

*Ethnic Trauma in the Traveller's Eye: On Naipaul's
The Masque of Africa, Including a Comparison with
Bi Shumin's 30,000 Miles of Africa*

QUAN WANG

Abstract: Insisting on the role of spectator in his travel writing, V.S. Naipaul claims he is merely the “manager of narrative”, who retells objective truths told by the people among whom he travels. Nonetheless, an examination of the ethnic trauma of post-apartheid South Africa in Naipaul’s *The Masque of Africa: Glimpses of African Belief* (2010) reveals that his voice dominates the narrative. Naipaul’s negative view of post-apartheid South Africa is consistent with his previous views of the “dark continent”. Contrary to other writers’ optimistic attitudes toward South Africa, Naipaul holds a negative view of the Rainbow Nation. For Naipaul, South Africa is still trapped in the mess of ethnic trauma: the ‘coloured’ population fears a lack of identity; the white people fear inverted black racism; and the black populace fear a lack of possibility. This article seeks to explore the reasons for Naipaul’s pessimistic perspective on South Africa by reading his related travelogues, African writings, interviews, authorised biography and Nobel lecture. These works reveal two main reasons for his opinion of South Africa: his Western bias against the “dark continent”, and his encounters with various local ‘elites’. A comparison with a travelogue by Bi Shumin further supports the argument that Naipaul’s view of Africa in general and South Africa in particular is selective and one-sided.

Keywords: V. S. Naipaul; ethnic trauma; travel writing; local elites; western stance

Trinidad-born Nobel laureate Vidia S. Naipaul is also a renowned travel writer, beginning in 1960 on the invitation of Trinidad’s then-Prime Minister Eric Williams. Following the publication of his first travel book about Trinidad in 1962, Naipaul travelled to his birthplace in the Caribbean, his ancestral land in India, and what in his Nobel lecture “Two Worlds” he called “the areas of darkness” (Naipaul 2001: 484): Africa, South America and the Muslim world. His travel writings include “A New King for Congo: Mobutu and the Nihilism of Africa” (1975), “The Crocodiles of Yamoussoukro” (1984); the “Trinidad story” of *The Middle Passage* (1962) and *The Loss of El Dorado* (1969); the “Indian trilogy” of *An Area of Darkness* (1962), *India: A Wounded Civilization* (1975) and

India: A Million Mutinies Now (1988); and the “Islamic world” stories of *Among the Believers: An Islamic Journey* (1981) and *Beyond Belief: Islamic Excursions Among the Converted People* (1998). Intending to explore “the nature of African belief” (Naipaul 2010: 3), Naipaul went back to Africa in 2008, at the age of seventy-six. In contrast to his 1966 visit to Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda, in 2008 he visited Uganda, Nigeria, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Gabon and South Africa. Unlike *In a Free State* and *A Bend in the River*, *The Masque of Africa: Glimpses of African Belief* (2010) mainly presents Naipaul’s reflections on religion, especially on African religions within the newly emergent postcolonial countries in Africa. He observes how African religions operate in their societies and how they affect the futures of those countries. However, South Africa holds a special place in Naipaul’s African tour because of the ethnic trauma it has experienced. Naipaul claims in his travelogue that “I had wanted, when I began this book, to stay away from politics and race... But... I felt stymied in South Africa and saw that here race was all in all” (Naipaul 2010: 288). The apartheid system was official policy in South Africa between 1948 and 1994. Specific laws divided the population into four groups based on skin colour: white, coloured (mixed-race), Indian, and black. After thirty-six years of this policy, Naipaul imagines a “fallen section of the post-apartheid town”, but he is still surprised by the chaos and damage the country and its people have suffered. He claims that “it is all awful, a great disappointment” (Naipaul 2010: 284).

Although it focuses primarily on Naipaul, this article will also use a comparison between him and Bi Shumin, a female Chinese writer who is less well-known and of another generation, but who wrote *30,000 Miles of Africa*, a significant work on Africa that is worth interpreting in and of itself as well as being a way of understanding Naipaul more clearly and fully. Her visit to Africa was half a dozen years after Naipaul’s last trip there. Bi Shumin ended up meeting a greater range of South Africans than did Naipaul and came to stress the optimism among them.

Controversy over Naipaul’s writing on the “Dark Continent”

In the eyes of Naipaul, South Africa has been torn up by apartheid, and there is no bright future for its people. Naipaul’s attitude towards South Africa echoes his previous view of the so-called “dark continent” as “an unfinished landscape, a scratching in the continent” (Naipaul 1984: 144) with “no future” (Jussawalla 1997: 49). Although the Swedish Academy praised his “united perceptive narrative and incorruptible scrutiny in works that compel us to see the presence of suppressed histories” (Swedish Academy 2001), Naipaul’s negative views on Africa, India, the Caribbean and the Muslim world in his travel writings

have received criticism in the academic world, especially from non-Western scholars such as Caribbean writer Derek Walcott, African writers Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o and Chinua Achebe, Indian scholars C. J. Wallia and Gayatri C. Spivak, Egyptian scholar Fadwa AbdelRahman, and Chinese scholars Yiheng Zhao and Guocheng Song. Spivak has described him as a "false native informant"; AbdelRahman has called him "the white traveler under the dark mask" and Walcott has referred to him as "V.S. Nightfall". However, Edward Said seems to hold one of the most negative views of Naipaul's travel writing, with Naipaul's authorised biographer even referring to Said as Naipaul's "old adversary" (French 2008: 468). Said regards Naipaul's travel writing as "an intellectual catastrophe", because he is "compelled to repeat the same formula over and over" (qtd. in French 2008: 469). The "same formula" Said addresses in Naipaul's work refers not only to his Islamic travel writings, but also to those of the Caribbean, Africa and India. Contrary to Pliny's view that "there is always something new out of Africa", Naipaul, as Jeffrey Meyers argues, "finds nothing new" (Meyers 2011: 386) there. The chaotic and violent Africa in *In a Free State*, the savage and brutal Africa in *A Bend in the River*, the repetitive descriptions of greedy witch doctors and non-scientific African animism in his African writings, recur throughout his works on Africa.

Although Naipaul's travelogues have received disapproving responses from non-Western critics, some "Anglo-American critics," as Amin Malak has observed (2006: 261), still celebrate him as an uncompromising truth-teller. Jeffrey Meyers praises Naipaul as "connoisseur of chaos and scourge of the Third World" and describes his writing as "brutally honest" (Meyers 2001: 387). Insisting on his "spectator" position in his travel writings, Naipaul defends himself from negative reviews and blames those writers who hold a political agenda, especially the "sort of self-conscious 'African Writing' which is obsessed with tribal mores" (Jussawalla 1997: 29). In his article "Images", Naipaul contends the possibility of such work being good, "but the attitude is political and one's sympathy with it can only be political" (Naipaul 1977: 26). Naipaul agrees with Joseph Conrad's notion of detached thought, the idea that a writer should be "a figure behind the veil; a suspected rather than a seen presence" (Conrad 1912: xiii). During his first tour in Uganda in 1966, he advised his young American friend and professor Paul Theroux to "be detached – detachment is very important. It's not indifference – far from it!" (Theroux 1972: 447). Naipaul believes that he has applied the concept of "detachment" to his travel writing, and that the criticism of his travelogues is therefore unfair.

The “manager of narrative” or the “dominance of narrative”?

In an interview with his biographer Patrick French, Naipaul stated that “I was not responsible for the world I was discovering. I was recording what I had discovered. I had no point of view. I think I just laid out the material, the evidence, and left people to make up their mind” (Naipaul and French 2008: 282). Accordingly, he claims that he had developed new methods of writing travelogues, which he applied on his second visit to the Muslim world. This new method is what Naipaul addressed in his Nobel lecture; in his view, “what was most important about a travel book were the people the writer traveled among” (Naipaul 2001: 485). Therefore, he invites other voices into the narrative process, those of people he meets on his visits or of his companions; in his view, he opens a presentation stage for locals to present their own ideas, while his voice merely reduces itself to an aside. At the beginning of his second Islamic travelogue, *Beyond Belief: Islamic Excursions Among the Converted People* (1998), he announces his “spectator” position and proclaims “THIS IS A BOOK about people. It is not a book of opinion. It is a book of stories” (Naipaul 1998: xi). Naipaul regards himself as “a manager of narrative” throughout the travelogue, since “the writer as traveler steadily retreats; the people of the country come to the front” (Naipaul 1998: xii). Naipaul’s new method of travel writing seems to dovetail with James Clifford’s *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, which promotes “new representational strategies” to allow for the emergence of a “long list of actors” previously relegated to the margins of travel writing (Clifford 1997: 25).

Naipaul’s travelogues seem to make the usual singular authority of the solo traveller’s voice into a multi-vocal approach incorporating the voices of people he meets on his travels, such as Lecturer Imaduddin from Indonesia, editor Mr. Parvez from Iran, Prince Kassim from Uganda and ambassador Patrick Edwards from Trinidad, all of whose opinions on religion, democracy, colonisation, modernisation, development and ethnicity are recorded in his work. His travel writing takes on a new collaborative model in which the traveller and the locals work together to create a communal narrative. In the prologue to *Beyond Belief*, he also declares that “the writer is less present, less of an inquirer” (Naipaul 1998: xii) so that the locals can tell their stories, which thus constitute a uniform narrative subjectivity.

Bill Ashcroft has expressed doubts about Naipaul’s claims for travel writing: “collective subjectivity is something to which the travel writing can never bear witness” (Ashcroft 2009: 238). From the perspective of authorship, Naipaul’s travel writings cannot truly be accounted as collaborative work. In writing a collaborative travelogue, more than one individual shares the same conventionally unitary space of authorship; therefore, “the strategies

of accommodation, coordination and resistance that are required” (Stone & Thompson 2006: 25) for a collaborative travelogue are not and have never been the case for Naipaul’s travel writing. No matter how sincere Naipaul seems to be in writing a travelogue, he cannot deny that he is not only the manager of the narrative, but also the dominant voice of the narration. The multiple voices of the locals are used merely to support his point of view or prove his claims about certain places or certain issues he discusses in his travelogues.

Naipaul emphasises his claim to objective truth, claiming “I am not a simple man. I have an interesting mind, a very analytical mind...also very true... I can’t lie” (Jussawalla 1997: 138). When Adrian Rowe-Evans asked him in an interview, “then you believe there is an objective truth?” Naipaul replied firmly, “Yes. Provided that one takes everything into consideration, when one reacts to it” (Jussawalla 1997: 24–25). The following questions should be asked about Naipaul’s travel writing: does he follow his own criteria to be neutral and detached from his work? Does he take everything into consideration? Naipaul’s last travelogue, *The Masque of Africa: Glimpses of African Belief*, can serve as an example of whether his claim to be a simple “spectator” taking a neutral position is as true as he says it is.

The selected local “elites” present one-side stories

The last chapter of *The Masque of Africa*, “Private Monuments, Private Wasteland”, features narratives of six people from three different ethnic groups, who were carefully chosen to tell about their experiences in post-apartheid South Africa: “Colored” Fatima, “Black” Winnie Mandela and Zulu traditionalist Joseph, “White” Colin, Phillip and Rian Malan. These three ethnic groups were considered the main ones during the apartheid era, and their selection suggests that Naipaul does take various ethnic elements into consideration. He appears to offer equal “space” for these representatives to tell their stories of their experiences and those of the communities to which they belong.

Fatima, an English/Xhosa “coloured” person, experiences the challenges of being “without an identity”. Because of her light skin colour, she could not be included in the black community, and even though her grandparents straightened her wiry hair, she is not seen as white enough for the white community. She has tried many times to enquire into her identity, but none of her efforts was successful. The “spectator” Naipaul asserts that “the whole South African journey for her was a discovery of pain: from her coloured beginnings to the Islamic dream, to the Indians of Durban, to the blacks of the townships” (Naipaul 2010: 287).

Unlike Fatima's perceived lack of identity, the white community suffers from Negrophobia, to use Frantz Fanon's term, or the inverted black racism that Naipaul observes. The half-English/half-Afrikaner Colin claims he "live[s] with fear and the paralysis it brings. The suffocation is very present" (Naipaul 2010: 303). Even as Colin states his fear of inverted black racism, Phillip, a Jew, feels hopeless in a country like South Africa, explaining that for him "there is no hope, seeing the crime, corruption and general decay" (Naipaul 2010: 307). As an author who keenly feels the racial pains of his country, Rian Malan suggests that post-apartheid South Africa is "a place where whites have no guarantees" (Naipaul 2010: 322). In order to heal the longstanding trauma that minority ethnic groups, especially the black community, suffered under apartheid, both Colin and Phillip believe that inverted black racism is inevitable. Colin is disappointed to know that "being white is a debt you can't pay even if you fought in the struggle" (Naipaul 2010: 306), whereas Phillip considers leaving his hopeless country. Naipaul uses Colin's and Phillip's fear of black racism and lack of hope to support his previous conclusion that "to be white and sensitive was to wonder about one's place in the new scheme of things" (Naipaul 2010: 302). From the accounts of Colin, Phillip and Rian Malan, Naipaul obviously implies that there is no place for white people in the new scheme.

Representatives of the black community, both the Zulu traditionalist Joseph and the well-known "Mama" Winnie Mandela, tell of black South Africans facing "no possibility" of overcoming the challenges of apartheid, for as Joseph claims, "black people are still called kaffirs, and coloured people are nowhere" (Naipaul 2010: 313). There is no possibility for a bright future, because, in the eyes of Winnie Mandela, "the 'compromised' freedom that had come to South Africa... But those who had struggled and had given blood were left with nothing" (Naipaul 2010: 316). Even the much-praised Truth and Reconciliation Commission could not truly solve the problems of South Africa, because "it opened up wounds that could not heal" (Naipaul 2010: 317). Neither the traditionalist nor the politician could see a way forward for black people in post-apartheid South Africa. According to Naipaul's black informants, even as the white community fears black racism, the black community is still struggling just to survive.

The rootless pain of "coloured" Fatima, the fear of Colin, the hopelessness of Phillip and Rian Malan, and the longstanding struggles of the black community are all combined in Naipaul's narrative to express the central theme that South Africa has "no future". As the dominant narrative voice, Naipaul asserts that "after apartheid a resolution is not really possible" (Naipaul 2010: 325) in South Africa, an opinion that is consistent with his negative view of the whole continent.

Does Naipaul take everything into consideration in his travel writing? It appears that he does, since the locals to whom he speaks come from the three main ethnic groups of post-apartheid South Africa. However, almost all of Naipaul's informants are from the "elite": Fatima is an educated reporter; Winnie Mandela, a political leader; Rian Malan, a well-known writer; Joseph, a Zulu traditionalist; and Colin and Phillip, both professionals. Although they do tell stories of ethnic struggles and feelings of hopelessness about the future, their anxieties are those of the South African elite. To some extent, none of them can testify to or deny their experiences of fear and anxiety; therefore, Naipaul can be said to be telling the truth about them, but not necessarily the whole truth. Rather, he presents a selective truth told by a group of selected people from the "upper" reaches of society, and not the full view of South Africa or of Africa as a whole.

In his authorised biography, *The World Is What It Is* (2008), Patrick French points out that Naipaul carefully selected the people among whom he travelled and whom he interviewed. For instance, in his second journey to the Islamic world, his Argentinean lover Margaret "travelled loyally with him through Indonesia, being permitted to collect and file useful press cuttings" (French 2008: 466). In addition, local contacts and helpers were provided by Naipaul's publishers in London and New York. As far as French knows, "Ian Buruma recommended the journalist Ahmed Rashid in Pakistan, who produced a string of names... Bob Silvers found regional experts and their telephone numbers. Harry Evans sent a gigantic list of possibly interesting people. Rahul Singh located reporters and politicians in Jakarta" (French 2008: 466). Before Naipaul's arrival, the news and materials on which he could rely and the people among whom he would travel were already predetermined by his lover and his publishers. Moreover, "Once Vidia arrived in the relevant country, diplomats would arrange dinners and foreign correspondents would open their contacts books for him" (French 2008: 466). Normally, he would be introduced to the "elite group" who had received Western education; for example, during his stay in Pakistan's cultural capital, "Vidia had fixed to meet bureaucrats, military men, lawyers, politicians and editors. The evening at the diplomat's house was a typical occasion of its type, where the educated elite of a failing state discuss how best to spring the country from its current mess" (French 2008: 471). "A typical occasion of its type" may have revealed some truth about the places he visited, but would also provide him with one-sided accounts. Similarly, on his last journey to Africa, Patrick Edwards, Trinidad's ambassador to Uganda, not only pre-arranged meetings with prestigious Africans but also helped obtain a bodyguard for Naipaul. Although he most likely enjoyed the privilege of his

“elite” friends, this kind of privilege also blocks him from obtaining stories from other perspectives.

An examination of another travelogue, that of Chinese female author Bi Shumin, further supports the argument that Naipaul’s view of Africa in general and South Africa in particular is selective and one-sided. Six years after Naipaul’s last African journey, Bi Shumin and her son flew from Beijing to South Africa. She spent nearly half a month in South Africa before taking a two-week train journey across the continent. In contrast to Naipaul’s elite informants, Bi Shumin encountered a more diverse group of South Africans: the white tour guide, Erven; the wiry-haired black guide at the Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein; a middle-class family downtown; a black businesswoman and her daughter in Soweto; and a group of schoolchildren in the public park outside the Apartheid Museum and on Robben Island. Her account *30,000 Miles of Africa* (2016) presents the opposite view of South Africa from Naipaul’s portrait of a fearful and hopeless nation. At the Hector Pieterse memorial, for instance, the white tour guide Erven tells Bi Shumin, “We don’t want to forget history... We don’t want to live in hatred every day, we hope that when we walk out of the Apartheid Museum, everyone will start a new life” (Bi 2016: 20–21).¹ Compared to the fear and despair Colin and Phillip expressed to Naipaul, Erven’s words convey a message of reconciliation. For Bi Shumin, “Their attitude towards this issue [apartheid] is – this matter is over, no need to bear the hatred anymore. Let us all move forward together” (Bi 2016: 22). She is impressed by their resilience and praises “the courage and method they take to end suffering is such a great deed of combining bravery and benevolence” (Bi 2016: 22). In contrast to the complaints of the black community in Naipaul’s travelogue, the black female owner of the hotel Bi Shumin visited in Soweto firmly believes that Soweto is the safest place in South Africa. She and her 15-year-old daughter are confident about the future of South Africa and proud to be members of the Soweto community. Nonetheless, Bi does address South Africa’s problems and admits to worrying about her safety: “Standing on the side of the street in Soweto, a black settlement in Johannesburg, South Africa, I looked around in a panic, for fear that a gunman would jump out from nowhere” (Bi 2016: 90). She also expresses concern for the poor people who live in the Squatter camps. However, the bravery and determination of the people of Soweto to let go of past trauma and to maintain optimism about the future leads her to believe that Mandela’s tragic experiences on Robben Island will not happen to the younger generation.

¹ All translations are mine.

Naipaul, travelling among the “elite” group of South Africa, experiences only long-lasting hatred and despairing visions, whereas Bi Shumin meets people who are confident about their country’s future. Both authors’ opinions of South Africa, obtained from their informants, are part of the truth of the country. *The Masque of Africa* and *30,000 Miles of Africa* are not merely about the people, but also about the viewpoints of their authors. The difference between Naipaul and Bi is whether either is willing to correct their misconceptions about South Africa by visiting it for themselves.

The “prefixed” Western stance of Naipaul’s African writing

Bi Shumin’s first impressions of South Africa were of “Scrawny people, cities with iron roofs, the spread of AIDS and the high mortality rate of Ebola, bare-chested primitive tribesmen and coups” (Bi 2016: 9), obtained from documentaries, news channels, and pictures of WPP, before she arrived there. However, she never allowed those impressions to interfere with her search for the truth about South Africa, and she was willing to correct her misunderstandings with the help of local people and historical materials. On the other hand, Naipaul appears unwilling to modify his prejudices and fixed opinions.

Normally, a traveller’s view would change after he/she completes his/her journey. Bi Shumin admits in the prologue to *30,000 Miles of Africa* (2016) that “During my travel in Africa, some of my misunderstandings about this land were gradually clarified” (Bi 2016: 9). The scenery and the local people the traveller meets during his/her journey can influence his/her understanding or cognition of the specific places he/she visits; and yet, Naipaul’s negative view of South Africa and the continent as a whole appears to coincide with his previous opinion. In addition to the stories of “elite locals” blocking his view of others, his “prefixed” stereotype of the “Dark Continent” may also interfere with an overall picture of South Africa. Naipaul does understand, however, that pre-existing biases can affect a traveller’s perception and/or cognition of the place in which he/she travels. In *Among the Believers*, for example, he criticises his friend Shafi, reminding him that “because you travelled to America with a fixed idea, you might have missed some things” (Naipaul 1998: 262). Whether Naipaul himself was able to overcome his own biases about Africa, though, seems doubtful. Margaret Cezair Thompson once suggested “Naipaul had a set and perhaps limited idea of what he wanted to find in Africa” (Thompson 1990: 191–192). Thompson’s opinion of Naipaul can be supported by comparing his account of Hector Pieterse’s sister to that of Bi Shumin. Even before Pieterse’s sister, who witnessed and survived the tragedy of 1976, tells her story, Naipaul predicts that she is “ready to re-live the incidents of that day”

(Naipaul 2010: 320). Conversely, Bi Shumin's guide Erven says that he had overheard Pieterse's sister telling visitors, more than once, that "everything has passed" (Bi 2016: 21). Where Bi Shumin is impressed by the determination of the South African people to achieve reconciliation and to move on from their tragic past, Naipaul assumes that the victims of ethnic trauma remain trapped in their anger and hatred.

Whereas Bi Shumin depends on history books and "a lot of materials, with images, pictures, texts...in the museum" (Bi 2016: 63) to learn about the historical changes in South Africa, Naipaul relies heavily on the stories that his Western models have told. Naipaul admits "I knew and was glamourised by the idea of the metropolitan traveler, the man starting from Europe. It was the only kind of model I had" (Naipaul 1987: 153). Among the European travellers who have inspired Naipaul in *The Masque of Africa* (2010) are John Henning Speke (1827–1864), David Livingstone (1813–1873), Richard Burton (1821–1890), Henry Morton Stanley (1841–1904), Mungo Park (1771–1806), Mary Kingsley (1862–1900), Albert Schweitzer (1875–1965), and Paul Belloni Du Chailly (1831–1903). Under their guidance, Naipaul develops the prejudicial view that "Africans, like the French and the Chinese and the Vietnamese, ate everything, not only elephants and dogs and cats, but everything else with life" (Naipaul 2010: 254–255) and is not willing to correct such misunderstandings during his travels. Thus Naipaul's westernised representations are works more of ignorance than of experience.

In addition to the travel writers mentioned above, Joseph Conrad's "vision of the world's half-made societies" (Naipaul 1980: 216) has also profoundly influenced Naipaul's writing about Africa: the "earliest beginnings of the world" (Conrad 2007: 35) that Conrad describes in his *Heart of Darkness* can also be seen in Naipaul's African writings, for instance. Naipaul once told his American friend Paul Theroux that there would be no future for the "dark continent" and "this will go back to bush. The jungle will move in. Look, already it has started" (Theroux 1972: 104). His negative opinion of Africa did not change with his later visit, as he still saw it as a place with "no future" and "no possibility". Fadwa Abdel Rahman accuses Naipaul of ethnocentrism when he points out that "Naipaul's works, instead of challenging the stereotypical representation of non-Western cultures, become implicated in their maintenance" (Rahman 2006: 181). One may not doubt Naipaul's conscience towards the "third-world", but one cannot claim that he tells the purely objective truth of those places. As an "adopted son" of Western culture, Naipaul takes a Western stance and is not willing to change.

Conclusion

Naipaul emphasises that he is merely a “manager of narrative” while the people among whom he travels collaboratively write the communal travelogue. Some scholars support his view, and claim that, unlike “most other intellectuals, particularly those from ex-colonial countries, Naipaul is not a strident collector of injustices”; rather, “his principal concern is...with the truth” (O’Brien et al. 1986: 68). Nevertheless, he does not entirely tell the truth in his work, even admitting to French that he “couldn’t see” (French 2008: 478) the positive qualities of India that his first wife Patricia could. He also fails to see the optimistic side of post-apartheid South Africa of which Bi Shumin writes in her account: she meets people more confident about the future of South Africa. Both authors try, from their informants, to seek the truth. Their tests are about the people and their authors, conceptions and misconceptions. What blinds Naipaul to these positive things are first, his bias toward Africa, and second, his careful selection of “elite” informants that continuously reinforces that bias. He visits South Africa with the knowledge that “the people of South Africa had had a big struggle” (Naipaul 2010: 284), and his views of this “struggle” are reinforced by elite members of the white, coloured, and the black communities, so that he continues to believe that the Rainbow Nation and its people are still haunted by ethnic trauma.

Quan Wang

emilywang@usst.edu.cn / wangemily@pku.edu.cn
University of Shanghai for Science and Technology
CHINA

References

- Ashcroft, B. 2009. Afterword: Travel and Power. – J. Kuehn, P. Smethurst, eds., *Travel Writing, Form and Empire: The Poetics and Politics of Mobility*. New York: Routledge.
- Bi, Shumin. 2016. *30,000 Miles of Africa*. Chang Sha: Hunan Literature and Art Publishing House.
- Clifford, J. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Conrad, J. 1946. *A Personal Record*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons.
- Conrad, J. 2007. *Heart of Darkness*. London: Penguin Classics.
- French, P. 2008. *The World Is What It Is: The Authorized Biography of V.S. Naipaul*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Jussawalla, F., ed. 1997. *Conversations with Naipaul*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

- Malak, A. 2006. Naipaul's Travelogues and the 'Clash of Civilizations.' – *Cross Currents*, 56:2, 261–268.
- Meyers, J. 2011. Beyond Belief. – *The Antioch Review*, 69:2, 386–389.
- Naipaul, V. S. 1977. Images. – *Critical Perspectives on V.S. Naipaul*. Ed. Robert D. Hamner. Washington, D.C.: Three Continents Press, 26–29.
- Naipaul, V. S. 1980. *The Return of Eva Peron, with The Killings in Trinidad*. New York: Knopf.
- Naipaul, V. S. 1981. *Among the Believers: An Islamic Journey*. New York: Vintage.
- Naipaul, V. S. 1984. *In a Free State*. New York: Vintage.
- Naipaul, V. S. 1987. *The Enigma of Arrival*. New York: Knopf.
- Naipaul, V. S. 1998. *Beyond Belief: Islamic Excursions Among the Converted People*. New York: Vintage.
- Naipaul, V. S. 2002. Two Worlds. – *PMLA*. 117: 3, 479–486. <https://doi.org/10.1632/003081202X60422>
- Naipaul, V. S. 2010. *The Masque of Africa: Glimpses of African Belief*. London: Picador.
- O'Brien, C. C., Said, E., Lukacs, J. 1986. The Intellectual in the Post-Colonial World: Response and Discussion. – *Salmagundi*, 70–71, 65–81.
- Rahman, F. A. 2006. V. S. Naipaul: The White Traveler under the Dark Mask. – *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics. & Wanderlust: Travel Literature of Egypt and the Middle East*, 26, 168–190.
- Stone, M., Thompson, J., eds. 2006. *Literary Couplings: Writing Couples, Collaborators, and the Construction of Authorship*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Swedish Academy. 2001. V. S. Naipaul. – <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/2001/summary/> (09.12.2021).
- Theroux, P. 1972. *V. S. Naipaul: An Introduction to His Work*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- Thompson, M. C. 1990. *Colonial Anxieties: The Psychological Importance of Place in the Writing of V.S. Naipaul*. Dissertation, City University of New York.