

Conclusion

Nostalgia can be understood in isolation as it has its meaning in a particular context by its literal definition. Literary analysis makes it an altogether different phenomenon involving diverse perceptions, emotions, memories, dreams and critical stances etc. Going through various disciplines, one may have numerous interpretations of it, but it is what one thinks of it. It depends on its contextualization in a particular literary text. Its meaning should not be thought as negative and positive primarily as it depends on the positioning of the writer's mind in his text. A writer does not write in alienation as he is concerned with diverse socio-political, religious, cultural and geographical gulfs which usually affect his mind. Therefore, he encounters with such pain and suffering that inspires him to express his innermost feelings. So, literary text is not just only a text as it deals with some specific contexts of surroundings. Outside realities have no meaning without their association with inner feelings of writers' mind. Text is an outcome of his imaginative relations with the world. Interpretations of this relation depend on creative and critical abilities of readers as there are various locations of readership from which s/he can trace and explore writers' imagination. In the forgoing thesis, the researcher has shown his scholarly abilities in dividing and contextualizing the concept of nostalgia in the four chapter of the thesis. These divisions are not only chapters, but they themselves manifest the overall crux of the thesis. In the chapterization, varied ideas and nuances have been discussed and projected in detail, thereby critiquing and identifying the true nature of nostalgia. However, it would be worthwhile now to underscore and highlight the overall understanding of this research.

Nostalgia is used and seen as a very negative term belonging to homesickness relating to the traumatic past. Therefore, yearning for past is suppressed by medical

interpretations. In Chapter-I, “Retrospective Nostalgia: Iconoclastic Perspective on History in Salman Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children* and Amitav Ghosh’s *The Shadow Lines*”, it is observed how yearning for past becomes a creative process of knowing one’s enlightened self. This chapter reveals how retrospection over past comes out with fruitful meanings from history. History as a discipline is likely to be grasped with fixed meaning and interpretation. There is no further scope to explore it from other angles. So, it becomes a one sided analysis of the official history. To explore new version of history, Salman Rushdie and Amitav Ghosh have attempted to project history into fiction or fiction into history. They mean to highlight a better understanding of the past. As multiple pasts are available; therefore one version is not to be thought as an ultimate one. Moreover, history has eliminated its gaps from other disciplines. This theme also comes out through an iconoclastic reading of history. They show how official history becomes central concern of the historians’ mind.

Unquestionably, history is a contentious issue in both texts as the novelists know that the past has no fixed base to articulate its reality. Therefore, the concepts of forgetting and remembering are used as a technique to deal with the politicized past. Both texts do not merely shift historical structures, but also affect the mindset of posterity to establish a good society. Both novels are dealt with memories concerning manifestation of individuals’ consciousness. In other words, the novelists operate their ideas of iconoclasm on history through the consciousness of the protagonists respectively. Rushdie operates his iconoclasm through Saleem by telling the saga of three generations of Sinai family. Ghosh does it through a nameless narrator of his novel. Therefore, both the novels strike against the pseudo-secular realities of Indian history in the twentieth century through memories. The idea of history in India is replete with politics of communalism dividing communities between ‘us’ and ‘them’.

Secondly, people are made to believe in such history which is not their history. Therefore, both the novelists reveal how local perspective of communities is censored and re-shaped by the State which represents an image of totalitarian regime in historical discourses. In other words, their (the margin) truth is monitored and filtered through power politics. These texts as counter-representative sets attempt to re-filter the entire ambit of Indian history.

Next, the novelists do not believe in the static form of history, for it is always a subject to change with respect to the contemporary times. Therefore, they bring out facts of fictional history as a reaction to official history. It simply means to justify facts of fiction as a substitute for larger truth of human civilization. Ultimate truth of the past does not lie in fiction, but it can represent a humanistic understanding of history in different forms. These forms do not make history a sensational discourse of demarcation and sectarian politics. History, in a sense, is full of violence and genocidal attacks where one community endeavors to subsume others. Portrayal of such types has affected not merely the past, but these layers show immense effects from generation to generation by perpetuating power-politics and massacres. The novels re-tell the pasts by exploring a harmonious understanding of history through common men. Therefore, relations with State are regarded as myth as there is a dire need to re-consider the role of State in human affairs.

Further, the major focus imbues with hollowness of freedom, as political independence is not the actual independence. It has been unable to cope with sustainable development of communities in the twenty-first century. Therefore, the novelists raise doubt and inquiry on the past. Freedom has different meanings to different people in the novels, but all are depicted as sufferers of historical fabrication. Thus, the novelists desire to re-shape socio-cultural practices associating them with the

issues of common men. History, in other words, is not a divided and ruptured phenomenon of violence only. The novels clearly show how reality comes into being with developing consciousness of individuals in society.

The novelists also experiment with the concept of nationalism. It has been a problematic aspect of history. Both writers desire to disrupt the tightness of nationalism as it has highly been political in nature befooling communities in the name of certain metaphors. Rushdie sees nationalism as communalism in his novel discussing the issues of partition. On the contrary, Ghosh takes nationalism as a manifesto of militarism primarily, but he does not deny influence of communalism in it. Therefore, it is worthwhile to re-conceptualize nationalism as humanism in day to day life rather than in philosophical realm. Both novelists reveal the idea of global past through undivided consciousness of the major characters. These structures of humanistic solidarity are completely missing from historians' records of history.

Both the novels deal with historical representation, but they are not the same in their engaging methodology in reference to the past. Rushdie explores the inside view of history showing internal turmoil of Indian society. He directly engages with history concentrating upon burning issues of twentieth century history. Conversely, Ghosh is comfortable with the outside view of history. It does not mean of having subjective and objective outlook on history, for both novelists are subjective in their treatment of history. The outside represents beyond geographical boundaries of a nation; and inside shows within boundaries. Yet, they are not different in their central theme of multiculturalism. In short, both novels provoke the concept of pluralism in which communities can be able to respect differences of others. This is also a demand of the twenty-first century. Therefore, these novelists have updated the reliability of their treatment of history.

As such, history is not linked to all memories; similarly, memory does not include all histories. Consequently, Rushdie and Ghosh do not cover up all realities of the past. In other words, both novels mainly focus on descriptions of cities rather than villages. It can be the only missing portion of their fiction. Moreover, these novels do not have any description of issues of villagers in Indian history in the twentieth century.

As such, narratives of forced diasporas explore vast range of human experiences concerning exilic sufferings of uprooted communities. Also, it is probably impossible to categorize them all at a single platform. Yet, Chapter-II, “Restorative Nostalgia: Politics of Home in the Dalai Lama’s *Freedom in Exile* and Rahul Pandita’s *Our Moon has Blood Clots* shares something significant about the displaced Tibetans and Kashmiri Pandits. It shows that restorative nostalgia has a very deep meaning while talking about the politics of home with reference to forcefully expatriated communities. Pain, suffering, rape, persecution and loss are the destiny of such communities who have been banished from their homeland. Moreover, ‘host-land’ does not appear to be a suitable place for living and learning. These are common assumptions and notions about uprooted communities living in exile, but their reactions are not always the same to this imposed destiny of exile. Their sense of living and developing vary from country to country and generation to generation due to the socio-cultural status-quo of their countries. Moreover, it also depends on their upcoming literature flourishing gradually through posterity. Apparently, the chapter is full of divergences and convergences pertaining to the critical scrutiny of select texts.

Undoubtedly, these texts come from such places which are known for their spiritual and religious cultures across the world. Tibet and Kashmir prove it by a little re-visiting of their socio-cultural history. Select narratives also tell that their history and literature are to be considered as a dispersal phenomenon of upcoming cultural studies

due to the ambiguous layers of several histories in them. Consequently, homelessness is not an event as it has been happening to them inside the boundaries of their respective territories. Both writers refer to this instability of home, but contemporary exodus has transformed this dispersal outside the boundaries. Therefore, their uprooted and unrooted lives are discussed and debated internationally.

Major focus of their life narratives is to share their socio-cultural history as a tool of distinct identity. Both writers follow the same route to explore it by referring to their conventions. Therefore, the whole socio-cultural setup is an integral part of their consciousness. The Dalai Lama shows Buddhist philosophy and geographical conditions of Tibet as a foundation of their aloofness. By contrast, Pandita assumes history and religion as the basis of their distinct identity. Both use this concept of distinct identity as a tool to critique the authoritarian voices in their respective territories. As a result, restorative nostalgia becomes a powerful medium of expression, resistance and retaliation against the authority. This simply means that uprooted communities have no respectable space within their homelands. It is, therefore, their textual politics speaking for their human rights. This should not be considered as a highly manipulated textual agenda as select texts also compromises with historical facts of their respective past. Moreover, both communities have been in exile till now. In addition, diaries, memoirs, autobiographies and lyrics are their instruments of expressing themselves.

Their memories recorded in such texts are treated as politics of home incorporating various tacks and tactics of belongingness. Therefore, home as a metaphor and as fact have touched certain widened dimensions through their life-narratives. Primarily, home is a longing for their respective homelands for both writers. Later, it does not remain a quest for homeland in geographical terms for the Dalai

Lama, as there is a development of thought in his life narrative. If scholars see his first book *My Land & My People* and compare it to the second, *Freedom in Exile*, then they will realize this tremendous change in his perception. Hence, the Dalai Lama is highly conscious about the ever changing and contingent realities of human civilization. Consequently, he is not rigid in his treatment of restorative nostalgia regarding the politics of home. At last, Tibet does not remain a home and homeland as he effectively erases these gaps by updating the Buddhist aesthetics in modern contexts. On the other hand, Pandita is unable to touch the larger truth of human life and have a narrowed perspective on home and homeland. In short, there is no such growth of thought pattern in his consciousness while talking about the politics of home. Therefore, his text becomes a combo of selective incidents to gain a sympathetic favor from readers. As a result, home is a yearning for Kashmir Valley. He also ignores the perspectives of third generation narratives which may have different types of realities and truth about Kashmir. For him, text is an agenda of selecting incidents rather than creative creation of imagination pacifying pain and suffering through viable literary writings. Hence, it emphatically reveals a dull side of his nostalgic mindset. Moreover, his treatment of 'self' does not have an appropriate validity speaking for the collective consciousness of his community.

Religion, in both texts, is highly problematic issue written in exile, but treatment of it shows differences in their thinking. For the Dalai Lama, religion is a constructive phenomenon which develops with its contexts. Therefore, it should not be considered as an authority of a particular time and space. His religion promotes negations and recognition of new knowledge for the betterment of human world. No religion is bad or good in his eyes. By contrast, Pandita takes it as an authority and hegemonic structure for other communities living in Kashmir. This should not be a job of a literary writer.

Moreover, there is no space for negotiations and new knowledge of twenty-first century. Therefore, he is a highly conservative writer in his treatment of religion. On the other hand, the Dalai Lama is also blamed as an authoritarian voice neglecting other traditions in Tibet, but his philosophy of 'mid-way' saves him speaking for negotiations. As a result, his restorative nostalgia proves to be having the highest sense of secularism and modern democracy without being influenced by the rigidity of religion and conventions, but he does not repudiate significance of traditions. Hence, he is also not a modern writer in his politics of home. Broadly speaking, he frankly stays in-between with a humanitarian vision. However, this vision also gets a bit dim when readers go through his conceptualization of non-violence as he does speak for self-immolations occurring in Tibet. Likewise, such events are also thought as a non-violent medium of expression for freedom, but this should be criticized as a means of self-destruction and self-deception. There could be other ways of expressions for freedom rather than destroying themselves. In short, restorative nostalgia dealing with politics of home, in the chapter, is not static and linear, but it reveals several zigzag socio-psychological layers of uprooted communities' minds.

Chapter-III, "Reflective Nostalgia: Contesting Secularism in Shashi Tharoor's *India: From Midnight to Millennium and Beyond* and Mukul Keshavan's *Homeless on Google Earth*" Shashi Tharoor and Mukul Kesavan have shown their perspectives on shifting modes of realism by exploring some sense of secularism. Reflective nostalgia is strategically weaved as a tool to know about their productiveness of textual representations. No specific order of governance is enough to say for secularism in the country as it is continuously in influence of diverse layers of religion, politics, culture, modernism including new political thoughts of liberalism and neo-liberalism. Secularism, thereby, is not an unchanged entity of justice, equality and well-being in

literary and non-literary texts as it re-shapes itself, as society evolves pertaining to displacing and re-placing of forthcoming versions of power structures. No structure or political thought is fully applicable to justify its consistency. Society, therefore, is not fixed as it rapidly changes and transforms itself for new ways of communication and signification. Simultaneously, basic realism appears to be the same in the minds of common men, but it is not always the same in larger terms as they have to be just commodities of all this shifting. Ethics, values, security, individual interests, expectations, and needs are the issues of Man's mind by which he is controlled and manipulated by structures of socio-political compendium. Broadly, it becomes difficult to differentiate between incorrect and correct. Text is always the same, but its hidden qualitative property is always a matter of doubt, inquiry and renovation. Both writers know all these complexities of societal apparatuses. Society is not governed by reason alone as reason has to negotiate with varied forces scattered in society. To realize this phenomenon of human civilization, Tharoor and Kesavan offer their critical and creative projection regarding socio-political issues of the contemporary society.

Both writers are of the opinion that secularism is not only a little trajectory to say only about the conventional setup of strained relationship between State and religion only. It is not just a definition to say about the separatism of State from religion as society is not something mathematical projections of laws and order. Beyond that, everything including violence, pity, corruption, and morality are there in society by its visible and invisible forms. Things show that society is not in evolution, but it appears to be in evolution by its external manifestations only. Basically, nature of Man is the same as it is not a matter of done and undone. To project his mindset for particular type of behaviour is layered psychology of socio-political ideas for ages. Man, thereby, does not live by bread alone as he is condemned to live and think outside realism by

encircled dimensions of ethics and purposes. Divergently, his individual interests sometimes appear to be in clash with the outside forces of stabilization. Secularism, thereby, belongs not only to a pure justification of outside realism as it also has numerous things to share with the inside view of human psyche. It is not possible to say about all these sides of his mind by selective rendering of symbolic iconographies. Both authors attempt to disillusion Man's mind from these ups and downs of outside world by exploring a new worldview of realism. Secularism, in the books, is not a political articulation primarily, but it is a technique to address the realities of the world at different levels of language, art, communication, materialism and spiritual etc. Society is not regressive or progressive in its evolution as it is just a fictional and imaginative event of Man's mind to define it by certain vocabularies of theoretical assumptions. It is to be done to shake the rigidity of human condition in order to create some sense of love, brotherhood and harmony in society. Simultaneously, all offensive and dirty layers are there to say about different pictures of human relationship. This is the point where Man and his expectations to outside world always change creating hypnotic and un-hypnotic effect towards existence. He is neither a machine nor a puppet in the hands of others' socio-political forces. His space is not defined by himself, but by several factors of mythology, history, astrology and politics. So, he has no individual space to say what he is to be for himself in this sense. It is the point where his quest for existence starts undoing the imposed codes of socio-cultural worldviews. Both writers, therefore, deal with the existential issues of Man and his responses to the outside realism. Thus, it is skepticism of writers' mind towards outside realities to twist them for justice and liberty in society. Society is not just a battle of ideas alone as there remains something valuable even beyond ideas and ideology of its socio-political projections.

Furthermore, the writers have critical sense of concrete realism by telling the pragmatic view of contemporary society. Tharoor does this by running between two poles of liberalism and neoliberals. His experiences look like a journey by observing the socio-political twists. Initial stage reveals his sensitization towards the notions of freedom of press, rights and human thinking; secondly, it merges with some sense of neoliberals justifying secularism in terms of economic settlements. On the other hand, Kesavan addresses the issues of the margins and non-margins by having critical sense towards Indian cinematic representations, art, and university-culture covering up a widened zone of human world. His major focus is to show a critical sensibility for the subaltern in this way. He desires to re-place the oppressiveness by showing affection and human sentiments. He is liberal rather than a neo-liberal one. Tharoor does the same by addressing the same issues, but his approach to deal with them is more pragmatic than Kesavan. He shows, in a way, his socio-political exposure to unfold the problematic component of India; whereas Kesavan engages with them by his academic and literary understanding of the country. Largely, they are the part of the same, but playing it differently having some common sense of criticism and creativity at some philosophical and pragmatic levels.

In Chapter-IV, “Prospective Nostalgia: Longing for Sustainability in Veronica Rossi’s *Under the Never Sky* and Ink Pieper’s *The Last Human*”, Science fiction disclosing its facts with respect to prospective nostalgia appears to be a new phenomena of writing. It mainly attempts to show the dominance of technoscience over Man. Both novels are written in the same category while showing this type of hegemony. Simultaneously, they reveal that old explanation of living and learning are replaced by technoscience and modern innovations. Therefore, man has new means of communication and interaction. His physical interaction has become minimal due to the

blurring of boundaries. It, in other words, is not new innovation in itself as it deals with a story of system breaking mechanism in which progress itself has seeds of its own destruction. This vision of self destruction is depicted in both the novels. Though Rossi and Pieper weave it differently, they have the same message to share with readers. They also know that they have not written anything new about sustainability pertaining to numerous aspects of prospective nostalgia as much has been said and discussed about it in earlier periods of literature and criticism. Renaissance also tried to cross boundaries in the beginning of sixteenth century. Moreover, plays of this period also show futility of man's limitless ambitions at that time as man discloses his desires for excessive amount of success and progress. This pushes him in the domain of questioning the very base of divinity. It also reminds the readers of egoistic mindset of man who has been heading towards extreme sense of individualism. Both novelists in their novels clearly project consequences of such type of individualism. This shifting of man's mind from divinity to technoscience is no freedom at all as real freedom does not come from technoscience only, but it also depends on harmonious existence of Man with Nature and vice-versa. Moreover, it does not depend on the policies of destroying others on the basis of power and hegemony as humanity would have to survive by other means of love, brotherhood, equality and equanimity. In the beginning of the twenty-first century, writers have started realizing hollowness of high and low cultures. No culture is low or high as Man has come to know the hypocritical confusion of boundaries. Prospective nostalgia, thereby, has merged with other trajectories of its being and becoming. Whatever happened in history, the same has been projected in science fiction by weaving it apocalyptically. Its plot construction and tools are different, but its essence is more or less similar to those who talk about human values in literary canon. Consequently, this becomes the phenomena of timelessness as time and space do not

create much distance when it is a matter of basic instincts of innermost parts of human mind.

Tragedies, therefore, do not occur externally as their very element comes primarily from inside worldview of human error. Due to this error, all destructive things come in man's lives. Both novelists attempt to show this vision of negative progressivism in their novels. They attempt to approach all inclusive trajectories where Man's ambitions work for the betterment of human society by bridging the gaps of individuals and society. They also desire to eliminate the gulfs of First and Third worlds showing the fruitlessness of hyper-rationality. Both works show how sustainable development may go side by side with the help of mature understandings of the innermost psyche of the margins.

Science fiction comments on the societal issues by making predictions about life in future. It is all about play of human imagination with reference to apocalyptic version of the forthcoming world. It is not about future as it addresses the present. Only present awareness may prevent the humans from upcoming disasters. Disaster is not an event which is yet to come in science fiction, but it already has occurred manifesting its worst consequences. Clay, Aria and Perry are weaved in such stories where they have eliminated the gaps and gulfs of time and space as they do not exist in actual sense of physical space and clock-time. Theirs' is an imbued memory which erases the differences of chronological timeline of events in stories. From this view point, there is no significant difference between retrospective and prospective nostalgia. All trajectories of nostalgic layers might be applicable interchangeably in the ongoing thesis. Characters of Rushdie and Ghosh, thereby, have experienced similar predicaments as Clay, Aria, and Perry in the fourth chapter have faced owing to technological governance and worst scientific discoveries. In both situations, Man faces

the most terrible crisis of circumstantial slavery caused by power politics and agenda of progressivism. Therefore, the reconsideration of history, longing for sustainability, contesting secularism and politics of home deal with placing and voicing of such communities which need safety, security and harmonious life-style in the world which has been displaced and marginalized for decades.

Nostalgia is not confined only to the four categories discussed in this thesis. It may be extended to other dimensions of its being. The present matrix is specified study of its nature. It can move its wings to other spheres of human existence. It, therefore, becomes an eternal fight for establishing various meanings of nostalgia in different situations. Its flexible nature makes it more relevant for other areas of society where one sees man's struggle for survival. It comes out with a new revolution in mind by projecting a new meaning in each text, as texts themselves are the products of socio-cultural ambit in which nostalgia occurs.