

### **I. V. S. Naipaul and Postcolonial Ambivalence**

The research work has analyzed the postcolonial ambivalence in V.S. Naipaul's *An Area of Darkness* in which Naipaul himself and other characters in the text come up to feel split psyche in postcolonial India which is the trait of the ambivalence in postcolonial society. The ambivalence is taken as the output of the colonization in the postcolonial era which indeed works as a resistive force on the one hand and a creative on the other against the colonial subjugation and colonial disillusionment. The term is commonly used to refer to the situations where mixed feelings of a more general sort are experienced or where a person experiences uncertainty, indecisiveness concerning something else. Homi K. Bhabha introduced this term into the postcolonial discourse to refer to the relationship between the colonized and colonizer as ambivalent because the colonized people cannot completely go against the colonizer's culture, language, civilization and the tradition. The contradictory relationship is obviously seen in it as Bill Ashcroft et al say, "It disturbs the simple relationship between colonizers and colonized. Ambivalence is, therefore, an unwelcome aspect of colonial discourse for the colonizer" (13). At the initial stage, the colonized people cannot accept the exact resultants of colonizers. However, after they take the center power, authority and show their presence everywhere then the colonized people are forced to encompass their deeds and outcomes. And steadily the hybridization, creolization process germinates in subjugating their pure cultural, social, ethnic practices through the imperialistic attitudes of the colonizers. Bhabha argues that "colonial discourse is compelled to be ambivalent because it never really wants colonial subjects to be exact replicas of the colonizers - this would be threatening" (13).

Ambivalence, most of the times, works as resistive force against the colonial practices of cultural traits. It resists the imperialism in terms of political, cultural, social and economic facets. While cultural differences are seen with split signs in the "colonial subjugated state" that creates ambivalent attitudes in the mental state of the common and learned people (22). In terms of the failure of colonial discourse, Bhabha marks it as a site of cultural difference:

Resistance is not necessarily an oppositional act of political intensions, it is the simple negation or the exclusion of the context of another culture, as differences are perceived [. . .]. But the effect of ambivalence produced within the rules of recognition of dominating discourse as they articulate the signs of cultural difference. (84)

While the foreign intervention is explicitly seen in holding the political authority in a territory then the native people show prompt responses in defending that through various traits of cultural tools but they fail to do because of the ambivalent modes of their mental state. But gradually, the imposed culture gets recognized in the social stratum. People themselves regard the signs of cultural difference explicitly prevailing in the society which, all in all, infuses the physic condition and make the people more ambivalent towards the dominance of political and cultural threats.

In the same line, Naipaul's psychic condition is found completely "split" or "scattered" by the colonial attitudes of the colonizers are the indecisive and uncertain nature of the colonized people, too (15). His characters like Mr. Malhotra, Jivan, Basant and Ramnath are completely disillusioned by language difference, hegemonial attitude and authoritative power in the text. Mr. Malhotra is found infested with the traits of western education and dominating attitude while he works in a government office. Contrarily, Ramnath acts opposite while his boss Mr. Malhotra orders him to

do some works where he has been employed as Clerk. Naipaul takes this relation between two personnel as "negative transparency" as articulated by Jeremy Hawthorn (159). The cultural disjunction between the urban life style which is the great impact of colonial era and the naïve nature of Jivan who hails from country is another fact of colonial "subjugated form" but "incompatible relation" (18). Those sorts of nature of disappointment and disillusion are the relative consequence of the colonial power, which has created ambivalence in the mental and behavioral attitude of them.

However, such ambivalent characters have made Naipaul more creative in his two dimensions: writing and reading postcolonial books with abundant references and implications. But, eventually, Naipaul himself gets falling in the crux of feeling uncertain and intellectually emotional that is what Jacob defines as "in-between space" (8). Naipaul is completely indoctrinated by Western (English education system and culture) academic and cultural traits while he travels across India. He sees the place of religious faith like Mosque and Temple which he concludes that "ruin, ruin" as their condition in India (202). His such outlook for the deteriorating conditions of Eastern monuments are the "dominating discourses" to conceptualize with the colonizer's notion which he poses it in "Third World Space" as Bhabha makes very harsh critique over it (38).

The encountering situation between the colonizer and the colonized, to great extent, forms the pattern of hybridity, which is considered, as a source of creative force that violates the binary categories of civilized and uncivilized. Ashcroft et al views it "the hybrid modality also challenge the assumption of the 'pure' and the 'authentic' concepts upon which the resistance to imperialism often stands"(9). Hybridity breaks the hierarchy of culture as pure and impure. It refers the creation of new and unique cultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonization. In

postcolonial writings, hybridity encompasses the writer's awareness towards the cultural roots for finding the location of identification. It also exposes the awareness of past and present.

However, *An Area of Darkness* has received wide critical acclaim from different perspectives. Irving Howe undertakes to study the novel and finds it the "impression of melancholy of the third world states" which remains unaltered (36). He articulates Naipaul's peculiar engagement with other in the terms: "Naipaul, in *An Area of Darkness*, offers no intimation of hope or signals of perspectives. It may be that the reality he grapples with allows him nothing but graveness of voice" (36).

Similarly, John Mander praises Naipaul's "descriptive power", but notes "*An Area of Darkness* is similar to other novels that explore British influences in colonial India" (132). The novel is more descriptive because of Naipaul's accounts of travelling across Indian Territory, Bangalore, Chennai, in south to Jammu-Kashmir where he acknowledges the mythically erected 'Lingam' of Lord Shiva, in the north. The westernized city Bombay to British's favorite place Calcutta in the east. So, he also describes the romantic life of Indian people when they discrete on the train track without shame and shyness.

Another prominent critic Abdullah Zahiri takes the novel into an account of postcolonial issues in Third World and reveals the fact that he follows Conrad's steps in Africa and Asia under the shadow of high imperialism:

*An Area of Darkness* in Naipaul's first Indian travelogue whose title is an atavistically Conradian inter-text, *Heart of Darkness*, which the polish expatriate voyager wrote under the shadow of high imperialism. He sees himself as another Conrad, an émigré, an intellectual wandering across the globe [. . .]. Temporarily, Conrad in the

Chronicler of the empire where as Naipaul covers the post Colonies. Naipual's instrumental rationality operated through out his visit to other third world states, including India. (16)

In this way, Colonial imperialism has left the syndromes of being colonized Indians by British from late 18<sup>th</sup> to early mid 20<sup>th</sup> century. Zahiri has comparatively viewed the imperialistic attitude of English people like of Polish in the way of colonizing attitudes. On the other Boris Bongemen makes his critique upon the novel, *An Area of Darkness* as the most emotional travel book and an earlier documented literary text:

[In] his novel, *An Area of Darkness*, Naipaul writes that the sweetness and sadness which are found in Indian writing and Indian films is a turning way from too overwhelming reality which reduces the horror to a warm, virtues emotion. Indian sentimentality is opposite of concern explains why Naipaul's unsentimental desperate - quite unexpected for the reader - a way if showing concern. (13)

Naipaul reveals the sweetness of Indian by depicting the life of people living in his homeland, Banaras, where people are mostly Brahmin with typical style of living. Similarly, the mythically dominated culture, which articulates Hindus worshipping lingam of Lord Shiva in Amarnath of Jammu - Kashmir. Unlikely, sadness is of the Indian people who romanticizes themselves by doing excretes in open area, rail track. The irrational activities of low class Indian people who love going openly for private excretes.

India has been ready by postcolonial writer, Naipaul with unromantic look and discovers horrible grades in the economic, social and cultural differences of Indian people. He meets the people who are living in absolute poverty in the degree of

degradation in Indian life. Tim F. Martin claims with his view that "the book details the experience of another V.S. Naipaul in India between February 1962 and 1964, of his excursion there with the locals, his discoveries about the people of India, and his own terms of what is India and what it seems to be Indian" (120).

Furthermore, it is the critic's job to distinguish Naipaul to different groups but in a true sense, he is a representative of Trinidad and the postcolonial world as well as to show plight and torture of those who are suffered by the sense of belonging nowhere in the world in the lack of their own cultural history. Some aforementioned critics with their specific comments over his work gone in such a way, too, revealing his ambivalent attitude mostly subdued by the colonial imperialism in both places Trinidad and India. Gareth Griffith receives Naipaul as a "double exile"(161). Indeed, it is a hard and sharp comment upon him. He is not only enslaved but also separated from his root culture as the grandfather of Naipaul living in India left behind a certain way in life.

In this way, many critics have interpreted this novel from different perspectives. All of them seem to have been concerned with the novel's preoccupation with unflinching, unromantic, emotional, mixture of genres and so on. Hence, most of the enquires of critics are far more negative. However, this research presents an enquiry into an issue that is researchable owing to its ambivalent nature and subjugation of coloniality- which works out as a resistive and at the same time a creative force with the shades of disillusionment and in that sense the novel is far more positive. Both thematically and structurally, it presents a critique of conventional narrative. Thematically, it creates ambivalence, estrangement, dislocated ness, hybridity, space of attachment and detachment and vice versa. Whereas structurally, it blows up the linear arrangement of plot with many sub-titles. Therefore, the issue I have chosen

deserves the merits of research. This research not only analyzes the ambivalence created by the colonial hybridization but also attempt to set it up as a proper defense mechanism in the face of disillusionment, split mind set which is at once fresh in the novel.

In order to prove the above mentioned hypothesis, the present work has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter presents a brief introduction to the research elaborated in the subsequent chapter; it gives a brief outline of hypothesis, statement of problem, methodology, critical review of literature and claims why it is researchable. The second chapter briefly explains what ambivalence is and how it occurs in the culturally hybridized, diasporic, postcolonial and subaltern conditions. The third chapter presents textual analysis to prove the hypothesis. The fourth chapter is the conclusion of this research work. It concludes the explanation and argument put forward in the preceding chapters. It shows how Naipaul applies postcolonial cultural element in the novel and visualizes the disillusionment in the human life in the present postcolonial India that is full of ambivalence.

## II. Ambivalence as a Powerful Tool in Postcolonial World

The term ambivalence defines that it is a state of having emotion of both positive and negative values or having thoughts or action in contradiction with each other, when they are related to the same object, idea and past (i.e. feeling both love and hatred for someone or something) experiences. The term is also commonly used to refer to situations where mixed feelings of a more general sort are experienced or where a person experiences uncertainty or indecisiveness concerning something. In psychoanalytic terminology, however, or more refined definition applies: the term (introduced into the discipline by Bleuler in 1911) refers to an underlying emotional attitude in which the co-existing contradictory impulses (unusually love and hate) derive from common sources and are thus held to be interdependent. Moreover, when the term is used in this psychoanalytic sense, it would not usually be expected that the person embodying this 'ambivalence' would actually feel both of the two contradictory emotions as such except in obsessional neurosis, which sees both sides being more or less 'balanced' in consciousness, one or other of the conflicting sides is usually repressed. Another relevant distinction is that whereas the psychoanalytic notion of 'ambivalence' sees it as engendered by all neurotic conflict, a person's everyday mixed feeling may easily be based on a quite realistic assessment of the imperfect, inconsistent or self-contradictory nature of the thing being considered.

More precisely, intellectual ambivalence refers to an inability or unwillingness to commit oneself to a definite answer, position or conclusion in thought (yes or no), normally either because a definite stance is deliberately avoided or evaded for some personal motive or because sufficient grounds (logical or experiential evidence) warranting a definite stance are lacking. The main problem with intellectual

ambivalence is that it provides no clear guide or orientation for action and leadership. It is difficult to act or lead on the basis that something might or might not be the case, that something might or might not be a good idea etc. Thus it often happens that someone in a leadership formation pretends to be very definite about one issue because the function requires it even though he or she is in truth ambivalent about the issue.

Ambivalent attitudes affect the colonial mentality of colonized as well as colonizers because it presents the split colonial relationship. Bhabha argues that “colonial discourse is completed to be ambivalent because it never really wants colonial subjects to be enacting replies of the colonizers – this would be threatening” (13). The conflict between colonizer and colonized is inevitable and one has to create the in-between situation for evaluating his cultural dualism. The colonized who are regarded as uncivilized by the colonizers have to evaluate the hybrid articulation. Regarding Bhabha’s concept of ambivalence and its relationship to the hybridity, Ashcroft et al say:

But this is not a simple reversal of a binary for Bhabha shows that both colonizing and colonized subjects are implicated in the ambivalence of colonial discourse. The concept is related to hybridity because, first as ambivalence ‘decentres’ authority from its position of power, so that authority may also become hybridized when placed in a colonial context in which it finds itself dealing with, and often influenced by other cultures. In this respect, the very engagement of colonial discourse with these colonized culture over which it has dominations,

inevitably leads to an ambivalent that disables its dominance.

(14)

The deepening engagement of colonial discourse brings out its subjects to encounter with the colonized authority and colonized people. As a result, the decentering of colonial authority and colonized people's culture get heavily influenced, intertwined and vice-versa. Such state of making compatible and incompatible with both cultural traits ultimately lead people to sense ambivalence in colonial and postcolonial world - because that proceeds to generate hybridity in their thoughts, ideas, attitudes and styles. So, hybridity has made very deep rooted relation with the ambivalence.

The sense of ambivalence is the cause of his biological as well as cultural dimensions. Like hybridity, Naipaul's ambivalent position is the cause of his parental and his twilight consciousness has been shaped by the split attitudes. Considering the issue of ambivalence Jeremy Hawthorn who borrows his ideas of Bhabha, says, "for the colonial hybrid is the articulation of the ambivalent space where the rite of power is enacted on the site of desire, making its objects at once disciplinary and disseminatory or, in my mind a mixed metaphor, or negative transparency" (159).

Ambivalence denotes the cultural conflict between the colonizer and the colonized. This ambivalent situation unsettles the mimetic or narcissistic demands of colonial power but re-implicates the identifications in strategies of subversion that turn the issue of the discriminated black upon the eye of power.

The writing of postcolonial studies bears the traces of hybrid experiences caused by cross-cultural encounter during colonial occupation is characterized by in between space. Such impression steers from the realization of the talk of cultural

root, identity and the space to locate the consciousness as well as from the profound desire in poet to evoke their afflictions. Like Hybridity, in-between space also lies between past and the present. Bhabha says that, “Hybridity and in-between space emerged between the claims of the past and the needs of the present” (219). The concept of hybridity represents not only the postcolonial contest against the notions of fixity like standard and pure but it is also the cultural space for opening up new forms of identification.

For the postcolonial writers like Naipaul, the in between position of hybrid existence is a third place that emerges in between that traits of two mixed cultures. This space explains the complexities of the postcolonial realities. According to Bhabha, the in between space or third place becomes the fertile land where the postcolonial writers evoke both colonial and postcolonial issues at the same time. According to Bhabha, it is significant that the productive capacities of this third space have colonial or postcolonial provinces. For willingness to descent into the alien territory may reveal that the theoretical recognition of the space of enunciation may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of the cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture’s hybridity. So, we should remember that it is the ‘inter’ – cutting edge of translator and negotiation, the in-between space that carries the burden of the meaning of culture. And by exploring this “Third Space”, we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the other of ourselves (38).

The space represents the postcolonial culture that is of hybridized nature. It is the space of negotiation and interactions between two cultures. This culture is also called the global culture because it is fertile in the multinational and multicultural

space that provides the location for the postcolonial writers to define their own divided roots, mixed blood and cultural dualism. Jacobs defines this space as:

I might involve a postcolonial notion of some 'in-between space' as a way of legitimating my transgression. I might argue that post-colonial negotiations are 'spaces' that are conveniently not of the center nor of the others, an orphaned surplus of hybridity for which anyone might speak. Such 'spaces' are produced in the politics of the colonialism and postcolonialism. (8)

The in-between space functions as a stage for Naipaul to evoke his search for root and against cultural identity. His in-between position governs his writing career that provides him with many spatial as well as temporal location to celebrate his cultural anguishes stretching from ambivalences to the liberation. His writing fertile in the in-between space that expresses his twilight consciousness. This space provides him many ideas to experience his divided identity. He enters into the inbetween location to heal the cultural complexities caused by colonial intervention and he exploits that space to locate his self-identity and roots.

The problematic boundaries of modernity are executed in the ambivalent temporalities of the nation space. The language of culture and community is poised on the fissures of the present becoming the rhetorical figures of a national past. Historians 'trans-fixed' on the event and origins of the nation never ask and political theorists possessed of the 'modern' totalities of the notion – 'Homogeneity, literacy and anonymity are the key traits – never pose, the awkward question of the disjunctive representation of the social, in this double time of the notion for Frans

Bhabha. It is indeed only in the disjunctive time of the nation's modernity – as knowledge disjoints between political rationality and its impasse, between the shreds and patches of cultural signification and the certainties of the nationalist pedagogy that questions of nation as narration come to be posed. How do we plot the narrative of the notion that most delicate between the teleology of progress tipping over into the 'timeless' discourse of irrationality? How do we understand that 'homogeneity' of modernity the people which if pushed too far, may assume something resembling the archaic body of the despotic or totalization mass? In the midst of progress and modernity, the language of ambivalence reveals a politics 'without duration', as Althusser once provocatively wrote: 'space without places, time without duration' (Althusser 78) to write the story of the nation demands. Homi K. Bhabha says, "We articulate that archaic ambivalence that informs modernity. We may begin by questioning that progressive metaphor of modern social cohesion – the many as one shared by organic theories of the holism of cultural and community, and by theorists who treat gender, class or race as radially expressive social totalities" (86).

What skin and masks have in common is that they mark the interfere between the self and the world: they are the border. For Bhabha, however, this image evokes an ambivalence that can be read not just as marking the trauma of the colonial subject but also characterizing the workings of colonial authority as well as the dynamics of resistance. Colonial authority, he suggests, undermines itself by not being able to replicate its own self perfectly. In one of his best known essays, signs taken for wonders he discusses the transmission of the Bible in colonial India and the way in which the book is hybridized in the process of being communicated to the natives. He concludes that the colonial preserve is always ambivalent, split between its

appearance as original and authorities and its articulation as repetition and difference.

For Bhabha, this gap marks a failure of colonial discourse and is a site for resistance:

Resistance is not necessarily and oppositional act of political intention, not is it the simple negative or the exclusion of the content of another culture, as difference once perceived . . .

But the effect of an ambivalence produces within the rules of recognition of dominating discourses as they articulate the signs of cultural difference. (41)

If in Fanon's writings colonial authority works by inviting black subjects to mimic white culture, in Bhabha's work such as invitation itself undercuts colonial hegemony. Whereas Fanon's black mimics are dislocated subjects, here as also in a wide range of writings on postcolonialism, "mimicry has the effect of undermining authority" (77-78). Naipaul's response to what he calls communal festering is complex and confused. Because his theory of the simple society does not admit such manifest historical agency, his account begins to appear more like a private vision – a romance, to use his term – and less like an authoritative explanation. The tone of his remarks about the arrival of dread locks is especially peculiar, as he begrudges the passing of black servity. And even in recognizing the limits of his romance, he still locates the simplified and sentimentalized version of the past only on the other side.

Naipaul promptly traveled back to Trinidad with the aim of returning the Island to his newly acquired understanding of its past. By a quick of history, he arrived the midst of Black power uprising of 1970s, and event that threw his theory of the Islands static simplicity quite tangibly into disarray. I found an Island full of racial tensions and close to revolution, so, as soon as I had arrived at a new idea about the

place, it had ceased to be mine. Twenty years later, the Negroes of Trinidad, following those of the United States, were asserting their separateness. They simplified and sentimentalized the past; they did not, like me, wish to possess it for its romance. They were their heir in a new way. The heir that had with them been a source of embarrassment and shame, a servile badge, they now wore as a symbol of aggression.

For Naipaul, he has argued that there is only the history of the Europeans in Trinidad. It is an attitude that participates the imperial traditions that have used the rhetorical banishment of African and Caribbean societies from history to rationalize their domination while foreclosing serious consideration of their cultural complexities. By bestowing on the terms Primitive and simple societies a sovereign, global explanatory power, Naipaul appends himself to this lineage. His writing thereby comes to exemplify the static binary between tradition and modernity that V.Y. Mudimbe has critiqued so powerfully in his work on the invention of Africa. As Mudimbe points out that it is the episteme of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries that invented the concept of a static and prehistoric tradition.

So far from rendering him an oddity, Naipaul's preferred locations with him securely to one of the west's most entrenched traditions of thought and action. If, as El Dorado testifies, the Charisma of his prose enhances the seductiveness of this argument, Naipaul's high standing as an interpreter of the postcolonial era nonetheless relies centrally on his clear cut segregation of the static, traditional cultures left outside the orbits of history from the dynamic, rational, modern ones, which set and occupy those historical circuits. Were Naipaul to replace this inherited colonial division with less predictable more differential readings of cultural identity and

change, his none fiction would risk losing at least in Britain and the United States – much of its reflex intelligibility.

The tension between the pedagogical and the performative haunt the symbolic formation of modern social authority. The people are neither the beginning nor the end of the national narrative; they represent the cutting edge between the totalizing powers of the 'social' as homogeneous, consensual community and the forces that signify the more specific address to contentions, unequal interests and identifies within the population. The ambivalent signifying system of the nation – space participates in a more general genesis of ideology in modern societies that Claude Lefort has described. For him too, it is "enigma of language" at once internal and external to the speaking subject, which provides the most apt analogue for imagining the structure of ambivalence that constitutes modern social authority. How do we articulate cultural differences within this vacillation of ideology in which the national discourse also participates, sliding ambivalently from once enunciatory position to another? What are the forms of life struggling to be represented in that unruling 'time' of national culture, which Bhakhtin surmounts in his reading of Goethe, Gellner associates with the rags and patches of everyday life, Said describes as "the non subjunctivity" and Lefort represents as the unexorable movement of signification that both constitutes the exorbitant image of power and describes it of the certainty and stability of centre or closure? What might be the cultural and political efforts of the liminality of the nation, the margins of modernity, which come to be signified in the narrative temporalities of splitting ambivalence and vacillation?

Deprived of that unmediated visibility of historicism, Bhabha remarks – "Looking to the legitimacy of past generations as supplying cultural autonomy – the

nation turns from being the symbol of modernity into becoming the symptom of an ethnography of the contemporary" within modern culture (160). Such a shift in perspective emerges from an acknowledgement of the nations interrupted address articulated in the tension between signifying the people as a priori historical presence, pedagogical object; and the people constructed in the performance of narrative its enunciatory 'present marked in the repetition' and pulsation of the national sign. The pedagogical founds its narrative authority in a tradition of the people, described by Poulantzas as a moment of becoming designated by it encapsulated in a succession of historical moments that represents an eternity produced by self generation. The performative intervenes in the sovereignty of the nation's self-generation by casting a shadow between the people as 'image' and its signification as a differentiating sign of self, distinct from the other of the outside" (147).

The term Diaspora is derived from the Greek, which means, "to disperse." The colonization is the historical fact of Diaspora. In this sense, we can define Diaspora as a movement of people from their homeland into new regions; the colonialism itself was a radically diasporic movement, involving the temporary or permanent dispersion and settlement of millions of Europeans over the entire world. Many settled regions were developed historically as plantation or agricultural colonies. Those colonies were used as place to grow foods for the metropolitan population. These settled regions demanded a large number of populations as laborers. For example, the West Indian European industrialist demanded many Indian workers for the sugar plantation and cotton plantation.

The plantation colonies imported many slaves. Most of the slaves were captured, bought from the African Coasts. After the slave trade, and where the slavery

was outlawed by the European powers in the first decades of the 19th century, the system of indentured labour replaced the demand of cheap agricultural in colonial plantation economies. This involved transporting, under indenture agreements, large populations of poor agriculture laborers from populations rich areas, such as India and China, the areas where they were needed to serve the plantations. The practices of slavery and indenture thus resulted in worldwide colonial Diasporas. For this reason, Indian populations formed substantial minorities or majorities in colonies as diverse as the West India, Malaysia, Fiji and the colonies of Eastern and Southern Africa.

The descendents of the Diasporas movements, generated by the colonialism, have developed their own real cultures. The notion of a Diasporic identity has been adopted by many writers as a positive affirmation of their hybridist. Again, they search the Diasporic cultures which questions essentialist models, interrogating the ideology of a unified, natural cultural norms, one that undermines the center/margin model of colonialist discourse. The word 'Diaspora' was originally applied to the condition of the Jewish people living outside Palestine. It connotes the community condition eel to be exiled or voluntarily exiled, Diaspora literature expresses the sense of longing for the original native society which is also the source evoking the sense of separation and loss.

Homi K. Bhabha produces a discursive context for recurrent instances of transgression performed by the natives from within and against colonial discourse. Here the auto colonization of the natives, who meet the requirements of colonialist address, is co-extensive with the evasions and 'sly civility' through which the native refuses to satisfy the demand of the colonizer's narratives of domination. This concept

of mimicry has since been further developed in the postulate of "hybridity" as a problematic of colonial discourse.

Bhabha contends that when rearticulated by the natives, the colonialist desire for a reformed recognizable, nearly similar other is enacted as parody, a dramatization to be distinguished from the 'experience of dependent colonial relations through narcissistic identification'. For in the 'hybrid moment' what the native rewrites is not a copy of the colonialist original, but a qualitatively different thing in itself a text whose misreading and incongruities expose the uncertainties and ambivalence of the colonialist text and deny its authorizing presence. Thus a textual insurrection against the discourse of colonial authority is located in the natives' interrogation of the English book within the terms of their own system of cultural meanings, a displacement which is received back from the record written by colonialism's agents and ambassadors.

Through the native's strange questions, it is possible to see with historical hindsight what they resisted in questioning the presence of the English – as religious mediations and as cultural and linguistic medium. To the extent to which discourse is a form of defensive warfare then mimicry marks important moments of civil disobedience within the discipline of civility, signs of spectacular resistance, example when the words of the master became the site of "hybridity" – the war like sign of the native – then we may not only read between the lines, but even see to change the often coercive reality that they so lucidly contain (24).

Postcolonialism pursues a post national reading of the colonial encounter by focusing on the global amalgam of cultures and identities consolidated by imperialism. To this end, it deploys a variety of conceptual terms and categories of

analysis which examine the mutual contagion and subtle intimacies between colonizers and colonized. In this regard, the term 'Hybridity' and 'Diaspora' in particular, stand out for their analytic veracity and theoretical resilience. By and large, the language of hybridist seems to derive its theoretical impacts from Fanon's astute reading of colonial oppression as a catalyst for the accelerated mutation of colonized societies. It is Fanon's contention in *A dying Colonialism* that "The unpredictable exigencies of the decolonizing project radically unsettle centuries and old cultural patterns in colonized societies. The shifting strategies of anti-colonial struggle; combined with the task of imagining a new and liberated postcolonial figure, generate a crisis, within the social fabric" (130).

The Indian Diaspora is generic term to describe the people who migrated from territories that are currently within the borders of the republic of India. It also refers to their descendants. The Diaspora is currently estimated to number approximately twenty million composed of "INRS" (Indian Citizens Non Residing in India) and "PSOC" (Person of some other country), and covers practically every part of the world (Lal's -13).

Who and what is an Indian? How we are to characterize the Indian Diasporic Community as Indian given that it is constituted of such diverse elements as South Indians, Hong Kong Muslim, Canadian Sikhs, Punjabi, Mexicans, Californians, Gujarati, East African Indians now settled in U.S. In the Indian Community has occupied a place of considerable privilege ground the world and many Indians could deflect the moment of recognition that Indianness and being Americans do not always happily coincide. The Indian women in her native dress, with vermillion dot on her forehead, are easily seen as an embodiment. Diasporic community is not admittedly

complex, but some presumed link between the Diasporic community and the motherland can be easily questioned. It is merely a subtractive issue of "origins". It is thus perfectly reasonable to speak about the existence of Indian Diaspora.

The unlikely fact that small Indian Diaspora in Trinidad, now more urban based and mixed, should find its chronicler is Naipaul, that the peculiar dedication, of an individual consciousness should be immortalized in what now looks like the epic of postcolonial literature, is in itself extra-ordinary. That the book should have a precedent is even more so; Naipaul drew some of the novel's events from the life of his father, but he borrowed more directly from his father's stories about his Hindu peasant childhood, about the life of the Indian countryside that the earliest immigrants brought to Trinidad, through their oral tradition the life that superseded himself had barely emerged from when he started writing about it.

This autobiographical novel is suffused with Naipaul's sense of wonder at his own transplanted physical self in England, at the unlikely achievement of profoundly ignorant Indian from a Hindu – peasant background who not only conceived of, but managed to realize, a high literacy ambition in addition it takes the reader through all the complex stages – the ignorance, presumption, failure and slow self-knowledge – of Naipaul's discovery of his subjects and themes. In the long chapter 'The Journey', he describes how unprepared he was for the big world he entered soon after parting from his family in Trinidad in 1950, and how, although he was traveling to be a writer, that states of unpreparedness, the fear and loneliness he felt in New York and London on that first trip away from home, the raw unmade self he sensed within, couldn't become for him a proper subject of writing seemed to him then a display of sensibility, where the writer had to come across as a serene man of the world. It was an idea Naipaul had

picked up from the literature of imperial Britain, "He had come across as young reader, from the books of Evelyn Waugh, Somerset Maugham, Aldous Huxley. More than wanting to write like these writers, he wanted to appear to their world as they appeared to him: aloof everywhere, unsurprised, immensely knowing (25).

The dilemma of return among Indian migrants in the West Indies, to cite the incisive work of historian Praphu Mahapatra, was more acute. As she says, "our unnamed Fin de Siecle Coolie was fished out by the two weeks for indecent exposure. His contemporary, one Laxman, twice gave the slip to the authorities in Guyana, returned to India under assumed names and findings himself in an alien homeland, and was desparated each time to get back to the sugar islands of the New World" (89).

The paradox, of course, in that without Naipaul's homeland there would have been nobody of his work. Sadly, he seems loath to want to admit this and his past statements to the press acknowledging. Britain and India but not Trinidad, would seem to confirm this fact. Britain did not produce V.S. Naipaul. True its literary culture allowed him to become a writer, while its literary establishment bestowed every possible honour upon him. Naipaul has even been rewarded by the state. But it is the Caribbean, a place for him of double exile, a place where he become as culturally inscribed migrant within a migrant world, which gave to him his great theme : loss. If as Eudora Welty once said about writing, one simply "dares to do with one's bag of fears", then Naipaul has done the daring in Britain (137). But his bag of fears is Caribbean, which is why, to throughout the Caribbean, people are celebrating this most olyspeptic of sons. Not so much, "well done sir Vidya; but you hear about video? Naipaul's boy. He done good, eh? ( Philips-137 )

When Robinson Crusoe set foot on the island and declared it his own, a new page was inscribed in the history of colonialism. The shipwreck becomes a historical moment in this history. Defoe is able to create a textual plantation with the undaunted Robinson at its center, involved in a double divine action of invention and original self invention. The footprint, however, will unsettle his undisturbed tranquility, and fear enters the stage. Neither the Bible nor his guns will bring him peace. Crusoe will undergo the painful experience of recurrent traumatic nightmares before the event. The silence is broken. The other has already inhabited the self prior to the uncanny encounter: anxiety invades the body and mind of the stranded hero. The 'textual empire' is shaken by the unknown: The island is full of noises. The captured absent/present utterances are therefore unbounded; authority is de-authorized (is it?), and writing hybridized. What is hybridization? Bakhtin asks, "It is a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by and epoch, by social differentiation, or by some other factor" (358).

He seems, Brantlinger states, "almost to will his isolation, and to cling to it even if is being invaded" (3). Friday does not exist. Friday is a lie, an illusion created by a mad masterly imagination. He is an ever complete, insubstantial image, a mere inorganic shadow, a dark spot on the ground, an image. Friday is filling an empty space cynically prepared and strategically organized by the colonizer as a speeding subject. The mirror image that Friday is striving to see reflected will be a distorted one, a neither-nor: one that is ambivalent, doubled. It was one of the tragedies of slavery and of the conditions under which creolization had to take place. Kaman Brathwaite states that it should have produced this kind of mimicry; should have produced such 'mimic – man'. But in the

circumstances this was the only kind of white imitation that would have been accepted, given the terms in which the slaves were seen.

Nevertheless, some postcolonial critics argue that it is precisely this kind of mimicry that disrupts the colonial discourse by doubling it. For them, the simple presence of the colonized other within the textual structure is enough evidence of the ambivalence of the colonial text, an ambivalence that destabilizes its claim for absolute authority or unquestionable authenticity. Hence, today, the term hybridity has become one of the most recurrent conceptual leitmotifs in postcolonial cultural criticism. It is meant to foreclose the diverse forms of purity uncompressed within essentialist theories. Homi K. Bhabha is the leading contemporary critic who has tried to disclose the contradiction inherent in colonial discourse in order to highlight the colonized ambivalence in respect to his position toward the colonized other.

Along with Tom Nairn, Homi Bhabha considers the confusion and hollowness that resistance produces in the minds of such imperialist authors as Rider Kaggard, Rudyard Kipling, and E. M. Foster. But while Nairn sees their colonialist grandiose rhetoric as disproportionate to the real decadent economy and political situation of late Victoriana England, Bhabha goes as far as to see this imperial delirium forming gaps within the English text, gaps which are:

The signs of a discontinuous history are an estrangement of the English book. They mark the disturbance of its authoritative representation by the uncanny forces of race, sexuality, violence, culture and even climatic differences which emerge in the colonial discourse as the mixed and split texts of hybridity. If the English book is read as a production of hybridity, then it no longer simply commands authority. (84)

His analysis, which is largely based on the Lacanian conceptualization of mimicry as camouflage focuses on colonial ambivalence. On the one hand, he sees the colonizer as a snake in the grass who, speaks in "a tongue that is forked," and produces a mimetic representation that, ". . . emerges as one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge" (85). Bhabha recognizes then that colonial power carefully establishes highly- sophisticated strategies of control and dominance; that, while it is aware of its ephemerality, it is also anxious to create the means that guarantee its economic, political and cultural endurance, through the conception, in Macaulay's words in his 'Minute on Indian Education' (1835), 'of a class of interpreter and between us and the millions whom we govern . . . a class of persons Indian in blood and colour but English in taste, in opinions, morale and in intellect' . That is through the reformation of that category of people referred to by Frantz Fanon in the phrase; 'black skin/white masks' or as mimic men' by V.S. Naipaul.

On the other hand, Bhabha immediately diverts his pertinent analysis by shifting the superlative certainty of the colonizer and the strategic effectiveness of his political intentions into an alarming uncertainty. Macaulay's Indian Interpreters along with Naipaul's mimic men, he asserts by the very fact that they are authorized versions of others, part-objects of a metonymy of colonial desire, end up emerging as inappropriate colonial subjects . . . [who], by now producing a partial vision of the colonizer's presence, destabilize the colonial subjectivity, unsettle its authoritative centrality, and corrupt its discursive parity. Actually, he adds, mimicry repeats rather than re-presents (author's emphasis), and in that very act repetition, originality is lost, and centrality decentered. What is left, according to Bhabha, is the trace, the impure, the artificial, and the second-hand. Bhabha analyses the slippages in colonial political discourse, and reveals that the janus – faced attitudes towards the colonized lead to the production of a mimicry that

presents itself more in the form of a 'menace' than 'resemblance' more in the form of a rupture than consolidation.

Hybridity, Bhabha argues, subverts the narratives of colonial power and dominant cultures. The series of inclusions and exclusions on which a dominant culture is premised are deconstructions by the very entry of the formerly – excluded subjects into the mainstream, discourse. The dominant culture is contaminated by the linguistic and social differences of the native self. Hybridity can thus be seen, in Bhabha's interpretation, as a counter-narrative, a critique of the canon and its exclusion of the other narratives. In other words, the hybridity – acclaimers want to suggest first, that the colonialist discourse's ambivalence is a conspicuous illustration of its uncertainty; and second, that the migration of yesterday's 'savages' from their peripheral spaces to the homes of their 'masters' underlies a blessing invasions that, by 'Third – Worlding' the center, creates 'fissures' within the very structures that sustain it. This table published fourteen years after *The Postmodern Condition*, reads like a space-age equivalent of the Delphic Oracle, with the message warning us of the ambivalence of post modernism and urging us to avoid its contemporary hubris [in the guise of tech-nology and un ending progress]. If we are to avoid the worst. In this passage there is the opposition of racial progress and culture that is essential to the idea of postmodern. In Lyotard's philosophy, the postmodern is ambivalent in three ways. First it is the ambivalent in safer as its products bring us both good and evil, the technology of nuclear power is not possible without or nuclear bombs. Secondly, it is ambivalent insofar as Lyotard understands the word 'postmodern' to apply to the whole range of contemporary culture, from everyday social life to science and art. Quite often, Lyotard writes negatively about the post modernity of popular culture, but positively about the post modernity of high culture (Art, Science, Philosophy, etc.) Thirdly, the term seems ambivalent in the sense of confusion. Lyotard intends to use it the prefix "Post" in a way different from the way it is usually used. "I have said and will say again," he insists, "that ' Postmodern'

signifies not the end of modernism", it is a type of new thinking in relation to modernism ("Les lumieres- *An interview*- 277). Lyotard finally resorts to an orthodox explanation in the form of the fable, which is most easily understood after a discussion of his entire theory originating almost twenty years earlier in the Post-modern condition.

Thus, colonialism has underpinned the multi-faceted dimensions in various aspects in colonized countries so as to make the people subservient, powerless and claustrophobic. This created the amalgamating discourse and hybrid culture in the life of native people. Eventually, such traits of colonialism result with the thematic issues such as ambivalence, indecisiveness, uncertainty, estrangement, dislocatedness, hybridity and schizophrenia. These techniques and issues have mostly made ambivalent to Naipaul and other characters like Jivan, Basant, Ramnath in the text. However, such ambivalence for them has become a very powerful tool to lead their life towards success in their respective careers. Therefore, postcolonial ambivalence can be a creative and maneuvering strategy for the people in the postcolonial world.

### III. Postcolonial Ambivalence in V.S.Naipaul's *An Area of Darkness*

*An Area of Darkness* explores the postcolonial ambivalence including uncertainty, indecisiveness, ambivalence, dislocatedness, estrangement, psychological trauma, hybridity, schizophrenia, mimicry and so on. All these techniques are devised in order to make appropriateness in the new circumstances, specifically, after the end of colonialism and emergence of independent states from the authority of colonial power in the early and mid of 20<sup>th</sup> century. The colonization which began from the late 17<sup>th</sup> century onwards when the discovery of Renaissance made tremendous effect in the human life emphatically in Europe that brought radical changes and disastrous impact in the various aspects of people such as culture, psychology, attitude, socio-economic realm, civilization, religions, moral ethics in the countries in Asia, Africa and North and South America. Principally, the expansion of Christianity, increment in militarisation and search of trade along with the hidden motif, political power eventually resulted the aforementioned characteristic in the life of native people living in the common wealth and third world countries. These techniques, in turn, become powerful for creating new dimensions in postcolonial literature. These have also played as important techniques in creating and being the issues to redraw the lines in the postcolonial history of the colonized countries. In this regard, the research work analyzes how all these techniques are applied by the writers in order to respond to postcolonial ambivalence which works as the resistive as well as creative in producing and publishing the literary genre with the distinctive features of postcolonial from the hybridized, ambivalent, disillusioned society of postcolonial countries.

*An Area of Darkness* thematizes completely ambivalent, hybridized, estranged conditions of people after the decolonization in mid 1900s. It opens with the obvious ambivalent attitude due to Naipaul's life grown up in two different locations one in

Trinidad and another in England where he suffers from the psychological trauma and gradually the frustration engulfs him, "London is not the centre of my world. I have been misled but there is nowhere to go" (38). This makes him realize the nowhere-ness and dislocatedness where a crux is clearly seen in his life which he experiences while he comes to encounter with two worlds of colonizers and colonized. *An Area of Darkness*, generates the assimilating ideas of darkness which was "his childhood imagination" where he traveled for the first time in India, his ancestral place (37).

While Naipaul leaves Trinidad for England for further study at the age of eighteen to quench his literary thirst, it becomes his center but always suffered from the psychological trauma. He finds no place to locate him in that far land. As a result one has to return to his own native place, "England a country of mist and rain and forest, from which the traveler is soon to hurry back to a warm familiar land for as no such land existed" (36). He can't mingle himself with the ancestral place. Language gives a man a sense of belonging. If one can communicate in a new environment he/she feels pleasure, and it saves from the sense of loss or dislocation. The narrator can't thrill with the Hindi. He says, "I now had almost no Hindi but it was language which divided me from what I knew of Hindi" (37). He fails to be owned by Indian-ness, thus, he feels ambivalent. Then, the narrator goes to London to follow his literary ambition. He works hard to achieve a space yet, he gets lost, the frustration engulfs him and finds himself as marginalized which he marks, "London is not the centre of my world. I have been misled but there is nowhere to go" (38). The psychological pang grows bigger. Man of no place grows up because he does not embrace even England. He further goes saying:

Here I became no more than an inhabitant of a big city, robbed of loyalties time passing, taking me away from what I was, thrown more

and more into my self, fighting to keep my balance and to keep alive the thought of the clear world beyond the brick and asphalt and the chaos of railway lines. All mythical lands faded, and in the big city I was confined to a smaller world than I had ever known, I became my flat, my desk, and my name. (38)

Obviously it illustrates that he can't accept the either places, one of physically stunning city, London, English and another mythically dominated society, Bombay (other cities in India). He finds himself unfit or inappropriate in both the environments. Both milieus of city offer him absolute detachment in his psyche. Neither he can embrace nor quit abruptly. The 'brick', 'asphalt' and the 'chaos of railway lines' disillusion him more and more as to make him feel exhausted in the big city. The prevailing mythical beliefs and practices confine him with and hardly finds to escape.

India has been in his mind since childhood. He still keeps some privileges of specialties about India. Later, after his arrival across Cairo, Greece-Athens, he comes to surprise with the linguistics. "Bakshish" he hears the word used in India then he feels "deformed" and "diminished "while the street beggars raise their palms towards him (6). All they prove the economic degradation in Indian lives. He analyzes the degree of poverty and well off the Indian people have simply made him more detached and alien in own country. His discovery concludes India a dark place, an area of darkness, which is the outcome of the colonial practices and discriminatory policy of the then government in India.

Furthermore, he keeps on comparing his way of thinking, attitudes and his father. His father used to prefer Indianess even while building house in Trinidad. He ignored the colonial style and impacts rather he followed Indian. Naipaul sees such

houses now in Uttar Pradesh, India, which are similar in structure and styles. He looks at the life of his father. He had the "appetite for Hindu" so he made the Trinidadian society as Hindu society with its intact norms and values (27). However, the narrator's detachment is concerned with the horror of "unclean" abode of Indian people and the distinction in "Casteism" (27). The untouchable, those works as third class job that the upper caste people take as inhuman act to do. The degree of degradation on the base of economic sufficiency and caste division are the principal grounds with which he can't reconcile and feels estranged.

Further, some other character like Malik and Malhotra represent here as the representative of colonizers. They themselves prove it by their attitudes, power, and functions as they are "addicted to English education" and have come in India with western mind sets (57). Malhotra, once, dismisses Ramnath from his job of clerk because he is not satisfied with his way of performing the duty. His colonial eye keeps him ever higher and looks other native Indian down who are born and brought up only in Indian soil. Similarly, Jivan and Vasant also face the same fate like of Malik, as native Indian who have to work under the officers who are educated and cultured in England in English environment. The clash is exclusively seen between the "colonizer" and "colonized" in postcolonial India (53). Both Malik and Malhotra have the notions and attitudes of colonizers. Therefore, they find themselves being rejected in India here it defines, "Malik and Malhotra are exceptional. They are not interested in the type of adventure the society can provide; their aspirations are alien and disruptive. Rejecting the badges of dress and food and function, rejecting degree, they find themselves rejected" (56).

Their common aspirations are same because they are the western product. They've studied in England, got the cultural practices of English people and had their

type of mind set. In the meantime, Naipaul finds very close compatibility in the physical existence of Trinidad and India. He reveals that both societies simply 'pretend to be colonial' and they 'co-exist' though they fall in two different locations. He traces back to history of Indian in which he claims the nature "mimicry" apparently prevalent in India (55). Either "it was of Mogul of yesterday" and keeps on prediction that "it will be Russian or American tomorrow"(55). He gives the evidence of cultural imprints of the past like of Mogul and there might be the hegemonial influence of America in coming years. Obviously, he remarks that it is 'English today'. Mimicry might be too harsh a word for what appears so 'comprehensive and profound'. He goes to scale the profundity of the acceptance and rejection of the alien language and culture. The appearance of mimicry is what he says is so comprehensive, too. He looks at the appearance and existence of mimicry in such areas: buildings, railways, administration, the intellectual discipline of the civil servants and the economists.

Schizophrenia and mimicry are intertwined in terms of two different nature of human. Schizophrenia, a mental illness in which a person becomes unable to link thought, emotion and behavior, takes into account of oriental attitude, that relates with our history, culture, rituals etc. Unlikely, mimicry is the amalgamation of native one and foreign influences. The narrator takes the mimic characteristics of Indian people. Here he explains:

Schizophrenia might, better explain the scientist who before taking up his appointment, consults the astrologer for an auspicious day, But mimicry must be used because so much has been acquired that the schizophrenia is often concealed, because so much of what is seen remain simple mimicry, incongruous and absurd, and because no

people, by their varied physical endowments, are as capable by mimicry as the Indians. (55)

The Indian scientist who has acquired modern scientific education and he believes in western system of discovery, exploration, research and experiments. But when he gets ready to take up appointment, he goes to consult with a astrologer for an auspicious day. Astrology is concerned with the oriental beliefs in knowing the fate and future of the person earlier. So, such mimicry is what the narrator says is "incongruous" and "absurd" (55). He gets the mimicry in the Indian people.

Moreover, he puts forward an evidence of mimicry in an Indian army officer. Being as Indian he is now a complete "English army officer" while he presents his views in a meeting (56). His "look" is English, his "gait" and "bearing" are both English, whatever he does and acts, mannerism then his "tastes" in drink all are English (56). But it is found as a fantasy the Indian English mimicry in Indian setting and he claims it is an undiminishing absurdity. This is mimicry not of England, a real country but of the fairy tale land of Anglo-India of clubs and sahibs. These obvious attitudes of mimicry and schizophrenia are the actors of creating disillusionment in the lives of Indian people and the narrator himself who gets bewildered after having seen the absurd and incongruous amalgamation of orient and occident, it is Indian ambivalence. Naipaul keeps on mentioning the conditions and people getting ambivalent. The father of Indians, the father of great soul, Mahatma Gandhi gives very bitter reviews on India; "well India is a country of nonsense" is the irony of greatness (70). Gandhi himself is ambivalent though he is an Indian because he became a scholar in England. So, he used English glass to look at India.

He was born and brought up during colonial era in India then went in England for English education where he did his professional study in law. His mind set was

structured by the norms and values of English colonial hegemony. He, therefore, underestimated the Indian people and whole Indian Territory with the expression of "a country of nonsense" (70). He is found that he was full of ambivalence whether to rationalize Indian or not.

The narrator was stunned at the attitude of Indian people while they go for defecating along the roadway, railway tracks. Mostly he meets the Indians in Uttar Pradesh going at the edge of open area, railway track and leave excrements. It is an Indian culture for excretion. Though he is an Indian Diaspora, he had never thought Indians would be like that but he experienced the wild nature of native Indians, living in India. He remarks at the excreting attitude of Indians that, "Indian defecates everywhere" proves their attitudes and lack of rationality (70). He realizes the meaning of "everywhere" which he often uses in the text and compares them with nature poets (70). Indians are very poetic people because they are fond of the presence of nature even during defecating. The attitude of ambivalence in the Indian people is found in relation between what they claim the Indian civilization, a distinctively pure and holy and what the English language and culture they perceive from the English ruler. Looking at such state of human life in Indian, he says Gandhi is a "failed reformer" (74). He saw India so clearly because "he was in part a colonial" (74). He was the passive follower of colonial regime. During his stay in South Africa he was engaged in "a colonial blend of east and west, Hindu and Christian" (74). He feels in the dilemma of two different religious beliefs, Hinduism and Christianity. So, he was the victim of the two religions even in the same country, India. Naipaul feels ambivalent over the beliefs of power in fate and includes this evidence as, "A tailor in Madrass, a south Indian city, every morning pause at the door of his shop, bows and touches the dust of the threshold to his

forehead. This is how he guards his luck; his enterprises, is a contract between god and himself alone” (78). This man, a tailor, represents the Indian who don't have beliefs over what they do, think and see rather they believe entirely over the supernatural power of god. People are ambivalent in their act and action and the divine power of god to make their action absolutely successful. He "guards his luck" by making relation between his job of tailoring and divine power (78). This is the common ambivalent attitude of Indian people.

Further, the Nehru, the first prime minister of Indian also gives the same remarks about common Indian people. He, too, is a fully-grown up man in colonial English environment. He takes into account of the class structure of Indians and says, "Class is a system of reward. Caste imprisons a man in his function" (76). His claim of class means the division in the life of people on the basis of economy and casteism are inhumanitarian practices. His out look towards such people and provoking it as a reward is a colonial attitude. Nehru, himself was injected by English education and colonial culture. Therefore, his remarks and real Indian attitude do not reconcile. They are found with ambivalent nature of thought. He favors the Casteism because he says it "imprison a man" means he is similar in the manners of English who did not desire to give liberty to the people (79). They make people devoted in their works only; so the colonial ruler politically provokes Nehru's thought. More colonial or western vision is kept in the eyes of Gandhi, as it reads:

It is system that has to be regenerated the psychology of caste that has to be destroyed. So, Gandhi comes again and again to the filth and excrement of India, the dignity of latrine-cleaning; the spirit of service; bread labor. From the west, his message looks limited and

cranky; but it is only that to a concerned colonial vision of Indian he is applying western simplicities. (82)

Gandhi is a mimic man, since his education and western culture shape him to grapple with colonial vision and attitude. He applied the simple lifestyle during the independent movement in India. He comes across the "filth and excrement of India" but makes no change at all (82). His message of great India, civilized Indians and prosperous Indian society seems elusive and gloomy because his entire message fails down. He simply applies the western simplicities leaving the ground of reality of native India. India undid him. He became a mahatma. He was to be revered for what he was; his message was irrelevant. He roused India to all her "formless spirituality"; he awakened all the Indian passion for self abasement in the presence of the virtues, self abasement of which the Kama Sutra would have approved, since it ensured a man's prospects in the other world, did not encourage him to any prolonged and difficult labor (82). Hence, his vision, attitudes, simple actions contradict with the native Indian peoples. Such contradictions make him more ambivalent in his vision of new India and colonial perspectives. "He succeeded politically because he was revered; he failed because he was revered" is the remarkable quote the narrator points out (83). Reverence is the term, which leads him to achieve success, and in the time he fails completely to transfigure the Indian society is apparently his ambivalent attitude. So, Gandhi is rigorously haunted by the ambivalence.

Naipaul's ambivalent position has been exclusively seen in his minute observation of Hindu culture and mythical beliefs. He gives his personal views how he predicts the Indian society ruining soon because of unfathomable practices of religious, cultural and mythical beliefs. Here he goes on remarking:

Out side the temple there were two wooden juggernauts decorated with erotic carving: couples engage in copulation and fellatio: passionless, stylized - there were my first glimpse of Indian erotic carving, which I had been longing to see, but after the first excitement came depression. Sex as pain, creates its own decay; Shiva, god of the phallus, performing the dance of life and the dance of death; what a concept it is, how entirely of India! The ruins were inhabited. (219)

He is mostly surprised by the dance elegantly performed by mythical Hindu lord Shiva. His pose of dance both of life and death are beyond his beliefs and imagination. So, he looks at Indian society, which is entirely structured on the base of myth and supernatural taboos, and then he assumes that it will ruin in the coming days. He says the "erotic carvings" is his first sight (219). He also claimed that "sex as pain" symbolically carved on the wall may create its own decay. He is not sure whether the Indian society would exist in the future or not. He is often ambivalent over the practice of Hindu culture without coherence and congruity and the existence of mythically rooted Indian Society. The double standard of mind he gets because of his western, materially influenced mindset in Trinidad and London and contrarily his sight in Indian social structure. On the other, art, culture of Indian remains alive until the European admiration grows continuously. It is said; "Where there had been no European admiration, there is no neglect" is an expression of colonial prejudices (221). The Indian ness will last longer till its colonial power keeps supporting it through huge admiration. This is the shame of Indian what Naipaul realizes. The illusion occurs in his thought while he feels such colonial surveillance in Indian symbols.

Furthermore, he looks at the school of Kangara and Basohli where the art has tremendously created confusion; "Indian art has been all confusion" it, all in all, leads him to be ambivalent. He is not sure whether the Indian art makes rhetoric in giving a solid image in the mind of a viewer like him. Therefore, he strives to keep the confusion under eraser and make it clear curtain in "New World" (222). This New World he takes as reference where the absolute certainty, straight-forwardness, clarity may be seen. But however, he finds the new world is still bewildering. More confusion, bewilderment arises in his thought, so he is a victim of Indian attitude of ambivalence. The bewildering situation is seen more in the extract:

And perhaps the British are responsible for this Indian artistic failure, which is part of the general Indian bewilderment, in the way what the Spaniards were responsible for the stapefaction of the Mexicans and the Peruvians. It was a class between a positive principles and a negative, and nothing more negative can be imagined than the conjunction in the eighteenth century of a static Islam and a decadent Hinduism. In any clash between post renaissance Europe and India, India was bound to lose. (224)

The narrator blames the British in making Indian bewildered in India. British people made the Indians artistically failure in such a way Spaniards caused to fail Mexicans and Peruvians, too. The divisions are created in Indians on the base of religious beliefs and casteism that has drilled out the class between Hindu Indians and Muslims Indians. He takes such class as examples are quite estranged at the static condition of Islam-religion and ruining stage of Hindu religion. However, the bewilderment has been widely created by the artificial failing situation by the British Hegemony. He is also bewildered at the decaying condition of Hindu society.

The narrator's failure to be a part of his ancestral land leads him towards loneliness and solitary. The aloofness gives him a sense of ambivalence which all the time haunts him, when he fails to merge himself into this land, so, he says "I have traveled lucidly over that area which was to me the area of darkness, something darkness remains, in those attitudes, those ways of thinking and seeing, which are not mine" (24) He further says that though he comes from a religious pundits family, he cannot understand the religion especially, those religious ceremonies and mantras (ritual verse) pronounced by the pundits. He says "I took no pleasure in religious ceremonies . . . I didn't understand the language" (27). It gives him more pain and proof to be detached who is unable to understand his own root culture. The colonial education has made him misfit to be accommodated by his own root culture. This incident makes him feel socially out caste; he feels himself rejected from the society. He, then, learn to accept the nature of separation. The feelings of two worlds (his own, western and ancestral) come side by side but he cannot juxtapose them now he realizes that:

This world should have existed all, even in the conscience of a child, is to me a marvel; as it is a marvel that we should have accepted the separateness of our two worlds and seems no incongruity in their juxtaposition. In one world we exist as if in blinkers as if seeing no more than my grand father's village; outside we are totally self-aware. And in India I was to see that so many of the things, which are newer, and now perhaps turns side of my nature kicked against. (30)

Melancholy becomes the part of his life and he feels to be lost in it. Thus, meaningless, isolation, and self-estrangement make him and his way of life melancholic when he is culturally, geographically, religiously and linguistically

unable to assimilate himself with his ancestral land and with their footsteps. Not only this much, out of his anxiety, he says, "the India, then, which was the background to my childhood was an area of imagination. It was not the real country"(37).

He further criticizes the Indian language, arts, and films. It is only language he thinks, gives him divided identity. He despises such language "I now had almost no Hindi" But it was more that language which divided me from what I know India, Indian films were both tedious and disquieting, they delighted in decay, agony and death" (37). Language is the tools and power of expression. Displacement brings dispossession of this power, which aggravated the ambivalent attitude due to the lack of expression thus, it is the fact to the narrator that he feels like dead in the ancestral homeland and this strangeness and solitary persists in his life. He says, "In India I have so far felt myself a visitor" (148).

However, the narrator feels happy to know about his source culture. The natural beauty and this cultural background, Hindu religion gives him more pleasure. He finds his existence after finding the religious pictures-in his imagination. He says "for in the India of my childhood, the land which in my imagination was as extension separate from the alien ness by which we ourselves were surrounded, of my grand mother's house, there was no alien presence"(199). His own world, though, clearly fading, was still separate; and an involvement with the English, of whom on the island he knows little, would have seemed a more unlikely violation than an involvement. He is much frustrated to live in the hybrid society in Trinidad. They always lose something neither there is possibility of wholeness in life. The wholeness is only possible in India.

The narrator is in India to find his cultural history but having not accustomed and familiarized with it, he is much found depressed. He cannot get the pleasure and

romance from the culture in Indian which he finds alien from western abode of culture, neither he can absolutely follow them. However, it is quite impossible to separate them from their romance and cultural pleasure. He feels as if he is an intruder because he says, "I was not English nor Indian; I was denied the victories of both" (102). Naipaul is in the pursuit of finding his cultural footsteps rather become the victim of displacement and alienation. It uproots him from his native soil and derives him of his native sky. He, at present belongs to Trinidad and his ancestry to India, his ancestor have lost their identity in Trinidad as they have lost their co-relation with India, her custom, heritage, cultures and traditions, when they were brought to Trinidad, "on a five year indentured labor"(277). But their contract ends in 1940 and all Indian are left there without history. This lack of history results in identity crisis. Every man needs his history; it helps him to know who he is, his inner desire for knowing his cultural history is to gain his individual identity, He knows that:

When he was a young man (Jussodra said) my grand father left this village to go to Banaras for study, as Brahmin's had immediately done. But my father is poor, his family is poor, and times were hard there might even have been a famine one day my grand father met a man who told him of a country far away called Trinidad. There were Indians in Trinidad, laborers; they needed pundits and teachers. The wages were good, land was cheap and a free passage could be arranged. The man who spoke to my grand father knew that he was talking about. He was an *arkatia* a recruiter; when times were good . . . people were willing to listen to his stories. So my grand father indentured himself for five years and went to Trinidad. (277)

Poverty is the cruelest punishment for all for all time. It can't be compromised with anything else. The narrator's forefathers became the victim of poverty. Its ugly reality destroyed and displaced them from India. They were bound to be indentured labour in the hope of prosperous days and a much secured future to their coming generation. Had they known about the feeling of loss ambivalent attitudes, cultural attachment and detachment and vice versa, they would never have migrated there in Trinidad.

Like Naipaul, another character, Jivan also becomes the victim of placelessness. He is poor by birth; poverty drags him to be a servant in a factory leaving behind his village at the age of thirteen. Bombay becomes his dreamland for work unlike the narrator; he hardly earns his bread and sleeps on the stretch of pavement at night. Traveler's rest and the pavement are the lodges for poor people sometimes, he runs pavement to pavement to be safe from the hooligans at night. Thus Jivan comes to know that there is more place but no place for poor people in the world in the lack of proper place, he is bound to continue a street life. He is, thus, dislocated, alienated and become more ambivalent in Bombay whether to live a life or die in poverty. He is detached from Bombay culture, which is the centre of colonialism.

The narrator searches both an ancestral place and root culture, but cannot be owned either by these. The tragedy is that when he desperately tries to mingle himself with the cultural root it becomes a fantasy. In a great pain, he says, "I was not English nor Indian" (102). Thus, the arrival of Indians in Trinidad brings them a sense of estrangement as they are historically disconnected with India and her culture. They arrived in a place from where they return or to join the root culture; "I had nowhere to go" (39). Hence, they can't return to the place of their origin. In this way, the narrator feels being ambivalent and he experiences the historical dislocation of indentured Indians as well. In a truest sense, Naipaul's *An Area of Darkness* is a complicated

accounts of such dislocations which ultimately push him to a status neither he comes closer to the attachment of the root culture nor runs away -with exhausting detachment from it because he feels being creative in writing and exploring new dimensions in his research career. The disillusionment, more often than not, occurs due to his uneasy feeling to get familiar with colonized society, its influences, and degrees in the socio-economic life of people and strange mythical - cultural practices in his ancestral land, India. As a result, his travelogue *An Area of Darkness* is a creative and comprehensive account of his grand father's land where he makes a survey of research and it is the credit of the creative forces of ambivalence. Further, it can be said that this is the memoir whose form and shape is: a review of the personal and social condition in the country of origin, an account of the uprooting and passage to the new land, the unexpected and harsh condition is found and included by the displaced person in the construction of a new life.

The East has the static nature in progress. It has been related with our culture and architectural objects. Both of them are consistent. There is no fluidity of change:

In the concept of Indian ness the sense continuing was bound to be lost. The creative urge failed. Instead of continuity we have the static. It is there in the ancient culture architecture; it is there in the much-bewailed loss of drive, which is psychological, more than political and economic. It is there in dead horses and immobile chariot of Kurukshetra temple. Shiva has ceased to dance. (233)

The concept of Indian ness is closer to the concept of ancient culture-this ancient culture was bound to be static. There was no change even in both economic and political aspects. Moreover, the mythically deep-rooted orient culture has psychological effects that are also deterministic to our fate. The portraits of dead

horse and immobile chariot of Kurukchetra have represented the static nature of Indian culture where the Mahabharat war took place. They are indeed the symbols of discontinuity or unchanged. The mythically powerful god Shiva has spotted no movement in his physical appearance, it is also constant. Such static, no movement has made the narrator feel ambivalent because he has been here where every moment the things keep in changing. The westerners are changed, mobile; they have continuous flow of transformation.

The narrator is ambivalent in the attitude of "degradation; human degradation" which he takes as the "end" of his mission of exploration in India (247). When he finds a man beside him in the train, he is stunned at him because he is a starved man; completely deformed. So, he claims the failure. He takes such "deformed human in India" as the symbol of degradation due to the unprecedented appearance of Indians (247). All these things lead Indians to face the failing situation. They face the downward situation because their cultures are intertwined with their fate. They take such life as the wish of god and the result of what they did in previously gone life in past era.

He finds the literary writers in India who are simply influenced by the English traits of writing and setting the issues in text. He goes through the novel of an Indian, Nirad C. Chaudhary's *An Auto Biography of an Unknown Indian* where he finds the characteristics of western writing, He says, "Indian attempts in the novel further reveals the Indian confusion" (230). What they write is leaving the main issue of downtrodden, marginalized and socially, culturally suppressed people. "The novel is of the west" because it has been written from the western perspective (230). Therefore he himself remains ambivalent in the Indian text, which represents more of west rather than east. And he takes it as "the part of the mimicry of the west and Indian self

violation"(230). It is violation in regard to not establishing Indian norms and rhetoric in writing text that should reflect the Indian ownness. He is ambivalent in the literary creation, which is the haunt of western mimicry. But it is more creative ambivalence so that he could write such marvelous novel on India.

This way, the author has been injected by postcolonial ambivalence along with the character he meets while traveling round postcolonial India with the same manner and attitudes. His rigorous research in exploring the people from downtrodden class to the top politicians and elites have illustrated how far the these people are naïve to coincide with the imposed culture and power in the life of natives and they are made disillusioned in the postcolonial societies. Naipaul's own self-realization of nowhere ness and mingling position in-between the western values and third world norms. Instead, such ambivalent position and psyche of Naipaul has been transformed into the most enchanting and creative literary work in postcolonial literature. In the same line, Malhotra's colonial disguise makes suffering in the life of Ramnath who faces disillusion when he washes hands from job but commits to struggle in hybrid society in Bombay. The ambivalence of Basant and Jivan explicitly compels them to work hard for economic prosperity with the colonizers thought and through resistance and creative techniques in postcolonial India.

#### IV. Conclusion

Ambivalence is a state of in-between in which the emotions and thoughts are reconciled with each other and that results into indecisiveness or contradiction with the positive and negative valence in the postcolonial society. Such nature of ambivalence, however, grows up as a powerful tool to resist the hegemonial modes of colonialism and becomes more creative with broad scopes such as in literary genre to the writer, struggle to keep native culture and identity alive of the native people and achieve the economic prosperity for the downtrodden people by any means like hybridizing and adapting the colonizer's concepts and techniques in the means of mechanical, industrial production and modern development.

V.S. Naipaul in his travelogue *An Area of Darkness* encounters with the disillusionment and impasse, and that shape him to be ambivalent through various techniques such as dislocatedness, uncertainty indecisiveness, hybridity, estrangement, psychic trauma, schizophrenia, mimicry as the devices to realize the condition in the countries after decolonization. All these techniques have a specific aim of making ambivalent. For instance, Naipaul locates himself in no man's land because his notion of no where belonging in England and Trinidad and even in his ancestral land India where he suffers from dislocatedness nags him to be ambivalent. Gandhi feels dislocatedness because he cannot assimilate his ideas, outlook, in India and goes in South Africa. Jiven and Basant have also same feeling of dislocatedness in the big cities where they come from suburban areas and get disjunctive in postcolonial cities. Naipaul's illustrations are all about the impasse of the attitude and thought of people. That's what the trauma resulted in the postcolonial societies.

Like dislocatedness, Naipaul uses cultural hybridity, indecisiveness, uncertainty and so on to discover the intertwined social and cultural life of people in

Postcolonial World. The narrator in the novel *An Area of Darkness* says there was no place to live. The dislocated feeling makes harassed and more ambivalent by the new culture; they happen to face. The great division comes in their life because they don't find any coherent relation between past and present. The narrator comes in India, his grand father's native land from Trinidad to his close ties of culture but he finds no space to be merged with consequently and gradually he feels ambivalent. The unprecedented rise of the feeling of ambivalence saddens him deeply. So, he says, whole side of India is closed to him. Therefore, finding the cultural space becomes a key concern to him. Naipaul's *An Area of Darkness* demonstrates how people feel shattered to live in the colony or new places being disconnected from the root culture. There won't have any escape to join the root culture as a result they move to solitude and get victimized of ambivalence.

To conclude, *An Area of Darkness* subsumes the characteristic traits of postcolonial literary genre such as dislocatedness, uncertainty, indecisiveness, ambivalence, estrangement, psychological trauma, hybridity, schizophrenia, mimicry and so on. All these techniques are devised in order to assimilate in the new circumstances that are in the period of decolonization in 1950s. These techniques, in turn, become the most powerful means for creating new dimensions in decolonized Third World. Naipaul's *An Area of Darkness* comes as an influential and effective genre in the period of decolonization to redraw the lines in the postcolonial history of colonized countries. In the regard, the research work analyzes how all these techniques are applied by the writer in order to respond to postcolonial ambivalence in which the aforementioned traits works as resistive in assimilating his ideas desire, intentions and creative in colliding all the techniques and ambivalent feeling in a textual form in postcolonial literature.

### Works Cited

- Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, eds. *The Postcolonial Studies Italics Reader*. London: Routledge 1995.
- - -, eds. *Key Concept in Post-Colonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Belnap, Jeffrey Grnt. *The post Colonial state and the hybrid Intellectual*. California: U.M.I., 1993.
- Bhabha, Homik. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Tharu, Prakash Bhadra, ed. *Subaltern Studies X*. Oxford University Press: New Delhi: 1999.
- ([http://www.lib.virginia.edu/area-studies/southasia/sa\\_serial/Biblio/bss10.html](http://www.lib.virginia.edu/area-studies/southasia/sa_serial/Biblio/bss10.html))
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Post Colonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*. New York OUP, 1995.
- Brathwaite, Esward Kamau. "Creolization in Africa." Ashcroft et. al. *The post colonial studies Render*. Eds. Ashcroft et. al. London: Routledge: 1995
- During, Simon, ed. *The Cultural Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Gnadh, Leela. *Post Colonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Delhi: OUP, 1999.
- Chakravarti, Dinesh, ed. *Habitations of Modernity: Essays in the Wake of Subaltern Studies*. The University Press, Chicago, U S A: 2002.
- Hall, Stuart. "Question of Cultural Identity". *Modernity and its Features*. London: Polity Press, 1999. 273-315.
- - - . "Cultural Identity and Diaspora". *Contemporary Post Colonial Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Padmini Mongia. Delhi: OUP, 2002. 10-12.
- Loan, BonnVan, ed. *Cultural Studies for Beginners*. Cambridge: Icon Books Ltd, 1997.

- Nye, Malory. *Religion The Basic*. London: Routledge, 2003
- Nixon, Rob. *London Calling: V.S. Naipaul, Post Colonial Mandarin*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Naipaul, V.S. *An Area of Darkness*. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1968.
- - *The Mimic Man*. New York: Penguin, 1978.
- - - *India: A wounded Civilization* London: Andre Deatsch Ltd, 1977.
- - - *India: A million Mutinies Now*. New York: Viking, 1991.
- Rusdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homeland*. London: Granta Books, 1992.
- Saraswoti, V. " The Culture- Literature Connection: Changing Implication for Curricular Design. " *Post-Coloniality: Reading Literature*. Eds. C. T. Indra and Meenakshi Shivaram. New Delhi: Vikas Pub, 1999. 221-230.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, *Subaltern Studies: Writing on South Asian History and Society* Ed. Ranajit Guha Vol-1, 1982
- ([http://www.english.emory.edu/Bahri/1 Web Page. html](http://www.english.emory.edu/Bahri/1%20Web%20Page.html))
- William, Raymond. *Culture*. London: OUP, 1981.
- Young, Robert J.C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. London: Routledge: 1995
- (<http://www.amazon.com/area-darkness-u-s-naipaul/dp/0375708359>)
- (<http://www.sencac.on.ca/quarterly/2005-vd08-numofall/zahiri.html>)