India: Naipaul’s Area of Darkness

India seems to be Naipaul’s area of darkness. It is, as he himself points out, “a difficult country” for him. It isn’t his home and cannot be his home. Yet he cannot travel in India only for the sights. “I am,” as he says, “at once too close and too far.” His being too close makes him see only the warts and moles of the country and his being too far results in a deficient understanding of her essentials. It is ironical that Naipaul finds a lack in Gandhi’s autobiography as it does not emphasize the external environment of people and places but because it is largely an inward journey dealing essentially with his internal struggles. However, Naipaul forgets that all true autobiographies are essentially inward journeys. Ironically he realizes this in his own relationship with India when he says, “An inquiry about India...has to be an inquiry about the civilization itself, as it is. And though in India I am a stranger, the starting point of this inquiry - more than might appear in these pages – has been myself.”

Having realized that an inquiry about India must be for him as for Gandhi an inquiry from within, Naipaul fails, at least in An Area of Darkness and India: A Wounded Civilization to make that inward journey. He gets enmeshed in the externals, which he describes brilliantly and incisively, but they shed no light, lead to no exploration within to allow him to come to terms with his understanding or relationship with India. Nor do there seem any inner resources to aid him in his comprehensions of the externals as he himself helplessly recognizes. Hence, the constant lack of serenity, acceptance and harmony or a reaching after a higher truth.

India, which I visited for the first time in 1962, turned out to be a very strange land. A hundred years had been enough to wash me clean of many Indian religious attitudes; and without these attitudes the distress of India was – and is – almost insupportable. It has taken me much time to come to terms with the strangeness of India, to define what separates me from the country; and to understand how far the ‘Indian, attitudes of someone like myself, a member of a small and remote community in the New World, have diverged from the attitudes of people to whom India is still whole.

In India: A Million Mutinies Nsw, Naipaul seems to largely come to terms with the “strangeness of India” but only by becoming more distant and remote as he becomes the intellectual and interested listener to the lives and experience of people although now more emotionally distanced and fortified. Naipaul’s coming to terms with India in A Million Mutinies Now does not mean that he understands it or develops an empathy with it or even sympathy for it. It is more as if he has moved on with his life after the break up of an intense love affair in which the wounds have gradually grown scabs with the passage of time but which can bleed the instant they are even a little scratched.

The question arises, what are the issues that most trouble Naipaul? As they emerge in the Area of Darkness and A Wounded Civilization, they reveal Naipaul’s stereotypical and diasporic vision of India. Nostalgia, pride, anger and facile although seemingly rational solutions for India’s problems are some of the characteristics that most diasporic writers display towards India. They are both too near and too far. Naipaul, too, He is pained by the obvious corruption, societal inequities and inequalities, the horrors of untouchability, the rigidities of the caste system, the filth and squalor and the utter disregard of any civic norms pointing to the complete self-centeredness and self absorption of people. His search for causes leaves him bewildered and groping. He finds the values of ancient India inadequate and uselessly outdated in dealing with the problems of the new industrialized and technological world but does not see any views values of civic society replacing them; hence the anarchy and chaos.

Even as Naipaul’s ship lands in Bombay on his first visit to India, he finds himself engulfed by chaos, self stimulated din, sudden feeling of insecurity, inequalities and fear. Men are diminished and deformed and there is an inverted pride in poverty so that a person’s very gaze seems to violate the poor. Jostling side by side with the horrors of the new India, Naipaul finds the colonial India too flourishing in the new aristocracy of the ‘boxwallas’ or the executives of British and other foreign firms, the Indian Civil Service and the Armed Forces. Their members belong to a privileged class of Indians who are two or three generations removed from the true India. They have been to an Indian or English public school and then to one of the two well known English Universities. They imitate a foreign accent, consider themselves ‘broadminded’, a happy blend of East and West, have Westernized nick name and freed of the caste rules of old India follow those of the new India equally faithfully. Yet when they come into contact with Europeans they feel compelled to assert a pride in their heritage that manifests itself in the Indian arts and crafts to be found on display in their living rooms.
While Naipaul’s portrayal of the mimicry of westernized by this ‘brown colonial’ of society is brilliantly accurately he stumbles in his diagnosis of the hollowness of their behavior by attributing it to a dichotomy between their outer and inner live: “...the society,” he says, “only pretends to be colonial, and for this reason its absurdities are at once apparent. Its mimicry is both less and more than a colonial mimicry. It is the special mimicry of an old country that has been without a native aristocracy for a thousand years and has learned to make room for outsiders, but only at the top. The mimicry changes, the inner world remains constant: this is the secret of survival”9. As evidence he juxtaposes the belief in astrology and acceptance of arranged marriages as symptoms of the inner world remaining constant while the outer changes. Here he equates the inner with the ‘traditional’ and the ‘traditional’ with the chronologically old thus misreading both what actually constitutes inner life and over simplifying concepts of tradition and modernity.

This upper segment of India lives in a make believe world that denies starvation, the beggars and the utter lack of sanitation. He thinks their attitudes go back to the roots of Indian civilization that are static and decayed. According to Naipaul, Gandhi was so conscious of the squalor and filth of India because he was a true colonial, aware of the horrors of subjugation and degradation of the colonial rule, his ideas having been formed first in England and then in South Africa. Naipaul is obsessed and revolted by the excrement and the defilement of human dignity of people forced to defecate in public that he sees all around him and applauds Gandhi’s emphasis on sanitation, cleaning of lavatories and eradication of untouchability. Gandhi also recognized the debilitating divorce that had taken place between physical labor and intellectual occupation in colonial India and that is why insisted on the value of working with one’s own hands. Naipaul subconsciously identifies his own responses to India with Gandhi’s or seeks to rationalize them through it. However, he simultaneously sees Gandhi as a failure revealing his own ambivalence towards both India and Gandhi. India, according to him has deified Gandhi thus rendering him irrelevant. What was worse was his soulless, absurd and meaningless caricature in the person of Vinoba Bhave with his impractical and useless moral stances10.

Naipaul attributes both Gandhi’s ultimate failure and the soulless caricatures that he spawned to Hinduism. Indian nationalism itself, according to Naipaul, was born out of Hindu revivalism encouraged by Gandhi himself perhaps as political expediency. Tolstoy, who inspired Gandhi, too found his Hinduism reprehensible. However, according to Naipaul Gandhi’s taking recourse to Hinduism to mobilize support and catapult it into a national movement also made his own failure a certainty because while he succeeded politically for a time, he was transformed by the people into a Mahatma who could then be systematically ignored while being worshipped. He became only seminar material or a name to be invoked for impertinent efforts like prohibition11. This is what exasperates Naipaul. His perception is that the old India consistently subverts the new rendering all efforts to develop India into a modern industrialized society useless. Gandhi tried to shake up the social order but it rose up against him and as a reaction became even more static. Gandhi’s spirituality finally only succeeded in strengthening the view that an individual had a private contract with God by which his own salvation mattered while society could be neglected12.

Naipaul’s lack of sympathy and may one say, even objectivity becomes manifest as we read a perhaps more thoughtful analysis of Gandhi in Octavio Paz’s In Light of India. Also attributing Indian nationalism to religion, Paz comments that the Gandhian religion was not that of the orthodoxy; it was a reform version acceptable to the masses because they approved of his personal conduct. Gandhi achieved what the moderates could not: establishing deep roots among the people, and at the same time demonstrating to the extremists that tolerance and nonviolence were not incompatible with perseverance and effectiveness. To the masses, Gandhi embodied a figure venerated by all Hindus: the ascetic who renounces the world; for political and practical minds, he was a man of action, capable of speaking both to the masses and with the authorities, skilled in negotiation and incorruptible in his principles.”13

Gandhi was both a traditional Hindu and a westerner: “His political actions were not founded on any Hindu tradition, but rather on the pacifism of Leo Tolstoy; his ideas of social reform are closer to Kropotkin than to the laws of Manu: behind is idea of passive resistance lies Thoreau’s ‘civil disobedience.’ His family was Vishnuite, and he himself was an ardent devotee of Vishnu, yet he read the Bhagavad –Gita in the English translation by sir Edwin Arnold. In Gandhi, the Jain tradition of nonviolence (ahimsa) was fused with the activism of Tolstoy or a Thoreau. (In 1847, Thoreau went to jail rather than pay the taxes for the American war against Mexico.) Nonviolence in India has a double
Naipaul, brilliant in his observation and articulation, fails in his analysis. This comes through in his understanding or lack of it in Gita’s idea of “selfless action”. Selfless action for Naipaul is no different than seeking self- fulfillment and hence opposite of the idea of service. This certainly is a convoluted argument and through it Naipaul tries to explain not only Gandhi’s failure but also the distinction between class and caste. Caste, according to Naipaul, imprisons man in its function that is a man is born to perform the function of his caste and hence must do it to the best of his ability as his dharma or duty without seeking any reward for performing it well. But this is at variance with human nature that seeks material incentives and since, caste as function, leaves no room them, now work is done and only banal moralities are propounded. This is a strange way of turning the ideal of ‘nishkama karma’ or performing to the best of one’s capacity without the desire for material gain into an explanation for irresponsible non action.

Naipaul goes on to conclude from the Hindu concepts of karma and moksha that Hinduism has no concept of service to humanity. More follows, Naipaul explains corruption in business and other walks of life through another religious concept that of maya or the idea of the external and material world of being an illusion. Again, Naipaul’s lack of understanding is evident. While the ‘advait’ concept that Naipaul is deriving his ideas from, has undoubtedly left a powerful and indelible stamp on the Indian psyche, it is not the only one and neither is it unquestioningly accepted by all. Not only does Naipaul seem to have done no serious reading of the actual texts from which these popular ideas are derived, he is also ignorant of other equally popular ideas derived from the same Hindu tradition. Naipaul, who consistently complains of the Indian lack of historic sense, seems to be amazingly obtuse himself on the chronological and intellectual evolution of Hindu philosophical tradition. Even at the popular level, Hinduism does not advocate a turning away from material possessions. India is the only country in the world where prosperity is actually worshipped as the goddess Lakshmi or Sri. Similar confusions are evident in Naipaul’s comments on Kama Sutra's justification of adultery or the duties of a cultured man that it enumerates. Naipaul damns India in every which way. It is made to pay both for its liberal thought as well as for the distortions in its philosophy over a passage of time leading to extreme and rigid orthodoxy.

Again, according to Naipaul, India is inefficient because Hinduism encourages hollow symbolism without any concrete action. This, he thinks, accounts for the inefficacy of programmes like malaria or small pox eradication or even for the lack of civic sense like disregarding traffic lights and others. Of course, in this analysis Naipaul forgets all the invasions suffered by India, the five hundred years of Muslim rule and the later colonization by the British. Naipaul’s utter lack of sensitivity is amazing and dangerous in person with such a powerful intellect, brilliant analytic skills and persuasive prose.

Naipaul is constantly quarrelling, wrestling with old India and condemning the new India. However, old India obviously has a great hold on him and exercises an almost fatal attraction that he cannot free himself of, try, as he will. The more he attempts to resist its fascination and fails, the greater is his anger, which is really anger with himself. It makes him lash out with harsh condemnation and constant quarrel and color every perception and experience. A trip to Vijaynagar, a Hindu kingdom established in the fourteenth century shows him not a belated attempt to preserve Hindu India but a symbol of the slide into degenerate Hinduism with its barbaric slave markets, temple prostitutes, human sacrifices and glorification of suttee. All around him Naipaul’s psyche and consciousness perceive nothing but ruin piled on piled especially in the North. India in a thousand years of its history has protected itself and survived, says Naipaul, because she has cowardly retreated again and again before conquerors rather than having the courage to confront and overpower them becoming repeatedly more anarchic and each time intellectually smaller and more vulnerable.

The new India has nothing to fall back upon, according to Naipaul, because of its archaic ideas that can provide no lasting institutions or inspiration. The British gave India some institutions like its political and legal system but borrowed institutions can only lead to hollow imitations as they do not emerge from within. They do not succeed because they have no roots. Hence they lead to turbulence. No retreat is possible in the new India because there is no foreign power to retreat from. That is a circular argument presented by Naipaul because in any case he does not find anything healthy and vitally nourishing in India’s heritage anyway. He can hardly find a good word to say of it. For example, he even finds R.K. narayan’s assertion that India is eternal intolerable. This, he feels, is only a superficial reading and an excuse for a psychological retreat from one’s duties, an abdication of
one’s responsibilities towards India; the argument being that if India is eternal then the individual does
not need to make any effort to preserve it. He can be indifferent to its fate. This larger indifference
creates, for Naipaul, a psyche that leads to indifference in smaller spheres for example towards the
fate of a friend or neighbor.

This indifference and abdication of responsibility, according to Naipaul, is encouraged by the
doctrine of Karma. For him, it creates a Hindu calm in which everything in creation is seen as just
and balanced. Since we pay in this life for the actions of past lives, the world becomes nothing more
than a religious theatre. It leads to non-action even in the face of subjection because people live
within and find contentment in so little. Also, it creates a mind-set that makes change impossible to
accept. Again, Naipaul exhibits no real understanding of Karma. He is picking up popular notions and
then using them to decry India, its past and Hinduism with a vengeance.

What annoys and what disappoints are not Naipaul’s pronouncements but the confidence, assurance
and patronizingly superciliousness attitude with which he decries all that he sees in India and the
certainty with which he presents his perceptions as the truth. There is a degree of intellectual
arrogance which does not admit a pause, a suspicion that there might be something beneath what
meets the eye and require further study and investigation or that there might be room for difference
of opinion. With utter lack of understanding of Hindu philosophy or even defining for himself what he
means by it considering its vastness and complexity, he pronounces again and again on it with utterly
sweeping statements as if he was the oracle of truth and wisdom. It might be instructive to take a few
random samples:

In the high Hindu ideal of self-realization – which could take so many forms, even that of worldly
corruption – there was no idea of a contract between man and man. It was Hinduism’s great flaw,
after a thousand years of defeat and withdrawal.

Or

India needed a new code, but it had none. There were no longer any rules; and India – so often
invaded, conquered, plundered with a quarter of its population always in the serfdom of untouchability,
people without a country, only with masters – was discovering again that it was cruel and horribly
violent.

Or

Hinduism hasn’t been good enough for the millions. It has exposed us to a
thousand years of defeat and stagnation. It has given men no idea of a contract with other men, no
idea of the state. It has endowed one quarter of the population and always left the whole fragmented
and vulnerable. Its philosophy of withdrawal has diminished men intellectually and not equipped them
to respond to challenge; it has stifled growth. So that again and again in India history has repeated
itself, vulnerability, defeat, withdrawal.

Naipaul does not seem to realize that there is no use in constantly pointing out the excesses
committed in the name of religion because similar crimes have been committed in the name of liberty
and social order. The root of evil does not lie in true religion but what Sri Aurobindo would call, its
infrarational parts, not in spiritual faith and aspiration, but our ignorant human confusion of religion
with a particular creed, sect, cult, religious society or church. There are two aspects of religion—
religion and religionism. True religion or spirituality lives in the spirit. It goes beyond the intellect
beyond the ethical, aesthetic and practical being of man while infusing all of these aspects with a
spiritual power. Religionism, on the other hand, lays exclusive stress on intellectual dogmas, forms
and ceremonies, fixed and rigid moral codes, or religio-political or religio-social systems. It is the
spiritual essence of religion that has to be realized. Also, spirituality is not something remote, hostile
or indifferent to worldly life. True spirituality seeks the perfection of each principle of our nature—
physical, psychological, emotional and mental—in its own sphere and if it is to obey a higher power, it
must be because that power gives it greater and fuller satisfaction in its own field. If this perfectibility
is denied to each human part or principle or it is denied that the aim of religion is to give aspiration for
such a perfection, both the world and spirituality itself will become sterile, a vale of sorrow and
suffering.

Naipaul’s reviling of India’s past because he does not look deeply enough into it, necessarily makes
him revile each individual strand of it with elemental passion and attribute all ills of the present to it. For example, he talks of the Naxalite movement and Kali worship in the same breath only to comment "old India had once again depressed men into barbarism." Ironically and with a strange blindness, the author of these large generalizations decries the people of India for their ignorance about their country, blames them for not being analytic and objective and hence lacking in a true comprehension of on their lack of habit of analysis of history and social inquiry as it is "too far outside the Indian tradition."27 In the face of such pronouncements, it is futile to even quarrel with a man who can so blithely ignore the vast intellectual and philosophical tradition of India. He can naturally only conclude that the primacy given to inner life in India is because of her "intellectual second rateness" revealing as much of himself as of India28.

Again, the whole concept of dharma is turned into its opposite by Naipaul when he says, "dharma, as expressed in the Indian social system, is so shot through with injustice and cruelty, based on such a limited view of man. It can accommodate bonded labor as, once, it accommodated widow-burning. Dharma can resist the idea of equity."29 Examples can be multiplied.

Paz, looking more thoughtfully at the ancient heritage of India and comparing it to that of Mexico finds "a world of an ordinary sacredness and of a daily poetry. The love of objects that function as talismans, utensils, or toys is central to the Indian sensibility." These are not hollow symbols that Naipaul finds but embodiments of great intellectual activity. As Paz points out there is on the one hand "an affinity for nomenclatures, numbers, categories, and lists, whether of shapes, tastes or sensations, philosophical ideas or grammatical figures. Logic, grammar, aesthetics, and erotics are alike in this predilection for catalogs and classifications. The treatises on the erotic are dictionaries of positions, caresses, and sensation." At the same time, "there is a passion for unity. It is not by chance that India discovered the zero; not that it was seen simultaneously as a mathematical concept and a metaphysical reality. For Shankara, one is the limit of the thinkable; for Nagarjuna, emptiness is. Between the one and the zero—incessant combat and instantaneous embrace—the history of Indian thought unfolds."30

As Paz goes on to savor the beauties of the rig Vedic "Hymn of Creation" and revel in its aesthetic, intellectual splendor, he is at all times deeply aware of the great antiquity and power of the Indian tradition31.

Where Naipaul finds intellectual sterility, Paz realizes "the duration of Hinduism as well as that of the civilization that created it, would have been impossible without the criticism and exegesis of the six major philosophical tendencies, fortified and revitalized Indian religion, which otherwise would have degenerated into an unformed mass of beliefs, rites and myths. Against the threat of conglomeration, which ends in chaos or petrification, India raised a barrier of criticism, exegesis, logical distinctions, and negation. But Hindu thought came to a halt, the victim of a kind of paralysis, toward the end of the thirteenth century, the period when the last of the great temples were erected."32 He then goes on to analyze, the impact of the extinction of Buddhism and the victory of Islam in Delhi and other places. Like Naipaul, he accepts, that "faced with Islam, Hinduism withdrew into itself.

It lacked the necessary components to wage a religious battle: a church and a state. Moreover, it had withered spiritually, turning into a series of rites and superstitions. At the end of internal criticism and the negations that had made Brahmanism a creative religion, the great lethargy of Hindu civilization began, a lethargy that persists today."33

What Naipaul fails to realize and what Paz is acutely aware of is that the past always mingle into the present consciously or unconsciously whether it is totally accepted, totally rejected or selectively accepted or rejected. The present built on the past, grows into the future. In this process, the dominant ideas of a culture get imperceptibly modified with the passage of time according to the layers of experiences that accumulate. Like every growing thing, culture too, has in it dead tissues that continuously need to be cast off and new tissues that have to be continuously added. In most cultures, the casting off of dead tissues that is outdated ideas and institutions that have lost their validity and meaning takes place automatically and new ideas get assimilated into the original culture naturally giving rise to new institutions. However, the residue or substratum of the outmoded ideas and institutions remains in a period of transition and a culture continues to be identified with it. This is complex because the period of transition itself is always present34. Human society is continuously in a state of transition if it is dynamic. That is why Buddhists would say which identity are you fighting for, that which you were yesterday or that which you are today. Hence, flux being the law of nature, some
aspects of a culture or civilization are continuously becoming redundant while new ideas and thoughts are getting assimilated.

When this movement stops or stagnates, as it happened for about a hundred years in India from the beginning of the eighteenth century to that of the nineteenth century, society clings to outward manifestations of culture but they become rotten and decayed from within. Why did this happen? And how did India respond? One reason was that for a time the social practices and Indian institutions became narrow and rigid. The superabundant energy of thirty centuries of unparalleled and amazing intellectual and creative activity finally ran out and the joy of life and creation became jaded and repetitive. Gradually, the freedom of thought and expression gave way to meaning less repetition of past formulations as the scientific and critical mind slept and creative intuition got stifled. The second was the impact of Islam. Several and continuously repeated invasions took place of varying degrees of terrifying brutality and plunder till the Mughals finally made India their home. While it led to the creation of a composite culture of Islam and Hinduism in certain section of society, the vast majority of the Hindu community felt threatened and insecure. As a reaction it defended with great ferocity every extravagance of custom and meaningless social institutions. Any observer of this time would find it hard not to find most of Indian society barbaric as it clung on to the extreme inequities of the caste system like untouchability, pre-puberty marriages of girls often with aged and already married men, enforced and rigorous widowhood, food taboos and other such horrifying customs and conventions. These were the dead tissues that were preserved with great tenacity as society closed in upon itself. Indian civilization and culture met the European at this time of social disintegration and political anarchy. It was the evening of the past from which a new age had to start and the impact of the West with its new ideas and, in many respects, opposite civilisational values proved a mixed blessing. While it created in Indians a sense of great inferiority with regard to their tradition and heritage, it simultaneously forced them to take a hard look at it, reassess it and come to terms with it. In the process it revived the dormant intellectual and critical impulse, awakened the desire for new creation by confronting the Indian spirit with new conditions and ideals that needed to be urgently understood and assimilated; and forced a new look at the past which led to an attempt to make connections between the past and the modern knowledge and ideas coming from the West.

The question arises what was the modernist agenda and what form did it take in India because of the European contact and British rule. The British highlighted the weaknesses of the traditional social order of the Indians, inferiorising their culture, epistemology and even the people as a race. The reaction took place on two planes. On one, it was against the traditional order and on the second against the cultural hegemonization by the colonial state. While the reformers found the traditional culture inadequate to meet the challenges of western modernity, they were also not willing to accept the western model in totality. It bred an anxiety about the survival of tradition itself hence the debates on tradition and modernity.

`Modern' became associated with `western' and all the debates took place from the point of view of how to come to terms with modernity and westernization and its vision of progress and economic prosperity. What was `western' provided the model and showed the way. The new worldview had some salient features. First, that man was the master of the world and could shape it according to his will. The measure of scientific progress became the capacity to master the secrets of nature and to control and exploit its resources for material wealth and prosperity. Belief in this or lack of it divided societies and social institutions into modern or traditional. In non-western societies, modernity was identified with westernization and it came to be believed that change could only be brought about in the western way; that the only possible route and finally acceptable model was the western one. It provided a linear concept of time as opposed to a cyclical one. The linear model assumes that people are always trying to change the world for the better in material terms and hence the future, too, comes to be evaluated in those terms, that is, solely through economic indicators of material prosperity. In the case of women it led to a paradox. Indian society had been labeled as less than civilized by the Europeans because of its brutal and repressive treatment of women. However, the western view of modernity did not bring them out into the external material world as a workforce. Rather, it concentrated on how to make them good wives and mothers. This agenda of modernity used women's natural nurturing capacities to provide an ideological framework to legitimize their confinement to the domestic sphere. In Europe itself it took two world wars to bring them out into the public domain.
The total acceptance of this model of modernization created the relationship of the teacher and the taught between the west and the east. The idea turned into a conviction that to become modern, people must learn the knowledge system of the west, its life-style and behavior patterns. In effect, the east must become the mirror image of the west. In India this relationship was not only established and strengthened by the British colonial rule but was also used to project Indians as incapable of self-rule. Since their own cultural traditions were condemned as static and primitive, Britain defined its white man’s burden to teach and civilize India.

However, Britain was at the same time not particularly keen to modernize Indian economy, culture and society because it did not want a dynamic rival. After all it used advances in technology and agricultural development to convert India into a colonial economy and codified customary law by aligning with feudal and traditional elements thus bringing in societal divisions making political maneuvering easier. Further, it attempted and succeeded significantly in colonizing Indian consciousness. As Amilcar Cabral points out, the colonizer, in order to maintain his domination provokes and alienates a part of the population by the so-called assimilation of indigenous elites distancing them from the popular masses. As a result, a section of the people assimilates the colonizer’s mentality, considers itself culturally superior to its own people and looks down upon their cultural values. This is the situation of the majority of colonized intellectuals and their position is consolidated by increase in social privileges. The colonizer installs such people as chiefs or leaders who support him and are also to a certain degree acceptable to the masses.

Naipaul’s reading or misreading of India reflects his own lack of awareness of the Indian intellectual and aesthetic tradition or a deliberately perverse interpretation of it that can only be caused by a deep psychological need to assert his identity by reacting violently against it just as a son has to metaphorically kill his father or a student his teacher or the Buddha in order to come into his own and establish his independent identity. The agitation that this causes is reflected again and again in his condemnation of inner peace, tranquility and harmony and his own lack of integral well-ordered personality, his sense of a life divided or half life.
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