

Tribhuvan University

Illusion of Freedom in V.S Naipul's *In a Free State*

A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University, in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in English.

Submitted by

Narayan Joshi Lamsal

T.U. Regd. No: 58717-91

March 2014

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled “Illusion of Freedom in V.S. Naipaul’s *In a Free State*”, submitted to the Department of English, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, Kathmandu, by Mr. Narayan Joshi Lamsal, has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

Mr. Chiranjibi Kafle

Supervisor

External Examiner

Mr. Chiranjibi Kafle

Head of the Department of English

Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, Kathmandu

Date: 1st April 2014

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my special and sincere gratitude to Mr. Chiranjibi Kafle, Head of the Department of English, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus for providing me scholarly suggestions and invaluable guidance. Without his constant supervision and intellectual guidance, this thesis would never have appeared in the present form. I heartily praise and show due regards to my wife Mrs. Bindiya Lamsal and daughters Shristi and Subrata for their untiring and encouraging support to accomplish the present work. Likewise, I would like to express my thanks to my endeared friends Mr. Ram Chhetri, Mrs. Goma Subedi and Mr. Posraj Dahal for their kind support and keen interest in my work. And my sincere gratitude goes to those authors whose works have been consulted in preparation of this work.

Mr. Narayan Joshi Lamsal

Abstract

This study explores how V.S. Naipaul's *In a Free State* portrays illusion of freedom by ironically making his protagonist the casualties of freedom in an alien culture. In 'One Out of Many', a short story presented beside the novella, an Indian servant Santosh is accidentally transported to Washington, where he finds a niche for himself but remains profoundly alienated from the world around him. He abandons his cultural values by marrying *habsi* woman. Despite his longing for greater freedom, he gains confusion and humiliation and realizes that his life has no dignity.

The second story 'Tell Me Who to Kill', also presented side by side, is a tragic story of a West Indian who moves to London to see his brother Dayo where he becomes a victim of racial violence.

The novella *In a Free State* is about expatriate English civil servant (Bobby and Linda) in a recently independent African state torn by civil war. It describes about their growing alienation from both Africa and each other, and their powerlessness to withstand the senseless violence and brutality ranging around them.

The study bases its argument in the theory of Freedom and Liberty and uncovers the sad fate of people in post-colonial societies who suffer illusion of freedom both at home and abroad. Illusion at home due to lack of social, psychological and cultural freedom despite political freedom and illusion due to cultural alienation and discrimination in a faraway land.

Contents

	Page No.
Cover Page	...
Letter of Approval	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Abstract	iv
Content	v
I. V.S. Naipaul and Post-Colonial Experience.	1-14
II. Freedom and Liberty	15-31
III. Illusion of freedom in <i>In a Free State</i>	32-59
IV. Conclusion	
Freedom: A Long Way Ahead	60-65
Works Cited	

I. V.S. Naipaul and Post-Colonial Experience

General Introduction

This research paper especially focuses on V.S. Naipaul's Booker prize winning novel of 1971, *In a Free State*, to prove how Naipaul tacitly exposes and expresses the illusion of freedom in a so-called free state. Pondering over the freedom that has arrived in the third world countries, Naipaul tries to analyse the concept of freedom itself. His attempt at experimentation with the novel form of fiction gives him the best result in this novel. In this work there is a prologue and an epilogue and there are two short stories and a novella. All these forms serve as flood lights on the concept of freedom. The rootless characters have been displaced and dislocated in an alien culture and geography and constantly reshape their identity in the course of time. It, therefore, tries to see the connection existing between cultural identity and sense of freedom both on the part of the writer and his characters, who face problems of alienation, belonging, dislocation, displacement, diaspora and exile.

In a Free State was published in 1971 after the colonial power was fading from Asia, Africa and America where the newly independent nations were hopefully trying their best to redefining their freedom along with the cultural line.

Freedom becomes an issue in the study of class, gender, race and culture. It concerns with human consciousness, but also with a range of social phenomena including religion, history and geo-political concerns. Freedom at one level can be used to refer to individual character and style to a state of intellectual development to express choices in life. Similarly at another level, freedom has very broad relation with the independence movements of colonial states such as-India, Pakistan, Srilanka, America and many African states. Countries in long or short run may obtain independence but they cannot be free from colonial culture, language, style, costume and lifestyle. People in those newly independent nations were trying to reaffirm their own identity. Moreover, the concept of multi-culture and globalization were their

Height after the decade of 60's and 70's and the pace of migration and displacement was also growing. People in these newly emergent nations, were in the state of confusion and bewilderment by the legacy left out by the colonizers.

In a Free State (1971), one of the greatest novels that won the Booker prize in 1972, is a fertile and suggestive novel, which refers to a 'State' – a national entity that is politically independent such as the independent and post-colonial states. The title here also refers to 'freedom' expressing psychological state of mind, mind for personal attachment and choice. Many writers' views about positive and negative freedom but that simply has difference in style. Though liberty and freedom are similar, they are used interchangeably. Regarding the two concepts of liberty (freedom) both in its negative and positive implications, Isaiah Berlin states:

We use the negative concept of liberty in attempting to answer the question 'what is the area within the subject, a person or group of persons is or should be left to do or be, without interference by other person?' Whereas we use the positive concept in attempting to answer the question what, or who, is the source of control or interference that can determine same on to do or be, this rather than that? (121).

Supporting Berlin's idea of 'freedom', MacCallum, an American Philosopher defines the concept of freedom in this way: "a subject or agent is free from certain constraints or preventing condition, to do or become certain things" (312). As such, freedom is a relation among three things, an agent, certain condition and certain action.

In the course of novel, the characters not only separate from their cultural tradition, society but also become the victim of cross cultural assimilation. The characters- Santosh from Bombay to Washington D.C., Dayo's brother, a West-Indian to London Bobby a government

official in Africa move without any clear direction in Free State and become hopeless and frustrate. Out of this full exploration emerges a cynical and pessimistic view of freedom. Finally the idea of freedom for most of the characters in the novel paradoxically becomes illusion. The tramp who calls himself 'the citizen of the world (38)' makes the sense that he belongs to nowhere. A free state for Santosh gives him the role of 'stranger' as he leaves his sahib and marries a Negro woman with a hope of secure living; Dayo's brother also seems to escape away from poverty but he finds his hopes slipping away from hand. Bobby calls himself a government official but which government makes an irony of his existence. Thus Naipaul's statement in *In a Free State* has reference to life in the island, but it is also a general reflection on life. The protagonists in the novel move freely in the Free State and reshape themselves adopting and abandoning their culture painfully and becoming victim of freedom paradoxically in Naipaul's *In a Free State*.

Naipaul and His Works

Naipaul's life was unorderly because of his father and family. His life was unstable and jumbled; he could not see his father for days but his school life was orderly and regular. His father died of heart attack in October 1953 at the age of forty seven. It was not until 1972, when V.S. Naipaul was forty and nearly twenty years after his father's death that he got a connected idea of his ancestry and early life.

Once in 1955, Naipaul had undergone a nervous breakdown that nearly made him commit suicide but he luckily survived. Naipaul met and married Patrica Hele, a class-mate in 1955 but their marriage could not last long because she died in 1965. This made Naipaul to marry a divorced Pakistani journalist, Nadira Alvin Naipaul's Art of Writing

It was not all surprising to know that Naipaul at the age of 18 won scholarship from the Trinidad government in 1950 to study at Oxford University, London, which he considers as an opportunity and good luck to save him from 'extinction and he remained there permanently in England and since then contributing in the field of writing. He was knighted in 1989.

After completing education from Oxford University, he started his career as a freelance writer. He was determined to write, but always experienced extreme difficulty in finding a center to write from. It was the first time he felt himself rootless writer finding himself far from his source, culture, language and people.

Naipaul has accepted the art of writing as the only occupation working on it with sincerity and devotion. However as a broadcaster for the BBC Caribbean Voice (1954-56) and fiction reviewer for the *New Statement* (1957-61), he got nascent cultural inspiration in coloring his one of the novels, *The Miguel Street* (1959) with nostalgia he had with Trinidad, describing the life of people from nearest sense and vision. *The Mystic Masseur* (1957) which describes the career of an imaginative islander who raises through a series of failure as a teacher, a writer and a masseur to become a successful politician and then ultimately a disillusioned member of British Empire. And the other novels called *The Suffrage of Elvira* (1958) which deals mainly with a successful complain by a Trinidadian Hindu named Harbans to win election from Elvira (in Trinidad), set his career as a novelist which ultimately blossomed in *A House for Mr. Biswas* (1961), a search for independence and cultural identity.

His journey to different places of India, Pakistan, Malaysia, Iran, Africa South America, and the U.S.A. during 1960s and 1970s provided him with immense material, knowledge which helped him to introduce different ranges of characters, landscape and ideas in his later novels. Most of his novels deal with exile, alienation, dislocation and disillusion.

The various literary form he has tried- fictional narrative, autobiographical feature story and historical documentary, have eventually merged into unique genre prose in style of Naipaul. In Naipaul's writing 'decay' and 'disappearance' are a fundamental theme but without grief rather as something that makes existence bearable.

In his novel *Mr. Stone and the Knight Companion* (1963), *The Mimic Man* (1967) *A Flag on the Island* (1967) and *Free State* (1971) he concludes that all the individuals are "colonial" even though they are ironically supposed to be in a 'Free State'. *In a Free State* seems to suggest that there is paradoxical aspect in the nature of freedom, and that men should neither accept fully nor reject completely the notion of freedom. His novels *Gurrillas* (1975) and *A Bend in the River*, Naipaul treats a violated and colonial society with understand and detachment. The writer shared experience, a past threatened by a dark age of colonialism and by the movement of freedom. In his two novels *The Enigma of Arrival* (1987) and *A Way in the World* (1994), the writer blends history with autobiography and the fictions deal with the writer's theme of exile and freedom.

In this sense, Rob Nixon calls Naipaul a "homeless citizen of the world" (18). The rhetoric displacement finds a powerful and often oblique expression in his books. In an interview with Rahul Singh, Naipaul strongly claims that "he is not English, nor a Trinidadian but his own man (3). Thus he belongs to nowhere in the true sense of the term. The question of identity and the ruinous effects of colonization haunt both his work and life. His works therefore raise the issue of identity, displacement, dislocation, mimicry and the effect of colonization on People.

In due course of career as a writer, he also alternates fiction with books of travel and history. Travelling different parts of the world, whatever he saw, he enjoyed and recorded in his finest travelogues. The important works of his in this field are: *The Middle Passage* (1962),

records his impression of a colonial society in the West Indies and South America, *An Area of Darkness* (1964) describes his first visit to India, his ancestral home, *The Loss of El Dorado* (1969), is the product of Naipaul's personal research to recover the unknown history of Trinidad; *Among the Believers: An Islamic Journey* (1981) and *Beyond Belief* (1998) offer critical assessment of Islamic fundamentalism in non-Arab world. His writing on Islam provoked the ire of Muslim readers worldwide for its narrow and reductive vision of Islam and he gets number of attacks from the intellectual circles for the views he expressed about the Muslims and so called the third world. Naipaul often regarded that Islam goes beyond the Islamic people and focus on converting other to Muslim and builds its imperial demands.

Later Naipaul again returned to fiction with a novel *Half a Life* (2001), whose protagonist Willie is striving in search of identity. Naipaul's other novels express similar views bringing civilization, nationality, culture, identity, history, freedom in one conflicted amalgam. *The Mimic Men* (1967) is probably the best known and complex handling of the post-colonial literary trope of mimicry in Caribbean literature. The character Ralph Singh here is the representative of displaced and disillusioned colonial individual and colonization is depicted as a process that takes away their identity, culture, history and sense of place. *The Enigma of Arrival, A Way in the World* (1994), deals with a writer's interaction with history and in it Naipaul consciously blends history with autobiography and fiction, reflection on the relationship among personal, national and world histories. Successful expression of genres, travel, autobiography, narratives reflection and history, has made him international writer of English literature. V.S. Naipaul has a powerful and unparalleled master over the language. William Walsh remarks:

His powerful master over the language and vision helped him add new dimension to the astonishing achievement of the West Indian Novel. An important feature of

his fictional world is his delineation of Indian immigrants' dilemma, his problems and plights in the fast changing Caribbean World (51).

His selection of the names of character in his novels turned out to be rich with ironies as Amitav Kumar in *Himal South Asia* quotes: "In Naipaul's work, the names of the books and authors and record of their use, repeat the story of newness, distortion, and often loss. It would make him more popular among literary minded readers, readers who like being charmed by the names of Victorian and Edwardian titles" (95). Some critics call Naipaul next Joseph Conrad because Naipaul turns his back on the hybrid half made colonial world to fix his eye on the universal domain of English literature. Naipaul's hard struggle, deep study of subject matter molding with conscience, knowledge raised him from margin to a prolific writer, on which Phillip Caryl expresses the mystery side of Naipaul in his book *A New World Order* (2001), stating:

Naipaul's supreme qualification is that he has himself been a part of unreal Conardian darkness, which he is shedding light upon. He too has been moored in a place of no history, but by soon supreme individual effort he has dragged himself to civilized higher ground to a place of good manner. It causes him great anxiety and stress to continue to gaze upon such bestial places but he will do so for our sake. It is his duty, his vocation. He has known no other. And we must trust him because he knows (261).

However, Naipaul's travelogue on India and Muslim world became pro-vocative and controversial which angered the people of cross section of sensitive readers and critics. Many critics evaluate him and his works differently. "Khuswant Singh regards him a "Literary Mulatto" (86), whereas Pico Lyer calls him a "literary sanyasi" (56), Derek Walcott brands him a "V.S. Naitht fall" (Suroor 54) and Evelyn says "Naipaul's mastery of English language should

put to shame his British contemporaries' (Suroor 55). Other critics like Edward Said and Salman Rushdie criticized Naipaul's view on Islam and Muslim (55). Naipaul, holding the position to be the celebrated figure in literature and a man of prose in English, still bears countless secret regarding his biography rigidity of opinion.

Naipaul, the winner of various awards including Nobel Prize in literature in 2001, a famous post-colonial writer, displaced from his root, tries to recreate his own choices and constraint of his past, history and culture. He was knighted by Queen Elizabeth in 1990, and has devoted himself in the field of writing which he has been proved by his novels where stories and characters mingled.

Expatriate, Post- Colonial Sensibilities

Naipaul did not like to live in Trinidad as he felt it as alien environment and his ecclesiastical origin which could not allow him to identify his life with the Trinidadian. His expatriate sensibility is greatly affected by his marginalized existence. He was totally rootless, homeless without any sign of identity. He has split sensibility of Hindu self. Naipaul's expatriate sensibly accounts "willed homelessness" with least possibility to return to Trinidad. Thus he is expatriate in England where he starts his career as writer, making writing his vocation. Naipaul is wholly alienated and hence, a citizen of nowhere and everywhere. Paul Theroux justifiably echoes Naipaul's rhetoric of displacement:

(He ranks among) the former colonials, transplanted people who can claim no country as their own. They travel because they belong nowhere; they cannot settle, they are constantly moving- in a sense they never arrive- and much of their travel is flight. Rootlessness is their condition; it is opposite of those for whom being metropolitan is a condition. The homeless are not calm; their homelessness

is a source of particular pain, for as with all travelers, they are asked, “Where are you from?” and no simple answer as possible; all landscapes are alien (76).

Expatriation has been a fashionable theme, a search for self or identity or existential 'I'. For the third world expatriate, writers like Naipaul, the migrant experience of rootlessness have been inspired by deep personal predicament compounded by rejection in the host countries on the basis of color. The colonial relationship of master slave encountered in the former colonizer's land is liberated in Third World expatriate writing by pitying spiritual, community oriented, tolerant value system of India against the materialistic, individualistic, power hunger, exploitative system of the west. On Naipaul's exploration of post-colonial societies, Lillian Feder opines:

His chief concerns are the lasting political, economic and social effects of past foreign domination; lack of education and training in the development of natural resources, long exploited by colonizers; the absence of preparative of independence and conquest wide spread poverty [---] for financial security, cultural enrichment, a sense of their own dignity, the freedom to develop their own ability and talents to pursue their “vocation” and thus their particular vision of happiness” (79).

As many ideas and themes found repeated in his books, the ideas of fantasy and dependence are given expression in his fiction and nonfiction works – All the books on India reveal the sensibility or identity of Naipaul – complex identity of an expatriate. Naipaul's style varies widely even idiosyncratically. In his hand the language becomes a gauge of society's development. Sudha Rai points out:

Language becomes a gauge of society's development and simultaneously paints back in its creative variety, vitality and command over ironic tone, to the superior status of the expatriate writer's being. Because the expatriate writer has chosen to remain uncompromised, he operates from detachment of perspective which crystallizes as the expatriate style (154).

In the writings of Naipaul, colonial consciousness finds a powerful expression. There were many writers before him to contribute to the range and variety of the literature of the West Indies. Only Naipaul with very few writers enjoyed reputation outside West Indies. V.S. Naipaul has a powerful and unparalleled mastery over language. William Walsh remarks:

His powerful mastery over the language and vision help him add new dimensions to the astonishing achievement of the West Indian novel. An important feature of his fictional world is his delineation of the Indian immigrants' dilemma, his problems and plights in the fast changing Caribbean world (51).

His novels try to voice aspiration and yearning, problems and plights of an emergent nation. It pulsates with a vast amount of felt life and the power to suggest in concrete term the menace and the indenture Indian immigrants' predicament in the West Indian context. Naipaul seems to regard the novel as a form of inquiry, rather than an opportunity for autobiography and boasting. His own fiction is both a creative interpretation of the past and a criticism of the contemporary life.

"Naipaul would curiously mix the devices of two distinct form of writing," observes P.C. David, "About the writing style of Naipaul. His tendency to caricaturing would not let his figure rooted properly in the situation. Their idiosyncrasy would show too soon, and, they would pop out their surrounding" (234).

V.S. Naipaul is certainly among a few prominent expatriate of our time, particularly writer with Indian background who have emerged as the most eminent writers in English in the West and have, at the same time, made significant contribution to Commonwealth Literature or what is now termed post-colonial literature. His name comes readily to mind as one of the major contemporary writers whose works so a deep concern for the culture of colonized countries, the socio-political and cultural history of India and the economic condition of a few Eastern countries passing through a period of transition from colonial dominate to independence. Besides, his early works have placed the exotic society of the Trinidad on the literary map of the English speaking world and thereafter have projected him as a journalist, a successful novelist.

The post-colonial writes or intellectuals should have the observation how Naipaul has presented his characters to strive for identity with different view, for example, *The Mimic Men* seems to be presenting that as Singh is able to revisit the painful experience of youth with new confidence as an adult politician, into the burden of colonial self-division before he or she can go ahead into the political sphere. In his political fictions, Naipaul presents his protagonist with their particular race, class, culture and temperament but cannot envision a reentering of cultural life for the entire post-colonial world. Naipaul has shown artistic centering that incorporates the racial and cosmopolitan setting. However, he presents a societal transformation from colonial to post-colonial situation.

Thus, the style of Naipaul is essentially a device that distinguishes Naipaul from writers writing in English today, either British or nonnative writer. The style is typically a Naipaulian, individual that speaks of Naipaul's writing of colonial world.

Usual Themes of Naipaul

Most of Naipaul's books—fiction, nonfiction, travelogues, ranging from *The Mystic Masseur* (1957) to *Magic Seeds* (2004) are especially linked by the theme to failure, futility, cultural confusion, dislocation, displacement, valuelessness, crisis of identity, mimicry, rootlessness, illusion of freedom of unanchored people in the post-colonial society. Bret McCabe in the review of *Magic Seed* says: "Naipaul's fiction and nonfiction career is one long treatise on post-colonial cultural nomadic and intellectual excursion through his own Trinidadian heritage via Indian and European histories and culture." (7). Naipaul is one of the literature's great travelers and his leading theme of rootlessness, the alienation effect of colonial past on today's post-colonial people has taken him to Africa, South America, India and all over the world not in search of roots but in search of rootlessness. In his more than fifty years of writing career he gets variety of responses developing both supportive and unsupportive corpus of criticism. "He is often said to be a 'racialist', 'imperialist' and 'colonist' (Feder 2).

His recurring themes are the collision of culture and the resultant ambiguities in human adjustment, the colonial situation that produces special kind of human psychosis. The problem that he in his work is how an individual resists or overcome the conditions in which he is placed and eventually succeeds or fails to survive and succeed. Naipaul's fictions thus acquire a three dimensional significance—historical, social and psychological, and understandably Naipaul is at once a chronicler, historian and biographer. Naipaul has strong sense of history in most of his fictions and nonfictions Trinidad his homeland, but he has said harsh things about it as he finds that it lacks the history and even rejects that his writings have nothing to do with it.

When he was awarded Nobel Prize in 2001, in the course of 'Nobel' Lecture, he gave credit to England, his present home nation rather than the nation of his ancestors or even the

nation of his birth. Almost all works of V.S. Naipaul have clear cut influence on Indian life and culture, though he denounce his views on Islam and so called third world nations. Naipaul got varieties of information about the people, places, culture, history and the condition of freedom through his travelling to different places, countries. His wide ranging experience and journey of post-colonial world helped him develop modernist eye to see the world as fragmented and fractured. He contributes in the field of fiction and travel writing both by innovation in form and verbal density and also by profound exploration of human condition. Thus Feder writes:

In every country he visited, Naipaul was concerned with the relation of historical past event in its seeming absence to the present, the most inter personal reaction he records is empathy with their heirs of a history of slavery and colonialism, economic, cultural and psychological oppression and especially the assault and individual identity, a legacy with which they still contain (13).

Naipaul reflects the location of his ancestry and its culture in his writing. Naipaul himself says that his culture and his ancestry came from India and it shows his writing, (Taleban 2). He is in search of his culture, religion and ultimately the civilization, and so do his characters for their diverse culture, religions and civilization.

“The West Indian novel is the creation of society which descended from European Landlords, traders, functionaries, African slaves and indentured Indians” (Pathik 129). His *A House for Mr. Biswas* depicts the exemplary life of Mohan Biswas, a failed Pundit and an accidental journalist. Nevertheless, the “loss” for him is his cultural past for which he has an Abecedarian longing. *The Middle Passage* depicts Trinidad in a different image rather than that of *A House for Mr. Biswas* because this nonfiction records the survey Naipaul had made when he

returned to Trinidad from London. Here with his Euro-centric idea, found Trinidad, his own birth place reeling in turmoil of historical and political upheavals; his views of an outsider.

Naipaul's actual world is the post-colonial world and it exhibits in most of his writings as Rob Nixon points that his prestige as a novelist has surely assisted him "in sustaining his high profile as an interpreter of the post-colonial world." (4). Naipaul is a "permanent exile, abandoned by the tradition." (14). Naipaul's own sense of displacement and a "longing for root" are reflected in his writing. "Like Naipaul all his characters carry out the theme of exile, émigré, expatriate, refugee . . ." (Nixon 17); and all are displaced ones.

All these themes are loaded in his fictions as well as nonfictions. His character, therefore, bring a deep sense of contemporary characters, the anti-pastoral sentiments with cosmopolitan awareness guides Naipaul's characters. So the oddities and contradictions inevitably come in his writings. Life and situation of characters in *In a Free State* give a sense of a whole since the setting runs from Bombay through Washington, London, and Trinidad to newly independent African state. The final point of this fictional travel is the same 'free state', perhaps the title of the book *In a Free State*.

II: Freedom and Liberty

Concept of Freedom

The term liberty and freedom more or less similar in meaning can be used interchangeably. Various attempts have been made to distinguish the difference between these two words but no appropriate meaning to differentiate them has been caught up. Neither can they be translated into another European literature which makes only one term *liber* from Latin origin. The terms like liberty, sovereignty, independence, lack of restriction, freewill, autonomy, self-determination, and self-government can be used to refer to the term liberty. However, the term freedom covers a greater meaning as it is the subjective experience of having rich and realistic set of alternative actions that one may undertake according to the nature of the work or situation. In the view of J Krishnamurti, freedom is considered as the situation to be free from fear or confusion. He says, “freedom is a state of mind – not free from something but a sense of freedom, a freedom to doubt and question everything and therefore so intense, active and vigorous that it throws away every form of dependence, slavery, conformity and acceptance” (Freedom 89).

The term liberty is used to describe various types of individual and social freedom like freedom of thought, political freedom, religious freedom, freedom of speech, expression, defence and others. Liberty is also used as a general term for the sum of specific liberties. Personal liberty is the fundamental need and rights and it is also implied the liberty to exchange idea by speech, writing, printing and religious belief and worship and enhance the freedom of a person to

the blessing of liberty...” “Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” “Life, liberty and prosperity.” The term is often used to describe the sum of total of specific liberties including, Personal liberty (liberty of thought without governmental or ecclesiastical control), Social liberty (that is birth, wealth, color, race or sex are not to bar men and women from the enjoyment of social rights, privileges and opportunities), Economic liberty (i.e. to contract or follow one’s calling or vocation in life), Fiscal and civil liberty (i.e. related to property and the rights of their owner and to enjoy certain constitutionally protected freedom) and political liberty (i.e. to participate in and change in government through the means of right to vote). Liberty has been mentioned in philosophical expression in individualism, anarchism nationalism. In these different kinds of political system, the term, liberty has been given due space highlighting value, right, and involvement of an individual in state, social, and political affairs. Philosophers like John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau popularized the conception of the individual as having certain natural rights that could not be denied or taken away by society or any external authority, rights that Thomas Jefferson expressed in the declaration of independence as “inalienable” and that were included in the Bill of rights of the constitution. Rousseau especially considered them as the rights possessed by people living in the ‘State of Nature’, not surrendered, but modified in the social contract by which they agreed to live together in the society.

In the view of Kant, the only kind of freedom to which a person is entitled was “freedom qualified by respect for others and controlled by Universal laws”; thus Vaughan remarks “rights expands into freedom and freedom expands into rights” (studied in the History of Political Philosophy, Vol II), Hegel’s opinion on the term “Freedom” is that, it is the essence of man and distinctive quality of man but the notion of freedom is not to be taken in the sense of casual free

will of each individual but in the sense of reasonable will. This clearly indicates that freedom is not merely having freedom from restraint or compulsion.

Similarly, initiating his essay “Freedom”, Shaw puts forward an argument that no person is perfectly free. A perfect free person is arguably none as men are restricted by slavery. This slavery has two principal constraints. Firstly, ‘for half the day we are slaves to necessities’. These are the compulsion of biological necessities which include eating and drinking, dressing and undressing, sleeping and moving about from one place to another. Thus, this ‘natural jobs’ are to be met for our survival which is pleasurable in itself. But the second restriction is imposed on freedom by man on man for purely self-considerations. Shaw opines that the slavery of man to man is the very opposite of ‘natural jobs’. It is hateful to the body and to the spirit. This degrades humanity and creates a division in the world. By several restrictions the master class ruthlessly safeguards their own interest and the poor class is deprived of their dues and human rights. (Freedom: a series of B.B.C. radio talks, delivered 18th June 1935. Printed in Freedom, London, 1936)

The word “liberty” derived from Latin word “Liber” means ‘free’. It is not merely philosophical and legal concept but also the product of historical circumstances but its meaning can be clear by looking at its development in the western political thought. Liberty is not merely an idea, ideal, slogan, or emotion, but is a fundamental concept without which man is hardly a man; however it is concerned with the quality of human life. Thus, freedom for man is not an empty claim but a basic necessity.

According to the Chamber’s Twentieth Century Dictionary (1961), liberty is freedom from constraint, captivity or tyranny; freedom to do as one pleases, the unrestrained enjoyment of natural rights; power of free choices, privilege,

permission, free range leisure, disposal; the bound within which certain privileges are enjoyed: (often in pl) a limited area outside prison in which prisoners are allowed to live: presumptions or in due freedom; speech or action violating ordinary civility (614). Jean Paul Sartre supports the idea of “absolute freedom” human being can have. He says “no limits to my freedom can be found except freedom itself, or, if you prefer, we are not free to cease free.” (567).

The concept of liberty that has developed in modern time is closely associated with the philosophy of individualism and it gives us two contrasting ways of thinking. On the one hand, liberty is free choice, each individual’s own decision concerning his own cause of action, it belongs to himself, not to the external world that surrounds him and one can think of liberty as the absence of obstacles external to the agents. One is free if nothing stops him/her from doing whatever one wishes to do. On the other hand, one can think of liberty as the presence of obstacles on the part of the agent, and it doesn’t come within the preview of state, it belongs to the sphere of man’s own captivity. In asserting Positive liberty as the desire of the individual to be his master, to be self-directed, to be moved by his own conscious purpose. So to be free one must be self-determined that he/she have the capacity to control his/her destiny in his/her interest.

In this regard, liberty has been put into two levels: Positive and negative. In Positive liberty man must have the capacity to enjoy his/her freedom with conscience, have control of one’s life, and realize the fundamental purposes. In Negative liberty, there remains the absence of constraints, obstacles, or barriers from the state so that the individual enjoys his/her freedom. Immanuel Kant French philosopher was the most important figure who developed the idea of distinguishing between a Negative and a Positive liberty and it was first examined by Isaiah

Berlin in the 1950s and 1960s. Discussion of the differences on liberty normally takes place in social, political, cultural, and literary context. However, the discussion about the nature of Positive liberty often overlaps with the discussion about the nature of personal autonomy and about freewill.

Negative and Positive Concept of Freedom

Of the contemporary writers Sir Isaiah Berlin is an advocate of Negative liberty, but he cleverly used the terms Negative and Positive liberty in his book “Two Concepts of Liberty” (1958) to show that the state can only secure Negative liberty to the individual and Positive liberty doesn’t come within the purview of state. The reasons for using these levels are that in Negative liberty, liberty seems to be mere absence of something (i.e. of obstacles, barriers, constraints and interference from others or state), it simply demands that an individual is not prevented from attaining his goal by other human beings where as in the case of Positive liberty, it seems to require the presence of something (e.g. of control, self-determination, self-mastery or self-realization), it belongs to the sphere of man’s own capacities.

The supporter of Positive freedom maintained that there are higher and lower self in an individual and freedom comes when an individual subjects himself to the dictates of universal reason. Given this difference, one must be interested to think that a political philosopher must concern exclusively on Negative freedom and a concern to Positive freedom highly relevant to the psychological or morality of an individual rather than political or social institution.

According to TH Green, personal liberty is associated with society, morality, right and the state which indicates that human consciousness needs liberty, liberty needs rights, and rights need state. This, however, for among the most hotly debated issues in political philosophy are the following: Is the Positive concept of freedom a political concept? Does political action provide

individual or group the sense of Positive freedom? Can it be possible for the state to promote freedom on behalf of its citizens? Is it desirable for the state to do so?

Various writers like Humboldt, Spencer, Mills, Marx, Hegel, Till Green have given answer to these questions in different ways. In political condition, Positive freedom can be achieved collectively. In this case Rousseau's theory of freedom gives clear view, according to which individual freedom is achieved through participation in the process from where one's community exercises collective control over its own affairs in accordance with the general will. In its simple meaning, one might say that a democratic society is a free society because it is a self-determined society and that a member of that society is free to the extent that he/she participates in its democratic process.

Many theorists have examined the term liberty as want or desire for freedom. Since one is free to the extent that one is externally unperfected from doing things one can be free to do what one does not desire to do. If being free means being unrestricted from realizing one's desires, then one could paradoxically reduce one's own freedom by coming to desire fewer of the things one is not free to do.

The Notion of Positive Freedom

The 'Positive' sense of the word 'liberty' derives from the wish on the part of the individual to be his own master. The freedom which consists in being one's own master, and the freedom which consists in not being prevented from choosing as I do by other men, may, on the face of it, seem concepts at no great 'negative' notions of freedom historically developed in divergent directions, not always by logically reputable steps, until, in the end, they came into direct conflict with each other.

One way of making this clear is in terms of the independent momentum which the, initially perhaps quite harmless, metaphor of self-mastery acquired. This dominant self is then variously identified with reason, with my 'higher nature', with the self which calculates and aims at what will satisfy it in the long run, with my 'real', or 'ideal', or 'autonomous' self, or with myself 'at its best'. Total patterns of life must be compared directly as wholes, although the method by which we make the comparison, and the truth of the conclusions, are difficult or impossible to demonstrate. But the vagueness of the concepts, and the multiplicity of the criteria involved, are attributes of the subject-matter itself, not of our imperfect methods of measurement, or of incapacity for precise thought which is then contrasted with irrational impulse, uncontrolled desires, 'lower' nature, the pursuit of immediate pleasures, 'empirical' or 'heteronymous' self, swept by every gust of desire and passion, needing to be rigidly disciplined if it is ever to rise to the full height of its 'real' nature.

The perils of using organic metaphors to justify the coercion of some men by others in order to raise them to a 'higher' level of freedom have often been pointed out. But what gives such plausibility as it has to this kind of language is that we recognize that it is possible, and at times justifiable, to coerce men in the name of some goal which they would, if they were more enlightened, themselves pursue, but do not, because they are blind or ignorant or corrupt.

The Notion of Negative Freedom

Political liberty in this sense is simply the area within which a man can act unobstructed by others. If an individual is prevented by others from doing what he/she could otherwise do, then the individual is not unfree to that degree; and if this area is contracted by other men

beyond a certain minimum, an individual can be described as being coerced, or, may be, enslaved. Coercion is not, however a term that covers every form of inability. Coercion implies the deliberate interference of other human beings within the area in which an individual could otherwise act. Mere incapacity to attain a goal is not lack of political freedom.

This is brought out by the use of modern expressions as 'economic freedom' and its counterpart, 'economic slavery'. It is argued, very plausibly, that if an individual is too poor to afford something on which there is no legal ban - a loaf of bread, a journey round the world, recourse to the law courts - he/she is as little free to have it as he/she would be if it were forbidden by law.

If Negative liberty consists in the absence of restraints, Positive liberty consists in extending the opportunity to the individual to pursue his happiness where he is obstructed for want of means or capacity due to prevailing socio-economic conditions. S.I. Benn and R. S. Peters say that, "if education is expensive and parents are poor, it makes a mockery of freedom to say that one is free to educate one's children merely because there is no law or custom against it..." (Social Principles and Democratic State, P. 212). Some theorists of Positive freedom say that the contented slave is indeed free that in order to be free the individual must learn not so much to dominating certain merely empirical order, but to rid himself of them. Berlin says, "If I have a wounded leg, there are two methods of freeing myself from pain. One is to heal the wound but if the cure is too difficult or uncertain, there is another method. I can get rid of the wound by cutting off my leg." (135).

Like Berlin's two concepts of liberty, Ian Carter also supports that we have to separate ways of thinking about the concept of freedom. One is the dissertation of specific freedom like-freedom of conscience, thought, speech, assembly and movement; the other is discussion about

the quantities of overall freedom. He thinks that both the forms of discourse are useful and should be preserved (290).

To sum up, if Negative liberty denotes that the state shall abstain from imposing unreasonable restraints on individual, Positive liberty signifies the removal of constraints which are the products of social set up and which are capable of being removed by making necessary efforts in the social set up.

Obstacles of Freedom- Sources and Kinds

Theorists of liberty have expressed their views on types of liberty, their sources and the kind of obstacles which hinders individual's freedom. The kinds and nature of hindrances consciously or unconsciously developed are viewed by different thinkers. The theorists of freedom such as Descartes, Hegel, Carter, Campbell and MacCallum etc have distinguished between different kinds of external obstacles, restricting the range of obstacles which counts as constraints on freedom, expressing the views or constraints and their sources of freedom.

MacCallum says:

For theorists who conceive of constraint on freedom in this way: I am only unfree to the extent that other people prevent me from doing certain things. If I am incapacitated by natural causes [---], I may be rendered unable to do certain things but I am not, for that reason, rendered unfree to do them. Thus if you lock me in my house, I am at least not free to leave (76).

In fact, the relevant preventing situations of freedom as social and political relation are put forth in narrow and broad sense in different sphere of human society. Man, by nature develops unlimited arena of personal liberty consciously or unconsciously that excels or exceeds reality

and can bring Negative impact on the society and can be an obstacle for the freedom of general people.

In attempting to distinguish between natural, social, political, cultural and economic obstacles, I shall inevitably come across grey areas. An important example is that of the obstacles created by economic forces. Do economic constraints like recession, poverty and unemployment merely incapacitate people or do they render them unfree? In this case, impersonal economic forces, being brought about unintentionally, 'do not restrict people's freedom, even though they undoubtedly make many people unable to do many things' (Ethics 66).

Though people can enjoy freedom more in democracy than in dictatorship, still there are certain tendencies in a democratic state which are a menace to liberty. John Stuart Mill argues in *On Liberty* (1978), a struggle, as abundance of freedom always takes place between the competing demands of liberty and authority and we cannot have the latter without the former.

All that makes existence valuable to anyone depends on the enforcement of restraints upon the actions of other people. Some rules of conduct, therefore by law --- in the first place, and by opinion on many things, which are not fit subjects for the operating of law (5).

Examining the different notions of constrain expressed on freedom, we can see that there are in fact two different dimension. The first dimension is that of the source of a constrain on freedom, that is the source that brings about a constraint on freedom, for example, obstacles that brought about by the action of human beings- the external obstacles. The second dimension is about the types of constraints involved, for instance, physical barriers or coercion, psychological difficulties or the disserted views bought by the ideological manipulation. To have a thorough

study on the difference between the two dimensions of the sources of a constraint on freedom, it is important to see the internal constraint.

MacCallum writes, “Internal constraint is a category that covers various psychological phenomena such as ignorance, irrational desires, illusions and phobias” (98). Such constraints can be caused in different ways intentionally or unconsciously, for example, it might be a “genetic origin”, or it might be ‘brought by others intentionally’ in the form of manipulation, social pressure of different kinds like- caste, discrimination, economic status, exhibition of noncooperation and superior or inferior complexities etc. which prevails in the society in the form of never ending conflict. Similarly, Hobbes opines that “will” and “desire” also play the role of constraint of freedom because it will deliver physically impossible a great number of actions on the doer’s side. Steiner’s accounts of the relation between freedom and coercive threats might be thought to have counter intuitive implications. He says that many laws that are normally thought to restrict Negative freedom do not physically prevent people from doing so by threatening punishment (33). Intra-liberty quarrel like the conflict between civil liberty, political liberty and economic liberty constitute the complex character of liberty. There may be a quarrel between one form of liberty and the other form of liberty. Weil says that “the weakness of human nature to understand the notion of work is the main constraint of freedom. She writes:

And yet nothing on the earth can stop man from falling himself born for liberty. Never, whatever may happen, can he accept servitude, for he is a thinking creature. He has never ceased to dream of boundless liberty, whatever as a past stage of happiness of which he has deprived him or as future state of happiness that is due to him by reason of a sort of pact with some mysterious providence (79).

Naturally, freedom is complex and unlimited desire in human society which cannot be provided without interruption. Human beings need full freedom to develop their inherent abilities. Garder in his book “Sophie’s World” writes that “man can strive for freedom, in order to live without outer constraint, but he will never achieve ‘free soul’; it is more or less imprisoned in mechanical body.” (224). Man tries to do what he/she wants which makes freedom impossible. Does man need freedom in such world? Can such freedom be sustainable? Does freedom have relation with responsibility and reason? Freedom is an inevitable part of human development both in personal and social activities otherwise he/she may feel alien. In this case Garder mentions in his book:

Sartre says that man feels alien in a world without meaning. When he describes man’s alienation, he is echoing the central ideas of Hegel and Marx. Marx’s feeling of alienation in the world creates a sense of despair, boredom, nausea and absurdity. Sartre experienced man’s freedom as a curse. ‘Man is condemned to be free,’ he said condemned because he has not created himself and is nevertheless free (457).

The problem of liberty involves the adjustment of claim between the individual and the society. The state comes into the picture as it has to regulate that relationship. If the claim of the individual is stretched to an extreme in utter disregard of the interests of the society, liberty becomes license. If more and more restrictions are put on the individual by the state, that results in the loss of liberty. Hence, it is necessary to fix the proper frontier between liberty and authority.

Liberty is good but to be free to do undesirable things is to enjoy not liberty but license which is bad. Such a condition is not desirable for the maintenance of social order. The liberty of

one man becomes a constraint on another or his oppression. The liberty of the strong results in the suppression of the weak. The liberty of a thief to take away the property of another person becomes a threat to the security of everybody. The liberty of a driver to drive the car at any speed endangers the lives and liberty of all others who use the road. If liberty is to be liberty for all, restraints have to be put on the liberty of all. Liberty of every individual has to be regulated in such a way that he does not use his liberty to destroy the liberty of others.

Freedom in Postcolonial World

During 1950s and 1960s most of the countries had been emerging out free from colonial rule and it was the period when colonial power was fading from the continents like Asia, Africa and Latin America. The newly independent nations were emerging hopefully trying their best to redefine themselves along their own cultural lives and sense of freedom. People in these newly independent nations emerging by the culture and rule imposed upon them and therefore were trying to reaffirm their own distinctly unified identity and preserve and promote freedom to live the life of their choice in independent state. Leela Gandhi in *Post-Colonial Theory* for example observes this cultural bewilderment in the colonial aftermath and says that it is marked by the range of “ambivalent” cultural mood and formations, which accompany periods of transition and translation and the rhetoric of independence and the creative euphoria of self-invention.” (5).

The independent movement in the period 50s and 60s which came across in the continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America created a feeling that their independent achievement can help them developing subtle way for social, political and economic prosperity in self-ruled sovereign state. The independent movement in these countries was influenced and inspired by awareness activities in Europe. Various European states administered their colonial states differently and finally they provided their colonies an institutional legacy. Naturally,

people believed that this colonial indolence would bring prosperity self-government, however, newly “free” people worked up to discover that their colonial masters had simply replace by local body. And independence of granted to the colonies but freedom did not bring with prosperity and self-government. The alien culture, civilization, activities and system designed and implemented by the colonial master remained there and have become part of the life of people of the independent countries.

The colonial or the post-colonial Free State faced new forms of economic exploitation and oppression. Aftermath of the independence, in the period of transition, the law enforcement was completely at the whim of the local government, meaning that in practice, there was no law. In Free State, a great degree of civic freedom seems to be advantageous for the freedom of the spirit of the people, and, yet it establishes impassable limits.

The influence of colonizer’s colonial education strongly imbedded and the post-colonial Free States cannot remain unaffected, and literature, a part of culture also got influenced. Edward said in culture and imperialism says: “there were scholars, administrators, travelers, readers, parliamentarians, novelists, merchants, theorists, speculator adventurers, visionaries, poets --- each of whom contributed to the formation of a colonial actuality listing at the heart of metropolitan life.’ (8). Thus the western cultural hegemony remained intact and became the part and parcel of the life of people of Free State.

Although there is not any scientific basis for the idea of race, still in the modern world, race seems as the basis for people hood or nation hood. The enduring black freedom struggle has exemplified this complicated development. Black and their allies have fought to create the world where race does not matter, no discrimination on the base of color or race. But unfortunately, despite their efforts, the race still matters. It even led to continue to frame group consciousness

and affect the society globally in a large and small ways. Such kind of case is in the depiction of the third world writing of the post-colonial writers.

With the passage of time, there developed the concept of hybridization and as people mixed together and slaves became free, a complex social hierarchy emerged in the past days. Such hierarchy classified by level and status and whiteness was highly valued, while the blackness and indigenusness remained at the bottom of the ladder or were marginalized. People were categorized as whites, free people of color, slaves and indigenus socially.

Though the countries became politically Free states, freedom in these states has its natural enemy. Deliberately, certain power holders make false claim that the freedom in society is bourgeois hoax. Independent and democratic countries, for example, like in Nepal, India, Pakistan and Bhutan etc freedom of people is curtailed owing to the monarchist, the army, the police and the administrator for their strange behavior. The system of self-government is hindered creating confusion and disorder. So people themselves should concern about their freedom. The colonial mind set of ruling group of post-colonial states still continue to work.

In post-colonial usage, the term independence refers to the achievement by a colony “of full self-government.” (Bill Ascheraft 128). India and Pakistan became Free State in 1947 as were the majority of African counties in 1960s. The formation is the clearest signal of the Separation of Colonized from imperial power. Griffith, Ascheroff and Riffin write, “The independence of that newly framed state is the *Sine qua non*, the claim to have left the power of the colonizer behind.” (193).

The post-independence literature is the post colonialist entity of colonial encounter... that focus on the role and function of post-colonial significance. Orientalism, Edward Said’s seminal work treats European colonization as a ‘discourse’, namely as the project of representing,

imagining, translating, containing and managing the intransigent and incomprehensible ‘orient’ through textual codes and conventions (Gandhi 143). Bloom’s *The Anxiety of Influence* (1973) absorbs Freud’s account of oedipal struggle into liberty theory. Rao’s *Kanthapura* (1938) portrays Gandhian thought “the counter-textual novel of anti-colonial or nationalist writings find its apotheosis,” Gandhi writes such as Salman Rushdie, Ben Rushdi, Ben Okri, Michael Ondoatje and Baharati Mukherjee (153).

Summing up

In conclusion of this chapter, it can be said that people can experience many kinds of freedom in different ways. It can be essential for individuals for their personal, social, political, economical and modern prosperous life. Some philosophers like- Thomas Hobbes, Locke, Montesquieu, John Stuart Mill were interested in the ways people may preserve their freedom against the actions of their neighbor and rulers. They were mainly concerned how people can attain independence of influences outside themselves. Some other thinkers such as Aristotle, Rousseau, Immanuel Kant and George Hegel were more interested in the quality of a person’s freedom. They considered how people could be free from the constraints of their desire so that they might live according to reason, free from slavery of their passion. Some religious writers such as St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, David Hume and J.Krishnamurti are mainly interested in how people can make themselves perfect attaining spiritual freedom.

Isaiah Berlin has used two types of freedom, Negative liberty and Positive liberty. Theorists of these freedom debated issues of different dimensions of freedom of human society and individual self. The thinkers of Negative and Positive liberty are associated with the problem of the relationship between liberty and authority. Ian Carter, Gerald Mac Callum and Oppenheim have supported the meaning of freedom in the context of social and political philosophy with the

relation to agent and action. However, these two theories of freedom do not necessarily contradict each other. One theory supports for individual freedom while the other theory talks about spiritual freedom. Both the theories express the idea of freedom for happy and successful life.

Since the beginning of 1990, the condition of freedom is deteriorating in different countries in the world. In the name of caste, class, community, religion and political, social, economical, religious right, freedom, identity, people are suffering a lot and losing their basic rights and freedom. Development of communist government established absolute rule over many people who once enjoyed high profile of freedom. The democratic movements in Eastern Europe of the late 1980s and early 1990s helped to establish the trend of freedom in democratic norms and value. Still, in some democratic countries, the rights of every individual person are not secured as before. In recent years the freedom of basic human rights is violated. Personal freedom, privacies, law and order and respect for justice which are the bases of freedom have been diminished.

III. Illusion of Freedom in *In a Free State*

V.S. Naipaul's one of the famous fictional works, *In a Free State*, was written in 1971, which won for him the Booker prize of the year, and is chronologically eleventh book in his oeuvre. The title of Naipaul, *In a Free State* is a fertile and suggestive one that has set many critical puzzles. Immediately, it seems to refer to a state which is politically free, such as the independent, postcolonial nation-states from which the characters in the stories come and in which the title novella is set: respectively, India and Trinidad and a Conglomerate of African nations. The book is divided into five parts, where two episodes from journal are set for prologue and Epilogue. The prologue is named as "The Tramp at Piraeus" which is an extract from a journal where an unidentified and meticulous narrator presents a detached point of view to describe a grim scene. The first story that follows the prologue is named as "One Out of Many" that describes a displaced character, Santosh. The story explores the traumatic cultural adjustments forced upon a humble Indian servant, Santosh, when he is uprooted from the pavement of Bombay by his diplomatic employer and taken off to a new life in Washington, D.C. 'One Out of Many' revolves around Santosh, an Indian immigrant in America who employs different tactics to get citizenship. He was a servant in Bombay and was comparatively happy also. He got a chance to migrate to America, his dreamland. He is however always under the tension of being deported. He had thought that in America he would enjoy greater freedom but it was not so. What he gains there cultural confusion, as he learns to deal with the industrial western World. The second half is simply tragic due to his new environment of lonely, meaningless freedom and 'television life'. Finally he resign himself to his new life and waits eagerly for death.

The second story, “Tell Me Who to Kill”, which is equally lengthy as the first story, charts an unnamed West Indian’s pursuit of his scapegrace brother Dayo to London, where he becomes a victim of racial violence, lapses into a world of Hollywood cinematic fantasy and appears to suffer a mental breakdown. This dreadful story is followed again by the title novella, *In a free state*, a yarn, where two English civil servants, Bobby and Linda, with both fear and hope undergo a journey in a newly emergent African free state in the throes of a tribal civil war. Their growing alienation from both Africa and each other, and their powerlessness to withstand the senseless violence and brutality raging around them. Bobby who identifies with the African natives, rejects his British background for personal freedom but the freedom of African state is in disorder.

The Epilogue “The Circus at Luxor” is from a journal like the prologue to end the sequence of stories. It also describes the chaotic world but introduces a sense of changing postcolonial world.

The common thread of each part of the book is the trauma of cultural alienation and the characters’ hopeless effort to establish their belonging, which is evident in the situation. Each of the protagonists in the novel is placed in the post-colonial Free State, but they are trapped in Free State having lost their culture and countries. They are in confusion where they try to assimilate the culture of new countries. They are in search of freedom but it becomes constraint. The more they try to gain freedom, the more they become individual, alienated, frustrated and victim of freedom.

What is freedom on human experience? Is freedom merely the absence of constraint or presence of something? Do the people of Naipaul possess qualities that entitle them freedom to be free in his novel *In a Free State*? Being based on different dimension of freedom – social,

economical, political, scientific, and psychological – an attempt to answer such question will be made in the following pages.

The Tramp at Piraeus: Journey to Disordered World

The journal entry that serves the Prologue for the book. *In a Free state* beings the story of Naipaul's journey from Piraeus to Alexandria, focusing on the people of different cultural background and are from different geographical sites. The scene of this extract is dominated by the presence of a tramp, an old man whose claim to thirty – eight years of travel, lacks clear cultural ties. The narrator from the very beginning poses a minute scrutiny of the people who belong where? Naipaul reports that Egyptian Greeks after the independence of Egypt from the invaders are returning to Egypt but Egypt was no longer their home'. They are having the position of refugee.

They were Egyptian Greeks. They were travelling to Egypt but Egypt was no longer their home. They had been expelled they were refugee. The invaders had left Egypt; after many humiliations Egypt was free, and these Greeks, the poor ones, who by simple skill had made themselves only just less poor than Egyptian, were the casualties of that freedom(1-2).

The tramp one of the characters in the story becomes the focus of the narrator whose appearance “from a distance”, however is not like a tramp (2). He looks like an English but the narrator is naively oblivious about it. The narrator becomes sure about the tramp only when he comes nearer with his clothes ruined. He clearly notices that the peculiar tramp is “an old man with a tremulous worn face and blue eyes.” (2). The tramp who says, “I have been travelling for thirty-eight years” (3) seems to have no secured place and identity, nor does he have any freedom. He becomes subject to the violence in that political crisis. His expression on

nationality, “But what’s nationality these day? I myself, I think of myself as a citizen of the world” (3) confirms the sense that he belongs nowhere. He wants only the camouflage and protection of company but ignores the people to stare at him. The tramp is the strangest example of depressed but there are also other people on the ship who seems to have no permanent home: Egyptian, Greek, Lebanese furniture maker, a tall German girl, and an Australian boy.

The tramp tries to present his identity swiftly explaining himself to himself, reducing his life to names and number.” (4). He is free to travel the world but, he is subjected to violence that he encounters everywhere. He loses his sense and every time he finds “odd” when he tries to develop “company” (4). As he claims that he has passed number of years as a traveler, he gets different cultures in new places. So cultural differences among the people of different places makes “freedom” an illusion as no one has the unified sense of their cultural identity.

The confused, restless, disorder attitude of the tramp shows that he is psychologically affected due to cultural and political crisis. The inner psychological condition is so strong that he cannot establish his own individuality and freedom. The narrator who observes the activities of the people present in the ship, expresses the activities of the tramp as, “He unfolded his magazine, then, unexpectedly, he began to destroy it, with nervous jiggling hands he tore at a page, once, twice. He turned some pages, began to tear again; turned back, tore.”(7). This shows his anger and frustration and his physical frailty evoke Naipaul’s pity” writes Lillian Feder. He further says, but he avoids involvement with him even when he is the victim of a cruel game that his cabin mates engage in.” (144).

Thus, the chaos of Naipaul’s World is established by this story in which the tramp who lacks clear cultural ties is subjected to violence and danger as he moves about new World. He

appears to be a rootless soul. There are characters from different cultural background, and countries, which create problem of culture and belongingness in their search of freedom.

Santosh's sense of dislocation and loss of freedom.

The first story in the volume entitled "One out of Many" Levels the similar theme of the book which is based on the problem shown in the prologue in the entire paragraphs. In the story the sense of rootlessness and the experience of minimal freedom is expressed. The title itself reveals the fact that there is a desperate "One" out of many. The story explores the psychic cost of being outside both in his own native and adopted places. That one, is Santosh, an Indian who came to Washington D.C. as a cook for his diplomat citing his position at the beginning of the story he says, "I am an American citizen and I live in Washington the capital of the world. Many people both here and in India will feel that I have done well 'But' (15).

Here the single Word "But" is introduced and later elaborated Santosh's dilemma. Caught between the portion that was dealt him and his decision to be free. Santosh, the narrator of the story, says about his life in a metropolitan city. He expresses his nostalgias when he remembers the life in Bombay and says: "I was so happy in Bombay. I was respected, I had a certain position (15). Santosh on the one hand wishes to have freedom but on the other hand he ends it renouncing the very freedom he gained. The delight of freedom soon vanishes and he realizes that newly acquired freedom has new risks. The so called freedom has made him a prisoner in an alien country freedom has become absurd for him and he observes. All that freedom ...number of years (53).

Santosh claims to have been happy in Bombay because he was among his friends in the street who were like him and have similar culture and way of living, was “respected because he worked for an “important man”. He had his friend in Bombay sharing feelings but now in Washington he has a sense of loneliness although he is among people, he finds everything moving otherwise. He develops a sense of dislocation in the land where he confronts different culture to which he is an outsider. He has a sense of belonging but he does not belong to those people among whom he finds himself.

His journey to America is not only an excited transformation to a new world but also the sign of hope to live in a free state to enjoy prosperous life. When his employer expresses view saying “Washington is not Bombay” that creates the sense that Santosh cannot become “free” man. He faces obstacles in his identity, job and security. “I saw myself having to return to my village in the hills, to my wife and children there, not for a holiday but for good I saw myself again becoming a porter during the tourist season...” (16), he fears being left there in Bombay alone.

It is hard to assimilate into a different culture for a man like Santosh. He finds himself in a dilemma in cross cultural assimilation. He is in between two different cultures. He is neither at an ease to come back to the Indian culture nor can he follow the American one. The cultural alienation in him is so powerful that he finds no color in the sky as if he was in a new planet. He experiences the questions asked to him by the tailor bearer. “Will the American smoke with you? Will they sit and talk with you in the evening? Will they hold you by hand and walk with you beside the ocean?”(17). Santosh’s efforts in his course of staying in Washington goes out of order. His struggle was not only political but also social, as his cultural belief and customs did not match with every day American life.

As human being is a social creature, he cannot live without some sort of co-operation with others, he prefers to have company of like-minded people having more or less similar culture or frank companionship. He is among the people but has a sense of loneliness. He searches his fellowship but he finds Washington is not Bombay for him.

Unless a person belongs somewhere, and life has some meaning and direction, he would feel like particles of dust and would have no freedom at all. Santosh is brought to America by his master. His sahib does not leave any room for Santosh to be a 'free' man since he has to obey the authority of his master.

He has the 'Loss' of his identity culture, people and geography. He tries to define himself but hopelessness surrounds him. Sometimes he agonizingly utters such exclamatory words such as "o father" which shows his desperate condition that he is going through (28).

People often have the sense of confusion when they find themselves in Santosh situation. To be free, one must be self-determined controlling his interest. Santosh makes attempts to gain freedom or to be free but psychologically he loses rationality and tactfulness and falls in despair. He says:

I gave up ideas of open air. I thought I would just go back up to the apartment.

But I had not noted the number and didn't even know what floor we were on. My courage flowed out of me. I sat on the floor of the elevator and felt tears come to my eyes (22).

Freedom for Santosh *In a Free State* remains illusion. Freedom for Santosh is punitive, destructive and nihilistic and its casualties retreat from it into the safety of their cabins, cupboards and expatriate compounds (Wright 3). His sahib says: "You don't understand, Santosh. Bombay is Bombay. Here if we start living in cupboard we give wrong impression.

They will think we all live in cupboard in Bombay.” (23). This happy Hindu from Bombay, Santosh is now in new culture, and geography. So he is one out of many. He is helpless at the loss of culture and geography. He grows the sense of ‘us’ and them as he says, “there were many people who looked like my own people (24).

Santosh becomes happy when he hears some jig dancers chanting Sanskrit words in praise of lord Krishna but he is disturbed because of the half-caste appearance of the dancers; and their bad Sanskrit pronunciation and accent (25).

Santosh finds difficult to adjust in alien culture and land, and expensive life. He request his master to send him back to Bombay but his patron says, “Santosh, I’ve paid five thousand rupee to bring you here. If I send you back now, you will have to work for six or seven years without salary to pay me back.” (26). This made him feel that he had no way to make and feel ‘free’. He says: “I understood I was a prisoner. I accepted this and adjusted.”(26). Regarding the level of English understanding Wright observes, “Santosh’s English, as in most colonial writing forms superficially Anglophone part of the common wealth, functions merely as a standard, conventional rhetorical device for presenting another language.”(Wright 67).

In course of time he learns and understands English. He says: “I watch a lot of television and my English improved. I made an offering to the girl. In returns she taught me a few words of English. 'Me black and beautiful' was the first thing she taught me. My English lessons were taken a stage further by the *hubsid maid* (27-28). His knowledge about freedom and identity therefore are further developed with the development English Language which he felt a kind of achievement.

The familiarity in English brings him the sense of adventure amusing in itself and encouraging to determine his security, freedom and future. He meets a black women (*hubsid* in his

word) who attempts to frolic with him. He was fascinated by her appearance although he fears his own desire and her size, her ardor. He expresses "But in our country we frankly do not care for the *hubsis*. It is written in our books both holy and not so holy that it is indecent and wrong for a man of our blood to embrace the *hubsis* women." (29). He is now different. He examines his face in the mirror and discovers himself handsome. Adventure in his feeling develops emotional intimacy with the black women and have physical relation. He fears to have sexual relationship with the *hubsis* women. His culture forbids him to have sex with her. He becomes the victim of his emotion the inner constraints of his freedom. He wants to be free but he can't. He feels "I saw further a hole in which I was dropping. Sometimes at night when I awakened my body would burn and I would feel the hot perspiration break all over (42). He compares the women with kali, "goddess of death and destruction, coal-black, with red tongue with white eyeball and many powerful arms" and feels disappointed when she is "playful" and laughing all the time when she embraces him (33). In order to be forgiven or to undo the disorder, after she leaves, he bathes, pays penance and meditates. In America, though he abandons his cultural value by marrying a *hubsis* women, leaving his employer, he does not get security in this new freedom.

He minutely senses the land, people and culture with a different taste. Disgust surrounds him and abnormal perceives whatever he finds there. He feels himself a "prisoner" a word he repeats usually. A more dangerous vision about this alien land come in his mind when he sees some houses burning. He is inspired by riots, as the blacks burn houses and shops. Unaware that they are burning the signs and structure of discrimination against them, Santosh doesn't want the stop of burning and hopes for destruction so profound as to prevent any means of escape from his present situation. Walking in the street, observing the "smiling" black people he "shares their

exhilaration”. Now he admits; “I couldn’t easily become part of someone else’s presence again.” (36). He no longer wants to return back to his previous life in Bombay.

While walking, after the fire and enjoying the sights and new freedom of movement in the street of Washington, Santosh meets his new employer Priya. Santosh, finds a sense of belonging while meeting her. Santosh feels a sense of satisfaction, freedom position in society and a job in the restaurant. He feels safe with Priya. He says: “for the first time since I had come to Washington I felt safe”. “I was earning my freedom” (40-41) “...the burden of being unemployed is very hard to bear psychologically and the dread of it overshadows the whole life.” (Erich Fromm 113). Now his position gives him rationality and responsibility and decides to be free to act for himself and says: “I had thought I was in charge of myself.” (42).

His “escape”, he thinks brings him a good job in a restaurant, a large increase in salary, a friendly natured employer-Priya, and marriage to a black woman and gets citizenship, still a “Free” state for Santosh makes him feel a ‘stranger’. He has lost his curiosity and doesn’t like to experience more of the society, its people or language. He says, “I had lost my looks, I was free man, I had lost my freedom.” (43). He further goes on saying “I felt a hole in my stomach, I couldn’t think ... And I couldn’t turn back.” (48). After some days, Santosh gets legality in America. His employer, Priya suggest him to marry the *hubsi*. He says, “Marry the *hubsi*. That will automatically make you a citizen. Then you will be a freeman.”(49) Santosh senses the cultural confusion when he thinks about the people of his culture, a feeling of belongingness grows strong. He thinks, “How nice it would be of the people in Hindu costumes in the circle.” (51). He deliberately pronounces the fact that he is a stranger in the world whose reality he cannot understand. In addition, his illusion of freedom “remains with him”. He says, “Then I

looked in the mirror and decided to be free.” (52). He doesn’t have other alternative to get freedom beyond watching his own image in the mirror.

The question what freedom means to a modern man and how and why he tries to gain it, is conceivable to Santosh in the story “One out of Many”. Freedom, which strives for characterizes his existence. The meaning of freedom he perceives with different perspective according to his awareness and conception of himself as an independent and separate being. The meaning of freedom for Santosh does not remain same as he thought earlier and it becomes his own knowledge to understand his own self. He doesn’t find a satisfactory alternative, a center, to replace the rigid Hindu hierarchy, which had determined his place. He, in his renunciation, has accepted the loneliness. The true sense of freedom remains in illusion. At the end he expresses his feeling- “All that my freedom has brought me the knowledge that I have a face and have a body, that I must feed this body and clothe this body for a certain number of years. Then it will be over.” (53).

Tell Me Who to Kill: A self-Lost to Anger and Frustration

Tell Me Who to Kill, in V.S. Naipaul’s *In a Free State*, is the tragic story of a Trinidadian citizen who moves to London hopelessly narrates his story. He lives through other, as he is unable to form identity or set goal for himself part of narrator’s crisis is his relocation to England, where he finds that he is not really free. The narrator is also the victim of deception and self-delusion, caused mainly by the faith that he builds in sense of self through others, especially through his deceptive brother, Dayo. The narrator’s uncertain sense of self is especially revealed through his focus on media such as movie, as a means to escape reality for him, freedom seems an escape from the shame engendered by the poverty and ignorance of his colonial heritage. At one level this story brings forth “Naipaul’s specific experience with the past-colonial world of

Trinidad and London (Morgan. 1). we first meets him in the story when he is a passenger on the train, looking out of the window at the rain falling day in the towns. His view of the landscape reflects his despair as he heads for London to attend his brother's wedding, an event that concluded a lifetime of devotion to visions of love and freedom that inevitably betray him.

Like Santosh of 'One out of Many', the protagonist is an exile in the world which is inhospitable. He passes through the same sense of despair and loss. He is almost mad due to psychological setbacks and is totally directionless. He has little knowledge of Indian origin but he is still sure about it. The story takes us one step further to the black cultural confusion from what Santosh, the narrator in One out of Many experiences in Washington. The narrator of this story has not even the security of nostalgia for the place he left, he has no memories and little knowledge of his 'Indian origin' (Trinidadian). His friend Frank is good but "from inside he is puffed up with pride." (54). He is confused by the new culture and geography as he says, 'I can't do. I can't see where I am going I can only wait to see what is going to turn up' (55). As he finds everything turning up, he does not care about himself and says. "I don't care about myself. I have no life". He senses dislocation and spoiled life and further says: "I know at that moment that the love and the danger I carry all my life burst. My life finish, it spoil, it spoil (57). He is going to attend his brother's wedding in the train but on the he wishes that the train never to stop (58). He dislikes the people he sees on the way and calls them "white bitch". He wants his brother to have better studies. He has, nevertheless, gone to London to help his younger brother Dayo in his studies. Judging the activities in London the narrator sees a new freedom in the social statuses of his friend Frank which he has acquired with his economic prosperity. Capitalistic society makes an identity to the people that make them feel secured and prosperous. The individuals like the

narrator, who gets little property and social prestige gets no social and economic freedom. He says, “I worship this man.” (61). The narrator exposes the fact of worshipping.

He was rich, but once upon a time he was poor like us and the story was that he had a few acres of oil land in the south. A simple man like my father, without too much education. But in my eyes the oil land and the luck and the money and the house make this man great (61).

Santosh, the character of earlier story with humble position as a domestic help feels proud of being a member of an ancient rich culture, its art, its belief and custom. The narrator of the “Tell Me Who to Kill”, a West Indian, has no memories and little knowledge of origin. His past, as he sees it was barren. He even doesn’t want his friend “Frank” who accompanied him to understand how ordinary the world was for me (him), with nothing good in it, nothing to see except the sugarcane and the pitch road and from small I know I had no life (60).

In the changing world, religion, language and culture hinder people to gain independence life. The narrator dislikes his “Father’s brother” who has been converted to the Christianity and has been baptized as “Stephen” (63). He doesn’t like the people from other culture who he calls enemy. He says, you cannot really joke with your enemy when you find out who your enemy is, you must kill him before he kill you (73). His cultural confusion and alienation shape his action and thought which assumes right. He remarks: “Night and day the ship is moving. The sea and sky lose color, everything is grey. I don’t want the ship to stop, I don’t want to touch land again.” (75).

Freedom is not merely an idea and it doesn’t base only in reality. In controlled mind nobody can really feel freedom nor do they gain happiness. The slave like situation of Dayo in

London and strong strive for freedom make him leave Stephen's house for good. The situation that compels Dayo to struggle for freedom makes like this:

You can imagine how glad they all was when Dayo sit for his various exams and fail. You can imagine how much that makes their heart rejoice. The reason was the bad school Dayo was going to. He couldn't get into any of the good ones.

Those schools always talk about a lack of background and grounding, and Dayo had to get to a private school where the teachers themselves was a set of dances without any qualifications. But Stephen's daughters don't look at that (68).

Like Santosh in previous story, the narrator also want to go away from London. The escape, he think can be the part of freedom for him. The freedom becomes an escape from poverty, shame, and ignorance of colonial cultures. The situation of the narrator on the one hand is like a stranger and on the other hand, he is aware of the fact that he has no unified belonging to any cultural heritage. The only vague belonging to the Indian Hindus itches his mind. Thus, in new land (culture) he understands, "there is nothing for me to do here." (68). The only freedoms he senses is an escape'. He says "I got to go away, I got to leave. I feel that if I stay here those people are going to cripple me with their jealousy."(69).

He is familiar with colonial policy of severe discrimination and domination that he says, "the while people keep the best job for themselves. All you could do there is to become a bench chemist." (70). His experience of poverty and ignorance exhibited in his chief association. He enjoys American film and his actors although their names he cannot spell correctly. The film Rebecca, always gives him a frame of reference in which his brother accidentally killed a friend in England. The narrator even proceed further saying that he and his brother hide the body "in a chest, like in Rope" (a film) with fairly granger (71); and eat dinner with the dead boy's parents.

The narrator hates the white people because of their attitude and of different culture. On this Lillian Feder writes, “they are not individual, just’ any of the white people’ representative of imperial power as it filters down to the quotidian life of its colonial subjects.” (198).

The narrator, Dayo, and their entire family are the victim of present and past history. Like Santosh in the story “One out of many, he also becomes the unwelcomed stranger in London. For the sake of his brother’s betterment and his hope for freedom from poverty he comes in London and labors hard but he find the situation different that makes him hate everything he sees:

“houses, shops, traffic, all those settle people, those children playing games in fields.” (77).

Economic prosperity plays vital role in personal freedom. The narrator starts working at two works and improves his financial position and becomes happy when he saves two thousand pounds and provides him a sense of security and freedom. He says:

“The money make feel strong. The money make me feel that many is easy. The money make me forget how hard money is to make that it take. Me more than four years to save what I have. The money in my hand, two thousand pounds make me forget that my father never get more than ten pounds a month for his donkey can’t work that money I have in my hand is the pay of my father for fifteen or sixteen years. The money make me feel that London is mine.” (82-83).

The freedom and happiness, the narrator buys with money doesn’t last long. The money he earns grows his ambition. With high ambition of money mind he buys Roti and curry shop which later appears to be a foolish move. He becomes the victim of prejudice of inspectors and the cruelty of “young English louts” (84) who harassed him.

Once again his ignorance of the world, in which he tries to better his ambition and uplift the position cannot be succeeded, his background defeats him, no one in his support. “But now

everything is hurting.” (84). Even he is unable to get any support from his brother Dayo in his work or his ambition. He condemns himself, curse himself on his foolishness. He says: “I see I kill myself. The little courage that still remain with me wash away, and the secret vision I had of buying up London, I always really know was foolishness, burst. I was without my strength, like Samson without his hair (84).

The time of realization of his delusion provides him with the sense of freedom. The advertisement in the carriage: “Prepare yourself for tomorrow’s world with or course in computer programming” (88) makes him realize his self. Person, through the realization of will realizes his individual self. But he finds himself helpless. He is frustrated and is not free to govern himself. He examines his present position in England and the environment of the land. The narrator gets insights owing to a dog. He narrates:

I am hungry, but I can’t stand thought of food. I make a little overtime. When I start to drink, the dog come right up to me again, wagging its tail. And wagging its tail, it follow me to the hall. I open the door. The dog know now it make a mistake. It race up the steps not looking at me, and run away in the night. It leave me feeling lonely (88).

His alienation is so great that he loses himself like Santosh.in addition, he is trapped in unsolvable problems of belonging displacement, dislocation, self-exile and alienation. He becomes helpless. He accepts his delusion, admitting that the brother who he tried to help, rejects him for the sake of his ‘while bride’, has now left him with nothing. He dislikes everything he sees. Even the holy place like ‘church’ is ugly for him and says he doesn’t like it. He is bewilder and frustrated. Only hatred remains with him and just prays to the God and says:

O God, show me the enemy. Once you find out who the enemy is, you can kill him. But these people here they confused me. Who hurt me? Who spoil my life? Tell me who to beat back. I work four years to save my money, I work like a donkey day and night. My brother was to be the educated one, the nice one. And this is how it is ending, in this room, eating with these people. Tell me who to kill (98).

In conclusion, the second story *Tell Me who to Kill*, the novelist presents the theme of disintegration of personality in a society which is full of prejudice and hatred against the immigrants. The protagonist, the nameless West Indian's pursuit of his scapegrace brother Dayo to London, where he becomes the victim of racial violence, lapses into the world of Hollywood cinematic fantasy and appears to suffer a mental breakdown. His primary emotions are hatred and revenge which he shows with his words "Tell Me Who to Kill", the title of one of the stories in *In a Free State*. The story in question begins and ends with a wedding ceremony. For the narrator, freedom seems as an escape from the shame engendered by poverty and ignorance of his colonial heritage.

Bobby and Linda in Falsehood of freedom

The title novella *In a Free State*, takes us to newly independent African state where the emergency is going on. The setting of the scene is four hundred miles south from the capital. The two British expatriates travel overland over rutted roads to a rundown deserted hotel. This is a free state and two tribes one led by president and other by the king are struggling to rule the state. Each tribe happy to exterminate other. The enmity and the feeling of genocide between them symbolizes the modern trapping between the president and monarch. The crisis is coming to the head and the two white English civilians, a civil servant and his women passenger, are

returning to the safety of their compound along the hazardous road. So it turns to them to be an adventure in an alien culture and geography. This title novella presents and examines the former colonized people of newly independent states of Africa are unable to maintain law and order and govern their country. They are divided. The natives are proud of their land and culture and consider their own culture, custom and traditions, religion and race as the main source to identify themselves with their experiences British expatriates imitate the native culture though they are far from their original homeland and original traditions. On the other hand the past colonial independent African states are undergoing political crisis. Here the independence itself has not been real experience or in practice. This freedom, however, turns out to be largely theoretical and ironic sense most of the countries featured in the book are perceived, one or even two decades on from independence, as still being the play things of colonial powers. The novelist's conflation issue in what Landeg white has called "a free state" sufficiently located in recent history to seem real, and sufficiently generalized to seem representative." (196). On this Wright says "His projection of his African state into a "free state", in fact, liberates him from any obligation to observe historical fidelity, or even to maintain plausibility and the outcome is somewhat tendentious and misleading (Wright 68). Naipaul reveals a wide gap existing between the rural and the urban Africans. The rural folks are less concerned whether they are free or not. They are lost in their traditional chores. On the other hand, the urban Africans are cut off from their roots. They imitate the American and the European life styles. The story of the novella reveals the fate of newly independent nations who do not know the significance of a free state. The forest Africans are having integrity and identity but they are illiterate, ignorant and poor. They, thus, cannot take up the responsibility of providing a direction to their state.

The initial paragraph of this novella sets the scene of two main groups who belong to two separate tribes involved in the confrontation that shows political struggle not the recent internal combatants but a history of conflict and exploitation that has led to the present crisis

In this country of Africa there was a president and there was a king. They belonged to different tribes. The enmity of the tribes was old, and with independence their anxieties about one another became acute. The king and the president intrigued with the local representatives of white government. The white men who were appealed to like the king personally. But the president was stronger; the new army was wholly his, of his tribe, and the white men decided that the president was to be supported so that at last, this weekend, the president was able to send his army against the king's people (99).

Bobby, the English character, who work as an "administrative officer in the collectorate is unaware of this crisis and spends week attending a seminar an community development where there are "more English participates than African" in the capital, "still a colonial city" and there everyone "was far from home." (100). An event that takes place before his drive back to the collectorate for tells his discovery of how dangerous is the freedom that he hopes and believes he has found in Africa. In the bar of New Shropshice hotel Bobby meets a South African boy-a Zulu, disgust him when 'Zulu' who he identifies as a 'Whore' (101), spits on his face. The colonial environment for a longer period has caused the colonized to imitate the custom, tradition, culture of the colonizer. They, however not successfully associated themselves without colonizer. This novella brings forth the socio-political and psychological effect of imperialism at the surface level. The impact of colonial rule on the native is so strong, that they imitate the

colonizers, forgetting their originality: In the lobby there was the new official photograph of the president.

It had appeared in the city only that weekend. In the old photograph the president wore the headdress of the king's tribe, a gift of the king at the time of independence, a symbol of the unity of the tribes. The new photograph showed the president without the headdress, in jacket, short and tie, with his hair done in the English style (104).

Bobby expresses his pride on Western culture and civilization and thinks his culture is superior to that of native culture. Even then, being far away from his land, he feels a kind of cultural crisis and identity problem. He has the sense of dislocation which makes him ask the question of his being there; the question of cultural belonging. The sense of hatred towards the native, to whom he thinks he is superior comes in light when he and Zulu express themselves their position: Bobby said, "You south Africans are all arrogant." We are not like your natives here. These people are most ignorant people in the world. Look at them Bobby looked at the Zulu, so small for a Sulu. Yu must be careful what you say. They might deport you (102).

Bobby's anticipation is diminished only then when he is asked to take on a passenger, Linda, one of the "compound wives from the coelenterate." (102). As Bobby, Linda has also come to Africa for the freedom. Lillian Feder writes, "In both cases this consist of opportunities for social status and sexual adventures hers with her compatriots his with African boys built like men." (200). Their conversation on the road reveals a fact that they came to Africa like other earlier colonists because they could not quite make it financially, socially or psychologically at 'home', as they still refer to England.

On their journey both Bobby and Linda feel fairly comfortable with each other. Bobby mentions having seen a psychiatrist in the past and explains, “I had a break down at Oxford.” (112). It is clear that this affliction- “like watching yourself become a ghost.” (112) - the loss of his fragile hold on selfhood, his determined his choice of exile. His move into Africa, he seems a relief as he expresses as; “And when the tree had been looked at, he said solemnly again, ‘Africa saved my life’. As though it was a complete statement, explaining everything’ as though he was at once punishing and forgiving all those who misunderstood him.” (113). He says: “I never knew a place like Africa existed. I wasn’t interested. I suppose, like you (Linda), I thought of tribesmen and spears. And of course I knew about South Africa.” (114). He also imagined himself in a room in which everything was white with a view of “green hills” and “a very blue sea.” (115). Bobby assents to Linda’s suggestion that this sounds “Like a hospital on a Greek island” admitting to her and to himself that this was a fantasy of total self-abnegation, “a wish to give up, to be nothing, to do nothing.” (115). This statement indicates from this state that state Africa has freed him, and it is through this dependence that he views Africa. His perception of” mountains, the rains, the forest, the clouds and his fantasy with the road etc. give him freedom. It is the only his state of freedom.

Though Bobby wants to escape into the ‘free state’ of his fantasies, he is defensive about Africa. To be there he says, ‘to serve’ (115). Feder writes, “One has only to recall Bobby’s contempt for the African who damaged his windscreen, his threat to call the police, his outburst when the man began to walk away”. “I’m a government officer! How dare u turn your back on me while I’m addressing you? His arm lifted as if to strike the man.” (202).

Linda, despite here “reputation as a man-eater,” is a colonial wife, who derives satisfaction of her supposed superiority to the Africans and her occasional sexual adventures.

Although she is found of the beauty of Africa and the freedom she has found there, she is also obsessive about so called African customs' the eating of excrement and dirt and oath of hate Linda says "They are going to swear their oaths of hate. You know what that means, don't you? You know the filthy things they are going to do? The filth they are going to eat? The blood, the excrement, the dirt [...] I believe they do is to eat a piece of meat. I don't think they even eat it. They just bite it." (119). Linda and her husband, "an old radio men" came to Africa because at the BBC he has reduced to "putting out rubbish and the hoped to do better as a colonist (123). She knew that she and her husband must leave soon even when Bobby says, "My life is here." (123).

They get difficulty on their journey as it was not easy to talk with black. "Bobby saw an African, the African was smiling [...] when Bobby smiled back the African did not respond. His smile was fixed. (127). Such odd and peculiar behavior they got on their way to "Hunting Lodge" in Collectorate.

The impact of the colonial power in the post-colonial independence Free State is left in term of "a lizard's tail, separate, dead." (130). Which is to legacy that left to native one on this the comment of Carter is: "You colonialist did pretty well." (131). But Bobby bemoans at dining hall of hotel:

I can't get over the Brutishness of this place. But Linda says, "When I was in West Africa, everyone was always saying what rotten colonialists we were and how good the French were. And when you crossed the border it looked true. You saw all those black men just ours sitting on the road side and eating French bread and drinking red wine and wearing those funny little French berets (132).

Though Bobby uses the sign of hegemony to underestimate the African boys whom he hitchhikes on his drive, says, I'm a civil servant. A bureaucrat. I have my in tray and my out tray. I have tea tray (134), but he finds difficult with them. "You stop", you turn right" are, for instance, the order that these African did to Bobby.

Bobby tries to develop the sense of closeness with African and whoever he meets he identifies himself with them saying "I am a government officer. I am attached to Mr. Ogguna Wanga Butere's department in the southern Collectorate." (136). To some extent he feels safe and comfort in Africa because he says he is "white and neutral" (139). His merry making on his driving back with Linda is long and seem as if it ends nowhere. As a bearer in this freedom of his driving in African state is the presence of black boys the way of his driving. They not only asked him coins but also made him "deeply angry" (144). Bobby shouts at these bush boys: you've ruined my wind screen. You've ruined all my window. You've knocked several hundred shilling of the resale value. Who's going to give me that? You? (145).

Bobby possesses the split personality for he enjoys the adventure he does with Linda but at the same time he is aware of his houseboy in the collectorate who was a Christian, a church goer, moneyless and drinker (108) of the king's tribe. Similarly, Linda physically unattractive to him, imagines the sound of car say the noise of child birth for them romance is a means to a state of free mind. Bobby gets his freedom in "the fantasy of driving through a cold and rainy night, driving endless miles." (151). He wants to enjoy a romantic situation or time of "rain outsider, fire inside." (151), that shows the real attitude of Bobby in that alien African state. Bobby, being a colonial agent, gets happiness in absolutely white object- curtains, wall and bed. He feels that Africa is everything for him, a hospital on some Greek island that he obtains through driving. In his drive, Bobby brings a number of social and political issues of Africa like - his hatred of

English queen, corruption, his mental break down, about the road, American Joke, medicine, but they do not become obstacle in the way of Bobby and Linda.

The drive of Bobby and Linda appears familiar and peaceful, for a while when they encounter a road block and take the road to the mountains. Then, they came upon are older Africa than the urban one. They have become accustomed to "bush on both sides of the road" and when they climb higher into the mountains, "it seemed they were on the roof of the world, at the heart of the continent." (150). They see a line of Africans, the 'bright colors' of their heads, creating a kind of "camouflage," which Linda "feels that sort of forest life has been going on forever." (159). On this Bobby responds, "You've been reading to much concord. I hate that book, don't you?" (160). Bobby believes that his freedom is in this sorts of divided that he used to dream of - "the mountains, the rain, the forest." (161). Bobby doesn't like Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. His need of Africa as a personal heaven prohibits his acceptance of Conrad's depiction of the horror of colonial rule, and justifies his own presence there as a government officer. Bobby smiles at the African but the African doesn't respond become of complicated relation. It is not only the relationship between colonizers and colonized but also the relationship between Western culture and indigenous African culture prevail throughout their journey. The fear of unknown always haunts them in their journey. Although for Bobby Africa is a place of dream for freedom, he has felt a sense of alienation, dislocation as he has no friends there to share his fear and freedom except Linda, the colonial woman.

Bobby's fantasy drive is suddenly disturbed when he finds his car "skidding slithering" and finally stuck in mud. When they drive down into the heart of the newly independent African State, they find the town in an image of total neglect; the drives of villas, "the park", the sidewalks" are all overgrown. Everything was broken, decayed, rusty, corrupted is it the hotel

where they stop for the night. The owner of the hotel, known as colonel, is a prototype of arrogant, patronizing settlers, manipulating and often brutal to the African staff in the hotel. Even the least choice of workers is also cut off. They have the lives of great exploitation. For them freedom gives nothing. Bobby and Linda in the land of alien culture and geography feel absurdity of being there. When Bobby listens: 'Fendal ... ter'rists ... sessionist ... ab'am Lincoln ... secu'ty forces exte'm' nated ... vermin' (168) fill a sense of fear in him. As he goes out of the hotel for a walk, he sees the houses converted by Africans to recreate the shelter of the round forest hut:

The town was inhabited. Many of the houses that looked abandoned were occupied, by Africans who had come in from the forest and had used the awkward, angular objects they had formed, walls, doors, windows, furniture, to recreate the shelter of the round forest hut. Written drawing rooms they had built shelters; they had raised roofs on Verandah half- walls (170).

A dialogue between the colonel and Peter shows the relationship between the colonizers and colonized in African Free State. Their year's long relationship sizing up one another's attitudes, mistrust, mutual dependence, envy and hatred. The colonel brought peter from the bush to his hotel and peter is clever and his accent echoes the colonel accent. Knowing that Peter wants to join a meeting of Africans who support the president and wishes to arrive there in his Volkswagen, the colonel demand the keys to the car. Peter's denial becomes an occasion on the colonel to insult and humiliate him:

But you like dirt, don't you, Peter" you like going in to some black hole to eat filth and dance naked. You will steal and lie to do that, won't you?

'I like quarter sir.'

While I live you will stay there. You won't move in here, Peter. I don't want you to bank on that. If I die you will starve, Peter. You will go back to bush.' (180 - 1).

In the course of Colonel and Peter's dialogue, Peter at last gives him answer, that he wants, only at this time, it is the truth; "I hate you sir", and a little later, " I will always hate you sir (182). Peter returns the car keys and leaves. It is clear that he thinks he will ultimately in this contest: on this Linda says, " They're waiting to kill him" (the colonel) (187).

Their rest journey is filled with tension, fear of unknown, and danger in what they discover: dogs, manner of Africans, sharp metallic vibration, ceaseless wails, rage and ache in head, damp valleys of fern, fat black savages, and rumor of king's murder. They also approve their disgust to the *Vox Populi* of the naked people and the "Dull eyed figured with mud." (205). In such case, more than Bobby, Linda is hopeless towards the Africans as she wonders what would have happened in the world if these people had been all over the world. She adds the world would be "sorts of strange place." (206). The Africans humiliate the whites by grinning at them. So, Linda says, "I hated this place from the first day, I came here, I felt I had no right to be among these people." (218). Though they have come for freedom in Africa, They are hardly adjusting in the chaos political situation. "Every night in the compound you hear them raising the hue and cry and you know they're beating someone to death outside (- - -) and some of them don't even have names." (219).

In the end of their journey, the president's soldiers stopped Bobby and Linda. The treatment towards their prisoner, black men of kings tribe, mostly naked and "roped up in the traditional forest way neck to neck, in small group of three or four, as though for delivery to the slave-merchant", (229) shows Africa violating African's rights (of freedom). Even seeing this situation, Bobby doesn't realize the danger he is going to face. Later he is beaten and his wrist is

fractured. At the very end of the story, Bobby is in pensive mood whether he would be able to stay there or not. Bobby, like the protagonists of other stories of *In a Free State*, is really a homeless. He says that he belongs to the government but which government? The question haunts his mind. He doesn't have family in Africa, nor does he have loyal friends, yet he says he has freedom in this dark Africa among the bush people. But infect he has the sense of dislocation, alienation frustration, and the loss of cultural identity and personal freedom.

In conclusion, Naipaul depicts freedom seeking car-driver of Bobby and Linda through the ways of bush people. This novella is set in an imaginary free state in Africa, where the political freedom has brought the tribal rivalry on the surface with greater intensity. Bobby senses the African attitudes to gain his personal freedom and tries to be African leaving his British back ground, adopting the external objects representing Africa. However it does not save him from violence. Thus, *In a Free State* reveals the sad fate of the post-colonial societies which attained political freedom without being socially, psychologically and culturally free.

The circus at Luxor: A world of Chaos

The book, *In a Free State* contains an epilogue from a journal which is named as "The Circus ant Luxor." The narrator of this section is going to Egypt from Milan by air. He observes the people and identifies them who they are. Some of them are the Chinese people. His first reaction, fellow Asiatic, the three of us ... wanderer in industrial Europe" (240), but soon he realizes that they showed no interest in him. He knows that they are from China and thinks of them as same as the alienated people. He presents his view which is more detached to describe the cultural magnetism that he examines in his journey to Milan. Apart from Chinese people, there are some other people from Greece, Lebanon and some more from other places. The narrator describes their language, clothing, behavior and so on. The focus of epilogue is the

diversity of culture, how people from different cultural background interact. With each other. Moreover, he narrates about the people place and culture with a reference to himself. It make a clear assumption that he cannot pursue his happiness and freedom in such cultural confusion. He feels himself alienated and dislocated in the world so inhospitable that people always seek cultural expression as that of Santosh, Bobby, Linda and others in other stories of the book.

IV. Conclusion

Freedom: A Long Way Ahead

In a Free State, a sequence of five works, deals with the common theme of freedom, refers to a politically free state, such as the independent, post-colonial nation-state from which the characters in the stories come and in which the title novella is set respectively, India and Trinidad, Washington, the USA and Conglomerate of African nations. This freedom, however, turns out to be largely theoretical and ironic since most of the countries featured in the book are perceived, one or two decades on from independence, are still being the play thing of colonial power. More commonly, the title has been taken to refer to freedom as a psychological state, a state of mind which the Naipaulian characters in the novel endeavor. In the course of time and places of five sections of novel, all are connected with a narrative of emigration and dislocation and attempt is made to survey different dimensions of freedom- political, social, religious and psychological, in these stories along with the degree of autonomy of his characters and illusion of their separate independent reality. Though the individual sections of the book are set in a 1960s post-colonial world, the displacement and transplantation to alien culture of main characters is the main obstacle to gain freedom for Naipaul's fictional beings. The chaos of Naipaul's world is established by the prologue in which a tramp the main character lacks clean cultural ties, is subjected to violence and danger as he moves about the postcolonial world among those who have distinct national and cultural backgrounds. The tramp has neither his own history nor home. He thus creates an identity that not only insulates him from the violence of the world around him but also he gains his freedom nowhere. He is free to travel but his social status and

cultural ties make him unfree. As such tramp possesses no positive sense of freedom. He is subjected to violence that he faces everywhere.

Santosh, a humble Indian servant, in *One out of Many* continually concedes his sense of place and history for the sake of financial prosperity in the cosmopolitan world. While in India, he had a distinct sense of a caste system and tradition that limited him to poverty. When he is uprooted from the pavement of Bombay by his diplomatic employer and taken off to a new life in Washington D.C., he abandons his cultural norms by marrying a *hubsi* woman and leaving his employer. Finally he feels that newly achieved freedom brings him no security. He is however always under the tension of being deported. What he gains there is confusion and humiliation. In attempt to gain security, he isolates himself from Americans. So, the journey of Santosh in the United States for the first time begin long before he sees the statue of liberty and end long before he gets his passport. However, Santosh's journey not only destroys his painful idealism but also raises important questions about his freedom identity including cultural, social, economic and personal.

The character of Santosh, ill-educated, painfully naïve to American ways, learns much about the United States, befriending a black woman, experiencing the Washington riots and sadly, becoming more and more alienated from this world he thought he would embrace so perfectly. The contrast of Indian society with the American way of life leaves Santosh alienated but also presents the reader the dilemma of cross-culture assimilation. Santosh gains his freedom nowhere. Where ever he goes he senses himself as Indian and in real he has no clear concept of what freedom is because he is a servants and perhaps enough food to eat and good clothes to wear may be his part of freedom, he has understood in the course of his journey from Bombay to

Washington (America). For Santosh happens and positive freedom is not possible in his personal self and the place wherever he goes on.

Doyo, in the story “Tell Me Who to Kill”, who studies in England is not totally free but is the victim of self-delusion and deception. For him to attain freedom is to escape from poverty, hatred and ignorance. He helplessly says that he neither can do nor can see what he has been doing and is the man having no knowledge what freedom is. Dayo’s story the studies in England to escape the cultural deprivation of Caribbean life, the cinematic fantasies seems to be drawn from the author’s won Trinidadian childhood. At the climax of this story, the narrative veers into one of the narrator’s preoccupying Hollywood fantasies, leaving a number of things unclear: whether narrator Dayo’s brother’s attendant Frank is his jailor, psychiatric nurse, social worker or friend and whether the enemy to be “killed “is his Caribbean family, the group of vandals who destroyed his London restaurant his wastrel brother, or the whole white society into which Dayo has married. The narrator is unable to explain any of these events. So, what is freedom as a human experience to the narrator? What can be the social condition upon whom his freedom is based? He has the illusion of freedom in his own restlessness. Freedom, thus exists nowhere for the unfree narrator in this story.

The title novella, *In a Free State*, describes the 400 miles road journey of two British expatriates, Linda and Bobby, across a newly independent African country in the throes of a tribal civil war to pursue freedom through travel. But, their growing powerlessness to withstand the senseless violence and brutality raging around them. Bobby’s exploration for a greater independence led him to alienation and dislocation and finally happens to come to the ex-colony with Linda. The situation of former colonial becomes metaphor for modern restlessness and homelessness. To be “*In a Free State*” is thus to be abroad and adrift into modern world. They

came to African Free State to gain personal freedom but they found the situation everywhere disorder- a world of violence and chaos. The scene of African Free State portrayed in the story is a decayed part of the continent where the native people inherit nothing on the day of independence and aftermath freedom here is punitive, destructive and nihilistic. The African, identified mainly by his smell, is simply “the man flushed out from the bush”. Thus, in such situation, freedom for unfree people like Bobby, Linda or people of bush does not valid at all.

In Naipaul's fictitious African state, the Ugandan and Kenyan episodes are pressed into one and made to happen at the same time and in the same place. The Africans, immediately upon gaining self-government, naturally revert to primitive tribalism, oath taking and blood-letting and that they waste their independence, throw away opportunities for national unity in the post-colonial phase, and go back to the bush. Thus this raise the question- what is freedom from the people in the Free State and the people in the bush? Do they really get freedom in true sense? This research tries to show the nation of freedom can't be practiced fully in different dimensions of human society. So, freedom has no meaning for the people in the bush. It seems in the title story “In a Free State” Naipaul's expression about Africa and African is nothing more than bush and its people because they have nothing to produce but only to consume. They have no place in the world and finally have to move back to the bush. It can be assumed that neither Bobby, not Linda nor independent bush people are the freedom seeker. For people like them, freedom doesn't exist as boon rather it turns as a curse. Their quest for freedom creates a sense of despair, boredom, absurdity hatred because man has never given up the dream of achieving boundless freedom.

Next, there is the notion of freedom as a scientific metaphor. The reference there is apparently to the random motion around the atomic nucleus of electrons whose speed and

position can be measure, but never at the same time and are said to be “in a free state” since their movement is impossible to plot exactly. The accidental, unpredictable travel of particles is comparable to that of the book’s characters. Santosh, Dayo’s brother, and the tramp in the prologue seem to move any clear direction in a space without any gravitational pull or magnetism which would hold them together around a common culture. On their long car journey across central Africa in the title novella Bobby and Linda, the ill matched travelers he a liberal and homosexual and she a racist and nymphomaniac, do not relate to attract each other in anyway and seem to have the un-connectedness of free floating particles in recently formed post-colonial “Free State,” though which they drive. The truth of these relationship is nearly true portrait the books individual sections. This individual section of the book is an abundance of arbitrary plot connection, parallel incidents and echoing motifs makes people weak, abnormal, absurd and victim of violence. Each of the characters thinks speaks and tells his own story in his own way and they appear to be free in fictional state with their respective view of temperament, experience and education etc. so, scientifically, most of the characters are unfree in the course of novel.

Naipaul *In a Free State* shows the present existing position of individuals in the cosmopolitan cities of England, Washington D.C. and in Africa where they are experiencing new culture, geography people, cultural assimilation and diffusion, clashes and wars, political and social environment, feeling of dislocation and the new place where they are. But it is clear that they are not free linguistically, socially and culturally. For them freedom to perceive the life without the bondage of time, situation and society because the freedom lies beyond the arena of consciousness. So, Naipaul’s fiction characters are unfree that means they are not free because their social condition is much worse. Santosh does not have clear Knowledge what he wants to

do and Dayo's brother is not sure who he is going to kill. Bobby and Linda also do not know what will happen in their lives in that political chaos in Africa. Though, these Indians, colonial people are free from their master, still they find themselves confused in chaos, mayhems and anarchy. In a true sense only small group of people are free socially and politically but freedom for a many people exists no where they are not aware what the freedom is. However, in the five part of the novel, Naipaul plays the role of both the imperialist and imperialized because it is the freedom related to both the characters' and the author's respectively. In this book Naipaul grants autonomy to his characters with one hand and in the course of their action of seeking out freedom and snatches it autocratically away with the other.

Works Cited

- Ashcroft, Bill. Et al. *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Berlin, Isaiah. "Two Concepts of Liberty." *Four Essays on Liberty*. London: Oxford University Press. (New Edition in Berlin) 2002. 120-30.
- Carter, Ian. *A Measure of Freedom*. Oxford: OUP, 1999.
- Caryl, Phillips. *A New World Order*. London: Seeker & Warburg, 2001.
- Christmas, J. 'Liberalism and Individual Positive Freedom'. *Ethic 101 (1991)*. 343-59.
- David, PC. "Between Two Stools." Naipaul's *An Area of Darkness*. Ed. Avdhesh K. Srivatsava. India: Lucknow Print House. 1984. 234-36.
- Descarte, Rene. "*Meditations on First Philosophy [1641] and Passions of the Soul [1649]*," in *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*. Vol I-III, Trans Nottingham, J., Stoothoff. R., & Murdoch, D., Cambridge: CUP, 1984. P. 183.
- Feder, Lillian. *Naipaul's Truth: The Making of the Writer*. Noida: Indialong, 2001.
- "Freedom". *The World Book Encyclopedia*. Vol 8. London: World Book, World Book Inc. A Scott Fetzer Company, 1992:433-35.
- Fromm, Erich. *The Fear of Freedom*. (1942) London: Routledge, 2001.
- Gaarder, Jostein. *Sophie's World: A Novel about the History of Philosophy*, Trans. Pulette Moller. New York: Berkley Books, 1998.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1998.
- Ghimire, Madhu. "Freedom: Hoax or Need?". *The Kathmandu Post*. 17 May 2005.

Gibaldi, Josep. *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*. 5th ed, New Delhi: Affiliated East-West Press, 2000.

Green, T.H. "Liberty; Political Theory." *Principles of Political Science*. New Delhi; S. Chand & Company Ltd. 2000: 354-56.

Helvetius, e l'esprit. *Liberty Political Theory (Principles of Political Science)* S. Chand & Company Ltd. New Delhi, 2000: 354-56.

Krishnamurti, J. *Freedom from the Known*. Mary Lutyens (ed.) Vijaya Nagar: The Indcom Press, 1969, Reprinted in 2005.

Kumar, Amitava.ed. *The Humor and the Pity*. New Delhi: Buffalo Books. 2002.

MacCallum, G C. "Negative and Positive Freedom." *Philosophical Review* 76 (1967) 312-34.

McCabe, Bret. "Review of *Magic Seed*," by VS Naipaul. Web, 1st May 2005. Accessed on 13th Dec 2013.

<http://www.citypaper.com/arts/review/magicseeds/4204/7>.

Mill, John Strut. *On Liberty*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Press, 1978.

Naipaul, V.S. *In a Free State*. London: Picador, 1971.

---. *An Area of Darkness*. Harmondworth: Penguin Books, 1968.

---. *A Bend of the River*. London: Penguin Books, 1990.

---. *Finding the Centre*. Great Britain: Andre Deutsch Ltd, 1984.

Nixon, Rob. *London Callings: V.S. Naipaul, Postcolonial Mandarin*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Oppenheim, F.E. *Dimensions of Freedom: An Analysis*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1961.

Patel, Vasant S. *V. S. Naipaul's India, A Reflection*. New Delhi: Standard Publishers. 2005.

Prasannarajan, S. "About Lives Half Lived." *India Today* 3 Sept. 2001: 56: 60.

- - - "Home and Away." *India Today* 4 March, 2002.

- - - "A Prize for Sir Vidia." *India Today* 22 Oct. 2001: 50-53.

Rai, Sudha. *Homeless by Choice*. Jaipur: Print Well, 1992.

Roy, Mohit k. ed. *Critical Essay: Vol. 1*, Atlantic Publisher and Distributors, 2002: VI –XVII.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness*. New York: Washington Square Press. 1956.

Steinner, H. "How Free: Computing Personal Liberty" *Of Liberty*. Phillips Griffiths Cambridge: CUP, 1983: 18.

Suroor, Hassan. "A Literary Brown Sahib." *Frontline*. 9 Nov. 2001: 54-55.

Thoreux, Paul. *Sir Vidia's Shadow*. London: Penguin Books, 1999.

Walsh, William. *Commonwealth Literature*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1973.

Wei, Simone. *Oppression and Liberty*. Trans. Arthur wills and John Petric. London: Routledge, 2001.

White, Landeg: *VS Naipaul: A Critical Introduction*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1975.

Wright, Derek. "Autonomy and Autocracy in VS Naipaul's *In a Free State*". *International Fiction Review*. 25.1-2.1998: 63-70.

Yee, Danney. Rev. of *In a Free State* by VS Naipaul. Web 4 March 1994. Accessed on 14th Nov. 2013.

[http://www.dannyreview.com/in a free state.](http://www.dannyreview.com/in-a-free-state)