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Abstract
Displacement and dispersion do not only feature prominently as topics in the New Literatures in English, but characterize the lives of many postcolonial authors who have chosen or been compelled to develop their writing careers in different parts of the Western world. This paper puts forward the term diaspora as an analytical field with which to map and apprehend multi-centred New Literatures, taking Anglophone Afro-Caribbean literature -produced along a London-New York-Toronto axis- as a case study. Background to the origin, development and widespread currency of the term across disciplines will be provided.
1. Genesis and Evolution of the term

In recent decades, experts from different disciplines in the social sciences and the humanities have incorporated the term *diaspora* into their discourses in an attempt to represent experiences of displacement. The creation in 1991 of *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* attests to the prominence achieved by the term as an instrument of analysis. In the Preface to the Journal’s inaugural issue, the editor, Khachig Tölölyan, links the term to a large semantic domain including words like ‘immigrant, expatriate, refugee, guest worker, exile community, ethnic community... the vocabulary of transnationalism’ (Tölölyan 1991: 4-5). The editor’s use of the word *transnationalism* reinforces his desire to ‘erode’ the ‘sharply defined borders of the nation-state’ (5), and he thus draws an example from Joyce’s *Ulysses*. Asked by a Dublin citizen to define what a nation is, Leopold Bloom answers “the same people living in the same place” (3). But this fails to satisfy the questioner, a nationalist at odds with the rule of the British Empire, whose definition of Ireland in turn includes the Irish diaspora: “We have our greater Ireland beyond the sea. They were driven out of house and home in the black 1847...” (3). What is at stake here is the location of culture. Are culture and place isomorphic categories?
Anthropologists, cultural critics and historians have called into question essentialist definitions of culture and nation. Current ethnography, for instance, has shifted away from reductive notions of culture as ‘dwelling’ towards a more capacious definition of culture as ‘multi-locale’ (Clifford: 1992). Multi-locale ethnography has consequently replaced the village as a cultural whole by more complex fields to do justice to transnational political, economic, and cultural forces that traverse and constitute local or regional worlds. Cultures such as ‘Haiti’ can now be ethnographically studied both in the Caribbean and in Brooklyn.

Indeed, the idea of nation as an immutable homogeneous entity has come under attack from different quarters. As early as 1882, historian Ernest Renan concludes that a nation is ‘a soul, a spiritual principle’, based on ‘the possession in common of a rich legacy of memories’ and a will to perpetuate it in the present (19); he reaches this conclusion after ruling out criteria such as race, language, religion or natural frontiers. Benedict Anderson defines nations as ‘imagined communities’. Nations, Anderson explains, are imagined because their members will never really get to meet their fellow-members, but will still hold an illusion of communion. Besides, nations imagine themselves as ‘limited’, with finite boundaries; as
‘sovereign’, and not divinely-ordained; and as a ‘community’ because ‘regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship’ (Anderson 1991: 6-7). Nations also imagine themselves to be ‘historical’, in spite of the fact that they ‘loom out of an immemorial past and glide into a limitless future’ (19). Picking up on Renan and Anderson, Bhabha conceives nations as ‘narrations’ perpetuated in time, ‘pedagogical knowledges and continuist national narratives’ (Bhabha 1995: 303). Whether a spiritual principle, a rich legacy of memories, an imagined community or a narrative, the notion of nation lacks a solid foundation. These approaches to the idea of nation reinforce its discursive character as a sociocultural construction. Postcolonial interventions, in the shape of mass migrations or cultural artifacts, have in fact destabilized essentialist definitions of nationhood based on dangerous identifications of place with culture and race. In Bhabha’s own words, ‘colonials, postcolonials, migrants, minorities, wandering peoples will not be contained within the Heim of the national culture and its unisonant discourse, but are themselves the mark of a shifting boundary that alienates the frontiers of the modern nation’ (315). It would be unrealistic to say, however, that the idea of the nation should be discarded. Nations continue to exist and to function as
political, administrative, and cultural units. But, in the light of new historical changes, the nation-space has to make room for cultural difference, nations are compelled to redraw the boundaries of their frontiers and become ‘the crossroads to a new transnational culture’ (4).

Diasporas are, indeed, ‘the exemplary communities of the transnational moment’ (Tölölyan, 1991: 5). The origin of the term is in the Greek translation of the Old Testament around 250 BC. Greek translators used the verb diaspeiren -to sow- to describe the scattering of peoples due to divine punishment found from Deuteronomy to the Psalms; and also to replace the term galut, describing the exile of the Jerusalem elite to Babylon from 586 to 530 B.C.E. Later on, the Hellenophone world began to apply the term to the Jewish communities that were well established within it. Since the earliest uses of the term are associated to Jewish dispersion, the Jewish experience has become a paradigmatic case of diaspora. In the classical definition, therefore, diaspora had strong connotations of enforced exile, uprooting, homelessness, perpetual longing for the lost homeland and racial purity. From the late 1960s on, however, the term has been loosely applied to a number of related phenomena, until then covered by distinct terms like exile, expatriate, ethnic minority or migrant commu-
In response to this capacious usage of the term diaspora, a host of social scientists and cultural critics have set out to codify it in the 1990s, distinguishing between traditionally recognized diasporas and newer claimants. William Saffran is a good example of this endeavor. Saffran picks up on Walter Connor’s broad definition of diaspora as “that segment of a people living outside the homeland” (quoted in Saffran 1991: 83) and tries to narrow it down to ‘expatriate minority communities’: that are dispersed from an ‘original center’ to at least two ‘foreign regions’; that maintain ‘a collective memory, vision or myth about their original homeland’; that ‘believe they are not fully accepted by their host society and feel partly alienated from it’; that regard their ancestral homeland as their ‘true home’ and place of eventual return; that are committed to the ‘maintenance or restoration’ of the homeland; and whose group consciousness is ‘importantly defined’ by this bond with the homeland. In terms of this definition, Saffran lists as ‘legitimate’ diasporas the Armenian, Polish, Maghrebi, Turkish, Palestinian, Cuban, Greek, and perhaps the Chinese and the Blacks in the Americas, although none of them ‘fully’ conforms to the ‘ideal type’ of the Jewish di-
aspora (83-4). The Turks, for instance, unlike the Armenians, were not ‘forcibly’ expelled from their country of origin (85). In spite of his initial reticence, Saffran ends up accepting as diasporas those expatriate communities that share some of his prescribed characteristics, even though they may not be ‘genuine’ in the Jewish sense. In fact, the strength of his argument lies in its realistic turn, the acknowledgment of the ambivalence surrounding diasporic consciousness. Diasporic identification, Saffran explains, may be weakened by material success in the hostland, or in the second generation, but it can also persist even when the community fits into the host society. Besides, a given diaspora may take different configurations depending on what the conditions are in the different hostlands -for instance, Armenians in Lebanon, Paris, and California. Saffran also concludes that, rather than a feasible plan, the return drive is an ‘eschatological concept’, a myth ‘used to make life more tolerable by holding out a utopia ... in contrast to the perceived dystopia of actual life’ (94).

Edward Said’s notion of exile is also in the vein of the Jewish catastrophic tradition, for he grounds it on the old practice of banishment. Although he points at some of the advantages of this condition such as the originality of vision, he dwells more
on its negative aspects. For Said, exile is a state of ‘terminal loss’ and isolation, toned down in literary renderings:

On the twentieth-century scale, exile is neither aesthetically nor humanistically comprehensible: at most the literature about exile objectifies an anguish and a predicament most people rarely experience at first hand; but to think of the exile informing this literature as beneficially humanistic is to banalize its mutilations, the losses it inflicts upon those who suffer them ... Is it not true that the views of exile in literature ... obscure what is truly horrendous ... that it has torn millions of people from the nourishment of tradition, family and geography? (Said 1990: 357-8).

In this passage, Said underlines the tragedy of uprootedness inherent in any situation of displacement, bypassing the possibility of an enriching community life beyond the confines of the homeland. ‘Exile’, he goes on to say, ‘is a solitude experienced outside the group: the deprivations felt at not being with others in the communal habitation’ (358). Said’s concept of exile does not only emphasize its most negative side, but is grounded on a notion of culture and community confined to the boundaries of the nation-state.

More recent contributions to the theorization of diaspora stress the need to go beyond the catastrophic tradition. The literature produced in the 1990s on this subject celebrates displacements as sites of creation, transcending negative no-
tions of displacement as exile, although George Lamming’s 1960 work *The Pleasures of Exile* pioneers this line of thought with statements like ‘to be an exile is to be alive’ (24). The author of *After Exile: Writing the Latin American Diaspora*, for instance, explains that ‘there is another way of living after exile, in the choice to remain in the diaspora’ (Kaminsky 1999: 16). Recent discourses on displacement, then, highlight this shift from the notion of exile to that of diaspora. Robin Cohen criticizes Saffran’s model for being too Jewish-oriented and thus exclusive. In turn, he calls for a model that makes room for ‘more ambiguous’ cases of diaspora, such as the case of the Caribbean peoples (Cohen 1997: 22). However, he does not turn down Saffran’s diaspora features, but introduces some interesting amendments. Distancing himself from the catastrophic or victim tradition, he introduces a voluntaristic element in the dispersal from the homeland, that may also happen ‘in search of work, in pursuit of trade, or to further colonial ambitions’. Therefore, he establishes a typology of diasporas, encompassing ‘victim diasporas’ -the Jewish and African-‘imperial diasporas’ -the Ancient Greek or the British-, or ‘labor diasporas’ -the Indian-, among others, acknowledging possible overlappings so that one diaspora can be victim and labour at the same time. Although a troubled relationship with the hostland is likely to occur, Cohen believes in ‘the pos-
sibility of a distinctive creative, enriching life in host countries with a tolerance for pluralism’ (26). Whereas Saffran emphasizes the relationship of the diasporic group to its homeland, Cohen stresses the need of ‘a strong ethnic consciousness sustained over a long time and based on a sense of distinctiveness’ in the hostland; in some cases, diasporic groups will need to do more than restore or maintain their homeland, but will have to ‘create’ an ‘imagined homeland’ that only resembles the original history in the ‘remotest way’ (26). Cohen also stresses the importance of the imagination, of cultural artifacts to hold a diaspora together.

In keeping with his relaxed definition of diaspora, Cohen finally resorts to the metaphor of a rope. A diaspora would be like a rope made up with fibers that ‘often intertwine to strengthen the rope’ (180). To summarize, the fibers of the ‘diasporic rope’ would be: dispersal from a homeland, voluntarily or traumatically; a collective memory or myth about the homeland and a commitment to its maintenance or creation; the existence of return movements -Zionism, Garveyism, Pan-Africanism-; a strong group consciousness sustained over a long time; troubled relationship with host societies, though with the possibility of an enriching live. The more features -fibers- a given dispersion presents, the stronger its diasporic consciousness
Cohen’s model as a whole stresses the positive side of diasporic developments. The sociologist shifts our attention away from the biblical paradigm towards the literal meaning of the Greek etymology, dispersion of seeds and subsequent growth.

Paul Gilroy’s work is another landmark in the process of codification of the diaspora concept. Unlike the above mentioned diaspora critics, who elaborate on a number of diasporic configurations -Jewish, Armenian, Turkish, Chinese, and so on-, Gilroy exclusively links diaspora to the dispersal of African peoples in the New World due to the slave trade, what he has labeled the *Black Atlantic*. His treatment of the term is closer to Saffran’s than to Tölölyan’s or Cohen’s, in that he stresses the parallels between the Jewish and the African experience of exile, thus attaching himself to classical definitions of diaspora. Gilroy’s Pan-African perspective allows him to dissociate African diasporic experiences from the borders and histories of specific nation-states. He thus argues that ‘national units are not the most appropriate basis for studying this history, for the African diaspora’s consciousness of itself has been defined in and against constricting national boundaries’ (Gilroy 1999 [1993]: 158). For him, black cultural studies should not be compartmentalized in African-American, Carib-
bean of African studies. From his angle of vision, the inclusion of a work such as Toni Morrison’s *Beloved* into the African-American cultural production is an act of appropriation, of ‘ethnic absolutism’:

... much of the precious intellectual legacy claimed by African-American intellectuals as the substance of their particularity is in fact only partly their absolute ethnic property ... the idea of the black Atlantic can be used to show that there are other claims to it which can be based on the structure of the African diaspora into the western hemisphere (Gilroy 1997:15).

In this light, *Beloved* is, above all, a black diaspora project. Gilroy is right in arguing that race and culture are not coextensive with national boundaries. However, his notion of the Atlantic as a single unit of analysis encompassing the experiences of blacks in North America, the Caribbean and part of Europe glosses over the distinctive features developed by black culture in those locations, which he interprets as traits of ethnic absolutism. He seems to privilege an immutable shared heritage over hybridity, which is essential to diasporic identification.

In my own treatment of the concept of diaspora I will adhere to Cohen’s theory, for it allows the critic to deal with recent diasporic configurations transcending the Jewish paradigm.
2. The Anglophone Afro-Caribbean Diaspora: A Case Study

The history of the Anglophone Caribbean can be apprehended as a series of migrations of peoples in the course of time. The first settlers, the Ameridian peoples from South America—the Arawaks and the Caribs—, fought among themselves for supremacy on the islands. They were followed by the Spanish, who contributed to their extermination and lost their hegemony to subsequent waves of Northern Europeans. The Dutch, the French and the English joined in the scramble for the islands and brought Africans to work as slaves on the sugar plantations that were established.

The abolition of slavery and the resulting emancipation of the slaves in the 1830s brought about further displacements in the British colonies. Since former African slaves refused to stay on the plantations, Indians were brought from the continent to work as indentured servants. There were also failed attempts to bring laborers from other places such as China or Azores. Former African slaves, in turn, started to move away from the plantations to occupations in towns and to other British islands in the Caribbean. This first movement out of the plantations and the islands after Emancipation is the origin of the almost continuous migration that followed. During a
second phase of migration, movements were channelled to foreign territories within the Caribbean basin, like Panama, where labour was needed for the construction of the canal. Migrations to foreign territories within the Caribbean area — Venezuela, Curacao— continued until the 1940s. A third wave of migration took place soon after the outbreak of World War II, when there was a transition from a regionally focused migration to one dominated by the North Atlantic. The migration stream was first directed mainly to Britain, the mother country, to alleviate post-war labour shortage. It reached its peak in the 1950s, and was finally halted by migration restrictions in 1962. Migration was then directed to the US in the 1960s and to Canada in the 1970s.

A migration tradition, therefore, started in the Caribbean after Emancipation and continued to the present in different configurations. Caribbean migration is, therefore, an institution, a rite of passage, a tradition rooted in a land made up of displaced people. The aftermath of the post-war migration from the British Caribbean was the dispersal of the Caribbean people throughout Europe and North America. The Caribbean ‘nation’ thus transcends its Caribbean boundaries, encroaching into a number of nation-states - England, US, Canada. The Caribbean abroad forms a multi-centred diaspora network,

Despite its presence in Western metropolises for several decades, the Caribbean diaspora has only recently attracted the attention of researchers. The growing popularity of this analytical field in the late 1980s and in the 1990s is reflected in the publication of sociological studies such as *Inside Babylon: the Caribbean Diaspora in Britain* (James and Harris, 1993), *Caribbean Life in New York City* (Sutton and Chaney, 1987), *Caribbean New York* (Kasinitz, 1992), or *The Caribbean Diaspora in Toronto* (Henry, 1994). It is also the subject matter of studies that show a comparative approach to the different branches of the Caribbean diaspora, such as the essays in *Caribbean Migration. Globalized Identities* (Chamberlein, 1988), or Bénédicte Ledent’s piece “New World Nomadism: Exile and the Caribbean Architecture of Cultures” (1993).

Given its multi-centered nature, the Caribbean diaspora has taken on specific characteristics depending on the host society it is inscribed in. The countries to which Caribbeans migrated in the post-war period have different histories, racial backgrounds, and of course different approaches to migration. Thus, Caribbean migration to England in the 1950s must be seen in the context of a colonial relation. Black British citizens
migrated to the mother country with a whole set of expectations and assumptions about England made on the grounds of a colonial education. Their filial expectations were soon shattered because what they encountered was a relatively homogenous society unprepared to accommodate its black subjects, and reluctant to grant them occupational mobility or educational opportunities. The Caribbean colonial’s encounter with England in the 1950s is best described by Cohen as a ‘psychic shock of rejection’ (1997: 140). In the United States the situation was rather different. Unlike England, the US is a multi-ethnic settler society with a long tradition of migration. When Caribbeans settled there in the 1920s and later on in the 1960s, they were incorporated into the country’s large African-American population, so that they were not a very ‘visible’ minority. This is not to say that they did not encounter discrimination, but it is often remarked that it is in US that allowed Caribbeans to achieve the highest degree of success, being even nicknamed ‘Jewmaicans’ (Cohen 1997: 140). Besides, in the US there was a tradition of Caribbean involvement in black culture and politics -Blyden, Garvey.

Being its youngest offspring, Canada is somehow a neglected branch of the Caribbean diaspora. A settler multiethnic society, Canada shares some of the features of the US, but has
its own idiosyncrasies. Until the arrival of Afro-Caribbeans in the 1970s, Canada’s black population was rather small, and its migration policies were known for its North European bias. Racial discrimination remained ingrained in Canadian society despite the adoption of multiculturalism as a federal policy in 1971 and the passing of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act in 1988. Furthermore, Canada did not live up to the expectations Caribbean immigrants had from a fellow colonial, a fellow Commonwealth member also struggling in a postcolonial fashion to define its national identity against European and American influences. Caribbeans found a country that was forgetful about its immigrant origins and which had taken on the role of colonizer.

3. The Literary Imagination in the Caribbean Diaspora

As I have suggested earlier, first used by political scientists, sociologists and ethnographers, the term diaspora allows literary critics to map and apprehend the multi-centred literary production of black writers of Caribbean descent in Western Metropolises.

In an oft-quoted sentence, Benedict Anderson claims that ‘communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined’ (1991: 6). Other social scientists have in fact stressed the important
role of the imagination and of cultural artifacts in ‘holding together’ or ‘re-creating’ a diaspora (Cohen 1997: 26). The different strands of the Caribbean diaspora have been recreated through the minds of a number of Caribbean novelists from their metropolitan destinations, where they have settled in search of education, publishers and an international audience. These novelists are themselves part of the diasporas they imagine. Their imaginative renderings of the Caribbean diaspora precede the narratives of the social scientists that in the late 1980s and in the 1990s set out to theorize this phenomenon. In fact, social scientists often draw upon their texts in order to illustrate their arguments on the vitality of diasporan communities in a more vigorous way. In his Caribbean Life in New York City, for instance, Sutton and Chaney bring out Paule Marshall’s novel Brown Girl, Brownstones (1959) to illustrate early Caribbean migration to New York (1987: 24); likewise, Walker refers to Austin Clarke’s Toronto novels in his book The West Indians in Canada (1984: 10). All aspects of the Caribbean diaspora examined here are indeed best rendered in imaginative writing. The literary imagination not only focuses on the human dimension of the Caribbean subject, but interlaces the host of historical, economic, psychological and cultural elements associated with the Caribbean diaspora.
experience more accurately than any intellectual conceptualization can do.

The approach to Caribbean literature that I suggest in this essay and elsewhere (López 2001) is in the spirit of recent works such as Frank Birbalsingh’s *Frontiers of Caribbean Literature in English* (1996), Stefano Harney’s *Nationalism and Identity: Culture and the Imagination in a Caribbean Diaspora* (1996), and Louis James’s *Caribbean Literature in English* (1999). All these three works approach Caribbean literature as a global phenomenon transcending the boundaries of the Caribbean region and assert that this literature cannot be discussed without including the works produced in the diaspora. Besides, they acknowledge the diversity of locations within the diaspora. Birbalsingh, for instance, starts his introduction alluding to the lecturing activities of one the Caribbean’s most active diasporic intellectuals and novelists:

In a lecture given at York University in Toronto, in 1986, George Lamming addressed an audience consisting mainly of immigrants from the Caribbean. When he described his audience as an external frontier of the Caribbean, Lamming appeared to reverse a traditional world view in which European rulers regarded their colonial possessions as outposts in the periphery of their world ... In reversing this global structure, ... Lamming was claiming that London, Paris, New York and Toronto had, in a certain sense, now
themselves become outposts of the frontier of other cultures, one of which had its center in the Caribbean (1996: ix).

These works indeed signal a shift in the study of Caribbean literature, as we can notice if we look at more traditional approaches such as that of Bruce King. His *West Indian Literature* (1995) adopts a diachronic perspective, surveying the development of Caribbean literature since its beginnings until the present. The most recent work of Harney and others provides a better insight into the diversity of the diaspora, but this is not the main point of their analyses.

The diaspora approach to Caribbean literature must be sensitive to the distinctiveness of each branch of the diaspora tree. The experiences in the different strands of the Caribbean diaspora all share the themes inherent to the condition of displacement: uprootedness, loneliness, hope, survival, or cultural preservation. Yet, at the same time, they display distinctive features. Whereas the landmark of the Caribbean North American -including Canada- experience is the development of an excessive acquisitive ethic at the cost of human values, the distinctiveness of the Caribbean experience in Britain lies in the immigrants’ attraction to and rejection by the mother country.
The London novels of Samuel Selvon - *The Lonely Londoners* (1956), *Moses Ascending* (1975)- and Caryl Phillips-*The Final Passage* (1985)- masterfully exhibit the shattering of expectations of the colonial in mythic England, and England’s own identity crisis at having the overseas empire coming home. This fiction debunks the myth of England as mother country fostered by colonialism. Contrarily, in their novels and short fiction, Paula Marshall -US-based-, Austin Clarke and Dionne Brand -Canada-based- harshly criticize the immigrants’ over-emphasis on material values induced by the acquisitive nature of North American society. Though they perceive their North American hostland as a land of promise, their encounter with it is “less emotionally loaded” (Ledent, 1993: 141) than the Caribbean encounter with Britain. What makes the Canadian experience different from the American is the fact that Canadian society does not look up to the expectations Caribbean immigrants may have from a country member of the Commonwealth with explicit multicultural policies. Austin Clarke - *The Meeting Point* (1967), *The Bigger Light* (1975)-and Dionne Brand’s -*Sans Souci and other Stories* (1988)-fiction suggests that the reception Caribbean immigrants experienced in Canada is very similar to that given in Britain. A central point of their agenda is to underlie Canada’s enduring links with its former mother country and its adoption of the role of the
colonizer. Paule Marshall’s immigrants are, in turn, relatively at ease within American society. The African-American contingent allows them to both enjoy certain degree of invisibility and to assert their own distinctiveness as Afro-Caribbeans in black America. Thus, Brown Girl, Brownstones, illustrates the formation of a vibrant Barbadian community in the heart of New York, and Daughters (1991), with its emphasis on transnationalism, is an emblematic example of the immigrants’ ability to maintain a strong diasporic consciousness.

In this paper I have charted the origin and evolution of the concept diaspora, highlighting its usefulness in the mapping of literatures written beyond the confines of an original host-land. Taking Afro-Caribbean literature as a starting point, I have attempted to encourage literary critics to appraise the potential of the comparative diaspora approach to analyse the complexity of ‘national’ literatures written from different locations.
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