



A Study on Indian Female Diasporic Writers in English

Dr.Rituraj

Associate Professor

Department of English

Kulbhaskar Ashram PG College, Allahabad, UP

Abstract

This article simultaneously covers two relevant subjects. The book's opening section talks about the history, context, and current status of Indian diasporic writing and its reception and any controversies it has encountered. The following section of the essay examines the many challenges that Indian women authors of diasporic descent confront while writing on behalf of their nation. The claim that Indian women authors in the diaspora exoticise and orient their experience is explored in detail. The second half of this thesis undertakes a detailed examination of various kinds of feminism to illustrate how female authors may achieve an integrated approach to resolve the many difficulties that arise in the works of diasporic female protagonists. This piece begins with a broad assessment of Indian diasporic literature, followed by a detailed examination of the problems facing women authors of Indian origin. One last method is how Indian women authors in diaspora may address both first and third world feminist concerns in their writing on a more global scale.

Keywords: Indian diasporic writing, diasporic women writers, feminism

Introduction:

English writing from India is gradually becoming a celebrated kind of literature for both readers and prize-panel judges. Indian English writing has been enjoying tremendous success, as seen by awards and best-selling status. It is possible to understand the history of English writing in India by reflecting on its colonial background. Many of the writings of the subcontinent deal with intense emotions, such as pleasure and terror, in regards to the history of the region. India's authors and their tales were affected inextricably by independence and partition in the 1940s. In addition to this, Morey (2000) suggests that Indian literature is being blended by "written and oral traditions, teleological and Cyclical understandings of history and narrative, and the re-invigoration of both language and genre" (Morey, 2000, p.16). Postcolonial authors, having freed themselves from the "long shadow of British writers" and "become that main road, rather than some dark and rather exotic side street," can address the traditional assumptions that pervade our society (Morey, 2000, p. 16). But, despite Indian English writing has its own set of standards, its reception was first reluctant. Several significant changes have marked the history of Indian novels and their reception. English literary criticism was born in the shadow of empire in the nineteenth century. As a



result, it was biased toward Eurocentric views, in which tropical literature was considered inferior. Indian English literature's narrative style saw its most significant alteration during its transition from colonial to postcolonial status. One may see evidence of gradual development and revolutionary breaks from a previous time in the history of Indian English literature. As explained by Gita Rajan (2006), this timeline of literary history "begins with Forster, reaches its climax with Rushdie, and culminates in today's writers and writers-to-be, who are writing stories about our relationship to values, ethics, and humanity" (p. 139).

Demarcation of Historical Phases of Indian English Writing:

The division of Indian English writing into colonial, postcolonial, and cosmopolitan periods is concurrent with the topic and narrative approach variations. Postcolonial authors appear, in contrast to colonial writers, to focus on ideas of nation-building. According to Riemenschneider (2005), "those ideas" were "remote from or disillusioned with" them (p.16). Postcolonial authors possess new confidence when it comes to writing in English. Sunanda Mongia (1997) explains that the Indian literature in English has transformed and may now be seen as a sequence of alterations defined by themes being replaced by linguistic assimilation and final cultural appropriation (p. 213). Both psychologically and technically, the conquerors' language is a challenging undertaking.

The complex process of transformation and modifications will take a long time. According to Mongia (1997), Indian English writing is divided into three main groups. Raj Mohan's Wife (1865) is a prime example of the "nativeness" of the English novel. Following this, writers like Mulk Raj Anand, RK Narayan, and Raja Rao entered the literary scene in the 1930s. Although it was still a problem for authors of the postcolonial era, the "clandestine illegal use of a conquering language" stopped being one for writers of Indian English novels. Some used Orientalism as a (Mongia, 1997, p. 214). These writers show themselves as "an object" for Western eyes and utilise the "exotic orient" as the substance of their work (Mongia, 1997, p. 214).

Although most postcolonial authors were unable to overcome their inhibitions, they were able to establish their individuality. An example is that Indian diaspora writers' English use is not stiff because they interact daily with English (Pollock, 2003, p.3).

According to Sheldon I. Pollock, Indian diasporic English writers can evoke the scents of Indian life in their works. It's a "combination of continuity and experimentation," he says (Pollock, 2003, p.3). Further investigation is needed to determine the extent to which postcolonial diasporic writers have been faithful to tradition and have pushed the limits of narrative experimentation.



History of Indian English Writing:

Mulk Raj Anand, RK Narayan, and Raja Rao helped to spearhead the rise of Indian English literature in the mid-1930s. Around the middle of the 1950s and 1960s, writers like Arun Joshi, Anita Desai, Kamala Markandaya, Ruth Praver Jhabvala, and Nayantara Sahgal made major advances. According to Mukesh Ranjan Verma, these writers “turned the tables on Indian English literature,” Mukesh Ranjan Verma (Verma, 2002, p.1). Next, in the 1980s, writers of Indian descent living overseas began to acquire international acclaim. *Midnight's Children* by Salman Rushdie introduced a new literary style of playing with words and mixing imagination, humour, sarcasm, and satire. As this tendency has continued, Indian English fiction's next phase will be marked by “a broadening of subjects and increased artistic experimentation.” A revival of women's writing was another critical feature of this period (Jain, 1997, p.60). Jasbir Jain's quote about the evolution of English-language Indian fiction has an equivalent paraphrase by Mukesh Ranjan Verma, who noted that “ the most remarkable aspect of modern Indian English fiction has been the development of female literature” (Verma, 2002, p.5). He adds that the female authors speak up on behalf of women in a historically male-dominated environment, sharing their sorrows, desires, and declarations (Verma, 2002, p.5). Women authors hence have made a significant mark in the postcolonial Indian English literary scene. Following independence, a considerable challenge for Indian English literature was the conflict between the nation and the individual self. Postcolonial Indian English authors were faced with a dilemma of representation, which had them pick between two options: portraying Indian nationalism or expressing their unique selves. Indian writing was initially accorded the “generous expansiveness typically afforded to the Indian nation” according to an examination of postcolonial Indian English literature (Kumar, 2004, p.xvi). Even though representing the nation was their duty, they nevertheless produced a massive national effort (Kumar, 2004, p.xvi). The consequences of such measures may be a division between the individual and the nation. Josna E. Rege (1997) discusses this in her piece, “Victim become Protagonist?” *Midnight's Children* and the Post-Rushdie National Narratives of the Eighties” outlines the post-independence period of India as a time when “the personal is thoroughly nationalised, taking on the nation's ideology at every social level” (Rege, 1997, p.348). It is not hard to imagine that impositions like these will at some point impede or perhaps mute the natural, spontaneous flow of writing. Rege emphasises that Indian critics of an Indian English essay in the 1970s equivocally called it “Janus-faced,” a reference to Tom Nair's description of “the contemporary Janus” for the nation (as cited in Rege, 1997, p.256). Homi Bhabha also adds to this idea, noting that a country is defined by ambivalence. The national storey reflects that ambivalence (as cited in Rege, 1997, p.256). Rege believes that many Indian authors of the sixties and seventies were forced to abandon their links to society by the imposition of a nationalistic central government. Authors in this period were “destroyed by the contradictions between their reality and the nationalist ideal,” and their works were “deadened by the creative stalemate that ensued,” as the nationalists



wanted the writers to represent their interests as a people, not as individuals (Rege, 1997, p.348). In the 1960s and 1970s, Indian English literature had to balance between Indian "authenticity" and English "correctness" by walking a "tightrope" (Rege, 1997, p.364).

New Theme and Style of Postcolonial Indian Novel:

A new standard for postcolonial Indian English writing arose in the 1980s when Rushdie's *Midnight's Children* offered a new type of storey with a unique style. Rege calls this fresh beginning "a discursive redesign of the self-nation connection" (Rege, 1997, p.342). In *Midnight's Children*, India's children searched for the flexibility of Indian identity, which was contradicted by a rigid national identity. Identity is complex and can be difficult, complex, and numerous. For the modern Indian English authors, Rege asserts, this notion was incredibly freeing as it allowed them to talk and write in a multitude of voices and forms (Rege, 1997, p.243). The authors of the 1980s escaped the position of national self-representation placed on them and instead worked to find unique selves.

Indian English authors of the 1980s were encouraged by their newfound confidence, allowing them to experiment with their form and substance. This new voice, as Rege explains, is founded on a realisation of the creative potential of ambivalence, with an emphasis on both one's own identity and that of the nation at the same time (Rege, 1997, p.366). While before this time, the authors had written only for themselves, they soon began to take their stories into the real world, forsaking their earlier use of subjectivity. Not all of them, however, were innovative or noteworthy. According to Rege, many of these people used their newly acquired freedom to seek a place for themselves in a state, or they found themselves estranged from any identity and accountability (Rege, 1997, p.367). While a desire for a sense of belonging and a distaste for all forms of connectedness are common in Indian English writing from the 1980s, a tendency toward a yearning for a strong connection to one's roots is also a significant theme.

Diasporic writing, a sub-genre of postcolonial writing, began to appear during these advancements in Indian English literature. The record of Indian diasporic writing begins in 1794 with the publication of *The Travels of Dean Mahomet*, which was written by an Indian, Deen Mahomed (1759-1851), who moved to England in 1784. Mirza Abu Taleb Khan, another writer, published a storey in Persian on his experiences in Europe. Because of the two writers' differing languages, their viewpoints are distinct. Deen Mahomed utilises English to communicate, so his speeches to Europeans are on behalf of his fellow countrymen. Whereas Abu Taleb, who had lived in Europe, wrote to his friends and family in India about his adventures. After that lengthy journey, Diasporic Indian literature has evolved dramatically. Indian postcolonial literature is inhabited by writers like V.S. Naipaul, Salman Rushdie, Amitav Ghosh, Anita Desai, Bharati Mukherjee, Rohinton Mistry, Kiran Desai, Chitra Banerjee Divakaruni, and Jhumpa Lahiri, who are predominantly expatriate Indians.



Controversy Around Indian Diasporic Writing:

Despite the solid loyalty for postcolonial and diasporic Indian writers, these writers have been known to cause significant rifts with the West due to their recognition. The editor's Om Prakash Dwivedi and Lisa Lau (2014) examine the role of the global literary market in the spread of post-Rushdian Indian literature in English in the book *Indian Writing in English and the Global Literary Market*. The Indian writing in English from India and outside appears to be very different. "If one looks at the pattern and the structure of the euphoric success of the postrushdian IWE on the world literary market, it is evident that it tends to be marked by a higher prominence than Indian diasporic writers" (Dwivedi and Lau, 2014, p.2). This statement links the Western publication policies to the creation and promotion of Indian diasporic writing in English. Dwivedi expounds further by discussing the distinction in how Indian ethnicity is represented by writers from within and outside of India. He believes that Eurocentric research and postcolonial studies devote much of their attention to the diasporic version of India (Dwivedi and Lau, 2014, p.2-3).

Postcolonial and diasporic Indian writing, as noted by Tabish Khair (2014), is characterised by a complex connection. As Khair points out in the introduction to the book *Literature of the Indian Diaspora*, "it is impossible to tell, at least in the context of Indian kinds of literature in English, which is the evil twin and which the good one" because postcolonialism and diaspora (Khair, 2014, p.vii). This is an especially relevant statement in the Indian context because of the country's colonial history. Postcolonial literature supports a new kind of colonisation in specific ways by contributing to the commodification of human experiences.

Defending Indian Diasporic Writing:

However, Indian English authors who are members of the diaspora can't be dismissed as neocolonial writers whose popularity comes at the expense of their country's history, culture, and customs. The literary, social studies and anthropology communities recognise diaspora writing as a notable tradition across the world. When they are faced with the difficult task of absorbing numerous cultural identities, diasporic writers are compelled to develop a hybrid, cosmopolitan self. Countries that have previously been colonised often hold conflicting views about postcolonial and diasporic studies. After this, I have to reference Partha Chatterjee extensively, who wrote "Our Modernity." Chatterjee notes that Indians' belief in their own culture, which is linked to the history of colonialism, is why they don't fully embrace the notion of free expression for everyone (Chatterjee, 1997, p.14).

Because of this idea that colonialism and modernity might coexist, there is a certain amount of cynicism about anything new, which is considered degrading and embarrassing in the Indian social, historical, and literary scenes. Regardless, it is impossible to avoid modernising a people's culture, like breathing in the fresh air. Ideas about imperialist activities and opposition to them are part of modern society, but so is their consciousness. In an astute



remark, Chatterjee argues that modernity has the components of "reason, fantasies of liberation; the desire for power, opposition to authority." Modernity doesn't provide a promised land separate from the network of power (Chatterjee, 1997, p.19). That means the only way to confront modernity is to understand how to manage it. To paraphrase Chatterjee, I'll now quote again. Therefore, he claims that one cannot support or reject modernity; one can only come up with solutions. This author notes that these methods may be helpful in some instances but they can also be harmful. In some cases, they may be kind, but they are also rather brutal and aggressive in others (Chatterjee, 1997, p.19). The diasporic authors need to find a method to express themselves that is not always straightforward and innocent to cope with their new life.

As Sheo Bhushan Shukla and Anu Shukla highlight in *Migrant Voices in Literature in English*, it is necessary to change the narrative around diasporic literature. They believe that a new discourse should include a "blend of the East and the West, neither of which should be overwhelmingly Oriental" (S. Shukla, 2006; A. Shukla, 2006, p.16). Many writers of Indian descent base their characters on traditional Indian stereotypes of men and women, but they "reinvigorate" them and "fill them with new vitality and a thirst for the unknown and unknowable" (S. Shukla, 2006; A. Shukla, 2006, p.16). Unlike other writers, these authors use "inscribe" rather than "describe" when speaking of India, and instead of creating new myths, they recreate old (S. Shukla, 2006; A. Shukla, 2006, p.16).

Such literature is best grasped in the whole of its complexity and collaboration. Sandra Ponzanesi examines the difficulty of writing about dislocation in diasporic writers by discussing the concept of their existential dispersion (Ponzanesi, 2004, p.xiv). By stating this, she shows the concept of diasporic spaces, which she describes as allowing for the depiction of individuals who straddle two or more cultures, languages, and ethnicities, and who give a method of understanding postcolonialism as blurring the borders of national enclaves (Ponzanesi, 2004, p.xv). Diasporic and postcolonial writers shake up the established imperial discourse by altering the meaning of the centre and periphery. They describe how they've developed their unique and complex views on the cultures that adopted them and how they saw themselves as multi-cultural authors (Ponzanesi, 2004, p.21). Since the writer is a diasporic one, a multifaceted identity is a product of this position's various roots. Even though the shift may be unpleasant, their move to hybridity might change their experience of dislocation and loss. As Gina Wisker suggests: "The writing practise of discovering and expressing a sense of identity, place, and voice may shift the discourse with diaspora from one of loss and liminality to a new configuration of hybridity and cosmopolitanism" (Wisker, 2006, p.22). Thus, there is no way to ignore diasporic literature as neo-colonial or market-driven. To grasp the intricacies and complications of diasporic literature, one must instead be rational.



Diasporic literature, an influential genre, is defined by its origins in a painful separation from home, having a “peripheral identity” and a “cosmopolitan life” all at once, as noted by Ponzanesi (2004, p.12). Ponzanesi and Bernheimer say that migrant literature's power is derived from the writers' state of being un-homed. This sense of the dispossession—a type of haunting by otherness—is the primary emphasis of migrant writing, according to Bernheimer (as cited in Ponzanesi, 2004, p.12).

Indian Diasporic Writing and Gender Politics:

While gender politics in Indian diasporic literary critique are most typically associated with Indian American women authors and their fictitious female characters, they are equally applicable to male Indian American writers. Female and male authors of South Asian ancestry who migrated to the West, as per critics such as Patricia Chu, Gita Rajan, and Shailja Sharma, exhibit a difference in literary styles. The Chu shows that Asian American integration narratives are gendered, resulting from social and cultural concerns (the Chu, 2000, p.4). Asian women's migration has long been limited by culture and customs. The female authors who were forced to emigrate were required to build an identity using different tools than their Western peers.

According to the Chu, the depiction of women as “symbols” of “landscape, society, and nation rather than active subjects” disallows Asian American female authors from envisioning themselves as independent individuals (Chu, 2000, p.5). Moreover, women's domestic duties offer them fewer opportunities to further develop their writing by following academic procedures. They act as cultural judges because of this. While historicism, geopolitics, and imperialism are often seen as the basic bricks, the three authors above are thought to be of more importance to female writers for their portrayals of ethnic authenticity.

Gita Rajan points out that the South Asian authors who preceded them were all literary. She splits them from popular writers like Monica Ali, Rukhsana Ahmed, Shyam Selvadurai, Mohsin Hamid, and Chitra Banerjee Divakaruni. Rajan links Jhumpa Lahiri with the latter group of writers, noting that Lahiri is positioned in “an intriguing historical-cultural (Rajan, 2006, p.123). Lahiri's achievement, Rajan believes, comes from her ability to “build relatable, familiar characters and situations” as well as her ability to confront “uncomfortable, ethical issues” (pg 124).

In the introduction to *Indian Writing in English and the Global Literary Market*, authors Om Prakash Dwivedi and Lisa Lau note that Indian women writers writing in English have increased a book's marketability by "agitating" the "production, distribution, and consumption" of Indian writing in English (Dwivedi and Lau, 2014, p.6). Domestication and exoticisation are used to undercut the political meaning of literature with themes like antiracism and feminism. Belen Martin-Lucas examines how Western readers' romantic



perceptions of content supersede a book's literary merits. The first page of a South Asian writer's book, as noted by Martin-Lucas, may depict ladies in traditional clothing. Still, those women may be “accompanied by visual elements” like “pagodas or dragons, which connote all things other” (Martin-Lucas, 2012, p.92). Western publishers more widely market Asian women's work because of the broader exoticisation and objectification of women employed for economic objectives. Martin-Lucas notes that “publishers like to depict stories of a female's strength and rebellion in an old-fashioned environment of violent customs” (Martin-Lucas, 2012, p.91). As a result, Indian women writers' marketing methods threaten the literary value of their novels.

One could wonder if South Asian female writers meet Western readers' need for an exotic depiction of the East. Regardless of its economic viability for the writers, this orientalisering endeavour would not be appealing to South Asian readers. Even successful Western authors may not want to market their ethnicity to Western readers in an unusual way. One shouldn't judge the works of these writers only in terms of their orientalisering nature. The publishing sector can conduct a specific style of representation for profit. However, this endeavour does not in any way impact the quality of the writing. Nevertheless, the argument about exoticising of South Asia is unavoidable in diasporic writers' works, which leads to the topic of orientalisering.

In American national identity, which is both paradigmatic and exceptional, the concepts of “real” and “exotic” as means of representation are increasingly problematised (Grewal, 2005, p.2). The line between genuine and exotic is becoming more difficult to discern as boundaries become more porous. Questions of racism and imperialism surround the United States as a global location. Grewal believes that the United States' alleged globalisation was cosmopolitan and imperial (Grewal, 2005, p.22). Because of this, South Asian diasporic writers towards the close of the twentieth century created new gendered colonial subjects. The conclusion that can be drawn from the points raised in the preceding paragraph is that the U.S. diasporic female subjects are met with various obstacles regarding identarian affinities in the socio-cultural and political setting. These people are not able to establish a simple, clear identity that is clear and certain.

Judith Butler (2004) quotes Gloria Anzaldúa saying “I am no unitary subject. I carry within myself countless subject positions that are all conflicted, that are all violently asserted and defended, that are all negated and contested” to illustrate the complexity of multiple identities (Butler, 2004, p.227-228). To accurately capture the essence of an immigrant woman of colour, it is crucial to acknowledge the myriad of personal ties that shape who we are, contends Butler (Butler, 2004, p.228). She asks a rhetorical question that affirms her view that the diversity of threads that make up the identity of Anzaldúa may be united.



In her identity, Anzaldua embodies a diversity of attributes. Postcolonial women and women of colour demand to be recognised for their diversity instead of being thought of as sisters in the global feminist movement, which the West spearheaded. The complex amalgamation of history, ethnicity, culture, class, politics, and gender characterises diasporic South Asian women in the United States influences their identity development. To truly comprehend the plight of these women from diverse backgrounds, it is vital to analyse the discrepancies in different strains of feminism. These women have to resolve their difficulties as women first and then as women who are displaced. The double identity they hold is more complex for them than for their local and foreign peers. No matter how you look at it, they are in the middle of a transition. It's a constant battle for them to reconcile their heritage with their environment. Even though they are willing to follow their emotions and make their judgments, it is evident that they are courageous enough to listen to their thoughts. This stance makes them appear independent and unbound by borders. Chapter 1's last portion covers the issue of plurality and its significance to the fictional characters' identity development.

Identity Formation of Diasporic Indian Women Writers:

Western feminism, which has traditionally focused on white women, can't address the issues South Asian women migrants face in the U.S. and other Western nations. Their racial and cultural diversity is an essential component of their identity. Other schools of feminism, such as postcolonial and postmodern feminism, argue that it is necessary to establish feminisms rather than feminism. They highlight the need of incorporating women's problems rather than the typical portrayal of them. These kinds of feminism also emphasise the issue of global female diversity. Second-wave feminism, the dominant form of feminism in the West, often conceptualises third world women as a monolithic, unified group. In Chandra Talpade Mohanty's (1991) view, Western feminist texts that present Third World women as a "singular, monolithic" subject present a flawed conception of Third World women because the representation of women as a "generalised" and "unhistorical" subject assumes a "unitary and universal unity between women based on a subordination they share" (Mohanty, 1991, p.17, 31). Women everywhere are sharing in the experience of oppression, which unifies them. Homogeneity creates an issue for the word "women." Mohanty points out in her landmark article "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourse" that the term "feminist" indicates a discursively created group, neglecting another denotation of the term, namely women "as material subjects of their history" (Mohanty, 1991, p.23). Therefore, discursively defining "women" as such relies on the unique, local circumstances in which they establish their identities. You cannot avoid talking about social class and ethnic identity when it comes to the subject of putting third country women on the map as a single group.



Contrary to popular belief, women are not only female identities, rather, but they are also a mixture of social and political variables. To attempt to do so under a single banner is patently ridiculous. Because of this, the phrase “universal sisterhood” created by Robin Morgan, instead of applying to everyone, refers to a Western female stereotype (Morgan, 1996, p.1). However, the rigidity of the Western feminism/feminism of colour dichotomy has lost its usefulness as the world has moved on from a slower era of global capitalism. To oppose the new type of masculinist and racist politics developing with global capitalism, Western and third world feminism are fated to form a new sort of solidarity/ reconciliation. In light of the shifting political and economic climates, the diversity of South Asian feminism must be reinterpreted. In her article, Chandra Talpade Mohanty offers interesting ideas about the possible unity between the third world and Western feminism. Mohanty's approach to solidarity is also outlined in this chapter. Despite Mohanty's objection, some feminist theorists, such as Phillips, believe that the different feminisms may understand one another. The type of reconciliation needed in third world feminism occasionally comes about when there is a division between white and third world feminism, which might create another deadlock. Third World feminism cannot be seen as a monolithic mass of distinct identities in opposition to Western, white, middle-class feminism. Underplaying the value of individuality might lead others to think of it as weird. Bell Hooks (1992) discusses this issue by stating that "the commercialisation of difference," in which diversity is represented as exotica, "is the portrayal of white culture as the bland dish that is livened up by the addition of ethnic spice" (hooks, 1992, p.21).

If you just look at the multiplicity of South Asian women migrants, the study may stall. First and second-generation South Asian diaspora women may be better understood through a reconciliation strategy that unites white and third-world feminisms. The term “white” is not defined in the context of this article. In her piece “U.S. Third World Feminism: The Theory and Method of Oppositional Consciousness in the Postmodern World” by Chela Sandoval (2009), she mentions a possible coalition between white and third-world feminisms. Zinn and Dill (1996) argued that the inability of feminism to address differences has led to a stagnant level of thought due to a lack of attention to the power relations that follow distinction. The inclusion of different strands of thinking can assist in avoiding misinterpreting third country feminist discourse. Linda Alcoff (1988) believes that the phrase “woman of colour” contradicts itself since it “reinforces the relevance of skin colour,” which “should have no meaning” (Alcoff, 1988, p.436). An inclusive strategy must be reinterpreted and reconstructed to reach all sorts of feminisms. Alcoff points out that "in the process of reinterpretation and reconstruction of our political identity, women and women in connection to the world and one another" a new theory should be created (Alcoff, 1988, p.436). Alcoff's idea might help analyse South Asian migrant women's negotiation with the West since it will



draw attention to the multiplicity of their identities while also making their blending with the West more apparent.

Conclusion:

The inclusion of third-world and white feminism is key to developing a sound, well-rounded ideology that will improve women's lives everywhere. In her 2003 essay "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses," Chandra Talpade Mohanty says, "I did not write this essay as a declaration of the impossibility of egalitarian and non-colonising cross-cultural scholarship, nor did I define Western and Third World feminism in such oppositional ways that there would be no possibility of solidarity between Western and Third World feminists" (Mohanty, 2003, p.5). Mohanty is rebutting certain critics' oversimplification of some terminology she used in her initial essay. The review of the article also serves to clear up some of Mohanty's ideas that stirred up a lot of controversies. Mohanty thinks that all feminisms, regardless of boundaries, are united in some way. The last argument of this study is that a broad view of feminism may help Indian women diasporic authors to produce a sort of writing that would depict the lives of the diasporic female characters in their daily struggles with shifting identities.

Many female writers have already achieved considerable success using this method. Indian diasporic literature is enriched and enlivened by the stories and novels of women authors, whose work accompanies their male counterparts. Thus, as can be seen, it seems diasporic women authors are in a position to piece together diverse elements of the world to portray the storey of women's tenacity and malleability.

References:

1. Alcoff, Linda. (1988). Cultural Feminism versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory. *Signs* 13(3), 405-436. jstor. Retrieved from www.citeulike.org/user/kem126/article/7999624
2. Butler, Judith. (1992). Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of 'Postmodernism.' In Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists Theorise the Political* (pp.3-21). New York, Routledge.
3. Butler, Judith. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.
4. Chatterjee, Partha. (1997). *Our Modernity*. Rotterdam/Dakar: South-South Exchange Programme for Research on the History of Development (SEPHIS) and the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA). Retrieved from cscs.res.in/data/archive/textfiles/textfile.2010-12-24.3303392527/file
5. The Chu, Patricia P. (2000). *Assimilating Asians: Gendered Strategies of Authorship in Asian America*. Durham: Duke University Press.



6. Dwivedi, Om Prakash, and Lau, Lisa. (Eds.) (2014). *Indian Writing in English and the Global Literary Market*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
7. Grewal, Inderpal. (2005). *Transnational America: Feminisms, Diasporas, Neoliberalisms*. Durham: Duke University Press.
8. hooks, bell. (1992). *Black Looks Race and Representation*. Boston: South End Press.
9. Jain, Jasbir. (1997). *The Plural Tradition: Indian English Fiction*. In Ram Sewak Singh Delhi: and Charu Sheel Singh (Eds.), *Spectrum History of Indian Literature in English* (pp.55-90). New Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.
10. Khair, Tabish. (2014). Foreword. In Om Prakash Dwivedi and Lisa Lau (Eds.), *Indian Writing in English and the Global Literary Market* (pp. vii-ix). By. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
11. Kumar, Amitava. (Ed.). (2004). *Away: The Indian Writer as an Expatriate*. New York: Routledge.
12. Martin-Lucas, Belen. (2012). *Grammars of Exchange: The "Oriental Woman" in the Global Market*. In Christine Kim, Sophie McCall, and Melina Baum Singer (Eds.), *Cultural Grammars of Nation, Diaspora, and Indigeneity in Canada* (pp.83-96). Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press.
13. Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. (1991). *Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses*. In Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres (Eds.), *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (pp.51-80). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
14. Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. (2003). *Under Western Eyes" Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles*. *Signs* 28(2), 499-535. /doi/abs/10.1080/
15. Morgan, Robin. (Ed.). (1996). *Planetary Feminism: The Politics of the 21st Century. Sisterhood is Global: The International Women's Movement Anthology* (pp.1-40). New York: The Feminist Press at the City University of New York.
16. Mongia, Sunanda. (1997). *Recent Indian Fiction in English: An Overview*. In Ram Sewak Singh and Charu Sheel Singh (Eds.), *Spectrum History of Indian Literature in English* (pp.213-232). New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.
17. Morey, Peter. (2000). *Fictions of India: Narrative and Power*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Limited.
18. Pollock, Sheldon I. (Ed.). (2003). *Literary Culture in History: Reconstructions from South Asia*. California: University of California Press.
19. Ponzanesi, Sandra. (2004). *Paradoxes of Postcolonial Culture: Contemporary Women Writers of the Indian and Afro-Italian Diaspora*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
20. Rajan, Gita. (2006). *Ethical Responsibility in Intersubjective Spaces: Reading Jhumpa Lahiri's Interpreter of Maladies and "A Temporary Matter."* In Shirley Geok-lin Lim, John Blair Gamber, Stephen Hong Sohn and Gina Valentino (Eds.). *Transnational*



-
- Asian American Literature: Sites and Transits (pp.123-141).Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
21. Rege, Josna E. (1997). Victim into Protagonist? Midnight's Children and the Post-Rushdie National Narratives of the Eighties. *Studies in the Novel* 29(3), 342-375. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/29533221>
 22. Riemenschneider, Dieter. (2005). *The Indian Novel in English: Its Critical Discourse, 1934-2004*.Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
 23. Sandoval, Chela. (2009). U.S. third world feminism: The theory and method of oppositional consciousness in the postmodern world. In George Henderson and Marvin Waterstone (Eds.), *Geographic Thought: A Praxis Perspective* (pp.338-354). London: Routledge.
 24. Shukla, Sheo Bhushan, and Anu Shukla. (2006). *Migrant Voices in Literature in English*. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons.
 25. Srikanth, Rajini. (2004). *The World Next Door: South Asian American Literature and the Idea of America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
 26. Verma, Mukesh Ranjan. (2002). Indian English Novel since 1980. In Mukesh Ranjan Verma and Krishna Autar Agarwal (Eds.), *Reflections on Indian English Literature* (pp.1-7). New Delhi: Sarup & Sons.
 27. Wisker, Gina. (2006). Dialogues of Belonging: Black and Asian British Women's Diasporan Writing. In Sheo Bhushan Shukla and Anu Shukla (Eds.), *Migrant Voices in Literature in English* (pp.19-41). New Delhi: Sarup & Sons.
 28. Zinn, Maxine Baca, and Bonnie Thornton Dill. (1996). Theorising Difference from Multiracial Feminism. *Feminist Studies* 22(2),321-331. Retrieved from philpapers.org/rec/ZINTDF