

Chapter One

Discourse on *Desiyata*

Some critics say the spirit of ‘Nativism’ dwells in native values, tradition, ideology, language and culture; it is against the imported values, tradition and belief system. The term native means a person is bound to home and clime or what we call in India ‘*desi*.’ The nativist approach suggests that a person native to a specific culture has more cultural completeness and desirability than the person with mixed or multicultural background. One offshoot to Nativism/ *desivad* appears to negate globalization and asserts the value of writer’s language and heritage. Nativism has affiliations in the Philosophy, Psychology and Linguistics. Linguists take it as a certain cognitive model that allows a child to learn and acquire skills. Bhalchandra Nemade and G N Devy provided the initial push to the nativist movement. Nemade has theorized about nativism in his influential essay “*Sahityateel Desiyata*”¹ in 1983. He differentiates native/ *desi* attitudes in three different forms: *desipana* or ‘nativeness’, *desivad* or ‘nativism’, and *deshiyata* or ‘naticity.’

Desivad is an inclusive term which includes all the three subtypes of *desi* in Nemade. *Desivad* or nativism is the key concept that stands for a conscious and critically aware foregrounding of the nativeness or local signature inherent in an object of artistic or cultural value. Nemade has explained three terms as “Nativeness/ *deshipana*, implies the natural state of sustaining the status quo. Nativism/ *deshivad*, on the other hand, is assertive expression of that “nativism,” the establishment of one’s right to exist as one is” (Paranjape 237). ‘Naticity’ includes both and benign and the aggressive the dimensions of nativism and nativeness.

Bhalchandra Nemade quotes the 1971 edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary* to bring out the connotation related to Nativism. Here the noun ‘native’ had an undeniably racist

meaning: “The original or usual habitant of a country, as distinguished from strangers and foreigners, now especially belonging to non-European and imperfectly civilized race; a coloured person, a black” (Paranjape 237). In the broad context Nativism has three different meanings: first, the xenophobic majority movement against immigrants as it goes against the concept of ‘Internationalism.’ Second, it is concerned with the characteristic of biological concept rather than acquired concept where biological entities plays vital role in determining the native characteristic. Third, is related with literature, literary theory and criticism. It is the last that Nemade is concerned about the most.

Nativism has various manifestations in literature. Native perceptions are everywhere expressed in different languages, cultures and societies. Nativism has different aspects and practices. Various critics have come out with their own version of nativism. Some call it an alternative to the Western and Sanskrit poetics. Critics are also concerned about the future and demerits of nativism as a cultural theory of criticism. In this chapter we shall take four major proponents of nativism: Bhalchandra Nemade, G.N. Devy, Namvar Singh and A. K. Ramanujan. They have their own idea, perspective and explanation about nativism.

The term ‘Nativism’ denotes the idea of social, political, religious, cultural aesthetics and indigenous form. The idea is rooted in the geographical arena, socio-linguistic and socio-cultural background. Bhalchandra Nemade lays stress on use and promulgation of *swadeshi* objects and boycott *videshi*. His nativism is deeply rooted in the roots and local cultural assets. He attacks internationalism and alleges it for the narrow mindedness. His version of nativism is against English language and its literature. According to him, we have forgotten our indigenous or native, linguistics, socio-cultural heritage and exert our narrow mindedness through the incorporation of English language and Western culture. Internationalism plays down the necessity of teaching local languages to the pupils; rather

it encourages the spread of any information in international/ English language only. Nemade's version of nativism elucidates problem of adopting internationalism as sensibility to modernism. Nemade emphasizes on the localism; he keeps localism with universalism. Vishwanath Tripathi, Indian critic, comments on Nemade's *Desivad* as "good literature comes out of grass roots" (Shamina and Nemade, N.p.).

Nemade values good literature in the arena of nativity and linguistic group. He emphasizes on the roots of a particular culture. He rejects the international parameters to judge a literary work. He speaks about the greatness of a literary work in the form of its spiritual and linguistics evaluation and nativity he puts it as:

The greatness of a literary movement or an author is not decided by the international standards; it is determined by how many functions ranging from spiritual elevation to linguistic experimentation it serves. A great writer writes primarily for his own time and for his own community. If at all any international recognition comes, it is purely incidental and secondary. Dante and Shakespeare, considered world writers, were basically native writers (Paranjape 235).

He rejects international approach to a literary work and provides a local approach to it. He limits writings of great writers primarily to their own community. Nemade says literary works, music, painting and sculpture belong to a particular geographical area. All these arts are stamped by the nativeness. "Its stylistic principles, forms, and structures bear the unmistakable stamp of its native place and time" (Paranjape 235).

India is a multilingual and multicultural country. She has many regional literatures, languages, groups, cultural festivals and societies; all are native in one way or other. They protect their own culture and linguistic arena. Multiculturalism is a cultural assemblage based on the idea 'unity in diversity'. Rosado defines it as "a system of beliefs and

behaviours that recognizes and respects the presence of all diverse groups in an organization or a society” (Rosado N.p.). There are many languages, religions, castes, societies, literatures, communities. Nemade pointed out that sometimes being native means attached to a particular place. Our societies have become native in order to protect their languages, cultural affiliation, and ethnic identity from the imported values. Nativism evokes an assemblage of thoughts, feelings etc. He explains it as:

Nativism evokes a whole constellation of feeling, perception, thought, enlightenment, and memory which has grown due to one’s attachment to a specific geographical area.... It prefers to look back into the past to looking ahead into the future. Nativism is a response of the people to the past and also to the future. It is a lifestyle of a whole group, past and the future society’s collective power of reflection and emotion is expressed through nativism. Broadly speaking, nativism prefers maintaining the status quo to gaining momentum (Paranjape 250).

Nativism evokes feeling for the specific region, as life style of whole group. The process of nativisation begins the historical and geographical circumstances in our country as it is wide and diverse; it includes minor groups, small communities, dying languages and cultures that give texture to the society at large. In the process of nativisation these small sects becomes the part of the native culture and values such as Parsis, Marathi Mulsims, Marvadis in Chennai, Kolkatta and Mumbai, Marathis in South India, Malayalis in the North India and Mumbai. Hundreds of these groups have retained their costume styles, cultural affiliations, food habits, religious practices, and traditions without dropping the original features of native values in the process of nativisation. Nemade has also come out with his idea of universalism. For him, universality is all about the appreciating native styles of different regions in particular/ individual context.

Though nativism shares similarities with universalism, it is contrary to *vasudhaivakutumbakam*² or cosmopolitanism. It does not bring all the cultural entities under the shade of one nation of entity. It also includes ‘Fourth World Literature.’³ as the part of its indigenous cultural process. Cosmopolitanism is contrary to the diversities; it explores homogeneity and uniformity. Nativism always prefers the uniqueness of the art, text, cultural entities of different regions. In an Interview published in *The Hindu*, *Desivad* is defined as “*desivad* sets out his idea on cultural hegemony of English language and the need to root writings in one’s own culture and milieu. His critical works are “modern set of values”, Nemade always equated this with the loss of culture in India which is essential argument in *Desivad* (Menon N.p.).

For Nemade all the literatures and works of art are basically native but they can be universal in their appeal. He tries to defend native language and stands up against the dominant language. He himself is not in the favour of the idea of one language and nation as it would be nothing but narrow mindedness. He says: “If the idea of the oneness of mankind is accepted, wouldn’t the comparison of one literature with another be an act of narrow-mindedness” (Paranjape 241)? It would be considered as narrow mindedness or lack of knowledge if we do not compare our self with others. We would not be able to know as Arnold says ‘the best that is known and thought in the world’. Comparison arises from an urge or instinct to move out of a subject or from a quest done within the similarities in cultural contexts between texts or authors as Matthew Arnold in his inaugural lecture at Oxford in 1857 elaborates: ‘everywhere there is connection, everywhere there is illustration.’ If we stick to a particular language then we would not be able to make any illustration. He explains second objection to the nativism as it may be misuse by fanatic, aggressive nationalists. ‘Native’ is misused by different dominant

regional parties in the name of region, religion etc. The emergence of Shiv Sena in Mumbai appears the potent instance of the misuse of nativism.

The concept of nativism has been interpreted in a narrow perspective. Internationalism, as a binary opposite to nativism has been imposed over the mass media. Here local news channels and newspaper are considered as signs of backwardness and narrow mindedness. Whether it is a philosophy or sign of backwardness or uncultured living, Nemade lays stress to justify nativism. He exemplifies it: “Are dogs in Europe more intelligent than human beings here? Such doubts were born in the mind of “Third World⁴” (242). Also he emphasizes that come and assimilates through the multi- cultural practices only.

Nemade provides examples of nativism through Marathi novel and critical essays to bring attention to the new possibilities in criticism. Nemade wants to establish cultural absorb and relationship of man with the plant and landscape: local hill, rivers, and geography. He explains it that a man absorbs values system from the local culture. He says that “to break away from the native culture and to go across in an international mega-system would be an unnecessary reverse process in literature” (244). He wants to create an arena for nativism to justify that powerful literature comes from soil:

An “international” literature without native reference does not exist. Even in Comparative Literary studies such internationalism is not acceptable. In these studies one native style, movement, or trend is compared with another native style, movement, or trend. If native elements are ignored, the comparisons become trivial. Comparatists often remind us that there are no universal literary systems. Even theoretically, internationalism without nativism as its basis is impossible because nativism is multi-centred, descriptive and real concept, whereas internationalism is an artificial and parasitic concept. Nativism is not a qualitative concept but a

common and unavoidable element. This is because nativism is expressed in all kinds of works produced in a particular culture (246).

Nemade stated that greatness of any literary work lies in spiritual elevation to linguistic experimentation it serves to society rather than value system in international market. Linguistic experimentation plays pivotal role in India where things gets recognition by the different exponent of language as such music, songs, hymns, singing styles. Language is an important part of our everyday life and literature. Language is a powerful means of communication. Language sets the tone for how people communicate with one another. The language we speak affects every single aspect of our living, as speaking and writing form the structure of our interactions with one another. Language is an easy, everyday aspect of culture to overlook, as it is so ubiquitous, but it is a vital one. For Nemade language is more microscopically period and region specific. Literature can be expressed through language in its medium of cultural, historical and geographical references; which indirectly rules the linguistic style of literary work.

According to him 'Native' means being aware of totality of geo-piety, "consciousness of the homogeneity of all its castes, ethnic communities, sects, religions, traditions, periods and places—with their vertical and horizontal intersections." (248). He defines nativity in the context of anthropological studies that is based on society and result of cultural contact. In anthropology it is the major indicator of a living society; it has to deal with the sanctity because nothing is considered inferior or superior. Everything has uniqueness of its type. Ralph Linton, a well known anthropologist puts nativity as a 'result of cultural contact.' He says that native values affirm when someone is under threat from the dominant or more aggressive culture. Nativity cannot be seen in an isolated context rather one should be aware of another cultures as well.

Nemade is not against internalizing or assimilating different features from different cultures, he recommends that it will only strengthen the native values as well as bring diversities in it. Makrand Paranjape defines it as merely truism, natural and self-evident. Nativism need not necessarily announce its presence. Nativism, as emerging approach, opines Paranjape, denies to a set particular criteria to evaluate it. He says “It is difficult to extract any definite set of evaluative criteria from it, but it helps situate a work of art in such a manner that its cultural affiliations are revealed” (xiii) He sees nativism with two different perspectives in the connection of several other empowered progressive movements as subaltern, marginalised group, dalits; and on the other hand it supports nationalist movement against foreign domination. It opposes bogus internationalism. He advocates introducing nativism in the academic activities which is fully unknown in our country. Paranjape advocates that studies in nativism should be part of curriculum activities in educational institutions. It is completely unknown discourse to the academia in India. He expects it as the forthcoming part of curriculum after the Seminar on ‘*Desivad*’ in Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur 1997 as he says “untaught in our institution of learning... which most students and teachers of literature in India have not even heard of, is now being given a voice and shape, however feeble and blurred (xv).”

In the keynote lecture in the seminar, G. N. Devy elaborates nativism as a new metaphor of socio-cultural existence in India. *Desivad* is there to challenge Eurocentric modernism and internationalism. Nativism is constantly exploring various segments to develop its modernity by keeping its ancient and traditional as well as new innovations. According to him we need *desivad*/ nativism to develop a sense of Indian consciousness “*desivad* does not ignore foreign influence. It only wants to develop a sense of Indianness and Indianness is a consciousness of compositeness of thought” (3). Devy says *desivad* develops ‘*desi*’ consciousness but it is not search for *swadeshi*, as he further says “*desivad*, therefore is not

a search for *swadeshi* but *swarajya*, a search for creation of categories of modernism. *Desivad* is a search for qualities or principles which can explain our modernity (4). Devy criticised the way our historiography was written in order to become modern and imitates western way as the only way of modernization. We need to create our own identity where our knowledge and disciplines should be considered fields of ‘good knowledge’, the general perception about western knowledge considered superior from our knowledge.

The second major exponent G. N. Devy is deeply rooted in *Bhasha* tradition with complete dedication towards the dying languages and literatures to make free Indian literary criticism from the fetters of Western criticism. Devy and Nemade have a schema to decolonise Indian literary criticism as Namwar Singh urges to decolonise the Indian minds his essay “Decolonising the Indian Minds.” Devy seeks to create awareness for the theoretical formulation of the Indian literary criticism. It would be done only through the awareness of native traditions as well as knowledge of modern critical theories.

G.N. Devy defines nativism ‘in terms of languages – specific oppositional status—opposite to colonial historicization and indigenous mainstream dominance as well as to any universalism.’ It views literature as an activity taking place ‘within’ a specific language. It understands writings as a social act, and expects from it an ethical sense of commitment to the society in which it is born. It has more to do with native born ideas, arts, crafts & languages. He characterizes it in two ways *margi* and *desi*. *Margi* claims for mainstream and *desi* claims for local/ subculture. *Margi* is not restricted to mainstream as he clarifies that it has traditional roots as well “*Marg* was not only the mainstream but also the traditional, and *deshi*, not only the regional but also the contemporary” (Devy 85). Devy states that *desivad* pertains to an awareness that is seeping into regional literature especially of the impeccability of native tradition. Devy seeks to establish historical parameters for meaningful Indian literary tradition. He states “A perspective of literature

and literary criticism with a greater self awareness, more accurate knowledge of native traditions, and an insight into their modern transformations, are preconditions for initiating relevant and useful debates about the function and practice of literary criticism” (1).

Most of Indian languages have history and literature of their own. Whereas Tamil, Kannada, Bengali have literary tradition more than thousand years old, Gujarati and Marathi and many more have more than seven hundred year old traditions. When these languages produced great literature in medieval era; it is unimaginable that they could not have come up with a critical tradition of their own. For Devy “the most damaging effect of this phenomenon has been a cultural amnesia, which makes the average Indian intellectual incapable of tracing his tradition backwards beyond the mid nineteenth century” (10).

Cultural amnesia of our literary tradition have brought crisis in Indian literary criticism. Devy describes tendency to imitate pre-colonial past and servile acceptance of Western theories as reasons of this amnesia. Nativism in the field of criticism is an attempt to free Indian literary sensibility and criticism from this amnesia only. He elaborates it in detail:

Cultural amnesia is an inevitable consequence of colonialism. It is caused when a dominated culture, or its constituent features, are branded as inferior by a dominating culture, and are accepted as being such by the subject culture. If this amnesia destroys the native perception of the immediate past, it also helps as a strategy to preserve the self-respect of the dominated culture as well as to win approval from the dominating culture (56).

Devy states that *desi* came as an alternative to *margi* – mainstream literature in the 10th century after the fragmentation of Sanskrit into *Bhashas*. He explains the nature and scope of nativism in following words:

It understands writing as a social act, and expects of it an ethical sense of commitment to the society within which it is born. It rules out the colonial standard of literary history as a series of epochs, and the *marg* claim of the mainstream literature as being the only authentic literature. Nativism is a language-specific way of looking at literature. It rejects the concept-specific method of ‘universal’ criticism. As such, it gathers its main critical issues and themes from within the traditions of the literature it examines, instead of approaching it with preconceived notions of good and bad literature. At the same time, it refuses to glorify history and tradition, and values realism (129-130).

Devy endorses Nemade’s effort to bring a new style of critical thought which opens a way to rooting criticism in *bhasha* tradition. In a multicultural *bhasha* tradition we need to develop India specific critical tradition that will be based on plurality. The existing traditions does not seem suitable for vernacular languages, as these traditions were developed either during *brahmanical* past or colonial period. Colonialism and *brahmanical* elite collectively introduced cultural amnesia which has distorted our *bhasha* tradition which was strongly rooted for more than 1000 years. Moreover it has brought crisis in Indian literary criticism as well. Now Devy claims that it can be resolved through nativistic self-awareness. Nativistic self-awareness would terminate the crisis in Indian literary criticism. He further adds that we have committed a mistake through cultural amnesia; if we would not overcome to it then we are again going to commit another mistake in the field of literary theory. We can perhaps overcome this through self awareness, education and plurality.

Nativism understands writings as social act. Prof. Devy elaborates it like this: “Nativism is a language specific way of looking at literature. It rejects the concept specific method of ‘universal’ criticism. As such it gathers its main critical issues and themes from within the

tradition of the literature it examines, instead of approaching it with preconceived notions of good and bad literature. At the same time, it refuses to glorify history and tradition, and values realism” (130). He even appears to defend Nemade as he terms latter’s theory of fiction *riti*⁵, *kriti*⁶, *pratikriti*⁷ similar to literary method, style, metre embellishes native values in the Marathi fiction.

K. Satchidanandan, a Malayalam poet and critic, considers nativism as the ‘positive and progressive part of celebrating pluralism.’ It is the core of our culture and literature. It is the cross examination of our existing values systems. He accuses our culture as the ‘continuation of the orientalist notion of ‘Indianness.’ For him our oriental culture has grown up in the wrong premises where:

privileging of high textuality, the marginalisation of the non-canonical, performative and counter- hegemonic texts and trends, simplifications of our over determined literary contexts and movements, aesthetic reductivism and revivalist nostalgia, trying to retrieve a supposedly lost metaphysical past, and exploration into the possibilities of alternative genealogies that take into account the indigenous elements of our popular creativity, or what A.K. Ramanujan would call our ‘little traditions’ (Paranjape 14).

Satchidanandan explains that the concept of nativism has been hijacked by ‘the ideologues of religious revivalism.’ It has become driving force for cultural politics because of the concept of ‘India’ and ‘Indianness.’ Our culture as well as human self has composed of multiple exponents such as family, linguistic identity, class, creed, caste, ethnicity, religion, gender, region etc. He says it is a cultural Ideology that contextualises communities in the language, region, way of living, and thought process and their structure. He specifies the context by contextualising the dalit literature and its cultural

and thematic difference from one region to the other region. Makarand Paranjape quotes him: “In Dalit literature, for example, we find Nativism put to a class caste use, while it can also go beyond class distinctions as in the times of a language based struggle... Nativism is post-colonial in its battle against the invasion of alien sensibilities and modernist in its cultural emphasis on cultural difference” (Paranjape 17).

He finds it as ties between linguistic and ethnic articulation of a particular region. He theorizes about multicultural and multilingual identity in the context of nativism. He is also aware of possible pitfalls if nativism is taken to the extreme. He explains:

The present Indian culture has *margi*, *desi* and *videsi* elements that keep interacting with one another...Nativism is progressive in so far as it fights this revivalistic destruction of our native plurality; it can also be regressive if it just creates an alternative past and obstructs the growth genuinely modern perceptions and attitudes, for nothing is necessarily good because it is native; our rural traditions have a whole feudal baggage of patriarchal, anti-egalitarian and anti-democratic values along with their more positive and cheerful aspects. Nativism can degenerate into another form of rustic revivalism and an uncritical valorisation of values (20).

R.B. Patnakar, academician, critic and aesthetician, explicates nativism in terms of ‘self’ and ‘other.’ The ‘self’ is identity, as *desi* fluctuates in the geographical boundaries where form of life exists. The form of life itself constitutes belief system, common religious structure, social, moral, artistic, common mode of production, language etc. The ‘other’ has notable difference from the self. These two forms of nativism by Patnakar can co-exist; to be conceived in opposite power relation. Both the concept of ‘self’ and ‘other’ has shifting boundaries, and disregards man made national boundaries. The meaning of ‘the self’ and ‘the other’ is not permanent; it keeps changing time to time. Later both the terms were replaced by ‘Different’ and ‘Opposite’. He redefines it in the context of colonialism

and economic exploitation. He discusses about the contact of Indo-English, which results in the composite middle class; and institutionalisation of English education.

Wagish Shukla, an academician, multilingual critic and commentator sets out the etymology of Nativism as: “it is a term borrowed from social sciences in its immediate genealogy, from a kind of ‘anthropologico-politics’. The mechanics are the more or less well defined” (49). Shukla calls nativism as puritan urge and anti-pagan philosophy. He seems to illustrate nativism in negative terms; the primary meaning goes against the definition of nativism. He talks about the origin of the concept of *margi* and *desi* and emphasizes it as the form of music and drama.

Shukla states that *Bhasha*⁸ tradition offers conflict to the Sanskrit language in the contemporary context. He discerns Sanskrit as *margi* and *bhasha* as *desi*. He considers Panini as the *Margi* writer who wrote grammar for Sanskrit as well as he develops grammar for *Bhashas*. Shukla judges the *margi* and *desi* not by the form of language but by the content of the work. He reckons *Meghadut* by Kalidas as *desi* whereas *Raghuvansh* by Kalidas as *margi*.

M. Srimannarayana Murti, academician accounts the origin of *desi* and *margi* by tracing back the history of origin of both terms. He seeks to locate these terms in the ancient Vedic period. He considers evaluation of both *margi* and *desi* a natural process in contradiction and convergence of ideas for yield uniformity, universal acceptance in the communication and society.

The survival of *desivad* in the different cultures might be difficult. Prasanna, *Kannada* playwright and director, locates the dangers of the *desivad* in different cultures. The survival of nativism might be at stake when it is taken to different regions. He draws an instance of the drama festival in Bangalore, where he performs a play with notable audiences but when he takes it to Delhi it falls short of success. He avers that the real form

of native art could not be conceived by the other region; but its narrative techniques can be conceived easily through mask as they play a pivotal role in the success of a play/ films/ music/ art. As well, cinemas in India represent similar narratives in different native forms/ masks. One should be aware of the cultural changes/ exchanges experienced in transferring art forms from culture to culture as native forms alter from region to region.

Rajeev Seth, Hindi novelist and poet calls nativism 'return to the roots and self awareness about country'. Work of art in other than native language/ form yields in cultural imperialism. Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, Kenyan writer felt so while writing in English. He wrote his two novels *A Grain of Wheat* and *Petals of Blood* in English; and believes 'languages and culture as the sharpest weapons of European imperialism.' He calls English language sign of imperialism. He pertains to be part of native roots and native awareness.

Sudhir Kumar, an academician, bilingual critic and translator states nativism as opposition to Sanskrit/ *margi* in the literary theory. He defines *margi* or great tradition/ mainstream/ national as synonyms with literary objects. He calls *margi* literature, a literature of dominant segment produced and enjoyed by elite segment of the society; and *desi* or little/ native tradition, produces non literary works in Indian languages; co-opted either in Eurocentric or Shashric/Sanskritic critical discourse. Kumar opposes the form of nativism that Devy had proposed. Devy includes critics like Romila Thapar, M.N.Srinivas, Ranjith Guha, Parth Chatterjee, Nemade etc. as the proponents of nativism. Most of them have written in the mainstream language. He criticized Devy for not providing the alternative tradition for Western and Sanskrit poetics. He puts it as "Devy's nativism "India" fails to exist either as civilisational or cultural entity, let alone as nation. What is his alternative then? (118). He questions Devy on the ground of Indian Intellectual tradition where he exemplifies Tagore's *Gora* as critic of nationalism and on the other

hand his national anthem celebrates Indian rich and bewildering diversities. Devy's ideas on nativism attacks nationalism but suggest less what should be alternative of it? Paranjape says about nativistic/ regional rhetoric as it "ceaselessly attack the ideology of nationalism as being hegemonic and oppressive, but they speak little what will replace it" (118). Sudhir Kumar criticises Devy for debunk India in his work and not providing proper alternative to cultural amnesia. 'India' the term is valid on the pages of atlas but it is inadequate, insufficient and simplistic when it comes to the colonial historiography. He provides the solution for decolonize the mind. In order to decolonize the Indian mind, it is necessary to harmoniously combine the two signifiers—the national and the native.

Kumar draw attention to the worries of Namvar Singh in destruction of regional literature by the so called critics who define national/ regional/ *bhasha* literature in the limelight of western theories. Kumar traces back the emergence and etymology of the term native and nation and comes to conclusion that both these words are derived from the *Latin* word *nasci* as well as in European it is *gene* and in Sanskrit it is *ja*; both are not contradictory terms but denote differences in cultural environments. He inspects nativism as a narrow theory in language specific domain to be called as a discourse for long. U.R. Anantha Murthy emphasizes on the literary structure to understand masses in order to become true writers. *Desivad* leads to nationalism as Anantha Murthy suggest it has to connect native people and their thinking in the literature, in order to produce good literature. Finally, Sudhir Kumar emphasizes on 'many nativisms.'

Ajit Thakor, a Gujarati critic and reader in Sanskrit quote nativism from *The University Desk Encyclopaedia* 1977 as "turning in of a country or society towards its own culture through movements rejecting foreign influences, ideas of immigrants...." (211). Nativism in Gujarati has flourished in '*Parishkruti*'⁹ movement. Gujarati *Parishkruti* movement looks back to the tradition and develops a sensibility that encourages nativistic approach as

well rejects detrimental characteristics. It also seeks to bridge up the gaps between the tradition and modern sensibility.

Debjani Ganguly an academician, critic and translator says that through *desivad* both Devy and Nemade attack English Literature academics. Ganguly says that they have taken up the responsibility of “decontaminating our *bhasa* tradition” from western and Sanskrit tradition; but it is in “danger of operating as a “totalising counter-discourse” (131). She suggest the way out to bring Indian literary culture from the shackles of westernization and sanskritisation; as Devy assumes “The only way in which the Indian critic can redeem himself is by turning to literature written in modern Indian languages and initiating a native comparatist practice” (145).

Makrand Paranjape, an academician, poet, novelist, translator and critic, takes on the Nativism as ‘more about practice and less about theory.’ Paranjape describe negative factors of the nativism as it becomes dangerously self-defeating when it implies to cultural exclusivism. He traces history of the term nativism. The term has been brought by Nemade from Ralph Linton “identified nativism as a strategic and symbolic mode of protest adopted by groups which feel inferior or threatened by the onslaught or more powerful or dominant or dominant cultures” (160). Paranjape questions the characteristic of the nativism/ native writings as it prefers local over foreign. It would be very difficult to categorize the writing of native and non native; for instance “Tamil writer living and writing...Bombay would be non-native, in a manner not too different from the way the Shiv Sena would have it” (164).

Paranjape dismisses Devy that modern Indian languages got new shape after coming into the contact with colonial languages. He suggests the way to include English language as native language and to apply native cultural values on English language. He quotes

Palshikar to define non-native as rootless, no longer at home. He says that Nemade's writings clearly depict nativism as a sort of reaction to the modernism. But returning to the roots and to cultural authenticity, depicted in the Marathi literature seems as part of postmodernism. Paranjape argues for the ongoing intellectual movement as part of nativism, he puts it as: "Nativism, thus, is subaltern—celebration of the local, the immediate, the marginalised. Hence, it is very much a part of the post-modern cultural scenario....it can be placed in the long and rich tradition of the literature of nationalism and decolonization....Plashikar says, "Nationalist movements everywhere have given birth to nativistic movements in the domain of language, literature, and culture" (173). Paranjape says that Nemade's *desiyata* already exist in different forms in the different parts of the world as *desh/ desi* translated as region, country. It is regional and opposed to national; and colonial opposed to metropolitan. Nativism would allow space for plurality and divergence.

Third major exponent of nativism, Namvar Singh, says a critic should know the background of his literary traditions, keen sense of Indian past, its essential continuity, despite its diversity in race, religion, language, philosophical outlook and its spirit of questioning. He refers to the other tradition or *Doosari Parampar*. *Doosari Parampar ki Khoj* is the version of Namvar Singh's nativism, where he offers new tradition to the mainstream tradition in Hindi literary tradition. History of modern Hindi literature has been written by Acharya Ramchandra Shukla, where he does not provide proper space for the *bhakti* poetry and Kabir. *Bhakti* poetry added new paradigms to Hindi poetry. Literature of masses introduces in the era of *bhakti* poetry. Hajari Prasad Dwivedi, proponent of other tradition introduces *bhakti* poetry and Kabir to the literary domain. He calls it an alternative tradition from the mainstream tradition/ Shukla *parampara*. Dwivedi deconstructs the high class literature through Kabir's poetry. Shukla considers Tulsidas as

a poet and his writings are major part of medieval literature. But, he does not offer any place to the Kabir. He does not consider him poet rather he calls him a saint. Dwivedi emphasizes on the poetic creation of Kabir as mass cultural poet. He compares Tulsidas and Kabir on certain parameters like language, art and social ideas in literature. Shukla labels Kabir as a saint and calls his literature *akhhad* and *fakkad*. Singh also argues that in Kabir's *parampara*, literature has reached to the masses; while in Tulsidas's *parampara*, its comprehension was limited to certain people. It made literature '*lokonmukh pragatiwadi parampara*.' In this way he offers an alternative to the mainstream Hindi tradition.

In the global literary perspective Singh argues for the Decolonization, as he puts that hegemony of the American and European literature came to an end after decolonization; replaced by the third world countries literature. Writers of these countries are taking indicatives to create a new variety of literary tradition. Latin America and African critic are challenging the language and literary creation of Europe and America. Writers of Asian countries are accelerating the process of decolonization.

It is very difficult to examine Indian literature(s). So, once we are set, to evaluate 20th century Indian literature, we must have a prior knowledge of its rich diversities. Our writers must have an ample knowledge of the much debated idea of subverting or decolonizing Indian literature, before actually doing so because, the interest in the process of decolonization among Indian writers has highly increased after independence.

The idea of decolonization does not only restrict to the rejection of west but it also brings the rejection of radical and social evils in country itself. We need those writers, who can write fearlessly against the so called modernism and discrimination faced by the subalterns

groups. In the western countries writers have already raised their voice against colonization and imperialism. In such perspective he extends different version of nativism.

The fourth major proponent of nativism A. K. Ramanujan was a poet, scholar, translator, and folklorist. He has been recognized as the world's most profound scholar of South Asian language and culture. His version primarily in relation with nativism is explained in his seminal essay "Form in Classical Tamil Poetry", it carries his ideas of nativism through the illustration of forms in *Tamil* Poetics. He comes up with an alternate idea of poetics to the mainstream poetics. He discusses principally about the two major poetic forms in *Tamil* Poetics *Akam*¹⁰ and *Puram*¹¹ from the anthology of Tamil Poetics *Tolakappiyam*.¹² *Tolakappiyam*, is the main source of his poetics where it illustrates about the different forms of *akam* and *puram* and summarised in succinct aphorism (*sutras*) the canons of the *cankam*¹³ tradition in the third section of *Tolakappiyam*.

Akam or interior and *Puram* or exterior has different meter, verbal expression, sign system, which differentiates *Tamil* poetics from Sanskrit and Western poetics. Ramanujan explicates a *Tamil* poem to define the basic parameters of *Tamil* poetics. Ramanujan's version of nativism in *Tamil* poetics refers to the different meter, linguistic forms, figures and other form in poetry. There seems a probability in *Tamil* poetics to offer an alternative poetics to the Western and Sanskrit poetics. Ramanujan explains different literary tools and application by explaining his poem "What She Said" published in 1967.

Bigger than earth, certainly,
higher than the sky,
more unfathomable than the waters
is this love for this man
of them mountains slopes

where bees make rich honey
 from the flowers of the *kurinci*
 that has such black stalks.

Tevakulattar Kuruntokai 3 (Dharwadkar 197).

It is written in *akaval*¹⁴ metre as most of the classical *Tamil* poems are written. There are four feet in every line in the poem. Ramanujan discusses the grammatical structure, forms, themes, and meter in the poem, by exemplifying the poem “What She Said.” He classifies *cankam* poetry into two major categories *akam* poems and *puram* poems. Theme of *akam* poetry is love and *puram* covers remaining themes in poetry. *Puram* encompasses good and evil, action, kingdom, and community. *Puram* poetry is the public poetry of ancient *Tamils*; celebrates the glory of kings, laments on the death of heroes, wars, elegy, tragic, trauma, and panegyric.

Tolkappiyam’s *Akattinai Iyal* chapter describes *akam* poetry as poetry of experiences, not action. It is poetry of inner world as word *akam* (interior) suggests. *Tamil* poetics has a rich tradition of poetical metre; its stylistics and adjectives are specified “The *dramatis personae* for *akam* are idealised types, such as chieftains representing clans and classes, rather than historical persons. Similarly, landscapes are more important than particular places” (Dharwadkar 199). *Akam* poetry is about inner world with variations of love of man and women and as ideal expression of inner or interior world and synonyms with love in *Tamil* poetry. It explicates love in all its forms, “Love in all its variety (with important exceptions)—love in separation and in union, before and after marriage, in chastity and in betrayal—this is the theme of *akam*” (199).

Thematics of *Akam* has seven sub-divisions. These are divided into two categories; ‘*akam proper*’ or well matched and ill matched. Ill matched includes *peruntinai* or mismatched, it is the major type of mismatched category and *kaikkilai* or unrequited which is minor

category in ill matched category. Well matched or *akam* proper has five subdivisions, *Tamil* poetics basically concerns with the ‘middle five’ phases of love. Ramanujan explains *Tamil* correspondences while the examining the material of poem, these are *mutul* (the ‘first things’), *karu* (the ‘native elements’) and *uri* (the ‘human feelings’).

He divides *mutul* or first thing into ‘Time’ as *kalam* and ‘Place’ as *nilam*. Time is divided into larger units; includes season and small units and small units includes times of day. Place or *nilam* subdivides into five units: Hills or *kurinci* which signifies the union of lovers; Forest or *mullai* signifies patient waiting; Seashore or *neytal* signifies anxious waiting; Pasture or *marutam* signifies infidelity; and Wasteland or *palai* signifies separation.

In *karu*, things born or native are divided into gods and nature. Nature is divided into human and non human. Human is divided into two parts; ‘tribes’ chieftains and occupations; arts, styles and instruments. Non-human is divided into animate and inanimate. Animate has two categories bird and beasts. Inanimate has two categories; Trees, includes flowers and leaves; Objects, includes forms of water & stone.

Five landscape described in the *akam proper* has been divided into two parts; one as wasteland landscape and other four as ‘four fertile landscapes.’ *Palai* comes under the category of wasteland and *kurunci*, *marutam*, *mullai* and *neytal* are under four fertile landscapes. Fertile landscape has two subdivision ‘hill’ and ‘valley,’ *kurunci* comes under the category of hill. ‘Valley’ is divided into two parts cultivated and uncultivated. ‘*Marutam*’ comes under cultivated category; while uncultivated is divided into two parts, forest and coast. ‘Forest’ comes under *mullai* and ‘Coast’ comes under the *neytal* category. It is well illustrated with the time and landscape “*Mullai* associate with the rainy season and evening; *kurunci*, with the early frost and midnight; *marutam*, with the later part of a night and the dawn; *neytal* with twilight of evening; *palai* with summer, late frost, and

midday” (202). The landscape poetics has defined according the fertility of land and flora and fauna of landscape, it as:

Mullai, a variety of jasmine, represents the forests overseen by *Mayon*, the dark bodied of herdsman(Visnu); *kuruci*, a mountain flower, stands for the mountains overseen by *Murukan*, the red-speared god of war, youth and beauty; *marutam*, a tree with red flowers growing near the water, for the pastoral region overseen by the *Ventan*, the rain-god (Indra); *neytal*, a water flower, for the sandy sea-shore overseen by Varuna, the wind god” (202).

Palai the wasteland has no specific region in the *akam* poetry. *Tamil* poetics had subdivisions of time and place. Time is divided in the ascending order; day, month, and year. Year has six seasons: the rains, the cold, early frost, late frost, early summer, late summer. Month is divided into fortnights, weeks and days. Day is divided into five unites: sunrise, sunset, nightfall, the dead night and sometime sixth segment ‘down.’

Each landscape is associated with an appropriate *uri* or phase of love. *Palai* represents search and elopement. Other four fertile landscapes come under ‘love in situ’, divided into two parts; union and separation. *Kurunci* represents union. Infidelity and fidelity come under the category of separation; *marutam* represents fidelity. Domesticity and anxiety comes under fidelity. *Mullai* represents domesticity: patient waiting; *neytal* represents anxiety: impatient waiting.

These five parts of *akam* landscape represent marriage. First part is represented before marriage and remaining four parts comes after marriage. “Each landscape has its native elements (*karu*): gods, foods, animals, trees, birds, drums, occupations, lutes or musical styles and such others” (203).

In the *Tamil* poetry each names are associated to their characteristics. Flower names are not only linked with landscape but to the feelings of people in the *Tamil* poetry. These

landscapes are now part of images that evoke specific feeling. *Tamil* poetry describes characteristic of flowers according to name of region and poetic genre; it includes time, season, bird, beast, tree or plant, or occupation of the people. Each landscape in *akam* poetry has different season, bird, beast, tree and occupation. “Tamil poets used a set of five landscapes and formalised the world into the symbolism. By a remarkable consensus, they all spoke this common language of symbols for some five or six generations. Each could make his own poem and by doing so allude to every other poem which had been, was being, or would be written in this symbolic language” (211).

Ramanujan illustrates the differences in the *akam* and *puram*; *akam* focuses on single spare image and in *puram* poems images rush and tumble over one another. Landscape of *puram* poetry is divided into seven categories: *vetcikarnti*, *vanci*, *urinainocci*, *tumapi*, *vakai*, *kanci*, *patan*. *Vetcikarnti* is cattle-lifting prelude to war; *vanci* is preparation to war; *urinainocci* is siege; *tumapi* is battle; *vakai* is ideals of achievement; *kanci* is struggle for excellence; endurance; *patan* is elegy. The *akam* and *puram* genre have many common features in the thematics of love and war. Love and wars are metaphors to each other; both contrasts in themes and structure for a unified imagery. Some poets could write both genres of *Tamil* poetry and place together in poems explicitly.

Akam poetry is personal while *puram* is public. Ramanujan says about the poetic evolution and paradigm shift in *akam* and *puram* “We have also shifted from the dramatic monologues of *akam* and *puram* to dramatic dialogue and interaction, from lyric to drama” (217). There are two minor genres in the Tamil poetry ‘*Peruntinai*’ and ‘*Kaikkilai*’. *Peruntinai* depicts human condition while *Kaikkilai* stands for one-sided or unrequited love “A great deal of Western love poetry would probably be described by ancient commentators as the one sided *kaikkilai*; a great deal of modern poetry, fiction and black

comedy as love among the misfits or *peruntinai*—exploring the unheroic, the anti-heroic, presenting the ironies of incapacity” (218).

Ramanujan provides a form of nativism that existed in *Tamil* Poetics. It has different type of themes, moods, landscape, meter etc. It provides methods to judge a literary work/poetry in our Indian literary tradition. These forms may apply to any type of poetry. It provides holistic and universal view of nativistic values in Ramanujan.

Sudeep Kumar has certain doubts about the functioning and approach of nativism ‘It has to define what exactly it stands for? In which manner it would work?’ he quotes nativism as “It is return of an attitude, movement or outlook. It situates a text in a literary context—place location or its cultural allegiances” (Sudeep Kumar 89). He comes out with three versions of Nativism; as ‘Radical Nativism or Nemade’s *Desivad*; Devy’s version, A Cultural Amnesia; Namvar Singh’s version, *Doosari Parampar ki Khoj*. He describes the works of nativistic critics as revisiting the critical parameters; revising literary history; fear about the possible foreign cultural import. He points out the problems of the nativistic approach; as fundamentalist might misuse it; it is yet to define certain criteria to be native/nativistic. He illustrates the possibilities of nativism as he says “Nativism has the capacity to cater the cultural products of multi-cultural, multi-linguist and multi-ethnic, space called India. No other contemporary theory but Nativism can explain the cultural amnesia and the rise of Bhakti poetry in Indian literary history in such a scientific manner” (Sudeep Kumar 97).

Amartya Sen, a notable scholar in his book ‘*The Argumentative Indian*’ discusses his ideas about the major facts of Indian identity and Indianness. It provides holistic view on regional literature and art forms. *Pather Panchali* directed by Satyajit Ray shows the Indianness as the major theme. Ray connects it to the masses and plight of farmers. Sen explicates the reason behind the success of Ray’s films as his films are rooted in Indian

culture and depict beyond the line of India as a country of snake charmer to add new dimensions to see India and its cultural diversities, religious diversities and religious diversities to the west; and multicultural, multilingual nation called India. Sen depicts the diversities and history on India, a form of nativism.

‘Nativism’ defined by different critics provides a holistic view to the possibilities of formulating our own traditions. View of different critics leads nativism to the multiple practices and definitions of nativism from culture to culture. It seems relevant in the contemporary context. Nemade takes English language as its rival to destruct the socio-linguistic and cultural nativity. Devy takes it for the vernacular languages. A K Ramanujan provides proper alternative in Tamil poetics. Namvar Singh provides an alternate poetics in Hindi traditions from mainstream criticism. Other critics have come out with their different version and practices of nativism.

Notes:—

1. *Sahityaateel Desiyata* is an essay written in Marathi by prominent Marathi Critic and founder of Nativist movement Bhalachander Nemade. It was translated into English by Arvind Dixit and Edited by Makarand Paranjape.
2. *Vasudevakutumbkam* is a Sanskrit phrase which means the world is a one family.
3. Fourth World Literature refers to the works of native people living in a land that has been taken over by non-natives and the literature of the marginalised.
4. Third world is collective name of the Asian, African, Latin American and Middle East countries who shared colonial past and termed as developing countries. Literature from Third World countries termed as Third World Literature.
5. *Riti* is used to denote design consciousness, and a formalistic, affected style.
6. *Kriti* is employed to mean action on the part of the novelist.
7. *Pratikriti* is used to indicate illusion or image
8. *Bhasha* is used for all Indian modern/ regional languages and terms as *Bhashas* by G N Devy.
9. *Parishkruti* is a Sanskrit word which may be translated as 'polishing', 'cleansing' or 'purification.'
10. *Akam* is one of the two major genres in Tamil poetics, literal mean the interior; it concern subject of love.
11. *Puram* is one of the two major genres in Tamil poetics, literal mean the exterior; it concern with the life style of human being.
12. *Tolkappiyam* is a work of grammar of the Tamil Language and earlier extant work of Tamil literature.
13. *Cankam* is referred to the Sangam period and poem in Tamil language. Sangam literature starts from the 2nd century BC.

14. *Akaval* is a metre in Tamil poetics. This metre is a simple but wonderful instrument, which causes no impediment to the freedom of expression of the poet. It has been found to be an appropriate and natural medium for the expression of the valuable experience of the poets.

Works Cited and Consulted

- Devy, G.N. *After Amnesia: Tradition and Change in Indian Literary Criticism*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 1995. Print.
- Dharwadkar, Vinay, ed. *The Collected Essays of A.K. Ramanujan*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.
- Kumar, Sudeep. "Nativism: A Cultural Theory and Conceptual Divergence." *Dialog*, 12 (Spring 2012). 89-97. Print.
- Menon, Meena and Bhalchandra Nemade. "Reviving the True Hindu Ethos." *The Hindu*. (4 July 2010). N.p. Web. 10 March 2015. <<http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-features/tp-literaryreview/reviving-the-true-hindu-ethos/article499146.ece>>
- Pranjapae, Makrand, ed. *Nativism: Essays in Criticism*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1997. Print.
- Rosado, Caleb. "Towards a Definition of Multiculturalism." *Rosado Consulting for Change in Human System*. 1997. Web. 28 October 2011. <http://www.rosado.net/pdf/Def_of_Multiculturalism.pdf>
- Sen, Amritya. *The Argumentative Indian: Writing on Indian History, Culture and Identity*. UK: Penguin, 2006. Print.
- Shamina and Bhalchandra Nemade. "Shakshiyat with Bhalchandra Nemade." *Rajya Sabha TV*. (7 April 2015). N.p. Web. 11 April 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UAEbX7tXbDE>

Singh, Namvar and Harish Trivedi. "Decolonising the Indian Mind." *Indian Literature*, 35.5. (1992): 145-156. Web. 15 January 2012.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23337172>

Singh, Namvar. *Dusari Parampara Ki Khoj*. New Delhi: Rajkamal Prakshan, 1982. Print.