Chapter - 6

Farah's Somalia

It has probably become clear from the foregone discussions in the previous chapters that Nuruddin Farah is indeed, in Ngugi's words "an important voice in postcolonial modernism, and speaks to our age in a very compelling prose." (1998) His is a fiction of an involved seriousness, in which truth is sought in the collision of opposing ideas. In his exploration of the truth in the conventional sense of politics he puts forth a variety of voices and views which underscore its ambiguous and open-ended nature. As a result resistance to the oppressive and unjust neo-colonial forces of the most Third World nations, which comes as a compelled state of affairs, ends up in failure. This is, Farah's texts seem to say, mainly because truth is not properly engaged, and those who are involved see no alternative to the change of system; the leadership. "I think what we need to do is to change the people too," says Farah. (Jaggi.)

In the sphere of gender politics and of patriarchal domination over women, Farah sees his works dealing with the core issues of the Somali society and truth. For him fighting for the feminist cause is the sole "worth revolution." As Ngugi observes, "the liberation of women" exists at the core of all "the general issues of national liberation and human rights," of Farah's
fiction, which makes him "probably the leading writer in Africa in feminist consciousness." (1998, 716)

Thus, unlike that of the resistance to the General's authoritarian rule, women's resistance to male domination is relatively successful. Women like Ebla, Medina, Duniya and Damac are finally able to dream their own dreams. As they succeed to have their alternative families to the patriarchal ones of the Somali society, they locate themselves in the centres of their dreams.

However, as shown in Chapter Five, it has become clear that Farah's real sense of political concern is found in the spheres of identity and individual autonomy. Accordingly all threats to an individual's identity are questioned and aptly challenged, which makes the character's efforts to thwart all those threats to their existence the genuine political struggle and resistance in his work.

These being the basic issues revealed in the preceding discussions of Farah's novels it is probably worth while to turn, in the conclusion, to certain wider issues of Farah and his fiction. In the following paragraphs of this chapter I intend to pick up those issues like Farah in the context of African Literature, exile and Farah's imaginary Somalia, and finally Farah as a Somali writer.
6.1. Farah in the Context of African Literature

The well-known question of what is African Literature or in other words, what constitutes African Literature may be asked before one is lost in the arbitrary phrases and evasive abstractions of the term in relations to Nuruddin Farah and his works. While many tend to ask whether it is the use of African vernacular languages, or an author’s Africanness or even the setting on the continent that makes a work of art ‘African’ the basic fact of the term is not so unknown to those who seem to drive an academic satisfaction by approaching it in this manner. The truth that the postcolonial African writer or critic is probably unwilling to challenge is that this term, African Literature, does not represent the continent in its entirety. African Literature is a colonial term conceived in racial grounds. Euphemistically known as the sub-Saharan African literature it is meant for that literature of the Black or Negroid Africa. (Shalash. 16) As is obvious, when understood in this way the term serves a particular colonial utility as it divides the continent racially. It excludes, on grounds unspecified, the Arab and Berber inhabitants of the north.

As I have shown earlier the Somali people, of whom Farah writes, suffer from an identity crisis on the continent. While the modern geopolitical discourses place them on the sub-Saharan portion of the continent they do not fit into that unproblematically. This is what the prominent British Somalist scholar, I. M. Lewis, had to say about the arbitrariness of
this colonial and geo-political positioning of the Somalis: “As Muslims, Hamitic in ethnic affiliation, predominantly nomadic, and inordinately proud, the Somalis belong more to north Africa than to Africa south of the Sahara.” (116)

This question of identity, cultural and geo-political otherness has its bearing on the discussion of Farah and his works in African context. Apart from certain aspects, which are common to the works of most Third World writers, Farah’s fiction does not easily fit into any of the known regions of the African literature, as observed by many. Derek Wright, a prominent critic on Farah, observes that, “Farah, like each of his protagonists from Ebla and Koschin to Askar and Duniya, is a liminal phenomenon, one who crosses boundaries and migrates between zones. He is an oddity among African artists, unique in his contradictions ... But then the Somalis are themselves something of oddity in the modern world and are equally unstable of definition and classification.” (20) Though this of Wright’s above observation is basically based on an intertextual reading of Farah’s novels, he has scarcely left the real issue of Farah’s oddity unpronounced, when he concludes that the Somalis are, “African people neither of the Maghrib nor black.” (21)

This cultural and geo-political oddity of Farah is echoed by other prominent scholars. In her review of Angela Smith’s book; *East African Writing in English* (1989), Jacqueline Bardolph underscores this problem of positioning Farah and his fiction in the sphere of African literature when she
writes: “a survey of East African literature always has to include Nuruddin Farah *a major but isolated figure difficult to ‘locate’ in any way.*” (1991, 160. Emphasis included) And in a more recent essay in *Encyclopedia of Literature and Criticism* C. L. Innes, who regards Farah “as the most significant African novelist apart from Achebe, Soyinka, La Guma and Ngugi,” writes that Farah’s “works did not fit easily into the already established concept of African novel nor into the better-known contexts of Nigeria and Kenya.” (1133)

A similar difficult of Farah’s problem of dislocation is voiced by the great critic of African literature, Simon Gikandi, when he says: “The complex history of the Somali nation – and its truncated nationalism – is, of course, a major concern in Farah’s works; but the novelist is also troubled by his own (dis)location within the African tradition of letters, because what makes his country different, especially within an East African context, is the multiplicity of its cultural and historical influences.” (753)

What all these observations underscore is the existence of great deal of controversy surrounding this writer, in relation to the term African Literature. The problem is mainly not one of willingness or choice on the author’s part or any one else’s, but probably one of culture. While Farah takes pride in his Africanness and belonging to the fold of African literature it is mainly due to his inability, despite continues attempts, to portray the real African culture; the utilisation of so-called African ideas, philosophy, folklore and imagery remain absolutely foreign to the world of his novels.
That this cultural question is very relevant can be understood from the fact that Farah finds closer affinities with the writers of the Muslim North Africa like Asia Djibar, Ben Jelloun, Naguib Mehfouz and others. This is what he had to say to Jagi’s question on the subject: “yes, with some North African writers, for example, and with Salman Rushdie’s works. Being culturally Muslim, these writers and I are hovering over the same Islamic terrain, trying to do similar things in our writing, questioning values, challenging things.” (Jaggi.)

These difficulties of positioning Nuruddin Farah in the context of African literature notwithstanding, Farah is acclaimed as “one of the finest of contemporary African novelists, [who] has been bringing us a very different world. His Africa, most particularly his native Somalia, is in revolt against the long hegemony of cartographers and bestowers of names.” (Rushdie 201) And in his Statement of Nomination to the 1998 Neusstadt Jury Ngugi said; “Nuruddin Farah’s narratives … come to be a metaphor for postcolonial Africa … [he] questions all the oppressive stabilities, whether rooted in the family, the clan, the nation or in the supranational claims of religion and political systems. He is a Somali writer, an African writer, an important voice in postcolonial modernism, and speaks to our age in a very compelling prose.” (1998 )

Therefore, in the context of ‘African literature’ Nuruddin Farah, though of a later generation, is one of those small corpus of writers who
managed to get over the ‘hump’ very rapidly and successfully. (Versi. 1987) He presently shares a place of prominence with those literary giants like Achebe, Ngugi, Ousmane and Soyinka. But this is a recent acknowledgement of his fiction, though his present popularity is mainly based on the intrinsic value of his very first novels; *From a Crooked Rib*, those of the *Dictatorship Trilogy* and *Maps*. The reason is mainly because he shunned both the domestic and international sides of ideology. This is what Karim Al Rawi said of Farah and his works; “The novels of Nuruddin Farah have met with wide acclaim, especially in Britain, yet he does not appear to have received the kind of following he deserves in Africa. The reasons for this are varied and contradictory. Politically, he appears to challenge both the rhetoric of the Left, and its poor practice, as well as the uncaring attitude of the Right.” It is Farah’s belief that dealing with the objective reality while staying away from any involvement in “the day-to-day mundane politics” is what really matters for a writer. (Jaggi.)

Critics found it virtually impossible to categorise his novels. They are, in Anver Versi’s words, “part allegory, part magic-realism (long before Salman Rushdie woke up the British literary establishment) and wholly about the Somali social structure.”(1991) Because of their complexities he is accused of alienating his African readership, while he draws the attention of many non-African readers. But Farah sees as this the very intrinsic value of his work. Complexity is for Farah a necessary aspect of his fiction with which he confronts the Western stereotype of reading the African social experience simple. Like Soyinka, who is also at pains to emphasise the
complexity of Yoruba and other Nigerian traditions in their complex interaction with other cultures and modern technological sophistication, Farah denies the allegation that his work's complexity is foreign to his subject strongly; "If my novels are complex it is because the Somali society I write about is complex." (Ibid.)

Julie Kitchener tells us how disturbed and defiant he became when he was accused of being too complex for his African audience. The BBC African Service asked him "to rewrite a commissioned radio play so that it was more comprehensible to African listeners," Kitchener narrates the anecdote. He was in no mood to do so since he considered that as an implied condescension; "What do they mean by the 'average African?' I am an African."(1981)

This of Farah's complexity means that he, like Soyinka, Armah and Christopher Okigbo, is accused of 'elitist' and 'obscure' fiction, which involves much straining to be a part of the Euro-modernist abscuranticism. Probably owing to his subject's psychological and socio-political otherness in Africa, Farah seems to be least influenced by those debates of literature, culture and social criticisms in Africa. We do not stumble upon a conscious defence of cultural otherness, a pertinent subject to most prominent African and other Third World writers, in his work. Again, perhaps because of his awareness of the reality of his nation's historical rhetoric, Farah never makes any glorified past the subject of his writing. As regards to the Negritude school and debates of African literature one finds that Farah stays away from
"[N]o race has monopoly on" sufferance, says Medina, the heroin in *Sardines*, in response to Atta's - the black American - "My race remembers sufferance." "This is similar to dreams," continues Medina, "there aren't any collective dreams. Each of us has his or her own dream, each of us suffers in his or her own way. And when some blacks are suffering, rest assured that others are doing well. You suffer because you are who you are, not because you are black." (S. 186. Emphasis in the original)

It is as well very intriguing to notice that although Farah, like most other Anglophone African writers, is influenced by Frantz Fanon, one of the distinguishing characteristics of his fiction is that the economic and cultural world of the peasantry and proletariat is hardly reflected in his fiction. In reference to this aspect of his work, Alden and Tremaine write in their book, *Nuruddin Farah*:

If we consider the actors in these political dramas and the concerns that generate political dissent, we are immediately struck by how particular Farah's world is and how much he differs from other prominent African political writers like Ngugi wa Thiong'o of Kenya, Ousmane Sembene of Senegal, or Chinua Achebe of Nigeria. In Farah's writing, unlike that of these contemporaries, we find no peasants forced from their land, no workers brutalized through rapid industrialization, no mass movement of any sort. (83)
6.2. Exile and Farah’s Imaginary Somalia

One of the highly intriguing issues related to Farah is that of the exile. Of those twenty eight years during which he has been a writer twenty four he has been in longer or shorter multiple residencies in Italy, Germany, Britain, the United States, Uganda, Nigeria, Sudan and Gambia. This means that he has been one of the first African exile writers, doubled with the banning on his works, like Ngugi’s, in Somalia, the subject that he kept working on a novel after novel. But Farah’s attitude towards exile has never been even ambivalical. Though he is exiled from the country and the people he portrays in his novels he does not see himself robbed. He sees himself as though on leave rather than compelled to stay away from his country: “I have taken an extended leave from Somalia.” (Kitchener)

Exile has never been his choice. In 1973 he posted the manuscript of A Naked Needle to his publisher. It was accepted but withheld from publication in consideration to his safety. In August 1974 Farah left for London to do a post-graduate course in theatre at University of London. After the completion of the course he went to Rome to take a plane back to Somalia. But the information received through his telephone call to his brother placed him in the beginning of his exile: he was told to forget Somalia and consider it dead.

Though denied the pure and the immediate experience of the source and the country of his creativity Farah never regretted his compelled
situation. He rather considered it a bitter-sweet one and made best of it. It gave him what is most dear to every good writer; the freedom to write without any political pressure and, as he tells Maggie Jonas, “without the binds and restrictions of family ties, demands and prejudices.”

Farah’s determination to put his exile predicament in a positive light shows the pastoralist influence upon him. Like the Somali nomad who brings with him the resilience to adapt himself or herself to his or her present situation and makes best of it, Farah prepared himself both mentally and physically to be the master of his own destiny and live in his imaginary homeland, though he feels denied what could have served as the primary source of his creativity, “the smells, the heat and the dust” of his country. “The fact that I cannot return to Somalia disturbs me enormously,” he tells Jonas, “but until things change, I will continue to live happily in the country of my imagination.”

The Somalia created in his fiction is a Somalia conceived from the distance with the help of whatever little memory he has taken with him. In his view, it is one of the benefits of exile that memory is more effectively clicked: “Memory is active when you are in exile, and it calls at the awkwardest hour, like a baby waking up its parents at the crack of dawn.” (Ibid.) He sees that exile also gave him the benefit to see his original Somalia from far and as a result know the subject better: “Being away has helped me write with a clearer vision. Distance distils and makes ideas worth pursuing. I think I have learned a lot more about Somalia by questioning
myself from afar. One needs to extricate oneself from the daily needs and demands of living at home.” (Ibid.) The ‘needs and demands’ which Farah talks of here should not be understood those of his own private life. As he himself mentions in the same interview the Somali social life allows privacy no one and there is no tradition where an artist may lock himself up in a room in the process of his writing and thinking. And in addition to that, in an oral society like his writing makes one a public figure. In his essay ‘Why I Write’ Farah makes clear that he knew from early age writing was his area. He also knew the subject of his writing; his country and people. In the beginning he thought his output apolitical. But before there was a clear picture of the idea he had to work under the great pressure of different opposing camps all courting his pen. But as the idea that consequently resulted in his great narratives of the Dictatorship Trilogy took shape Farah knew the challenges that lay ahead of him. Exile, thus, came to him as a curse in blessing. It gave him the chance to put his rightful claim to Somalia by creating it in a novel after another so as to live in it as “the country of his imagination.” As observed by Alden and Tremaine in their book, Nuruddin Farah: “Out of the material of Nuruddin Farah’s personal and sociohistorical worlds, for all their contradictions and ironies, emerges a ‘country of the imagination’ that is remarkably unified … The body of the work that contains that world is a close weave of artistic elements and intellectual concerns sustained and developed over a career of three decades.” (42)
Totally given himself to this world of his Farah found the tyrant General first in exile and then the people of Somalia, “who have been made exiles by being removed from the mainstream economy by the regime of Siyad Barre. Yet my believe is that it is really Siyad’s tyrannical regime that is in exile, on account of the distance separating it from the people of Somalia.”(Jonas) It should be noted that in Farah’s point of view it is the original and material Somalia from which the General and people are in exile while in his created ‘alternative’ Somalia General Barre’s active and intriguing shadow is fully felt. The difference is that in this latter world of Somalia it is Farah, who is, though himself in physical exile, in full control.

But what tends to be his bravura attitude to exile should not indeed lead us to be oblivious to the painful experience of his predicament. The distance that he sees as distilling and necessary angle of his understanding of himself and his subject indeed “estranges”, as Wright puts it, “and alienated a writer from his native experience if it is maintained for too long a period.”(140) Owing to his nomadic cultural background Farah may not feel fixed to a particular territory geographically but even if he succeeds to avoid his exiled conscience find its way into his works, it is worth noting that he is denied what is so dear for a writer, the direct experience and the primary source of his inspiration. Thus, while his pre-exile works, *From a Crooked Rib* and *A Naked Needle* for instance, gave the reader a vivid touch of certain aspects of the society and locales the later narratives deal with circumstances without bringing minimum awareness of the physical aspects of the Somalia at the backdrop. This is certainly what Wright means when
he observes: “However positive a light he throws upon his predicament, the problems of relevance and accuracy of representation must become especially acute in the career of a writer who continues to set his fiction in a homeland which he has not seen for twenty years.” (140)

It is the paradox that even in the post-General era of Somalia, when there is no a direct threat from instituted authority to him, Farah is not in position to end his exile. In a more recent article, “A Country in Exile” he asks; “But does the choice of ending my exile rest solely with me?”(1998)
And his implied answer is ‘no’ since that country itself exists in exile due to the warlords-dominated civil strife: “However, if because of the civil war the country has altered beyond recognition, ... I wonder should I join my country in exile?” (Ibid.)

The exploration of the truth in history is one other major contention of Farah’s fiction. It partially contributes to the making of his Somalia. In his essay, “Why I Write,” Farah tells us that he “wrote to put down on paper, for posterity's sake, the true history of a nation.” But it needs saying that for sure Farah is not the writer of historical fiction in the ordinary sense. Though both pre-and-postcolonial major historical events of Somalia are what inform his fiction Farah never deals with them in the usual sense of the term history. The relevant question is, then, how does he render this declared objective of his: “the true history of the nation.”
As most of his postcolonial colleagues, Farah tries to counter the colonial and neo-colonial untruths about Somalia. In his view history is alienated by these forces, as the narrator in *Close Sesame* says:

> Time was history: and history was a shy little thing hiding in the fold of its robe a giant; ... And history was a congeries of half-truths: of the so-called peace-loving nations who are progressive; and the so-called free nations who are democratic: ... History was a string of intolerable nonsense: of dominations that were called civilizing missions; of “pacifying” expeditionary forces which looted and raped and robbed while they misdescribed these “mass killings” as the ennoblement of the savage. (86)

This is mainly the colonial historical terrain, which Farah counters in his fiction, as it does that of the neo-colonial forces. Referring to the General’s version of Somali history Farah writes in his essay ‘Why I Write’:

> “Somalia was a badly written play, I had thought, and Siyad Barre was its author.” He was also all that went into the making of the Somali history – the ‘play’- he was its “main actor, its centre and theme”, and also “its stage-designer and light technician, as well as the audience. You can imagine how Siyad-Barre-as-subject oppressed and obsessed me.

As a result characters like Koschin, Loyaan, Medina, Mursal, Deeriye, Askar and Duniya are all conceived to balance those historical untruths. Farah, often seen as a fair-minded writer, felt that, while he dealt with his alternative history and Somalia, it should not as well turn out subjective, thus messing “it all up for future authors dealing with the same material even...
if from a detached, historical angle.” (Ibid., Emphasis included) This suggests that Farah saw the historical content of his fiction as involved, since it made a major part of the creation of his alternative Somalia, the country of his imagination. Thus, it may be said that along with his fiction's defining sense of political autonomy of individuals, his concern of history makes Farah’s work one of those powerful metacommentaries which explore the nature of truth, by underscoring the possible relevances and legitimacies of narratives of nationalism, liberation and neo-colonialism. This is one such major contentious issues of African literature that makes Farah’s fiction highly acclaimed and relevant.

6.3. Farah as a Somali Writer

As we have already seen in our discussion of his novels’ political implications, feminist advocacy and the characters’ pursuit of individual sphere of identity, his philosophy of resistance is aimed against all forms of socio-political oppressions and injustices. And the basis of his politics and social authorities is found in the family unit whose members come under the patriarchal grip of highhandedness. Thus the only possible answer to the question of whether Farah’s work is revolutionary and change-oriented becomes ‘yes.’ He tells Kitchener: “I believe that there is no revolution worth talking about any where in the world unless the structure of the family is changed from one nurtured on social blackmail and financial investment and where the position of women is one of enslavement.”
But when the next relevant question of how this truth of Farah’s takes root and is realised is posed the answer may not be as simple and easily fetched. With the exception of a limited privileged Somali intellectual audience Farah’s work has had zero-influence on the major sections of the Somali society. Among the number of reasons that led to this zero-influence are exile, ban on his books and his choice of the English language as the medium of his fiction. The first two of these difficulties concretised the ‘distance’ between Farah and the subjects of his fiction, the Somali people. This can be better appreciated when we see how other dissident Somali artists made a following. All the prominent Somali artists, mainly poets and playwrights, were, like Farah, quick to see beyond the rhetoric of the General Barre’s regime which came soon after their earlier full support for the revolution waned.

As a Somali Farah’s fiction does not show sensibility foreign to the works of the other Somali artists whether they are poets, playwrights or fiction writers. This is mainly so because literature in Somalia always waged war against authoritarian rule and injustice. The phenomenon of brief love-affair with the system found in Farah’s intellectual development can be, therefore, also seen in the works of all the Somali major poets and playwrights. For instance Hadraawi, Abdi Mohamed Amin and Dhoodaan are three such Somali artists who like Farah, initially gave the General’s regime their support, but later became disenchedanted and disillusioned with it.
At the time when Farah was writing the first of his *Dictatorship Trilogy* novels poets and playwrights, like Hadraawi, Amin, Gaariye and Dhoodaan began to capture in their works the evils of the General’s regime. While the public followed with great enthusiasm and was involved in the continues tussle between these artists and the General for almost two decades Farah’s role in the battle never figured in this context. While some of these contemporary Somali artists attracted the people’s attention both from in and out of the detention centres, and even from exile, others took arms, along with their powerful poetry, against the regime. The fact is that Somali artists have had the rare power to give and withdraw legitimacy from the regime. Barely a few months before his overthrow in January 1991 General Barre sat helplessly in the national theatre while the nation’s accusing finger was pointed right at him physically by the famous singer, Saado Ali, (the character Farah calls Dulman in his novel *Sardines*) as she sang Amin’s powerful song ‘*waar ninkow, ninkow*’ (Oh you man, man!) This shows the negative side of Farah’s romanticised ‘distance’. It may have been distilling for Farah but on the other hand distance alienated him from his people.

As his choice of language Farah is almost a stranger to his people, about and to whom he says he writes. As Abdulla Jamali argues in his essay “The Roots of Great Literature,” Farah’s choice of English as the medium for his fiction leaves him very objective undermined. Farah “wants to introduce his country and people to foreign audience but it might be said better that Nuruddin Farah needs to be introduced to his own people.”
For Farah, a multilingual writer, English which is the language of his creative work comes the fourth. Belonging to the Somali culture, where language is one of its basic defining and unifying factors, Farah may be well-aware of the fact that writing on the coloniser’s language, which is, as Ngugi puts it; “the most powerful vehicle through which power fascinated and held the soul prisoner … the means of spiritual subjugation.” (1987, 9) Yet unlike that of the Nigerian, South African or the Indian writer, it amounts to a personal choice of his, though somewhat realistic.

Farah who began his writing profession in Somali even before the language was officially given orthography, has had a variety of reasons to his use of the English language. “My love of the Somali written language lasted only briefly, like my love of the Somali government,” he tells Maggie Jonas. His exiled predicament and censorship, besides what he calls practical problems, were mainly those factors which brought his brief love-affair with the Somali language to a violent end: “I didn’t actually decide, it was decided for me by the censorship of my novels.” (Jaggi.) Partially admitting to the complexity associated with his novels and his limited local Somali audience Farah believes he does not miss a great deal because of his use of the English language; “I wanted to be read not only by Somalis but also by other people. I often ask the question, who are the people in Somalia who read, since reading novels is not easy, but is something that is taught. My feeling is that the very people who read my novels in English are the people who are likely to have read them in Somali.” (Ibid.)
Though he vehemently rejects the allegation that he wrote in English so as to pander to Western audience, he seems to have disregarded his responsibility toward the development of his language when he says; “A language, and the vocabulary of a language is not invented by one person … Somali is at present inadequate.” (Ibid) This indeed amounts to a weak disclaimer and poor excuse of Farah’s. Somali language may be technologically, and in the modern sense, ‘inadequate’ for a writer of works of great complexity and consciousness of style as Farah’s, but it is also the language in which his pastoralist ancestors –he takes pride in that he is related to the master of Somali oral poetry, the Sayyid- composed their poetry for centuries. The question is, while he points out to his native language’s inadequacy, does Farah understand the paradox of being to so obsessed to take from his mother tongue to enrich English as Ngugi puts it. (1986, 8) But the fact is that Farah, like Rushdie, is absolutely scarcely disturbed by “the anti-colonial” or “postcolonial cudgels against English.” (Rushdie. 64)

In short Farah is not only one of the continent’s most prominent writers but also one of its most dynamic ones. The present study reveals that, as a writer of the postcolonial era, Farah shares with his other African and Third World counterparts the view that a writer should “speak to the nation, compose the sentence which expresses the heart of the people and become the mouth-piece of new reality in action,” as opined by Fanon. Accordingly, his novels deal with what is often termed as “the new realism,” which has a
direct bearing with the post-colonial socio-political set-up of the Somali people in particular, and the other African nations in general. Like those of Achebe, Armah, Soyinka, Ben Jelloun, Mehfouz, Djibaar, wa Thiong’o and many others, his novels, especially those of the Dictatorship Trilogy, create vivid socio-political realities which reflect on the post-independence Somalia. With his unmatched indirect and innovative narrative skills, he lays bare the rampant corruption and despotism of the dictatorship and the postcolonial predicament of his nation.
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