T.C.
YÜZÜNCÜ YIL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI

# A COMPARISON OF V.S. NAIPAUL AND GEORGE LAMMING IN THE LIGHT OF POLITICS OF POSTCOLONIALISM AND POETICS OF ALIENATION

DOKTORA TEZİ

Mehmet Recep TAŞ

VAN-2011

T.C.
YÜZÜNCÜ YIL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI

# A COMPARISON OF V.S. NAIPAUL AND GEORGE LAMMING IN THE LIGHT OF POLITICS OF POSTCOLONIALISM AND POETICS OF ALIENATION

DOKTORA TEZİ

**Hazırlayan**

Mehmet Recep TAŞ

**Danışman**

Prof. Dr. Hasan BOYNUKARA

VAN-2011

YYÜ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜGÜ'NE

Bu çalısma, jürimiz tarafından İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI'NDA DOKTORA TEZİ olarak kabul edilmistir.

İmza

Başkan: Prof. Dr. Hasan BOYNUKARA (Danışman)....…….....

Üye: Doç. Dr. Ahmet BEŞE..... …….

Üye: Doç. Dr. Yaşar ŞENLER.....…….

Üye: Yard. Doç. Dr. Bülent TANRITANIR……..……..….

Üye: Yard. Doç. Dr. Metin BARLIK...……..……...

Onay: Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen ögretim üyelerine ait oldugunu onaylarım.

…../…../ 2007

……..

Enstitü Müdürü

## CONTENTS

**CONTENTS** ..... **I**

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT** ..... **III**

**ABBREVIATIONS** ..... **IV**

**ÖZET** ..... **VII**

**INTRODUCTION** ..... **1**

**CHAPTER ONE: WAYS OF SUBJUGATION** ..... **8**

1.1. IMPERIALISM ..... 8

1.2. COLONIALISM ..... 12
1.2.1. TYPES OF COLONIALISM ..... 18

1.3. NEOCOLONIALISM ..... 21

1.4. EVALUATION ..... 23

**CHAPTER TWO: COUNTER DISCOURSES: ...** ..... **26**

2.1. POSTCOLONIALISM ..... 26
2.1.1. DEFINITION ..... 29
2.1.2. FUNCTION ..... 33
2.1.3. DEBATES ..... 36
2.1.4. EVALUATION ..... 40

2.2. POSTCOLONIAL THEMES ..... 43

2.3. ORIENTALISM: ..... 49

**CHAPTER THREE: NAIPAUL AND LAMMING ON POLITICS OF POSTCOLONIALISM** ..... **52**

3.1. THEIR VIEW OF THE WEST INDIAN HISTORY ..... 62

3.2. LANGUAGE, STYLE AND THEIR WRITINGS ..... 67

3.3. NAIPAUL AND LAMMING ON THE CARIBBEAN NATION.....79

3.4. THEIR VIEW OF THE IDENTITY OF THE CARIBBEANS .....87

3.5. EVALUATION.....92

**CHAPTER FOUR: ALIENATION AND EXILE IN *A HOUSE FOR MR BISWAS* AND *IN THE CASTLE OF MY SKIN*.....100**

4.1. EXILE, UNHOMELINESS, UNCANNY AND ALIENATION.....101

4.2. *A HOUSE FOR MR BISWAS* AND *IN THE CASTLE OF MY SKIN*: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND .....116

4.3. V. S. NAIPAUL .....122
4.3.1. A HOUSE FOR MR BISWAS .....126
4.3.2. ALIENATION IN A HOUSE FOR MR BISWAS.....130

4.4. GEORGE LAMMING .....137
4.4.1. IN THE CASTLE OF MY SKIN.....142
4.4.2. ALIENATION IN *IN THE CASTLE OF MY SKIN*.....148

4.5. EVALUATION.....164

**CONCLUSION .....176**

**BIBLIOGRAPHY .....191**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Hasan BOYNUKARA for his close and careful readings, and his supportive guidance.

I am also grateful to my co-adviser Metin BARLIK for his support and encouregement he supplied during the course of this study, and to Bülent TANRITANIR for his doctoral courses which broadened my horizon.

I also owe a dept of gratitude to Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL for his commentaries and invaluable suggestions that I greatly benefitted from.

And lastly, I am indebted to my wife Ayfer, the mother of my beloveds, my daughter Azra and my son Robin both of whom were born in the course of this study. I sincerely appreciate her support and infinite passion without which it wouldn't be possible to complete this study.

## ABBREVIATIONS

**MP:** The Middle Passage

**PE:** The Pleasures of Exile

**ICMS**: In the Castle of My Skin

**AHFMB:** A House for Mr Biswas

**OAI:** Of Age and Innocence.

**TE:** The Emigrants,

**NOMP:** Natives of My Person.

**EOA:** Enigma of Arival

**MM:** The Mystic Masseur

**Pp**: Pages

## ABSTRACT

This thesis is two-fold. On the one hand, it focuses on the political views of Naipaul and Lamming as regards the culture of once-colonized countries considered as the "Third World", on the other hand, it focuses on how they experienced and treat the concept of alienation which must be considered to be the resultant of their politic standpoints. The first fold is based on Naipaul's *The Middle Passage* and Lamming's *The Pleasures of Exile*, both of which are the writers' the first nonfictional works portraying their political standpoints as regards the history, nationalism, and the cultural identity of the West India, in particular, and the 'Third World' in general. The second fold takes Naipaul's *A House for Mr Biswas* and Lamming's *In the Castle of My Skin* into consideration. Relying on Homi Bhabha's notion of 'unhomeliness' and Melvin Seeman's highly influential five-fold classification of the theme of alienation, and considering Hegelian, Marxist and existentialist theories as regards the noition of alienation as well, it portrays how V. S. Naipaul and George Lamming may have experienced and dealt with the theme of alienation, unhomeliness and displacement in these novels.

Drawing on postcolonial theory, this thesis compares two opposing literary figures exploring their political cultural and ethnic backgrounds and how these have developed their world view from which they yield their oeuvres, and it illuminates how versions of reality or binary oppositions may vary from an individual to the other, or speaking generally from one culture to the other. Having different versions of their own realities, George Lamming and V.S. Naipaul are known to be the two

writers who represent the two opposing poles, namely; the East and the West, between which there has been a solid tension on the ground that each propounds its own thesis to be for the benefit of humanity. This study comes to a conclusion that in order to abstain from such vicious circles of the clashes between thesis and antithesis, all binary oppositions had rather appropriate Hegel's concept of *Aufhebung* which also means sublation.

# ÖZET

İkinci dünya savaşından sonra batılı güçler tarafından sömürgeleştirilen toplumlar birer birer görece bağımsızlıklarını elde ettikten sonra, Batı söylemine (discourse, thesis) karşı postkolonyal teori adı altında başka bir söylem (counter discourse, antithesis) geliştirdiler. Her ne kadar bu iki karşıtın çatışması sonucu daha kapsayıcı bireşimler (syntheses) meydana gelmiş olsa da, bu bireşimler de bir süre sonra birer tez haline gelip kendi karşıtlarını oluşturmuşlardır. Insanlık, özellikle de 'Doğu' diye tanımlanmış toplumlar, bu kısır döngü içerisinde enerjisini tüketmektedir. Günümüz dünyasında hem ulusal hem de uluslar arası politik ilişkilerin büyük bir kısmı Doğu-Batı ikili karşıtlığı üzerinde hareket etmekte ve bu hareketten de çoğu zaman çatışmalar çıkmaktadır.

Bu açıdan değerlendirildiğinde bu tez postkolonyal teoriyi temel alarak, bir şekilde doğu-batı karşıtlığını temsil ediyor diyebileceğimiz George Lamming ve V.S Naipaul'un politik söylemlerini ve bu söylemlerden ya da anlayışlardan kaynaklanmış olabilecek 'yabancılaşma' temasını yapıtlarına nasıl yansıtmış olduklarını inceleme konusu yapmaktadır.

Tezin iki ayağından biri olan politik anlayışları karşılaştırılırken, her iki yazarın kurgusal olmayan, gezi ve gözlemlerine dayalı ve hemen hemen aynı tarihlerde yazmış oldukları *The Pleasures of Exile* (1960, Lamming) ve *The Middle Passage* (1962, Naipaul) adlı iki eser temel alınmıştır. Diğer ayağı ise Homi Bhabba'nın 'homelessness', Melvin Seaman'ın 'alienation' kavramı ile ilgili beşli sınıflandırması, Marx, Hegel ve varoluşçuların yabancılaşma (alienation) teorileri temel alınarak, Naipaul ve lamming'in *A House for Mr Biswas* (1961) ve *In the*

*Castle of My Skin* (1953) adlı romanlarında yabancılaşma teması ve işleniş biçimi incelenmiştir.

Bu çalışma, sadece kendi doğrularını ileri süren tez ve antitezlerin, ya da ikili karşıtlıkların kısır döngüsel çatışmalarından kurtulmanın, Hegel'in 'bir ikiliğin iki ucunu da hem kapsayıp hem de inkar ederek ötesine geçmek' anlamına gelen '*Aufhebung'* kavramının benimsenmesiyle mümkün olabileceği sonucuna varmıştır. Bülent Somay'ın 'En Ölümcül Günah' adlı makalesinde belirttiği gibi; "Şark/Garp, Sömürge/Sömürgeci ikilikleri de taraflardan birini tutup ötekini imhaya çalışarak aşılmayacak. İkisini de hem kapsayıp hem inkar ederek geçilecek bunların ötesine".

# INTRODUCTION

As Ania Loomba underlines, conquest and control of other people's lands and goods have always been the main interest of mankind throughout the history (1998: 2). Hence, the history of humanity is full of colonizers and colonized. Nevertheless, this study will focus on the period that is called modern colonialism which spans from the 15th to the 20th century.

Especially from the late fifteenth until the second half of the twentieth century Britain, Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, France and Belgium had been the principal colonizers. These countries colonized most of Africa, Asia, and the West Indies. During that period of colonization they performed a harsh political, cultural and economic exploitation, and compelled the native people towards radical changes. The colonizers imposed their language in education system of the colonized, natives became attracted to western luxuries and migrated to towns, native language speakers became a minority, and the most crucial one was that they caused the native people feeling their culture (way of life) as being inferior. This feeling caused the natives to accept the colonizers as masters. Another imposition was that the colonizers imposed their religion by conversion activities of missionaries claiming that it was superior to those of the natives. Due to the slave trade and mass migration of the workforce to large plantation farms, the fundamental rights of the peoples from the colonized countries were cancelled.

During the colonization period, because of those radical, crucial, and brutal changes in culture, religion and ethnic identity, natives acumulated various feelings and reactions which range between negation and appropriation of the culture of the

colonizers. In the struggle for freedom and self determination while some people from these colonized countries favoured a clear-cut return to their native culture rejecting all the effects of colonial culture, the others appropriated, affirmed, and even idealized a hybrid culture claiming that it is not posible to turn back to the native culture from now on. From the beginning years of the twentieth century on, -no matter what they favour- all suppressed peoples began to interrogate and rebel against imperialism and its constitutions. The First World War led many colonies to be aware of their own nationality and created a great disengagement with Europe and its culture. This accumulated aspire for independence peaked during the Second World War, which changed the power relations of the world, and created a new phase towards decolonization. Following the rise of these nationalist movements, the European colonies obtained a new consciousness of their position and began to demand economic and political independence. Consequently, most of these colonized nations began to gain their independence. Although there have been debates highlighting that a new kind of colonialism (neo colonialism) took place, yet, the colonized nations, relatively, enjoyed a more free self-determination period.

By the time the colonized nations got their independence, many native writers and literary scholars who were educated in the west began to shed lights on the processes that the colonized people experienced during the colonization. Thus, a new literary canon, known as 'postcolonial literature' emerged. Postcolonial literature is completely engaged with the interactions between European nations and the peoples they had colonized. In other words, it deals with the relationship of the colonial power to the (formerly) colonised country, its population and culture and vice versa. And this relationship eventualy generated a culture clash. Clashing

cultures and the huge problems resulting from it is considered as a major theme in post-colonial literature. Postcolonial literature also deals with conflicts of identity and cultural belonging. Colonial powers came to foreign territories and destroyed the culture and traditions of the native people, and they constantly imposed their culture on these peoples. This practise inevitably resulted in confusions and conflicts when countries became independent and unexpectedly faced the challenge of generating a new national identity and self-confidence. In brief, postcolonialism can be considered as an ongoing debate about what happened with the colonizers and the colonised during and after the colonial era, and what social, cultural and economical consequences could be seen and are still visible today.

In this regard, anyone who wants to study postcolonial literature has to scrutinise some certain experiences and themes which constitute the basic subject matters of the field of postcolonial literature. These themes can be listed in order as suppression, resistance, migration, deracination, displacement, exile, hybridity, otherness, mimicry, ambivalance, ethnicity, decolonisation, alienation and so forth.

Postcolonial theorists, writers, scholars, and intellectuals - regarding these postcolonial themes and concepts - favour discrepant approaches in order to heal the effects that the colonial experience left on the colonized peoples. For example, while some favour ‘hybridity the others favour nativism. In this regard, this study will focus on two prominent postcolonial figures, namely, V. S. Naipaul and George Lamming, both of whom were born in Carribeans, but originally descended from India and Africa respectively. Although both of them experienced almost the same ways of life [thus; both being born in the West Indies in 1930s as descendants of indentured ancestors, both having been educated under colonial conditions, both

having travelled to the imperial centre (England) for better life conditions, both having inspirations to become writers that they eventually achieved, both being considered as postcolonial writers who have taken certain postcolonial themes (such as cultural identity, exile, alienation, the sense of homelessness) as their subject matters, both writing their oeuvres in English, and etc.], they are considered as two almost completely opposite postcolonial writers who have discrete thoughts about colonial societies. While Lamming favours a literary counter attack on the metropolitan centre in his writings, Naipaul rather attacks and harshly criticises the social, cultural, and psychological decadents that the colonial subjects entangled in.

This thesis dwells on two peculiar aspects. First; it will put forward the answers of such questions as: although they experienced almost the same colonial lives, what are the reasons that made them to have discrete thoughts as regards their culture and societies. Secondly; relying on Hegelian, Marxist and Existentialist theories as regards the noition of alienation, and considering Homi Bhabha's notion of 'unhomeliness' and Melvin Seeman's highly influential five-fold classification of the theme of alienation, it will compare some selected works of these two writers. Thus, it will put forward their sense of some certain postcolonial themes such as unhomeliness, exile and alienation all of which can be subsumed under the theme of cultural displacement, and which have incessantly been articulated in the field of postcolonial literature. The aim in comparing two opposing literary figures, exploring their political cultural and ethnic backgrounds and how these have developed their world view, is to lay down how versions of reality or binary oppositions may vary from an individual to the other, or speaking generally from one culture to the other.

Chapter one presents the process of colonization and subjugation. It focuses on the experiences that the colonized societies encountered relying on the theoretical foundations that the postcolonial scholars, critics, and theorists propounded. It also focuses on the debates of what the terms 'colonialism', 'imperialism', and 'neo-colonialism' connote.

Chapter two focuses on postcolonial theory which is considered, in this thesis, as being the struggle to get rid of the economic, cultural, and psychologic degradations that imperialism (the primordial instinct to suppress the other under its hegemony) left on the once/still-colonized societies. This colonization may be territorial, cultural, political, or anything else. It compares the debates on the definition, function, and scope of the term postcolonial. Given that a good deal of postcolonial studies addresses the problem of cultural identity, postcolonial studies developed some conceptual vocabularies along with the last four decades. These concepts are cultural, and mostly related to 'identity.' All postcolonial studies can be said, in a way, to be concerned with these terms and concepts connoting the experiences between the oppressor and the suppressed, or in other words, the colonizer and colonized, and their relation with the rest of the world. Hence, this chapter will also dwell on these themes and concepts which can be enumerated as mimicry, ambivalence, hybridity, double consciousness, syncretism, otherness, alienation, unhomeliness, exile, nativism, and orientalism, all of which can be considered as the "poetics of postcolonialism," and which will constitute the framework on which I am going to base this thesis.

Taking Naipaul's *The Middle Passage* and Lamming's *The Pleasure of Exile* into consideration, chapter three constitutes a comparison of Naipaul and Lamming

in terms of their politics of postcolonialism. It mainly highlights their literary lives, their oeuvres, their political and ideological affiliations as regard the third world societies and the West. It underlines the general qualities that characterize and differentiate each of them, and the question as although both of them have almost the same backgrounds, why they are considered as two almost completely opposite postcolonial writers who have discrete thoughts about colonial societies. I have chosen these two non-fiction works because they portray both writers' political views on the West and the Third-World, or on the colonizer and the collonized. These works are comprised of their observations they performed via the travels through the islands that form the Caribbean and their visits to homelands of their ancestors. In *The Middle Passage*, Naipaul documents his reactions to the West Indies. As for Lamming's *The Pleasures of Exile,* it contains a narration of his visit to America and Africa and his exploration of the history of the West Indies.

It is a fact that writers', intellectuals' and scholars' political standpoints are built on their perceptions they have experienced in the course of their lives. In this process, they eventually experience various senses of alienation from the cultural and traditional codes of the social milieus which they have organic bounds. On that account, Chapter four, taking Naipaul's *A House for Mr Biswas* and Lamming's *In the Castle of My Skin* into consideration, tackles with how Naipaul and Lamming have experienced and treated the theme of alienation which is most likely to be the cause that has led them to their current political standpoints. Juxtaposing the abovementioned texts, each of which can be regarded as its author's semi-autobiography, relying on Hegelian, Marxist and Existentialist theories as regards the noition of alienation, and considering Melvin Seeman's highly influential five-fold

classification of the theme of alienation as well, it will put forward how these two eminent postcolonial writers experienced and portrayed the sense of alienation, unhomeliness and displacement.

The conclusion chapter exposes a thorough overview of the whole study on the basis of Naipaul's and Lamming's politics as regard the postcolonial societies, and their handling of such postcolonial themes as alieniation, homelessness, and displacement.

# CHAPTER ONE

## WAYS OF SUBJUGATION: IMPERIALISM, COLONIALISM, NEOCOLONIALISM

There have been various debates on what the word imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism connote. In this chapter all these words and their relation to the field of postcolonial literature will be scrutinised respectively. The difficulty in defining imperialism and related concepts such as colonialism, neocolonialism, or even postcolonialism stems from that: they have been in progress, and interpreted as social phenomena existing since ancient times throughout the world.

### 1.1. IMPERIALISM

Colonialism and imperialism are the two concepts which are considered to have the same meaning, hence they are often used interchangeably. Both words resemble in terms of their economic and political aspects of controlling the other, as they both include political and economic control over a dependent territory. As both colonialism and imperialism means political and economic domination of the other, and as both can be traced back to the pre-capitalist past, scholars often find it hard to differentiate the two. In *Encyclopedia Britanica* the term imperialism is defined to be "state policy, practice, or advocacy of extending power and dominion, especially by direct territorial acquisition or by gaining political and economic control of other areas. It always involves the use of power…"[1]. However by referring the etymology

[1] "IMPERIALISM." Encyclopædia Britannica. 2010. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. 11 Aug. 2010 <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/283988/imperialism>.

of the word, one can realize the difference between their cannotation. In Latin the term ‘colony’ means ‘farm,’ as for ‘imperium’, it means ‘to command or ‘superior power’ (Loomba, 1998: 4-5). That is, the meaning of imperialism is more closely related to the control or subjugation of a settlement.

Although both words highlight subjugation of the other, imperialism is where an entity aspires for the control over the other, and colonialism refers to political or economic control, either, formally or informally. Simply, colonialism must be considered as an execution, and imperialism as the idea which leads to that execution. Thus, as Loomba states in *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, “imperialism, colonialism and the differences between them are defined differently depending on their historical mutations (1998: 6).” And she continues to draw a clear distinction between colonialism and imperialism stating that:

> One useful way of distinguishing between them might be to not separate them in temporal but in spatial terms and to think of imperialism or neo-imperialism as the phenomenon that originates in the metropolis, the process which leads to domination and control. Its result or what happens in the colonies as a consequence of imperial domination is colonialism or neo-colonialism. Thus the imperial coun[t]ry is the 'metropole' from which power flows, and the colony or neo-colony is the place which it penetrates and controls. Imperialism can function without formal colonies (as in United States imperialism today) but colonialism cannot (1998: 6).

There have been many critics, scholars and theorists who underlined the distinction between imperialism and colonialism. Among them; Jane M Jacobs, in

the *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*, designates both terms as Loomba does. She asserts that:

> …The Exchange designated imperialism as 'belonging' to the metropolitan core: addressing its cultural constructs and its accumulative drives and territorial expansions. Nineteenth-century British territorial expansion, in this corrective exchange, was registered as imperialism at the core but colonialism at the edge or, to put it differently, imperial in intent, colonial in effect (2002: 15).

Likewise, Edward Said puts a clear distinction between colonialism and imperialism in his book *Culture and Imperialism*. He defines imperialism as the practice, the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory, and colonialism as a specific articulation of imperialism associated with territorial invasions and settlements (1994: 8). For him "Imperialism is 'an act of geographical violence through which virtually every space in the world is explored, charted, and finally brought under control" (1994: 271). Jurgen Osterhammel states the relation between imperialism and colonialism as "imperialism is in some respects a more comprehensive concept and colonialism might appear to be one special manifestation of imperialism" (1997: 22). Jane M. Jacobs propounds that the process of subjugation follows a chronology, stating that "Imperialism was activated by numerous desires and needs, colonialism took hold in a variety of forms and colonialist formations survive and are reactivated in a multitude of ways (2002: 17)."

So, bearing in mind the abovementioned definition of imperialism and colonialism, one can infer that the 'imperial' desire comes first and paves the way for

colonialism. This assessment leads us to assume that imperialism is prior to colonialism, but not in terms of a periodical timeline, only in perception. Imperialism is the thought of control, while colonialism is the practice of that control. So, we can simply think that the idea or the instinct and impetus of ‘imperium’ (to command), which is primordial in humankind, leads to takeover, to control (to colonize) the other’s belongings (realestate or goods). This is where the practice of colonization begins.

## 1.2. COLONIALISM

According to Oxford English Dictionary, the word colonialism was derived from the Roman "colonia", which meant 'farm' or 'settlement'. The word is described as "…a group of people living in a colony, consisting of the original settlers and their descendants and successors"[2]. It is obvious that this definition can rather be used in a biological or geographical context. It lacks a comprehensive meaning. As Ania Loomba states in her reference book *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, it "evacuates the word 'colonialism' of any implication of an encounter between peoples, or of conquest and domination" (1998: 1).

In Encyclopedia Britannica, colonialism is defined as being "A political, economic, cultural phenomenon by which various European nations explored, conquered, settled, and exploited large areas of the world"[3]. But this definition, too, lacks the comprehensibility of the term 'colonialism'. Because, as Loomba states, European powers are not the merely colonizers that expanded into Asia, Africa or the Americas from the sixteenth century onwards (1998: 2). Because of the fact that conquest and control of other people's land and goods have always been the main interest of mankind, colonialism has been a reappearing and widespread feature of all human history. When looked backward, one can observe that there had been various

---

[2] "colony". Oxford Dictionaries. April 2010. Oxford Dictionaries. April 2010. Oxford University Press. 20 May 2010 <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/view/entry/m_en_gb0163530>.

[3] "COLONIALISM, Western." Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. Encyclopædia Britannica, 2011. Web. 26 Apr. 2010. <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/126237/colonialism>.

nations that can be labeled as colonizers. For example; the Roman Empire, the Mongols, Aztecs, Inca Empire, the Ottoman Empire, etc. All these powers were trying to expand and have the control of other territories. In the second century, a vast surface of the earth was under the control of the Roman Empire, the Mongols had conquered and reigned the Middle East and China in the thirteenth century; the Ottoman Empire conquered most of Asia Minor and the Balkans, and it still extended from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Ashcroft et al, in *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures,* states that "More than three-quarters of the people living in the world today have had their lives shaped by the experience of colonialism" (2002: 1).

In *Colonialism:* A *Theoretical Overview*, Jurgen Osterhammel makes a clear definition of the word stating that "colonization designates a process of territorial acquizition" (1997: 16), as for colony, it "designates a particular type of sociopolitical organisation, and colonialism as a system of domination" (1997: 16). Giving some further explanation, he comes to a conclusion that the word colonialism is independent from the word colony, and it is:

> A relationship of domination between an indigenous (or forcibly imported) majority and a minority of foreign invaders. The fundemantal decisions affecting the lives of the colonized people are made and implemented by the colonial rulers in pursuits of interest that are often defined in a distance metropolis. Rejecting cultural compromises with the colonized population, the colonizers are convinced of their own superiority and of their ordained mandate to rule (1997: 16, 17).

He further asserts that the basis of all these three concepts (colony, colonization, and colonialism) "is the notion of expansion of a society beyond its original habitat" (1997: 4).

Philip Wolny, in *Colonialism: A Primary Source Analysis*, defines the word colony as "a territory that has been settled by people from another country and that is controlled by that country"(2005: 59), and he defines the word colonialism as " an economic, social, and political system that existed from the 15th to the 20th centuries in which colonies were used by conquering nations as source of economic and military advantage" (2005: 59).

**T**he history of mankind is full of colonizers and colonized, and depending on the dialectics, once being the colonizers, some empires or communities may have been conquered and colonized as well and vice versa. Fieldhous, in *The Colonial Empires*, underlines that "Only at the time of that massive colonization some parts of Arabia, Persia (Iran), Afghanistan, Mongolia, Tibet, China, Siam and Japan had never been under formal European government" (1989: 373). Looking at the current world conjuncture, we observe that the cultures or states, which have never been colonized, are economically, politically, and even territorially under the siege or have been intruded by the current hegemonic powers. America's intrusion of Afghanistan and Iraq with the alliance of the West under the guise of UN shows us that the process of imperialism and colonization has not been over. What have changed are only the tools with which the hegemonic powers try to legitimize their intrusions. Considering all these experiences, one can envisage that this vicious circle of domination and colonization has been, and most likely will be, a recurrent practice through the history of mankind.

Among the scholars of postcolonial theory, history of colonialism is generally divided into two periods first of which spans from the beginning of the history to the 15th century, and the second from the 15th century to the late 20th century. Giving reference to *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, Ania Loomba states that Marxist thinking, on the subject, "locates a crutial distinction between the two by classifying the earlier colonialisms as pre-capitalist, and modern colonialism as performing alongside capitalism in Western Europe" (1998: 3). Modern European colonialism, which spans from the 15th century to the 20th, can be said to have been inspired of the pre-capitalist colonial desires. But as Loomba marks, "…these modern European colonialists brought and adobted new and different kinds of colonial practises which altered the whole world in such a way that the other [earlier] colonizers or conquerers did not" (1998: 3). This difference between classical and modern colonizers was that; while colonization by the classical empires was performed through the conquest of a region and its population, or by confiscating goods or material resources, modern colonizers; from the fifteenth century on, additionally, restructured the economy and culture of the colonial for the benefit of the economic interests of the metropolis. The securing of raw materials to be used exclusively by imperial industries and the restrictions placed on the production of goods in the colonies in order to transform them into exclusive markets for metropolitan products, or the impositions on the language, education and religion of the colonized are examples of such restructuring. That is, the desire laid underneath the seccond period of colonialism had a characteristic peculiar to capitalism which emerged in the consequence of industrial revolution in Europe. Loomba, in Colonialism/Postcolonialism states this experience saying:

> So far, we have defined colonialism as the forcible takeover of land and economy, and, in the case of European colonialism, a re-strucruring of non-capitalist economies in order to fuel European capitalism. This allows us to understand modern European colonialism; not as some transhistorical impulse to conquer, but as an integral part of capitalist development" (1998: 20).

In addition to reshaping economic structures, modern colonialism also attempted to change the cultures of the populations they conquered. The colonizer was not only interested in the sources of the lands that they invaded. Colonizing cannot only be regarded as a military event. These colonial forces exerted to debilitate the solid beliefs of the colonized peoples in their religions, traditions and moral values to strengthen and endure their domination in the future too. It is interesting that while religion or the thought of revelation was in descent in the West due to the thought of modernism, it was promoted in the colonized countries. That is why wherever the colonizers went, missionaries followed them. Although Christianity and modernism were in conflict with each other in the motherland, they were promoted and presented to justfy the occupations in the colonized countries. Especially, religion was the most effective tool to suppress the oppressed peoples in the colonized lands. Due to the technology they had acquired in the consequence of industrial revolution which eventually came to existence owing to the enlightenment phase, the colonizers had the beliefs that their whole culture was more highly advanced, and they ignored or swept aside the religions, customs, and codes of behavior of the peoples they subjugated. Therefore, native peoples were defined as savage, backward, and undeveloped. So the colonizers saw themselves at the center of the world, and the colonized were at the margins. We see that colonialism is one

of the ways which imperialism employs to exploit the oppressed peoples, so the end of colonialism does not signify the demise of imperialism for a colonised nation. Colonialism involves the settlement of the colonizer, therefore, it is visible and evident, whereas imperialism is often secret and invisible and it is very difficult to determine if a country is exposed to imperialism or not. So, no matter whether it performed during the pre-capitalist period (from the beginning of the history till 15$^{th}$ century) or alongside with capitalist period (the period of modern European colonialism which marks between 15$^{th}$ and the 20$^{th}$ century), colonialism can be defined to be the conquest, the domination and the control of other people's territories, cultures, and belongings.

### 1.2.1. TYPES OF COLONIALISM

There are several types of colonies which alter in form, but have the same purpose, that is, the purpose of exploitation, the practise may be different, but the purpose is the same. These types can be enumerated as: settler colonies, dependencies, plantation colonies, and trading posts. United States of America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Argentina are considered to be **settler colonies**. These colonies were established by the migration of the citizens from a mother country or a metropole to the new colony. The local people or tribes, such as the Aboriginal people in Canada and in the United States, were either moved forcibly to other infertile regions or exterminated by the settlers. This practice of moving the inhabitants caused the indigenous peoples to loose their original life conditions which they were content with.

In **dependencies**, the colonizers sent administrators to govern the native population for the benefit of the metropolis. British Raj, Egypt, the Dutch East Indies are examples of this category.

With **Plantation colonies**, such as West Indies (Barbados, Saint-Domingue and Jamaica), the white colonizers imported black slaves or indentured workers to work in large plantation farms.

**Trading posts**, such as Hong Kong and Singapore, are the colonies where the primary purpose of the colonizers was to engage in trade rather than performing for further cruelty.

Historians generally classify colonialism into two forms, as settler colonialism and exploitation colonialism. Dependencies, plantation colonies, and trading post colonies are often subsumed under the title of exploitation colonialism. The common behaivour in these three models of exploitation colonies is the imposition of the power to the colony and extraction of the raw or refined sources to the metropolis. Thomas Benjamin, in the preface of the first edition of *Encyclopedia of Western Colonialism since 1450*, asserts that "…the history of Western colonialism and imperialism since the fifteenth-century has been organized and classified by historians and scholars in a number of different ways (2006: 16)." He claims that one of the best schemas of the process of colonialism is provided by a political scientist, Professor David B. Abemethy who deliberated a chronology of five periods. These periods are Western expansion, colonialism and imperialism, contractions, and decolonization. Benjamin quotes Abemety's phases as:

> In the first phase, European oceanic expansion led to the possession of a significant portion of the Americas through conquest and colonization... In the second phase the descendants of the European settler societies in the Americas… rebelled against imperial rule and established independent nation-states. During the third phase, what is often called the age of ''modern imperialism,'' a new period of European expansion took off in Africa, Asia, and the Pacific. During this phase of expansion the disparity of power between Europeans and non-Europeans grew as a result of the Industrial Revolution, which provided European empires with steamships and gunboats, repeating rifles and machine guns, railroads, new tropical medicines, as well as attractive and seductive manufactured goods…

As Benjamin asserts, Abemety is of the opinion that during the third phase it was due to the industrial development, which may likely be said to have emerged on the

consequence of modernism, that the Europeans had the power to colonize other parts of the world. As regards the other phases, Benjamin, quoting Abemety, goes on saying that:

> During the fourth phase, World War I (1914–1918) and the Great Depression of the 1930s weakened Western Europe and European colonial power and legitimacy… The war, on the other ha[n]d, led to the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in the Middle East, which permitted the British and the French, under the League of Nations mandate system, to move into Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Trans- Jordan, and Iraq… During the late nineteenth-century and the first four decades of the twentieth-century the rise of popular nationalist movements in colonial India, Egypt, Indonesia, Vietnam, and in other European colonies prepared the way for decolonization. World War II (1939–1945) abruptly began the last phase of Western colonialism. The war dramatically assaulted the key European imperial powers,… Europeans could not longer sustain foreign rule by force or collaboration… Thus, between 1940 and 1980 more than eighty colonies achieved their independence and were recognized as sovereign nation-states (17).

Although, as Benjamin quotes, Abemety considers the second World War as the last phase of Western colonialism, and though most of the colonies gained their independence, it does not mean that the imperial desire, which came into being under the guise or practice of the direct colonization, has ended. This imperial desire transformed itself into an indirect controll in the form of neocolonial practises.

## 1.3. NEOCOLONIALISM

Althoug most of the colonized nation achieved their independence, and although western powers no longer had the direct territorial control, it is believed that western powers, through some political, economical, and cultural practices, perform a new phase of exploitation which is called Neo-colonialism.

Neocolonialism is a concept which has been articulated by the postcolonial critics since the beginning of the period of decolonization, and it signifies the interference of the powerful or developed countries to undeveloped or developing countries. Critics of postcolonial theory assert that neocolonialism is the practice of multinational corporations which exploit the resources of the once colonized countries. Neocolonialism can be imagined as being the interference of powerful countries in the political, economic, and cultural affairs of less powerful countries. Elleke Boehmer, in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*, states that "Although theorists may differ in ascribing causes, they broadly agree that the decline of one sort of colonialism in the 1950s and 1960s led to the rise of another, less overt, more insidious, form which has also been called a super or new imperialism" (2005: 9). The developed countries' investments in undeveloped or developing countries are considered as neocolonial since, as it is claimed, the general assumption that the aim

in these investment is not the transferring of the capital but exploiting the surplus value by the cheap work force available in these countries.

## 1.4. EVALUATION

Giving the connotations of these three words (imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism) relying on the definitions attributed by the scholars most of whom are deemed authorities in their field, one can surely come to a conclusion that although the techniques and methods of controlling the other peoples and their territories may have been different, the primordial instinct, the thought of imperium (the instinct to command) has always been existed through the history of mankind. As a result, imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism have always been performed consecutively, the latters (colonialism and neocolonialism) as being methods or techniques of the imperial thought. Therefore, since the thought of this 'instinct command' (imperium) has not perished, and since it will most likely not, there shouldn't be a necessity to make various attributes referring to political, economic, geographical aspects, and the periods of the term imperialism. No matter when, how, and why this imperial desires have been articulated, the result has always been the exploitation of the periphery. What have changed are the means, the tools, and the discource by which the powerful -be it empire, state, a group, or even an individual- tries and exerts to legitimate its practices of subjugation. In a conference called *Second Economic Seminar of Afro-Asian Solidarity,* which was held in Algeria in 1965, Che Guevara, an Argentinian revolutioner, states that "As long as imperialism exists it will, by definition, exert its domination over other countries. Today that domination is called neocolonialism"[4].

[4] GUEVARA, Che, "Colonialism is Doomed" speech to the 19th General Assembly of the United Nations in New York City on December 11, 1964.

Generally speaking, though many scholors of the once colonized cultures propound that the concept of subjugation is something inherent in the culture of the West, the aspire for imperialism and its practices (be it colonialism or neocolonialism) is not something peculiar to the west merely. It is a primordial instinct of humankind. No matter what nationality one is, or what culture one has, if the zeitgeist has processed in favour, it is no doubt that the subject will not be reluctant to subjugate the other or the weaker. As Boehmer puts it;

> …at the time of high imperialism in the late nineteenth century, most British imperialists cherished an unambiguously heroic image of themselves as conquerors and civilizers of the world. Such self-projections were of course not unique to Europe. They were pretty much standard practice for any regime with territorial ambitions, such as might be found among Arabic, Indic, and Chinese peoples also (2005: 24).

And she goes on, quoting Robert Young, that "What distinguished the colonialist mission of nineteenth-century Europe, and of Britain in particular, was first the industrial and military power that underpinned it; and secondly the often explicit ideologies of moral, cultural, and racial supremacy which backed its interpretative ventures" (2005: 24). In other word, the zeitgeist has been, dialectically, in favour of the West from the fifteenth century on. Though it is no longer in its heydays and is in descent due to the economic crisis, and due to some new alternative emerging economic powers, such as Japan, Chine, and Turkey, it still maintains the control of the other parts of the world.

The colonized countries experienced many changes during the period of colonization. Before the intrusion of the powerful countries, one can see that the

original culture, beliefs and customs of those subjugated people run smootly. Colonialism causes unbearable changes in terms of the norms, beliefs and cultural codes of the natives. Due to the brutal force that the colonizers imposed on the colonized, the natives, having no choise but to accept, begin to feel as being inferior. Having a more advanced technological advantage, the colonizers do their worst against the natives who refuse to conform to the new culture. Natives loosen or stop performing their religion. Generally, they begin to consider Christianity being superior, mainly because it is forced onto them. In order to communicate with the colonizers/ settlers, they begin speaking the settlers' language. Soon enough their languge becomes indistinct. The education system in the colonized countries being under the control of the colonizers paves the ways for the assimilation of the natives. The younger generations who were educated in such a system lost their bounds to their native culture. After many years of such a cultural assimilation, the natives accumulated hate and anger, and they created a counter discourse involving in fight for independence and their culture that has almost been forgotten. Due to the aspire for independence and the search for their own culture, the colonial era ends gradually after World War II. Scholars and academicians began to discuss the cultural effects that the colonial period left on the psyches of the once colonized people. Thus postcolonial theory, through which the effects of cultural deteriorations are deeply scrutinized, takes place.

# CHAPTER TWO

## COUNTER DISCOURSES: POSTCOLONIALISM, ORIENTALISM

The rise of the desires for a national identity, following the first World War, stimulated English and French-speaking writers from Africa, Asia, South America, and the Caribbean to define themselves and their culture in their own terms. These aspire for cultural self definition also stimulated, following the Second World War, an inclination for political self determination. Consequently; many scholars, critics, writers, and intellectuals began to be involved in creating works that reflect their own culture. Among them the most prominent ones are Chinua Achebe, Wole Soyinka, Homi Bhabba, Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, Derek Walcott, V. S. Naipaul, and George Lamming. Postcolonial studies as an academic field emerged in Western universities, as "activists and intellectuals in or from the colonies and newly decolonized nations have formed the opposition to colonialism, imperialism and eurocentricism in collaboration with Western intellectuals (Young 2001: 63).

### 2.1. POSTCOLONIALISM

There have been much debates and controversies on the process, meaning and scope of the term postcolonialism. In this chapter, first; the process of the emergence of the term postcolonial, and then, the controversies on its definitions, functions, and debates will be discussed respectively. Before delving into these debates, it will be more comprehensible to consider postcolonialism as – no matter when, how, or by whom it was carried out - being the struggle to get rid of the economic, cultural, and psychological degradations that imperialism, (the primordial instinct to suppress the

other under its hegemony), left on the once/still-colonized societies (this colonization may be territorial, cultural, political, or anything else).

In the general introduction of *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*, the editors (Ashcroft, Tiffin, Griffiths) state this historical process as;

> European imperialism took various forms in different times and places and proceeded both through conscious planning and contingent occurrences. As a result of this complex development, something occurred for which the plan of imperial expansion had not bargained, the immensely prestigious and powerful imperial culture found itself appropriated in projects of counter-colonial resistance which drew upon the many different indigenous local and hybrid processes of self-determination to defy, erode and sometimes supplant the prodigious power of imperial cultural knowledge (2006: 1).

In the very begining of *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*, the emergence of postcolonial literature is emphasized in the same way with another referential work called *The Postcolonial Studies Reader* written by the same writers. In both works, Ashcroft et al refer to the emergence of postcolonial literature saying;

> The experience of colonization and the challenges of a post-colonial world have produced an explosion of new writing in English. This diverse and powerful body of literature has established a specific practice of post-colonial writing in cultures as various as India, Australia, the West Indies and Canada, and has challenged both the traditional canon and dominant ideas of literature and culture" (2002).

In the course of the colonial period the literature that was produced in the periphery, and which was taking the experiences between the colonizer and the colonized as its

subject mater, was titled as the commonwealth literature. Propounding that, "One important antecedent for postcolonialism was the growth of the study of Commonwealth literature," Mcleod defines Commonwealth literature as being "a term [that] literary critics began to use from the 1950s to describe literatures in English emerging from a selection of countries with a history of colonialism" (2000: 10). Later in 1970s, after almost all colonized countries gained their independence, and as they engaged in a vast cultural, political and historical enquiry of the colonial period and its consequences, which was more critical and more challenging than before, the term commonwealth was substituted with the term postcolonial. Hans Bertens asserts that the Commonwealth studies were trying to set up common ground between the cultural products of the former colonies and the culture of the metropolis. Nevertheless, from 1970s on, postcolonial theory and criticism highlights the tension between the metropolis (the colonizer) and the former colonies with a non Eurocentric vision (2001: 202). That is, loking at the discourse of the works produced during the time which was considered as Commonwealth, one can recognize that these works disseminate the imperial and Eurocentric thoughts, because they were under the control of the imperial power. Following the independence period, literary discourse changes in a radical way with a non Eurocentric vision. And this radical change in discourse begins to be classified as postcolonial literature. Ashcroft et all emphasizes this process of postcolonial development by categorizing it in several stages. They set out these stages as: 1- The literature produced by "a literate elite whose primary identification is with the colonizing power" (2002: 5). These literate elites, they say, were the representatives of the imperial power, and "despite their detailed reportage of landscape, custom, and language, they inevitably privilege the centre, emphasizing the

'home' over the 'native', the 'metropolitan' over the 'provincial' or 'colonial', and so forth" (2002: 5). 2- The literature produced by natives and outcasts "under imperial licence" (2002: 5). These two stages, in which the writers and poets were patronized by superintendents, were the stages of the period called as Commonwealth literature. It is understood that literature and literary figures were under control and restricts of the ruling powers during the early two stages of postcolonial development which can be mentioned to be the era of the commonwealth literature. The third stage of this development can be said to cover the period after 1970s, when the colonized nations gained their independence and began to search for a cultural decolonization. In this respect, the peripherial literature of non Western can be said to have undergone two stages. From the beginning of colonization until 1970s as 'Commonwealth,' which had, as Mcleod states, "a philanthropic sprit," and from 1970s on in the course of decolonization this Commonwealth literature, which was philanthropic due the imperial control and suppression, was replaced by a more challenging movement called postcolonialism which "was to concentrate on darker side of exploitation and dependence" (2000: 16).

### 2.1.1. DEFINITION

Having detailed the emergence of postcolonialism, now, it will be more comprehensive to dwell on its meaning and subject matter. It is generally accepted, among the scholors of the field, that postcolonial studies theoretically began with the publication of *Orientalism*, the fundemantal book written by Edward Said in 1978. It is also consented that this work "completely changed the agenda of the study of non-Western cultures and their literatures and pushed it in the direction of what we now

call postcolonial theory" (2001: 202). Edward Said points out that, postcolonial period was a kind of fight "against an alien and occupying empire on the part of people possessing a common history, religion and language" (1995: 74).

Postcolonial theory is "a collection of theoretical and critical strategies used to examine the culture (literature, politics, and history and so forth) of former colonies of the European empires and their relation to the rest of the world" (Makaryk, 1993: 155). It becomes an umbrella term to include all literatures written on or by the people of the countries which were once colonized by European nations.

According to Patke's article published in *Theory, Culture and Society*, another connotation of the term might be "an ongoing process in which native inhabitants and non-European migrants struggle to find voice and representation within their cultural dynamics of a settler country" (2006: 370). Patke provides a broad connotation of the term postcolonial, which implies the consciousness of "the ways in which modes of thought and belief learned through colonial history to continue to affect cultures after the formal collapse of empires" (2006: 370). Elleke Boehmer also highlights the power of the postcolonial consciousness in questioning and distortment of the colonial authority. This power overthrows epistemologies and grand narratives "abusing violence and the self-validating conceit of colonial authority in its relationship with the colonized" (2005: 341). According to Boehmer, postcolonialism, thus, is likely to be considered "as a field which contains the theories, texts, political strategies, and modes of activism that engage in such questioning which aim to challenge structural inequalities and bring about social justice" (2005: 342).

Lois Tyson classifies postcolonial criticism in two categories asserting that postcolonial criticism, as a domain within literary studies,"is both a subject matter and a theoretical framework" (2006: 418). He goes on saying

> as a subject matter, postcolonial criticism analyzes literature produced by cultures that developed in response to colonial domination, from the first point of colonial contact to the present. Some of this literature was written by the colonizers. Much more of it was written, and is being written, by formerly colonized peoples. As a subject matter, any analysis of a postcolonial literary work, regardless of the theoretical framework used, might be called postcolonial criticism (2006: 418).

As for theoretical framework; Tyson claims that postcolonial criticism tries to understand the relationship (political, social, cultural, and psychological) between colonialist and anticolonialist ideologies. "For example" he says, "a good deal of postcolonial criticism analyzes the ideological forces that, on the one hand, pressed the colonized to internalize the colonizers' values and, on the other hand, promoted the resistance of colonized peoples against their oppressors, a resistance that is as old as colonialism itself" (2006: 418).

Ashcroft et al's definition of postcolonial literature puts it as being a result of the interaction between imperial culture and the complex of indigenous cultural practices. They further define it as "a specifically postmodern term which covers all the culture[s] affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day. This is because there is a continuity of preoccupations throughout the historical process initiated by European imperial aggression" (2002: 2). For Ashcroft et all postcolonial does not mean 'post-independence', or 'after colonialism,' it has, rather, a beginning from the very first moment of colonial contact. It is a counter

discourse of hegemony which colonialism brings into being. In this sense, they assert that "post-colonial writing has a very long history, but it would be true to say that the intensification of theoretical interest in the post-colonial has coincided with the rise of postmodernism in Western society and this has led to both confusion and overlap between the two" ( 2006: 117). As a consequence, they assert that "post-colonial theory has existed for a long time before that particular name was used to describe it. Because; once colonised, peoples had cause to reflect on and express the tension which ensued from this problematic and contested, but eventually vibrant and powerful mixture of imperial language and local experience, post-colonial 'theory' came into being" (2002: 1).

Postcolonial literature, eventually, was a struggle to the colonial hegemony, colonial supression and the silence of the colonized. Frantz Fanon asserts that it was the time "the colonized masses mock at these values, insult them, and vomit them up" (qtd Gikandi, 1996: 17). During the colonial period, while the Occident was able to reflect the Orient as being inferior and opposite image of Western civilization, the colonized, because of the silence they were in, were deprived of the chance to articulate that, this so-called negative image was a constructed image by the West. It was not until the independence that they began to convert damaging stereotypes into positive images. As Boehmer puts it they began "to recover a displaced and fragmented native cultural integrity, and they began to be concerned with recovering an identity fragmented, displaced, or discredited under colonialism in order to reconstitute cultural integrity and, in this way, to construct a vision of an independent future" (2005: 122).

### 2.1.2. FUNCTION

It is generally acknowledged that postcolonial theory functions as a subdivision within the field of "cultural studies", the whole body of generally leftist radical literary theory and criticism which includes Marxist, Gramscian, Foucauldian, and various feminist schools of thought, among others (Brians)[5]. The common interest of these schools is a determination to make an analysis of unfair power relationships in cultural products like literature, film, art, etc. Scholors, who, generally, are engaged and committed to this field, are the ones who strive for liberation process. People who call themselves postcolonial scholars generally see themselves as part of a large movement to expose and struggle against the influence of large, rich nations (mostly European, plus the U.S.) on poorer nations such as African, Asian, and West Indian. In addition, postcolonial theory offers us a framework for examining the similarities among all critical theories such as Marxism; feminism; gay, lesbian, queer theories; and African American theory all of which deal with human oppression. Of course, that doesn't mean that all postcolonial scholors are engaged with literature. Alongside literature, postcolonial theory is also applied to political science, to history, and to other related fields. Ashcroft et all, in *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*, defines the function of the post-colonial theory as follows

> [it] involves discussion about the experience of migration, slavery, suppression, resistance, representation, difference, race, gender, place, and responses to the influential master discourses of imperial Europe such as

5 Paul Brians, "Postcolonial Literature": Problems with the Term. 20 07 2010 < http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/anglophone/postcolonial.html>

> history, philosophy and linguistics, and the fundamental experiences of speaking and writing by which all these come into being. None of these is 'essentially' post-colonial, but together they form the complex fabric of the field (2006: 2).

According to Hans Bertens "Postcolonial theory and criticism radically questions the aggressively expansionist imperialism of the colonizing powers and in particular the system of values that supported imperialism and that it sees as still dominant within the Western world. It studies the process and the effects of cultural displacement and the ways in which the displaceds have culturally defended themselves"(2001: 160). Homi Bhabha, one of the most prominent postcolonial theorists, puts it as:

> Postcolonial perspectives emerge from the colonial testimony of Third World countries and the discourses of 'minorities' within the geopolitical divisions of east and west, north and south. They intervene in those ideological discourses of modernity that attempt to give a hegemonic 'normality' to the uneven development and the differential, often disadvantaged, histories of nations, races, communities, peoples. They formulate their critical revisions around issues of cultural difference, social authority, and political discrimination in order to reveal the antagonistic and ambivalent moments within the 'rationalizations' of modernity (1994: 245-246).

Stephen Slemon, in his article *The Scramble for Postcolonialism*, published in *The Post-colonial Studies Reader,* enumerates the various fields of postcolonialism. He asserts that the term postcolonialism has been used:

> As a way of ordering a critique of totalising forms of Western historicism; as a portmanteau term for a retooled notion of 'class', as a

> subset of both postmodernism and post-structuralism; as the name for a condition of nativist longing in post-independence national groupings; as a cultural marker of non-residency for a third-world intellectual cadre; as the inevitable underside of a fractured and ambivalent discourse of colonialist power; as an oppositional form of 'reading practice;' and as the name for a category of 'literary' activity which sprang from a new and welcome political energy going on within what used to be called 'Commonwealth' literary studies (Ashcroft et all, 2006: 45).

"The obvious tendency", he further asserts, "in the face of this heterogeneity, is to understand 'post-colonialism' mostly as an object of desire for critical practice" (Ibid 45).

### 2.1.3. DEBATES

There seems to be a great deal of uncertainty about the term postcolonialism, ranging from its meaning to the historical period in which it emerged. Some scholors, even, underline that the term postcolonial, with and without a hyphen (postcolonial, post-colonial), denotes diffrent meanings. There have been great debates on its connotation, sphere, and historical period. That is, in other words, what does the term postcolonial mean? When did it start? What about its historical range? Does colonization start with Columbus's discoveries? Or should we consider it having been started with the beginning of history as a premordial desire peculiar to humankind. We can increase the number of such questions. Before highlighting the debates and controversial spheres, it will be more comprehensible to underline that, as Bertens puts it, all postcolonial theorists and critics agree that "they are all engaged in a reassessment of the traditional relationship between the metropolis and its colonial subjects"…(2001: 202). Bertens further asserts that

> They [postcolonial theorists and critics] agree in their focus on colonial (and neo-colonial) oppression, on resistance to colonization, on the respective identities of colonizer and colonized, on patterns of interaction between those identities, on postcolonial migration to the metropolis, on cultural exchanges between colonizer and colonized, on the ensuing hybridity of both cultures, and so on… Central to these interests are issues of race and ethnicity, language, gender, identity, class, and, above all, power" (2001: 202).

Designating the common agreement among the scholars of the field, now, it is time to highlight the controversial issues. One of these issues, among others, is the controversy on the prefix of the term, the 'post' of postcolonialism. Ata Quayson, in

*Postcolonialism: Theory, Practise or Process*, highlights this issue saying: "Like post- modernism and post structuralism, postcolonialism designates critical practice that is highly eclectic and difficult to define. The term itself is sometimes written with a hyphen and sometimes is left unhyphenated, with the two forms being used by different critics" (2000: 8). Some scholors write the term putting a hyphen after the 'post', such as 'post-colonialism,' referring a period, whereas some of them dont, writing the term as 'postcolonialism,' which, accordingly, refers to theory. Ania Loomba, in Colonialism/Postcolonialism, underlines this issue saying;

> To begin with, the prefix 'post' complicates matters because it implies an 'aftermath' in two senses — temporal, as in coming after, and ideological, as in supplanting. It is the second implication which critics of the term have found contestable: if the inequities of colonial rule have not been erased, it is perhaps premature to proclaim the demise of colonialism (1998: 12).

To exemplify her assertion, Loomba goes on saying that:

> A country may be both postcolonial (in the sense of being formally independent) and neo-colonial (in the sense of remaining economically and/or culturally dependent) at the same time. We cannot dismiss the importance of either formal decolonisation, or the fact that unequal relations of colonial rule are reinscribed in the contemporary imbalances between 'first' and 'third' world nations. The new global order does not depend upon direct rule. However, it does allow the economic, cultural and (to varying degrees) political penetration of some countries by others. This makes it debatable whether once-colonised countries can be seen as properly 'post-colonial' (1998: 12).

For Ashcroft et all, in their preface Of *The Postcolonial Studies Reader,* the term with and without hyphen (postcolonial, post-colonial) is the sign of an active

and unresolved debate between those who see the postcolonial to be a similar term as postmodernism, "designating discursive practices", and those who see it as "designating a more specific, and historically located set of cultural strategies" (2006: XV). Even this latter view is divided between those who believe that post-colonial refers only to the period after the colonies become independent and those who believe that it designates the colonized societies from the moment of colonisation to the present day, because colonialism hasn't ceased, but it continues in a neo-colonial mode to be active in many societies. Loomba defines the term 'post-colonial'(hyphenated) as referring to the historically determined condition of the former colonized nations and cultures as unfolding in postindependence times taking into account both 'neo-colonial' and 'anti-colonial' dynamics (1998: 19). As for postcolonial (without a hyphen), she continues;

> [It refers] to the theoretical framework that is postcolonial theory which aims to scrutinise relations of domination between cultures and nations based on an understanding that the colonial enterprise has profoundly shaped the nature of the relationships between societies in today's world of economic and cultural globalisation" (1998: 19).

Another issue of controversies on the term postcolonialism is the question of the period it covers. While some critics claim that postcolonialism began after all former colonized societies gained their independence, the others claim that it should cover all experiences between the colonizers and colonized from the very beginning of colonization. In this respect Loomba states that it would be more helpful "to think of post-colonialism not just as coming literally after colonialism and signifying its demise, but more flexibly as the contestation of colonial domination and the legacies of'colonialism" (1998: 12). Ashcroft et al are of the same opinion with Loomba

saying, in *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*, that "it addresses all aspects of the colonial process from the beginning of colonial contact. Post-colonial critics and theorists should consider the full implications of restricting the meaning of the term to 'after-colonialism' or 'after-Independence'"(2006: 1). Paul Brians, a professor of English in Washington State University, draws attention to the problems with the time span that postcolonialism should cover, "although the term postcolonial refers to the period after the nations under colony got their independence, there exists some novels like Claude McKay's Banjo and Chinua Achebe's Things Fall Apart which were written while the nations in question (Jamaica and Nigeria) were still colonies" (Brians)[6]. From that explanation, one infers that Paul Brians, too, has the opinion that the term postcolonial should address the experiences between the colonizer and colonized, not after the colonized societies gained their independence, but from the beginning of colonization.

The debates about whether the settler colonies (such as Australia, New Zealand, and Canada) should be considered in the framework of postcolonialism or not give rise to another dispute. While some critics argue that these settler colonies should be included in the field, propounding that their inhabitants, too, "have suffered displacement and marginalization at the hands of imperialism and have been forced to develop cultural identities against the odds of imperial relations" (Bertens, 2001: 202), others argue that these settler colonies are white, and haven't been subjugated or suppressed by the metropolitan centre. As Bertens puts it; "the question of race does not feature in the relations between white overseas subjects and

[6] Paul Brians, "Postcolonial Literature": Problems with the Term. 20 07 2010 < http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/anglophone/postcolonial.html>

the metropolis" (2001: 203). These critics claim, instead, that in settler colonies the postcolonial approach is only relevant for the encounter between (white) settlers and indigenous populations.

### 2.1.4. EVALUATION

Although postcolonial theory generally confines itself to the past half-century, it can be argued that everyone has been colonized at some time or other. And under this colonization they produced pieces of literature which judgementally makes analysis of the encounters between the colonizer and the colonized from the earliest days of exploration and colonization. This literature, "Drawing on Foucault's Notion of 'discourses', on Gramsci's 'hegemony', on deconstruction, and, as the case may be, on Marxism, focuses on the role of texts, literary and otherwise, in the colonial enterprise" (Bertens, 2001: 214). Loomba, in *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, quoting McClintock, claims that "It might seem that because the age of colonialism is over, and because the descendants of once-colonised peoples live everywhere, the whole world is postcolonial" (1998: 7).

In this respect, though the term postcolonialism covers a wide range of usages, and though it is difficult to find an appropriate term for its sphere of literature, the most convenient attribution sould be that: Withought highlighting the trivial nuances such as the period, form, and scope, all of which impede us to concentrate on its malicious aspects, the term postcolonial should comprise the literature of those who, economically, physically and culturally, were and still are being exploited and subjugated by hegemonic powers. Because; the compulsion to have a control over the other is primordial, and it has been existed from the

beginning of the history, and accordingly, it will never last. Ashcroft et all, in Postcolonial Studies Reader, underline this continuous postcolonial process saying:

> All post-colonial societies are still subject in one way or another to overt or subtle forms of neo-colonial domination, and independence has not solved this problem. The development of new élites within independent societies, [often buttressed by neo-colonial institutions] the development of internal divisions based on racial, linguistic or religious discriminations, the continuing unequal treatment of indigenous peoples in settler/invader societies, all these testify to the fact that post-colonialism is a continuing process of resistance and reconstruction (2006: 1).

To sum up, due the facts;

1) that the desire for economic and cultural subjugation has always been existed, and most likely, will always exist,
2) that although most of the once-officially-colonized societies are physically no longer under the seige or subjugation, but they are being exploited by various neo-colonial tools,
3) that the history has shown us that, in the course of time, the once-colonized society can become the colonizer, or vice versa
4) and that the primordial imperial desire (the desire for subjugation and control) has never ceased or changed, (what have changed are the methods and tools carried out for exploitation and the relative decrease in physical harassment of the individuals of the exploited society due to the assimilation of the idea of democracy by almost all developed and developing societies),

postcolonialism had better be considered as a continuous struggle to become completely decolonized, or in other words, to be out of the control of another power both economically and culturally. The following quotation shows us how the methods and tools, but not the imperial desire, have changed

> In the current phase of imperialism, the most striking change is that instead of bringing workers to the point of production (Caribbean sugar plantations, South African diamond mines, etc.), capitalism takes the point of production to the workers, as transnational corporations endlessly relocate factories to the zones of lowest-cost labour, such as Central America or the Pacific rim, providing themselves with a workforce which is low-paid, non-unionized… (Childs and Williams 1997: 6).

## 2.2. POSTCOLONIAL THEMES

All postcolonial studies can be said, in a way, to be concerned with some terms and concepts referring the experiences between the oppressor and the suppressed, or in other words, the colonizer and colonized, and their relation with the rest of the world. Given that a good deal of postcolonial studies addresses the problem of cultural identity, postcolonial studies developed some conceptual vocabularies along with the last four decades. These concepts are cultural, and mostly related to 'identity.' Among them, mimicry, ambivalence, hybridity, double consciousness, syncretism, otherness, alienation, unhomeliness, deracination, exile, and nativism are of the most important. It is of crucial importance to grasp these concepts in order to understand the highly ambiguous term 'postcolonial' which itself has been the subject of considerable debate, and which is still used differently in different parts of the world. Whatever the debates on postcolonial studies are, all of them take the above themes as their subject matter. It so seems that, in order to be more comprehensible and to form a conceptual base for this thesis, it will be of use to define these conceptual themes, which constitute the poetics of postcolonialism.

The struggle for individual and collective cultural identity and the need for continuity with a precolonial past and self-defnition of the political future paved the way for postcolonial scholors to derive some concepts that help to understand the relation between the oppressor and the oppressed. These common concepts can be considered as evidences which illustrate that there is a close relationship among psychology, ideology, individual identity and cultural beliefs.

The basis that paved the way for The West's expansions from the fifteenth century to the twentieth century subjugating the rest of the world were due to

Renaissance which also constructed the basis for the ideas of Enlightenment and industrialization. And in a chain reaction came the phase of rationalism and modernism which gave priority to science and logic rather than revelation. These reactions, (scientific and theories of social revolutions) as Jane M. Jacobs underlines, "gave The British Empire [The West in general] a natural logic that the world, in evolutionary terms, was inhabited by 'advanced' and 'backward' peoples" (2002: 17). Consequently, The West (The White Men) imagined itsef in a position of superiority and 'burdened' itself with the idea that all other parts of the world, especially Africa, which hasn't experienced the processes of Renaissance, Enlightenment, and modernism were the spaces that should be civilized. This logic produced some rational thoughts for the idea of imperialism and its practices such as colonialism or neocolonialism. The inculcation of a British system of government and education, British culture, and British values that denigrate the culture, morals, and even physical appearance of formerly subjugated peoples, eventually, formed such identities that range between acculturized (fully assimilated) and nationalized individuals. Between these two poles range such identities as those who see themselves as being casted aside as 'the others' having no sense of belonging to a certain culture, those who try to mimic the colonizer's way of life, those who linger between the two cultures, and those who favour to have a complete return to their own native culture. Thus; postcolonial scholars and intellectuals derived such postcolonial consepts as Eurocentrism, mimicry, unhomeliness, alienation, hybridity, nativism, othering, etc.

Eurocentrism can be considered as the general assumption that the European culture is the standard culture to which all other cultures are peripherial and

uncivilized. Europeans mention their culture as equal to universalism. So, for example for a literary work to be considered a great work, it has to have universal characters and themes. In other word, it has to bear the characteristics of European thoughts. The assumption was, and still is that European ideas, ideals, and experience are universal, that is, the standard for all humankind. Consequently, Eurocentric thought divides the world into four parts, such as; First World, Second World, Third World, and Fourth World. Britain, Europe, and the United States constitute the First World. The white populations living in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and southern Africa are considered as the Second World. The technologically developing nations, such as India and those of Africa, Central and South America, and Southeast Asia are called the Third World. And the indigenous populations subjugated by white settlers and governed today by the majority culture that surrounds them, such as Native Americans and aboriginal Australians are deemed as the Fourth World. In this regard, as Lois Tyson underlines, such a categorization "ignores the existence of earlier worlds, such as those of Greece, Egypt, and Africa, and it privileges European military conquest as the primary means of organizing world history" (2006: 419). This Eurocentric colonialist ideology was in action in the schools established in the colonies to infuse British culture and values in the indigenous peoples. The aim was to generate colonial subjects, the colonized persons who did not resist colonial subjugation because they were taught to believe in British superiority. In *Key Concepts In Postcolonial Studies*, Ashcroft et al define the colonial subjects as;

> The colonized subject may accept the imperial view, including the array of values, assumptions and cultural expectations on which this is based,

> and order his or her behaviour accordingly. This will produce colonial subjects who are 'more English than the English', those whom V.S. Naipaul called 'The Mimic Men' in the novel of that name (1998: 227).

Many of the individuals from these colonized countries "tried to imitate their colonizers, as much as possible, in dress, speech, behavior, and lifestyle" (Tyson, 2006: 419). Postcolonial critics refer to this phenomenon as ***mimicry***, a term coined by Homi K. Bhabha. It comprises both the aspire of the colonized individuals to be accepted by the colonizing culture and the inferiority experienced by the colonized individuals concerning their own culture, which they were programmed to see as inferior.

Postcolonial theorists and scholars describe the colonial subject as having a ***double consciousness*** or double vision; in other words, a consciousness or a way of perceiving the world divided between two opposite cultures; the culture of the colonizer and the culture of the indigenous community. In this regard, Tyson asserts that;

> This feeling of being caught between cultures, of belonging to neither rather than to both, of finding oneself arrested in a psychological limbo that results not merely from some individual psychological disorder but from the trauma of the cultural displacement within which one lives, is referred to by Homi Bhabha and others as ***unhomeliness****"*(2006: 420).

Being "unhomed" is not the same as being homeless. To be unhomed is to feel not at home even in your own home because you are not at home in yourself; that is, your cultural identity crisis has made you a psychological refugee, and you are alienated.

Hybridity, or syncretism as it is sometimes called, is another term coined by Homi K. Bhabha. The culture of the colonized has been lost through many

generations of colonial education system. On the other hand, the amount of the change is more intense in the culture of the subjugated people; it is a general thought that the culture of the colonizers has also been affected by its interaction with the culture of the colonized. Hence, the postcolonial theorists consider hybridity as a positive phenomenon. Because, they claim that if there even hadn't been a colonization period, the culture of both the West and the East would have changed by now. Since cultures, which can be conceived as beliefs, customs, traditions and daily behaviours, are not static, they eventually change. No culture stands still, frozen in time. Therefore, most of the theorists and scholars who study in the field of culture are of the opinion that identity is necessarily a dynamic aspect which continiously evolves and appropriates certain codes of various cultures.

Nevertheless, although *hybridity* is regarded as having a positive characteristics by many theorists, there are many theorists as well who propound that in order to being purified from the dominant culture of the colonizers to avoid being swamped, it is essential to turn back and rely on the native culture. Tyson articulates this confrontation saying:

> Before colonization, the colonizers claimed, native peoples lived barbarically, without any systems of government, religion, or rational customs. Or if colonizers acknowledged that a native culture existed, they claimed that such cultures were not worth sustaining in the face of the “superior” civilization offered by the Europeans. Many ex-colonials therefore feel they must assert a native culture both to avoid being swamped by the Western culture so firmly planted on their soil and to recuperate their national image in their own eyes and in the eyes of others (2006: 421).

The struggle to turn back and rely on the native culture negating and eliminating all Western cultural codes is called ***nativism*** or ***nationalism***. Nativists or nationalists claim that the natural cultural change through the time is not the same with a forcible change which aims to cut off the people from their original culture.

Othering is another postcolonial term which was coined by Gayatri Spivak. It is the practice of judging an individual, a nation or a civilization as the sub-entity of a more powerful one which considers itself as being the center. The term is written in two different ways, (Othering and othering) each referring to different meaning. In this regard, Ashcroft et all. underline that while "the Other corresponds to the focus of desire or power (the M-Other or Father – or Empire) in relation to which the subject is produced, the other is the excluded or 'mastered' subject created by the discourse of power" (1998: 171). They further assert "Othering describes the various ways in which colonial discourse produces its subjects. In Spivak's explanation, othering is a dialectical process because the colonizing *Other* is established at the same time as its colonized *others* are produced as subjects. (1998: 171). The colonizers saw themselves as the civilized 'self,' and native peoples were considered as other, different, and inferior, and it divides the world between two poles; 'us' (the civilized) and 'them' (the others or savages). Although in some certain circumstances the natives are considerd as being exotic having a primitive beauty, they are generally thought of being the savages that must be civilized.

## 2.3. ORIENTALISM:

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary, "Orientalism* was in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries generally used to refer to the work of the orientalist, a scholar versed in the languages and literatures of the East; and in the world of the arts to identify a character, style or quality commonly associated with the Eastern nations" (qtd. Macfie, 2002: 3). Macfie, in *Orientalism* further asserts that:

> The meaning of the word orientalism, as given in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, remained more or less unchanged until the period of decolonization that followed the end of the Second World War (1939–45). Then, in a little more than twenty years, it came to mean not only the work of the orientalist, and a character, style or quality associated with the Eastern nations, but also a corporate institution, designed for dealing with the Orient, a partial view of Islam, an instrument of Western imperialism, a style of thought, based on an ontological and epistemological distinction between Orient and Occident, and even an ideology, justifying and accounting for the subjugation of blacks, Palestinian Arabs, women and many other supposedly deprived groups and peoples (2002: 4).

The concept of *Orientalism*, which was coined by Edward Said, is one of the fundemental texts of postcolonialism. As mentioned above, professional orientalists are considered to be scholars in various disciplines such as languages, history and philology. But for Edward said the discourse of orientalism is something much more different than its lexical meaning. As Said puts it, *Orientalism* is "a style of thought based on the ontological and epistemological distinction between the "Orient" and the Occident" (1995:1). *Orientalism*, in Said's formulation, is principally a way of

defining and 'locating' Europe's others. Its intention is to construct a positive national identity for Western nations in contradistinction to Eastern nations on which the West attributes all the negative characteristics it doesn't want to see among its own people. Thus the Chinese or the Arabs, Asian or Middle Eastern populations are portrayed as unkind, deceitful, corrupt, cunning, dishonest, etc. The binary oppositions for all these negative concepts, then, are attributed for the peoples of the West. Citizens of the West then define themselves as kind, frank, good, honest, and moral. Hans Bertens mentions about this situation saying: "The sensuality, irrationality, primitiveness, and despotism of the East constructs the West as rational, democratic, progressive, and so on. The West always functions as the 'centre' and the East is a marginal 'other' that simply through its existence confirms the West's centrality and superiority" (2001: 205).

Orientalism is a striking critique of how through the ages, but particularly in the nineteenth century, the heyday of imperialist expansion, the Western texts have represented the East, and more specifically the Islamic Middle East. Hans Bertens claims that "Using works of literature, political tracts, journalistic texts, travel books, religious and philological studies, Said examines how these texts construct the Orient through novels, through journalistic reports and travel writings, and through histories, anthropological writings, and so on" (2001: 203). Orientalism, the Western discourse, Western perception or thought about the Orient, is 'hegemonic' for Edward Said. Antonio Gramsci defines the word 'hegemony' as "domination by consent, the way the ruling class succeeds in oppressing other classes with their apparent approval" (qtd. Bertens, 2001: 204). Hans Bertens explains Gramsci's analysis of 'hegemony' saying that 'hegemony' dominates through culture. Thus,

The ruling class makes its own values and interests central in what it presents as a common, neutral, culture. Accepting that 'common' culture, the other classes become complicit in their own oppression and the result is a kind of velvet domination. Orientalism, then, has traditionally served two purposes. It has legitimized Western expansionism and imperialism in the eyes of Western governments and their electorates and it has insidiously worked to convince the 'natives' that Western culture represented universal civilization. Accepting that culture could only benefit them – it would, for instance, elevate them from the 'backward' or 'superstitious' conditions in which they still lived – and would make them participants in the most advanced civilization the world had ever seen (2001: 204).

# CHAPTER THREE

## NAIPAUL AND LAMMING ON POLITICS OF POSTCOLONIALISM

As mentioned in the introduction, this thesis has two basic aims. On the one hand, while it focuses on the political views of Naipaul and Lamming as regards the culture of once-colonized countries which are considered as the "Third World", on the other hand, it focuses on how they treat the concepts of alienation, cultural displacement and identity in their fiction.

Based on Naipaul's *The Middle Passage* and Lamming's *The Pleasure of Exile*; this chapter deals with a comparison of Naipaul and Lamming in terms of their politics of postcolonialism. It highlights their literary lives, oeuvres, political and ideological affiliations as regards the third world societies and the West. It tackles the general qualities that characterize and differentiate each of them, and the question as although they both have almost the same backgrounds, why they are considered as two almost completely opposite postcolonial writers who have discrete thoughts as regards their culture and once-colonized societies. I have chosen these two non-fiction works, because both works portray their writers' political views on the West and the third world, in other words, on the colonizer and the collonized. The works are comprised of their observations they experienced via the travels through the islands which form the Caribbeans, and their visit to homelands of their ancestors. In *The Middle Passage*, Naipaul documents his reactions to the West Indies. As for Lamming's work, *The Pleasures of Exile*, it contains a narration of his visit to America and Africa and his exploration of the history of the West Indies.

As is generally known, literature has been an important and effective means of searching for meanings and values. It is almost the only means to illuminate the collective consciousness and psyche of a people in universal patterns. But from these universal patterns emerge different versions of realities. Richard Terdiman's assertion that each discourse brings its counter discourse *(Discourse/Counter Discourse,* 1985), and Mikhail Bakhtin's that no discourse can be regarded as a monologue are premises that an utterance will always bear a competing, contrary utterance from which it procures its own energies. In that sense, Naipaul and Lamming represent two discrete poles, each obtaining its discourse (its energy) from the other's theories. This is the common inclination in the majority of postcolonial writings. While some writers like Naipaul dwell on the contradictions and failings of the postcolonial cultures and societies criticising them for their intellectual and 'cultural parasitism' on the West, the others, like Lamming, beleive that it is possible to restore a sense of original identity by looking back at the past with the help of tradition, languge or myth. These different ways of thinking may stem from diverse cultural, political, historical or geographical circumstances or subjectivities. The intermingling of races and cultures due to some global practises such as transportation and information technologies has compelled many scholars to review the human situation afresh. Each writer may have a version of his own reality depending on his/her political, religious, ethnic, sexual, national etc. stand points. So each nation's writers have developed their personal ethos. For example, while on the one hand, Trinidad, Naipaul's birth place, or Barbados, Lamming's birth place, have smiliar experiences of colonization and reactions, they have dissmiliar experiences and reactions as well. Whereas Barbados is known to be one of the most anglicized

parts in the world outside England, Trinidad has had a complex intermingling of races and cultures for a long time. This diversity has accounted for paralel opposition of views about society, history, tradition and identity among various writers. In this context George Lamming and V.S. Naipaul have emerged as standard examples of writers who have different versions of reality and take different approaches to resolve the ambivalence of the major issues in the Carribean context.

Naipaul and Lamming are the descendents of slaves and indentured workers from India and Africa who were deracinated from their homelands and brought to the Caribbeans to work in large plantations to produce sugar cane after the abolition of slavery in Europe. Both of them were educated in the schools which were based on British educational system built to, as Thomas Babington Macaulay puts it, "form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect."(qtd. Young, 1967: 729). The formal education system - be it British, French, or American which were established by the colonizers - had one feature in common: they were based on the assumption that the colonial culture was superior to the native. The aim of the education was to civilize the colonized, cutting them away from the roots of their culture. This politics eventually constituted the extreme poverty and illeteracy of the colonized on the one hand, and the enormous power of the colonizer on the other. The dependence of the colonized on their masters resulted in the slave's loss of vision, power and identity. As Manjith Inder Singh states "The production of a lumpen bourgeoise was the main purpose. All that it produce much to the detriment of the native interests were minor, inexpressive cogs, such as clerks, glorified office boys, officials and a few professionals meant to

run the colonial administrative machine" (1998: 12). This operation resulted the people of the colonized countries in a state of passivity which injured their confidence and self respect, and caused them to experience a psychic damage such as; being ashamed of their culture. "It transformed many into what Naipaul terms "mimic men" inducing a subconscious slavery to the foreign values" (Singh, 1998: 12). For example, as Lois Tyson underlines, the indoctrination through a "British system of education, British culture, and British values that distorted the culture, morals, and even physical appearance of formerly subjugated peoples"(2006: 419), eventually, formed such identities that range between acculturized (fully assimilated) and nationalized individuals. Thus, while some favour hybridity claiming that it is not possible to turn back to their original culture, the others favour nativism propounding that unless they haven't relied on their own culture, they won't completely be decolonized. In this respect; postcolonial theorists, writers, scholars, and intellectuals favour discrepant approaches in order to heal the effects that the colonial experience left on the colonized peoples. For them, the crucial issue is to understand not only the influence, but also how colonialism and its policy changed the character of whole societies. In this regard Naipaul and Lamming can be considered as two prominent writers standing on two completely discrete poles.

Both V.S. Naipaul and George Lamming were born in Carribeans, but originally descended from India and Africa respectively. Although they experienced almost the same ways of life, [thus; both being born in the West Indies in 1930s as descendants of indentured ancestors, both having been educated under colonial conditions, both having travelled to the imperial centre (England) for better conditions of life, both having inspirations to become writers that they eventually

achieved, both being considered as postcolonial writers who have taken certain postcolonial themes (such as cultural identity, exile, the sense of homelessness) as their subject matters, both writing their works in English, and etc.] they are considered as two almost completely opposite postcolonial writers. On the one hand, while Lamming, in his writings, favours a literary strike back on the existing assumptions attributed to the West, Naipaul, rather attacks and harshly criticises the social, cultural and psychological decadents that the colonial subjects are entangled in.

Naipaul has always been engaged in the relation between the West and the East, and the consequences that arise from this relation. All of his works revolve around this relation. However, although Naipaul has always been engaged in the concepts and themes peculiar to the societies which have experienced the colonial processes, and although he took these colonial themes as his subject matters in all his fiction and nonfiction works, among the postcolonial circles, especially among those writers such as George Lamming, Edward Said, Derek Walcott, and Caryl Phillips who have opposing views of colonialism, he is known to generate controversy, and to be the mouthpiece of a Eurocentric view. He is not welcomed in postcolonial circles, because, as claimed, Naipaul does not articulate any dismissions on the practices of colonization, that is, he does not clearly blame the West for its subjugation on the once colonized peoples. He is blamed and even hated for ‘having no loyalty’, as it is claimed, to his home country and his ethnicity. Additionally, it is claimed that he doesnt seem to show sympathy for the oppressed, as he generally looks at them ‘with contempt’, and criticize them with a severe language. In fact, anyone who is familiar with Naipaul’s works can easily recognize that he does not

praise his people and idealize his ethnic culture. From the following excerpt from *The Middle Passage*, one can infer that he has not any contentment for his country of birth, Trinidad: "when I was in the fourth form I wrote a vow on the endpaper of my Kennedy's Revised Latin Primer to leave within five years. I left after six; and for many years afterwards in England, falling asleep in bedsitters with the electric fire on I had been awakened by the nightmare that I was back in tropical Trinidad" (2001: 41). Naipaul, from the beginning of his adolescence on, has shown a steady attitude towards the third worlds way of life. He has articulated, in Fawzia Mustafa's word, "the same nervous energy" in all his works. He is a man who feels a physical bound to the East, and a psychological, mental bound to the West. Due to his harsh criticism on Islam and third world countries, and due to his stand point of being inbetween the two cultures, his work has always been the object of radically divergent views, depending on the perspectives of the readers. As Fawzia Mustafa states, "For almost his entire career, […] Naipaul's writings and their idiomatic inflections have been simultaneously celebrated and castigated with descriptions that range between objective or ahistorical, unsentimental or culturally ignorant, unafraid or hysterical" (1995: 1,2). In other words, his fiction and non-fiction works have formed pros and cons. On the one hand, while he is welcomed by the Western critics for his candid opinions on the political, social, and cultural issues in the Third World countries, on the other hand he is severly criticized and blamed by the intellectuals of the countries that once were colonies of the West. In *The Pleasures of Exile*, George Lamming mentions Naipaul, saying:

> His books can't move beyond a castrated satire. (…) When such a writer is a colonial, ashamed of his cultural background and striving

> like mad to prove himself through promotion to the peaks of a 'superior' culture whose values are gravely in doubt, then satire, like the charge of philistinism, is for me nothing more than a refuge. And it is too small a refuge for a writer who wishes to be taken seriously." (1995: 225)

Likewise, Said, in his Reflections on Exile and Other Essays, draws Naipaul's profile as follows: "a witness for the Western prosecution, specializing in the thesis of. . . self-inflicted wounds, which is to say that we 'non-Whites' are the cause of all our problems, not the overly maligned imperialists" (Intellectuals, 1996: 437). Selwyn R. Cudjoe, in a critical study called *V.S. Naipaul: A Materialist Reading,* portrays Naipaul as if he were a traitor of his cultural heritage, concluding that "if Naipaul has become the darling of the First World, it is because he has said so well what many white racists wanted to say all along but could not. . . . VS. Naipaul has clearly aligned himself and his writing on the side of the dominant class" (1988: 5).

In the search of an authentic identity both Lamming and Naipaul have been trying to investigate the history of the West Indian. They have traveled through the Caribbeans and visited their homelands, the lands of their ancestors, namely, India and Africa. Naipaul documents his observations of the West Indies in *The Middle Passage*. As for Lamming's work *The Pleasures of Exile,* it is comprised of the observations of his visit to Africa and his searchings of the history of the West Indies. In these visits, while Naipaul just collects data as if each scene were taken by a camera, Lamming makes his observations underlying that the cause for the West Indians being in such entanglements is the West itself. Lamming claims a new way of seeing of the history which was pushed to a situation considered as periphery by the forced assumption that the colonizer created his as being of the center. In spite of

its connections to a European tradition, he propounds, its future depends on its avoidance of mimicry. On the other hand, Naipaul is one of those writers who, as Elizabeth Nunez Harrell underlines, "attempts to weed out the evils in morals and manners existing in the Third-World societies by resorting to satire" (Contemporary Literature, 1978: 46). Nevertheless, Naipaul's attempt of weeding out the Third-World people's folly behaviours which have been laughed at, instead of being considered as stimulus for a leap, is the basis for antipathy towards Naipaul in the West Indies. In this regard, as Imre Szeman states, "if critics have wondered about Lamming's politics, they are at least willing to concede that his heart is in the right place; with Naipaul, this remains a perpetually open question. (2003: 98).

Naipaul's literary and nonfiction works take their subject matter from the Caribbean, India, Argentina, Pakistan, the Congo, the American South, etc., in which he sees barbarism ruling in the absence of civilization. His views are taken either as being Eurocentric, or as presenting a brave if unpopular assessment of the true state of affairs in the third world. Or in other words, as Szeman puts it, Naipaul's works are "seen either as the literary equivalent of developmental and modernization theories or as its almost exact opposite — as an important corrective to the overly optimistic characterizations of the postcolonial world offered by other writers and critics" (2003: 98).

*The Middle Passage* (1962) is V. S. Naipaul's fourth book, and the first example of the nonfiction travelogues that he has produced with increasing frequency throughout his career. Naipaul writes about some topics such as the deterioration caused by slavery and colonialism, the relations of black and brown cultures under the hegemony of the whites, and differences in language, culture, and economics.

This nonfictional book takes its title from the infamous triangular trade in which millions of people from Africa were taken to the New World, as part of the Atlantic slave trade. In this trade, as Charles Johnson asserts, "ships loaded with manufactured goods set off for Africa where the goods were traded for humans. The human cargo was transported to the Americas and traded for raw materials to be sold in England" (1999: 70).

As for *The Pleasures of Exile*, it can be said to be partly autobiography, partly travelogue, and partly literary criticism. George Lamming, in *The Pleasures of Exile*, embraces the intricate issues of colonization and decolonization. The work, though a series of interrelated essays, explores the cultural politics and relationships of the experiences created by the practice of colonization. Discussing Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and C. L. R. James's *The Black Jacobins*, as well as his own fiction and poetry, Lamming tries to have his readers to focus on the relations between the colonizer (Prospero) and the colonized (Caliban), and he lays bare the physical, intellectual, psychological, and cultural responses to colonialism. "My subject, he writes "is the migration of the West Indian writer, as colonial and exile, from his native kingdom, once inhabited by Caliban, to the tempestuous island of Prospero's and his language" (PE, 1995: Backcover). This book is a report on Lamming's way of seeing.

Having introduced the above statements, now, in order to unroll the distinction between Naipaul and Lamming, I think, it will be more precise and comprehensive to assemble their views and stand points under such certain titles as how they regard the history, the language, nationalism, and the identity peculiar to the West India and the Third World.

## 3.1. THEIR VIEW OF THE WEST INDIAN HISTORY

As regards the need to look back and rely on the history of the West India, Naipaul and Lamming have discrete thoughts. While Naipaul thinks that it is futile to consantrate on the history and roots of the West Indian, asserting that "How can the history of this West Indian futility be written?.. .The history of the islands can never be satisfactorily told. Brutality is not the only difficulty. History is built around achievement and creation; and nothing was created in the West Indies" (MP, 2001: 28-29), George Lamming is of the opinion that these deracinated peoples had a rich heritage before the coming of the colonizers. He thinks that it is the Eurocentric view (concretized in the image of Prospero) itself that distorted the history of the colonized societies (all being the descendants of Caliban), hence the colonized societies must reconsider their past by an affirmation of links to the non-European world. He is in search of a connection to a non-European past trying to bring the folk or the peasant group in his society to the foreground. According to Lamming, if the West Indians want to recover the established or endemic myths by creating new myths, they must rewrite their history.

Naipaul, who, as Singh claims, "can not be understood in a conventional, traditional or nationalist idiom alone" (1998: 16), does not bear any contentment as regard the history of the once-colonized nations. He can not be associated with one single national identity or cultural sensibility. Naipaul assumes that history is not an inactive, motionless record of the past that it can be arranged to serve the present and the future. He thinks that one cannot divide history into segments, because each day's experiences are dependent on the previous days. If a culture tries to erase a

segment of its past, then, he propounds, there will unavoidably be a void in its historical linearity. Thus, all people living in the West Indies are descendents of slaves and indentured workers who were deracinated from Africa and Asia. So it is not likely for them to have any sense of an inherited original history except that of the colonial period. For Naipaul, it is futile to instill a sense of history or roots to the psyche of the West Indians, since; from the fifteenth century on there has been a rupture between the Caribbeans and their roots. He assumes this rupture as a void from which the Caribeans could not derive any stimulative tools for their future. Writing as regards of the history of Trinidad, he articulates that:

> Though we knew that something was wrong with our society, we made no attempt to assess it. Trinidad was too unimportant and we could never be convinced of the value of reading the history of a place which was, as everyone said, only a dot on the map of the world. Our interest was all in the world outside, the remoter the better; Australia was more important than Venezuela, which we could see on a clear day. Our own past was buried and no one cared to dig it up. This gave us a strange time-sense. The England of 1914 was the England of yesterday; the Trinidad of 1914 belonged to the dark ages. (MP, 2001: 36)

He thinks that it is impossible to return to an unspoiled original culture since we are living in a globalized world. By this contention, of course, he doesn't suggest to forget the West's subjugation of the once colonized people. On the contrary, the following statement proves that Naipaul, who left Trinidad quite early, still has a strong and undeniable link with his place of birth. *"A* writer after a time carries his world with him, his own burden of experience, human experience and literary experience (one deepening the other) and I do believe... that I would have found equivalent connections with my past and myself wherever I had gone." (FC, 1985:

10).

Naipaul wants these peoples to construct an order from disorder, not to dissipate their energies within nativist longings. He is too committed to a sense of modernity. Singh, in this respect, asserts that Naipaul's attempt is "what he calls a synthesis of the worlds and cultures that made [him]. The debris of experience is deftly related into an arched vision of decay and disorder. This historical and experiential conditionality of life viewed as a theatre of memories and events are tokens of Naipaul's powers and qualities as a modern and modernist writer" (1998: 76). He has done (despite the traditionalism of his early fiction) what all modernists have done—to make good through style and language what has been lost through history. In *The Middle Passage*, he writes:

> Living in a borrowed culture, the West Indian, more than most, needs writers to tell him who he is and where he stands. Here the West Indian writers have failed. Most have so far only reflected and flattered the prejudices of their race or colour groups. Many a writer has displayed a concern, visible perhaps only to the West Indian, to show how removed his group is from blackness, how close to whiteness (2001: 64).

Naipaul, articulating the above excerption, is of the opinion that the writer should lay bare all the intricacies that the people are in. These once colonized peoples need writers who articulate their words as whips to make them be aware of their situation. Because if they recognize their situation, they will naturally show inclination towards beter situations. Naipaul's not mentioning the process of the subjugation that The West performed does not mean that he is content with The West. He rather thinks that it is of no use to continually talk of these practices which lead to nativist stand points, because in such an era of transportations, cultural intermingling, and mass

medias, he asserts, it is not possible to construct a pure culture. “The multi-cultural, ethnic and bilingual exposure has given a new twist to [his] respective sensibilities” (Singh, 1998: 16). On his being blamed of reflecting the West Indians backwardness, Naipaul argues that “No writer can be blamed for reflecting his society. If the West Indian writer is to be blamed, it is because, by accepting and promoting the unimpressive race-and-colour values of his group, he has not only failed to diagnose the sickness of his society but has aggravated it” (MP, 2001: 66).

Lamming, on the other hand, thinks that The West Indians need creative historians who do not keep away from the traditional habits and practices of history. Historians should rather recover lost historical traces. Supriya Nair asserts that “the most important example of Lamming's creative historiography is in his representation of Vodoun, the Ceremony of Souls in which "underground rituals" of dance and song are a means of retrieving the past" (1996: 108). As Nair argues, thanks to vodoun, the present does not allow the past to fade away, and it (the present) repossess it (the past). Thus, by such an emphasis, Lamming simply asserts that if the once colonized people want to escape from the cultural effects of the colonizer, the old rituals and conventions should be retrieved. Nair considers Lamming's strong emphasis on the practice of Vodoun as “an emancipatory project" (1996:117). Lamming is aware of the negative cultural codes of the Caribbean and struggles to explore new visions and meanings of experience in the region through the imaginative possibilities offered by the novel. “From a close study of the content and form of Lamming's novels as they have developed through his career, it is easy to see how the novelist interprets and invests new meaning in human experience in the region” (Odhiambo, Research in African Literatures, 1994: 122). In Lamming's

view, as Chiristopher J. Odhiambo underlines, “the Caribbean artist is compelled to move beyond the confines of history and experience, to explore new alternatives and possible meanings even in a history of displacement, slavery, and subjugation” (Ibid 122). Lamming asserts that “... the mystery of the colonial is this: while he remains alive, his instinct, always and forever creative, must choose a way to change the meaning and perspective of this ancient tyranny” (PE 1995: 229). For Lamming, Odhiambo asserts, “this ancient tyranny is the whole colonial structure of awareness which is the self-perception and personality created by the colonial experience” (1994: 123). All Lamming's novels, Odhiambo further asserts, are engaged with this dramatization of this colonial structure of awareness while at the same time they explore new and counteracting interpretations of these experiences, enabling the Caribbean to transcend the history of subjugation and displacement (1994: 123). By such an exertion, Lamming displays the psychological entanglements and the cultural and economic dependence of the Caliban upon Prospero, and he searches and presents new ways of overcoming these obstacles.

## 3.2. LANGUAGE, STYLE AND THEIR WRITINGS

Naipaul and Lamming, leaving their countries in search of recognition, have almost the same literary themes which portray their native societies. Lamming is conscious of belonging to an underprivileged society which is regarded as a colonial outpost. Naipaul's stance is more complex. On the one hand, his themes and plots centre around Trinidad, on the other hand he is a ruthless critic of the cultural and moral poverty of the island. On this account, Quoting Naipaul's articulation which says: "one of the terrible things about being a colonial is that you must accept so many things as coming from a great wonderful source outside yourself and outside the people you know, outside the society you have grown up in", Ian Hamilton contends that "he [Naipaul] sees all ex-colonial states as second-hand societies, condemmed only to imitate the ideas, manners and values flowing from the metropolitan centres of advanced countries" (1977: 42).

Lamming uses a sophisticated language in his works. His writing style aims to prevent readers from uncritically absorbing his books. With such a style, J. Dillon Brown states that; "Lamming encourages his readers not to proceed without pausing to consider the notion of their civilization in light of the history" (Brown 691). In *The Pleasures of Exile* Lamming himself makes the connection between a sophisticated use of language and a need to fight the degrading assumptions fostered by the discourses of colonialism. Placing the issue into his characteristic Prospero-Caliban trope, Lamming argues that "if Caliban [the colonized] aspires for a world which is not ordered by prospero [the colonizer], he must find a new discorse and a new pattern of looking at history" (PE, 1995: 119). For Lamming, language and history

are two crutial aspects for a complete decolonization. He is of the opinion that "[They] shall never explode Prospero's old myth until [they] christen Language afresh; until [they] show Language as the product of human endeavor; until [they] make available to all the result of certain enterprises undertaken by men who are still regarded as the unfortunate descendants of languageless and deformed slaves" (PE, 1995: 119). Lamming sees a type of reordering necessary. In this regard, Brown mentions of Lamming's view on an anecdote about an Englishwoman's response which utters no "black stamps" have arrived on being asked to check. Lamming, as Brown asserts, heighligting the necessity for a new ordering, interpretes the Englishwoman's response as:

> She meant stamps marked Africa or India, China or the West Indies. One kind, honest and courteous old woman had fixed almost two thirds of the World's population with one word. You might say that the woman was a simple example of ignorance but I maintain that ignorant or not it has fundamentally to do with a particular way of seeing. (2006: 672)

Lamming considers this dialogue as a fundamental effect of her (colonizer's) perception that she is white and superior to those black ones, a perception which Lamming continuously underlines as "an inherited and uncritical way of seeing prevalent on both sides of the colonizer/colonized" (PE, 1995: 76). Lamming, Brown asserts, "applies the term 'colonized' for the people who have found models and texts which they... embraced uncritically", and for Lamming, he further asserts, "colonization can often be understood as simply a tradition of habits that become the normal way of seeing" (2006: 672). Dillon Brown considering the abovementioned perceptions concludes that "It is against these stubborn, ingrained, and effectively

naturalized routines of perception that Lamming positions his literary difficulty. He wants to oblige his audience to read his works more slowly, with more consideration, paying more attention" (2006: 672). Nadi Edwards, in *George Lamming's literary nationalism: Language between The Tempest and the Tonelle,* argues that "For Lamming, the conceptual metaphor is that of Shakespeare's *The Tempest;* hence, the conflict between Prospero, and Caliban becomes a conflict between colonizer and colonized" (Small Axe, 2002: 60). Edwards, commenting on Lamming's nonfictional book, goes on articulating;

> Lamming's essays in *The Pleasures of Exile* constitute one of the most powerful post-colonial interventions in the construction of genealogies of cultural and literary nationalisms. The paradigmatic importance of Lamming's revisionist reading of *The Tempest* derives from the self-conscious exploration of the filial relationship between European canonical discourses and the construction of Caribbean subjects as well as the subversive potential of the reading. This synthesis of historical and cross-cultural interrogations prompts Jose David Saldivar to describe Lamming as the supreme commentator, the one author from our America, who pulls Old World colonialist and New World colonized writing into a coherent and continuous line.(60)

Language, for Lamming, is the tool of colonization and is therefore central in the process of decolonization and cultural nationalism. To Lamming, as Edwards states, "if language enables the displacement, dislocation, and alienation that characterize deterritorialization, it also possesses the potential to break out of this centrifugal dynamic" (Edwards 63). It is language, he proposes, that constructs the colonized as being the other within a discourse of control:

> The Negro is a man who the Other regards as a Negro; and the dichotomy, the split as it were, which may exist at the very centre of this consciousness, shall have been created by that old, and it would seem eternal conflict between the naming of a thing and the knowledge of it. For it is one of the mischievous powers of language, and particularly that aspect of language which relates to names that it enables us to rob things of their power to embarrass us. Language in this respect is intentional, and the intention seems clearly part of the human will to power. A name is an infinite source of control. (*Conversations*,38).

To Lamming, knowledge, power, and language are crutial, and they are the central themes of *The Tempest*, a chapter revealing the relation between the colonizer and the colonized under the guise of Prospero and Caliban, the characters of Shakespeare's The Tempest. It is language, Lamming assumes, which Prospero is able to have the control of Caliban; "For Caliban is Man and other than Man. Caliban is his convert, aptized by language, and excluded by language. It is precisely this gift of language, this attempt at transformation which has brought about the pleasure and paradox of Caliban's exile. Exiled from his gods, exiled from his nature, exiled from his own name!" *(*PE, 1995: 15). To Lamming, English is one among other Caribbean languages, brought to the West Indies as a result of the colonization and resulting in a language imposed on an alien population (PE 1995: 36).

Though Naipaul has not any proposals concerning the style and content of the Caribbean writing, his subject matter is composed of his assumptions about the nature of colonialism, oppression, historical fracture and the consequent cultural sterility in Third World societies. He is in search of, as Manjit Inder Singh heighligts, creating "an alternative world to the nightmarish human societies" (1998: XV).

However, despite a description of denial and futility, his writings leads to an interpretation, a translation to a new undestanding. Singh further asserts that “In Naipaul’s writing significance arises out of the assertion of insignificance, something is created out of the sense of having nothing” (1998: 40). His dystopian stance, “while nursing a cautious, precarious hope, defines itself by reconstructing them (the societies) out of decadence and hopelessness”(Ibid, XV). His ‘destructive logic and laconic world’ view is the result of the political and personal knowledge about history and abstract issues which have done so much to transform relations of power, authority and values. In almost all his works, Naipaul writes about himself, his past and its complex relations with the present. Contrary to the general impressions which indict Naipaul as if he were articulating in the language of the colonizers, to recall what Naipaul said as regard the English language is an indication and an answer to those who indict him to be the mouthpiece of the west: "Every writer is in the long run, on his own, but it helps in the most practical way, to have a tradition. The English language was mine the tradition was not" (Walcott, 1967: 8).

In Lamming’s fictional aesthetics the most significant thing is to have a leap of consciousness. He is of the opinion that if one becomes conscious of his nation being subjugated by another entity, he will consequently establish a self defence. In an interview Lamming states that he aggrees with Fanon that in certain situations violence is a necessary and inevitable instrument in the case of self defence. For Lamming also, writing has an educative, pedagogic role through his application of the role of the houngan in his writing. Central to this belief is the recurring motif of the Haitian Ceremony of the Souls. In this annual ritual, the dead return to converse with the living through the medium of the houngan in a dialogue leading to

reconciliation, forgiveness, and redemption. As Lamming has explained, the details of the ceremony are not important so much as its operation as a symbolic drama, as a cleansing for the future (Paquet, 1982: 2). In this scenario, the writer functions as the houngan both in Lamming's work and in his own appraisal of the social function of art. The writer, therefore, has a crucial responsibility for the interpretation and meanings that he or she confers on the dialogue between past, present, and future. Indeed, for Lamming, the concept of a West Indian identity is entirely the consequence of the experience of exile. As he put it, "no islander from the West Indies sees himself as a West Indian until he encounters another islander in a foreign territory… in this sense, most of the West Indians of my generation were born in England" (PE, 1995: 214).

Commenting on the relationship between the Caliban and Prospero in The Tempest, Elizabeth Nunez Harrell asserts that;

> The most lyrical passage in *The Tempest* is Caliban's reverie of an earlier time: a time when there was no need for fear; a time before the coming of Prospero, when the spirits of the island were not controlled by the European duke; a time when noises, sounds, airs were not cause for alarm, but gave "delight and hurt not"; a time, according to Caliban, that can only be restored when Prospero is destroyed (Contemporary Literature, 1978: 26).

She further asserts that for many of the writers from the colonized countries, literature has one purpose: to protest against inequities, against oppression, against domination. Here, she asserts;

> Caliban is plotting the annihilation of Prospero, and to many writers of the once-colonized world, this is the only possible response to the loss of a culture and a heritage destroyed by colonization. The brutality of

> the Prosperos of the world becomes the focal point for the artist; the audience is persuaded to assert the dignity of the Calibanic protagonist through a condemnation of the inhuman treatment that is inflicted upon the hero by a demonic oppressor.

For Lamming, the point is that in the process of struggle, in Carribean or elsewhere, one must become conscious of the depths of one's humanity and creativity. "…this is both the emotional and creative apocalypse as a man and writer. His fiction, much less concerned with the psychologist's or the thinker's goal of decolonization, celebrates the resources which enable the people to cope with problems that limit human fulfilment, no matter what their source" (Singh, 1998: XVI). Lamming's novels can be considered as a totality written as a whole political struggle which had been initiated with his first novel *In The Castle of My Skin*. In this regard, Christopher J. Odhiambo asserts that "the emigrants in Of Age and Innocence can be assumed to be the very same emigrants who had left the Caribbean island in search of a better break and fulfilment in The Emigrants and now seem to be returning home with new visions and sensibilities but are nevertheless still alienated" (1994: 123). George E. Kent in his interview with Lamming in 1973 underlines this issue stating that:

> Lamming's novels in sequence are dynamic and revisionary, both horizontally and vertically […] If you take In the Castle of My Skin, where the realization of the world is seen through the boys — this is the growing up; and then the next book, The Emigrants, with these men moving out to England. The emigrants on that ship can be seen as the extensions of the boys of In the Castle of My Skin (1992: 104).

In this interview Lamming describes all his fiction as "the unfolding of one work," implying that *The Emigrants, Of Age and Innocence* and *Season of Adventures* were all a continuation of *In the Castle of My Skin* (Ibid, 104).

In this regard, Sandra Pouchet Paquet states that "In this way he records a fictional chronology, each novel ordered within the parameters of a progressive movement towards an anticipated fulfilment of rupture or break with the region's colonial beginnings that culminates in Season of Adventure, the fourth novel in the series" (Paquet in Shibboleths: 98). Paquet further states that:

> In Lamming's fiction, the continuous act of questioning is evident everywhere in the rejection and renewal of old codes of representation. …Lamming's novels from In the Castle of My Skin (1953) to Water with Berries (1971) and Natives of My Person (1971) are structurally and thematically preoccupied with the question of liberation, explored over time from many different angles. As he explains, "liberation is [a] word which suggests process. It is a process of trying to free self and society from various forms of imprisonment. The imprisonment of social injustice, the imprisonment of intellectual backwardness, the imprisonment of disfigured spirits. We liberate ourselves from a condition that is undesirable or intolerable but there is an implication in this word that we have to liberate ourselves into some other kind of being. You fight a struggle in order to construct something of the future" (Paquet in Shibboleths: 99, 100).

All of Naipaul's books, be it fiction or nonfiction, employ a relentless inquiry of the past, the current and the future of postcolonial societies. *The Mystic Masseur* (1957), *The Suffrage of Elvira* (1958) and *A House for Mr. Biswas* (1961), *all of which are considered as satirical novels,* were written before *The Middle Passage*. In all these three fictional works, Naipaul satirizes the politics of the once colonized societies propounding that they are irrational, feeble, and devoid of questioning. *The*

*Middle Passage*, it seems, is the compilation of Naipaul's three satirical fictional works into a nonfictional work. Naipaul's first nonfiction book reveals the logic behind his aggressive, dismissive characterization of politics and culture in the space of the Caribbean. To Naipaul, what is lacking is modernity which is considered as a set of thoughts constructed by the West. In this regard he says that:

> Nationalism in Surinam, a movement of intellectuals, rejects the culture of Europe. Ras Tafarianism in Jamaica is nothing more than a proletarian extension of this attitude, which it carries to its crazy and logical limit. It resembles African nationalism, which asserts the importance of the 'African personality', and is the opposite of middle-class West Indian Negro nationalism, which is concerned only to deny the existence of a specially Negro personality (MP 2001: 227).

It is clear that, as Szeman states, Naipaul measures the once colonized societies with an ideal modern and civilized West (2003:102). Modernity is the theme of almost the entire section on Trinidad and of *The Middle Passage* as a whole. After many years of being abroad, Naipaul travels through his home country and comes to a conclusion that will never change by the course of the passing years later. ‘‘Ambition — a moving hand, drink being poured into a glass — was not matched with skill, and the effect was Trinidadian; vigorous, with a slightly flawed modernity’’ (MP 2001: 34). Naipaul, in the section written on Trinidad, gives casual examples of daily life. Giving an example, among the others, which reads “The excellent coffee which is grown in Trinidad is used only by the very poor and a few middle-class English expatriates. Everyone else drinks Nescafe or Maxwell House or Chase and Sanborn, which is more expensive but is advertised in the magazines and therefore acceptable” (MP 2001: 40), he concludes that, for Trinidadians, “To be modern is to ignore local products and to use those advertised in American magazines” (MP 2001: 40). In fact

Naipaul's the following observation clearly shows where his contentments have been derived from:

> Charles Kingsley, who ten years later spent a winter in Trinidad, tells the story in *At Last* of a German who, because Trinidad produced sugar, vanilla and cocoa, decided to make chocolate in Trinidad. He did, and his price was a quarter that of the imported. But the fair Creoles would not buy it. It could not be good; it could not be the real article, unless it had crossed the Atlantic twice to and from that centre of fashion, Paris (MP 2001: 41).

For Naipaul, the concept of modernity is a positive social phenomenon, but only, he suggests, when it develops ''organically'' out of the soil of the country. ''The main, degrading fact of the colonial society,'' Naipaul writes, is ''that it never required efficiency, it never required quality, and these things, because unrequired, became undesirable'' (MP 2001: 53). Much of Naipaul's description of the problems with modernity in Trinidad stems from an assessment of the thorough penetration of Trinidadian society by American culture. But it is because Naipaul also has a different sense of modernity. For him, modernity entails something more than just the existence of consumerism, hence, he speaks of it as ''flawed'' in Trinidad. Observing that The West Indians are in an entanglement and a greedy absorption of the American culture, he suggests that ''living in a borrowed culture, the West Indian, more than most, needs writers to tell him who he is and where he stands'' (MP 2001: 64). The West Indian writer needs to speak the truth about the West Indian condition and the particularity of the West Indian. Naipaul claims that this has never happened. In this regard Naipaul is of the opinion that the writer should use his words as drops of cold water, primary task of which must be to awaken the readers of these words. It

is because, he propounds, that "…Here the West Indian writers have failed. Most have so far only reflected and flattered the prejudices of their race or colour groups. The insecure wish to be heroically portrayed. Irony and satire, which might help more, are not acceptable; and no writer wishes to let down his group" (MP 2001: 65). He thinks that the inability of the West Indian writer to escape from the racial divisions is the main cause of the problems. In a sense, Naipaul suggests that *there is no literature* in the West Indies: "To the initiated one whole side of West Indian writing has little to do with literature and much to do with the race war'' (MP 2001: 65). The literature of the West Indies is at its best didactic and ''propagandist'' (MP 2001: 65), since ''the Trinidadian expects his novels, like his advertisements, to have a detergent purpose'' (MP 2001: 65).

The West Indian writer's attitude to racial themes is another issue that Naipaul and Lamming have opposing views. Naipaul, in *The Middle Passage*, states that: "When people speak of the race problem in Trinidad they do not mean the Negro-white problem, they mean the Negro-Indian rivalry" (MP 2001: 75). In this regard, Singh states that although Naipaul rejects the possibility of the Negro-Indian clash in view of their diverse professions and places of residence, he sees the racial mixture in the Caribbean as a permanent problem (1998: 269). On the West Indian negro writers, Naipaul is of the opinion that;

> "The involvement of the Negro with the white world is one of the limitations of West Indian writing, as it has been the destruction of American Negro writing... The American Negro's subject is his blackness. This cannot be the basis of any serious literature… With two or three exceptions, the West Indian writer has so far avoided the American Negro type of protest writing, but his aims have been equally

propagandist: to win acceptance for his group (MP 2001: 65-66).

As Singh asserts, Lamming rejects Naipaul's understanding of the African memory in the Caribbean, particularly, in the cultural sense, taking up Naipaul's remarks about Samuel Selvon and himself in the following quotation from *The Pleasures of Exile:*

To quote Naipaul first:

> Mr. Samuel Selvon, who has won a reputation for his stories of West Indians in London, is an Indian. In Trinidad where he comes from, he would be called an East Indian.... Mr. Lamming is a Barbadian Negro. It is not fully realized how completely the West Indian Negro identifies himself with England...Africa has been forgotten; films about African tribesmen excite derisive West Indian laughter .... (Singh 1998: 270).

Quoting Lamming's reply which reads; "It is precisely because Africa has not been forgotten that the West Indian embarrasment takes the form of derisive laughter. And how do we explain inspite of this amnesia, the calypso, which is the basic folk rhythm of the Caribbean", Singh concludes that "This is perhaps one of the most glaring examples of the opposing stances of Naipaul and Lamming towards the structure of the Caribbean society and its compulsive ethos" (Singh 1998:271).

## 3.3. NAIPAUL AND LAMMING ON THE CARIBBEAN NATION

From 1958 to 1962, the period in which both Naipaul's *The Middle Passage* and Lamming's *The Pleasures of Exile* were published, there had been a project of federation in the West Indies. The West Indies Federation was a brief political entity (1958–62) that proposed to join all of the various British colonies in the Caribbean into a new independent national entity. Although it was not a functioning political entity, it existed for four years. But, "it failed to materialize because of in-fighting among the islands over such fundamental issues as the nature of the federal constitution, power-sharing arrangements in the new nation, the system by which representatives would be elected, and the like" (Szeman 2003: 67). Szeman asserts that richer countries' drawbacks that the federation may bring rapid in-migration from poorer countries, their racial concerns and national leaders' agitating these threats to enhance their own political interests are some of the hinders that caused the project of federation to fail (2003: 67). Naipaul's *The Middle Passage* and Lammin's *The Pleasures of Exile* were written in this period in which the project of a national entity was in charge. Both of these texts constitute in their own way a response to the promise and possibility of federation, and they deal directly with the question of how to constitute a common political space which will gather all the Caribbean Islands within one federative state. In their works, while Lamming is of the opinion that there are the conditions of possibility for federation, Naipaul, in *The Middle Passage*, tries to deny the possibility that these conditions might exist. Thus, as Szemans also states, Naipaul repeatedly suggests the necessary conditions for the existence of a federation are absent in the Caribbean (2003: 98). For constructing a national unity Lamming asserts that the role and importance of the novel in producing a regional or national culture is of great

importance. And in order to produce these essential novels by which The West Indians will construct a national identity, Lamming suggests that the writer must accept an exilic situation because of the problems and hindrances that stand in the way of the colonial writer which prevent him from being a writer. He writes that ‘‘these men had to leave if they were going to function as writers since books, in that particular colonial conception of literature, were not—meaning, too, are not supposed to be— written by natives’’ (PE 1995: 27). Lamming propounds that in The West Indies‘‘the desire to be free, the ambition to make their own laws and regulate life according to their own impulses, is dormant’’ (PE 1995: 35). It is the novel, according to Lamming, that is to activate these desires. For Lamming the advent of the novel in The West Indies is one of the three most significant historical events in the region (PE 1995: 37). Lamming writes that ‘‘the novelist was the first to relate the West Indian experience from the inside . . . for the first time, the West Indian peasant became other than a cheap source of labour ... It is the West Indian novel that has restored the West Indian peasant to his true and original status of personality’’ (PE 1995: 38-39).

Imre Szeman, in this regard, claims that:

> For Lamming, this is what the novel alone is able to do, a fact that grants the novelist an important and historic role, and this claim about the subjective energies of the novel is fraught with problems that reflect the complexities of bringing about (in Jameson’s terms) a cultural revolution in the West Indies. For instance, the fact that the subject of the West Indian novel is, as Lamming claims, ‘‘peasant’’ as opposed to the middle-class orientation of the British novel (OS 38), does not alter the fact that the form of the novel, the very idea of its potential effects, as well as its place within the culture—the assumption of its deep link to subjectivity

> and inner experience, for example—remain middle class and Western. (2003:75)

Szeman finds Lamming's claim being 'excessive and politically suspect' and claims that: "…this shift in representation does not by itself constitute a corresponding shift in the position of the peasant in social and economic terms or, for that matter, in terms of a more general shift of their cultural awareness. Representation does not all at once break up the accreted habits of subalternity to bring about a cultural revolution" (2003:76)

Written in 1960 in the midst of the political experimentation with the West Indies Federation, and appearing in 1962 when this experiment had failed, Naipaul's *The Middle Passage* is interested explicitly in cross-examining the prospects for the nation in the Caribbean. In the foreword of this nonfictional work, Naipaul writes that the book was funded by the government of Trinidad and Tobago and written at the behest of Eric Williams (MP 2001: X). It seems that Eric Williams, the president of Trinidad, invited Naipaul to come home to write a book on the Caribbean, bacause he was probably in search of whether there existed a possibility of the new federation. Naipaul, visiting all of the major islands, especially the ones most deeply engaged in the debates over the form that the federation was to take, produced a text which laid bare that it was imposible to built a West Indian Federation, because of the lack of a peculiar history in the West Indies. He writes that ''the history of the islands can never be satisfactorily told. Brutality is not the only difficulty. History is built on achievement and creation; and nothing was created in the West Indies'' (MP 2001: 20).

Naipaul's claim that it is imposible for The West Indians to built a union does not mean that he is opposed of a national unity. Although he is the most 'ruthless' critic of the once colonized world, he is, nevertheless, as deeply tied to the project of the nation as is Lamming, as well as to the place of literature with respect to the nation. As Szeman states; "What he sets out to show is not that individual Caribbean nations or even a federation is undesirable, but simply that it is not possible" (2003: 99). Naipaul, in the middle passage, writes;

> For seven months I had been travelling through territories which, unimportant except to themselves, and faced with every sort of problem, were exhausting their energies in petty power squabbles and the maintaining of the petty prejudices of petty societies. I had seen how deep in nearly every West Indian, high and low, were the prejudices of race; how often these prejudices were rooted in self-contempt; and how much important action they prompted. (MP 2001: 241)

He propounds that The West Indians, instead of being in the search of a binding national identity, are rather in pursuits of their personal or group interests. He asserts that "Everyone spoke of nation and nationalism but no one was willing to surrender the privilege or even the separateness of his group. Nowhere, except perhaps in British Guiana, was there any binding philosophy: there were only competing sectional interests. With an absence of a feeling of community, there was an absence of pride, and there was even cynicism" (MP 2001: 241). Naipaul's reasons for the collapse of the federation are knotted on the assumption that the existence of the West Indies as a totality is tied too closely to the spatial impression (vague memory) left behind by colonialism. Lamming, too, shares the same idea that the people of The West Indies are in a void which was constructed by the

colonial practices. What separates the analyses of Lamming and Naipaul is their understanding of the difficulties that exist in the Caribbean which impede the creation of a genuine nationalism. For Lamming, it is a difficulty imposed by historical circumstances that can be erased in time with mental and physical struggles. Naipaul, on the other hand, as one critic states, turns this difficulty into a kind of ontology.

Lamming, considering his generation's literary figures as "the first builders of what will become a tradition in West Indian imaginative writing: a tradition which will be taken for granted or for the purpose of critical analysis by West Indians of a later generation" (PE 1995: 38), can be considered to be a staunch nationalist as regards his cultural feelings. In terms of education, language, and culture, J. Dillon Brown underlines, “Lamming regards himself not only as a descendant of Caliban but also as a direct descendant of Prospero worshipping in the same temple of endeavor, using his legacy of language. Nevertheless, he is far from being a quiet, obedient worshipper (2006: 689).

The new structure of awareness, Lamming proposes, derives from a reconsideration of previous definitions to which the West reduced all the other realities. For Lamming, one of these definitions, which initially ought to be questioned, is probably the geographical one. Attempting to geographically define the West Indies, Lamming underlines the peculiar position of the country, it being constituted by dozens of variously-sized islands, each characterized by an incredible cultural and linguistic variety. He specifies the meaning implied in his use of the word “nation” in reference to the Caribbean:

> A concept of Nation that is not defined by specific territorial boundaries, and whose people, scattered across a variety of latitudes within and beyond the archipelago, show loyalty to the "nation-state" laws of their particular location without any severance of cultural contiguity to their original worlds of childhood. They have created the phenomenon of a transnational family. (Conversations 2000: 32)

He advocates fighting for linguistic, political and cultural unity as a prerequisite for social transformation. Lamming examines fragmentation from a cultural materialist perspective, and he calls for its transformation into a unity. In *Of Age and Innocence,* Lamming mentions the late phases of colonialism in San Cristobal, a fictional name for the Caribbean island. San Cristobal is portrayed as an island fragmented by racial and class divisions which endanger the consolidation of the fragile nationalist movement. One of the characters, also a writer and a staunch nationalist articulates the following exerption, which one can also recount to be Lamming's ideas concerning the concept of nationalism:

> Nationalism is not only frenzy and struggle with all its necessary demand for the destruction of those forces which condemn you to the status we call colonial. The national spirit is deeper and more enduring than that. It is original and necessary as the root to the body of a tree. It is the source of discovery and creation. It is the private feeling you experience of possessing and being possessed by the whole landscape of the place where you were born, the freedom which helps you to recognize the rhythm of the winds, the silence and aroma of the night, rocks, water, pebble and branch, animal and bird noise, the temper of the sea and the mornings arousing nature everywhere to the silent and sacred communion between you and the roots you have made on this island. It is the bond between each man and that corner of the earth which his birth and his work have baptized with the name, home. And

the freedom you sing… freedom…(OAI 1981: 174-175)

As regards the nation, Lamming, due to his Marxist thoughts, is of the opinion that every nation has the right to freely choose their sovereignty and international political status with no external compulsion or external interference. This is the principle in international law and it is called Self determination. On the other hand, being aware of the multi racial and multi cultural characteristics of the Caribbeans, he proposes that all islands should be gathered under the federation of the West India. Thus, it is obvious that Lamming's aspiration is to build a hybrid or creole nation state out of many rootless ethnicities, a concept that was put into practise with the emergence of the idea of modernism.

The writers need to rely on their native past when taking the themes of alienation, a search for home, the search for historical roots or colonial exploitation, as their subject matter. For the writers like Naipaul and Lamming, the quest for an identity or a root is difficult due to the fact that they are the descendents of deracinated people. In this regard, having been formed by a juxtaposition of communities brought together by historical accidents who have little or no shared tradition in terms of culture, religion or language, the West Indies present a highly complex atmosphere for the writers. As Manjith Inder Singh states; composed of such chaotic communities which have entangled in terrible geographical and socio-cultural alienation, here the patterns of exile and culture shock are more complicated, compared, for example, with the American Negroes whose sufferings may rather have been stemmed from the racial discrimination and denial of rights than a search for native identity (1998: 12-13). This exercise has led writers like Naipaul and Lamming to have the feeling of being alone in a vulnerable situation

with an erased past, no imaginative centre or history to hold on to. In an interview with Adrian Rowe Evans, Naipaul mentions his pshycic process as follows:

> I long to be happy, I still have a great instinct towards great happiness and delight and pleasure. And the idea was that the work would absorb and obliterate all my distress, continually. At first I looked for that release in humour, but as the horizon of my writing expanded, I sought to reconstruct my disintegrated society, to impose order on the world, to seek patterns, to tell myself—this is what happens when people are strong; this is what happens when people are weak. I had to find that degree of intellectual comfort, or I would have gone mad (Transition 1971: 56).

Naipaul's comments explicitly indicate the need for a writer to nourish on the positive aspects of the world around. In this regard, Singh's assertion lays down clearly the difference between Naipaul and Lamming;

> Indeed, for a novelist like him [Naipaul], it is not easy to come to terms with the element of negation inherent in his society of "weak" people. But to face one's destiny and experience is perhaps significant for intellectual comfort and the necessary creative balance, as Naipaul says. Lamming, however, is not as panicky about his personal 'trauma' and the artistic void in which his work has to grow. He sustains his vision as a writer by viewing it as a part of the larger human destiny (1998: 54-55).

## 3.4. THEIR VIEW OF THE IDENTITY OF THE CARIBBEANS

In portraying the effects of the colonial period and how it damaged the psychology of the people of the colonized nations, Lamming fictionalizes the entanglements in which his characters struggle with their alienated selves, disappointments, inadequacies, and feelings of abandonment. But at the same time he presents ways and solutions of how to overcome such feelings. Futhermore, Lamming is also in search of rebuilding the relationships between the colonizer and the colonized by presenting new ways of responses which, according to him, will help them in their liberation process.

Lamming is of the opinion that satire eliminates concern and it puts the artist to reproach individuals from a stance of superiority. But, as Elizabeth Nunez Harrell states, "it is because satire demands involvement that we question whether Naipaul's fiction can be considered as such. For satire expresses concern not merely by its exposure of evil, but by its assumption that society as a whole is not corrupt, but recognizes certain inherent moral and social norms"(Contemporary Literature, 1978: 31). Nunez goes on asserting:

> It becomes too clear that the normal world by which he measures the distortions in West Indian society is England. Hence we are missing in his works about the West Indies the *sine qua non* of satire; an assumption of societal norms that is the very basis for the exposure of distortions in a society. A comparison between scenes treating the West Indian's unabashed mimicry of the English way of life reveals Naipaul's contemptuous attitude towards the West Indian and Lamming's sympathetic understanding of this distortion. (Ibid, 31-32)

The following is an exerption taken from Naipaul's *The Mystic Masseur*:

> …The dinner was a treat for the photographers… the blackest M. L. C. wore a three-piece blue suit, yellow woollen gloves and a monocle. …Unoriginal disaster befell Mr. Primrose. His monocle fell into his soup. …"Eh, eh," he chuckled, "but see how it fall down!" The M. L. C's looked on with sympathy. Mr Primrose turned on them. "What all you staring at? All you ain't see nigger before?" The man in jodhpurs whispered to Ganesh, "But we wasn't saying anything." "Eh!" Mr Primrose snapped. "Black people don't wear monocle?" He fished out the monocle, wiped it, and put it in his coat pocket. The meal was torture to Ganesh. He felt alien and uncomfortable. He grew sulkier and sulkier and refused all the courses. …He was in a temper when he returned late that night to Fuente Grove. "Just wanted to make a fool of me," he muttered, "fool of me." "Leela!" he shouted, "Come, girl, and give me something to eat." She came out, smiling sardonically. "But, man, I thought you was dining with the Governor." "Don't make joke, girl. Done dine. Want to eat now. Going to show them," he mumbled, as his fingers ploughed through the rice and dal and curry, "going to show them" ( MM 1964: 208-209).

Nunez, quoting the above exerption from Naipaul's *The Mystic Masseur*, contends that Naipaul's satire is loaded with "derisive laughter". As for George Lamming, quoting an exerption from *The Pleasures of Exile* which reads:

> On the day of the Queen's coronation, Thomasos, a reporter famous for his marvelous sense of humor, is confronted by a West Indian official on his way to Windsor Abbey: The gentleman was wearing a morning suit—like those I saw at the Windsor funeral—those charcoal-grey trousers, whose stripes go chasing like black snakes up and down the legs, a hat tall as a mountain top with a silver-grey precipice and mourning black band, a white glove fitted like skin over the left hand; and held—not worn—but held by the right hand was his second glove, tossed and swung to the rhythm of his military stride, a flag of surrender showing five fingers bled white and swollen with longing for its lost hand. Thomasos' reaction is immediate.

> Barely allowing the man to shape a question, he runs. *(qtd.* Nunez-Harrel in Contemporary Literature, 1978: 33)

Nunez-Harrel, underlining Lamming's comment on this scene which reads "Foreigners may smile, but this black apparition was no joke for Thomasos who was now beginning to feel the arrows of civilisation pierce his pride" *(PE*, 1995: 55), asserts that "Lamming's narration is painfully accurate, but it prohibits any laughter. Rather, it inspires fear, for it demands that the reader realize the horror of the colonial experience and its corrosive effect on the self-esteem of the native"(Contemporary Literature, 1978, 33).

The past with its brutality and nostalgia is a recurrent theme in the West Indian novel. Having been descended from indentured workers, it is natural both for Naipaul and Lamming to feel in a vacuum and anchorless life. This feeling of having been deracinated eventually leads such mental disorders as feeling alienated, alone and losing the sense of pride, place and race. To quote Naipaul again from *The Middle Passage;*

> Everyone was an individual, fighting for his place in the community. Yet there was no community. We were of various races, religions, sects and cliques; we had somehow found ourselves on the same small island. Nothing bound us together except this common residence. There was no nationalist feeling: there could be none. There was no profound anti-imperialist feelings, indeed, it was only our Britishness, our belonging to the British Empire, which gave us any identity. So protests could only be individual, isolated, unheeded. (MP, 2001:36)

On the other hand, there is a wish to retreat from the forced identity and return to inherited identity. Writers with Marxist point of view, as Lamming is, believe that it

is possible to restore a sense of inherited identity by logically looking back at the past with the help of tradition, language or myth. They have inclined to stuff this great void from which grew extreme individualism and isolation.

George Lamming, though himself one of the Caribbean literary exiles in England, has underlined the need for writers to be more sympathetic to their native society in his non-fiction work *The Pleasures of Exile*. The task of the Caribbean or African writer, displaced emotionally and culturally, is to find an identity and acceptability of the society and characters portrayed in his work. Sandra Pouchet Paquet, in *The Novels of George Lamming*, makes a simple and clear statements on Lamming's stand point asserting that his principal goal is "the dismantling of a colonial structure of awareness", something which affects his people (like every other colonized people) first on a psychological level, then exposing its legacies in social, political and artistic dimensions (Paquet, 1982: VIII). Lamming's argument stems from his personal quest as a writer who believes in the indestructibility of roots. They can be temporarily violated as is the case in, *In 'the Castle of My Skin, but* their authenticity in life is the only certainty to which one comes back.

On the other hand, Considering Naipaul's standpoint which can not be associated with one single national identity or cultural sensibility, one can infer that he could not be understood in a conventional, traditional or nationalist idiom alone. Naipaul has been highly suspect of the response from the West Indian society and readership, as it has been spelled out repeatedly in *The Middle Passage,* and *A House for Mr. Biswas,* among other works. He believes that the colonial aftereffects has caused the colonized people's mind and finer sensitivity crippled so that these peoples are hardly left with any original views of their own. To establish an

intellectual stance in a society devoid of asthetic and cultured responses is very difficult for him as a writer. He seems to have found no way of recreating it except through satire and humour. Contrary to Lamming's ideas, Naipaul believes in the impartiality of art, even more, in its impersonality. In this regard he says "We want more realism, not more romanticism; the time for that is finished. One can't be entirely sympathetic, one must have views, one must do more than merely respond emotionally" (Transition, 1971: 57).

## 3.5. EVALUATION

Although Naipaul's clear depictions of the cultural displacement, deracination, and unhomelines and his creative use of fiction and travel forms of writing draw the admiration of the critics both from the West and the East, his fiction, especially his travelogues which portray the East has received harsh criticism from the eastern scholors and warm receptions from The West. While he is welcomed by Anglo-American critics for his straightforward opinions on the political, social, and cultural issues of the countries known as the Third World, on the other hand, in Post-Colonial circles, especially among those writers who have an opposing view of colonialism and among the people in the countries he writes about, he is blamed not to have shown sympathy for the oppressed. Especially his three books on India (An Area of Darkness, India: A Wounded Civilization, and India: A MUlion Mutinies Now) created anger and hatred among the Indians. He is accused of being an arrogant who transformed himself into an Englishman despising the culture of the once-colonized countries, and writing from a single-sided point of view which portrays only the negative characteristics of Indian society. While writers like George Lamming, Derek Walcott, and Caryl Philips who have opposing views of colonialism, idealize their culture and their people, Naipaul seems to be in a situation of inbetween, a writer who doesn't have a root or a connection to any entities, be it a country, a culture, or a political group. On the other hand, in Europe and the United States, critics and academics praise Naipaul for the truthfulness of his views on the issues of the Third World. Nevertheless, Despite all accusation from the postcolonial circles, as Bruce King puts it, "Naipaul blames European imperialism for the horrors of slavery

and for the problems it left on its former colonies, while praising it for bringing peace and modern thought to areas of the world that remained medieval and debilitated by continual local wars and destructive non-Western invasions" (King, 2003: 4). Due to his being born and brought up in the period in which modernism was in its heydays, Naipaul is possible to be considered as a writer whose thoughts have been shaped by aspects of modernism, but writing in an era of postmodernism. Although all his works, be it fiction or nonfiction, are engaged in the experiences between the colonized and the colonizer, and though among the literary circles, he is considered to be a postcolonial writer, his views towards the third world countries are rather of a modernist who champions logic and ration with a realist point of view. In other word, his subject matter is postcolonial, but as King states, "his perspective on decolonization, imperialism, black-white relations and other themes of post-imperial literatures is more complicated than that of nationalists and their foreign sympathizers" (King, 2003: 3). He looks at the relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed as a universal and continuing practise, triying to tell us that since culture and identity are not fixed notions peculiar to some certain races, and since they are moveable and changing mechanisms, we should not regard them as being crucial for survival of the peoples. According to Naipaul identity is not fixed since it is shaped by the relations with other cultures. He propounds that due to the mass migration of the people from different cultures and geographic locations to find better living standards, peoples' travelling all around the world, and information technologies, the world has become culturally interwoven that no one can assert s/he has a fixed or peculiar life style. He also thinks that one should be aware of his/her history in order to evaluate himself/herself, but he doesn't consider history as the

outcome stemmed from a specific culture's characteristics. Hence, for him, imperialism is a recurrent, primordial instinct of mankind that is not peculiar to a certain civilization, but to all. This is the feature that distinct Naipaul from the other postcolonial writers.

As for George Lamming, he is known for his investigations to have the West Indians being aware of their colonial past, and the effects of this colonial past on the present. He beleives that it is possible to restore a sense of authentic identity by logically looking back at the past with the help of tradition, languge or myth. His novels, like most postcolonial writers, are engaged with the central themes peculiar to the literature of decolonization. These themes can be listed as colonialism and nationalism, emigration and exile, history and myth, tradition and modernity; cultural hybridity; identity in the context of race, class, gender, and ethnicity; and the role of the writer in a time of revolutionary social change.

Lamming's novels, being in a sequence from the first to the last, are characteristically political and experimental in nature. They follow logically one after the other in order to form a single unfinished plot. The unifying theme underlying all of them is the colonial experience. He is in a struggle to dismantle the colonial structure that the West Indians have been shaped with, and tries to establish a consciousness among his people by underlying the importance of the old traditions and myths. Chief among his concerns are the cultural rootlessness, alienation, and exile, all of which, he believes, are the resultant of slavery and colonialism. He is not of the opinion, contrary to Naipaul, that the West Indian are "peasant-minded, money-minded community, spiritually static because cut off from its roots" who are unsure of themselves, having no taste or style of their own" *(*MP, 2001: 80). He

thinks that in order to recover all the ill characteristics attributed to the West Indies, it is essential for the Caribbean societies to restructure its multicultural, multiracial, multiethnic social structure around the needs of its peasant and working-class majority. The role of artist, he believes, is to produce works which underline the need for that leap. Lamming does not favour middle class portrayal as he finds it away from the centrality of the Caribbean experience. According to him, the West Indian middle-class is generally representative of borrowed white values which have rendered such fictional characters hollow and vulnerable. Though he himself is the victim and partner of the anglicized Caribbean socio-cultural outlook, Lamming has oppenly criticized the West Indian writer's British education and white-collar approach. For him, the only positive thing_for the writer is to have remained provincial. As he wrote about the peasant origins of Caribbean literature in *The Pleasures of Exile:*

> Unlike the previous governments and departments of educators, unlike businessmen importing commodities, the West Indian writer did not look out across the sea to another source. He looked in and down at what had been traditionally ignored. For the first time the West Indian peasant became other than a cheap source of labour. He became through the novelist's eye, a living existence, living in silence and joy and fear, involved in riot and carnival. It is the West Indian novel that has restored the West Indian peasant to his true and original status of personality. (PE, 1995: 38-39).

In this respect, considering Lamming's propoundings, one is likely to establish a viewpoint that Lamming can be regarded among the "socialist realists" of 1930s who favoured, socially and economically, the disadvantaged to call attention to social ills and needs for reform. The theory of Socialist Realism was adopted by

the Congress of Soviet Writers in 1934 which alleged and demanded that all art must depict some aspect of man's struggle toward socialist progress for a better life, and that the creative artist must promote and elevate the common worker, the proletariat whether factory or agricultural, by presenting his life, work, and recreation as admirable. Socialist realism, as Berna Moran states, is not being aware of the current social issues and realities, but it is to know [to anticipate] where it is inclined towards (Moran, 1998: 54). Because, in Marxist theory of historical materialism, the phases that the society is going to pass through has been manifested. These successive stages are known as the primitive society, the slave society, feudalism, capitalism, socialism, and eventually, comunism. So; since these stages are visible and fixed, the task of the artist, according to socialist realist, must be, as George Lamming does, to underline the intricacies of the lower classes such as the peasants and industrial workers, and to find remedies for promoting and elevating these classes' way of life. In this respect, in exploring the damaged psychology of the subjugated peoples that once had been colonized, Lamming lays down the effects of the colonial period and how it damaged the psychology of the people of the colonized nations, fictionalizing the entanglements in which his characters struggle with their alienated selves, disappointments, inadequacies, and feelings of abandonment. But at the same time he presents ways and solutions of how to overcome such feelings. Futhermore, Lamming is also in search of rebuilding the relationships between the colonizer and the colonized by presenting new ways of responses which, according to him, will help them in their liberation process.

Lamming, like Naipaul, is aware of the individual and social entanglement and shortcomings that the Caribbean are in, but unlike Naipaul he is in a struggle,

due to his Marxist thoughts and through the imaginative possibilities offered by the novel, to explore new visions and meanings of experience in the Caribbean. Lamming's quest is obviously for a fresh starting-point in historical and ethnic terms which would bring out the true nature of his people's identity. According to Lamming, as Odhiambo states, the Caribbean intellectual has to "move beyond the confines of history and experience, to explore new alternatives and possible meanings even in a history of displacement, slavery, and subjugation"( *Research in African Literatures*, 1994: 123). He, in *The Pleasure of Exile*, asserts that: "the mystery of the colonial is this: while he remains alive, his instinct, always and forever creative, must choose a way to change the meaning and perspective of this ancient tyranny" (PE, 1995: 229).

Oscar Wilde, in the preface of The Picture of Dorian Gray, states that nineteenth-century dislike of Realism is the rage of Caliban seeing his own face in a glass. The nineteenth-century dislike of Romanticism is the rage of Caliban not seeing his own face in a glass." (Wilde, 1983: 1). Brian May ads a third sentence to Wilde's above inference, saying, "The twentieth-century dislike (hatred, rather) of colonialism, however, is the rage of Caliban seeing or not seeing his own face in a glass" (Contemporary Literature, 1998: 452). In this article May makes a clasification of all postcolonial canon into three figures of Caliban. The first figure is concretized through Matthew Arnold's nineteenth-century 'Philistine' staring stolidly and stupidly at art. This figure is the Old Caliban or 'Patsy Caliban'. The second figure, as May claims, is the one that became the very type of the intrepid colonial victim "who sheds his current servitude and physical disfigurements in the process of discovering his essential, pre-colonial self" (Said, 1994: 212). Brian May calls this

figure as ‘old new Caliban’. May goes on saying: as the nineties draw to a close, one notices a ‘new new Caliban’ on the scene, one who does not "nourish and require" the old so much as upstage him. If the old new Caliban was enraged equally by seeing and by not seeing his face in the Western mirror, the new new Caliban is smoother, cooler, cannier, more pragmatic— less concerned about essences and more aware of the dangers of chauvinism and xenophobia (Contemporary Literature, 1998: 214).

Juxtaposing two texts, one of which is Supriya Nair's *Caliban's Curse: George Lamming and the Revisioning of History,* and the other, Michael Gorra's *After Empire: Scott, Naipaul, Rushdie,* May claims that “One of Gorra's chief ambitions is to close the gap between Naipaul and his critics, a gap created by (in Sara Suleri's description) the "exquisitely angry" Naipaul, but one sustained and widened by the more bluntly angry words of such writers and commentators as Selwyn Cudjoe, Rob Nixon, Derek Walcott, and, of course, George Lamming” (Contemporary Literature, 1998: 455). As for Nair’s texts, May asserts “Nair's ambition, on the other hand, is to explore that gap or, rather, map out the Lamming side, following the Lamming-Naipaul divide as it widens further and turns from a rift between two individual writers into a deep division between two groups. Perhaps, it is a division between a group and a single lonely talent” (Contemporary Literature, 1998: 455). Reading these texts, May’s inference is that “Gorra's postcolonialism claims that though the argument against imperialism as a political structure may need to be carried on, it no longer needs to be made as it has been. Nair, on the other hand, asserts that, Lamming has never abandoned this fundamental argument, even in his latest works” (Contemporary Literature, 1998: 455). In the light of May’s classification, one can

easily identify Lamming with the ‘old new Caliban’, and Naipaul with the ‘new new Caliban’.

# CHAPTER FOUR

## ALIENATION AND EXILE IN *A HOUSE FOR MR BISWAS* AND *IN THE CASTLE OF MY SKIN*

It is a fact that writers', intellectuals' and scholars' political standpoints are built on their perceptions they have experienced in the course of their lives. In this process, they eventually experience various senses of alienation from the cultural and traditional codes of the social milieus which they have organic bounds. On that account, This chapter will dwell on how Naipaul and Lamming may have experienced and treated the theme of alienation which must be considered to be the cause that has led them to their current political standpoints.

Taking Naipaul's *A House for Mr Biswas* and Lamming's *In the Castle of My Skin* into consideration, this chapter tackles their stand points concerning the theme of cultural displacement which eventually leads the individuals experiencing certain feelings as being alienated and displaced from his/her original culture. Juxtaposing the abovementioned texts relying on Homi Bhabha's notion of 'unhomeliness' and Melvin Seeman's highly influential five-fold classification of the theme of alienation, and considering Hegelian, Marxist and existentialist theories as regards the noition of alienation as well, it will put forward how these two eminent postcolonial writers, V. S. Naipaul and George Lamming, dealt with the theme of alienation, unhomeliness and displacement in these novels. Nevertheless, before the novels in question, it is of great importance to deliberate the themes of alienation, displacement and unhomelines which have been the constant problems of the world, and on which this chapter is going to be based.

## 4.1. EXILE, UNHOMELINESS, UNCANNY AND ALIENATION

In The Oxford English Dictionary Online, an exiled individual is defined as "a person who lives away from their native country, either from choice or compulsion"( "exile". Oxford English Dictionaries). But, delineating only one aspect of the theme among the others, this definition does not connote the psychological dimensions of exile, since it does not imply those people who have the sense of being exiled in their home country, in other words those who have the sense of being unhomed even in their home as well as those who have become exiled from themselves either by the resultant of their intellectual development or by compulsion. Homi K. Bhabha explores the sense of being unhomed through the concept of 'unhomeliness' which brings to mind the concept of "the uncanny" which was coined by Ernst Jentsch in his essay "On the Psychology of the Uncanny" in 1906, and developed by Sigmund Freud's 1919 essay 'The Uncanny' (Das Unheimliche). The word 'uncanny' literally means 'unhomely' and it denotes a psychological state where someone feels both familiar and foreign with something at the same time.( Jentsch, 1997: 7-16). As for the concept of 'unhomely', Bhabha identifies it as:

> To be unhomed is not to be homeless, nor can the 'unhomely' be easily accommodated in that familiar division of social life into private and public spheres. The unhomely moment creeps up on you stealthily… The recesses of the domestic space become sites for history's most intricate invasions. In that displacement, the borders between home and world become confused; and, uncannily, the private and the public become part of each other, forcing upon us a vision that is as divided as it is disorienting. (Bhabha, 1994: 9)

These psychological aspects of exile, the feeling of unhomeliness even in one's own home, or the sense of estrangement from one's own self, can best be delineated through the concept of 'alienation', because; the instinct which leads the individual to have a physical or a psyhcological exile stems from the sense of alienation.

Alienation is defined "as a feeling of separation or isolation which results problems stemmed from rapid social changes such as industrialization and urbanization which has broken down traditional relationships among individuals and groups and the goods and services they produce" (alienation." The American Heritage New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy). However, this definition does not give a comprehensive delineation of the term. The concept of alienation has intrigued and troubled many sociologists and philosophers and consequently enjoyed a turbulent history which stretches to Hegel. Due to its widespread usage through various disciplines, there hasn't been an agreement on even its most basic aspects yet. As Iain Williamson and Cedric Cullingford heighlight"There is disagreement about the definition, debate over whether the phenomenon is a sociological process or a psychological state, or both, and confusion over the inevitability of the experience" (1997: 263). The concept has been used widely in the contemporary literature, sociology and philosophy. Melvin Seeman underlines that "It is a central theme in the classics of Marx, Weber, and Durkheim; and in contemporary work, the consequences that have been said to flow from the fact of alienation have been diverse, indeed"(1959: 783). Since the concept has a wide range of uses some of which do not have relevance with this study, after putting forward a brief historical process, its social and psychological aspects will be considered in a way to make it possible to construct a base for the abovementioned literary works.

Iain Williamson and Cedric Cullingford mention a brief historical process of the term asserting that although Hegel is considered as 'the godfather' of alienation, the concept had been featured before in the work of early theologians such as Calvin and Luther (1997: 263). They argue that in theological terms;

> Alienation describes the estrangement of humanity from God following the banishment from Eden. Here the notion of being an alien as from another world is clear. The concept is used somewhat differently in the work of many of the social contract theorists (the term is used explicitly in Rousseau and Grotius and is implicit in the writings of Hobbes & Locke). For these writers, alienation is a positive phenomenon, through which the human yields some of his/her freedom, rights and individuality for the benefit of the formation of a civilised community (1997: 264).

Hegel uses two distinct German words entausserung (surrender) and entfremdung (a state of separation) for describing the theme of alienation. He, as Williamson and Culingford assert, was much influenced by Schiller's (1954) theological use of the term as a state of separation, and also by Rousseau's discussion of alienation as a surrender of personal self and control. According to Williamson and Cullingford, Hegel's discussion of alienation (or entfremdung) can be drawn out in two major senses: alienation-as-separation, and alienation-as-surrender. The first sense echoes Schiller's writings, and the second those of the social contract philosophers (1997: 265). Hegel, as they claim, argues that "through self analysis and contemplation, the human moves from an immature sense of universality to a powerful sense of his/her own individuality, but as universality is essential to all things spiritual, this process leads to an acute sense of self-alienation from one's inner nature and the extremity of discord"(1997: 265). This is alienation-as-separation. They go on saying "recognition of this leads the individual to a second alienation process where this particularity is

yielded back to the universality of the social substance. This sense of universality is mature and the experience is one of actualisation, although Hegel remains vague on how this occurs" (1997: 265). This is alienation as surrender. To sum up, the issue that must be underlined in Hegel's understanding of the theme of alienation is that for Hegel the theme of alienation has a positive nature. Thus; Hegel puts forward two different processes, 'alienation-as-seperation' being distressing but necessary for maturity, and 'alienation-as-surrender' being positively peacefull and free from worry due to the fact that "it involves a conscious relinquishment or surrender with the intention of securing a desired end: namely, unity with the social substance" (Schacht, 1970: 36).

Alienation is usually considered as a concept associated with minorities, the poor, the unemployed, and other groups of periphery who have limited power to bring about changes in society. Although Nicholas Churchich states that Marx has never defined the term alienation itself in his manuscript of 1844, but described "the socioeconomic conditions under which men are dehumanized, exploited, and estranged" (1990: 309), there is a general perception that in Marxist theory alienation is considered as being the process in which the workers in capitalist nations are separated from the tools they need to do their works. The workers experience such an estrangement because they have not the power on the control of the products they produce. This seperateness makes the worker vulnerable to be exploited by members of other classes. For example, prior to the printing machine, calligraphers owned their own tools. This meant that they could set their own rates for doing work and have control over their lives and their employment. As a result, these penmen were often well-to-do and respected members of the community. After the invention of

printing machine, calligraphy was largely replaced by mass production of the related items. It was cheaper and easier to produce paper goods in large quantities in printing offices rather than piece by piece by calligraphers. However, printing machines were extremely expensive to build, and so they were owned by wealthy investors. Calligraphers could not compete with printing offices, and so their choice was to leave the profession or give up their tools and work in the offices. A job that used to be a well-respected and profitable profession was now performed by low-paid, unskilled laborers, with profits going to the investors instead of the workers.

Marx dwells on the theme of alienation in his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* (1844). In the Manuscripts, Marx considers alienation as a sociological process which leads to a psychological state of having the feelings of estrangement and powerlessness. He classifies the concept of alienation in three categories: religious, political and labour alienation. In religious and political alienation, individuals disempower themselves by relating their own power with the God (for religious) and the state (for the political). Marx regards both these forms of alienation as secondary to the alienation of labour. As Inder Singh states, to Marx; "alienation is the loss of fluency in human relations which in modern terminology is the loss of identity" (1998: 22). Singh also adds that "it is the clash of economic forces which necessitates self-estrangement and negation, something close to the relationship of the colonial masters and slaves" (1998: 22). In *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, Marx assertion is that;

> "The more the worker spends himself, the more powerful that alien objective world becomes, the poorer he himself, his inner world becomes, the less it belongs to him as his own. The worker puts his life

> into the object, but now his life no longer belongs to him, but to the object. Whatever the product of his labour is, he is not… He does not affirm himself but denies himself. He does not develop freely his physical and mental energy but mortifies his body and ruins his mind. Just as in religion the spontaneous activity of human imagination, of human brain and human heart operates independently of the individual, that is, operates on him as an alien" (Marx, 1961: 71).

While Marx's theory has been of immense value and dominates the imagination of writers and thinkers in a large part of the world, the concept of alienation in Marxian terms is only one aspect of the problem. Several other theories such as Existential, Religious and Psychoanalytic have been advanced.

Williamson and Cullingford argue that alienation appears less frequently and less significantly as an explicit concept in existential philosophy. Giving a few existentialists' ideas, one of whom is Tillich, regarding the concept of alienation they argue that "Tillich (1955) talks of the "tragic universality" of "entfremdung" and sees alienation as estrangement in space and time through a disparity between "essence" and "existence" (reminiscent of Schiller's work). As a theologian, the mortal is viewed as alienated from the divine (the "essential humanity" of God)" (1997: 267). For the existentialists, they say, "Estrangement is characterised by a sense of unbelief (rather than faith), a desire for concupiscence (not love) and a drive for hubris and self-elevation rather than surrender to the omnipotent immortal" (1997: 267). In general sense alienation can be defined in the existential context as the process whereby something or someone is constrained to become other than that it properly is. Manjit Inder Singh argues that for the existentialists "Alienation is a constant feature of the human situation and it cannot easily be eliminated. In the artistic sense

it is an unavoidable state, for creation involves the cancellation of the old and the birth of new ideas and visions. Creativity is impossible without the transcendence of one's old and worn-out ideas" (1998: 25). The truth that man is constantly altering himself in any act he commits is the sign of his changing experience in creative, intellectual and socio-economic terms. He is constantly taking one role and giving up another, as the process of history and growth reveals. In the colonial system of exploitation and dehumanisation, it was a complete overshadowing of one existence by another.

Meanwhile, during those interpretations of Marxists, psychoanalysts and existentialists on the concept of alienation within their philosophies, as Williamson and Cullingford put it "Seeman and other American sociologists and social-psychologists began to pay close attention to the concept, and it was this work that was to provide a valid paradigm for researches around the concept" (1997: 269). Melvin Seeman, in his paper *On the Meaning of Alienation*, tries to put this complex structure of alienation into an order by a five-fold classification: Powerlessness, Meaninglessness, Normlessness, Social Isolation and Self- Estrangement (1959: 783).

*Powerlessness*, as Seeman asserts, refers to "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behaviour cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks" (1959: 784). Seeman argues that this is "the notion of alienation as it originated in the Marxian view of the worker's condition in capitalist society: the worker is alienated to the extent that the prerogative and means of decision are expropriated by the ruling entrepreneurs" (Ibid.784). Devorah

Kalekin-Fishman makes a clear definition regarding the concept of powerlessness saying: “A person suffers from alienation in the form of ‘powerlessness’ when [he]/she is conscious of the gap between what [he]/she would like to do and what [he]/she feels capable of doing” (1996: 97). Powerlessness, then, can be interpreted as the perception that the individual does not have the means to achieve his goals. In this regard one can claim that most of the colonized people have most certainly experienced this kind of alienation in their course of decolonization.

*Meaninglessness*, as Seeman asserts, refers to “the individual’s sense of understanding events in which he is engaged” (1959: 786). He goes on saying “meaninglessness is characterized by a low expectancy that satisfactory predictions about the future outcomes of behaviour can be made. …where the first meaning of alienation refers to the sensed ability to control outcomes, this second meaning refers essentially to the sensed ability to predict behavioural outcomes” (Ibid 786). In other words meaninglessness refers to an individual's failure to appreciate the purpose of his/her work. Individuals experience this feeling when they are unable to see the relevance of a particular social norm to their current lives. For example, the imposition of the colonial educational curriculum which had no relevance on the cultural norms of the students of the colonized societies made them feel to question that why they were required to take certain courses at all. In this respect, meaninglessness is closely tied to powerlessness, and it shows the indication of nihilism. Seeman argues, “We may speak of high alienation, in the meaninglessness usage, when the individual is unclear as to what he ought to believe when the individual's minimal standards for clarity in decision-making are not met” (Ibid 786).

Seeman defines *normlessness,* the third variant of the alienation theme, as having been derived from Durkheim's description of 'anomie'. He asserts that "in the traditional usage, anomie denotes a situation in which the social norms regulating individual conduct have broken down or are no longer effective as rules for behavior" (1959: 787). In other words, normlessness refers to a situation lacking effective norms or in which individuals assume that unacceptable behaviors are required for success.

Seaman classifies the fourth type of alienation as *social isolation* which refers to the detachment of intellectuals or writers from popular cultural standards. In other words it refers to one who has become estranged from his society and the culture it carries. Kalekin-Fishman asserts that social isolation refers to "The feeling of being segregated from one's community" (1996: 97). Dwight G. Dean also articulate in his article titled *Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement* that social isolation, may also be traced to Durkheim's conception of anomie, which includes "a feeling of separation from the group or of isolation from group standards" (1961: 753).

The final type of alienation is the sense of *self-estrangement*. Self-estrangement, also called self-alienation, involves dissatisfaction with oneself or losing intrinsic satisfaction with one's work. Seaman explains self-estrangement as: "…the worker who works merely for his salary, the housewife who cooks simply to get it over with, or the other directed type who acts "only for its effect on others" all these (at different levels, again) are instances of self-estrangement" (1959: 790). Kalekin-Fishman explains this type of alienation in a smilar way saying: "Self-estrangement is the psychological state of denying one's own interests – of seeking out extrinsically satisfying, rather than intrinsically satisfying, activities [...]"(1996:

97). In this regard, self-estrangement can simply be identified as the individual's dissatisfaction with the activities s/he is expected to performe. To be alienated in this sense is to be aware of a discrepancy between one's ideal self and one's actual self-image.

Underlining the unclarity and difficulty of the concept of alienation, Seeman sums up it by quoting Nathan Glazer's essay which considers alienation as "our modern sense of the splitting asunder of what was once together, the breaking of the seamless mold in which values, behavior, and expectations were once cast into interlocking forms" (1959: 791). To sum up, alienation is the state of having the sense of estrangement or separation from one's environment, social settings, work, products of work, or self. In other words, the term alienation, like anomie, may occur in the sense of powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, social isolation, and self-estrangement, all of which come to existence due to the lack of the convenience between individual needs or expectations and the social order.

Identity crisis is deeply related to human alienation and cultural confussion in personal, psychological and sociological terms. It destroys the established personality. E. Josephson and M. Josephson, in *Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society*, asserts that "The concept of identity in sociological and psychological terms implies the solidarity of the individual with his community. In its absence, the direct result is a feeling of lostness and being ill at ease in a world lacking assured values" (1962 12). And they argue that "various usages of the term include various psycho-social disorders such as the loss of self, anxiety states, despair, depersonalization, meaninglessness, isolation, and pessimism among the others" (1962: 13). R.D. Laing, in *Self and Others*, underlines the importance of complementary identity. He

asserts that the relations of the self with others are of great importance for the formation of identity. According to Laing identity is: “Whereby one feels one is the same in this place, this time as at that time and at that place, past or future; it is that by which one is identified. An identity sometimes becomes an object that a person has or feels he has lost, and starts to search for.” (1969: 86). Erik Erikson, in *Identity, Youth and Crisis* conceptulizes the ego as the central organising agency of personality (1968: 289). According to him, the ego functions to balance the demand of society and environment and one’s iner aspirations. He considers the mutuality of inter-personal relation in the development of a healty personality as being essential (1968: 289). He underlines the fundamental principal that man simultaneously belongs to three different orders of things: “somatic, personal, and social” (1968: 289). According to Erikson, personality is the basic unit of analysis throughout the life circle. He emphasises the organized personality as being essential for the formation of true identity. Its absence leads to a pathological state in which one feels cut off from the community or society. He points out that the state of identity confusion leads to a heightened sense of isolation, disintegration of the sense of inner continuity and sameness, and the failure to derive the sense of achievement from any activities (1968: 289).

To brief, alienation is considered to be an ambiguous and multidimensional theme, since it involves philosophy, psychology, sociology, religion and history. One is alienated from something that is familiar. Alienation is not a natural condition so it occures as the result of a complex of factors. In terms of psychological aspects, alienation has a destructive feature especially for the inhabitants of the Caribbeans most of whom are the descendents of indentured workers deracinated from Africa

and Asia. In traditional Africa and Asia, everyone was a member of a group, everyone was functioning in harmony with his or her group. Torn from their homeland and forced to endure the most evil form of racism, Africans and Asians suffer a uniquely agonizing alienation. Especially the Carribean situation is highly complex, in the sense that it forms a juxtaposition of communities brought together by the greed of some other comunities, having little or no shared traditions in terms of history, culture, religion, or language. Due to this fact; the sense of expatriation, alienation, and cultural displacement is more intense in the Carribeans than, for instance, Africans and Asians who were colonized in their native geographical lands. The West Indians are doubly alienated and displaced: geographical and cultural. This fact made West Indian writers vulnerable with an erased past, no imaginative centre or history to rely on. Naipaul, in *The Middle Passage*, underlines this situation saying:

> Though we knew something was wrong with our society, we made no attempt to assess it, Trinidad was too unimportant and we could never be convinced of the value of reading the history of a place which was as everywhere said, only a dot on the map of the world. Our interest was all in the world outside, the remoter the beter. Ausralia was more important than Venezuela, which we could see on a clear day. Our own past was buried and no one cared to dig it up. This gave us a strange time-sense. The England of 1914 was the England of yesterday, the trinidad of 1914 belonged to the dark ages.(MP 2001: 36)

Asserting that the only thing that bound them was the geography, Naipaul thinks that due to the fact that the individuals were of various races, religions, sects and cliques, they failed to build a community. Everone, he says, was an individual fighting for his place in the community. In such a circumstance, he thinks, nationalist feelings,

naturally being anti-imperialist, cannot blossom. Hence, he says that “it was only our Britishness, our belonging to the British Empire, which gave us an identity” (Ibid 36).

In view of the explanations above, and due to the fact that these different types of alienation are highly correlated with one another, one can assert that the personality disorders in the people of the ex-colonies are of all the abovementioned types of alienation. Hence, placelessness, lack of aesthetic standards, absence of cultural heroes a general negligence of life and abrupt transitions are recurrent subjects in the major West Indian novelists. The deterioration of native culture due to the education system, language and comunity customs being under the control of white colonial rulers was the critical reason in the individual’s alienation from his native society or group. In this stiuation the writer takes this disordered mass as his subject matter to form a viable and continious sense of roots, and to come to terms with a fragmented present world.

One of the reasons of the increasing sense of alienation in the modern era, as Manjith Inder Singh states, “is man’s awareness of the futility of a spiritual or purely symbolic quest of reality. For the creative writer this dilemma is two fold; to comprehend the world of order and pattern, and to transform it through the creative medium. He constantly searches for a state of creative liberation, to find an imaginative resting-place” (1998: 26). So, writers like Naipaul and Lamming, as Singh underlines, find themselves in such an unevoidable condition. On the one hand, they are cut off from the whole European-Western tradition, ‘being only the rejected children of humanity’; on the other, they have to create a tradition and a composite way of life out of this very waste.

Fragmentation, alienation, and exile are common terms in postcolonial literature. It is self-evident that imperialism played a key role in bringing a sense of alienation and disorder to the countries where imperialists ruled. The history of the Caribbean and modern African states has so far been full with uprooted and displaced values. And this emotional, cultural, spiritual, environmental, social and economic displacement and uprootment caused psychological traumas, symptoms of alienation, rootlessness and an endemic colonial mentality. Nevertheless, although the experience of displacement, homelessness, exile or alienation is eventual and unavoidable for most of the intellectuals, the context of their portrayal is quite different. For example, while the pain and the anxiety of alienation in the works of European and American writers stems from their socio-cultural seperation, the problems of mechanization or technical advancement all of which can be deemed as the consequences of modernism, for the West Indian writers like Naipaul and Lamming, it stems from historical and political rootlessness which debase and destroy the personality and identity. Even the West Indian writers, each having different perceptions of their history and a diverse version of their realities peculiar to their own subjective life, have portrayed different approaches in their responses to the brutal effects that the colonizers left on the colonized cultures. In this respect, George Lamming and V.S. Naipaul are the two most prominent writers who have different versions of their own realities, and who have portrayed these different realities in their works.

Naipaul's *A House for Mr Biswas* is a tragicomic novel set in Trinidad in 1950s, and was published in 1961. It deals with an East Indian's struggle for a place to strike his deracinated root afresh. It also attacks the Indian society's segregated,

traditional way of life which contents to live in its shell and preserve its own special religious identity. As for Lamming's In the Castle of My Skin, one of the novels of decolonization, it is an autobiographical novel of Lamming's childhood and adolescence. Lamming, narrating his childhood experiences, describes the protagonist G.'s growth to manhood in the context of the social and political changes in the Caribbean in the 1930s and 1940s. The novel dwells on the changes that disrupt life in the fictional Creighton's Village and displace many of its inhabitants. Both novels fictionalize the lives of the once colonized peoples struggling with the sense of displacement and alienation through the experiences of the protagonists, Mr. Biswas and G. and their social environments. At this point, before delving into the novels and their themes, it seems essential to overview the biographies of Naipaul and Lamming, and the historical backgrounds and circumstances of the West Indies in which the novels were written.

## *4.2. A HOUSE FOR MR BISWAS* AND *IN THE CASTLE OF MY SKIN*: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Caribbean islands form an extensive archipelago in the far west of the Atlantic Ocean. These islands string between North and South America. Another name for the Caribbean is the West Indies which received its name On Colombus's belief that the native people of the Caribbean Islands were Indians. The Arawak Indians are known to be the first inhabitants of the islands who later were to be invaded by a more aggressive tribe, the Caribs. Then the Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, French, Danish, and British arrive and exploit the islands constructing vast plantations farms and deracinating slaves from Africa and India in order to supply the necessary work force for these plantations farms. *A House for Mr Biswas* and *In the Castle of My Skin* are the novels which treat the cultural problems of the descendants of these deracinated people. The novels were published in late 1960s, in a period of political exertions for independence and decolonisation. *A House for Mr Biswas* treats the lifetime of Mohun Biswas, the protagonist, over a period of about fifty years during the first half of the twentieth century, and its setting is Trinidad, an island in the Caribbean. *In the Castle of My Skin* takes its subject matter from Lamming's childhood experiences as he describes the protagonist G.'s growth to manhood in the context of the social and political changes in another Caribbean island, Barbados, in the 1930s and 1940s. In these years while Barbados was known of being the most anglicized island, Trinidad had the most ethnically diverse population in the Caribbean.

The cultural and ethnic diversity of the Caribbean is a consequence of its 500 year history of conquest and subjugation. As mentioned above, The Caribbean

islands were originally the home of Amerindian peoples. Spain was the first state to take over and colonize the island in 1498. After Spain's intrude begins a flux of thousands of European settlers and African slaves driving out native peoples and dramatically transforming the landscape. By the end of the 18th centurey the invaders together with their immigrants, mainly comprised of French Catholics settlers and African slaves, displace all of the indigenous peoples. By this time sugar is the most important commercial item, hence large sugar plantations dominate the island and economy. Soon, this lucrative trade tempts the British to have the control of the West Indian colony in 1797. A wave of British settlers follows the Spanish and French, while African slaves continue to constitute the main part of the workforce. After the emancipation of slavery in 1834, Britain transports indentured workers from another colony, India, mainly to Trinidad as replacements. In this regard Joyse Moss claims that "From 1838 to 1917 some 144,000 East Indians moved to Trinidad under a policy of unrestricted immigration to support the sugar industry (2001: 172). Contracted to work for five years, these indentured servants, namely East Indians, are granted land at the expiration of their contracts or after ten years of residence. Moss further asserts that "Approximately one-third of the servants returned to India, while the majority stayed and established shops, opened businesses, and farmed sugar on their newly acquired land" (2001:172). There is a common aggrement that the Caribbeans' lack of a unified national cultural identity is due to its colonial heritage and legacy of slavery and indentured servitude. Although the population of the Caribbean is mostly comprised of the people of African or East Indian descent, the islands are controlled by the white Europeans who constitute some twenty percent. The class structure is based on racist and discriminatory politics in society in which

economy and colour are the two most indicative characteristics. As it is inhabited by the descendents of the slaves and indentured workers from Africa and India, there hasn't been a general consensus concerning a unified national identity. Although they reject the culture of the Europeans, both the descendents of Africans who largely reside in Barbados and of Indians, residing largely in Trinidad, regard themselves as minorities and clash with each other. While white upper class strengths its economic and political position remaining at the top of the society, the descendents of East Indians and African are forced to compete with each other for lower positions and opportunities. Being in such a competitive position, they have shown a general distrust for each other, and consequently segregate themselves as two different societies. These two communities, as Moss asserts, adapt differently: "while the descendants of African slaves, whose ancestors had come from diverse regions, created their own new culture in Trinidad, East Indians held firmly to old Asian traditions, refused to assimilate or change cultural patterns. East Indians were physically separated because they lived in rural Trinidad. Poverty was widespread" (2001: 173). Beside the poverty and imposibilities stemmed from their lack of constructing a political and cultural unity, housing is known to be an important obstacle in the process of building a cultural identity. The following exerption shows the imponderable situation of The East Indians in Trinidad

> Just 48,000 houses existed on the island in 1911, which together with an additional 45,000 barrack rooms (former slave quarters) had to provide shelter for the bulk of Trinidad's 300,000 inhabitants. As evidenced in the novel, dozens of East Indians lived in a single dwelling or squatted in ramshackle squatter's cabins erected illegally on others' property, as Mr. Biswas's mother and many aunts and uncles do in the

> novel. Ideally the East Indian household sheltered one nuclear family or one extended family (traditionally a mother, father, unmarried children, and married sons with their wives and children), with the family sharing "a common kitchen" and "family purse" (Klass, 1961: 44).

This grave housing problem among East Indians can be considered as an answer to why having a home is so important for Mr. Biswas in the novel.

The education system being under the controll of the colonizers is another obstacle in their search for an authentic cultural identity. In this regard, Morton Class asserts that “The majority of schools were private and secular, operated by Christian religious institutions that did not cater to Muslims or Hindus. Racial and economic differences were accentuated. Non- Christians were discriminated against, and there was no uniformity of curriculum” (1961: 44). As a result, as Joyce Moss underlines “just one in ten East Indian boys attended primary school, and one in 14 East Indian girls. In contrast, the island average at the time was one in two boys, three in five girls. An even worse situation existed at the secondary- school level. There were just four secondary schools in Trinidad, all very expensive and strictly urban” (2001: 173). The only possibility for primary students to secondary school is the government-sponsored exhibitions, whose winners receive free tuition and textbooks. A second possibility or academic contest enable winners to attend college abroad, usually Cambridge or Oxford in England. But the figures which Moss articulates show how difficult it is to be granted for these awards:

> While just 800 students of about 47,000 advanced to secondary school in 1911, only four attended with exhibition scholarships, and only three advanced from secondary school to college abroad as exhibition winners. Of the lucky few, Mr. Biswas's son, Anand, and Naipaul himself won the secondary and college scholarships, as did Trinidad's first black prime minister, Eric Williams” (2001: 173) .

For the students of East Indians and Africans, these awards are considered to be the only chance for educational and socioeconomic advancement, and so are very important for the families. A fact which is also treated in both *A House for Mr Biswas* and *In the Castle of My Skin*. In such an educational aplication, the ultimate aim is to seperate the younger generations from their culture. In fact this practise of seperating the promising children from their family is common among the poltics of colonizers. The main purpose is to build a gap or a void between these younger generations and the previous ones who are more stubborn to assimilate the culture of the colonizers. These African and Indian students educated by such an educational system become more assimilated than their parents, but they remain the same in the eyes of the colonizers. Because of the colonial education system, these younger generations eventually have the feeling of alienation. They begin to question their inherited cultural codes. Like the "Vagabonds" of Lamming's *In the Castle of My Skin*, who have the sense of alienation on the consequence of their school life, being inbetween the two cultures, these students loss their sense of belonging. Likewise, "Naipaul's characterization of the ethnic outsider seems to stem from his own experience as a product of this educational system, from his "rootlessness" as a colonial divided from his cultural heritage yet unable to share in that of Trinidad's imperial ruler" (Chapman, 1996: 303).

In short, the Caribbean Islands were comprised of various characteristics. As Brereton also underlines, such inherited characteristics as class, colour, caste and race cooperatively created "an immensely complex pattern of human relationships and made it extremely difficult for change to ocur" (In Rogozinski, 1999: 317) As mentioned earlier, blacks and East Indians were in clash. And even within the East

Indian community, Hindus and Muslims divided along religious lines. Reinforced by the social and educational systems, these divisions helped isolate power in the hands of the colonizers and their compradors.

## 4.3. V. S. NAIPAUL

Vidiadhar Surajprasad Naipaul, descendant of a Hindu family who were brought to the West Indies as indentured workers, was born in Chaguanas, a small impoverished rural town on the Caribbean island of Trinidad, in August 1932. From the birth until his sixth, Naipaul and his family live in his maternal grandparents' home, which was known as Lion House and which forms the model for the Hanuman House of the Tulsis in *A House for Mr Biswas*. Like the children of Mr. Biswas, the Naipaul children, too, move with their parents several times before finally settling in Port of Spain, the ethnically and racially mixed capital of Trinidad and Tobago. His father, like Mr Biswass, is dependent on his wife's family with whom he quarrels and he often lives separate from his wife. Naipaul's early years pass in turmoils stemmed from his family's unsettled life that they can not afford a house of their own until 1947. The constant shifting from house to house with his sisters and younger brother has an important impact on Naipaul's nomadic psychology. A good student having been trained at home by his journalist father, Naipaul wins a scholarship to Trinidad's prestigious high school and later a government scholarship to study abroad. His father, a local journalist, introduces him to literature and instilled in him the feeling that he should become a writer. A hard-earned scholarship to Oxford University, like Anand in *A House for Mr Biswas*, paves the way for Naipaul to go to England where, as Bruce King heighlights, "he has lived, written more than twenty-five books, won many literary prizes and was in 1990 knighted for his services to English literature" (2003: 3). He gets a degree in English literature in 1953 and stays in England to pursue a writing career. He supports himself as a

freelance writer and editor for the British Broadcasting Corporation radio program Caribbean Voices, which was broadcasted to the West Indies. During this time, he writes short stories set in Trinidad. In 1958 he publishes his first novel, *The Mystic Masseur*. The novel is a comic story of a Trinidadian con man. In 1961, After *The Mystic Masseur, The Sufrage of Elvira* and *Miguel Street*, all of which were comic portraits of Trinidadian society, comes *A House for Mr Biswas* which brings him international attention. Reviewers from United States and England pay heed for Naipaul's writing, both for its sense of humor and for its portrayal of people who have the sense of being separated from the culture in which they lived. After the success of *A House for Mr Biswas*, the prime minister of Trinidad and Tobago, Eric Williams, who was also a historian, asks the novelist to consider writing a nonfiction work about the Caribbean. Naipaul feeling uncertain about his ability to write nonfiction decides to accept a scholarship to travel the islands. This mission is considered to be the beginning of his career as a journalist, and he becomes known as a writer who scrutinizes the deeper aspects beneath the surface of a culture to examine its social and cultural underpinnings. Naipaul's book, *The Middle Passage* (1963), criticizing the negative social conditions in the newly independent colony with a deprecatory language, angers many Trinidadians. Following this nonfictional book, Naipaul receives an offer to write about his ancestors' homeland India. Before his journey to India, Naipaul has a hope that he may well get a sense of belonging that he has not felt in Trinidad or England. But India's poor living conditions and failure to make a westernstyle progress disappoints Naipaul. After his observations in Trinidad published in *The Middle Passage*, and his explorations of India with the idea that he might live in the land of his ancesters published in *An Area of Darkness*

(1964), he comes to a conclusion that he can neither live in Trinidad nor India. In India he writes Mr Stone and the Knights Companion (1963). This book, his first book with an English setting, is considered to be the beginning of the second phase of his work. As Bruce King asserts "The manner is more serious, less openly humorous, and more clearly philosophical in its themes" (2003: 10). Subsequent novels develop more political themes and he begins to write novels about colonial and post-colonial societies in the process of decolonisation which marks 1960s. These novels include *The Mimic Men* (1967), *In a Free State* (1971), *Guerrillas* (1975), *A Bend in the River* (1979), *The Enigma of Arrival* (1987), *A Way in the World* (1994), and *Half a Life* (2001). And follows *Magic Seeds* (2004). V. S. Naipaul is also the author of a number of works of non-fiction, including three books about India: *An Area of Darkness* (1964), *India: A Wounded Civilization* (1977), *India: A Million Mutinies Now* (1990), and two books about Islamic societies, *Among the Believers: An Islamic Journey* (1981) and *Beyond Belief: Islamic Excursions* (1998). He has written about the Caribbean in *The Middle Passage: Impressions of Five Societies - British, French and Dutch in the West Indies and South America* (1962) and *The Loss of El Dorado: A History* (1969), and has published two collections of essays, *The Overcrowded Barracoon and Other Articles* (1972) and *The Return of Eva Peron* (1980). *The Writer and the World: Essays*, was published in 2002: *Literary Occasions* (2004), is a further collection of essays. His latest book is *A Writer's People: Ways of Looking and Feeling* (2007). Naipaul is generally considered a British writer. His unwillingness to excuse what he considers evil, stupid, or foolish on the part of the governments and the peoples of developing countries sometimes offends those concerned as well as outside observers. Using

London as a permanent return base, Naipaul began to travel extensively after 1960. His prolific writing continued, alternating between autobiographical fiction and reportorial non-fiction based on these travels. The unifying persona is that of an alienated ex-colonial, cut off temperamentally both from his native roots and from the European culture.

### 4.3.1. A HOUSE FOR MR BISWAS

*A House for Mr Biswas* is a tragicomic novel set in Trinidad. It starts with the birth of Mohun Biswass and ends with his death which marks some fifty years. Having been published in 1961, it is about an East Indian who is in search for meaning, identity, and a sense of place in colonial Trinidad. It also attacks the segregated, traditional Indian society, content to live in its shell and preserve its own special religious identity.

Tracing the life of Mohun Biswas, a modest East Indian born and raised in Trinidad, *A House for Mr. Biswas* begins at the end, in the house that Mr. Biswas spends his life for. It then flashes back to the beginning of Mohun Biswas's troubles. Born to indentured servants in "a crumbling mud hut in the swamplands," Mohun Biswas seems doomed from the beginning (AHFMB, 1982: 15). He has six fingers and comes out feet first. “Whatever you do, this boy will eat up his own mother and father," (AHFMB, 1982: 16) says the midwife who delivers him. The midwife's prophecy proves true. Mr. Biswas's father, Raghu, drowns while diving to rescue Mr. Biswas, who Raghu mistakenly thinks has fallen into a pool. To increase his fortune in life, he is named Mohun, which means "the beloved,". After her husband’s death, Bipti, Mr Biswas’s mother, is forced to sell her house by neighbors who threaten her for the money they think her husband Raghu has buried in the yard. Hence Biswas’s mother sells the family’s small hut, unfortunately just before oil is discovered on the property. Being unable to support or house her family, Bipti sends her children away to live with their relatives. While his brothers Prasad and Pratap and his sister Dehuti begin lives of servitude, Mr. Biswas is enrolled by his Aunt Tara in school and is later given as an apprentice to the pundit Jairam. After Mr. Biswas profanes Jairam's

sacred oleander tree with night soil, Jairam expels him from the apprenticeship. Once again made homeless by people more powerful than him, Mr. Biswas begins to associate ownership of a house with power and security. The strong, he reasons, have a place to go; the weak do not. His position of weakness humiliates him but plants the seed of ambition. Mr. Biswas returns briefly to his aunt's house to collect his few possessions and goes into the world to make his way as a sign writer. A job at the Tulsi family store in Arwacas leads to his introduction to Shama, the youngest Tulsi daughter, and results in the marriage that changes his life. The Tulsis, being one of the most influential Hindu families in Trinidad, own sugar plantations, stores, and cinemas, and they are considered as being one of the upper class family in their community. Mrs. Tulsi, on realizing Mohun's attraction to Shama, as well as his Brahmin caste status, she doesnt hesitate to arrange his marriage to her daughter. After the marriage, Mohun Biswass continues his life in Hanuman House, which, in the course of time, becomes restrictive. Since all of his wife Shama's siblings and their families (about 30 peoples) live there together under the reign of Mrs. Tulsi and her son Seth, Mohun feels as if he were in a restricted place without an iota of private life. He finds nothing in common with the Tulsis, and continually causes disruptions and quarrels. Naipaul portrays a perfect setting by Hanuman House. Being crowded, chaotic, isolated and despotic, this house represents the living conditions of East Indians in Trinidad. From the moment that Mr Biswas begins to reside in the house, he realizes that the house functions on complex relations. Feeling alone among such a crowded family, Mr Biswas searches for aliances with the other live-in sons-in-law "It was a strain living in a house full of people and talking to one person alone, and after some weeks Mr. Biswas decided to look around for alliances" (AHFMB, 1982:

105). Failed to get the support, he begins to act as he likes. He declares that his motto is "paddle your own canoe" (AHFMB, 1982: 107). Mr. Biswas quickly falls into disagreement with the Tulsis; he refuses to do what the family expects of him, though he willingly takes advantage of the possibilities it offers. Mrs. Tulsi and Seth, hearing that he scorns Seth's spoiled children and refusing to work for the family, reminds Biswas of his obligations. They reminds him that, he is indebted because they have taken him in, without money, a stranger and given him their daughter, a home, food and shelter (AHFMB, 1982: 109). On his being reproached in the hall in front of the other family members, Mr Biswas feels that there is not any difference between him and an indentured slave. Shama does not appreciate his rebellion. Being under a shelter run by her family, Shama remains loyal first to the Tulsis and she does not change her attitude until Biswas removes from the Hanuman House and buys his own home. Estranged from his wife and family, he spends his next years working in the Tulsis' holdings, living with the dream of his own house, a place of which he is master. To realize this dream, Mr Biswas makes two unseccessful attempts, both of which are destroyed by natural calamities. But he doesn’t lose his faith. After failing in some various Tulsis jobs, one of his friend, who has moved to Port of Spain, advices Mohun to move to the city. He moves and finds a job as a reporter for the Trinidad Sentinel. He build a friendship with the editor who benefits Mohun's keen powers of observation and black sense of humor. Mohun begins writing sensational stories. He writes fictional stories. His bold humor seems to make a change in his fortune. Though the newspaper is eventually bought out and his writing assignments become more ordinary, Mohun is content with his career and

begins to focus on his family. His family moves to Port of Spain and for the first time he is able to establish a parental relationship with his children, especially his son, Anand, to whom he transfers his ambitions. They have a passion in common for reading and writing books, and he spends his time and energy preparing his son Anand for the secondary school exhibition. After his son accomplishes to win a scholarship, Mohun once again begins to concentrate on having his own home. Although it has some flaws, he eventually buys a house, and moves his family into a home of his own. Everything he dreamed of comes true. His relationships with his wife and children radically transform: "Since they had moved to the house Shama had learned a new loyalty, to him and to their children . . . and to Mr. Biswas this was a triumph almost as big as the acquiring of his own house" (AHFMB, 1982: 8). He is very content with his current life, having the sense to be in his own house, “to close his doors and windows every night, to hear no one's noise except those of his family, to wander freely from room to room and about his yard, instead of being condemned” (AHFMB, 1982: 9). He is excited for finding a place of his own in the world. But this happiness remains short lived. He dies in his own home a short time before he moves, and his daughter Savi officially announces to pay the mortgage and care for the family while her brother is away at college.

### 4.3.2. ALIENATION IN A HOUSE FOR MR BISWAS

Born in the West Indian Trinidad to a family descended from the East India, educated, married, and mostly resided in England, Vidiadhar Surajprasad Naipaul is regarded as a mouthpiece of displacement and rootlessness by the critics and scholors of the field. Speaking in an interview, Naipaul confirms the above idea saying “When I speak about being an exile or a refugee, I am not just using a metaphor, I am speaking literally” (Evans, 1972: 62). It is clear that even after having lived in England for many years, he, still, has not had the sense of belonging, as he says: "I still had that nervousness in a new place, that rawness of response, still felt myself to be in the other man's country, felt my strangeness, my solitude" {EOA 1987: 7). He is, as Mohit K. Ray articulates, “an Indian in the West Indies, a West Indian in England, and a nomadic intellectual in a postcolonial world” (2005: 208).

The state of one’s feeling of having been deracinated and displaced is called ‘unhomeliness’, a term coined by Homi Bhabba and other theorists of postcolonialism. It is the sense of being inbetween of two or more cultures. An unhomed person does not have the feeling of belonging since s/he is in a psycho-logical limbo which generally ends in some psychological disorders and cultural displacement. Here, being “unhomed” does not mean being homeless. To be unhomed, as Lois Tyson states in Critical Theory Today, “is to feel not at home even in one’s own home because you are not at home in yourself; that is, your cultural identity crisis has made you a psychological refugee” (2006: 421). In this regard, anyone who scrutinizes Naipaul’s works, consisted of both fiction and nonfiction, can realize that Naipaul has a strong feeling of unhomeliness, although he has a home in Wiltshire, England. Being a person brought up by a culture that has been

deracinated from East India to Trinidad in West India as indentured labourers who have been colonized long before, and having had a leap (due to being educated first in Trinidad by a colonial, namely, British education system and later in Oxford, England) from a culture which had no self-determination to one which was a world power that initiated reason, science, and logic, (the corner stones of modernism) Naipaul seems to be in a psychological limbo, to feel between the culture of colonized and colonizer.

Naipaul based A House for Mr. Biswas on his own experiences in Trinidad. Mr. Biswas is the prototype for Naipaul's father, Seepersad. And Anand, Mr Biswas's son for Naipaul. In his book, *Letters Between Father and Son: Family Letters* (1999), Naipaul says that the relationship between him and his father is similar to that of Anand and his father Mr. Biswas. Reading the novel in light of Naipaul's biography, one can clearly recognize similarities between the real and fictional fathers and sons. For example, Both the Naipaul's father and Mr Biswas are born in a village. Both of them changes many houses until they have one of their own. Living with wealthy relatives, working as a sign painters, getting married with the daughters of conservative, wealthy Hindu families; holding a series of jobs are some of the other similarities. Further more, Seepersad Naipaul, too, finds work on a newspaper after moving to Port of Spain, as Mohun Biswas does. The events in the life of Mr. Biswas's son Anand reflect those of Naipaul's himself. Anand, like Naipaul, is instilled with the idea of reading, being incited to be one of those students who achieve to win a scholarship at school and to share his father's involvement with writing.

Naipaul, mentioning *A House for Mr. Biswas* says that it was “very much my father’s book. It was written out of his journalism and stories, out of his knowledge he had got from the way of looking MacGowen had trained him in. It was written out of his writing” (FC 1984: XIII). The novel takes its subject matter from the excluded peoples who have been alienated from societies to which they apparently belong, and who are in search of an identity. Naipaul portrays the West Indians lives, the reality of descendants of indentured servants by presenting his familial experiences as a miniature sample of the larger truths about the general colonial predicament in Trinidad. In his book *Reading and Writing*, he says that he began to see what his material might be: the city street from whose mixed life they had held aloof, and the country life before that, with the ways and manners of a remembered India" (Naipaul in Schmitt, 1998: 132).

The feeling of deracination and displacement and lack of a national community in Trinidad are the fundemental themes in *A House for Mr. Biswas*, as they were for Naipaul personally. Both Mr. Biswas and Naipaul are in search of a home by which they will be able to find their identities. A sense of place and self which, at the time, was difficult for East Indians in Trinidad to have. Being an East Indian descendent in West Indies, a colony of England, Mr. Biswas is physically in one place (West Indies) and culturally in another (East India), and searches to find a genuine identity.

Having been taken from East India to the West Indies as indentured workers, the Tulsis never have the sense of belonging although they build many enterprises and acquire many real estates in the course of a long time. They do not regard themselves as the real inhabitants of Trinidad, having the idea and hope that they will

move back to their ancestral lands, as the narrator tells "…only the death of Pundit Tulsi had prevented them fromgoing back to India; the old men who gathered in the arcade every evening [were talking] of moving on to India" (AHFMB, 1982: 390). But for the Tulsis, it is not such easy as they talk since the later generations are familiar only with Trinidad. Although they remain reluctant to assimilate a new culture preserving their Indian identities, it is too late for them to leave their established lives in Trinidan of which they have become a part. From now on, they will be in a place which postcolonial scholars call as 'being in limbo'.

By constructing Hanuman House, Naipaul tries to portray the East Indians original culture representing both the colonized and the colonizer. While standing for the colonized, it stands for the colonizer as well. Thus; while it represents the community of Hindus having been displaced from their original lands and being under the reign of the English, on the other hand being under the reign of Mrs Tulsi and her older son Seth, it is portrayed as a colonial structure which considers the inhabitants of the house as indentured workers. The Tulsis consider the bridegrooms as if they were indentured workers, and compell them to succumb and do whatever Mrs Tulsi and her older son want since they supply these bridegrooms with food and shelter. Mrs Tulsi and Seth, representing the power in the house, act in the same manner that the English do to assimilate the Hindus in Trinidad. As Kumar Parag heighlights, for Mr. Biswas, "it is a typical joint family which functions on the same pattern as the British empire in West Indies. Hanuman House provides shelter to Mr. Biswas but wants total dilution of his identity in return" (2008: 138).

By such a plot, Naipaul reveals that he does not consider the theme of colonialism as being a practise peculiar to the West or a certain characteristics of the

occidental culture; but that it is an intrinsic, premordial phenomenon in all humankind. He underlines that colonialism is a practise related to economic and political power. Whoever has this economic and political power, no matter from what culture he is originated, he will not refrain to do his worst for his own benefits. In this respect, Mr. Biswas struggles for his own identity or a place of his own. His life and search for idnetity may well be considered as that of the East Indian immigrant community as a whole who were indentured servants, having been brought to an unfamiliar land, compelled to live and work for those who provided food and shelter. For Biswas this house which represents a microcosm of the colonial world is a confinement from which he must free himself in order to take his place in society and forge his own identity. He regards himself as an individual who must be able to stand on his own feet.

Analysing the sense of alienation and the agony of exile experienced by the characters, *A House for Mr. Biswas* delineates the problems of a distorted and troubled past and tries to find a purpose in life. Alienated from his folk, family and from the Tulsi's Hanuman House, for Mr. Biswas, a house of his own symbolizes freedom and a place to strike a root. In the search of his own identity, Mohun Biswas moves from village to town and from joint family to nuclear family but fails to find his own roots amidst socio-cultural change. Mr Biswas is an alien even in his own family since he was born with six fingers and feet first, signs for bad luck. Being considered as an unlucky baby, he stays as an outsider, a lonely individual in his own family. Hence, Mr Biswas is likely to be considered as having had the sense of alienation in the form of what the existentialists defined. As mentioned above, the existentialists consider the theme of alienation as "estrangement in space and time

through a disparity between “esence” and “existence” (Williamson and Cullingford, 1997: 267). For the existentialist alienation occurs when someone is constrained to become other than what he is. Being a constant feature of the human situation which can not be eliminated, as Singh asserts, it is an unavoidable state in the course of creativity (Singh 1998: 25). Because if one wants to have new ideas and visions, he has to cancel his previous ones. In this process of taking one role and giving up another, he constantly faces this sense of alienation. In this respect, an existentialist’s understanding of the theme of alienation resembles to Hegel’s concept of ‘alienation as seperation’ which reads “through self analysis and contemplation, the human moves from an immature sense of universality to a powerful sense of his/her own individuality" (Williamson and Cullingford, 1997: 265). But it differs from Hegel’s concept of ‘alienation as surrender' being positively peacefull and free from worry due to the fact that “it involves a conscious relinquishment or surrender with the intention of securing a desired end: namely, unity with the social substance” (Schacht, 1970: 36) or any other entities like the state or religion. Because existentialists, rejecting all forms of authority, believe in the self-authority. They abstain from all forms of power because authoritarianism or power conflicts with their basic views of life. They believe in one’s own self-actualization and self-determination. A self-determined one, according to the existentialists, is capable of comprehending his/her problems without relying on any religious or political dogmas and ideology, and s/he can overcome these problems by bringing about realistic solutions that serve to him.

In this respect, one can assert that Naipaul’s protagonist Mohun Biswas is experiencing the sense of alienation in an existential form, since he does not submit

the authoritative and exploitive rules of the Tulsis. He never gives up struggling for his existence and identity relying on his own capabilities which eventually lead him to create or own the house which he considers essential for his authenticity and freedom.

To conclude, for alienated and displaced people of the colonized countries, Naipaul seems to suggest that searching for creativity (as Mr Biswas does and never gives up) relying on their own originality is one of the basic means to find their lost and alienated identity. As Kumar Parag also underlines “a house is not just a matter getting a shelter from heat, cold or rain. In fact, it is both an imposition of order and a carving-out of authentic selfhood within the heterogeneous and fragmented society of Trinidad” (2008: 139).

## 4.4. GEORGE LAMMING

Born of mixed African and English parentage to an unmaried woman in 1927 in Carrington Village, about two or three miles from the center of Bridgetown, the capital of Barbados, George Lamming grows up partly in his native village and in St David's Village, where his stepfather worked. The only child of a devoted mother, Lamming enjoys a sense of privilege granted to him even in the limited circumstances of a peasant and working-class environment. In a similar vein he enjoys the interest and attention of Papa Grandison, his mother's godfather, who gives him pocket change and always has a meal for him when he visits. (Lamming explains the importance of Papa Grandison as a formative influence in his life as a writer in the concluding chapter of *The Pleasures of Exile*.) His mother's marriage gives him yet another place to experience, St. David's Village, where his stepfather works. But Lamming is raised primarily in Carrington Village and attends Roebuck Boys School there. From Roebuck he wins a rare scholarship to attend Combermere High School, where he has a friendship with Frank Collymore, a member of the faculty at Combermere and editor of Bim, a literary journal which publishes and promotes Caribbean writers. By the help and encouragement of his teacher Frank Collymore, Lamming enters the world of books and starts to write. Collymore gives Lamming the freedom of his extensive personal library and encourages him to begin writing poetry. In 1946 Lamming leaves Barbados for Trinidad. With Collymore's help he gets a teaching position at El Collegio de Venezuela, a school for boys in Port of Spain. In Trinidad he also works as an agent for Bim, and this job brings him into contact with other writers. Before moving to England, he works from 1946 to 1950 as a teacher in Trinidad. Having the idea that if he wants to be a writer, he must

leave Trinidad, Lamming travels to London as the place where he might realize his ambitions. He sails for England in 1950.

In London, Lamming works briefly in a factory and also as a freelance writer. He publishes writings in the Barbadian magazine Bim. In England Lamming has the opportunity to meet some Commonwealth citizens, Africans and Asians, and he becomes very aware of Africa. While in England, Lamming quickly establishes himself as a writer and intellectual of influence and great promise. He publishes four novels in quick succession: *In the Castle of My Skin,* (1953) *The Emigrants* (1954), *Of Age and Innocence* (1958), and Season of Adventure (1960). He also publishes *The Pleasures of Exile*, his pioneering collection of essays on intellectual history and cultural politics and which is regarded as a forerunner of current postcolonial formulations around identity and cultural hybridity. The partly autobiographical novel gains a huge success. It is Lamming's account of growing up in poverty in Barbados and Trinidad. In England, Lamming works for the overseas department of the British Broadcasting Service and travels extensively. He visits the United States in 1955 on a Guggenheim Fellowship and travels to West Africa and the Caribbean. In 1956 he becomes one of the participants in the first international Congress of Black Writers and Artists in Paris

Lamming's first novel, *In the Castle of My Skin*, gains an immediate success, and he finds himself in the vanguard of a new literary movement. It is bought by Jean-Paul Sartre for translation into French and publication in the journal Les Temps Modernes in 1954, and it is published in the United States with an introduction by Wright. In 1957 it receives the Somerset Maugham Award for Literature. Lamming's second novel, *The Emigrants*, follows thematically and logically from *In the Castle*

*of My Skin*, in which G.'s departure for Trinidad is partly the result of his colonial education and upbringing and partly the result of poverty and limited opportunities at home. In *The Emigrants*, Lamming explores emigration as a regional phenomenon that affects West Indians of all classes regardless of their island of origin. Lamming represents the massive post-World War II migration of West Indians to Great Britain not simply in terms of economic necessity but as part of the cultural legacy of colonization. The migration and the West Indians' subsequent attempts to adjust to the incomprehension and lack of welcome they encounter on arrival provide the framework for Lamming's continuing exploration of the alienation and displacement occasioned by colonialism in the Caribbean.

After the publication of his second book, Lamming involves himself in the independence movements in the Caribbean. Lamming involves with the People's National Movement (PNM) in Trinidad and, speaking at a convention, introduces the party's candidates for their first election in 1956. He writes for the PNM's weekly publication, the Nation. Then comes his third novel, *Of Age and Innocence* (1958), which is about his extended visit to Guyana. The novel gathers up Lamming's major concerns, such as the centrality of the peasant majority in the Caribbean, the recovery of Africa as a place of cultural value and a base of power in the postcolonial Caribbean, and the roles of the artist and of women in the process of national reconstruction. The central symbols work well. The Haitian Ceremony of Souls is represented as a remnant of African culture that exercises compelling and transforming power over a disbelieving middle class, as well as the poor and illiterate. In the novel the drums represent another direct cultural link between West Africa and the Caribbean. He publishes *Season of Adventure* (1960) which makes a

strong statement about reconnection with Africa as the key to national reconstruction in the postcolonial Caribbean. This novel also makes a statement about the role of women in this process.

In the same year with the publicaton of Season of Adventure, Lamming publishes his collection of essays, *The Pleasures of Exile*. This book is considered to be a seminal work of self-inquiry and cultural assessment in the context of Caribbean life. It blends Lamming's memoirs of his life as a writer in England and his travels in the Caribbean, West Africa, and the United States. It includes extended discussions of William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, C. L. R.James's *The Black Jacobins* ( 1938), and Lamming's own fiction and poetry. In *The Pleasures of Exile* Lamming establishes a dialogue with the cultural assumptions of classic texts of imperialism and decolonization. Taking into account his experiences as an exiled writer in the country (England) that colonized his history, he creates a counter discourse of his own. He criticizes British cultural icons and institutions from Shakespeare to the Institute of Contemporary Arts, the British Broadcasting Corporation, the Times Literary Supplement, and the Spectator. It also illuminates the coercive, transgressive processes of production in colonial societies everywhere. The main theme is a theory of language, discourse, and representation that transforms the author from being a colonial subject and consumer of British intellectual and cultural history into a self-conscious producer of alternative discourses.

Though he does not publish new fiction in the decade following the publication of *The Pleasures of Exile*, Lamming remains active in several ways. In 1962 he receives a Canada Council Fellowship. He travels extensively in the Caribbean and North America and remains active in the political debates affecting

the status of black Americans and West Indians. In the decade between 1960 and 1970 Lamming engages closely to political developments in the Caribbean, but he does not write any new novel until the publication of Water with Berries in 1971.

In 1971, He publishes *Water with Berries* by which Lamming returns to the themes of emigration and exile previously treated in The Emigrants and The Pleasures of Exile. He also returns to an earlier preoccupation with The Tempest as a master text of imperialism discourse. Lamming's next novel, *Natives of My Person*, is about the men who made those first voyages of exploration, plunder, and conquest in the sixteenth century, who decimated the indigenous population, and who rationalized the African slave trade as a necessary component of their settlements in the New World. As Lamming explained it in an interview with George E. Kent, Natives of My Person follows up logically on his earlier novels, and it deals with recent developments in the Caribbean. This continuity is "a way of going forward by making a complete return to the beginnings; it's actually the whole etiology of In the Castle of My Skin, The Emigrants and Season of Adventure." (Kent 105).

In 1974 Lamming edited and published an anthology of poetry and prose titled Cannon Shot and Glass Beads. As he explains in his introduction, the book is a comparative survey of the black response to the politics and culture of white racism. The central theme of the volume is the encounter between Europe and Africa. Since editing this anthology Lamming has returned to the Caribbean and he lives in Barbados.

### 4.4.1. IN THE CASTLE OF MY SKIN

Lamming's first novel, In the Castle of My Skin, was published in 1953 and it as an "autobiographical novel of childhood and adolescence written against the anonymity and alienation from self and community the author experienced in London at the age of twenty-three" (Paquet, 2002: 111-112). The story traces the rapid changes of a colonial society on its way to independence. It can be regarded as the first step of Lamming's walk on the way to independence. In the novel we follow G, the protagonist, from experiences in the village school to experiences in the high school. He is one of only a few boys who, on the basis of their performance in the public examinations, are promoted to the high school.

The novel begins with G., the protagonist, celebrating his ninth birthday, a day in which it rains cats and dogs, a day with a torrential rain. This first chapter portrays much about the village, a community with unremarkable, ordinary features: street lamps where people gather to gossip at night, a few ruined stores, plain houses, roads full of clay. Apart from the memorable rain, G.'s birthday is little noted. He celebrates it with his mother drinking a glass of tea and with a piece of bun. In this chapter we, the readers, learn that G. has been brought up by his mother since his father left his mother before he was born. The readers also learn that most of G's beloveds have either gone away for beter life conditions or passed away, as he utters. He has not got grandfather, since they have died, his grandmother lives in Panama, he has an uncle but he is away in US. Drawing such a picture, Lamming tries to portray that colonialism had an immense effect on black people in the guise of poverty which is the main reason of child deathes, torning out families due to the

lack of jobs, etc. In the first chapter, G tells about him and his familial relationships. In the second chapter, the scope widens from his home to his neighbours. Some women gathers and talk about their children's misbehaviours. After these conversations, the narrator changes. It is now another voice which narrates. This voice seems to be an older and wiser one. It narrates the history and social structure of the village, the landlord's power and how the villagers are confined by his overseers. The landlord and his overseers are presented as the ones who make people have the sense that they and their language are inferior. In this chapter, Lamming lays bare the social order of the village. The landlord is on the top protected by the overseers, below him are some of the others who identify them with the ruling elites, teachers, clercks, policemen, etc. At the lowest stands G, his friends and neighbours, 'the low-down nigger people'(ICMS, 1991: 26). And there is a struggle among these social layers, each running its orders after improving their status.

In chapter three, the scope shifts to the school of the village in which there are some preparations for the Empire Day. After giving a portray of the schoolyard, it moves quickly to a description of the meeting for Empire Day. The inspector visits the school, and delivers a speech to the lined up students in the parade ground. He talks about the relations of Barbados and England. There is a rituel on Empire Days. The boys are given coins which, as the inspector underlines, are granted by the Queen. Looking at the King's face on the coins, they are amazed and begin to talk about slavery. Being curious they ask their teacher that what slavery means, but do not get a satisfying answer. A promising primary school student, G. is pushed by his mother to achieve. She scolds him for hanging on the corner with his friends, viewing them as a potential threat to his possibilities for success in the white-

dominated world. This tension between his mother's aspirations and his desire for acceptance grows as his education proceeds. G. feels himself pulled away from his friends, despite the fact that they're "my people." Trumper, Blue Boy and Bob have been less fortunate academically; they are confronted by meager opportunities on the island. G. also becomes aware of the growing separation from his mother. In chapter four, the readers meet two new characters, an old man called Pa, and an old woman called Ma. The two, who represent the old ways of the village. Mr. Slime opens a bank called a "Penny Bank and Friendly Society" in which all of the inhabitants of Creighton Village put their money. They trust him and suppose that he will be one among them against the landlord Mr Creighton.

In the following chapters, the daily activities of the boys and the villagers are narrated. Thus; the Savory's coming to the village, Mr Slime's ascendence of being the leader of the village, G's joining to the boys on the beach, and the villager's discussions on the tensions between the workers of the dock and Mr Creighton. On the way to home from the beach, one of the boys, Boy Blue says that in the village "there be only two great men round here, Mr. Slime and the landlord" (ICMS, 1991: 167). They discuss Mr. Slime's plans to sell the land to the villagers. They pass near the landlord's house and are clearly intimidated by the large wall outside. Sneaking around the fence, they observe an elegant party going on at the house in honor of the newly arrived ship, Goliath, and compare the behavior of the sailors they know with the manners of these officers. As they sit under a tree watching and talking about the party, they hear a noise by the trash heap. Creeping over to where they heard the noise, they discover a man and a young woman making love in the shadows; the young woman appears to be Mr. Creighton's daughter. Realizing they are crouching

on an anthill, they yelp, alerting the two lovers to their presence, and flee. The overseer and sailors chase them but they disappear into the crowd of worshippers. In the following chapter the old woman goes to the landlord's house to pay the rent and he, apparently disturbed by the changes in the village, tells her his discontent about disturbences in the village. He is especially concerned about the violation of his daughter, which he and the old woman blame on "vagabonds" from the island, thus absolving the sailor whom she was really with of his responsibility. The old woman describes to her husband that he is thinking of selling the land and leaving. Later, in chapter nine there is a tension in the village. The disturbences of the city begins to effect the village. The head teacher tells a student that there is fighting in the city, but nobody seems to know exactly what is happening. The police are absent, the school and shops are closed. The old man persistently tries to find out what is happening, but nobody knows. Trumper comes running down the road back to the village saying that he and his friend Bob walked to the city, and that when they got there they saw that cars were badly damaged and that fighting had taken place. They got caught up in a battle between police and workers. Bob has returned by then and tells of getting involved in the rioting. He says that the strike had begun the previous night, spurred by a mass meeting at which Mr Slime was a featured speaker. The village, agitated, waits for the fighting to reach. The villagers nervously wait for something to happen. Miss Foster says that she saw some men come into town with weapons and hide. They seem to be waiting to ambush the overseer. Soon after this, the village sees Mr. Creighton, with dirty clothes and a terrified face, walk through the town. Some men wait to attack him and follow him as he walks down the road. Mr. Slime appears, and does not give his approval to the men to jump on Mr. Creighton, and the landlord

walks out of sight and escapes. Chapter ten narrates the passing of some years, in which "nothing" changes and the landlord stays. In chapter eleven, G tells of Trumper's departure for America and his own scholarship to the high school. He describes the differences between the village school and the high school, and talks of his alienation from his village friends. Life continues in the village as G. finishes high school. Boy Blue and Bob join the police force and Trumper has already emigrated. G. forms a friendship with an assistant at the school who encourages his intellectual development. Trumper writes G. telling him of America, and G. is given a job teaching English at a boarding school in Trinidad. In the following chapter, for the first time, the old man and G. speak to each other. They talk of the changes in the village, especially of the growth of Slime's Penny Bank and Friendly Society and of the departure of Mr. Creighton's daughter. The villager are surprised hearing that Mr creighton has sold the village. The village has been sold to Mr Slime. And the villagers are told to evacute the land. The head teacher goes to the house of the old man (whose wife is now dead) and informs him that his land has been sold as well. Since he is too old to find his own place, he will relocate to the Alms House. Resigned, the old man asks the teacher how Mr. Slime managed to acquire the whole village for resale.

In the final chapter G comes back to the village from his high school and goes to his mother's house. She and G. quarrel about how he is not doing as well in school as he should, and about their differing visions of his upcoming life in Trinidad. Trumper arrives at the house, having just returned from America, noticeably changed. He is more self-confident, speaks more quickly, and has adopted a black nationalist outlook that does not exist in Barbados. In America, he was confronted both by the

vast economic opportunities (he impresses G. and his mother with his tales of telephones and electric fans) and by the United States' naked racism and discrimination. Trumper and G. go out and have a beer at a pub and talk politics. As the young men return to G.'s house, they hear men attempting to move the shoemaker's house, which collapses. Trumper and G. part ways. G. runs into Pa, on his way to the Alms House, who tells him that the changes in the village date from the floods that occurred on G.'s ninth birthday. As the book closes and G. prepares to leave for Trinidad, the thought occurs to him that he has to leave his birth place.

### 4.4.2. ALIENATION IN *IN THE CASTLE OF MY SKIN*

*In the Castle of My Skin* is an autobiographical novel of childhood and adolescence; it is also one of the novels of decolonization. Lamming draws heavily on his childhood experiences as he describes the protagonist G.'s growth to manhood in the context of the social and political changes in the Caribbean in the 1930s and 1940s. The changes that disrupt life in the fictional Creighton's Village and displace many of its inhabitants mirror the labor unrest and consequent social upheaval that occurred throughout the Caribbean at the time.

The novel portrays Lamming's boyhood and adolescence. In a fine balance of first-person and omniscient narrative Lamming describes what it meant to grow up poor and black in a British colony in the Caribbean. When the novel begins, G. is celebrating his ninth birthday rather miserably, since his birthday coincides with the floods that beset the village annually. The novel ends with the dismantling of Creighton's Village and G.'s impending departure, at age eighteen, for Trinidad. G.'s growth to manhood and his moving to another island are paralleled in the novel by the disintegration of the feudal structure of life in Creighton's Village. Lamming uses omniscient narrative to provide an overview of the feudal structure of village life, which is dominated by the white landlord, Mr. Creighton, who owns the land on which the village stands. Feeling threatened by the organization of labor and island-wide riots, Creighton sells his estate and the village (in secret) to island entrepreneurs who have a purely speculative interest in the resale of the village lands for a profit. The result is that many of the villagers are displaced, losing their homes, their community, and their livelihood. The betrayal of the villagers by their leadership,

and the dislocation that follows, gives a heightened sense of displacement and dispossession to G.'s departure at the end of the novel.

Sandra Pouchet Paquet, in *The Novels of Geroge Lamming*, asserts that Lamming's principal goal is "the dismantling of a colonial structure of awareness, something which affects his people (like every other colonized people) first on a psychological level, then exposing its legacies in social, political and artistic dimensions" (Paquet, 1982: VIII). Lamming in his novel makes an attemt to move to a new comprehension as a fundamental element for freedom underlining the "inherited feeling of difference, which meant privilege and supremacy for a certain part of humanity and lack and subjugation for the others" (ICMS, 1991: 19). In his novel, Lamming shows how whiteness has become the norm, the highest level of a scale to which the oppressed people aspire. He underlines that "No black boy wanted to be white, but it was also true that no black boy liked the idea of being black. Brown skin was a satisfactory compromise, and brown skin meant a mixture of white and black" (ICMS, 1991: 127). Lamming tries to fill the gap between the current time and the past which was the resultant of the colonial duration that uprooted the West Indians from their past and alienated them from their natural flow of cultural codes by implementing its superiority via economical, religious, and educational means. The protagonist G's (who represents the West Indies) assertion clearly portrays this gap: "And what did I remember? My father who had only fathered the idea of me had left me the sole liability of my mother who really fathered me. And beyond that my memory was a blank" (ICMS, 1991: XXII).

In Lamming's novel, *In the Castle of My Skin*, the education system is considered as a major tool for the alienation and estrangement of the villagers,

especially of the boys who attend the school. The colonial system decides what to teach at school and what to omit, what to preserve and what to forget:

> He [a boy] said he heard someone say something about slave. An old woman said that once they were slaves, [...]. [...] The small boy was puzzled. He understood the meaning of jail and prisoner. [...] But the old woman [...] was talking about something different. Something bigger [...] But he couldn't understand how one man could buy another man. He told the teacher what the old woman said. She was a slave. And the teacher said she was getting dotish. [...] it had nothing to do with people in Barbados. No one there was ever a slave, the teacher said. It was in another part of the world that those things happened. Not in Little England [Barbados]. (ICMS, 1991: 57)

On one of the scene at the school, it is Empire Day. The aim is to use spectacle to impress the boys with the greatness of the British Empire. About one thousand boys form nine squads in a formation are gathered in the yard. The school is decorated with an abundance of red, white and blue flags of varying shapes and sizes bearing images of princes and kings, thrones, ships and empires. The school inspector, a white Englishman, arrives in his car. There is a flag on its bonnet and he is also wearing the three colours. As regards the effect of the spectacle Lamming writes: "In every corner of the school the tricolour Union Jack flew its message. The colours though three in number had by constant repetition produced something vast and terrible, a kind of pressure or presence of which everyone was a part" (ICMS, 1991: 36). The inspector says: "The British Empire, you must remember, has always worked for the peace of the world. This was the job assigned it by God, and if the Empire at any time has failed to bring about that peace it was due to events and causes beyond its control" (ICMS, 1991: 38). God and religion are often used to back

up moral claims, and this is what the inspector does. In short, if you are against the Empire you are against the promotion of peace in the world, you are also against the will of God. Another aim of colonial education was to shape behaviour into the desired submissive forms through the use of drills, regimentation and force. Here, the aim is to cut the bound between the new generations and their roots. Imposing such a mass of codes belonging the empire on the students eventually makes them to question their native practises, a questioning which most likely results in a sense of estrangement and alienation.

According to Lamming, the head teacher "blew the whistle and there was complete silence. He blew it again and they all sat. They knew the rules. They were trained. Each pipe of the whistle meant something, and they knew that something. They were well trained" (ICMS, 1991: 74). The head teacher is portrayed as an agent of the Empire. He is important for the assimilation of the villagers. Because Villagers seek his advice on "Marriage, religion, sin, work… he told them what to do and invariably they did what he advised" (ICMS, 1991: 67). He reads the lesson at church and sometimes buries the dead. He is a poor village boy who has made something of himself. An important agent of socialization, he advises the boys not to shout in the streets, to be careful when crossing the road, and to be polite to their elders. Beside seeding the idea that the Empire is morally praiseworthy, there is a need to portray its generocity too. This is actualized by giving the boys pennies on Empire Day. The pennies are a gift from the queen. The students are fascinated by the manufacture of the coins, and the head teacher advises them to spend their gifts wisely.

The village school aims only at teaching the basics. Trumper, one of G's friends who has recently returned from the United States, claims that apart from teaching him how to write his name and count, the school taught him nothing that was of use in later life. According to Lamming "the village school served the needs of the villagers, who were poor, simple and without a very marked sense of social prestige" (ICMS, 1991: 219). Most graduates of this school start learning a trade after they leave; they become carpenters and shoemakers; some, like G's friends, become policemen; the academically gifted ones become pupil teachers at the school and perpetuate the elementary school system which has remained relatively unchanged over the years. In this regard Manjit Inder Singh makes a clear statement saying:

> The formal education systems, whether British, Australian, American, French, which were established by the colonizers had one feature in common: they were based on the arrogantly mistaken assumption that the colonial culture was superior to the native. Education was thus meant to civilize' the colonized, cutting them away from the roots of their culture. The production of a lumpen bourgeoisie was the main purpose. All that it produced, much to the detriment of the native interests were minor, 'inexpressive' cogs, such as clerks, glorified office boys, officials and a few professionals meant to run the colonial administrative machine. (Singh, 1998: 12)

The head teacher can be considered as one of those 'inexpressive cogs'. G's feeling of alienation occurs when he returns from high school and is separated socially from others in the village, saying that "I was no longer one of the boys. Whether or not they wanted me they excluded me from their world just as my memory of them and the village excluded me from the world of the High School. It

would have been easier to go to a more respectable district "(ICMS, 1991: 220). Many believe him to be part of another world, a world that they did not understand.

Submission to British power and authority is one of the aims of British colonial education. Fanon, in *The Wretched of the Earth* (1963) underlines that colonialism aims at the distortion, disfigurement and destruction of the history of the colonized. This is evident in this novel as well. The boys overhear the older folk talking about Queen Victoria who, it is said, freed them. The boys try to make sense of this notion. An old woman says they were once slaves, and that it was the queen who had freed them. They ask a teacher to explain the meaning of "slave". This is the response: "And moreover it had nothing to do with people in Barbados. No one there was ever a slave, the teacher said. It was in another part of the world that those things happened. Not in Little England" (ICMS, 1991: 57). The fact that slavery was a major part of Barbadian history, and that there were slave insurrections is completely denied. They are taught that slavery was in the distant past:

> They had read about the Battle of Hastings and William the Conqueror. That happened so many hundred years ago. And slavery was thousands of years before that. It was too far back for anyone to worry about teaching it as history. That's really why it wasn't taught. It was too far back. History had to begin somewhere, but not so far back" (ICMS, 1991: 58).

The boys are taught to take pride in the fact that Barbados is "the oldest and least adulterated of British colonies" (ICMS, 1991: 25). Yet in spite of attempts at deceiving them, we get the impression that not all the boys are fooled. Anticipating Bob Marley's "mental slavery" idea, one of the boys says: "The old woman isn't an

old fool. She knew what she was saying. She was a slave. We're all slaves. The queen freed some of us, but most of us are still slaves" (ICMS, 1991: 70)

Lamming, in his book, dramatizes the effect that the loss of memory of Africa has on the lives of the people of his village. A boy in the village school asked the teacher what it meant to be a slave. Lamming explains the boy's response:

> He didn't understand how anyone could be bought by another. He knew horses and dogs could be bought and worked. But he couldn't understand how one man could buy another man. He told the teacher what the old woman had said. She was a slave. And the teacher said she was getting dotish. It was a long, long, long time ago. . . . The little boy had heard the word for the first time and when the teacher explained the meaning, he had a strange feeling. The feeling you get when someone relates a murder. . . . Thank God nobody in Barbados was ever a slave. It didn't sound cruel. It was simply unreal. The idea of ownership. One man owned another. They laughed quietly. (ICMS, 1991: 57–58)

Joyce Ann Joyce evaluates this response saying that:

> This lack of knowledge about the reality of their history also suggests why the Blacks in the village below the hill have, for the most part, always accepted the landlord's (Mr. Creighton's) living in the big house on the hill and the payments they pay him for living on their land. The Barbadians live like squatters while the landlord, the colonizer, lives like a king. The inhabitants of the village referred to Barbados as Little England innocent of the reality of slavery that had entrapped them into a position of servitude. Only the old generation maintained the memory of Africa. (Joyce, 2009: 596).

Lamming is of the opinion with Frantz Fanon that in colonial societies men of culture should "take their stand in the field of history" (Fanon 1963, 209). In the novel, G and his friend underlines the importance of making history. They have read, or heard, of great persons in European history, but they feel themselves outside of history, or if somehow history has nothing to do with them. So they are determined to make history. While they are at the pipe cleaning up the boy who defecated while being beaten by the head teacher, they talk about taking revenge on the teacher.

> First Boy: We'd be making hist'ry if we stone him.
> Second Boy: We going to make hist'ry. I always want to make some hist'ry.
> Third Boy: If you going to make hist'ry you got to think how you doing it. (ICMS, 1991: 48)

The boys, while joining on the beach chat about some of the oral history of their village. Boy Blue tells the story of Bots, Bambina and Bambi. Boy Blue observes that although many things happen in their village, history has not taken note of them. He says, "Those things never happen in hist'ry, an' even if they did, hist'ry ain't got eyes to see everything" (ICMS, 1991: 141). During their crab hunt, the boys are curious about the history of Barbados, and other places they have heard about, like America and England.

> "But what about America?" Trumper asked.
> "America?" Bob got up from the rocks.
> "You talking about the olden times," he said, "You talkin' about a way back
> in 1492. But Barbados was discovered by the English in 16 something or
> the other, an' that is modern times."
> "An' who discovered America?" Trumper asked.
> "The English too," Bob said quickly.

> "An' where the English come from?" Boy Blue asked.
> "From England," Bob said, making the question seem ridiculously simple.
> (ICMS, 1991: 156)

Lamming, here, underlines that the history of the oppressed people has been neglected or distorted. So they have been alienated from their history. In order to have the conscious of a native history and original roots, Lamming implies, one has to turn to his old myths and folk tales. He compells his readers to focuss on these uprooting practises of the colonizers which are put forward as being the indications of civilization. In this regard Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, in *Freeing the Imagination*, evaluates Lamming's novel "as a reflection, and a celebration of a people making history" (Thiong'o, 2008: 164). He asserts that "Their awakening, from just a people in themselves, with lives governed by a mythic consciousness and local allegiance, to a people for themselves, governed by a vision that goes well beyond the boundaries of the village and the Caribbean shores to the outer arena of black and social struggles worldwide, is the central drama of the narrative" (Ibid 165). In his article Thiong'o, too, considers colonialism as a system of alienation, saying that "It turns a people's land, labor, power, values, even psyche, into an enemy, a threat, as in the case of the overseer. Colonialism is a totality of alienation, and when this is later nationalized into a norm in the postcolonial state, it becomes the most dangerous threat to our imagination of a different sovereignty" (Ibid 165).

Elizabeth Nunez Harrel, exerting the following passage from Lamming's novel, puts forward a clear situation regarding the sense of alienation that the two characters experienced on being imposed to conform some certain rules of The Church, that is, the religion of the colonizer:

> Bambi and Jon, in the two anecdotes told by the children in chapter six of *In the Castle of My Skin*, suffer the sense of alienation imposed on them by The Churge's rule of monogamy. Both of these characters had been apparently happy and at peace, each living with two women. Indeed, this life-style is not disturbing to either the women or the society. But, The Church compels them to conform monogamy(Nunez-Harrell, 1978: 36).

Nunez implies that, having been compelled to conform the rules of The Church, the two characters experience a sense of alienation in the form of which Melvin Seaman denotes as powerlessness. Thus;

> Jon, unable to make a decision, promises each of the women, Susie and Jen, that he will marry her. Bambi, having the consent of Bambina, decides to marry Bots but to continue to live with both women. Unable to communicate their feelings, their alienation from a way of life that denies their natural responses of affection and hence of responsibility for more than one woman, both men withdraw from society into a stony silence (Nunez-Harrell, 1978: 36).

Jon and Bambi feel powerless in the face of an alien rule implemented by an alien religion. They have not the power to come out against the rule of the church. Having been bound by such a rule, as Nunez-Harrel goes on:

> Jon sits on top of a mahogany tree that is located symbolically in a cemetery, staring at the two churches where Susie and Jen have come to marry him. He is rendered speechless, as quiet and silent as the graveyard where he waits for the next day to arrive. Unlike Jon, Bambi does marry one of the women, but he can find no language to express his feelings of alienation from his new life-style. Bambi finally dies appropriately of a heart attack, an implosion of all feeling for which language has offered no release through communication (1978: 36)

George Lamming's novel portrays the disintegrated world of alienated black West Indians. It portrays a boy's alienation from the people among whom he lives

and from the self. Beside, it also shows the villagers' alienation from the colonizer and from their environment. The gap between the villagers and the landlord (the colonizer) is obvious from the beginning of the novel. Mr. Creighton (the landlord) lives in a big house high on a hill, segregated from the villagers, first by a forest and then by a high wall with broken glass glued to the top. The villagers live in their barracks homes which they have built on Mr. Creighton's land and they pay their ground rent on the account that the land on which the villagers built their home belongs to Creighton family which has owned it for generations. In the villagers' sight, Mr. Creighton is their master. His coming to town and deigning to speak with the villagers make them feel proud. The distance between Mr. Creighton and the villagers is crystallized in the scene in which G. and his two friends, Boy Blue and Trumper manage to get inside the wall and hide outside the house where they can show a party at which the Creightons are entertaining the officers of a newly arrived British ship. They are literally on the outside looking in. Feeling the sense of powerlessness, the boys understand that they are far away to have such a life which they are seeing on this scene. They see the distort in which they are entangled in when they are discovered in the garden. They run away, but their attempt to watch the party was manipulated by the landlord as if the "vagabonds" have broken into the sacred grounds to rape the landlord's daughter. The alienation of the people from the colonizer is clear also in the scene in which the schoolboys are engaged in the annual review for the birthday of the Queen of England. The visiting inspector is a white government official for whom the black head teacher lines up the boys to sallute the official. Here, Lamming's description of the inspector reveals the approach of the whites to the villagers :

> The inspector was smoother than anything you had ever seen except perhaps a sore. Sometimes a villager caught a chigoe flea in his toe. He was careless in his attention, and the flea hatched in the flesh. Under the skin of the toe there would soon be a small bag fertile with fleas. The toe swelled up into a white and shiny smoothness. It was an indescribable smoothness of skin under which fleas lodged. When the toe was pricked with a pin, the skin cracked and the pus spilled out. The smoothness had slid away, but you couldn't forget it. You couldn't forget it when you saw the inspector smile. Smooth like the surface of pus. It gathered and secreted so much, so quietly and so stealthily. (ICMS, 1991: 40)

Having been colonized for centuries, the West Indians eventually find themselves in an ambivalent situation with the desire for being accepted by the colonizer. Consequently, this state of ambivalence results in the seperation of the colonized people from each other. As it was mentioned in the previous sections, the practice of colonization and subjugation leads the subjugated people to develop such identities that range between nativism and appropriation. The villagers are exceedingly proud that Barbados is called Little England; they are loyal, and are content to be subjects of the Queen. Obviously, the villagers' aspirations to be like the whites are futile. But the very aspiration fragments the people. The ones who come closest to the image of the Queen in physical proximity or in lifestyle are superior to the ordinary folk. Those “inexpressive cogs, such as clerks, glorified office boys, officials, and a few professionals” (Singh, 1998: 12) such as the managers, the police, the teachers who were given a post to conduct the government’s affairs, are illusioned with this power which show off their superiority over their villagers. Villagers who go to England to be educated and to become lawyers and doctors return "stamped like an envelope with what they called the

culture of the Mother Country. Through their consciousness rings the bitter refrain, The enemy. My People ... My people are low-down nigger people. My people don't like to see people get on..... The image of the enemy, and the enemy was My People" (ICMS, 1991: 27). And the villagers themselves believe it. The myth, says Lammings, "has eaten through their consciousness like moths through the pages of aging documents." (ICMS, 1991: 27) Not only class snobbery but also differences in skin color separate the villagers from each other. “Nobody wants to be black, but most are. They make bitter jokes about each other's blackness and consider mulattoes as the most beautiful”(ICMS, 1991: 128).

Lamming's description of the games in which white tourists set the black boys against each other in diving for pennies (coin of the lowest value) shows how the villagers are alienated from a civilized society in the hands of the white and civilizeds.

> The boys dived and the white men watched the sprawling black limbs in their scramble. Some minutes later the boys would surface, disputing the accusations they made against each other. Some complained of being kicked, and others of being scratched and later decided to settle the dispute by tossing more coins. If the dispute went on after their return the white men would tell them to fight it out and the boys fought. (ICMS, 1991: 116)

Worst of all, the people are separated from their past. In Lamming’s view, It is the past which gives one the sense of identity. By implementing the characters of Ma and Pa, Lamming wants to construct a bound between the younger generation and their past. He is well conscious that if we want to know who we are, we have to know who we have been. Oppressed people have been cut of their past by the

manipulation of the oppressor. Their history has been distorted intentionally. *In the Castle of My Skin* highlights the people's separation from their past in several occasions. For example, the schoolchildren's talking about slavery, freedom, and the English king in a distorted way shows that in spite of their education, they have not the true knowledge of these notion, since they have been educated in a colonial education. Moreover, the villagers disdain Africa from where their ancestors were deracinated and brought to the Caribbeans. The shoemaker, one of the more informed and articulate of the villagers, insists ". . .. if you tell half of them .. . they have something to do with Africa they'll piss straight in your face." (ICMS, 1991: 104) And another adds that "no man like to know he black" (ICMS, 1991: 104). The old man Pa, who represents the past, sums up the problem one night when he is apparently talking in his sleep. Actually in his subconscious mind, released in sleep, he aspires to associate with his ancestors and to speak not as himself but as the racial unconscious. Pa speaks of ancient African cultures in which the people, being in a harmony, were content with their world until the arrival of the strangers who buy and sell them, and impel them to betray their brothers. Their old rituels and traditions are destroyed and there is no turning back:

> The families fall to pieces and many a brother never see his sister nor father the son. Now there's been new combinations and those that come after make quite a collection. So if you hear some young fool fretting about back to Africa, keep far from the invalid and don't force a passage to where you won't yet belong. (ICMS, 1991: 211)

The protagonist G. is deeply affected by the fragmentation from which the village suffers. He has not got a unified family, his father has left them, his relatives have had to leave the island for jobs and education as most of the Barbadians have

done before. Growing up, he wants more than anything to be an accepted member of the boys. But he never is. His mother's dotting on him makes it impossible to associate with his friends Trumper, Bob, and Boy Blue. In their interaction he is the watcher, telling what they say and do. The apparent indications of alienation and separation emerge when he passes his examinations for high school while his friends remain in the village. In high school G. feels more alone. Being educated by a curriculum produced by colonial mentality, G. does not have the sense of belonging with his village anymore. The educational curriculum of the colonizer raises his separation. On the consequence of G's going high school, Bob's and Boy Blue's joining the police, and Trumper's leaving for America, the group of 'vagabonds' dissolves. G's alienation is in its climax when he thinks he must leave Barbados to teach in Trinidad. As Eugenia Collier states

> The severe class system inherited from the oppressor, the economic exploitation which keeps people poor and hopeless and ignorant and ready to be victimized by anybody with the sagacity and the nerve, the psychological pressures which ultimately force ambitious people to leave the island, the little-understood World War II which disrupts and destroys - all of these aspects of oppression trap the narrator G. into isolation (Phylon, 1960: 54).

And isolation from family, friends, neighbours, school, etc., brings about the sense of alienation. Living in such a fragmented world, G. has the sense of the worst kind of alienation, alienation from the self. As he grows up, and as his perception increases, he feels more alone and despondent. On the eve of leaving his island home with the thought of no return, he tries to repeat some of the rituals of his boyhood, but they

are forever lost. He realizes sadly that those elements which have comprised his life are somehow other than himself:

> When I review these relationships they seem so odd. I have always been here on this side and the other person on that side, and we have both tried to make the sides appear similar in the needs, desires, and ambitions. But it wasn't true. It was never true. .... I am always feeling terrified of being known; not because they really know you, but simply because their claim to this knowledge is a concealed attempt to destroy you. That is what knowing means. As soon as they know you they will kill you, and thank God that's why they can't kill you. They can never know you.... They won't known the you that's hidden somewhere in the castle of your skin (ICMS, 1991: 261).

## 4.5. EVALUATION

Alienation and exile are the concepts which the writers of postcolonial literature mainly discuss and treat in their works. Because the writers or intellectuals from once colonized countries encountering the distortments that the colonizer has left on their culture, eventually establish discrete responses. This sense of not belonging to a significant country or culture results either in its rejection by the writer through criticism and satire, or by his physical or psychological withdrawals in the form of various kinds of alienation, as it has been the case with Naipaul and Lamming at the very beginning of their adolescences and later at their matured lives.

In the period of their adolescence, both Naipaul and Lamming are of the opinion that in order to be creative writers they must leave the West Indies, which they think, impedes their artistic development. They feel a sense of social alienation. But after they traveled to London they operated in different ways. While from the beginning of his school life, Naipaul has firmly rejected the majority of the Third World societies, including India, africa, and Asia, Lamming has portrayed a more sensitive approach to these societies. Everywhere in Naipaul's work, one discovers these Third World people's lack of order and pattern, with western imitation, leading to a kind of second-rate psychology of inhibited minds, unable to control the world around through their own vision. This is partially the rejection of his own past and his link with the Caribbean which he has severly criticized for its failure to achieve anything in historical, cultural or aesthetic terms. Although it is evident that Naipaul, who withdrew from trinidad quite early and who states that "A writer after a time carries his world with him, his own burden of experience, human experience and

literary experience (one deepening the other) and I do believe… that I would have found equivalent connections with my past and myself wherever I had gone"( FC, 1985: 10), still has a strong and undeniable link with his place of birth. He just does not romanticize the writer's inevitable sense of exile and alienation stemmed from his colonial experiences. He observes the life with a realist point of view saying that "We want more realism, not more romanticism; the time for that is finished"( Evans, 1978: 50).

As for George Lamming, who also experienced exile in England, he underlines the need for writers to be more sympathetic to their native society in his non-fiction work, *The Pleasures of Exile* (1960). He thinks that the task of the Caribbean or African writer, displaced emotionally or culturally, is to portray an identity and acceptability of the society and charaters in his work. Singh asserts that this point of view "stems from his personal quest as a writer who believes in the indestructibility of roots"(1998: 35). As he further asserts these roots "can be temporarily violated, but their authenticity in life is the only certainty to which one comes back" (1998: 36). On the other hand Naipaul has not been convinced that the West Indian society and readership will be able to cure these violated and eradicated roots. Because, as he thinks, these roots have been deracinated, then; how will a root be able to maintain its authenticity after having been deracinated long time ago? He believes that the colonial aftereffects leave the human mind and his sense of creativity disabled, so that the ex-colonials are hardly left with any views of their own. To establish an intellectual stance in a society devoid of aesthetic and refined cultural codes was a lonely exercise for him as a writer. He seems to have found no way of recreating it except through satire and humour. Contrary to Lamming's ideas,

Naipaul believes in the impartiality of art, even more, in its impersonality. He thinks that “One can’t be entirely sympathetic, one must have views, one must do more than merely respond emotionally”( Evans, 1978: 49).

Having been written, to some extent, in autobiographical context, both the protagonists of *A House for Mr Biswas* and *In the Castle of My Skin* portray similar experiences (estrangement and alienation) which their writers have experienced in their real lives. Thus; although both the boy protagonist G in *In the Castle of My Skin*, and Mohun Biswas in *A House for Mr. Biswas* portray similar behaviours at the very beginning of their estrangement from their surrounding environment (as was in the case of Naipaul and Lamming when they left for England), their responses to their societies at the end of the novels portray that they have different points of view in terms of their alien situation. While in *In the Castle of My Skin*, the white landlord Mr Creighton and the overseer who inspects the school represent the oppressors, in *A House for Mr Biswas*, it is the Tulsi family that limits Mohun Biswas’s life. Both Mr Biswas and G., thinking that the only way to freedom is escape, try to leave these limited worlds. For Naipaul’s protagonist Mohun Biswas, the Hanuman House is a suffocating place where Tulsi family, being extremely conservatist, enjoys a dictatorship upon the others.

> "Among the tumble down timber and corrugated iron buildings in the high street at Arwacas, Hanuman House stood like an alien white fortress. The concrete walls looked as thick as they were and when the narrow doors of the Tulsi's store on the ground floor were closed the House became bulky, impregnable and blank." (AHFB, 1982: 80).

As for Lamming’s progatonist G., it is the village and its inhabitants that make him to feel that it is imposibble to stay anymore. While Mohun Biswass struggles with the problems stemmed

from his society, especially from the Tulsi family trying to construct a house which symbolizes creativity, Lamming's protagonist G. prefers to leave his native land, if he wants to be a creative person.

A House for Mr Biswas, metaphorically, is a miniature world which symbolizes the colonial world. Mr. Biswas's personal battle with the stronghold of the Tulsi household (the symbol of the colonial world) is a quest for existential freedom and the struggle for personality. As Singh underlines; "Mr. Biswas is the unaccommodated man representing the outcast's symbolic quest for a place in the hostile universe" (1998: 126). The Tulsis are running a sort of mimic world of colonialism and the important thing is that the Hanuman House too is run on the traditional Hindu familial lines and protocols. On the surface, the Tulsis have made an admirable reconstruction of the clan in strange and hostile conditions. It has its own schemes, leaders, duties, law and order, religious rituals and provides jobs and help to men of their community on merits. Mr. Biswas is repeatedly accused of not being grateful to the Tulsis despite the fact, as Mrs. Tulsi says, "Coming to us with no more clothes you could hang up on a nail" (AHFB, 1982: 557). At first glance, Mr. Biswas's rebellion may appear meaningless and unfair. Because one is likely to think that the Tulsi family provides shelter and job for Mr Biswas whenever he needs, but nevertheless, he ungratefully reject their help propounding the idea that the Hanuman House is like a prison. But beneath the surface, one can see that the Hanuman House is not a coherent or benevolent entity of the traditional Hindu joint family. It is more a slave society where Mrs Tulsi and Seth need workers to boost their sinking influence and economy. They exploit the homelessness and poverty of men like Biswas and others. The acceptance of Hanuman House and its dubious

claims is the submission of slavery. By such a picture, Naipaul tries to portray that subjugation is not something peculiar to the West, or to the whites. He satirises the Indians' insistence on carrying out their older caste system within themselves while they resent white colonialism.

It is clear that both Naipaul and Lamming depict the negative impact of marginality in human and social stratum, and its link with the history of colonialism. Yet this is presented by the two Writers with an important difference. While Lamming, by the character of the landlord, blames the West and consequently the white race for the cruelty they imposed on the blacks, and agrees with Fanon that in certain situations violence is necessary and inevitable instrument, a form of self-defence, Naipaul does not regard the cruelty and oppression, which has been a common practice of men against men and nature, as something peculiar to the West or whites. He thinks that the instinct to have the control of the other is primordial in humankind no matter what race or culture he belongs. By this idea, of course, he does not proclaim to exonerate the West's cruelty on the people of Africa and Asia. Interestingly, Lamming's novel, in a sense, is a justification of Naipaul's point of view. Thus, Mr Slime is one of the villagers who becomes a teacher, the villagers consider him as a political leader. He runs a bank called Friendly Society and Penny Savings Bank to which the villagers delivered their savings left from the rents of the lands. Towards the end of the novel, Mr. Creighton sells the lands to Mr. Slime with the result that the shoemaker and Mr. Foster are dispossessed and Pa is sent to the almshouse. Thus the power shifts hands. Now, the white landlord goes, the black landlord comes. And the villagers are forced to move their shabby houses from Mr. Slime's lands. Lamming equips his characters with a subjective dignity and cultural

stability. It is due to this fact that Naipaul's approach to the political set-up in the post-independence phase in the Caribbean is decisively negative and pessimistic, though searching and analytical. He sees little hope in the Caribbean transition from slavery to independence. Naipaul seems to cast doubt on the feasibility of the multi-racial and inorganic societies of the New World in the absence of any viable platform of tradition and experience.

As alienation does not always constitute a state of despair, İt, in some circumstances, can be considered as a psychological and aesthetic prerequisite for creativity. It leads the writers to recognize the gap between ordered and disordered, eduvated and uneducated, and cultivated and uncultivated. Both the protagonists of *A House for Mr Biswas* and *In the Castle of My Skin* are alienated individuals from the circumstances of their lives. Naipaul's protagonist is alienated from the Hindu community in Trinidad, and is fighting out a personal battle for freedom and recognition. For him, to built a house of his own means freedom and recognition. And by the end of the novel, in spite of all its deficiencies, he manages to buy this house which eventually brings him his wife's respect, and saves him from his sense of being rootless and alienated. He does not regard the Tulsi's way of life which was consisted of the old traditions of the East India. As for Lamming's protagonist, history, together with myths and traditions, is the most important element for decolonisation, they are antidotes of the sense of alienation. At the initial parts of the novel, Lamming's protagonist is neutral as regards of nation, race and slavery. He is unconscious of his situation. He becomes conscious of his position as he contacts with other characters. For instance, talking with Pa, who represent the past, the history, makes him being aware of his past. Trumper, who has recently come back

from America, tells his experience of Black revolution to convey the message to the still innocent G when he says, "I am going to fight for the rights o' the Negros, I'll die fighting"(ICMS, 1991: 297). G. understands the meaning of experience after his long dialogue with Trumper and he becomes partially separated from the traditional village ethos. His life too is now 'free' and rootless, and he is now a part of the West Indian situation with all its misery and confusion and alienation. The deep attachment to land and common values was what had united the village. With the disintegration of these values and the peasant consciousness, the balance is overturned. The new turn of events symbolizes a break with the past which is illustrated in G's own sense of alienation. Though at the end of *In the Castle of My Skin*, G is of the opinion to leave for Trinidad, Lamming's emphasis is on what the hero has recently learnt from Trumper about 'his own people'. Here, Lamming, being strongly nationalist, thinks that one can overcome the sense of alienation by constructing a relation with his people and their past.

The outcomes stemmed from the interactions between the colonizer and the colonized are constant themes in Lamming and Naipaul. However, each writer, having his own version of his own reality, has a peculiar situation and a different approach to these themes. While exile and alienation may have negative results on some writers, for the others as in the case of Naipaul, it may be stimulative for creativity, in the form of which Hegel termed as 'alienation as seperation'. As for George Lamming, it is likely to say that he has experienced the concept of alienation, first as Naipaul has, but later in the form of which Hegel termed as 'alienation as surrender'. As has been mentioned previously, Hegel puts forward two different processes regarding the concept of alienation. 'Alienation-as-

seperation' being distressing but necessary for maturity, and 'alienation-as-surrender' being positively peacefull and free from worry due to the fact that "it involves a conscious relinquishment or surrender with the intention of securing a desired end: namely, unity with the social substance"(Schacht, 1970: 36). For Lamming this 'social substance' is his 'nigger people'. As Williamson and Cullingford state, Hegel is of the opinion that through the analysis of self and deep thought, one moves from an immature sense of universality to a powerful sense of his/her own individuality (1997: 265). They further assert that "This process leads to an acute sense of self-alienation from one's inner nature and the extremity of discord" (Ibid 265).

Reading *A House for Mr Biswas* and *In the Castleof My Skin*, one can easily observe that the sense of alienation that the protagonists Mohun Biswas and G. experience in their fictional lives is the very sense that Naipaul and Lamming have experienced in their real lives. Thus, both Naipaul and Mr Biswas, the protagonist of *A House for Mr Biswas*, experience a sense of alienation first in the form of normlessness which eventually leads them to an existential sense of alienation which also is likely to be considered as having common qualities with Hegel's concept of 'alienation as seperation'. As has been explained previously, Melvin Seeman, in his paper *On the Meaning of Alienation*, classified the theme of alienation in five categories one of which is normlessness. Normlessness, as Seeman states, is said to have been derived from Durkheim's description of 'anomie'(1959: 787) (breakdown of social structure) which is considerd as "a condition of instability resulting from a

breakdown of standards and values or from a lack of purpose or ideals"[7]. As for normlessness, as Seeman defines, it refers to a situation lacking effective norms or in which individuals assume that unacceptable behaviors are required for success (1959: 787). Naipaul's protagonist Mohun Biswass, as well as Naipaul himself, struggles for their individuality through a realization that the entanglements they are in stem from the immature (uncivilized) structure of their comunity. For Mohun Biswas, the Hindu folk of the Hanuman House represent this structure, as for Naipaul it is all comunities that form the West Indies and the Third world. Having been alienated in the form of normlessness, both Mr Biswas and Naipaul improve a reaction relying on their creativity. They do not remain inactive in the face of their encounter with familial or societal norms. Thus; Naipaul became a writer and Mr Biswas built a house struggling with the drawbacks of their society. Hence, it is likely to assert that their alienation from their society leads them to a condition of existential standpoint. Existentialist, as Singh asserts, propound that alienation occurs when someone is constrained to become other than what he is. Being a constant feature of the human situation which can not be eliminated, they regard alienation as an unavoidable state in the course of creativity (Singh 1998: 25). Because, as they propound, if one wants to have new ideas and visions, s/he has to cancel her/his previous ones. In this process of taking one role and giving up another, s/he constantly faces this sense of alienation. In this respect, an existentialist's understanding of the theme of alienation resembles to Hegel's concept of 'alienation as seperation' which reads "through self analysis and

[7] "anomie." *Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica, 2011. Web. 24 January. 2011. <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/26587/anomie>.

contemplation, the human moves from an immature sense of universality to a powerful sense of his/her own individuality" (Williamson and Cullingford, 1997: 265). But it differs from Hegel's concept of 'alienation as surrender' being positively peacefull and free from worry due to the fact that "it involves a conscious relinquishment or surrender with the intention of securing a desired end: namely, unity with the social substance" (Schacht, 1970: 36) or any other entities like the state or religion. Because existentialists, rejecting all forms of authority, believe in the self-authority. They abstain from all forms of power because authoritarianism or power conflicts with their basic views of life. They believe in one's own self-actualization and self-determination. A self-determined one, according to the existentialists, is capable of comprehending his/her problems without relying on any religious or political dogmas and ideology, and s/he can overcome these problems by bringing about realistic solutions that serve to him.

In this respect, one can assert that, since they do not submit the authoritative and exploitive rules of the Tulsis and the Third World, Naipaul and his protagonist Mohun Biswas have experienced the sense of alienation first in the form of normlessness, then in an existential form which also can be considered to denote the same points as Hegel's concept of 'alienation as seperation' does. They never give up struggling for their existence and identity relying on their own capabilities which eventually lead them to be an eminent writer in the case of Naipaul, and to create or own the house that he longed for in the case of Mr Biswass which they consider essential for their authenticity and freedom.

As for Lamming and G, the protagonist of *In the Castle of My Skin*, they experience almost the same phases of the sense of alienation. They first experience

the sense of alienation in the form of what Melvin Seeman defines as self-estrangement, and then in the form of what Hegel classifies as ‘alienation as seperation’ and ‘alienation as surrender’. As Seeman asserts, self-alienation involves dissatisfaction with oneself or losing intrinsic satisfaction with one's work (1959: 790). He further explains self-estrangement as: “…the worker who works merely for his salary, the housewife who cooks simply to get it over with, or the other directed type who acts "only for its effect on others" all these (at different levels, again) are instances of self-estrangement” (1959: 790). In this regard, self-estrangement can simply be identified as the individual’s dissatisfaction with the activities s/he is expected to perform. To be alienated in this sense is to be aware of a discrepancy between one's ideal self and one's actual self-image. Thus, living in a fragmented village having not a unified family (his father has left them, his relatives have had to leave the island for jobs and education), he wants more than anything to be an accepted member of the boys. But he never is. His mother's diligent care on him makes it impossible to associate with his friends Trumper, Bob, and Boy Blue since they are considered as ‘vagabonds’. In their interaction he is the watcher, telling what they say and do. The apparent indications of alienation and separation emerge when he passes his examinations for high school while his friends remain in the village. In high school G. feels more alone. Being educated by a curriculum produced by colonial mentality, G. does not have the sense of belonging with his village anymore. The educational curriculum of the colonizer raises his separation. And isolation from family, friends, neighbours, school, etc., brings about the sense of alienation from the self. In the very beginning of their adolescence, both Lamming and his protagonist have the same feeling of alienation. Realizing that the

circumstances they are in are not the ones they have been longing, but rather the ones that satisfy the expectencies of the others, they feel more alone and despondent. Alienated from the self and having the feeling of powerlessness, they decide to leave their communities for the realization of a more pristine self and original identity.

Lamming's novel ends with the protagonist's intention to leave his village and community due to his experience of self estrangement and powerlessness. From this point on, since Lamming's novels are considered as being written in sequence, one being the continiuation of the previous, one can observe G's sense of 'alienation as seperation' and 'alienation as surrender' in the following novels, *The Emmigrant, Of Age and Innocence*, and the others.

To sum up, while Naipaul and his protagonist are likely to be considered as having experienced the sense of alienation first in the form of normlessness which has led to a sense of existential alienation or 'alienation as seperation', Lamming and his protagonist may well be considered to have experienced the sense of alienation first in the form of self-alienation, then in the form of Hegel's concepts of 'alienation as separation' and 'alienation as surrender'.

# CONCLUSION

As it has been mentioned in the introduction, the aim in comparing two opposing literary figures, exploring their political cultural and ethnic backgrounds and how these have developed their world view and perception, is to lay down how versions of reality may vary from an individual to the other, or speaking generally from one culture to the other. We can say that everyone has his/her own version of his/her own reality depending on his/her ethnical, geographical, political, ideological and cultural experiences. In other words, one is the totality of one's experiences. But is it true to consider an individual's or a group's experiences as universal truths? Or are there any universal truths? In this regard, contrary to the modernists who were in search of universal truths for the prosperity of humanity, postmodernists have propounded that there are not any universal truths, claiming that all meta-narratives can surely be deconstructed. Postmodernists regard the universe, in which we human being constitute a part, as being a chaos that cannot be controlled by constructing unchangeable meta-narratives or universal truths. Each universal truth or meta-narrative creates its counter one bringing forward its own version of reality. Richard Terdiman's assertion that "each discourse brings its counter discourse"*(Discourse/Counter Discourse*, 1985), and Mikhail Bakhtin's that no discourse can be regarded as a monologue are premises that an utterance will always bear a competing, contrary utterance from which it procures its own energies. Hence, it would not be an exegeration to propound that the problems with which humanity is entangled stem from the struggle of these versions of realities which also constitute irreconcilable binary oppositions. In other words, because of these versions of

realities which constitute binary oppositions, humanity has been struggling with incessant problems such as starvation, huge income inequity, economic or cultural wars between groups, states and civilizations, mass-migrations, cultural deterioration, the sense of alienation and displacement in the psyches of individuals or groups, etc.

In this struggles of discourses, dialectically, theses clash with antitheses, and from these endless clashes emerge syntheses which also eventually create their own antitheses. Each discourse (or thesis), legitimizing and relying on his own versions of realities, tries to have the control of the necessary tools which pave the ways to the power. This vicious circle is evident in every stratum of social life. The history of mankind has shown us that the inclination towards the power is primordial in living creatures. It is this primordial instinct that has led the idea of imperium which paved the way to colonize and subjugate more than half of the people living in the world. In other words, as I underlined in the first section of this thesis, one can claim that although the techniques and methods of controlling the other peoples and their territories may have been different, the primordial instinct, the thought of imperium (the instinct to command) has always been existed through the history of mankind. As a result, imperialism, colonialism, or neocolonialism have always been performed consecutively, the latters (colonialism and neocolonialism) as being methods or techniques of the imperial thought. Therefore, since the thought of this 'instinct command' (imperium) hasn't perished, and since it will most likely not, there shouldn't be a necessity to make various attributes referring to political, economic, geographical aspects, and the periods of the term imperialism. Because no matter when, how, and why this imperial desires have been articulated, the result has always

been the exploitation of the periphery. What have changed are the means, the tools, and the discource by which the powerful (be it empire, state, a group, or even an individual) tries and exerts to legitimate its practices of subjugation. If we consider the European colonialism or Eurocentricism as a discourse, many scholors of the once colonized cultures, relying on their own versions of reality, created a counter discourse in the period of postcolonialism propounding that the idea of imperialism is something inherent in the culture of The West. But looking at the history of humanity, one can clearly observe that the aspire for imperialism and its practices (be it colonialism or neocolonialism) is not something peculiar to the west merely. It is rather a primordial instinct of humankind. No matter what nationality one is, or what culture one has, if the zeitgeist has processed in favour, it is no doubt that the powerful will not be reluctant to subjugate the other or the weaker. Of course, this assumption should never be concieved as a whitewashing of the cultural and economic subjugation and oppression that the West carried out on the people of Africa, Asia, and West India from the fifteenth century on. Simply, it means that the zeitgeist, dialectically, has been in favour of The West from the fifteenth century on. Though it is no longer in its heydays and is in descent due to the economic crisis, and due to some new alternative emerging economic powers, such as Japan, Chine and Turkey, it still maintains the control of the other parts of the world by continually renewing its discourses. Considering the subject matters and theorethical framework that the postcolonial theory deals, one can undoubtedly assert that the postcolonial theory has been the counter discourse against the idea of colonialism.

In this respect, as every discourse creates its counter discourse relying on its own version of reality, in the course of this “concentration on darker side of

exploitaion and dependence" (Mcleod 2000: 16), Naipaul and Lamming represent two discrete poles, each obtaining its discourse (its energy) from the other's theories. While Naipaul dwells on the contradictions and failings of the postcolonial cultures and societies criticising them for their intellectual and cultural 'parasitism' on the West, Lamming beleives that it is possible to restore a sense of pure identity by logically looking back at the past with the help of tradition, languge or myth. These different ways of thinking, as I mentioned above, may stem from diverse cultural, political, historical or geographical circumstances or subjectivities. Naipaul and Lamming are two of the most prominent writers from the Caribbeans who, in spite of experiencing the same life conditions until their adolescences, represent two discrete poles on their approaches to the process of decolonization. While Lamming favours a literary counter attack on the metropolitan centre in his writings, Naipaul rather attacks and harshly criticises the social, cultural, and psychological decadents that the once colonized people entangled in.

Their standpoints on the concepts of the history, the language, the national culture, and the identity of the once colonized nations answer the question that why they are regarded as two almost completely opposite writers who, if generalized, also represent the opposing standpoints of the West and the East concerning the culture of the colonized people and their struggle for decolinazation.

Considering both writers' different standpoints regarding the history, the writing style and language, the prospect of an integral Caribbean nation, and the identity of the individuals of the once colonized nations, all of which have been described in detail in the third chapter, one is likely to conclude that;

Although Naipaul draws the admiration of the critics both from the West and the East, his fiction, especially his travelogues which portray the East has received harsh criticism from the eastern scholors and warm receptions from The West. While he is admitted warmly by Anglo-American critics for his straightforward opinions on the political, social, and cultural issues of the countries known as the Third World, on the other hand, in Post-Colonial circles, especially among those writers who have an opposing view of colonialism and among the people in the countries he writes about, he is blamed not to have shown sympathy for the oppressed. While writers like George Lamming, Derek Walcott, and Caryl Philips who have opposing views of colonialism, idealize their culture and their people, Naipaul seems to be in a situation of inbetween, a writer who doesn't have a root or a connection to any entities, be it a country, a culture, or a political group. On the other hand, in Europe and the United States, critics and academics praise Naipaul for the truthfulness of his views on the issues of the Third World. Nevertheless, Despite all accusation from the postcolonial circles, as Bruce King puts it, "Naipaul blames European imperialism for the horrors of slavery and for the problems it left on its former colonies, while praising it for bringing peace and modern thought to areas of the world that remained medieval and debilitated by continual local wars and destructive non-Western invasions" (King 4). Due to his having been born and brought up in the period in which modernism was in its heydays, Naipaul is possible to be considered as a writer whose thoughts have been shaped by aspects of modernism, but writing in an era of postmodernism. Although all his works, be it fiction or nonfiction, are engaged in the experiences between the colonized and the colonizer, and though among the literary circles, he is considered to be a postcolonial writer, his views towards the third world countries

are rather of a modernist who champions logic and ration with a realist point of view. In other word, his subject matter is postcolonial, but as King states, "his perspective on decolonization, imperialism, black-white relations and other themes of post-imperial literatures is more complicated than that of nationalists and their foreign sympathizers" (King, 3). He looks at the relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed as a universal and continuing practise, triying to tell us that since culture and identity are not fixed notions peculiar to some certain races, and since they are moveable and changing mechanisms, we should not regard them as being crucial for survival of the peoples. According to Naipaul identity is not fixed since it is shaped by the relations with other cultures. He propounds that due to the mass migration of the people from different cultures and geographic locations to find better living standards, peoples' travelling all around the world, and information technologies, the world has become culturally interwoven that no one can assert s/he has a fixed or peculiar life style. He also thinks that one should be aware of his/her history in order to evaluate himself/herself, but he doesn't consider history as the outcome stemmed from a specific culture's characteristics. Hence, for him, imperialism is a recurrent, primordial instinct of mankind that is not peculiar to a certain civilization, but to all. This is the feature that distinct Naipaul from the other postcolonial writers.

As for George Lamming, he is known for his investigations to have the West Indians being aware of their colonial past, and the effects of this colonial past on the present. He beleives that it is possible to restore a sense of authentic identity by logically looking back at the past with the help of tradition, languge or myth. Lamming's novels, being in a sequence from the first to the last, are characteristically political and experimental in nature. They follow logically one after the other in

order to form a single unfinished plot. He is in a struggle to dismantle the colonial structure that the West Indians have been shaped with, and tries to establish a consciousness among his people by underlying the importance of the old traditions and myths. He is not of the opinion, contrary to Naipaul, that the West Indian are "peasant-minded, money-minded community" who are unsure of themselves and, having no taste or style of their own" (MP 47. 82). He thinks that in order to recover all the ill characteristics attributed to the West Indies, it is essential for the Caribbean societies to restructure its multicultural, multiracial, multiethnic social structure around the needs of its peasant and working-class majority. The role of artist, he believes, is to produce works which underline the need for that leap. In this respect, considering Lamming's propoundings, one is likely to establish a viewpoint that Lamming can be regarded among the "socialist realists" of 1930s who favoured socially and economically the disadvantaged to call attention to social ills and needs for reform. Futhermore, Lamming also explores new ways of changing the relationships between the colonizer and the colonized by creating new levels of understanding which will liberate them. In so doing, Lamming lays bare the psychological damage and the cultural and economic dependence while also exploring new ways of overcoming these barriers. Lamming, like Naipaul, is aware of the individual and social entanglement and shortcomings that the Caribbeans are in, but unlike Naipaul he is in a compassionate and romantic struggle, due to his Marxist thoughts.

To conclude, in terms of their politic standpoints, one is likely to assert that; while Lamming has a compassionate vision, propounding that it is possible to construct an original identity by looking back at the history, traditions and myths,

Naipaul has a realist and positivist vision. He does not romanticize the West Indians' culture. He portrays them as they are. For Naipaul, race and culture are constructed, subjective and changeable. In this regard, while Lamming's novels fragment into a series of remedies which aim to cure the feeling of alienation and rootlessness on the basis of subjectivity and intuition, Naipaul mixtures satire and comic irony to awaken the colonized subjects from their romantic and subjective thoughts to the contemporary world's positivist and objective realities. This is the main difference between Naipaul and Lamming. Or to put it in other words, while Lamming represents the one side of the binary opposition in a biased manner, Naipaul acts in a manner which may likely be percieved through Hegel's concept of *Aufhebung* which also means sublation. Aufhebung can be considered as a concept which aims to abstain from the circular clashes of theses and antitheses (binary opposition, or versions of realities) by both comprising and negating both sides of the oppositions.

As it has also been laid down in chapter four, Naipaul's and Lamming's discrepant standpoints regarding their politics has influenced their novels as well. They have also different approaches regarding the theme of alienation and cultural displacement, two of the most common themes treated in the field of the postcolonial literature. Alienation and cultural displacement are the concepts which the writers of postcolonial literature mainly discuss and treat in their works. Because the writers or intellectuals from once colonized countries encountering the distortments that the colonizer has left on their culture, eventually establish discrete responses. This sense of not belonging to a significant country or culture results either in its rejection by the writer through criticism and satire, or by his physical or psychological withdrawals in the form of various kinds of alienation, as it has been the case with

Naipaul and Lamming at the very beginning of their adolescences and later at their matured lives. In the period of their adolescence, Both Naipaul and Lamming are of the opinion that in order to be creative writers they must leave the West Indies, which they think, impedes their artistic development. They feel a sense of social alienation. But after they travel to London they response in different manners. While from the beginning of his school life, Naipaul has firmly rejected the majority of the Third World societies, including India, africa, and Asia, Lamming has portrayed a more sensitive approach to these societies. Their different sense of alienation and exile is evident in their novels too.

Both Naipaul's *A House for Mr Biswas* and Lamming's *In the Castle of My Skin* portray a movement from a simple rural existence to a state of exile and alienation. Having been written, to some extent, in autobiographical context, both the protagonists of *A House for Mr Biswas* and *In the Castle of My Skin* portray similar experiences (estrangement and alienation) which their writers have experienced in their real lives. Thus; although both the boy protagonist G in *In the Castle of My Skin*, and Mohun Biswas in *A House for Mr. Biswas* portray similar behaviours at the very beginning of their estrangement from their surrounding environment (as was in the case of Naipaul and Lamming when they left for England), their responses to their societies at the end of the novels portray that they have different points of view in terms of their alien situation.

A House for Mr Biswas, metaphorically, is a miniature world which symbolizes the colonial world. Mr. Biswas's personal battle with the stronghold of the Tulsi household (the symbol of the colonial world) is a quest for existential freedom and the struggle for personality. The Tulsis are running a sort of mimic

world of colonialism and the important thing is that the Hanuman House too is run on the traditional Hindu familial lines and protocols. On the surface, the Tulsis have made an admirable reconstruction of the clan in strange and hostile conditions. But beneath the surface, one can see that the Hanuman House is not a coherent or benevolent entity of the traditional Hindu joint family. It is more a slave society where Mrs Tulsi and Seth need workers to boost their sinking influence and economy. They exploit the homelessness and poverty of men like Biswas and others. The acceptance of Hanuman House and its dubious claims is the submission of slavery. By such a picture, Naipaul tries to portray that subjugation is not something peculiar to the West, or to the whites. He satirises the Indians' insistence on carrying out their older caste system within themselves while they resent white colonialism. It is clear that both Naipaul and Lamming depict the negative impact of marginality in human and social stratum, and its link with the history of colonialism. Yet this is presented by the two Writers with an important difference. While Lamming blames the West and consequently the white race for the cruelty they imposed on the blacks, and agrees with Fanon that in certain situations violence is necessary and inevitable instrument, a form of self-defence, Naipaul does not regard the cruelty and oppression, which has been a common practice of men against men and nature, as something peculiar to the West or whites. He thinks that the instinct to have the control of the other is primordial in humankind no matter what race or culture he belongs. By this idea, of course, he does not proclaim to exonerate the West's cruelty on the people of Africa and Asia.

Both the protagonist of *A House for Mr Biswas* and *In the Castle of My Skin* are alienated individuals from the circumstances of their lives. Naipaul's protagonist

is alienated from the Hindu community in Trinidad, and is fighting out a personal battle for freedom and recognition. For him, to built a house of his own means freedom and recognition. And by the end of the novel, in spite of all its deficiencies, he manages to buy this house which eventually brings him his wife's respect, and saves him from his sense of being rootless and alienated. He does not regard the Tulsi's way of life which was consisted of the old traditions of the East India. As for Lamming's protagonist, history, together with myths and traditions, is the most important element for decolonisation, they are antidotes of the sense of alienation. Hence, it is likely to claim that while Lamming tries to cure the sense of alienation by underlining the importance of history, traditions and myths, Naipaul highlights the importance of individual creativity which leads to have a sense of alienation in an existential norm.

Lamming and Naipaul, having their own versions of the reality, act in different manner on the themes of alienation or cultural displacement. While exile and alienation have negative results on some writers, for the others as in the case of Naipaul, it may be stimulative for creativity, in the form of which Hegel termed as 'alienation as seperation'. As for George Lamming, it is likely to say that he has experienced the concept of alienation, first as Naipaul has, but later in the form of which Hegel termed as 'alienation as surrender'. Thus; Lamming first leaves his community with the sense of 'alienation as seperation', and later returns to live among his people with the sense of 'alienation as surrender' after spending some twenty years apart from them. Hegel has put the concept of alienation into two phases. Alienation-as-seperation' being distressing but necessary for maturity, and 'alienation-as-surrender' being positively peacefull and free from worry due to the

fact that “it involves a conscious relinquishment or surrender with the intention of securing a desired end: namely, unity with the social substance”(Schacht 1970: 36). For Lamming this ‘social substance’ is his ‘nigger people’.

As Hegel puts it, through the analysis of self and deep thought, one moves from an immature sense of universality to a powerful sense of his/her own individuality. This process leads to an acute sense of self-alienation from one's inner nature and the extremity of discord (265). Naipaul’s protagonist Mohun Biswass, as well as Naipaul himself, struggles for his individuality through a realization that the entanglements they are in stem from the immature (uncivilized) structure of their comunity. For Mohun Biswas, the Hindu folk of the Hanuman House represent this structure, as for Naipaul it is all comunities that form the West Indies.

When *A House for Mr Biswas* and *In the Castleof My Skin* are closely examined, one can easily observe that the sense of alienation that the protagonists Mohun Biswas and G. experience in their fictional lives is the very sense that Naipaul and Lamming have experienced in their real lives. Thus, both Naipaul and Mr Biswas, the protagonist of *A House for Mr Biswas,* experience a sense of alienation first in the form of normlessness which eventually leads them to an existential sense of alienation which also is likely to be considered as having common qualities with Hegel’s concept of ‘alienation as seperation’. Naipaul’s protagonist Mohun Biswass, as well as Naipaul himself, struggles for their individuality through a realization that the entanglements they are in stem from the immature (uncivilized) structure of their comunity. For Mohun Biswas, the Hindu folk of the Hanuman House represent this structure, as for Naipaul it is all comunities that form the West Indies and the Third world. Having been alienated in

the form of normlessness, both Mr Biswas and Naipaul improve a reaction relying on their creativity. They do not remain inactive in the face of their encounter with familial or societal norms. Thus; Naipaul became a writer and Mr Biswas built a house struggling with the drawbacks of their society. Hence, it is likely to assert that their alienation from their society leads them to a condition of existential standpoint. An existentialist's understanding of the theme of alienation resembles to Hegel's concept of 'alienation as seperation' which reads "through self analysis and contemplation, the human moves from an immature sense of universality to a powerful sense of his/her own individuality" (Williamson and Cullingford, 1997: 265). But it differs from Hegel's concept of 'alienation as surrender' being positively peacefull and free from worry due to the fact that "it involves a conscious relinquishment or surrender with the intention of securing a desired end: namely, unity with the social substance" (Schacht, 1970: 36) or any other entities like the state or religion.

Therefore it can be asserted that, since they do not submit the authoritative and exploitive rules of the Tulsis and the Third World, Naipaul and his protagonist Mohun Biswas have experienced the sense of alienation first in the form of normlessness, then in an existential form which also can be considered to denote the same points as Hegel's concept of 'alienation as seperation' does. They never give up struggling for their existence and identity relying on their own capabilities which eventually lead them to be an eminent writer in the case of Naipaul, and to create or own the house that he longed for in the case of Mr Biswass which they consider essential for their authenticity and freedom.

As for Lamming and G, the protagonist of *In the Castle of My Skin*, they experience almost the same phases of the sense of alienation. They first experience the sense of alienation in the form of what Melvin Seeman defines as self-estrangement, and then in the form of what Hegel classifies as 'alienation as surrender'. In the very beginning of their adolescence, both Lamming and his protagonist have the same feeling of alienation. Realizing that the circumstances they are in are not the ones they have been longing, but rather the ones that satisfy the expectencies of the others, they feel more alone and despondent. Alienated from the self and having the feeling of powerlessness, they decide to leave their communities for the realization of a more pristine self and original identity. Lamming's novel ends with the protagonist's intention to leave his village and community due to his experience of self estrangement and powerlessness. From this point on, since Lamming's novels are considered as being written in sequence, one being the continiuation of the previous, one can observe G's sense of alienation in the form of Hegel's concepts 'alienation as seperation' and 'alienation as surrender' in the following novels, *The Emmigrant*, *Of Age and Innocence*, and the others.

To sum up, while Naipaul and his protagonist are likely to be considered as having experienced the sense of alienation first in the form of normlessness which has led to a sense of existential alienation or 'alienation as seperation', Lamming and his protagonist may well be considered to have experienced the sense of alienation first in the form of self-alienation, then in the form of Hegel's concepts of 'alienation as separation' and 'alienation as surrender'. Naipaul, through satire and irony, tries to instill in the psyches of the once colonized people a sense of alienation in the form of normlessness and 'alienation as seperation'. Thus, he thinks, they will be able to leap

into a phase of creativity which will consequently supply them with original and authentic identities of their own. As for Lamming, he, too, wants the colonized peoples to rely on their authentic identities. But, his reaction is different. He is likely to be said to be in such a struggle which aims to save the self-alienated psyches through an instillation of the history, tradition and myths, which may likely be perceived through Hegel's concept of 'alienation as surrender'. In other words, while Naipaul tries to instill a sense of alienation, Lamming exerts to save his 'people' from the sense of alienation.

The last word; The clash between the East/the West, colony/colonialist, rightist/leftist, or any other binary oppositions can rather be solved through an appropriation of Hegel's concept of *Aufhebung*, not through a complete negation or annihilation of the opposite.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

ASHCROFT, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*.(Second edition) New York: Routledge, 2002. (First published in 1998)

ASHCROFT, B. Et all. *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies*. London and New York. Routledge, 1998.

ASHCROFT, B. Et all. *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. Second Edition. London and New York: Routledge, 2006. (First published in 1995)

"alienation." The American Heritage New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy, Third Edition. HoughtonMifflinCompany,2005.29Oct.2010.<Dictionary.comhttp://dictionary.reference.com/browse/alienation>

BHABBA, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

BENJAMİN, Thomas. *Encyclopedia of Western Colonialism since 1450*. Macmillan: London, 2006.

BERTENS, Hans. *Literary Theory: The Basics*, London: Routledge, 2001.

BOEHMER, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*, OUP: New York, 2005. (First published in 1995)

BROWN, J. Dillon. *Exile and Cunning: The Tactical Difficulties of George Lamming*, UWP, Contemporary Literature, Vol. 47, No. 4 (Winter, 2006), pp. 669-694

BRIANS, Paul. *Postcolonial Literature: Problems with the Term*. 7 August 1998, 12 November 2009 <http://www.wsu.edu/~brians/anglophone/postcolonial.html>.

CHAPMAN, Jeff, and Pamela S. Dear, eds. *Contemporary Authors,* New Revision Series, Vol. 51. Detroit: Gale, 1996

CHILDS, Peter and Patrick Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory.* London, Prentice Hall, 1997.

CHURCHICH, Nicholas. *Marxism and alienation*. Associated University Presses: London, 1990.

"COLONIALISM, Western." Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. Encyclopædia Britannica, 2011. Web. 26 Apr. 2010. <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/126237/colonialism>.

COLLIER, Eugenia. *Dimensions of Alienation in Two Black American and Caribbean Novels.* Phylon (1960-) Vol. 43, No. 1 (1st Qtr., 1982), pp. 46-56, Clark Atlanta University. http://www.jstor.org/stable/274598

CUDJOE, Selwyn R. *V.S. Naipaul: A Materialist Reading*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

DEAN, Dwight G. *Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement*. American Sociological Review, Vol. 26, No. 5 (Oct., 1961), pp. 753-758.

EDWARDS, Nadi. *"George Lamming's Literary Nationalism: Language between The Tempest and the Tonelle"*. Small Axe: A Caribbean Journal of Criticism. Number 11 (Volume 6, Number 1), March 2002, pp. 59-76

ERIKSON, Erik. *Identity, Youth and Crisis*, New York, Norton, 1968.

"exile". Oxford Dictionaries. April 2010. Oxford Dictionaries. April 2010. Oxford University Press. 24 March 2011 <http://oxforddictionaries.com/view/entry/m_en_gb0280190>

EVANS, Adrian Rowe. *V.S. Naipaul* (Interview), Transition, 8, No. 40 (December 1971, pp. 56-61.

FANON, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Grove Press: New York, 1963. (Originally published in French in 1961).

FIELDHOUSE, D.K., *The Colonial Empires: a comparative survey from the eighteenth century.* Macmillan, London, 1989.

GUEVARA, Che, "*Colonialism is Doomed*" speech to the 19th General Assembly of the United Nations in New York City on December 11, 1964

GIKANDI, Simon. *Maps of Englishness: Writing Identity in the Culture of Colonialism*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

HAMNER, D. Robert, ed. *Critical Perspectives on V. S. Naipaul*. London: Heinemann, "IMPERIALISM." Encyclopædia Britannica. 2010. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. 11 Aug. 2010 <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/283988/imperialism>.

JACOBS, Jane M. *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*. Taylor & Francis e-Library, London, 2002.

JENTSCH, Ernst (1997) *'On the psychology of the uncanny* (1906)', Angelaki, Journal of Theoretical Humanities, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 7-16. 20 12 2010 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09697259708571910>

JOHNSON, Charles and Patricia Smith. *Africans in America: America's Journey through Slavery.* Mariner Books, 1999.

JUSSAWALLA, Feroza. and Reedway Dasenbrock, eds. *Interviews with Writers of the Post-Colonial World*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1992.

JUSSAWALLA, Feroza. *Conversations with V. S. Naipaul*. USA: University Press of Mississippi, 1997.

JOSEPHSON, E. and M. Josephson. *Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society,* New York, Dell, 1962.

JOYCE, Ann Joyce. *"What We Do and Why We Do What We Do: A Diasporic Commingling of Richard Wright and George Lamming."* Callaloo 32.2 (2009): 593-603. Project MUSE. Web. 21 Jan. 2011. <http://muse.jhu.edu/>.

KALEKIN-Fishman, Deborah. *"Tracing the Growth of Alienation: Enculturation Socialization, and Schooling in a Democracy"*, in Geyer, F. (ed.) Alienation, Ethnicity, and Post-modernism, London: Greenwood Press, 1996.

KAMRA, Shashi. *The Novels of V. S. Naipaul*: a Study in Theme and Form. New Delhi: Prestige, 1990.

KENT, George E. *"A Future They Must Learn" in "Conversations: George Lamming: Essays, Addresses and Interviews 1953-1990*"." Ed. Richard Drayton and Andaiye. London: Karia Press, 1992. Pp. 86-105.

KING, Bruce. *V. S. Naipaul*. London: Macmillan, 2003.

KLASS, Morton. *East Indians in Trinidad*. Prospect Heights, 111. Waveland Press, 1961.

LAING, R. D. *Self and Others*, Harmondsworth, Penguins, 1969.

LAMMING, George. *The Pleasures of Exile*. USA: University of Michigan Press, 1995. (First Published in 1960).

LAMMING, George. *"The Negro Writer and his World."* İn "Conversations: Essays, Addresses and Interviews, 1953-90". Ed. Andaiye and Richard Drayton. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990. pp. 35-44.

LAMMING, George. *Coming, Coming Home: Conversations II: Monographs*. Philpsburg, St.

Martin: House of Nehesi, 2000

LAMMING, George. *Of Age and Innocence*. Allison and Busby, London, 1981. (First published in 1958).

LAMMING, George. *In the Castle of My Skin*. USA: The University of Michigan Press, 1991 (First Published in 1953).

LAMMING, George. *The Emigrants*, New York: McGraw Hill, 1955.

LAMMING, George. *Natives of My Person*, London: Picador, 1974.

LOOMBA, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London & New York: Routledge, 1998.

MACAULAY, Thomas Babington. *"Minute on Indian Education," in Macaulay: Prose and Poetry*, ed by G.M. Young, London, Rupert Hart-Davis, 1967, p.729.

MACFIE, A. L. *Orientialism*. Pearson Education: London, 2002

MARX, Karl. *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1961.

MAY, Brian. "*Why Can't We Be Friends Now? Caliban's Rage after Empire"*. Contemporary Literature, Vol. 39, No. 3 (Autumn, 1998), pp. 452-467. Published by: University of Wisconsin Press

MCLEOD, John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. New York: Manchester Universirty Pres, 2000.

MEMNI. Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. 1965. Boston: Beacon P, 1991.

MORAN, Berna. *Edebiyat Kuramları ve Eleştiri*. İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2008.

MOSS, Joyce. *World Literature and Its Times: Profiles of Notable Literary Works and the Historical Events That Influenced Them*. Volume 4, 2001. pp 171-180

MUSTAFA, Fawzia. *V.S. Naipaul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, New York, 1995.

NAİPAUL, VS. *The Enigma of Arrival*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987.

NAIPAUL, VS. *Finding The Centre: Two Narratives*. London: Deutsch, 1984.

NAIPAUL, V.S. *A House for Mr Biswas*. London, New York, etc.: Penguin Books, 1982. (First published 1961)

NAIPAUL, V.S. *In a Free State*. New York: Vintage Books, 1971.

NAIPAUL, V.S. *A Bend in the River*. London, New York, etc.: Penguin Books, 1980. (First published 1979.)

NAIPAUL, V.S. *A Flag on the Island*. London: Penguin Books, 1988. (First published 1967)

NAIPAUL, V.S. *Letters Between a Father and a Son*. London: Little, Brown and Company, 1999.

NAIPAUL, V.S. *Mr Stone and the Knight's Companion*. London, New York, etc.: Penguin Books, 1980. (First published 1963.)

NAIPAUL, V.S. *Guerillas*. London, New York, etc.: Penguin Books, 1976. (First published 1975.)

NAIPAUL, V.S. *The Mimic Men*. London, New York, etc.: Penguin Books, 1969. (First published 1967).

NAIPAUL, V.S. *The Mystic Masseur*. London: Penguin Books, 1964. (First published 1957.)

NAIPAUL, V.S. *Half a Life*. London, Basingstoke and Oxford: Picador, 2001.

NAIPAUL, V.S. *The Middle Passage*. London, Picador, 2001. (First Published in 1962)

NAIR, Supriya. *Caliban's curse: George Lamming and the revisioning of history*. University of Michigan Press, 1996.

NIGHTINGALE, Peggy. *Journey Through Darkness: The Writing of V.S. Naipaul*. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1987.

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

NUNEZ-Harrell, Elizabeth. *Lamming and Naipaul: Some Criteria for Evaluating the Third-World Novel*. Contemporary Literature Vol. 19, No. 1 (Winter, 1978), pp. 26-47. Published by: University of Wisconsin Press.

ODHIAMBO, C. J. *Outside the Eyes of the Other: George Lamming and Definition in "Of Age and Innocence"* Research in African Literatures Vol. 25, No. 2, Special Issue: Caribbean Literature (Summer, 1994), pp. 121-130 Indiana University Press http://www.jstor.org/stable/4618267

OSTERHAMMEL, Jurgen. *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. Ian Randle Publisher, Kingston, 1997.

PARAG, Kumar. *"Identity Crisis in V.S. Naipaul's A House for Mr. Biswas*". In Shands, Kerstin W., Editor. Neither East Nor West: Postcolonial Essays on Literature, Culture, and Religion. Sweden: Södertörns högskola, 2008. Pp. 135-142.

PAQUET, Sandra Pouchet. *The Novels of George Lamming*. London: Heinemann, 1982

PAQUET, Sandra Pouchet. *"The Serial Art of George Lamming: Myth and Archive."* Shibboleths: a Journal of Comparative Theory 2. 2 (2008): pp. 96-106

PAQUET, Sandra Pouchet. *Caribbean autobiography*: Cultural Identity and Self-Representation. London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2002.

PATKE, Rajeev S. "*Postcolonial Cultures. Theory, Culture & Society"* May 2006. 23: 369-372, doi:10.1177/026327640602300267

QUAYSON, Ata. *Postcolonialism: Theory, Practice or Process?* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000.

RAY, Mohit K. *V S Naipaul: Critical Essays*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2005.

ROGOZINSKI, Jan. *A Brief History of the Caribbean*. New York: Facts on File, 1999.

SAID, Edward W. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London, New York: Penguin Books, 1995. (First published 1978.)

SAID, W. Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage, 1994.

SAID, Edward. "*Intellectuals in the Post-Colonial World*." In The New Salmagundi Reader. Ed. By Robert Boyers and Peggy Boyers in 1996. P. 437.

SCHACHT, R. *Alienation*. London, Allen & Unwin, 1970.

SCHMITT, Deborah A., ed. *Contemporary Literary Criticism*, Vol. 105. Detroit: Gale Group, 1998.

SCHWARZ, Bill. *The Location of George Lamming*, Thailand: Macmillan Carribean, 2007.

SEAMAN, Melvin. *On The Meaning of Alienation*. American Sociological Review, Vol. 24, No. 6 (Dec., 1959), pp. 783-791. Published by: American Sociological Association. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2088565Accessed: 11/11/2010 08:20

SINGH, Manjit Inder. *The Poetics of Alienation and Identity*. India, Ajanta Books International, 1998.

SOMAY, Bülent. "*En ölümcül günah: Yedi günahın en ölümcül olanını sömürgeci efendi ile paylaşıyorsunuz"*. Radikal Gazetesi, 28 11 2010 <http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=RadikalYazar&ArticleID=1030496&Yazar=BÜLENT SOMAY&CategoryID=96>

SULERI. Sara. *"Naipaul's Arrival." The Rhetoric Of English India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992. Pp. 149-173.

SZEMAN, Imre. *Zones of Instability: Literature, Postcolonialism, and the Nation*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, London 2003.

TERDIMAN, Richard. *Discourse/Counter-discourse: The Theory and Practice of Symbolic Resistance in Nineteenth-Century France*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 1985.

THEROUX, Paul. *V. S. Naipaul*. Modern Fiction Studies 30 (1984): 445-54.

THIONG'O, Ngugi Wa. *Freeing the Imagination*. Transition, No. 100 (2008), pp. 164-169 Indiana University Press

TYSON, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. Routledge: New York, 2006.

WALCOTT, Derek. *Interview with V.S. Naipaul*, Trinidad Sutiday Guardian Magazine, 6 August, 1967, p. 8.)

WILDE, Oscar. *"Preface," The Picture of Dorian Gray*. New York: Penguin, 1983.

WILLIAMSON, I. and Cedric Cullingford. *The Uses and Misuses of 'Alienation' in the Social Sciences and Education*. Blackwell Publishing, British Journal of Educational Studies Vol. 45, No. 3 (Sep., 1997), pp. 263-275

WOLNY, Philip. *Colonialism: A Primary Source Analysis*. The Rosen Publishing Group: New York, 2005.

YOUNG, Robert. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

YOUNG, Robert. *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West*. London & New York: Routledge, 1990.