

## Chapter 1

### **‘First World’ within the ‘Third World’: Introducing Postcolonialism and Diaspora**

“I leave one place for the other, welcomed and embraced by the family I have left...I am unable to stay...I am the other, the exile within...afflicted with permanent nostalgia for the mud” (Hagedorn 328).

The diasporic writings, also known as ‘expatriate writings’ or ‘immigrant writings’ largely give voice to the personal experiences of the writers, which are the results of the clash of multiple cultures. Consequently, postcolonial literature by diasporic writers covers a wide variety of emotional experiences which are formed with the prominent components such as alienation, assimilation, displacement, adaptation, diaspora, second generation migrant, deracination, alterity, indigeneity, nationhood, imagining homeland, identity, ethnicity/culture, exoticisation, history/ memory, etc. Every major diasporic writers including Raja Rao, V. S. Naipaul, Satyendra Nandan, Salman Rushdie, Vikram Sheth, M. G. Vassanji, Rohinton Mistry, Bharati Mukherjee, and Jhumpa Lahiri (to name a few) write about people and their lives which are distinct not only to their homelands but have the fragrance of their host countries. However, those who have been able to identify themselves with their new geographical environment procured the bi-cultural perception which equips them to write from a wider and more exciting angle.

It seems that this bi-cultural perception has widened to a stretch which allows the postcolonial literature to undergo a visible change. It has, of late started taking shape of a new phenomenon, which interrogates post colonialism, suitable to the contemporary era. It is observed that the diasporic writers tend towards more contemporary issues rather than conventional ones. This is possible because of two reciprocally compatible ideas: the first is

equal basic human rights for all and second is no objective cultural criteria by which one can determine the worth of others. Another possibility is vital roles played by globalization and cosmopolitanism. For the writers what matters now in the modern world are the small issues which had not gained prominence till now. Minute, so far unappreciated things, have started attaining vast significance in the altered circumstances. It demonstrates that the inner needs of all human beings are same, but it is this unappreciated minute things, where one can witness the superficially differing reactions by Indian, Western, and diasporic characters towards similar situations. There is a distinct decrease in the intensity in the sense of alienation, identity crisis, nostalgia for homeland, which is witnessed in second generation Indian diasporic writers gradually and frequently. The second generation Indian diasporic writers- Neil Bissoondath, Hari Kunzru, Jhumpa Lahiri, etc- tend to touch the contemporary phenomena such as self-consciousness (paranoia at some extent due to the notion of subjectivity), the quest for understanding the self and (not retrieving the selfhood as if lost and found), finding a grasp of one's place in the world (to search for your place in the world, you must first define the world in which you live, an endless task in itself), endless deferral and the distinction between life and art, reality and imagination, the blankness of suburban life (a then-recent phenomenon), a disease of aimlessness and spiritual emptiness that came about from gratuitous comfort and tedious routine.

Thus, this research proposes to explore the changing diasporic trend – journey of post colonial experience from conventional perspective to the shifted contemporary perspective. This journey would be explored, analyzed and compared with the help of the literary works (fiction) of first and second generation Indian Diasporic Writers. And the criteria for the investigation are the fundamental postcolonial characteristics in context of the postcolonial literary theories. The study focuses on the primary sources of three novels by first generation Indian diasporic writers-

*The Nowhere Man* by Kamala Markandaya, *Manhattan Music* by Meena Alexander and *Bye-Bye Blackbird* by Anita Desai, and about the second generation Indian diasporic writers- selected stories from two short story collections, *Digging Up the Mountains* and *On the Eve of Uncertain Tomorrows* by Neil Bissoondath, selected stories from two short story collections, *Interpreter of Maladies* and *Unaccustomed Earth* by Jhumpa Lahiri and a novel *Transmission* by Hari Kunzru. To start the journey of the research, let us have a glimpse of postcolonialism in the light of various post colonial theories.

### **1.1 Postcolonialism:**

Though writing about colonialism is as old as colonialism itself, a study of post-colonialism stimulates abundance of thrill, perplexity and especially skepticism. Because of its ambiguous discourse, still this field of study prevail its uncertainty among many. The motive of the post-colonial literature and theory is to examine the clash of two cultures and how one of the cultures empowers the other on the basis of its ideology and deems itself superior to other. The writers of *Empire Writes Back* use the term “post-colonial’ to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day” (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, *Empire* 2). The apparent connotation of ‘post-colonial’ is its reference to a period following the end of colonialism by handing over the essential powers and political and cultural sovereignty to the native people to overcome political and cultural imperialism.

Postcolonialism is consisting of certain philosophical theories and a range of approaches to literary analysis of the literature written in English by the writers of the countries that were or still are colonized. Most of the postcolonial studies count out the literature that represent colonizer’s perspectives and only consider on writings from colonized or formerly colonized cultures. This kind of literature can be referred to as ‘third-world literature’ by Marxist critics

and ‘Commonwealth literature’ by others, which many contemporary critics depreciates. Here the main concern of the postcolonial theorists is also to inspect what happens when two cultures clash and one of them dominates and finds its ideologies higher to the other.

After the Second World War, the post-independence period was denominated by the historians through the term ‘Post-colonialism’ as ‘post-colonial state’. Nevertheless, later on the literary expositors employed this term to confer numerous cultural effects and outcomes of colonization. After 1978, though with *Orientalism*, Edward Said initiated the study of regulating the colonized societies, which directed towards the expansion of ‘Colonialist Discourse Theory’ in the work of critics like Gayatri Spivak and Homi Bhabha, they didn’t employ the term ‘post-colonial’ so far. But in the late 1980s and early 1990s, this term was frequently visible and used, focusing the political aspect of both text and context of this literature, replacing the term ‘Commonwealth literature’ or ‘Third World Literature’, coined by Alfred Sauvy. Meenakshi Mukherjee utters, “Post-colonial literature’ is presumably free from such centralist undertones; it suggests de-centering, plurality, hybridity, a dismantling authority – hence many ways it is an enabling and protean term” (6-7). Furthermore, the term ‘post-colonial’ was promoted by the books, *Empire Writes Back* by Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin and *The Encyclopedia of Post – Colonial Literature in English*, edited by Benson and Connolly, which also contributed in the recognition of post-colonial literature.

“Postcolonialism”, in the words of Charles E. Bressler, “is an approach to literary analysis that concerns itself particularly with literature written in English in formerly colonized countries” (265). It generally eliminates the writings from the colonizer’s viewpoints, and focuses merely on the literature that represents the colonized cultures that were formerly subjugated by Europeans. In his book *A Glossary of Cultural Theory*, Peter Brooker defines

postcolonialism as “the study of the ideological and cultural impact of Western colonialism and in particular of its aftermath – whether as a continuing influence (neocolonialism) or in the emergence of newly articulated independent national and individual identities” (198).

Similar to the critical theories such as deconstruction, postmodern and other approaches, postcolonial studies has attained a range of perceptions and it is a diversified field of study in which even its spelling presents numerous alternate meanings: post-colonialism, postcolonialism, or post/colonial. The hyphenated term ‘post-colonialism’ indicates a sequential ordering, in other words a shift from a colonial to a postcolonial phase. The non-hyphenated term postcolonialism’, as per the views of Boehmer in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*, refers “to writing that sets out in one way or another to resist colonialist perspectives” (5), both before and after the period of colonization. As claimed by some critics, the term ‘postcolonialism’ covers an extensive critical field, inclusive of the literature of earlier British colonies, than does the term ‘post-colonialism’. Some critics believe that the third spelling of this term ‘post/colonial’ is more appropriate than the earlier two terms, since it interrelates numerous literatures, that share a similar entangled situation between colonial and post/colonial discourse and between coloniality and post/coloniality. Among these three, the most commonly used term is ‘postcolonialism’.

John McLeod deliberately prefers the term ‘postcolonialism’ rather than the term with hyphen ‘Post-colonialism’, because it refers to representations, reading practices and values which overcome both physical and chronological borders between colonialism and independence, rather than restraining itself within the firm boundary of the time ‘after colonialism’:

“Postcolonialism is not contained by the tidy categories of historical periods or dates, although it remains firmly bound up with historical experiences” (McLeod 5).

McLeod also argues that postcolonialism can't be interpreted as the 'after colonialism', as it also deals with the colonial values. It does not label 'an entirely novel historical era' or 'a completely brave new world', where all the frailties of the colonialism will be healed.

Postcolonialism recognizes both historical continuity and change. It acknowledges that the material realities and modes of representation common to colonialism are still with us today even if the political map of the world has changed through decolonization. (McLeod 33)

Meenakshi Mukherjee rightly observes:

Post-colonialism is not merely a chronological label referring to the period after the demise of empires. It is ideologically an emancipatory concept particularly for the students of literature outside the Western world, because it makes us interrogate many concepts of the study of literature that we were made to take for granted, enabling us not only to read our own texts in our own terms, but also to re-interpret some of the old canonical texts from Europe from the perspective of our specific historical and geographical location. (3-4)

Postcolonial theory emerged just after the colonization, when the colonized people have had time to ponder upon and to put in writing about their subjugation, frustrations, cultural clashes with the colonizer's culture, agitations and aspirations about their future and loss of identity. The evolution of the theories and practice of postcolonialism depends on how the colonized act in response to various concerns, including the act of writing, such as the changes in language, educational curriculum, racial divergences and issues such as economical, moral, ethical, etc. "Postcolonialism", in the words of G. Rai, "is an enterprise which seeks emancipation from all types of subjugation defined in terms of gender, race and class.

Postcolonialism thus does not introduce a new world which is free from ills of colonialism; it rather suggest both continuity and change” (2).

Postcolonialism can be bifurcated into two branches- the first branch includes those critics such as Bhabha and Arun P who view postcolonialism as a set of diverse methodologies that possess no unitary quality and the second views postcolonialism as a set of cultural strategies ‘centered in history’, as argued by Edward Said, Barbara Harlow, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. The latter group of critics can also be subdivided into two – first group believes that postcolonialism represents the period after the independence of the colonized countries and the second group believes that postcolonialism represents the period from the time of colonization to the current time. Makarand Parajape states,

The best way to begin interrogating postcolonism is not by pretending that we are the masters of our own academic destinies but by admitting, how colonized we still are. What is more, we cannot continue to blame only the West for our sorry state of subjection; we must blame ourselves. The dignity of the brown-skinned scholarship depends more than even before on how we view ourselves, rather than how others view us. (43)

Postcolonialism has offered the writers of formerly colonized community the ability to write the inventive literature in English and literary criticism from the point of view of the colonized - then in true sense the ‘post-colonial’ converts the colonial. Paranjape further adds that, “We need to strengthen ourselves, our institutions, journals and publication industries. We need not merely attempt to duplicate or copy metropolitan system, but develop our needs” (46).

A further issue of great significance in post-colonialism is anti-colonial resistance because the colonial practice is ongoing even after the formal ending of the colonialism. Anti-

colonial resistance, therefore, must not confront colonialism at only political level, but also at cultural, emotional and intellectual levels. Gandhi and Fanon, the two historical personalities, represented resistance in totality, targeted the political and cultural evils of the colonialism. In Fanon's point of view, the colonized has the capability to oppose the European cultural superiority and he asserts, "Total liberation is that which concerns all sectors of personality" (*Black* 250). Mahatma Gandhi, a sort of emancipators to literary men, is expressing his disappointment towards Indians consistent attraction for the western enchanting shallowness and remarks, "We brought the English and we keep them. Why do we forget that our adoption of their civilization makes their presence in India at all possible? Your hatred against theirs ought to be transferred to their civilization" (66).

Anti-colonial resistance is a movement, which has appropriated many formations in diverse colonial situations and these formations have drawn upon an extensive variety of resources. On one hand, this movement is often connected with the principles of racial freedom. On the other hand, it may be associated with the demand for appreciation and acknowledgement of cultural differences on an extensive facade. To confront the imperialism, anti-colonial movements employed western ideologies and their language and hybridized them by bringing them together with the native ideas of the colonized countries. English education fostered the ideas of liberty and freedom in native population. In the context, Leela Gandhi states in her book, *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*: "It is helpful to think of this stipulated shift from abrogation to appropriation as a shift from 'unlearning English', to the project of 'learning how to curse in the master's tongue'. This latter mode, in turn, marks the emergence of what we might call a 'Caliban paradigm'" (148). Through 'Caliban paradigm', Leela tries to indicate the sense of challenging the ideologies of colonialism rather than the cultural vocabulary of colonialism.



Thus, the term ‘Postcolonialism’, as John Yang suggests, ‘a definition in progress’, indicates the ending of colonialism and the possession of political and cultural authority and freedom by the indigenous people as a result of overcoming political and cultural imperialism. As Geetha Ganapathy-Dore suggests, “Postcolonial is defined sometimes with regard to history, sometimes with regard to ideology, sometimes with regard to geography, sometimes with regard to writing, sometimes with regard to reading and at other times with regard to teaching” (9). There are some critics like Loomba and Rukhmini Bhaya Nair, who have foreseen critical perspectives beyond postcolonialism. Loomba’s book, *Post-colonial Studies and Beyond* endeavored to evaluate the past and present of the field, enlarge the agenda of diaspora studies and influence its future advancement. Likewise, it also indicates that diaspora studies have much more to offer as an alternative to postcolonialism.

## **1.2 Post-colonial Literary theories**

The expansion of postcolonialism was highly dependent on the basis of colonial ideologies. Writers such as Aime Cesaire, Frantz Fanon, Ngugi Wa Thiango, Edward Said, Bill Ashcroft and his collaborators, Homi Bhabha, Gayatri Spivak, Aizaz Ahmad, etc have contributed in the development of postcolonial discourse. Postcolonial studies are engrossed with the issues such as hybridity, alterity, in-betweenness, diasporas and ambivalence, ethnicity, identity, mimicry, etc. Arun P. Mukherjee is of the view that –

Indian literatures, I believe, are too multifarious and too heterogeneous to be containable in the net of a single theory. Anyway, the questions Indian readers must ask Indian literary texts particularly in the context of struggle against fundamentalism, casteism and patriarchy cannot be answered within the framing grid provided by postcolonial theory where readers are instructed solely how to

decode the subtle ironies and parodies directed against the departed colonizer. I think I need another theory. (20)

Within the postcolonial theory, exists an inbuilt conflict among three classifications of postcolonialists, who have developed conflicting theoretical and practical criticism: First group of postcolonialists such as Georg Gugelberger and Fredric Jameson, who belong to an American or European background, have been educated and are residing in the West. Second group of postcolonialists such as Gayatri Spivak, Edward Said and Homi Bhabha, who were brought up in non-Western cultures but have or now reside, study, and write in the West. And third group of postcolonialists such as Aijaz Ahmad, a kind of subaltern writers, living and writing in non-Western cultures.

Historically, one of the anti-colonial revolutionaries and the earliest postcolonial theorists, Frantz Fanon (1925–1961), has born in the French colony of Martinique, fought with the French in World War II and remained in France after the war to study medicine and psychiatry. His contemporary philosophers and poets such as Jean–Paul Sartre and Aime Cesaire influenced him. Fanon employs psycho-analytical theory to investigate the situation of blacks living in Martinique under French colonization in his books, *Black Skin, White Masks* (1952) and *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961), which were based on his experiences of racialism as a black man and the fight for autonomy as the colonized.

The publication of the book *Black Skin, White Masks* has not merely given rise to the Civil Rights movement in America and the wars of independence in North Africa, but also contributed as a proclamation of rage against the system of colonialism. In this book Fanon asserts that due to colonialism, both the colonizer and the colonized undergo the experience of ‘psychic warping’, which often causes what Fanon describes as “a collapse of the ego” (154).

Fanon believes that so far as the colonized were imposed with the language spoken by the colonizer, circuitously the black colonized were either accepted or compelled to accept the collective consciousness of the French colonizer that blackness indicates evil or sin and whiteness stands for purity and righteousness. In this book Fanon expressed the domination of the white man over the black man through the linguistic construction of opposite terms: the 'One' and the 'Other'. Here 'one' subordinates the 'other' and renders it inferior. Both the colonizer and the colonized are entrapped in an ailing association of remorse and innocence.

Another book of Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, highlights the conflicts or binary oppositions of white in opposition to black, good in opposition to evil, and so on. In this book, Fanon develops a postcolonial theory influenced by Marxism, in which he finds the requirement of violent revolution, that according to him brings an utterly new world into existence to overrule the binary system, in which black represents evilness and white represents purity and righteousness. Fanon himself was part of this type of revolution, when he was the representative for the Algerian revolutionaries against France. In this book, Fanon expressed out the outcome of deep rooted issues more eloquently than any Hegelian variation on the 'One' and the 'Other', the 'whites' and the 'blacks', to be judged on the basis of the skin complexion. Fanon employed psychoanalytical Marxism to understand the trauma of colonized people and essentiality of their liberation in true sense. *The Wretched of the Earth* also deals with another major concern: the problem of rising of the 'native bourgeoisie' to assume power over the colonized masses to the same extent after the colonial powers subsided, which create worse situation than before the conquerors arrived. Fanon suggests the ways in which intellectual leaders often betray the national working-class. Fanon concludes this book with a remarkably alike and undeniably clairvoyant vision for postcolonial futurity: "The human condition, plans for mankind and

collaboration between men in those tasks which increase the sum total of humanity are new problems, which demand true inventions” (252). Overall in his writings, Fanon focuses on the key postcolonial issues such as the ‘Otherness’, subject formation, and given weightage on linguistic and psycho-analytic structures on which post-colonialism will expand in the decades to come.

Edward Wadie Said, a literary theorist and scholar of America, basically from Palestine, contributed in establishing the literary theory of postcolonialism. As per the view of Robert Young, Edward Said, Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak are called the ‘Holy Trinity’ of postcolonial theorists. As Sawant says, “If the origin of postcolonial aesthetics lies in Frantz Fanon’s *The Wretched of the Earth*, its theory is found in Said’s *Orientalism*” (122). Like Fanon, Said’s key foundational text, *Orientalism* investigated a way of seeing the world in the context of colonialism, but unlike Fanon, Said paid more attention to the colonizers rather than the colonized.

Said defines ‘Orientalism’ as “Western style for dominating, restructuring having authority over orient” (*Orientalism* 3). The term ‘Orientalism’ which refers to “the historical and ideological process whereby false images of and the myths about the Eastern or the ‘orient’ world have been constructed in various Western discourses, including that of imaginative literature” (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, *Post-colonial* 318). Orientalism, which is based on the Western cultural superiority over the Eastern countries, smoothen the path of imperialism. As Said believes, “the creation of non-European stereotypes that suggested so-called Orientals were indolent, thoughtless, sexually immoral, unreliable, and demented” (*Orientalism* 3). Said comments, the European subjugators believed that they were portraying the ‘orients’ precisely but they are unable to realize the fact that all human knowledge is contextual to one’s political,

cultural, and ideological structure. Said argues that in reality what the European subjugators were disclosing was their hidden aspirations for power, wealth, and supremacy. Said emphasized on the binary division between the 'Orient' and the 'Occident', wherein the West represents the seat of knowledge and learning, rationality, sensibility, while East represents a place of lack of knowledge, irrationality, abnormality, superstition and illiteracy. Through *Orientalism*, Said tries to project the deteriorating picture of the Orient given by the Occident.

Said's *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) prolonged and broadened the task commenced in *Orientalism* by giving the details of the imperial involvements of several key works of the Western literary norms. This book has acquired the underlining argument of Orientalism and used it to read seminal 19th century and early 20th century British novels through the lens of imperialism. In *Culture and Imperialism*, Said on one hand differentiates imperialism from colonialism and on other hand inking the two terms. He defines imperialism as "thinking about, settling on, controlling land that you do not possess, that is distant, that is lived on land owned by others" (*Culture* 7). Thus Said argues that imperialism has survived the colonial empires from vanishing of and contributed the final section of 'Culture' to its workings in the US since Second World War.

Builds on Said's concept of the 'Other' and 'Orientalism', Homi K. Bhabha has become one of the leading postcolonial theorists and critics since the 1980s. Other main influences on Bhabha were Sigmund Freud, the psychoanalyst; Jaques Lacan, the post structuralist and Frantz Fanon, the psychiatrist and literary critic. In his works, *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha emphasizes the concerns of the colonized because the colonized observes two distinct views of the world: that of the colonizer and that of himself or herself as the colonized. This concern leads him to some questions regarding the colonized community such as what is the individuality of

the colonized. Further, to what culture the colonized belongs. Apparently, neither culture makes him feel like home. According to Bhabha, this feeling of homelessness, of being trapped amid two cultures, is called 'unhomeliness'. This notion is also referred to as 'double consciousness' by some postcolonial theorists, which causes the colonized to become a psychological person in exile. Bhabha argues against the tendency to vitalizing third-world countries into a homogenous identity because each psychological person in exile distinctively unifies his or her two cultures and no two writers who have been colonized will interpret their blended culture equally.

Bhabha has popularized the terms 'ambivalence', 'mimicry' and 'hybridity'. Adapted into colonial discourse theory by Bhabha, the term 'ambivalence' illustrates the intricate blend of relationship between colonizers and colonized, that characterizes the fascination and revulsion. 'Mimicry' is a term which helps in describing the ambivalent association between colonizers and colonized. When colonialism necessitate the colonized to 'mimic' the colonizer, by adopting the colonizers' culture, habits, language, theories, institutions, standards and values, the consequences are by no means a simple reproduction of these traits, rather a hostile 'blurred copy' of the colonizer. Bhabha discovers the prospect of reading colonialism as continually ambivalent and describes mimicry as "the desire for a reformed, recognizable other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite" (*Location* 89). He argues that both ambivalence and mimicry are the power to threaten the colonizer. The colonizers are threatening of the simulation of the colonized as the colonizer by hearing their own language through the mouths of the colonized.

One of the major contributions of Bhabha to the postcolonial studies is his belief that when two cultures intermingle, the character and the distinctiveness of the newly formed culture alter both the cultures. Bhabha names this process as 'hybridity', which is 'a political and

cultural negotiation' between the colonizer and the colonized. Bhabha explained in an interview with Gary Olson and Lynn Horsham: "Hybridization is a discursive, enunciatory, cultural, subjective process having to do with the struggle around authority, authorization, deauthorization, and the revision of authority. It's a social process. It's not about persons of diverse cultural tastes and fashions" (39). As a result, says Bhabha, a feeling of unhomeliness develops in the colonized.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak is a philosopher from India, an immigrant intellectual, at present settled in the USA, who has contributed abundantly in the field of postcolonial literary theories. She has been one of the prominent theorists of the subaltern studies and the feminist postcolonial critics. In her studies, she has made a critical analysis of the non-Western culture status and the cultural experience of the newly decolonized community. In her book *The Postcolonial Critic*, she identifies herself as "a postcolonial intellectual caught between socialist ideals of national independence movement in India and the legacy of colonial education system" (qtd. in Morton 2). Spivak initially attained the status as a postcolonial intellectual for her translation and preface to Derrida's *Of Grammatology*. She has applied deconstructive strategic tools to numerous textual analyses and a variety of theories including Marxism, Deconstruction, Feminism, globalization and postcolonialism.

Spivak has questioned the notion that the Western world is superior in the context of civilization, democracy and development than the non-Western world. About the 'Third world women', Spivak has argued that "the everyday lives of many 'Third world' women are so complex and unsystematic that they cannot be known or represented in any straight forward way by the vocabularies of Western critical theory" (qtd. in Morton 50). In her significant essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Spivak deals with the problems regarding the subaltern and concludes that

the subaltern cannot speak, highlighting the silence of the subaltern. About the silence of subaltern, Spivak explains that the term ‘silence’ doesn’t suggest literal meaning. Spivak says, “It doesn’t mean that subaltern did not speak, but rather that others did not know how to listen and enter into a transaction between speaker and listener” (qtd. in Sawant). The subaltern cannot speak because their words cannot be properly interpreted; therefore it is a failure of interpretation rather of articulation.

One of the most inquisitive and possibly puzzling characteristics of post-colonial studies is its overlap with postmodernism. In the same context, Kwame Anthony Appiah, a professor of philosophy and literature has contributed in the field of theorizing Postcolonialism. In his article, “The Postcolonial and the Postmodern”, Appiah analysis the conditions of ‘postcoloniality’ and its relations to ‘postmodernism’ in the context of the two stages of modern African novels set in 1950s to the later sixties. Appiah clarifies that the advancement of the first stage novels from the commemorative to the cynical novels of the second stage is an accumulation of space-clearing gestures with the prefix ‘post-’. ‘Space-clearing’ means to surpass it and confront it. On one hand, Appiah argues that postmodernism is a dismissal of modernism. Similarly, postcoloniality is challenging its earlier narratives, for instance, nationalism, realism, binarism and nativism. On the other hand, postcoloniality is dissimilar from postmodernism for its involvement of common human state of distress and universally ethical rather than coming back to traditionalism. At the end of the essay, Appiah also recommended a postcolonial post-binarism that confronts the postcolonial obedience to an unpolluted Africa by revealing its ‘multiple existence’ and its disobedient circulation of cultures with the West. In his another eloquent essay “Is the Post- in Postmodernism the Post- in Postcolonial?” Appiah scrutinizes the connection between postcolonial and postmodern. He concerns about the vagueness of the association of postmodern



and postcolonial, and the sense in which they both reflect diverse historical and cultural background, is an expression of convenient but misplaced parasitism.

Chandra Talpade Mohanty is one of the postcolonial and transnational feminist theorists, who have developed on the theme of postcolonial feminism, like Trinh-Minh Ha, Gayatri Spivak and so on. '*Postcolonial feminism*' or sometimes '*third-world feminism*', derived out of analysis focused on western feminism, argues that just as ethnic research missing gender perspective, feminism lacks the effects of ethnicity and colonialism. "The colonized subject was seen as male, while the 'female subject' was seen as white, leaving no space for the intersection between woman and coloured" (Loomba 160). Postcolonial feminism classifies, as Mohanty is speaking of a 'double colonization' of women, who subsist in the patriarchal colonized societies. Postcolonial feminism can be seen as an overlap of postcolonial theory and feminist theory, closely connected to Black Feminism, simultaneously focused on racism.

In her book *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, Mohanty argues that the general classification of women in non-Western countries is mostly done through constructed monolithic expressions and categorizations and this approach is keen to label women in the Third World countries as 'poor, uneducated, tradition-bound, and victimized' (22), overlooking the class, complexity, ethnicity, diversity, racial contexts and multiplicity of them. The consequence of this digressive domination that western feminism holds is the "systematization of the oppression of women in the third world" (Mohanty, Under 304). Mohanty identifies three "problematic directions within U.S.-based feminisms" (*Feminism* 6). The first is the growing, mainly class-based split between activist feminism and university-based feminism, second is intensified with consumerist and corporatist values, causing a rise of 'neo-liberal' and 'free market' feminism, third is the 'narrowing of feminist politics and theory',

which she defines to be a result of the “critique of essentialist identity politics and the hegemony of postmodern skepticism about identity” (*Feminism* 6).

In the year 1986, Aijaz Ahmad’s forceful discussion with Frederic Jameson in the *Social Text* was an exhilarating landmark in the ‘Third World’ literature studies. Since then the term ‘Third World’ has been overtaken by ‘postcolonial’ and afterwards Ahmad’s book *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures* has combined and lengthened those discussions with Frederic Jameson into a detailed analysis of the postcolonial studies. In this book, Ahmad primarily discusses the role of theory and theorists in the movement against colonialism and imperialism. Ahmad’s argument against those who defend post-structuralism and postmodernist conceptions of material history revolves around the fact that very little has been fulfilled since the arrival of this sort of postcolonial inquiry. The book includes an especially sarcastically critical analysis of Frederic Jameson’s arguments in his “Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism”. However Ahmad in his book expresses his disappointment at how his critique of Jameson has been appropriated by Postcolonial scholars as a condemnation of Marxism. In the book, Ahmad also extensively analyses Edward Said’s *Orientalism* and argues that Said reproduces the very Liberal Humanist tradition that is weakened by the selection of Western canonized texts, which meant to analyze their Orientalism. Moreover Ahmad states that Said’s work is tracing Orientalism all the way back to Ancient Greece, which creates ambiguity if Orientalism is a product of Colonialism, or Colonialism is a product of Orientalism.

Considered as one of the key influential scholars in Asian studies, Dipesh Chakrabarty is known for his work in modern South Asian history and historiography, Subaltern Studies, postcolonial theory and its impact on how history is written and comparative questions and

politics of modernity. An apparent vital theme of Chakrabarty's work is to conceptualize the connections between history and postcolonial theory.

Chakrabarty's exceedingly admired book *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (2001) has become a milestone for the approach and advancement of the discourse of post-colonial history. In this book, Chakrabarty gives emphasis to the essentiality of the historians to distinguish between the post-colonial experience and the perseverance of Western scholarly justifications of post-colonial modernity. As Chakrabarty points out: "European thought is at once both indispensable and inadequate in helping us to think through the experiences of political modernity in non-Western nations, and provincializing Europe becomes the task of exploring how this thought ... may be renewed from and for the margins" (16). In his contribution, Chakrabarty suggests a systematic revision and restructuring of academic history in India that persistently centering Europe in its describing the past. Chakrabarty's aim of diminishing Europe comprised of two fundamental strategies: first, displacing the narrations of modernity in history from the center and second, the eminence of non-modern aspects of history in historical narrations.

The concept of diaspora is worth discussing now, as it is the outcome of postcolonialism.

### **1.3. Theorizing 'Diaspora': Then and Now**

The land is home to me  
 Now homeless, a true refugee  
 Of the soul's last corner  
 Sadhu days, and babu days  
 And Mai in ohrni days  
 Lost to me – like elephants

And silks, the dhows of Naipauls's

Yearning, not mine. (Espinete 10)

There are a few terms which are meant to lose their meanings with time or one can say acquire new meanings with time. 'Diaspora' is one of the terms. It had varied use over the years. The original use of the term by the Greeks implies a 'triumphalist migration' (Chandramohan 145). As described in *Introducing Human Geographies*, the term diaspora suggests the fertility of dispersion, discrimination and the scattering of seeds. The biblical use was one of 'scattering', what the Lord would do as a punishment for not obeying the divine laws. The Hebrew equivalent was 'galuth' or 'galut', which meant captivity or exile. In the Ancient Greece, based on 'speiro=to sow' and the preposition 'dia=over', the word referred to migration and colonization (Cloke et al. 673). As Shuval states in his paper presented on "The Dynamics of Diaspora: Theoretical Implications of Ambiguous Concepts" at Conference of Diasporas and Ethnic Migrants in Twentieth-Century Europe, "In Hebrew, the term initially referred to the setting of colonies of Jews outside Palestine after the Babylonian exile and has assumed a more general connotation of people settled away from their ancestral homelands" (qtd. in Berthomiere 25). "The Hebrew usage and Jewish experience of expulsion, forced exile and collective suffering from Jerusalem provided the basis for the use of the term. The age-old doctrine of Jewish homelessness, thereby the typical marginalized consciousness and creativity has all become a part of the diaspora syndrome. 'Babylon' subsequently became a code-word among Jews (and, later, Africans) for the afflictions, isolation and insecurity of living in a foreign place, set adrift, cut off from their roots and their sense of identity, oppressed by an alien ruling class. Since the Babylonian exile "the homelessness of Jews has been a leitmotiv in Jewish literature, art, culture, and of course, prayer" (Ages 10).

Though many scholars claim to accept Greek and Jewish as the origin of the term ‘Diaspora’, Eliezer Ben Rafael in his book *Transnationalism: Diasporas and the Advent of a New (Dis)order* raise his doubts for the Greek or Jewish origin of Diaspora. While he doesn’t deny that the term ‘Diaspora’ was coined after a Greek verb ‘diaspeiro’, he objects on association of Diaspora with Jewish history and its translation or equivalence of the Hebrew word ‘galuth’. He also questions the association of Diaspora with Greek Lexicon of colonization. He states:

Diaspora’ was never used during the Antiquity to describe Greek colonization and settlement abroad. The most usual Greek word for these phenomena was ‘apoikia’ meaning life abroad (Casevitz 1985: 120-121) yet this statement is repeated text to text, usually relying on Cohen (for instance, Shuval 2000: 42, Reis 2004: 44, Bordes-Benayoun and Schnapper 2006: 20). (Dufoix 48)

Further Eliezer quotes Cheyette for the misconception of Diaspora as a Hebrew usage and Jewish experience of expulsion:

The Hebrew root for exile or diaspora has two distinct connotations. *Golah* implies residence in a foreign country (where the migrant is in charge of his or her own destiny), whereas *galuth* denotes a tragic sense of displacement (where the migrant is essentially the passive object of an impersonal history). (Cheyette 45)

The most significant statement, which initiates the contemporary diaspora studies, was Safran’s article in the opening issue of the journal *Diaspora* edited by Kachig Tololyan. In the article one can find that Safran was influenced by the classic case of the Jewish diaspora, but he could also perceive that many other ethnic groups were experiencing similar circumstances possibly due to the difficult situations of their departure from their places of origin and possibly

because of their fragile reception in their places of settlement. Of course Safran was not the only one to recognize this extended concept of diaspora, but he was crucial in investigating some social scientific form to the new claims. The influence of Jewish experience was persistent to Safran's view of the importance of homeland as one of the vital characteristics of diaspora. As per Safran's view, members of a diaspora retained a collective memory of 'their original homeland'; they idealized their 'ancestral home', were committed to the restoration of 'the original homeland' and continued in various ways to 'relate to that homeland' (83-84). In the article Safran suggests that in his view the term diaspora could be considered as a 'metaphoric designation' and could apply to various populations (expatriates, political refugees and so on). In his essays, while defining diasporas, Safran observes the following features:

1. they or their ancestors, have been dispersed from a specific original 'center' to two or more 'peripheral', or foreign regions;
2. they retain collective memory, vision or myth about their original homeland- its physical location, and achievements;
3. they believe that they are not and perhaps cannot be – fully accepted by their host society and therefore feel partly alienated and insulated from it;
4. they regard their ancestral homeland as their true ideal home and as the place to which they or their descendants would (or should) eventually return – when conditions are appropriate;
5. they believe that they should collectively be committed to the maintenance and restoration of their original homeland and to its safety and prosperity;

6. they continue to relate, personally or vicariously to that homeland in one way or another, and their ethno-communal consciousness and solidarity are importantly defined by the existence of such a relationship” (83-84).

While Safran’s criteria are generally accepted as a starting point, others, like Robin Cohen, developed other criteria that gave more weightage on characteristics other than the group’s relationship with its homeland. These additions aspire to create a further and more detailed definition that can easily be evoked. According to Cohen, a diaspora group must have the following characteristics:

- The dispersal of the group must be the result of a traumatic experience, a pursuit of work or trade, and colonial ambitions.
- A commitment to the homeland’s maintenance, restoration, safety, prosperity, and even in some cases its creation.
- A group consciousness sustained over a long period of time including a sense of empathy and solidarity with other members of the group in the host land.
- A potential for contribution to the host land when a tolerance for pluralism is present (Cohen, *Diasporas* 516).

As the list indicates, Cohen puts stress on the group’s self-awareness and the inter-relations among the members of the group. The members of the group in different host lands must persist to identify with their homelands as well as other groups who share the same fate in other places. It would be beneficial, but it is necessary that these groups are formally organized across the borders that separate them. They should also be free for maintaining relations with the home land if the basic grounds of the dispersal cease to exist.

There are only few traces of this concept of diaspora before the decade of 80's. One can sum up the diasporic occurrence before 80's with its common diasporic features as discussed by Cohen in his book *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*, "the traumatic dispersal from an original homeland and the salience of the homeland in the collective memory of a forcibly dispersed group" (4), imbibed by the scattered events of this time span- Babylon for the Jews, slavery for the Africans, massacres and forced displacement for the Armenians, famine for the Irish and the formation of the state of Israel for the Palestinians. It was due to the fact, as Shuval emphasizes on that "before the 1960's immigrant groups were generally expected to shed their ethnic identity and assimilate to local norms. Groups that were thought unable to do this, weren't admitted, eg. Chinese to Canada, non-Whites to Australia" (41-56).

The first and foremost question raised by this period was: does there exist any such specific spatial and social organization that characterizes and differentiates the migrant groups, which can be described under this term of diaspora, from the other social and spatial temperament, produced by the other migrants groups and studied before? This question leads to the very first theory of diaspora, which according to Gabriel Sheffer published in the *American Political Sciences Review* in 1976, with the work of Armstrong in his paper "Mobilized and Proletarian Diasporas". For Armstrong, the term 'Diaspora' applies to "any ethnic collectivity which lacks territorial base within a given polity i.e. is relatively small minority throughout all portions of the polity" (393). Gabriel Sheffer himself, in his book *Modern Diasporas in International Politics* writes that it is an error to sustain the concept of diaspora only for the Jewish people since many others have existed before (such as Nabatheans, Phenicians or Assyrians). Another reason is that during the second half of the 19th century some groups



sharing resemblances with the Jewish diaspora appear in Europe, such as the Greek or the Chinese. In his point of view, three criteria could be proposed for a definition:

1. the maintenance and the development of a group's own collective identity in the 'diasporised people';
2. the existence of an internal organization distinct from those existing in the country of origin or in the host country;
3. Significant contacts with the 'Homeland': real contacts (i.e. Travel remittances) or symbolic contacts (as in the sentence: 'the next year at Jerusalem' at the end of the prayer for Pessah (Easter) (Sheffer, *Diaspora* 116).

There are various typologies relying on different criteria for diaspora. Anteby-Yemini and Berthomière in "Diaspora: A Look Back on a Concept" present four different typologies: Alain Medam (1993); Michel Bruneau (1995); Gabriel Sheffer (1993); and Robin Cohen (1997) (Anteby-Yemini, and Berthomière 264). The main dimension of Medam was diasporas as categorized based on intra-group relations and outsiders' perception of the group. He made a distinction between 'crystallized diasporas', where there is an efficient network in place and 'fluid diasporas', where the group's identity is not quite as clear and its members are not organized around their common identity. In 'crystallized diasporas', he presents some vibrant diasporas characterized by the competence of their transnational networks; to give an example, the Chinese diaspora (Medam 59-66).

In the context of cultural dimension, the diaspora discourse offers a large place to the notion of hybridity, which is frequently used by post-modernist authors to denote the evolution of new social dynamics as mixed cultures. According to Christine Chivallon, the French Caribbean is a good example of the emergence of the question of hybridity. In a letter dated on

April 2nd, 1567, García de Castro gives the first account of the word “creole”. Some years later, El Inca Garcilaso explains: “Creole is a name that black slaves invented .... It means, among Black slaves, to be born in the Indies; they invented it in order to establish differences between those who come from here, born in Guinea, and those who are born there [America]” (qtd. in Corominas 943).

Maryse Condé’s Tituba in his essay, “The Art of the Hybrid Consciousness” states that ‘creole’ came to describe individuals born and reared in the New World with strong ties to their parents’ country of origin, whether it was Europe or Africa. The conflict between the Old and the New World conveyed in the term ‘creole’ explains the interest that discourses about cultural hybridity in the French Caribbean have generated.

On one hand, the concept of hybridity is conceptually researched with reference to ‘travelling cultures’, which is theorized by James Clifford (1994). On the other hand, in the context of hybridity, found a substantial added value in the debate about the Black diaspora and also in the work of Paul Gilroy. Clifford favors Paul Gilroy’s book on as a point of reference, in which the term ‘Black Atlantic’ designates the black diaspora of the New World. Gilroy’s *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* conceptualizes the Black Atlantic as a counterculture to European modernity and modernism, to the project of the Enlightenment and its concomitant rationalism, historical progress and scientific reason. He suggests that the Atlantic be treated as ‘one single, complex unit of analysis’ which could ‘produce an explicitly transnational and intercultural perspective’ (Gilroy, *The Black* 15). It should be said that Gilroy’s work sustains James Clifford’s conception of ‘travelling cultures’ as a substitute to the localized and indigenous visions of traditional anthropology, a conception put forward by Clifford in a text that has remained a key reference in cultural studies. Gilroy’s perspective agrees with the

concept of ‘travelling cultures’ and enables a confirmation of the death of the community paradigm: “It is now widely understood that the old localizing strategies- by bounded *community*, by organic ‘culture’, by region, by ‘center’ and ‘periphery’ – may obscure as much as they reveal” (Clifford 303). The diaspora, as conceptualized by Gilroy, opens onto a cultural universe definitively detached from ‘tribal’ and ‘national cultures’. It exhibits a capacity to unite the two apparently opposing topological markers of community construction which are ‘roots’ (permanence) and ‘routes’ (mobility), and succeeds in the prowess of maintaining ‘identifications outside the national time/space in order to live inside, with a difference’ (Clifford 308).

Cohen summarized this current by quoting that in this perspective: “diasporas are positioned somewhere between ‘nations-states’ and ‘travelling cultures’ in that they involve dwelling in a nation-state in a physical sense, but travelling in an astral or spiritual sense that falls outside the nation-state’s space/time zone” (*Global* 95).

Thus, on one hand, we come across a kind of scholarly researches, a very different space of thoughts in comparison with the problematic space, as described previously. On the other hand, we are also at a converging point because all these researches lead to the same questions about the correlation between nation-states and diasporas. In Gilroy’s view, the concept of diaspora is fore-grounded as an antidote to what he calls ‘camp-thinking’, which involves oppositional and exclusive modes of thought about people and culture that rest on basis of purity and cultural identities (*Between* 84). In contrast with this approach, the diasporic identities are conceived as being “creolized, syncretized, hybridized and chronically impure cultural forms” (Gilroy, *Between* 129). Notably, the diaspora concept can be ‘explicitly antinational’ and can have ‘de-stabilizing and subversive effects’ (Gilroy, *Between* 128). It offers “an alternative to the

metaphysics of race, nation and bounded culture coded into the body, diaspora is a concept that problematizes the cultural and historical mechanics of belonging” (Gilroy, *Between* 123).

Diaspora is also ‘invariably promiscuous’ and it challenges “to apprehend mutable forms that can redefine the idea of culture through reconciliation with movement and complex, dynamic variation” (Gilroy, *Between* 129-130).

According to Kim Butler, with a view to emerge with a functional classification one ought to stop looking at diaspora as an ethnic group, but as a result of a definite process of community set up. Another possible approach is enlisting five major dimensions diaspora groups vary on. This list comprises most of the typologies mentioned previously. These five dimensions are: reasons for, and conditions of, dispersal; relationship with the homeland; relationship with host lands; interrelationships within communities of the diaspora; comparative studies of different diasporas (Butler 195).

The first dimension is a significant one because “A people that is expelled will necessarily develop a different cultural ethos from those who flee, or who are taken as captives. A group that leaves en masse also differs from a group that gradually constitutes itself after a protracted period of individual emigrations” (Butler 199). While all these experiences are traumatic, it is obvious that relationships of people with their homelands will differ on the basis of the reasons of their ending up in diaspora. The second dimension can be assumed that a gradual immigration is caused more by opportunities outside and less by any traumatic experiences in the homeland with the least amount of negativity towards the homeland, allowing the establishment to some extent, close relationships between migrant groups and their homelands. Forced migrations consists a more extreme version of dispersal that can cause traumatic feeling that affects the relationships between migrant groups and their homelands for

considerably longer periods of time, making it more difficult to rebuild a healthy relation until some significant transformation takes place in the homeland.

The third dimension is the relationship with the host land. Once a group is dispersed to two or more countries, the relationships of the group with the country they settle in rely upon the role they play in their new environment. Initially when they settle in a country, potential diaspora groups tend to possess an isolated status. To an extent they remain outsiders even if they regularly interact with the local population. But in most of the cases, this changes over time and group members are gradually accepted as a part of the host society sooner or later. As the acceptance increases and some individuals begin to occupy more visible positions, the overall status of the group enhances accordingly. Since this is a gradual procedure, the improvements of relationships with homeland and host land go parallel.

Further, the fourth dimension takes a glance at the groups themselves and categorizes them keeping in mind their internal relations. Evidently, an organized group will be more efficient in its relations with the homelands as well as the host lands because it is almost always more capable of working together toward common goals and it is often more effective in improving its circumstances in the host lands. An organized group is also more likely to have good relations with its homeland which perceives it as an asset they can use to lobby on their behalf in host countries.

However it is clearly visible that the early phases of diaspora existence is perhaps less applicable over the course of its history, migration studies do not prioritize such dimensions as the relationships among diasporic communities. Since this type of framework suggests diaspora studies to focus on the definite clarification and unique dimensions of the diasporic experience, it helps distinguish it from conventional ethnic studies. The framework's preciseness also provides

a substitute of determining the validity of a specific group to be considered as diaspora. A comprehensive study of a single diaspora should enable to comprise the first four dimensions and if it can, it will be possible to engage the group in comparative diasporic studies. However, if it cannot, perhaps the group is other than diaspora community.

Today the concept of transnationalism is used worldwide among migration researchers (e.g. Faist 2000a; Labelle and Midy 1999; Portes et al. 1999; Rex 1996; Smith and Guarnizo 1998). The research during 90's viewed the emergence of the notions of transnational space, transnational communities, nations unbound remarkably with the work produced by Basch, Glick-Schiller and Szanton Blanc. They have tried to summarize the unification of all these problematics when they quoted that the contemporary diasporas are 'nation unbound' who 'reinscribe' space in a new way. They continued to state that in contrast with the past when nation-states were defined in terms of a people sharing a common culture within a bounded territory. This new conception of nation-states includes as citizens "those who live physically dispersed within the boundaries of many others states but who remain socially, politically, culturally and often economically part of the nation-state of their ancestors" (Basch, Schiller, and Blanc 8). They have introduced a new conception of 'transnational migration', which questions this extensive conceptualization of immigrants, suggesting that in both the U.S. and Europe, increasing number of immigrants is best understood as 'transmigrants', whose daily lives depend on multiple and constant interconnections across international borders and whose public identities are configures in relationship to more than one nation state (Basch, Schiller, and Blanc 48). Transnationalism further defined by them:

We define 'Transnationalism' as the process by which immigrants forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and

settlement. We call this process Transnationalism to emphasize that many immigrants today build social fields that cross geographic, cultural and political borders. (Basch, Schiller, and Blanc 7)

In the group of diaspora ‘specialists’, the difficulty of managing all these terms is definite. Cohen’s book, *Global Diasporas: An introduction* and Nicholas Van Hear’s book, *New diasporas* are devoted to diasporas in the age of globalization and transnationalism. In *Global Diasporas: An introduction*, Cohen conceptualizes:

The idea of diaspora thus varies greatly. However, all diasporic communities settled outside their natal (or imagined natal) territories, acknowledge that ‘the old country’ – a notion often buried deep in language, religion, custom or folklore – always has some claim on their loyalty and emotions. (ix)

There is a potential understanding that during this era of globalization, diasporas are not simply migrants in the eyes of host countries; they are linked all together to many political contexts through inferior communication and transportation networks. Diasporas are playing the role of political actors with local and transnational agendas. Diasporas in the global period fluctuate from nations of the modern age because they have multiple national identities and loyalties and are interlinked across the globe. The original nation is no longer ‘homogeneous’. Double citizenship and multiple loyalties flourish but are not yet theoretically integrated into the term ‘diaspora’.

Butler mentions three main reasons for the change of identification for the simple fact that more and more people migrate away from their homelands today than few decades ago (190). First of all, many members of these groups end up with the notion that even if they completely integrated with their host country, they would always be considered as foreigners.

Instead of giving up their native culture for the sake of their host country's culture, many members of these groups preferred to organize around their common identity and mobilize from that starting point, sometimes with the support of their home country, to attain the privileges and the position they believed they deserved. This was made possible by another cause. As a result of the advancement in technology and globalization it became easier to keep acquainted with their homeland. This would help them nurture their culture and identity even if they were far from their home land. Butler also highlights the problematic nature of the term 'diaspora' in light of increased global migration of individuals and groups and the risk of essentializing the term as an 'ethnic label rather than a framework of analysis' (193). She does however state clearly that "the construct of homeland is essential; it functions as the constituting basis of collective diasporan identity" (193).

Roza Tsagarousianou suggests that the new use of the term diaspora is a result of its changing meaning. She argues that the emphasis shifted from displacement to connectivity. While earlier we used to focus on the circumstances under which these groups were displaced, now we tend to focus on their level of relationship with their homelands. She states,

Diasporas should better be seen as depending not so much on displacement but on connectivity, or on the complex nexus of linkages that contemporary transnational dynamics make possible and sustain. Diasporas should be seen not as given communities, a logical, albeit deterritorialized, extension of an ethnic or national group, but as imagined communities, continuously reconstructed and reinvented. It is in the context of this intersection of connectivity and cultural reinvention and reconstruction that media technologies and diasporic media become crucial factors in the reproduction and transformation of diasporic identities. (52)



As a result from the change in perception of these groups in their homeland, the term diaspora started to represent a “potential empowerment based on the ability to mobilize international support and influence in both the homeland and host land” (Butler 190). On one hand diasporas performed as the entrance for their homeland in the country they reside in. On the other hand, diaspora groups were also able to influence and manipulate their homeland and its policies, especially but not solely when their conflict continued. Demmers termed this second case as the ‘deterritorialization’ of conflict’ (86). More lately, Nicholas van Hear provided some essential elements, when he proposes three minimal criteria to define diasporas:

1. the population is dispersed from a homeland to two or more other territories;
2. the presence abroad is enduring, although exile is not necessarily permanent, but may include movements between homeland and new host;
3. there is some kind of exchange –social, economical, political or cultural- between and among the spatially separated populations comprising the diaspora (6).

In *Global sociology*, the recent book by Robin Cohen and Paul Kennedy, they have offered a chapter on identity and belonging in which a sub-chapter is dedicated to transnationalism elaborated via three examples: The cosmopolitan city, diasporas, diasporas and a global business. It emphasizes that the researchers have to pay attention to these multiple inclusions of the notion of diaspora. Though intriguing, these elements raise questions on the permanence of the term ‘diaspora’ in the ‘age of globalization’, which seems validate and on the capacity of the new forms of migration to evolve ‘automatically’ in a space transcending the national frontiers.

According to Cohen, diasporic communities have shown a continuing or newly asserted attachment to places of origin. This has generated many attempts at using diaspora for the

purpose of homeland economic and social development, sometimes in cooperation with the international development agencies and the governments of rich countries. At the same time the idea of 'homeland' and 'home' are intrinsic to the diasporic condition has been questioned.

Osten Wahlbeck in "Transnationalism and Diasporas: The Kurdish Example" argues that "...the discussion concerning transnationalism within social science at large, and specially the concept of diaspora, can provide refugee studies with some of the conceptual tools that are needed to study refugees in an increasingly global world. The concept of diaspora can take into account the refugee's specific transnational experiences and social relationships" (2). He added that 'the social relations of migrants and refugees are no longer confined within the borders of nation-states. Thus, the social relations can be regarded as transnational. The notion of transnationalism indicates a relation over and beyond, rather than between or in, the nation-states' (2).

On one hand, authors such as Cohen and Sheffer emphasize the competence of diasporas to make precious and creative contributions to the country of origin and to the country of destination. On other hand, Bordes-Benayoun and Schnapper identify two elements that unite diasporas: 1) a common ethnic identity; and 2) a collective relationship of solidarity towards their country of origin (65). To address the contours of a 'diaspora' in the global space, a definition of diaspora used by Adamson and Demetriou, which contains both positivist and constructivist elements:

A diaspora can be identified as a social collectivity that exists across state borders and that has succeeded over time to 1) sustain a collective national, cultural or religious identity through a sense of internal cohesion and sustained ties with a real or imagined homeland and 2) display an ability to address the collective interests of

members of the social collectivity through a developed internal organizational framework and transnational links. (497)

As Marientras says, giving an explanation of new diaspora in “On the Notion of Diaspora”, globalization might have lead to time-space compression and might have lessened this required time. Thus for diaspora it is likely to hybridize with the society in which it is rooted culturally, excluding ethnically. If it does not, and lives as segmented and isolated, then it is an exile community (Faist 11). Thomas Faist claims in fact diasporas are one type of ‘transnational communities’ (10). “Transnational communities consist of international movers and stayers connected by dense and strong social and symbolic ties over time and across space to patterns of networks and circuits in two countries- based upon solidarity” (Faist 9). “The community without propinquity link through reciprocity and solidarity to achieve a high degree of social cohesion, and a common repertoire of symbolic and collective representations” (Faist 10). Among transnational communities, Faist claims diasporas do not necessarily need concrete social ties: “It is possible that the memory of a homeland manifests itself primarily in symbolic ties (also approved in Cohen, 1997:176)” (11).

As Werbner expresses in “Introduction: The Dialectics of Cultural Hybridity”, diaspora nationalists are not merely nationalists who are living outside of their homeland. Being transnational means the diaspora is culturally hybrid. Werbner adds that the hybridity of transnationals is unconscious, organic, and collectively negotiated in practice, as opposed to deliberate, external, and transgressive hybridity. Thus according to him diaspora is not pure or mixed. In other words hybridity does not cause anti-essentialism or anti-integrationism, the hybrid culture or identity itself becomes the essence of their loyalty. Although the hybrids think

globally like cosmopolitans, in fact their loyalties are anchored in trans-local social networks and cultural diasporas rather than global ecumene (Werbner 12).

In summation, these contributions offer a rich variety of different approaches. As far as analysis is concerned, all these aspects attribute the notion of diaspora to ‘historical migrants’ and to privilege the question of time as Marientras (1989) and Medam (1993) proposed and to prefer the term of transnational communities to the latest migrant groups, presenting a multi-polarized organization.

#### **1.4. Diasporic Literature: Celebration or Lamentation?**

I recognize my living room asking each piece

Where it would like to be placed.

I give a new spot to the sofa and the lamp,

Change the drapes, and

Replace the old rug with a wall-to-wall carpet.

When everything is just right

I begin to wonder: where among these

Should I place myself? (Naik)

The ‘diasporic writings’ or ‘expatriate writings’ or ‘immigrant writings’ chiefly give voice to the distressful experiences of the writers when they are under stress due to the conflict of two cultures or the racial discrimination they endure. As per the views of P. A. Abraham, though many use expatriation and immigration as synonyms, there is a fine line between the two. “...expatriation focuses on the native land that has been left behind, while Immigration denotes the country into which one has ventured as an immigrant” (Abraham 50). Only a few immigrants, who can cope with new geographical, cultural, social and psychological

surroundings, can witness immigration as a pleasing experience. Customarily the focal points for diasporic literature can be brief out as dispersion, discrimination, nostalgia, identity crisis and lack of sense of belonging. Diaspora writers tend to elaborate their everyday experiences of isolation in the new land, the problems they face in the new society and their 'in-betweenness' in their writings. Although the idea can be conceived that there are requisite resemblances in the experiences or expressions of the diasporic writers, their writings cannot be considered homogenized.

Like the class factor, the language factor also counts, especially in terms of accommodation, negotiation and reception. The experience of someone writing in English from England, USA, Canada or Australia, is certain to be different from that of a writer writing in English in France or in Gujarati in England. The diasporic experience also becomes a gendered experience when it comes to the writing of Indian women abroad, such as Meena Alexander, Panna Naik, Malati Rao, Sudha Chandola, Sujata Bhatt, Anita Desai, Kamala Markandaya, Bharti Mukherjee, Suniti Namjoshi, Jhumpa Lahiri and so on. The minority-majority status too contributes to the intensity or otherwise of the felt alienation. A Tamil in Ceylon or an Indian Mauritius member is even perceived as a threat by the dominant community there because of the size and confidence of these migrant populations. Again, the experience of the second generation or third generation migrant is very different from that of the first generation migrant; home becomes illusory to them, just a space of imagination rather of nostalgic reminiscence.

One has to take into account different forms of 'othering' experienced as different levels of identity within the diaspora. Imagining the other is not necessarily an incapacitated experience; in fact it defines one's self and reassures one about one's own distinct identity. The idea of home is related to the place one comes from, one comes to and one belongs to. The

narrative production of home also assumes many strategies according to one's relation to time that transform it into history or myth. One can trace out post-colonialism in those writers who survive the third culture, who dwell in the third space and who form the third history.

As stated by Avtar Brah in her article "Diaspora, Border and Transnational Identities", diaspora experiences fluctuate according to "When, how and under what circumstances" (616) one has settled in the new society. In context of the Indian diaspora, the first phased migrants were not literate so they passed the record of their culture and torments orally to the next generation. Being educated, the second and the third phase of migrants could document their experiences in written form.

Although the diasporic experience, depicted in literature is realistic, it is also to some extent fictionalized. Emphasizing this point, Jasbir Jain in his article, "Memory, History and Homeland: The Indian Diasporic Experience" refers to this kind of portrayal as a 'split narrative'. In the context of the past and the present of diaspora literature, Jain further discusses that – the past has a different 'history', 'tradition', 'regional and colonial memories' and 'political equations' and the present has different kinds of 'loneliness, isolation, social ghettoisation, success, affluence and recognition'. In spite of living in the present they co-exist in the past too (Jain 76).

The commonality among the writings of the diaspora writers is their sense of guilt for not being loyal to either society – whether homeland and host land. With such state of mind, they fluctuate between the home country and the settled land. The tension of living in-between the two worlds is reflected well in their works. Rushdie in his essay "The Indian Writer in England" describes the diaspora community's recollection of their homeland and its culture as, "... our physical alienation from India almost inevitably means that we will not be capable of reclaiming

precisely the thing that was lost; that we will, in short, create fictions, not actual cities or villages, but invisible ones, imaginary homelands, Indias of the mind” (76).

Tololyan makes a distinction of the literature emerging from the background of diaspora between two types of writing by explaining that there are two discourses, namely the emic diaspora, which is more autobiographical with references to the narration of self and the etic diaspora, which is more scholarly dealing with studies on diaspora. According to Tololyan, the other matter that is significant in diaspora studies is the aspect of representation: “Who represents diasporas—the community itself or scholars— matters. As the works of Louis Althusser and Pierre Macherey imply, the diasporic social domain that exists when only emic study and self-representation is going on takes a different shape when it is constituted as the object of knowledge of diasporic studies” (qtd. in Tololyan, *The Contemporary* 654). Tololyan finally hints at an additional factor in this aspect:

A corollary of this point is that the object of knowledge in area studies is also always in some sense a given and always, in another sense, created. For example, the territory and populations of the Middle East existed as sociopolitical domains before orientalism, and then Middle Eastern studies, represented and transformed them into disciplinary objects. They continue to exist, but in subtle ways how they think of themselves, how they act, what they are, is altered by the dialectic between self-study and the disciplinary and area studies emanating from powerful quarters. (The Contemporary 655)

Talking about the initial phase of diasporic literature, in spite of certain differences most diasporic writings divulge definite features that are common in nature. Many of the diasporic works confer the attachment of the individual or community to the homeland and the urge of

belonging in the settled land, which results in their revelation as a hybrid existence. In the context Lau states:

They are people who are as multi-cultural as they are multi-lingual. They do not regard themselves as fully belonging in either culture, and have practically evolved a sub-culture peculiar to themselves. They try to take the best from both worlds, but suffer the sense of hybridity and cultural entanglement. (241)

Nevertheless another point of concern is that of Ramraj in his article *Diaspora and Multiculturalism* wherein he discusses the dissimilarities among immigrant, exile and expatriate writings. According to him “exile and expatriate writing is more immersed in the situation at home and the circumstance that prolong the individual’s exile or expatriation” more than with “the emigre’s or emigre’s community’s relationship with the dominant society” (229). Therefore he thinks that diasporic writing is often about “people who are linked by common histories of uprooting and dispersal, common homelands, and common cultural heritages”, but due to the political and cultural particularities of the society, on the other hand it develops different cultural and historical identities (229).

Nostalgia and dislocation are the other common features of diasporic writings and this is pointed out by Rushdie in “The Indian Writer in England”, when he states, “exiles or emigrants or expatriates, are haunted by some sense of loss, some urge to reclaim, to look back, even at the risk of being mutated into pillars, of salt” (76). He further mentions while discussing the diasporic group, “... our physical alienation from India almost inevitably means that we will not be capable of reclaiming precisely the thing that was lost; that we will, in short, create fictions, not actual cities or villages, but invisible ones, imaginary homelands, Indias of the mind” (76).



One of the first and foremost feelings that haunt a diasporic community is dislocation. There are several voluntary or non-voluntary factors which are the reasons for the dislocation of a community from their home land to a host land. Voluntary factors can occur due to either educational need or economical need. On the other hand, non-voluntary factors transpire due to political and national suppression and it could be marital causes, especially in the case of women. When diasporic community find themselves dislocated from the home society, they try to escape from the reality of life in the settled land with the help of being nostalgic by relocating themselves in past:

Nostalgia, by its very nature, often produces a romanticized perspective of the homeland. Indulgence in these illusions evokes a pseudo comfort and security which sustains the individual away from home...the motherland reconfigures into a phantom of displaced paradise. (Sheik 189)

Sten Paultz Moslund refers to Roy Sommer's novel *Fictions of Migration* with the central theme of hybridity. In his work Sommer employs the term 'transcultural' literature as equivalent for hybrid work of migration literature. Sommer sees the transcultural, hybrid literature as concerning "visions of the dissolution of fixed cultural identities and the assertion of cosmopolitan hybridization and ethnic fragmentation" as counter-models to 'exclusive national or ethnic identities' (qtd. in Moslund, 5). He is the supporter of the fluidity of this fiction because of such inbuilt features as 'in-betweenness', 'borderless cosmopolitanism' and 'transitory identities' as inseparable parts of the theme (qtd. in Moslund, 6). These characteristics – which have their root in Bhabha's concept of hybridity – have now become the basic characteristics to categorize as the literature of migration, a new kind of literature that copes with multiplicity, fluidity, replacing the old identities of steadiness and belonging.

In Leslie Adelson's words, "the literature of migration is not written by migrants alone" (qtd. in Walkowitz, 533). Therefore the migrant writer should not be bound to the borders of the cultural engagements, because it consequences into the risk of their experience of development and recognition. On the contrary, a writer can be acclaimed as a migrant writer in his homeland, because what distinguishes him is not the geographical borders and places, but the hybrid nature of their works. Carine Mardorossian put forward the suggestion that being a migrant writer or even writing about the migration experience does not certify the writing as migration literature. This means that even non-immigrant writers who portray characters crossing the geographical boundaries and cultures, and who exhibit the configuration of a hybrid selfhood from the heart of cultural divergences, could be considered to be the producer of immigrant fiction. In this respect, the old ideas that a migrant shifts between two diverse worlds and the migrant writer brings with himself an entirely unique literary structure to the host land is no more pertinent in the conception of a work of migration.

Another theme of the migration literature is ambivalence, as the character's response towards any intricate, perplexing or emotionally charged social phenomenon. In this consideration, the experiences of the migrant character are investigated in the context of ambivalence as either a lasting emotion, a situation, a specific attitude, or even as an enduring life condition.

The conflict between the two opposing affections – homeland and host land - is perceptible in immigrant's common experiences of life, which are noticed by divergent and occasionally opposing positions obtained by the migrant in the community life. These struggles resolve when the migrant readily adjusts himself to the new surroundings, disregarding the either roles and selecting the third space: the hybridized in-betweenness. These are considered to be the

complications of the migrants who tumble between identities, desire to retain cultural roots, at the same time, experiencing the acceptance of and integration to the new culture. Ambivalence is therefore a common feature of many of migrant writing, because it enables the writer to tell the readers that the migration event does not long between the individual's leaving the homeland and entering the host society. The event of migration lays within a long extensive web of individual manifestations, adjustments and reactions within the individual that start even before the move and which remains the integral part of his life for many years afterwards, which is well depicted in the migration literature. This leads to Paul White who claims in his well-known article "Geography, Literature and Migration" that migration literature focuses on the intricate world that we all dwell within. This article provides some important insights about the way in which self-identity is ratified and being formatted: "Creative or imaginative literature has a power to reflect complex and ambiguous realities that make it a far more plausible representation of human feelings and understandings than many of the artifacts used by academic researchers" (15).

White also believes that migrant literature is interestingly unambiguous for it deals with the way in which our sense of self can be undermined by such great changes as being uprooted from one culture to another. Migration Literature generates the feelings that can be stirred up by migration, feelings like ambivalence, alienation, excitement and joy. In other words, "the experience of migration acts as a catalyst and conduit for nascent feelings, a re-conception of our sense of self and our relationships with others" (Jacobs 142). However, ambivalence operates as a route which leads the migrant to the more secure coast of adjustment through successful contact with diverse cultures within a created hybrid space. That's how the thematic aspect of

migration works –ambivalent and adjustment –meets the first and most significant theme - which is ‘hybridity’, which is the experience of being neither the one, nor the other.

Another theme which is scarcely transpired by the writers of migrant fiction in their work is abandonment and return. This theme deals with the comprehensive depiction of the expedition from homeland to the host land along with the notion of return, which represents the migrant's feeling provoked by a visit to the home of origin. This aspect usually concerns with describing the varied experiences of the journey of migrants and the fright and dishonor they suffer when seeking for shelter. The focus is often on the “pressing flood of emotional upheaval confronted with the decision that takes a moment to make but which has immeasurable consequences” (White 13). This theme is being manifested in the migrant literature because progressively more interrelated world has made the alternative of settling in new country or homecoming more tangible than in previous times.

This dilemma of migration was well depicted in his article “Journeying South: The Contribution of Contemporary Australian Literature for Migration Research” by Jacobs in the context of a novel written by the contemporary novelist Graham Kershaw, entitled, *The Home Crowd* written in 2002. The protagonist of the novel is a young English man, a migrant in Australia who desires to reconnect with his former life in England. The central theme of the novel is the protagonist's journey back to England and realization that he had left behind far more than he knew. This novel and the similar works of migration can be read as intercession on the unbreakable ties and bonds that arise from intense relationships (either with homeland or host land or both), everlasting adjustments on the part of migrants and the prevalence of ambivalence.

The general conception of the writers of migration is that they often deal with biographical themes that concern with the journey from their homeland to host land, the

difficulties of adaptation with new world, the frustration they experience as the outsiders, facing discriminations and so on. However, apart from these issues these writers, as a part of assimilation procedure, learn the language of their host land and start writing all diverse literary genres, so that the label 'writers of migration' is not fully justified. The only common characteristic they share is their choice to write in their second language.

In his article "Three Myths about Immigrant Writing: A View from Germany", Saša Stanišić has offered three myths for Diasporic writings. They are:

1. Immigrant literature is a philological category of its own, and thus comprises a fruitful anomaly in relation to national literatures.
2. Immigrant literature deals mono-thematically with migration and multicultural issues. Immigrant authors have a closer and thus more authentic perspective on related questions.
3. An author who doesn't write in his mother tongue enriches the language he has chosen to write in.

While explaining the first myth, Saša says that to converse about a single 'immigrant literature' is meaningless because the nature of migration and the level of foreign writers' assimilation with new environment defer to the extent to be accumulated in one single category, without concerning about the authors' distinctive biographical backgrounds and diverse cultural, religious, or social background. Regarding second myth Saša states that most works of immigrant authors deal in one way or another with a single (often autobiographical) experience of migration. This basic statistical observation speaks for itself. But these percentages lead to overhasty and deficient assumptions about subjects 'reserved' for an author with a background of migration. Through third myth Saša conveys that writing itself is a foreign language because for

every new literary creation, an author has to learn a new language: to find the narrator's voice, to decide on the character's specific verbal characteristics and to learn and keep the rhythm and flow of the whole.

The theme of writing is not only the criteria to bifurcate the diasporic writers, but they are also diverged on the basis of generations or ages. Majority of the first generation diasporic writers prefer to locate their writings either in their home land or in their host land or both because as Lau states, they are familiar with “culture and the geographical location of their countries (and cities) of origin” (240). They express about their earlier life patterns through their writings. On the other hand, most of the 2nd generation diasporic writers acknowledge the host land as their homeland and they are mostly disappointed by the way their parents live, which leads to numerous misunderstandings and ambiguities between both the generations. The 2nd generation diasporic writers, according to Werbner as expressed in his another article, “Theorising Complex Diasporas: Purity and Hybridity in the South Asian Public Sphere in Britain”: “send out a critical message to the South-Asian community, portraying it as still locked in the obsolete and reactionary customs and beliefs of the old country” (901). Werbner also feels that the central theme of these writers is “the sexual politics of the family, represented by the struggles of a younger ... against arranged marriages imposed by authoritarian, coercive, gerontocratic elders” (901). He also points out the difference in the kind of writings of the second generations:

The new novels and films promote images of transgressive sexuality: gay, inter-racial or inter-ethnic love marriages and illicit cohabitation, to make their point.

They satirise an older generation's profligate consumption, false ethics, superstitious religiosity, blind prejudices and obsession with honor and status. (901)

One cannot proclaim that the common features of diasporic literature are presented in all the literary works of diasporic writers. Furthermore, on the bases of the theme of writing, diasporic writers can be alienated into two categories. The first category of writers prefer to locate their writings in their home land in order to portray their home land and its culture to the foreign readers or use their work as a means to memorize their home land or to criticize it. Examples for this category of writers can be counted are Rohinton Mistry, Salman Rushdie, Kiran Desai, Ha Jin, etc. The second category of writers prefer to locate their writings in their host land to reflect the changes they go through or to expose off multicultural nations by portraying its discrimination towards them or to show their developed condition in the settled countries. Writers who belong to this category are Bharati Mukherjee, Uma Parameshwaran, Meena Alexander, Chitra Bannerjee Divakaruni, etc.

Today the enhanced processes of globalization, cross-fertilization and trans-culturization make new diasporic literature and culture important everywhere. Diasporic writers interpret reality and their personal experiences in different systems, which is why the work of diasporic writers can be regarded as enhancement for both the cultures of origin and adopted. The work of diasporic writers can also be considered as a significant element of the upcoming multinational trans-culture. As per Cohen's views "diaspora, the dispersal of various peoples around the world, often caused by major historical and political changes, carries with it the collective cultural memory and capital of the past, overseas or across borders, as well as the acknowledgement of the old country as a concept deeply embedded in an individual language, religion, customs and folklore" (qtd. in Maver 10). Today diasporic writing links the past and the present and falsifies new concepts of fluid and transnational individualities. It offers an opportunity to widen the new

expressions of a transnational universal culture and sincerely confronts the centre-periphery locating central to 'traditional' post-colonial studies.

Thus the postcolonial frame of mind highlights the misery of parting from past life to postmodern existential discontinuity unlike the neocolonial and post-colonial world, often a product of forced immigration, of people escaping from religious and other political or social discrimination. But in the mid-1970s and afterwards, numerous Indian migrants to America were the new kind of colonizers, went to explore a better materialistic life, by taking full advantage of the war-time labor market and at the same time having no intention of ruling over the new land, because they always had a home to go back to and an identity to protect. In his Inaugural Address at a conference on diaspora writing held in New Delhi, Satchidanandan noted:

We are living at a time when the idea of 'Indianness' is being interrogated from different perspectives – those of Dalits, tribals, women, gays, lesbians and minorities for example. The essentialist, often Orientalist, conception of India derived from colonial-Indological and nationalist discourses is beginning to give way to a more federal democratic perspective of a polyphonic India, a mosaic of cultures, languages, literatures and world-views. (19)

Still the critical discourse on the diaspora appear to be standing by that exotic, eternal India which is also at times interwoven with the diasporic writer's individual perception of the country. Several Indian writers are engaged in projecting re-imagined communities, the unconventional nation-hoods. The recent diasporic literature may be depicting the character who is perceived in the role of a differently imagined foreigner, the one who has no perfect homelands to re-justify, but has constant distressing questions concerning to his or her own inner self. This reminds us the definition of a foreigner by French critic Julia Kristeva: "One who is



within us — he is the concealed face of our identity” (qtd. in Monti 19). We may extend the notion and say that the post-migrant character should be comprehended as the organization that detonates circulative concerns in a contemporary transnational world. He does not challenge the diasporic notion of belonging, but suffers from an influential question of self-realization, the one which has not been answered yet.

### **1.5. Indian Diaspora: Past and Present**

To study a banyan tree, you must not only know its main stem in its own soil, but also must trace the growth of its greatness in the further soil, for then you can know the true nature of its vitality. The civilization of India, like a banyan tree has shed its beneficent shade away from its own birthplace... India can live and grow by spreading abroad – not the political India, but the ideal India. (Tinker, *Banyan Tree* 1)

The Indian diaspora is chiefly the major area of investigation since it is the second major diaspora to China; with over 20 million people globally (Walton-Roberts). This is immediate evidence that makes Indian diaspora significant on the base of sheer size alone. Moreover, the Indian diaspora can be considered as the diaspora consisting vast diversity. As Bandyopadhyay and Voight-Graf observes, it is a miniature representation of India, which encompasses distinct religions, for instance Hindus, Sikhs, Muslims, Christians, Jains as well as regionally disparate cultures and ethnicities such as Punjabis, Gujaratis, Kannadigas, and Bengalis just to name a few. Furthermore, India has 16 official languages and around 1000 dialects (Bandyopadhyay 95).

India has a long history of migration, with three distinct phases. The first of which was migration pertaining to trade between monarchies and colonies endowed with imperialism and colonization. Then 19th century saw obligatory, forced or involuntary migration in the form of

indentured labour to other colonies such as Fiji and the final phase has been 20th century voluntary migration of Indians to industrialized nations forming ‘organic linkage[s] with the colonial diaspora’ (Jain, R. 339). As stated by Sanjay Chaturvedi, “diasporas and their practices produce and inhibit a postcolonial frontier” (142) a statement on the whole true of the Indian diaspora as it enters ‘contemporary currents of post-coloniality, globalisation and transnationality’ (Jain, R. 340). Hence, several justifications offered to make the path perceptible, in which investigating the Indian diaspora is a pertinent area of inquiry and will escort to a better conceptualization of how diaspora operates in a globalizing world generally.

According to Scott Cameron Levi, during the mid 16th century, Indian people from cities of Gujarat, Punjab, Rajasthan and Delhi, Bombay and Allahabad migrated to the Caucasus, Central Asia, and Russia. They were referred as ‘Multanis’, ‘Shikarpuris’ and ‘Banias’. It was an ‘Indian Merchant Diaspora’. Throughout the British reign, many Indians made short trips to England and European countries. When India got Independent, many Indians on temporary basis migrated to European countries mostly with the intention of either higher education or learning industrial skills. Indians who stayed permanently, kept in touch with their families in India. Unlike South European and North African countries, they were not considered as ‘guest-laborer’ immigrants by Europeans. The European countries developed into a multi-lingual, multi cultural and multi-religious society after World War II, where Indians became a prominent part of number around more than 2 million of the European canvas.

In *India Abroad: Diasporic Cultures of Postwar America and England*, Sandhya Shukla investigates the history and impact of Indian diaspora as a part of the large south Asian diaspora. She argues that the international movement of all classes of Indians was the result of British imperialism and she also says that the Indian diaspora, spanning from 1835 to 1920, comprised

diverse groups leaving India, each group having a different level of choice and compulsion. Proletarian were those who were compelled to become indentured servants and field workers because of social and political conditions, while mobilized were others who emigrated mainly to seize economic opportunity and advancement (qtd. in Brighton 18).

While talking about Indian diaspora, Kingsley Davis says, "...pressure to emigrate has always been great enough to provide a stream of emigrants much larger than the actual given opportunities" (99). On the same lines, Tinker in his work, *The Banyan Tree: Overseas Emigrants from India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh*, observes that there is a combination of push and pull: the push of inadequate opportunity in South Asia and the pull of the better prospects in the West (10). According to Amitav Ghosh, "The modern Indian Diaspora – the huge migration from the subcontinent that began in the mid-nineteenth century – is not merely one of the most important demographic dislocations of modern times: it now represents an important force in world culture" (243). These explorations helps to conclude that overseas emigration of Indians may be examined in the terms of three phases:

- (a) The ancient and the medieval,
- (b) The colonial and
- (c) The post-colonial phases

Among these three phases of migration, the post-colonial phase is more relevant to this research. The migration in the post-colonial phase was completely diverse in comparison to the earlier phases of migration, for in this phase the migrants belong to the middle-class. They were skilled with Instruction in English, due to the educational system in the post Independent India, which was patterned after the British and American educational systems, producing professionals. This led to a kind of professional migration, mainly to the developed Western

countries, frequently expressed as 'brain drain', aided with the fast revolutions in the fields of communication and transportation.

Foadmin and A. Siddique expresses in their article “The Indian Diaspora – Past, Present and Future” that if we can denote the earlier forms of migration in the ancient-medieval and the colonial phases as ‘Old Diaspora’, at present it comprises 60% of our Indian diaspora, or near about 18 million Persons of Indian Origin. Differentiating the old and new diaspora, they say that the Old Diaspora is primarily a pre-world war II phenomenon. And the New Diaspora consists of migrants who left India in large numbers from the mid of 1960s onwards, primarily to developed countries like the UK, US, Canada, Australia, and Western Europe. Further they add that the migration in the post-colonial period was completely different from the old diaspora. The system produced professionals who exceed the availability of jobs that can occupy them. This led to a kind of professional migration, aided by the speedy progress in the transportation and communication (Foadmin, and A. Siddique).

A review of literature in the field of Indian Diaspora discloses that the interest in the study of these communities is gradually strengthening, as great movements of populations across the national boundaries in this free-market economy is ultimately resulting in the formation of a multiethnic transnational society which is culturally pluralistic. It is also revealed through the review of literature on the Indian Diaspora that most of the analytical perspectives have their roots in the concepts of the terms such as ‘culture’, ‘migration’, ‘nationalism’, ‘ethnicity’, etc.

Tinker have a glance at the Overseas Indians with two different approaches- Overseas Indians as regenerating India in the land adopted and considering Indians as always victims of circumstance in the host lands. Tinker provides pragmatic proof for both to authenticate his study. He asks,

Do the Asians create their own difficulties by their own way of life, and by remaining separate from the host society; or do their troubles arise mainly from excess chauvinism or racism in the country of adoption? Do they offend because they are, visibly, both pariahs and exploiters in an alien society? Or are they scapegoats, singled out for victimization because their adopted country (or its government) needs an alibi for poor performance in the national sphere? (Tinker 138-39)

In their book *Overseas Indians : a study in adaptation*, Kurian and Srivastava dealt with not only a comparative study on the adaptive and adjustment patterns of the Indian immigrants but also showed how differentiations occur and differ with places of destination, in the context of lifestyles, attitudes and adjustment patterns. In *The Indian Diaspora: Dynamics of Migration*, the editor of the book, Prof. Narayan Jayram outlines a catalogue of important themes and issues that can be (and often are) pursued under the scope of Indian Diaspora. Jayram states that the agenda of Indian Diaspora as an area of academic study is necessarily multi-disciplinary in nature, which deals with the themes and issues such as demography of population movements, causes of and conditions of migration, the background of emigrants, the process of emigration, the changing composition of the 'Host' country, the dynamics of the 'Host' society, the social organization of the diasporic community, the cultural dynamics of the diasporic community, the question of identity, the struggle for power, the secondary emigration, orientation of the diasporic Indians to the ancestral lands, orientation of the ancestral lands to the diasporic Indians, etc (*Indian Diaspora* 23-31).

Amarjit Chandan, a Punjabi poet living in Britain analyses how capitalism leads to the formation of immigrant workers in the receiving countries, and their resultant marginalization.

The immigrants are subjected to racial discrimination, economic deprivation, and socio-cultural denigration. They are not allowed to form unions and are subjected to all sorts of humiliation. They are entangled between the two cultures and suffer from double consciousness, finally finding detached away from his or her own culture, language, and roots.

In the context of the theoretical aspects, different types of approaches to the study of Indian Diaspora are discussed by many sociologists. According to S. L. Sharma, most of the accessible literature on the Indian Diaspora can be categorized under three extensive kinds- historical, diplomatic and anthropological- and classify two main perspectives underlying these studies:

- (a) The socio-cultural perspective and
- (b) The political economy perspective

The socio-cultural perspective has largely operated from within the parameters of conventional structural-functionalism, if we focus on cultural identity and assimilation of the diaspora groups. It raises the questions of socio-cultural consistency and alteration among the diasporic communities on the one hand and the dynamics of these communities in the context of multiculturalism on the other (Jayaram, *Indian Diaspora* 33). A variety of Marxist and non-Marxist socio-economic thinking encourages the political economy perspective to focus on the political and economic aspects of the Indian Diaspora. This perspective highlights the historical context of the diaspora, the mode of economy of the 'host' country and the place of diasporic Indians in it, and the nature of the state in the host country. Despite the fact that these two theoretical perspectives are diverse in nature in the context of their substantive interests and conceptual apparatus, they can only be harmonizing each other in the matter of providing a more comprehensive understanding of the Indian diaspora (Jayaram, *Indian Diaspora* 33).

The above two approaches help us understand the Indian Diaspora with a broader manner. Nevertheless, most of the research studies on the Indian Diaspora have been autonomous and mainly determined with their specific migratory aspects -culture, identity formation and retention- and the processes of integration as well as adjustment. But as Bhat says, “the approaches to the study of the Indian Diaspora should go beyond the barriers of the disciplinary boundaries”, instead of simply focusing on historical, anthropological, or political point of views, the research studies should be more interdisciplinary and comparative in nature and analysis (Jayaram, Study of). Kalam believed that the study on Indian Diaspora community should be evidently specified in the contexts of time and space because though Indians are from the same geographical entity, they are treated under different categories in various ‘receiving societies’. The consequence of which is denoting various identities to a inhabitants from the same origin, such as Asian Indians, Indian Americans, and South Asians, Asians and name a few. So, a prior definition of the category under study is a pre-requisite for an analytical understanding of the category Indian Diaspora.

Vijay Mishra, one of the proponents of the studies of Indian diaspora, argues that in terms of implications the Indian diaspora can be divided into particular stages. He names early Indian diaspora of indentured labour, ‘a diaspora of exclusion’ that created somewhat autonomous ‘Little Indians’ in the colonies and relocated Indian icons of spirituality in the new destination (qtd. in Ghosh and Chatterjee 19). Mishra also differentiates this diaspora from the post-1965 ‘diaspora of the border’, which is itinerant but variously linked to the homeland and concerned with hyphenated subjectivity. Thus, in these cases, marginality is of economic sense, while it can be of racial or social sense too (qtd. in Ghosh and Chatterjee 19).

R. K. Jain in “A Civilizational Theory of Indian Diaspora and its Global Implications” brings out a synthetic ‘Civilizational Perspective’, wherein he integrates the two views of cultural persistence and the socio-cultural plurality of the host society, which he designates as ‘settlement societies’. He is more concerned to perceive the ongoing migrant group as a ‘developing civilization’. In *Indian Communities Abroad: Themes and Literature*, Jain classifies two frameworks or research paradigms in the study of the Indian diaspora. The first examines cultural resistance and the second inspects the adaptation of communities in their countries of residence, even though the later is more or less exclusively contributed to by scholars who are non-residential Indians or non-Indians (52).

In 1994, an ‘International Conference on Indian Diaspora’ was organized by the University of Hyderabad with the objective of opening up of a centre exclusively for the study of the Indian Diaspora. In that conference a paper was presented by Nadarajah on “Diaspora and Nostalgia: Towards a Semiotic Theory of the Indian Diaspora”. The approach by Nadarajah in the paper is of more analytical in nature. He discusses about semiotic theory of the Indian Diaspora, which is based on the context and discourse.

Indian Diasporic group of people can be understood as an element in any one of the above kinds of existing societies. However, as Bhikhu Parekh states in his paper on “A Commitment to Cultural Pluralism”, multicultural society should find “ways of developing a strong sense of mutual commitment and common belonging without insisting upon a shared comprehensive national culture and the concomitant uniformity of values, ideals and ways of organizing significant social relations.” Thus, we examine that as a large and distinct group, the Indian Diaspora has its foundation in the British colonial suppression of the rural Indian population. This phenomenon has not only disturbed the conventional social formation but also



created the indenture and *kangani* forms of labor that led to extensive migration of the Indian laborers to the plantations in the British colonies, starting from early 18th to the early 20th century. The occurrence of the migration took a new turn with the migration of the professionals to the developed nations, one such is the migration to the United States in the post 1960s period.

### 1.6. Indian Diasporic Literature

Aritha Van Herk states -

Imagine a country as this country is, peopled by characters who have abandoned their setting and who seek to plot their own story in a new way. They choose to displace themselves, to surrender the familiar...Curiously enough, because they make the choices, they are happy, if not always satisfied with their story, and the effects of displacement only begin to appear in the children or grand children. (qtd. in Abraham 50)

The diasporic writings in English are produced manifestly by persons of Indian origin who are currently settled outside their country. In the last decade *Indian diasporic writers* have fairly gained importance chiefly because of the increasing concern in cultural studies and the theoretical formulations which are now being produced by the critiquing of the diasporic literature. The diasporic writers are now spread all over the world and their writing raises issues concerning the definitions of 'home' and 'nation'. Nostalgia and/or depression are time and again the major concerns of these writers as they strive to reestablish themselves in new cultures. In such circumstances, the matters of great importance are to inquire the type of their connection with the work of writers and literatures of their homeland and to investigate the diverse approached adopted by them with the purpose of negotiating the cultural space of the host land.

We may categorize the diasporic writers in to three various types. Among the first category, there are writers like Raja Rao, who dwelled out of India for longer period of time but could never approve the culture of that adopted country. He remains an undeviating foreigner in a foreign country. Then there is the second category, where in there are some writers who are neither 'here' nor 'there'. If we use the metaphor suggested by Uma Parmeshwaram, they are like 'Trishankus'. Then in third category among the writers there are perfect immigrants who take foreign countries as their homes quite willingly. However, their narratives certainly display hidden discontents and contradictions (Nimavat 54).

From the beginning of Indian writing in English, the talented Indians, who have migrated abroad, are reaping a rich literary harvest out of a mingling of cultures and languages. Prof. K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar in his book, *Indian Writing in English*, thinks that modern Indian literature begins with Raja Rammohan Roy, who "was destined to act as a bridge between India and England" (30) and we know that Roy was a master of English prose. Sudhir Kumar, in his article "Diasporic Consciousness of Gandhi", entitles Gandhiji as a diasporic writer who tried to assemble the subjugated and disparate 'girmitias' in South Africa and given a fight against racial discrimination and repression. The Indians in South Africa have been aware by this fight, touching upon their feelings of dislocation, hostility and longing for home. As Sudhir Kumar says, the diasporic discourse mostly deals with political issues and imbalanced authority between two cultures and Gandhiji was the first activist to realize this fact,

This makes Gandhiji, scores of decades before a Homi Bhabha and Spivak could theorize the hybridity who showed through his words and deeds both, how well this 'hybrid condition' could be used for political empowerment of the most deprived diasporic subjects. (41)

Sudhir Kumar argues that the contemporary writers of diaspora have got a fundamental intimation from Gandhiji's dedication to diasporic issues. The diasporic writers have realized that an imaginative writer needs to be 'an activist and crusader for justice and equality' (41).

To start with Michael Madhusudan Dutt, Toru Dutt, Romesh Chander Dutt, Manmohan Ghose and Sri Aurobindo, with Indian origin but shifted to the West for academic and literary pursuits and frequently shuttled between Europe and India. They have acquired prominent places as diasporic writers by their work of lasting value. Dutt's *Meghnad Badha*, Toru's *Ancient Ballads* and her earlier book of translations *A Sheaf Gleaned in French Fields*, Romesh Chunder's skilled translations of *Sansar* as *The Lake of Palms* and *Madhavi Kankan* as *The Slave Girl of Agra*, Ghose's *Love Songs and Elegies*, and Aurobindo's *Savitri* are some of the outstanding works by all means. The Nobel Prize in literature to Rabindranath Tagore for *Gitanjali* encouraged a number of authors - Sarojini Naidu, M. K. Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Mulk Raj Anand, R. K. Narayan, Raja Rao and a host of other authors - to write in English. But all these authors returned to India after their temporary stay in the West. The diasporic writing however has a global perspective and it includes writers of both old and new generations who have left India and settled abroad.

Among the old generation of diasporic writers, we may mention Kamala Markandaya, B. Rajan, Santha Rama Rau, Bharati Mukherjee, Anita Desai, Salman Rushdie, Vikram Seth, V. S. Naipaul, Nirad Chaudhari, Amitav Ghosh, Ved Mehta and A. K. Ramanujan. Kamala Markandaya, who might be called 'the fourth wheel' (Dwivedi 4) of Indian English Novel, has been a prolific writer, with ten novels to her credit. Most of her writings are anti-colonist and anti-imperialist. Well acknowledged as a literary critic of Milton, Yeats and Eliot, than as an ingenious writer, Balachandra Rajan has published two novels, *The Dark Dancer* and *Too Long*

*in the West*. His daughter, Tilottama Rajan is also worth mentioning as an author of *Myth in a Metal Mirror*, which is a poetical collection of thirty six poems in all, nevertheless she belongs to the second generation of diasporic writers. Another diasporic writer Santha Rama Rau, has authored books such as *Home to India*, *Remember the House*, and *Gift of Passage* and *The Adventures* and well known for her scripting of the dramatic version of E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*.

Santha Ram Rau is trailed by Bharati Mukherjee, who is basically a writer of diasporic fiction, who clings to the belief that migration occurrences have enhanced the diasporic literature. Her literature deals with the diasporic issues like identity crisis, the sense of alienation and uprootedness, the conception of longing and belonging, displacement and relocations. She has written six novels and in most of her novels, she represents the woman of Indian in a cross-cultural context. Anita Desai has, of late, become a diasporic writer of eminence. Her major subjects of writings have been solitude and alienation. She usually dealt with private lives of particularly women in general. As a diasporic writer, one of Desai's frequent subjects is cross-cultural connection between the East and the West, which results into the sense of alienation and frustration in her protagonists. It must be mentioned here that Kiran Desai, Anita Desai's daughter is also a diasporic writer with two novels on her name, *Hullabaloo under the Guava Orchard* and *The Inheritance of Loss*.

Sulman Rushdie is pre-eminently concerned with the treatment of history and religion. In his writings, Rushdie explores the themes of geographical and physical migration dealing with spiritual alienation and up-rootedness, the disturbed and vicious political situations. Vikram Seth is an astounding diasporic writer who has exhibited his expertise first in prose and then in poetry. Seth draws upon his rich experience of the land of his birth, India in writing and approaches the

modern Indian problems such as rights of property, inter-cast marriages and crisis of identity. It can be concluded that Seth's writings do not merely possess diasporic themes but the endeavour to seek for the answer to the issues of the diasporic community. The winner of the Nobel Prize for literature in 2001, V. S. Naipaul's writing has themes like displacement, homelessness, deracination, spiritual remoteness, rootlessness and lasting exile. Nirad Chaudhuri is also critical of and apathetic towards India like Naipaul and it seems that in later stage of his life, he suffered from colonial hang-over and demonstrated his extra-fidelity towards the erstwhile masters of India in some of his works such as *A Passage to England*, *The Continent of Circe*, *To Live or Not to Live*, etc.

For Amitav Ghosh, who has also resided for long in England, Egypt and America, globalization or moving across the national frontiers is 'an everyday fact of experience' (Thieme 274). In his novels Ghosh remains an international vagabond, rejecting the theory of cultural centrality. In his writings, one can find the stories of those diasporic persons whose lives overlap, pull apart and separate, yearning for their homeland and find each other again in new contexts or the demonstrates how imperialism evolves in merciless exploitation. Another noteworthy diasporic writer, Ved Mehta reflects the picture of his mother India and her people, their traditions, customs and ceremonies, in an absorbing manner. In such works he nostalgically recollects his past links with India, with his relatives and friends.

Of all the Indian English poets, A. K. Ramanujan occupies a place of pride, for his poems often concerned with the recollections of the land he was born and brought up. Most of his poetry in his initial course of time in Chicago reflects his sense of expatriation. Being a diasporic writer, he maintained deliberate distance from his mother land where he persisted to return through nostalgia. This investigation of the diasporic writers of the old generation leads us to

believe that they have lived long or too long in the West and that they are generally scattered all over the world particularly in England, America, Canada and West Indies. After England, Canada has enormously fascinated the diasporic writers. Since long Saros Cowasjee resides in Canada and in his novel, *Goodbye to Elsa*, he shows his concern for the sovereign nationality and identity of Canada. Cyril Dabydeen is also an old settler in Canada and twice-removed geographically. Being both poet and novelist, he has about 20 books on his name.

Uma Parameswaran, Ashish Gupta, Rohinton Mistry, Neil Bissoondath, and M. G. Vassanji are to be mentioned in the connection of other diasporic writers of relatively younger generation, who have shifted to Canada and settled there. Of these writers, Uma Parameswaran has done some admirable creative works, highlighting the themes like sense of alienation, rootless and nostalgia in the lives of the immigrant undergoing the experience of the diaspora in Canada. In the fiction of Rohinton Mistry, one can frequently witness a luminous illustration of the sense of displacement. His portrayal of violence and life's gloomy side is extremely realistic. He depicts how tragedy emerges over the brittle lives of the protagonists, who belong to suppressed community. Ashish Gupta is another such writer of power and pulse, who has made a mark in diasporic writing with his two novels *Dying Traditions* and *The Toymaker from Wiesbaden*. The theme of *The Toymaker from Wiesbaden* is the third space, a space different from both the homeland and the land of adoption. Neil Bissoondath is an East Indian, who migrated to Canada from Caribbean and claims to be a Canadian writer. His writing mostly focuses on the lives of people, who are displaced by political hostility and also those, who are marginalized within their own societies, estranged by their own culture. Also, M. G. Vassanji has created ripples in the literary world by his modernistic work, *No New Land*, and experimental

novel, *The Book of Secrets*, which depicts the experience of the Community, uprooted from homeland and relocated.

Pico Iyer and Gita Mehta are two of the younger diasporic writers based in Britain. Iyer produced two travelogues, a memoir set in Japan, *The Lady and the Monk*, a novel located in Cuba, *Cuba and the Night*, and numerous essays, as a result of his constant shifting from England to Japan and to Cuba. As for Mehta, she has acclaimed fame through her novel, *A River Sutra*, Which is inventive in its weaving the theme of diaspora. Instead of usually approaching the theme of marginalization or the gendered nature of identity politics and ethnicity, the novel evolve unusual depiction strategy to express the concept of ‘otherness’ through malleable sarcasm directed at the peculiarities of both the culture of motherland and the host land in some works, and in others, through the dialectic of self-appraisal.

The United States of America is the residence of many diasporic writers of younger generation like Chitra Bannerjee Divakkaruni, Meena Alexander and Jhumpa Lahiri. Divakaruni’s works mainly focuses on the diasporic Indian women trapped amid two opposite worlds, in an in-between state, struggling to carve out individualities of their own. Meena Alexander has a genuine diasporic voice, articulating her own experiences in her poetry- displacement and banishment, migrant nostalgia and suffering, separation and isolation - all the way from India to Sudan and USA. Born in London and after her birth shifted to the United States with her Indian parents, Jhumpa Lahiri’s elegant writings tell the lives of Indians in exile, of people navigating between the strict traditions they’ve inherited and the baffling New World they must encounter every day.

Anjan Appachana is an Indian migrant to US, resembling Jhumpa Lahiri. In most of her work, Appachana focuses on the lives of urban, educated middle class women reflecting on

gender relations, who are trapped amid traditions and modernity. Anita Rau Badami's novel presents different perceptions of the cultural association in opposition to individual aspirations and depicts the emotionally interwoven stress and tension that lies beneath existing Indian diasporic notions. Shauna Singh Baldwin is the diasporic Indo-Canadian writer and her writings are mainly about early displacement from India to North America and also mostly concerning to closed Indian societies either in India or North America. The winner of Sahitya Akademi Award, Sunetra Gupta's works is characterized by stream of consciousness technique focus on the inner lives of her characters. Her writing incorporates cultures, histories and human understanding and it shifts the fundamental concern of diasporic writings from the identity crisis to the mapping of a procedure of emotions and experiences.

When we talk of expatriate or diasporic literature, the sense of longing, hostility and nostalgia for homeland differ from individual to individual and consequently differ from author to author. Hari Kunzru, a British-Indian novelist and journalist, focuses on the importance of pluralism as an individual experience and it also endeavours to investigate the center lost between past of the country and British nomination. His writings also concern of migration, which plays a significant role in the demonstration uncertainties of life of an individual and a community. Hybridization, conflict and intersection of diverse cultures are the major themes of Vikram Chandra, an Indian- American.

Upamanyu Chatterjee proved that even within the same country, one can experience the feeling of displacement and homelessness. Most of his works based on the theme of alienation but it is not the diasporic alienation rather of a dislocated, urbanized Indian. Amit Chaudhuri belongs to writers of a new generation and most of his works deal with everyday city life recounting the family servants, Indian culture, food and music, etc. But deep down they explore



the themes of displacement and belonging through its characters, which are though in their familiar places but still feeling homelessness and alienation. Meera Syal has a specialty of comic elements through which she expresses her optimism for a positive change and she tries to portray the conflict between old and new generations of South Asian women.

Heretofore, numerous important diasporic writers have been discussed. Out of these writers, the current research focuses on the fiction by Kamala Markandaya, Anita Desai and Meena Alexander as the representatives of first generation Indian diasporic writings and Jhumpa Lahiri, Neil Bissoondath and Hari Kunzru as the representatives of second generation Indian diasporic writings.

To end with, the above account of the diasporic writing in English persuades us about the considerability of the literature produced by the Indian diasporic writers in several forms and genres, with diverse attitudes and backgrounds. Both old and new generations of the diasporic writers are settled abroad in different countries and their writing focuses their consciousness of geographical displacement, cultural ambiguity, social and political alienation, absence of centrality and nostalgia for their homeland and past associations, which also feed their imagination to churn out something innovative every time.

### **1.7. First and Second Generation Diaspora**

Before focusing on the terms ‘first generation’ and ‘second generation’, it is essential to first note the uneven definitions used to define this population group, as well as the multiple understandings of the more general term ‘generations’. According to Susan Eckstein, a specialist on urbanization, immigration, poverty, rights and injustices, and social movements in the context of Third World Countries, there is also a great argument about the usefulness of the very notion of ‘generation’ as a demographic and sociological concept. In the interpretation of the biological

definition in context of the position within the migrating or ‘post-migration’ family, Eckstein insists for a deeper historical re-conceptualization to differentiate between the ‘old’ and the ‘new’ generations of immigrants in the United States. Hence as per the views of Eckstein, both, biologically first and second generations of the earlier (historical) generations of immigrants, have been affected by identical integration circumstances, identical backgrounds of home-country in Europe as well as elsewhere. The same principle holds for the ‘new’ generation of immigrants: adaptation path, economic opportunities and experiences of trans-nationalism for both first and second (biological) generations reflect specific new historical conditions that have fundamentally changed since the 1960s (Eckstein 213).

According to Fakiolas and King, Eckstein’s view has another application, namely ‘second-generation returnees’, according to which historical period and emigrant destination (i.e. chronotope) are inter-located. As a result we might expect that second-generation immigrants relocating to Greece from the US. Historical distinction of immigrants into former and later generations by Eckstein is nothing but one of the explanations of generation, which would lead to confusion. For Loizos, “the term ‘generation’ is too seductive; a ‘rhetorical trope’ which tells us rather less than it should. Fundamentally fickle in its polysemy, generation is ‘unsafe’ in serious empirical research unless its precise meaning is specified in advance” (194). Kertzer identifies four meanings:

- generation as a principle of kinship descent: here it is a relational, genealogical concept used to define patterns within the larger universe of kinship;
- generation as life-stage, often referring to a particular life-course segment or to more generalized contrasts where there may or may not be a genealogical relation such as parent–child;

- generation as cohort: a set of similar-age people moving through the life-course, for instance based on a birth cohort;
- generation as historical period: the meaning used by Eckstein above, where generation is linked to some historical event or to people living/moving in a particular historical period (126).

In social science literature, though each of these meanings is extensive, each has a tendency to be analytically distinct studies— respectively with anthropology, sociology, demography and history. Moreover, although these meanings are connected with a particular discipline, some of them overlap and now and then, by mistake, been used interchangeably. In day to day conversation, generation is frequently used by us without specifying which definition we are employing, when we speak of the ‘older generation’, the ‘generation gap’, ‘generational conflict’ etc. In the context of the migration studies, the eminent concept of immigrant generations (generally first, second and third) is traditionally used to determine the growing loss of ethno-cultural uniqueness, heading towards assimilation. According to most researchers and scholars, including Kertzer the concept of immigrant generations is much more challenging. As Kertzer identifies the problems:

- People sharing the same genealogical and generational position may belong to different historical periods, coming from an origin society and arriving in a destination society which will have both changed over time.
- Parents often migrate with their children, and in some cases even three generations move together. Are both parents and children to be considered first-generation? The concept of ‘fractional’ generations (1.5 generation etc.) resolves this question to some extent, but we

are still left with an anomaly of how to ‘define’ the grandparents, who may either migrate with their first-generation children or join them at a later date.

- As we move beyond the first generation in the host country, subsequent marriages are not necessarily generation-homogenous nor ethnically endogenous. It is quite common (for various reasons) for the second generation to seek spouses from the ‘home’ country. Any children thus have one second- and one first-generation parent – in which case they could be labeled 2.5 generation, although this term has little currency (qtd. in Rumbaut, Age 1185).

These problems certainly causes complicated environment for research on distinguishing the first and second generation, but in a way they also enrich the field, by introducing the complexity of reality and the primary difficulties of classifying the populations.

### **1.7.1. Defining First and Second Generation Diaspora**

Usage of the terms ‘first generation’ and ‘second generation’ in context of immigrants creates challenges for description as well as analysis. Though the researchers take freedom in using the terms freely to connote a specific group of people, their definitions are blurred and often inadequate. There are major definitional issues regarding the first and second generation, which may influence the outcomes and the interpretations of research. The second generation rigidly or typically defined as it is made up of offspring born in the host country to two immigrant parents, the latter being the first generation. However, complications emerge when this definition begin to weaken, giving birth to some questions - what about children with one immigrant parent? How do we view children brought to a host country when they are very young? What about those who are twice or thrice removed from homeland?

The literature dealing with worldwide migration, settlement and assimilation, frequently uses variety of practicable definitions of the first and second generation, without much debate. Many theoreticians such as Irvin Child, Louie, Portes and Zhou, Ellis and Goodwin-White, Wilpert, Crul and Vermuelen, Modood, Andall have endeavoured to conceptualize and define the term ‘second generation’ in context of immigrants.

- Irvin Child’s classic study of second-generation Italians in the United States: “the offspring of immigrants, either born here or brought from the mother country at an early age” (3). The immediate question is: how early is early-age?
- Vivian Louie, whose research focuses on the second-generation Chinese and Dominicans in the US, more or less follows the Portes and Zhou definition: the second generation as US-born children of (presumably two) immigrant parents and foreign-born children who immigrated by the age of 12 (537), and who were thus largely educated and socialized in the United States.
- Ellis and Goodwin-White define as ‘1.5 generation’ those who arrive in the US under 10 years of age. Thus an 11-year-old arrival is classed second-generation by Louie and as first (and not even 1.5) by the latter authors (900).
- In European studies of the second generation, Wilpert offers a very broad definition: “children who may or may not have been born in their parents’ country of origin” (3).
- Crul and Vermuelen are a bit more precise: “those born in the country of immigration or... who arrived before primary school” (971).
- Modood, in a study of the qualifications achieved by ethnic minorities in Britain, uses ‘the second generation’ to include those who arrived in Britain up to the age of 15.

- In her study of African-Italians in Italy, Andall defines the second generation as those born in Italy or who arrived before the age of 6.

Among these definitions, the approaches of Andall as well as of Crul and Vermuelen seem most rational and sensible, as it assimilates the school starting age. However in this concern, Modood's stretching to the age of 15 seems problematic. Another approach is a more graduated one: the 'true' second generation (host-country-born with two foreign-born parents); and then the 1.75, 1.5 and 1.25 generations, referring respectively to foreign-born children arriving before 6, between 6 and 12, and after 12 and up to 17 years of age (Rumbaut, Ties 29). Others offer less numerically precise definitions: the 'post-immigrant generation' (Rumbaut, Severed) or 'post-migrant generation' (Wessendorf).

All the definitions some or other ways differs from one other but the most adequate definition for second generation is by Portes and Zhou: "native-born children with at least one foreign-born parent, or children born abroad who came to the United States before the age of 12" (75). These definitional problems undoubtedly complicate the environment for research on the first and second generation, but in a sense they also enrich the field, alerting us to the complexity of reality and to the fundamental difficulty of categorizing populations.

### **1.7.2. Differentiating First and Second Generation Diasporic Literature**

The diasporic writers deviate not only on the basis of the subject matter of the writing, but they also on the basis of ages or generations. On one hand, most of the diasporic writers of the first generation have the settings of their home country as well as the settled country in their work and their writing depicts their nostalgic feeling about their earlier life patterns, feeling of loneliness and alienation and gradual feeling of assimilation. Most of the diasporic writers of the second generation, on the other hand, willingly and expectedly adopt the land in which they are

born and brought up as their own homeland. They are discontented with the way their parents lead their lives, which results into several kinds of misunderstandings between both generations. Consequently, the central theme of most of the diasporic writers of second generation is “the sexual politics of the family, represented by the struggles of a younger ... against arranged marriages imposed by authoritarian, coercive, gerontocratic elders” (Werbner 901).

The first generation diasporic population often experiences a sense of isolation, displacement, loneliness and sense of loss in the new land; as a result they cannot intermingle with the people of other community in the settled country. Even if they try, they find it difficult for they are frequently victimized of the bitter experiences of discrimination. Initially they try to mingle with the new culture and society of the settled country, but their close bonding with their homeland and culture does not allow them to follow the new land’s culture completely. Sometimes it takes years to get assimilated with the new land and sometimes years of living in new land also make them consider it as another country and they prefer to strictly follow their own culture in this alien country. Most of the times, their own internal problems like isolation, alienation and loneliness cause more suffering to them than the outer problems like identity crisis, prejudice and discrimination.

In the case of discrimination, the first generation progressively starts accepting it in a normal manner, but for the second and the subsequent generations it is a severe psychological torment. The reason is that the connection and bonding with the homeland, which is observed in first generation, gradually gets substituted by the adopted country from the second generation and further. It is obvious for the second generation to consider the adopted country as their own, as they born and bought up in that foreign atmosphere. Therefore, when they experience

discrimination, it hurts them to the core and raises issues pertaining to their roots or backgrounds, parting them from their adopted country with bitter feelings.

The community of the host country discriminates with the diasporic community, because the host country considers it a danger of the disintegration of its own cultural identity, when the diasporic group of people tries to merge with them, continuing practicing their own culture. As pointed out by Wieviorka, “Under such circumstances the national majority considers migrants to be the root of its difficulties, and draws on racial definitions that combine the idea of natural race and the idea of culture in order to make them scapegoats” (71). Not only the government of settled country, but also the people of the country take law into their hand and discriminate the diasporic community culturally, nationally and religiously. As Wieviorka states, when a diasporic community is “constantly rejected or interiorized while only wanting to be included, either socially or culturally, or when this group or this individual is racially discriminated, and dominized under the argument of a supposed cultural different” then the individual or the group is embarrassed and this eventually “leads to a self-definition and behaviors based on this culture and, eventually, racial distinction” (72). A Hungarian scholar, Mária Kozár also notes:

Assimilation is an integrative process within the family and between generations, and is not socially and culturally equable, thus resulting in hybridity and the confusion of cultural identity. The assimilation of the first generation is never complete, they are in an in-between state where they have already left their culture behind but have not integrated the new culture yet. On the other hand, the second generation tends to aim at total assimilation, by breaking away from the roots and traditions. (qtd. in Pataki 2)



In the context of gender perception, while quest for the identity and dealing with the identity crisis, the first generation immigrant women all go through a process of substantial liberation and westernization. The first generation women preserve a traditional pose with respect to marriage and family roles, and that the second generation seem to be questioning about the significance of traditional values in their lives. The first generation women initially tries to perform their ultimate duties in an arranged marriage as a good homemaker, raising children; but their confined connection with the outside world does not help them in preventing the issues like identity crisis and female inferiority. However, as time passes, they learn to balance between traditions and feminism, make their own decisions and control their lives, initially by revolting silently, then by making their voices heard in family and out of family.

The second generation women however, are caught between the two cultures – of their country of origin and that of the settled country. They have been born, brought up in the settled country and educated in schools there. During their formative years, the curriculum and socialization within the school system would have a considerable influence on them as well as their parents. Moreover, the second generation has never visited their country of origin so they could never understand their parents' nostalgia for their own country and culture. In most cases, they consider the customs and values of their parents as old-fashioned, backward or suppressive. These circumstances generally results into the conflict of traditions, family crisis and domestic violence, throwing the second generation into a sense of isolation and dislocation.

Another key problem a diasporic community faces is the predicament with regard to identity.

Identity is one of the most common themes in their literature, and in many cases the search for self-identity is portrayed as confusing, painful and only occasionally

rewarding. Some write semiautobiographical novels, delving into personal pasts in order to either discover or re-examine their motivations and affinities. Others use fictional characters and situations to question traditional norms, testing, trying, and occasionally reinforcing (whether internally or otherwise) notions of race and culture. (Lau 252)

The second and later generations of the diasporic community usually exhibit a twofold or dual identity, because they are tossed between two different cultures and societies. Though they believe the country in which they are born and brought up as their own country, the society still perceives them as foreigners and sometimes discriminates with them, which lead them to a hyphenated identity. Therefore, torn between two divergences, they start developing a sense of in-betweenness, which consequences either into the loss of identity or hybrid identity, which means adopting both the cultures of home and host country in bits to their convenience. This has also been termed as plural identity. Kwame Dawes' words as quoted in Weedon's article "Migration, Identity, and Belonging in British Black and South Asian Women's Writing" substantiates this issue, "They were born there or have grown up there all their life. They are uncomfortable with the notion of a home elsewhere for they have no sense of exile. Their sole exile is the exile within their own home country" (qtd. in Weedon 28).

But the complications occur, when on one hand, the people of second and further generations get cognizant about their cultural, religious and social identity and struggle to realize its space in the adopted country and on the other hand the people of first generation did not even bother about it. The first generation is generally engrossed with making money and supposedly failed efforts of mimicking the white people, developing a type of confused dilemma towards their own culture and traditions. They fail in their efforts because it is not the difference

of only language and culture but also of color and race, which give birth to further problems like tremendous generation gaps and differences of ideology between the first and second generation diasporic community.

These complications are well depicted in the writings of second generation diasporic writers, who are born and brought up in alien culture of adopted country and moreover they have no thorough acquaintance with the notion of the 'home' or 'nation' of origin. Hence there is lack of feelings like nostalgia for their home land and its culture. The connection they have with their country of origin is by virtue of their ancestral heritage or ethnic derivation. Therefore, when they face discrimination both from their land of origin and the land of adoption, it causes agony within them and urges them to raise questions concerning their roots in their writings. Most of the writings of such writers narrate the issues related to diasporic existence and the 'homing desire' or 'desire for home'. "The literature they produce, speak of, from and across migrant identities and develop 'narratives of plurality, fluidity and emergent become even when they have not witnessed the trauma and turmoil of displacement or dislocation being second generation diasporics'" (Ray 159).

It can be concluded that the first generation diasporic writers who are equipped with bundles of memories, eloquently combined the worldwide and nationwide strands that symbolizes real and imagined diasporic experiences, try to share their various sentiments in exiles with the readers through literature. However, the present day diaspora is consists of willing migrations towards the material achievements, professional and business benefits, facilitated by the numerous visas and repeated flyer conveniences. Writers residing away from homelands have shared different ideas in their writings that enable the readers to realize about the optimistic sides of diaspora. In his essay, titled "Imaginary Homeland", Rushdie presents

diaspora as a productive strength and focuses on the predicaments that are created by diasporic experiences to the diasporian writers. He argues that on one hand the diasporic experience may bring to mind a sense of loss but on the other hand, it may act as a stimulator that makes migrants nostalgic and sensitive towards the homeland, enhances the possibility to have new knowledge and can be the source of creativity. Rushdie thinks:

...if we do look back, we must also do so in the knowledge-which gives rise to profound uncertainties- that our physical alienation from India almost inevitably means that we will not be capable of reclaiming precisely the thing that was lost; that we will, in short, create fictions not actual cities or villages, but invisible ones, imaginary homelands, Indias of the mind. (428)

### Works Cited

- Abraham, P. A. "Crisis of Unbelonging in Some Expatriate Stories from the Canadian and Indian Context." *Writers of the Indian Diaspora*. Ed. Jasbir Jain. Jaipur and New Delhi: Rawat Publications, 2003. 50-62. Print.
- Adamson, Fiona B, and Madeleine Demetriou. "Remapping the Boundaries of 'State' and 'National Identity': Incorporating Diasporas into IR Theorizing." *European Journal of International Relations* 13:4 (2007): 489-526. Print.
- Ages, Arnold. *The Diaspora Dimension*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973. Print.
- Andall, J. "Second-generation attitude? African-Italians in Milan." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 28:3 (2002): 389-407. Web. 21 May 2015.  
< <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13691830220146518?journalCode=cjms20>>
- Anteby-Yemini, Lisa, and William Berthomière. "Diaspora: A Look Back on a Concept." *Bulletin du Centre de recherchefrançais à Jérusalem* (n.d.): 262-270. Web. 15 January 2014.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "The Postcolonial and the Postmodern." *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. Ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1995. 119-124. Print.
- . "Is the Post- in Postmodernism the Post- in Postcolonial?" *Critical Inquiry* 17:2 (1991): 336-357. Web. 14 Jan. 2015.
- Armstrong, John A. "Mobilized and Proletarian Diasporas." *The American Political Science Review* 70:2 (1976): 393-408. Web. 20 February 2014.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London : Routledge, 1989. Print.

---. *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. London and New York: Routledge, 1989. Print.

Bandyopadhyay, R. "Nostalgia, Identity and Tourism: Bollywood in the Indian Diaspora."

*Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change* 6:2 (2008): 79-100. Print.

Basch, Linda, Nina Glick Schiller, and Cristina Szanton Blanc. *Nation Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. New York: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, 1994. Print.

Berthomiere, William. "Diaspora: An Overview of a Concept at the Crossroad of Nation-State and Transnationalism." *Comparative European Research in Migration, Diversity and Identities*. Ed. Wolfgang Bosswick and Charles Husband. Bilbao: University of Deusto, 2005. 25-32. Print.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994. Print.

---. Interview. "Staging the Politics of Difference: Homi Bhabha's Critical Literacy." *Race, Rhetoric and the Postcolonial*. By Gary Olson A. and Lynn Horsham. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999. Print.

Bhat, C.S. "Methodological Approaches in the study of Indian Diaspora (a mimeo)." Workshop on The Study of Indian Diaspora: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. University of Hyderabad. 12 & 13 Sep. 1997. Presentation.

Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995. Print.

Bordes Benayoun, Chantal, and Dominique Schnapper. *Diasporas et nations*. Paris: Odile Jacob, 2006. Print.

Brah, Avtar. "Diaspora, Border and Traditional Identities." *Feminist Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Reina Lewis and Sara Mills. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003.

613-634. Print.

Bressler, Charles E. *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to theory & Practice*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1999. Print.

Brighton, Stephen A. *Historical Archaeology of the Irish Diaspora: A Transnational Approach*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee, 2009. Print.

Brooker, Peter. *A Glossary of Cultural Theory*. London: Arnold, 2003. Print.

Butler, Kim D. "Defining Diaspora, Refining a Discourse." *Diaspora* 10:2 (2001): 189-219. Web. 15 January 2014.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000. Print.

Chandan, Amarjit. *Indians in Britain*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt Ltd., 1986. Print.

Chandramohan, B. "Diasporic Writing." *Encyclopedia of Postcolonial Studies*. Ed. J. C. Hawley. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001. 144-150. Print.

Chaturvedi, Sanjay. "Diaspora in India's Geopolitical Visions: Linkages, Categories and Contestations." *Asian Affairs: An American Review* 32:3 (2005): 141-168. Print.

Cheyette, Bryan. "Diasporas of the Mind: British-Jewish Writing Beyond Multiculturalism." *Diaspora and Multiculturalism: Common Traditions and New Developments*. Ed.

Monika Fludernik. New York: Rodopi, 2003. 45-82. Print.

Clifford, James. "Diasporas." *Cultural Anthropology* 9:3 (1994): 302-338. Blackwell Publishing. Web. 7 January 2014.

Child, Irvin. *Italian or American? The Second Generation in Conflict*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943. Print.

Cloke, Paul, Crang, Philip, and Mark Goodwin, eds. *Introducing Human Geographies, Third*

- Edition*. New York: Routledge, 2014. Print.
- Cohen, Robin. "Diasporas and the Nation-State: From Victims to Challengers." *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)* 72:3 (1996): 507-520. Ethnicity and International Relations, Web. 21 February 2014.
- . *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- Corominas, Joan. *Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana*. Berna: Francke, 1954. Print.
- Crul, Maurice and H. Vermeulen. "The second generation in Europe." *International Migration Review* 37:4 (2003): 965–986. Web. 11 May 2015.
- Davis, Kingsley. *The Population of India and Pakistan*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1968. Print.
- Demmers, Jelle. "Diaspora and Conflict: Locality, Long- Distance Nationalism and Delocalisation of Conflict Dynamics." *The Public* 9:1 (2002): 85-96. Web. 2 April 2014.
- Dufoix, Stephane. "Deconstructing and Reconstructing 'Diaspora': A Study in Socio-Historical Semantics." *Transnationalism: Diasporas and the Advent of a New (Dis)order*, Ed. Eliezer Ben Rafael and Yitzhak Sternberg. Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2009. 47-74. Print.
- Dwivedi, A. K. "Diasporic Writings in English." *English Literature: Voices of Indian Diaspora*. Ed. Malti Agarwal. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2009. 1-12. Print.
- Eckstein, Susan. "On Deconstructing and Reconstructing the Meaning of Immigrant Generations." *The Changing Face of Home: Transnational Lives of the Second Generation*. Ed. P. Levitt and M. C. Waters. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002. 211–215. Print.



Ellis, Mark and Jamie Goodwin-White. "1.5 generation internal migration in the US: Dispersing from states of immigration?" *International Migration Review* 40:3 (2006): 899–926. Web. 11 May 2015.

< <http://d-nb.info/998929050/34/>>

Espinet, Ramabai. "Hosay Night." *Nuclear Seasons: Poems, 1<sup>st</sup> edition*. Toronto: Sister Vision Press, 1991. Print.

Faist, Thomas. "Transnationalization in International Migration: Implications for the Study of Citizenship and Culture." *Working Paper Series: Transnational Communities, Oxford: University of Oxford* (1999): 1-41. Web. 20 April 2014.

Fakiolas, R., and R. King. "Emigration, return, immigration: a review and evaluation of Greece's postwar experience of international migration." *International Journal of Population Geography* 2:2 (1996): 171–190. Web. 12 May 2015.

<<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12347606>>

Fanon, Franz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. UK: Pluto Press, 1986. Print.

---. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 1963. Print.

Foadmin, and A. Siddique. "The Indian Diaspora – Past, Present and Future (Part II)." *Central & South Asia* (2013): n.pag. Web. 20 Aug. 2014.

<[http://www.fairobserver.com/region/central\\_south\\_asia/indian-diaspora-past-present-and-future-part-ii/](http://www.fairobserver.com/region/central_south_asia/indian-diaspora-past-present-and-future-part-ii/)>

Ganapathy-Dore, Geetha. *The Postcolonial Indian Novel in English*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011. Print.

Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.

Gandhi, Mahatma. *Hind Swaraj*. Ahamdabad: Navjivan Publishing House, Reprint, 1938. Print.

Ghosh, Amitav. *The Imam and The Indian: Prose Pieces*. New Delhi: Ravi Dayal Publisher, 2002. Print.

Ghosh, Lipi and Ramakrishna Chatterjee. "Introduction." *Indian Diaspora in Asian and Pacific Region*. Ed. L. Ghosh and R Chatterjee. New Delhi: Rawat Publications, 2004. 13-20. Print.

Gilroy, Paul. *Between Camps: Race, Identity and Nationalism at the End of the Colour Line*. London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 2000. Print.

---. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. New York: Verso, 1993. Print.

Hagedorn, Jessica. "Homesick." *Visions of America: Personal Narratives from the Promised Land*. Ed. Wesley Brown and Amy Ling. New York: Persea, 1993. 326-328. Print.

Hear, Nicholas Van. *New Diasporas: The Mass Exodus, Dispersal and Regrouping of Migrant Communities*. London: URL Press, 1998. Print.

Iyengar, K. R. Srinivasa. *Indian Writing in English*. 4<sup>th</sup> revised and enlarged edition. New Delhi: Stearling Publishers, 1984. Print.

Jacobs, K. "Journeying South: The Contribution of Contemporary Australian Literature for Migration Research." *Imagining Home: Migrants and the Search for a New Belonging*. Ed. Diana Glenn, Eric Bouvet, and Sonia Floriani. South Australia: Wakefield Press, 2011. Web. 4 Sep. 2014.

<[http://books.google.co.in/books?id=URFvYOhym\\_0C&pg=PA139&lpg=PA139&dq=Journeying+South:+The+Contribution+of+Contemporary+Australian+Literature+for+Migration+Research&source](http://books.google.co.in/books?id=URFvYOhym_0C&pg=PA139&lpg=PA139&dq=Journeying+South:+The+Contribution+of+Contemporary+Australian+Literature+for+Migration+Research&source)>

Jain, Jasbir. "Memory, History and Homeland: The Indian Diasporic Experience." *Theorizing*

- and Critiquing Indian Diaspora*. Ed. Adesh Pal. New Delhi: Creative Books, 2004. 74-81. Print.
- Jain, R. "Indian diaspora, globalization and multiculturalism: A cultural analysis." *Contributions of Indian Sociology* 32:2 (1998): 337-360. Print.
- Jain, R.K. "A Civilizational Theory of Indian Diaspora and its Global Implications (a mimeo)." Workshop on The Study of Indian Diaspora: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. University of Hyderabad. 12 & 13 Sep. 1997. Presentation.
- Jayaram, Narayan. Ed. *The Indian Diaspora: Dynamics of Migration*. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2004. Print.
- . "The Study of Indian Diaspora: A Multidisciplinary Agenda (a mimeo)." Workshop on The Study of Indian Diaspora: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. University of Hyderabad. 12 & 13 Sep. 1997. Presentation.
- Kalam, M. A. "Indian Overseas: Are They A Diaspora. (a Mimeo)." Workshop on The Study of Indian Diaspora: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. University of Hyderabad. 12 & 13 Sep. 1997. Presentation.
- Kertzer, D.I. "Generation as a sociological problem." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9 (1983): 125-149. Web. 6 May 2015.  
<<http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.so.09.080183.001013>>
- Kumar, Sudhir. "Diasporic Consciousness of Gandhi." *Contemporary Diasporic Literature: writing history, culture, self*. Ed. Manjit Inder Singh. New Delhi: Pencraft International, 2007. Google Book Search. Web. 19 Jan. 2015.

Kurian, George, and Ram P. Srivastava, eds. *Overseas Indians: a study in adaptation*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1983. Print.

Lau, Lisa. "Making the Difference: The Differing Presentations and Representations of South Asia in the Contemporary Fiction of Home and Diasporic South Asian Women Writers." *Modern Asian Studies* 39:1 (2004): 237-256. Web. 10 Sep. 2014.  
<<http://dro.dur.ac.uk/79/1/79.pdf>>

Levi, Scott Cameron. *The Indian Diaspora in Central Asia and Its Trade, 1550-1900*. Leiden: Brill, 2002. Web. 16 Aug. 2014.

Loizos, P. "Generations' in forced migration: towards greater clarity." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20:2 (2007): 193–209. Web. 15 May 2015.  
<[http://www.researchgate.net/publication/249248684\\_%27Generations%27\\_in\\_Forced\\_Migration\\_Towards\\_Greater\\_Clarity](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/249248684_%27Generations%27_in_Forced_Migration_Towards_Greater_Clarity)>

Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/ Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge, 1998. Print.

Louie, Vivian. "Second-generation pessimism and optimism: how Chinese and Dominicans understand education and mobility through ethnic and transnational orientations." *International Migration Review* 40:3 (2006): 537–572. Web. 3 May 2015.  
<<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2006.00035.x/pdf>>

Maver, Igor. *Selected Essays on Canadian, Australian and New Zealand Literatures, Chapter Two: Diasporic Literature in a Post-Ethnic Canada*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014. *British Library*. Web. 18 sep. 2014.

McLeod, John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000. Print.

Medam, Alain. "Diaspora / Diasporas. Archétype et typologie." *Revue Européenne des*

- Migrations Internationales* 9:1 (1993): 59-66. Web. 12 March 2014.
- Modood, T. "Conclusion: ethnic diversity and disadvantage." *Ethnic Minorities in Britain*. Ed. Modood, T., et al. London: Policy Studies Institute, 1997. 339–359. Print.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003. Print.
- . "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Theories of Race and Racism: A Reader*. Ed. Les Back, John Solomos. USA and Canada: Routledge, 2000. 302-323. Print.
- Monti, Alessandro. "Outframing the Self in Diasporic Writing." *Journal of Postcolonial Cultures and Societies* 1:3 (2010): 14-21. Web. 5 Dec. 2015.  
<<http://www.jpcs.in/upload/1489037342Outframing%20the%20self%20in%20diasporic%20writing.pdf>>
- Morton, Stephen. *Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*. USA and Canada: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Moslund, S. P. *Migration Literature and Hybridity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. Print.
- Mukherjee, Arun P. "Post-colonialism: Some Uneasy Conjectures." *Interrogating Post-colonialism: Theory, Text and Context*. Ed. Harish Trivedi and Meenakshi Mukherjee. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1996. 13-20. Print.
- Mukherjee, Meenakshi. "Interrogating Post-colonialism." *Interrogating Post-colonialism: Theory, Text and Context*. Ed. Harish Trivedi and Meenakshi Mukherjee. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1996. 3-12. Print.
- Nadarajah, M. "Diaspora and Nostalgia: Towards a Semiotic Theory of the Indian Diaspora." International Conference on Indian Diaspora. University of Hyderabad. 1 & 2 Nov. 1994. Presentation.

Naik, Panna. "The Living Room." *Journal of South Asian Literature* 21:1 (1986): n. pag. Web. 6 May. 2015.

Nimavat, Dushyant B., "The Cassandra in Exile: A Study of the Diasporic Sensibility in the Poetry of Meena Alexander, Sujata Bhatt, Chitra Banerjee Divakaruni, Moniza Alvi and Jean Arasanayagam." MA thesis. Saurashtra University, 2011. Print.

Paranjape, Makarand, "Coping with Post-Colonialism." *Interrogating Post-colonialism: Theory, Text and Context*. Ed. Harish Trivedi and Meenakshi Mukherjee. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1996. 37-48. Print.

Parekh, Bhikhu. *A Commitment to Cultural Pluralism*. blog.krachtvancultuur.nl. n.pag., n.d. Web. 25 July 2014. (<http://kvc.minbuza.nl/uk/archive/commentary/parekh.html>)

Pataki, Éva. "Caught between Two Worlds: The Confusion of Cultural Identity in Three British Asian Novels." *University of Debrecen, Hungary*. n.pag., n.d. Web. 18 July 2015. <[http://theroundtable.ro/Archive/.../eva\\_pataki\\_caught\\_between\\_two\\_worlds.do...](http://theroundtable.ro/Archive/.../eva_pataki_caught_between_two_worlds.do...)>

Portes, A. and M. Zhou. "The new second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants among post-1965 immigrant youth." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530 (1993): 74–98. Web. 6 June 2015.

<[http://web.stanford.edu/group/scspi/\\_media/pdf/Reference%20Media/Portes\\_Zhou\\_93\\_Immigration.pdf](http://web.stanford.edu/group/scspi/_media/pdf/Reference%20Media/Portes_Zhou_93_Immigration.pdf)>

Rai, G. "Postcolonialism: Its Meaning and Significance." *The SPIEL Journal of English Studies* 1:2 (2005): 1-22. Print.

Ramraj, Victor. J. "Diaspora and Multiculturalism." *New National and Post-Colonial Literatures: An Introduction*. Ed. Bruce King. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000. 214-229.

Print.

Ray, Amit. "The Question of Diasporic Existence in the Second Generation Immigrant Writers:

A Reading on Meera Sayal's *Anita and Me* and Hari Kunzru's *Transmission*." *Galaxy: International Multidisciplinary Research Journal* 3:IV (2014): 158-161. Web. 27 July 2015.

< <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/V3/n4/Ray.pdf>>

Rumbaut, R. "Age, life stages, and generational cohorts: decomposing the immigrant first and second generations in the United States." *International Migration Review* 38:3 (2004): 1160–1205. Web. 2 May 2015.

<<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00232.x/pdf>>

---. "Severed or sustained attachments? Language, identity, and imagined communities in the post-immigrant generation." *The Changing Face of Home: The Transnational Lives of the Second Generation*. Ed. P. Levitt and M. C. Waters. New York: Russell Sage, 2002. 43–95. Print.

---. "Ties that bind: immigration and immigrant families in the United States." *Immigration and the Family*. Ed. A. Booth, A. Crouter and N. Landale. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1997. 3–45. Print.

Rushdie, Salman. "Imaginary Homelands." *The Post-colonial Studies Reader. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. Ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. London and New York: Routledge, 2006. 428-33. Print.

---, Trans. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism*. By Milano Mondadori. New York: Routledge, 2001. Print.

---. "The Indian Writer in England." *In the age of Beholder: Indian Writing in English*. Ed.

- Eaggie Butcher. London: Commonwealth Institute, 1983. 75-83. Print.
- Safran, William. "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and return." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 1:1 (1991): 83-99. Print.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1993. Print.
- . *Orientalism*. London : Penguin, 1978. Print.
- Satchidanandan, K. "That Third Space: Interrogating the Diasporic Paradiagn." *In Diaspora: Theories, Histories, Texts*. Ed. Makarand Paranjape. New Delhi: Indialog Publications, 2001. 15-23. Print.
- Sawant, Shrikant B. "Postcolonial Theory: Meaning and Significance." *Proceedings of National Seminar on Postmodern Literary Theory and Literature, January 27-28, 2012, Nanded*. Web. 5 Jan. 2015.
- Sharma, S. L. "Perspectives on Indian Abroad." *The Indian Diaspora: Dynamics of Migration*. Ed. N. Jayaram and Yogesh Atal. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2004. 44-65. Print.
- Sheffer, Gabriel. *Diaspora Politics. At home abroad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Print.
- Sheik, Ayub. "Identity, Dislocation and Loss in B. D. Lalla's Poetic Trilogy, *The Black Collie* (1946), *The Ugly Duckling* (1947) and *The Epic Struggle*." *Indians Abroad: The Diaspora Writes Back*. Ed. Rajendra Chetty and Per Paolo Piciuccio. STE Publishers: South Africa, 2004. 187-197. Print.
- Shukla, Sandhya. "Locations for South Asian Diasporas." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30 (2001): 551-572. Department of Anthropology, Columbia University, New York. Web. 7 April 2014.
- Shuval, Judith. "Diaspora Migration: Definitional ambiguities and a theoretical paradigm."



- International Migration* 38:5 (2002): 41-56. Print.
- Singh, Anita. *Existential Dimensions in the Novels of Anita Desai*. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons, 2008. Print.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. London: Macmillan Education, 1988. 271-313. Print.
- Stanišić, Saša. "Three Myths of Immigrant Writing: A view from Germany." *Words without Borders*. n. pag., 2008. Web. 6 Sep. 2014.  
<<http://wordswithoutborders.org/article/three-myths-of-immigrant-writing-a-view-from-germany>>
- Thieme, John. "The Discoverer Discovered: Amitav Ghosh's The Calcutta Chromosome." *The Literature of the Indian Diaspora: Essays in Criticism*. Ed. A. L. Mcleod. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1999. 274-290. Print.
- Tinker, Hugh. *The Banyan Tree: Overseas Emigrants from India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977. Print.
- Tololyan, Khaching. "The Contemporary Discourse of Diaspora Studies." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 27:3 (2007): 647-655. Web. 8 sep. 2014.
- Tsagarousianou, Roza. "Rethinking the Concept of Diaspora: Mobility, Connectivity and Communication in a Globalised World." *Westminister Papers in Communication and Culture* 1:1 (2004): 52-65. University of Westminister, London. Web. 5 Jan. 2014.
- Voight-Graf, C. "The Construction of Transnational Spaces by Indian Migrants in Australia." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31:2 (2005): 365-384. Print.
- Wahlbeck, Osten. "Transnationalism and Diasporas: The Kurdish Example." *International*

Sociological Association XIV World Congress of Sociology, Montreal, Canada. 26 July  
- 1 August 1998. Reading.

Walkowitz, R. "The Location of Literature: The Transnational Book and the Migrant Writer."  
*Contemporary Literature* XLVII:4 (2006): 527-545. University of Wisconsin. Web. 12  
Sep. 2014.  
<<http://rci.rutgers.edu/~walkowit/pubs/Location.pdf>>

Walton-Roberts, M. "Globalization, National Autonomy and Non-resident Indians."  
*Contemporary South Asia* 13.1 (2004): 53-69. Print.

Weedon, Chris. "Migration, Identity, and Belonging in British Black and South Asian Women's  
Writing." *Contemporary Women's Writing* 2:1 (2008): 17-35. Web. 21 Sep. 2014.  
<<http://cww.oxfordjournals.org/content/2/1/17.extract>>

Werbner, Pnina. "Introduction: The Dialectics of Cultural Hybridity." *Debating Cultural  
Hybridity: Multi-cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*. Ed. Pnina Werbner  
and Tariq Modood. London. Zed Books Ltd, 1999. 1-26. Print.

---. "Theorising Complex Diasporas: Purity and Hybridity in the South Asian Public  
Sphere in Britain." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30:5 (2004): 895-911. Web.  
25 Sep. 2014.

< <http://www.nabilechchaibi.com/resources/Theorizing%20diaspora.pdf>>

Wessendorf, S. "Roots migrants': transnationalism and 'return' among second generation Italians  
in Switzerland." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33:7 (2007): 1083-1102. Web. 1  
June 2015

< <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13691830701541614?journalCode=cjms20>>

White, Paul. "Geography, Literature and Migration." *Writing across Worlds: Literature and*

*Migration*. Ed. Russell King, John Connell, and Paul White. London: Routledge, 1995.

Web. 4 Sep. 2014.

<<http://www19.homepage.villanova.edu/silvia.nagyzekmi/cultural/migration%20writing.pdf>>

Wieviorka, Michel. "Racism and Diaspora." *Thesis Eleven* 52 (1998): 69-81. Web. 25 Sep. 2014.

<<http://burawoy.berkeley.edu/Public%20Sociology,%20Live/Wieviorka/Wieviorka.Racism%20and%20Diasporas.pdf>>

Wilpert, Czarina. "From One Generation to Another: Occupational Position and Social

Reproduction- Immigrant and Ethnic Minorities in Europe." *Entering the Working World*.

Ed. Czarina Wilpert. Aldershot: Gower, 1988. 1-23. Print.