



Hegemony, Migration and Dictatorship in V.S Naipaul's *A Bend in the River*

* Sanjida Kalam

Article Information

Article History:

Received: 18-03-2024

Accepted: 15-04-2024

Published: 20-04-2024

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license



This article is published with open access at <http://theachieversjournal.com>

Abstract

V.S Naipaul as a migrant and a living bystander of the transition of an era—colonial to postcolonial, becomes an eyewitness about the horrendous condition of migrants in Congo who went through massive discrimination because of the hegemonic attitude of the rulers. His novel A Bend in the River focuses on the catastrophic situation of the migrants of Congo and the commoners who become the subject of animosity and subjugation by new elites—the watchdogs of the previous masters in Congo. In this connection, this paper will examine how the new-puppet democrats dominated the lives of the Africans, particularly the mixed-raced African descendants who were subject to subjugation after their emancipation from a long slavery system. Thus, using the lenses of Gramsci's "hegemony", and "colonial hangover", this paper will investigate how Naipaul reveals the mechanism of previous British rulers and how they implement hegemony among the Africans, resulting in a shadow colonial system in which the Africans, as well as mixed-race Africans, are dominated.

Keywords: hegemony; colonial hangover; migration; discrimination; and slavery

The Achievers Journal: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Culture (2024), 10(1), 19-31

Copyright © 2024, Sanjida Kalam

* **Sanjida Kalam**, Lecturer, Department of English, Metropolitan University, Sylhet, Bangladesh, E-mail: imsanjidakalam@gmail.com, Mobile: +880-1617957966

Initially, hegemony refers to the dominance of one state within a confederation, which is “now generally understood to mean domination by consent”... [besides] hegemony is “the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interest is the interest of all” (Ashcroft et al. 134). As a result, hegemonic people will subconsciously believe that those who control them are doing a good deed for the benefit of everyone else. To implement this conception, the bourgeoisies start from the root. Their target is the juvenile cohort and they also manage to convince the lower class that they are the messiah and they will help them to get their freedom at any cost. However, the new colonizers, who are, in fact, their own people, use the historical shock and colonial hangover to manipulate their citizens. Accepting the culture and tradition of the previous masters becomes exotic for them. Gramsci believes that they are already being injected with the idea (qtd in Bates 351) that they are the slaves and uncivilized, and their previous rulers are their masters. Therefore, they mostly use this ideology rather than violence or force, and subconsciously invade their minds, and where they find any barrier they use their ultimate power to destroy it. While arguing about political education, as people should be conscious of their basic rights and their

collective power in a democratic state, Gramsci scrutinizes the idea of “hegemony” of the ruling class, in which circumstances the new bourgeois remain oblivious to their own people asserting, “[t]hey [become] critical for the ruling class only when they provoked a crisis of their authority” (Adamson 141). Therefore, the existing hegemony prevails and they continue to govern their people using the same strategy alike their colonizers. Even after gaining emancipation from their past masters, colonized people think that “there is no modernity without coloniality” (Mignolo 3). Araoye advocates this idea and asserts, “[a] configuration of power may emerge [after emancipation from the British] that advances the interest of the international community in controlling the internal political forces in the post-colonial state and dominating the immediate and larger environment” (12). Consequently, colonized people still believe that their former masters were predominant to them, and to be modern, they must follow their antecedents that led them to accept this ideology subconsciously. The idea of hegemony is closely related to colonial hangover. The colonial hangover is a period after a colony’s liberation in which the colonized people consider themselves inferior and their previous colonial masters as superior. This stage is the consequence of a long colonial period where the ruler

diffused the idea that “colonized people did not have any culture; they were not born with one. As if they just sprouted out of nowhere and there were the colonizer’s actors to be their saviors. Therefore, the colonizers had left the colonized people no choice but to embrace whatever was being offered” (Pal and Dangwal 147). Nevertheless, by using colonial hangover over the new elites of the free countries, the previous masters continued to rule them by aiming the fresh minds to spread the knowledge of being uncivilized and inferior whereas “[t]he colonizers had façade their own purpose behind all these and pretended to help the uncivilized people [by shaping the minds of the child]” (Pal and Dangwal 148). Now, when hegemony is on the table to talk about, there is another aspect that is related to it: dictatorship. When the colonial masters are gone, there comes the new one with the name of “democrats” who runs the country autonomously like a dictator prioritizing Westerns as better and by implementing their method of governing their colonies for their benefits. “Dictatorship [is a] form of government in which one person or a small group possesses absolute power without effective constitutional limitations” (Saxena 1). Martin Meredith gives a glimpse of dictators in his book *The Fate of Africa: A History of the Continent Since*

Independence and explains, “[d]ictators [were] who strutted the stage, tolerating neither opposition nor dissent, rigging elections, emasculating the courts, cowing the press, stifling the universities, demanding abject servility, and making themselves exceedingly rich” (374). Thus, dictators try to impose their own ideologies on others, and in the same way, the concept of hegemony spreads and exists in post-colonial societies through the newly elected dictators. Nonetheless, migration has always existed in the history of humankind for various reasons. Tataru points out, “[w]hen people cross the border of a country, a metamorphosis happens to their legal status. They suddenly gain a special label or status – of migrants” (11). Therefore, these migrants face difficulty in coping with the new culture and people. They are neither invited by the new people of their migrant land nor are they able to accept them and leave their preceding culture. Thus, this research focuses on how the idea of hegemony, migration, and dictatorship are portrayed in V.S. Naipaul’s novel *A Bend in the River*.

A Bend in the River when published in 1979, it was readily understood that the ‘Big Man’ was modeled in large part after Mobutu Sese Seko, then President of Zaire and now widely acknowledged as the archetypal African kleptocrat” (qtd in

Haslam 47). It captures the post-colonial status of Congo, the horrific injustice towards people, and the dirty politics of the new-colonial masters. As an Indian African citizen, Naipaul “dispenses with geographical identity and regard[s] himself as a former colonial who became a homeless cosmopolitan” (qtd in Johnson 209). In response to the title, Naipaul exposes the extreme sufferings of Africans even after getting independence and the oppression that spreads throughout the small villages in rural areas. Mahesh Hapugoda endorses this statement, asserting, “[t]he dream of independence, once the colonized nations’ imperial masters left them after centuries of exploitations, under new ingenious masters, has been overshadowed by complete anarchy triggered by economic instability” (43). Likewise, Haslam also advocates this situation describing that “[t]his incident neatly summarizes multiple incidents under Mobutu’s rule, including the seizure of over 2,000 foreign-owned enterprises in 1973 and a further expropriation of assets in 1974”(48). However, the story revolves around the village- Zaire where the protagonist Salim, an Indian African, comes to make a fortune. He, who represents migratory Africans during the colonial period, experiences racism because of not being entirely African and succumbs to the

trauma of having no particular identity. In this connection, Naipaul delves into the tenacious conundrums regarding the demolition of human rights within a sovereign state, parallel to the enduring obedience to the cultural legacy of former Western colonizers among those previously subjected to their dominion. Naipaul highlights the predicament of individuals of mixed-race African descent confronting a weighty sense of identity crisis. He aptly illustrates this theme through the character of Ali, who chooses to reject his given name in favor of “Metty,” a term proclaiming his biracial heritage. This narrative accentuates the ubiquitous ambiguity surrounding one’s sense of self, constraining individuals to embrace new identities in order to adapt in their native society. Naipaul also depicts Big Man as a dictator who establishes new laws against people like Salim to confiscate their properties and hand over them to the indigenous new elites. Under extreme pressure, Salim has been compelled to hand over his shop to an African who gradually treats him like a slave under the Big Man’s new laws and regulations. These ideologies are developed through a long process and the ongoing subjugations that the Big Man is continuing which is the result of the British colonizers’ subtle brainwashing through soft invasion. Ranbir and

Utkarsh's research justifies theses and shows, "[t]he colonizers had set up educational institutions and forcefully convinced the colonized people to send their children to the colonial school. They targeted the children mostly because the mind of a child was fragile and could be easily shaped. They wanted the colonial child to grow up with the ideologies of the colonizers and thus be their prisoner forever" (160). Hence, these children appear as the potential assets of the independent state of Congo, who inclines as the future new governor and maintain the ideology of British preeminence through culture, media and linguistic channels. Consequently, the Big Man exploits his authority to forge a new generation in Congo, utilizing posters, media platforms, and educational institutions, who will become forever slaves to him and his lineage. Additionally, Naipaul wants to state that Africans could not get out of their previous condition of the slavery system because their masters were their black fellows in post-colonial periods which framed a new colony where the new black masters ran and ruled.

In the novel *A Bend in the River*, Naipaul introduces the autonomic ruler Big Man, who represents King Mobutu, and the condition of the people of Congo in post-

colonial times. To maintain indigenous culture and restore their golden past, Mobutu tortured his people, subjecting them to corruption and injustice while living in severe poverty (King 118). By portraying Salim's character and giving him a psychological battle regarding his identity, Naipaul raises questions about the ongoing politics that bring injustice and immorality into society through violence and corruption, making the lives of ordinary people painful. He, on the other hand, begins his novel with a quote: "[t]he world is what it is; men who are nothing, who allow themselves to become nothing, have no place in it" (Naipaul, *A Bend in the River* 3). It depicts the idea that when people gain power, they tend to abuse it for their benefit, and those who do not use unethical means to gain power tend to live a horrible life like slaves to their masters, who are either colonial masters or autocratic governments claiming to be democrats. It also allows another aspect of colonial legacy and here 'the world' refers to British colonizers and their way of ruling their previous colonies through hegemony. Naipaul has aptly used this sentence by enforcing the perception that even though the colonies are independent, they will not be able to completely free from their predecessors. Those ancestors have created an intellectual barrier and left no room to avoid them. Thus, to seat in the

throne, one need to take the help from their antecedents. However, in the name of the development of the country, Big Man starts doing business and destroying the natural beauty of their country as the narrator describes, “[y]ou could imagine the land being made part of the present: that is how the Big Man put it later, offering us the vision of two-hundred-mile ‘industrial park’ along the river” (Naipaul, *A Bend in the River* 9). In his book, King addresses these concerns, stating, “[t]he modern state, like the technology and the Big Man’s ideas, his -ism, is imported, a mimicry” (120). As a result, Naipaul demonstrates how Big Man oppresses his people in the name of technological and revolutionary advancement. Big Man is unquestionably hegemonic, which explains why he continues to follow in the footsteps of his former colonial masters. Besides, the author creates an imaginary world that symbolizes Congo, and he has drawn his characters and story in such a way that gives the true experiences of people of that time. However, Naipaul has depicted Big Man’s inhumane acts, his oppression towards poor people, and the severe corruption of society in this novel. Haslam argues, “*A Bend in the River* offers us numerous vignettes of neopatrimonialism in practice, many of which have a clear historical basis in Mobutu’s rule of Zaire

as well as affinities with contemporaneous events in other African nations” (48). Therefore, this novel offers a journey to the post-independence era in Congo that signifies history in the form of fiction. Salim’s narration provides information about the colonial period and the Indians who came to reside in Africa, and his experience as an Indian descendant helps readers understand the history. He used to live on the coast, and there were slaves in his home. He asserts, “I remember hearing from my grandfather that he had once shipped a boatful of slaves as a cargo rubber...he just told it as something unusual that he had done-not shipping the slaves but describing them as rubber” (Naipaul, *A Bend in the River* 13). This scenario sketches the dehumanization of migrant people in Congo and the conditions of their lives. Salim and Indar’s conditions, as well as Big Man’s seizure of property, reveal the migrants’ actual condition after independence.

Naipaul describes the colonial period to compare these two eras, which are the same yet have different rulers. Big Man deceives those people who have dreams of freedom. “The Big Man has brought a kind of peace...demand for cultural authenticity with the taking over of property belonging to such powerless foreigners as Indians, Greeks and Syrians” (King 118). As a

result, the new ruler, whom they believe to be their own man, subjugates his people to uphold ethnicity which generates an identity crisis for migrants who are subject to tyranny even while living in their motherland. Their ancestors and masters torture and judge people. People go through corruption and injustice at the hands of society's elites during his rule. The new bourgeoisie and its authoritarian dictator silence the voice of the common people by committing injustice and oppression. He (Big Man) is an offspring of a pure African tribe and wants to make everything pure African, which is why he intends to wipe out all half-blood Africans from his homeland. "Mobutu, stayed in power for over two decades—but at the price of destabilizing and nearly destroying their nations, as the uncertainty created by neopatrimonialism prevents social institutions from functioning properly" (Haslam 49). Haslam's debates justify the dominance over Mobutu's people that he made their lives chaotic and hellish. Everywhere poverty and injustices make people fed up. Their notion of living in a free country where they would be granted basic human rights was a mirage. When Salim learns about a local war rebellion in the story, he feels stuck because he is not entirely African. He feels like an outsider and his sense of belonging gives him shock as migrants like him

"struggle for their independence and individuality...[and] their lives are partly determined by their circumstances and the society in which they exist" (King 119). However, when people began to migrate to the city during times of war, Big Man, to prevent war, sent an army, and many innocent people got murdered in the process. Haslam further makes this statement sheer clear by providing data that shows, "Mobutu did not shy away from publically executing, humiliating, or banishing those who opposed him, he preferred to manipulate rather than simply punish potential adversaries" (48). Furthermore, Metty relates one incident that he witnessed while returning to the shop and illustrates, "[t]he first thing they did at the barracks was to shoot Colonel Yenyi. It was what the President asked them to do. He doesn't play, this new President...They didn't let him talk. They shot him in front of the woman and everyone" (Naipaul, *A Bend in the River* 86). This dossier highlights the fact that throughout the colonial time, the masters were all in all, and after independence, people have become victims to their men who have a colonial hangover in them.

The novel demonstrates that in Zaire, people in authority can do anything

because they control the laws, and they abuse those powers against the masses. Bourgeoisies enjoy such authority to get everything they need, whilst commoners stay starving and suffer the harshest treatment while living on their land. The President's command is sufficient, demonstrating how dictatorship prevails in Congo. Naipaul criticizes Mobutu's autonomy and comments, "he has occupied every ideological position and the basis of his kingship cannot be questioned. He rules; he is grand; and, like a medieval king, he is at once loved and feared. He controls the armed forces; they are his creation" (*The Writer and the World: Essays* 256). Mobutu grabbed control of the entire Congo, and he was a fraud who disguised himself as a humanitarian. Being a watchdog for previous colonial masters, he proclaims all around that he would bring back Africa's golden age. As Haslam presents, the same situation was unfolding in Africa's other continents, such as Sierra Leone, where President Stevens seized control of the diamond business, leaving the country destitute (qtd in 48). As a result, Big Man wants to build buildings like the Europeans and develops a strategy to impose their structure by depleting their natural resources which advocates his hegemonic attitude towards foreign masters. Nonetheless, people feel helpless

and rebel against him, resulting in the deaths of a large number of commoners. Using local elites, Big Man begins to seize control of people's property. He creates a new law that takes away the belongings of unpurified Africans and turns them into slaves of Zaire's new aristocracy. During the colonial period, everyone was a slave of the colonial masters, but in postcolonial Africa, poor people have become victims and chattels of their new black monster-like masters who absorbed their people's blood. In the novel, a local African bourgeois grabs Salim's business and then Salim starts working as a slave for that elite. Suddenly a man comes to him and lets him know about new laws and says, "[y]ou will suffer in no way. Adequate compensation will be paid...You will continue as manager...the President insists on that" (Naipaul, *A Bend in the River* 301). That was the scenario in Congo at the time, and men were looting the people. The notion of independence, in which they would love to work and have equal rights, was a delusion. Bruce King states which clinches Naipaul's portrayal of those situations, saying, "Africans are given businesses they do not own and the owners become managers and everyone becomes frantic to amass wealth before the coming chaos as the country slides quickly towards another rebellion" (129). The owner became a slave just for not having

power and for being helpless against such a dictator. Africa's post-independence status becomes worse than the colonial period, as implied by Naipaul's character Father Huisman, who believes that the colonial period was better than the present. It can be said that it is Naipaul's wrath towards the new political leaders who used common men to obtain independence and then used that power against innocent men to keep their positions. People became disappointed with the constant political turmoil, and their wrath resulted in the fight against Mobutu, depicted in this story, in which residents of a small rural community come together to speak out against a terrible dictatorship. The situation was the same in most of the countries of African continents and Meredith debates, "[u]ltimately, many Big Men were able to outmaneuver the opposition and remain in power; a few succumbed to the tide of protest" (384). However, while Salim is contemplating his departure to the city, he provides an illustration of common men's rabidity, saying, "the Africans had called up this war; they would suffer dreadfully more than anybody else; but they could cope...even if terrible things happened to them, they would die with the comfort" (Naipaul, *A Bend in the River* 80). From the dreadful conditions and the psychological situation of these people,

Naipaul elicits a voice for the independence of those innocent individuals who were ruthlessly deceived by their own community's inhabitants, in contrast to the post-modern era—where people have all of the basic human rights and freedoms of speech.

Mobutu could rule for such a long time because of his international allies. They helped Mobutu to remain in power in exchange they wanted their share of resources from Africa and wanted to do business there. By adopting the voice of Salim, Naipaul skillfully gives hints about the involvement of the foreign allies. Big Man's reaction to the rebellion results in gunfire everywhere by his white armies which signifies his connection with foreign confederates. Salim describes, "the sound of a steady grinding machine made me think of guns; then I thought of the crazed and half-starved village people against whom the guns were going to be used" (Naipaul, *A Bend in the River* 78). Big Man used those armies and intimidated his citizens not only to stop the war but also to show his power and his connection with international allies. He employed secret police to hunt down opponents, licensing them to detain, torture, and murder at will, if necessary (Meredith 374). However, this indirectly indicates his weakness that Big

Man is nothing without their help and he considers himself inferior to those Westerns. So, Africa's long history of slavery has a profound impact on African psychology; no matter what they say, they can never forget their past, and those traumas have paralyzed their intellectual faculties, making them believe that they are inferior to those Westerns.

Naipaul provides evidence of violence and moral ambiguity that portrays how is the condition of Congo immediately after the independence. Big Man uses forces to vanquish common people and frighten them. "Young men were being kidnapped here and there by the police and the army; it was the new government tactic" (Naipaul, *A Bend in the River* 261). He knows that to stop rebellion he has to threaten them and if some people lose their lives, war will automatically stop and everything will be under control. Mobutu's evil laws made Congo a place of destruction and a slaughterhouse. He was a cruel dictator who killed so many innocent people including Arabs, Indians, and tall warriors so that they could not go against him (King 119). He knew that if all went against him, he would not be able to rule the country; consequently, he used local elites and his armed force to stop those warriors. He was hungry for power and

attention and even at a point; his connection with the West became weak because of his attitude. He wanted to be the biggest for which everyone would bow down. He controlled everything and he was everywhere. Zabeth gives an idea about Big Man and the ongoing political condition there and says to Salim, "he will allow nobody to get big in this place. It is only his photo everywhere. And look at the papers. His photo is bigger than everybody else's every day" (Naipaul, *A Bend in the River* 262). His willingness to take over all the power and all the attention is portrayed through his actions. Meredith vindicates the same issues that were ongoing in every African country and argues, "[t]heir faces appeared on currency notes; their photographs graced offices and shops. They named highways, football stadiums, and hospitals after themselves" (374). However, his dress-up and dressing sense is also evidence of his tyranny. Bruce King has analyzed his dresses and has given a precise description asserting, "[a]lways, in public, he wears a leopard-skin cap and carries an elaborately carved stick. These—the cap and the stick—are the emblems of his African chieftaincy. Only the chief can kill the leopard. The stick is carved with symbolic figures: two birds, what looks like a snake, a human figure with a distended body" (255). Here, his leopard-skinned cap symbolizes his

power over everyone, and that he can kill anyone according to his wish if they go against him. Meanwhile, his stick depicts his poisonous attitude towards his people who have the power to destroy everyone. It may also represent him as a destructive force that has annihilated a country's freedom and crippled its people beyond recovery. His clothes also represent his violence to remain in power and the miserable condition of the people living in his territory. Mobutu's cruelty gives hints about the immoral acts that were practiced then. Nevertheless, Naipaul has sketched in his novel the postcolonial condition of Congo as well as how their previous colonial masters continued to rule their country even after the end of the colonization period.

British had a great bond with the new rulers of African countries and they influenced them with the idea that they would give the power to control their respective countries and to have a lavish life. African elites thought those colonial masters knew all about power and politics and they would help them to remain in power. In the novel, Salim gives a clear description of Europeans who sustain their rule over African countries. "Europe no longer ruled. But it still fed us in a hundred ways with its language and sent us its

increasingly wonderful goods, things which, in the bush of Africa, added year by year to our idea of who we were" (Naipaul, *A Bend in the River* 269). This idea of being inferior and making people civilized with the help of their previous colonial masters brought all the problems back then. However, from this attitude that "the colonial city, more extensive than ours" (Naipaul, *A Bend in the River* 293), Big Man continues to torture his people brutally. He has used his manpower to his best to stop the protests against them. People become sick of his injustices and corruption. As the battle continues, people in authority captured many innocent individuals and demanded a high amount of money to leave them. Big Man gives his local elites authority, and they begin to abuse that power on innocent people. When the police caught Salim for no apparent cause, he discovers that the jail has become full of innocent people and discovers kidnapping operations in the community to prevent protesters. Salim comes to know that the commissioner is Ferdinand and from his speech, the readers can get an explicit idea about the dirty politics of Big Man. He warns Salim to leave this place saying, "[y]ou must go right away. There's nothing here for you. They've taken you into jail now. They haven't done that before. Do you know what it means? It means they will take you

again” (Naipaul, *A Bend in the River* 319). Ferdinand’s tone and his concerns for Salim reflect the dire situation in Congo. His comment implies that when the government targets someone, he will be trapped again wherever he is. Big Man, however, is a symbol of Mobutu, who made Africans’ lives terrible and oppressed them in inconceivable ways. The effects of colonial hegemony are enormous and apparent in the lives of African leaders who, like their masters, use their power against their men for their benefit. They desire to make their country developed and civilized like Europe without perceiving that they are mimicking their master, which is nothing but their colonial hangover. Therefore, those new elites and politicians took Europeans as their role models and thought of them as superior which brought the entire predicament, and consequently, people had to face injustices in their native land.

In conclusion, the postcolonial politics of Africa in Naipaul’s *A Bend in the River* manifest the utmost corruption of the politicians, poor condition of the common people, and hegemonic attitude of them. It results in the destruction of freedom and poverty in African countries like Congo by newly colonial masters who disguised themselves as democrats. This work has

sensibly depicted the challenges of having a colonial hangover and the chain reaction of gaining freedom that was controlled by corrupt politicians, which was also relevant to the situation of mixed-race’ Africans in Congo. Therefore, the novelist has precisely exhibited Congo’s dreadful situation after getting independence and the consequences of having new masters who oppressed them along with so many scars from their ‘colonial time’, which remained the same.

Works Cited

- Adamson, L., Walter. *Hegemony & Revolution: A Study of Antonio Gramsci’s Political and Cultural Theory*. University of California Press, 1980.
- Ashcroft, Bill et al. *Postcolonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. 3rd ed., Routledge, 2013.
- Araoye, Ademola. “Hegemonic Agendas, Intermesticity and Conflicts in the Post-Colonial State.” *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, vol. 12, no.1, 2012, pp. 9-32.
- Bates, R., Thomas. “Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony.” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol.36, no.2, 1995, pp. 351-366.
- Hapsari, Lia Indri and Titien Diah Soelistyarini. “Negotiating Biracial Identity as the Effect of Double Consciousness in Durrow’s *the Girl Who Fell from the*

- Sky." *Allusion* , vol.4, no.2, 2015, pp. 47-52.
- Haslam, J., Thomas. "The 'Big Man' in V.S. Naipaul's *A Bend in the River*." *The Explicator* , vol.75, no.1 ,2017, pp. 47-51.
- Johnson, L., Erica. "Provincializing Europe: The Postcolonial Urban Uncanny in V.S. Naipaul's *A Bend in the River*." *Journal of Narrative Theory* , vol.40, no.2, 2010, pp. 209-230.
- King, Bruce. *V.S. Naipaul*.2nd ed., Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Mahesh, Hapugoda. "Naipaul Postcolonial Identity Politics and Totalitarianism: Zizekian Re-reading of the Novel, *A Bend in the River*." *KJMS* , vol.1, no.2, 2018, pp. 42-55.
- Meredith, Martin. *The Fate of Africa: A History of the Continent Since Independence*. Simon & Schuster, 2011.
- Naipaul, V. S. *The Writer and the World: Essays*. Vintage Books, 2002.
- . *A Bend in the River* London: Picador, 1979.
- Mignolo, Walter D. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity*. Duke University Press, 2011.
- Pal, Ghanshyam and Surekha Dangwal. "The Colonial Hangover in V.S. Naipaul's *A Bend in the River*" *International Journal of English Language & Literature* , vol.4, no.8, 2016, pp. 146-150.
- Ranbir, Priyansh and Uthkarsh Vivaan. "Hangover of Colonial Master's in V.S. Naipaul's *A Bend in the River*." *Global Journal of Arts and Social Science*, vol.4, no.3, 2016, pp.159-163.
- Saxena, Shalini. *Dictatorship, Fascism, and Totalitarianism*. Britannica Educational Publishing, 2015.
- Tataru, G.F. "Migration –an Overview on Terminology, Causes and Effects." *Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty: Law*, vol.7,no.2, 2019,pp.10-29.