

I. INTRODUCTION

Trauma: A Driving Force in *A Turn in the South*

The present research is an inquiry into the traumatic experiences of the writer who visits American South and links most of the events and incidents with his childhood and the life of West Indies. Naipaul's approach, as he says, is to define a theme and to allow it to develop. And his theme in this case began with a book he knew from his own Trinidad childhood, *Up from Slavery*, by Booker T Washington. His discoveries began with his accompanying two friends to the home of one of them in a small town called Bowen. "Home" - the identification of "one patch of the earth" (3) as home - is something Naipaul says he does not have, although he frequently refers in this book to the Trinidad of his early life, and to its customs and history. Naipaul meets and listens to people from all parts of the community, old and young, radical and liberal, religious and atheistic, black and white, his voyage of discovery takes him to Atlanta, Charleston, Tallahassee, Tuskegee Jackson, Nashville and Chapel Hill.

The civil war and its lingering effects on loyalties and ways of thinking, the importance of religion and the sense of community it fosters; the Civil Rights movement, its results and its continuing struggles' and the pervasive awareness of colour, race, and family history; all these are an important part of Naipaul's book. He seems to tap into a pervasive sense of loss for the old community values. It also seems the rapidity of change in the fifty years has meant that new patterns of living and working have broken up the old, close-knit families and communities.

Naipaul often finds link between the Southern States and the West Indies. And he discovers parallels between their histories and notes the difference which slavery and eventual freedom from slavery have made in two areas. Naipaul's memories of his own culture and its history add footnotes to the stories he is told but, more than

anything, it is the people Naipaul meets and their thoughts and ideas which make *A Turn in the South* so interesting and valuable. The reflexion of his tour of the region could have assisted in furthering the basic inquiry that had previously taken him to Africa and India, the Caribbean and Latin America. Whatever he has witness in Caribbean country haunts him and comes as a flashback which ultimately pull him back to his own childhood island Trinidad. The experience of the colonial Trinidad in his childhood reflects in the South.

The book starts off in a highly unlikely way, with Naipaul journeying into the South in the company of two black Americans, a designer and lettering artist and his assistant, Howard, for an Easter visit to Howard's home. The idea that Howard believes that he has a home is itself central to the journey, for he has surprised both his employer and Naipaul with his response to his boss's question, "Howard, if I had to give up, and you couldn't get another job, what would you do?" Howard had replied, "I would go home to my mama" (3). Naipaul writes:

Jimmy [the employer] was as struck by this as I was when Jimmy told me that Howard had something neither Jimmy nor I had, a patch of the earth he thought of as home, absolutely his. And that was where--many months after I had heard this story--I thought I should begin this book about the South with the home that Howard had. (3)

This sense of wonder at Howard's confidence about home introduces from the start a central element in Naipaul's identity as a writer--his own sense of homelessness. Out of this feeling evolved much of his career as a writer of nonfiction, as well as important aspects of his career in fiction. He is a man without a home in his native Trinidad, although most of his family is still there. Naipaul concedes a similarity between his black subjects and himself. He too, although of the Brahmin caste in

Hinduism, cannot go back more than two generations before losing the past. Certain things are lost for him, the grandson of immigrants from India to Trinidad, ancestors as close as grandparents are mysterious, and some unknown, making it impossible to give a good answer, after just a hundred years, to a question like: Where did your people come from? His link to his family's past in India, however humble that past might have been, had been severed by the indentured servitude that brought Indians to Trinidad in the second half of the nineteenth century to work in cane fields that the former slaves now disdained. His grandparents arrived in the New World, the spine of their history broken, to attempt a new life in a place where (as Naipaul tells us most eloquently perhaps in *The Loss of El Dorado*, which traces the history of Trinidad from Columbus to the end of slavery), nothing happened. Nothing happened because, with the abolition of slavery in 1833, the British abandoned the colonies (in spite of a continuing colonial administration) as the course of empire led elsewhere. The Caribbean became a backwater.

Growing up in this backwater, Naipaul tells us here in *A Turn in South* his greatest terror was of falling "into nonentity" (33). At that point in his book he associates this fear with his later "feeling of taint and spiritual annihilation" (33) at seeing the human results of the swamping of East Indian culture in Martinique and Belize by non-Indian cultural values, which is to say African-American values. For this reason he concedes a point of similarity between himself and Howard's community, in the fore-closure of their sense of the past; and he concedes, too, his surprise at the formality and sense of community in the black church. But he concedes all those by way of empathy here.

The novel has been analyzed, criticized and appreciated by different critics from different views. Since the time *A Turn in the South* appeared on the literary

horizon in 1989, it has drawn the attention of good many critics and literary men. There are many critics who have criticized and appreciated the theme of politics and emphasized a sense of order, as well as shown an intense religious faith in this novel. But no one has tried to analyze this book as a traumatic experience of Naipaul. This dissertation is based on the close study of V. S. Naipaul's *A Turn in the South*. Here the researcher will see how Naipaul becomes one of the victims of trauma and how he re-experiences the events of his childhood life of Trinidad. As well as how his traumatic experiences revived when he was visiting the American South.

The present research work has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter represents the elaboration of title, short introduction to the author, a brief outline of this novel *A Turn in the South* and introductory outline of the present research study itself. It gives a short view of the entire book. The novel and its related aspects are introduced in it.

The second chapter tries to explain the theoretical modality that is going to be applied in this research work. It provides a short introduction to the trauma and trauma studies that is going to be used frequently in this research study. The theoretical modality moves around the Naipaul's text *A Turn in the South* and attempts to show how trauma and Naipaul's visiting of south are correlated to each other. The third chapter will be the analysis of the text *A Turn in the South* where concept of trauma helps to dig the reality of Naipaul's travel to the South. It will sort out some extracts from the text as evidence to prove the hypothesis of the study.

The fourth chapter is the conclusion of this present research work on the basis of analysis of the text done in chapter three. It will conclude the explanation and arguments put forward in the preceding chapters and show the prevalent internal

traumatic effect of the life of Naipaul. Thus, this research work will give a fair judgement of Naipaul on the basis of his novel *A Turn in the South*.

In nutshell, this research will study how V. S. Naipaul's East Indian nationality has crated a close link between the people of South and himself. It also shows how he became a pray to trauma without his conscience. He thought he has sympathy towards Southerners but instead of that he empathesized on himself and his own origin. Hence, it will be an effort to study how trauma has created a space on the mind of Naipaul.

II. Trauma and Empathy

The term 'trauma theory' first appears in Caruth's *Unclaimed Experience*. Though this critical category frequently referred in the writing of Humanities, its provenance and reach are rarely traced as it raises questions about the nature and representation of traumatic events arising from different fields such as psychology, philosophy, ethics and aesthetics.

The trauma theory developed in the writings of Caruth, Felman and Laub owes much, on the one hand, to deconstruction, post structuralism and psychoanalysis. But it is also informed by (mainly US-based) clinical work with survivors of experiences designated as traumatic. This combination of influences can be traced through the contents of Caruth's *Trauma: Explorations in Memory* which includes, alongside chapters by Felman and Laub, contributions by the neuroscientists Van der Kolk and Van der Hart and the literary theorists Georges Bataille and Harold Bloom. It also includes the experience of survivors of the Holocaust and other catastrophic personal and collective experiences and the theoretical and methodological innovations that might be derived from this work and applied more generally to film and literary studies. The clinical work that has shaped trauma theory is informed by a particular and specific type of psychological theory influenced by developments within US psychoanalytic theory. Critical to these developments has been the codification of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Critical, too, has been the development, particularly in the United States of a neuroscientific approach to memory disorders. In this work, a Freudian emphasis on memory's relations with unconscious conflict, repression and fantasy is replaced by an understanding of memory as related to brain functioning.

Deconstruction was one of the theories which, along with these clinical developments, most shaped the emergence of trauma theory. Its influence can be traced through repeated references to the work of Paul de Man (Caruth's erstwhile teacher) throughout Caruth's *Unclaimed Experience* as well as through a chapter devoted to him in Felman and Laub's *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History*. To put things at their simplest, trauma theory appears to help the Humanities move beyond the impasses and crises in knowledge posed by these theories, without abandoning their insights. Trauma theory promises, that is, not a way round the difficulties presented by these theories, but a way through and beyond them.

The direct effects of external violence in psychic disorder are highly considered in the present era. Basically this trend is focused on "Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder"(PTSD), which describes an overwhelming experience of sudden, or catastrophic events, in which the response to the event occurs in the often delayed, and uncontrolled repetitive occurrence of hallucinations, flashbacks and other intrusive phenomena, dreams, thoughts or behaviors stemming from the event, along with numbing that may have begun during or after the experience, and possibly also increased arousal to (and avoidance of) stimuli recalling the events. As it is generally understood today, traumatic disorders reflect the direct imposition on the mind of the unavoidable reality of horrific events, the taking-over-psychically and neurobiologically-of the mind by an event that it cannot control. As such it is understood as the most real, and also most destructive psychic experience. And this traumatic problem is not only destruction but enigma of survival too. When we understand the paradoxical relation between them, we can recognize the legacy of incomprehensibility at the heart of catastrophic experience.

The Encarta Dictionary defines trauma as: 1. Emotional shock: an extremely distressing experience that causes severe emotional shock and may have long-lasting psychological effects 2. Bodily injury: a physical injury or wound to the body. These definitions of *The Encarta Dictionary* gives a clear vision that any types of severe pain or emotional event can cause lifelong effect on the human psychic. It can also be in the form of physical injury. Trauma may also be in the form of natural and technological disasters, war, or individual trauma.

There are different types of trauma. It can be physical, emotional, betrayal, mental, vicarious, inherited, structural, historical trauma etc. Physical is taken as a response to the physical injury which depends on the degree and the suddenness of the injury and the previous physical condition of the victim. Physical trauma is related more to physical hurts and damages which affect vital organs leading to the serious condition of the patients; emotional trauma occurs when “the psychological pain of a traumatic event involve damage or threat of damage to an individual’s psychic integrity or sense of self” (carlson29). Betrayal trauma occurs when the people or institutions we depend on for survival violate us in some way. In the same way, mental trauma is described as the neurosis as a disorder. Freud describes it as a disorder which has its roots in some experience long since consciously forgotten and repressed, and which later on manifests itself in nightmares, overwhelming anxieties and motor disturbances. Therefore physical and the psychological disturbance, arising from the unconscious remaining aftereffects of trauma upset the patient. (*Beyond the Pleasure Principle*19)

Freud, a great contributor in trauma theory, has raised problem of trauma in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. This piece, written in the aftermath of World War I, has been called upon as showing a direct relation between trauma and historical

violence, a directness presumably reflected in a theory of trauma. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* indeed opens with Freud's perplexed observation of a psychic disorder that appears to reflect the unavoidable and overwhelming imposition of violent events on the psyche. Faced with the striking occurrence of what were called the war neuroses in the wake of World War I, Freud is startled by the emergence of a pathological condition-the repetitive experience of nightmares and relivings of battlefield events-that is experienced like a neurotic pathology and yet whose symptoms reflect, in startling directness and simplicity, nothing but the unmediated occurrence of violent events. Freud, thus, compares it to the symptoms of another long-problematic phenomenon, the accident neurosis. The reliving of the battle can be compared, he says, to the nightmare of an accident:

Dreams occurring in traumatic neuroses have the characteristic of repeatedly bringing the patient back into the situation of his accident, a situation from which he wakes up in another fright. This astonished people far too little . . . anyone who accepts it as something self-evident that dreams should put them back at night into the situation that caused them to fall ill has misunderstood the nature of dreams.

(13)

The returning traumatic dream perplexes Freud because it cannot be understood in terms of any wish or unconscious meaning, but is, purely and inexplicably, the literal return of the event against the will of the one it inhabits. Unlike the symptoms of a normal neurosis, whose painful manifestations can be understood ultimately in terms of the attempted avoidance of unpleasurable conflict, the painful repetition of the flashback can only be understood as the absolute inability to avoid an unpleasurable event that has not been given psychic meaning in any way. In trauma, that is, the

outside has gone inside without any mediation. Taking this literal return of the past as a model for repetitive behavior in general, Freud ultimately argues, in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, that it is traumatic repetition, rather than the meaningful distortions of neurosis, that defines the shape of individual lives. The flashback is not the incomprehensibility of the event of one's near death, but the very incomprehensibility of one's own survival. It is this incomprehensibility of survival that is at the heart of Freud's formulation of the death drive. Freud compares the beginning of the history of the organism in the drive as the response to an awakening not unlike that of the nightmare:

The attributes of life were at some time awoken in inanimate matter by the action of a force of whose nature we can form no conceptionThe tension which then arose I what had hitherto been an inanimate substance endeavored to cancel itself out. In this way the first drive came into being; the drive to return to the inanimate state. (38)

Freud suggests that it is not the traumatic imposition of death, but the rather the traumatic "awakening to life" (35). Life itself, Freud suggests, is an awakening out of death for which there was no preparation. The origin of the drive is thus, precisely the experience of having passed beyond death without knowing it. Repetition, in other words, is not the attempt to grasp that one has almost died, but more fundamentally and enigmatically, the very attempt to claim one's own survival. If history is to be understood as the history of trauma, it is a history that is experienced as the endless attempt to assume one's survival as one's own. Starting from the accident neurosis to explain the nature of individual histories, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* can, thus, be said to ask what it would mean for history to be understood as the history of trauma.

Freud's later work, *Moses and Monotheism*, deals with this history which examines the delayed experience of trauma in the history of an entire people.

Cathy Caruth, one of the critics of the trauma studies, has also played a great role in order to disclose the truth of trauma studies. She believes trauma is incomprehensible by nature. She also says although it is comprehensible, it is referential as well. Caruth claims that victim of trauma, however reluctant to express his or her hidden traumatic truth, unknowing reveals certain personal truth. To add referential flavor to trauma, she says:

By turning away as we have suggested from a notion of traumatic experience a neurotic distortion, the authors of these essays bring us back continually to the surprising fact that trauma is not experienced as a more repressive of defense, but as a temporal delay that carries the individual beyond the shock of the first moment .the trauma is a repeated suffering of the event but it is also a continual leaving of its site. The traumatic re-experiencing of the event thus collapse of witnessing, the impossibility of knowing that first constituted it .and by carrying that impossibility of knowing that first constituted it. And by carrying that impossibility of knowing out of the empirical event itself ,trauma opens up and challenges us to a new kind of listening ,the witnessing, precisely ,of impossibility. (10)

By this speech she clarifies that the personal truth revealed by traumatic victim can be extended to the level of cultural and historical level. She also means to say that the traumatic experience may come to the traumatic victim in delayed form.

Similarly, Cathy Caruth in her book, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History*, is concerned principally with questions of reference and

representation: how trauma becomes text, or how wound becomes voice. Caruth sketches a theory of trauma as instigator of historical narrative which describes the intersections of traumatic narrative. Caruth argues that trauma as it first occurs is incomprehensible. Traumatic narrative, then, is strongly referential, but not in any simple or direct way. Berger cites Caruth to claim that the historical narrative arises from traumatic repetition. Caruth says “ the historical narrative arises from such intersections of traumatic repetitions, that history, like trauma, is ever simply one’s own, that history is precisely the way we are implicated in each other’s traumas”(5).

Roger Luckhurst’s view to trauma is somewhat different from Freud and Caruth. He believes that traumatic event can be represented. He says traumatic event is subject to literary representation. Experience of trauma is subject to narrativization” (126). Luckhurst argues that trauma does not easily get related to experience or language. It, as he says, can be registered but can never be fully assimilated to the obvious mode of communication. “Language alone is not capable of conveying traumatic truth. Symptomatic silence, the unexpressed-these are some of the subtle form of narrativizing trauma and experiences associate with it”(502).

Citing crucial remarks from Caruth’s *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*, Roger Luckhurst says:

Traumatic experience suggests a certain paradox. That the most direct seeing of a violent event may occur as an absolute inability to know it, that immediacy, paradoxically, may take the form of belatedness. This paradoxical structure put trauma at the heart of important questions about truth and history. Because trauma is registered but never quite assimilated to experience or language, this means that the truth [. . .]

can't be linked only to what is known but also to what remains
unknown in our very actions and our language. (502)

Contradictory state, paradoxical circumstance, symptomatic silence,
nonrepresentational of the representation of traumatic event- these are some of what
Luckhurst said are integral parts of trauma.

Though other trauma may also help us to dig into the mind of V.S. Naipaul,
the present dissertation basically focuses on secondary traumatic effects on him while
interacting with American Southerners. Secondary traumatic stress, vicarious trauma
or compassion fatigue, is commonly described as stress reactions resulting from
indirect trauma exposures that occur during work activities of professional caregivers.
Helping professionals indirectly exposed to trauma have reported symptoms such as
intrusive secondary trauma-related thoughts or memories (flashbacks), avoidance
behaviors, sleep disturbances, irritability, and dissociation. Freud himself and many
clinicians following him never isolated or named vicarious or secondary trauma.
Vicarious trauma has been recognized by clinicians in recent years, to the extent that
there is now a substantial literature on the subject. Martin Hoffman summarizes the
largely accepted definition of the phenomenon in a paper reporting findings of indepth
interview with clinicians that he conducted together with Tatiana Friedman:

Pearlman & Saakvitne define vicarious traumatization as the
deleterious effects of trauma therapy on the therapist. It is a process of
change in the therapist's inner experiences- the normal and
understandable by-product of personal engagement with clients'
trauma memories and narrative description. (34)

Charles Figley wants to suggest that clinicians' empathy plays a vital role in the
impact of working with victims, but Hoffman, whose research on empathy is well

known goes on to cast vicarious trauma “within a comprehensive theory of empathy based pro-social behavior” (2), so as to explore in depth its relevance to therapists’ motivation to help their trauma parents, as well as detailing what aspects of patients’ behavior trigger the painful effects of empathic distress.

Charles Figley defines secondary traumatic stress as “the natural consequent behaviors and emotions resulting from knowing about a traumatizing event experienced by a significant others; the stress resulting from helping or wanting to help the traumatized or suffering person” (10). Figley suggests the term “compassion fatigue” as an alternative name for secondary traumatic stress that is the equivalent of PTSD. The most common symptoms of PTSD include intrusive thoughts, often in the form of flashbacks or nightmares, in which the traumatic event is re-experienced. This may result from an internalization process, whereby interviewers identify so closely with the experience of the victim that they begin to internalize the trauma symptoms of the victim and experience their own stress reactions. These effects are considered “secondary,” because they occur in those who have not been directly traumatized by the event. According to Pearlman and Saakvitne, long-term empathic engagement with traumatized persons can transform the victim’s ways of experiencing the self, others, and the world.

Researcher has shown that hearing stories or re-enactment of multiple persons’ traumatic incidents can cause many of the same symptoms as post-traumatic stress disorder, including disturbed sleep, anger, fear, suppression of emotions, nightmares, flashbacks, irritability, anxiety, alienation, feelings of insanity, loss of control, and even suicidal thoughts.

Victims suffering the effects of vicarious traumatization quite often become haunted by the imagery of the client being involved in the traumatic event. These

intrusive thoughts can stay with the victim long after the session and can emerge at the most unexpected times. But as my research specifically focus on the witnessing body or victim. I think special attention must be given to trauma victim who is themselves trauma survivors. If the victim is still recovering from his/her own traumatic experience, there are risks of over identifying with others or confusing personal healing with others healing. Studies have shown that survivors' victims are at high risk of vicarious traumatization; Pearlman and Mac Ian found much higher rate of psychological disturbance in the 60% of victims who stated they had a history of trauma. Survivor's victim may hear other's experience and relive memories and feelings associated with their own traumatic experience. Trauma victims who have gone through similar experience as others may begin to dissociate during sessions, causing serious disruption in the present situation.

The tendency of trauma analysis is to foreground the analyst's sensitivity and empathic capacities. In this regard, trauma analysis arguably revises that Leavisite emphasis on fineness of response that was the butt of such extensive critique within the theories from which trauma theory appears to draw breath. Carolyn Steedman's comments on the historical genealogy, particularly in the eighteenth century, of what she calls 'Empathy Theory' in her book *Feminism and Autobiography: Texts, Theories, Methods*, provide a timely corrective to the view that the display of empathy, in cultural criticism, is simply to be welcomed:

Using empathy theory, a sense of self (. . .) was articulated, through the use of someone else's story of suffering, loss, exploitation, pain. (. . .)

In those moments of vibrating reception, when the heart throbs in sympathy and we are sublimely aware of the harmony of our reactions with those of the person we are sympathizing with, it seems necessary,

an absolute rock-bottom line of exchange, that he or she who tells the harrowing tale, is diminished by having that story to tell; and is subordinated in the act of telling. (34)

Steedman's timely remarks invite a greater degree of reflexivity concerning the ethics of trauma criticism. For what she reveals is that critical 'empathy' is not without its darker aspects. As well as partaking of a discourse of power that establishes the critic's sensibility as 'finer' than that of nameless others, the empathetic recovery of the voices of traumatized testifiers and texts may be at the expense of those for whom trauma criticism claims to speak. In this context, it is perhaps salutary to be reminded, also (as the insights of psychoanalysis of any hue would demonstrate), that a focus on texts of catastrophe and suffering is bound to be inflected, also, by less easily acknowledgeable fascinations and fantasies concerning victimhood grounded in aggressivity, which is more elaborated in Susannah Radstone's *Social Bonds and Psychical Order: Testimonies*.

The word empathy, unlike sympathy which has been in use since the sixteenth century, makes its first appearance at the beginning of this century. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, sympathy is "a real or supposed affinity between certain things, by virtue of which they are similarly or correspondingly affected by the same influence." While sympathy presupposes an initial likeness between subjects, empathy starts from the position of difference. In the same way empathy is defined as the power of projecting one's personality into . . . the object of contemplation. We might say that empathy depends less on natural affinity than sympathy, less on some kind of essential underlying connection between the two subjects. While sympathy, therefore, relies upon an essentialism of identification, empathy recognizes the alterity of identification. Eric L. Santer in *Stranded Objects: Mourning, Memory, and Film in*

Postwar Germany says "The capacity to feel grief for others and guilt for the suffering one has directly or indirectly caused, depends on the capacity to experience empathy for the other as other"(7). Empathy, then, is about the lack of identity between subjects, about negotiating distance. Empathy, especially as it is constructed out of mimesis, is not emotional self-pitying identification with victims, but a way of both feeling for, while feeling different from, the subject of inquiry.

Similarly, Dominick LaCapra says " Post traumatic situation in which one relives(or acts out) the past, distinctions tend to collapse, including the crucial distinction between then and now wherein one is able to remember what happened in the past but realize one is living in the here and now with future possibilities"(699).

Dominick LaCapra, being an important critic of trauma theory, has written a lot about secondary or vicarious trauma. For the nature of witnessing body and vicarious victimhood he says:

The response of even secondary witnesses (including historians) to traumatic events must involve empathic unsettlement that should register in one's very mode of address in ways revealing both similarities and difference across genres. But a difficulty arises when the virtual experience involved in empathy gives a way to vicarious victimhood, and empathy with the victim seems to become an identity" (699).

Here, with these definitions LaCapra wants to convey that if the virtual experience involve in empathy replaced vicarious victimhood, it poses problem due to complete identification with the victim. He means to say that the secondary witness can not separate himself with the victim and misunderstood his own identity with the victims'.

In the same ways, LaCapra also argues that the secondary witness (including historian) who resist full identification and the dubious appropriation of the status of victim through vicarious or surrogate victimage may nonetheless undergo empathic unsettlement or even muted trauma. Indeed the muting or mitigation of trauma that is nonetheless recognized and, to some extent, acted out may be a requirement or precondition of working through problems. Empathy in the arena of trauma theory means being responsive to the traumatic experiences of others and, crucially, it involves affectivity as a central aspect of attempting to understand the others' pain by shifting the focus of empathetic identification. However, empathetic understanding must not become conflated, as LaCapra emphatically stresses, 'with unchecked identification, vicarious experience, and surrogate victimage'. It is important to note that the interviewer is victim of past which at times relived or acted out in the present. Nevertheless, LaCapra's evocation of the Freudian theories of acting out and working through are particularly useful, provided, as he himself insists, that psychoanalytic concepts such as these are linked to economic, social and political analyses and do not become a substitute for them. Acting out is a form of melancholia, characterised by stasis and an affective state of arrested process, in which the traumatised person or collection of people are caught up in the compulsive repetition of traumatic scenes - scenes in which the past returns and the future is blocked or fatalistically caught up in a melancholic feedback loop.

This secondary trauma is very appropriate to apply in the research of V.S. Naipaul's non-fiction: *A Turn in South*. Here Naipaul bears striking witness to the condition of Afro-Americans and Americans traveling through American southeast from North Carolina to Mississippi. His narration as a flashback to Trinidad enforce that he is surrogate victim of trauma whenever he witness the miserable condition of

blacks, he empathizes himself as LaCapra argues “a difficulty arises when the virtual experience involved in empathy gives a way to vicarious victimhood, and empathy with the victim seems to become an identity” (699). This politics of empathy vividly comes to surface when he says:

The flags of the older states were distinctive; they made me think of the British colonial flag (and the British-given colonial motto, in Latin, from Virgil) I had known as a child in Trinidad. And for the first time it occurred to me that Trinidad, a former British colony (from 1797), and an agricultural slave colony (until 1833, when slavery was abolished from British Empire), would have had more in common with the old slave states of the Southeast than with New England or the newer European-immigrants states of the North. That should have occurred to me a long time before, but it hadn't. What I had heard as a child about the racial demeanor of the South had been too shocking. It had tainted the United States, and had made me close my mind to the South. (24)

These lines are spoken by Naipaul when he was in Dallas in the middle of August. After a glimpse of the states in convention center, he can not control his mind and suddenly speaks the ideas which was/is in his mind. He compares the flags of the older states with the British-colonial flags which he has known as a child in Trinidad. He not only compares the flag but also says as he has heard about the racial demeanor of the South in his childhood; he can not stop himself to be far away from this place. So, he feels close to the South.

This “has made me close to mind” (24) creates similarities between him and Afro-Americans. But LaCapra says “the response of secondary witness to traumatic

events must involve empathic unsettlement” (699). Here, in this non-fiction *A Turn in the South*, he is unable to involve empathetic unsettlement rather empathy with victim seems to become his own identity.

By this one may easily contest the idea that one of the roles played by the interviewer (or historian) is that of secondary witness. One may argue that the historian is limited to objective modes of understanding involving only empirical inquiry, observation, analysis, and commentary. It is probably less contestable to argue that the interviewer is a secondary witness in bearing witness both to the witness and to the object of testimony conveyed by the witness. This status implies an affective bond with the witness which Dori Laub describes as follows: "Bearing witness to a trauma is, in fact, a process that includes the listener. For the testimonial process to take place, there needs to be a bonding, the intimate and total presence of an *other*-in the position of one who hears" (Testimony, 70). At most one may argue that the interviewer is a secondary witness through empathy that nonetheless respects the otherness of the other and does not pretend to full and intimate presence of either self or other, much less to bonding (mis)understood as fusion or identification. To the extent that one denies the role of transference and rejects an affective component in understanding, notably in the form of empathy, one will also resist the notion that one role played by the interviewer is that of secondary witness, even when that witnessing is situated at a respectful distance from the experience of the victim, not necessarily tantamount to secondary traumatization. Empathy is an affective component of understanding, and it is difficult to control. Empathic unsettlement may take different forms, and it may at times result in secondary or muted trauma as well as objectionable self-dramatization in someone responding to the experience of victims. It is plausible to think secondary trauma is likely in the case of those who treat

traumatized victims or even in the case of interviewers who work closely with victims and survivors.

III. Politics of Empathy in *A Turn in the South*

This research attempts to study Nobel Laureate Sir Vidiadhar Naipaul's non-fiction novel *A Turn in the South* as a traumatic experience of Naipaul. He visits the American South with the intention of writing a book about race relations, but as he travels from state to state, or rather from community to community, he finds the communities' lives as a reflexion to his early childhood in Trinidad where he frequently witnessed the effect of racism, the plight of the Indian indenture family who always wished for their past as well as the life of the labor who was working in tobacco fields and many more. The consequences of racism, devotion to mythology, life in tobacco fields are some of the ingredient part of Southerners life which became source of his empathy towards Southerners from Atlanta to Charleston.

As an Indian, who surely had witnessed prejudice of race, nationality and economic status in India and the West Indies, he is acutely aware of the nuances in United State's racial relations in the South. For that reason too, the place can not be called an alien place for him. He says, "It is too well known, too photographed, too written about; and being more organized and less informal. It is not so open to causal inspection" (222). His more than 30 years of living in metropolitan city has created belongingness and alienation towards his own native land; West Indies. He suffers from dislocation, placelessness, fragmentation and loss of identity. All those elements are part of his psyche. The earlier traumatic effect was so powerfully imprinted in his mind which he never forgets. Those traumatic effects get manifested in the American South, so he calls it "to well known" (222).

A Turn in the South is one of the books of eleven novels and eight books of nonfiction by Naipaul. His reputation is based upon remorselessly unsentimental accounts of his travels in a series of societies ranging from the West Indies plus

Argentina and Uruguay in the New World to Central and East Africa and on to India from which his grandparents left as indentured servants for Trinidad in the late nineteenth century. As he, being a victim of past, always has a sense of belongingness towards his past. So, he basically focuses upon the tension between rejection and acceptance of modernity in former colonial societies. His background to an indenture labour from Indian territory who lived in West Indies during the time of British Empire has given him a profound sense to claim himself as a man who understand plight and pain of former colonial societies and Afro-American in his book *A Turn in the South*. Many colonial and post colonial critics have a basic assumption that the people of colonial and post colonial time have dual identity. They live in the condition of nowhere. They love their past and at the same time unable to leave their present life. The memory of past repeatedly comes in the present life of the people. They are always haunted by the memory of past. The haunting memory of the past is a kind of traumatic repetition. In the same way, here too Naipaul is caught between past and present. He claims that he understands the pain and plight of Afro-Americans but the reality is that he is one of the victims of trauma.

A Turn in the South is a book in which African or people of African decent are found in considerable number. Naipaul effectively deals with racial attitude of Afro-American. As he is one of the sufferers of racial politics in past he develops an intimacy towards Southerners. This is the reason that helps him to claim “the place is known to me” (222). The book is not only about race though Naipaul claims he began with that as his central theme, there is still enough hints of inner fragility and of an unstable sense of self. These sense of inner fragility and unstable sense of self manifest in the book when he meets Applewhite and others. In the same way, he links

the political scenario of the southerners with the political culture of Africa and African diaspora.

All those similarities which he basically makes to the black people are less threatening and more sympathetic. He experiences the pathos and tragedy of a community threatens with disintegration in the wake of desegregation. His past repeats in present. It is justifies when he says “How important it was not to fall into nonentity” (33). The line seems very energizing theme of his writing: its origin and center, the goal and the standard by which he has judged the fate of his own and other cultures. For instance, to Indians in the West Indies, the black power movement of the 1960s (which had imported much of its rhetoric from America), or the removal of Asians from Uganda, was extremely ominous. Naipaul's reaction then and since has been organized around a fear of engulfment by what he perceives as a dominant black majority; and from his perspective, racial politics has always seemed a threat to existence, a deep evasion of reality and a substitute for thinking. It does help us to know that Naipaul, though try to record the voice of the southerners, he speaks for no one but himself. Therefore *A Turn in South* though, not intended, turned into autobiography of Naipaul of his early year in Trinidad.

Naipaul is highly concerned with his Trinidad family and it's past, and with the memory of his father, to whom *A Turn in the South* is dedicated "In ever renewed homage". The dedication of the book suggests that he is more concerned towards his Trinidad family and it's past. When he begins this book he is prejudiced with some expression of the South so he thought he could write a travelogue about the southern states. The love for past which was imprinted came as a flashback and the repetition is his traumatic expression. The most common symptoms of PTSD include intrusive thoughts, often in the form of flashbacks or nightmares, in which the traumatic event

is re-experienced. This may result from an internalization process, whereby interviewers identify so closely with the experience of the victim that they begin to internalize the trauma symptoms of the victim and experience their own stress reactions. These effects are considered 'secondary,' because they occur in those who have not been directly traumatized by the event.

V.S. Naipaul, the Caribbean native of East India descent, and celebrated novelist, is to be found, on the evidence of his precise but warmly sympathetic reporting in *A Turn in the South*, one of the profoundest listeners our time can offer. He hears in the spoken sentence volume of implication, clues to personal and regional history, inflexion that tells everything while keeping the speakers true privacy in tact. He listens artfully and with a fine goodwill. Naipaul's Caribbean background aids him in treating the American South with sympathy. His native Trinidad was an agricultural slave colony until 1833 and has had much more in common with the Confederacy than with the Northern States, but Naipaul has fail to see these broad similarities because of the dreadful repetition of his own past.

There are enough events to show the traumatic repetition of Naipaul in *A Turn in the South*. Once he visits Howard's home town at Easter. He sees tobacco seedlings being planted where he notices the nature of tobacco field; its leaves, ripening and harvesting. The man who made him to see all those things was James Applewhite. He takes him by byways to his house. Naipaul sees a man on a sit-down mowing machine in the garden of a house where he talks about sweeping of the dirt yards in the old days. With these words the man of an Indian background, Naipaul, enters into his own traumatic life. He says:

Something else remained, though, it came to me later: a memory, from some unplaceable time in my childhood, of the marks in dark sand of a

cocoye broom made from the hard central stems . . . Those marks in a corner of a Trinidad Indian yard that came back to me did stand for order and cleanliness, almost the piety of a house, its adherence to good old ways. There was a ritual about yard-sweeping in Indian or Hindu families like ours in Trinidad when I was a child. It had to be done first thing in the morning; it was part of the purification of a house before prayers. (268)

He means to say that people of South is not only touch with religious life in order to confirm their identity. But Indian or Hindu people families like him in Trinidad were also practicing the same things. This repetition of his early life in Trinidad in the case of sweeping of dirt in yard is traumatic experience which has returned in an uncontrollably wild way. Here, he seems a puppet of his own hidden urges and impulses of Trinidad. Instead of pursuing for certain creative and fresh venture, Naipaul, a victim of trauma, repeats the similar things of his childhood as though he is too compulsive to do it.

He is indeed on a mission, a sort of pilgrimage to sacred ground, where blood, of which the Civil War was a mere token, had been spilled immemorially for the preservation of a certain feeling about history, religion, and identity that Naipaul considers to be the essence of civilization. Most important for Naipaul in viewing Southern history is not the fact of white enslavement of blacks or white rebellion in the name of that cause, but the enduring desire of Southern whites to live with reverence for their past. The South is offered here as a dynamic site for the investigation of this proposition on a global scale, for an investigation of the possibility of civilization's truce with the full irrationality of the world. One may be disappointed by the supposition that this irrationality is founded in large part on the

unhappy interpenetration of white and nonwhite cultures, but at the very least *A Turn in the South* offers an illumination of history and society while revealing Naipaul's expanded sense of, and respect for, the irrational. What he has seen above all, with the South as his laboratory, is the extent to which its people need the irrationality of history and the irrationality of religion (and of art and politics) to sustain them, especially when so much of their lives is being threatened by powerful, possibly irresistible forces. Although Naipaul devotes several interviews and several pages to the truce with the irrational in the context of politics, it is clear that he has little interest in that subject, and even less in politicians.

Naipaul gives priority to the region because of the self-investigation that he conducts in the place that reminds him so much of his Caribbean origins—even as he works hard to conceal that self-investigation. He has spent his most of the time by interviewing southern people. They are themselves one of the victim of past like Naipaul, their stories have indirect effect to him. Trauma theorist believes that helping professionals indirectly exposed to trauma have reported symptoms such as intrusive secondary trauma. It can be related to thoughts or memories (flashbacks), avoidance behaviors, sleep disturbances, irritability, and dissociation. He time and again remembers and sometime compares his Caribbean Island and feels sympathy to the southerners. He compares Caribbean island with Southern life saying:

In the Caribbean the black man, after a hundred years of colonial neglect, a hundred years of separation from slavery, found himself in a majority on his own island, with the power of electing his own leaders and his won government. The black American, at about the same time, found himself just liberated but in a minority in the world's most advanced country, and among the most denuded in that country. His

possibilities, as an American, were far greater than those of a West Indian. (119)

Here Naipaul compares the present living style of the Southerner with his traumatic repletion of West Indies. He means to say that though West Indies' black suffered from colonial rule they lived in majority and had freedom to elect their leader but at the same time American blacks, though live in the place of prosperity, lives in minority. If a victim is still recovering from his/her own traumatic experience, there are risks of over identifying with people or confusing personal healing with others' healing. The witnessing body or a victim is himself a trauma survivor. So, Naipaul identify with the blacks of Southern states to the blacks of Trinidad.

A Turn in the South is, then, a kind of repetition for the prejudiced opinion Naipaul had held. At age of 28, he wrote his first travel book about the former slave colonies of the Caribbean and South America. Naipaul says "it seemed to me fitting that my last travel book . . . should be about the old slave state of the American South East" (25). Though it turn out that the unsavory name the south gained for racial violence was in large major deserve, this perceptive observer comes to optimistic conclusion. He says:

The chief difference lies in the distance of the two societies from slavery. Slavery was abolished in the British colonies in 1834; and the Caribbean colonies were thereafter neglected. So 150 years separate the black people of the British Caribbean from slavery. American slavery ended with the civil War. But it might be said tat freedom came to the black man only in 1954; so American blacks have reached where they have reached in just thirty years. In those thirty years American blacks have grown to see opportunity; while the larger independent

territories of the British Caribbean-Trinidad, Jamaica, Guyana-have in their various easy been plundered and undone. (87)

Slavery became his point of departure for empathy. As he had witnessed the cruel side of slavery, he works as an agent who understands the pain and anxiety of Southerners by listening all the people of South but he associates himself in such a way that it seems he is not only trying to empathize the people of Southern American but towards the people of Trinidad as well. And as it is well known fact that he is an active member of Trinidadian community, he on the other hand empathizes on himself so his empathy becomes a politics. He remembers his own generational slavery of past. When he says American blacks have grown to see opportunity while the larger independent territories of British Caribbean-Trinidad, Jamaica, Guyana-have in their various easy been plundered and undone, he means to say he is more empathize on British Caribbean-Trinidad and its people.

Naipaul's view of the black South seems to come from his view of Trinidad: there slavery was abolished in the 1830s, the island and its people became economically superfluous, and a society that Naipaul considers corrupt and second-rate came into being. In the South a slavery-like system existed until well after the Second World War, and the United States is place of grater potential than Trinidad so, Naipaul believes, there's still time for blacks to avoid a Trinidad-like fate. And as he himself is of the Caribbean background man which aids him in treating American South with empathy and at the same time creates empathy on him. Slavery is a tool to Naipaul that helps him to link the American south with the former colonies. And this link has produced empathy to him.

This research basically tries to find the truth of empathy in the writing of V.S. Naipaul's *A Turn in the South*. As I am going to deal with the role of empathy in the

light of trauma theory, it is appropriate to say that empathy in the arena of trauma theory means being responsive to the traumatic experiences of others and, crucially, it involves affectivity as a central aspect of attempting to understand the others' pain by shifting the focus of empathetic identification. Dominick LaCarpa argues “a difficulty arises when the virtual experience involved in empathy gives a way to vicarious victimhood, and empathy with the victim seems to become an identity” (699). He wants to convey that if the virtual experience involve in empathy replaced vicarious victimhood, it poses problem due to complete identification with the victim. It is important to note that the interviewer is victim of past which at times relived or acted out in the present. In the same way, when he interview the victim of past and their mode of living at present, his virtual experience involves in empathy replaced vicarious victimhood. So, the empathy with the victim seems to become his own identity. His narration has repeated flashbacks of Trinidad because he remembers his own empathetic condition in Trinidad. Naipaul’s experiences of his childhood come up at the time of writing the book *A Turn in the South* as a traumatic experience. His repletion of the past relives in the present when he listen to the people of South. It can be vividly noticed when he visits a city of American South, Atlanta. In Atlanta Naipaul narrates:

I was taken back to some of the feelings of my childhood in Trinidad. There , though most of my teachers were Negroes(brown rather than black) and though for such people(as well for policemen, Negroes again) I as a child had the utmost awe and respect , and though in my eyes people like teachers didn’t really have racial attributes but were their professions alone, yet the minute I found myself in an out-of-school relationship with them I became aware- a child from an Indian

family, full of rituals that couldn't be transferred outside the family house, rituals and attitudes that had day after day to be shed and reassumed, as one went to school and returned home(57)

His experience of racial politics in Trinidad has a linking point to empathy towards Southern people. He goes down into the street where the people were black and confessed that he was assailed by a very old feeling of constriction and gloom. His direct attachment with the people of Atlanta and other Southern states create a close link between his own past of Trinidad and the present south. In this way he is empathized with the people but the same empathy becomes politics when he remembers his own racial plight of Trinidad.

From North Carolina through the lower South to Mississippi, his penetrating eye took in a great deal, as you would expect from his novels, travelogues, and historical meditations. Struck by similarities, as well as by contrast, with the societies, of the West Indies, he provides a running commentary on the legacy of slavery and emancipation, on class and ethnic tensions. For Naipaul, well grasps the psychological burden carried by the descendants of slaves, much as he understands the pain of the slaves. But he grasps also the difference between the burdens and the responsibilities carried by black people who survived the torment of colonial slavery and rose to power in societies in which they are a majority, and those carried by black people who passed from slavery to segregation and racial subordination as a minority in the Southern states. He said he understands the pain of the slaves. He always emphasize that he is understanding the situation of the Southerners and their love for past because he himself belong to a descendent of India and lived in colonized country like Trinidad. But Schneider says empathy means that I am trying to understand (both cognitively and emotionally). As I try to understand, I can help somebody to

understand. When he feels that I am trying to understand him, I think, is empathy. Therefore, it is easy to grasp that he is a victim of empathy. In order to know the role of empathy in secondary trauma, we must quote LaCapra. He says:

The response of even secondary witnesses (including historians) to traumatic events must involve empathic unsettlement that should register in one's very mode of address in ways revealing both similarities and difference across genres. But a difficulty arises when the virtual experience involved in empathy gives a way to vicarious victimhood, and empathy with the victim seems to become an identity (699)

He says difficulty arises when empathy with the victim seems to become an identity so, Naipaul himself is a victim of racial politics and when he listens to the same situation of the Afro-American he feels a sort of closeness and he claims that he understands the pain of Afro-American. He is unable to involve empathetic unsettlement to his traumatic events. So, the problem arises when he associates his virtual experience with his identity and mistaken his own empathy with the Southerners. Naipaul's own traumatic events come in surface when he meets and listens to the Southern people, and as LaCapra says virtual experience involved in empathy gives a way to vicarious victimhood, Naipaul is victim of vicarious trauma. The empathy seems his own rather than the people of Southern states. In this way empathy is being politicized in *A Turn in the South*.

Naipaul, being a hard critic of third world, has made a laboratory to Trinidad and Caribbean country for he and his descendents has suffered there as a slave under British Empire. The racial politics of Trinidad and later life of in European countries has created the situation of no where. But the things of Trinidad from his childhood

have created a long life effect. So, he finds similarities of Afro-Americans' life with Trinidadian' black people in every aspects. The political upheaval of Africa and Trinidad was so devastating that whether they produce anything or not but especially they had a lot of leaders. His earlier experience of blacks matches with the case of Afro-American in South. The similarities become stronger when Naipaul writes:

Teepen also said this: white people in the United States don't have "leaders"; only black people have leaders. And I felt he had said that because (according to some other columnists in the paper) the current scandals about black politicians in a number of states were being used to run down black people generally. (31)

In the matter of leading black people, a number of black leader come to run down them. He has witnessed the similar situation in Trinidad. These political situation among Afro-Americans', Trinidadians' and Africans' give enough space to go into his won traumatic experience of Trinidad. So, compares and says "I wonder whether it was possible in these circumstances for black people to stand apart from their leaders, any more than it was possible for people of the Caribbean or Africa to stand apart from the racial or tribal chiefs whom they had created.(31)

Nevertheless, in this book, art also plays a part even more important than other theme. The work is carefully structured so that the figure of a poet, James Applewhite of North Carolina, becomes the apotheosis of the Southern will-to-civilization. Applewhite dominates the end of the book, in precise counterpoint to the antic figure of black "Al Murray" of Harlem in the beginning. Both senses of the term home, I think, are implicated in the fact that his many references to Trinidad prompt him to make connections not simply between the island and the South but between his personal past and the Southern landscape that compels his recollections. About home,

his personal past, two insights appear near the end of the book to dominate Naipaul's thinking. For him, what lends a peculiar force to these two startling insights or ideas is that they are quietly expressed by the poet Applewhite, whom he meets in Durham. In writing about Applewhite, Naipaul is writing about himself, his own traumatic memories. Of the first insight he says:

He [Applewhite] elaborated on that, and he couldn't have known how directly he was speaking to me. (the scarcely bearable idea of the beginning of things now existing only in my heart, no longer existing physically in the ravaged, repopulated Trinidad of today). I could understand how the past he meditated on, though physically so close and still existing in Wilson County, was in his mind quite far away.
(268)

These above lines of Naipaul clarify his self centered belated response of traumatic expression. Naipaul finds similarities between him and Applewhite in the terms of past and sense of home so, he says even Applewhite could not understand the pain of past and sense of belongingness to home as he can understand. Except this, he directly claims that the speeches of Applewhite express the feelings which Naipaul has felt as a child and an adolescent in Trinidad.

Naipaul knows that Jim Applewhite's sentiments reflect primary intuitions of his own. As his response to the tension between a feeling of home and a feeling of estrangement help Naipaul to relate his sentiments with Jim Applewhite. But the sentiments of Naipaul repeat as an example of traumatic effects. He desires for reconciliation with Trinidad and he feels reconciliation with Trinidad when he relates the traumatic experiences of Trinidad in American South. So, of the second insight he says:

It was extraordinary. Not only (as had happened more than once) did I find Jim Applewhite talking for me, expressing things I had felt as a child and an adolescent in Trinidad. He was also-though he was from the other side of the tracks--talking like Howard, Hetty's son. In New York, at the airport, Howard had said, of the place that was his home, I hated the place when I was young, for the continuity. (303)

Naipaul knew at once that these two sentiments reflect primary intuitions of his own. His response to the tension between a feeling of home and a feeling of estrangement bounds them together. As Charles Figley defines secondary traumatic stress as "the natural consequent behaviors and emotions resulting from knowing about a traumatizing event experienced by a significant others-the stress results from helping or wanting to help the traumatized or suffering person" (10). In the same way, here by the above lines it is very clear to say that when Naipaul meets Applewhite and Howard; the two traumatic person, he know the traumatizing event experienced by them and at the same time his traumatized situation of Trinidad came as a flashback. Their love and feel attached to their homes, in spite of often feeling alien to it, or even having moved away and therefore his longing for past comes up at present and transfigures his subjectivity and he is guided by the traumatic memory.

The search for the meaning of Southern history has been the book's main theme. Although the central theme is search for Southern history, there is always an additional interest to this book. Search for Southern history reflects to the history of Naipaul's search for his own history in Trinidad. An Oxford-educated, world-traveling Trinidadian from a family with roots in India, he decided it was time to see a part of the United States. His wondering took him to the homes, churches, and communities of country and small-town blacks and whites, urban grand bourgeois,

rising black politician, white industrialists, socially engaged preachers, and some celebrities. Every place where he visits in South has a relation with the theme of history and as it is clear that his own history is a thrust for him in his life but at this point he feels a link between his own history and Afro-American's history. In this way, the sense of belongingness creates empathy but at the same time he remembers his own time of Trinidad and says:

Growing up in multiracial Trinidad as a member of the Indian community, people brought over in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to work the land, I always knew how important it was not to fall into nonentity. In 1961, when I was traveling in the Caribbean for my first travel book, I remember my shock, my feeling of taint and spiritual annihilation, when I saw some of the Indians of Martinique, and began to understand that they had been swamped by Martinique, that I had no means of sharing the world view of these people whose history at some stage had been like mine, but who now, racially and in other ways, had become something other. (33)

These lines come into his writing as a flashback of Trinidad when he started asking about the issue of identity and race to the people of the Northern suburbs of Atlanta. He says that the attitude was reflection of his own temperament and background, his own lack of religious faith and his thirty-five years and more in England where formal religion had all but withered. Therefore it can be said that his own temperament and background memory overlaps his present witnessing of Atlanta. His individuality is shaped by his childhood experiences which come as a repetition in American south. But if we see the above lines of Naipaul in the light of Freud's concept of trauma, he urges that it is traumatic repetition, rather than the meaningful distortions of neurosis

that defines the individual shape. The same thing happens to Naipaul when he was writing *A Turn in South*. His individuality is shaped by his childhood experiences which come as a repetition in American south. And this is a cause for his belongingness to the Southerners with the preoccupied sense of knowing which produce empathy in him due to his own traumatized experience.

In the same way, Cathy Caruth claims that trauma is not experienced as a mere repression or defense, but as a temporal delay that carries the individual beyond the shock of the first moment. The trauma is a repeated suffering of the event, but it is also a continual leaving of its site. She says that the victim of trauma, however reluctant to express his or her hidden traumatic truth, unknowing reveals certain personal truth. Once Naipaul writes narrating the physical world of South:

The oaks were 150 years old; and these oak trees of South Carolina had the shape and spread of the saman trees of Central America, which had been introduced in the Caribbean is lands as a shade tree for certain crop- cacao and coffee- and had been taken on from there to places as far away as Malaysia; so that tropical plantations and colonies of the imperial time acquired look, with the vegetation that had been brought together from different parts of the world. Here, in SouthCarolina, was something like the saman trees of Trinidad. (80)

The flashback of trauma comes in vivid form and this is one of them. As many events of the book *A Turn in the South* has similarities to the experience of Trinidad so the natural phenomena has also a sense with his own Trinidadian background. The scene of South Carolina and its saman trees reminds him of his Trinidadian background. The delayed impression of his childhood presents in different form and this is one which he finds in the natural environment. Person suffering from the effects of

vicarious traumatization quite often haunted by the imagery of the things being involved in the traumatic event. These intrusive thoughts can stay with the victim long after the session and can emerge at the most unexpected times. These imageries are considered as secondary. These effects are considered “secondary,” because they occur in those who have not been directly traumatized by the event. In the same way, when Naipaul travels through American South his earlier experience of Trinidad came as a flashback in his writing. He is not directly traumatized by them.

As "Post-traumatic Stress Disorder"(PTSD), describes an overwhelming experience of sudden, or catastrophic events, in which the response to the event occurs in the often delayed, and uncontrolled repetitive occurrence of hallucinations, flashbacks and other intrusive phenomena. Naipaul's *A Turn in the South*, a full reading of this book, help us to come into the conclusion that overwhelming experience of sudden and catastrophic events of Trinidad came as a delayed and uncontrolled repetition. This is due to the traumatic effect in the psyche of Naipaul. It will be more vivid that his understanding of Southern people has a good link with his own empathy when we bring Lillian Feder, a critic, writes in his book *Naipaul's Truth*, that Naipaul's journey is an example of similarities between his own life and Southerner's life which leads to sense of empathy in him. Regarding this he says:

Here, as in many of his travel narratives, his pervading theme is the indelible, often painful links between individual identity and the historical past persisting as a wound which inhibits, reduces, but can also challenge individuals and communities. It is this wound that is the source of his empathy with people seemingly so is this wound that is the source of his empathy with people seemingly so different from

himself who have shared with him a cruel and violent history in the New World.(67)

Lillian Feder basically focuses on two things, individual identity and historical past. Many black Southerner's history, religion convert resistance to slavery in the past and public opposition to racism in the present is one. Naipaul's personal identity was shaped in Trinidad in the same way as he was living as a descendent of indenture labour from Indian origin. Lillian Feder calls this link as a wound which is the source of empathy to Naipaul. In this way, we can say that the wound is his source of empathy.

Naipaul is a man without a home in his native Trinidad, although most of his families are still there. Early on, Naipaul once denied to a BBC reporter that he had ever visited Trinidad, much less lived there. He has also steadily maintained that he is a man without a true home in metropolitan England, even though he has lived there more or less since 1950. It has been strongly suggested by some of Naipaul's critics that this professed sense of homelessness is merely the most essential piece of his professional costume, and that it is perverse for anyone so intimately connected to England by education, marriage, and professional success to pretend that he is not at home there. Such critics of Naipaul see his alleged homelessness as meant only still further to court white metropolitans. Underlying it all, they see a profound sense of shame, flattering to his English hosts, at his lowly, un-English origins, his light brown un-English skin, his un-English names: Vidiadhar Surajprasad Naipaul.

Growing up in Trinidad, Naipaul tells us here; his greatest terror was of falling "into nonentity"(33) At that point in his book he associates this fear with his later "feeling of taint and spiritual annihilation" (33) at seeing the human results of the swamping of East Indian culture in Martinique and Belize by non-Indian cultural

values, which is to say African-American values, which is to say, for Naipaul, no values at all. He concedes a point of similarity between himself and Howard's community, in the fore-closure of their sense of the past; and he concedes, too, his surprise at the formality and sense of community in the black church. But he concedes all those by way of empathy which is his own empathy as we see those flashbacks on the light of two trauma theorists: Dominik LaCapra and Cathy Caruth.

By the two trauma theorists, Dominik LaCapra and Cathy Caruth., it has been proved that he is a victim of traumatic event which happened in his living period of colonial Trinidad. His sense of belongingness and estrangement always haunt him in his life so when he visits American South, he associates himself with the southerners. The love for the past religion of the southerners give a gust of air to his traumatic feelings of past and his the delayed experience of his own vividly comes in the present. His comparison and contrast of American South with West Indies is a temporal delay of trauma especially secondary trauma which has shaped his present personality and so he traumatized on himself rather on the people of South. We can easily say that he is a victim of secondary trauma because he has not been directly traumatized by the condition of Afro-American but he re-experiences his own traumatized memory of Trinidad. So, as Cathy Caruth says "The traumatic re-experiencing of the event thus collapse of witnessing, the impossibility of knowing that first constituted it .and by carrying that impossibility of knowing that first constituted it. And by carrying that impossibility of knowing out of the empirical event itself ,trauma opens up and challenges us to a new kind of listening ,the witnessing, precisely, of impossibility"(10), the witnessing has collapsed with his own trauma and he became vicarious victimhood. The whole book is nothing but manifestation of traumatic expression of Naipaul. Though he tries to show empathy to

the Southerner his present subjectivity transforms at the same time. Memory of Trinidad over comes in his present time. The flashback and repetition of his childhood in Trinidad is just reappearing of traumatic memory. He, linking some incident of South to the Trinidad, tries to show empathy but in the other hand empathize on himself.

IV. Conclusion

V.S. Naipaul's *A Turn in the South* basically demonstrates how trauma is a determining force of human consciousness. The people who works in his/her daily life does not notice the effect of it but knowingly or unknowingly, he is guided by the internal mechanism of earlier traumatic effects. In the same situation, Naipaul's *A Turn in South* manifests traumatic consciousness of Naipaul. He finds himself in such a situation that he cannot help himself comparing his own childhood experience with the situation of South. The comparison has created a type of close relation between the Afro-American and Indian origin man who was/is brought up in West Indies and England. The similarities between his childhood experience and South produce empathy on him which is a politics as he does not only limit his empathy onto Southerner but onto his own situation in Trinidad.

His reporting of American South has created a close relation between Naipaul and Afro-American people. He listens to them with great curiosity because the racial politics of Trinidad and South has similar situation. His feeling of constriction and gloom revives in the place where he finds sense of belongingness. So, he emphasizes that he understands the pain of the Afro-American people who are far from their native land. But he is victim of trauma as his delayed experience of past revives in present. It is the traumatic repetition that shapes his life and it can be said that the effect of trauma is secondary because Naipaul is not directly affected by the Afro-American people rather he is re-experiencing his own past. The memory of past repeatedly comes in the present life of Naipaul. He is always haunted by the memory of the past. In this way, his past comes up at present and transfigures his subjectivity, therefore he, no longer, feels empathy on Afro-American people but on himself. Empathy is being politicized here.

Empathy seems to become an identity to Naipaul in *A turn in the South*. His virtual experience involved in empathy gives a way to vicarious victimhood. So, he says "I was taken back to some of the feelings of my childhood in Trinidad" (57). The complete reading of the book in the light of trauma theory helps to derive the conclusion that overwhelming experience of sudden and catastrophic events of Trinidad came as a delayed and uncontrolled repetition. He is nothing but a victim of trauma and his book is a pile of traumatic repetitions.

Works Cited

- Berger, James. "Trauma and Literary Theory." *Contemporary Literature*.
Vol. XXXVII.3: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin, 1997.
- Carlson, Eve B. *Trauma Assessments: A Clinician's Guide*. New York: The Viking Press, 1997.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Trauma: Exploration in Memory*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1995.
- - -, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1995.
- Feder, Lillian. *Naipaul's Truth*. New Delhi: Indialog Publication, 2001.
- Figley, C. *Compassion fatigue as secondary traumatic stress: An overview*.
New York: Brunner/Mazel. 1995.
- - -, *Compassion fatigue: Toward a New Understanding of the Costs of Caring*. Baltimore: Sidran Press. 1999.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Beyond the Pleasure Principle". *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Ed. and trans. James Strachey. Vol. 18. London: Hogarth, 1953. 7-64.
- - -, *Moses and Monotheism*. Trans. Katherine Jones. New York: Knopf, 1939.
- - -, *Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Ed. and trans. James Strachey. Vol. 18. London: Hogarth, 1953.
- LaCapra, Dominic. *Representing the Holocaust History, Theory, Trauma, Bhaca*.
New York: Cornell UP, 1995.
- Laub, Dori, M.D. *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, History*. Ed. Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Luckhurst, Rogar. "Mixing Memory and Desire: Psychoanalysis, Psychology, and

Trauma Theory". *An Oxford Guide: Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed.

Patricia Waugh. Oxford UP, 2006.497-506.

Mohan, Champa Rao. *Postcolonial Situation in the Novel of V. S. Naipaul*. New

Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, 2004.

Naipaul, V.S. *A Turn in the South*. India: Picador, 1989.

Nixon, Rob. *London Calling: V.S. Naipaul Postcolonial Mandarin*. New York:

OUP, 1992.

Pearlman, L. A., & Mac Ian. "Vicarious traumatization: An empirical study

of the effects of trauma work on trauma therapists." *Professional Psychology*

Research and Practice. (1995). 558-565.

Steedman, Carolyn. "Enforced Narratives: Stories of another self." *Feminism and*

Autobiography: Texts, Theories, Methods: Ed. Tess Cosslett et al.

London and New York: Roudedge, 2000. 25-39.

1<http://www.nobel.se/literature/laureates/2001/naipaul-lecture-e.html>