

V S Naipaul: An Author with a Contentious Intellect

Ajay K. Chaubey

Department of Sciences and Humanities
National Institute of Technology, Uttarakand

Abstract

This article examines the reception of V.S. Naipaul's writings with emphasis on responses to his work in Indian contexts that react to his often controversial statements about India and Islam. It looks at him in terms of his rich immigrant background and tries to see both the positive and negative aspects of the discussions he has stirred.

Keywords: V.S. Naipaul, India, West Indies, Islam

“...Naipaul has become Sir V S Naipaul, an extremely famous and, it must be said, very talented writer whose novels and non-fiction (mostly travel books) have established his reputation as one of the truly celebrated, justly well-known figures in world literature today.” (Edward Said)

“There are three great trade routes along which the Naipaul controversies steer. The first is his depiction of India...Islam is the second controversy...The third controversy is the most bitter: that in his travel books about the Caribbean, and Africa, Naipaul has written about black people in ways no white man could ever have got away with.” (Arvind Adiga)

Vidiadhar Surajprasad Naipaul is one of the most prominent authors of the twentieth century and now of the twenty first. His scholarship on history, culture, civilisation and ethnicity—a journalistic approach to unearth the past—has been appreciated even by his critics. He has been successful not merely by being a good author but also by producing a diatribe against “third world countries”—Trinidad, a place of his birth and India, a place of his ancestors— both of which he has often described as ‘half-baked societies’ that have led him to be the butt of controversies. Shobhaa De remarks on his

controversies, “Naipaul has fed off controversy all his life. He is an 'agent provocateur' and a brilliant one at that.”¹ Naipaul's erudition, his faculty of criticism and brush with controversy are *outré*. His willingness to vilify, all that he encounters, has not won him many friends, but the simplistic and near-universal assertions of a consistent heart-felt racism and Orientalist misogyny seldom undergo close scrutiny. Most of criticism of his work is trivial, hopelessly oblivious to the complexity of his tortured negotiations with his own post-coloniality. Naipaul's permanent alienation is expressed through a series of surprisingly different and amazingly defective narrators who are placed in an astonishingly similar succession of “chronotopes”.

What makes V S Naipaul unique is his distinctive way of situating the post-colonial subject matter. He dexterously negotiates the text and context, matter and manner in his fictional and non-fictional corpus of writings. His dichotomy of the 'East and West', dialectics of India and Indian subcontinents, Africa, Trinidad and the USA present the 'national allegory' of the countries he has visited at regular intervals. His literary corpus is a matter of serious debate and discussion in academia. Naipaul himself is the product of cross-section of a society. His main themes of his writings are based on Indians who had migrated from India living in Trinidad. He depicts rootlessness, quest for identity, dislocation, displacement and mimicry of East-Indians which springs from it. His works are started with sufficient biographical references. His works disclose the fact that the problems faced by protagonists were actually faced by Naipaul himself.

For multiple reasons, V S Naipaul is a novelist and non-fiction writer whose works have been under scanner for long. Critics have been vocal both against him and for him. His association with India is still a red-herring question. To enquire of his belonging to the country is equivalent to unravel the enigma from the womb of the terrain since he himself is not sure enough about his identity as Patrick French remarks, “he was aware that his identity had been compromised by external events” (French 213). This is an impervious truth. There is conviction about his diatribe against India that let him stand in the queue of anti-Indians not pro-Indians. This always lands him in hullabaloo that is his much-loved legion since the publication of his first travelogue on India, *An Area of Darkness* (1964). Yet, one cannot simply ignore his major contribution to Literature—fiction as well as non-fiction—written in English. Neither can one deny the fact that Naipaul's vulnerability actually lies in overwhelming popularity.

One finds, on the said grounds, that his novels present “a postcolonial dilemma for us” (Bhattacharya 245). His corpus of fiction manoeuvres his autobiographical information that recounts his historical, socio-cultural and political affairs. He amalgamates biography and history in his writings to make his subject matter tangible and substantial. Fawzia Mustafa may appropriately be quoted here, “...Naipaul's use of biographical information in his writing constructs an over determined relation between notions of the Author and the multiple usages of what is called the colonial subject” (Mustafa 13). The same blend has made him a world fame author who leaves no stone unturned to juxtapose eulogy and elegy of the world that gives him countless prizes.

Again, he is the only living author who has bagged almost all the prestigious awards as though his “name spells almost endless accolades” (Singh 19) which include: the Booker Prize in 1971 for *In a Free State*, a Knighthood in 1990 and the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2001 for his corpus of literary works. He has also received literary awards like the John Llewellyn Rhys Prize (1958), the Somerset Maugham Award (1960), Phoenix Trust Award (1962)², the Bennet Award (1980), the Jerusalem Prize (1983), the T S Eliot Award (1986) for Creative Writing³, the David Cohen Prize for his lifetime achievement in British Literature (1993). Naipaul, as is well known, was often given grants to travel and document his experiences, as he “writes about a racially complex world with all the compassion and insight which is missing in some of his public pronouncements.”⁴ Through his multiple texts, Naipaul successfully silhouettes for his ethnicity and discovers for himself an appropriate position that constructs his subjectivity and identity. His works were archived and housed at the University of Tulsa in 1994 as a token of tribute to his contribution to the literature.

V S Naipaul was born in 1932 and lived in Trinidad till 1950, and is the only author who has mapped the trajectory of the post-colonial world and has beautifully painted the literary canvas in multiple hues that reflect his ambivalent relationship with the world he lives in. His maiden travelogue, *The Middle Passage* (1962), the upshot of his revisit to Trinidad, his birthplace, was written on a fund from the Government of Trinidad. In this modern travel narrative, he has “created a deft and remarkably prescient portrait of Trinidad and four adjacent Caribbean societies—*British Guiana, Suriname, Martinique, and Jamaica*.”⁵ Both his fictions and non-fictions usually deal with the individuals trying to preserve their wholeness in terms of individuality while they are “functioning as cogs in the wheels of a social

structure” (White 1). His revisit to Trinidad was prolific on the creative front but he is a man divorced from his Caribbean roots: the purist made nauseous by filth and flesh, or the racist who has “forgotten” his own family’s sojourn in the cane fields of the New World.

Naipaul’s roots lie in the routes of the world. After Trinidad, he looked toward the East to come to terms with the land of his ancestors. His visits to India resulted in the publication of *An Area of Darkness* (1964) that created a hullabaloo in the media and academia. His sojourn provided him with a splendid opportunity to learn about Indian classics that presented him untold tales of an Indian legacy that he often received from his “Gold Teeth Nanee”. The “new discovery” of India was a contortion for natives as it was called “an area of ‘defecation.’”⁶ The non-fictions of Naipaul are a touchstone for what is happening in every ex-colony of postcolonial world.

Naipaul did not discontinue writing about India after *An Area of Darkness*. His thirst for the Indian subcontinent was and remains unquenchable. Naipaul published two subsequent travelogues on India—*India: A Wounded Civilization* (1977) and *India: A Million Mutinies Now* (1990). The former portrays Naipaul’s dialogue on postcolonial civilization and records “India at the time of Indira Gandhi’s State of Emergency” (Nixon 13) while the latter describes his perspectives on contemporary and multicultural politics and in many ways “(the) most ambiguous work” (Ibid). His travelogues—from *The Middle Passage* (1962) to *The Masque of Africa: Glimpses in African Belief* (2010)—investigate Naipaul’s ‘self, map the trail of history, and narrate the politics of society but “...totally ignore a massive infusion of critical scholarship...” (Said 53). Thus, one can say that V. S. Naipaul has identified the strange emotional and sophisticated contortions that bind together culturally, in an ambiguously globalized world—as he investigates not only Trinidad, Africa and India but also countries such as the USA in *A Turn in the South* (1989) which describes his racialised thinking in the context of the southern part of America.

Naipaul is an author whose works are often subject matter of many disputes among the critics of contemporary literary landscape. This controversial writer has divided the critics into binaries—some praise him as one of the most gifted authors of these days; the others blame him for “racial arrogance” (White 2). He is known as an author who is either loved and admired or renounced. After all, there is one thing that most of the critics concur on and it is the fact that Naipaul is the master of observation and

depiction who always provides his reader with very sophisticated descriptions. He belongs to the lineage of authors whose works are primarily focused on the post-colonial countries, their present situation and the impact of colonialism on identity of individuals. His Indian genesis, Trinidadian nativity and British citizenship allow him to see India and Indian people from a considerably different perspective. He is an “insider” as well as “outsider” to India (Rai 16). Through his Indian ancestry he can see the country from a very intimate point of view, this kind of double perspective makes it more difficult for him to understand his own feelings and reactions in some of the situations that he has to face in India, especially when he realizes his own strangeness. Sometimes he himself seems surprised by the revelation of his merits or demerits that he was not aware of. For him, the cognition of India is simultaneously the discovery of himself. His Trinidadian childhood, Indian origin and the residency in London make his position in the world highly indeterminate. He fully identifies with none of these countries. He rather sees himself as a blend of the three cultures. He feels absolutely alienated and unable to identify with any of these societies. The innermost notion of his books is “the struggle against the effects of displacement” (Nightingale 6). He intentionally observes what he has expected and ignores what he does not want to see.

Naipaul’s literature presents the image of an author who does not experience any sense of belonging anywhere, but the wide array of whose intellect has resulted in many superb books. His literary works present the image of a person who is constantly in search of a cultural mooring. Although he has a vast repertoire of literary output at his disposal, he is not only a natural writer but also a natural novelist. His vision is his own, unaffected by contemporary social cliché or political bonanza. He has not only autonomy to dictate the ‘truth’ but also relevance to subjugate the hideous lies of the societies. He is engaged with the stresses and strains that we recognize vital in our experience now.

His writing is a fusion of creeds, cultures and continents in him, with his expatriate career, his being able to practice an art in and of totally dissimilar worlds, all give him peculiar contemporary quality. In this context, Dagmar Barnouw remarks: “A British-educated West Indian, Naipaul has tried to understand and document the difficulties of other cultures through his difficulties at understanding his own multiethnic background” (1). Critics of international repute, even today, present the foray of criticism on V S Naipaul in a diverse way. His multi-ethnic

background, his faculty of mind, his “sophisticated literary strategies” (Ibid, ix) and creative mission have remained relatively unexplored. The paper, therefore, explores Naipaul’s intellectual world in terms of his crusading zeal as the first Nobel Laureate in Literature of the twenty first century.

V S Naipaul and Islam

Muslim Imperialism in India properly started when the Turks stepped on the scene of history and not before. One of the most remarkable episodes of this time was the journey and long sojourn in India of one of Islam's greatest intellects, Al-Beruni, forever known as the master, a philosopher, mathematician and astronomer of great repute who had accompanied Mohammed Ghazni down into the Punjab. Having settled there, he proceeded to make a thorough study of Sanskrit and of Hindi literature, and has left us a penetrating description of India in his famous work, *Tahkik-i-Hind* (An Enquiry into India)². In this brilliant and yet scholarly study of India in the eleventh century, we have a mine of information about the country and its people on the eve of the great Muslim invasions. Gripped by an irresistible impulse to discover truth for its own sake, Al-Beruni was not content with merely describing India as he found it, but philosophized at great length about India's relations with the powers of the Middle East throughout the ages.

Naipaul’s scathing and prejudiced circumspection on Islam, his contours on Islamic countries and his pronouncements on Muslims’ contribution to India declared him as a ‘voice’ of the West. Naipaul's views on Muslim imperialism in India have reiterated his spurious and schematic notion of Indian history. His notion of Indian history cannot be described in a nutshell because it begins from an Islamic invasion from approximately AD 1000 which has vandalized a self-contained essentially Hindu India, followed by an intellectually debilitating Muslim imperialism and rationally regenerative British imperialism, the main victims in all of which have been Hindu Indians. The dilapidation of Indian civilization, culture and history by Muslim invaders has created a hiatus in the classical knowledge system of India. Naipaul’s observations in this regard have landed him in a series of controversies. He, of late, caught the nerve of controversy as a subject on him and for him. In the Mumbai Literature Festival, Girish Karnad, an Indian playwright of renowned stature, pulped a much awaited criticism on Naipaul for unfavouring Muslims and their contribution to the Indian cultural heritage. Karnad was of the opinion that Naipaul has been vocal against Muslims on racial and religious grounds, not on their contribution to music,

art and literature. The Karnadian demarche brought Naipaul into the lime-light once again. He pulverized that "Naipaul has no idea of how Muslims contributed to Indian history."⁷ Adversely, Karnad was trapped in the ruins of controversy because he was not invited to speak on Naipaul but on 'Indian Theatre.' The intelligentsia across the country poured in verbally and in writing. Some favoured Naipaul and some Karnad. But Naipaul remained silent. His silence was not a mere stillness but it was the rubble of an arrogant mind. Through his flabbergasted posture, he has indicated that he does not care to make any comment nor does he understand what is said against him. His unavailability on the current scenario has displayed that he need not utter in counter reaction. He says what has been unsaid because he is the "sum of his books."

In the penultimate chapter of *India: A Million Mutinies Now*, Naipaul comes to the conclusion that "medieval India", or what I would say is Muslim Imperialism in India, has left an unfathomable lesion on the body of India which is the root cause of the same in Muslims (495). They ruled, ruined, looted and abused the antique and celebrated culture and civilization of India. In an interview with Rachael Kohn Naipaul dictates:

India was destroyed by the Muslim invaders, they ruled it severely and ravaged it for five to six centuries and they left nothing behind. They didn't build a school, no institutions, so that was the cause of the poverty, that utter wretchedness where people had no faith in institutions, had no – one to appeal to ever produced this idea of holy poverty. I think we have to understand that. (4)

Naipaul smartly avoids commenting directly on any subject in his books. He speaks through characters he meets on the way or at any particular place or anywhere else. One clear thing is that he has always been a very stern critic of Muslims and Muslim invaders. Meena Kandasamy appropriately remarks: "Naipaul's views on Islam are stark enough to show his Hindu prejudice and his limited knowledge." He has not only criticized Muslim invaders but also their creations, their *modus operandi* and *modus vivendi*. Kandasamy quotes Naipaul in the support of the previous

comment, "The Taj is so wasteful, so decadent and in the end so cruel that it is painful to be there for very long."

Naipaul, a votary of controversy, has been caught the whirling vortex of the religious avalanches, its repercussions and his personal prejudices. The statements which he produced in the very texts have subjugated the religious hierarchy in the hegemonic dispossessions on the global front. He has underscored the Indian civilization in his Indian Trilogy. His criticism of Muslim imperialism in India is perceived as a seminal critique in the back drop of the 9/11 attack on the USA. He was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2001 by the Swedish Academy because of the pressure of the USA that was camouflaged by the secularist press across the world. Especially in the Christianity dominated and anti-Muslim nations of the world.

To quote Edward Said:

There is very little pleasure and only a very little affection recorded in these two books [*Among the Believers: An Islamic Journey* (1982); *Beyond Belief: Islamic Excursions Among the Converted Peoples* (1998)]. In the earlier book, it's funny moments are at the expense of Muslims, who are "wogs" after all as seen by Naipaul's British and American readers, potential fanatics and terrorists, who cannot spell, be coherent, sound right to a worldly-wise, somewhat jaded judge from the West. Every time they show their Islamic weaknesses, Naipaul the Third World witness appears promptly. A Muslim lapse occurs, some resentment against the West is expressed by an Iranian, and then Naipaul explains that "this is the confusion of a people of high medieval culture awakening to oil and money, a sense of power and violation and a knowledge of a great new encircling civilization [the West]. It was to be rejected; at the same time it was to be depended on." (Said 2)

Naipaul has been successful in displaying new attitude expressed in *India: A Million Mutinies Now* which is called "*Lotus Sutra*" by Arvind Adiga. It brings to the dawn a new Naipaul with 'a central will, a central intellect, a unifying idea' indicative of that the inconsistent mechanism of his identity are not to be wished away as

they have been conscientious for his growth and reinstatement and attainment of the pernickety truth he had conceived.

Naipaul's Major Fiction—Issues and Perspectives:

Naipaul's embarked on his literary expedition with Caribbean fiction—*The Mystic Masseur* (1957), *The Suffrages of Elvira* (1958) and *A House for Mr Biswas* (1961)—which displays how the second and third generations of Indian expatriates in Trinidad survive by negotiating with the 'peculiarities' of the Caribbean region. They, moreover, address the issues of memory, history and identity as they are venerated in Naipaul's fictions on the region. Naipaul unfolds that Indians in Trinidad after one generation or two of the traumatic exodus affirm the alien and continue to live confirming to the Caribbean heterogeneities. The land they once left remains for them a land of curiosity and imagination, not the land to return.

Naipaul's several visits to India have displayed his longing for belonging to the country though he finds it "difficult". But his quest for 'home' has been subverted by his Eurocentric visions and visualisations. His aspiration for 'home' has already been fictionally narrated by him in his *magnum opus*, *A House for Mr. Biswas*, the best literary project and fiction with a Caribbean setting he has ever produced. The novel not only discusses Naipaul's concupiscence for 'home' but also recapitulates his fissured identity in this post-colonial globe. It gives a pen-portrait of one's endeavour for 'home' in urban space where a person, ultimately, realises that it is not his 'home' which he craved for but it's merely a 'house'. It has been widely read, critically anthologised and most debated novel in academia. This novel is an attempt to connect Naipaul's autobiographical feelings of 'home' to the Caribbean island particularly Trinidad through his character Mohun Biswas. It is argued that Naipaul's postcolonial novels expose the formation of imperialist myths of places, challenge them and deconstruct them. The quest continues but not for 'home' only; it also looks for 'identity' and 'liberation.' The liberation from the other's home is conquest, on one hand, but on the other one feels physically 'unhoused' and psychosomatically 'defeated'.

In a Free State, Naipaul's 1971 Booker Prize winning novel, presents the themes of cultural incommensurability and the broken symmetry of colonial relationships from the traveler's point of view. The plight of the uprooted former colonial becomes a metaphor for modern restlessness here, and homelessness and exile are seen as a contemporary state of mind afflicting all in this novel. His *Guerrillas* (1975), a significant work of 70's, closely

peruses multiple themes, issues and polemics of desires of his protagonists in the 'neo-colonial' world. The matrix of the novel was woven against the backdrop of race, ethnicity, sexual violence and neocolonialism, racial tension and political disorder which are indissoluble constituents of 'postcolonialism'. The materialistic society portrayed in *Guerrillas* is a bankrupt one, devoid of the right vision and competence to tackle the enormous doom hanging around it.' Pradhan further emphasises Naipaul's point that 'borrowed' ideas have 'no viability and strength to take the country forward to the path of progresses.

A Bend in the River (1979) vividly describes the disorder that follows in the wake of imperialism and the problems of embryonic but underdeveloped Third World people caught between old tribal ways and the new technology of dangerous arms and tinsel consumer materialism in a small town in 'New Africa' through the eyes of a Muslim migrant, Salim, who journeys to the interior of Africa in search of a new life, is uprooted from there and undertakes another journey to an indefinite future. *The Enigma of Arrival* (1987), a partly autobiographical novel by Naipaul, describes the narrator's exodus from Trinidad to England. The quixotic quest for an ideal homeland, however, eludes the travelling narrator as he feels constantly out of place even after arriving in the England of his fantasies where he finds a decaying empire that does little to satisfy his sense of homelessness.

Naipaul's 21st century contributions to literature were his two major novels which were written on the request of his Pakistani wife, Nadira. His two novels—*Half-a-Life* (2001) and its sequel *Magic Seeds* (2004)—have occupied a momentous place in his literary monarchy. On one hand the former presents the dialectics of homelessness, fissured identity, and cartography and topography which are futile concepts in a world that is not our own. It also deals with the position of the third world women. It is more in the form of two biographies—the first tells about Willie's father's life compressed within the first thirty pages, and the second is that of Willie's own. Or one can say that these two 'half lives' comprise this complete novel. On the other hand the latter begins from isolated life style of Willie Chandran, gripped with pessimism and misogynist negative attitude. To him, "It is wrong to have ideal view of the world. That's where the mischief starts. That's where everything starts unraveling" (Naipaul 2004:280). In these two novels, Naipaul disparaged the Western world for ethical blankness and lack of people's fidelity.

Naipaul's Select Travel Narratives: Notion of the Nation/s:

Naipaul's travel narratives on Trinidad, India, Islamic nations and Africa have put him in the cauldron of callous criticism. His notion of Third World countries has won him many laurels in the Western academia but it has also brought scathing remarks from the staunch Orientalist/s. Edward Said accused him in his essay titled "The Intellectual in the Post-colonial World" in these words, "He (Naipaul) is a Third Worlder denouncing his own people, not because they are victims of imperialism, but because they seem to have an innate flaw, which is that they are not white." Naipaul's critique of the Third world commenced with the publication of *The Middle Passage* (1962) which mapped the Trinidadian socio-political, cultural and Diasporic issues. "He attributes", writes Timothy F. Weiss on the same travelogue, "the political "squalor" of Trinidad in the 1950s to the "picaroon" nature of the colony and to the public confusion that was brought about by the sudden granting of universal adult suffrage in 1946..." (30). It was written on travel grant by the Govt. of Trinidad.

After *The Middle Passage*, his Indian Trilogy captures the "national allegory" of the post-colonial India of the 60s, 70s and 80s in his *An Area of Darkness*, *India: A Wounded Civilization* and *India: A Million Mutinies Now* published in 1962, 1977 and 1989 respectively. Naipaul's exposition of the ambivalent discourse of India is perceived from his marginalized perspectives as he himself is not yet out of his 'gimitiya' self. Vijay Mishra is contextually quoted here: "India, declares Naipaul in *An Area of Darkness*, was the country from which his grandfather had come to Trinidad. Because it was never really described... it had no reality as such. His own grandfather as well as other indentured labourers of his childhood had ceased to carry the marks of indenture and were now ensconced in Trinidad" (Mishra 121). There is another book, after Indian Trilogy, *The Overcrowded Barracoon* (1972) which carries Naipaulian *eidos* about India. It "reflects on the incongruities of Naipaul's cultural and literary identity" (Weiss 82). He has overtly and covertly contributed to the account of politics of Indian civilization through multiple ancient and modern classics and has left a plethora of issues to be debated in the future course of time.

After Trinidad and India, Islam and Islamic nations have been much loved by Naipaul. In the 80s, he visited four non-Arabic nations—Iran, Pakistan, Malaysia and Indonesia. His first one, *Among the Believers: An Islamic Journey* (1982), is based on his seven-month journey across the Asian continent. Here he explores the life, the culture, and the current ferment

inside four nations of Islam: Iran, where the hysteria and rage of revolution continues; Pakistan, tragically underdeveloped thirty- two years after its founding as a homeland for the Muslims of India; Malaysia, governed by Muslims but economically dominated by the Chinese who constitute half of its population; Indonesia, confused about both its Muslim and its national roots, confused by the rule of four regimes in less than forty years. In this travelogue Naipaul depicts an Islamic world at odds with the modern world, fuelled only by an implacable determination to believe. After having a close perusal of the book, we notice the use of some of the tenets of travel theory in it. Here, Naipaul being a tourist or traveller visits Tehran pushing a car with effort to make a trip. A fine blending of colonialism and multiculturalism is to be found in his travel through Malaysia.

The next travelogue, *Beyond Belief: Islamic Excursions Among the Converted Peoples*, is a sequel to the previous one. Actually, Naipaul has produced these travel narratives in the sharp contrast to his Hinduite political and parochial views as it is more apparent through Naipaulian perspective when he says that, “there has probably been no imperialism like that of Islam and the Arabs” (331). Hence, Imraan Coovadia is more relevantly quoted on Naipaul, “...in his career Naipaul’s view changes, becoming far more protective of political Hinduism and far more critical of Islam’s impact on the subcontinent” (2009:95). After the visit to the Indian subcontinent, Naipaul moved towards Africa as it allured through his close readings of Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*.

“Africa, I got you!” says Naipaul in his banquet speech after receiving the Nobel Prize in 2001 and the dialogue continued till recently, “Africans need to be kicked, that’s the only thing they understand.”⁸ His cognitive intelligence has relentlessly delivered the colonizers’ perspective regarding Third World nations. After Islamic nations, Africa has attracted Naipaul for its cultural amalgamation, its history and civilization and of course his visit to the same resulted in the publication of *The Masque of Africa: Glimpses of African Belief* (2010), his latest creative feat. He encompassed four countries—Uganda, Nigeria, Ghana and the Republic of South Africa for his narrative. The travelogue is an architectural devise of history, culture and civilization with Chaucerian tale, art of characterization and a record of cultural crisis from the middle ages (Dark Age) of irrationality to the modern and post-modern age of illumination and of critical thinking.

Thus, Naipaul's contentious comments on Islam, Islamic nation-states, ethnic perceptions on Africa, his ambivalent relationship with India and blinkered remarks on female authors put him into an absolute squall of criticism worldwide. But his virtuosity in prose writings, his narratives on history and civilization, his craftsmanship and use of facts in his fiction make him an inimitable author.

Notes:

1. <<http://www.mid-day.com/news/2011/jun/040611-V-S-Naipaul-psychiatrist-controversy-Jane-Austen.htm>> Accessed on June 3, 2013.
2. V S Naipaul was given this award to enable him to write a book on India (Suman Gupta x).
3. <<http://core.ecu.edu/engl/deenas/caribbean/naipaul.htm>> Accessed on May 21, 2013.
4. <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/1593673.stm>> Accessed on May 21, 2013.
5. <<http://www.fantasticfiction.co.uk/n/v-s-naipaul/middle-passage.htm>> Accessed on June 3, 2013. Emphasis mine.
6. <<http://yabaluri.org/TRIVENI/CDWEB/anareaofdefecationoct65.htm>> Accessed on June 4, 2013.
7. <<http://www.ndtv.com/article/india/vs-naipaul-slammed-by-girish-karnad-for-his-views-on-muslims-288026>> Accessed on July 13, 2013.
8. <<http://flavorwire.com/319649/a-collection-of-the-worst-things-v-s-naipaul-has-ever-said/>> Accessed on November 29, 2013.

Works Cited

- Adiga, Arvind. "Magical Thinking." Web. November 29, 2013.
- Bhattacharya, Baidik. "Naipaul's New World: Postcolonial Modernity and the Enigma of Belated Space." Web. 03 June, 2013.
- Burnouw, Dagmar. *Naipaul's Strangers*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2003. Print.
- Coovadia, Imraan. *Authority and Authorship in V. S. Naipaul*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.

- French, Patrick. *The World Is What It Is: The Authorized Biography of V S Naipaul*. London: Picador, 2008. Print.
- Gupta, Suman. *V S Naipaul*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors (P) LTD, 2010. Print.
- Kandasamy, Meena. "Casteist, Communalist, Racist, and Now A Nobel Laureate". Web. July 21 2013.
- Mishra, Vijay. *The Literature of the Indian Diaspora: Theorizing the Diasporic Imaginary*. London & New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.
- Mustafa, Fawzia. *V S Naipaul*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Print.
- Naipaul, V S. *An Area of Darkness* (1964). London: Picador, 2002. Print.
- . *India : A Million Mutinies Now* (1990). London : Vintage, 1998. Print.
- . *Among the Believers: An Islamic Journey*. New York: Vintage, 1982. Print.
- . *Beyond Belief: Islamic Excursions Among the Converted Peoples*. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1998. Print.
- . "Banquet Speech". Web. November 29, 2013.
- Nightingale, Peggy. *Journey Through Darkness: The Writing of V. S. Naipaul*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1987. Print.
- Nixon, Rob. *London Calling: A Postcolonial Mandarin*. New York & Oxford: OUP, 1992. Print.
- Rai, Sudha. *V. S. Naipaul: A Study in Expatriate Sensibility*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1982. Print.
- Saloni, Dhvani. "Naipaul Needs a Psychiatrist." Web. 3 June, 2013.
- Said, Edward. "Intellectuals in the Postcolonial World." Web. 03 June, 2013.
- . "Unraveling V. S. Naipaul's Islamophobic Imagination: An Intellectual Catastrophe." Web. 03 June, 2013.
- Singh, Manjit Inder. *V S Naipaul*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications, 1998. Print.
- Weiss, Timothy F. *On the Margins: The Art of Exile in V.S. Naipaul*. USA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992. Print.
- White, Landeg. *V S Naipaul: A Critical Introduction*. London: Macmillan Press, 1975. Print.