

I. Introduction

1.1 General Introduction

'Alienation' bears the constant notion of having the feeling of being a stranger or an outsider. Though the term, alienation, gets its conceptual and teleological definition in Marxism, it has now been frequently applied to refer to the cultural estrangement under which the individuals feel a loss of their cultural belonging. *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy* defines, "Alienation (German *Entfremdung*, also translatable as estrangement) is centrally the idea of something being separated from or strange to something else" (12).

Alienation is inextricably related to its akin terms: displacement, dislocation, diaspora and exile. All these terms are related to 'homelessness'. People often realize the sense of 'loss' when they are displaced and dislocated. Displacement and dislocation necessarily bring the individuals to a different place and culture, thereby gives the victims a sense of cultural alienation.

V.S. Naipaul's one of the famous fictional works *In a Free State* (1971) is divided into five parts, where two episodes from journal are set for Prologue and Epilogue. The Prologue is named as "The Tramp at Piraeus" which is an extract from a journal where an unidentified and meticulous narrator presents a detached point of view to describe a grim scene. The story "One Out of Many" describes a displaced character, Santosh. He has been to Washington from India who depicts the life of cultural alienation. He realizes a sense of being away from his place, culture and people. In another story "Tell Me Who to Kill" a Trinidadian worker is helplessly transported to London Where he is confused by the foreign culture and people. In the title novella *In a Free State* two English civil servants, Bobby and Linda, undergo a journey in a newly

emergent African 'free' state with both fear and hope because there is a tribal war, chaos and disorder.

The expression of culture is bound up with the notion of identity. Culture as Raymond William defines is "a whole way of life" (51). People express their identity by seeking their relation to the source culture and questioning if they find the difficulty of belonging. All the main characters in the novel find this type of problem.

Statement of the Problem

In the novel, *In a Free State*, the main characters, Santosh, Bobby, Linda and the narrator of the story "Tell Me Who to Kill", have been away from their native land. They are yearning for a good place in someone else's land. They feel they have ceased to be a part of the flow. There are a number of characters from different cultural backgrounds who encounter many problems in different geographical regions and the different cultural milieus. The situation of the characters in *In a Free State* is frustrating. They are puzzled by the alien culture, people and geography. What problems do the characters face? Do the characters search for their root? What circumstances compel them to feel alienated? How do they express their feeling of cultural alienation? Giving major consideration to the questions raised above, this academic research seeks to analyse and explore the responsible factors to the issues.

Hypothesis

Almost all the characters in *In a Free State* are away from their source culture. The novel shows the individuals stranded by the foreign culture, people and geography. They find themselves detached from their culture. They are

suffered by the continuous sense of loss and nostalgia. There is a strong sense of displacement and expression of cultural alienation in *In a Free State*.

Literature Review

V.S. Naipaul's novel, *In a Free State* (1971) has been reviewed in a number of ways. He wrote the novel as a result of his experience from the wide range of travels in the 1960s in India, Africa, Iran, Pakistan and the USA. From the time of its publication, many critics have put their views about this novel.

Naipaul's *In a Free State* includes sequences of five works—two short journal extracts (the "Prologue" and the "Epilogue"), two short stories and one novella linked by a common theme. Most of the reviewers concentrate on the condition of the characters in their respective situations. They have also explored the use of multiple stories in a single volume and their thematic connections. Reviewing the characters and the theme of the book, Daney Yee remarks:

All are individuals stranded in foreign cultures. In "One Out of Many" an Indian servant is almost accidentally transported to Washington, where he finds niche for himself but remains profoundly alienated from the world around him. "Tell Me Who to Kill" is the tragic story of a west Indian who moves to London. The novel *In a Free State* is about expatriate English Civil Servant in a recently independent African State torn by Civil War. And the epilogue and prologue present the more detached view of an experienced traveller writing in his journal. (1)

Yee mentions the "alien" cultures in which Naipaul's characters are "stranded" and "confronted". The geographical dislocation of the characters and foreign cultures call forth the issue of cultural alienation.

William Walsh in "V(idiadhar) S(urajprasad) Naipaul" makes a review of his major novels including *In a Free State* and says that there is "the fullness of grasp, strong original and an occasion even an overwrought" (174). He found Naipaul fair and having no prejudice in reporting the case.

Lillian Feder, a noted author of several classic works of literary criticism, explores Naipaul's method of discovering the truth about himself by saying.

Now writing *In a Free State*, he continues to use the technique of his childhood, reversing the process as he projects the violent Africa of that novel onto the safe atmosphere of Wiltshire so that the world of his African novel becomes one with the world he inhabits in *The Enigma of Arrival*. (239)

Some reviewers as well as the critics have described this novel from a realist point of view. Edward W. Said finds Naipaul's fictional world as "imagined communities, parodied and mocked" (culture 63) but Lillian Feder gives a different interpretation. She emphasizes on their history, as "Like Santosh, the narrator of 'Tell Me Who to Kill' and his family are products and victims of past and present history"(198). S. Prasannarajan remarks:

"Naipaul in lovely grandeur continues to make sense of a world condemned by the passions of history, a people let down by the conceits of civilization in scantyclad sentences that are parented

items in the market place of imagination" (*A Prize for sir Vidiya*).

(50)

He writes, *In a Free State* appears to be the "small incentives from the sociology of the colonized heritage, the borders of which are extended in it" (51).

He brings forth the themes of colonial relationship and the aftermath of colonialism. Explaining the characters and their situations in *In a Free State* and some other novels like *The Mimic Men*, *Guerrillas*, and *A Bend in the River* Lillian Feder remarks:

In societies seeking independence and in those having recently attained it, the narrators and characters of Naipaul's novels contend with political and social upheaval in a variety of ways. They enter into the fray; they retreat in helpless despair, they use any available resources to escape the chaos threatening them. Mundane experiences reflect an amorphous state without and within. (194)

She views that his characters face same type of problems and sufferings.

Dr. Vasanta S. Patel says, "The book explores the ways in which the conscious individual in a given society establishes models of meditation between himself and his experience" (25). Wherever the characters go, they are haunted by the sense of their source culture.

Significance of the Study

This research lays its focus on V.S Naipaul's Novel, *In a Free State*, to prove how Naipaul tacitly exposes and expresses the trauma of cultural alienation. On the one hand it analyses culture, displacement and its crisis; and

on the other, it highlights, in relation to the text, the fact that cultural identity is expressed in variety of ways. Therefore it tries to see the connections existing between displacement and cultural alienation. So, the research necessarily throws a light to the expression of cultural identity and alienation both by the writer and his characters in the book with relation to its formative sources - alienation, dislocation, displacement, nostalgia and diaspora.

Methodology

Cultural and post colonial analysis will be used as a theoretical tool to examine the hypothesis. The hypothesis will be proved with the support of different writers and critics from the domain concerned. And sources will encompass library consultation and internet. Moreover, the instructions and suggestions from the teachers of the English department will also be taken as guiding sources.

Delimitation

To analyze the issue "Expression of Cultural Alienation in V.S Naipaul's *In a Free State*" postcolonial and cultural study are applied as theoretical modalities. Interpreting the situation of cultural alienation in other's culture in the novel *In a Free State* is, however, a limit in itself. To accomplish the goal, the researcher will delimit the issues but other relevant texts and criticisms with the similar theme will also be studied.

1.2 V.S. Naipaul: His Life and Work

Naipaul was born on 17th August 1932 at Chagnas in Trinidad of Hindu immigrants from northern India. He was the second son of seven children in a large family of orthodox Brahmins. His ancestral roots lay in Gorakhpur Uttar Pradesh, India. After attending Queens Royal College, Trinidad's leading

secondary school, he was awarded a government scholarship to study abroad, which led him to University College Oxford, in 1950

Naipaul's father Suraj Prasad Naipaul was a journalist who used to contribute occasional articles on Indian topics to the Trinidad Guardian. He left the Trinidad Guardian two years or so after Naipaul was born. He was almost a stranger for Naipaul because he was almost absent from the house. Naipaul's life was disorderly because of his father and family. Dr. Vasant S. Patel mentions; "The condition of Naipaul's father in his family was always like that of a member of the opposition party. He was made a pariah by the members of the family. Temperamentally Naipaul's father was completely different from all others in the family" (11).

Naipaul married Patrica Hale in 1955 but their marriage could not last long as she died in 1965. His second marriage was to a divorced Pakistani Journalist Nadira Alvin.

A third generation Indian in Trinidad, Naipaul was never at ease with his identity as a Trinidadian. Naipaul's rejection of his birthplace has something to do with the nature of the Trinidadian society itself. He found it unimportant and uncreative.

Dennis Walder writes about Naipaul:

One writer whose career has plunged through his own post colonial writings into a kind of settled unsettledness offers an instructive comparison; V.S. Naipaul hailed as a prize winning British writer, as well as (since 1990) a knight of the Realm, while endlessly rewriting his identity as not British-nor, for that matter, Caribbean, nor Triniadian, nor Indian nor black, nor

white. His is, on his own terms (which exclude gender) an identity always in process. (195)

Naipaul, in spite of being associated with no less than three societies, Indian, Trinidadian and English, has been unable to find his moorings in any of them. Giving Naipaul's introduction, Champa Rao Mohan remarks:

Much of Naipaul's writing issues from his personal experience of being a displaced member of minority race and religion in Trinidad. However, his multiple heritage places him in a position that makes it possible for him to render a detached account of his subjective experiences. Being an Indian by ancestor, Trindadian by birth and English by intellectual training and residence, Naipaul is indeed a man with broader perspectives. (9)

Naipaul currently lives in Wiltshire, London, with his wife Nadira. He got the Nobel Prize in 2001. Apart from the Nobel Prize, Naipaul has also been honored by the Booker Prize in 1971, the W.H. Smith Prize, the Hawthroneden Prize, the Bennet Prize and the T.S. Eliot Award and was also knighted in 1990. Naipaul is undoubtedly a prolific writer today. Dr. Vasant S. Patel says, "He does not accept another occupation, either through inclination or financial need. He is an exceptional writer, in a sense that he is a man totally devoted or dedicated to the art of writing, he has never been anything else besides being a writer" (324).

1.3. Naipaul's Style

Naipaul has mostly lived in England since his Oxford education. After his graduation, he has started his lifelong career as a freelance writer. Writing has been his only career, and the large number of successful novels prove his

time well spent. Naipaul is probably the most honored living author in the British literary world. Even those post colonial intellectual averse to his politics accept his great talent as a novelist and the rewards of reading him. In addition, there is his irrefutable commitment to the third world, implicit in 40 years of writing about non western nations and peoples. His practice of revisiting places written about earlier Africa, India, the west Indies, Non-Arabic Islamic countries and South America underscore the abiding strength of his interest in cultures and governments of the Third World. They are the subjects on which he has chosen to expand his talent.

For Naipaul, self validation is the only platform for his ego and ideas, the only strategy against his displacement from Trinidad, where he was born and raised. He has the alienation of living in England his usual residence as an adult. Naipaul's cultural displacement and existential unease explain why he is quick in expressing his opinion, two forces from his Trinidadian childhood and youth help to explain the occasion racial caste of his opinions on his fiction. Throughout his political fiction including along with *The Mimic Men* (1976), *In a Free State* (1971), *Guerrillas* (1975) and *A Bend in the River* (1979), these attitudes direct, shape and colour his work. About Naipaul's writing issues Champa Rao Mohan writes:

Naipaul being an East Indian himself speaks largely from his own childhood memories and is able to render a mere accurate and comprehensive picture of what was to him a lived experiences. In his early novels that form the Trinidad tetralogy- *The Mystic Masseur* (1957), *The suffrage of Elvira* (1958), *Miguel street* (1959), Naipal deals predominantly with the East Indians in the

west Indies. He presents a poignant picture of the East Indians struggling to preserve their identity in an alien environment, but ultimately succumbing to the influence of the dominating culture.

(13)

Naipaul is an expatriate and exile in London from his ancestral land, India. Therefore, he has a strong sense of history; Naipaul really wants to write his history as one of his autobiographical character, Ralph Singh, who in the *Mimic Men*, says; "My first instinct was towards writings of history" (81). He tries to evoke the history and has expressed in an embellished and clear language that stands Naipaul as writer.

About Naipaul and his writings Rob Nixon writes, "Naipaul's familiar and personal displacements figure so badly in both his work and its critical reception that he has come to be celebrated as the ultimately literary apatriote, the most comprehensively uprooted of twentieth century writers" (17).

His writings make him a novelist of distinction, whose fastidious sardonic tone conceals a profound concern of twentieth century uncertainties and insidious effects of imperialism upon the people of so-called Third World nations.

Naipaul uses his memories of the past and more recent times to define the narrators of his travel books. He reveals his immoderate personal reactions, his remorse at his own conduct, and the relief that friendship affords. His past is always haunting him. Lillian Feder writes:

Naipaul's reminiscences of his early life in Trinidad and his efforts as a youth in London to make himself a writer recur throughout his work. Although many of the details remain the

same, this is not mere repetition. His relations with people he meets in his travels affect the very nature of his memories and enlarge his perspective on his heritage: the religion and customs of immigrants from colonial Trinidad. (11)

In every country he visited, Naipaul was concerned with the relation of the historical past. He resounds a history of slavery and colonialism: the economic, cultural and psychological oppression in the novels like *Guerrillas* (1975) and *A Bend in the River* (1979).

Naipaul's nonfiction and fiction portray the language of selfhood words, gestures acts-as a vehicle of truth. In his novels the characters reveal themselves in relation to social history. It suggests that even omniscient narrator is gradually earning his knowledge. Feder further points out:

Diverse as the narrators of Naipaul's fiction are non seem to fit the usual categories even when his narrator seems omniscient the ways in which characters reveal themselves in relation to social history suggest that his knowledge is not given but gradually earned. (9)

The study of style and technique of Naipaul will seek to trace the reflection of a way of looking at the world, especially the colonial world. The world is built around common assumptions. William Walsh remarks:

In Naipaul's work we see an independent and fastidious talent fully engaged and brilliantly successful in the treatment of the second hand violated colonial and post colonial society; in the understanding of the psychology of the sensitive young, appalled by the sight others have of their secret life; in the rendering of

political and social ideas, not as untethered formulations but living activities; in the evocation of place and physical context. [. . .] the conscious individual in a given society establishes modes of meditation between himself and his experience.

Naipaul is the self-conscious migrant who does not hide the nationalist idealism in his fiction but powerfully exposes the cultural confusion and identity crisis in the post-colonial time.

Pico Iyer writes "in the process, he has fashioned the most transparent English sentences of our times" ("Stalking the Center" 56). Naipaul is a typical writer who is always clear and compact. He has an art of telling details minutely. His descriptions are sensuous. His style is really picturesque. His narratives are marked by his picturesqueness.

1.4 Naipaul's Major Themes

V.S. Naipaul is a prolific writer who has written twenty-six books in all thirteen books on non-fiction and thirteen books of fiction. A close reading of Naipaul's writings shows that Naipaul is primarily concerned with displaced individuals, with uprooted immigrants without home but longing for home all the time.

Naipaul presents the theme of dislocation and alienation which he is not only writing but also living. In fact, he writes about his childhood experiences mostly in an autobiographical mode of representation. Naipaul tries to depict the real world with all its cruelties. Though he exceeds further to deliver the hollowness of the world where the individuals like him are wandering in the search for belonging. Lillian Feder remarks:

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

Naipaul has the talent of transforming the present reality in fiction. His actual world is the postcolonial world and he does represent it. Naipaul is a novelist of the colonial experience. He is a post colonial novelist who situates his novels in both colonial as well as ex-colonial societies and gives a perceptive account of the problems inherent to such societies. Mohan points out:

The major themes that emerge from a reading of his novels are related to the problems of the colonized people; their sense of alienation from the landscapes, their identity crisis, the paradox of freedom and the problem of neocolonialism in the ex-colonies. (8)

Naipaul's writing expresses the ambivalence of the exile and the problem of an outsider, a feature of his own experiences as an Indian in the West Indies, a West Indian in England, and a nomadic intellectual in a post colonial world. Naipaul merges history, memoirs, fiction and journalism and lets them bare in his books creating a comfortable place for each. His chief concerns are the lasting political, economic and social effects of past foreign domination.

Naipaul's masterpiece *A House for Mr. Biswas* (1961) was set in Trinidad. The novel is both a minutely circumstantial account of an individual's life and an allegory of the East Indian's situation in Trinidad or of the colonial

predicament more generally. Mohan Biswas, the main character is in search of his role in the world more specifically, a home he can call his own. *The Middle Passage* (1962), is written in the form of a travelogue or a record of impressions by an outsider and is the first of Naipaul's non fiction to examine the societies of developing countries. *An Area of Darkness* (1964) describes Naipaul's travels to India. He portrays Indian people, places and incidents in the book. *The Mimic Men* gives an account of the political career of protagonist Ralph Kripal Singh. Kripal Singh is like Naipaul: educated complex, forever conscious of his physical and spiritual rootlessness. To some extent the novel subverts accepted ideas of third world post colonial politics.

One of the major themes in his works is his view on Islam. *Among the Believers* (1981) is based on Naipaul's journeys in the Middle and Far East in which he examined the Islamic revival in Iran, Pakistan, Malaysia and Indonesia. Naipaul presents a scathing picture of the civil and social disorder in those countries and attributes it to the dominance of Islamic. His notion about Islam appeared to be much more controversial and Muslims found it offensive.

The question of identity and various effects of colonization haunt both his works and life. His novel, *The Enigma of Arrival* (1987) shows the personal history from a new vantage point. *The Enigma of Arrival* depicts the condition of the protagonist, the first person narrator I, who leave one world (Trinidad) and arrives in another world (England). The arrival in England for him is an enigma because he arrives at a place that is both familiar and unfamiliar, he is confused of having a home or not, and he is not even satisfied with the arrival. Thus, this enigmatic arrival has created a sense of dislocation and alienation. Finally, the protagonist becomes a man without a country and home. *Guerrillas*

takes place on a Caribbean island recently liberated from colonial rule where the involvement of an American couple, with a native rebel leader ends in tragedy. In *A Bend in the River* an Indian merchant tries unsuccessfully to establish himself in a newly independent African country. Both novels, *Guerrillas* and *A Bend in the River* contain elements of sexual and political violence within an atmosphere of impending chaos. *Finding the Centre* (1984) recounts the story of his own beginning as a writer and a visit Naipaul made to the Ivory Coast, an economically and politically stable African republic.

The idea of rootlessness, dislocation and alienation energize a man like Naipaul to define the self which is rightly the case in his latest novel *Half a Life* (2001). The protagonist of the novel, Wilie Chandram has an incessant struggle in nameless nation. S. Prasannarajan sees this novel as "A novel of permanent displacement and renewal, of arrivals and departures, every movement or discovery an updated version of the first, original sacrifice". (Lives Half Lived. 56) A negative appraisal of life in the third world is apparent in Naipaul's novels and stories. *In a Free State* (1971) involves characters whose alienation stems from a loss of cultural identity. The "Prologue" and "Epilogue" from journal entries, the two stories "One Out of Many" and "Tell me Who to Kill" and the title novella that comprise *In a Free State* deal with travelers going to or having arrived at even more inhospitable places than they have left. The characters of *In a Free State* Santosh, Bobby, Linda, Dayo and his brother are in a state of being aimless and adrift.

In all Naipaul's work, fiction and nonfiction, Naipaul's diasporic Indian sensibility is vividly exposed. The theme of cultural alienation, dislocation and

consequent loss of identity has been recurring in the literature of diaspora.

Naipaul's writings prove that he is champion of this type of issue.

II. Cultural Expression and Postcolonial Study

2.1 Culture

The term culture in English is derived from the Latin, 'Cultura' which means to cultivate the soil. Culture is not simple to define since it possesses many layers of meanings. Along with the time and context the term is giving new meanings. During the medieval period, "Cultura" as cultivation was often associated with the development of religious faith whereas in Roman literature it was referred to the cultivation of farming. Culture was regarded as mental cultivation for renaissance humanists. In modern sense the term culture denotes whole product of an individual, group or society of intelligent beings. It includes technology, art, science, as well as moral systems and characteristics behaviours and habits of human beings. Culture is the way of life for an entire society. As such, it includes codes of manners, dress, language, and religion, rituals norms of behaviour such as law and morality, and systems of belief. Thus, culture belongs to "the realm of broader human consciousness that is both developed and shaped by society, religion, history and geography (Saraswathi 223, *Culture*). As there are multiple religions, societies, histories and geographies there are many cultures existing in the world. Stuart Hall defines culture as "Culture is the whole body of efforts made by a people in the sphere of thought to describe, justify and praise the action through which a people has created itself and keeps itself in existence" (121).

Culture is continuously embodied, practiced and reproduced, which does not simply "exist" in abstract forms. It is an entire way of life of people

or group. It consists of systems or patterns of shared symbols. Studying culture is always studying the acts of behaviours of a specific set of people who are linked together in a social structure. A notable post- colonial/ cultural critic Edward W. Said defines culture as:

In time, culture comes to be associated, often aggressively, with the nation or the state; this differentiates 'us' from 'them', almost always with some degree of xenophobia. Culture in this sense is a source of identify, and a rather combative one at that, as we see in recent 'returns' to culture and tradition. These 'returns' accompany rigorous codes of intellectual and moral behaviour that are opposed to the permissiveness associated with such relatively liberal philosophies as multiculturalism and hybridity.
(*Culture* xii-xiv)

Said emphasizes the importance of culture as "The source of identify". Culture is inextricably bound up with the notion of identity. Said further writes, "Culture is never just a matter of ownership, of borrowing and lending with absolute debtors and creditors, but rather of appropriations, common experiences, and interdependencies of all kinds among different cultures. This is a universal norm" (*Culture* 261-62).

So, culture is powerful means of differentiation, appropriation and domination. Rein T. Segers writes about culture:

Cultural elements also bind together into a coherent whole; they reveal a certain pattern at a deeper, invisible level. Secondly, culture denotes the accumulated shared learning of a given

group, covering behavioural, emotional and cognitive elements of the group's members total psychological functioning. (67)

Culture is a collective phenomenon since it is shared with people who live within the same social environment, which is where it was learned. Culture is learned, not inherited. It derives from social environment, not from genes.

When someone nurtured in one culture is displaced in another she/he may face cultural shock and the reactions may be anger, frustration, fear, curiosity, hatred or confusion. The totality of culture as a frame of reference, shapes and controls man's views of the world around him/her. Johan Fornas writes about culture:

Culture is everywhere in human life and society. We are human by understanding and interpreting what we perceive, that is by constructing symbols where something stands for something else. Symbols make it possible to think of what is not present, and thus to reflect upon the past and plan the future, to explore the other (s) and speculate about the unknown. By collectively shaping such symbolic patterns we construct a world and give ourselves specific positions in it. (i)

Culture is the fabric of meaning in terms of which human beings interpret their experience and guide their action. Such action, then, takes the form of social structure, the actually existing network of social relations. Culture is an entity consisting of different levels, which are interrelated. At the same time, a person always belongs to a number of the following levels, or indicators of identity, for instance: a national level according to one's

country; a regional, ethnic, religious, linguistic affiliation; a gender level; a generation level; a social class level; and an organizational level for those who are concerned.

2.2 Cultural Alienation and Exile

'Alienation' (estrangement) bears the constant notion of having the feeling of being a stranger or an outsider. It is to be in exile – exile from the milieu one lives, from one's products and even from oneself. It has different meanings in everyday life, in science, and in philosophy. Alienation generally means turning away or keeping away from associates or former friends. In psychiatry, alienation usually means deviation from normal life – that is insanity. In sociology and psychology, it means an individual's feeling of disapproval towards society, nature, other people or himself.

The concept of alienation was first philosophically elaborated by Hegel. Some writers have taken the Christian doctrine of original sin and redemption to be the first version of Hegel's doctrine of alienation and dealienation. Some others found the expression of concept of alienation in *The Old Testament's* concept of idolatry. Karl Marx turns to socio-economic analysis regarding the employee's alienation from the means of production as the derivative of private ownership and the social division of labour.

Alienation today has become the significant subject of discussion in many fields. Among psychologists, philosophers, sociologists, literary critics and writers, it is the subject matter much discussed and in this postcolonial world writers perceive alienation differently. Cultural alienation is the process of abandoning one's own culture or cultural background. In the post

colonial world alienation is linked with the sense of dislocation or displacement. If an individual is thrust upon in an alien world where the cultural practice including customs, rituals, beliefs are quite different she/he would certainly meet some crisis there. Such condition is increasing day by day whether it is through migration, colonization or such other means. An individual in such a situation is forced to lead an alienated life since s/he does not experience him/her self as the center of his/her world. The individual loses significant aspects of his/her world of experience since estrangement occurs when there is cultural displacement. Maria- Leena Hakkarainen explains the cause of cultural alienation thus, "The migrations caused by colonialism, the two world wars, development and the new global economy have, however, made homelessness the cultural characteristic of the late twentieth century" (191). Hakkarainen further classifies the types of homelessness, "There are two very different classes of homelessness: one group is mobile on a world scale ("no country as home, but the whole world as its property"), the other lives in refugee camps, resettlement colonies and other reserves" (191-92).

After losing a home in their country of origin it is not easy to be familiar with new living conditions or to set up a new identity, so this is a question of alienation or it can be interpreted as a problem embedded in the idea of becoming culturally rooted. Pirkkoliisa Ahponen points out:

Contrary to the concept of cultural identity, alienation means that one is separated from one's communal ties. Alienated people live outside a membership circle in isolation. Aliens are

no more enemies than they are friends in so far as they are not identified by certain properties according to which they are known. (289)

Alienated people have no home in a familiar community. They lack culturally identifying common properties. Experiences of rootless alienation are the fate of the modern people in a fast changing world. Ahponen further remarks:

Alienation is not only a state of a lack of communal ties but also an inalienable right for individuality. This point of view is sensible for analyzing expressions of personal eccentricities but it can also help in understanding how individual experiences are used as a source of creative energy for interpreting difficulties during the life course, especially when living conditions have been changed. (290)

To Ahponen, alienation may be a fruitful means of creative understanding and experience. Migrants have to cross geographical natural, political, social and cultural obstacles on their travels. These obstacles are symbolically significant so that they enhance the cultural understanding.

Alienation is very closely related to exile. The condition of exile involves the idea of a separation and distancing from either a literal homeland or from a cultural ethnic origin. Exile is discontinuous state of an individual. It brings a sense of dislocation and forces human beings to leave their native place to create psychological alienation in them. Exiles are cut off their roots, their lands and their past. They generally don't have states, although they are often in search of them. According to Said:

Exile is strangely compelling to think about but terrible to experience. It is the unhealable rift forced between a human being and a native place, between self and its true home: its essential sadness can never be surmounted. And while it is true that literature and history contain heroic, romantic, glorious, even triumphant episodes in an exile life, there are no more than efforts meant to overcome the crippling sorrow of estrangement. ("*Reflection*" 173)

Though the nature and circumstances of exile have varied from one case to another, the sense of loss is common to all exiles. Said further says, "Exile is one of the saddest things which is sometimes interchangeable with banishment" (*Representation* 47). Exile originated in the age-old practice of banishment. Living in exile is an alienated life.

One reason for alienation is that it is not possible to identify friends and enemies by means of given social grouping. The life of a stranger lacks safe boundaries but, nevertheless the frontiers are always present in this liminality. In a strange land it is impossible to find a place to hide from fear. Ahponen writes:

An involuntary migrant is floating ambivalently in his or her life with no clear destination or purposeful intentions for reaching safety. Unsettled nomads have to continue wandering around. Home is always missed in diaspora. Living in exile is an extreme example of the ambivalence that illustrates how

important the "politics of location" are for a modern cultural identity. (297)

In exile an individual loses his place, he enters into an alien language, and he finds himself surrounded by people whose social behaviour and code is very unlike, and sometimes even offensive to his own. Exile deny roots, language and social norms that are very important norms of a human being, so they are obliged to find new ways of describing themselves, new ways of being human.

In Naipaul's writing culture collision is reflected which is often marked by bewilderment, a sense of shock, withdrawal or adaptation. Moreover, problems of adjustment and cultural differences are vividly reflected. Mohan says, "The themes of alienation, homelessness and mimicry still preoccupy Naipaul, but the perspective has changed. They are now viewed as a universal condition of the modern world afflicting both colonized and colonizers alike" (81).

2.3 Post Colonial Expression: Colonial Experience

Post colonial world is colonization and its aftermath. We might call it post colonial because it was a direct result of colonialism and imperialism. Post- colonial literature rather than simply being the writing which 'came after' empire is generally defined as that which critically or subversively scrutinizes the colonial relationship. It sets out in one way or another to resist colonialist perspectives. As well as a change in power, decolonization demanded and still demands symbolic overhaul a reshaping of dominant meanings. Postcolonial literature forms part of that process of overhaul. To

give expression to colonized experience, post colonial writers sought to undercut thematically and formally the discourses which supported colonization- the myths of power, the race classifications, the imagery of subordination. Therefore, postcolonial writing is deeply marked by experiences of cultural exclusion and division under empire. Thus postcolonial can be defined as that condition in which colonized peoples seek to their place, forcibly or otherwise, as historical agents in an increasingly globalized world.

Postcolonial situation has been dealt most significantly with cultural contradictions, ambiguities and ambivalence associated with the history of colonialism. It accounts for the experiences of displacement of third world peoples and cultural hybridity generated by the first and third world interactions. Post colonial study has often used to cover such a wide area that it includes multiplicity of identities and subjects which results from displacement, immigrations and exiles and includes multi-cultural perspective and experiences.

M.H. Abrams in *Glossary of Literary Terms* writes, "A major element in the post colonial agenda is to disestablish Eurocentric norms of literary and artistic values, and to expand the literary canon to include colonial and post colonial writers (237)". Post colonial discourse gave rise to the marginalized people about their culture, history and real representation, which were written by colonized people for them. Natives were not only neglected but also never discussed about before. But after the rise of post colonial discourse it is taken only as accepted norms but still the European

measuring rod measures its value. The practical meaning and the operating ideology of culture and literature were Euro-centric. Abrams further writes:

In the United states and Britain, there is an increasingly successful movement to include, in the standard academic curricula, the brilliant and innovative novels, poems and plays by such post colonial writers in the English language as the Africans Chinua Achebe Wole Soyinka, the Carribbean islanders V.S. Naipaul and Derek Walcott and the authors from the Indian subcontinent G.V. Desani and Salman Rushdie.

(237)

Colonialism has caused many diverse problems to the nations of the third world. The damage that colonialism made to the economy of these countries is immense but it has done much more overwhelming damage of the psyche of the colonized people, through the subtle process of colonization. Colonizers, who always had the upper hand in the colonies, were always dominating to the colonized. It is clear that colonialism was a lot more than military conquest. It was a cultural project of control. Colonialism displaced traditional cultures and left a deeper scar on the psyche of the colonized people, who found themselves in the state of betweenity. Champa Rao Mohan writes:

The colonizers were well aware that for the purpose of cultural colonization to become a possibility, it was first important to make the colonized receptive to western cultural influences.

The grounds for cultural colonization were prepared through the

propagation of myths about the colonized masses that projected them in the most unfavorable light. These myths instilled a feeling of inferiority in the minds of the colonized and psychologically conditioned them for the process which the Europeans chose to call "modernization." (6)

There was a similar process of cultural colonization in all colonies. It was systematic and planned, through the school and the church.

But when the power and glory of empire began to wane in the early part of the imperial writing was broken and the colonized elites could articulate their protest against the imperial power by using the language and literary forms of the colonizers. So post colonial literature concerns itself primarily with the experiences of the former colonized people. The post colonial literatures are the product of interaction between imperial social and cultural and indigenous social and cultural practices. After colony people experienced an intense need to create new worlds out of old stories. The business of colony proved complete failure. Post colonial writing is a written reply against written document of the colonizers. Denis Walder writes:

The term post colonial is used to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day. What each and every national literature has in common 'beyond their special and distinctive regional characteristics' is their emergence out of this process, and their assertion of differences from the assumptions of the imperial centre. It is this which makes them distinctively post colonial.

'Writing back is the key motive for this approach to post colonial writings. (68)

Post colonial world is an anticolonial world. Various anticolonial expressions have been influential among the oppressed peoples of the world. The writings bring together psychoanalytic notions of the alienation of the colonized.

Elleke Boehmer writes: "Post colonial migrant literature can be described as a literature written by elites, and defined and canonized by elites. It is writing which foregrounds and celebrates a national or historical rootlessness (233).

Post colonial indigenous writing is the quest for personal and cultural identity. Post colonial indigenous writers believe that writing is an integral part of self-definition, they can reconstruct their self through writing.

So post colonial has to do with the past, but it is being reinterpreted towards the future.

2.4 Diapora: Displacement and Dislocation

The term 'diaspora' is used to refer to any people or ethnic population forced or induced to leave their traditional ethnic homelands: being dispersed throughout other parts of the world, and the ensuing developments in their dispersal and culture.

In the beginning, the term diaspora was used by ancient Greeks to refer to the citizens of a grand city who migrated to a conquered land with the purpose of colonization to assimilate the territory into the empire. The original meaning was cut off from the present meaning when the old Testament was translated to Greek. The word diaspora was used to refer specially to the populations of Jew exiled from Judea in 586 BC by the

Babylonians, and Jerusalem in AD 136 by the Roman empire. This term is used interchangeably to refer to the historical movements of the dispersed ethnic population or the population itself. The term was assimilated from Greek into English in the late 20th century. The academic field of diaspora studies was established in the late twentieth century, in regard to the expanded meaning of 'diaspora'. Makarnand Parnjape writes:

The diasporic experience, to mind must involve a significant crossing of borders. These may be borders of a region or a language, but more often are multiple border such as the loss of homeland would suggest. To me, the whole importance of the diaspora and its potential for creating a new kind of culture arise out of such a crossing of boundaries. The diaspora, then, must involve a cross-cultural or cross-civilization passage. (6)

When where is forced crossing of boarders, there is a significant tension between the source and the target cultures. Although there are different types of diasporas with different nature and features we might call them postcolonial diaspora because it was a direct result of colonialism and imperialism. This is why, postcolonial diaspora would include all those diasporas which arose from the moment of colonization to the present day. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin say, "The practices of slavery and indenture labour resulted in world-wide colonial diaspora" ("Key Concepts" 69).

Explaining diaspora Paranjape clearly remarks:

The nature of the diaspora, its cultural location and politics, consequently depend on the nature of the most, not just on that

of the diaspora. Diasporas, despite their common origin, may behave in a totally different manner depending on their country of relocation. (7-8)

Diaspora in general is a condition of mourning for the lost homeland that gathers around quite specific moments of trauma. It is the movement of peoples from their homelands to new regions. It creates a sense of dislocation and alienation because diasporic people can not fit themselves in new environment and culture. Considering the vast range of diaspora David Punter points out:

The diasporic terrain, which we may also ally to the territorialisation of the refugee, is also and inevitably one that can not be fully written or read. It is a land of 'secrets', of the uncanny, where any reading is curiously doubled, falls again under the rule of the 'text instead. (166)

Place and displacement is crucial feature of post colonial discourse. By place, we do not simply mean geographical region. In post colonial societies place is a complex interaction of language, history, culture and environment. The concept of place itself may be different in different societies and cultures. Displacement is the lack of fitness between language, culture and environment. A sense of place is embedded in cultural history in legend and language of specific areas but such a sense disrupted due to the propound discursive interference of colonialism. So such intervention may disrupt a sense of place in several ways: by imposing a feeling of displacement in those who have moved to colonies, by physically alienating

large populations of colonized people through forced migration, slavery or indenture, and by disturbing the representation of place in the colony by imposing the colonial language.

Dislocation as a phenomenon is the result of transportation from one country to another by slavery or imprisonment, by invasion or settlement, a consequence of willing or unwilling movement from a known to unknown location. It can also be extended to include the psychological and personal dislocations that result from the cultural denigration. Jasbir Jain remarks,

People who were dislocated were termed "refugees." And territorial dislocation was full of memories and associations, break up of families and relationships, homesickness, shared cultural myths, legends and history and all these gave rise to questions of identity (85).

Diasporic communities formed by forced or voluntary migration may all be affected by this process of dislocation. Dislocation, in a different sense, is also a feature of all invaded colonies where indigenous or original cultures are often dislocated. Dislocation is a structure which is characterized by never ending processes as the societies have no single articulating or organizing principle; rather it is constantly being dislocated by force outside it. The migrations caused by colonialisms, the two world wars, development and new global economy have made homelessness the cultural characteristic of the present world.

Culturally alienated people are separated from their communal ties as they live outside a member circle in isolation. They have no home in a

familiar community and they lack culturally identifying common properties. Their alienated existence denotes that they are flying loose in a situation in which everything is strange and without a meaningful context.

Cultural alienation presupposes the predominance of such feelings as alienation, dispersal, longing for the ancestral homeland, a double identification with original homeland and the adopted country, identity crisis, remembering myths related to the homeland, protest against discrimination of all sorts in a new land etc. The creation of imaginary homeland is the condition of the diasporic communities. The feelings of alienation, nostalgia and possession of mythical memories are all presented in his fictional characters in *In a Free State*.

III. *In a Free State* and Expression of Cultural Alienation

3.1 General Introduction: *In a Free State*

Naipalul's one of the famous fictional works *In a Free State* won the Booker Prize in 1971. The book throws light on the post colonial realities that have shaped the contemporary societies and thus provide important insight relating them. Such study of the novel leads to a better understanding of the problems that face the post colonial generations.

In this novel, Naipaul is mainly engaged in reconstructing his personal experiences in the fictional form in an attempt to come to terms with his own displacement. Travel plays a vital role in *In a Free State* as all the characters are involved in traveling. And the journey is always to strange place. As Champa Rao Mohan writes, "Travel indeed proved to be an important stimulus for the further development of his art. For, it not only helped Naipaul to overcome his uncertainties but also enabled him to find his vision " (79). Thus, travel broadened his perspective and made it possible for him to view personal emptiness and homelessness against the wider context of the world. His homelessness is effectively conveyed in the grim and humorless tone of the novel.

Structurally the book is divided into five parts. The book opens with a prologue "The Tramp at Piraeus" which is an extract from a journal. In the journal an unidentified and meticulous narrator presents a detached point of view to describe a grim scene. The first story that follows the prologue is entitled "One Out of Many" where the displaced character Santosh expresses his complete cultural alienation and displacement in Washington D.C. He has

an acute sense of nostalgia of Bombay, his native city. The second story "Tell Me Who to Kill" depicts a desperate condition of a Trinidadian worker who is helplessly transported to London. He is totally confused and shocked by the strange culture and people.

The title novella "In a Free State" depicts the cultural confusion in post colonial exile represented by two English civil servants Bobby and Linda. It also presents the vulnerable plight of the whites who represent the colonizers in a newly independent African 'Free State'.

Naipaul concludes the book with an Epilogue which is named as "The Circus at Luxor" that also begins and ends with a journey to someone else's place.

The themes of cultural alienation, homelessness, nostalgia, displacement and exile are vividly presented by all the protagonists and by means of various form and content in the book. The themes are now viewed as a universal condition of the modern world which are afflicting both colonized and colonizers alike.

The book displays the traumas of dislocation and alienation because it includes a number of characters from different cultural backgrounds, who encounter many problems in different geographical regions with different cultural milieus.

3.2 Diasporic Reflection in "The Tramp at Piraeus"

In the Prologue "The Tramp at Piraeus" there are people belonging to diverse nationalities as Egyptian, Indian, Chinese, African, American, Swede, German and Dane. "The Tramp at Piraeus" tells of Naipaul's crossing from

Piraeus to Alexandria, a trip dominated by the presence of a tramp, an old man who claims that he has traveled to different countries for 38 years. His view of himself as a citizen of the world confirms the sense that he belongs no where. The tramp is an example of the rootlessness and the placelessness that is the universal crisis of the modern predicament. The tramp says, "I've been to Egypt six or seven times. Gone around the world about a dozen times" (3). The Prologue presents the arrival and the farewell, the migration and the transmigration and the history of all enforced diasporas in their dispersal and fragmentation. The tramp remarks:

I have been traveling for thirty eight years. Youth hostelling, that's what I do it. Not a thing to be despised. New Zealand, have you been there? I went there in 1934. Between you and me, they are cut above the Australians. But what's nationalities these days? I myself, I think of myself as a citizen of the world. (3)

For the tramp himself, nationality has ceased to have meaning. The tramp is the most striking example of dispossessed but there are many other people who do not have a permanent home. The Egyptian Greeks 'deck passengers are also traveling to Egypt, but Egypt is no longer their home. They had been expelled from Egypt by the invaders, but eventually Egypt is free and they are the casualties of that freedom. All the people on the deck are in desperate mood. No one has expressed a satisfactory remark about their present situation. The relationship to each other is hostile and unwanted. The narrator says, "Even before we had lost sight of Piraeus and the Leonardo da Vinci the tramp had exhausted the relationship. He hadn't wanted company he

wanted only the camouflage and protection of company. The tramp knows he was odd" (4).

There are various examples given to the diasporaic sense and its resultant ethnic and cultural reflection. Moreover, multiculturalism, cross-culturality and expatriate positions have been presented in the light of diasporic situation. The narrator says, "They spoke in a mixture of French, English and Arabic and were exciting and impressing each other with talk of the many other people, mainly Lebanese were making in this or that unlikely things" (4). Although colonials are no longer in Egypt, the effect of colonialism is much more striking. The Lebanese furniture maker's business in Cairo has diminished since the Europeans left. The narrator points out:

He made reproduction furniture in Cairo and he said that business was bad since the Europeans had left. Commerce and culture had vanished from Egypt; there was no great demand among the natives for reproduction furniture; and there was growing prejudice against Lebanese himself. (4)

The furniture maker has a very acute sense of alienation. He says "I will leave Egypt first. I will close my factory. It is a horror, the modern style. It's grotesque, totally grotesque" (5). The furniture maker is terribly weary of the natives.

Many diverse nationalities are presented to show the reality of post colonial world. An Egyptian sings an Arabic song. The man from Beirut speaks in American accent. The narrator says "The non- American part of the room was predominantly Arab and German and had its own cohesion. The Egyptian

was over entertainer, and there was a tall German girl we could think of as our hostess" (6). An Austrian boy is a passenger from Italy. The narrator says "No one was in a good mood" (8). No one's journey is pleasant. The passengers are not appreciative to each other till the end of their journey. The narrator further views," Their blotched faces were immobile, distant, but full of a fierce foolish cunning" (14) .

Thus the story presents the on going chaos and trauma in the post colonial world.

3.3 One Out of Many: Santosh's Sense of Alienation and Nostalgia

"One Out of Many" is the first story in the novel *In a Free State*. The protagonist of the story Santosh states his present situation in the beginning of the story who is now an American citizen and lives in Washington. He vividly presents his feelings and realizations of being in Washington and adopting American citizenship. He is not satisfied with his leaving of native land, India and new life in Washington. Naipaul himself has this type of complex fate that inspite of being associated with no less than three societies, he has been unable to find his moorings in any one of them.

Naipaul depicts his efforts to come to terms with his own displacement and understand his place in the world. To Naipaul, writing is an activity that leads to self discovery.

Santosh has come to Washington D.C. as a cook for a diplomat. In the very beginning of the story the narrator and protagonist Santosh says "I am now an American citizen and I live in Washington, capital of the world. Many

people both here and in India, will feel that I have done well. But "(15) The single word sentence "But" further implies the reversal of the situation.

Santosh fondly recalls his life in Bombay. He is haunted by the memory of his former friends, the activities he had involved and the atmosphere. He says:

I was free simply to stroll. I liked walking beside the Arabian sea, waiting for the sun to come up. Then the city and the ocean gleamed like gold. Alas for those morning walks, that sudden dazzle, the moist salt breeze on my face , the flap of my shirt, that first cup of hot sweet tea from a stall, the taste of the first leaf- cigarette. (16)

He expresses every detail minutely. The memory of the past life becomes much more agonizing in the present.

Santosh did not like the place Washington. He is faced with the threat of displacement. Mainly at first he was scared of the presence of "hubshi" people about whom he had heard in stories or he had seen one or two in Bombay. He finds them terribly annoying. He helplessly remarks, "O father, what was this place I had come to" (21). He finds many things different from Bombay, Thus, he says, "I felt like a prisoner (21)". He remembers and mentions Bombay all the time and compares with Washington. Indian things are much more appreciating and dear to him. He says, "I had brought a trinity of the weed with me from Bombay in one of my bundles, together with a hundred razor blades, believing both weed and blades to be purly Indian things" (23).

Santosh and his employer both are offended by an American's remark about the pieces of sculpture in the employer's apartment. The American said he had himself brought back a whole head from one of the ancient temples. Their cultural feeling made them feel insulted.

Pursuing freedom in other's land Santosh deserts his employer and joins Priya, an Indian who runs a restaurant there. He has a good relationship with Priya but after running away from his employer, he is an illegal immigrant and the fear of being discovered constantly nags him. Priya highly adores the heritage of his source culture. He has the collection of good luck objects, a brass plate with a heap of uncooked rice for prosperity a little clay lamp, for general good luck. He wants to do in Washington what his Indian ancestor saints did in India. He is tired of the mundane world and says, "Why don't we renounce and go and meditate on the river bank?" (37). Santosh finds his talk fascinating. Both of them have a nostalgic feeling that they compare everything with Indian culture and events. Santosh says, "I loved his talk. I hadn't heard anything so sweet and philosophical since the Bombay days" (38). Santosh is feeling himself a stranger and alienated in those places. He expresses, "But now even in my mind, I was a stranger in those places" (43). Santosh has an alien feeling to the hubshi woman to whom he was once attracted. He says:

Then as if remembering anger, she gave me a look of great hatred; and again I saw her as a Kali, many armed, goddess of death and destruction. She looked hard at my face. She considered my clothes [. . .] She moved towards me. I got up and

ran. I ran across the road then, not looking back hurried by devious ways to the restaurant. (48)

Santosh knows he is dislocated and displaced but he can not help himself. He wants to run away but he is caught in a vicious circle. He has a great remorse for the relationship with the hubshi woman. He realizes that he has done a terrible mistake. Neither religion nor culture or tradition has allowed him to be in contact with the hubshi woman. So he expresses his agony "I felt a hole in my stomach. I couldn't think" (48). He further says " I had been nothing; I have made myself nothing" (48)

In the end Santosh discloses all his secrets to Priya, who then advises him to marry the hubshi woman because that is the only way to legalize his presence in Washington. Santosh follows Priya's advice, but the freedom he gained brings him loneliness and fragmentation. Santosh wants to be with the people of his culture. He says, "I thought how nice it would be if the people in Hindu costumes in the circle were real [. . .] In this city I was alone and it didn't matter what I did" (51). He was one of many in that alien culture and place. Till the end Santosh thinks himself as a stranger because everything around him is strange and alien. He concludes", Its smells are strange, everything in it is strange. But my strength in this house is that I am a stranger" (52). Although he fulfills his physical needs, he is not satisfied anymore. He feels cultural loss and culturally alienated forever.

3.4 Tell Me Who to Kill: A Victim of Colonialism

The narrator in the story "Tell Me Who to Kill" is a West Indian who goes to the West Indies, the familiar Naipaul territory. He is an exile in an

inhospitable world. He feels completely alienated to the place where he is going. He is not even sure to his destination. He envies to the boy with his mother who is writing on the wet window with his finger because the boy knows where he is going He says grimly:

The boy is with his mother and he is all right. He knows where they are going when the train stops. It is a moment I don't like at all, when the train stops and everybody scatter, when the ship deck and everybody take away their luggage. Everybody have their own luggage and everybody's luggage is so different. Everybody is brisk then, and happy, no time for talk. Because they can see where they are going. since I come to this country that is something I can't do. I can't say where I am going. I can only wait to see what is going to turn up. (55)

The narrator is going to attend his brother's wedding but he is not sure what bus or train to take and to what station. He is very careful to give the detail of his uncertainty. He says, "What street we will walk down, what gate we will go through and what door we will open into what room" (5). Though the narrator has not got an opportunity to make his life significant, he nurtures dreams of a better life for his brother, Dayo. His self effacement is so complete that he remains Dayo's brother till the end and is not given a name. So he somehow manages to send his brother Dayo to England to study aeronautical engineering.

While on the way he is confused by his situation. He has a disillusionment of the post colonial world. He knows clearly where his house is

and he longs to go to his house. He expresses his nostalgia to his house. He says:

I know where our house is and I know, oh my God, that if ever I go back I will get off the taxi at the junction and walk down the old Savannah Road. I know that road well; I know it in all sorts of weather. But what I see in my mind is no place at all. (57)

The narrator thinks that his life is spoilt. In that alien culture and people he feels he is finished. He says, "My Life Finish. It spoil, it spoil" (57). He doesn't like to see white people.

The narrator's uncle is also a victim of colonialism. He has adopted foreign life style and culture. He has changed his religion and now he is a Christian. He has taken a Christian name as a mark of his progressiveness. The narrator hates white people. He hates his uncle and his family because of their white relationship. He says, "Even today I can hate them, when I should have more cause to hate white people, to hate this café and street and these people who cripple me and spoil my life. But now the dead man is me" (67).

The narrator finds everywhere strange to him and he feels himself a stranger. He says, "I feel it is not my life" (76). The narrator talks about his brother and says that he loses confidence. He is psychologically very weak, he lacks the vigour of life. He too feels the same and says, "I don't have confidence, brother, I lose my confidence" (77). He is totally alienated with the people and place in London. He thinks he is making himself fool being in that place. He says, "Look at these things and people I never did see. They have their life too; the city is theirs. I don't know where I thought I was, behaving as

though the city was a ghost city, working by itself, and that is something I discover myself" (81). He finds the city like a ghost city. The people were insulting him and there was discrimination to him. He has a sense of nostalgia. He remembers home all the time and compares the place, London, with his home. He expresses his disgust to the strange place as "At home, at home, windows are always open and everything get clear in the open air. Here everything is locked up. Even on a bus no breeze does blow" (82). He is really suffering from homesickness. He fancies running a roti-and-curry shop where he wants to keep a little pile of rotis or chapattis or dalpuris on the counter on the side. He says, "A reminder of home and simple things" (83).

Where someone does not feel comfortable and happy, nothing gives him pleasure. Sorrow and happiness are the stage of mind and they depend on the other circumstances. When someone doesn't feel comfortable and has a desparate mood, everything becomes nuisance and torturing. The narrator says, " But now everything is hurting. I can't bear the way those louts talk or laugh or dress, and I feel my heart getting full of hate" (84). He hates everything there as he hated Stephen. He says:

It is like a different city, and he is like a man among the tourists: watch him going up the wide steps with his suit and his books. But these people come for the day, they are happy. They have buses to take them back to their hotels; they have countries to go back to, they have houses.

The sadness I feel makes my heart seize. (90)

The narrator has a very precise and minute psychological perception. He is studying the effect of alien culture on his brother. His brother is

psychologically poor and frustrated in the strange place. The narrator says, "This is like a man who breaks his back in truth. It is face of a tired foolish boy. It is the face of someone lost" (9). The narrator is very sorry that Dayo is lost.

Naipaul makes clear that the sense of insecurity that springs from the identity crisis leads to existential fears which result in psychosis. The narrator presents a very detached point of view. People are doing their duties as usual and other natural things are also in their usual respective movement but nothing gives him a satisfactory and pleasant feeling. The narrator has a break down. His neurosis is the result of an intense alienation with which he can not cope. He presents:

The school-girls sitting young and indecent on the concrete kerb in their short blue skirts, laughing and taking loud to get people to look at them. The buses come and go. The taxies come and turn, and men and women get out and get in. The whole world going on. And I feel outside it. (91)

Naipaul's inability to identify with India makes him view the concepts of identity and the state of homelessness. Naipaul and the narrator have the same fate. The narrator feels he is outside and dislocated. He does not belong to that place and culture. He has nowhere to go. He has not any fixed destination. Regarding Dayo and himself the narrator remarks, "He mingles with them. But he has nowhere to go. And after I watch him leave I feel that I too have nowhere to go"(91).

He can't stand what Dayo is going to do. Dayo is going to marry a white girl. He sometimes thinks of him as a stranger, different from the man he knows. He does not find any cultural ritual on his brother's wedding day. He says:

Taxi today. No turban, no procession, no drums, no ceremony of welcome, no green arches, no lights in the wedding tent, no wedding songs. Just the taxi, the thin white boy with sharp shoes and short hair, smoking, and my brother with a white rose in his jacket. He is just the same. The ugly labourer's face and he is talking to his friend showing everybody he is very cool. I don't know why I did think he would get different in three years. (96)

He doesn't like being in church. His brother has wedded a stranger. His brother has been a lost man there. Dayo spoilt his life. He is very furious at the alien people and culture. He says very desperately, "O God show me the enemy. Once you find out who the enemy is, you can kill him. But these people here confuse me. Who hurt me, who spoil my life? Tell me who to beat back" (98). He doesn't like their company. He says, "And this is how it is ending, in this room eating with these people. Tell me who to kill" (98). He feels shattered within. He feels so much cultural loss that he does not like to live any more. He prefers himself to be dead. He sends home the message that he is dead. He says very pathetically "Because it was my idea after my trouble that nobody should know that the message should go back home that I was dead. And for all this time I am the dead man" (98). But the enemy is not a person. The enemy is the past, of slavery and colonial neglect. Like Santosh, the narrator, Dayo and the

rest of his family are products of colonization and its aftermath Feder writes "In him Naipaul has created a figure whose increasing rage and alienation from a society that has scorned him are his only defenses against a total descent into madness" (*Naipual's Truth*, 199).

In a sense the story "Tell Me Who To Kill" presents the theme of disillusionment with England.

3.5 Bobby and Linda: Desperate Colonials

The title novella *In a Free State* portrays a newly independent unnamed African country in turmoil. At the background of the novel there is a tribal war between the king and the president. It is a struggle for power between them. With independence their anxieties about one another became acute. The king and the president intrigued with the local representative of white governments. The white man supported the president and the president was able to send his army against the king's people. Bobby, the protagonist in the novel, works as an administrative officer in one of the departments of the central governments and lives in the Southern Collectorate, a territory of the king's people. In the beginning of the story Bobby is in the capital, four hundred miles drive from the southern Collectorate, attending a seminar on community development.

Even after the independence, colonial dominance is not less in Africa. The seminar has more English participants than Africans. The Africans wear English made Daks suits and they have English hair style. Even the African officers prefer to be seen and noted by white people. In the introductory paragraph, thus, the narrator presents the clear view of post colonial Africa. He says, "It was still a colonial city, with a colonial glamour. Everyone in it

was far from home" (100). Phil Langram rightly writes, "Naipaul's fiction is framed by an insistence on the separateness of individuals" (46 *The Literary Criterion*).

Bobby, an expatriate, is encountered by another English expatriate, Linda, one of the compound wives. She is another major character in the novel. So both of the main characters are in their exile. Bobby and Linda undergo a hazardous journey throughout the novel. It gives the meaning that they are not safe in another's country. All the time Bobby's mood is desperate. There is no vigour and enthusiasm in him from the beginning. He has "Disappointment rather than need"(106).

The various episodes in the novel emphasize the cultural alienation and placelessness overwhelming in the post-colonial world. It also throws light on the corrosive influence of colonial rule in the psyche of the colonized.

In addition to the circumstances they face during the journey Bobby and Linda confess their past lives. Bobby confesses that he had a breakdown and he hadn't learnt to drive before he came to Africa.

The circumstances do not favour Bobby in Africa. Bobby a homosexual, flitters with a Zulu and tempts him for money. But at last the Zulu spits Bobby on his face. He is so helpless that he can not react any way. He feels suffered even in his dream in these places.

Inevitably there is conflict and hatred between two cultures. The Africans cause trouble on their way. They get in the car and don't want to get out of car. It is only Linda's anger that saves the situation. There is everywhere disorder and chaos in Africa. There is murder and crime. In order to be safe

among the native people, Bobby wears native shirt. Bobby and Linda are afraid all the time. Mostly they are afraid of the soldiers in Africa. The narrator describes Bobby's mood as:

But as the soldiers came near, and saved heads appeared above bobbing vests, Bobby became uneasy. It was wrong to stare; he would be noted. So looking straight ahead, resisting the rhythm of the dance he walked past the sweating, blinking soldiers and their instructor, who scampered by, inches away, shouting 'Ah! Ah ! ' (172) .

Nothing in Africa is fresh and pleasant for them. They find Africa always poor. The narrator says "Farms appeared again, and fenced fields: little shack settlements at cross roads, houses and huts in dusty yards, two or three wooden shops : flaking distemper on old timber, faded advertisements on door's twisted frames, dark interiors" (221). The settlement in Africa is described as muddy, full of dust and rubbish, bush and shed and broken.

The narrator presents a very bad condition of people as well. He writes, "Collapsed huts of mud and grass would have seemed part of the bush, corrugated iron made a ruin. Here and there women and children had returned to the ruins" (236). Description of the natural and physical things symbolize the feelings of the characters. Because of the dislocation and cultural difference they find nothing fascinating in Africa.

Bobby and Linda most of the times describe the physical appearance of the African. It is because they are different from them. They are alienated to the people and culture there. Bobby doesn't find his people and company there. He

doesn't feel fresh. Both mentally and physically the journey is very troublesome for them. He feels exhausted because of the long drive and the exhaustion turns to melancholy. He wants to be alone there. He wants to be absent and missed because what he is facing is a nuisance all the time.

There is always the feeling of cultural difference. They don't like African people's dress, costume and activities. Linda says, "That's the sort of the thing that makes me feel far from home. I feel that sort of forest life has been going on forever" (159). Linda further comments, "Somewhere up there they have taken off their nice new clothes and dancing naked and holding hands eating dung. The president probably sent them a nice piece of dung" (164).

In this novel Naipaul presents the boarder post colonial state of power , freedom and neocolonialism in the emergent African nation and hence the novel is intensely political. Bobby and Linda are rigid colonialist. Their views about Africa is very much biased. Bobby says, "I suppose I vaguely felt when I came here that they would be hostile because I was white and English and because of South Africa and things like that" (158). Every scene and situation is strange for them. Bobby is really a homeless citizen who has no sense of belonging. He has no friends there to whom he can share his tension. Bobby and Linda feel themselves insecure when they face 'other' culture and an unknown fear haunts them. Naipaul himself has the trauma of identity crisis and feels himself homeless and frustrated as Bobby does.

Linda has a terrible prejudice against Africans. She thinks the natives to be much inferior and savage. Linda says, "They are going to swear their oaths of hate. You know what that means, don't you? You know the filthy things they

are going eat? The blood, the excrement, the dirt " (119). They make plenty use of metaphor of bush and forest. They think the natives to be uncivilized and inferior- living in bush and forest. Whenever Bobby and Linda dislike the things and people they mention 'bush'. Linda says, "Those same grinning soldiers threw away their guns and tore off those uniforms and ran off naked into the bush" (217). Linda and Bobby call the natives 'savage'. Linda says, "we mustn't let our minds grow rusty. We are among savages and we need our cultural activities. We are among these very dirty savages and we must remind ourselves that we have this loveliness" (220). Linda boasts about her colour and she hates the people with black colour. She says, "Did you see them grinning ? Savages. Fat black savages. I can't bear it when they grin like that" (214).

Linda and Bobby's journey is filled with tension, fear of the unknown, and danger in what they discover. The road is difficult: worn, damp, dust, mud and falling rocks. Similar to this, the situation they are facing is also full of fear and threat. They are desperately trying to be free from the grip of the natives. Linda and Bobby are sorry for themselves for their desperate conditions because there is a threat to them. Linda says, "I hated this place from the first day I came here. I felt I had no right to be among these people. It was too easy. It wasn't at all what I wanted" (218). They find that their life is in danger in the alien place and culture. Linda feels completely alienated. She says "It's their country. But it's your life. In the end you don't know what you feel about anything. All you know is that you want to be safe in the compound." (218-19).

The president's men stop Bobby on the way and demand his wrist watch. Bobby is then beaten badly and his hand is fractured. The condition of the place where they are going is very dangerous. The president's men are burning down the king's village. The narrator describes the chaos as:

They were a people who lived, vulnerably now, in villages along their ancient straight roads; roads that had spread their power as forest conquerors, until the forest explorers came. The villages were close together; the highway was normally full of pedestrians and cyclists. But the road now was empty; and the villages they passed were empty, dead, and burnt-out. The village that blazed were in the dirt tracks off the main road. (236).

Even after the colonial rule the condition of the people is not different. There is still chaos and ruin.

So Naipaul proves that social fragmentation is the common fate of all postcolonial societies. Bobby is homeless and he doesn't belong to any country. He only introduces himself as a government officer but which government he belongs to is not mentioned. The theme of displacement and dislocation is mingled in the different stories in the novel. Like Santosh, Linda recalls and compares the places with England. Like Dayo's brother, Bobby has also a breakdown. The feeling of cultural alienation haunts the people who are culturally dislocated.

3.6 The Circus at Luxor : A Symbol of Violence

In a Free State concludes with an entry from Naipaul's journal, "The Circus at Luxor", which is the epilogue of the book. Unlike in the prologue the Epilogue presents Naipaul's involvement in the world around him.

Naipaul describes his journey to Egypt and the time he stays at Milan. He watches a lot of Chinese people who are from Red China. There are German, Italian and English tourists and soldiers from Sinai.

The narrator represents the characteristic of the modern world that there are people from all over the world in a place. He says:

The rest house was crowded. Sunglassed tourists, exploring their cardboard lunch-boxes, chattered in various European languages, I sat on the terrace at a table with two young German. A brisk middle-aged Egyptian in Arab dress moved among the table and served coffee. (243)

So the narrator focuses on the diversity of culture where people from different cultural background interact each other. But all of them are indifferent to each other.

Naipaul presents a pathetic situation in which children are being lured by some tourists with scraps of food, which they throw on the sand. When the children come closer to the food a coffee waiter strikes them with a whip. Other tourists watch it with joy but Naipaul can't stand it and snatches the whip from the coffee waiter. It gives the message that Naipaul is against violence and in favour of ordered world.

IV. Conclusion: Cultural Alienation

In the novel *In a Free State* all of the major characters are exile who have to cross natural, geopolitical, cultural and social obstacles on their travels. Naipaul himself is an expatriate in London because of his self made exile. His magnificent obsession is India, the land of his ancestors. He finds himself a homeless person. Actually, he is in search of an identity. He argues that self examination and historical inquiry are the two modes of examining the problems of identity. He thinks that people have to consider the culture from which they have come. So in a sense Naipaul's this work is at least partly autobiographical. He has expressed his experience of exile, which has ennobled him to treat his own alienation and dislocations as instance and analogue of the changes and search for identity of colonial and post colonial peoples. This position of the exile thus makes Naipaul an authority to talk about cultures and experiences as an outsider insider or vice versa.

In a Free State consists of a prologue, an epilogue two short stories and a title novella. Though distinct, the pieces are integrally the same theme of rootlessness, placelessness and cultural alienation. In the Prologue there are people belonging to many diverse nationalities. The Tramp has no fixed nationality and nationality has ceased to have any meaning for him. He is an example of rootlessness and placelessness that is the destiny of the modern man.

Santosh, the narrator of the story "One Out of Many" is dislocated in Washington D.C. The place, people and culture are very much strange and disgusting to him. All the time he remembers his native land India. He has a

strong nostalgia to Bombay. Legal freedom and material prosperity can not console him. He is culturally alienated in other's land and strange culture.

The narrator of the story "Tell Me Who To Kill" faces much more deplorable plight. He feels completely lost in London where his brother is pursuing his studies. His brother's marriage to a white girl shocks him much. The narrator and Dayo are the extreme victims of colonization.

In the title novella *In a Free State* the major characters Bobby and Linda are far removed from the landscape of their native place. Though these characters become aware of the landscape, they fail to get a sense of place because they realize that it can never be in their's in the real sense. They experience a deep sense of fragmentation and they encounter greater confusion and troubles in the course of their journey. They choose their exile seeking freedom but they feel isolated and alienated in the strange culture. Their superiority complex of the colonizers also causes them more trouble with the native African. Naipaul presents the inferiority of post colonial African societies in this novella. He holds the colonial past of these societies responsible for their deficiencies.

Epilogue from a Journal "The circus at Luxor" presents Naipaul's involvement in the activities around him as a conscious human being. It presents Naipaul's hopeful note of the future world.

Thus, Naipaul's *In a Free State* presents the post colonial world where people of different cultures are confronted to new cultures. The people are detached from their root culture for diverse reasons and they feel sense of loss,

nostalgia and alienation. They feel hatred toward other culture and there appears separation, frustration and violence.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *Glossary of Literary Terms*. Banglore: Harcourt College Publishers, 2001.
- Ahpoen Pirkkoliisa "Flying in the Liminality between Alienation and Identification: Interpreting the Border Crossing of Migrants." *Cultural Identity in Transition*. Ed. Kupiainen Jari, Erkki Sevanen and John A. Stotesbury. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2004.
- Aschorft Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Hillen Tiffin Eds. *Key Concepts in Post Colonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- "Alienation." Blackburn, Simon. *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Boehmer, Elleke, *Colonial and Post Colonial Literature*. New Delhi: OUP, 2005.
- Feder, Lillian. *Naipaul's Truth, The making of the Writer*. Noida: Indialog, 2001.
- Fornas, Johan. *Critical Theory and Late Modernity*. London: Sage Publications. 1995.
- Hakkarainen, Majra Leena. "German Home and Hybridity: Reclaiming New Cultural Identities in Selected German Migrant Narratives from the 1990s." *Cultural Identity in Transition*. Ed. Kupiainen Jari, Erkki Sevanen and John A. Stotesbury. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2004.
- Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory*. Ed. Padmini Mongia. Delhi: OUP, 1997. 121.
- Iyer Pico, "Stalking the Center: Noble Winner V.S. Naipual Kejurenated Literature by Reinventing Himself." *Times* 22 Oct. 2001: 56.

- Jain, Jasbir. "The New Parochialism: Homeland in the Writing of the Indian Diaspora." *In Diaspora: Theories, Histories, Texts.* Ed. Makarand Paranjape. New Delhi: Indialog Publications, 2001.
- Langran, Phil. "Earl Lovelace and V.S. Naipaul: Representations of Trinidad." *The Literary Criterion*. Vol XXXV 2000.
- Mohan, Champa Pao. *Post Colonial Situation in the Novels of V.S. Naipaul*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers. 2004.
- Naipaul, V.S. *In a Free Sate*. London: Picador, 1971.
- - -. *The Mimic Men*. London: Penguin Books. 1990.
- Nixon, Rob. *London Calling; V.S. Naipaul, Post Colonial Mandarin*. New York: OUP, 1992.
- Patel, Dr. Vasanta S. *V.S. Naipaul's India: A Reflection*. New Delhi: Standard Publishers, 2005.
- Prasannarajan. S. "A Prize for Sir Vidia." *India Today* 22 Oct. 2001: (50-53).
- Punter, David. *Postcolonial Imaginings: Fictions of a New World Order*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers. 2005.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1994.
- - -. *Reflections on Exile and Other Literary and Cultural Essays*. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2001.
- Saraswathi, V. "The Culture - Literature Connection: Changing Implications for Curricular Design." *Post - Coloniality: Reading Literature*. Ed. C.T. Indra and Meenakshi Shivram. New Delhi: Vikas Publications. 1999
- Segers Rein. T. "The Underestimated Strength of Cultural Identity Between Localising and Globalising Tendencies in the European Union." *Cultural Identity in Transition*. Ed. Kupiainen Jari, Erkki Sevanen and John A. Stotesbury. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2004.

Walder Denis. *Post Colonial Literatures in English*. U.K.: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.

Walsh, William. *Naipaul, Sir V(idiadhara) S(urajprasad) Commonwealth Literature*. Chicago: St. James Press, 1990.

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

Yee, Danny. Rev. of *In a Free State*, By V.S. Naipaul, 4 March. 1994.

<[http:// www.dannyreview.com/in a free state](http://www.dannyreview.com/in_a_free_state)>.