



## RESEARCH PAPER

### Naipaul's Travelogues and His Inscription of "Other" of the Muslim World

<sup>1</sup>Humaira Kalsoom, <sup>2</sup>Asim Karim and <sup>3</sup>Tahir Jamil\*

1. Assistant Professor of English, Higher Education Department, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Professor, Department of English, Riphah International University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Assistant Professor, Area Study Centre for Africa, North & South America, Quaid-e-Azam University Islamabad, Pakistan

\*Corresponding Author | [tjamil@qau.edu.pk](mailto:tjamil@qau.edu.pk)

## ABSTRACT

This paper analyses Islamophobia from the perspective Naipaul as writer who is at the crossroad of both worlds and a real representative of mestiza The West is rife with islamophobia where Muslim are treated aptly as others; still foreign and strange in the west. There is a little change in the western perception regarding Muslim since their initial interaction with later in Levant, Middle East and beyond provided a raw material to construct whole façade of Orientalism that helped in the formulation of colonial discourse. The research conceptualizes how Muslim identity as "other" is archetypical that has influenced latent development in the relation between West and the rest. V.S. Naipaul is one among the writers who progressed with such a formulation and framework in his travelogues i.e. *Among the Believers* and *Beyond Belief*, where he ascribed Muslim, in a pedantic style, primitive and uncivilized. The study is descriptive and qualitative in nature where the text of Naipaul with reference to Muslim and the west has been analyzed. Naipaul is being criticized for one sided monologic views leaving no space for any counter argument. Seen in this context, both Colonial and postcolonial theory and legacy in terms of intellectual and artistic output represent a persistent mode of reciprocal "othering". It would be suggested in the end that it is not only the Colonial legacy that insists upon the secondary status of the colonized polities and culture; postcolonial itself thrives on constructing the West as a superior "other" through persistent mode of either resistance or its glorification.

**KEYWORDS** 'Other', Dialogism, Monologic, Naipaul's Travelogues, Non-Arab Muslims

## Introduction

Language In the post 9/11 West the Islamophobia is again fashionable, and it has turned much obvious, with equal vehemence, since Trump's election as the president of the United States during his campaign, proclaimed a total and complete ban on Muslims entering the US. Immediately after formally assuming the presidential office he signed executive orders banning people of several principally Muslim countries from entering the US. Such a policy was put together clumsily and executed cruelly. It was a sheer vindication of Western hostility to Islam and an arbitrary craving for security and cultural homogeneity that is finding adherents across the Western world – and not just on the far right. Quite recently US administration has recognized Jerusalem as Israel's capital and has announced to shift US embassy there, a decision pending for seven decades. Such a declaration has embittered the peace process Middle East embroiled in a sectarian cross fire the last decade. It has reminded the strategist dealing with the Middle east the Clash of Civilization. Huntington's, though controversial, argument is remembered today primarily for its prescience in spotlighting the divide between "Western and Islamic civilizations" – a rift

that was revealed most vividly by the 9/11 attacks and their aftermath. Thus polarization is increasing, monologism is threatening the solidarity of the world. Naipaul seen in this context assumes a particular significance. Certainly he has been reviewed by critics for Singular biased views. So in the emergent Islam versus West context, there is need to revise Naipaul's views about the Muslim as he presented in his travelogues *Among the Believers* and *Beyond Belief*. This study particularly refers to Naipaul against his negative representation of Muslims in his travelogues. This particular aspect on the one hand deprives dialogic existence of the polarized cultures, but also constructs a superior "othering" of the Western ideologies.

### Literature Review

Apparently Naipaul stands apart rather against the majority of the postcolonial authors for adopting a specific ideological and cultural position while representing the issues of developing countries. In these travelogues, he depicts an essentialist construction of the Muslim world and represents faith in the form of religion as an oppressive force in these societies. Critical Approaches on Naipaul's travel books relating to the Muslim world follow two divergent lines, as critics like Imraan Coovadia (2009), Amin Malik (1998), Gyllen A. Griffith (1993) and Fadwa Abdul Rehman (2006) have indicted Naipaul for portraying the Muslim world in a disparaging way and according to them writings like Naipaul's has aggravated polarization between western world and the Muslim world, on the other hand critics like Dogmar Barnouw (2003), Bruce King (2003), Lacy Wright (2002) finds no fault with Naipaul's representation of the Muslim world. According to them, Naipaul's works accurately portray extremism of religion in these societies.. Furthermore, there is a need of debating his stance with respect to broader multicultural perspective as well that denotes co-existence and mutuality of divergent faiths and races in spirit of acceptance. This study intends to analyse Naipaul's one sided perception of the non-Arab Muslim world that would be very significant in the emergent context of the Islam versus West discourse.

### Material and Methods

This study employs analytical and critical method . The textual analysis of Naipaul's works: *Among the Believers* and *Beyond Belief* has been carried in postcolonial theoretical perspective. This study argues that in his travelogues, Naipaul has embraced the basic tenants of Orientalist discourse treating developing world and other faiths as 'other'. Reiteration of colonial legacy of colonized othering constitutes a monologic content of Naipaul at the helm of lauding the existence of Europe as a center, superior to the East as well as denigration of the Islamic East. It will be argued that the aesthetic of Naipaul support the divisive global voices to create a unilateral /singular worldview

### Results and Discussion

Naipaul's appreciation of the West and its colonialism invites criticism from postcolonial writers in South Asia, Middle East, Asia, America, Africa and Europe. Colonialism and post colonialism are the theoretical constructs to be construed being a binary to each other. The conflict emanates from the fact that both concepts are polar apart and mutually exclusive. Colonialism is symbolized with exploitation, hegemony, control, coercion, repression and deprivation of the colonized; creating an aura of its "otherness". Spivak's "Can the subaltern speak" draws attention to the persistent exploitation of Indians and ascribed them a "general attribute of subordination in the south Asian society" and "oppressed subject" (Gandhi, 1998, 1) who were positioned in the context of the oppression exercised by the colonial politics and legacy. Ghandhi has the view that postcolonial

theory despite all interjections and complexities surrounding its complex interdisciplinary nature and definition, has in certain areas responded to the colonialism by conceptualizing the condition of such a societies in the aftermath of colonial occupation; developing in turn its own counter argument. According to her: "In response, post colonialism might be viewed as a theoretical resistance to the mystifying amnesia of the colonial aftermath. It is a disciplinary project devoted to the academic task of revisiting, remembering and, crucially, interrogating the colonial past." (Gandhi,1998, 4). That is a condition of fragmented subjectivities and ambivalent relation between the two. If antagonism has resulted in complex mode of resistance to the colonial hegemony, desire has resulted in such even more complex development as migration to imperialist metropolitan, displacement, hybridity, mimicry and incommensurability.

Naipaul's desire to explore the role of religion in postcolonial societies took him to the Muslim world. He wanted to see how religion intertwines with politics, culture and history to shape the living of the people. His Indo-Trinidadian background is pivotal in shaping his observation and understanding of Islam. Trinidad, where Naipaul spent his early life, is a multiracial society where people from various origin and religious beliefs lived together. From a very early age, he was skeptical of communities including Hindus and Muslims particularly when he used to experience their religious rituals, and often found them somewhat different from other communities living in Trinidad. In *An Area of Darkness*, he comments: "but at an early age I understood that Muslims were somewhat more different than others" (p.31). However, the perception of differences, unfortunately engendered a hatred in him that ignited a disparaging view of these communities to be applied generally, as he says, "They were not to be trusted"( 31). Importantly this initial perception develops into a persistent derogatory view regarding the Muslim world and the Islamic faith as well. In *Among the Believers*, Naipaul says Islam: "the doctrine or what I thought was its doctrine didn't attract me" (p. 12). Particularly in the wake of 9/11, this very thought pattern reflects a blind perusal of a political propaganda against role of Islam in terrorism and violence, and it left a deep impression on Naipaul which is reflected in his writings. In "Among the Mimics and Parasites: V. S. Naipaul's Islam" Rob Nixon expresses his point of view: "American responses to *Among the Believers* suggest how the author's unmodulated binary thinking helped fuel the anti-Islamic racism of the early eighties and encouraged the drawing of self-satisfied equations between Western technological inventiveness and human worth"(159).

In both *Among the Believers* and *Beyond Belief*, Naipaul expounds a Western viewpoint and colonial discourse as a reference point to explore the cultures and traditions of non-Arab Muslim countries. He portrays the people of these regions in Eurocentric framework of considering Muslims as "Other." Quite often he describes Muslim civilization as antagonistic to the progressive tendencies of the western civilization. Such identification of the Muslim is essentialist and reductive one as found in the discourse of orientalism. Furthermore he condemns the Islamic culture as being parasitic unable to cope with the modernity, as they can produce the technology they themselves consume.

The people residing in these countries are portrayed as mentally incapacitated. For example In Pakistan, he observes, "for the community as a whole a way of ceasing to strive intellectually. It is to be parasitic. Parasitism is also one of the unacknowledged fruit of fundamentalism" (Naipaul, 1981,p. 158). Unfortunately, whatever chaos and mismanagement Naipaul observes in these Muslim societies and in the given case in Pakistan, he equates it with Islam. He seems to be governed by some preconceive notions about this particular faith and labeling is done indiscreetly to reveal his preferences for the western notion concerning Islamic radicalism, militancy, and its association with violence. Even in its monologic stance, it reaffirms Western orientalist supremacy and othering of

the Muslims. Although Naipaul, being a firsthand observer, has provided a valuable information about such a societies but his position always gravitate towards reinforcing Western prejudices against Islam.

Among *the Believers* and *Beyond Belief* further reflect Naipaul's disregard for multiplicity. His view of presenting western civilization as "universal" resonates with his disregard for various cultures and traditions of different civilizations of the world. Malak (1998) criticizes Naipaul for presenting a despising view of the peripheral cultures. He questions the authenticity of Naipaul's view on Islam, when he is ignorant of this religion and its civilization. His view is that such authors have just created divisiveness between west and the other cultures.

Such a views of Naipaul are sheer oblivion on his part to the wide diversity within Islam. The people he encounters on his travels, identified them as Muslims converts and establishes a general category of all non-Arab Muslims whose world views has diametrically changed after a conversion process over the centuries. For convert and equivalent of a rootless one, his own history and civilization gradually turns meaningless and it is the history and culture of Arabia that is found to be sacred. For example Pakistanis, according to Naipaul, instead of liking their local fruit mangoes cherish dates that are connected with Arabia peninsula, is quite frivolous a statement. In fact, Naipaul ignores the diversity of the Muslim religion. His founds the tribal fantasy ascribed as fundamentalist fantasy, in the cultural essentialism of Islam that claim religious or cultural purity. The tribal communities in essence are shut away entities, enclosed within their boundaries, enjoying being exclusive while the rest of the world right now is culturally mixed, retaining complexity and diversity in varying degrees as well (5). It is such a fantasy, according to Naipaul as expressed in *Beyond belief*, prevalent among the Muslim of Indonesia, Iran, Pakistan and Malaysia, who disown their pre-Islamic past. Such an invocation of difference between history and faith in such a countries exposes him to charges of anti-Islamism thus subjected to the post colonial criticism. In the same way, Mohammad Ayub Khan, in "A Nobel for Islamophobia?" comments:

One wonders if he [Naipaul] thinks that Christianity is a Palestinian religion and the European and American Christians are "converts". One might well ask him if he thinks that the majority of Hindus these days are converts since it is not an indigenous religion, but was brought along with by the invading Aryans (Khan, 2006).

His criticism of the Islamic ideology clearly reveals his biases. "To the political issues it raised it offered no political or practical solution. It offered only faith. It offered faith ---- [that] would settle everything-but who had ceased to exist" (Naipaul, 1981, 355). This clearly reveals Naipaul's monologic stance of the supremacy of the Western world. Mohammad Bakari says: "All ideologies, whether social, political, economic or religious, are in essence totalizing in their demand from the adherents. They are exclusionist as much as they are inflexible in what they demand of their followers. This is certainly not unique to Islam. It is exclusively true of fascism, capitalism, and socialism, Hinduism or Zionism "(Bakari, 2003).

Naipaul's own voice resounds in his narratives; there is no place where we feel absence of Naipaul's voice. "The fury he brings to the now immense tragedy of the post-colonial world seems free of all but the most private allegiances, and this fury, whatever one makes of it politically, has given him a diagnostic insight missing in more neutral accounts" (Seshadri, 1985). "Consequently Naipaul cherishes Western civilization and refuses to condescend to Third World people by using dishonest euphemisms to describe

what he calls their “half made” societies”. For Naipaul Universal civilization is chiefly the Western in the pursuit of progress happiness. And yet, he may not underscore the real problems of these people. His view of presenting western civilization as “universal civilization” resonates with his disregard for various cultures and traditions of different civilizations of the world, ensuing polarisation between ‘us’ and ‘them’. Such a view do not hold some scope for the third space or hybrid space. The only monologic view of Naipaul wishes all non-Western civilizations to adopt all aspects of Western civilization, for sheer survival.

However, in some critical perspective Naipaul and Samuel P. Huntington share the same controversial view of clash of civilizations. Huntington in *Clash of Civilizations* in his article “The Clash of Civilizations,” has raised this issue and described in future the fundamental conflict will not be ideological or economic but it will be cultural. Again he says that differences in culture do not necessarily mean an instant conflict and violence but in the past these differences among civilizations have been the main reason of violent conflicts. However, Huntington, leaving a room for hybrid spaces makes it clear that his article does not advocate that different non-Western civilizations should abolish their own distinctiveness and become a single entity by adopting universal civilization. He also does not assert that in future there would be a global civilization of Western model but he concludes the article by arguing: “For the relevant future, there will be no universal civilization but, instead a world of different civilizations, each of which will have to learn to coexist with the other” (Huntington, 1993). But Naipaul is one step ahead of Huntington. His view is coloured by his prejudices and biases. Amin Malak (2006), in “Naipaul’s travelogues and clash of Civilization Complex,” making comparison between Naipaul and Huntington’s views says:

Apart from their fetishization of Western values, both Naipaul and Huntington share two striking attitudes: both reveal a suspicion, if not a hostile dislike, of other cultures and an uncanny tendency towards grand generalizations about nature and values of these “other” cultures that Naipaul and Huntington have essentially constructed and attributed whatever they fantasized to them. This constructed ‘other’ is often subjected to all sorts of reductive, essentialist qualifications, none of which is complimentary or appealing.

In fact his travels also reveal non-Arab Muslim world in transitional phase. Everywhere his personal response makes the final vision “That is, the character’s voice is equally as important and ‘fully weighted’ as the author’s own, and the former cannot be simply viewed as an appendage of the latter” (Gardiner, 1992, 24). These are non-progressive stagnant societies, that are hostile to modernity and newness. The ideas of Western universalism lauded by Naipaul is also is contested by the postcolonial approach that believes in the independence of postcolonial societies, only allowing for the cross cultural, multicultural, hybrid and interactive equation with the West. Achebe in “Colonialist Criticism” rejects the myth of universalism. He is of the opinion that every literature must be reflective of the locality and the people it represent. He favours localisation. He also criticizes third world and Western critics for ignoring the particularity of the African experiences and favouring universality in the same way Indian author. Among *the Believers* and *Beyond Belief* further reflects Naipaul’s monologic disregard for multiplicity. His view of presenting Western civilization, as “universal” resonates with his disregard for various cultures and traditions of different civilizations of the world. Malak (1998) criticizes Naipaul for presenting a despising view of the peripheral cultures. He questions the authenticity of Naipaul’s view on Islam, when he is ignorant of this religion and its civilization. His view is that such authors have just created divisiveness between west and the other cultures. Amitav Ghosh believes in the co-relation of diverse culture. “The notion of unified identity implies ‘unity in diversity.’ An ideal writer like Ghosh

believes in the co-relation of all the cultures" (Kadam, 2006, 26). Naipaul's uni-centric view of transgression of boundaries to adopt Western culture does not leave any space for co-relation of various cultures and civilisations.

He rejects Islam as a religious ideology like other. In order to present the Western imperialism in better terms Naipaul takes a relative position, consider Islam as a form of Arab imperialism and juxtaposing it with supposed human face of the western, callings it an uncompromising kind of imperialism. Such a perception of him about Islam leaves serious implications for his representation.

Naipaul's attitude is discernibly disparaging about Pakistan, he criticizes all institutions and individuals along religious practices and believes. While referring to the pre-partitioned India, he hold Muslim responsible for communal tensions; and Muslim always remained behind the Hindus because of the rigidity of faith and remained constrained within their religion while, the Hindu were more open community to welcome the British colonials; in reality it is not because of supposed mellowness in Hindu community but for them arrival of British hold the prospect to increasing their status in India vis a vis Muslim. In *Beyond Belief*, he has presented a reductionist view of Pakistan society, to be understood only in religious terms that is Islam and Arabic in essence; the post partition Pakistan has replaced its history with the history of Arabia. He is surprised to find that students have no knowledge of their real history. Evan Iqbal of Pakistan, according to him, is offering the concept of a separate country to prove himself a loyal Muslim.

Naipaul admires the hybridity at function during Moghul rule in India. He praises the Moghul ruler of Akbar as commonly appreciated by whole of the Hindu community, who took an interest in Hindu philosophy and mythology. He also praises his descendant Jahaghir for crossing the barrier of religion and culture by marrying a Hindu women. Here again Naipaul criticizes a constructed notion of the history of Pakistan where the Mughul ruler Akbar is considered responsible for initiating the downfall of Muslim rule in India by adopting the Hindu traditions while ignoring Islamic rules in all spheres of life. It seems like perhaps the "hybridity" that Naipaul praises is not really based on coexistence of two different religions and cultures, but rather the replacement of a worldview that he considers "other" with one that he finds more familiar.

Naipaul is satisfied to meet some people in Indonesia, who are very much critical of their religion, Islam. Naipaul meets a father, who favors his daughter's radical thinking. Here Naipaul's agenda of promoting the Western civilization is quite clear. His appreciative remarks are only reserved for those, who cross the barriers of their culture and religion. In 1992 Naipaul delivered a lecture at Manhattan institute, entitled "Our Universal Civilization" in which he talked about the superiority of the Western civilization with reference to Muslim countries. In both travelogues Naipaul seems to favour those who adopt western civilization.

Naipaul's Orientalist construction frames these travel works that is revealed in his essentialist and monologic construction of the non-Arab Muslim societies. He considers religion Islam responsible for all the failures in the society. Dogmar Barnouw (2003) defends Naipaul by arguing that Naipaul's criticism of non-Arab Muslim societies is not directed at the religion of Islam but he is critical of the political goals of re-Islamization that is going to create divisiveness in this global world. But Dogmar Barnouw is unable to take into account that Naipaul has mostly targeted the Islamic ideology in these travel works, he does not seem to take into account the various political and social factors leading to this extremity of religion. Various such example can be quoted from the South American,

African and Asian countries which are not Muslim but decadence is very attendant. To holding Islam or Islamization only responsible for the retrogressive trends among the Muslim countries cannot be justified without generating a debate which encompass the reasons for underdevelopment among the Non-Muslim countries.

Imraan Covadia (2009) says Naipaul's travels through the Muslim world are imbued with his own judgment about Islam as a religion. "Being of Hindu origins, he would be arguably expected to be averse to Islamic claims. As a lapsed Hindu with a strong and recognized antipathy toward all religious fanaticisms, he could find all that he needs in the Islamic fundamentalism and revivalism to confirm his aversion. His aversion to Islam is neither religious nor existential, but driven primarily by political considerations and intellectual skepticism" (Mottale, 2010). So, Most of the events that he describes with reference to the non-Arab Muslim countries are linked to the social and political factors than to the ideology of Islam. Naipaul's vision of the Muslim countries lacks historical imagination. He is unable to see that these countries are suffering not because of Islam but the divisiveness in the societies is the main reason of their backwardness. The extremity of fundamentalism that he finds in these is product of various political factors. For example, fundamentalism was deliberately promoted in Pakistan due to US involvement in the Afghanistan issue. By infusing fundamentalism in the country mujahidin were prepared to side with the Western World during the Afghan war. In fact the fundamentalism that Pakistan is facing now is rooted back in that Afghan war. Ian Buruma (1998) argues: "One thing that remains obscure in Naipaul's account of his Islamic journeys is the distinction between historic Islam and the modern, revolutionary, or at least militant versions he observed. Perhaps he sees no meaningful distinction. But Islam was not always revolutionary. Mullahs do not have a history of ruling countries".

He views postcolonial societies from a distance and unable to understand the ground realities in these countries. Mukherjee, P. (2007) criticizes Naipaul for ignoring historical and material conditions of third world countries and mentioned his essentialist views about Third World that reflects his view of the superiority of Western civilization. He says "Naipaul is so decided in his distribution of moral and cultural worth between the cultures of anarchic rage and the universal civilization that he ends up demonizing a homogenized Islam almost as routinely as the most brittle-minded of his Islamic interlocutors demonize the West" (Nixon, 2003, 159). In his prognosis the problem in Muslim world is fundamentalism that he considers an impediment for such societies to embrace the modern values of democracy and become an active part of the global world. The critics of the Muslim world often substantiate their argument through the same logic regarding the failure of the democracy in the Muslim world. But here Naipaul himself has been criticized for embracing a fundamentalist position; his criticism of fundamentalism in Islam is biased and its generalization is unfounded. He has not acknowledged the wide diversity of religion Islam. His main focus is the fundamentalist Islam. He does not regard the evolution of Islam as syncretic religion that developed by incorporating so many civilizations and the transfusion was mutual imbibing the best of all.

## **Conclusion**

Reviewed in the contemporary polarization between Muslim and the west, Naipaul is premonition for monologic. Unfortunately Naipaul presents the one side of the reality giving an impression of deliberately neglecting the "other" that render him controversial, biased and monologic in terms of Bakhtin. All such representation of the Muslim culture and society clearly aligns him with the Orientalist tradition. He distances himself from the postcolonial societies. He is unable to understand the ground realities in these countries. Most of the events that Naipaul describes with reference to the non-Arab Muslim countries

are linked to the social and political factors of these countries than to the ideology of Islam. Naipaul's vision of the Muslim countries lacks historical imagination. He is unable to see that these countries are suffering not because of Islam but the divisiveness in the societies is the main reason of their backwardness.

Naipaul verily follow the Orientalists' construction of the Muslim as 'other' in both travel works and remain focused on the fundamentalist Islam. He does not regard the evolution of Islam as syncretic religion developed by incorporating so many various civilizations and culture and ignores multicultural trends found among the people of these countries. Following the syncretic view these non-Arabs Muslims have not only devotion for their religious center but they have also great admiration for their own cultural heritage. Both travel works lack contextual knowledge; Naipaul has presented a highly crafted truth, confining Islam only to fundamentalism and extremism. He considers few people as a representative sample whole Muslim community. It is quite disquieting that a person, who is always assumed as the upholder of broader perspective, only presents a partial view of the Muslim world. By negating the wide diversity within religion Islam. Naipaul agrees with the core conceptualization of Orientalism in which West is presented as superior and rest is treated as inferior and 'other.'

In Bakhtinian analogy Naipaul is monologist always at the helm of dictating his view leaving no space for any dialogue and other voices to be heard. Therefore, he embraces the basic tenants of Orientalist discourse treating developing world and other faiths as 'other'. Particularly his views pertaining to Pakistan follow the revised position of the west regarding the Muslim that is reflects much of the antipathy. Reiteration of colonial legacy of colonized 'othering' constitutes a monologic content of Naipaul when he is lauding the existence of Europe as a center, superior to the east as well as ascribing denigration of the Islamic East.



## References

- Al-Quaderi, G. G., & Habibullah, M. (2012). Travels in absurdity: Islam and V.S Naipaul. *Journal of Postcolonial Cultures and Societies*, 3(1), 22-37.
- Bakhtin, M.M.(1981) Discourse in the Novel . in M. Holquist(Ed.) *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist.(pp259-422) Austin, Tx: University of Texas Press.
- Barnouw, D. ( 2003). *Naipaul's Strangers*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bawer, B. (2002). Civilization and VS Naipaul. *The Hudson Review*, 55(3), 371-384.
- Coovadia, I. (2009). *Authority and Authorship in V.S.Naipaul*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cudjoe, S. R.(1988). *V. S.Naipaul: A Materialist Reading*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P.
- Fadwa, A.R. (2006). V. S. Naipaul: The white traveler under the dark mask" *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics* ,168-190 .
- Goodheart, E. (1981). Naipaul and the Voices of Negation. *Salmagundi*, (54), 44-58.
- Griffith, G. A. (1993). Travel narrative as cultural critique: V.S. Naipaul's travelling theory. *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, 28(2), 87-92.
- Huntington, S. P. (1997). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. Penguin Books India.
- King, B. (2003). *V.S. Naipaul*. London: Macmillan.
- Leela, G.(1998). *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Malak, A. (1984). Among the believers: two views: VS Naipaul and the believers. *Modern Fiction Studies*, 30(3), 561-566.
- Malak, A. (2006). Naipaul's travelogues and the " clash of civilizations" complex. *Cross Currents*, 261-268.
- May, B. (2001). Memorials to modernity: Postcolonialism and pilgrimage in Naipaul and Rushdie. *ELH*, 68(1), 241-265.
- Mottale, M. (2010). VS Naipul and Islam. *Caribbean Quarterly*, 56(3), 71-79.
- Mukherjee, P. (2007). Doomed to smallness : Voilence , V S . Naipaul , and the global south. *The Year book of English Studies*, 37(1), 209-226.
- Naipaul, V. S. (1981). *Among the Believers: An Islamic Journey*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Naipaul, V. S. (1998). *Beyond Belief*. New York: Random House.
- Naipaul, V. S. (2002). Postscript: Our universal civilization. *The Writer and the World*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 503-517.
- Nixon, R. (2003). Among the Mimics and the Parasites: VS Naipaul's Islam. In *The New Crusades: Constructing the Muslim Enemy* (pp. 152-169). Columbia University Press.

Ray, S. (2005) Postscript: popular perceptions of postcolonial studies after 9/11. In Schwarz, H & Ray, S. (Eds.) *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*. London: Blackwell.

Said, E.W. (1995). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.

Thieme, J. (1987). Searching for a Centre: The writing of VS Naipaul. *Third World Quarterly*, 9(4), 1352-1365.

Wright, L. (2002). Naipaul: more right than wrong. *Caribbean Quarterly*, 48, no. 2/3 (2002): 69-70.