CHAPTER TWO

Exploring the Past

Memory is not an instrument for exploring the past but its theatre. It is the medium of past experience, as the ground is the medium in which dead cities lie interred.

– Benjamin Walter
An impression of the writing, by a representative cross section of diasporic immigrant writers of the first generation in Britain, is presented in this chapter. A brief account of their work indicating diasporic leanings or highlighting the immigrant experience has been referred with a purpose of giving an idea of the kind of writing adopted by the early members of this group. The major themes are angst, nostalgia, loneliness and existential rootlessness at the cultural, emotional, physical displacement. The themes are a reflection of the dilemmas faced by the first hand experiences of the authors and hence have autobiographical notes in them. The characters look homewards only to counter the negative aspects of the West. Diasporic lives represented here become complex sites marked by both memory and an understanding of their location.

The other major aspect of this chapter is the overview given of the critical theories used to explain the strategies which immigrants use in the process of acculturation. Only those concepts of postmodern and postcolonial theories which are connected with the analysis of the diasporic identity have been taken up. The process of identity formation is related to the multicultural scenario prevalent in Britain, where these ethnic individuals have a right to preserve and develop their own culture in social, linguistic and religious ways. In a multicultural society, cultural boundaries become porous, blurred and undefined, values are contested and questioned and loosely held and fluid bodies of beliefs emerge.
The Indian Diaspora can be read as two autonomous diasporas designated by the terms ‘old’ and ‘new’. The literature of the Indian diaspora is suffused with the actual issues raised by its subject and so brings up the values imbibed by the South Asian community as a whole. As Viney Kirpal notes:

Third World émigrés come from societies where bonds with family, community, religion, folklore and other traditional arts are more or less intact. Unlike Western émigrés they also carry their ethnic roots with them, even though these grow fainter with every passing year, intensifying their sense of nostalgia.¹

The use of ‘old’ and ‘new’ here is not meant to isolate communities: the old diaspora has become part of the new through re-migration (Fiji-Indians moving to Vancouver or Trinidadian – Indians to Toronto) and has also undergone multiple contrasts. Brij Lall adds

The distinction between the two has to be kept in mind, however, so as to avoid merging two rather different diasporic experiences and to ensure that the global sweep and economic strengths of the new diaspora located in Western nations do not silence the lives of diasporic Indians whose history is marked by the experience of indenture.²

The ‘old’ diaspora came about primarily when indentured migrants settled in colonies which already had large numbers of other colonized peoples, both ‘indigenous’ and ‘bound’. They came to lands which already ‘belonged’ to someone else. This meant legitimating their claims to the nation became more acute as did their commitment to them. With exception of those in Malaysia, Singapore and parts of Africa, the people of the ‘old’ Indian diaspora are linked to
the production of one commodity – sugar. Between the mid-1950s and the early 1970s, the Indian diaspora grew from a few thousand to over a million strong. They were encouraged by the governments of the colonies as they were an important source of cheap labour. Vijay Mishra observes “…The aim was to get people in as guest workers who even after acquiring citizenship, would function very much …as ‘passive citizens’, to be distinguished from ‘active citizens’.³

Recalling homelands from a diasporic space and capturing the experience of displacement as the migrant remembers a past or history, a sense of continuity from which he or she has been wrenched is a common theme in the diaspora, more in the old or sugar diaspora. Early writers did bring up the theme of colonization and its impact time and again as they were from colonized countries themselves. A basic grievance is the feeling of homelessness inspired by deep personal anguish along with a lack of total or partial acceptance in the host country. Grounds for rejection include colour, race and history. The writers of the early phase have tried to project their homeland as superior with a spiritual and tolerant value system. He tries to make the dominant group see itself as others see it. His concern with his race, his people, his country (and history and system of values) is very much alive and active. He is not the de-regionalised, de-racinated man of the modem West. His marginality itself is the result of his race, region, and history. And he writes with this realization:

…most Third World expatriates have migrated to the metropoles because of the repressionist colonial/neo-colonial policies of the
coloniser/neo-colonisers. Angst, loneliness, existential rootlessness may have caused the major cultural displacement of twentieth century writers in the West moving from one metropole to another but it was the need for a market for their books and the colonials ideal of assimilation to the coloniser's ways that prompted the large-scale emigration of writers from British/French colonies to the metropolitan countries.⁴

Unlike their contemporary Western counterparts who have experienced the total collapse of a shared background of values, these immigrants come from societies where bonds with family, community, religion, folklore and other traditional arts are more or less intact. They also carry their racial ancestry with them, even though these grow fainter and intensify their sense of nostalgia. The feeling of nostalgia is heightened in the expatriate writer because of the absence of proper treatment in the host countries, mostly white. Therefore, for the metropolitan writers, expatriation is an important theme. Homelessness has been inspired by deep personal and compounded by rejection in the host countries. The Third World migrant novelist attempts to comprehend the colonialist host society and to disillusion his countrymen back home about the myth of the white man's dominance.

The migrant experience of homelessness, universal in all immigrants is found because of the host's unwillingness to treat him as an equal. This is after all the loud declarations of "assimilation" made during the period of colonization, and the promises of citizenship. The Third World immigrant sees through the deception, perceiving assimilation for the first time, not as a melting pot of
different peoples and ideas, but as a tool for securing the other’s (the migrant's) allegiance to the superior, rational, civilised, achievement-oriented Western culture. The migrant reacts by withdrawing, and expressing his difference and divorce from the white man's value system.

Early writing in English by an Indian dates back to 1794, Sake Dean Mahomet's, “The Travels of Dean Mahomet”. A number of travelogues and diaries have also been penned providing a rich source of information about the life in those times. A significant contributor is J.M. Malabari, a Parsi journalist and Gujarati poet. Raja Rao was deeply involved in nationalism like Mulk Raj Anand and many of their formative years were spent in England. With R K Narayan they have been slotted into the category of the forerunners of Indo Anglian writing. Rao’s book The Serpent and the Rope deals with the motif of marriage between a white wife and an Indian migrant, a recurrent motif in a diasporic society is dealt but with many underlying layers of thought at the metaphysical level. The characters seek truth in India. Rootlessness and a quest for Identity are the major tropes taken up. The unbridgeable gap between the two main protagonists reflects at a symbolic level, the difference between the East and the West. Mulk Raj Anand, a part of the renowned Bloomsbury group had a rare knowledge of many literatures and was remarkably well read. Considered one of Anand’s finest novel, Across the Black Waters records the exploitative nature of the Britishers and the pervading sense of inevitability.
G.V. Desani’s novel *All about H Hatterr* had what Susheila Nasta calls a “Tripartite Vision” created by both a Nairobi and Sindhi Indian childhood. He discussed many issues and had a subversive approach. The hero is like his creator and launches out on a hazardous journey across the sea of language. It gives us the transcultural adventures of an immigrant traveler, an anti-hero who traverses in India searching for wisdom. The novel can be read as a postcolonial and postmodern text moving backwards and forwards in time and place, culture and history.

Aubrey Menen wrote about mixed-race or dual cultural backgrounds and described himself as a native in at least three lands. He draws in a beautiful, semi mocking satirical mode certain typical portraits of the white man’s arrogance over his superiority, which his hybrid vision could see. The racism he suffered everywhere in Britain is a revelation of the hypocrisies, as after the first world war everyone was reinstated in public favor and all was well. A radical with courage in his writings, Menen exposed the truth behind race, culture and sexual practices. His work *Rama Retold* was banned in India.

Born and brought up in an aristocratic background Attia Hossain’s *Sunlight on a Broken Column* was the first novel of its kind being more important especially because it was written by a Muslim woman as a story of a nation’s tumultuous birth. She continued staying in Britain even after independence and brought out a
collection of short stories *Phoenix Fled*. She stayed back, aware of the massacres and infinite loss which came about with the enforced migrations, her writing reflecting the nostalgia and loss of her inability to go back. Her decision to stay on, Susheila Nasta relates, represented the possibility of inhabiting, albeit briefly an alternative mental geography, ‘a room in the proverbial attic’ as she has called it, a “neutral area where I could still meet those from whom we were now divided by borders of nationality and an artificially nurtured hostility”.

She exposes the realities and hypocrisies of the women’s world behind closed doors.

Kamala Markandaya labeled herself as an Indian expatriate and projected the clash between the urban-rural divide in India. She primarily wrote novels on the life in Indian villages. *The Nowhere Man* shows a sensitive portrayal of the diasporic experience felt by Indians in Britain. Set in 1968, the story includes talks of racism and other diasporic realities – educational degrees that are not accepted, the resistance of immigrants to the expectations of the host culture, communication gap between generations, cultural values and other baggage. Her writing shed new light on our understanding of the reception of South Asian writing. *Some Inner Fury*, shows the heroine’s awareness of the political condition. It foregrounds a feminist viewpoint against the background of the anti-colonialist nationalist project. Mrs. Pickering turns out to be a figure of solace as she helps Srinivas adapt to racist England and a parable of assimilation emerges. Srinivas believes that it is England and not India to which he belongs. Abdul, his friend warns him not to consider it as his homeland.
“First thing, that goes wrong it'll be their country, and you go back, nigger to yours, back where you came from.” Srinivas refutes and Abdul continues, “…You been in a pub lately? Know who gets served last, never fail? Why, yours truly…”

His son dies in England’s war and despite the sacrifice he is heckled by racist hoodlums to “go back to your country,”. Bewildered, he says “But this is my country.” ⁶

Markandaya’s novels focus on the interracial, intercultural relations between the former colonizers and the colonized. *The Golden Honeycomb* is a semi historical recreation of colonial Indo-British relations. Commenting on this Paul Scott wrote “For once in a novel by an Indian, the British presence is illuminated in a way that commands admiration as well as recognition”.⁷ *Possession* deals with intercultural tension representing the materialism of the west. Recognising Valmiki, a poor goatherd’s artistic talent Caroline brings him to Britain and nurtures his aptitude. When Valmiki gets drawn towards the domestic help she effectively removes her and cannot tolerate even the Swami who has been Valmiki’s mentor and teacher. The Swami symbolizes the spiritualism of India as opposed to Caroline who is a materialist, greedy, overpoweringly possessive woman locked in a tough contest terminating in Valmiki’s return to the Swami (India) in preference to Caroline (England).

Nobel Laureate V. S. Naipaul is referred to as “the founding writer of the old diaspora” by Vijay Mishra in *The Diasporic Imaginary (442)*. Naipaul’s *The Mimic Men* reveals his disillusionment with the migrant experience. The book depicts
men suffering from dislocation, placelessness, fragmentation, and loss of identity. They become mimic men who imitate and reflect the colonizer's lifestyle, values, and views. Ralph Singh, the narrator of "The Mimic Men", lives in exile in London and tries to impose order on his life, reconstruct his identity, and get rid of the crippling sense of dislocation and displacement. He represents displaced and disillusioned colonial individuals, and colonization is portrayed as a process that takes away identity, culture, history, and sense of place. Thus, the novel considers the relationship between the socio-political and the psychological consequences of colonization. Naipaul had a close understanding of Nirad C Chaudhuri’s work. Ruvani Ranasinha states, “The trope of the ‘true ‘vision of the alienated, displaced observer that resonated in both writers’ works has had lasting impact on the construction of South Asian writing in the West”.

Anita Desai’s *Bye, Bye Blackbird* shows alienation at different levels. It explores the lives of Dev, Adit and Sarah, who are seeking to forge a new identity. The novel has been said to be the closest to her personal experience as an immigrant. The plot shows a twist when Dev, a cynic about anglophiles develops fascination for them and Adit an assimilated Indian in London, married to an English lady Sarah, starts nostalgising about his native land. By the end of the novel Adit decides to leave England for good to India with Sarah, and Dev who has been critical of English and England, decides to stay back. The novel touches the racial problem and feeling of displacement in England. Desai probes deep into the unconscious and sub-conscious psyche of the expatriates.
Expatriation of the individual is a persistent theme in Anita Desai’s novels. The sensitive human being suffers from a sense of alienation who could reach the intensity of an existential malaise. Anita Desai’s works mark a new and mature phase in Indian English fiction. Along with colonial and postcolonial issues, the theme of women writers fore-grounded the emotional incompatibility between partners in marriages and voiced the woman’s need for space in a patriarchal society. Her early novels concentrate on the feminine sensibility, at war with the male centered universe.

Farrukh Dhondy was educated at the universities of Bernbay, Cambridge, and Leicester. He taught English in London schools until 1982 and gave it up to become a full time writer. He is best in his delineation of race relations. In his collection of stories written primarily for young adults *East End At Your Feet*, we have Pushpa who is restricted by the invisible bonds of her Indian-ness and the want to be modern and progressive like the westerners. She sleeps with an English boy, undergoes tremendous pressure to assimilate more because she is caught between her ethnic identity at home and the English lifestyle outside. Racial prejudices are reflected in a touchingly poignant way in Dhondy’s stories. The story, *Keep Britain White* shows how when a white girl suffers from typhus, conclusions are drawn that the new immigrant Paki family are the origin of the infection and so they are socially shunned and ostracized. In *Dear Manju* also, the theme deals with the actualisation of white expectations over a fulfillment of traditional values. Dhondy’s first novel *Bombay Duck* (1990), depicts a lively
treatment of conventional assumptions concerning black, white, and Asian cultural identities and is divided into two interlinking parts with a different narrator.

A.K Mehrotra says:

Violence in the liminal zone is also a feature of this animated novel by Farrukh Dhondy where he maps out the trajectories of sexuality, politics, crime, migrancy, nationalism, zealotry, aesthetics, and ethnicity that connect Delhi and London, upper-class Indians and subaltern West Indians, Jamaican creole and masala English, director David Stream and poet Valmiki, the epic Ramayana and the holy Koran.

Ravinder Randhawa, an active member of the Asian Women Writers’ Collective played an influential role in providing a platform for the likes of Chila Burman, Rukshana Ahmad, Leena Dhingra and Meera Syal. She discusses conflicts of culture and identity which affects first and second generation Asian women in Britain. Her debut novel *A Wicked Old Woman* (1987), shifts seamlessly between places and states of mind, physical settings and stream of consciousness, between poetic prose and documentary realism. It explores the various worlds in which South Asian people live in contemporary Britain, featuring poor, retired men, successful middle classes, working classes, support groups and young people who have joined white sub-cultures. Randhawa’s cities, like her characters, are transitory sites of reinvention and constant renewal. Her vision is informed by the experiences and aesthetics of the migrant, and it seems significant that only streets, the conduits of travel, remain the same. However, as with *A Wicked Old Woman*, journeying is not an end in itself.
Pakistan-born Nadeem Aslam wrote the award winning *Season of the Rainbirds* (1993), contrasting a poetic vision of his childhood with the violence of local Punjabi politics and the need to work abroad. Asian writers in England were birds of passage who returned home or moved to North America and did not feel part of an community in England. Rukhsana Ahmed, originally from Pakistan and a founder of the Asian Women Writers' Workshop, wrote an extraordinary novel *The Hope Chest* (1996) which shows knowledge of social shades, class differences, differences in clothing, and a understanding of influential influences on character and action, psychology, rearing, other than now common in literature. The author uses a woman's perspective to portray individuals and literature. The men in her stories are distant, unlikeable, ruthless and exploitative of women-shows how their behaviour has been shaped by their culture and social situation. *The Hope Chest* focuses on the complex relationship between mothers and their daughters, a relationship which can be destructive to both. Three women's lives touch, sometimes directly, sometimes tangentially – Ruth is unable to distinguish between her dreams and reality; Rani is caught up in her own fantasy; and Reshma hopes that her life has some profound meaning. The title points to the main theme, and projects how traditionally a woman's hopes were directed towards marriage and how mothers dedicated themselves and placed their own hopes, in their daughters' marriages. Ahmad takes the 'whom shall she marry' plot of earlier novels and offers a feminist criticism of its assumptions through following the lives of several women including an English woman. Most of the novel takes place in Pakistan and shows extremes of Muslim
attitudes towards women, it also looks at Muslim women in England and how western individualism can also be as destructive as Asian obsessions with family, tradition, and community.

A few writers from Sri Lanka had settled in England since the early 1940s when Tambimuttu was a literary entrepreneur. Tambimuttu ‘s work reproduces images of England that largely correspond to the expectations of a dominant group in England. He shows pictures of colonial Sri Lanka which were recognizable only to the indigenous elite.

Sivanandan won the Commonwealth writers First book award for his book, ‘When Memory Dies’. It relates in fragments, pictures of Sri Lanka and the political tension which tore apart the country. Racial tension is present in his writing as he belonged to the first generation of Tamil minority displaced from Sri Lanka after anti Tamil riots and made Britain his home as a political exile. He has written extensively on Black British politics and Marxist internationalism. His first novel Where the Dance is: Stories from Two Worlds and Three (2000) draws attention to the class and race dynamics in some of the interconnected areas of dispute in Sri Lankan conflict and also to economic factors, language rights, employment and university admissions policy.
The various aspects in the early diaspora considered in this thesis is briefly sketched below, as the impressions captured above are a reflection of the dilemmas faced by the early immigrant writers in the hostland. In early immigrant fiction, ‘home’ is not a search for a spatial identity but a search for one’s roots. Viney Kirpal adds:

It is also a hunt for self in a world arbitrarily divided into the White world progressive, developed and the coloured world – backward, underdeveloped.\textsuperscript{10}

The search for home was in the head, irretrievably lost, as the immigrant tried to satisfy an undefinable need, a feeling which surfaced sometime or the other leading to greater loneliness and angst. The spatial distance made distances great as he was unable to return to the new home despite its uncertainties and the characters are shown as unable to locate a ‘new home’ in the adopted land. The physical construct might exist but it cannot substitute for home in the homeland. Consumed by a nostalgia for the host country the immigrant expresses sentimentality:

I was born an orphan and have remained one. I have wandered the world and sobbed in hotel rooms and in trains have looked at the cold mountains and sobbed, for I had no mother (Motherland)\textsuperscript{11}.

Immigrant writing showed the traditional South Asian woman as the ideal one. The feminine and masculine blend to produce a personality that is gentle but not submissive, strong but not egotistic, the spiritual centre of her family. Women feel
doubly ostracized and removed from the alien surroundings, the weather, language, unfamiliar faces and alien smells away from home making survival a difficult issue. Their children who have assimilated better don’t seem like their own, and it is only when the community members rally that they feel at home. Early immigrant writing focuses on families and their struggle for adaptation into the mainstream.

The longer the NRSA stays abroad, his decision to stay or return seems to be on horns of a dilemma. However, all immigrants continue to stay and say just how much they long to go back and how much they detest staying in the adopted land. With every passing year, the yearning for home intensifies. There is a search for identity. As assimilation in the society was projected as an ideal, many novels depicted South Asian men married to English wives but there was an unbridgeable gap between two world views. This led to postcolonial angst and alienation. South Asians were perceived to be inferior and racism was the main detractor leading to more personal anguish.

Acculturation doesn’t signify a process of pure and complete assimilation. The process of acculturation and the strategies adopted by immigrants across three generations, as depicted in the novels taken up for this thesis, are considered in the context of certain concepts from postmodern and postcolonial theories.
Postcolonial literature recognizes that there is a cultural binary i.e. a culture that dominates and a culture that is dominated claiming a cultural past and looking forward to a multicultural and polyvalent future. Hybridity is used in postcolonial theory to describe the newness of the many forms of migrant writing that flourish in the diasporas of the modern period. In common parlance, hybridity speaks of the disintegration of old forms and the creation of new ones. In the *Location of Culture*, Homi Bhabha, creates a series of concepts that work to undermine the polarization of the world into the self and the other. It refers to the mixed-ness of cultures. Transnational links are hybrid as they include boundary crossing. The liminal is that, what are in-between settled cultural forms or identities. Talking of what happens in-between cultures Homi Bhabha refers to the ‘liminal’ by which he means, that which is on the border or the threshold. To allow this is to undermine solidity and authenticity of cultures and encourage porosity and hybrid variations. The liminal is found in postcolonial social spaces and marks the constant process of creating new identities. Hybridity as Bhabha explains is a product of the historical and political specificities of different versions of the colonial cross-cultural experience. It implies confrontations and cultural cross fertilizations involving several nations and cultures and not just the internal configurations within a single culture.

Bhabha clarifies:

Hybridity is the revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects. It displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination. It unsettles the mimetic or narcissistic demands of colonial power but reimplicates its
identifications in strategies of subversion that turn the gaze of the discriminated back upon the eye of power. For the colonial, hybridity is the articulation of the ambivalent space where the rite of power is enacted on the site of desire, making its objects at once disciplinary and disseminatory - or, in my mixed metaphor, a negative transparency.¹²

Hybridity deconstructs and recreates with new ideas in new ways. In this way it is like postmodernism, there is unsettling and decentering but unlike postmodernism there is also a recentering. Bhabha explains this through a series of binary oppositions:

It implies cultural cross fertilizations involving several nations and cultures and not internal configurations within a single culture. Bhabha opines hybridity is a margin where cultural differences come into contact, create conflict and unsettle all the established identities that are constructed around oppositions such as past and present, inside and outside, inclusion and exclusion. It offers a release from the singular identities that are constructed when class, race or gender are used as primary categories.¹³

Thus hybridity becomes an enriching process rather than weakening the system.

Yet it is ambivalent and must be distinguished from an inversion.

Hybridity is the name of this displacement of value from symbol to sign that causes the dominant discourse to split along the axis of its power to be representative, authoritative. Hybridity represents that ambivalent 'turn' of the discriminated subject into the terrifying, exorbitant object of paranoid classification - a disturbing questioning of the images and presences of authority. To grasp the ambivalence of hybridity, it must be distinguished from an inversion that would suggest that the originary is, really, only an I effect.⁴
Bhabha celebrates the ‘in-between spaces’ created and inhabited by hybrids and holds that all cultures are now caught up in a continuous process of hybridization which can be compared with that of creoleness. Contemporary culture is hybrid like its precedent colonial culture. Emphasising that it is not possible to just haphazardly combine a series of cultural traditions Bhabha says in his essay *Art and National Identity*:

In my writing, I’ve been arguing against the multiculturalist notion that you can put together harmoniously any number of cultures in a pretty mosaic. You cannot just solder together different cultural traditions to produce some brave new cultural totality. The current phase of economic and social history makes you aware of cultural difference not at the celebratory level of diversity but always at the point of conflict or crisis.  

Bhabha takes one aspect of multiculturalism which attempts to blend disparate cultures into harmonious wholes. The different cultures do not pre-exist but are an effect of colonial and postcolonial changes. In this situation, the production of cultures is an inevitable consequence of contested authority. The two cultures are not the source of conflict but ‘the result of discriminatory practices.’ Cultures are the effects of stabilization produced by authority.

Cultures cannot be fully present: they are not a matter of being, but of becoming. Cultures are crafted, sculpted or narrated objects: like traditions, cultures are invented. We might view this inventions as a bad thing to be deplored for its falsification of reality. Alternatively we might want to grasp the positive potential in this invention of tradition, but only if we acknowledge that invention will be ongoing.
In a colonial context, hybridity is not an issue of two different cultures, but a problem that alienates the basis of contested authority and reevaluates the same. Bhabha clarifies that:

...colonial hybridity is not a problem of genealogy or identity between two different cultures which can then be resolved as an issue of cultural relativism. Hybridity is a problematic of colonial representation and individuation that reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal, so that other 'denied' knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority - its rules of recognition. Again, it must be stressed, it is not simply the content of disavowed knowledges, - be they forms of cultural otherness or traditions of colonialist treachery - that return to be acknowledged as counter-authorities. For the resolution of conflicts between authorities, civil discourse always maintains an adjudicative procedure. What is irremediably estranging in the presence of the hybrid - in the revaluation of the symbol of national authority as the sign of colonial difference - is that the difference of cultures can no longer be identified or evaluated as objects of epistemological or moral contemplation: cultural differences are not simply there to be seen or appropriated.¹⁷

Kumkum Sangari points out that hybridity need not be an east/west binary that is usually privileged by Western based writers but should incorporate the complex cultural intersections of regional, linguistic, class, caste and gender affiliations.¹⁸

In cultural hybridity, Bhabha describes all cultural relations to be ambivalent, subversive, transgressive and hybrid. Hybridity challenges the assumption that cultural encounters invariably establish hierarchical relationships. Notions of hybridity are not intended to demarcate a new and entirely ethnic or racial form such as ‘mixed race ‘or biculturalism. In Bhabha's view Hybridity is not a thing but a process. It does not comprise of ‘two original moments from which a third emerges', but gestures to an ambivalent ‘third space of cultural production and
reproduction.’ Hybrid representations are thus an encounter with newness that
does not conform to one thing or another – a space where aspirations to fully
acknowledge national culture can never be realized. Bhabha himself admits that
his ‘third space’ is a rather utopian concept which may reveal that the theoretical
recognition of the split-place of enunciation may open the way to conceptualizing
an international culture based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the
diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture’s hybridity.\textsuperscript{19}

Hybridity emerges as the major theme of his essays that are constructed when
class, race or gender are used as primary categories. Bhabha draws on a vision
of postmodernity in which the compression of time and space produces complex
patterns which undermine any sense of national or personal identity and in
which class and gender cease perpetuating the narratives that are internal to its
national identity and listen to the postcolonial histories told by migrants and
refugees. Hybridity is used in postcolonial theory to describe the newness of
many forms of migrant or minority discourses that flourish in the Diasporas of
modern and postmodern periods. Bhabha feels hybridity is a margin where
cultural differences come into contact and conflict and unsettle all the stable
identities that are constructed around oppositions such as past and present,
inside and outside, inclusion and exclusion. It offers a release from the singular
identities between spaces created and inhabited by hybrids.
The idea of “third space” conceives the encounter of two distinct and unequal social groups as taking place in a special third space of enunciation where culture is disseminated and displaced from the interacting groups, making way for the invention of a hybrid identity, whereby these two groups conceive themselves to partake in a common identity relating to shared space and common dialogue. Bhabha believes that hybridity interrogates traditional analysis of colonialism. He links all these in an interview with John Rutherford, where he explains about the connections between colonial discourse and post-colonial ‘third space’:

[F]or me the importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original moments from which the third emerges, rather hybridity to me is the ‘third space’ which enables other positions to emerge. This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood through received wisdom. 20

Bhabha is concerned with migrant and minority groups and how they apparently translate and hybridise this space even as they adapt, they take up some of its cultural forms and are also incorporated into it. This third space describes the areas of cultural interaction and mutual intervention as it relates in particular to migrant and Third World communities where they interact with one another, agree and diverge on others.
There are different types of hybridities which can be categorised under racial, linguistic, literary, cultural and religious, though they overlap with each other. A brief description of each category is as under:

**Racial Hybridity** : Colonial societies have their specific words to describe people of mixed race ancestry, though the term ‘hybrid’ is not used in the context of race. This term does not appeal in a larger context as it relies on the idea taken from 19th Century race science, that racial difference is an empirically verifiable reality. The norm today is to emphasise ‘culture’ over biological or genetic race.

**Linguistic Hybridity** : This occurs when elements from different languages enter into a given language including slangs, patois, pidgin and dialect.

**Literary Hybridity** refers to a connection between literary genres at the level of narrative form. For instance, narration by blending local traditions and folk culture with experimental (postmodernist) ideas.

**Cultural Hybridity** speaks of fusion in terms of various cultural aspects like food, music, fashion, dance and art, etc. Cultural hybridity is celebrated as it creates new artistic forms and develops new ideas.

**Religious Hybridity** refers to an interaction between different beliefs systems with traditional and local cultural-religious frameworks and not imposition of any particular religious belief system.

Mimicry is an important term in post-colonial theory, because it has come to describe the ambivalent relationship between colonizer and colonized and is multi-layered. Mimicry in colonial and postcolonial literature is seen when members of a colonized society imitate the language, dress, politics, or cultural
attitude of their colonizers. In case of immigration however, mimicry is seen as an opportunist pattern of behaviour: one copies the person in power, because one hopes to have access to that same power oneself. At this time one has to intentionally suppress one’s own cultural identity. As copying of identity traits is present mimicry is often seen as something shameful, and a black or brown person engaging in mimicry is usually derided by other members of his or her group for doing so. The mimicry of the post-colonial subject is therefore always potentially destabilising to colonial discourse, and locates an area of considerable political and cultural uncertainty in the structure of imperial dominance. Bhabha considers mimicry as a complex, elusive and effective strategy to transcend colonial power.

Mimicry emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal. Mimicry is, thus the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which ‘appropriates’ the ‘Other’ as it visualizes power. Mimicry is also the sign of the inappropriate, however, a difference or recalcitrance which coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance, and poses an imminent threat to both 'normalized' knowledges and disciplinary powers.²¹

Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin elaborate that mimicry is not a simple copy but involves a certain level of destruction:

Mimicry reveals the limitations in the authority of colonial discourse, almost as though colonial authority inevitably embodies the seeds of its own destruction. When colonial discourse encourages the colonized subject to ‘mimic’ the colonizer, by adopting the colonizer’s cultural habits, assumptions, institutions and values, the result is never a simple reproduction of those traits.²²
The above is also admitted by Bhabha in regards to the effect of mimicry on the authority of colonial discourse – “For in 'normalizing' the colonial state or subject, the dream of post-Enlightenment civility alienates its own language of liberty and produces another knowledge of its norms”.  

Mimicry suggests that our construction of identity is necessarily fluid and imaginary. Bhabha’s idea of mimicry, needs to be thought of as a process that mimics no fixed, final, foundational identity. The colonizer has no absolute pre-existent identity which can be mimicked, and the colonized likewise has no real identity which he or she is betraying through mimicry. Bhabha’s terminology is closely derived from ideas of Freud and French thinkers like Derrida, and Lacan. In the Location of Culture Bhabha argues that mimicry ‘does not merely “rupture’ the discourse, but becomes transformed into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a ”partial” presence’.  

Situations in the immigrant world also call for reverse mimicry. In the colonial context it was referred to as often as “going native.” Though mimicry is almost always used in postcolonial studies with reference to colonials and immigrant minorities imitating white cultural and linguistic norms sometimes the roles are reversed. While discussing the authority of colonial discourse as a result of mimicry and ambivalence, Bhabha states that mimicry does not only rupture the discourse but changes into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a
partial presence. The interplay between equivalence and excess makes the colonized reassuringly similar but also terrifying.

It is from this area between mimicry and mockery, where the reforming, civilizing mission is threatened by the displacing gaze of its disciplinary double, that Bhabha’s instances of colonial imitation come. What they all share is a discursive process by which the excess or slippage produced by the ambivalence of mimicry (almost the same, but not quite) does not merely 'rupture' the discourse, but becomes transformed into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a 'partial' presence. By 'partial' I mean both 'incomplete' and 'virtual'. It is as if the very emergence of the 'colonial' is dependent for its representation upon some strategic limitation or prohibition within the authoritative discourse itself. The success of colonial appropriation depends on a proliferation of inappropriate objects that ensure its strategic failure, so that mimicry is at once resemblance and menace\textsuperscript{25}.

Referring to Lacan, Bhabha states “that mimicry is like camouflage, not a harmonization of repression of difference, but a form of resemblance, that differs from or defends presence by displaying it in part, metonymically”.\textsuperscript{26}
Considering certain terms and concepts associated with postmodernism and multiculturalism, it is now attempted to analyse the cultural condition of the immigrant in a diasporic scenario. Post colonialism speaks of hybrid identities, whereas postmodernism considers fractured identities and true to the postmodern structure of feeling there exists a recognition and understanding of cultural difference and the erosion of cultural boundaries, the blurring and collapse of conventional boundaries between culture and art. The postmodern self often assumes different identities sometimes pulling in different directions where cultural identity is seen not as a state of being but a process of becoming. There is a constant shifting and fragmentation of identities that can be articulated differently. The self in a postmodern context is multiple, fragmented, decentered. However, one must not assume that because the term postmodernism does not offer one meaning, one definition it follows there is no meaning or no more meaning.

One can take Linda Hutcheon's remarks on this:

Few words are more used and abused in discussions of contemporary culture than the word 'postmodernism'. As a result, any attempt to define the word will necessarily and simultaneously have both positive and negative dimensions...In general terms, it takes the form of self-conscious, self-contradictory, self-undermining statement. It is rather like saying something whilst at the same time putting inverted commas around what is being said...Postmodernism’s distinctive character lies in this kind of wholesale ‘nudging’ commitment to doubleness, or duplicity...The postmodern’s initial concern is to de-naturalise some of the dominant features of our way of life; to point out that those entities that we unthinkingly experience as ‘natural’ (they might even include capitalism, patriarchy, liberal humanism) are in fact ‘cultural’. 27
Ihab Hasan explores the implications of post modernism agreeing that it resists categorisation and is read by many as a collection of adjectives. In his essay entitled “Towards a Concept of Postmodernism” he endeavours to explain postmodernism in terms of the disjunctive, antiform, play, chance, anarchy, silence, performance, deconstruction, antithesis, absence, dispersal, misreading, antinarrative, the polymorphous, schizophrenia, difference, irony and in determinacy.28

This devaluation of men and women, resulting in destabilisation, rootlessness, alienation and marginalisation consequently leads to a fragmented personality as memories are borrowed, overheard, experienced in fragments dismantling any fixed structures or paradigms. It is Jean Francois Lyotard who attempts to explain in detail the concept of postmodern invoking the modern outlining its non-acceptance of forms and also including a brief idea of the postmodern artist or writer:

The postmodern would be that which in the modern invokes the unpresentable in presentation itself, that which refuses the consolation of correct forms, refuses the consensus of taste permitting a common experience of nostalgia for the impossible, and inquires into new presentations – not to take pleasure in them, but to better produce the feel that there is something unpresentable. The postmodern artist or writer is in the position of the philosopher: the text he writes or the work he creates is not in principle governed by preestablished rules and cannot be judged according to a determinant judgement. By the application of given categories to this text or work. Such rules and categories are what the work or text is investigating. The artist and the writer therefore work without rules and in order to establish the rules for what will have been made. This is why the work and the text can take on the
properties of an event; it is also why they would arrive too late for their author, or, in what amounts to the same thing, why the work of making them would always begin too soon.29

Postmodernism celebrates multiculturalism. The postcolonial literature reflects the changing nature of British society which is multicultural. These societies accept and respect social diversity and hold that all these diverse groups are equal members of the society. No culture is sacrosanct by itself – all have developed an interaction and intermingling with others. Multicultural societies are those whose members have different visions, conceptual vocabularies and organizing principles, know this to be so and agree to disagree. This makes contemporary multicultural societies different from plural societies, with the former stressing equality of cultures and the latter plurality and co-existence. Multiculturalism is indeed a factor of renewed and reinvigorated Britishness. Cultural boundaries weaken, get blurred, beliefs are contested and interrogated and a loosely held and fluid body of beliefs emerges. To complement this cultural interaction, public institutions ensure equal power and access to members of the non-dominant community.

Every society has a dominant culture which is represented in its institutions, beliefs, customs and practices. In current (multi)cultural theory, the term can be used for all those societies which have expatriate groups who chose to leave their homeland. A multicultural society produces new forms of diasporic existence in which the identities are hybridized as a multicultural discourse
includes ethnic and cultural differences. Bhikhu Parekh opines that no culture is perfect or represents the best and therefore it can benefit from a critical dialogue with other cultures. He defines multiculturalism in a broad sweep:

...a body of beliefs and practices in terms of which a group of people understand themselves and the world and organize their individual and collective lives. Unlike differences that spring from individual choices, culturally derived differences carry a measure of authority and are patterned and structured by virtue of being embedded in a shared and historically inherited system of meaning and significance...Multiculturalism, then, is about cultural diversity or culturally embedded differences.

Multiculturalism denotes diversity of class, gender, language, ethnicity, sexual orientation and religious persuasions in one society. All cultures and subcultures are allowed to keep their peculiarities intact under the broad spectrum of an overarching culture. It implies legitimization of cultural, ethnic and racial differences among communities professing different belief systems, religion and customs by their institutionalization. Multiculturalism means different things in different countries and also different things in the same country. America with its assimilationist model refers to it as the ‘melting-pot’, in Australia it is a ‘counter discourse to the residual ideology of White Australia’, in Canada it means a ‘state sanctioned policy of social equalization’. Speaking about the changing nature of multicultural societies and citizenship, Tariq Modood asserts “What is clear is that multiculturalism will [increasingly] challenge [...]our existing notions of culture, identity, nationality and citizenship across Europe as people and states enter into political dialogues which may mark the crafting of multicultural citizenships”.
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The main thrust of the politics of multiculturalism was to achieve tolerance of cultural difference. Roy Sommer in his essay *Simple Survival in “Happy Multicultural Land”*? differentiates between the two type of multicultural literature that can be seen in Britain today:

The first type of multicultural literature includes the tradition of migrant narratives going back to the 1950s whose gloomy titles signal what the first generation of hopeful immigrants encountered in the streets of racist London: loneliness, second-class citizenship and un-belonging….A more optimistic kind of second-generation writing has emerged since the late 1980s with the works of authors such as Hanif Kureishi, Farhana Sheik, Meera Syal and Diran Adebayo.

The second type of contemporary multicultural fiction includes authors such as Salman Rushdie or Zadie Smith who are less concerned with the politically correct, authentic representation of ethnic diasporas than with the collective perception and construction of cultural alterity and fictions of racial or ethnic purity.32

According to Stuart Hall the multicultural question addresses how we are to envisage the futures of those many different societies composed of people form very different backgrounds, cultures, contexts, experiences and positions in the ranking order of the world: societies where difference refuses to disappear. Hall feels that multiculturalism is a tired, over used category “it contains the seeds of a major disruption in our normal common sense political assumptions”.33 Pointing out to various racial events and changes occurring in the British society he expresses that the multicultural remains an unresolved question which is also contradictory. Britain’s Asian and Black communities become an increasingly visible feature of national life and slogans like “Cool Britannia” are accepted with
the multicultural drift. On the other hand, Hall also refers to the return of ‘commonsense policing’ that he associates with Thatcherism: tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime. He also speaks of multiculturalism under erasure and thereby distances himself from the substantive use of the term by referring to various post-war policies which were developed to manage multicultural societies. In *The Multicultural Question* he states that the multicultural is not a policy decision, a lifestyle choice or a variance of hybridity where “life is nothing so much as a Scandinavian smorgasboard (help yourself)” but an “inevitable process of cultural translation”.

Further, proponents of Multiculturalism such as Bhikhu Parekh, David Theo Goldberg, Amy Gutman, Will Kymlicka, and Stephen Castles explaining about the new forms of practices in the contemporary scenario provide an understanding of the myth of a nation-state with a single culture and instead imagine a multicultural community in which the rights for cultural preservation and society building are a requirement. They propose multiculturalism as the alternative for assimilation policies of immigration. Multiculturalism represented an attempt both to respond to and to control the dynamic process of the expression of cultural difference, administering a consensus based on a norm that propagates cultural diversity. As cultures possibly cannot exist without external influences they also create a common, distinctive pluralist national composite culture. This makes contemporary multicultural societies different from plural societies, with the former stressing equality of cultures and the latter
plurality and co-existence. Bhikhu Parekh in the essay *Composite Culture and Multicultural Society* defines a multicultural society as one with a plurality of cultures. Cultures might be embedded in the lives of relevant communities, and such a society has a plurality of well-defined cultural communities; or its members might be drawn to different bodies of ideas and subscribe to them in different degrees without forming distinct communities.

Stuart Hall’s thoughts on shifting politics of identity in *New Ethnicities* are not based on anthropological studies, but arise out Black British films of 1980s. Hall gives no understanding of identity outside culture and representation, a fact which he makes clear with his use of the term ‘cultural identity’. Identity, as he elaborates is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside representation. These diaspora identities are those which are constantly producing and reproducing themselves anew through transformation and difference. Hall proposes two ways of considering cultural identity: identity as similarity and continuity, and identity as difference and rupture. While the former includes thinking of identity in ‘essentialist’ terms, the latter is in ‘cultural’ terms. The essentialist view is:

In terms of one, shared culture, a sort of collective ‘one true self’, hiding inside the many other, more superficial or artificially imposed ‘selves’, which people with a shared history and ancestry hold in common. . . . This ‘oneness’, underlying all the other, more superficial differences, is the truth, the essence of ‘Caribbeanness’, of the black experience. It is this identity which a Caribbean or black diaspora must discover, excavate, bring to light and express.(393)
The second model of identity, which Hall favours and acknowledges is:

The critical points of deep and significant difference which constitute ‘what we really are’; or rather – since history has intervened – ‘what we have become’. From this point of view, cultural identity is a matter of ‘becoming’ as well as of ‘being’. It belongs to the future as much as to the past. It is not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture. Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But like everything which is historical, they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power. Far from being grounded in mere ‘recovery’ of the past, which is waiting to be found, and which when found, will secure our sense of ourselves into eternity, identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past. (394)

Hall stresses that it is one thing to “position a subject or set of peoples as the Other of a dominant discourse. It is quite another thing to subject them to that ‘knowledge’, not only as a matter of imposed will and domination, by the power of inner compulsion and subjective con-formation to the norm” (394). Hence, he reiterates that cultural identity cannot have a fixed origin or be imposed. He expounds on this in the following statement:

It is not some universal and transcendental spirit inside us on which history has made no fundamental mark. It is not once-and-for-all. It is not a fixed origin to which we can make some final and absolute Return. (395) Cultural identities are the “unstable points of identification . . . which are made, within the discourses of history and culture” (394).
Analysing the formation of identity, he suggests considering “black Caribbean identities as “‘framed by two axes or vectors, simultaneously operative: the vector of similarity or continuity [the first model of identity]; and the vector of difference and rupture” (395). Rejecting imperialising and hegemonising forms of ethnicity, Hall’s idea of diasporic identity focuses on difference and hybridity. He problematizes the issue of the Palestinian homeland by arguing that his model does not offer the securing of identity “in relation to some sacred homeland to which they must at all costs return, even if it means pushing other peoples into the sea” (401). It is “defined, not by essence or purity, but by the recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity . . . hybridity” (402). Hall projects a different way of projecting about cultural identity. He explains identity “as constituted, not outside but within representation; and hence of cinema, not as a second-order mirror held up to reflect what already exists, but as that form of representation which is able to constitute us as new kinds of subjects, and thereby enable us to discover places from which to speak” (402).

In, New Cultures for Old Hall further summarises the basic issues covering diaspora studies and states:

Diaspora refers to ... people who belong to more than one world, speak more than one language (literally and metaphorically); inhabit more than one identity, have more than one home; who have learned to ‘negotiate and translate’ between cultures and who, because they are ‘irrevocable the product of several interlocking histories and cultures’ have learned to live with, and indeed speak from difference. They speak from the in-between of different cultures, always unsettling the assumptions of one culture from the
perspective of another, and thus finding ways of being both the same as and different the others amongst which they live. Of course such people bear the marks of the particular cultures, languages, histories and traditions which ‘formed them’, but they do not occupy these as if they were pure, untouched by other influences, or provide a source of fixed identities to which they could ever fully ‘return’. They represent new kinds of identities – new ways of ‘being someone’ in the late modern world.  

Salman Rushdie has depicted a great emotional link between relations in space and identities. Explaining about the present age where displacement, deportation, voluntary immigration and a movement to lands not one’s own is normal, Rushdie voices out the difficulty of creating fixed national and cultural identities just like Stuart Hall. In his essay *Imaginary Homelands* he draws out those aspects of the diaspora that has the potential to contest the reductive process of homogenization. The identity created is partial and fragmentary, again echoing postmodern aspects as it is made from ‘bits and pieces’, from ‘here and there’. This is the thought behind imaginary homelands as a concept that attempts to problematize national formations and the question of identity in them. The need of the writer who is caught between clarifying his position and his location forces him to write:

It may be that writers in [his] position, exiles or emigrants or expatriates are haunted by some sense of loss, some urge to reclaim, to look back…which gives rise to profound uncertainties that our physical alienation from India almost inevitably means that we will not be capable of reclaiming precisely the thing that was lost; that we will in short create actual fictions, not actual cities or villages, but invisible ones, imaginary homelands, Indias of the mind.
Unlike the above thinkers, Abdul Jan Mohammed’s theory of the syncretic individual signifies peaceful coexistence in the society rather than an uneasy self-splitting. He describes the expatriate’s position as being one of either the “specular border intellectual” or the “syncretic border intellectual”. The latter is more at home in both cultures and reaches out to both simultaneously, combining and synthesizing them while the specular border intellectual “finds himself or herself unable or unwilling to be ‘at home’ in these societies.” Such individuals are engaged in defining other possibilities and in their functioning they are likely to be critical of the new culture. The syncretic border individuals borrow cultural ideas and mythologies from the homeland and remake their identity in the hostland. He emphasizes that borders do not inherently carry any concreteness in themselves but are merely points marking the separation of the inside from the outside.

He says:

They [borders] are not really spaces at all; as sights of differences between interiority and exteriority, they are points of infinite regression. Thus, intellectuals located in this site are not, so to speak, “sitting” on the border; rather, they are forced to constitute themselves as the border, to coalesce around it as a point of infinite regression. In consciously or unconsciously constituting themselves in this manner, they have to guard themselves against the trap of specularity, for the border only functions as a mirror, as a site of defining the “identity”, and “homogeneity” of the group that has constructed it. (original emphasis)\(^{38}\)

To enable this hyphenated, diasporic individual to strategise and create a cultural identity in the multicultural society of the host land, while simultaneously rooting
for his imaginary homeland, the syncretic border individual uses dialogical approaches for communication. When we use a dialogical approach, we can begin to formulate a model of acculturation that is culturally specific, dynamic, historically and politically situated. For the thesis we have chosen three forms of dialogicality to demonstrate how hybrid selves and hyphenated identities get constructed. I.e polyphonization, expropriation and ventriloquation.

Voice, as referred by Bakhtin is the ‘speaking personality’ or ‘speaking consciousness’. Elaborating on the same, Joseph draws out various other characteristics that render a personal meaning, agree or disagree, support or even effect change.

He clarifies:

The obvious characteristic of a voice is its potential to speak, to tell a story. The story is not just any story, but a motivated story, which is rooted in emotions. A voice can talk to other voices, agree or disagree with other voices’ stories. A voice can also be ignored or silenced by other voices, but also by “real” others! A voice can ‘take over the floor’ and become the monological figure on a ground of—temporarily—invisible, backgrounded other voices. But a voice can also support another previously suppressed voice to come to the fore. Last but not least, a voice can change qualitatively due to its interaction with another voice. ...that even though a voice can contain a reference to a “social label,” it is also imbued with “personal meaning” .39
Applying Bakhtin’s concept of voice, Hermans and Kempen suggested that the term dialogic does not apply only to literature. They conceived the dialogical self in terms of a number of dynamic but relatively autonomous ‘I’ positions or voices that are in dialogue with real, actual and imagined others. The ‘I’ is not static but can move from one position to another with changes in time and circumstances. From the perspective of the dialogical self, any given individual or ‘I’, depending on the sociocultural constraints, can take a stance or a position of ridicule, agreement, disagreement, understanding, opposition, and contradiction toward another ‘I’ position.

Polyphonization has been defined as the phenomena where the selves oppose each other’s voices and sub-voices in an “increasingly complex—differentiated but loosely organized—structure of the dialogical self”. Expropriation refers to the process where a singular voice swallows all other voices and becomes “monologized”. These forms of “dialogical monologization,” for example, can be witnessed when social institutions require total obedience and loyalty from individuals and demand people to act and think in ways that meet the “right” expectations of their social norms.

Ventriloquation, was described by Mikhail Bakhtin as a concept of an internal dialogue of voices – a process through which construals of experience receive linguistic formulation in the “speech genres” available in a given cultural frame.
As pointed out by both Bakhtin and Lev Vygotsky, at first I speak myself through the voices of others. The process of forming a coherent self becomes a process of sorting through this heteroglossia or this multiplicity of voices that co-exists first around me and then within me. This occurs until discourses that are "internally persuasive" emerge. In Bakhtin's words, Language, for the individual consciousness, lies on the borderline between oneself and the other. The word in language is half someone else's and becomes "one's own" only when the speaker populates it with his own intention.

Bakhtin uses the term “ventriloquation” to describe how a novelist positions himself or herself by speaking through others’ voices. All utterances are “filled with others’ words.... These words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and re-accentuate”. By re-accentuating others' voices, narrators and ordinary speakers can establish positions for themselves.

Rather than posit migrant identity as an allocation of different cultural components in a fortuitous, congenial amalgam, the concept of voice allows us to emphasize the constant contradiction, struggle and negotiation that immigrants experience between different cultural selves. It is this process of negotiation and contestation between different voices that adds different levels of complexity to the study of identity in the diaspora.
The subsequent chapters will establish the theoretical formulations outlined above along with the strategies of acculturation and examine how he uses them. It will also enlist the dialogical processes which the immigrant may use as strategies in the process of acculturation.
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