

CHAPTER : 1

Narratives of Nation and Diaspora: An Introduction

In the modern contemporary times, the concepts of diaspora and transnationalism have played a very vital role to understand the aftermath of international migration and changes in the state borders in and across populations. Much of the modern research present today focuses on the operational part of how social formations like globalization and multiculturalism tend to function especially in the context of nationalism and national identity. The point of difference between the two lies in the ideas which the two terms represents. Diaspora is usually used to denote the varieties of groups either religious or national who live outside the imagined homeland of the point of origin. Transnationalism on the other hand can be used in a much wider as well as narrower scope. It can be used to refer to the ties of the migrating individuals to both their imaginary homeland and host land. It is also used to denote various communities, social formations as well as the various groups, organizations and network of people who are active across the globe. The two words Diaspora and Transnationalism are sometimes used interchangeably but they come from very different genealogies. However, it remains true that the usage of theories and ideas of both are useful in answering the major questions of nation and national identity.

Diaspora and Transnationalism are two concepts which have a very wide category of significance in policy formation and academia. The reason for such significance is the complexity of the nature of two concepts. In today's time Diaspora has become notion strife with politicized ideas whereas transnationalism is yet to gain entry into any form of public debates or discussions. The end result is the boundaries of these two concepts are overlapping with each other. The term diaspora has become quite well known in academia and literary discourses. The notion of diaspora can thus might very well be possibly used to understand the process of building of the nation state and nation itself. However, this function seems to have a downside to itself also. Many times, it is seen or noticed that these terms are used by governments with the agendas of controlling the diasporic population. It can also be used as a propaganda tool to mobilize the masses to fulfill individual agendas and ideologies of state leaders. It is observed that homeland or home-nations invoke this notion of diaspora in order to get the expatriates who are successful in their host-land to either return or to invest some of their hard-earned money in the homeland. These points to the fact that the term diaspora has to be used with caution and care. The point of importance here is to understand what diaspora is. How is a diaspora formed? What are the effects of formation or destruction of a diaspora on a nation?

The notion of the term transnationalism is a complex one. The term and its various derivations like transnational spaces, transnational fields and translational formations are all used to denote the day to day activities and

actions of the migrants of any nation in any other nation. These activities include but are not limited to being reciprocal and showing unity among the network of other migrants in the home-land as well as host land, start of small-scale business run by these migrant networks across various borders and the transfer of cultural ideas, values and norms. The idea of transnationalism is something which is also strife with political connotations although not as widely used as diaspora. The beginners and pioneers of the term transnationalism used it as a tool to lure the migrants back in their homeland as agents of important social change. One of the major agendas of transnationalism was to empower the migrants with the idea of the suffix -ism denoting a particular ideological bent. Since its introduction in 1990's transnationalism has always talked about how to integrate the migrants back in the process of nation building. It also talked about what is the nature of this migrancy; is migration really transnational in nature or are they at odds with the idea of national social integration and nation building. The observation which seems to be peeking out is that the two concepts cannot be separated from each other and cannot be done away at the same time; as doing so would destroy the vast varieties of definitions and meanings which come out when these two ideas overlap.

Based on the ideas and theories of Wittgenstein we are aware of the fact that concepts can change meanings on the basis of their inferring and how they are used. Thus, the question in such a Wittgenstein manner is: how does diaspora form a meaning such that it co-relates and runs parallel to the concept of nation building and national identity.

Diaspora is a very old concept which has undergone a huge change at regular times in human history. Originally it referred to the experiences and memories of particular groups like Jews and Armenians. Later on, it expanded its scope to include the religious minorities in Europe as well. The scope of the term diaspora really opens up in the post 1970's era. Each definition of the term diaspora can be divided into three major types based on characteristics. Each of these characteristics can be further subdivided into old and new uses of these definitions. The first category is based on the use of diaspora and its relationship to the causes of migration. The old usage used to refer to the idea of forced migration like in the experiences of Jews and Palestinians, while the newer usage refers to migration of any form including the migration due to trade and commerce like that of Chinese or Japanese. It also includes migration due to labor necessities like that of Turkey or Mexican migration. The second category is based on the link or connection between home-land and host-land. The older version of the definition refers to the migration of people back to their homelands. One example of such a migration is when migrants fund a 'back-home' oriented project which allows the future of the homeland to flourish. The newer usage of the definition of diaspora does not advocate such a singular isolated movement. Instead it refers to a continuous movement between homeland and host land which creates points of links which are complex and dense. This results in the formation of a migration-development cycle nexus. Such newer forms of meanings of diaspora are not limited to the ideas of origin and destination but talk about the continuous development and formation of national ties. A much recent and wider use of such a

definition is the idea of an experience of migration which is diasporic and yet -trans-national in nature. Such instances point to the fact that even in its earliest stages diaspora used to refer to ethnic as well as religious groups and communities. The third category of definition of diaspora talks about the process of integration of migrants as well as minorities in the process of nation building especially the host lands. The older forms of definitions pointed to the fact that the migrants did not integrate fully that is culturally, economically, politically as well as socially in their host lands and maintained certain boundaries with the majorities of host lands. This also precluded the domination and discrimination by the majority communities of the minorities and diasporic individuals.

The detailed analysis of these older and newer definitions reveals that they are not clearly compatible with each other. But what it does is it creates a tension between the two and opens it up for further analysis and study.

The idea of a nation is multi-varied. The main point of concern here is to understand what this concept of nation is all about. Reading Homi Bhabha's *Narrating the Nation* seems to bring out two very different perspectives. The first one arises out of the literary and creative freedom of the individuals. The first perspective seems to show that nation is a mythic archetype and a historical idea which is created out of political and literary traditions of the west. Such an image of Nation is created in the minds of its citizens and seems to be excessively romantic and metaphorical. If this seems to be true then the very existence of Nation itself seems to derive its identity from the existing body of literature

within the country. This further seems to show nation as a point of unity of symbolic force. Nation by this idea can become the site for the intersection of literary, cultural and aesthetic traditions. The second perspective of nation shows it as a continuous discourse of national progress. This is apparent in all the major government publications with regards to public announcement. This national discourse seems to be the result of ‘the present’ of the citizens of any particular geographical boundary of a country. The idea of what it is today for them. This point to the binaries in the two fundamental ideologies of what constitutes a nation that is the leftist and rightist ideologies. These two images of nation seem to be strong enough that they have not been taken over the new realities of internationalism, multi-nationalism and late-capitalism. The existence of these new realities seems to stem from the rhetoric of power and influence that each of these nations seem to wield within their borders. These two images of the nation give rise to a unique ambivalence in the process of creating the narrative of a nation. This ambivalence as Bhabha Notes “emerges from a growing awareness that despite the certainty with which historians speak of the ‘origins of nation as a sign of the modernity of society, the cultural temporality of the nation inscribes a much more transitional social reality. This simply means that there is a conflict between the idea that the origin of any nation as a sign of modernity and its changing cultural landscape as a marker of its temporariness.

The idea of the nation’s ambivalent emergence is shown with great clarity by Benedict Anderson in his *Imagined Communities* as follows:

“The Century of Enlightenment, of rationalist secularism, brought with it its own modern darkness...[Few] things were (are) suited to this end better than the idea of a nation. If nation states are widely ‘considered’ to be new and ‘historical’, the nation states to which they give political expressions always loom out of an immemorial past and glide into a limitless future. “What I am proposing is that nationalism has to be understood, by aligning it not with self-conscious held political ideologies but with large cultural systems that precedes it, out of which -as well as-against which it came into being” (*Anderson, Imagined Communities*)

This ambivalence and instability are emphasized by the representation of nation as a space of social life rather than that of social polity. It represents nation as a system of cultural signification. This would mean that nation is the site where the social life of its citizens is lived out. This performance of their social life acts as signification of the culture. This instability seeps further in the domains of knowledge and knowledge systems. It is evident by the fact that research being carried out in the field of nation seems to be very dynamic and fluid in nature. One of the detailed instances of the binary of leftist and rightist is the accounts of what makes a nation is by the Tory Right, that is the liberal high ground or the new Leftist Whigs. This binary conflict defines what came to be known as ‘society’ of the nation. One of the best accounts of the Modern Nations is that of Michael Oakeshott’s *Character of a Modern European State*. According to Oakeshott the national space is constituted from two different dispositions. The first disposition is ‘Societas’ which is the

acknowledgement the rules of morality and the codes of conduct. The Second Disposition is 'Universitas' which is an acknowledgement and of common goals and solid objectives. It seems clear that these two dispositions have co-existed side by side instead of merging into a new identity which has led to the ambivalence of the institutions of a modern state. It has also added a second layer of ambiguity on the vocabulary of its own discourse.

Hannah Ardent has a very different take on the idea of what a nation and its society in the modern world is. She calls it 'curiously hybrid where the private interests of citizens acquire public importance where both these realms flow into each other endlessly like the life-process itself.' A third perspective of nation was given by Tom Nairn who calls it 'the modern Janus' after the two-faced Greek God of binary choices. By ascribing to the nation, the image of a Greek god of choices he seems to be pointing to the movement of capitalism, progression and regression, political rationality and irrationality. Bhabha while thus talking about the ambivalence on the idea of a nation seems to consider it a problem of its history of transition, its conceptual indeterminacy and its movement between various vocabularies. He seems to be considering the impact of these various factors on the discourses and narratives of what constitutes 'being the part of a nation' that is nationness. He also seems to be pondering the impact of these various voices of nation on social belongingness, class, customs, power politics, sexuality, bureaucracy, institutions and justice.

The emergence of narrative of nation in the realm of the political rationality can be seen to have a very clear cut and demarcated history. This can be seen in various forms like textual strategies, metaphoric displacements, sub-texts and figurative strategies. This is found to be very evident in the idea of Nation as a two-dimensional space and time entity in the views of Benedict Anderson. Its embodiment is found in the narrative style of realist novel genre; one instance of which is the reading of post-imperial racist themes in the poetry of Enoch Powell by Tom Narin which is also called as Neo-Romantic Poetry. The development of any modern Nation State with regards to time can be understood by examining the narratives of nation 'as they are written' that is the idea of nation as it is. This is very much in tune with the way meaning is ascribed to the very idea of what a nation is in any language and the discourse within the very sign of a Nation both written and symbolic. This approach to understand the nation as it is in written narratives creates a struggle for existence. This struggle seems to be happening with the traditional methods of understanding the idea of a nation and its body of knowledge-tradition, people, state, high culture-to name a few. These traditional methods always rely on their representation as concepts having a natural order of history, evolutionary value and historical continuity with pedagogy. The study of nation through its narratives thus draws attention to its language and rhetoric. It also attempts to allow the reader of these narratives to modify their understanding of a nation thus making it a fluid (not stable) entity. It creates a space where it seems to totalize the space of narratives on national culture. At the same time, it also facilitates distribution of these

narratives which helps to create the various fields of meanings and symbols associated with a nation. It is related directly with the objective of understanding the idea of a nation within cultural studies as it not only studies the nation as an abstract concept but as a process of textuality.

The tradition understanding of Nation as seen by Bhabha seems to have two major modes of study. The first approach understands and studies nation as an ideological apparatus of state power. It is reminiscent of Louis Althusser's idea of nation as one of the many apparatuses of state. This seems to be due to a hasty and inaccurate reading of the writings of Bakhtin and Foucault. This approach seems to be highly functionalist in nature that is, it understands the idea of a nation as having a functional value. The second approach looks at the nation as a space which allows the expression of national and popular sentiments of their citizens by a variety of ways like sports, festivals, traditions, customs which have been long preserved in their memories. It seems to be more utopian in nature. According to Bhabha the two approaches mentioned above seems rather restrictive in nature. They are however useful in bringing to the fore-front the idea of an assimilated national culture. This idea of a culture which acts a binding force for the citizens and/or people of a nation to unite are usually hidden by the dominant narratives of state-power. The above two approaches allow us to bring them to the front. This assimilated culture seems to manifest itself in the categories of youth, the present every day, nostalgia of the past of a nation, its ethnicities and social movements and the politics of difference.

In the idea of formation of a Nation such processes assign meanings and different directions to historical change. Its most progressive form is seen in the conception of ideology as a fluid concept which is discursive in nature. These varieties of discursive ideologies allow individuals and communities to come up with a better and more nuanced understanding of the concept of nation. The problems seem to arise in the understanding of the idea of nation when these discursive ideologies are not understood as dynamic but are taken at face value with fixed meanings.

In the idea of Nation as a narrative Bhabha tried to study the various discourses and narratives of the nation in the context of the language and themes of these narratives. This study of such narratives as fluid and in the process of being written and re-written what Derrida calls as ‘constantly under erasure’ allows us to do a detailed analysis of nation-space and its various elements. In such a study meaning of nation/s are always partial and fluid because the very idea the history is in the process of being made. Also, the very authority of culture itself seems ambivalent because at each instance of study the idea of the nation keeps on changing its image. We can juxtapose it to what Edward Said has prescribed the idea of ‘analytical pluralism’ in his discourse on nation. It means that for an individual’s each encounter with the concept of nation there seems to be multiple entry points to understand that concept in terms of its cultural aspects. Such a study is only possible if one can understand the fluidity and dynamism of the language of such narratives on nation like that of Said.

Antonio Gramsci seems to be looking at idea of Nation as a category of 'cultural elaboration'. What he seems to be hinting at here is that nation can be a tool for understanding the process of dispersion and development of culture and its various forms of representation. This is another approach which allows us to understand nation as a narrative which in contrast to earlier approaches holds culture in such a way that it allows for a development of a positive space of production, creation and guiding of newer meanings of nation.

Bhabha seems to be of the view that Nation is a major structure of Ideological ambivalence within the representation of Modernity. That is Nation seems to the space where conflicting ideologies come at play whenever we represent something as modern. For Bhabha the better understanding of idea of a Nation seems to be springing from a series of reading strategies. This would allow any narrative to be examined and analyzed from the post-colonial theories of textuality, discourse, enunciation etc. What this does is, it invokes in the mind of the reader this margin of nation space. This invocation usually seems to be happening from two positions. First is the position of older post-imperialist nations which are usually at the center of the narratives of power about Nations. And second is the position of the new or emerging or independent nations on the margins of representation in the narratives of nation. A closer examination of these voices in the margins shows that they are not the kinds which are depicted in fictions or the imaginations of writers about Nations. There such voices are shown to be more utopian or celebratory in

nature where they tend to undergo self-marginalization in order to serve a bigger purpose. According to Bhabha these voices have a more crucial function. It is to be the voices of intervention which justify the existence of modernity as well as rationalize the authoritarian narratives and representation of Nation. Such interventions are seen usually in the idea of progress, homogeneity, cultural unity and the lost past and history of any nation. They normalize the main stream views and images of nation by selecting certain narratives and giving them the tendency of being normal by labeling them as strategies of national interest and having ethnic prerogative.

The notion to consider Nation as a narrative can be a meaningful strategy in understanding the various voices which ascribe meaning to the idea of a nation. It can also account for the various narratives both fictional and non-fictional which depict multiple representations of nation. Finally, it is useful to establish the cultural boundaries of such narratives which give the answer to the question. What is a Nation?

The location of the variety of meanings of nation is not fixed. They are neither united nor singular. They cannot be seen simply as 'the other' or opposite to one main-stream meaning. The location and boundaries of the meaning of nation is ever changing and dynamic. These meanings seem to undergo continuous transformations to incorporate new ideas and voices of citizens to the central narrative of nation. This allows for the creation of newer meanings of nation and instead of being limited to the boundary of inside-outside it occupies the space of in-between. This process of constant

change and regeneration of meanings especially in the context of Nation is termed as hybridity by Bhabha. This constant regeneration of meanings especially of the category of nation generates what Bhabha says ‘unmanned sites of political antagonism and unpredictable forces for political representation’. Thus, the idea of nation as a narrative lead to a complete upside down turn of the meanings, boundaries and limits of the nation into the above-mentioned in-between spaces through which newer meanings of nation and cultural and political authority are generated. This is how Hybridity seems to be operating and giving rise to newer and multiple meanings of nation.

Franz Fanon’s statement “National Consciousness, which is not nationalism, is the only thing that will give us an international dimension” seems to ring true here. It becomes evident that it is through a close examination of narratives and cultures of nation, its theories and texts the idea of what constitutes a nation becomes clear. Fanon seems to be hinting at the creation of a central narrative of nation, this narrative can then become the voice of citizens within the nation as well as that of the diasporic voices outside it. The international dimension which Fanon refers to points out to those voices of nation which are either born outside its borders or to those which are born inside it but later on migrate to other nations and areas. It is these international diasporic voices both within the nation and outside it which constitute its meaning.

The process of hybridity along with these diasporic voices is the base upon which the idea of nation as a narrative is built. In this fluid meaning of

nation the voices of diaspora representing it are never relegated to the position of the other or outside of a nation. Rather these voices occupy the above-mentioned in-between spaces within the very discourse of nation itself.

In the present era of Twenty-first century the idea of existence is not seemed to be seen in the investigations of the death of the author, epiphany or the birth of the subject. The individual of 21st century seems to be more concerned with the idea of location of the culture. This culture has become the metaphor in its seeming existence in the beyond. The sole existence of an individual today seems to be marked by their understanding of the temporal present. Whose nomenclature has always been found to be problematic. In order to solve the problem of this nomenclature the modern-day scholars seemed to have taken the controversial prefix into account 'shift'-indicating the change in something or change to something. Vis. Postcolonial, postmodernism etc.

The idea of using the trope of 'beyond' to indicate the location of any cultural arena does not seem to follow the standard idea of linear time. It does not begin 'begin' at a designated past or does not lean to a designated future. Thus, the politics of locations of culture do not follow the beginnings and endings of normal time. Rather the idea of finding locations of culture seems to bring us to specific moments or intersections in time. These intersections in turn produce complex terminologies and figures of identity and differences, past and present, inside and outside and inclusion and exclusion.

The recent theoretical move to step away from the traditional organizing categories of race and gender has allowed the space to be opened up for the creation of new categories which can take the position of the subject in allowing pinpointing of the location of culture. These new categories are race, gender, generation, institutional location, geopolitical locale and sexual orientation. The most important move to make in the discovery of locations of culture is to think beyond the narratives of origin and initial subjectivities. Rather the need has now arisen to focus on the specifically those moments which articulate the cultural differences. The moments for the purposes of understanding can be defined as the 'in-between spaces. These in-between spaces allow the creation of the newer forms of self or self-hood which can be both singular and communal. This does a very important task of allowing the creation of new signs of identity and culture which leads to the path of defining the idea of society itself.

The idea of nation is located and negotiated in these in-between spaces or interstices. It also can be a location of nationness, community interest, culture and cultural value. This gives a rise to a very important question. It is the question of the formation of self-identity or self or subject. The intonation or invocation of this sense of subject is usually represented in culture by race/class gender etc. Another site of contest in the experience of formation of self and identity is the question of how are the cultural tropes of representation and empowerment formulated. This becomes more pertinent especially when the histories of communities are not

collaborative and dialogic but rather isolated and interwoven amongst itself and its citizens.

The entire logos or logic of the above questions seems to find their strength in the politics of language. This politics of language refers to the complex discourses of language on politics of location which come into existence due to vast cultural differences. Two major instances can be cited indicative of this movement. The first instance is the focus on the term of 'disrespect' which was forged on the liminal lines of ethnic deprivation in the conflict in South Central Los-Angeles indicating radical violence and social victimization. The second instance can be seen in the aftermath of 'The satanic verses affair in Great Britain' where Black and Irish feminists despite their different constituencies have made a common struggle against 'radicalization of religion' which is claimed to have been used by the state as a discourse through which it represents its conflicts and struggles which can be secular, communal or sexual etc.

The idea of pinpointing the location of culture and the socio-political engagements which can be seen in this act are seen performatively. Usually the representation of these locations is seen to be reflections of ethnic or cultural traits of any particular tradition. However, upon closer examination that does not seem to be the case. The idea of identity or culture and its location from a minority perspective is a very complex and continuous process which wants to give rise to newer forms of hybridity of culture which can be pinpointed in the specific moments of historical evolution. This power of ascribing a location or an identity from the

margins of power does not come from 'persistence of tradition'. It is acquired by the power these traditions to be reinscribed via contingences and contradictoriness of the lives in minority. However, the recognition of culture which seems to be achieved by tradition seems to be partial in nature. This process does something much more important. In the process of pointing to the past of identities and cultures it gives rise to multiple anomalies in the form of cultural temporalities which in turn go in the invention of traditions. One of the major effects of this process is that it restricts access to an origin of identity or any received tradition. Several other effects of such liminal cultural interaction can be reconstructions of definitions of traditions and modernity, realignment of boundaries of private and public spaces, adjustment of high and low status and last a challenge to normative desires of development and progress.

Renee Green an African-American artist in the below statement reflects on the need to understand the idea of differences of culture as the site of production of minority identities which are further estranged unto themselves in the act of being represented as a collective body

"I wanted to make shapes or set up situations that are kind of open... My work has a lot to do with a kind of fluidity, a movement back and forth, not making a claim to any specific or essential way of being. Multiculturalism doesn't reflect the complexity of situation as I face daily... It requires a person to step outside of him/herself to actually see what he/she is doing. I don't want to condemn well-meaning people and say (like those t-shirts

you can buy on the street) ‘it’s a black thing, you wouldn’t understand.’ To me that’s essentializing blackness.”

Any kind of empowerment the act of pinpointing locations of identity and culture especially in a multiculturalist sense comes from the posing questions of solidarity and community occupying the intervening spaces between cultural locations. The variety of social differences of culture is not simply arisen out of authenticated experiences of cultural traditions. The differences are rather a sign of an emergence of a culture, a community which takes an identity beyond one’s self in a continuous process of erasure and reconstruction leading to creations of political spaces of the present.

Renee Green’s below statement seems to open up the intervening space between the act of representation of whom, what where of a community and the presence of community itself:

“Even then, it’s a struggle for power between various groups within ethnic groups about what’s being said and who’s saying what, who’s representing who? What is a community anyway? What is a black community? What is a Latino community? I have trouble with thinking of all these things as monolithic and fixed categories.”

Renee Green comes up with her own creative invention in her work *Sites of Genealogy*. Its effect is that it successfully tries to displace the binary logic through which identities of difference are often constructed namely

Self/Other, Black/White. In order to do this Green makes use of a metaphor of museum building:

“I use architecture literally as a reference, using the attic, the boiler room, and the stairwell to make associations between certain binary divisions such as higher and lower and heaven and hell. The stairwell became a liminal space, a pathway between the upper and lower areas, each of which was annotated with plaques referring to blackness and whiteness”

The metaphor of stairwell in the above passage is indicative of a very important fundamental feature of politics of location. This stairwell between the upper and lower floors becomes a liminal space in which the in-between spaces are the designators of identity and process of symbolic interactions between such identities. The movement on the stairwell refers to the temporal movement of identities which prevents them from being fixed or stationary into primordial archetypes or polarities. This leads to a very important result. This movement between spaces of fixed identities opens up the idea of cultural hybridity which will be more accepting of difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy. This is evident in the below comment of Green in her *Sites of Genealogy*:

“I always went back and forth between racial designations and designations from physics or other symbolic designations. All these things blur in some way... To develop a genealogy of the way of the colors and noncolors function is interesting to me.”

The location of culture in being signified as beyond points to a spatial plane and paves the way for future. However, the act of crossing any boundary, ‘going the beyond’ represents something unknown and unrepresentable. It resists a return to present which creates disjuncture between the future and present of the past of identity and culture. This kind of an imagination of spatiality brings to focus the temporal, social differences which hinder our sense of collective cultural contemporariness. This leads to the ideas that the ‘present’ is no longer a break between the past and the future. It exposes the discontinuity, inequality and conflicts in our public-image identity and self-identity. The result of such a complex movement is worth nothing. This leads to a transformation in our perception of self in the temporal sense of identity. The earlier conception of self in linear and sequential history is the one of establishing causal connections between events and the self, self and the other and of events amongst themselves. However, with the break in present the new confronted idea of self and identity in the context of location of culture is what Walter Benjamin describes as ‘A blast of a monadic (singular) moment from the homogenous course of history. This leads to the idea of establishment of self and identity in the present as ‘the time of now’. This refers to the idea that self and identity are not linear homogenous as they may seem at the first glance. They are rather instances of individual moments in time where confluence of self with identity marks the location of culture/s in the context geo-political and sociopolitical values and traditions.

The prefix 'post' in terms like postmodernism, post colonialism; post feminism therefore does not seem to indicate the idea of sequentially at all. Rather these terms with their prefix as post seem to reflect the restless energy which is a signal or clue to the existence of beyond- the location of cultural identity. These terms thus seek to transition the present into ex-centric and expanded sites of experiences and empowerment. A case can be made in the idea of postmodernism in the first instance. If understood in its sense of being simplistic fragments of any grand narrative of a post-enlightenment rationalism it remains a narrow enterprise. Rather its significance lies in the fact that the epistemological basis of ethnocentric ideas are also the lineal boundaries of a wide range of discursive voices and histories liken women, the colonized, minority groups and bearers of policed sexualities. The key demographic of the new internationalism consists of histories of postcolonial migration, narratives of cultural and political diaspora, social displacements of peasant and aboriginal communities, poetics of exile and the grim reality of economic and political refugees. It is in this context that the idea of boundary too can be made sense of as a process. It becomes a place or site from where the somethingness of identity and culture begins to make its presence felt in a movement.

The older idea of cultural comparativism having its grounds in homogenous national cultures, continuous transmission of historical traditions and organic ethnic communities seem to be in a complex process of redefining. A few instances of this new form of internationalism are

noteworthy. For instance, the case of extreme violence in Serbian nationalism shows that the idea of a pure ethnically cleansed national identity can be arrived at only through the literal and figurative death of the complex interweaving of history along with a set of specific circumstances leading to cultural borderlines of modern nation and nationhood. This instance seems to highlight the psychotic side of patriotic fervor and leads to an evidence of a sense of translational hybridity of imagined communities.

Another such instance can be found in the contemporary Sri Lankan theatre which represents the deadly conflict between the Tamil and Sinhalese through the allegory of State brutality in South Africa and Latin America. In the case of Australian literature, its Anglo-Celtic canon seems to be in the process of being rewritten from the perspectives of aboriginal political and cultural imperatives. In the case of South African literature, the novels of Richard Rive, Bessie Head, Nadine Gordimer, and John Coetzee seem to be the documents of a society divided by the apartheid which joins the international intellectual communities to come and mediate on the unequal worlds that exist elsewhere. Salman Rushdie's texts like *Midnight's Children* and *Shame* seems to be fabulist historiographies which in turn reminds us in his *Satanic Verses* that the truest form of eyes which observe reality may now belong to the migrant's double vision. Another instance of new internationalism is the text *Beloved* by Toni Morrison. This text revives the past of slavery along with its rituals of possession and self-possession which does a task to portraying it in the form of a contemporary

fable of women's history. At the same time, it is also a narrative of effective historical memory of an emerging public sphere of men and women alike.

A most striking feature of this new internationalism is its from specific to general and material to metaphoric does not seem to be a smooth and direct transition and transcendence. The passage of the contemporary culture of internationalism is a continuous process of displacement and disjuncture which seems to be incapable of totalizing experience. It seems that nowadays the majority of national cultures are being produced from the perspectives of minorities. The effect of this process along with formation of alternative histories of the excluded voices is the change in the basis of the formation of international connections. If this argument is found to be true that the currency of cultural comaprtivism as understood until now is no longer the idea of a sovereign national culture which is conceived by Benedict Anderson as an 'Imagined Community' which is rooted in 'homogenous empty time' of modernity and progress. It seems that the engines of social reproduction are being driven by the connected narratives of capitalism and class. By themselves alone these however do not seem to provide a frame or foundation for the various modes of cultural identification and political affect around the issues like sexuality, race, feminism, life world of refugees and migrants.

The above instances seem to be a testimony of a radical revision in the very concept of human community. It seems as if this geopolitical space of human community whether local or global or transnational, is being

reexamined and rediscovered. For instance, in the 1990's Feminism finds much solidarity in narratives of liberation as much as in the ethical position of a slave woman like Toni Morrison's Sethe in *Beloved*. Thus, it seems that the western metropolis needs to confront its own postcolonial history in the light of the influx of migrants, refugees as a narrative of the native internal to its own national identity. The statement made by Mr. Whisky Sisodia in *Satanic Verses* seems to make this act clear:

"The trouble with the Engenglish is that their his history happened overseas, so they dodo don't know what it means."

Post-Colonialism is a constant remainder of the constant presence of neo-colonial relations within the new world order and the national division of labor. This perspective can enable the authentication and examination of the histories of exploitation and development of the strategies of resistance. Postcolonial criticism also is a marker of those countries and communities in the North and South which constitute of 'Otherwise than Modernity'. These contra-modern postcolonial cultures can be contingent, discontinuous or in conflict with modernity and its various assimilation technologies. These countercultures however also are responsible for the deployment of cultural hybridity of various borderline conditions to transform and re-inscribe the social imagination of the metropolis and modernity. This is evident in the words of Guillermo Gomez-Paza, a performance artist who lived among all other times and places including on Mexico/US Border.

“Hello America. This is the voice of Gran Vato Charollero broadcasting from the hot deserts of Nogales, Arizona de libre Cogercio 2000 megahertz en todas direcciones. You are celebrating Laborer’s Day in Seattle while the Klan demonstrates against Mexicans in Georgia. Ironia, 100% ironia.”

The idea of the spaces of locations of culture in the beyond according to Homi Bhabha is a process to re-inscribe our human history. The fact it seems is that any kind of intervention or analysis of culture and identity in the beyond requires a new kind of hybrid aesthetic which Tomas Ybarra-Frausto describes as ‘rasquachismo’ in his below statement:

“The utilization of available resources for syncretism, juxtaposition and integration. Rasquachismo is a sensibility attuned to mixtures and confluence... a delight in texture and sensuous surfaces... self-conscious manipulation of materials or iconography. The combination of found material and satiric wit; the manipulation of artifacts, codes and sensibilities from both sides of the border”

The analysis of culture and identity in a liminal framework seems to demands a kind of newness which is not part of a linear narrative of time of past and present. This newness seems to reflect a kind of transformation of culture in a very aggressive manner. Any kind of art form or narrative in such a scenario seems to treat the cultural past as a precedent of aesthetic and seems to rework it as an in-between contingent space which can impact the performance of the present. The Past-Present complex thus becomes a necessary part of existence. One instance of this can be found in the text “Objet Trouve” by Pepon Osorio. He seems to want to create a hybrid

cultural space for the act of migration among the New York/Puerto Rican Community making it a space of cultural memory and identity.

Another very fascinating example of the liminal form of cultural-identity transformation is in the photographic art project oh harbors titled ‘Fish Story’. According to Seluka, “the harbor is the site in which material goods appear in bulk, in the very flux of exchange”.

Franz Fanon, a critic, psychoanalyst and a participant in the Algerian revolution’s below statement seems to locate a source of empowerment in the case of Norway’s nationalist ideals.

“As soon as I desire, I am asking to be considered. I am not merely here- and –now, sealed into thingness. I am for somewhere else and for something else. I demand that notice be taken of my negating activity insofar as I pursue something other than life; insofar as I do battle for the creation of human world- that is a world of reciprocal recognitions.”

The chain of circumstances leading to incarceration of Salvadorian and Filipino communities can be ascribed to Transnational Capitalism and lack of resource in the developing world. The migrant workers in their voyages and passages seems to represent a passage to culture which also form a majority portion of economic and political diaspora of the modern world. They seem to embody what Walter Benjamin describes as the Benjaminian ‘present’: a specific moment blasted out of the continuum of history. The whole case seems to represent conditions where political survivors become witnesses to history.

The above statement by Fanon marks a desire for recognition. The recognition seems to be of experience beyond the normal human temporality. Again it seems that this idea gives rise to an emerging space of identity in the cultural interstices which allows identity to come into existence. This marks the idea of identity as being a performance. This identity performs as a re-iteration and recreation of the self in the physical world which corresponds to the journey and resettlement of the various migrant communities. Fanon's concept of 'negating activity' seems to resonate with Homi Bhabha's idea of breaking the fixture and temporality of identity as being something which exists in a culturally collusive present.

Franz Fanon seems to recognize the need for subordinated communities of migrants to assert their own indigenous cultural identities and reassert their own histories. However, he also seems to be aware of the dangers of fixed rootedness of identities which seems to be stuck in the frames of colonial cultures. These colonial cultures seemed to have fixed identities and its roots in between the space of concrete past and the homogenized history of the present. The concept of negating activity by Fanon seems to a solution to this dilemma. It acts like a device which can reach out beyond the fixtures of identity and can make one feel the presence of the lost nostalgia for homeland and the adopted host land for any diasporic community. This according to Bhabha seems to lead to the newer category of migrants which the psyche of 'unhomliness'. This feeling of unhomlinees seems to be different from being homeless. It sorts of seems to present itself as a

struggle. This unhomeliness can become a site for struggle and representation of identity.

The struggle seems to manifest itself in both public and private spheres. This space of domesticity for migrant and diasporic communities represents one of the most major invasions of identity. At this site the line between homeland and host land become blurred. The private and public identities of such communities or individuals become part of and blend in each other. A major instance for this entire process can be seen in the character Isabel Archer of Henry James's *The Portrait of a Lady*. It becomes apparent in her struggle to survive uncharted waters and its rushing torrents. This moment seems to be the point where James kind of introduces her unhomeliness as a space for cross cultural migration. This unhomely framework seems to problematic structure which seems non-continuitist in nature. Feminism seems to address this moment of unhomeliness. It makes this moment which seems invisible in the society. It specifies and points to the patriarchal and gendered nature of civil society which can create a disturbance in the private and public identities of any individual. As a result of this when the private and public identities of an individual seem to mesh together the domestic identity space is redrawn and rediscovered as a space of normalizing, pastoralizing and individuating techniques of modern power structures.

W.H Auden wrote the following lines on the power of poesis in *The Cave of Making* which he aspired to be a narrative on the par with Goethe on this side of the Atlantic:

“While knowing speech can be at best, a shadow echoing the silent light, bears witness to the truth, it is not.”

A comparative framework can be found in Goethe’s final *Note on World Literature* which can serve as a method to unravel the feeling of unhomely in the modern world. Goethe suggest that the possibility of a world literature can exist from the confusion within cultures which arises out of wars and conflicts:

“Could not return to their settled and independent life again without noticing that they had learned many foreign ideas and ways which they had unconsciously adopted and come to feel here and there previously unrecognized spiritual and intellectual needs.”

Goethe here seems to adhere to the idea that the inner workings of any nation as a whole as well as that of an individual man seems to be unconscious in nature. This seems to be very close to his idea that the cultural life of a nation too is unconscious in nature and its physical representation. When they are placed together side by side literature and its narratives seem to acquire a new emerging form of cultural alteration and failure of consensus. This seems to lead to a form of trauma which is historical and psychological in nature. Therefore, the study of literature can then become the methodology by which cultures can recognize each other via their projections of ‘otherness’. The detailed study and analysis of such a form of literature can throw some light on the complex of identity formation. In such a form of study the major thematic concerns of literature would be not just transmission of national traditions but also

histories of migrants, the colonized or refugees. The focus here can be on the feeling of unhomeliness of such communities and individuals and their social and cultural displacements. It is just possible that it may lead to study of understanding of identity formation in such narratives.

According to Homi Bhabha such a study of literature points to its historical specificity and aesthetic distancing which focus on the sublimity of literature. According to him as individuals of literature we need to keep in mind the understanding of human actions and social world: how it is 'something beyond control but not beyond accommodation'. This points to the fact that private, public lives, past and present and the psyche of an individual seem to develop a form of identity of intimacy which can become a tool for analysis and questioning of the binary form of social existence. These binary forms of existence of man are often liminal in nature and opposed to each other spatially. They are connected to each other through an in between temporality which points to the feeling to being at home at the same time while projecting the image of the histories of the world. This precise moment of distancing inside a narrative in its aesthetics seems to provide it with an edge. This edge seems to represent hybridity; a kind of a difference inside or within pointing to the subject which occupies the in-between reality and that site thus becomes the place for his in between identity. This kind of a liminal existence seems to carry within it a kind of stationariness or stillness, a form of discursive framework which points to the identity formation within history and literature creating a bridge between homeland and host land.

Initially the term diaspora was used to address the migration and transplantation of Jews into being forced in exile in Babylonia. However, in recent times the term has come to mean any community or group of a nation or a region living outside of its own national borders and sharing some common goals which give them a sense of identity and bonding. However, what seems to constitute the idea of an identity especially ethnic identity seems to be fluid and changing over time. According to various generations of diaspora the term can mean different things to different people at different times. For the first-generation diaspora it means a strong feeling of nostalgia about the origin of their homeland. For the second-generation diaspora and onwards their bonds and ties with their homeland seems to loosen and being replaced by their bonds wither host land or adopted land. It seems as if their host land now longer seems to be an adopted land but becomes their own. There seems to be a case of cultural differences which do remain with the host land but what is of interest is due to migration new differences seem to arise with the homeland too. Two terms seem to be of particular interest and focus here. A clear demarcation can be made between immigrant culture and ethnic identity and will seem to bear further study. A group of migrants from any nation are not homogenous and monolithic in nature and they are very clearly impacted by the cultural variations among themselves and those of the host lands. Certain elements which constitute identity formation in migrant communities are food, clothes, language retention, religion, music, dance, myths, legends, and customs of individual community, rites of passage and others. They are adopted or discarded at different time periods

over time but what they all have in common is they bring a sense of belongingness, a sense of oneness to a common cultural and Indian roots even after years and centuries in a foreign land.

The migration of these communities and individuals in as human movement of diaspora has always been in the form of nomads, hunters, traders, cultural carriers, soldiers, exiles and conquerors. The communities and individuals of India have migrated since the beginning of history. Historical evidence can be found of Indian migration to Africa and central Southeast Asia in the form of traders, priests, monks and adventurers. Indian migration overall seems to have been relatively peaceful and seems to have left a tremendous cultural and civilizational impact evident even today. In the recent times of Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries people of Indian origin began to migrate in large numbers in the form of indentured labor. This seems to be a direct consequence of the colonial exploitation and the abolition of slavery in the West. The direct result of this was the migration of Indian communities and individuals to Caribbean, Fiji and Mauritius and other place to work on sugar plantations. History also saw them migrating to Africa to work on the railroads at great personal cost and working in sawmills and farming in Canada. However, this was only the first half of a large-scale migration. In the second half of twentieth century this migration was seen in the form of individuals as professionals of industry which led to the coining of the term brain drain.

In today's time there are people of Indian origin spread over hundred and thirty-eight countries. All of them speak different languages, have different

vocations and professions. However, all of them seem to have a commonality of identity which is the existence of a consciousness of their Indian origin, its heritage and culture. All of these migrant communities and individuals have worked hard and have overcome huge odds of deprivation, social, political and economic discrimination. One line of thought is that the inability of these to integrate into their host lands and its societies while being firmly tied up to their own culture, traditions and customs has proved to a big obstacle in their cultural assimilation in the host land. However, another line of thought feels that these very same things have provided them with the strength and endowed them with a value system which has helped them to stay true to their host lands.

According to Prof. Kapil Kapoor in his “*Theorizing Diaspora and the Indian Experience*” the movement of Indian diaspora seems to follow two pathways: one that of inside the nation and the other outside of the nation. According to him as the very idea of diaspora is one of dislocation and relocation both of the above movements have to be kept in mind while discussing the Indian diasporic experience. In the current world scenario where, international borders are becoming more and more fluid and communications are making the world smaller, Indian diasporic consciousness and experience can be used to provide models and frames of study which can show the movements of nativisation, acceptance and assimilation. Out of all the above their movements the most common form of diasporic effect seems to be of assimilation. It seems to be a direct result of the two movements mentioned above. The ultimate aim of

migration always seems to be some form of acceptance by the shost land and its communiqés. This is the truest form of assimilation in the host land and host culture. However, as the same time the true strength of host culture seems to lie in the fact that till what extent does it allow a diasporic individual or community to maintain their own individual culture and identity.

The first mythical and fictional references of migration in India seem to come from the epic in Mahabharata war. It is hypothesized that the Hittian people who were worshipers of gods like Varun (Wind God) and Mitra migrated from Indian after the war and then ended up in the middle east. There is a significant presence of attested migration of people form our country to all over Asia, South Asia and the Middle East till as far as Rome. Another major instance of migration is in the case of Buddhism when Buddhist monks migrated all over the Asia and Sri-Lanka. Then there were recorded instances of migrations being done from the east coast to different places in South Asia along with cited incidents of indentured labor, cyber labor and the El Dorado labor.

There is always a sense of ambivalence with regards to people going in a country or coming out of a country. Whenever someone seems to migrate to a country like USA for instance it is considered that that country is something far to grand and flattering. Whereas when people migrate from a country there seems to be all kinds of impressions about that country as poor, insufficient in resource where violence is strife.

The story of migration out of India is quite important with some success. These migrations out of India have always ranged into wide varieties right from conversions to conquest to desire for freedom from oppression and in recent times from freedom of want. On the surface the first major reason for this seems to be cultural expansion especially in Central, South and East Asia. Secondly another major reason for this migration is their critical role in the develop of industries and infrastructure in the host lands. Migrant communities from India especially played a critical role in the development and construction projects in Asia and Africa in remote places like Fiji, Mauritius, and the Caribbean's under the Western colonialism. The third major reason is the question of communities itself. Due to major migrations such communities become very fluid in their very nature. Along with this they have played a significant role in the development of the economies of the said countries as well.

There seems to be a repetitive use of the term diaspora for all the kinds of movements or migration including migrants, immigrants, colonialists, missionaries, anthropologists' soldiers and exiles. In doing so it seems that we are negating the significance and the originality of the diasporic experience and discourse. Hence it seems that a particular care has to be taken while keeping in mind the usage of term. It refers to an idea, an experience: The experience of transition of movement. This very movement makes and breaks the identities and representations. It disperses the migrant communities and breaks them up and rebuilds them. Hence what seems to be required is the separation of categories like migration,

diaspora and immigration. The experience of movement in each instance is completely different. Each kind of movement of above three has its own structure and identity. It is important to determine the nature; characteristics features and intensity of all the three kinds of above movements. However, in all the three kinds of movements there seem to be three common elements: a formal movement and its inquiry, the home land and the host land. It is also important to determine the intensity and the nature of each of the above experience.

Therefore, in conclusion Diaspora is an experience of an individual or a group going from one nation/country to another for a variety of purposes. In the Indian diasporic context, it seems to be a case of separation. In the case of diaspora, it is the separation and experience of isolation for the individual who seems to undergo the migration process. This individual diasporic consciousness and its experience is important at a fundamental level rather than economic or political diaspora. In the individual diasporic consciousness, we are talking about narratives of literature seems to deal with specific time period, specific location and specific situation. Thus, this kind of diasporic experience by is very nature of movement seems to be creating an identity or in other words the very act of movement and migration is an act of identity creation within a diasporic movement of the self. This creation of identity seems to be rooted and in turn creating a conflict in the movement itself. This movement shows a kind of form-to. While going from the home land there seems to be a loss of mother land and there seems to be a consecutive search, to find the lost identity: the

lost self. In such a context it can be speculated that everyone is rooted without a home. When an individual is born, he or she is without a home or identity. Once being born, they form relations, associations and networks which allow them to locate their own self in this world and create their own identity. And this process resembles the process of finding a home and is endless. Hence what is necessary is a sense of defining a teleological sense of understanding of what this home is and what its identity is.

Post-Colonialism is a tricky term, regardless of whether seen very close, from inside a field it names that is scarcely a quarter century old, or from a different domain. Terry Eagleton wildly required “a mystery handbook for post-pilgrim pundits,” which he felt should definitely exist some place in the vainglorious supermarket, But for some scholars, the equivocalness laid out is vital to the force of post colonialism and finds it in a lot bigger field of basic speculation, to which the demeanor of innovation is essential. It is that mentality of advancement that drives Stuart Hall to pronounce, “Thus, postcolonial isn’t the finish of colonization. It is after a specific sort of expansionism, after a specific snapshot of high dominion and pilgrim occupation? In its wake, in its shadow, arched by it? It is the thing that is on the grounds that something “different has occurred previously, however it is likewise something new.” And Simon Gikandi, as well, in his exceptionally insightful perusing of “Englishness,” thinks about post colonialism as a “code for the condition of un-decidability in which the way of life of imperialism keeps on reverberating in what should be its negation.” As a versatile representation, post colonialism is best

summarized by Emily Apter, who finds in it a “train, portmanteau quality, “with transnational incentive as a method of social investigation independently appropriate for the examination of artistic and social variety, what John Erickson has called this “social m tissage.” It could be suggestive that Apter’s middle is situated in earnest issues in her present, for which post colonialism gives a point of view and setting, as opposed to being at the focal point of her consideration. In our terms, the postcolonial makes due into the present definitely as a result of its status as past. We represent the way the arrangement of terms around “postcolonial(ism)” capacities in current basic talk from a regular book, a book on exilic and diasporic filmmaking by Iranian-American film pundit Hamid Naficy. It has the accompanying passages in the list as follows: postcolonial and identity movie producers, postcolonial films, postcolonial nations, postcolonial relocations, postcolonial movie producers (not to be mistaken for postcolonial and personality producers), post colonialism, postcolonial technique, postcolonial hypothesis. We returned to the content to follow up these terms and build up a corpus. On this premise we mention two objective facts which would apply to numerous different messages in this field. To begin with, the expression “postcolonial (ism) “is once in a while utilized all alone. It ordinarily is one of at least two terms that cover and back one another: most generally “postcolonial” and “third world” or “postmodern” Second, the actual term is losing its power through semantic reliance (the need to assemble it with another word) ; it is debilitated, minimized, and as a hypothetical development utilized only one-10th as regularly as the modifier. “Post colonialism” is a neologism that outgrew

more established components to catch an apparently interesting crossroads in world history, a setup of encounters and bits of knowledge, expectations and dreams emerging from an until now quieted part of the world, exploiting new conditions to look for options in contrast to the talks of the pioneer era, making an out and out of various vantage points from which to audit the past and what's to come. That situation what Apter has named "a transnational certainty of interdisciplinary ordinary life" demanded a name. The name it asserted was "postcolonial," and consequently "post colonialism." Embedded in it is obviously was the "way of life" of "colonialism" itself, which we contend might be recuperated from the root words themselves, here settlement also referred to as colony.

'Colony' comes by means of French from the Latin 'colonia' and 'colonus', 'rancher', from 'colere', to develop, abide. Webster's 1905-word reference characterized it as "An organization of individuals relocated from their homeland to a distant area or nation, staying subject to the locale of the parent state: as, the settlements of America." The philosophy implanted in the section is obvious, given the date and source, and too evident to even consider requiring remarks. More subtle is the bizarreness of the historical underpinnings. As Webster notes, "colony" comes from a rich and significant root, colo, which, shockingly, is additionally the wellspring of "culture." How could this hang together in the cutting-edge implications of "settlement or colony"? For an answer we go to White and Riddle's Latin word reference (1876). They report that it is much the same as the Sanskrit root 'kshi' "to abide or to dwell and live,"

its base importance additionally in Latin: “to withstand, abide, stay (in a spot), to possess it.” From this significance it built up a bunch of related implications: to work (the earth), to develop it and subsequently allegorically to work the psyche or soul, and to love the divine beings. These are different implications for a cutting-edge attitude, however in the pre-modern world, in which these terms were framed, there is a characteristic association between living in a spot, working the land, and regarding its divine beings, the spirits of the land.

Colonus, is one who is the subject of col, derived from this complex root, so its essential importance was that of an occupant or rancher or farmer. From this utilization it floated to allude to a pilgrim in an unfamiliar spot, a ‘pioneer’ in the cutting edge of modernity. Yet this drift was not innocent, and in the Latin the other meanings are still active, part of the ideological work it did to justify and legitimate different modalities of invasion: living in (and dominating) a new land, “improving” it by work, and bringing new gods all strategies that European powers employed in the five hundred years of European colonization. This contradictory legacy then underwent over the course of fifteen hundred years an amnesiac shift in the stock of words of modern European languages. “Colony” came to refer primarily to invasive settlements, not to a neutral “dwelling.” It also lost its deep roots in pre-modern ways of life, especially religion. We will argue that all these elements are still present in contemporary forms of colonization, in both its classic (colonial), and postmodern (postcolonial) forms. The realities have not changed, but meaning has slowly seeped out

of the term over two millennia. It is now less rich, less adequate to the complexities of the present as well as the past, missing surprising connections and contradictions that are still current. ‘Post colonialism’ emerges from this complex history with two potent affixes attached in front and behind to an adjectival form in “-al”. The prefix “post-” is relatively easy to understand, though still with complex effects. In all its compounds it gestures toward a time just after some main event that defines its existence, of which it is the shadow. But how long and strong is that shadow, whose form and meaning is only guaranteed by the now-past originary form? ‘Post’ has marginality and obsolescence built in. “Post colonialism” is not immune to this fate. “-Ism” is harder to track. The three suffixes “-ism,” “-ist,” and “-ize” all derive from the Greek *-izein*, which is added to a noun or adjective to make it a verb, describing a related action. The trouble is that this very productive set of morphemes have been applied over two thousand years to form a bewildering variety of words in many languages, Greek and Latin as well as modern European languages. In this heterogeneous set of words, “-ist” usually refers to a kind of agent who makes whatever it is happen. But it matters what kind of thing is made to happen: a thing (like a colony) or an adjective (like colonial). So ‘colonists’ make a colony happen by what they do, whereas “colonialists” reflect the qualities of a colony, the attributes and attitudes associated with one. “-Ism” still has a reference, obvious or latent, to actions or behaviors, habitual actions performed in relation to its headword. As with “-ist,” its meaning depends on qualities of the headword. In modern English there are two strands of meaning of “-ism” relevant to “postcolonialism.” One takes

‘postcolonial’ in a general sense, referring to the kinds of things typically done in a postcolonial situation. The other strand has a long tradition, attested at least as early as 1680 in the OED, in which the headword refers to a doctrine, theory, or practice. From its first appearance this usage always had a negative sense. These two strands coexist, their differences unstated and in tension, in contemporary usages of ‘post colonialism,’ creating ambivalence and confusion around the word. Does it refer to the inexhaustibly open and rich set of possible actions and states that can flourish in the shadow of (after) colonialism? Or is it the militant tendency stemming from “postcolonial (theory),” an “-ism” as in “dogmatism,” notable more for energy than subtlety or originality, a rhetoric calling for action (real or imagined) on behalf of a cause whose tenets are not to be questioned? “Post colonialism” in this sense is postcolonial thought without the thought, following postcolonial theory not as theory but as dogma, looking at its object through dangerous blinkers.

As opposed to remain with words in dictionaries we need to proceed onward to edifices of words and thoughts as they work in writings, in what we will call the contemporary postcolonial chronicle. Our conversation will zero in on few writings which adequately show some of the equity to the variety of the field, of Post-Colonialism. We start with Homi Bhabha (effectively present in the basic talks of Hall, Gikandi, Apter, and Robert Young), since his work is key to a comprehension of current expressions of post colonialism.

The semantic slippage of 'post colonialism' is far more in Bhabha's works, where it has floated into the circle of "postmodernism." Far from this being a profitable collusion, the relationship has come to rehash the old connection among colonizers and colonized, in which "postcolonialism" is appropriated and abused to real the metropolitan term and its metropolitan context. "Postcolonial thought is the last shelter of postmodernism," Alex Callinicos says, from his Marxist angle in an evaluation on Bhabha's work. It would not be prudent to excuse either Bhabha or all types of postmodernism as seriously as Callinicos does, yet in the current hypothesis there is a trinity of 'posts' that has viably colonized and encased the open space of "afterness," each transforming into the others in an interminable play of nearly similarity, shutting around a solitary subject and a solitary variant of history for the sake of majority.

Callinicos takes the work of Bhabha as emblematic of this move, with good reason we feel, given Bhabha's hallowed position in the dominant (postmodern) school of post colonialism. Bhabha rejects foundationalist historiographies on the grounds that the postcolonial present (with its global flows and hybrid identity politics) finds them attenuating. In the new historiography fashioned by Bhabha, anticolonial nationalist practice repeats, with a difference, an original metropolitan nationalism. Theorists of bourgeois anticolonial struggle would agree this often happens. For Bhabha it seems this is the only model of nationalist struggle in the domain of anti-colonialism: a metropolitan nationalism repeated with a difference (an ambivalence) but within a space that is semiotic ally the same, since it

is invested with the same bureaucratic and juridical systems. This is a little uncanny, as Bhabha says, because it is a kind of return of the repressed, a compulsive repetition but one to which one desires to return to participate in the (il) logic of having been there before. The colonized subject is thus bound to mimic (the narrative of the struggle presupposes a prior metropolitan grand narrative) and can only exist in a condition of ambivalent hybridity. But in doing so it undermines, in Neil Lazarus's words, the 'colonialist script' itself.

This move is fundamentally textualist, in that Bhabha's style of postcolonialism deprives colonial discourse of its singularity and power and, hence, suggestively undercuts its dominance by demonstrating, indeed parodically (sly mimicry is what he calls it), the colonized individual's equal proficiency in its various registers: when asked what he thought of Western civilization the Mahatma is reputed to have replied, "I think it would be a very good idea." At the level of the aesthetic the decisive writer was of course V. S. Naipaul, whose early social comedies discursively mimicked metropolitan English stylists. Bhabha's subjects are the colonial elites who function around the edges of the colonial frame of domination and whose current avatars are the people of the diaspora, exiles and migrants who are at once here and elsewhere and whose presence disrupts received definitions of the nation. For Bhabha, then, the hybrid, mobile subject of diaspora "the transnational as the translational" is the exemplary postcolonial who stands ambivalently against atavistic nationalism. Bhabha writes: "At this point I must give way to the vox

populi: to a relatively unspoken tradition of the people of the pagus-colonials, post colonials, migrants, minorities, wandering peoples who will not be contained within the Heim of the national culture and its unisonant discourse, but are themselves the marks of a shifting boundary that alienates the frontiers of the modern nation.” Bhabha’s term “hybrid” has become the mantra of much recent postcolonial theory, where it functions as an archeseme, a redemptive sign that affirms the agency of the postcolonial subject, without need of further exemplification, nowhere more so than in those nation states where the postcolonial is also a diasporic subject. It is strange this word has conquered the field so effortlessly, since in biology hybrids are sterile.

Bhabha’s postcolonial as migrant (ideally the migrant of color), dispossessed, schizophrenic, exilic, often profoundly unhappy and exploited under capitalism, gets transformed into a powerful subject of (post) modernity. His history of “cultural displacement [whether it is] the ‘middle passage’ of slavery and indenture, the ‘voyage out’ of the civilizing mission,” becomes the substance of “contemporary postcolonial discourses.” However, this experience, which Bhabha declares signifies the trans-nationality of culture, is also “translational,” because it complicates the definition of culture itself. Our difficulty with these propositions (often used uncritically in postcolonial theory) is that the transformation takes place only inside discourse, a particular specialist discourse at that. The illusion of power (in a new translational cultural episteme) is achieved by a radical separation from power as it operates in a wide range of discourses

and practices, leaving the postcolonial theorist in the end as sole beneficiary. In effect Bhabha's argument is often mounted from the "sign of post-coloniality," so that it is not divergent historical experiences that require narration in post colonialism but a particular epistemological stance (although he shifts the "subject of culture from an epistemological function to an enunciative practice") that arises out of the initial project of bourgeois anticolonial nationalism.

Lazarus's references to the materiality of historical memory offer a further critical corrective to Bhabha. Historical experiences (the Marxist understanding of "consciousness as bearing social effects") are materially constitutive of postcolonial sociality. This is not a matter of relating life-worlds in terms of lived experiences, but of seeing life-worlds as being part of a systemic process of imperialist domination and exclusion. It therefore becomes important for post colonialism to bear witness to the distinctions between imperialist and anti-imperialist movements so that one can see, with Fanon, that bourgeois anticolonial nationalism invariably effected "neocolonial class consolidation". A proper, non-bourgeois anti-colonialism that leads to decolonization in fact "brings the future of capitalism radically into question", because, as for Fanon, the postcolonial national project is one that is built around a demand for a "fundamental transformation rather than a mere restructuring of the prevailing social order". It is on this point that Bhabha's own widely circulated essay "*Remembering Fanon*" disavows Fanon's revolutionary commitment to a radically altered postcolonial world order, in favor of a reading that locates

him as a theorist of the “subversive slippage of identity and authority,” because for Fanon, as Bhabha (mis)reads him, the social’ is always an unresolved ensemble of antagonistic interlocations between positions of power and poverty, knowledge and oppression, history and fantasy, surveillance and subversion. .” What Bhabha’s intense textuality misses is Fanon’s understanding of decolonization as a process that heralds a new nation state, in which the past may be redeemed through a new scansion of literary history seen in the tales of the postcolonial storytellers (inheritors of the age-old oral tradition) where the “present is no longer turned in upon itself but spread out for all to see.” It is clear that Bhabha’s theorization cannot address the uneven and discrepant histories of colonial struggle in many parts of the world, and certainly not the struggles of First Nation peoples.

Gayatri Spivak’s *Critique of Postcolonial Reason* develops themes ranging from the subaltern and diaspora to the new multinational world order. The work isolates the “foreclosed [woman] native informant” as the absolutely silenced figure in the master philosophical texts of Europe and in colonial discourses as well. She does this through a deconstructive reading, which to her has great merit in being “unaccusing, unexcusing, attentive, situationally productive through dismantling”, and of value in delivering meanings otherwise foreclosed. For our argument Spivak’s book has value in that it locates its thesis in the heart of the project of the Enlightenment itself and critiques that legacy (as the presencing of a difference) from a postcolonial perspective. Against the bourgeois male subject of

instrumental reason (the subject of imperialism) she advances the native informant as the subaltern woman subject, foreclosed by/in history. Insofar as the native informant has been rejected (the ideology of imperialism was based on this fact of rejection, or at least arrived at the idea of rejection not long after colonization had set in: the move from Indophilia to Indophobia, for instance, is well documented, he/she remains the untheorized subject of post colonialism. Spivak hopes to graft the native woman on to the occluded sign of the foreclosed (native) informant. She defines the native informant as “that mark of expulsion from the name of Man, a mark crossing out the impossibility of the ethical relation”. There are significant compressions at work here. First, “Man” is also the Enlightenment/imperial subject, and the native (as potential Man) is the transformed or transformable universal subject who could then enter history, though only in the terms laid down by this narrative. Second, “the impossibility of ethical relation” also presupposes a number of things: the impossibility of justice (on the natives’ own terms), the absence of foundational absolutes that underpin justice, the absence of social institutions through which “property” relations can be defined, and so on. Third, the “native informant” is a discursive construct no less in supposedly emancipatory narratives than in classic colonialist forms.

From this she goes on to argue that in the foundational texts of the West: Kant, G. W. F. Hegel, and Marx, “the last Three Wise Men of the Continental (European) tradition”. the foreclosed native informant is necessary for the construction of the European norm: “In Kant he [the

native informant] is needed as the example for the heteronomy [presence of different law] of the determinant, to set off the autonomy of the reflexive judgment, which allows freedom for the rational will; in Hegel as evidence of the spirit's movement from the unconscious to consciousness; in Marx as that which bestows normativity upon the narrative of the modes of production". The moves thus summarized are not simply a matter of historical periodization; they inhabit the modern and shadow the new divisions of labor that distinguish the North and the South. And the figure of the poorest woman of the South is the "typecase of the foreclosed native informant today". The implicit necessity of the native Other in Kant signifies as well the exclusion of her from the category of the sublime, which is a figurative trope that draws us to the fundamental laws of reason and morality, indeed to justice. The sublime does not come to people who are "naturally alien to it." Kant writes: "Without development of moral ideas, that which we, prepared by culture, call sublime presents itself to man in the raw merely as terrible". This is an exceptionally astute postcolonial reading of Kant, the recognition of which (that is, the "raw man") leads Spivak to isolate an important anthropological moment in Kant, which, because it surfaces only as a trace, had been considered unimportant by Kantian scholars. After Kant's rhetorical question "why it is necessary that men should exist" we get a parenthesis: "(a question which is not easy to answer if we cast our thoughts by chance on the New Hollanders or the inhabitants of Tierra del Fuego)" These examples of absolute rawness, the irredeemable native Others, are presented as figures who cannot be the subject of speech or judgment in the third Critique.

Being outside culture, they are outside sublime experience and cannot think the final purpose. The exclusion of the raw man from the sublime has enormous consequences. Since the raw man is not “man,” he is not the subject of morality and hence cannot understand legislation and purposes; he is outside also of John Rawls’s theory of justice (Rawls is remarkably Kantian) and invites Europe “to be global legislator.” Spivak’s analysis here shows deconstructive criticism doing what it does best: interrupting, intervening, opening up the discourses of the dominant, restoring plurality and tension. If in her reading of Kant, the native informant is foreclosed as a subject outside of culture and the law of reason, her reading of Hegel sees the native informant already marginalized in his own canonical texts. The complicity is best seen in an Indian nationalist ethos that writes its grand narratives in the shadow of Hegelian history and in so doing excludes the native subaltern informant quite as dramatically as the colonizer had done. Hegel had reserved the sublime specifically for those cultures that had moved away from the mystical over coding of fantastic symbolism. As the underdeveloped Spirit, the native informant again becomes the absent other for the essential Occident/Orient binary.

In Spivak’s account the native informant is simultaneously crucial but foreclosed in Western thought. Yet this part of the exposition does not simply grow out of the deconstruction. Spivak uses this discursive move to lay claim to this other, who is her own creation. She presents the native informant as the diasporic subject, the marginalized migrant or indeed the postcolonial. Writes Spivak: “Let me point beyond the argument here to

suggest that an unquestioning privileging of the migrant may also turn out to be a figure of the effacement of the native informant". The "native informant" in all her singularity remains outside space and time, hovering in Hegelian space and time, waiting to connect with a new moment of the Geist. Postmodern ethnography has critiqued the idea of the anthropologist as mediator and decoder of cultures, exposing it as a ruse, a "cover story" that does not change fundamental power relations. Spivak has skillfully folded back one part of the dominant colonialist discourse: the "native informant" of anthropology into another part, its foundational philosophical texts, to disrupt both. But the move remains internal to dominant discourses. It does not go outside them to discover or connect with an excluded reality. In Spivak's celebration, this "postcolonial subject" (rethought as the colonized [female] "native informant") and her history are actors on a stage of world history as grand as in Hegel, and just as specious. A tactic that seemingly aimed to disrupt the power of the Fathers becomes a trick to appropriate it.

The aims of this chapter and its initial analysis thus are to try to understand the various strands of Nation, Narratives, Identity and its imagination in the context of ideology and postcolonial theory. The idea of try to understand the various intersecting roots of the said concepts mentioned above and try to analyze that how do they impact the idea of re-imagination of any diasporic narrative. The sections which have been discussed separately all do merit further inquiry and re-working for the

purposes of better understanding as well as for a fluid adaptability of the textual narrative of the said concepts in the context of Diaspora.

Works Cited

- Alba, Richard. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press., 2003.
- Ali N., et al. “The limits to “transnationalism”: Bosnian and Eritrean refugees in Europe as emerging transnational communities.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 578-600.
- Ambrosio, T. *Irredentism: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics*. Westport/ London: Praeger., 2001.
- Anderson, Benedict. (1983), *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso, 1983.
- Anderson, Bridget. “Battles in time: The relation between global and labour mobilities’,” *Centre on Migration, Policy and Society*, vol. 55.
- Andrijasevic, R. “Gendered borders, or missing links between feminist and migration studies.”
- Bhabha, Homi K. *Nation and Narration*. Routledge, 1990
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 2004.
- Brah, Avtar. *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. Routledge, 1996

- Crul, M., and H. Vermeulen. “‘The second generation in Europe’,” *International Migration Review*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 965-968.
- Csepeli, G., and A. Örkény. “‘The changing facets of Hungarian nationalism’,” *Social Research*, vol. 63, no. 1, 1996, pp. 247-286.
- Cummings, S. “‘The Kazakhs: Demographics, diasporas, and return’,” *Nations Abroad: Diaspora Politics and International Relations in the Former Soviet Union*, by C. King and N. Melvin, Boulder/Oxford: Westview Press., 1998.
- Dahinden, J. “‘Contesting transnationalism? Lessons from the study of Albanian migration networks from former Yugoslavia’,” *Global Networks*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2005, pp. 191-208.
- Dahinden, J. “‘Deconstructing mythological foundations of ethnic identities and ethnic group formation: Albanian-speaking and new Armenian immigrants in Switzerland’,” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 34, no. 1, 2008, pp. 55-76.
- Hall, Stuart. “Cultural Identity and Diaspora.” *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, edited by Jonathan Rutherford, Lawrence and Wishart, 1990, 222-237.
- Said, Edward. . *Culture and Imperialism*. Knopf, 1993.
- Spivak, Gayatri. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, University of Illinois Press, 1988, 217-313.

V, Amit, and N. Rapport. *The Trouble with Community: Anthropological Reflections on Movement, Identity and Collectivity*. Pluto Press, 2002.

Young, Robert J.C. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2001. Jonathan Rutherford, Lawrence and Wishart, 1990, 222=237.