in America have to undergo various sorts of miseries and humiliation. Same happens with the Africans. Biju, an Indian, witnesses the similar plight one African has to cope up with as himself, and feels sort of empathy:

Biju's sympathy for Saeed leaked into sympathy for himself, then Saeed's shame into his own shame that he would never help all those people praying for his help, waiting daily, hourly, for his response. He, too, had arrived at the airport with a few dollar bills bought on the Kathmandu black market in his pocket and an address for his father's friend, Namdu, who lived with twenty-two taxi drivers in Queens. Namdu had also not answered the phone and had tried to hide when Biju arrived on his doorstep, and then when he thought Biju had left, had opened the door and his distress found Biju still standing there two hours later. (98)

The reference here once again to Kathmandu black market is obviously an intentional attack by the novelist on the socio-political aspect of the northern neighbor to India. First queries first. How come an expatriate writer, who does not have much reliable information about India itself, can assume to know about the secret of black market in Kathmandu? Next, was it so necessary, whenever there pops up an opportunity, to slander against Nepal and the Nepalis? Would that gain positive response from the readers worldwide, or does she think of gaining favour only with the readers of Indian origin?

Gaining an entrance to the imperial job may be a matter of much happiness and pride. But to depict an Indian youth so overwhelmed with his success in entering the British Raj service that he confines himself for three days to weep for joy is surely a disgusting exaggeration. May be, if one wants to turn acrid, it was the personal experience of the novelist herself when she got admission to the west that she wept for joy. Anyway, the following is the depiction she has made of Jemu Bhai Patel:

Looking neither right nor left, the newest member, practically unwelcome, of the heaven-born, ran home with his arms folded and got immediately into bed, all his clothes on, even his shoes, and soaked his pillow with his weeping. Tears sheeted his

cheeks, eddied about his tormented ragged nerves. He lay there crying for three days and three nights. (117)

This is the scene after his admission into the (Imperial Civil Service) as the lucky candidate at the last hour as the government decided to Indianize the service by including members from all sectors of India. This is a humiliating scene in reality. It is difficult to see whether the novelist is trying to demean the native and appease the westerner in their search of the superior image of themselves at the vilification of the west.

Kathmandu:

Two weeks later to his success at the interview this would lead to his migration to the USA, Biju traveled by bus to Kathmandu for a week of training at the recruiting agency's main office. The novel, or rather the novelist takes the opportunity here to paint a picture of the capital of Nepal, along with reporting the nasty practices there:

Kathmandu was a carved wooden city of temples and palaces, caught in a disintegrating tangle of modern concrete that stretched into the dust and climbed into the sky.

He looked in vain for the mountains; Mt. Everest—where was it? He traversed along flat main roads into a knot of medieval passages full of the sounds of long ago, a street of metal workers, a street of potters melding clay, straw, sand, with their bare feet; rats in a Ganesh temple eating sweets. (181)

This shows Desai is more interested in humiliating the Nation of Nepal in telling a fictional story about what she herself might have experienced as an Indian trying to gain success in the USA, with the difference that she came from a well-to-do and educated family. Otherwise, why, there was no need of dragging the reference to the street or the dirty talks or the swear words of the butcher as it is reported immediately to reveal the fact of Biju being cheated. An over exaggerated scene of the

butchering of a goat is given along with the deception Biju was exposed to while he thought he was nearing his dream of a life time by succeeding in the interview which happened to be a fake one. The men at a murky street in Kathmandu tell him how he had been deceived. While he aimlessly ponders over the fact of his being misled about the interview, he hears a butcher killing a goat: "Before the butcher slit the goat's throat, Biju could hear him working up his disdain, yelling '*Bitch, whore, cunt, sali,*' at her, dragging her forward then, killing her" (181).

One does not believe if butchers in Katmanmdu curse at the goats before they slit the poor creatures. It is all coked up in the crooked mindset of Kiran Desai, an Indian mind as it is said in Nepal where people think that Indian means deception and sham and giving false impression.

One night, some rebellious boys of the GNLF come to Lola and Noni's house and demand the night to be spent at their house. At that time Budhoo, the Nepali caretaker there at the house is absent. Now the sisters start unreasonably to suspect the Nepali guard:

"I told you" Lola said in a scorched whisper, "these, Neps! Hand in hand. . . ."

"May be the boys threatened him," spat Noni.

"Oh, come on. He's probably uncle to one of them! We should have told them to go and now you've started this, Noni, they'll come all the time." (239)

Neps, a distracting shortened form for Nepalis, is used to signify that the Nepalis are essentially inimical to the Indians; that they come to looting whenever they get a chance. The watchman, Budhoo, is missing from their house the same night the GNLF boys come for sacking the house. This occasion gives them space for suspicion that he might have been aligned with the boys. And sure enough, before a month has passed by, the boys come back one night to construct huts for the homeless ones around there on the yards of the Mon Ami villa. No effectual resistance from the sisters' side is made; they are too weak for that. The novel then goes on explaining the root cause of all this confiscation business; the hatred of the poor for the well-off, of the native for the settlers, of

the laborers for the tourists. It came, it says, from an old feeling of anger that couldn't be divorced from Kalimpong:

It was part of every breath. It was in the eyes that waited, attached themselves to you as you approached, rode on your back as you walked on, with a muttered remark you couldn't catch in the moment of passing; it was in the snickering of those gathered at Thapa's Canteen, at Gompus's, at every unnamed roadside shack that sold eggs and matches. (241)

The enmity felt by the poor locals towards the rich settlers, Europeans, is evident everywhere. The treason was the disparity between the life standard of the two groups. The two sisters, who are at the heart of the villa, consuming the beauty and the facility available only to them there, become the centre of attraction and hatred for the locals. They incite envy, but they did not know previously that the feeling would lead the poor to act against them. Now, to get the matter peacefully settled, Lola visits Pradhan, the flamboyant head of the Kalimpong wing of the GNLF, to complain about the illegal huts built by his followers on Mon Ami property. The response of the leader is very irresponsible and childish, foolhardy even. One wonders whether Desai was not tempted into presenting a stereotypical figure of a heady but headless rebel. The description indicated to that effect:

Pradhan said: "But I have to accommodate my men." He looked like a bandit teddy bear, with a great beard and a bandana around his head, gold earrings. Lola didn't know much about him, merely that he had been called the "maverick of Kalimpong" in the newspapers, renegade, fiery, unpredictable, a rebel, not a negotiator, who ran his wing of the GNLF like a king his kingdom, a robber his band. He was wilder, people said, and angrier than Ghising, the leader of the Darjeeling wing, who was the better politician and whose men were now occupying the Gymkhana Club. (242)

Pradhan might have been a rebel, and he must have been, one can conclude looking at his action of capturing the property of somebody else overnight. But to label him a teddy bear, or one who cannot negotiate, and other such entirely darkish epithets is to undervalue the liberation movement in the northern Indian regions where the locals are demanding autonomy of governance while remaining annexed to the Indian nation. One has to get at the complex politics there. It is not like Desai residing in the west and commenting upon Kathmandu black-market and the independence movement in India. Not all the states are demanding for total political independence; nor that is conceivable even to India. They are just demanding for equality in the treatment done out to the Indian states by the central government, and also a degree of autonomy of the state whereby the locals can choose the chief minister themselves along with the civil servants, without the interference of the central government which is decidedly always against the people of Nepali and Tibeto-Burman origin. Whether one likes it or not, the Indians have acquired a character trait in the course of their intercourse with of the Britishers: they act servile to their masters but act as lordships to their juniors.

Before Lola gets the turn of seeing Pradhan, a Marwari is presented to have his plea expressed to the leader there. His speeches tell the truth about the exact nature of Indians, if one can ever generalize so:

When the man was ushered in front of Pradhan, he began such a bending, bowing, writhing, that he would not even raise his eyes. He spewed flowery honorifics: "Respected Sir and Huzoor and Your Gracious Presence and Your Wish my Pleasure, Please, Please Grant, Your Blessing Requested, Your Honorable self, Your Beneficence, May the Blessings of God Rain upon You and Yours, Might Your Respected Gracious Self Prosper and Might You Grant Prosperity to Respectful Supplicants. . . ." He made an overabundant flower garden of speech, but to no avail,

and finally, he backed out still scattering roses and pleas, prayers and blessings. . .

(243)

The Marwari is in control of the business of selling Tibetan objects of worship, lamps, bells, thunderbolts, plum robes, turmeric, undergarments, lotus-embossed buttons and incense etc. He wants to bring a shipment of prayer lamps past the roadblocks created by the people of Pradhan as a part of their protest against the central government. But the submissive way the businessman has acquired tells something deep about the Indian psyche: they are the worshippers of wealth in the first place, and do not hesitate to fall prostrate in front of humiliation if they can make any money by doing that. Second, they are adept at employing the tactics of threat and control if the other side is weak, but extreme flattery if the second party is stronger than themselves. These two character traits are made evident in an Indian personality, especially one coming from the business class:

The incidence of horror grew, through the changing of the seasons, through winter and a flowery spring, summer, then rain and winter again. Roads were closed, there was curfew every night, and Kalimpong was trapped in its own madness. You couldn't leave the hillsides; nobody even left their houses if they could help but stayed locked in and barricaded.

If you were a Nepali reluctant to join in, it was bad. The Metal Box watchman had been forced to repeat "Jai Gorkha," and dragged to Mahakala Temple to swear an oath of loyalty to the cause. If you weren't Nepali it was worse. (279)

The description of the Gulf Air in connection with Biju's frustrated return home in India from America seems deliberately intended so as to dehumanize and slander the poverty, mismanagement of the so-called third world service. A contrast is pictured between the service provided to the Europeans and Americans on the one hand and the Asian on the other hand. Whatever might have been the original motive of the writer, now it has become accessible to public, the interpretations can vary greatly from one to another and from the authors as well. The contention of this thesis is

that the novel is written by a person who can neither align herself with her ancestry, meaning her poor, third-worldist lineage, nor can she completely sever her relations with her past. She is somehow entangled between the east and west, trying deftly and subtly to earn the sympathy and readership of both while vowing allegiance to none. Rather by making it clear that she can smugly comment on the eastern poverty and folly, she hopes to prove herself sufficiently exalted so as not to be contaminated by the blemishes. Contrarily, by referring, needlessly and out of the context, to the missionaries who flee India in times of turmoil to refurbish themselves at home from the missionary work in the languid peace time after riots, the business talks of encroaching Asia as the biggest world market, the failure of the judge in asking of help with the missionaries who “would have been duty-bound to help” (289) him, Desai has revealed her reviling heart that is neither fish nor fowl. At the same time that she enjoys western, Christian freedoms, she condemns them. Further, she mocks at the olden traditions back in India without setting a line as to what she could support as her original cultural roots. Truly, the novel is the product of a mind marred by colonial legacies but uncomfortable with the national feeling too. This proves how hell-bent she is in portraying the pitiable and inhuman plight of the crew waiting from the flight of the Gulf Air:

All the third-world flights docked here, families waiting days for their connections, squatting on the floor in big bacterial clumps, and it was a long trek to where the European-North American travelers came and went, making those brisk no-nonsense flights with extra leg-room and private TV, whizzing over from a single meeting in such a manner that it was truly hard to imagine they were shitting-peeing, bleeding-weeping humans at all. Silk and cashmere, bleached teeth, Prozac, laptops, and a sandwich for their lunch named The Milano. (285)

In contrast to the western life style, the eastern one is mean, miserable, and loathsome. But what does the writer mean by recurrently underlining the difference? Does she not intend to gain favor in

the west? Here her novel would be hailed as a true document merely for the fact that it has inferiorized the nationalist feeling of the east.

IV. Conclusion

The novel, *The Inheritance of Loss* is about dislocation and the impact of colonization that lingers upon the socio-political map of India long after the restoration of independence. Desai in this novel makes a worthy reading of it if looked from the post-colonial viewpoint where the developed and the developing worlds collide in their efforts for economical encroachment and surviving. Most of the novel is set in a small Himalayan community at the foothill of Kanchenjunga, where a retired and isolated Indian judge lives with his orphan granddaughter Sai, his cook, and his dog. The judge's house is a decaying relic of the British Raj, and virtually everybody in the story has been touched in some way by the dead hand of colonialism in terms of their language, lifestyle, and loyalties. Thus the inheritance of decaying effect of colonialism upon the Indian nation becomes the major theme of the novel, which this thesis intended to justify.

The next related theme is the nationalist movement gaining momentum in the northern Indian states. In the name of Ghorka National Liberation Front, people of mixed ethnicity and history are trying to assert their own identity. And as a minor counterpoint, though somewhat less successful, there is the cook's son Biju, an illegal immigrant in New York, another displaced person struggling for his livelihood and identity. Since Desai has written the novel in short chapters dissecting into even shorter images, and her powers as a miniaturist are so charming, it takes long time for the readers to become fully aware of the larger themes of the book. But they are there, validating a vision that is funny, moving, and sad all at the same time.

Although it focuses on the fate of a few powerless individuals, Kiran Desai's novel manages to explore, with intimacy and insight, every contemporary international issue:

globalization, multiculturalism, economic inequality, fundamentalism and terrorist violence. The amalgamation of characters from different races and continents, and the possible clash between them is also suggested by the novelist. Still what she binds is the fact that these seemingly disparate characters are the part of shared historical legacy and have common experience of unprivileged and humiliated from the society. In postcolonial India, long-suppressed people have begun to awaken to their dereliction and have started to express their anger and despair with the privileged ones, which sometimes have turned into unwanted anachronism. Though Desai moves between first and third world, between upper and lower class, between master and servant and she has shown how the revolution destroyed lives, still she fails to show the undercurrent dynamisms of why those isolated and unprivileged started the liberation movement as done by Gorkhalis in Kalingpong.

Desai's exploration of postcolonial chaos and despair leads one to suggest that colonialism doubtless was bad, but worse still is the fact that the people of the so-called third world think the first world is the fortune making furnace.

Kiran Desai completely misses the importance of the family of Indian social structure, in terms of its contribution to happiness despite of the poverty and other challenges. A setting where every character is missing at least a parent/spouse/child seems unrealistic and makes it all the more negative. Throughout the book, she gives a distinct impression of not knowing what she is writing about. The poor light in which Indians are depicted is truly reprehensible. Still more abominable is her depiction of the fighters for free Gorkhaland for Nepalis. The references to Kathmandu as black markets and deception rampant that there is yet another instance as to how harsh an Indian writer, stationed in the USA, can be against Nepal. All the Indians, as well as Nepalis are portrayed to be hypocritical, unsuccessful, frustrated and devoid of personal

hygiene. Such evidence lead the thesis to conclude that the novel, thorough it might have been a successful post-colonial one, turns out to be a strongly debilitated colonial novel in its depiction of Indian and Nepali characters and lives.

The theme Desai tackles in the novel, the inability to integrate/assimilate into an alien Western world, is tremendously interesting, but she rarely produces a scene that addresses this with any depth or originality. The novel is at its best with the story of Biju, living and working illegally in the US; but even though what he goes through as he is preyed upon by avaricious restaurant owners. Looking for cheap labor is horrific, there's no psychological depth in the narrative voice to emphasis the horror of alienation and to express its results. Desai just touches the surface of despair in the stories of Biju in the US and the Sai's grandfather as a university student in England. Although *The Inheritance of Loss* was awarded the prestigious Booker Prize, and was warmly received in the west, where Desai lives and for whom she primarily writes, it fails to leave the reader with anything other than a superficial brush against the important issues of racism, dislocation, assimilation and post colonialism. Thus, the novel rather being a postcolonial collage of eastern world turns to be a colonial out product in which the legacy of colonialism inherits culminating in the unconscious psyche of the writer that is due to her upbringing in the Western world.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Singapur: Thomson, 2003.
- Achebe, Chinua. "Colonialist Criticism." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Washington: Harcourt, 1992. 1191-1198.
- Bhaba, Homi K. "Postcolonial Criticism" *Redrawing the Boundaries*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt, and Gills Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992. 440-480.
- Bilwakesh, Campa. Rev. of. *The Inheritance of Loss*. Desai Kiran. The New York Review of Books. October 11, 2007.
- Desai, Kiran. *The Inheritance of Loss*. Viking. Penguin Books India, New Delhi. 2006
- Foucault, Michel. "Truth and Power". *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Washington: Harcourt, 1992. 1134-1145.
- Mishra, Pankaj. "Wounded by the West". *The New York Times Book Review*. 12 Feb. 2006. 11-13.
- Nayar, Promod K. *Postcolonial Literature*. New Delhi: Pearson Education, 2008.
- Rev. of. *The Inheritance of Loss*. Desai Kiran. The New York Times. 2006.
- Rev. of. *The Inheritance of Loss*. Desai Kiran. Publishers Weekly. 2006.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991.
- Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1994.
- Sen, Mandira. "Stranger to Themselves." *Women's Review of Books*. Vol.23. May/June 2006. 27-30.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, Helen Tiffin. Routledge. 2002. London. 17 -20.

Wallace, David. "Solid Knowledge". Rev. of. *The Inheritance of Loss*. Desai Kiran. Heldref Publications. VOL. 51, NO. 1. 74-89.