I. Introduction

A Look into Naipaul's Works

Sir Vidyadhar Suraj Prasad Naipaul born on August 17, 1932 in Trinidad of Hindu parents has been universally acclaimed as one of the finest writers in the English language. He is generally considered as the leading novelist of the English speaking Caribbean. Naipaul left the island at the age of eighteen to attend school in England. He was educated at Queen's Royal College in Port of Spain. And later at University College, Oxford, after winning a scholarship he was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature in 2001 and earlier knighted by Queen Elizabeth II in 1990. A master of English prose style, he is known for his penetrating analysis of alienation and exile. Writing with increasing irony and pessimism, he has often bleakly detailed the dual problem of the third world: the oppression of colonialism and the chaos of postconialism. Naipaul has probed the Muslim, Latin American, West Indian and African worlds by providing entertaining and enlightening reading. Naipaul has succeeded in making a career for himself because his prodigious talent has been so repeatedly on display and so celebrated that it has long since grown to something of canonical proportions. Naipaul's works in novels as well as travels books have attained the pinnacle of success in contemporary literature. He has maintained resistance to the western hegemony in his works, taking up the situations of Africa, India and West Indies and the role played by the colonizer and the colonized in the postcolonial scenarios.

Naipaul is twice married. First he married Patricia Hale in 1955 but her death in 1965 led Naipaul to marry a divorced Pakistani journalist Nadira Alvin.

It was then for the first time that he felt himself as a rootless writer finding himself far from his root culture, language and people. After being awarded the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1953 from the University College, Oxford, he continued to live in England (since the 70s in Wiltshire, close to Stonehenge) but he has also spent a great deal of time traveling in Asia, Africa and America. Apart from a few years in the middle of the 1950s when he was employed by the BBC as a free-lance journalist, he has devoted himself entirely to writing.

Naipaul, as a broadcaster for BBC Caribbean Voice from 1954 to1956 and as a regular fiction reviewer for the New Statesman from 1957 to 1961, got cultural impetus in coloring one of his earliest novels, *The Miguel Street* (1959) with the love and nostalgia he had with Trinidad. All his early novels expose his ambivalent stance as a son of Trinidad, depicting the lives of the people as he could sense them from the nearest possible point. *The Mystic Masseur* and *The Suffrage of Elvira* written in 1951 and 1958 respectively set his ambitious career as a novelist that ultimately flowers in *A House for Mr. Biswas* (1961) a tragic-comic story of the search for independence and identity. The protagonist of the novel, Mohun Biswas is said to have been partly modeled after the author's own impoverished father. The solid basis of existence- a house for him touches the book that ultimately became one of the main themes of his subsequent novels. The same daring theme is repeated in his *Letters between Father and Son* (1999), a collection of family letters from the years leading up to the time of his earliest published works. This work, as a record of father –son correspondence in the early 1950s continues to add to paradox of his life's work.

Merging history, memoirs, fiction and journalism and laying them bare in his books creating an accomodable place for each. Naipaul solves the problem,

of their incompatibilities. His arrival, for example, in Wiltshire, his home now, turns to be *An Enigma of Arrival* (1987), a novel in which he depicts its pastoral life and a man's love and hatred to the arrival itself. His three full fledged books about *India-An Area of Darkness* (1964), *India: A Wounded Civilization* (1997), and *India: A Million Mutinies Now* (1990) appear as homage as well as a protest and disenchantment to his Hindu root. These are his journeys from memory to the reality, eschewing the ambivalence within the collage of generic distinction and scaffolding the cultural remnants of the historical inquiry, and the result being the source for his own identity in writing.

Naipaul's extensive travels in India, Malaysia, Iran, Africa, South America and the USA in the 1960s and 1970 helped him to find immense materials for his ambitious and dazzling novels and travel books. Those books are the small incentives from the sociology of the colonized heritage, and the boarders of which are extended in works like *In a Free State* (1971), *A Bend in the River* (1979) and *A Way in the world* (1994). He presents the world with typical obsession relating to the world replete with the faultiness of conquest and rear. The irredeemable duskland that he presents in his work can be taken as an enlarged Conradian heart of darkness, whose new variation is the nameless African country as portrayed in *Half a Life* (2001)

He saw Islam not as a religion but as an emporium in his *Among the Believers* (1991) and *Beyond Believer: Islamic Excursion Among the Converted Peoples* (1998). He often regards that Islam goes beyond the Islamic peoples i.e. to the converted Muslims and thus makes its imperial demands. Other novels also seek the similar themes bringing civilization, culture, nationality, history, geography, journalism and travels in one conflated amalgam. One of them is *The*

Mimic Men (1965) which explores the contemporary problems of identity in a disguised portrayal of the novelist himself. Whereas his *The Middle Passage* (1962) a novel of his reflections depicts the problems of his native island Trinidad, that he experienced as he first arrived there after leaving for London in 1950.

He has successfully distorted the boundaries of genres such as travel, narratives, autobiography reflection and history that are conflated in a changeable non fictional mode, which he has used repeatedly. His presentation of the dark side with his own entrepreneurs can aptly be compared to Joseph Conrad's vision of the so called third world. Like Derek Walcott, Wole Soyinka Salman Rushdie and some other writers in English form the stance highly debated as 'margin,' Naipaul also struggles hard to find his place, culture and history. About his own life, he says, "My life is short, I can't listen to banalities. If writers only think of oppression of there will be no time for writing" (Kuravilla 1).

Edward said and Salman Rushdie often criticize Naipaul's views on Islam and Islamic people's. Rob Nixon calls him a "Postcolonial Mandarin". Naipaul nevertheless, stands to be one of the celebrated figures in literature and a man of fine prose in English, but still countless secrets linger regarding his biography and rigidity of the opinions, which make an echo in Paul Thoreaux's book *Sir Vidia's Shadows* (1998). No one has gone such depth of closeness with Naipaul, and as a result, Thoreaux's, book appears to be the outcome of his frustration with Naipaul after their three decades long friendship. The Novel Prize award to Naipaul encouraged Lillian Feder to write *Naipaul's Truth* (2001) that reveals the truth behind his writing.

Naipaul's peculiar artistic quality related to his creative force in his writing is that he turned to his own life for materials, writings of his migration from Trinidad to England. His latest novel is *Magic Seeds* (2004). Writing has really been his own career, which has been proven by his many novels where he seeks his own image. Naipaul is trying for a house for himself for which he has devoted his whole career as a writer .

Naipaul takes a wide range of issues and setting from Non Western world for the justification of his autobiographical elements in his writing. Although his parents descended from Hindu immigrants from India, Naipaul's inability to form spiritual connections with his heritage, be it Trinidadian or Indian or even British, dominates his thought as it appears in his work. His writings express the ambivalence of the exile, a feature of his own experience. It is proclaimed that Naipaul is probably the greatest living writer writing in English. It is not only so because his craftsmanship in writing is innovative but also his fiction and travel memoirs are the profound exploration of human condition damaging effects of the 'Third World' exemplified in cultural alienation and illusory freedom. Though it has become challenging job to draw a demarcation line between his truth and fiction, he produced much of non fictional work in his maturity. His political essays and travel memoirs help to forward his ideas about the post colonial scenario of the world, and at the same time his works make him an outspoken critic of mysteries and controversies prevailing in the colonial aftermath.

Naipaul has been honored by almost all principal literary awards in England including the knighthood in 1990, it is after receiving the Novel Prize for literature in 2001 that his canonicity as an English writer form so called

margin is conformed. He tries to expose the controversies and the hypocrisies in a simple and apparent language. There is yet another aspect of the writer too: Naipaul is a great chronicler of the diasporic experience and loneliness of the world. He prospers, after all, as a writer because so much of his work, not withstanding the change of aloofness in some of the travel writings, is also an occupied, engaged and prolific narrative about writing from the periphery with the voice producing from the splits created within history. The raptures in the history exhibit the problem of cultural belonging, and thereby create among individuals a sense of cultural alienation. The subjects facing this problem, like Naipaul himself, try to articulate that sense of loss in their writing ultimately stressing the need of individual struggle in the world of cultural confusion.

He is not only an expatriate in London but also an exile from nowhere and his life is full of oddities, complications and problems. So, he has strong sense of history. Naipaul really wants to write his history as one of his autobiographical character, Ralph Singh, who in *The Mimic Men* says "My instinct was towards writing history"(81). Regarding his style, Tarun J. Tejpal writes:

> With Naipaul there were no excesses of language, no flashy turns of phrase, no exhibitions of vocabulary. In fact there is a word out of place. There is no better school to learn the craft of writing. There is architecture to the phrase that, in its simplicity and design, is classical. The words staking off, the sentences staking off, the paragraph staking off, have an air of profound inevitability. (54)

The way of presenting cultural desiderata in equally powerful and fine language makes Naipaul a writer of both interest and difference. Tejpal further says "Vido is already an original, seized of his own opinion, prodigiously

intelligent and intellectually unafraid"(162). His writing therefore, makes him a novelist of distinction, whose choosy and sardonic tone conceals a profound concern for twentieth century uncertainties   and insidious effects of imperialism upon the people of so-called third world nations. This is a trauma of alienation and deracination to which Naipaul himself belongs. This fact of the expression of truth compels Lillian Feder to write:

> I approach the body of Naipaul's fiction as part of composite opus, the central theme of which the lifelong process of self creation, an individual narrative of a search for truth that incorporates the historical and social framework in which it is enacted. (20)

Naipaul's Truth as Feder emphasizes, simply rests on his exploration of his self in his own writing. And Feder writes a single book on the same theme to reveal Naipaul's basic preoccupation with writing. The representation of Africa in his books is taken to be a sequel to Joseph Conrad's views. Conrad, a Polish born British novelist whose work including his novella *Heart of darkness* (1902) explores the darker side of human nature, and so does Naipaul. Naipaul and a number of twentieth century novelists got a significant influence from Conrad's theme and style.

Naipaul is a self conscious migrant who does not hide the nationalist idealism in his fiction but powerfully exposes the cultural confusion and identity crisis in the post colonial time. The writing of any kind, after all involves language, and about language, David Crystal clearly states:

> Our use of language can tell our listener or reader a greater deal about ourselves-in particular, about our regional origins, social background, level of education, occupation, age, sex and

personality. The way language is used to express these variables is so complex that it requires separate discussion but the general points can be made here, that a major function of language is the personal identity-the singling of who we are and where we 'belong.' (13)

Thus, Crystal emphasizes that the case of language is purposely related to the expression of personal identity crisis. In other words the trauma of identity crisis can be sensed in the language that one uses

An Outline of *A Bend in the River*

A Bend in the River is one of the finest novels produced in his maturity. The novel was published in the year 1979, when the people of the newly emigrant nations found engulfed by the whirl of cultural confusion in the process of re/configuration of 'we' and the ' other.' The novel is set in the post independent state of a nameless country. Like the nameless of the country, Naipaul has made the use of common noun The Big Man, ruler of the nameless African country as the proper noun. Characters are both: the natives and the European Intellectuals and Africans of Asian origin. The novel is divided into four chapters: The Second Rebellion, The New Domain, The Big Man and Battle: the first, the second, the third and the fourth respectively. All four chapters are divided into seventeen sub-chapter of unequal length.

The novel is presented through the first person narration. Salim, both the narrator and the protagonist of the novel, is an East African Muslin of Indian origin. His family has been living there for centuries. He leaves the coast and journeys towards the African interior. He buys a small shop in the town at the bend of the river. His business prospers as the peace is restored after the

independence. The novel traces his relationship with different characters. Like Salim's, Inder's family, Indian Hindu has been living there for generations. Inder returns to the nameless African country after studying in London. He is a government official, in the Domain, a small Europe made in Africa by the Big Man. Raymond, a European intellectual adviser has been residing in the Domain. He has been enjoying the influential role as he is the only person whose writing is read by the president. He is the Big Man's White man. He writes lectures for the Big Man. Father Huismans another European, a priest, is enthralled by all things African-the food the religious belief, the art-yet also reveres the remnants of European colonization. He has little interest in the reality of contemporary Africa. His equanimity is not enough to protect him. Soon after the peace is restored after The Second Rebellion, during a visit to the bush, he is killed.

The novel also describes the progress of the African state itself through revolution, counter revolution, the nationalization of the property, prosperity and bloodshed. Under the name of nationalization, the property belonging to the 'foreigners' including Salim is confiscated and rendered to the local trustees. Raymond has not more influencing role and flees the land to save his life. The Big Man's power is rivalled by the Liberation Army. The Liberation Army declares that they are going to kill everyone who can read and write. Not only exile, but also natives are in the state of insecure. Thus, the social scenario of the state is of complete chaos.

In the last chapter 'Battle', Ferdinand, now one of the commissioners of the country, once who used to come to Salim to learn, rescues him from being persecuted. Thus, he is compelled to live in the ambience of European intellectual advisers, natives, profiteers and other Third world flotsam and

jetsam, gradually losing his property and his integrity in the mounting confusion. He can not feel of being secure or being in the center. He feels being an exile in his own country. And the novel ends with the indication of need of another migration for Salim. The novel seems to be the sequel to Joseph Conrad's novel *Heart of Darkness* as it also explores the sense of futility and corruptibility of human endeavour.

V.S. Naipaul, a post-colonial writer, traces the thematic aspects of diasporic experience, homelessness, rootlessness and subaltern experience in his novels. He tries to present the ambivalent characters searching for the existence of themselves in canonical arena of so called central or mainstream cultural practice. His characters basically suffer from the anxiety of inclusion which they always want to derive. Because of the high gap between the expectation and achievement, his characters suffer.

In the present novel, he presents the most ambivalent characters-Salim, an Indian merchant and the narrator of this novel, his inherited servant, Metty and his old friend Indar. They are Africans yet not Africans, circumstances have pushed them inland from the rim of the continent, and they cling to their distinctive identity. The colossal experiment of the British has left vast migrant populations, entire cultures are on the move, physically displaced, psychologically bewildered, and condemned to the worst kind of spiritual privation, which is to seek homesick without ever having had a home, to feel nostalgia for the non existent past.

Salim, a Muslim Indian shopkeeper of Indian decent, and his struggle to adjust himself in the hopeless situation, his detached observations of the attitudes, acts and words of other characters expose how black people are rising

to understand and analyse their own condition after independence. Naipaul's narrator justifies neo-colonialism by seeing only bad qualities in the life of newly decolonized countries due to the cultural influence for its irresponsibility for such conditions. The western colonial power has not relinquished control in the newly independent countries which is another manifestation of imperialism. Naipaul's narrator is a spokesman for a new form of colonialism, i.e., neo-colonialism who tries to establish the justification of new-colonialism, a defense that concludes that third world mimic men are not genuine and authentic human beings like Europeans.

Themes of Dislocation and Alienation in Naipaul's works

Modern societies have witnessed a number of internal ruptures and fragmentation in cultures. Dislocation as a phenomenon is the consequence of willing or unwilling movement from known to unknown location. Similarly, we find that writing creates a home for Naipaul. However, the problem of belonging becomes never ending. This situation cerates the problem of alienation. Alienation is inextricably related to its akin terms: displacement, dislocation, diaspora and exile. People often realize this fact of 'loss' when they are displaced and dislocated. The dislocation and displacement of the subjects give them the sense of alienation. A term for both the occasion of displacement that occurs as a result of imperial occupation and the experiences associated event. The term is used to describe the experiences of those who have willingly moved from the imperial 'Home' to colonial margin.

Naipaul tries to depict the real world with all its cruelties. Though he exceeds further to deliver the hollowness of the world where the individuals like him are wondering in the search for belonging, he does not shy away from the

oddities of the world. Lillian Feder says that 'Naipaul has depicted the contemporary society that is both actual and living' (160). She point out.

> In his stories and novels Naipaul transforms actual societies he has known, their rules and subjects, into fictional communities that generate narrators and characters more vivid than their models. Emerging from different social classes, with various talents, goals, levels of education. They reveal the truth about themselves. 161)

Naipaul has thus vigour of transforming the present reality in fiction. His actual world is the post-colonial world and he does represent it as Rob Nixon points further that his prestige as a novelist has surely assisted him "in sustaining his high profile as an interpreter of the post-colonial world" (4). Nixon observes in his fiction "a voice of the post-colonial mandarin who is obviously Naipaul who has his own vision different from other writer" (2). His characters, as Nixon says, carry out the themes of "exile, émigré, expatriate, refugee", and all are displaced one. Thus, Nixon is encouraged to say that "Naipaul is reading his own life" (17). It is because he himself is 'alienated' and is "haunted by a global homelessness" (17). Naipaul's own sense of displacement and a "longing for root" are reflected in his writing. His ostracism with his Trinidad and Western colonialism colour his writing. His characters are also in the process of defining themselves. Paul Thoreaux shows his anger by saying the same thing that Naipaul's condition is the juncture of homelessness. He is the first in line without tradition and home (29). Naipaul like his character, Willie in *Half a Life*, tries to find a place in the world. Before finding the place, one belongs nowhere. So, he says: "I was born in Trinidad. I have lived most of life in England and India is the land of my ancestors. That says it all, I am not English, not Indian, not

Trinidian. I am my own person" (3). Naipaul, as he revealed some important facts in an interview with Rahul Singh, is entirely his own person, and so are his characters facing new culture, geography and people. They are their own.

All these themes are found in his both fictions and non-fiction. The oddities and contradictions inevitably come in his writings. The displaced characters are not only obsessed with their geography and people but also with their culture. They have been the eviction of the alien culture, always trying to define themselves but hopelessness finding the way out of that grim reality. They are after all, seeking their cultural identity in the world of cultural hybridity. The endless search for identity gives them a sense of 'rootlessness,' 'dislocation' and 'alienation' to some extent, it turns to pessimism. Feder sums up:

> Emerging from different social classes, with various talents, goals, levels of education and accomplishment a number of these protagonists are lined to each other and to their world however circuitous that course. (161)

The rhetoric of dislocation finds a powerful but often oblique expression in Naipaul's books because he does not belong to that land, where he lived and has a perpetual sense of dislocation. In an interview with Rahul Singh, Naipaul strongly determines that he is not English nor a Trinidian, nor an Indian but his own Man (3). It shows that his home is there where he lives. It is his philosophy of Life that the world has a move and he belongs to many places and "there are many things that go to make our ideas of who we are" (Huntington 74) . For this reason Naipaul is considered "a voice of dire times "(Jones, Newsweek 50). The question of identity and the ruinous effects of colonization haunt both his works and life. His work, therefore, is a creative preparation upon the anguish of whole

countries and peoples unable to cope. So, his novel, *A Bend in the River* shows the personal history from a new vantage point. Naipaul, thus brings many issues together but his chief concern is to show the individual struggle for identity the frustrations and agonies of the contemporary people, cultural loss, multiculturalism, diaspora, rootlessness, dislocation and alienation. The idea of rootlessness, dislocation and alienation energize a man like Naipaul to define the selfhood rightly the case in his latest novel *Half a Life* (2001). The protagonist of the novel Willi Chandran sees this novel as "an enlarged Conradian heart of darkness" (A Prize 50). It had always been the case of half male societies where the past is not completely rejected and the future is yet to come.

Naipaul's writing express the ambivalence of the exile and the problem of an outsider, a feature of his own experience as an Indian in the West Indies, a West Indian in England, and a nomadic intellectual in a Post Colonial world. Naipaul merges history, memoirs, fiction and journalism and lets them bare in his books creating accomodable place for each, but in contrary to this, solves the problems of their incompatibilities. The novel, *A Bend in the River*, depicts the condition of the protagonist the first person narrator 'I', who leaves own world, Trinidad and arrives in another world in an unnamed African country after independence at the bend of a river. This arrival for him is a question because he arrives at the pace where he wanted to make his home (his identity) and build carrier he could not. Therefore this arrival has created a sense of dislocation and alienation. Finally the protagonist becomes a man without a country and home.

Naipaul's recently published book *Half a Life* is the fictional autobiography of Willie, the result of an accidental mismatch between a Brahmin and an ' untouchable' in pre-independence India. The theme of his tale boils

down to a simple three-step scene of his life: India, London and Portuguese East Africa. Willie is a mixed- caste misfit in India because he cannot reconcile his high Brahmin aspirations with his confused adolescent longings. Then he remains a misfit among the Weirdoes and hollow men of 1950 Behemian London. Finally he thinks that he has found where he belongs among the mixed race second class Portuguese of Mozambique. At length, however, he realizes that he is wrong. He cannot escape from his own fragmented identity.

Dislocation can be extended further to include the psychological and personal dislocation resulting from cultural denigration as well as voluntarily chosen status. Dislocation a structure which is characterized by never ending process as the societies have no single articulating or organizing principle rather it is constantly being dislocated by force outside it.

II. Theoretical Modalities Applied to Assess Naipaul

Colonialism

The term colonialism is basically used to define cultural exploitation. It is the process of one country's domination over another country or state. It is developed with the expansion of Europe over last 400 years. There were many practices of domination before Renaissance period. But it is explicitly seen after the post renaissance practices of imperialism. The term colonialism and imperialism are sometimes used interchangeably, but scholars usually distinguish between the two, reserving colonialism for instances where one country assumes political control over another and using imperialism more broadly to refer to political or economic control exercised often formally or informally. Edward Said offers the following distinction: "'imperialism' means the practice, the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory, 'colonialism' which is almost always a consequence of imperialism, is the implanting of settlements on distant territory" (Said 1993-8)

The fact is that European post-Renaissance colonial expansion was made with the development of a modern capitalist system of economic exchange. The colonizers trying to provide raw materials for the burgeoning economics of the colonial powers. While doing this the relation between colonizer and colonized was locked into a rigid hierarchy of difference. It leads to the deeply resistant to fair and equitable exchanges whether economic, cultural or social.

In colonies, where minority indigenous people existed, are subverted by ideology of race of an unequal from of intercultural relations. Racial prejudice was great product of the post-Renaissance period, for example the development of slave trade of the Atlantic Middle passage. Colonizer's aim was not just to

profit and convenience but also could construct a natural state. Albert Memmi in *Colonialism and Neocolonialism* elaborates the condition of Colonialism:

> These people excluded from system will proclaim their exclusion in the name of national identity: it is colonialism that creates the patriotism of the colonized. Maintained at the level of animals by an oppressive system they are not given any rights, not even the right to live and their condition worsens day by day: when a people's only remaining option is in choosing how to die when they have received from their oppressors only one gift-despair- what they got left to lose? (4)

It is significant that no society ever attained full freedom from the colonial system by the involuntary, active disengagement of the colonial power until it was provoked by a considerable internal struggle for self-determination or most usually by extended and active violent opposition by the colonized. It is one of the great myths of recent British colonial history in particular that the granting of independence to its colonies was the result of a proactive and deliberate policy of enlightenment on the part of the British people, a policy that distinguished British colonialism from the inferior and more greedy European brands. Such readings are of course part of the construction of the ideology of late nineteenth century imperialism in which literary representation played a vigorous part whether actively as in the work of Rudyard Kipling or in a more ambivalent way in the way of Conrad. Despite the anti-imperial strain in some of his writing, Cornad continues to distinguish actively between the English model of colonialism, which has 'an ideal at the back of it' and the mere rapacity of the imperialism of lesser breeds of imperialists. These specious distinctions are

projected back into the narratives of the greedy Spanish conquistadors; though the British treatment of the Indians in Virginia differed from that of the Spanish only in quantity not in the degree of its brutality (Hume 1996).

Post-colonialism

The term post-colonialism has been used by literary critics to discuss the various cultural effects of colonization since the late 1970s. In post-colonial era, the indigenous people have to struggle with newly arrived culture and all of its beliefs, values, habits and traditions that have now become complicated within their own lives. The term has subsequently been widely used to signify the political, linguistic and cultural experience of societies. Here, the term 'post-colonialism' comes into play. "The word is a tool or a methodology of examining most often through literature, what happens when two cultures clash, based upon one of the culture's assumptions of its superiority," says Zandra Kambysellis. He further adds, "The term 'post-colonialism' can be taken as the name for condition of natives longing in post-independence national groups and the need of those nations, which have been the victims of imperialism to achieve an identity uncontaminated by Euro-centric concepts" (7).

Post-Colonialism is a way of examining an unconsciously changed culture through its literature and creates discourse of oppositionality which colonialism brings into being. Basically, post-colonialism creates and introduces the two distinct parties of colonizer and colonized or oppressor and oppressed. It also refers to more than just a people adjusting to changes. Thus adjustment includes the relationship between the changer and changed. So, post-colonialism can rightly be considered as continuing process of resistance and reconstruction. After the colonizer had left and the formerly colonized nation has been liberated,

the presence of the colonizer still remains as something of a shadow. Post-colonialism touches many issues, language, land, men's and women's souls, nationalism and hybridism. A forced mixing of cultures and a strange process of indigenous adaptation is hybridism.

Colonialism has been contested by a more elaborate understanding of the working of post-colonial cultures, which stresses the articulations between and across the politically defined historical periods of pre-colonial, colonial and post independence cultures. Aijez Ahmed complains that the term 'colonialism' can be pushed back to the Incas and forward to the Indonesian occupation of East Timor, then it becomes a transhistorical thing, always present and always in process of dissolution in one part of the world or another(1995:9). So, it is clear that post-colonialism has been primarily concerned to examine the processes and effects of, reactions to, European colonialism from the sixteenth century up to and including the neo-colonialism of the present day.

In colonialism people disregard their responsibilities due to the dictatorship. Natives' oppressor and colonizer were the two types of dictators. But western culture caused so many changes in African, Caribbean and post-colonial societies where people were thrust into new experiences which they couldn't comprehend with the guidance of their old original traditions. Their original cultures changed too much and it was very difficult to return to the root. New problems and situations existed and will continue. These things affected African, Caribbean and Indian countries after colonization.

Post colonialism can be seen as a theoretical resistance to the mystifying amnesia of the colonial aftermath. It is a disciplinary project devoted to the academic task of the revisiting, remembering and crucially, interrogating the

colonial past. The process of returning to the colonial scene discloses a relationship of reciprocal antagonism and desire between colonized and colonizer. And it is the unfolding of this troubled and troubling relationship that we might start to discern the ambivalent prehistory of the postcolonial condition (Post-colonial Theory, 4).

Now a days new term anti-colonialism is used, which is the political people against the specific ideology and practice of colonialism. Anti-colonialism raises various form of opposition against the operations of colonialism in political, economic and cultural institutions. It emphasizes the need to reject colonial power and restore local control. Anti-colonialism has taken many forms in different colonial situation. It is sometimes associated with an ideology of racial liberation, as in the case of nineteenth-century West African nationalists. Conversely, it may accompany a demand for recognition of cultural differences on a broad and diverse front, as in the Indian National congress, which sought to unite a variety of a single, national independence movement.

Diaspora and Hybridity

The term Diaspora is derived from the Greek, which means 'to disperse'. The colonization is the historical fact of Diaspora. In this sense, we can define Diaspora as a movement of people from their homelands into new regions; the colonialism itself was a radically diasporic movement, involving the temporary and permanent dispersion and settlement of millions of Europeans over the entire world. Many settled regions were developed historically as plantation or agricultural colonies. These colonies were used as place to grow foods for the

metropolitan populations. These settled regions demanded a large number of populations as labourers.

The plantation colonies imported many slaves. Most of the slaves were captured, bought from the African coasts. After the slave trade, and when the slavery was outlawed by the European powers in the early decades of the 19th century, the system of indentured labour replaced the demand of cheap agricultural labour in colonial plantation economies. This involved transporting, under indenture agreements, large population of poor agricultural labourers from population's rich areas, such as India and China, to the areas where they were needed to serve the plantations. The practices of slavery and indentured labour thus resulted in world wide colonial diasporas. For this reason, Indian populations formed substantial minorities or majorities in colonies as diverse as the West Indies, Malaya, Fiji and the colonies of Eastern and Southern Africa.

The descendent of diasporic movements, generated by the colonialism, have developed their own real cultures. Again, they search the diasporic cultures which questions essentialist models, interrogating the ideology of a unified, 'natural' cultural norms, one that undermines the center/margin model of colonialist discourse. The word Diaspora was originally applied to the condition of the Jewish people living outside Palestine. It connotes the community conditioned to be exiled or voluntarily exiled. Rushdie, in this regard, argues, "I've been in minority group all my life–a member of an Indian Muslim family in Bombay, then of a 'mohajir'–migrant–family in Pakistan and now as a British Asian"(4),creating an 'imaginary homelands' that he belongs to. Thus diaspora Literature expresses the sense of longing for the original native society which is also the source of evoking the sense of separation and loss.

People in the Diaspora have been forced by cultural displacement to accept the provisional nature of all truths. Their identities are at once plural and partial. According to Radhakrishnan, "The diaspora has created rich possibilities of understanding different histories. And these histories have taught us that identities, selves, traditions and natures do change with travels"(210). So, the proposition can be drawn that identities, perspectives and definitions change when people move. Diaspora is not infertile space to occupy in spite of that diasporan people feel to be torn part between root culture and adopted culture and the ground to be shifting and ambiguous. As Hall argues.

> The Diaspora experience [. . .] is defined, not by essence or purity, but by the recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity; by a conception of identity which lives with and through, not despite, difference; by hybridity. Diaspora identities are those which are constantly producing and reproducing themselves anew, through transformation and difference. (119-20)

Thus, the notion of a diasporic identity has been adopted by many writers as a positive affirmation of their hybridity.

Homi K. Bhabha has recently associated the term hybridity in his work. His analysis of colonizer-colonized relations stress their interdependence and the mutual construction of their subjectivities. Bhabha contends that all cultural statements and systems are constructed in a space that he calls the third space of enunciation' (1994:37). Cultural identity always emerges in this contradictory and ambivalent space, which for Bhabha makes the claim to a hierarchical 'purity' of cultures untenable. For him, the recognition of this ambivalent space of cultural identity may help us to overcome the exoticism of cultural diversity in

favour of the recognition of an empowering hybridity within which cultural difference may operate:

> It is significant that the productive capacities of this Third Space have a colonial or postcolonial provenance. For a willingness to descend into that alien territory . . . may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's hybridity. (Bhabha 1994:38).

It is the 'in-between' pace that carries the burden and meaning of culture, and this is what makes the notion of hybridity so important.

Hybridity has frequently been used in post-colonial discourse to mean simply cross-culture 'exchange'. This use of the term has been widely criticized, since it usually implies negating and neglecting the imbalance and inequality of the power relations it references by stressing the transformative cultural, linguistic and political impacts on both the colonized and the colonizer. It has been regarded as replicating assimilationist policies by masking or 'whitewashing' cultural differences.

Mimicry

Mimicry reveals in so far as it is distinct from what might be called an itself, that is behind. The effect of mimicry is camouflage . . . It is not a question of harmonizing with the background, but against a mottled background, of becoming mottled exactly like the technique of camouflage practiced in human warfare.

It is out of season to question at this time of day the original policy of a conferring on every colony of the British Empire a mimic representation of the British Constitution. But if the creature so endowed has sometimes forgotten its real significance and under the fancied importance of speakers and maces, and all the paraphernalia and ceremonies of the imperial legislature, has dared to defy the mother country, she has to thank herself for the folly of conferring such privileges on a condition of society that has no earthly claim to so exalted a position. A fundamental principle appears to have been forgotten or overlooked in our system of colonial policy that is of the colonial dependence. To give to a colony the forms of independence is a mockery; she would not be colony for a single hour if she could maintain an independent station; "Sir Edward Cust, *'Reflections on West African affairs* . . . addressed to colonial offices,' Hatchard, London 1839."

Edward Said describes as the tension between the synchronic panoptical visions of domination – the demand for identity stasis and the counter presser of the diachrony of history change, difference mimicry represents an ironic compromise.

According to Samuel Weber's formulations of marginalizing vision of castration the colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of difference that is almost the same but not quite, which is to say that the discourse of mimicry is constructed around ambivalence; in order to be effective mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference. The authority of that mode of colonial discourse that I have called mimicry is therefore stricken by an indeterminacy mimicry that emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal. Mimicry is

thus the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which 'appropriates' the other as it visualizes power. Mimicry is also the sign of the inappropriate, however, a difference which coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance, and poses and imminent threat to both 'normalized' knowledge and disciplinary powers.

The effect of mimicry on the authority of colonial discourse is profound and disturbing. For in 'normalizing' the colonial state or subject, the dream of post-Enlightenment civility alienates its own language of liberty and produces another knowledge of its norms. The ambivalence which thus informs this strategy is discernible, for example, in Locke's second treatise which splits to reveal the limitations of liberty in his double use of the word 'slave': first simply, descriptively as the locus of a legitimate form of ownership then as the trope for an intolerable, illegitimate exercise of power. What is articulated in that distance between the two uses is the absolute, imagined difference between the colonial state of Carolina and the original state of nature.

The figure of mimicry is locatable within that Anderson describes as the inner compatibility of empire and notion. It problematizes the signs of racial and cultural priority, so that the 'national' is no longer naturalizable. What emerges between mimesis and mimicry is writing or a mode of representation that marginalizes the monumentality of history, quite simply mocks its power to be a model that power which supposedly makes it imitable. Mimicry repeats rather than re-presents and in that diminishing perspective emerges the displaced European vision in Conrad's Nostromo as:

The endless of civil strife where folly seemed even harder to bear than its ignominy . . . the lawlessness of a populace of all colours and races, barbarism, irremediable tyranny . . . America is ungovernable.

Or Ralph Singh's apostasy in Naipauls the Mimic Mean:

We pretended to be real, to be learning, to be preparing ourselves for life, we mimic men of the New world, one unknown comer of it with all its remainders of the corruption that come so quickly to the new.

Mimicry is not the familiar exercise of dependent colonial relations through narcissistic identification so that, as Fanon has observed, the black man stops being an actional person for only the white man can represent his self-esteem. Mimicry conceals no presence or identity behind its mask: it is not what Vsaire describes as 'colonization and thingification' behind which there stands the essence of the presence Africaine . The menace of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority. And it is a double vision that is a result of . . . the partial representation/recognition of the colonial object. Naipaul's colonial politician as play actor of the new world objects to a new colonialist chain of command, authorized versions of the otherness. As I have shown, the figures of doubling chain, the part-objects of metonymy of colonial desire which alienates the modality and normality of those dominant discourses in which they emerge as ' inappropriate' colonial subjects. A desire that, through the repletion of partial presence which is the basis of mimicry, articulates those disturbances of cultural, racial authority. It is a desire that reverses 'in part' the colonial appropriation by now producing a partial vision of the colonizer's presence; a gaze of otherness, that shares the acuity of genealogical age which as Foucault describes it ,

liberates marginal elements and shatters the unity of man's being through which he extends his sovereignty (The Location of Culture: 85-88).

Naipaul's long standing concern with "mimicry" can be read as a variant of his autobiographical preoccupation with transplanted people that may result. In a sense he writes of exile and mimicry as inverse responses to be fated, foreshortened possibilities of life in the former colonies. Those who can flee to a metropolitan land; those who cannot flee in imagination, taking refuge in scattered fantasies of metropolitan provenance. Naipaul perceived his own emigration from Trinidad as a bid for a level of self sufficiency unattainable in that or any other 'mimic' society. In his early conception of the mortifying threat of dependency lie the roots of his later insistence that he has never been anybody's imitator. One recognizes, then a personal and rhetorical, affinity between his representation of the inhabitants of former colonies as unimaginative mimics and his conception of his own imaginations as autonomous and self-defined. It is as if his image of himself as a writer has become predicated on a contempt for those whom he feels have capitulated to a parasitic or imitative life of the sort that he is confident he has eluded. Yet, ironically, the special animus that he reserves for cultural and racial hybrids, fort from securing his literary autonomy, binds him to a tradition of pathological colonial anxiety towards the evolve that marks writers from Froude, Haggard and Kipling to Conrad and Cary . Naipaul's response to a lecturer at Uganda's Makerere University reeks of precisely that attitude: "Those are the ones that frighten me . . . He is carrying a book. The ones that carry books scare the hell out of me, man."

Naipaul's account of 'Colonial mimicry' is consistent with his general tendency to be less incensed by the imperiousness of the powerful than by the

ideals and self- delusions of the largely disempowered. He directs his ire primarily at the misguided efforts of the formerly colonized peoples to emulate the values and institutions of "whole" substantive notions like the United States, England and France in territories where such values and institutions can be unwittingly parodied but not meaningfully transplanted.

As Naipaul invokes it, "colonial is a potentially confusing term and he extends its customary frame of reference. Colonial in his sense is any inhabitant of any colony or erstwhile colony. The term thus becomes historically and geographically inclusive. A British Shelter in eighteenth century Trinidad is a colonial, as is any citizen of Argentian, Jamaica or India in the 1970s. This has the effect of collapsing distinctions between the colonial and post colonial periods, as well as effecting differences between colonizers and colonized. By viewing the beneficiaries and casualties of colonialism in the same term he establishes 'colonial mimicry' as a function of place, not a function of power"(London Callings 132-133).

The term mimicry has been very important in Homi Bhabha's view of the ambivalence of colonial discourse. For him, the consequence of suggestions like Macaulay's is that mimicry is the process by which the colonized subject is reproduced as "almost the same, but not quite" (Bhabha 1994:86). The copying of the colonizing culture, behaviour, manners and values by the colonized contains both mockery and certain 'menace', 'so that mimicry is at once resemblance and menace' (86). Mimicry reveals the limitation in the authority of colonial discourse, almost as though colonial authority inevitably embodies the seeds of its own destruction. The line of decent of the 'mimic man' that emerges in Macaulay's writing, claims Bhabha, can be traced through the works of

Kipling , Forster, Orwell and Naipaul and is the effect of 'a flawed colonial mimesis in which to be Anglicized is emphatically not to be English' (1994:87). The consequence of mimicry for post-colonial studies is writing, that is, postcolonial writing, the ambivalence of which is 'menacing' to colonial authority.

Cultural Identity

Identity has become the central area of concern in cultural studies since the 1990s. Identity is the process how we describe ourselves to each other. Cultural studies explores how we come to be the kind of people we are, how we are produced as subjects, and how we identify with descriptions of ourselves as male or female, black or white, young or old, Asians or Europeans. Identities are not the things which exist simply there with universal qualities, rather they are discursive constructions. Baliber perceives, "Identity is never a peaceful acquisition: it is claimed as a guarantee against a threat of annihilation that can be figured by another identity or by erasing of identities"(186). Thus, in this sense, identities are constituted, made rather than found by representations, notably language.

Culture has a very broad meaning. According to a British cultural Marxist, Raymond Williams, the term in its most widespread use in latter nineteenth and twentieth centuries, refers to the world of arts (literature, music, painting, sculpture, theater, film). Thus, Williams receives the term as being intricately related to changing history, exposing different forms in different periods. Culture has therefore been defined in relation to this historical form of society, and the forms may oppose each other (36). As a result, culture is seen as a reflection of necessary automatic and spiritual values of a particular period, but

demands a continuous and often superstitious continuation. Similarly, Theodore Adorno and some other Marxists from Frankfurt school valued culture as that of minority or on elite, though the authors, artists, genres and individual works may be different as the Greek classics. The thinking and concept of popular culture can also be adjusted in the same line. Edward Said, a postcolonial critic, puts the definition of the term as follows:

> A concept that includes a refining and elevating element, each society's reservoir of the best that has been known and thought, as Mathew Arnold put it in the 1860s- this differentiates 'us' from 'them' almost always with degree of xenophobia. Culture in this sense is a source of identity, a rather combative one at that as we see recent 'returns' to culture and tradition. (Culture xiii-xiv)

This definition emphasizes the importance of culture as "the source of identity" and equalizes the term to something as "reservoir of the best". So, culture appears to him as a "protective encloser" (xiv). Nevertheless, it is to be noted that Said does not digress from his point that "culture is a sort of theatre where various political and ideological causes engage one another"(xiv). Similarly, Samuel P. Huntington shares Said's idea of culture and highlights his point that power in relation to culture and civilization in shaping the consciousness of people (13).

The next factor of identity crisis of an individual, as can be seen in V.S. Naipaul's migration which leads him through altering relation between western and other cultures. The sense of identity of the individuals whose lives have taken them across the boarders-between so-called the first worlds, the second worlds, and the third worlds, or across in effect, pre-modern run has caused the

interfusing of identities which can be termed as "the hybridity of cultural identities." This notion of hybridity suggests that it has the relation to 'racial' and 'ethnic' identities. In spite of mixing, fusion, and realization, the cultural movements continue in their own way. Specifically from the slave trade to mass media, there lies the great shape of modern identities. The result is the fusing or hybridity of identities, which cannot be taken as the product of 'assimilation' of one culture or cultural tradition by another, but the production of something new. This new notion of identify is equated with the studies of the hybridity of cultural identity that are closely related to accounts of diasporic identities.

Identities are wholly social construction and cannot exist outside of cultural representation. There are, according to Hall, at least two different ways of thinking about 'cultural identity'. The first position defines 'cultural identity' in terms of one shared culture, a short of collective 'one true self' which people with a collective shared history and ancestry hold in common. Hall writes, "Within the terms of this definition, our cultural identities reflect the common historical experiences and shared cultural codes which provide us as 'one people' with stable, unchanging and continuous frames of reference and meaning" (111). Such a conception of cultural identity played a critical role in all the postcolonial struggles which have so profoundly reshaped our world.

Cultural identity, in the second way of thinking, along the many points of similarity has critical points of deep and significant difference which constitute 'what we really are' or rather 'what we have become'. We cannot speak for very long, with any exactness, about 'one experience, and identity', without acknowledging its other side. Hall writes about the second notion of cultural identity as follows:

> Cultural identity, in this sense, is a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being'. It belongs to the future as much as to the past. It is not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture. Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But like everything which is historical, they undergo constant changes. Far from being externally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous 'play' of history, culture and power. (112)

In this second sense, identity is continuous subject to 'play' of history, culture and power. Far from being grounded in a 'mere' recovery of the past, waiting to be found, identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by and position ourselves within the narratives of the past. It is only from the second position of the identity proposed by Hall that we can properly understand the traumatic character of the 'colonial experience', out of which are constituted the identities such as Indianness, Caribbeanness, Africanness and Blackness. The ways in which such identities were positioned by and subjected in the dominant regimes of representation were the effects of a critical exercise of cultural power and normalization. The dominant or superior culture has the power to influence or dominate the other. So, not only in Said's 'Orientalist' sense we were constructed as different and other within the categories of knowledge of the west by those regimes, but also, they had the power to make us see and experience ourselves as 'other.'

<center>**III. Cultural Ambivalence in *A Bend in the River***</center>

V.S. Naipaul is the third generation migrant from India to Trinidad. Trinidad, the multicultural society, has a typical colonial history. Naipaul himself is an inheritor of colonial legacy. During the early days of colonization a fierce conflict was inevitable between the colonizers and native Indians. Indigenous Indians who had no immunity power for defense were exterminated. The remaining natives were forced to work in the plantation estates developed by European settlers. With the rapid expansion of such estates, plantation owners needed more and more workforce and this led to import of slaves from Africa and indentured servants from India and China. Consequently, West Indies in general and Trinidad in particular emerged as richly diversified society in terms of race, religion, language and culture. Naipaul is fully aware of colonial history of Trinidad so, he cannot write being oblivious the shipwrecked condition of his forefathers who had arrived to the unknown land, Trinidad, leaving their cultural identity far behind in India. Thus, his ancestor's experiences become important themes in his writing.

The novel *A Bend in the River* deals with the protagonist narrator's ambivalent and diasporic experience and its consequences. The novel is set in an unnamed newly independent African state. The namelessness of the country stands for the most Third World countries which have faced the dilemma of choosing between the present and their traditional past. The title of the novel is metaphorically presented. The 'River' connotes the river of colonialism which had immense influence in the colonial time, whereas 'Bend' is the time of independence. The colonial rulers were withdrawn from the occupied land at the struggle for independence by the natives. 'Bend' refers to the change brought in a

colonized country and 'River' refers to the flow of river in spite of disturbances. Colonialism flows with its different shapes according to time as the river changes its shape.

European intellectuals like Raymond and Father Huismans and the members of Indian minority like Salim and Inder migrate from their own community and join the west. These characters attempt to set themselves in this unnamed African country. The African characters are slaves, magicians, intellectuals and corrupt soldiers.

The narrator Salim and the intellectuals Raymond and Inder find themselves confronted with ambivalence in the African setting. They find themselves homeless in their own homes. Their diverse culture pushed them heither and thither for a permanent settlement and identity. Life in the African setting is restless. Observing the difficulties of Arabs the narrator Salim says, "Once they were supported by their idea in their high traditions . . . now they were empty in Africa, an unprotected, with nothing to fall back on. They had begun to rot" (228). Salim judges his situation like their and wants to escape.

The narrator's family background is found in a detailed description that they are the Muslim immigrants from north-western India to Eastern Africa where Indians, Persians and Portuguese live. As he compares himself with these people he feels that he belongs to neither of these communities but an African living for generations. Their history is not dated by themselves but it is reflected upon his knowledge of past by European source. "All that I know of our history and the history of Indian Ocean I have got from book written by European" (11). In this sense, Europe has become the important source of knowledge, power and meaning that defines other.

On the coast, Salim observes that the things are introduced for their importance by the British government as their community is ignorant. So, being a realistic and an objective observer Salim writes, "From an early age I developed the habit of looking, detaching myself from a familiar scene and trying to consider it from a distance" (15). This brings a hopeless condition and becomes the beginning of his insecurity which Salim realizes is due to his lack of true religious sense of his family. "The insecurity I felt was due to my lack of true religion" (16). He is helpless and unreliable to other, and thinks, to be with the community is to reach at the same destruction which his forefathers faced. Salim decides to live with his idea which seems to be better and releases his conformation as, "I could be master of my fate if I stood alone" (20). But he is not the believer in fate but he believes in the deeds, "I could no longer submit to fate. My wish was not to be good, in a way of our tradition, but to make good" (20). He is in confusion what sort of skill and talent should he apply to make good to stand and face the postcolonial world.

Salim moves into the interior where the newly independent state is ruled by the 'Big Man' and where there is a site of reverse conflict between past and present. There he meets Zebeth, a woman from African tribe, mother of Ferdinand, is one of his regular customers. She addresses Salim as 'Mis' i.e. 'Mister' because of his Englishness. He observes his position himself, "I was mister because I was foreigner, someone, from the far off coast, and an English speaker; and I was mister in order to be distinguished from the other resident foreigners, who were monsieur" (6). His association with the English culture gave Salim superior position to the locals and different from other foreign residents.

Salim compares other people with the Africans themselves. African people are best suited for inferior work. They are not fully developed. He observes, "That was no doubt why the region had provided so many slaves in the old days: slave people are physically wretched, half-men in everything except in their capacity to breed generation" (76). So, in this sense, Salim's comparison concludes that slave people are no more than biological animals. They have no social elements that make them different from other biological animals. Salim opines that these people want to remain what they are. He says, "The slaves, the people who might be considered slaves, wanted to remain as they were" (13). He also opines that slave people feel of being superior by connecting themselves with the family of repute. As he claims:

> In my family's compound there were two slave families, and they had been there for at least three generations. Officially these people were only servants. But they wanted it known to other Africans, and to poor Arabs and Indians that they were really slaves. It wasn't that they were proud of slavery as a condition; what they were fierce about was their special connection with a family of repute.(13)

So, the slaves were proud because they had special connection with the family of repute. Thus, Naipual's spokesman, Salim, is trying to convince the readers that Africans are not complete whole men. He condemns the Africans for being oppressed. They themselves are responsible for their misery since "The world is what it is"(3). Thus he tries to prove that he and other like himself, either Europeans or people who are close to European by culture are inferior. Their culture is different from African cultures.

Salim finds him as well as third world people " incompetent and helpless"(20) in his self evaluation. Other people also face the same insecurity and feel themselves like Salim. No one can escape the onslaught. Every one, either Africans or foreigners, feel threatened. So, Salim says, "Every tribe felt more threatened in its territory now than in the days when everybody, including traders from the coast like our grandfathers, went about on foot, and a single trading venture could take up to a year"(201). Inder's ideas concerning the past are radical, "We have to learn to trample on the past . . . the world is in movement and the past can only cause pain"(141). He is right because the people in Diaspora have the same ambivalence that makes them impatient. The case is similar to Salim also when he reflects on his own situation comparing with Inder and Nazruddin, "The illumination I held on to, about the unity of experience and the illusion of pain was part of the same way of feeling"(244). The common experiences of these people give them unity of feeling and force them to take similar actions. No one feels safe and sound.

Salim's existentialist thought and his experiences lead us to this pessimistic journey from one cycle of destruction to another. The political disorder causes him to emigrate. All the characters Salim meets confirm his hopeless condition. His physical relationship with Yvette is symbolical and leaves important traces in his life. He finds the difference in sexual experience between Yvette and brothel prostitutes. His physical relationship with prostitutes couldn't provide him satisfaction at all but as he keeps sexual relationship with Yvette this experience leads him to discover new dimensions of himself. He narrates:

Until then my fantasies were brothel fantasies of conquest and degradation with the woman as the willing victim, the accomplice in her own imagination. It was all that I knew. It was all that I had learned from the brothels and night clubs of our town . . . I thought I had reached the stage where there was nothing in a women's nakedness to surprise me. But I felt now as if I was experiencing a new, and seeing a woman for the first time. (174-75)

Salim experiences a joy and satisfaction with the sexual relationships with Yvette, wife of Raymond, which he had never had with other. The sexual experience with Yvette gives him the emergence of 'new self' because she is a European. Their relationship is metaphorically presented for the relationship between Africa and Europe. Salim, who himself has no culture, no identity, no family, no flag and no religious sense, concludes that the failure or destruction of culture in Africa, Zaire or Third World is not the product of the colonial system but it is because of nationalism which tries to bring the past of the people to the present, i.e. cultural authenticity together with local socialism or 'radicalization'.

People in diaspora cannot feel at home and secured. Raymond who works for 'Big Man' wonders whether the truth ever gets known. He is European historian known as 'Big Man's white man' (125) that he knows more about the African country than anyone else. He enjoys influencing the Big Man with his role in diaspora. His praise to the president vanishes as he discovers that he himself is not needed to the Big Man. He is disillusioned. He says, "Time, the discoverer of truth, I know. It's the classical idea, the religious ideas . . . Do we

really know the history of Roman Empire?"(130). He questions whether we can know the real history.

Salim finds the situation has been dramatically changed when he returns from London. Properties of foreigners have been nationalized. The foreigners are willing to leave Africa because they are not belonging to Africans culture and feeling insecure in diaspora. Salim finds Raymond and Yvette has left the country:

> . . . I saw that Raymond and Yvette's had a new tenant, an African. The house had been closed since. I had come back Raymond and Yvette had gone away; no one, not even Mahesh could tell me where or in what circumstances . . . I was glad for Raymond's sake that he had gone away. He wouldn't have been safe in the domain or the town now . . . that reputation might have encouraged the Liberation Army to kill him . . . (259-60)

Salim himself is an expatriate. He feels glad that Raymond another expatiates has left the domain and is safe. Raymond's identity as Big Man's white man has faded away. Liberation army, the Big Man's rival might have killed him. He is safe only by leaving the adopted place, different from his own culture.

Ambivalence of culture between Africa and foreign are traced through the dignity of father Huismans, a priest in the interior. He is captured by all the African things like, the food, the religious belief, the art etc. Yet he shows great respect to the remnants of European colonization: "And to Father Huismans colonial relics were as precious as the things of Africa" (64). Salim is drawn to

Huismans in part because of their difference, "He goes into the bush. I don't want to go into the bush" (60). Father Huismans interests whom Salim tries to understand, seems to open an avenue for the knowledge of the country and of himself. Father Huismans explains that in the masks and carvings he collects there is 'always something new', a unique 'religious purpose' that is absent in copies. Salim gets surprised by Father Huismans' involvement in art he himself does not admire and in beliefs ignored in his upbringing on the coast. Unlike Salim, Father Huismans is indifferent to the state of Africa as Salim says, " . . . I never felt that he was concerned about Africans in any other way; he seemed indifferent to the state of the country"(62). So, the difference in their perspective of looking Africa draws Salim to Huismans. However, his equanimity is not enough to protect him from the reality of contemporary Africa.

In Salim's eyes. Father Huismans is not only a representative of colonial condescension. Soon after peace is restored after second rebellion, during a visit to the bush he is killed. Through Salim, Naipual mourns the Huismans' demise. ". . . So much of his knowledge was buried with him, and what to me was more than knowledge – his attitudes, his relish for Africa, his feelings for the beliefs of the forest. A little bit of the world was lost with him"(82).

After Father Huismans' death, the Asian or European diasporic people in the nameless African country are aware of their location, existence and position, "But now we who remained-outsiders, but neither settlers nor visitors, just people with nowhere to go – put our heads down and got on with our business"(85). In such situation people are not able to feel themselves as settlers and feel they have nowhere to go. They realize their present situation. "The only message of his death was that we had to be careful ourselves and remember

where we were"(85). In this sense, they feel themselves neither settlers nor visitors.

Breaking with the past, the Big Man mimics a political career, imitating the display of power he sees in the west. "He needs a model in everything, and I believe he heard that de Gaulle used to send personal regards to the wives of his political enemies"(188). The Big Man never understands the theoretical nature of French politics. It is not something that has been produced in his own culture. He can only mimic the external gestures of political life which are alien to the African experience. Salim comments:

> He was creating modern Africa. He was creating a miracle that would astound the rest of the world. He was by-passing real Africa, the difficult Africa of bush and villages, and creating something that would match anything that existed in other countries. (100)

The Big Man's politics and the construction work in African cities are " and echo of Europe, and like make – belief, at the end of all that forest"(247). The Big Man decides to build the New Domain; a place for educating the African youth by European teachers. He is mimicking Europe and trying to bring it to Africa. The Domain becomes a European model with Western values Salim says, "What the [Big Man] was building was meant to be grander"(10). The tendencies of Non-Western people being a consumer of what the west has produced is making them less creative. Such faults of the people can only be found by the people like Salim.

Inder is also the representative of third world people. He is not genuinely African. He is an Indian by decent and Hindu by religion. He returns to the nameless African country to teach in the New Domain after studying in London. His ideas regarding the past are radical, "We have to learn to trample on the past . . . The world is in movement, and the past can only cause pain… it isn't easy to turn your back on the past"(141). So, he believe that past is the source of pain. He tries to be a self-made man and have a place in the world by becoming an international adviser on the third World problem. His all the attempts become futile when he confronts with Wealthier Americans in New York. As Kareisha, a proposed girl to Salim comments:

> Inder went to America , to New York. Being Inder, he stayed in an expensive hotel. He saw his American people. They were all very nice. But he didn't like the direction in which they were using him. He felt they were pushing him towards smaller things and he pretended not to notice . . . What Inder was expecting from these people . . . he was hoping to be one of them.(242)

He continuously attempts to assimilate himself with the West and alienate himself from his past, a source of pain but as he discovers that the Americans are pushing him in the direction he didn't like, his assimilation is hindered. Inder becomes totally hopeless person with no place and no past to refer to, to get help and to have a secure a sense of identity.

The political and social scenario make Salim think of abandonment of the state despite his attempt to be a man of himself, to make an identity in diaspora. Frustrated with the lack of security he decides to travel to London: "When no other choice was left to me, when family and community hardly existed, when

duty hardly had a meaning and there were no safe houses" (228). He leaves the state where the story is set and another rebellion is about to take place against the Big man. His fate, that he controls, is different from Africa's bad fate where "nobody's gong anywhere", where "everybody is going to hell" and "nothing has any meaning" because " there is no place to go to"(272). Movement to the new place is the only option left for him but there is no definite place to go to.

When he reaches to London he experiences as the expatriate travelers. The expatriate travellers carry on some traits of culture of their upbringing and acquire some traces of the culture of the adopted land. So, they feel, sometimes neither a settlers nor visitors; neither insiders nor outsiders rather in between of the both due to the ambivalence of the dual culture they are with.

Salim returns to the African state which becomes a state of terror for him. The situation of the interior is changed. It is chaotic. The state witnesses counter revolution. Ferdinand one of the commissioners of the African state tells Salims about the miserable condition of the state:

> It's bad for everybody. That is the terrible thing . . . Nobody is
> going anywhere. We are going to hell, and everyman knows this
> in his bones. We are being killed. Nothing has any meaning. That
> is why everyone is so frantic. Everyone wants to make his money
> and run away. (272)

The state is sure to witness the bloodshed and violence. So, Ferdinand expresses his frustration to Salim. Ferdinand suggests Salim to leave the country, "You must go right away. There is nothing here for you"(172). He is compelled to migrate again because he is no longer welcomed by the adopted place. The

only way to remain alive is to be in another diaspora. So, Salim abandones the nameless African state. All the foreigners in the unnamed African state of *A Bend in the River* confronted with ambivalence and homelessness without an identity in their own country. Salim, the observer as well as experiencer stands as modern intellectuals being exiled.

Colonizer-colonized Conflict

Direct presence of colonials in distant territory is not possible but the colonial power is still practising to form political, economic as well as cultural control formally or informally over the African sate. The neo-colonial representatives 'mimic men' try to continue the legacy of colonialism in the postcolonial time. Salim expresses the White's ability and their way of equipping with the changes and condemns the inferiorness of Africans. He narrates:

> Because they could assess themselves, the Europeans were better
> equipped to cope with changes than we were. As I saw when I
> compared the Europeans with ourselves, that we had ceased to
> count in Africa, that really we no longer had anything to offer.
> The Europeans were preparing to get out, or to fight or to meet the
> African halfway. We continued to live as we had always done.
> (17)

The polices and the way of coping with new things in European are better Salim views that people who have no new techniques and polices are inferior in comparison to Europeans. It's a sense of colonial legacy.

Similarly, in *A Bend in the River* African people in the eyes of Salim, are considered better off in their culture and civilization because they have preserved

their culture despite colonial power. As we see Naipaul's comparison between outsiders and native Africans the outsider life is like a pendulum moving this and that side, searching for opportunity in the African state. They penetrate themselves in Africa in the name of civilizing the Africans but the fact is they are there for wealth. They have the nomadic kind of life acting various roles from business, politics to preserving African relics and writing about African history like Raymond performs. Salim says:

> The Africans who had abandoned the town and gone back to their villages were better off; they at least had gone back to their traditional life were more or less self sufficient. But for the rest of us in the town, who needed shops and services – a few Belgians, some Greeks and Italians, a handful of Indians it was stripped, Robinson Crusoe kind of existence. (25)

Africans who follow their local traditional way are safe, happy and self-sufficient. The outsiders who follow the white ways of living are the victims of insecurity and uncertainties like Robinson Crusoe had.

The country of *A Bend in the River* has two kinds of politicians, the 'Big Man' and the 'Liberation Army' members. None is good enough. All the people should be dependent on the Big man and remember that he is always present; hence his photographs appear everywhere since it is 'a picture of all Africans" (155). The hidden solution that one tends to think about is a new revolution against the Big Man, a revolution that is expected to comprise by preserving certain social, cultural traditions and by adopting certain modern principles. The power of the Big Man is rivaled by the Liberation Army whose badly written leaflet says:

> We have decided to face the ENEMY with armed confrontation . . . By ENEMY we mean the powers of imperialism, the multi-nationals and the puppet powers that be, the false gods, the capitalists, the priests and the teacher who give false interpretations . . . The schools teach ignorance and people practice ignorance in preference to their true culture . . . We of the LIBERATION ARMY have received no education. We do not print books and make speeches. We only know the truth, and we acknowledge this land as the land of the people whose ancestors now shriek over it. (212)

In order to achieve this liberation, the Liberation Army members are going to resort to killing. They can not think the better methods for raising their voices. Again, like the revolution against the colonialists, the state is sure to witness the bloodshed and violence, i.e., a revolution that is expected to destroy the old regime and bring a worse one.

It is significant that the relationship between the Big Man and the people can never lead to prosperity. Hence the economic boom the country witnesses as a result of the selling of copper easily collapses. The new Africa, the president is trying to construct, is only an ideal place that has nothing to do with the "Africa of bush and villages" (100). They tend to overlook the real Africa for ideal place.

The Africans see the invisible presence of whites in everything. The whites manipulate and use African people through education system, economic structure and white hegemony in different ways of their lives from shaping social condition, thought and functioning style. The Africa, where nothing is produced, gets everything from European world for consumption. Africans get everything

through only the means of money. The African intellectuals as well as the common people begin to be aware of the white manipulation of Africans through the representatives of white world. Zebeth, the mother of Ferdinand, an uneducated and simple minded woman from bush, is growing to understand the Big mans manipulation seeing his pictures in newspapers and pamphlets. ". . . in pictures in the newspapers only visiting foreigners were given equal space with the president. With local people the president was always presented as a towering figure" (224). In Zebeth's thought, the Big Man is manipulating and bringing trouble to the African people with the help of whites. She tells Salim that a white is accompanying the president in his every effort. She says:

> He's got a man, and this man goes ahead of him wherever he goes.
> This man jumps out of the car before the car stops, and everything
> that is bad for the president follows this man and leaves the
> president free. I saw it, Salim. And I will tell you something. The
> man who jumps out and gets lost in the crowd is white. (224-25)

Africans are realizing how the Big Man is performing his activities. They understand the real situation of Africa and are getting awareness that how they are being used by white education and white ways through the mimic men.

The characters' views about Africa are not based on the real situation of Africa. The Big Man's rule is not based on real Africa. He follows the white ways though he is a black person and tries to mimic the white traditions. He tries to show the African people that his wish to improve Africa by constructing the Domain. Inder, an African teacher, educated in European university comes to teach in the Domain. He finds living in such a place and pretending to improve the situation of Africa is "to live in a construct" (155). The Big Man needs

Inder's outfit to put the common people in submission by misleading them intellectually so that the opportunity can be grabbed.

Inder, Salim and Raymond with European education are superior to the ignorant Africans. The representatives of Colonial rulers who are the Third World intellectuals are afraid of the potential threat from the Africans. So, to engage them a construction like polytechnic is needed. Inder says, "Unless we can get them thinking, and give them real ideas instead of just politics and principles, these men will keep our world in turmoil for the next half century" (123). Inder protests the white ways. His saying proves that African thinking is primitive. Now, it is time for the Africans to think analytically.

African people are supposed to depend on the Big Man and to remember that he is always present by displaying his photographs with Africans. The Big Man's obsession needs a white model in everything. He mimics the life style of whites. He blindly follows the ways of white man and leaves his African styles. The narrator believes "he heard that de Gaulle used to send personal regards to the wives of his political enemies" (188). The Big Man does not understand the diplomatic ideas of whites so, he incompetently mimics the external gestures. He mimics Europe and trying to build Europe in Africa. His plans are not realistic.

The Big Man established the New Domain to educate the African people by European teachers: "He was creating modern Africa. He was creating a miracle that would astound the rest of the world. He was by passing real Africa" (100). He brings the European experts to rebuild the destroyed town and to suppress the rebellion. His failure to rule the people raises a new revolution against him. As the Big Man can not do anything without Europe, he hires the

European mercenaries to suppress the rebellion. The situation of Africa is dreadful.

Inder who is educated in Europe finds his living in Africa. He works in the domain as teacher. He says, "My education and my background made me extraordinary and I could not fight the idea of my extraordinariness" (145) Inder gets the occupation at polytechnic because of his European education and African background. Inder is an Indian living in Africa. Inder, the European mercenary has high flown ideas about Africa. He says:

> Everything has conspired to push black Africa into every kind of tyranny. As a result Africa was full of refugees, first-generation intellectuals. Western governments didn't want to know, and the old African hands were in no position to understand – they were still fighting ancient wars. If Africa had a future, it lay with those refugees. My idea was to remove them from the countries where they couldn't operate and send them, if only for a little while, to those parts of the continent where they could. A continental interchange to give the man themselves hope, to give Africa the better news about itself, and to make a start on the true African revolution. (154)

Thus, Inder's idea suggests a way to remove the state of refugee and a start of revolution for the welfare of Africa. Inder doubts the capacity of Africans and says, "There are times when I feel that Africa will simply have its own way – hungry men are hungry men. And that is when I get very low" (155). The same situation can not be long lasting. It is the European education that shaped this idea in him.

Ferdinand, the African intellectual questions the dream of the Big Man. He knows the difficulties in his dream. Ferdinand feels pain as he understands the way Africa is taken towards the self-destruction. He understands how one African is being killed by another. He laments, "It is one of us who is going to be executed, but the man does not know. He thinks he is going to watch" (273). So, the ways of execution is chaotic. It is wise to save Africa from this lot. Ferdinand says the Big Man is going alone towards the place of his execution. Thus awareness in the part of newly growing African intellectual is the positive sign for the future Africa.

Salim finds the Africans as barbaric and that they are insect-like uneducated living in the bush. They are unprogressive but retrogressive, greedy and lazy people. These Africans are nothing, and allow themselves to become nothing; they have no place in the world. They have no other way, either they have to follow the European civilization or to die in the bush. Africans are obsessed with the new technologies – either they accept more than needed or totally reject them and destroy everything that is new. The narrator compares the colonial time of miraculous peace and the neocolonial presents. Africans imitate white ways so the novel is full of images of mimicry and destruction. Naipaul realizes that Africa is in the process of nationalistic movement that suits the land. Salim also sees "White in the white light" (278) everywhere. He has no hope of seeing any place without the whites.

Africa is facing the extremely bad situation. The country with such political system invites uprising and a new system is required but they are not the better alternatives but is the process of nation building such development of the countries is the usual process. Metty, Salim's servant describes the insurgent,

"They are going to kill all the masters and all the servants. When they are finished nobody will know there was a place like this here. They are going to kill and kill. They say it is the only way, to go back to the beginning before it's too late" (275). It is one stage of revolution towards the competent self-rule. So, insurrection is the only way left for the African people.

Black people are taking the Bigburger, a symbol of colonialism, as their favourite thing although they are resisting almost everything European. Africans are aware of the educational and cultural influence of white but the Bigburger is penetrated into their heart. Salim says, "Bigburger was a success" (144). In this sense, Africans are accepting the things, which is good for them and rejecting which is unfavorable to them. The white mimic men only try to prove that without whites African themselves can not be safe and peaceful. Whites are applying different measures to undermine black culture and life styles. Whites' ways of othering black Africans and only keeping them in centre is not a long lasting solution for future. A sense of equal position is required for this.

Quest for identity

Culture is the source of identity. It is also the source of protection. It is represented for different purposes. It serves the purpose of appropriation and differentiation. Identity is the crucial issue. One makes effort to associate oneself to culture or to an organization or to represent his/her presence through different deeds no matter even by dying or to differentiate oneself from the rest to make his/her identity clear. It becomes the issue when it is in crisis; when one is not within one's own culture or even being with the culture too, one may feel so. One finds similar with others or different from others in the process of presenting oneself in culture.

A Bend in the River depicts the narrator's search of identity. Salim, the narrator feels insecure and culturally alienated. He has the trauma of an outsider that underlies the loss of roots. He is alienated wherever he goes. The narrator, an Indian migrant, has cultural dilemma. His crisis of identity originates from the bad historical experience of slavery in the aftermath of colonialism. So, he tries to be associated with a new identity despite the difficulties.

Salim, both the narrator and character of the novel, narrates, observes, experiences and comments on both his and other characters' lives. He has strong sense of individuality from the inception of the novel. At the beginning of the novel he says, "The world is what it is, man who are nothing, who allow themselves to become nothing, have no place in it" (3). By using the repeated negation, he asserts on the sense of individual being. According to him, one must allow oneself to become something to have a place on earth.

Salim introduces himself from the beginning, "My own pessimism, my insecurity was a more terrestrial affair. I was without the religious sense of my family. The insecurity I felt was due to my more materialist attitude, my seeking to occupy middle ground" (16). He lacks religious sense of his family not because of any compulsion imposed upon him but because of his own impulse or effort to introduce himself. He confronts with existential philosophy. He does not accept the role of fate or chance in his life. "I could be master of my fate only if I stood alone . . . I could no longer submit to fate. My wish was not to be good in the way of our tradition, but to make good." (20). Thus, what he is, is his own choice, not of fate or chance. Sooner or later he rejects the external factor that comes in his life. Towards the end of the novel, he beats Yvette brutally. He has sexually experienced something new with Yvette, unlike with the women in

brothels. But by rejecting Yvette ". . . and then I spat on her . . . until I had no more spit" (220) as an external factor that helps him to discover himself. He realizes that he should depend on himself in order to find his own way. He is left alone with "no family, no flag, no fetish" (36) as he narrates his position in the early part of the story.

Salim has been presented as the only realistic character who has the ability of observing things objectively: "So from an early age I developed the habit of locking, detaching myself from a familiar scene and trying to consider it as from a distance" (15). Because of his objective observation he has developed the idea of positionality in the adopted country and feels insecure: "It was from this habit of looking that the idea came to me that as a community we had fallen behind. And that was the beginning of my insecurity" (15-16). Salim is an immigrant from an East-African Muslim Indian family. He has the keen observation of his social insecurity being an African but not a genuine African: "Africa was my home, had been the home of my family for centuries. But we came from the east coast, and that made the difference" (10). Because of the cultural gaps, Salim can not associate himself with Africa truly. Identity becomes an issue when it is in crisis. In such a condition, it also becomes special: "My family was Muslim. But we were a special group. We were distinct from Arabs and other Muslims of the Coast; in our customs and attitudes we were closer to the Hindus of north western India, from which we had originally come" (11). In this sense his family was of special kind. In spite of being Muslim, they were distinct from 'Arabs and other Muslims' and closer to the 'Hindus of north western India' in 'customs and attitudes'. This way his culture is assimilated to Hindus that plays a vital role in adoption of new land.

In the land of adoption, Salim tries to locate his position. He always sees that culturally Europeans are superior and Africans are inferior. He finds himself in between Europeans and Africans. Zebeth, an African woman, a trader by profession, chooses Salim to teach her son Ferdinand, a Lycee student and would be commissioner of nameless African state:

> If Zebeth chose me for this job, it wasn't only because I was business associate she had grown to trust. It was because I was a foreigner, an English speaking as well, someone from whom Ferdinand could learn manners and ways of the outside world. I was someone with whom Ferdinand could practise. (36)

Because of his association with English speaking world, he has acquired the ability to teach and to train the Africans. Because of his Englishness he is 'Mis', i.e. Mister. In this sense, Salim makes effort to form identity with the means of association in the adopted country.

Salim identifies himself neither with the religion, and customs of his relatives nor with the Africans of the interior in their recent independence. Recognizing that way of life his family had established and maintained for centuries is doomed, he says, echoing Inder's words, "Another tide of history was coming to wash us away" (20), He takes what seems to be his own opportunity to survive as an individual. "I could be master of my fate if I stood alone" (20). His most appealing quality is his uncompromising quest for the truth of whatever situation, problem and danger he encounters. He is determined in his need to create new life and identity in the ruins left by violence and anarchy.

IV. Conclusion: Cultural Difference as Cause of Cultural Ambivalence

V.S. Naipaul, a post-colonial writer, traces the thematic aspects of diasporic experience, homelessness, rootlessness and subaltern experience in his novels presenting the ambivalent characters searching for the existence of themselves in canonical arena of so called central or mainstream cultural practice. His characters basically suffer from the anxiety of inclusion which they always want to derive. Because of the high-gap between the expectation and fulfillment/achievement, his characters suffer. In *A Bend in the River*, he presents the most ambivalent characters – Salim, an Indian merchant and the narrator of this novel; his inherited servant, Metty; and his old friend Indar. They are Africans and yet not Africans, circumstances have pushed them inland from the rim of the continent, and they cling to their distinctive identity.

A Bend in the River, a diasporic novel on the themes of nostalgia, rootlessness and homelessness is largely shaped by the ambivalent situation of the characters who swing like the pendulum heither and theither in search of the existence and identity. Salim thinks of himself as the product of a place not truly African; Metty is only half-African, Indar is the grandson of Punjabi railway workers. All of them move along among the locals conscious of the fact that they are neither assimilated nor have any real wish to be.

Naipaul's *A Bend in the River* shows the expatriates' or exiles' location in the newly independent Third World countries. The diasporic experience is the common feature of human civilization since the time immemorial. Naipaul brings to light the harassment of exiles by presenting the fictional characters' sufferings in nameless African state in this novel. The setting of the novel, the newly independent nameless African nation, is the representation of the

postcolonial Third World. Salim, Naipaul's spokesman, both the narrator and the protagonist of the novel, is a fictional projection of modern intellectuals in exile. Through Salim's point of view, Naipual has minutely treated the issues of sufferings of the foreigners in the adopted land. Through his characters like Salim, Indar and Raymond, Naipaul has expressed the ambivalence situation in non-western places.

People belonging to the same nation cannot feel being the citizen of their own state when it is in the matter of cultural difference. So, in a way, these migrant people, expatriates or exiles, become homeless or citizen of no state. In spite of getting citizenship, Salim and Indar are not treated equally as the original and genuine citizens of the state. They are harassed and exploited under different names because of their cultural difference. Salim is exploited under the name of so called 'nationalization' process. His property is confiscated and he faces different hazards. Thus, he finds his marginalized position in the diaspora and his location quite insecure.

Salim's quest for the truth is the story of his relation to the story of his homeland. His grand parents had migrated from India and his family has been living there for centuries. However, he is, in a way or other, attached to India. He is an Indian by descent, a Muslim by religion. Naipaul, by means of fictional characters: Salim, Indar and Raymond, has slightly shown the exiles marginalized location in the diaspora. Salim and Indar, the Indians born in diaspora, and Raymond, a European, voluntarily adopted the land to teach the Africans about their history. All try their best to survive in the adopted land. Being culturally different from the Africans all three characters, diasporic people, suffer much from the ups and downs the nameless African country

undergoes. The migrants or expatriates feel of being insecure and exploited. Ultimately they find themselves in the state of homelessness for them, the adopted land is no more welcoming.

Salim argues that the returning up to the past home is almost impossible. For him home is hardly a place he could return to. Thus, the home only becomes the matter of mental speculation. His movement from one culture to another causes his insecurity. He is Muslim but his attachment to Indian culture creates ambivalence. His European education brings differentiation with African culture in him. His association with western culture to create new identity leaves him nowhere to go. Raymond's collision with his European culture and the president's mimicry of Europeanness in African land cause his insecurity and he flees the nameless African state. Likewise, Salim also abandons the adopted land.

To conclude, Salim, Metty, Indar and other characters' instability, their penetracy, and the culture as well as political dilemmas leads to the ambivalence in both personal and professional aptitudes due mainly to unpleasant cultural hybridity. The conglomeration of different cultural praxis into the unnamed land of Africa lacks the cultural uniformity which leads the characters to the ambivalent situation having confusion to adopt or leave the culture.

Works Cited

Abrahms, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th Ed. India: Harcourt India,

    2001.

Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory*: *Class, Nation and Literatures*. London: OUP, 1992.

Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*.London: Routledge, 1994.

Crystal, David. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. 2nd Ed. Cambridge.

    CUP, 2000.

Chatterjee, Partha. *Nationalistic Thought and The Colonial World*. New York:

    Zed, 1986.

Feder, Lillian. *Naipaul's Truth*: The Making of the Writer. Noida: Indialog,

    2001.

Gandhi, Leela, "After Colonialism". *Post-colonial Theary*. New Delhi: OUP,

    1998.

Hantington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of the World*

    Order. New York: Vintage, 1992.

Hall, Stuart, "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." *Contemporary Postcolonial*

    Theory. Ed. Padmini Mongia, Delhi, OUP, 1997.

Kambysellis, Zandra. "Postcolonalism: The Unconsciousness Changing of a

    Culture." *IPL Online Public Library Criticism Collection* 21 March 2003.

    3rd January 2004.

    http://www.scholard.nus.edu.sg/landow/post/polidiscourse/kzl.html.

King, Bruce. *V.S. Naipaul*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Kuravilla, Elizabeth. "Angry Old Man Naipaul." *Hindustan Times* 22 Feb. 2002: 1.

Lichtenstein David P. *A Brief Biography of V.S. Naipaul*. Chicago: Pablo Press,

    2001.

Memmi, Albert. "A Dark Vision." *IPL Online Literary Criticism Collection*. 13

    May 1999. 3rd January 2003.

    http://bttunes.cin/books/98/06/07specials/naipaul.river.html.

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

- - -. *A Bend in the River London*: Picador, 2002.

- - -. *A House for Mr. Biswas*. London: Picador, 1961.

- - -. *Half a Life*. London: Penguin Books, 2001.

- - -. "I am not English, Indian, Trinidadian, I'm my own man. V.S. Naipaul."

    Interview with Rahul Singh. *Times of India* 19 Feb. 2002:3.

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

    OUP, 1992.

Radhakrishnan, R. *Diasporic Meditations Between Home and Location*.

    Minneapolis: University of Minnsotta P, 1997.

Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands*. London: Granta Books, 1992.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1994.

- - -. *Orientalism*, London: Vintage, 1994.

Tejpal, Tarun J. *In Sir Vidia's Shadow*. New Delhi: Vikas Publication, 2000.

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

Williams, Raymond. *Culture.* London: OUP, 1981.