I. INTRODUCTION

This research is a kind of diagnosis into V.S. Naipaul's travelogue An *Area of Darkness* to prove how people feel estranged and dislocated when they happen to face a new language and culture in a new environment that always gives them a sense of cultural estrangement and alienation. There is no another way than literature to express sadness and unhappiness of being aloof from the root culture and to exist in a new environment. So, literature is a weapon to cultivate hopes and dreams through which one can have solace and the meaning of life in strange place. Creativity is a fuel to kindle the light to tear up the curtain of estrangement. The narrator of this travelogue finds himself in the darkness of his ancestral place in India. So, he mentally tries to mingle him with his forebears through writings.

Literature is not merely the communication in images, rather it is the easiest way to express the mental and physical Sadness and happiness of life. Facts are always changing. Fiction is durable entity. The literary production, fiction or non-fiction has to do with certain terrains of socio-reality. Literature uses language or makes the culture speak through language. Each writing is associated with culture in general and with the writer in particular. No matter, how much a writer roars that he is detached from his personality; he is always haunted by the root culture and terrified by the ghosts of his ancestors. The more he detaches himself form the root culture the more he attaches to it. Writing is always associated with the identity of a culture or society. All the colonial writings, in this respect, can be studied as an endeavour for the quest of cultural identity or cultural root. Thus, it is evident that writing fictions or non-fictions for Naipaul means a research for root.

V. S. Naipaul is a Trinidad born novelist who was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature in 2001 for his extraordinary creativity and verbal dexterity with which he didn't, only make us realize the life, reality and histories of colonized people but also helped much to extend the area and importance of English literature. *An Area of Darkness* (1964) is another travel narrative, written after his first visit to India in 1961. It is his first journey from "Memory to reality" and in reality his ancestral homeland (277). Naipaul is very much successful to dramatize his autobiography in his travel narrative. In this travel memory, the narrator who is grown up in a hybrid culture in Trinidad goes to India to find his cultural root but he can't find a cultural space to merge himself over there because he lacks behind a cultural history of his own and a young man of mixed-heritage can't find a proper place to stand upon; for him the whole world is a strange place and he is a stranger wherever he goes consequently, he feels estranged from the world. So, my objective is to drive the causes to feel aloof from the world for those who are displaced from their homeland and root-culture.

V.S. Naipaul stands among the most prominent contemporary English novelists not only by writing fictions and travel memories to enrich the area of English literature but also by experimenting with documentary prose and journalism. These different genres equally make him popular among the English novelists. Derek Walcott, a frequent Critic of his ideas, hails him as "Our finest writer of the English sentences" (qtd: in Nixon 1). Similarly, British and American Commentators are liable to single Naipaul out as "Unarguably the most brilliant interpreter in English (Perhaps in any language) of the mainstream of the Third world" (4). Apart from the Nobel Prize, Naipaul has also been able to receive almost all the principal literary awards – the Booker Prize in 1971, the W.H. Smith Prize, the Hawthornden Prize, the

Bennett Prize and the T.S. Eliot Award in 1990, the Queen awarded him a Knighthood. These awards help him to get the canonicity as an English writer and a prestige as well. This prestige as a novelist has surely assisted him in sustaining his high profile as an interpreter of the postcolonial world.

An Area of Darkness emerges after his first visit to India, remains a valuable record of an India in transition, an India to sing, under a weak and exhausted Nehru, a war with China and losing along with its flush of post-independences idealism and innocence. Indeed, each of Naipaul's trilogy of books on India has come to stand as a historical documents of India's post-colonial evolution. Published just after Mrs. Gandhi's emergency, *India: A Wounded Civilization* 1977, captures the post-Nehru years of drift and aimlessness," the simplicity of a country ruled by slogan's" (98). In *India: A Million mutinies* 1990, Naipaul correctly intuited, and made his theme, the rise of long-suppressed identities that radically altered Indian society in the last decade of 20th century.

Many different ideas and expectations prompted Naipaul's first visit India. He left Trinidad, where he was born in 1932, when he was 18 to study at Oxford. He had sole and singular aim based upon the wish of his father that is to be a writer so he traveled to England, which was the then centre of the world for English speaking World. It had taken much time to fulfill his writerly ambition. He wrote five books in just seven years. *A House for Mr. Biswas* gave him a considerable achievement. It was published at a time when "Indian" novels were an oddity, particularly Indian novels from the West Indies. Naipaul's books suffered critical and commercial neglect. There were other disappointments because he could not live in London forever consequently, life became "sterile" and "mean" for him. But what were the alternatives? What were the places he could think of as "home" as the centre of his

world? He had been back to Trinidad; the visit described in the *Middle Passage* had merely indicated an early childhood vow to distance himself from the Island. There remained only India, the land of his Brahmins ancestors.

On his first visit, Naipaul took with him the conventional ideas of India and the Indian people. Previously, it was the land of Gandhi and Nehru, which had been changed more or less by the white colonization. He looks with him his own childhood memories of an old India, the Brahmanic world of rituals and myths that had been carefully preserved in Trinidad. This past held an emotional charge for Naipaul. His ancestors had come to Trinidad as an indentured labourers in the last quarter of the 19th century. The regions of North India they lived in were systematically rendered destitute by the British in the post muting period. Brahmins had been a special target. They were compelled to violate their cultural norms and values. The history of these Brahmins was one of the great poverty and wretchedness; and to the generation that followed the first arrivals in Trinidad those early traumas were fresh in the memory of Naipaul, a third generation Indian had just begun to outgrow this painful past when he went to India. But poor and abject, was to revive in the most unexpected way all the fears and insecurities he had known as a child.

His entire visit to India gave him nothing more than a sense of cultural estrangement. His journey proves him as a rootless man. So, he desperately says "It was a journey that ought not to have been made, it had broken my life in two" (289). Naipaul wrote on the Penultimate page of *An Area of Darkness* " a record of intense fear and anguish" (179). They can't find a cultural root to assimilate himself neither he can communicate and share his emotional thoughts and feelings, causes him to feel cultural, historical and linguistic loss. He finds himself "faceless" in the sea of faces in

India. Writing has really been his career, which has been proved by his many novels where he searches the cultural space, root and proper place to lean upon himself.

Regarding the theoretical tools, the postcolonial perspectives especially related to diasporic experiences will be used to analyze the text. Some of the terms which will be used in this present study are: culture, cultural identity, hybridity, mimicry, diaspora, location, dislocation etc. This work has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter, "Introduction" includes a discussion of the title and hypothesis, a short introduction of Naipaul and his book, *An Area of Drkness* in relation to his representation from the post colonial world. It gives an outline of the entire job.

The second chapter contains a theoretical modality related to cultural identity, diaspora, hybridity, mimicry etc. While analyzing the text in the third chapter, all the ideas will be used to prove the hypothesis by analyzing Naipaul's *An Area of Darkness*. It will reveal how the narrator feels lonely and aloof from the world, in the lack of cultural spaces, which is the crux of this study.

Now, finally, the fourth chapter concludes the thesis. This chapter comes out of some necessary explanations and arguments put forward in the preceding chapters. It will give enough proofs and logic to discuss how the estranged and displaced characters from the world search for their ancestral footsteps.

Critics on *An Area of Darkness*

There is no doubt that the Nobel laureate, Naipaul has been able to draw the attention of many critics since the publication of this book *An Area of Darkness* in 1964. Travel writing and journalism consist of the large portion of Naipaul's oeuvre which is reviewed as works of colonial writer. It is the critics' job to distinguish him to different groups but in a true sense he is a representative of Trinidad and the

postcolonial world as well to show the plight and torture of those people who are suffered by the sense of belonging no where in the world in lack of their own cultural history. Some prominent critics with their specific comment over Naipaul's work are mentioned below.

Gareth Griffith receives Naipaul as a double exile. Indeed, it is a sharp comment upon him. He is not only enslaved but also separated from his root culture. As the grandfather of Naipaul living India left behind a certain way of life– a culture. In Trinidad these indentured labours were exposed to cultural patterns imported from England. They had no any way out; for the advancement in life meant imitation of their white masters. Commenting upon their double exile Griffiths interprets:

> The African was colonized, the West Indian was enslaved. The process of enslavement of the West Indian was deprived of his personality, as well as his root cultural identity. In Trinidad these indentured labours were exposed to cultural patterns imported from England. The generations grew up in their foster culture even the educational system was geared to produce 'overseers'. (160)

Thus, for a man like Naipaul the sense of history and cultural jumbled up. For him India was a mythical land, a dream world where he tries to connect himself. Unlike Griffith, P.C. David says that the darkness of Naipaul is the darkness of his own situation born out of romantic reveries which can't stand the glory of the day. He commits the basic mistakes of looking of east through western eyes naturally the whole prospective appears wrongly aligned. He needn't explain the ancestral place in such a mocking tongue. It might be an area of light for Indians for ever. He comments upon the book as:

In *An Area of Darkness,* obviously, Naipaul has become a victim of the dilemma mentioned above. Why use the western criteria in determining India to be an area of light or darkness? Naipaul's view of India is biased though it must be added that it is not cynical as in Nirad Chaudhuri's *The Continent of Circe.* Though there is no venom in his attack, it betrays shock of recognition, similar to Gulliver's discovery that he was after all a despised 'Yahoo'. (160)

This might not be his interest to look India through western eyes but it is simply his anguish for not finding his space in the ancestral land. Instead of finding a place, he finds a terrible predicament in lack of place.

Next critic, Rob Nixon accepts the book dealing with the problem of identity that Naipaul has experienced. He says *"An Area of Darkness* contains his most sustained attempt to become self conscious about his projection of an autobiographical persona" (81). The difficulty and instability of his efforts turn this book into a forceful instance of the potential for interference between the goals of self portraiture and cultural description. He further values it as:

For *The Area of Darkness* is on one level, also the dark landscape of his childhood imagination, a region he had been pointed toward by his grandfather's stories, a region that had showed his life but had yet to assume the precise hues of memory and experience […]. The record of a man who had intended to travel toward a sense of his Indian identity but instead finds himself recoiling from the land and assuming an aloof. (81)

Edward Said calls Naipaul a "demystified of the west crying over the spilt milk of colonialism" (Said 113). He sees Naipaul starting from the side to his (Naipaul's) thesis or the plate form from which he addresses the world: the west is the world of knowledge, criticism, technical know-how, and functioning institution. Said expresses more as:

> He is a kind of belated Kipling just the same. What is worse, I think, is that this East/West dichotomy covers up a deep emptiness in Naipaul the writer, for which Naipaul the social phenomenon is making other pay, even as a whole train of his present admires applaud his candor, his telling it-like- it- is about that Third world which he comprehends "better" than anyone else. (115)

It is the stand point of explanation that causes variation in the commentary. In a different way, R.S. Pathak accepts Naipaul as a writer who always tries to portray the contemporary reality. In his book *An Area of Darkness* he takes Indians to task for ignoring reality. He seems to be somewhat obsessed with the reality of the West Indian life. He sees Indian life "the featureless area of darkness" (36). We must know that he himself is obsessed with featurelessness. He comments that Naipaul seems to be somewhat obsessed with the reality of the West Indian life. He once described India as the featureless area. This featurelessness characterized the West Indian life and characters before Naipaul's appearance on the scene. He tried to give a specific character to it, and then "In Trinidad to be an Indian was to be distinctive; difference was each man's attribute" (37). He made use of his powers to create images of reality of colonial experience out of the featureless man and women (153).

This is the major contribution of Naipaul to our understanding of the predicament of the modern men who are always haunted by the sense of

placelessness. Not only Naipaul, we would rather have the same passion for the root culture if we were in his position.

Likewise, another critic, I.K. Masih criticizes Naipaul very severely. Indeed, Masih is right to some extent because Naipaul is rootless and remains as outsider, but he has no any right to despise Indians for their beliefs on their cultures and religious. He says Shiva has ceased to dance and sees the Indian civilization as wounded. He need to know it that no God is dead for Indians and their own homeland, culture and civilization is much more lovelier for them than any other that exists in the world. He himself is wounded neither he has any place to lean upon nor has any particular religion to keep his belief on. He further says:

> Naipaul has lost his identity I have my sympathies with him. He is too caste-conscious and egoistic to appreciate and understand the rhyme of Shiva's cosmic dance and Krishna's eternal sermon. No, Shiva has not ceased to dance. India lies on the beats of Shiva's cosmic dance. It may be a land of darkness for Naipaul for me it is an area of light and it will remain so. (165)

Many critics analyze Naipaul from different angles and perspectives. Nevertheless, I found him as a wounded man of mixed heritage. Having no own cultural history means having no identity. So, the pang of rootlessness always haunts his narrators. Naipaul's narrator always seeks his homeland, culture and ancestral footsteps either through his physical journey or mental. This is the trauma and a bitter reality of those who are culturally disconnected, geographically displaced, linguistically estranged and spiritually shattered. Now, this is the question of

wholeness and my whole focus is thus for the vision of rootlessness and sense of estrangement.

II. CULTURE AND CULTURAL IDENTITY

Introduction

The term "culture" refers to a number of different types of activities. On one level, we all feel we have a culture that we belong to and that makes us who we are. Identity has become the dominant question and concern of cultural studies since 1990s. It is an essence which can be signified through signs of tastes, beliefs, attitudes, and lifestyles. So, identity concerned with sameness and difference that is possible to know only after cultural studies.

Cultural studies appears as a field of study in Great Britain in the 1950s out of Leavisism, a form of literary studies named after F.R. Leavis, its most prominent member. Leavisism was an attempt to redisseminate what is now commonly called, after pierre Bouridies, 'Cultural Capital'– though this is not how it saw itself. Leavis wanted to use the educational system to distribute literary knowledge and appreciation more widely. To achieve this, the Leavisites argued for a very restricted canon, discarding modern experimental works like those of James Joyce or Virginia Woolf, for instance. Instead they primarily celebrated works directed towards developing the moral sensibility of readers, such as Jane Austen, Alexander Pope or George Eliot –the 'great tradition'. Leavisites fiercely insisted: "culture was not simply a leisure activity, reading the great tradition was rather a means of forming mature individuals with a concrete and balanced sense of life" (2). The main threat to this sense of life came from the pleasure offered by so-called "Mass culture" (2). In this, Leavisism was very much in tune with what cultural studies has come to call the 'social democratic power bloc', which dominated post-war Britain. After the war, Britain was administered by a sequence of governments that intervened in the private section both socially (in areas like health and housing) and (culturally in education and the arts).

When the education system expanded radically through the 1950s and 1960s, it turned to leavisism to form citizens' sensibilities.

The word 'culture' in English is derived from the Latin 'Cultura' which means that act of cultivating the soul. Later, the term is used to any custom, art, social institution, literature, music etc. that is cultivated in society. Culture, thus, belongs to "realm of broader human consciousness that is both developed and shaped by society, religion, history and geography" (Saraswoti 223). It surprisingly gives individuals their identify. Since, there is no single history, religion, society and geography, cultures vary; and the literature as the reflections of cultures also varies. And when someone nurtured in one culture is placed in another, she/he may face "cultural shock" and the reactions may be anger, frustration, fear, curiosity, fascination, repulsion, hatred or confusion (Saraswoti 223). The totality of culture as a frame of reference shapes and controls man's view of the world around him/ her.

Cultural Studies explores how we identify with description of ourselves as male, female, black or white, young or old, Asians or Europeans, Nepalese or Indians. As perceived within the domain of culture, identities are not things which exist simply there with universal qualities, rather, they are discursive constructions, notably language. 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 of by erasing of identities" (186).

Culture is an undemarcated area where people express themselves when the identity is in question, but they don't bother to think and express much about it when it is in comfort. The main argument is that the old identities which stabilized the social world for so long are in decline, giving rise to new identities and fragmenting the modern individual as a unified subject. This so-called crisis of identity is seen as

part of a wider process of change which is dislocating the central structures and processes of modern societies and undermining the frameworks which gave individuals stable anchorage in the social world. Stuart Hall thus claims "Modern identities are being de-centered that is, dislocated or fragmented ("The Question" 274). He thinks that modern identities are breaking up since the second-half of the 20th century. He finds the fragmentation of the cultural landscape of class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race, and nationality that give us firm location as social individuals. This transformation undermines our sense of ourselves as integrated subjects. It crates double displacement, decentering individuals both from their place in the social and the cultural world, and from themselves constitutes "a crisis of identity" (275).

Again, he quotes another cultural critic, Kobena Mercer and says "Identities becomes an issue when it is in crisis. When sometimes assumed to be fixed coherent and stable is displaced by the experience of doubt and uncertainty" (275). Thus, he keeps this problem of cultural identity in what he calls "Structural and institutional change" (277). In such contradictory situation the problem of identity continuously changes. He explains that:

> If we feel we have unified identity from birth to death, it is only
> because we construct a comforting story or "narrative self" about
> ourselves. The fully unified, completed, secure and coherent identity is
> fantasy. Instead, as the systems of meaning and cultural representation
> multiply, we are confronted by a bewildering, fleeting multiplicity of
> possible identities- any one of which could identify with-at least
> temporarily. (277)

He accepts that globalization and modernization have a crucial role for cultural

identity. Globalization suggests that global culture is brought about by a variety of

social and cultural developments. The term globalization, refers to a number of facts:

such as economics (for example, high volumes of trade and other money flows), high-

speed communications (internet, email, telephone, and fax), and travel, along with

sophisticated technologies (genetic engineering, cloning, and industrial by-products),

emergence of global patterns of consumption and consumersion, the cultivation of

cosmopolitan life styles, the attraction and popularity of global sports such as – the

confederation cup, world cup, the Olympic Games, the spread of world tourism etc.

Therefore, these all make national boundaries extremely porous and hard to define.

Thus, Malory Nye adds more as:

> With globalization it is not only things, but people also who more
>
> about the global, either physically or virtually (through communication
>
> technology). An obvious example of this globalize world were the men
>
> born in middle-Eastern Countries (such as Egypt), educated in Europe,
>
> and then resident in the USA, who received military training in
>
> Afghanistan, and went on to kill others from scores of different
>
> countries in New York on 11 September 2001. Of course, many of the
>
> people who move about the globe do so for quite different and far less
>
> violent reasons than Muhammad Atta and his fellow 9/11 hijackers. It
>
> was not globalization that caused the tragedy, but rather that the
>
> tragedy could only have happened within the context of the forces of
>
> globalization that so powerfully shape the cotemporary world. (179)

The Cultural identity is felt when the cultures are cut across and intersects

natural frontiers, and when people have been dispersed for ever or temporarily from

their homelands. Thus, the professor of Harvard University, Huntington says, "culture and cultural identities, which at the broadest level are civilization identities" (20). In the present world, however, cultural identity is the central factor for shaping each and everyone. Regarding this question, he further says, "almost everywhere one looks" people have been asking, "Who are we?" "Where do we belong?" and "what is not us?" (125). People always fear to be unknown and solitary so, they try hard to capture the links with places of origin and their root, he again interprets, "in a fluid world, people are seeking identity and security, people are looking for roots and connections to defend themselves against the unknown" (26). People bear upon the dominant culture but search the traces of the particular, tradition, language and histories by which they were shaped. Hall gives it new terms "culture of hybridity" to such a newly emerged culture ("The Question" 274). They are irrevocably translated or "borne across" to quote Salman Rushdie's terms (17).

The feeling of displacement necessarily haunts them. The newly found identity never gives them the sense of unity within. They never obtain a stable, complete or an unquestionable identity. In a true sense, they always have an ambiguous identity. Most of the contemporary writers, notably V.S. Naipaul, express nostalgia for a stable cultural identity from the avenue of cultural crisis. They think themselves, culturally estranged and dislocated and vigorously try to join with the origin and root culture obviously, in their writings.

Cultural Estrangement

Much discussions have been done in the previous chapters about culture and cultural studies. Now we can say that culture is a sum total of human beings that guides their acts and actions. Apparently, it seems so simple but if we go deep down into the culture there, we can find a kind of affinity which gives us our identity. There

are so many countries, races, religions, people having different culture and customs, yet the key source to be distinct from each other is culture. It identifies them, who is who? And who is from where? People get their name and fame in their respective culture. It doesn't only give them their identity but also gives them a safety land to live thus, people feel secured and alive in the domain of culture.

The ambiguity of the concept of culture is notorious. Some anthropologists consider culture to be social behavior at all, but an abstraction form of behaviour. To some, stone axes and pottery, dance and music, fashion and style constitute culture; while no material object can be culture to others. The definition of culture however, depends upon the time and context. Eventhough , one of the oldest anthropologists, Sir. E.B. Tylor defines culture as a, "complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, customs and other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society" (4). Culture has a very broad are a of acts we do ourselves and about ourselves. For Raymond Williams, "Culture is an all-inclusive entity; a whole way to life, materials, intellectual and spiritual" (20).

The idea of culture as people's 'whole way of life' appeared first in the late 19th century. Culture for Arnold was the best that has been thought and known in the world. The emergence of postcolonial discourse made culture a most contested space. Postcolonial perspective emerged from the colonial testimony of third world counties and the discourse of 'minorities' within the geopolitical division of east and west, north and south. Such discourse formulated their critical revisions around issues of cultural differences, social authority, and political discrimination in order to reveal the antagonistic and ambivalent moments within the realization of modernity. Postcolonial criticism bears witness to there unequal and uneven forces of cultural representation involved in the contest for political and social authority within the

modern world order. It forces us to engage with culture as much as uneven, incomplete production of meaning and value often compared to incommensurable demands and practices, produced in the act of social survival. Culture reaches out to create a symbolic textuality to give the alienating everyday aura of selfhood, a promise of pleasure. Bhabha observes as:

> Culture as a strategy of survival is both transnational and translation. It is translational because contemporary postcolonial discourse are rooted is specific histories of cultural displacement . . . it is translational because such spatial histories of displacement . . . make the question of how culture, signifies, or what is signified by culture, a rather complex issue. (138)

Estrangement means a kind of break or separation either from homeland or from origin. The *Oxford Learner's Dictionary* defines that it is a period of being estranged or no longer involved in or connected with something, epically something that used to be important. Now, cultural estrangement means to be alienated from culture. Cultural alienation is inseparably related to exile that involves in the idea of separation on distancing one from his literal homeland or from a cultural root. The separation from a cultural root brings a sense of estrangement. It is closely related to other similar terms like alienations, displacement, diasporas and exile. According to Nixon these terms symbolically stand for "homelessness", one who has been abandoned by tradition (14). He further says that the alienated and rootless writers are always hunted by a global homelessness (17). It is to be noted that exile necessarily brings the individual to different places and culture, and thereby gives the victims a sense of cultural estrangement. According to Rob Nixon, "the medley of terms exile, emigrant, émigré, expatriate, refugee and homeless individual-applied to writers who

undergo geographical, cultural and national displacement" are necessary to understand Naipaul and his works (18).

We find the estrangement of individual from each other since the immemorial time. After, medieval period, the estrangement was defined differently. The Romanists dwell on the individual's alienation from other or from the society. The personal freedom and liberty always haunted them. It became the main theme of literature of all genres. In the 20th century, it became a dominant theme most notably in Marxism. Marx basically talks about cultural estrangement under which the individuals feel a loss of their cultural belonging. In the sense, the term is applied as the summation of the individual's emotions and it comprises of the following dimensions. (I) Powerlessness – when the individual believes, his activity will fail to achieve the result he looks, (II) Meaninglessness – when the individual has no clear understanding of the events in which he seeks, when he doesn't know what to believe and what not to believe. It gives a kind of dilemma, (III) Normlessness – a situation in which the individual encounters contradictory role expectations and is compelled to behave in an odd way that society doesn't accept, to obtain his purpose, (IV) Isolation – it is an estrangement of the individual from the main norms and values of his society, and at last (V) Selfestrangement – which is the individual's estrangement from the self, the feeling that his own self and abilities are something strange and alienating. Much arguments have been discussed in the earlier chapter to consist of alienation with above mentioned terms. Thus, alienation unnecessarily brings a feeling of 'loss'. People often realize this fact of loss when they are displaced and dislocated. The displacement of the subjects gives them the sense of estrangement.

The unified and stable subject is becoming fragmented in the modern and post-modern world. It helps much to feel the subject alienated. The identities which

composed the social landscape 'out there', and which ensured our subjective conformity with the objective 'needs' of the culture, are breaking up as a result of structural and institutional change. So, there is no fixed, essential or permanent identity which plays a vital role to bring, the sense of estrangement. Hall rightly elaborates:

> A dislocated structure is one whose centre is displaced and not replaced by another, but by plurality of power centre, no single articulating or organizing principle and do not develop according to the unfolding of a single 'cause' or 'law'. Society is not, as sociologists often thought, a unified and well-bounded whole, a totality, producing itself through evolutionary change from within itself, like the unfolding of a daffodil form its bulb. It is constantly being 'de-centered' or dislocated by forces outside itself. ("The Question" 278)

The terms displacement (one displaced from the root culture), dislocation (one located in the situations, she/ he doesn't belong to), exile (one being away and facing now culture), are often associated with cultural, geographical and national problems. This is to say that cultural identity and cultural estrangement are intricately inter connected with the issues of cultural and national problems. This "cultural alienation", as Rob Nixon says, "represents rhetoric of expression in V.S. Naipaul's uniting" (26).

Problem of Location

> Problem of location is intrinsically related to dislocation one becomes a victim of placelessness. In other words, it is a lack of fit between language and place, may be experienced by both those who possess English as mother tongue and

those who speak it as a second language. In both cases, the sense of dislocation from historical 'homeland' and that created by the dissonance between language, the experience of 'displacement', generates a creative tension within the language. Place is thus the concomitant of difference, the continual reminder of the separation. In Heiddegger's term unheimlich or unheimlichkeit literally 'unhousedness' or 'not-at-home-ness' which is also sometimes translated as 'uncanny' or 'uncanniness' (*London Calling 18*). The displacement is a phenomenon that occurs as a result of imperial occupation and the experiences associated with this event. It may be a result of transportation from one country of another by slavery or imprisonment, by invasion and settlement, a consequence of willing or unwilling movement from known to unknown location.

Historically, dislocation was developed in the institution of slavery and the system of indentured labour. For example, Ashcroft Griffith and Tiffin say, "The practice of slavery and indentured labour resulted in world-wide colonial disapora" (*Key* 74). Diasporic community thus, formed by slavery, indenture labour and forced or voluntary migration are dislocated and alienated in new socio-cultural milieu. In this sense, disaporic movement is the beginning of dislocation and alienation, Malory Nye says that disapora creats a kind of cultural confusion and displaced people will be more dispersed and alienated in lack of cultural identity (189). These people happen to seek their identity in the local mix-circumstances. He puts logics as:

> The development of diasporas through transnational migration and
> settlement creates a range of cultural complex situations. Within the
> broad 'Hindu diaspora', there are new people of Indian ancestry settled

in new contexts across the globe. In each context, their cultures and
religions are involved in process of transplantation and adaptation, as
individuals and groups seek to accommodate their own expectations
and ways of life to the local circumstances. (*Religion*189)

Dislocation doesn't only have to negative aspects; it never brings only the confusion
in the fusion of different subject but also opens up the possibility of creating new
identity. Quoting Ernesto Laclau, Hall argues that:

Dislocation has positive features. It unhinges the stable identities of
the past, but it also opens up the possibilities of new articulation -the
forging of new identities, the production of new identities, the
production of new subjects, and what he calls the 'recompositon of the
structure around particular nodal points of articulation'. ("The
Question" 279)

However, dislocation gives less prosperous chance for any subject, because dislocated
person always misses its centre. Having no centre means there is no single articulation
or organizing principle thus, one can't move in accordance with the society, its norms
and values. Such situation we can find in Nuipaul's and his characters' life in his *An
Area of Darkness*. None can locate themselves in a particular place.

It is very common for Hall for post modern people not to have a fixed,
essential or unshakable permanent identity. Identity becomes a moveable feast formed
and transformed continuously in relation to the ways we are represented or addressed
in the cultural system which surrounds us. The subjects assume different identities at
different times, identities which are not unified around a coherent 'self', within us are
contradictory identities, pulling in different direction, so that our identifications are

continuously being changed. If we think a stable and fix identity form birth to death, it will be not less than a narrative or pleasant story about ourselves. So, the fully unified, completed, secure, and coherent identity is a fantasy. There is multiplicity of possible identities so this is nothing but a crisis of identity. Dislocation is also a term that is used to describe both the occasion of displacement that occurs as a result of imperial occupation and the experiences associated with it. Place and displacement is crucial feature of postcolonial discourse. By place, we do not mean physical landscape. Indeed, it is predicated upon a particular philosophic tradition in which the world is separated from the viewing subject. For Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 'place' is a term that can't be separated from the issue of culture.

> Place in post colonial societies is a complex interaction of language, history, environment. It is characterized firstly by sense of displacement in those who have moved to the colonizes, or the more widespread sense of displacement from imported language, of a gap between the experienced environment and descriptions the language provides, and secondly by a sense of immense environment of culture in the construction of place. (*Postcolonial* 391)

A sense of place may be obtained in cultural history, in legend and language, without becoming a concept of contention and struggle until the profound discursive interference of colonialism. Such intervention may disrupt a sense of place in several ways: by imposing a feeling of displacement in those who have moved to the colonies; by physically alienating large population of colonized peoples through forced migration slavery or indenture; by disturbing the representation of place in the colony by imposing the colonial language." In many cases, 'place' doesn't become an

issue in a society's cultural discourse until colonial intervention radically disrupts the primary modes of its representation by separating 'space' from 'place' (*Key* 177).

One of the deepest reasons for the significant of place in colonized societies lies in the disruptions caused by modernity itself in the links between time, space and place. The mechanical clock was instrumental in separating time from space, telling the time in a way that could allow the precise division of 'zones' of the day without reference to other markets. In pre-modern times, space and place are more or less synonymous with one another, but once relations with absent others were made possible by the invention of the clock, the calendar and the map, things changed radically.

The movement of European society through the world, the 'discovery' and occupation of remote regions, was the necessary basic for the creation of what could be called 'empty space'. The creation of universal maps established space as a measurable, abstract concept independent of any particular place or region. The separation of time and space allows social relations to be lifted out of their locale, 'place' which is in some sense left behind by modernity becomes an "anxious and contested site of the link between language and identity, a possible site of those local realities that the universal separation of time, space and place leaves virtually untouched" (*Key* 179).

In addition to the separation of space from place, brought about European ways of measuring a universal space and time that sever them from any particular location, place becomes an issue within language itself. A sense of displacement may be experienced not only in place but in language too. If a man can not express himself in a new place automatically, he feels displaced. Place can thus be a constant trope of

differences in postcolonial writing, a continual reminder of colonial ambivalence, of the separation yet continual mixing of the colonizer and colonized.

The concept of place itself may be very in different societies and this can have quite specific political as well as literary effects in the extent of displacement. For instance, in aboriginal societies, place is traditionally not a visual construct, a measurable space or even a topographical system but a tangible location of one's own dreaming, an extension of one's own being. As Bob Hodge and Vijay Mishra point out, the 'place' in aboriginal culture, rather than existing as visual construct is a kind of "ground being" (*Postcolonial* 392). The idea of net owning the land but in some sense being 'owned by it' is a way of seeing the world that is so different from the materiality and commodification of a colonizing power, that effective protection of one's place is radically disabled when that new system becomes the dominant one.

The most concerted discussion of place and its location in language has come from settler colony writers for whom the possession of English as a first language has produced a particularly subtle, complex and creatively empowering sense of the lack of fit between the language available and the place experienced. Canadian Robert Kwestch, in 'Unhanding the hidden', suggests that the particular predicament of the colony writers is that they work in a language that appears to be authentically their own, and yet is not quite. The theory of place does not propose a simple separation between the 'place' named and described in language, and some 'real' place inaccessible to it, but rather indicator that in some sense " place is language, something in constant flux, a discourse in process" (*Key* 182).

Rhetoric of Hybridity and Mimicry

Hybridity originates from the Latin *hybrids*, a term used to classify the offspring of a tame sow and a wild boar. A hybrid is something that is mixed, hybridity is simply a mixture. As an explicative term, hybridity became a useful tool in forming a fearful discourse of racial mixing that arose towards the end of 18th century. Scientific modes of anatomy and carniometry were used to argue that Africans and Asians were racially inferior to Europeans. The fear of miscegenation that followed responds to the concern that the offspring of racial inter-breeding would result in the dilution of the European race. Hybridity as a concern for racial purity responds clearly to the zeitgeist of colonialism where despite the backdrop of the humanitarian age of enlightenment, social hierarchy was beyond contention as was the position of European at its summit. The social transformations that followed the ending of colonial mandates, rising immigration, and economic liberalization profoundly altered the use and understanding of the term hybridity.

The rhetoric of hybridity, sometimes referred to as *hybrid talk* is fundamentally associated with the emergence of postcolonial discourse, and its critiques of cultural criticism. This second stage in the history of hybridity is characterized by literature and theory that focuses on the effects of mixture upon identity and culture. Key theorists in this realm are Homi Bhabha, stuart Hall, Gyatri Spivak, and Paul Gilory, whose work responds to the increasing multicultural awareness of the early nineteen nineties. Often the literature of postcolonial and magical realist authors such as Salman Rushdie, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Milan Kundera, and I.M. Coetzee recur in their discussions. A key text in the development of hybridity theory is Homi Bhabha's The *location of Culture* (1994) which analyzes the liminality of hybridity as paradigm in a departure form the colonial anxieties of

miscegenation. His key argument is that colonial hybridity, as a cultural form, produced ambivalence in the colonial masters and as such altered the authority of power.

Hybridity refers in its most basic sense to mix. As Malory Nye says, "Hybridity is a cultural fusion" (190). Hybridity is thus possession or occurrence of mixture. Hybridization is understood as the process by which hybridity occurs and hybrid is formed. The term originates from agriculture and has for a long time been strongly related to concepts of racism and racial purity from colonial history. Quoting Paul Gilroy, Leela Gandhi Says", Hybridity, inheres, as in the educational of those processes of cultural mutation and restless (dis)continuity that exceed racial discourse and avoid capture by its agents" (131). Its contemporary uses are scattered across numerous academic disciplines and is salient in popular culture.

The next phase, in the use of the term has been to see hybridity as a cultural effect of globalization. For example, hybridity is presented by kraidy as the cultural logic' of globalization as it entails that traces of other cultures exist in every culture, thus offering foreign media and marketers transcultural wedges for forging affective links between their commodities and local communities. Another promoter of hybridity as globalization is Nederveen Pieterse, who asserts hybridity as the rhizome of culture. He argues that globalization as hybridization opposes views which see the process as homogenizing, modernizing, and westernizing, and that broadens the empirical history of the concept. However, neither of the scholar has reinvigorated the hybridity theory debate in terms of solving its inherent problematic. The term hybridity remains contested precisely because it has resisted the appropriations of humorous discourses despite the fact that it is radically malleable.

Hybridity has frequently been used in post colonial discourse to mean simply cross-cultural exchange and hybridization is understood as the process by which colonized mimic the colonizing groups language (sometimes in order to subvert the colonizers), borrow-western ideas and practices, and reject their own socio-cultural structures in exchange for western structure. It takes many forms: linguistic, cultural, racial etc. Regarding hybridity Ashcroft, Griffith, and Tiffin write as:

> Hybridity occurs in post-colonial societies both as a result of conscious moments of cultural suppression, as when the colonial power invades to consolidate political and economic control, or when settler-invader disposes indigenous peoples and forces them to assimilate to new social pattern. It may also occur in later periods when patterns of immigration form the metropolitan societies and from other imperial areas of influence (e.g. indentured labours from India and China), continue to produce complex cultural palimpsests with the post-colonized world. (*Postcolonial* 183)

Therefore, in talking about hybridity, we have to look at the various problems in which people are dislocated and displaced from their known social environment and indigenous culture when they are forced to assimilate to new social pattern and environment. Similarly, immigration causes hybridity and thus in turn leads to identity crisis, creating displacement and estrangement and sometimes-cultural deformation of subjects. Thus, Ashcroft, Griffith and Tiffin as quoted by Bhabha define hybridity, "the revaluation of the assumption of the assumption of colonial identity through repetition of discriminatory identity effects" (*Postcolonial* l34). Hybridity as a shared postcolonial condition has been seen as part of the tendency of discourse analysis to de-historicize and de-locate cultures from their temporal spatial,

geographical and linguistic contexts and to lead to an abstract, globalized concept of the textual that obscures the specificities of particular cultural situations.

Hybridity, Bhabha argues, subverts the narrative of colonial power and dominants cultures. The series of inclusions and exclusions on which a dominant culture is premised are deconstructed by the very entry of the formerly excluded subjects into the mainstream discourse. The dominant culture is contaminated by the linguistic racial differences of the native self. Hybridity can thus be seen, in Bhabha's interpretation, as a counter narrative, a critique of the Canon and its exclusion of other narratives. In other world, the hybridity – is a conspicuous illustration of its uncertainty, and second that the migration of yesterday's "savages" from their peripheral spaces of the names of their "master" underlies a blessing invasion that, by "Third-worlding" the centre, creates "Fissures" within the very structures that sustain it.

Mimicry is a notion that has played an important role in both feminist and postcolonial theory. The term was initially used in Biology to refer to the close external resemblance which one living creature bears to another, or to some inanimate object. Now, it transcends its area to include other areas of knowledge and expertise. Clearly, the central usefulness of the concept involves the subversive potential contained in the forced and half-hearted adoption of the style or the conventions of the dominant authority – whether national, cultural or gender or gender-political. The concept also carries with it same of the association of 'poking fun' – a sort of body language equivalent of parody.

When colonial discourse encourages the colonized subject to 'mimic' the colonizer, by adopting the colonizer's cultural habits, assumption, institutions and values, the result is a 'blurred copy' of the colonizer that can be quite threatening. Rob

Nixon says "Caribbean nations, it is a society founded on colonial fantasies and so severed from the cracks of the 'real' (the absence of the real world) world that fantasy has become a national pastime" (134). What Naipaul sees, in short, is a hollow imitation of Europe, a pretence of a nation that doesn't recognize the self-destructive character of what he terms it philistinism. Mimicry therefore, locates a crack in the certainty of colonial dominance an uncertainty in its control of the behavior of the colonized. Quoting Bhabha, Ashcroft says," The coping of the colonizing culture, behavior, manners and values by the colonized contains both mockery and a certain "menace', so that, mimicry is at once resemblance and menace (*Key* 140). Mimicry reveals the limitation in the authority of colonial discourse, almost as though colonial authority of inevitably embodies the seeds of its own destruction.

Mimicry emerges as the representation of difference that is itself a process of disavowals: mimicry is, thus the sign of double articulation, a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which 'appropriates' the other as it visualizes power. In his novel, *The Mimic Men*, V.S. Naipaul presents "We Pretended to be real, to be learning, to be preparing ourselves for life, we mimic men of the new world, one unknown corner of it, with all its reminders of the corruption that came so quickly to the new" (123).

In this extract the narrator, Ralph Singh Expresses the predicament of the people who are mimic men in the colonial world. Mimicry is also the sign of the inappropriate, however, a difference or recalcitrance which coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance, and prose an immanent threat to both 'normalizing' knowledge and disciplinary powers. Mimicry makes the colonized subject forget himself in forging other culture, rules and values. The copy culture becomes the subject of mockery. So, Bhabha rightly observes that:

It is from this area between mimicry and mockery, where the reforming civilizing mission is threatened by the displacing gaze of its disciplinary double, that my instances of colonial imitation come. What they all share is a discursive process by which the express or slippage produced by the ambivalence of mimicry calmest the same, but not quite does not merely 'rupture' the discourse, but becomes transformed into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a 'partial' presence. (86)

The mimicry of colonial power in terms of education, civilizing mission, clothing, customs, governance, food and many other aspects of human life seems not only evident but also inevitable. Again Bhabha says", colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same but not quite" (86). The colonized mentality to go through all this hybrid mentality is caused by the post-war cultural bewilderment and loss of ones cultural identity.

Mimicry, thus understood, is related to the culture of others of other people, often of the so-called high cultures. Nevertheless, it is not necessary that they, who do it, should reject their own culture. In this sense there emerges as Bhabha says, the double articulation of the identity, sometimes, these double articulations are intermingled in such a way that there appears a sense of mongrelism. In this sense, it is a related term to hybridity and crisis of cultural identity.

Now, in the succeeding chapter, Naipaul's one of the thought provoking texts *An Area of Darkness* will be analyzed. It will be done illustrating the ways in which Naipaul has handled the issue of estrangement of those who are displaced and separated from the root culture. Efforts will be made to analyze the travelogue, keeping in mind the various facts, figures and modes of estrangement, which are

discussed above to some extent. Apart from this, main focus will be given to analyze the sense of estrangement in relation to the narrator and finally, to the level of culture and society he belongs to. It is because; the joys and pangs, hopes and aspirations, attachment and detachment, behaviors and attitudes are after all constructed by the culture in which one survives.

Introduction

As culture refers to a number of different types of activities, on one level, we all feel that we have a culture that we belong to and that gives us the frames to the question like who we are. There is another level of culture which we don't possess, but with which we engage, that is, the sort of culture which is manifest in particular things, such as art, music, literature, thus, literature is a main source to acquire cultural identity for those who happen to be uprooted or grown up in a hybrid culture.

Culture shapes the human behaviour, and helps people to guide their action. Unexpectedly, it gives the individuals their identity. However, the changing place or culture brings identity crisis in the lives of individuals as they can not assimilate themselves in a new culture or place. More than this, the superiority of new culture, if it is so, dominates individuals as they feel inferiority of their culture in new culture. When someone grown up in one culture is placed in another, she/he may face cultural estrangement that causes fear, anger, loss, attachment, detachment, fascination, frustration, loneliness, hatred, helplessness and so forth.

Naipaul's one of he most famous travelogues, *An Area of Darkness* depicts the cultural change, cultural problems and its consequences in the lives of the narrator and characters. As Naipaul's family, like thousands of others, was forced by poverty to migrate from India to the West Indies as an indentured servants, a journey for which they suffered a loss of caste, became forever disconnected from India, and yet discovered that they would never feel at home. The narrator, a spokesperson of the writer, expresses the pangs and sufferings faced by the servants in a colonial world, in

lack of cultural history. Having found no place to live and no distinct culture to identify oneself, the narrator reveals his pain, "There were few Indians there and no one likes us on the street. Though everything was very close and houses were open to every kind of noise and no one could really be private in his yard, we continued to live our old enclosed way" (200). Around the world these communities found themselves torn between half remembered stories about their ancestors ("mangled bits of old India").

History made Naipaul an exile depriving him of a part of any identify of rootless, and has spent his career as a writer and an inveterate traveler attempting to understand this phenomenon on a personal and global scale. Thus, this text, *An Area of Darkness* is a quest for cultural root. The narrator grown up in a hybrid culture in Trinidad goes to India to find a cultural space to merge himself but finds no proper place to lean upon. This cultural placelessness in his life brings frustration, confusion and estrangement. He feels that he belongs no where. He doesn't find a cultural tie, to overcome this cultural estrangement; he goes to England as it is the center of his world. He encounters different people with multi-cultural background yet, he remains aloof, his desperate efforts to mingle with them become meaningless. He himself gets lost. He remained unknown, not more than an inhabitant of a big city. The narrator reveals that:

> I came to London. It had become the center of my world and I had
>
> worked hard to come to it. And I was lost .London was not the center
>
> of my world. I had been misled; but there was no where else to go. It
>
> was a good place to getting lost in, a city no one ever knew, a city
>
> explored from the neutral heart outwards until, after years, it defined

itself into a jumble of clearings separated by stretches of the unknown, through which narrowest of paths had been cut. (38)

His visit remained meaningless in London. It made him more unknown. He tried his best to achieve his identity, but in a big city he was more confined to a smaller world that he had ever known. Thus, the narrator like other characters, (Aziz, Jivan, Ramon, Bunty) feels distorted having found no place to locate himself. His different cultures – Indian, Trinidadian, and English confuse him. It makes him identityless, and consequently, he becomes like a rootless crow of mist. No new cultural milieu gives him a fixed cultural space to be assimilated, in lack of his own cultural history. It causes him to face different challenges and fragmentations which give him a sense of estrangement and makes him a uprooted person from this very world.

Identity Crisis

Identity crisis is felt when something assumed to be fixed, coherent and stable is displaced by the experience of doubt and uncertainty. Identity is not something once and for all; rather it constantly keeps on changing according to the context and situations. So, the fully unified, completed, secure and coherent identity is a day-dream. There different cultures have contributed Naipaul's identity – Indian, Trinidadian and English. He always feels the identity crisis. This very constant haunt made him reveal his trauma in his works. In his novel, *An Area of Darkness,* he reviews his life and ponders among other things, the distortions of his identity during his on year stay in India in early 1960s.

An Area of Darkness is about identity crisis of the expatriate who finds himself no where from beginning to end. There is high amalgam of autobiography and travel narrative to explore the issues of culture and identity. Starting with the

narrator's experience of coming to India from Trinidad, he comes to acknowledge that his ancestral place is more dearer than the English colony that is unable to give him a sense of belonging. Indeed, he is happy to find the source about himself in India. He expresses:

> I had grown up in a British colony and it might have been expected that much would have been familiar to me but England was at least as many faceted as India. England as it expressed itself in Trinidad was not England I had lived in; and neither of these countries could be related to the England that was the source of so much I now saw about me. (199)

Hence, the narrator feels happy to know about his source culture. The natural beauty and this cultural background, Hindu religion gives him more pleasure. He finds his existence after finding the religious picture in his grandmother's house that used to dwell in his imagination. He says, "For in the India of my childhood, the land which in my imagination was an extension, separate from the alienness by which we ourselves were surrounded, of my grandmother's house, there was no alien presence" (199). His own world, though clearly fading, was still separate; and an involvement with the English, of whom on the island he knows little, would have seemed a more unlikely violation than an involvement. He is much frustrated to live in the hybrid society in Trinidad. They always lose something neither there is possibility of wholeness in life. The wholeness is only possible in India. "The Chinese or the Africans, of whom we knew more, into this alineness we daily ventured, and at length we were absorbed into it. But we knew there had been change, gain, loss (200). Thus, the narrator finds no stable identity in his society. He knows that something which

was once whole had been washed away what is whole for him is the origin that is India.

The narrator is in India to find his cultural history. Having not found it, he is much depressed. He can not get the romance from the Indian cultures, neither he can follow them. It is impossible to separate them from their romance. He feels intruder because he says, "I was not English or Indian; I was denied the victories of both" (102).

The narrator is in the pursuit of finding his cultural footsteps rather becomes the victim of displacement and alienation. It uproots him from his native soil and deprives him of his native sky. He belongs to Trinidad and his ancestry to India, his ancestors have lost their identify in Trinidad as they have lost their connection with India, her customs, heritages, cultures and traditions, when they were brought to Trinidad, "on a five year indentured labour" (277). But their contracts ends in 1940 and all Indians are left there without history. This lack of ancestor's history is also the lack of his history. History gives a man his identify and the lack of history results in identity crisis. Every man needs his history; it helps him to know who he is, his inner desire for knowing his cultural history is to gain his individual identity. He knows that:

> When he was a young man (Jussodra said) my grandfather left this
> village to go to Banaras for study, as Brahmins had immediately done.
> But my father is poor, his family poor, and times were hard; there
> might even have been a famine. One day my grandfather met a man
> who told him of a country for away called Trinidad. There were
> Indians in Trinidad, laborers; they needed pundits and teachers. The
> wages were good, land was cheap and a free passage could be

arranged. The man who spoke to my grandfather knew what he was

talking about. He was an *arkatia* a recruiter; when times were good . . .

people were willing to listen to his stories. So my grand father

indentured himself for five years and went to Trinidad. (277)

Poverty is the cruelest punishment for all for all time. It can't be compromised with

anything else. The narrator's forefathers became the victim of poverty. Its ugly reality

destroyed and displaced them from India. They were bound to be indenture labour in

hope of prosperous days and a very secured future to their coming generation. Had

they known about the result of their new generation's identity crisis, they would never

have migrated there.

What the narrator finds that India is a featureless area. He finds so many

people and things but he can't connect him with them. On the one hand, he lacks his

stable identify on the other, he knows the degree of pain to be an uprooted man. As a

result, the area becomes an area of darkness. In the dark as nothing can be seen

similarly, he can't find his identity in the vast land. His bitter reality does not help him

to accept the area. He comments:

To me as a child the India that had produced so many of the persons

and things around me was featurelessness and I thought of the time

when the transference was made as a period of darkness, darkness

which also extended to the land, as darkness surrounds a hut at

evening, though for a little way around that there is still light, the light

was the area of my experience, in time and place. And even now,

though time had widened, though space has contracted and I have

traveled lucidly over that area which was to *the area of darkness*,

something of darkness remains, in those attitudes, those ways of

thinking and seeing which are no longer mine. (24)

The narrator lacks his own coherent history and becomes the victim of a hybrid

culture. He doesn't possess a solid identity. He thus, savors the irony of hybrid

identity between two places (India and Trinidad). There is nothing in his appearance

or dress to distinguish him and to locate him in a proper place, it leads him to identity

crisis. In Trinidad, he is known as Indian-Brahmins in England he is Anglo-Indian,

but now in India, he is nobody, a faceless man. He says:

In Trinidad to be an Indian was to be distinctive. To be anything there

was distinctive, difference was each man's attribute. To be an Indian in

England was distinctive; in Egypt it was more so. Now in Bombay I

entered a shop or a restaurant and awaited a special quality of

response. And there was nothing. It was like being denied part of my

reality, again and again I was caught, I was faceless. I might sink

without a trace into that Indian crowd. (39)

Thus, in short, the narrator's identity is in crisis because of his colonial background,

his educational background and the lack of his ancestor's history, the hybrid identity

shaped by different cultures and his inability to harmonize the different cultures.

Problem of Location in *An Area of Darkness*

Location is inseparably related to a fixed place or source, when one lacks a

stable place doubtlessly, he feels problem of location. Now, the narrator and some

characters of the text, *An Area of Darkness* become the victim of it. They always roar

for a space on the periphery of root culture. The problem of location grips one when

he moves from known to unknown place.

It's a phenomenon that may be result of transportation from one country to another by slavery or imprisonment, by invasion and settlement a consequence of willing or unwilling movement. Dislocation does not involve only in slavery but also includes the psychological and personal dislocation that results from the cultural change. One feels estranged and dislocated in new socio-cultural milieu. "Displacement demonstrates the very complex interaction of language, history and environment" (391). If one is clutched by different language, history and environment she/he feels estranged or displaced. A sense of displacement, of lack of fit between language and place may be experienced by both those who possess English as a mother tongue and those who speak it as a second language. In both cases, the sense of dislocation from historical homeland is possible.

In *An Area of Darkness*, Naipaul presents the personal dislocation of the protagonist, the first person narrator and of other characters who loom their life in lack of existence. He also describes the historical dislocation of Indian community in Trinidad. In the beginning, the narrator talks about his friend named, Ramon who died in the car crash, never had place to locate himself in this world. The narrator says, "He was a child, an innocent, a maker; someone for whom the world had never held either glory or pathos; someone for whom there had been no place" (36). He was guiltless of humor or posturing. One place was like another; the world is full of such places in which, unseeing, one passes one's days. The narrator expresses his intimacy and sympathy towards him, because he was the part of his life, in a truest sense, a representative of the displaced and the alienated people. He says, "We were a tiny, special part of that featureless, unknown country, meaningful to us, if thought about it, only in that we were its remote descendants" (36). As Naipaul had left Trinidad for

England, at the age of eighteen to quench his literary thrust, it became his center but always suffered by the sense of rootlessness.

Now, his narrator is suffered by the same trauma. He finds no place to locate him in that far land, as a result one has to return to his own native place "England, a country of mist and rain and forest, from which the traveler is soon to hurry back to a warm familiar land for us no such land existed" (36). The narrator has to fight for his existence whenever he goes. So, the sense of no state man haunts him much. He says "The India, then which was the background to my childhood was an area of the imagination" (37). He can't mingle himself with the ancestral place. Language gives a man a sense of belonging. If one can communicate in a new environment, she/he feels pleasure, and it saves from the sense o dislocation. The narrator can't thrill with the Hindi. He says, "I now had almost no Hindi but it was language which divided me from what I knew of Hindi," (37). He fails to be owned by India thus, he feels estranged and displaced. Then, the narrator goes to London to follow his literary ambition. He works hard to achieve a space yet, he gets lost. The frustration engulfs him "London was not the centre of my world. I had been misled; but there was no where to go" (38). The psychological pang grows bigger. There is no place for him even in England, it proves him a man of no state. He further says:

> Here I became no more than an inhabitant of a big city, robbed of loyalties time passing, taking me away from what I was, thrown more and more into myself, fighting to keep my balance and to keep alive the thought of the clear world beyond the brick and asphalt and the chaos of railway lines. All mythical lands faded, and in the big city I was confined to a smaller world than I and ever known. I become my flat, my desk, my name. (38)

Like the narrator, another character, Jivan also becomes the victim of placelessness. He is poor by birth, poverty drags him to be a servant in a factory leaving behind his village at the age of thirteen. Bombay becomes his dream land far work unlike the narrator. He hardly earns his bread and sleeps on the stretch of pavement at night. Traveller's rest and the pavement are the lodges for poor people. Sometimes, he runs pavement to pavement to be safe from the hooligans at night. Thus, Jivan comes to know that there is more place but no place for poor people in the world, in lack of proper place, he is bound to continue a street life.

The narrator searches both an ancestral place and root culture, but can not be owned either by these. The tragedy is that when he desperately tries to mingle himself with the cultural root, it becomes a fantasy. In a great pain, he says, "I was not English or Indian" (102). Thus, the arrival of Indians in Trinidad brings them a sense of estrangement as they are historically disconnected with India and her cultures. They arrived in a place from where the return or to join the root culture is almost impossible. So, he says, "I was faceless; I had no where to go" (39). Hence, they can't return to the place of their origin. In this way, the narrator feels a sense of estrangement and he experiences the historical dislocation of indenture Indians as well. In a truest sense, V.S. Naipaul's *An Area of Darkness* is a complicated accounts of such dislocations his very own. This is the memoir whose form and shape is: a review of the personal and social condition in the country of origin, an account of the uprooting and passage to the new land, the unexpected and harsh condition found and endured by the displaced person in the construction of a new life.

Sense of Cultural Estrangement

Estrangement means a kind of break or separation to be away from someone or some thing, cultural estrangement refers to the cultural alienation, it may be of

individual from one another, or from a specific situation or a process. It also comprises the dimension of powerlessness, meaninglessness, rootlessness, isolation, normlessness, self -estrangement and so forth. Exile also evolves the sense of dislocation as it necessarily brings the individual to a different place then, gives the victims a sense of estrangement.

V.S. Naipaul was born in the Indian community of Trinidad, but at the age of eighteen, he left for England, having won the scholarship to Oxford, England has become his base ever since but he was continuously meditated on his origins and traveled the world, exemplified in cultural estrangement and dislocation. His writings express the crisis of an exile, a result of his own experience as an Indian in the West Indies, a West Indian in England and a wandering intellectual in the modern world.

Naipaul's *An Area of Darkness*, mostly depicts the estrangement of the narrator along with other characters which results from cultural change as he leaves his native land Trinidad and goes to India to find his cultural footsteps to be merged with. In India, he visits place to place (Bombay, Kashmir, Srinager, Goa and finally Utter Pradesh) but no where he can connect his self with his ancestral place rather, he becomes a faceless, unknown and a very strange citizen. Even in his own ancestral homeland (Utter Pradesh) becomes a far land and a strange place that proves him a stranger. This is the psychological trauma of the narrator to be a rootless man and belonging no where as well as the reality of the writer.

He comes to India with the hope of finding a cultural space rather it becomes a void, a false land like a shadow, which doesn't have any coherent relation with the concrete object. He says, "India had in a special way been the background of my childhood. It was the country from which my grandfather came, a country never physically described and there fore never real" (21). He can't find cultural tie with the

country found later "It couldn't be related to the county discovered later" (21). It is India from where his grandfather and other people had gone to Trinidad as servants but never carried the cultural mark with them. Thus, it makes the narrator culturally disconnected and geographically isolated man. He says:

> India remained a special, isolated area of ground which had produced my grandfather and others I knew who had been born in India and had come to Trinidad as indentured labours, though that past too had fallen into the void into which India had fallen, for they carried no mark of indenture, no mark even of having of labourers. (22)

The narrator's failure to be a part of his ancestral land leads him towards loneliness and solitariness. This solitariness gives him a sense of estrangement which often haunts him, when he fails to merge himself into this land, so, he says "I have traveled lucidly over that area which was to me the area of darkness, something darkness remains, in those attitudes, those ways of thinking and seeing, which are not mine" (24). He further says that, though he comes from a religious pundits family, he can not understand the religion especially, those religious ceremonies and mantras (ritual verse) pronounced by the pundits. He says, "I took no pleasure in religious ceremonies. They were too long, and the food came only at the end. I didn't understand the language" (27). It gives him more pain and proof to be an estranged man who is unable to understand his own root culture. The colonial education has made him misfit to be accommodated by his own root culture. This incident makes him feel social out caste; he feels himself rejected from the society. He learns to accept the separation. The feeling of two worlds (his own and ancestral's) come side by side but he can not juxtapose them. Now he realizes that:

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

Melancholy becomes the part of his life and he feels to be lost in it. Thus, meaninglessness, isolation and self-estrangement nag him and his way of life when he is culturally, geographically, religiously and linguistically unable to assimilate himself with his ancestral place and with their footsteps. Not only this much, out of his anxiety, he says," The India, then, which was the background to my childhood was an area of imagination. It was not the real country" (37). He further criticizes the Indian language, arts and films. It is only language he thinks, gave him divided identity. He despises such language" I now had almost no Hindi. But it was more that language which divided me from what I knew India, Indian films were both tedious and disquieting; they delighted in decay, agony and death" (37). Language is the tool and power of expression. Displacement brings dispossession of this power, which aggravates the sense of estrangement due to the lack of expression thus, it is the fact for the narrator that he feels like dead in the ancestral home land and this strangeness and solitariness persists in his life. He says, "In India I had so far felt myself a visitor" (148).

The narrator feels very nervous and shattered when he is not known by anybody else. When he goes to Bombay, he tries hard to be owned by the people and the place as well rather, he becomes only an islander. He tries hard to find his social

similarities but the people he meets in Delhi clubs and Bombay flats, the villagers and officials in country districts are all strangers for him, whose background he can not read. The landscape is too harsh and wrong which with he can not relate himself. He seeks the similarities between the landscapes of India and Trinidad but no where he finds the similarities thus, he feels estranged and culturally dislocated man. He expresses his pangs:

> From the day of my arrival I had learned that social similarities meant little. The people I had met, in Delhi clubs and Bombay flats, the villagers and officials in country 'districts', were strangers whose background I couldn't read. They were at once narrower and grander. Their choice is almost every thing seemed more restricted than mine, yet they were clearly inhabitants of big country . . . The landscape was harsh and wrong. I couldn't relate to myself: I was looking for the balanced rural landscape of Indian Trinidad . . . In all the striking detail of India there was nothing which I could like with my own experience of India in a small town in Trinidad. (149)

The feeling of strangeness haunts him time and again as he feels himself away from his ancestral homeland. He moves place to place in search of cultural space to lean upon he goes to Kashmir from Bombay with a same purpose, the surrounding environment becomes alien for him. He feels excited to be among the Himalayas. He feels linked with them, out of sudden cry he speaks the name 'India' (178). Yet, it remains a fantasy to be mingled with Indian culture for him. Moreover, such deep and dark feelings foster a strong sense of estrangement. He says:

> It was the joy of being among mountains; it was the special joy of being among the Himalayas. I felt linked to them. I liked

speaking the name: India, the Himalayas: they went together. In so many of the brightly colored religious picture in my grandmother's house I had seen these fountains, cones of white against simple, cold blue. They had become part of the India of my fantasy. (178)

The more he wants to be detached from India the more it attracts him. He thinks that he would never see those beautiful scenery in Trinidad. He walks through the busiest market places and among the dusty stock of Pavement bookseller. It is more lovelier. He wants to hug everyone with compassion as if they are his own relatives. To reject this for him is hundred times painful that to forget Trinidad. He says, "This is mine" (179). He flows in his emotion. Ultimately, he comes to realize the ugly reality that one day he will leave it, he'll turn his back again. This sense of strangeness makes him solitary and isolated. Thus, he accepts:

To reject the legend of the hundred thousand Sheshnag was easy. But the fact of the legend established the lake as mine. It was mine, but it was something I had lost, something on which I would soon have to turn my back again. Was it fanciful to think of these Himalays, so well charted and perhaps once better known, as the Indian symbol of loss mountains to which, on their burning pains, they looked back with yearning, and to which they could now return only in pilgrimages, legends and picture? (179)

The narrator fails to assimilate him with the city, he feels alien wherever he goes, it brings a kind of sadness for him. So, he despises that now onwards, India never can do a magical attraction. He says it is a country of darkness. It is just a mythical area

that seems to exist in timelessness, but in reality, it is far land and *An Area of Darkness*. He says:

> India had not worked its magic on me. It remained the land of my
> childhood *an area of darkness*; like the Himalayan passes, it was
> closing up again, as fast as I withdrew from it, into a land of myth; it
> seemed to exist in just the timelessness which I had imagined as a
> child, into which for all that I walked on Indian earth, I knew I could
> not penetrate. (274)

He spends a year in India yet, it never attracts him rather, it gives him a deep sense of estrangement and alienation. His imagined mythical land and his ancestors' homeland changes into a dry and desert area. It makes him more solitary and very aloof than before, in a truest meaning, he became simply an islander. It makes him a content of colonial, a man without history and culture. To have no history and culture means to have no identity consequently, one becomes an itinerant in the world. He thinks that it is his duty to come to the ancestral place. The birth place of his grandparents always haunts him but after visiting Utter Pradesh from where his grand father had gone to Trinidad, he becomes more stranger, he cannot celebrate even a moment. The place can not own him as her own, rather gives him more strangeness. It is the saddest thing for one to forget his forebears and their land because mother and motherland are dearer for every one, however, he accepts the cruelest reality as:

> In a year I had not learned acceptance. I had learner any separateness
> from India, was content to be a colonial, without a past, without
> ancestors. Duty alone had brought me to this town in eastern utter
> Pradesh, not even graced by a rain celebrated only for its connections
> with the Buddha and its Backwardness. And it was duty that, after a

few days of indecision, idleness and reading, was as taking me along

this country road, infested with peasants indifferent to wheeled

vehicles, to the village which my mother's father had left as an

indenture more than sixty years ago. (274)

Finally, the narrator says that he was really alone and lonely in India. The fear and

loneliness as he got in India is always painful and unbearable. So, he says; "It was a

journey that ought not to have been made; it had broken my life in two" (289). His

visit makes him an alienated and isolated man. He couldn't follow the ancestral

footsteps neither he could assimilate himself with their culture. He feels nervous for

being an estranged and a rootless man. The sense of estrangement haunts him

wherever he goes.

Sense of Hybridity and Mimicry

Hybridity is inextricably related to multi-cultural society in which people

foster a new type of culture just by imitating each other's culture. They become

mimic men, degraded from the root culture. So, hybridity and mimicry are intricately

related to each other. In a mixed-culture there will be a conglomeration of different

cultures, then cross-cultural experience becomes a common phenomenon and thereby

people become estranged and isolated form their origin. Mimicry makes them misfit

to be merged with any culture. In his text, *An Area of Darkness* Naipaul presents a

similar situation that makes the narrator along with host charters, victim of hybridity

and mimicry that makes him citizen of no state.

In the beginning pages, Naipaul depicts the estranged and uprooted condition

of the narrator. He is vigorous to find his root culture and eager to merge with it. So,

at the first sight in India, he finds an unbelievable scene. One the one hand, he finds

the malnutrative children crying for *bakshis,*on the other hand, he finds the fossil of

the imperialism, European-style shops, franch-hairdnesser, French perfume which he

no longer believes. It surprisingly gives him a strange sense. He can't find the

similarity between the stories what he had heard from his forefathers and the real

India he finds. He says, "There were reminders of imperialisms that had withdrawn in

the dark, glass-caged European-style shops, wilting for lack of patronage; in the sad

whispering of the French hairdresser that French perfumes could no longer be

obtained . . ." (4). From this fact, he knows that Indians have known to copy the

imperial culture though they have forgotten to uplift their economy. Not only in

economy but also in language, he finds the fusion of English and Hindi. They are

slowly but gradually forgetting their own language. He finds a lady who had two or

three gold teeth and was called by everyone "Gold Teeth Nanee, Gold Teeth

'Grandmother' the mixture of English and Hindi revealing to what extent the world to

which she belonged was receding" (22).

The narrator reveals the pain to live in the hybridity culture that makes him

away and estranged from his root culture. He can not deny Trinidad where he grew

up, having heterogeneous people and culture. Indian society, more or less happened to

imitate others culture. Ultimately, he became a victim of such multi-racial society. He

exemplifies that:

> We who came after could not deny Trinidad. The house we lived in
>
> war distinctive, but not more distinctive than many. It was easy to
>
> accept that we lived on an island where there were all sorts of people
>
> and all sorts of houses. We ate certain foods, performed certain
>
> ceremonies . . . . We expected others to have their own. We didn't wish
>
> to share theirs, we didn't expect them to share ours. They were what

they were; we were what we were. We were never instructed in this.

To our condition as Indians in a multiracial society, we gave no

thought. (25)

The sadness comes in his life when he has to live in a mixed -society. He feels sorry

to miss his particular way of cooking, eating and living style. He becomes a mimic

man and mimicry is the way of his life. There is communication gap but mimicry

comes easily, later, everything he adopts becomes his own. He says:

It is not easy to understand just how communications occurred, but we

were steadily adopting the food styles of others: the portugues stew of

tomato and onions in which almost anything might be done . . . Negro

way with yams, plantation [. . .]. Everything we adopted became our

own; the outside was sill to be dreaded, any my prejudices were so

strong that when I left Trinidad. (28)

The narrator already knows each other's culture before going to U.K in the

literary pursuit. Lots of mimicries come into his life and make him strange from root

culture. He becomes an out caste in India, which really makes him depressed and

uprooted similar to a man of street culture. He says, "Caste system in India was not

what it had been to me in Trinidad. In Trinidad caste had no meaning in our day to

day life" (28). It really aches his heart to be an outsider and out caste in his ancestral

homeland.

Not only the narrator but also one of the host characters, Mr. Malhotra

becomes an unacceptable man in India. He also becomes an isolated and very

estranged from his root culture. People in India perceive him as a colonial

representative. No one can measure the degree of his pain to be an enemy in one's

own native land. The narrator narrates, "For Malhotra, too, with his Italian styled suit and English university tie, the society and his violations were new. East Africa, the English university and the years in Europe had made him just enough of colonial to be out of place in India" (49).

Naipaul finds the outer and inner worlds not being separated that he had in Trinidad. They co-exist; the society pretends to be colonial. Its mimicry is both less and more than a colonial mimicry. He says that it is the special mimicry of an old country, which has been without natives aristocracy for thousands of years and has learned to make room for outsiders, but only at top. The mimicry changes, the inner world remains constant; this is the secret of survival, Naipaul says mimicry might be too harsh a word for what appears so compressive and profound such as: buildings, railways, bureaucratic system and the whole socio-economic structure. Mimicry makes the people of Trinidad a schizophrenic. The introduction of new science and technology along with European values made a transformation in the society. The Indian society was, in fact, a ritualistic and traditional community, dominated by a certain tribal people. The new reality baffled them and made them schizophrenic.

Naipaul presents another character, Bunty very stringed and aloof from the society. His root culture is Indian, he is perhaps the three generation removed from purely Indian India; he, possibly like his father, has been to an Indian on English public school and one of the two English universities, whose accent, through all the encircling hazards of Indian intonation. The narrator says, "He is a blend of East and west" (57). He thus, becomes a victim of hybridity and mimicry.The Indians can't mingle him in the society.They mock him. He has some manners; he has keen interest in decoration. His neatness and cleanliness is very extra. Indians don't like him yet, he still wishes to be an Indian. According to the narrator:

It is easy for Indians to make fun of Bunty of being called 'daddy' by

English speaking children; for his imitated manners; he rises when

ladies come into his room . . . (the Indian lavatory and the Indian

Kitchen are the visitor's nightmare). But Bunty is not fool. He has

withdrawn from India, but he does not wish to be a European. (58)

At any cost, Bunty wants to be an Indian, he loves his root culture and homeland. Not
finding any cultural place to be mingled with, the narrator feels sorry for Bunty and
says, "The poor becomes faceless" (67). The western mimicry has made them subject
of mockery and satire but he requests to ignore the background and accept the reality.
He says "first the background, the obvious, must be ignored" (67).

Obviously, the narrator searches his existence in ancestral homeland that
really doesn't exist and his cultural root which has been cut off because of his
circumstance to live and grow up in one of the British colonies, where he feels more
stranger than to be in India. It brings him self-estrangement. Neither he can find his
footsteps on his forefathers nor can be happy in his British dominated colony, He
knows it that to seek a fixed space from Trinidad remains false and to survive in the
cultural root becomes a fantasy. So, he expresses his agony as:

I had grown up in a British colony and it might have been expected

that much would have been familiar to me. But England was at least as

many faceted as India. England, as it expressed itself in Trinidad, was

not the England I had lived in; and neither of these countries could be

related to England that was the source of so much that I now saw about

me. (199)

The narrator does the self realization for being a victim of hybridity and mimicry and not to belong any where in the world; not to find the cultural root and not to find the bliss of life in the ancestral land. It is not less than to have a hollow life. This proves him an islander and a man of no state. Everywhere he is taken as if a man of another space .He feels that because of their involvement with the English culture their real world is fading away. Moreover, their involvement with the Chinese and African culture made them misfit. He says more as:

> Our own world, though clearly fading was still separate and an involvement with the English, of whom on the island we know little, would have seemed a more unlikely violation than an involvement with the Chinese or the Africans, of whom we knew more. Into this aloneness we daily ventured and at length we were absorbed into it. But we knew there had been change, gain, loss. We know that something which was once whole had been washed away. (200)

The Indians of Trinidad, as shown in Naipaul's novel, are a decadent group. Rootless and alienated, they live in a world of cultural confusion. Their lives and interest are petty and trivial. To these people the outer and inner worlds have physical separateness; they don't co-exist. Theirs is a mixed culture.

Naipaul's narrator in this text, An *Area of Darkness* shows his tragic reality to be enslaved in hybrid culture in Trinidad cutting off his Hindu heritage. When Naipaul went to England, he discovered that he was rootless, it gave him a sense of estrangement neither he had a personal sense of identity, nor an Indian link, nor even a British. His chartered journey to England via the colonial enslavement in Trinidad has left him far away from his Hindu culture. He says: half way across the world was Trinidad a truly imperial creation. There people of many races accepted English rules,

English institution and the English language without questioning yet England and Britishness, as displayed in India, were absent" (213).

Hence, an enslaved man has no religion no identity and no place to live. This has been dilemma of a Caribbean writer for he has seen past collapsing and the possibility of a new set of cultural pattern appears bleak. His world is a divided that ever gives a sense of estrangement and the feeling of isolation to its people. A new culture which should have emerged has failed to take roots. Obviously, the people of such place will suffer from the problem of rootlessness and homelessness having found no distinct cultural identity. To be misfit with any culture means to be estranged form the world thus, the sense of estrangement always becomes key a concern for them, which Naipaul wants to mitigate through his writings.

IV. Conclusion

The world has become a global village because of science and technology thus, the sense of estrangement has become a common experience of expatriates, exiles, indentures and those who are compelled to leave their origin in one or other way and bound to leave in remote land in nostalgia. For this reason Naipaul is considered as a voice of dire times, who has a strong sense of estrangement and dislocation.

The identity is inextricably related with culture we belong to, which shapes our life and gives us our identity. It is not a fixed source for ever rather it goes on changing with the passage of time. As the people fall in trap of changing their culture, cultural values also transfer along with them as a result cultural loss has appeared as a dominant problem in the modern world. People have been uprooted and alienated, and that sense of loss always haunts them. The changing place or culture brings identity crisis in the lives of uprooted individuals as they can not assimilate themselves in a new place. More than this, the superiority of new culture, if it is more powerful, dominates individuals as they feel inferiority of their culture in a new culture.

Hence, culture is the source of identity. It is also the source of binding and dividing people. People belonging to the same country can not feel being the member of it neither they will have any existence, when it is the matter of the cultural difference so, in this sense, these migrant people, expatriates or exiles become nameless and homeless citizen of no state. Thus, the narrator of the novel *An Area of Darkness* says "There was no place to live". The dislocated people feel harassed and estranged by the new culture, they happen to face. The great division comes in their life because they don't find any coherent relation between past and present. When we feel ourselves cut off from our root culture, we continuously feel estranged and

displaced as the narrator does in the text, *An Area of Darkness.* The narrator in the novel comes to India from Trinidad to find his cultural foot steps but he finds no space to be merged with consequently, he feels estranged. The sense of estrangement saddens him so, he says "whole side of India closed to me". Therefore, finding the cultural space becomes a key concern for him.

Next thing to be considered is language. People feel themselves relaxed and comfortable when they can communicate their feelings and emotion in their own language. If one is unable to communicate in her/his accustomed language in a new cultural milieu, the lack creates a sense of estrangement. They can not expose themselves with new language they happen to adopt as a result, the harassment engulfs them. They always have divided identity. The narrator faces the same situation in the text "I was not English or Indian, I was divided the victories of both". He feels distorted and isolated in the ancestral home land. Other characters are also the victim of distortions in lack of language. Their own native land becomes a remote land for them. There are taken as a second-class citizen.

Naipaul's *An Area of Dankness*, demonstrates how people feel shattered to live in the colony being disconnected from the root culture. Culture doesn't provide only home but also provider a sense of belonging. The sense of belonging gives us a meaning of life. Definitely, one loves much his home land and root culture when he is dislocated from his origin. The narrator says, "India was mine but it was something I had lost". From this fact, we can say that it is very difficult and hard for people to be separated from their root culture. For the dislocated man, there won't have any escape to join the root culture as a result they mooch in the remote land.

The next important point is, when people find themselves in a new place they continually feel a loss of cultural belonging. They never find the wholeness in the new

geography they happen to live in. The new language becomes a thread of separation. Wherever they reach, life becomes a void and meaningless like the narrator in *An Area of Darkness.* It can aptly term as a sense of estrangement. For a man like Naipaul, who neither has a homeland nor can find a cultural space in the ancestral homeland, his creation becomes a home for him. Hence, in the books, he has written and writes, seeks his root culture and ancestral foot steps to be merged with.

Finally, history made Naipaul an exile depriving him of a past, of any identity, of root, and has spent his career as a writer to find his root, and inveterate traveler attempting to understand this phenomenon on a personal and a global level. He had started his journey to find the origin form *The Mystic Masseur* (1957) till today, it is continued. This travelogue, *An Area of Darkness* is only a big step in the quest of his root culture. In the text, we find his roars in lack of cultural space, because he has been victim of mixed-heritage. His different identifies–Indian, Trinidadian and English are his pseudo-identities as a fact, he finds no proper place. Thus, he always feels estranged and constantly writes to overcome this trauma in his books. It gives a way to think about the link between his state of living and his creativity.

To sum it up, V.S. Naipaul exposes nostalgia for a stable cultural identity from the avenue of colony. He thinks himself, culturally estranged, geographically dislocated, linguistically aloof and spiritually empty. Thus, he vigorously tries to join himself with the origin and root culture obviously through his writings.

Works Cited

Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, eds. *The Postcolonial Studies Reader.* London: Routledge, 1995.

- - - , eds. *Key Concept in Post-Colonial Studies.* London: Routledge, 1998.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture. London: Routledge, 1993.*

Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Post Colonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors.* New York: OUP, 1995.

Dhawan, R.K., ed. *Commonwealth Fiction,* 3 Vols. New Delhi: Classical Publishing Company, 1988.

During, Simon, ed. *The Cultural Studies Reader.* London: Routledge, 1993.

Gandhi, Leela. Post Colonial Theory: *A Critical Introduction.* Delhi: OUP, 1999.

Hall, Stuart. "The Question of Cultural Identity." *Modernity and Its Features.* Ed. By Hall. London: Polity Press, 1999. 273-315.

- - -. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora". *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader. Ed.* By Padmini Mongia. *Delhi:* OUP, 2002. 110-121.

Huntington, Samuel P. The *Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of the world Order.* New York: Viking, 1995.

.

Loan, Bonn Van, ed. *Cultural Studies for Beginners.* Cambridge: Icon Books Ltd., 1997.

Masih, I.K. "India Theirs and Mine: Dhawan 2: 158-165.

Nye, Malory. *Religion The Basic.* London: Routledge, 2003.

Nixon, Rob. *London Calling: V.S. Naipaul, Post Colonial Mandarin.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Naipaul, V.S. *An Area of Darkness.* New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1968.

- - - . *The Mimic Men. New York: Penguin, 1978.*

- - - . *India: A Wounded Civilization London:* Andre Deutsch Ltd., 1977.

- - - . *India: A Million Mutinies Now*. New York: Viking, 1991.

Pathak, R.S. "Disorder within Disorder without". Dhawan 2:128-156.

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

Said, Edward. *Orientalism.* New York: Routledge, 1992.

Saraswoti, V. "The Culture-Literature Connection: Changing Implication for Curricular Design". *Post-Coloniality: Reading Literature.* Ed. C. T. Indra and Meenakshi Shivram. New Delhi: Vikas Pub, 1999. 221-230.

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