

Chapter Two

Politics of *Desiyata*

In the previous chapter, there was an attempt to explore as many as possible shades of nativism. Whereas the nativist movement appears very committed in its priorities, its critics have also come up with equally strong opinions about it. In such a background, it becomes pertinent to investigate the possibility of politics involved in the discourse of *desiyata*. The present chapter charts the likelihood of politics involved in critical/ literary works dealing with the thematics of nativism/ *desiyata*. Intellectuals sometimes indulge into politics in order to sell their artefact en route for their propaganda and ideology. Politics of language, culture, and the manipulation of subject-matter are practiced. Bhalchandra Nemade, G N Devy, Namvar Singh and A K Ramanujan are some of the major proponents of *desiyata*. Nemade's preoccupation with the concerns about the hegemony of English language/ English medium, perennially recurs in his writings. Devy here is concerned with the possible threat to the *bhashas*/ endangered languages. Namvar Singh on his part is concerned with the search of other *parampara* (tradition). A K Ramanujan critically surveys the politics of *Tamil* poetics in his writings. Akshaya Kumar, an Indian academician, defines politics as "Politics is an organic reflex of postcolonial 'interpellated' subject. Hailed and appropriated by power-brokers right from the feudal times to the present era of late capitalism, this subject is not just an innocent medium of ideological warfare, but at times a happy and willing collaborator and co-participator in politics.... Politics as the very psychology of the postcoloniality, it is the condition itself" (Kumar 161). It is also struggle for power.

Cultural hegemony¹ of English language has been thoroughly discussed about by the nativistic writings. It is generally accepted that politics is involved everywhere in the terrain of literary writings. The social theorist Antonio Gramsci asserts that everywhere we

are surrounded by power but whatever the relationship is power doesn't arise naturally. Power relies on physical force, economic constraint, legal guidelines or other coercive techniques. Power is secured if the subordinates buy into the arrangement, agree to the terms and make the relationship there. Politics arises through power and it may be by consent or coercion.

Dominant social groups may have leadership and power in a society, but without the active consent of the population, these groups cannot maintain the mechanism of power relations or hegemony. Hegemony appears as a consensual culture and politics that meet the minimal needs of the majority while advancing the interests of the dominant groups. There are three necessary conditions for hegemony: material, political and cultural. Material benefits out of hegemony need not be abundant or economic. While lacking options, subordinate groups may be satisfied with minimal rewards. Although consent may be reluctant, groups often consent to hegemony because the limited benefits are immediate and easily attainable. Material conditions interact with political conditions. Within a stable hegemony, how we live our lives and how we understand our lives generally correspond to the political and material conditions for that hegemony.

Nemade's politics of *desiyata* begins with the language as he, calls English language, a killer language. In a recent interview on Rajya Sabha TV, he stated English as a killer language. He is not against English language but he is against English medium. For him nativism is that our kids should be educated in our mother tongue. English language is a sign of slavery. Nemade gives stress on *swadeshi* and to boycott *videsi*. He says we have forgotten our roots. We have to come back to our roots. We can adopt foreign culture but we cannot annihilate our problem by becoming modern. His idea on *desivad* commences with cultural hegemony. He always gives stress upon regional languages/ medium. He boycotts English medium despite being privileged by English. In an interview he says:

Indian Writings in English is not authentic; any writings have to be authentic. Under colonial rule English has exempted writer from being authentic, they use a language which may not be understood properly and the slang they use, may be black slang, put into the mouth of a white girl or an Indian or a coolie....his objection for English is like: it is so superficially Indian, a sort of touristry narration, only meant for tourists....Is that to qualify as literature. It should have roots and branches and stems. You can't have a book as a literature. It should have folklore, it should have women lullabies, jokes and family jargon and reflect a whole space, a cultural space. (*The Hindu*, Feb. 9 2015, N.p.)

When we start thinking critically Nemade might appear to have inferiority complex to English language. As we know that India has the second largest English speaking population. His charges against Indian Writings in English as unauthentic writings need to be revisited in the context of a smaller readership in Marathi language. Indian Writing in English begins in the nineteenth century. We have significant literary achievements here in the form of Rabindranath Tagore, Toru Dutt, M M Dutt, Sarojini Naidu, R K Narayan, Raja Rao, Mulkraj Anand, Mahesh Dattani and Salman Rushdie etc. They have got large number of readers in English. His second charge for English language as 'language of tourists' merely divulges his 'burning anger' towards the limited target readership. English language has now become the part and parcel of our everyday life. Though English language starts from the colonial rule yet subverting the hegemonic and imperial English dialect, India has developed an English vocabulary of its own. Indian English writers use Indian English. As we see it in Rushdie's *chutnification* in his novel *Midnight's Children*². Indians writers have adopted English language as our own language. Indian Writings in English have elements from Indian folklores and native narrations. R K Narayan's fiction, for instance, is an example of native and folk narration. His *Malgudi Days*³ is all about

folk narration. It is about masses. It is a celebration of mini narratives in postmodern world. Narayan's works portrays essence of our past, superstitions, myths, subaltern narratives. Nemde's charges against Indian writings in English are unjustifiable.

The politics of language recurs quite repeatedly in Nemde's writings/ interviews. Recently Nemde dismissed the works of Rushdie and Naipaul, calling them as "pandering to the west." He seems to be deeply antagonistic and diseased of the English phobia. Rushdie hits back at him through a tweet "I doubt you've ever read the work you attack", he called him "grumpy old bustard" (The Hindu 9 Feb. 2015, N.p.). Nemde's stance against English does not qualify him to criticize the rest of writers who subvert the English languages to represent their own diverse traditions and complexity of cultural ethos. He has no right to criticize them. Nemde said that the primary and secondary education should be in the mother tongue "What is so great about English? There isn't a single epic in the language....Don't make English compulsory, make its elimination compulsory"(Govind, N.p.).

Here a political tussle between the Indian origin English writers and regional writers takes place. Nemde uses 'footwear' metaphor for English language. He says that English language is encroaching innocent lives. Nemde advocates regional literatures at the cost of European literature (universalism). Though a Professor of English himself, he appears not much comfortable with the expansion of English language in India. He does not accept it a language of career and job. But, interestingly, he accepts his favour for career oriented courses. In an interview with Makarand Paranjape, he documents his choice:

Paranjape: But what about your career? Were you never a careerist?

Nemade: No, never — not until I found that I couldn't get a job. When Linguistics didn't get me anywhere, I thought I should take up journalism and things like that. So I went to Bombay; so the Bombay phase, 1961-1964, begins.

Paranjape: That's how you started your little magazine?

Nemade: Yes. Yes. But that was the time when Penguin paperbacks started coming to India—you could buy Camus and Sartre for four annas on the footpaths. That's how we went deep into the best of European literature (Paranjape and Nemade 179).

Once he accepts that he has gone for career-oriented courses than how he can impose regional and less career oriented literature/ course. The critics allege that he appears to have complex to the other globally dominated literatures. He accepts that a higher language is needed for the national integration. He says that Sanskrit language has been replaced by the English language during colonial period. He admits certain benefit of writing in English language: “there are certain materialistic benefits for writing in English instead of one’s own mother-tongue in a colonial state... He insists that, in fact, literature produced by English-speaking writers of the commonwealth countries must be studied along with the literature of native languages like Marathi, Bengali, Kannada, Housa or Swahili. Though the possibility of the creation of a valuable English literature in India cannot be totally ruled out, Nemade feels that such literary creation would only have a temporary value” (Mirajkar 133-134). He gives the impression to have a kind of reverence for regional languages and abhorrence for English language despite being privileged by the same. He indulges in politics of language in the terrain of regionalism. He could not provide an alternative approach to avoid English writings for multilingual, diverse nation like India.

Nemade creates two classes of ‘educated Indian’ and ‘uneducated Indians’ as Debjani Ganguli puts it as “The politics of ‘English’ in India and its complicity in India’s modernisation project, a complicity that is manifested in a hiatus between what Gandhi has called “the educated classes and uneducated masses”, has been a matter of concern to the social scientists and political activists since Nehruvian era” (Paranjape 143). Nemade has been always against the English medium. He seems to formulate native literary tradition. The question is: is it possible to have only one literary tradition in multilingual, multicultural nation? Devy suggests one way out to overcome the situation. He says “the Indian literary culture trapped between ‘Westernisation’ and ‘Sanskritisation’. 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. This is where the English language, the otherwise regrettable colonial legacy, according to Devy, can play a vital role by functioning as the Target Language to which literature in the modern Indian languages can be translated” (Paranjape 145).

Devy and Nemade consider nativism as a critical option for Indian literature. Paranjape says “I wonder if the case is much different in our other *bhasas*. Obviously, a ‘nativistic’ awareness is not all required to produce good criticism” (Paranjape 162). Is it possible to have great literary tradition by inculcating native values? It is far from realities for a new literary tradition only imposing native values. There are certain other things to foreground new literary theories. Nemade is certainly not providing proper definition for the nativism/ nativistic writings. The question of what is native and what is non-native still remains unsettled. Paranjape, for instance, questions the basis of nativity: “If nativism is a preference for the local over the foreign, than a Tamil writer living in, say, Bombay, would be non-native, in a manner not too different from the way the Shiv Sena would have it. Even in medieval India, migrancy, exile, bilingualism, code-switching, and code mixing

were widespread, making the question of one's nativity and domicile far more problematic and complex than Nemade implies" (164). Nemade fails to contextualize nativism in regional writings. If someone writes at the difference place in different language will it be consider as native writings? He is supporting monolingual writings in a multicultural nation. It seems dangerous for the diverse nation like India. Paranjape says "Nemade's nativism, thus certainly seems to assert the single-language system as best domain for criticism" (165).

Nemade appears to be biased against English language. But the fact is that it is becoming mother tongue for urban India. English language cannot be ignored as easily Nemade desires. It has past of more than two centuries. Probal Dasgupta calls it 'auntie-tongue' it has large number of people in our country. Dasgupta says it "a vast body of other Indians, whose number may be as large as the population of France. Surely, the language with this kind of following and with a history of nearly two hundred years of domestication cannot be dismissed so easily as "alien" or "foreign"" (167). Nemade also says that English language can write only creativity not criticism. By saying this he is not doing justice with Indian critics. Prof C D Narasimhiah, Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, A K Ramanujan, M N Srinivas, etc. have written criticism in English language. It is not easy to dismiss creativity of someone by the parameters of language. Paranjape suggests more productive way to apply native values. He says "Instead of dismissing Indian English creativity all together, it is perhaps more fruitful to apply the cultural values of nativism in order to distinguish the alien and the alienating from the local and the authentic" (168).

An inferior complex could be seen as Nemade says in his essay "The Indo-Anglican writers who have gone international by printing certificates from English writers on backcovers of their books can also be a topic of another research paper" (Paranjape 253).

It explains Nemade's attitude towards English writers. He may be facing identity crisis. He has only limited number of readership in Marathi language. These English writers might be using native values/ artefacts in their writings. These writers are thinking about the global readership perspective. There are number of people from our country residing in different parts of the world. The second generation of these people might not be able to read in regional languages as they are not introduced with such languages. They desire to know about our culture. Rushdie and many other writers are providing them platform to connect with India. What is wrong in it? Why do not Nemade accept them as native writers? In Nemade's views only language is the medium for nativistic writings. For certain purposes he chooses English language. In an interview Nemade says that "he had to compromise for his circumstances. He had to choose English for his bread and butter because he could not get any other alternative. He used English for betterment⁴" (Khadse and Nemade 82). He accepts that he lived in English countries and learnt English language. He says "I lived in big cities like London, Beijing, Paris, Frankfurt etc. I studied English" (83). Nemade always talks against the English medium; but he is also a product of English language/ medium. He says "I studied English after 11th standard. He says that if you have to read literature from the world you have to learn that language for translation." (84). Here he, advocates for the languages. His point is to learn English language; if you want to read literature across the globe. Overall Nemade is sick inferiority complex. He feels alienated from the glittering world of English. The spark of English language takes him to isolation. He is feeling jealous of glamour of English writers. Indian writings in English, has achieved higher status now-a-days. He may have inferiority complex and power discrimination travels along with him; or may have other issues.

The second major proponent of nativism, G N Devy concerns with the endangered *bhashas*. In his masterpiece *After Amnesia* he gives the history of these *bhashas* and

advocates for new historiography of modern Indian languages. Sudhir Kumar says that Devy has done a great work to remind us about the cultural amnesia. But he took most of the inspiration for his amnesia from the *margi* tradition. He says “most of the *bhasa* or *desi* critical texts draw their inspiration from the *marg* tradition” (Paranjape 115). He further says that Devy indulges in politics for the formulation of the *bhasa* tradition. Devy’s major proponents of nativism/ local tradition come from *margi* tradition. Sudhir Kumar gives an example that Devy did not concern about the Gujarati and its literature “I was disturbed not to find much discussion on the relevance of Gandhi’s writings (most of his works was in Gujarati—belonging to *bhasa* tradition) to the making of the other tradition of *bhasa* criticism” (116).

Devy is talking against the mainstream but he does not provide an alternative to replace it. Paranjape about his critical rhetoric (nativism) says he “ceaselessly attack the ideology of nationalism as being hegemonic and oppressive, but they speak little what will replace it” (qtd. in Paranjape 118). Devy’s idea of national literature seems hazardous, as he considers Sanskrit part of mainstream literature. But the fact is Sanskrit is no more mainstream literature; it has been replaced by English writers. He has often criticized for this by his critics. It would have been better if Devy had taken a note on the condition of Sanskrit language. Once it was a dominant discourse in culture but now it is a dying language. Devy somehow could not take a note of it. The statuses of modern Indian languages are far better than Sanskrit; but Devy still consider them endangered languages. There are vast numbers of reader in modern Indian languages. Debjani Ganguly brings out Devy’s politics is replete in his *After Amnesia* as “replete with discrepancies between his expressed overt intentions and his actual implications on them” (Paranjape 135).

Paranjape says that “It seems to me that Devy is afraid that if nativism is appropriated by theory it will become another self-serving game, another arid, intellectual exercise which academics comfortably tenured, and I may add, tethered to the academy, indulge in as a professional sport and pastime. Devy, instead, would want critics to re-establish their links with the *bhasa* traditions and thereby to contribute directly “to the development of the literary culture” (Paranjape 156).

Devy is acknowledging the facts of colonialism. There are conflicts, interaction, influence, hybridity, assimilation, evaluation in every culture. There is a stage of cultural growth when one culture comes in touch with another. It accepts something which is good and rejects something which is bad. The purity in culture gets compromise. It changes traditional culture through creolization. Devy is lamenting over the evaluation of it. As Paranjape says:

Devy’s own lament over the damage done by colonialism certainly acknowledges the historical fact of cultural conflict, influences, and interaction. As such his other claims of cultural separateness, incomprehensibility, and exclusionism is untenable. Moreover, Devy while making this claim, seems to see cultures as static, timeless, frozen, again going contrary to the rest of the book which surveys the growth and development of the *bhasa* traditions. In asserting differences, Devy doesn’t take into account the fact that cultures are constantly evolving, changing, assimilating, and adapting or that cultures which were totally different from one another once, sometimes become so similar that their differences become hard to identify (Paranjape 159).

Devy does not appear in favour of logocentric approach where linguistic expression and languages has much importance rather than its historical context. As he says “How can an

Indian critic brought up on the Derridan sense of difference [sic] do justice to literature produced in a society which has never experienced the anxiety resulting from logocentricism?" ... consider Nemade to have been brought up on Ralph Linton? Surely, we must allow for a reading of Euro-centric texts which does not automatically and necessarily enslave us" (Paranjape 161). He acquires different perspective where people justify different literary text in other theories. Devy concerns on logo centrisism and euro-centrisism make a way to impose his ideas on us. His basic concern is literary historiography. His takes on Nemade for adopting Ralph Linton seems envious for him. Linton's idea on theoretical approach disapprove "one culture's theoretical insights are useless to another culture" (161).

For many Indian critics Devy himself is a product of *margi* tradition. Harish Trivedi, for instance, says Devy has introduced us to *bhasa* literature and all of it comes from the Sanskrit or *margi* tradition. He had ignited a new trend in Indian literary tradition for a debate; but he could not draw to a close alternative for new Indian literary tradition. Trivedi says:

In terms of a critical tradition or poetics in the *bhashas*, Devy deserves credit for having discovered a hole, but he leaves it as big a hole as he found it, except perhaps a little more gaping and glaring. So what is his amnesia all about? What is it that we have forgotten? Or have we even forgotten what we have forgotten? Rather, it would appear that there was nothing to forget in the first place, and that the whole metaplior of "amnesia" (picked up, it appears, casually enough from a newspaper article at the last minute, after the book had been completed) is misplaced, misleading, and in the ultimate analysis, no more than a wishful construction, or rather, a construction of nativist wishfulness (Trivedi 38).

The fundamental issue Trivedi raises seems to have significance in the context of politics. Devy does not give full clarification on how we can perceive our literary tradition to be more native or what he calls *bhasha* dominated. Devy do not properly provide explanation for the queries he raises. Do we need to contemplate our literary thoughts in modern Indian languages? Our modern Indian languages are still surviving without any effect. The ‘*desi*’ tradition as he labelled to the tradition of modern Indian languages seem richer than the *margi*/ Sanskrit tradition. If it is the truth; what we have forgotten. If we go through the list of publication of literary text in India we find significant increase in publication of modern Indian languages. We can see the significant decrease in the publication of Sanskrit texts. Devy says that Indian literature does not need theoretical discussion rather we need a realistic historiography. Trivedi takes on him and says “It is ironical then that Devy's own work is rather more theoretical speculative than historical-analytical, and not entirely “realistic” (Trivdi 38). It is the major problem with Devy. The second major components we see in Devy is opposition of English education in India.

Devy is making a statement about the beginning of English education which shows his reluctance of adopting English education in India. He says “There is no doubt that British education delivered knowledge of enormous value, and made familiar many thoughts developed in Europe but the system did not encourage exchange between traditional Indian knowledge and modern European knowledge” (Devy, *Amnesia* 22).

Devy is providing history in his book *After Amnesia* about the beginning of the *bhashas*. Various *bhashas* begins from 8th century BC to 17th century; Tamil as the oldest among and Sindhi as the youngest of *bhashas*. If these languages are still surviving; than why he is worrying about the death of the languages. These are still alive and have sufficient number of speakers.

Devy's concern with *desi* and *margi* tradition, colonization, literary historiography, cultural amnesia just seem full of politics for getting attention without providing any alternative solution to it. He just provides pessimistic approach to Indian literary historiography rather formulating a new literary tradition for Indian literary tradition. C D Narasimhaiah in his essay "Towards the Formulation of common poetic for Indian literature Today" offers significant ideas on the common poetics by using *Rasa*, *Dhavani* theory. He also criticises British rule; the only difference we find in both is Narasimhaiah is offering Sanskrit poetic and Devy is offering *Bhasha* poetics.

Despite writing in English Devy always represents himself as a messiah of modern Indian languages. Devy's concern with the future threat of linguistic amnesia seems merely an illusion. As we see today Hindi, Marathi, Malayalam, Tamil, Telegu, Bengali and all other *bhashas* are very popular languages in India. In the terms of publication of literary text and other books these '*desi*' languages are far ahead of *margi*/ Sanskrit. There is vast production of regional cinema and other TV shows. They are having large number of target audiences. There is no such cinema exist in Sanskrit language as such. Numbers of people who speak Sanskrit are very less; while all modern Indian languages have significant number of speaker. Sometime these numbers are larger than the population of many countries. How can consider them as dying languages? Most of the *bhashas* secure position of world's top hundred languages in terms of number of speakers.

Today we see large number of newspapers in all modern Indian languages. There are large numbers of news channels in all modern Indian languages. Hindi and regional cinema are everywhere. There is no particular popular cinema in English or Sanskrit in India. Where is the Devy's concern with the endangered languages when these languages have rich literature, large population, print and electronic media as well. Our constitution has

included twenty two languages in its eighth schedule. These languages occupy position of national language. In government circulars, and other official activities these languages have been used widely.

The next major exponent of nativist criticism is Namvar Singh. He sets a new tradition of writings in his well-known work *Doosari Parampar ki Khoj* (In Search of Alternative/ Other Tradition). His critical commentary on Ramchandra Shukla⁵ and Acharya Hazari Prasad Dwivedi⁶ brings out the contribution of *Bhakti* poetry and Kabir as a mass cultural contribution and mass culture poet. He gives more importance to the mass language or *desi* language. Shukla is the writer of the most accepted literary history of Hindi literature. Dwivedi talks about the *akkad* and *fakkad* tradition. In his *parampara* Dwivedi considers Kabir not as reformer but as a revolutionary. Singh here is searching for another tradition; he is not trying to build up new community. Here we are exploring the critical commentary on Kabira and his poetry.

Dwivedi explores the revolutionary personality of Kabir and his mysticism in his critical work. He explores two types of tradition 'inner' and 'outer' tradition. Namvar Singh gives examples of Nirala's⁷ writings. He considers the subject matter of writings which are connected to the native values. Nirala has got his themes and subject matter from his native place. Singh find out similarities between Dwivedi with Nirala as both of them were inspired by native place. Singh draw closer attention to the critical works of Dwivedi. Dwivedi tries to formulate a new tradition and criticises mainstream writers for not considering Kabir as a writer. He meaningfully points out riddles of mainstream writers. Dwivedi attacks on Shukla *parampara* or mainstream tradition in Hindi literature. Dwivedi criticises Shukla *parampara* in his many work and vice versa. Shukla's *parampara* follows Tulsidas while Dwivedi follows Kabir. Namvar as being disciple of

Dwivedi defends him in his notable critical commentary *Dusari Parampara ki Khoj*. Singh says the Kabir not only gives us a new tradition but also brings new critical parameters to judge the literary texts.

Dwivedi considers Kabir's language as mass language; his literature breaks the paradigm of caste, creed and religion. Shukla considers his language unliterary and arbitrary. Dwivedi says Kabir is dictator of his language and king of irony. "Kabira was the greatest figure in the history of Hindi literature⁸" (Singh 51). Babu Shyamal Das criticizes Kabir for being emotional. He has spirit of *Bhakti* and emotion rather than having poetic quality. His arbitrary languages hearted people. Whatever he said was done by his emotion. Singh says that Shukla brought Tulsidas, Surdas and Jayassi to the world but he did not give any importance to the Kabir. He kept him limit to the history rather than giving him good position in literature. Namvar Singh brings the subject matter of Kabir's poetry to the community. Kabir's language was totally different from the literary language that has certain parameters "his language was mixture of many languages and his ideas too" (51). Kabir's rebellious spirit was creation of his own mind. Poetry was not his aim, even though his poetry gets high reflection in the history. Poetic quality contains mass/ local language. His language was different language. He brought *akkad* and *fakkad* tradition to the poetry. He was a *yogi*; yogis are *akkhad* by nature and *fakkad* by mindset. Both Dwivedi and Namvar Singh consider him not as a reformer but as a revolutionary. "Dwivedi consider mass religion as birth place of *bhakti* poetry"(96). He quotes Gramsci as ideas of common people are comparatively easy and less combined. Usually they are jumbled and contradict each other; mixture of myths, based on experience of everyday life. These ideas have less value in society. But they are enough for mass revolution. Singh and Dwivedi attempt to search new tradition basically for the direction of *pundits* of

Sanskrit; to bring an alternative tradition. Both are concerned with the progressive writing movement in literature.

Harish Trivedi supports Namvar Singh and his proposal of constituting an alternative tradition in Hindi. Trivedi describes the work he puts up to the reader will bring a new tradition in literature: “One understands that he is at it, and that the Other Tradition will begin to be adumbrated not only from Apabhramsha and Kabir but indeed from Ashva ghosha and *Bhasha* and any number of other Sanskrit and Prakrit works....work is bound to alter radically our understanding not only of Indian and Hindi literature but also of the very concept of tradition, and of the whole syndrome of what has now come to be called the subaltern. (Trivedi 142)

Namvar Singh brings up new tradition in his writings. It is involved in politics. Shukla *parampara* is concerned with certain parameter in poet and poetic quality. Wordsworth says that a poet is a “man speaking to man” and also gives importance to rustic life. It shows that Kabir has conceded to this line of thought can be tagged as a mass poet. Wordsworth was criticized by his fellow Coleridge; he prescribed certain parameters to the poetry and poetic language. He recommends meter in his poetry. Coleridge also gives definite and true nature of a poem he states “A poem is that species of composition, which is oppose to the work of science, by proposing for its immediate object pleasure, not truth; and from all other species it is discriminated by proposing to itself such delight from the whole, as is compatible with a distinct gratification from each component part.”(Leitch N.p.) Rene Wellak says that the poetry is “an all-inclusive, all conquering, all absorbing term.” Matthew Arnold defines poetry “a criticism of life” in his essays he says a “a poetry of revolt against moral ideas is a poetry of revolt against life, a poetry of indifference towards moral ideas is a poetry of indifference towards life” (Leitch N.p.). Kabira’s poetry

is *akkkhad* and *fakkad* in its subject matter. His literature does not come under the rubric of mainstream literature/ writer.

Poetry has been defined differently. It should have standard literary language. It must provide aesthetic pleasure to the readers. It must contain certain meter and figure of speech. Kabir did not concern any of them in his poetry. Poetry has to fulfil certain parameter; and aesthetic appeal. Poetry should have some aesthetic pleasure in it. In Kabir's poetry it is missing. Shukla criticises him "I did not consider creation of yogis, and sadhus as literature rather I consider them as communal/ religious teachings. It does not come under the category of pure literature.... *bhakti* literature's creations are jumbled, arbitrary" (123). Sudeep Kumar says that Kabir's entry in the Hindi literary scene not only brings with it a new way of writing poetry but added a whole new paradigm in critical parameters to judge the existing one. Kabir *parampara* is *parampara* of *akkad* and *fakkad*.

Namvar Singh is talking about the *Doosri Paramara* but he is not offering any alternative to the literary theory. India is multilingual, multicultural nation. We produce literature in many regional (minor/major) languages. If *doosri parampara* is an alternative to the mainstream theory; then we have to read/ write literature in certain major languages. The criteria of being major language keep changing as Raymond William's concept of "Dominant, Emergent and Residual"⁹ depict the changes after a particular time. In Indian literature: Indian English literature is considered as elite class literature. Hindi literature/ language comes under the rubric of elite for the regional language/ literature. There are many mainstream and marginal literatures in our country. Every literature is elite or marginal in comparison of any other Indian literature. Sequences of dominant, emergent and residual concept are significant in Indian literary context. Now we have so many languages; we if accept them than we might have many *paramparas*. We need many new

literary traditions. There are many emergent writers in every literature. We compare one as elite and other as mass poet/ writer. In the view of Singh Tulsidas is elite while Kabir, a mass poet. Namvar Singh and Dwivedi both try to portray Kabir through *desiyata*. Now question arises that how can we differentiate between the two traditions. Of course everywhere we find superiority/ inferiority complex with writings/ writers, literatures and languages. Can his *doosari parampara* be able to accommodate all emerging cultures, traditions, and *parampara's* in India? We find that it is not possible. But Singh puts out a seminal concern on opposite to the mainstream/ Sanskrit tradition. He favours indigenous tradition or follows non Aryan and opposes elite culture.

Krishna Rayan criticizes *Bhakti* movement and *Bhasha* literature for not developing its own method. He says modern Indian languages have their own literature but they tend to have similar structure as common cultural formation/ origin in language family. Many Indian languages have their own poetics as Sanskrit and Tamil but they confines only in the structure of their own languages. Formation of literary system will be prevailing literary practices of concern languages. Rayan says if it is already formed it will be prevailing literary/ critical practice. If it is formed later it will influence them. He criticizes many literary traditions for not formulating their own criticism as he says:

Even the Bhakti poetry tradition, despite its mass base and despite its preponderance across most of the system, failed to evolve an alternative and was content to seek legitimacy by having devotion enumerated as yet another rasa. No doubt each literature had its popular subaltern component in which the pressure of the system and its poetic was peripheral and relatively weak, but the mainstream was motivated by a strong sense of the Tightness and relevance of Sanskrit literary theory. Admittedly, as an inventory of textual devices the Sanskrit poetic had latterly grown

rigid and mechanical in its functioning, but it was its seminal insights into the nature of meaning and of the response to literature that nourished and controlled the Indian literatures through their centuries of development (Rayan 12).

Avadesh Kumar Singh once interviewed Namvar Singh. Here Namvar Singh was worried about the criticism. Singh mentioned that our creative side is very strong but theoretical portion is very weak. Here AK Singh talks about the third tradition as we already have two 'lok' and 'shastra' but third one is the combination of east and west or contemporary tradition. AK Singh is considering him proponent of 'third tradition,' "I always felt that your position of the Other tradition contains the seeds of the Third tradition. And this tradition is made of the best gleaned from Shukla's tradition, Dwivedi's tradition and of your perception that includes Shukla's and Dwivedi's perceptions" (Singh and Singh 170).

After becoming proponent of criticism he accepts the weaker section of Indian literature. He is doing politics and supporting mainstream tradition and considers them superior to the mass literature, as he says:

The fact is that criticism is stronger only where the foundation of thinking and philosophy is strong and developed. Earlier the Sanskrit poetics developed in 1500 years when Indian philosophy, Indian logic and linguistics were at their acme. We had great theoreticians like Bhamah, Anandvardhan, Abhinav Gupta and Mammata whose match the world has yet to offer. They could do so because the Upanishadas had been written by then. A great philosopher of language like Bhartuhari had already been here. A grammarian like Panini before whom the whole world bows down its head was there. The Buddhist philosophers like Pinnark, Dharmabudha, Dharakirti and Nagarjuna had already been. The great Vedantist thinker and philosopher like Shankaracharya had also been there. So there was the base of

philosophy, grammar and nyaya. That is why poetics was called the tail of grammar (vyakaranasya puchcham) (Singh and Singh 170).

Namvar singh says India as a colony failed to develop its own philosophy. He accepts that there should be *swadeshi* philosophy without it we won't be able to develop *swadeshi* criticism. He accepts that many great writers like Shukla, Dwivedi in Hindi, D.K. Vijaykar in Marathi, KK Marar in Malayalam and Tagore in Bangla gleaned their criticism from Sanskrit as well as western criticism. "They developed an indigeneous Indian criticism by picking up the best from this encounter and what was of use to them" (171).

Sudhir Kumar criticizes Singh for not being oppositional to the *margi* tradition. He says "a critical text that insightfully and analytically probes the connection between the *shashtra* and the *lok* traditions of literary criticism...views the local (or *desi*) tradition as a counter narrative to the mainstream theory, not as oppositional to it" (Paranjape 115-116). There are certain parameters to create a new critical tradition. All should be solved and answered properly before formulating one. Namvar Singh is looking for new tradition. The theory of nativism/ other tradition should be contextualized properly. Sudhir Kumar says that "nativism or *desivad* as a language-specific literary theory is too narrow a discourse to be tenable for long. This fragmentary discourse may create a ridiculous situation where nativism (*bhasa* tradition) in the Hindi critical cannon might colide against the *Braj* or Maithili *bhasa* traditions" (Paranjape 122). Namvar Singh after giving new tradition to the Indian literary tradition is doing politics. He is not providing any solution to thousands of emergent traditions. He did not describe certain parameters for new critical traditions. He is more concern with his teacher Dwivedi. He is defending him rather than offering permanent alternative.

Fourth major proponent of nativism A.K. Ramanujan provides the alternative poetics largely based on the *Tolkapiyam* and Sangam poetry. It is based on the search of an alternative to the *margi* tradition. We had different poetic traditions in the ancient period. Tamil poetic tradition was very ancient. It could not reach to the people, access remains only to the Tamils. Akshaya Kumar says about Ramanujan “It is very difficult to label Ramanujan either as a nativist or a nationalist or an internationalist poet” (Kumar 6). Ramanujan is giving an alternative tradition to literary tradition; somewhere he is surrounded by the *margi* tradition. He is using all mythical, ancient elements to get international fame. It is clearly shown up in his poetry; where he combines his works in *desi*, *margi* and *videsi* tradition. Kumar says that “since the western scholar, as yet does not have access to local or *desi* unwritten literatures, he images India in terms of canonical Sanskritic texts and icons....he aims at some kind of universalist profile through the use of multicultural mythological frame” (Kumar 99). He is exploring folklore, poetics and translating ancient work not for the nativist approach; but for the benefit of get acknowledge as an international writer.

Ramanujan in his essay “Is There an Indian Way of Thinking?” comes up with a different explanation of the question. He says there is an Indian way of thinking it goes to *pundits*, *Vedas* and ancient scriptures. He talks about the many ways of thinking “Great and Little Traditions¹⁰, ancient and modern, rural and urban, classical and folk” (Dharwadkar 34). Ramanujan is giving an alternative tradition to the poetics; but at the same times he is talking about the uniformity in the Indian thought. He is contradicting to himself. In his next step he comes out with new version of Indian way of thinking and says “what we see in India is nothing special to India; it is nothing but pre-industrial, pre-printing press, face-to-face, agricultural, feudal, Marxist, Freudians, McLuhanites, all have their labels for the stage in India is in, according to their schemes of social evolution; India is only an

example” (35). In last step of Indian way of thinking he says “whether Indian think at all; It is the West that is materialist, rational; Indians have no philosophy, only religion, no positive sciences, not even a psychology” (35). Ramanujan’s nativism seems to be mixture of *desi*, *margi* and *videsi* tradition. In his way of thinking he is offering four different alternative of Indian way of thinking. It is very difficult to adapt one among them. He is compiling Indian way of thinking in four different forms. The first is *Vedas* and *pundits*; those we believe in that may accept his first Indian way of thinking. It seems to be *margi*/ mainstream tradition. Second Indian way of thinking he offers for Little and Great tradition, folklores, ancient, classical, rural etc. seems to be *desi*/ local tradition. Third Indian way of thinking offered by him is *videsi*/ foreign/ international tradition. In *videsi* tradition he talks about the western poetics/ theories in Indian context. In his fourth alternative he doubts whether Indians thinks at all. In this way Akshaya Kumar’s word comes true to difficulty to label him nativist, nationalist and internationalist.

The last section of this chapter deals with the politics of publication and blockbuster. Politics of *desiyata* basically is about the propaganda of a writer/ critic who tries to get fame and readership. Recent Indian English novels and films about India prove that India and Indians are being represented in a new orientalist manner, one which has been called Indo – Chic. India is known in the Western world as the ‘land of snake charmers and ancient Maharajas.’ This is an orientalist perspective on the part of the Western people. India was always known as the exporter or producer of cultural commodities in the form of exotica. Now, India has become an emerging market of anything and everything. The emerging upper middle class and the urban class have become the consumers of all cultural commodities. The role of Indian diaspora is also important in fashioning Indian identities both home and abroad. The older representation of India was the “exotic other.” Orientalism is the depiction of East by West as the other. A New Orientalist perspective is

being propagated by Orientals and diasporic Orientals to look at the culture and literature. Saadia Toor in her article, 'Indo – Chic: The Cultural Politics of Consumption in Post – Liberalization India', comments that, "If Orientalism past was a manifestation of the 'Occidents' will to power over the 'Orient', New Orientalism rehearses the same relationship but with a crucial difference; today the production-circulation- consumption circuit in the case of these cultural commodities originates and culminates in India" (Toor 5). M S Veena divides the propagation of New Orientalism into three levels: Author/ Text, Market and Academia (Veena 4).

In the first level, Author/ Text, we will analyse the three Booker Prize winning novels: Aravind Adiga's *The White Tiger*, Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children* and Arundathi Roy's *The God of Small Things*. Aravind Adiga's *The White Tiger* is a novel that conforms to the stereotypical conventions of the West about India. Adiga narrates the place as an exotic land, "full of paddy fields and lakes." All Indian English writers face a dilemma of representing the real "Indianness." Thus to represent the popular notion of India they portray India through the Western eye. Adiga in an interview says that, "Stories about rottenness and corruption are always the best stories, aren't they?" His statement is clear that Adiga believes that the representation of India's poverty and corruption is very much appealing to the readers, thus causing the popularity of the book. Rushdie in his novel represents a society of snake charmers, genies, fakirs, conforming to western notions. *Midnight's Children* also represent India as a spiritual land and it is also contains many semiotic markers relating to Orientalism. Like these Booker Prize winning novels, Roy's *God of Small Things* also represent 'Ayyamannam' as the exotic land, similar to Kerala Tourism's caption of "God's Own Country." Even though all these writers are representing the same western notions, they are also subverting these notions in their work.

In the area of market, we will look at how these authors are marketed throughout the world. Arundathi Roy was marketed similar to a celebrity in the promotion of her book. The publishers were tapping into the notion of 'Indian beauty.' An expert's approval is also needed which was given by Rushdie branding it as the 'Best Indian Novel' and 'Best Novel ever written.' Roy was also portrayed as a "rags to riches tale." It was essentially a marketing of postcolonial fiction in the west. The New York weekly ran a story citing the success of the novel and it said, "The book has proved that Americans could be persuaded in millions to buy and read books by exotic novelists other than Garcia Marquez and Amy Tan."

In the field of Academia also, we divide the literature into "Postcolonial Literatures and New Literatures" to portray this western gaze. The books that also get into the syllabus were conforming to the orientalist stereotypes. The films like *Slumdog Millionaire* and *Kamasutra* also became successful by portraying the "Poverty Porn" and "exotic Sex" respectively. As M S Veena opines, "Although the West still retains its hegemonic position, there is a paradigm shift in power today from the West towards the East. New Orientalism is a manifestation of this power shift" (Veena 8).

In different sections of this chapter the endeavour was to trace the possibilities of politics involved in the different approaches of nativist theorists. Right from Nemade, Devy, Namvar Singh, Ramanujan to publication, Booker prize and blockbuster politics has been pervasive in different perspectives. But we also have to accept that it is more a kind of ideological commitment than a shallow identity or regional politics. The purpose has always been the enrichment of Indian literary and critical tradition.

Notes:—

1. Cultural Hegemony, a term developed by Antonio Gramsci. The term is concerned with how power works. He coined this term during his imprisonment. It describes the cultural domination of ruling class by consent and coercive power. Hegemony in simple terms is power through consent. We can define hegemony as the process of moral, philosophical and political leadership that a group attains only with active consent of the other important social group.
2. *Midnight's Children* is a novel by Salman Rushdie published in 1981. It is considered an example of post colonialism and magical realism. It won Booker Prize in 1981 and Booker of Booker Prize in 1993.
3. *Malgudi Days* is a collection of short stories by R. K. Narayan, first generation of India English Novelist. It was published in 1943. It includes 19 stories. Narayan is known for his fictional creation. Malgudi Town is a fictional creation. He uses Malgudi throughout his writing.
4. Damodar Khadse's Interview with Bhalchandra Nemade in *Naya Gyanodaya* published by *Bharatiya Jnanapith* in Hindi. All the quotes used in this paper are translated by me in English from Hindi due to the unavailability of the English version of the work.
5. Ram Chandra Shukla is better known as Acharya Shukla (1884-194), is credited of being the writer of the first codified history of Hindi literature in a scientific system. He was the prominent figure in Hindi literary criticism.
6. Hazari Prasad Dwivedi (1907-1979), was a Hindi novelist, literary historian, essayist and critic. He has written number of novels, collections of essays, historical research on *Bhakti* poetry. He is better known for bringing Kabir to Hindi literary domain.

7. Suryakant Tripathi 'Nirala' was one of the most famous figure of modern Hindi literature. He was a poet, novelist, essayist and short story writer.
8. *Doosari Parampar Ki Khoj* by Namvar Singh is written in Hindi. All the quotes from this book are translated by me due to unavailability of the English version of the text. I am apologetic for mistakes in translation, if any.
9. Raymond William in his book *Marxism and Literature*, locates three main forces that shape cultural system: the dominant, the residual and the emergent. According to him "the residual by definition has been effectively formed in the past, but it is still active in the cultural processes, not only and often not at all as an element of the past, but as an effective element of the present" by emergent he means that the "new meanings and values, new practices, new relationships and kinds of relationships are continually being created.
10. Milton Singer and Robert Redfield developed this twin concept of Little and Great Tradition, while studying the orthogenesis of Indian civilization in Madras city (Now Chennai). Great tradition is associated with the elites, literate and reflective few who are capable of analysing, interpreting and reflecting cultural knowledge. Great tradition is a body of knowledge which functions as the beacon light if knowledge. In contradiction to little tradition comprises the belief pattern, the institutions, knowledge including proverbs, riddles, anecdotes, folk tales, legends, myths and whole body of folk-lore of the folk and/ or the unlettered peasants who imbibe cultural knowledge from the great tradition. Bhalchandra Nemade is considered as one of the proponents of Little tradition in India.

Work Cited & Consulted

- Devy, G.N. *After Amnesia: Tradition and Change in Indian Literary Criticism*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 1995. Print.
- , *Of Many Heroes: An Indian Essay in Literary Histiography*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 1998. Print.
- Dharwadkar, Vinay, ed. *The Collected Essays of A.K. Ramanujan*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.
- Govind, Nikhil. "New Voices in an age-old debate." *The Hindu*. (2 March 2015). N.p. Web. 17 April 2015. <<http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-opinion/new-voices-in-an-ageold-debate/article6949653.ece>>
- Khadse, Damodar and Bhalchandra Nemade. "Abhivyakti ka Kshresta Madhyam Matrabhasha hi." *Naya Gyanodaya*, 146. (April, 2015) : 81-84. Print.
- Kumar, Akshaya. *A K Ramanujan In Profile and Fragment*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications, 2004. Print.
- Kumar, Sudeep. "Nativism: A Cultural Theory and Conceptual Divergence." *Dialog*, 12 (Spring 2012). 89-97. Print.
- Leitch, Vincent B. ed. *Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 2001. Print.
- "Marathi Novelist Bhalchandra Nemade chosen for Jnanpith award." *The Hindu*. (7 February 2015). N.p. Web. 11 March 2015. <<http://www.thehindu.com/books/books-authors/marathi-novelist-bhalchandra-nemade-chosen-for-jnanpith-award/article6865738.ece>>

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>>

Mirajkar, Nishikant D. Rev. "Marathi: A Shock- Therepy in Literary Criticism." *Indian Literature*, 35.6(152) (Nov.-Dec.,1992): 130-136. Web. 15 May 2015. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23336635>>

Nemade, Bhalchandra and Makarand Paranjape. "Speaking Out: Bhalchadra Nemade in Conversation with Makarand Paranjape." *Indian Literature*, 39.4 (174), (July-Aug. 1996): 175-186. Web. 15 May 2015. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23336213>>

Pranjapae, Makrand, ed. *Nativism: Essays in Criticism*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1997. Print.

Rayan, Krishan. "Towards a Rewritten Indian Poetic." *Indian Literature*, 37.2 (160), (March-April, 1994): 9-17. Web. 15 May 2015. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23337583>>

Roy, Devapriya and Bhalchandra Nemade. "India Writings cannot come close to Manto, Premchand, or Bibhutibhushan." *Scroll.In*. 22 March 2015. N.p. Web. <<http://scroll.in/article/715348/indians-writing-in-english-cannot-come-close-to-the-organic-literary-culture-which-manto-premchand-or-bibhutibhushan-represent>>

"Salman Rushdie Hits Back at Jnanpith Winner Bhalchandra Nemade." *The Hindu*. (9 Feburary 2015). N.p. Web. 10 March 2015. <<http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/stung-salman-rushdie-lashes-out-at-jnanpith-winner-bhalchandra-nemade/article6871171.ece>>

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. *Doosari Parampara Ki Khoj*. New Delhi: Rajkamal Prakshan, 1982. Print.

Singh, Namvar and Avadesh Kumar Singh. "Namvar Singh in Conversation with Avadesh Kumar Singh." *Indian Literature*, 43.4 (192) (Jul- August 1999): 165-177. Web. 15 May 2015. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23342507>>

Trivedi, Harish. "In Search of the Other Tradition or the Importance of being Namvar." *Indian Literature*, 35.5 (151) (Sept-Oct. 1992): 135-144. Web. 15 May 2015.
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23337171>>

Toor, Saadia. "Indo – Chic: The Cultural Politics of Consumption in Post – Liberalization India." *SOAS Literary Review* 2 (July 2000): 1 – 9. Print.

Veena, M S. "New Orientalism in Literature: A Critical Overview." *The Criterion* 4.2 (April 2013): 1 – 8. Print.