Chapter: I

Nation and Identity: An Understanding

Of late the word 'diaspora' has found an increasing entry in evaluating the works of writers who fall into this category. It is well-known that 'diaspora' and diasporic writing has wide ranging connotations and complexities, some which defy an easy explanation or definition. The dictionary meaning of the word indicates its epistemology to the Greek word, meaning 'dispersion' ('diaspeirein') or to 'scatter'. The second and the widely known meaning of diaspora relates to the settling of scattered colonies of Jews outside Palestine after the Babylonian exile. The standard deduction out of this meaning, as it stands to be understood today, is the dispersal abroad.

When the continental plates separated out, the local migration within a geographically defined single landmass was transformed into cross-continental migration. Aided by the tectonics of the earth, the earliest human beings became great migrants but they were not 'civilized' and hence when the first civilizations cropped up they became the first 'civilized' natives. Still, the civilizations of Indus Valley (India), Yangtze-Kiang
Valley (China, Tigris-Euphrates basin (Mesopotamia) and Nile basin (Egypt) cannot be said to have been inhabited by the original natives as they were periodically overrun by newer migrant groups. The newer migrant groups either scattered the former groups or amalgamated with them to become the new natives.

The process went on for ages and allied with the increase in population, it ultimately gave rise to the concept of a 'melting pot'. India became the first melting pot of the world and since the coming of the Aryans, India has received invaders, traders and refugees in various migratory patterns. There are the Greeks and the Macedonians who came with Alexander; then came the case of displacement of the whole Parsi community from Persia to India; then came Arab traders followed by Persians, Afghans and Turkish traders as well as invaders, and finally came Mughals. All these migratory people have undergone such assimilation in the melting pot of India that they have become its natives. Even the colonial powers did not escape effects of the melting pot. The Anglo-Indian Community in India is more Indian than anything else. Of late the Second
World War saw the migration of some Jews to India; the 1970s saw the coming of 'hippies' and all along there has been constant migration of traders and refugees from India's neighbouring countries like China, Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh, and Burma. These latter groups are still in the process of assimilation.

The 'melting pot' is not an isolated concept related to India only. The United Kingdom is also an example of the same. Since the early Phoenicians to the Angles, the Jutes, the Saxons, the Normans and the Romans, all have become the natives of Britain (2). The later day migrants from the British Colonies of Africa and Asia along with the Irish, Poles, Jews and those from the Commonwealth countries have made British society multicultural. The United States of America is perhaps the most active melting pot of the world. Clark also explains that the Red-Indians, the original inhabitants of that territory, were not as 'civilized' as the Incas of South America (3). The migrant population from Europe, especially the U.K., along with the indentured laborers they brought from Africa, now constitutes the native population of the U.S.A. Peter Kivisto in the
Introduction' to his book, *Multiculturalism in Global Society*, depicts five major world migration patterns in the 1990s: from Asia to US and Canada; from Central America to Canada; from Africa to Europe; from Asia to Europe; and from India and South-East Asia to Saudi Arabia and the Gulf countries. What this indicates is that migration is as good as any natural phenomenon.

Nowadays the problem of migration is different from that of the early times. Today people are leaving their countries willingly under certain motives for the satisfaction of some personal ambitions. But in early times it was not migration at all; it was the transportation of third world people as labourer to a slave island. That is why today people migrate only with "a part of total culture in which so long as they remained at home, they participated" (4). Therefore, their adjustment in a different social, religious, economic and political milieu is not so pathetic as was that of the early émigrés, because of the former's education and determination. In early times, people were more or less illiterate and their illiteracy was the reason behind their nostalgia (their adherence to mother country's religion, culture
and language). In early times, it was whole tribe or at least a wholly representative part of it that moved away, this shows their outer-migration because their inner world is occupied by their mother country. This outer migration of different races and communities creates racial, cultural and linguistic confusion and this becomes a great hurdle in the formation of a national culture. The new culture which develops in this island is bafflingly alike and also different from the parent culture because as the time passes, the old values gradually diminish leaving their remnants in their memories while the migration in modern times is entirely otherwise.

No doubt, America is the 'crowning glory' of our time and so has a sole dream of people around the world. The young ambitious personnel, especially from third world countries where they cannot get enough to do, are making an unabated flow to America. This flow of divergent races, classes and cultures has totally changed the face of America. These aspirants to the New World are dead set even in their own country to blindly imitate American habits and American culture. They feel more American than their native counterparts in all
respect and obviously their cultural elasticity enables them to adjust to the new set up comfortably. But it is rarely so that everyone who goes to America finds the same amicable environment. Some people are lucky enough to get their dreams fulfilled while others become victims of circumstances and are forced to lead worse lives than the ones they left behind. Those who experience acculturation sing with America and are never tired of showering all praise on the country of their adoption for its 'providence', but others can never forget that plunge into a culturally different ethos has been a 'big mistake' for them. No doubt, cultural conflict has minimized in modern times because people have become primary and all other things have become secondary. The finesse of culture has lost its luster in the dazzling light of American discotheque. Madonna and Michael Jackson have obscured the chanting of Ramayana and The Gita.

In fact, the class which moves out of its cultural contours, has no love lost for its motherland. Moreover, there is so much of cultural mixing in the post-colonial era that it has given birth to 'hybrid-culture'. In every country the highest class (and
especially in India) is worse affected by this phenomenon. As Ashcroft and his colleagues observe:

Post-colonial culture is inevitably a hybrid phenomenon involving a dialectical relationship between the grafted European cultural systems and an indigenous ontology, with its impulse to create or recreate an independent local identity. Such construction or reconstruction occurs as a dynamic interaction between European hegemonic and ‘peripheral’ subversions of them. (5)

The contemporary times have witnessed a total transformation of cultural logic in that they have almost done away with all possibilities of nursing the old specific sense of culture. Earlier it was religion which was more vital, to use the Wordsworthian phrase ‘the breath and finer spirit’ of culture. Now it is economy which is governing supreme in the formation and alteration of cultural norms of a society. Fredric Jameson rightly comments:

The post is...the forcefield in which very different kinds of cultural impulses — what Raymond Williams has usefully termed ‘residual’ and “emergent” forms of cultural production must make their way. If we do not achieve some general sense of cultural dominant,
then we fall back into a view of present history as sheer heterogeneity, random difference, a coexistence of a host of distinct forces whose affectivity is undecidable. (6)

This new capitalistic culture which has emerged in post-modern times is an outcome of American dominance as Jameson convincingly puts it:

Post modern culture is the internal and super structural expression of a whole new wave of American military and economic domination throughout the World: in this sense, as throughout class history, the undesirable of culture is blood, torture, death and terror. (7)

The process of migration to America that started in mid-nineteenth century has reached a new high in terms of immigrant population within a span of one hundred years. People from all over the world are drawn towards this country for a variety of reasons. Notwithstanding their intention, those who choose to stay on and finally settle down, experience qualitative cultural transformation.

Before I get on to the ramifications of literary diaspora, I wish to clarify the two terms in which I intend to discuss
diaspora, writing and experience in this context. The two terms are 'nation' and 'identity'. While thinking about the problems of nation and identity, it becomes essential to examine the way of living life and human existence, in the past and present. Problems of nation, identity, national identity, individual identity etc. are the recent needs, that have emerged, which were never experienced by mankind in the past. The life which people lived in the past was largely introvert with himself and his family. It was a life more given to the spiritual aspects and with as less as possible material needs. So, question of nation and identity was neither imagined nor experienced by mankind in the primitive times. The whole globe was a nation for him and he never imagined any boundary lines on the face of the earth. Since most of his needs were satisfied within the surrounding only, there was no question of mobility and migration. The earth was his nation and man's understanding about himself was his identity. But who can stop the changing times and tenets of human existence? Those primitive values, way of life, needs of life and goals of life have completely undergone a change. Man has continued drawing lines on the face of earth and thus he
goes on imprisoning himself more and more. The irony of this truth is that, when there were no political lines on the face of earth, he was satisfied with his life in his small village and the earth was home for him. Now he has drawn the lines and wants to cross it, creating the problem of nation and identity.

The twentieth century proved to be the century of scientific advancement, industrialization, globalization and materialism. It created a need for migration and mobility, in search of better existence and more sophistication. Of course, whether it is better existence or not in reality is one more debatable issue. But the fact is that human mobility, witnessed in the twentieth century brought with it several problems and two of them are nation and identity. The migration and the mobility, that we are talking about is at such a large scale and spread over the whole globe that one, who migrates has to think about his identity in the new surrounding and environment. The basic issue which emerges here is: Does a person, who knows to a new land, cease to be a native of his native land? Should he consider himself a native of new nation and new culture? There is one more angle of looking at it and
that is in the form of our oriental belief, that wherever a person goes, he cannot disconnect himself from his root. Migration and mobility, according to this belief may bring a change in the dress, language and way of living life, but the spirit remains the same. The actual problem of nation and identity emerges, when such a person finds himself nowhere, even amid them ocean of human beings. He fails to disconnect himself from his original root and equally fails to implant himself in the land of new culture. Sometimes the land of that new culture does not accept him fully and such a state creates in him the feeling of nowhere ness, that is nothing but the problem of nation and identity. Psychologically, every person desires to be accepted, in other words I can be said that the problem of nation and identity is after all a psychological and emotional problem, because it is concerned with human sense of belonging. One wants to accept and to be accepted. Whenever any disturbance takes place, in this need, the problem of belonging emerges. It is not necessary for one to take it for granted that the problem of nation and identity takes place in the life of a person only when he accepts migration and mobility. Since it is a psychological
feeling, there are chances of its experience even within his native land. The best example of it is the dilemma of the Muslim community, within India, after the partition and independence. Both the communities have not still emotional settled with each other peacefully, which finally leads to the problem of nation and identity on the part of that Muslim community.

It is said, “Home is where your feet are” (8) but it equally demands the involvement of heart with that land on which we rest our feet. Simply by resting our feet on a particular land, it is difficult to consider that land as our home. It is the emotional involvement of heart with that land which creates a home for us. It would be proper to say that by enlarge, the problem of nation and identity begins after migration and mobility, the problem gets solved, when our heart is emotionally attached to that new land.

There are three basic factors which intensify the problem of nation and identity after migration and mobility takes place. Those three factors are: language, dress and social-cultural background. Language is perhaps the most effective mean of creating affinity and making one feel at home. The same
Language strengthens the bond of human relationship because it creates a feeling of oneness. The sense of aloofness and getting isolated is experienced by a person, the moment he realizes that the language, which the people speak in surrounding is different from his own language. This leads to the basic question of "Where am I?" and "Who am I in this strange land?" The difference of language intensifies the issue to such an extent that the person starts considering himself an outsider. Such a situation compels him either to change himself or to live in the castle of his own self, ignoring the surrounding.

Dress is one more factor, which intensifies the feeling of aloofness, alienation and finally leads to the problem of nation and identity. There is a proverb in Gujarati "Desh tevo Vesh". In fact, sometimes dress itself becomes the identity of a person, which is a fake identity. When a person's dress differs from the people in his surrounding, he feels himself different from others and others consider him an odd one. Language and dress create distance and barrier causing the problem of nation and identity. In fact most of the cultures have their own typical or traditional dresses. When the dress is different, culture is
considered to be different. In this sense dress intensifies the problem of nation and identity.

Language and cultures are transformed as they come into contact with the other languages and cultures. This is certainly, an important factor, which intensifies the problem of nation and identity, because a migrant always seeks to locate himself in a new culture. Cultural change and the cross-fertilization of cultures, appears unstoppable in this day and age, except by dictatorial decree. Sociologists tell us that every new social construct contains the germs of the past. But what if the past becomes unrecognizable and the present only causes distress?

It seems too fanciful to call ourselves members of the 'global village' and then imagine that the plague raging in one corner of the village will forever be confined to that corner. The cancer of poverty, corruption, confusion and rootlessness that afflicts the Indian subcontinent appears to rage with equal ferocity, as a cancer of the spirit in the 'developed' nations of the world. There is no escape, no exit.

The only solution or the compromise probably we can talk about is to accept the fact that all expatriation/emigration
involves anxiety and belonging to two communities which forces a kind of struggle with something other people do not have to struggle with. That growth is painful, but that is part of the expatriate experience. In other words, it is recognition of doubtless 'fluid identity'. It is an acknowledgement of alternative realities. This is a positive way forward, where we talk from each other's cultures and redefine our hopes and aspirations. After all, culture is not a static thing. It constantly moves.

The problem of nation and identity should also be viewed from the psychological angle. It is a problem related not only to the area of political or social boundaries. It involves in it a great deal of human psychology. It is a psychological fact that a person would feel and experience a kind of oneness and affinity when he comes across some other people of the same type of culture or language. But modern man's emigration to different parts of the world has made it difficult to come across the same type of people. Naturally his psyche makes him feel that he is different, unsafe and having no tie to the place on which his feet rest. With that begins his struggle to settle and establish himself in that new place which involves a great psychological
preparation on his part. A time comes when he tries to part with his original self and identity by the way of merging with the culture of that place. Of course it is a difficult process, just like killing one's own self and getting a new form. But the merging is also not that easy because the counterpart – the other culture – should also be ready to accept and approve the newcomer as one of them. Even if the merging takes place and a person is accepted by the counterpart, tome and again he is reminded of his original identity and culture. That is the reason why even after the total merging, there remains one hidden desire to go back home. The psychic desire of any average normal human being is to be loved, looked after, to live together and to look after the young ones, but all these elements can not be fulfilled, when he tries to fasten his roots in a land other than his own. All his desires remain intact, up to his own generation but he would certainly find it collapsing with the next generation. His genuine concern and desire to look after his children may be taken as a suffocating experience by his young ones who belong to the next generation. This psychological truth makes him aware of the fact that, the castle of family tie is collapsing.
slowly and gradually. This makes him aware of where he is and for what he left his native land as well as identity. This set back makes man aware of his original culture, role and identity. One more psychic truth, which is related to the culture and identity of an immigrant person is the state of, 'nowhereness', such an immigrant knows it well that the castle of his original values and tie has already started collapsing but at the same time going back to native home becomes equally a painful experience for him. The new culture and identity, in which he has imbibed himself hardly gets accepted by the people of his native land. He became a stranger when he went abroad and when he comes back he becomes a stranger once again. This state of 'nowhereness' creates a great agony and enigma for him. He becomes a puzzle for others and others become a puzzle for him. Such a man might follow the defense mechanism of psychic adjustment and compromise that he has made the life of his people happy by earning material wealth. But the loss that has occurred for him is irreparable in the form of the loss of original identity and a family tie.
Nowadays, many use expatriation and immigration as synonyms. However, it important to draw a line of demarcation between the two though that line is a thin one. As the theme implies, expatriation focuses on the native-land that has been left behind, while immigration denotes the country into which one has ventured as an immigrant. According to Stainslaw Barnezak, the words 'exile' 'emigrant' and 'expatriate' are sad prefixes that conjure up "states of exclusion" (9). However he points out that the excluding 'e' has its opposite in, as in immigrant or inclusion. In other words the expatriate lives on his 'ex' status while the immigrant celebrates his present in the new country. Caught between two worlds, the expatriate negotiates a new space, caught between two cultures and often languages; the expatriate negotiates a new living space. Therefore, an anxious sense of dislocation is the characteristic of an expatriate. The shifting designation of 'home' (Where's it?) and the attendant anxieties about homelessness and the impossibility of going back are perennial themes that we observe. The mind of an expatriate is also described as a state of mind and emotion which includes a wistful longing for the
past. It is often symbolized by the pain of exile and homelessness. There is a complex view of the double vision of the expatriates both a looking forward and a yearning backward. It is, in fact, part of every person's life; it is part of the human condition. No matter where you lived, even if you lived in the same place all your life, you would look at the past, at lost moments, at lost opportunities, lost loves. The migrants often live in a world of homesickness, bearing the pains of uprooting and re-rooting the struggle to maintain the difference between oneself and the new friendly surrounding. In many cases of 'Indians abroad' seem to have developed a feeling of inferiority complex and also a sense of refusal to accept the identity / non-identity forced by an alien environment.

It is also pertinent to state that colossal universally common experiences of imperialism and colonialism contain near parallel patterns of diasporic movements and creations. The point is that rational, national and regional (and of course idiosyncratic and gendered distinctions and subtleties of response) are the first features that foreground diasporic living. As shall be observed, nationalism, internationalism and the
tied-up issues of cultural identity and cultural politics are recognized ways of conceiving and constructing modes of belonging and forms of identity. The issues of colonialism and slavery, imperialism and subjugation, centre-periphery, insider-outsider, important-unimportant, oppressor-oppressed, power-powerlessness etc. have posed the most difficult problems in the production of identity, particularly for the black and the Third World People.

For the modern Third World Man, it is not easy to negotiate the competing claims of the national and the international paradigms. One of the reasons for this is the reversed situation of becoming and more "international" (10) - the diasporic exodus of the black or non-white populations to serve the ever increasing, variable needs of industrial capitalism. Hence this migration, global movement of so many sorts situates the individual, very often unevitable, torn between on the one hand the country of his origin (seen or nostalgically remembered as the country of his possible return even after many generations), and on the other, he country of residence, the metropolis- London, Paris, New York- former colonial
citadels, looked at with illusory promises of justice, betterment, racial tolerance, and so forth. This kind of inner conflict and tension, though it overlaps so much of the diasporic culture or expatriate living, also accounts for striking new identities, canceling out old ones.

However, significantly, as sociological and race analysis show, racism and nationality, colour and location are still prominent issues in an extremely reductive climate in formerly imperialist nations. One is still defined by the 'nation' we belong to, a style that derives its authority from an unbroken tradition. But the idea of an international human heritage has caught up faster than had been imagined. The centrality of empire is still manifest in concepts like 'the commonwealth nations' but, as Said points out, "because of the empire, all cultures are involved with one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinary, differentiated and unmonolithic" (11). What used to be talked about fragmentation and rootlessness a few years back to define the kind of scattered and splintered experience (exemplified by writers like Naipaul) one tried to come to terms with, is now perhaps better
understood in the two tendencies of essentialism and pluralism. Diasporic assimilation or its possible failure (which is crucial to its own definitions) rests on the one hand in unitary, essentializing tendency derived from one's national identity and the more open, pluralistic one as internationalistic. There is a natural pull between the two: the unitary, essentialist and subjective, and the internationalist, decentred, dispersed. This sort of 'binarism’ between a static, old, fossilized and remembered identity, and its collision with the dispersed, developing, and somehow necessitated one is grounded in one's location – where one speaks from the reality of this cultural location and the dialogue or the questioning of it results in the problematizing of diasporic living.

Spivak has touched upon a rather sensitive issue that has affected the structure of societies like the British today where Diasporas of different ethnicities participate in the political debates and strategic maneuvers, but their role is indeed limited. The hiatus between self-articulation and the necessity for social – cultural adjustment in the post-colonial age is replete with known vestiges of the history of imperialism, the
kind which produced complex racial conglomerations and dispersal beyond control. Homi K. Bhabha argues how the mid-nineteenth century was one of the most sustained periods of mass migrations within the West and colonial expansion in the East. He says that the nation feels the void left in that uprooting of communities and kin, and turns that loss into the “language of metaphor” (12), transferring the meaning of home and belonging, across those distances and cultural differences. Bhabha draws up a map of a particular type of experience, so crucial to the question of identity formation in the latter-half of the twentieth century, with the paradigmatic experience of exile, emigration and expatriation reflecting the unaccommodated man’s predicament. In the post colonial text the problem of identity returns as a persistent questioning of the frame, space of representation, where the image-missing person, invisible eye, oriental stereotype- is confronted with its difference, its other. The research for colonial identification invariably splits the subject in its historical place of utterance (the various ‘masks’ of the immigrant), Calliban, black, slave which dramatize the negotiations of identity, the elision of the seeing
eye which must contemplate what is missing or invisible. Hence, the impossibility of claiming an origin of the self (or other) within a tradition of representation that conceives identity as the satisfaction of a totalizing, plenitudinous object of vision. Consequent to the nineteenth century developments in overseas colonial empires, the idea of the stable/ unitary/ monolithic gave way to the plural/ fragmented/ dispersed/ hybridized in the twentieth century. This kind of dispersal and movement of people complicates the process of identity construction. This situation is further complicated by the diasporic dimensions, where the five filiative links may be actually weakened (by distance), but simultaneously and for that very reason, intensified in their ability to exert ideological pressure, as the need to maintain a group of individual identity becomes more acute. Diaspora and the diasporic writing that emerges as a response does, therefore, both necessitate and problematize the migrants or the émigré’s split situation in the above context.

The strains of the colonizer-colonized syndromized relations are also indirectly fore grounded in the diasporic
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experience that comes as an extension through the experience of a migrant, a traveler or an émigré, already fore shadowed by the earlier and historical experiences of slavery, plantation colonialism or indenture system. Diasporas of the nations today are a result of the complicated process of the earlier knotted relationship of the colonized societies with the colonizing nations.

However, the racial question, the socio-political and even the community-based antagonism between the migrant/diasporic/individual/group and the metropolitan west is one of the most incendiary issues in the process of adjustment in today's mixed, multi-racial reality of existence, the question, therefore, of living in one's 'construct' is hardly simplistic because "constructs" (13) do come from one's background, origin, religion and family, but other constructs framed by knowledge, power, history, race and professions do impinge one in the multi-cultural, multi-racial situations.

While providing an overall theoretical paradigm, the "designing machine" (14) also allows for the specificity of competing histories and races forced together in unnatural
unions by colonialism. Colonialism as a part of its own tangled history of dream, adventure, violence and miscegenation, has always triggered a huge culture of disjunctive connections between territories and bodies, pushing forward a process of deterritorrialization, too visible in the contemporary crossings of territories and oceanic spaces. What links the experience of Diasporas is marked in the aftermath of today's racial categories that speak of hybrid peoples, yoked together: Black British, British Asian, Kenyan-Asian, Anglo-Indian, Indo-Caribbean, African-Caribbean, African-American, Chinese-American. The name of these diasporic doubles bear more black than white identities because in today's political terms any product of black and white must always be classified as black. It is also truism though, that most diasporas- Asians, Caribbeans, Africans, Chinese- are trying to develop their own ways of living in England or Canada, a way one couldn't really call 'English' or 'Canadian'.

There are a few general issues, especially about the conglomerations of diasporics in British society in the twentieth century. The paradox of Britain is that it had a relatively small
non-European population during the colonial period, but then, Black immigration and Asian migration around the 1960's has radically changed the character of not only British Society, but that of the pre-existing communities themselves. The immigrations from the empire for all kinds of reasons have led to the fanning out of people of all professions in different geographical directions of Britain: students, academics, doctors, engineers, writers, poets, scientists, workers, businessmen and exiles. Immigration, whether as a right, a need or motivation, and the consequent creation of diasporas have been propelled by any number of reasons. However, what is of concern and interest here is the kind of literary or intellectual production that has come as a ruse of immigration. And that speaks of the relationship between immigration, exile and literary imagination.

The question of national belonging surfaces or is remarkably reflected in the literatures of the diaspora, along with others of internationalism, of divided loyalties, the generation gap that makes a great difference in the younger set of people who feel more English, Canadian or American,
compared with the older generation. Still, the question belonging, charting, new identities is not straightforward. In fact diasporic placement and identity crisis are invariably linked with the name of the nation, state which stands for a whole range of cultural forms, moral training, colour neurosis, sexual openness or diffidence, which outweigh or impede the natural process of identity formation.

When one focuses on with the people of the host country, get in anyway influenced by the migrants, one has to take into consideration the other side of globalization, the other is localization. Local gets influenced by global as global gets influenced by local. One can say that globalization has the other way round created a wide space for localization. It would be futile to say that, the people of the host country remain completely unaffected by the migrants. That effect may be positive or negative. It may create in them want for the migrants or a strong dislike for the migrants. They may be curious to understand the culture of migrants or they may become impatient to impose their culture on the migrants. One thing is
certain that the interaction leads to some kind of influence upon each other.

The present study has been carried out with special reference to the Indian Diasporic literature. Those who migrate, generally become aware of their identity only after migration. It is psychological fact that one doesn't think about himself as long as one lives within his own group, but the moment he is separated from his group, he becomes aware of himself and his identity. It is that sense of separation and aloofness which creates the problem of identity and nation for a migrant. The whole issue is related to the psyche of a migrant and it compels him to recall again and again the homeland that he has left behind. If we examine the works of most of them, Indian Diasporic writers, they have chosen the locale, settings and the characters with the Indian background. Their ultimate attitude may be positive or negative, but they can hardly become free from the Indian syndrome. Works of V.S. Naipaul, Nirad C. Chaudhri or even the latest Kiran Desai deal with the Indian background. In fact it is a psychic attempt made by those writers to have India, to be in India if not at the level of reality, at
the level of at least imagination. On the one hand it serves the purpose of Catharsis as they express their good or bad reactions to their motherland and on the other hand it gives them a chance to have Indian which they miss every moment. This is the best proof of how migrants experience the problem of nation and identity.

The diasporic Indian is 'like the banyan tree', the traditional symbol of the Indian way of life, he spreads out his roots in several soils, drawing nourishment from one when the rest dry up. Far from being homeless, he has several homes, and that is the only way he has increasingly come to feel at home in the world. Yet this multiplicity of 'homes', does not bridge the gap between 'home'- the culture of origin; and 'world'- the culture of adoption. The boundaries have an uncanny habit of persisting in thousand different ways, and are very often conflictual.

So, the word 'diaspora' is literally a scattering carrying within it the ambiguous status of being both ambassador and a refugee. The requirements of the two roles are different. While one requires the projection of one's culture and ability to
enhance its understanding, the other seeks refuge and protection and relates more positively to the host culture. Further categories emerge through the use of such words as immigrant, exile, and refuge. Their use attempts to give some indication of the ideologies, choices, reasons and compulsions which may have governed the act of migration. While 'immigrant' defines a location, a physical movement and a forward-looking attitude, 'exile' evokes multiple meanings which cover a variety of relationships with the mother country—alienation, forced exile, self-imposed exile, political exile and so on. In the Indian context perhaps all meanings are true with the migratory movements have been governed by different reasons at different times of history, and different reasons even contemporaneously. Economic reasons governed the movement of indentured labour and of the trading communities; they have also governed the pursuit of a higher standard of living. Opportunities for work, research and freedom have motivated migration. Again migration a colonial state to a free country calls for an entirely different set of assumptions that migration from one free country to another.
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