THE DETERRITORIALIZATION OF HOME AND IDENTITY IN BRIAN CHIKWAVA'S *HARARE NORTH* AND CHRIS CLEAVE'S *THE OTHER HAND*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

İSMAİL KAYGISIZ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

AUGUST 2020

Approval of the thesis:

THE DETERRITORIALIZATION OF HOME AND IDENTITY IN BRIAN CHIKWAVA'S *HARARE NORTH* AND CHRIS CLEAVE'S *THE OTHER HAND*

submitted by **İSMAİL KAYGISIZ** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Master of Arts in English Literature, the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences   _____

Prof. Dr. Çiğdem Sağın ŞİMŞEK
Head of Department
Foreign Language Education

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak-AVCI
Supervisor
Foreign Language Education   _____

Examining Committee Members:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hülya Yıldız-BAĞÇE (Head of the Examining Committee)
Middle East Technical University
Foreign Language Education   _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak-AVCI (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Foreign Language Education   _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa KIRCA
Çankaya University
Translation and Interpreting Studies   _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: İsmail KAYGISIZ

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE DETERRITORIALIZATION OF HOME AND IDENTITY IN BRIAN CHIKWAVA'S *HARARE NORTH* AND CHRIS CLEAVE'S *THE OTHER HAND*

KAYGISIZ, İsmail

M.A., The Department of English Literature

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak-AVCI

August 2020, ; 2 pages

The issue of migrancy has been spotlighted in the millenial London novel, in which there are many different approaches to issues of multiculturalism, both affirmative and pessimistic, Britishness and otherness. Moreover, these issues entail a questioning of the notion of identity and home that are exposed to transformation in the course of migration. The in-betweenness in the sense of identity and home can best be explained through the concept of deterritorialization. The aim of this thesis is to analyze comparatively the deterritorialization of home and identity in Brian Chikwava's *Harare North* and Chris Cleave's *The Other Hand* in the light of Deleuze and Guattari's and Arjun Appadurai's conceptualizations of the term from within the context of migrancy, specifically refugeehood and irregular migration. In the former work, the narrator, a fanatical Mugabe supporter from Zimbabwe, undergoes a self-destructive deterritorialization, losing all he has and thinks as to his identity and home, whereas in the latter, one of the two narrators, Little Bee as a Nigerian teenage refugee girl reflects on globalisation and consciously creates a new identity free from essentialist perceptions.

Keywords: deterritorialization, refugees, identity, home, globalization.

ÖZ

BRIAN CHIKWAVA'NIN *HARARE NORTH* VE CHRIS CLEAVE'İN *THE OTHER HAND* ROMANLARINDA EV VE KİMLİĞİN YERSİZYURTSUZLAŞMASI

KAYGISIZ, İsmail

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak-AVCI

Ağustos 2020, ; 2 sayfa

Göç çokkültürlülük, İngilizlik ve ötekilik konularına birçok farklı yaklaşımın olduğu 2000 sonrası Londra romanında sıkça işlenmiştir. Bu konular beraberinde göç esnasında dönüşüme tabi tutulan kimlik ve ev kavramlarının da sorgulanmasını gerektirmiştir. Kimlik ve ev açısından bu arada kalmışlık yersizyurtsuzlaşma/topraksızlaşma mefhumuyla açıklanabilir. Bu tez Brian Chikwava'nın *Harare North* ve Chris Cleave'in *The Other Hand* romanlarını Deleuze ve Guattari'nin ve Arjun Appadurai'nin göçmenlik, özellikle mültecilik ve düzensiz göçmenlik bağlamında, yersizyurtsuzlaşma/topraksızlama kavramları ışığında mukayeseli olarak tahlil etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. İlk romanda fanatik bir Mugabe taraftarı olan isimsiz anlatıcı, kimliğine ve evine dair sahip olduğu ve düşündüğü her şeyi yitirerek öz-yıkımcı bir yersizyurtsuzlaşma/topraksızlaşma deneyimlerken, ikinci romandaki iki anlatıcıdan biri olan Little Bee küreselleşme mefhumu üzerine düşünür ve bilinçli bir şekilde özcü alımlamalardan azade yeni bir kimlik ve ev duygusu yaratır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: yersizyurtsuzlaşma/topraksızlaşma, mülteciler, kimlik, ev, küreselleşme.

To all the deterritorialized, both human and nonhuman…

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The novel of the new millenum by Britain-based writers deal frequently with issues of migration and identity. Salman Rushdie, Caryl Phillips, Monica Ali, Timothy Mo, Zadie Smith, Hanif Kureishi, Mohsin Hamid, Andrea Levy and Gautam Malkani are some well-known names who scrutinize the issues of identity and home regarding migration. This thesis focuses on the work of some relatively less-known novelists, Brian Chikwava's debut novel *Harare North* (2004) and Chris Cleave's *The Other Hand* (2008). The main motive for this comparative analysis is that both novels explore the issue of migration and the transformation of the characters' sense of identity and home, which will be discussed in terms of the notion of deterritorialization. The narrators in the novels come from different countries and they differ in their motives to migrate as well as their gender position. While the unnamed narrator of *Harare North,* when in Britain, resists change in his identity and sense of home as a former member of the youth militia Green Bombers having a strong affinity with Mugabe, one of the two narrators of *The Other Hand*, Little Bee's sense of belonging, identity and home is always in the making. Therefore, deterritorialization works differently in each case.

Michael John Perfect gives a concise account of the millenial London novel in his *Contemporary Fictions of Multiculturalism: Diversity and the Millenial London Novel.*Perfect's chapter titled "London as a Safe Haven? Asylum, Immigration and Missing Fingers in Chris Cleave's *The Other Hand* (2008) and Brian Chikwava's *Harare North* (2009)" is the most detailed literary analysis of these two novels. Perfect compares the novels by focusing on the employment of certain metaphors. He argues that although both novels are "in some ways, very different works," they employ the "image of a missing finger as a representation of loss" (Perfect 157). The importance of missing fingers, he argues, is that the exclusion of others from the society is to show

us the lack of understanding, and the common approach to "the plight of others" (179) so that the reader can defamiliarize themselves from the point they stand and see through the discriminatory structures. After exploring the historical and political background contexts of the British asylum politics, immigration and multiethnic London, Perfect presents an overview of how the British asylum and immigration system affect the newcomers as well as multiculturalism in Britain. Moreover, he highlights the issue of loss in migration through the metaphors of missing fingers and pound coins in detail, with references to the traumatic consequences.

In this thesis, the main argument has been shaped in the light of Deleuze and Guattari's and Arjun Appadurai's conceptualizations of deterritorialization. They define it as transcending the fixed, stable, epistemologically-accepted norms. Deterritorialization is the decentralization of the power and totality of the Oedipus. Yet, their accentuation of collectivities is important since deterritorialization as a revolutionary action requires conscious and mass movements. The notion of deterritorialization has attracted attention in migrant literature and sociology of migration, as seen in the works of Arjun Appadurai and Caren Kaplan. The term, thus, can be applied in the migrant context because the act of migrating may push one to the margins of the host society even though they are in the centre in their country of origin. In the margin or in the marginalized diaspora, one can be expected see through the power structures, identity politics, cultural politics and be exposed to transformation of identity and sense of home, consequently. According to Appadurai, deterritorialization refers to the transformation of identity, sometimes as a radical break from the concept of a fixed identity, resonating with Deleuze and Guattari's conceptualization of deterritorialization. The transformation is a result of globalization, and in the global context, he works on diasporas and how diasporic people imagine and reimagine new pasts, new homes. He deals with the issue of deterritorialization through his –scapes, ethnoscape, financescape, ideoscape, mediascape, technoscape, with the help of which he comes to analyze deterritorialization as regards migrants.

Migration has now become a global issue. Yet, a great body of literature on it has always been present. The Book of Exodus from *The Old Testament,* many WW2 movies, *Eternity and A Day* and *The Suspended Step of the Stork* by Theo

Angelopoulos, Michael Haneke's *Happy End*, Sylvain Estibal's *When Pigs Have Wings* are some well-known examples of narratives about migrancy. And almost all examples on this topic reveal that hopes, fears, expectations, disillusionments, frustrations of migrants are in every corner of the world. The cut in the migrant's life, and the disengagement from their no-more-homes are perhaps best summarized in Derek Walcott's mourning in "Laventille":

> We left
> somewhere a life we never found,
> customs and gods that are not born again.

During the act of leaving, migrants are hopeful, of surviving, finding and founding a better life. They are deterritorialized and look for ways to find a new territory. However, what follows departure is usually the disappointment of deterritorialization and the feeling of no going back to one's previous life. They are not the same people as they were. They can only be reterritorialized; or they become nomads. And the past is only a failed memory of "a life [they never found]" and "customs and gods that are not born again."

Moreover, some migrants, who are identified as "refugees,"[1] face further difficulties such as a division of places from the general population that restrains one from participating in everyday life easily and makes them internalize being the other, thus keeping them at a certain distance.[2] At present, millions of people are going through similar phases in their lives. For many scholars, this flow results from globalization and the "disintegration" of the nation state. Zygmunt Bauman explains the issue of globalization as follows: "Globalization means that the state no longer has

---

[1] The UK has been a party of the 1951 Convention under the protection of the 1967 Bellagio Protocol which defines a refugee as

> any person who: owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his [sic] nationality and is unable to or, owing to such a fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it (Bloch 7).

According to that definition of the term, a refugee is a person who is under a constant fear of persecution due to their race, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, and so on.

[2] Hanna Arendt in her influential "We Refugees" defines the condition of refugees, drawing on her own experiences as a refugee in France. According to her, "In daylight, of course, [they] become only 'technically' enemy aliens all refugees know this. But when technical reasons prevented you from leaving your home during the dark hours, it certainly was not easy to avoid some dark speculations about the relation between technicality and reality" (Arendt 266).

the clout or the wish to keep its marriage with the nation rock-solid and impregnable" (28). The rock of the nation state in the international arena is broken and the impregnable is penetrated into, by means of millions changing their locations to metropolis.

Migration has been an issue not only for the migrant or refugee but also the members of the host country. Specifically in the case of Britain, for instance, even in the beginnings of the mass migration from colonies to the centre of the empire, there was a propaganda against the "black immigrants" that they came to rob the white British people of their jobs. Nevertheless, it was the case that "housing shortages, inadequate social services, high levels of unemployment and poor educational facilities were common features of these areas long before the arrival of the 'immigrants'" and the jobs they took up were not wanted by the white workers (Brah 22). Still, the black immigrants were accused of lowering the life standards of the population due to their "cheap labour."

This, in response, has been a challenge to globalization, giving rise to the discriminatory discourse, hate speech, attacks on the "underclass"[3]. Likewise, in the 50s and 60s, the British government was pressured to "restrict black immigration" (Brah 23). In opposition to that, there has been resistance too as pointed out by Stephen Castles in *The Age of Migration*:

> Globalization has challenged the sovereignty of national governments from above and below. The growth of transnational society has given rise to novel challenges and has blurred formerly distinctive spheres of decision making. Trends are contradictory (see Castles, 2004b): on the one hand, politicians cling to national sovereignty, with such slogans as 'British jobs for British workers'. On the other hand the complexity and fragmentation of power and authority that have resulted from globalization typically require governments (whether national, regional or local) to cooperate with other organizations and institutions, both public and private, foreign and domestic. (Castles et al. 17)

As is highlighted by Castles, globalization or the network of corporations, international institutions and compulsory coordination of countries with one another, or in Hardt and Negri's idiom, Empire have led to transformation of the international community in that parties of it have come to negotiate over one another's peoples and take actions

---

[3] The term "underclass" refers to people who cannot even find a job and are also marginalized by lower classes. They are also classified as the "precariat." See Guy Standing's *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*.

in harmony. It has opened the way for new territorialities and augmented reterritorializations. However, the hatred against the newcomers has become one tool for politicians all over the world and it can be seen in the far right parties in Europeand the US, which call for the action of sending the migrants and refugees back. Anti-migrant laws too keep newcomers away, and even if they are on the brink of death, they are denied the entrance to the metropoles of the Empire. Moreover, in Britain, the 1971 Immigration Act[4] was restrictively against the presence of the black immigrants who were seen as "problems" for they did not fit the "superior" western standards (Brah 27). Those who did not reterritorialize according to what was shown as the focal territory of the UK were either deported or made illegal, criminalized and marginalized.

Still, they do not stop the movements of illegal immigrants who flee their country due to a social conflict, war or famine in order to live on. Besides, asylum, refugeehood and illegal immigration have recently been the subject matter for many target countries. According to Koser, "the movement of asylum-seekers[5] and refugees and irregular migrants has also become increasingly significant across the industrialized world in the last 20 years or so" (Koser 4). That is why it is not possible to count the numbers of the people having to leave their countries for one or another reason and being denied the visa and taking the "illegal" path to live on. Being "illegal" or in Koser's words, "irregular"[6] almost all the time makes integration[7] impossible for them, keeping them suspended in the line of flight as if nomads. They could only seem to integrate into the oedipal-territorial, which is the hegemonic network of ideology,

---

[4] The whole act can be seen in the link: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1971/77/contents

[5] An asylum seeker is one who seeks asylum and applies to the Home Office with the same motives and reasons as those of refugees (Bloch 9). Most of "forced immigrants" who arrive in Britain fit the definition of the "spontaneous" and thus "receive no formal and coordinated assistance" (ibid.).

[6] "Irregular migration includes people who enter a country without the proper authority, for example, by entering without passing through a border control or entering with fraudulent documents. It also includes people who may have entered a country perfectly legally, but then remain there in contravention of their authority, for example, by staying after the expiry of a visa or work permit, through sham marriages or fake adoptions, as bogus students or fraudulently self-employed. The term also includes people moved by migrant smugglers or human traffickers, and those who deliberately abuse the asylum system" (Koser 55-56). Here it is important to take note of the fact that there are other names given to irregular migrants such as "illegal," "undocumented," "unauthorized," and "*sans papier*" migrants.

[7] According to Koser, integration is "the process by which immigrants become accepted into society, both as individuals and groups" (25).

social and professional life by acting like the white Londoners, e.g., Sikh men being able to find a job only if they did not wear their turbans, exposing the fact that as long as they act in accord with the "superior" culture they are accepted, just by being seen to have reterritorialized.

As for identity, it is the encounter with the other through dialogue and it can be deduced that identity is derived from the social and it is identity only when in relation to others. Therefore, it is socially constructed. It is evolutionary and a never-ending process as long as we live. It is both a signifier and signified in a free-floating world of signification. It is the best means of territoriality - territorialization and deterritorialization -at the same time in that it is always in flux. Homi K. Bhabha similarly in his "Foreword to the 1986 Edition" of Frantz Fanon's *Black Skin White Masks* marks it as follows:

> For identification, identity is never an *a priori*, nor a finished product; it is only ever the problematic process of access to an "image" of totality. The discursive conditions of this psychic image of identification will be clarified if we think of the perilous perspective of the concept of the image itself   (Bhabha xxix-xxx).

Drawing on his definition of identity, we can claim that the concept of the image is the imagined identity, dependent upon the whole or the total. Unlike the common primordialist or essentialist belief that people in a specific territory make up a homogenous whole, identity too is, as pointed out by Bhabha above, heterogenous phenomenon that is always "becoming." It is created over time, and always changes. Identity is therefore a nomadic concept.

In the first analytical chapter of this study, deterritorialization of identity and home of the unnamed narrator in *Harare North* (2004) will be explored. In the novel, the Zimbabwean narrator comes to the UK, asking for asylum, which is not granted. He, as a strong supporter of Mugabe, criticizes the diaspora as "lapsed" and tries not to change so that he can remain an "original native." Yet, his resistance to change makes him more and more dogmatic, and finally, his in-betweenness leads to his self-destruction as deterritorialization.

In the second analytical chapter, the issue will be explored in *The Other Hand*, published as *Little Bee* in the USA. Despite the fact that there are two narrators, the chapter focuses mainly on the Nigerian refugee girl calling herself Little Bee. By

6

naming herself on her own, she creates a new identity in her transnational movement. Her sense of identity and home is deterritorialized, and she, too, remains in-between, until the end of the story when she restores her identity and home, and goes beyond the structural nation-state and in-betweenness.

CHAPTER 2

A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Arjun Appadurai defines deterritorialization in general terms as "one of the central forces of the modern world because it brings laboring populations in to the lower-class sectors and spaces of relatively wealthy societies" (Appadurai 37). It indicates the ever-changing potential of deterritorialization prompted by labor market and globalization in the contemporary society, where "money, commodities, and persons are involved in ceaselessly chasing each other around the world" (38). Globalization in that sense drives people, especially those from the former colonies, to move to the center of the Empire from the periphery bringing in culture clash amongst the residents in the centre. As for the international migrant, it is a rupture in the moment of leaving one place, and in the connection with the past time and the past home. They, therefore, move to and fro in the new place, sometimes trying to fit in, sometimes trying to preserve their past. They are deterritorialized; some reterritorialize whereas others get lost, permanently, in search for a territory but end up with despair. It is then hypothetical that globalization spotlights the issue of deterritorialization in the migrant context, though both concepts may from time to time be used interchangeably. Since this thesis focuses on deterritorialization and migration in the British novel in the 2000s, this chapter will explore the concept of deterritorialization. The concept's components in this very case are space and migration as the plane of immanence, identity and home, sometimes their transformation over time. These make up the concept of deterritorialization,

Deterritorialization has many different, varying components. In this thesis, the locus is the plane of migration compartmentalized into home, identity and the past. Though it is unambiguous that there are chromatisms in the definitions of

deterritorialization which will be recuperated on the plane of migrancy, it is an exigency to get an overall encapsulation of the concept first, and, second to construe what deterritorialization is in the migrant context.

According to Deleuze and Guattari, deterritorialization is the destruction of the Oedipus, the hegemonic and ideological superstructure. They postulate that the oedipal super-ego is the cause of people being oedipalized, i.e., those who are, as subjects, unconsciously based on a territory, the state, family, etc., which are called the "Oedipal and oedipalized territorialities" (Seem xvii). According to Deleuze and Guattari, one should avoid such spaces, oppression and ideological/oedipal yoke. They, moreover, look for ways to break free from the Oedipus which operates through stability and territorializations, repressing the subject to the point of lacking multiplicities and living on a linear line that is constructed to keep him/her territorialized. They seek to figure out new ways to get out of such an ideological sense of the territory. Only by escaping or fleeing can one free oneself from the subjugation of the territory, not only in terms of physical space but the epistemological one as well. However, it is important to note that territory is not the exact opposite of deterritorialization. They take territory as deterritorialization's "transformative vector," (Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* 327), i.e., territory can be a plane of change but it is not a transcendent approach; the change or a potential of change is immanent in a certain territory. Deterritorialization is therefore a rupture in time and space.

Deterritorialization is disillusionment. According to Deleuze and Guattari, humanities and social sciences keep people from perceiving the "reality of power" so that they can perform the necessary act of domesticating and create "docile and obedient subjects" for the Oedipal (Seem xx). In a similar vein, this kind of act is colonization of the mind and prompts people to mimic what they are shown, which makes the Oedipal as the vantage point of subject-fabrication. It binds people in and to their determined territories. Therefore, it can be purported that Oedipus is the territory itself, and every kind of oedipalization or territoriality, an agency of the state, paranoia, power inflicts 'neurosis' on individuals: "Everybody has been oedipalized and neuroticized at home, at school, at work. Everybody wants to be a fascist" (xx). Territorialization is then codification; territory is a set of codes; Oedipus is ideology.

Through the oedipal territorial codification, Oedipus creates subjects creating a whole, a totality.

Deterritorialization is the destruction of totality. Deleuze and Guattari, in response to the oedipal politics, challenge it within a revolutionary framework and through Anti-Oedipus that seeks to dismantle believes and the agencies of power:

> Such a politics dissolves the mystifications of power through the kindling, on   levels, of anti-oedipal forces –the schizzes-flows— forces that escape coding, scramble the codes, and free in all directions: *orphans* (no daddy-mommy-me), *atheists* (no beliefs), and *nomads* (no habits, no territories) (xxi)

It is anti-oedipal to shake off all that is territorialized, ideological, to break off the normal and the territory where all the relationships between subjects are based on discrimination and segregation and conglomeration. In accordance with Seem's summary of *Anti-Oedipus*, it can be suggested that the "schizzes flows" are most evident in the cases of orphans, atheists and nomads whose desires are out of the coding territory of the Family, the Church and the State. Hence, schizzes-flows are the deterritorializing flows that attack the territorial. Similarly, Michel Foucault in his preface to *Anti-Oedipus* warns the reader against "[withdrawing] allegiance from the old categories of the Negative (law, limit, castration, lack, lacuna)" and suggests to the reader to "prefer what is positive and multiple, difference over uniformity, flows over unities, mobile arrangements over systems" (Foucault xiii). He in this warning and piece of advice infers that the territory makes a subject out of an individual who otherwise would be deterritorialized.

Deterritorialization is "becoming" (*devenir*):

> 1) unlimited and unending, as it has no true point of origin or destination (the world is always in 'flux'), and 2) insofar as the past is itself considered *infinite*, the present counter-intuitively always occurs as the 'return' of recognizable and even foreseeable forms, but is irreducible to such forms precisely because becoming can never be 'given': it is, as Deleuze shows, always in between the past and future since 'it moves in both directions at once' and 'always eludes the present' (Young et al, 40)

In Young's entry on "becoming" in *The Deleuze and Guattari Dictionary*, it is accentuated that becoming is omnipresent in that it has no origin and no stop in time and space, and while it is the past in question, the present acts according to the past

though it does not mean it is completely causal (because it would lead one to perceive the present as a direct result of the past, which makes it predetermined). This lack of predetermination in time makes one oscillate between the past and the future. This oscillation consequently results in the forever-transformation of the present. Deterritorialization as becoming unroots the present, beams one to the past and the future, both of which are ever in a continuous process of metamorphosis. Therefore, becoming is not the end product or an outcome of an action; rather, it is the process itself. Deterritorialization is a continually becoming process. It "is the pure movement evident in changes *between* particular events" and "the very dynamism of change, situated between heterogeneous terms and tending towards no particular goal or end-state" (Stagoll 26). Thus, becoming is not a spot in a continuum but it is the continuum itself. And this continuum itself has neither a beginning nor an end.

Deterritorialization stems from assemblages of segmentarity and accentuates segmentarity: "We are segmented from all around and in every direction. The human being is a segmentary animal. Segmentarity is inherent to all the strata composing us" (Deleuze and Guattari 208). According to Deleuze and Guattari, segments compose an assemblage, and in a sense an assemblage is composed of different lines of segmentation, comprising the horizontal, the vertical and the circular. Every assemblage is "a constellation of heterogeneous elements" and these are territorial as they "[sustain] connections that define it," the connections Deleuze and Guattari refer to as "lines" (Thornton 11, Lorraine 147). And each assemblage is made up of lines of deterritorialization which "run through it and carry it away from its current form" (Lorraine 147). Accordingly, different kinds of segmentarities lead to different assemblages, and it is clear that they are correlated and can be changed, disrupted, deconstructed. As pointed out earlier, deterritorialization occurs in accordance with the territorial and territorialization. In the examples given in the passage above how de-territorialization can turn into a sort of re-territorialization can be seen. And, again, it is necessary to emphasize the fact that the case of the Roman Empire shows the reader what rigid segmentarity is: a specific territory where everything is listed and compartmentalized following the Oedipus. The molecular works in deterritorializations though it is in-between to cause the segmentarity to go to a rigid state as in the case of "the migrant barbarians" who have no specific consitutionalized

11

- institutionalized - oedipalized territory. On the other hand, the line of flight functions as an everlasting hinge that abrogates borders. The distinction between the molecular segmentation and the line of flight is that the former keeps the door open to reterritorializations, which can be called as relative deterritorialization, while the latter is in a spectrum of absolute deterritorialization that leaves no or little space for reterritorializations.

Deterritorialization is an operation that transforms. If taken as a line of flight, it actually shows the transformative power of an assemblage. As long as it is on the move, the assemblage of deterritorialization is always in the process of becoming and anti-oedipalization. Therefore, "to deterritorialise is to free up the fixed relations that contain a body all the while exposing it to new organisations," concludes Adrian Parr (69). It is in that sense a disfiguration of the socius[8]. It is intrinsically a turbulence.

Put succinctly, deterritorialization is the decentralization of the power and totality of the Oedipus; it is to become anti-oedipal and shatter the blinding binoculars; it is an everlasting metamorphosis, cutting the ties from a root; it is segmentary, made up of assemblages and lines; it is the spectrum of change and becoming itself. It is leaving a unitary place, a unitary identity by being on the pace, on the move.

From the 1990's on, new technological developments and the flows of people at an unprecedented degree have come to problematize the relations of the migrants and deterritorialized masses and communities and masses with their "homelands" and how they now conceive these relationships. Life in the new millennium is "shaped by the two important disjunctive elements: Globalization and the search for an identity[9]" (Abadan-Unat 299). Thanks to the developments in communication, the contemporary society has come to the attention of many scholars, e.g., Manuel Castells who calls that society as the "network society" (qtd in Abadan-Unat 299), in which people

---

[8] In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari defines the "socius" as follows: "If we wish to have some idea of the forces that the body without organs exerts later on in the uninterrupted process, we must first establish a parallel between desiring-production and social production. We intend such a parallel to be regarded as merely phenomenological: we are here drawing no conclusions whatsoever as to the nature and the relationship of the two productions, nor does the parallel we are about to establish provide any sort of a priori answer to the question whether desiring-production and social production are really two separate and distinct productions. Its one purpose is to point out the fact that the forms of social production, like those of desiring-production, involve an unengendered nonproductive attitude, an element of antiproduction coupled with the process, a full body that functions as a socius. This socius may be the body of the earth, that of the tyrant, or capital" (Deleuze and Guattari 10)

[9] "Günümüz dünyasında yaşamımız birbiriyle çelişen iki önemli etken tarafından şekillendirilmektedir: Küreselleşme ve Kimlik arayışı" (Abadan-Unat 299). My translation.

interact through networks that include cyperspace as well. Moreover, this age of migration along with these networks has also become an age of deterritorialization in because the former perceptions of time and space have changed and the boundaries of states, especially those of nation-states, have come to be questioned, which makes them lose ground as borders are blurred. In this atmosphere, the deterritorialized people make up the network society and they too problematize their relationship with the notions of home and identity in that they, as in the conceptualization of Deleuze and Guattari, distance themselves from the oedipal boundaries they previously received as the norm. Arjun Appadurai applies the concept to the deterritorialized migrants in the context of globalization which helps scrutinize and analyze the notions of home and identity and how these notions are deterritorialized.

Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson ask the questions "What does it mean, at the end of the twentieth century, to speak ... of a 'native land'? What processes rather than essences are involved in present experiences of cultural identity?", drawing on James Clifford's approach to the changing patterns of mobility and global cultural economy (Gupta and Ferguson 37). Accordingly, no one or nothing "stays put" and mobility entails a sense of loss in terms of territoriality of origin. Clearly, formerly accepted and previously normative differentiation of cultures that were seen directly related to space as homogenous has changed; thus, the idea that a specific culture is only a product of a certain place has come not to make sense any more. Both the collective and the individual are deterritorialized. It is not far-fetched to claim then that the extended present, in Appardurai's words, is the age of deterritorialization.

As aforementioned, Arjun Appadurai undertakes the issue of deterritorialization in the context of globalization. In his work, he first distinguishes the extended present from the past. He puts forward that "the past is now not a land to return to in a simple politics of memory" while one can elaborate on an extended present by an imaginary past (Appadurai 30). He implies that the deterritorialized global subject cannot bring back the past through memory as there is now a different phase in history that cannot be related to remembering. Accordingly, the sense of time and the approach towards the past have been deterritorialized as well. That is why he brings up the issue of Frederic Jameson's "nostalgia for the present," i.e., lamenting the loss of a world that never was (30). That refers to deterritorialization in time and

space. With that said, in the global context, due to such deterritorialization free-floating times become an issue that is related to "larger global forces" that have shown that "the past is usually another country" (30). A group of people embrace another's culture (as in Appadurai's exemplification of Filipinos taking on the American culture as part of their own) and the dislocation of time and culture is explained to the American readership as follows:

> If your present is their future (as in much modernization theory and in many self-satisfied tourist fantasies), and their future is your past (as in the case of the Filipino virtuosos of American popular music), then your own past can be made to appear as simply a normalized modality of your present. (30)

That Filipinos sigh over an American song which they in fact historically and experientially have no association with, accordingly, indicates that cultural identification acts according to the global now. Not relying merely on memory is also part of that project; instead, we resort to imagination.

Appadurai purports that "the imagination is now central to all forms of agency, is itself a social fact, and is the key component of the new global order" (31). Therefore, imagination is the key feature of globalization of the contemporary deterritorialized present. He explains the significance of imagination as follows:

> [T]hese [the image, the imagined, the imaginary] are all terms that direct us to something critical and new in global cultural processes [. . .] as a social practice. No longer mere fantasy (opium for the masses whose real work is elsewhere), no longer simple escape (from a world defined principally by more concrete purposes and structures), no longer elite pastime (thus not relevant to the lives of ordinary people), no longer mere contemplation (irrelevant for new forms of desire and subjectivity), the imagination has become an organized field of social practices, a form of work (in the sense of both labor and culturally organized practice), and a form of negotiation between sites of agency (individuals) and globally defined fields of possibility (31)

The change in the emphasis on imagination becoming social and cultural practices can be found in many works such as Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* and Salman Rushdie's *Imaginary Homelands*. What the stress here on imagination reveals is that it is not to fantasize, to escape or make a shelter against the outside or the foreign; it is not exclusive or merely individual. It directs the social, shapes it, thus replacing all former conceptions of imagination. Moreover, it is shaped by the global.

14

It is not incorrect to propound that imagination has a reciprocal relationship with the global, and in addition to the former statement, imagination shapes the global. Yet, this reciprocity in the deterritorialized global scene is not dualistic. The new global context is to be regarded as a "complex, overlapping, disjunctive order that cannot any longer be understood in terms of existing center-periphery models (even those that might account for multiple centres and peripheries)" (32). It means that the imagination and the global are not on an end-to-end spectrum; in fact, it is not a single spectrum but a web of disjunctive and intersecting networks and encounters.

Appadurai studies the aforementioned disjunctures through flows of global cultural economy in a world where "everyone is in and out of place," (Appadurai), deterritorialized as populations (and collectivities) out of place. He conceptualizes the flows of the deterritorialized global as "ethnoscapes," "mediascapes," "technoscapes," "ideoscapes" and "financescapes," with -scapes referring to "fluid, irregular shapes of these landscapes" (Appadurai 33). Furthermore, the reference to landscapes suggests that these landscapes are shaped by perceptions, seen and construed differently and constructed by "historical, linguistic, and political situatedness of different sorts of actors," which are, in this context, "nation states, multinationals, diasporic communities, as well as subnational groupings and movements [. . .] and even intimate face-to-face groups, such as villages, neighborhoods, and families" (33). With the help of these -scapes does Appadurai explain the culturally and globally deterritorialized landscape of the world he calls, drawing upon and extending the notion of "imagined communities" of Benedict Anderson, into "imagined worlds." They are also important in his conceptualization of globalization, which he defines in his speech of "Flows of Globalization" at Vienna Humanities Festival in 2016 as that which "has made us more connected, connected in reality, in travel, in communication, in media, in economics and so on; connection, connection, connection has simultaneously opened the horizons of imagination for many people" (Appadurai). In the context of deterritorialization connection and disconnection, deterritorialization and reterritorialization go hand in hand, it is suggested; it is an everlasting process of making connections, creating a network of roots while at the same time bringing about disconnectedness, displacement, rootlessness and alienation. And upon this connectedness and

15

disconnectedness of the world and masses Appadurai builds his conceptualization of "flows" of -scapes.

The abovementioned differentiation of the past and the present is the vantage point of Appadurai's argument: "[. . .] with the advent of the steamship, the automobile, the airplane, the camera, the computer, and the telephone, we have entered into an altogether new condition of neighborliness, even with those most distant from Ourselves" (29). This is how the deterritorialized world begin to function. Before exploring the -scapes, it is important to note that for Arjun Appadurai, deterritorialization is not a result of the millenial technology or migration only. It is part of the 50s, 60s and the 70s, as well, "in which the kind of sense that nation-states are natural things had begun to get distorted"; the nation-state has come to be problematized and the "naturalness of national borders [has come] to be unsettled" in a world of more and more migrants, more and more commitments to different places (Appadurai, "Flows of Globalization"). It is a world with "'no sense of place' (Meyrowitz 1985)" (qtd in Appadurai 29), which appears to "rhizomic (Deleuze and Guattari 1987), even schizophrenic, calling for theories of rootlessness, alienation, and psychological distance between individuals and groups on the one hand, and fantasies (or nightmares) of electronic propinquity on the other" (29). Ergo, it is a world with no *cordon sanitaire* in terms of global deterritorialization, crossing boundaries through imagination as a "constitutive feature of modern subjectivity" in a "new order of instability" within which everyone is deterritorialized (3).

As for the imagined worlds of -scapes, first, ethnoscapes refer to landscapes of many more people who "constitute the shifting world" and the category includes migrants, tourists, exiles, asylum-seekers, guest workers, who all influence the politics of states in an unprecedented way (33). While there are still "relatively stable" groups and communities, the "warp of these stabilities is everywhere shot through with the woof of human motion, as more persons and groups deal with the realities of having to move or the fantasies of wanting to move" (33-34). Due to their motion, they are in constant deterritorialization and reterritorialization, and their imagination therefore is in motion too, i.e., deterritorialized. Second, technoscapes refer to "global configuration, also ever fluid, of technology and [to] the fact technology, both high and low, both mechanical and informational, now moves at high speeds across various

kind of previously impervious boundaries" (34). Technoscape apparatuses link peoples, groups, populations everywhere, providing people with communication in and out of place they are in and out of. Third, mediascapes stand for both the "distribution of electronic capabilities to produce and disseminate information" and "for the images of the world" stemming from media (35). The media provides the deterritorialized viewers with complicated, large-scale views of images and narratives which are overlapping and disjunctive. It is of importance for the making of imagination as the "lives between the realistic and the fictional landscapes [. . .] are blurred, so that the farther away these audiences are from the direct experiences of metropolitan life, the more likely they are to construct imagined worlds that are chimerical, aesthetic and even fantastic objects" (35). The production for a deterritorialized audience and of images, narratives, leads to the production of imaginary lives different and exclusive/selected sections/dimensions of life. How these images and media are chosen is the concern of ideoscapes comprised of "concatenations of images" depending on the ideological standings of different actors who employ and consume media and ideology. They create a specific logic to follow in order that a creation of an ethnoscape is made possible. And last, financescapes are important for the global economy and global cultural production in that capital is in circulation faster than it was in any period of history and they are an important component of Appadurai's conceptualization of deterritorialization shifting masses' location to lower sections of relatively affluent countries.

These -scapes are disjunctive and intersecting at the same time; in this case, they prove the rhizomic nature of the globalized world. The overall encapsulation of deterritorialization is laid bare by Appadurai. We see the overlapping -scapes: ethnoscapes create a sense of belonging or identity for the deterritorialized Hindus through technoscapes, and their interests, in both where they are and where they come from, are shaped by financescapes and ideoscapes and mediascapes by means of interaction of the deterritorialized people, in and out of place. According to Appadurai, this also leads to the creation of imagined homelands and imaginary communities of the deterritorialized. They are related to global disjunctive flows.

On the other hand, nation-states also use the -scapes to justify their actions and ideological steps they take. With the help of the -scapes they create a base to lay their

17

legitimacy, "special sites of sacredness, their special tests of loyalty and treachery, their special measures of compliance and disorder" (Appadurai 190). And the global trajectory defines even the smallest locale. Therefore, the always-constructed lives and pasts affect the present and future of the deterritorialized, and "the more we unravel these pasts the closer we approach worlds that are less and less cosmopolitan, more and more local" (163). In this context, the national-transnational, local-global, micropolitics-macropolitics, microidentity-macroidentity affect one another in the disjunctive-intersecting politics of deterritorialization.

In a nutshell, according to Appadurai, deterritorialized, displaced, and "transient populations that constitute today's ethnoscapes are engaged in the construction of locality, as a structure of feeling," and it is realized "often in the face of the erosion, dispersal, and implosion of neighborhoods as coherent social formations" (199). That may also be to say that locality is built as regards the global and that is why locality is created not as a singular entity but as plurality and multitude. Consequently, the locality in question is to be treated through the global flows of deterritorialization and -scapes at large, owing to the reciprocal nature of disjunctive and overlapping global cultural politics.

It can be asserted that deterritorialization is a result of the –scapes in question because via those –scapes deterritorialization creates a sense of breaking free from the national boundaries in the context of deterritorialized migrant communities. Mutman, nonetheless, finds Appadurai's use of deterritorialization problematic. Mutman insists on the fact that Appadurai does not clearly define the concept, and the former juxtaposes the deterritorialization of Appadurai with that of Deleuze and Guattari: whereas Deleuze and Guattari's conceptualization refers to a "radical break with or liberation from any origin, belonging, or fixity," Appadurai's approach lacks the "radical affirmative sense of" the term "as radical break with the logic of identity" (Mutman 2390). For Mutman, Appadurai takes the term as a "negative development, in terms of alienation" (2390). However, it can lead to a destruction of the individual and/or can be followed either by absolute deterritorialization or reterritorialization. So it cannot be easily claimed, while comparing and contrasting the two uses of deterritorialization, that one is celebratory whereas the other's reception is negative. Yet, Appadurai does not use the term in a monocausal way. He stresses the break and

the creating of new presents and futures, though from time to time negatively too, in terms of exploitation of the feelings and senses of identity and belonging of the deterritorialized subjects.

Furthermore, Appadurai's approach highlights it as a spectrum where one can get away from the oedipal sense of a nation and a culture and look back at it from the margins, out of the territory. In that respect, Appadurai presents deterritorialization as a way of counter-expression and thought. It leads to the destruction of the norm and totality. This is also underlined by Nermin Abadan-Unat's interpretation of Appadurai's approach: "The interaction between the scapes along with deterritorialization provides the action and ideas with the opportunity to find a ground so as to express and even justify themselves[10]" (Abadan-Unat 314). Deterritorialization, thus, makes up a "radical break" from the oedipal. This comes true through mediascapes in Appadurai's case.

In a similar vein, Caren Kaplan approaches the issue of deterritorialization, taking Deleuze and Guattari's conceptualization as the vantage point. She first defines the contemporary age as "one characterized by market fragmentation" (Kaplan 8). The global cultural flows do not result from a radical and voluntary/conscious break with the status quo or result in the abandonment of a certain identity. Kaplan's approach to Deleuze and Guattari's conceptualization of deterritorialization resonates with that of Appadurai:

> Their [Deleuze and Guattari's] model of deterritorialization, like most Euro-American modernist versions of exilic displacement, stresses the freedom of disconnection and the pleasures of interstitial subjectivity. Yet deterritorialization itself cannot escape colonial discourse. The movement of deterritorialization colonizes, appropriates, even raids other spaces: "Write, form a rhizome, increase your territory by deterritorialization, extend the line of flight to the point where it becomes an abstract machine covering the entire plane of consistency." Deterritorialization is always reterritorialization, an increase of territory, an imperialization. (Kaplan 89)

Just as Kaplan asserts that deterritorialization is a sort of expansion of a territory in imagination, Appadurai takes the concept as the movements of people on the move

---

[10] "Appadurai'nin resmettiği mekanların etkileşimi (-scapes) beraberinde 'deterritorialization'u (topraksızlaşma) getirerek eylemin ve fikrin kendisini rahatça ifade edebileceği, hatta meşrulaştırabileceği bir ortam bulmasını da sağlamaktadır. Bu durumun bir adım ötesi global sanallaşma olup, toplulukların 'siber alan'da (cyberspace) ilişkiye girmeleridir" (Abadan-Unat 314). My translation.

experiencing "dangerous moments." Those who produce and reproduce their deterritorialized senses of images, pasts, presents, futures, identities, homes, homelands, languages, literatures, not all the time end up in completely Deleuzeo-Guattarian deterritorialization or reterritorialization, in contrast to the way Mutman perceives it. Kaplan recapitulates the concept both in Deleuzeo-Guattarian and Appadurai's way, in her "Deterritorializations: the Rewriting of Home and Exile in Western Feminist Discourse":

> "Deterritorialization" is one term for the displacement of identities, persons,   and meanings that is endemic to the postmodern world system. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari use the term "deterritorialization" to locate this   moment of alienation and exile in language and literature. In one sense it describes the effects of radical distanciation between signifier and signified. Meaning and utterances become estranged. (Kaplan 188)

Calling for attention to Deleuze and Guattari's sense of the concept as a "radical break with or liberation from any origin, belonging, or fixity," Appadurai's approach is valid since for the deterritorialized the decentering of the signified is replaced with imagination of the people overseas: The void created by this destruction of the "homeland" is replaced by imagination. With the help of imagination, the deterritorialized find an opportunity to reflect on the past and the past home through various media. That is the reason behind the diasporic spheres which creates a space for the deterritorialized to engage in local cultures in their own cultural and authentic characteristics (Abadan-Unat 314). While doing so, the deterritorialized get away from the oedipal through shifting boundaries. In addition, in the context of migrancy, Appadurai's approach deals with the deterritorialized, as transnationals, defined by Nermin Abadan-Unat as those who feel a sense of belonging both to "there" and to "here" and "do not confine their identities to a certain nation[11]" (Abadan-Unat 225). In short, both Deleuze and Guattari's and Appadurai's conceptualizations of deterritorialization resonate each other in that both present deterritorialization as a sort of distancing from home; both problematize the issue of identity and belonging; and, both operate through collectivities.

---

[11] "kimliğini belli bir ulusal sınırla belirlemeyen kişiler" (Abadan-Unat 225). My translation.

2.1 Changes in the Understanding of Territory

Salman Rushdie states due to a sense of loss of home and identity, he believes "it's [his] present that is foreign, and […] the past is home, albeit a lost home in a lost city in the mists of lost time" (Rushdie 10, 9). He claims he has lost the sense of India as home as the time has changed everything that was India for him, and he and those people he mentions, because of their physical alienation is to "create fictions," but they are "invisible ones, imaginary homelands, Indias of the mind" (10). The physical alienation brings about an epistemological and ideological alienation. The past that was home is lost. The immigrant is now deterritorialized, comtemplating on the lost home. Yet, the present is also foreign. The deterritorialized as part of a transnational community now has a different sense of space, which weakens the idea that a person belongs to a certain space and a certain nation (Abadan-Unat 311). Unlike the colonial understanding of space, the contemporary spatial understanding problematizes the relationship of immigrants with a specific geography.

As such, "colonial analysis has seen the spatial as inherent to the questions of identity, power and resistance it often raises, seen in the highlighting of geography," states Sara Upstone, shedding light on the colonial reception of space[12], and she compares the colonial to the postcolonial or the contemporary in the twentieth-first century when the borders are blurred as a result of transnational movements (4). She emphasizes the *a priori* knowledge that the colonial perspective of a colonial space presents it as fixed, homogenous in tandem with the Euclidian and Newtonian perceptions of space. In the colonial understanding, there needs to be a specified and fixed territory to create an identity. Homi K. Bhabha analogically asserts that "what is increased is the visibility of the subject as an object of surveillance, tabulation, enumeration and, indeed, paranoia and fantasy … a fixed reality which is at once an 'other' and yet entirely knowable and visible" (qtd. in Upstone 6). It emphasizes the significance of mapping and territorialization for the colonizer, drawing attention to the other's space in a given territory. As such, territory turns into an instrument of

---

[12] "As the zenith of several hundred years of military seizures of territory by economic trading groups, and appropriations of land and culture by religious missions under the approving gaze of their governments and sovereigns, these projects have been defined as 'geographical violence'" (Said, Culture 225)" (Brah 4)

control. The colonial *ancien regime* put the colonized in a mapped sphere in order to have them embody the territorialized identity in order to control and label anyone and anywhere in absolute terms. It confirms Upstone's argument: "Colonial spatial order is *not* natural. Rather, it is a conscious act, a purchase of an imaginary, on the part of the coloniser in order to secure power" (6). In short, that space was a means of territorialization and oedipalization in that the colonizer needed to compartmentalize what they had to conquer and make it their own so as to rule over.

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri have a similar approach to the colonial spatial history. They deem that the act of statically staying put was a *sine qua non* of the colonial rule. Thanks to mapping, the colonizer had at his disposal the opportunity to locate the colonized in mathematical terms and to calculate and control the masses and take action accordingly. It was an attempt to define the area of repression and the hegemonic-colonial space. Dividing districts, zones in cities, cities, countries via borders by districting helped the abovementioned surveillance and enumeration for authorities and helped create distinct/districted identities. It recalls the distinction between the former understanding of space and the present one drawn by Hardt and Negri, who put forward that "whereas colonial power sought to fix pure, separate identities, Empire thrives on circuits of movement and mixture" (Hardt and Negri 199). As for deterritorialization, unlike the system in the past that took space as only a piece of land and control, the comtemporary oedipalization and territorialization are in relation to Empire, which is "postcolonial and postimperialist" (9). It takes place in multiplicities stretching from the spatial to the ideological.

The understanding of the spatial has changed from the decolonization processes on, with countries being re-mapped, peoples displaced, dislocated from their homes; some moved to the empire's centre, London, some to the USA and France; the formerly colonized started looking for life opportunities, employment, education and so on. Its effects on migrants and migrant writers are clear in the abode they have taken so as to write on and back to the empire, and their abodes cannot be located directly, due to the deconstruction of a so-called pure centre.

Elleke Boehmer defines the postcolonial writers' movements both in literature and geography as "from national bonding to international wanderings, from rootedness to peregrination" (Boehmer 225). This spatial change in attitude derived from the

temporal is due to globalization[13]. According to her, pioneering post-independence authors dealt mostly with national narratives for a communal understanding; however, "from the late 1980s and into the twenty-first century many writers' geographic and cultural affiliations became more divided, displaced, and uncertain" (225). This division and blurring, at the same time, of space, displacement and uncertainty mark the twenty-first century's global stage in that the meta-narratives of the local-national and nation-states have come to lose dominance thanks to the growing interest in what is global. This issue of course changes the landscape in the centre and it results in the diversification of the mainstream culture as more and more people come to live. The landscape is shaped by the formerly colonized now. Boehmer claims that "the populations of western cities are now formed out of the constant sedimentation of diverse movements of transcontinental drift" (226). Space has witnessed more than ever deterritorializations and reterritorializations owing to the change of space and multiplicities of distinct oedipalization, visible in the diasporic networks, creation of new contact lists and 'imaginary homelands'[14].

Globalization and deterritorialization of space blurs boundaries between nationalities. Yet, this is accompanied by another development, which is reminiscent of the colonial practices, i.e., the division of districts, ghettos becomes the case for London. For instance, the British government policy in the 60s and 70s required that Ugandan Asians stay at a certain district while other migrant ethnicities stay at different places, differentiated as "red" and "green" zones[15] (Brah 34). It paved the way to the creation of diasporal zones, which have been the subject matter of many novels such as *Brick Lane* (2003) by Monica Ali and *Londonstani* (2006) by Gautam Malkani.

According to Arjun Appadurai, though there are still spatial boundaries between states, in the global cultural politics, there is a disjunctive link amongst the – scapes and one outcome of that relationship is that "state and nation are at each other's

---

[13] Or in this case, deterritorialization or in Nikos Papastergiadis's idiom, "turbulence." For more, see his *Turbulence of Migration: Globalization, Deterritorialization and Hybridity*.

[14] Aforementioned oedipal apparatuses in multiplicities make an imaginary space in the mind, which leads the half-deterritorialized to hanging on to an ideal place that never turns out to be *natural*.

[15] This sort of segregation policies indeed help the Oedipus repress the anti-oedipal. Then we can also take into account that deterritorialization is not the case for the migrant only; the former colonial politics tried to confine the immigrant to preserve the *status quo*.

throats, and the hyphen that links them is now less an icon of conjuncture than an index of disjuncture" for nations are created and produced and reproduced all over the globe while states, particularly nation-states stick to their boundaries for their perpetuity, bringing about a "battle of the imagination, with state and nation seeking to cannibalize one another" (Appadurai 39). Appadurai puts forth that "ideas of nationhood appear to be steadily increasing in scale and regularly crossing existing state boundaries," since "previous identities stretched across vast national spaces or, [. . .] the dormant threads of a transnational diaspora have been activated to ignite the micropolitics of a nation-state" (40). Therefore, the spatial deterritorialization causes a conflict between the identity and the boundaries, and the previous understanding of space as a mapped area that belongs to a certain group of people has been questioned and come to be dismantled.

2.2 Identity and Deterritorialization

Identity creates a sense of belonging to a certain group, and the totality of a certain identity is revealed through the encounter with the other. The positioning of one group comes to existence as "groups classify 'others' during their own acts of self-identification" (Macgonagle 2). The process of making of an identity takes place by how a group defines itself against others and compares itself to others. Zygmunt Bauman suggests that national identity in particular is part of the human experience; nevertheless, it is not 'natural' but a fiction that is presented as if a "self evident 'fact of life'" (Bauman 20). On the other hand, it is still a prevailing figure in the global cultural imagery. The significance of identification is that it is a "powerful factor in stratifications" (38) because the variety of identities means the variety of social strata and helps create hierarchies. Though this work will touch upon the utilization of identity as criteria and a means of justification for who can assert power over the other later on, it is not too soon to exert that through differential identifications is the colonial

sandwich[16] made possible, and thus the binary of the "superior" and "inferior" comes to the surface without feeling guilt (Brah 1). And through such an oedipal identification, it is possible to territorialize and codify masses.

The stratification based on national identity silences the other and the *status quo*/the Oedipus remains sustainable. In Deleuzean terms, this is how compartmentalized territoriality works in the epistemological register. The Oedipus pays efforts to represent identity, which is in flux, as if stable, natural, through the molar line. It is in the rigid territoriality and to preserve itself, it needs to produce subjects rigidly territorialized.

According to Homi K. Bhabha, the questions of identification and identity are explicit in the way people take on their roles because of the "production of an 'image' of identity and the transformation of the subject in assuming that image" (Bhabha xxix). This way it elucidates that the image of an identity is, against the grain, deterministically pre-given when they are part of the social. It makes people act in accordance with the image. This experience of identity-making can be considered to exclude autonomy, accordingly; it cannot tolerate any line of flight.

What is more is that national identity is formed through the network of millions of unknown people sharing similar traits of *Lebenswelt* such as language, education etc. that make people feel a sense of belonging. To speak of one national identity actually means to speak of other national identities in that to have an identity is to position oneself in relation to others. This of course creates a binary between positions of different nationalities. The main reason behind colonial exploitation is the stratification of national and racial identities. The colonized were imagined to occupy a "lower space than low" and are 'denied the right to claim an identity as distinct from an ascribed and enforced classification' (Bauman 39). They are made passive in speech and their ability to assert themselves is either limited or determined by the hegemonic identity.

Zygmunt Bauman refers to a poster against racism in Berlin in 1994 that says: "Your Christ is Jew. Your car is Japanese. Your pizza is Italian. Your democracy - Greek. Your coffee - Brazilian. Your holiday Turkish. Your numbers - Arabic. Your

---

[16] Brah explains "the colonial sandwich" as in the case of "the formation in East Africa—via the effects of colonial policy—of the 'colonial sandwich', with Europeans at the top, Asians in the middle, and Africans at the bottom" (Brah 1).

letters - Latin. Only your neighbour is a foreigner" (Bauman 27). This is uttered in the context of xenophobia in Europe. This quotation makes it possible to put forward that the national identity is only a delusion and part of oedipalization (and how oedipalization is only ideological) despite the fact that everything is in flux in material terms too.

What about refugees, asylum-seekers and "illegal immigrants"? They are the "non-territorials in a world of territoriality grounded sovereignity" (Bauman 39). Territory has not lost its determining force in positioning people; and the stateless or the "non-territorials" are given no space anywhere. Line of flight does not necessarily turn out to be liberating all the time, maybe since line of flight requires a rupture in the border and when this is not achieved, the refugee or "illegal" immigrant might wind up in a detention[17] centre or a refugee camp. Paradoxically, it confirms that the strength of power asserted over a specific space still determines identity. Furthermore, if the assigner of that identity and the state of "origin," or their "original" territoriality and the Oedipus do not back one up, she or he is seen a complete outsider, and consequently the immigrant is denied the claim to place in the host country and kept in camps – "non-places" - or sent back to where they are coming from so that they are kept away from the citizens and they do not become part of the social-spatial. They are expected to reterritorialize back in 'home.' On their journey, the "illegal" or "irregular" immigrants or refugees cannot claim a specific identity, which confirms the territoriality of identity and the fact that it is socially-spatially and oedipally constructed.

As for the Appaduraian approach to the issue of the immigrant identity, as within the home-state's borders, the deterritorialized immigrants feel the urge to create locality through the –scapes as a "structure of feeling, a property of social life" that

---

[17] Detention literally means imprisonment and more and more asylum seekers have been detained in Britain: In the early 90s about 200 asylum seekers were "detained at any one time" (47). "In October 1996, there were 864 asylum seekers in detention of which 343 were in ordinary prisons (Liebaut and Hughes, 1997)" (qtd. in Bloch 47).. As of the mid-1998 almost 800 asylum seekers were imprisoned and two years later the number of the people detained was 1,037 (47). "Of those detained, 37 per cent are in immigration detention centres and 63 per cent are in prison establishments (National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns, 2000)" (qtd. in Bloch 47). And Inspite of the fact that they normally stay detained for 65 days there are those as well who stay in detention centres for longer according to UNHCR (47). The detention process is conducted by "immigration officials at the beginning of the asylum process" because of two primary reasons: stop asylum seekers from feeling so as to accelerate the deportation process and to use it "as a deterrent to other asylum seekers from a particular country of origin (Morrison, 1998)" (qtd. in Bloch 47).

turns into a struggle. There are many congeries of that struggle and the deterritorialized people earn an identity through self-identification with an ambiguous space and collectivity. Both a sense of belonging and that of loss are the determining questions in that sense. Additionally, media's effect cannot be denied ~~at this very point~~ in that it functions as an ideological state apparatus for both the country of origin and the host country so that the deterritorialized people can look for ways to reterritorialize. The bulletpoints listed by Appadurai can be summarized as follows:

First, the national territory has come to lose ground and therefore nation-states are in search for new links and networks to create a sense of belonging in the face of globalization. As K. Onur Unutulmaz emphasizes, "sending countries, while talking of their citizens who migrated to other countries, use the concept of integration in order to strictly differentiate it from the notion of assimilation[18]" (Unutulmaz 135). Yet, globalization theorists stresses the importance of transnationalism which is based on, " collective memory, imagination and electronic media, instead of national borders" and which "questions the classical notions of nationality and the parameters set by it[19]" (Abadan-Unat 295). Second, "the growing disjuncture between territory, subjectivity, and collective social movement" can be understood in the transnational communities networks and diaspora because the three terms are closely-knit and according to Appadurai, the diasporic public spheres are shaped by many different factors depending on the status of the participants. What makes these spheres different from being a migrant is that the status of migrants and asylees are determined in law, but that one is a member of a diaspora and sustains her/his ties is a voluntary preference[20]" (Abadan-Unat 293). Therefore, the struggle is one between a given diaspora and the individual and the past home. Third, "the steady erosion, principally due to the force and form of electronic mediation, of the relationship between spatial and virtual neighborhoods" can be understood in terms of the improvements in technology and

---

[18] "Göç gönderen ülkeler de başka ülkelere göç etmiş vatandaşlarından bahsederken entegrasyon kavramını, asimilasyon kavramından katı bir şekilde ayrıştırmak kaydıyla, kullanmaktadır" (Unutulmaz 135). My translation.

[19] "Bağlantılarını ulusal sınırlar yerine kolektif bellek, hayal gücü ve elektronik medyanın yaymakta olduğu simgelerden alan bu ulus-ötesi (transnational) ulusçuluk, klasik ulusçuluk ve onun koyduğu parametreleri sorgulamaktadır" (Abadan-Unat 295). My translation.

[20] "Göçmen ve sığınmacılarla illegal işçilerin statüleri hukuk yolu ile belirlenir, ama kişinin diasporanın bir üyesi olması ve bağlarını sürdürmesi iradî bir tercihtir" (Abadan Unat 293). My translation.

through that technology "the new form of structuring capitalism has taken has paved the way to a new society" over the last thirty years[21] (Abadan-Unat 299). "Types of work in the organization form in which the concepts of space and time have disappeared have become flexible and unstable, and the articulated media and virtual realities create cultures[22]" (Abadan-Unat 299). The erosion in question, hence, results from the deterritorialization of space and reality and that deterritorialization leads to the deterritorialization of identity.

2.3 Deterritorialization and the Notion of Home

Avtar Brah explains the notion of home with two different definitions: first, as a "mythic place of desire in the diasporic imagination," which makes it a "place of no return, even if it is possible to visit the geographical territory that is seen as the place of 'origin'" (188). Second, she furthers (and contrasts the first definition) the definition of home as "the lived experience of locality, its sounds and smells" (4). Home is not definitely a place of origin, where one comes from, but where one feels at home. Home is where one reterritorializes oneself. Home is what one invigorates, *inter alia*, and one is underpinned by. Therefore, both definitions can be applied to one who is in pursuit of a home. Drawing on the notion of nation theorized by Benedict Anderson as imagined and socially constructed, through the hegemonic epistemology, home is an ideological apparatus and sphere where one feels the sense of belonging to a specific piece of land and group of people, a sense shared by millions of unknown others. It is an ontological sphere in which one is defined in her/his relation (psychological, physical, economic) to others in direct contact and in person.

On the other hand, in the context of migrancy, "the association of home with familiarity which allows strangeness to be associated with migration (that is, to be located as beyond the walls of the home) is problematic" because strangeness and

---

[21] "İletişim teknolojisinin yarattığı devrim ve 1990'dan sonra kapitalizmin yapılanma biçimi yeni tür bir toplum yaratmıştır" (Abadan-Unat 299). My translation.

[22] "Mekan ve zaman kavramlarının ortadan kalktığı bu örgütlenme biçiminde iş türleri esnek ve istikrarsız hale gelmekte, birbirleriyle eklemlenmiş medya, sanal gerçeklikler kültürleri yaratmaktadır" (Abadan-Unat 299). My translation.

28

changes of spaces are possible/present within the home; therefore, home is not to be directly associated with familiarity in a given, specific space (Ahmed 88). However, it does not still stop one from asserting that moving away from where one takes her/his abode leads to a kind of strangeness, hence a correlation between migration and alienation and deterritorialization of home and identity. Ahmed reiterates that it can be possible to reconcile these two conceptualizations of home on following grounds:

> The journeys of migration involve a splitting of home as a place of origin and home as the sensory world of everyday experience. What migration narratives involve, then, is a spatial reconfiguration of an embodied self: a transformation in the very skin through which the body is embodied. Hence the experience of moving often to a new home is most felt through the surprises in sensation: different smells, different sounds as night, more or less dust. (92)

Accordingly, the migrant undergoes a metamorphosis, a certain break from home and identity in fixity. And the metamorphosis in the act of leaving makes the migrant problematize the space. Formerly-fixed, the present space turns out to be erratic, putting the abode for the migrant at the throes. This kind of change of space is actually dislocation-displacement, or to put it better, deterritorialization.

In this "strange" space, the lack of reterritorialization for the immigrant results in the reimagination of home, the reconstruction of it in the imagination of the immigrant. What she/he finds as exigency is to feel the milieu of the past home, the ideological sphere. As Keya Ganguly puts it, in terms of reimagining and reconstructing the past home, "[t]he past requires a more marked salience with subjects for whom categories of the present have been unusually unstable or unpredictable" due to the displacement stemming from the immigrant circumstances (qtd in Ahmed 93). the importance of memory and acts of remembrance are emphasized via migrant narratives:

> The experience of leaving home in migration is hence always about the failure of memory to fully make sense of the place one comes to inhabit, a failure which is experienced in the discomfort of inhabiting a migrant body, a body which feels out of place, which feels uncomfortable in this place (Ahmed 92)

This failure of memory and remembering can be purported to have an effect on the migrant who vainly tries to repeat the unrepeatable, concretize the abstract, in an attempt to reterritorialize. As Susan Stewart claims, it has effects on the migrant whose

nostalgia is the "repetition that mourns the inauthenticity of all repetitions and denies the repetition's capacity to define identity" (Boym). Yet, the denial of how this kind of repetition impacts her/him does not relieve the "temporal dislocation" derived from the spatial dislocation. Also, it is this denial and the useless efforts that deter the migrant from repudiating that she/he is not in the realm of being as she/he presupposes. Nevertheless, they are in pursuit of reterritorialization, in the process of becoming. Niels Albersten and Bülent Diken present a definition of becoming as *"deterritorialization always in search for new connections,"* as well as the search for reterritorializations through connections, analogies and so on to create a new home.*"*[23] (Albersten and Diken 161). A migrant is a deterritorialized person who is in a constant process/in the condition of becoming. For the deterritorialized individual, the home is deterritorialized, too. Therefore, it is safe to put forward that the deterritorialization of home stems from the deterritorialization of time and space.

Appadurai's diagnosis for this arbitrariness, or in his words, disjunctive and overlapping relationship in the context of migrancy in the age of globalization, is explained with transnational communities and diasporic spheres within those communities. The deterritorialized transnational migrant who is in-between embraces ties both with the host country and country of origin. In a similar vein, according to Abadan-Unat, one of the most important issues here to take note of is that members of a diaspora generally "have organic ties with the main opposition groups in their homelands[24]" (Abadan-Unat 294-295). They have ties with the host country as well. Accordingly, Appadurai summarizes the conditions of the deterritorialized as follows:

> As populations become deterritorialized and incompletely nationalized, as nations splinter and recombine, as states face intractable difficulties in the task of producing "the people," transnations[25] are the most important social sites in which the crises of patriotism are played out. The results are surely contradictory. Displacement and exile, migration and terror create powerful attachments to ideas of homeland that seem more deeply territorial than ever. (Appadurai 176-177)

---

[23] "her zaman başka bir şeyle bağlantı kurmaya çalışan yersizyurtsuzlaşma" (Albersten and Diken 161). My translation.

[24] "Bu arada göz önünde bulundurulması gereken en önemli konulardan biri, diasporaların bağlı oldukları anayurttaki muhalefet grupları ile sürdürdükleri organik bağlardır" (Abadan-Unat 294-295). My translation.

[25] Here Appadurai refers to transnations as the deterritorialized people who have a sense of fructured relationship both with "there" and "here"; who belong "there" and "here"; who do not belong either "there" or "here".

In the target country, sometimes through diasporic networks, the creation of homelands is made possible. New imaginary homes are produced for "patriotic" ends. Appadurai exemplifies this in his reference to the invention of Khalistan as a homeland for the "deterritorialized Sikh population of England, Canada, and the United States," which he calls an instance of "the bloody potential" of mediascapes since the creation of homelands involves the postnational imagery and imaginary (38). This is the way the deterritorialized is after a new or nostalgic territoriality. This nostalgia makes up the way to a construction of an imaginary home as a work of imagination.

2.4 Britain and Immigration

2.4.1   An Overview of International Migration to Britain

Immigration to Britain is not a recent phenomenon. London itself was founded by an "invading imperial force" (Perfect 3). In due course, especially starting from the twelfth century, the influx of migrants and refugees has been the case. In that century, Jews started taking refuge in Britain and were in the money-lending business[26] (Bloch 22). In the following two centuries, European merchants, the Flemish, the Dutch, the French, the Italian, the Spanish, and the German, were in the ethnic scene in Britain, and however, due to "hostile" politics and treatment they were to go through expulsion for seven years in 1598 (22). In the sixteenth century new minorities came to Britain such as Calvinists from Germany and France as "victims of religious persecution" (22). Moreover, during that time when London was "at the centre of an empire that was only in its infancy," Africans, "mostly as slaves," Italian, German and Irish and gypsy travellers were already in Britain (Perfect 3, Bloch 22). Accordingly, it is gathered that "immigrants 'formed approximately 10 per cent of London's total population during the early 1570s' (Luu 2005, p97), with 'an average of 5600 immigrants arriving annually between 1560 and 1625' (Luu 2000, p5)" (qtd in Perfect 3). With the cancellation of the 1598 Edict of Nantes in 1685, "more Huguenots fled

---

[26] Yet, it is important to take note of the fact that that they were given a place in society does not mean they did not face discrimination: They were "compelled to wear badges which distinguished them as Jews" (Bloch 22).

to England and the word 'refugee' from the French 'réfugié' entered" the English language (Bloch 22). In the nineteenth century most of the immigrants that came to Britain were from Europe, with the largest numbers from Ireland, Germany and Russian Poland (24). Another example of a wave of immigration to Britain is that the Jewish population between 1879 and 1914 was 120.000 and it reached 300.000 in 1917 (24). Due to the rise of fascism in Europe there was an increase in the number of political refugees (28). It was followed by the lack of labour in the 40s and the 50s; thus 70.000 to 100.000 Irish workers and families came to England between 1945 and 1951. Along with that, labour migration included those from the Caribbean and South Asia as well as Europeans and Eastern Europeans in lesser numbers (29). In 1948, a seminal phenomenon, the *Empire Windrush* came to Britain[27] as the newly-decolonized started migrating to London. Consequently, it changed the course of immigration to Britain and the cultural landscape, as it "saw the arrival of the first Caribbean migrants to London, and has rightly   been identified as a key moment in the history of multiethnic, multicultural London, in turn, contemporary British history more broadly" (Perfect 2).

Another important point that needs scrutiny is that with the Windrush Generation, the questions of the UK citizenship and Britishness was a question for the 1948 British Nationality Act "ensured an open door policy for migrants from the Commonwealth," giving a right to citizenship to "anyone who was born within the territories of the crown" (Bloch 31). This paved the way to increase in migration from former colonies. However, the immigration policies were to change in the following period: The Commonwealth Immigration Act of 1962, in practice till 1988, was meant to "curb black immigration among Commonwealth citizens" (33). Furthermore, this epoch witnessed not only labour migration but many people seeking asylum and refugeehood in Britain, in addition to "racialization of immigration controls," concluded from the restrictive controls of immigration such as "Asylum and Immigration Act," 1993, "Asylum and Immigration Act," 1996, "Immigration and Asylum Act," 1999 (47-48).

---

[27] During that time, post-war London was described by D. H. Lawrence as "the 'heart of the world', as collapsing, a 'vortex of broken passions, lusts, hopes, fears and horrors'" (qtd. in Boehmer 95).

As a result, "37 per cent of Londoners - some three million people - were born in a foreign country" as data from the 2011 census shows (Perfect 4). The number of migrants has been increasingly on the move: "Data shows that more than twice as many migrants arrived in London during the period 2001 to 2011 as did during the period 1991 to 2001" (Perfect 4). The increasing number is not confined to London; in general, the number of migrants from the Commonwealth countries in 1951 was 218000 while in 1991 there were more than three million people (Bloch 38), despite restrictive controls.

As for today's immigrants, there are still the similar motives of finding better employment and better wages and better standards of living as paychecks in the "Global North" are bigger than those in the "Global South" and economic stability is one key attraction for those from the latter, who also have the dreams of sending remittances (Donato and Massey 15). Access to social mobility is another drive. These reasons were also the case in the past.

On the other hand, in the late twentieth and the first decade of the twenty-first centuries the flows of migration have increased in quantity and there are many reasons for some of which are "international wars, civil wars, the rise in fascism, decolonization, national liberation struggles and the creation of nation states" (Bloch 1). Obviously, they are not moved to earn savings but "to evade threats" from "civil violence, crime, warfare, family violence, natural disasters, political upheavals, and economic catastrophe - events that often produce a stream of out-migrants whose mobility is motivated by fear" (Donato and Massey 15-16). This situation highlights the aporia faced by migrants, refugees and asylees: "If they remain within their home nation, they become internally displaced persons; if they cross an international border, they become refugees or asylees (16).

Still, this impasse has not stopped the movements of illegal immigrants who flee their country due to a conflict, war, famine in order to live on. Besides, asylum and refugeehood and illegal immigration have recently been the subject matter for many target countries, according to Koser, who writes that "the movement of asylum-seekers and refugees and irregular migrants has also become increasingly significant across the industrialized world in the last 20 years or so" (Koser 4). That is why it is not possible to count the numbers of the people having to leave their countries for one

reason or another and being denied the visa and taking the "illegal" path to live on. Being 'illegal' or in Koser's words, 'irregular,' almost all the time makes integration[28] impossible for them, keeping them suspended in the line of flight like nomads. They could only seem to integrate into the oedipal-territorial, social and professional life by acting like the white Londoners, e.g., Sikh men being able to find a job only if they did not wear their turbans, exposing the fact that as long as they act in accord with the "superior" culture they are accepted. In other words, it is the case only after they seem readjusted to Britain and reterritorialized.

Concluding from the conditions of migrants, be it a refugee, an asylum-seeker, or a guest worker, we can suggest that the path to deterritorialization includes the loss of home, going to another place, either for work or survival, and it creates –scapes for those people in those categories so that they can find reterritorialization or get lost in search of a home.

In the chapters that follow, this study will focus on Brian Chikwava's *Harare North* (2009) and Chris Cleave's *The Other Hand* (2008) in the light of theoretical discussion in this chapter. In both novels, the first person illegal immigrant narrators reveal the problematic deterritorialization they experience in their loss of home and identity. In *Harare North*, written in completely Zimbabwean colloquial English, the issue of identity and home is problematized through the transformation of the unnamed narrator, who comes to Britain from Zimbabwe to earn some money so that he, charged of torture and possibly murder, can bail himself out by bribing the police; however, he ends up losing his sense of home and identity day by day because of the loss of his strong fanatism for Mugabe, once the real-life dictator of Zimbabwe. Unlike other "illegal" immigrants who work and stick to their diasporas with their organic ties with the opposition in the "homelands," the unnamed narrator, in the end, loses all the grounds with which he initially defines himself: Zimbabwe, the political party he is a member of, Mugabe, who turns out to be demolishing his village and the graveyard the narrator's mother is buried in. And, in the end he turns into, involuntarily and unconsciously, his friend Shingi, whom he tricks into giving him money and he exploits. There remains no trace of him in the end, nor his home. On the other hand,

---

[28] According to Koser, integration is "the process by which immigrants become accepted into society, both as individuals and groups" (25).

in *The Other Hand*, written in "Queen's English", in which there are two narrators, one a sixteen-year-old Nigerian "illegal" immigrant, the other a middle-class white British woman living in Surrey. the Nigerian girl has escaped death following her family's death and has issues of belonging, in terms of both identity and home in that she names herself other than her real name and does not feel any sense of belonging neither to Nigeria nor to Britain. However, during her stay in Britain, she comes to discover her identity, which she reveals later in the novel, and her home different from the flashbacks prevailing throughout the novel. This thesis aims to show, first, how the former unnamed narrator in *Harare North* undergoes absolute deterritorialization in terms of home and identity while Little Bee in *the Other Hand* goes through relative deterritorialization, and, second, how imagination operates for the narrators through – scapes and flashbacks, efforts to remember.

CHAPTER 3

DETERRITORIALIZATION IN *HARARE NORTH*

The deterritorialization of identity and the resultant deterritorialization of home in Brian Chikwava's *Harare North* are a direct consequence of change of space, i.e., migration from Zimbabwe. The aim of this chapter is to discuss the deterritorialization of the first-person narrator's identity in *Harare North* through the character's initial self-perception, diasporic relationships, loss of Zimbabwean territorial and oedipal ties and eventually of his own self and identity.

In *Harare North*, the unnamed narrator of 20 comes to the UK so as to find a "graft" and save US$5000 so that he can bribe the police and no longer be charged with the acts of killing and torture he committed against an opposition party supporter when he was a member of a paramilitary group called Green Bombers. Upon his arrival at the Gatwick Airport, he is detained for around 10 days during which he applies for an asylum and released after he says, paradoxically, that he is a member of the opposition group and under threat back in Zimbabwe though he is not granted a legal asylee status. Later, he is met by his cousin Paul's wife, Sekai, who, the narrator thinks, is assimilated and has lost her Zimbabwean character that is an essential part of the narrator's identity. During his stay at their home he is explicitly not welcomed and feels disturbed by Sekai's treatment of him and her oppositional tendencies against Robert Mugabe, the President of Zimbabwe. After a while, he leaves for his old friend Shingi, who lives in a squat in Brixton populated mostly by African immigrants. In the squat there are other immigrants: Aleck, who is the head of the house as he collects the rent and sets the rules, Farayi, who shares a room with Shingi, and Tsitsi, who is a teenage girl and a mother impregnated by Aleck. The narrator moves in to the squat and his life in Brixton turns out to be a failure and disappointment as he cannot find "graft" easily and when he finds one, he cannot work permanently and dismissed. In the meanwhile, he comes to live as a parasite on Shingi, whom he deceives. After the squat is scattered due to tricks the narrator plays on others, he slowly turns mad as he

loses everything that makes up his identity: his passionate belief in Mugabe[29], his ties with Zimbabwe and Zimbabwean culture, his mother's burial place, and his own self-perception as he transforms into his friend, Shingi.

The deterritorialization of the narrator's identity is based on the loss of everything that he thinks makes him who he is. His sense of belonging is shattered and his identity becomes a void; his deterritorialization of identity as a loss of the territory he once is rooted in, which comprises his identity, turns out to be destructive for him. This condition stems from his resistance to change in order not to lose his Zimbabwean origin, his belief in Mugabe and his party-front ZANU-PF. He, therefore, is exposed to absolute deterritorialization in Deleuzeo-Guattarian terms, losing all that is his own with an eventual and radical break from the concept of identity, yet, at the same time, trying to survive through his imagination of would-be events back in Zimbabwe.

The narrator has orthodox views as to his Zimbabwean heritage and political background. In the beginning of the novel, the "Prologue," which presents the reader with a scene almost from the end of the story, it is clear that he, who has embodied the Mugabeist politics throughout the novel and has caught the flaws in it myriad times, has still not got away from the Mugabeist discourse, and as will be discussed in relation to the quotation below, he feels he does not have any ties to the UK, and, therefore, keeps his distance from it. In this very scene, nearly the end of the narrator's story and the beginning of the novel, we see him run away from the squat following a delirium due to the fact that everyone has got away from the squat because of the tricks he has played on others cunningly in order to break their power and have the ultimate say in the household. And now he has nowhere to go, nothing to do, walking aimlessly in London:

> To the rigth of the station entrance one newspaper vendor stand beside pile of copies of *Evening Standard*. On the front page of every one of them President Mugabe's face is folded in two. I can still identify His Excellency. The paper say that Zimbabwe has run out toilet paper. That make me imagine how after many times of bum wiping with the ruthless and patriotic *Herald* newspaper, everyone's troubled buttock holes get

---

[29] Robert Mugabe was a Zimbabwean politician and revolutionary, and general secretary of ZANU (Zimbabwe African National Union), one of the two nationalist movements in Zimbabwe in the 60s and the leader of it during the 70s. He also led the ZANU-PF (ZANU – Patriotic Front). He acted as the Prime Minister in Zimbabwe between 1980 and 1987, and for the next thirty years, he was the president of the country. Yet, his policies have been subject of criticism: "Mugabe, like many other durable African leaders, has been associated with large-scale violence against opponents, which has contributed to the population's impoverishment" (Kriger 307).

vex and now turn into likkle red knots. But except for this small complaint from them dark and hairy buttocks, me I don't see what the whole noise is about. (Chikwava 39)

Evening Standard, a medium of the opposition groups in Zimbabwe, which is also distributed in the UK for the diaspora, is compared to the "patriotic" *Herald*, which is "ruthless." According to the narrator, it is clear that *Evening Standard* is piled up in the UK for the oppositional diaspora whereas *Herald* is the one that works for the people in the narrator's opinion, which is seemingly not sold in bulk. It suggests how the diaspora is positioned politically in London. The juxtaposition of two politically-different newspapers refers to how the narrator situates himself against the opposition and how strict policies of Mugabe can make people end up in misery. Mugabe is still the narrator's "His Excellency"; yet, his devotion to Mugabe is treated ironically in the novel as is suggested by the image of his face folded in two. Despite being folded in two, alluding to the political division of Zimbabwe, Mugabe, who for the narrator symbolizes Zimbabwe and home apart from the narrator's mother, stands out. The narrator implies that in spite of hardships, the "patriotic" finds a solution to problems though the solution may end up hurting some as suggested by the reference to "buttock holes [getting] vex and now [turning] into likkle red knots." Moreover, that *Evening Standard* is sold in piles in the UK whereas *Herald*, whose propagandist nature of ruthlessness and patriotism is celebrated throughout by the narrator himself, is not creates a reason for the narrator to keep his distance from the Zimbabwean diaspora in London. That is why he identifies the opposition as "noise." He, therefore, cannot locate himself or reterritorialize in the UK. His resistance to deterritorialization and to criticism of anything Mugabeist prevents him from doing so.

Likewise, his distancing of himself from the UK and political asylees of the oppositon in Zimbabwe is laid bare in his arrival in the UK and his application for asylum: "Me I tell them [immigration officers] I have been harass by them boys in dark glasses because I am youth member of the opposition party" (67). He is aware of how he can trick the immigration officers in order to enter the UK and he makes use of the common ways of acceptance for an asylum. He excuses himself, for he does not say so "trying to shame our government in any way," however, "if you don't spin them smooth jazz numbers then immigration people is never going to give you chance to even sniff first step into Queen's land" (67). Although he used to be one of those "boys

in dark glasses," he uses the counter argument of those the group targets to deter from criticizing the government. By "[spinning] them smooth jazz numbers," he manipulates the immigration officers, believing his mind is above them all because he does not think as a "civilian" but as a "military" persona. The animal imagery evoked by "sniffing" here is necessary to take note of in that it refers to hunting animals. The paramilitary group referred to many times, the "Green Bombers," some of whom call themselves the "jackal-breed", is an examplary part of this imagery and it suggests that the narrator, as a jackal, sees the UK as a prey. This is one of the reasons why he cannot have a sense of belonging to the UK and the Zimbabwean diaspora. He cannot even loosen his ties embedded in his every mode of thinking and acting. The Zimbabwean paramilitary tied to Mugabe defines his identity.

Drawing on Achille Mbembe's views on "the postcolony," Pucherová states

> the postcolony denies personhood to its subjects through state ideology of normative identities and censorship on expressions of individuality. In addition, it oppresses its citizens by creating a permanent atmosphere of fear, improvisation, discontinuity, surreality, absurdity and simulacra: "The postcolony is characterized by a distinctive style of political improvisation, by a tendency to excess and lack of proportion, as well as by distinctive ways identities are multiplied, transformed, and put into circulation (102). (Pucherová 160)

From what the narrator asserts about his intellect and knowledge of history and politics can it be inferred that, similar to Mbembe's approach, he turns himself into a character living at the extremes who resonates with the politics of Mugabe as a dictator. The hyperbolic and unproportional aspects in the making of the unnamed narrator are indeed reminiscent of the former colonial politics now mimicked by the post-colonial subjects and states. Therefore, it is also declareable that post-colonial characters and societies have been deterritorialized as a consequence of the colonial politics; however, the deterritorialized may reterritorialize by sticking to the invented normativity, by transforming into a state of unclarity, hypocrisy, conflict, contradiction and inconsistency according to Mbembe. The reterritorialization turns out to be a norm, creating a strict sense of identity and home. However, double-deterritorialized and transnational individuals go beyond that idealized identity created in the postcolony and see through what Appadurai calls "scapes," not abiding by, in Anderson's idiom, cenotaphs or "ghostly *national* imaginings" (Anderson 9, original

emphasis). They, in a sense, attack the cartographical sense of identity congragated into maps, which are "ultimately an 'archetype of representation' (Massey 106)" (qtd in Upstone 6). The deterritorialized, in both Deleuzeo-Guattarian and Appadurai's sense, create a radically transformed perception of home and identity that transcends the Oedipus and the idea of nation-state. The postcolony, in other words, may not get away from the colonial understanding in terms of space-oriented identity, and its absolutism becomes the very means of its corruption as well as the fact that the unproportional rule acts in such a way as to create new imaginary landscapes that are multiplied or transformed with every act. And given that the narrator acts as a citizen of what Mbembe calls the "postcolony," he is at both extremes of the spectrum of arrogance and fragility, and resistance to change and transformation: "[D]espite his seeming arrogance and confidence, the narrator is really just a naive man who fails to negotiate the insecurities of life in the Diaspora," claims Yuleth Chigwedere and adds, "[b]eneath the masculine exterior lies a mis-educated young man of 20 who feels extremely disoriented in the diasporic space that has now become his existential reality" (Chigwedere 175). While performing the normative Zimbabwean and Mugabeist paramilitary identity, the narrator neither belongs to the past nor to the present, therefore ending up in the reproduction of identity as the same ideological apparatus as a shelter.

Similarly, due to his inability to deterritorialize his Green Bomber and jackal-breed identity, which makes the narrator untransnationalizable, he resorts to his memory and imagination. He is not far from change, he asserts, but still does not accept change in the UK: "[c]hange of life sometimes feel sweet and can give new ginger to your life," he says, "but sometimes you have to resist it even if you are not favourite pet in the house" (Chikwava 241). He, through the metaphor of "pet," defines himself apart from the UK which stands for the "house." Upon this statement he continues: "Me I know sweet change; I have the same feeling before I join them boys of the jackal breed, the Green Bombers. Those days, nothing is moving in my life because I have just come out of prison" (241). When he has nothing, the paramilitary group changes his life and identity, and whenever he feels isolated from the British society and the diaspora, he immediately brings up his past memories. He is aware of the harsh

conditions of the life back in Zimbabwe, which is not quite promising, and shows how he invents his identity with the help of the youth movement of the ZANU-PF party:

> If you is back home leading rubbish life and ZANU–PF party offer you job in they youth movement to give you chance to change your life and put big purpose in your life, you don't just sniff at it and walk away when no one else want to give you graft in the country even if you is prepared to become tea boy. Me I know what I have to do when the boys come to take me in they van: the people's shoes, broken belts and all that kind of stuff, I toss them out onto pavement, give my stall one kick and it fall over easy. That's it! Me I jump onto the van as it speed off. I'm free. That's how new beginnings start. My life have found big and proper purpose. (241)

Participating in the group, he feels free because he does not have any responsibility for anyone but the "big and proper purpose." This purpose for him is a defining feature of his life, even in the UK. The change is acceptable, he implies, as long as it is for such a purpose. However, the new beginning inflicted by his advent in the UK does not resemble the abovementioned one in that it has no grand and glorious cause that signifies a *raison d'etre*, and therefore is not welcomed by the narrator. The juxtaposition here serves as the two-folded story of his identity: The naming of London as Harare North actually echoes this two-foldedness in that the narrator is split between Harare, Zimbabwe's capital city, and the other Harare that is in the North, the former being one to which he belongs while the latter represents the opposition the narrator despises. Because of this distinction and similarity the narrator resists change. It is just Harare for him but in the North. He does not see a change necessary. On the contrary, if Harare as the capital city of Zimbabwe is taken as the "authentic" Zimbabwe with Mugabe as the "patriotic" and "ruthless" head, the diasporic Harare North becomes the "noisy" opposition, for the narrator. It thus makes any change for the narrator a case to be averted.

      The narrator's alienation from the diaspora and the transnational community is also exposed when he stays with his cousin and his cousin's wife, Sekai: "I turn twenty-two years that day but me I don't tell Paul or Sekai because I know this is wrong place to celebrate birthday. So I go to bed early that evening" (191). That Harare North is a wrong place to celebrate his birthday shows that he does not feel a sense of belonging to London and thus cannot sense a room for sincerity. Again, he resorts to imagination and has a dream in which he sees his mother:

Mother. Home. Early morning. She water bed of tomato plants at the back of house. By doorstep, there is she old shoes. Wet and red with mud. Mother. She sweep floor. Since she funeral, she have knit sheself back into life. Mother. She expect friends. The kettle on the stove begin to shake lid, letting out steam. Mother throw easy look at it and continue sweeping. Your house is like your head, she say to sheself, you have to keep sweeping it clean if you want to stay sane. (191 – 203, original emphasis)

His mother is already deceased; nonetheless, the narrator has not had an umbiyuso, a funeral ceremony, conducted for his mother. With this in his mind, the narrator over time becomes obsessed with this lack of "proper burial" for his mother because he believes she still is not accepted into earth. The constantly recurring image of his mother in his imagination illustrates that she represents a certain guide for the narrator and part of his identity. As a result, he feels the urge to "sweep" his house and mind against the deterritorializing effects of living abroad as an immigrant. On the other hand, he has no one to talk to sincerely because he believes no one will understand him as he thinks he is superior to them and different from all others who live in Harare North and have long forgotten their Zimbabwean origin. This results in solitude for him and he imagines, in his dream, the would-be conversation of his dead mother with her friends as follows: "*She dig out the rest of them photos of me in Harare North – me I am feeding them pigeons in this big city. Mother go into show-off style, telling friends yea he is my son that one" Them other women look them photographs; they tea go cold. 'He's my son that one,'*" (216). He sticks to imagination to survive in London because he has no one like himself. However, other women immediately intervene in the "show-off style," reminding the narrator of Zimbabwe: *Mother continue, but MaKhumalo complain that why am I feeding them pigeons in Harare North when people here is near starving? They talk talk talk talk like usual until the air crowd up with they voices and me I can't hear nothing now"* (216, italics in the original). Now, again, the other part of his orthodox identity is laid bare in this scene and shows signals of deterritorialization in itself as he comes to loosen his sense of belonging only to one place. His imagination, the house, the conversation, his identity are two-folded in his dream too, like Zimbabwe. However, no matter how hard he tries, the narrator comes to feel detached from them: *"There is them other sounds in air. Crows. Cries. Over the room me I am like ghost."* Being like a ghost, he is neither

there nor here (216). That "*[k]nitting pins drop and go clink on cold concrete floow, Tanganda Tea spill everywhere*" foreshadows that everything is falling apart both in the UK for him and in Zimbabwe (216), as well shown in the use of tenses in the narrator's bastardisation of English that shatters every grammar rule and is a sign of how his identity is coming apart like spilling of tea. He wakes up in the morning under the influence of the dream and thinks of his mother and the *umbiyuso*: "You die and your spirit go into wilderness. One year later, your family have to do umbuyiso ceremony to bring your spirit back home so it can leave with other ancestor spirits" (229). Though he thinks he is very cunning and a jackal smarter than civilian people, portraying himself as a rational one, he is also superstitious. He believes that so long as they do not perform the *umbiyuso*, his mother will not rest in peace and will stroll in the wild. Since his mother, who is part of what ties and territorializes the narrator to Zimbabwe, is not tied to earth and is now graveless and not in the world of the dead, he needs to restore the deterritorialization of his mother's soul and hence the deterritorialization of his own identity. Moreover, he repeatedly utters that he did not want to be in the UK, "this funny place," but had to (229):

> US$5,000 – US$1,000 for my uncle because that's what I owe him for my plane ticket here, and US$4,000 to sweet that pack of them hyenas that chase me around Zimbabwe wanting to catch me until I have to run away here because I don't have the money that they want so they can make my troubles go away. (254)

Apart from the corrupt police, called "pack of hyenas," the narrator mentions the news of the Mugabe government's activities: "And then me I hear that people in the village where Mother is buried will be moved somewhere because government want to take over the area since emeralds have now been discovered there" (229). Yet, he does not even think about it. He just mentions that villages will be evacuated, and graves removed; yet, he does not believe that Mugabe can perform such atrocities. He does not lose his confidence in Mugabe and his "Excellency," which ties the narrator to the Zimbabwe soil.

He does not lose his trust in the paramilitary in Zimbabwe, either, because the gang is what he identifies himself with and what gives him an identity and confidence. In the act of torture and killing of an opposition party member, he is chosen the head of the gang to perform "forgiveness," i.e., the torture and killing act. This gives him

an identity because Comrade Mhripiri, whom the narrator admires, tells him that because he knows "heaps of history," he should lead the jackals (279). He gives an account of the event as follows:

> This opposition party supporter, he have been arrest on account of he is one of them people that attack our party's supporters who have invade white man's farm. When we get to them tall trees we only ask him why they attack the sons and daughters of the soil, but the traitor say the soil belong to the white man and that our brothers and sisters is invaders. Me I give him one small lesson in history of Zimbabwe – how in the 1890s them British fat stomachs grab our land, pegging farms by riding horse until it drop dead; that just mark only one side of the farm boundary and that's where the corner peg go. But even after this, the traitor, who have been farm labour supervisor all his life and now have barrel stomach that is so taut any blunt old instrument can punch through it easy if that become necessary, he is still saying that the farmer buy the land. How do you say you buy land that was never sold by no one in the first place unless you like buying things that have been thief from someone? (279)

According to this narration of events, the narrator embodies an anti-colonial stance and echoes the real-life Mugabe who, upon the seizure of farmlands from White owners by force, says that it is their land and it is the white people that "occupied the land illegally [. . .] seized the land from our people" and are "[c]itizens by colonization, seizing land from the original people, indigenous people of the country," therefore, "historically have a debt," and removing them "has to do with national sovereignty," because "[t]hat Zimbabwe belongs to the Zimbabwean people" (Robert Mugabe in his interview with Christiane Amanpour[30]). The seizure of the farmlands is present in the novel, as well, though there is no direct quotation from Mugabe himself. He is seen as a cruel dictator by the diaspora whereas the narrator looks up to him and never accepts the fact that Mugabe might be making mistakes in his policies. The narrator admires Mugabe as a paternal figure whose policies affect the narrator, shattering his sense of identity and home though every one else in the diaspora hates him. He puts his absolute confidence in Mugabe while Mugabe's every political and social move make his self crumble into pieces, i.e., the demolishing of his mother's village and grave, which is part of the territory for the narrator's home and identity, to which he responds through denial because Mugabe is part of his self and therefore

---

[30] http://edition.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/africa/09/25/zimbabwe.mugabe.amanpour.transcript/index.html

cannot go beyond him. That comprises one of the common conflicts amongst the diasporic characters. It is not far-fetched at this point to claim that the narrator, through "heaps of history," justifies himself for his acts against a supporter of the opposition party. He in this respect is an embodiment of Mugabeist ideas and acts in accordance with his politics. He cannot get away from these ideas, which makes it harder for him to adapt to the life in the UK. Also, the reference to the "British fat stomachs" summarizes how he conceives the British and the UK as exploiters, imperialists, thieves, and murderers. That is why he tries hard not to assimilate there, losing his Zimbabwean past intertwined with himself. He thus mimics Mugabe whereas the Mugabe government, as a reflex of the postcolony, mimics the colonial governmental logic. Again, the narrator's ideological distance stems from the historical background of his country while he is away from Zimbabwe, ironically, because of political reasons, which makes it the case that his identity is folded in two, resonating with Mugabe, Zimbabwe, the UK, his imagination and his reality. Upon this issue, he accentuates the importance of belief that glues him to Mugabe:

> Mother's village area is now going to be take over by mining company that belong to commander of armed forces and villagers that don't want to move have been telled that the army and Green Bombers is coming to move them. That's what I read yesterday at Internet cafe. But that is all propaganda because this story is in the Zimbabwe Independent, the newspaper that never like our government. What you believe is your best weapon, I know. (Chikwava 1153)

According to what he reads in the internet cafe, his mother's village is going to be appropriated but the narrator does not believe in anything anti-Mugabeist. Consequently, he considers the news as "propaganda" against the goverment by a newspaper that "never like[s]" it. His territory, Zimbabwe, is made up of Mugabe as a paternal figure and his mother; and the divorce between the two figures will tear the narrator apart. Due to this, he does not want to lose his faith in Mugabe.

Like Mugabe, the narrator utters highly confident and even assertive sentences. His arrogance stems from his uncritical way of understanding the world through a Mugabeist lens and essentialist view of identity:

> When the past always tower over you like a mother of children of darkness, all you can do is hide under she skirt. There you see them years hanging in great big folds of skin and when you pop your head out of under the skirt you don't tell no one what you have see because

that is where you come from. You tell them and people will treat you funny. Especially civilian people. You don't tell no one about the past or you frighten them. Me I don't say even one word about the past to anyone inside our house. (963-975)

He sticks to his past while keeping it a secret from others. His essentialist viewpoint is clear when he differentiates himself from the diasporic others on the grounds that he is not a civilian but a military person, unlike others who live in the squat. As he does not want to face criticism, he does not reveal his "authentic" identity of a Mugabeist Green Bomber. He locates himself apart from the members of the squat and his cousin, Paul, and Sekai because they are losing their Zimbabwean spirits.

As discussed earlier, the narrator's essentialist approach to the notion of identity has an impact in his relationship with other immigrants in the UK. In the narration, he first differentiates himself from other Zimbabwean immigrants, claiming that he is not a "civilian" person. Added to that, because of their "civilian" perceptions, others come to appear as "lapsed Africans" while he himself stays an "original native." It can be discussed in two instances mainly: his relationship with those who live in the squat and his perception of Sekai.

The narrator thinks he knows everything and has power on everyone else, personifying himself as Mugabe. He gives the reader an account of the life in the squat and one of the first instances of how he seperates himself from others in the house is when the narrator depicts Tsitsi, who is confined to either the kitchen or her room and who "rents" her baby to asylum applicants in order that they can easily get their applications approved:

> Tsitsi start singing as she wash them dishes. She always sing them songs that she have carry from she rural hills where them women sing while carrying they buckets of water from borehole. But some days she sing them real ignorant songs by villagers that have never even peep inside classroom window. (722)

In contrast to the narrator who does not cheer on anything, Tsitsi, despite the hardships she has undergone, maintains a hopeful approach to life. While she reminds the narrator of the rural Zimbabwe, some songs Tsitsi sings are "ignorant" according to the narrator. The reference to the "classroom window" is of significance as well in that it implies the villagers have not been exposed to the Mugabeist education and codification. He both distinguishes himself from the rural and "ignorant"

Zimbabweans and attributes his identity to Mugabeist discourse as a "genuine" Zimbabwean now that, he supposes, he has learnt "heaps of history" and transcended ignorance via the Mugabeist teaching and Green Bomber training. His overtly confident utterances throughout the novel, asserting himself as an omniscient character, contradict the fact that whatever he does and believes in turns out to be wrong, which the implied author portrays as the naivety of the narrator. The narrator believes he is in control of everything while he cannot even control himself in the end, cannot even be himself, which makes the situation the narrator is in ironic.

As for his emphasis on being not a civilian, the narrator through his understanding of principles and discipline always represses himself so as not to display a lack of them:

> She is now sitting in funny cross-legged way on bed, with she pointy breasts jumping out at me and she have no idea that this kind of sitting can give people funny ideas. But it don't do nothing to me because me I am not civilian person but military person. Tsitsi, she is just rural mother. She is also just one small child. I don't need to worry about Tsitsi. Me I am not civilian. (759)

In the quotation above, the narrator, sexually aroused, tries to suppress it by reminding himself of his "military" personality so that he can distantiate himself from Tsitsi, looking down on her by portraying her as "just rural mother," and "just one small child." His military, principled, and disciplined persona is not a coincidence. As Mbembe puts forward, "If the colony was focused on making the citizens more productive, the postcolony is intent on disciplining their bodies" (Mbembe 114), which makes it easier to understand the narrator's identity as a docile body of the Mugabe government, in Mbembe's words. Therefore, it is not wrong to propound that his identity is part of a network of codification of the Oedipus. However, he cannot get away from the ideological state apparatus of Zimbabwe and the Mugabe government, which restricts his potential to be a transnational individual via migration and to look back at Zimbabwe from the margins. He unnaturally resists any change of behaviour in his approach to himself and the Zimbabwean diaspora. Therefore, he ends up denying the transformation he is going through. Moreover, the rhizomic nature of home and identity, in Deleuzean terms, is refused by the narrator, who sticks to the trunk of the tree of Zimbabwe and Mugabe. It also leads him to restrict his imagination, which is an essential part of Appadurai's approach, to see through the migrant politics

now that he can only imagine Zimbabwe, his mother and his military persona. He feels the urge to avoid mediascapes of the diaspora, as in the case of the *Evening Standard*; ethnoscapes, clear in his calling other diasporic Zimbabweans as "lapsed;" financescapes visible in his unwillingness to participate in paying the rent as a common necessity; technoscapes when he comes to the point of breaking Shingi's phone so as not to talk to Shingi's uncle and cousin, and lastly ideoscapes as he exerts that he only embodies the Mugabeist ideology, clear in his resistance to the opposition. Consequently, he treats his imagination and the transnational identities of the Zimbabweans in London in a regimental way whereas they are the things that could deterritorialize him in the sense of liberation, rather than the absolute deterritorialization which destines him to self-destruction.

The issue of being principled unlike others that are civilian and thus unprincipled is raised in the novel many times. The narrator's principles determine the quality of jobs in Britain too. An exemplary point in the novel is the job of BBC, "British Buttock Cleaners." The narrator, though in the end he comes to imagine himself to be a Shingi Buttock Cleaner with the hope that Shingi will wake up from the coma, finds this job unacceptable as he thinks it is a degrading job. Aleck, who acts as the head of the squat, tells others that he is a shop manager; however, the narrator finds out he is a BBC.

> 'BBC GRAFT FOR £8 per hour. Immediate start, and it's in Croydon.'
> That's what Aleck tell us. He is trying hard to head us in BBC direction and Shingi is drooling now. 'The fly that land on dollop of poo is the lucky one,' I tell Aleck. 'The one that land on honey is in big trouble. That's the tricky thing about living in Harare North. But some of us, we have to ask the question: you want to do something – what is better, to try doing it your own way and risk finding small success, or to do it in undignified pooful way and find big success?'
> Both Shingi and Aleck get the score quick and stop all this BBC talk. Me I am principled man. (837)

Aleck in this passage advises the narrator and Shingi to find a BBC job. He tells them to do so because he cares about the rent he collects. Though this job pays more than any work they can possibly find, the narrator defines it "undignified," and it is understood from the image of the fly that he finds the work parasitic. This is part of his nature and identity as a "principled man." The masculine tone of the narrator is staged here in this scene again in that "in the homeland, this kind of care work is

usually associated with women and considered quite degrading and emasculating" (Chigwedere 173). Therefore, as Chigwedere asserts, Aleck "is an example of the unfortunate paradox of migration to the UK because although the move signified status, the subjection to 'dirty, demeaning, feminized works' (McGregor 179) causes such men to be caricatured by those back home as the BBC in language is indicative of loss of status and abjection" (Chigwedere 173). For the narrator, working as a BBC is a proof of lack of self-respect and principles. Also, the use of BBC, an acronym for the British Broadcasting Corporation is an indication of how life in Britain for immigrants is since it is a prestigeous institution while for immigrants it is a job for those at the bottom, a degrading and unprincipled one. Similarly, at a point in the novel when there is not much to eat and the narrator and Shingi do not have money to buy food, "[w]hen Aleck is gone, Shingi say I can have the last piece of his meat on his plate. But me I don't eat no leftovers. I'm principled man" (Chikwava 1039). Yet, he, paradoxically and hypocritically, confesses that while others work, he stays at home to eat what they have bought: "You know that kind of madness that is always inside them rural people. I don't want no one to start saying that I only stay inside the house so I can hit they food while they is doing graft. Me I am principled man" (759). Though he is a "principled man," he acts parasitically. Again, it illustrates that even though the territorialized and oedipalized discourse is imagined to be built upon principles, it has its flaws. As Mbembe indicates upon the issue of the postcolony, the postcolonial Oedipus first resists the colonial, then mimics it, and turns into a harsher form of government, thus ending up in hypocrisy, violence, hubris. The transnational subject, on the other hand, would undergo the deterritorializing effects of migration during which she or he experiences a break from the idea of an essentialist identity and home. It is what makes it significant that unless deterritorialized, one cannot see oneself. In that sense, it can be claimed that deterritorialization operates in a way that changes the very being of the rhizomic nature of the subject. Being a so-called "principled man," the narrator cannot see himself from the margin as the territory sets itself in the centre. In other words, he cannot look back to Zimbabwe in a critical way, and he even brings

Zimbabwe in his embodiment of Mugabe to London, which is referred to Harare North[31].

The rigid segmentarity of his sense of identity and perception of home causes his distantiation of himself from the Zimbabwean diaspora. The more he observes them, the further he gets away from them since they do not act as "natives," thus losing their "genuine" identity. His positioning of himself as the "original native" while others are "lapsed Africans," reveals itself soon after his arrival in the UK. He shows his disapproval when Sekai does not welcome her husband's cousin and makes the narrator pay for his own ticket and always warns him against acting as an ignorant and traditional Zimbabwean unaware of English ways, and his diapproval becomes part of his resistance to the deterritorialization of his identity. On the other hand, later on in the novel, when he sees her having an extramarital affair, his to-the-bone honest and principled identity in theory turns out to be hypocritical. Likewise, this in-betweenness affects his reactions; although he represses himself all the time as a "military" person in an effort not to act like a "civilian" one, he has his own ruptures from time to time:

> Today I have to cry. Today I cry for everything that have happen and everything that have not happen. Today I cry to Mother. I don't know how to cry for she when she leave, Mother. Today I cry because the river of pain have run through our hut sweeping everything with it. (1052)

He comes to accept that he has sentiments, too. However, he immediately changes the subject and starts talking about something else. He has his own regrets, pains, upsetting experiences he cannot forget. On the other hand, the identity given to him by the Mugabe politics as a patriotic and endlessly "altruistic" person for the Zimbabwean people keeps him subject to the Oedipus of Zimbabwe, i.e., Mugabe. It spares him the responsibility for himself, for his friends and for his family at the same time. That is why he acts like a Narodnik while trying to save himself. What is more, his clinging on to his believes and confidence does not let him turn to deterritorialization as a line of flight, which keeps him suspended on the past and makes him unable to generate

---

[31] Harare North is used by Zimbabwean immigrants to refer to London. It is "a reference to the number of Zimbabwean immigrants who have chosen or been obliged to settle in the city. Johannesburg is Harare South" (Forna). For more information about this use, see: https://www.theguardian.com/books/2009/apr/25/brian-chikwava-petina-gappah , https://www.litnet.co.za/african-library-harare-north-by-brian-chikwava/ , https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/books/reviews/harare-north-by-brian-chikwava-1673186.html

any other ideas. The deterritorialization of identity in *Harare North* therefore ends up in the void of identity for the narrator.

The narrator slowly goes mad in a mode of self-destruction. He explains his potence through a comparison between hair and pubic hair echoing the contrast between how he sees himself and how he actually is, between how he perceives Mugabe and Zimbabwe and what they are like in fact, which is another example of the motif of two-foldedness in the novel:

> Pubic hair is like your future; you have to find out by yourself what colour it become when time has move on. That is true if you are civilian person. But me I am not civilian person. I know how things is going to turn out. I have already pick my second wages. I know the future; I know what the colour of my pubic hair will be tomorrow. (1140)

He takes everything into consideration via his territorialized rigid segmentarity, with a deterministic view of his future. However, as the squat falls apart, he cannot control anything. Moreover, he comes to lose everything and everyone. First his mother's grave is demolished due to the reforming acts of Mugabe, and Shingi asks him his opinion upon this issue. As a to-the-bone Mugabeist, he cannot explain how the Mugabe government destroys what he keeps as sacred and part of his identity, his mother's grave as part of an operation: "Th . . . this p . . . principled . . . m . . . man style will stop you getting back home. But anyway I don't understand why y . . . you w . . . want to go back to Zim if y . . . your mother's village is going to be t . . . take over?' Shingi say. Me I have nothing to say" (1944). Because they demolish the narrator's mother's grave, which keeps the narrator tied to Zimbabwe, Shingi cannot understand why he still insists on going back instead of staying in the UK and trying to start a better life for himself. Hence, the narrator comes to lose his confidence in Mugabe for confirming the opposition's claims. Likewise, he learns that the Green Bombers are no more as they all flee Zimbabwe. The government first uses the paramilitary and then starts imprisoning them for their illegal activities contradictorily, though the narrator still does not believe in any such activities the Mugabe government can be involved in. For the violence and inconsistencies taking place he blamess the police force, which is full of "traitors." Another crack in the wall of his identity takes place when he realizes that a weird person hanging out in the park in Brixton called the Master of Fox Hounds, aka MFH, is Comrade Mhripiri, once the head of the

paramilitary groups and the leader at the training camp. "Mhiripiri represented a father-figure to the narrator and stood as an icon of patriotism. When he discovers that Comrade Mhiripiri had deceived him and lied about the bribe required, the narrator feels betrayed" (Chigwedere 174). As Chigwedere puts forward, that Comrade Mhiripiri has also escaped what the narrator has been tied to with admiration causes his identity to crack because he is losing his strictly-territorialized sense of belonging, and because he comes to London, encouraged and assured by his Comrade, the reason for his being in London becomes null.

Towards the end of the novel, the narrator comes to take on the role of Shingi, sending money to his relatives and using his ID card to look for "graft." The narrator, who likens the shape of the house to the head of Shingi, now acts as Shingi and actually embodies Shingi while also inhabiting the house. Even when he looks at a pond in the end, the reflection in the water is that of Shingi. This unstability of identity implies the deterritorializing effects of migration and a rupture in identity. The house signifies the narrator's head as he acts as Shingi now. However, he deterritorializes the house and figuratively the head of Shingi by destroying it. He, obsessed with a mouse in the kitchen for a long time, at the end, tries to find and kill it in an outrage of insanity:

> Midnight. I throw myself into this graft. I start to rip them kitchen-floor skirting out with claw hammer. Then the floorboards; they pile up in the hallway. One floorboard out; I see them dusty and PVC pipes. Another floorboard, another pile of rat kaka, but no rat. Another litre of Coca-Cola I drink in thirty seconds. I start to apply myself flat out on my graft. Then the diarrhoea, it come again. Even my hair now feel like cat's hair but me I know life is not fair; I don't worry; I am hard. (Chikwava 2758-2769)

The repeatedly-mentioned "graft" has many different resonances and images here. First, when he looks for "graft," he refers to illegal gain because he is an illegal immigrant in the UK. In addition, the word has a meaning of uniting plants to create a graft as is used in horticulture. Moreover, it means surgical implantation of tissues as well as uniting and joining. In the illegal working atmosphere in the squat, the narrator by trying to pull everything together through "this graft" actually demolishes everything. It reminds the reader of the fact that the narrator comes to London to preserve what he has had, but ends up losing all that is his own. The deterritorialization in both the Deleuzean-Guattarian sense and in Appadurai's approach can be

considered to be a graft, an amorphous, heterogenetic whole. Yet, as is discussed in this chapter, the narrator's deterritorialization paradoxically refers to self-destruction while it is expected to turn into a "graft." In a similar vein, trying to save his identity but losing it at the same time, the narrator destroys Shingi's head as well, the only reminder of his Zimbabwean past in the UK and destroys his imagination as the power of the deterritorialized. Consequently, he destroys his own identity. He packs everything in the house and everything as to his identity and gets away from there without knowing what to do next. He attends a London tour and leaves for an improbable-where now that he has no one and no where. He does not show any consistent behaviour as we see it better that his identity is falling apart and the narrator begins to talk of himself in the second person:

> Even me – there is my double image reflected on the wet tarmac [. . .]Shingi's trousers is missing now, I am only in his underpants. Right in front of my feeties there is puddle of water that has form from the rain and street lamp is shining into it. I look down into puddle; the crack that is screaming out of corner of my glasses' left lens in all directions make things unclear; I can see Shingi looking straight back. My stump finger now feel cold and sore from carrying suitcase. I shake my head and Shingi shake his head until I start to feel dizzy. Why he want to shake me out of his head like so, me I don't know. (2885)

The "double image" is again a significant point here now that his identity is torn apart between Harare and Harare North, himself and Shingi, his mother and Mugabe, Zimbabwe and the UK, the civilians and the military. He reflects both sides of the story while losing them all:

> You don't know when or from which direction the rock of truth will come tearing through the air to smash your head and bring everything to one final end. Half naked, you turn left into Electric Avenue and walk. You start to hear in tongues; it feel like Shingi is on his way back to life. You can tell, you know it; Shingi is now coming back. Already there's struggle over your feeties; you are telling right foot to go in one direction and he is telling left foot to go in another direction. You tell the right foot to go in one direction and he is being traitor shoe-doctor and tell left foot to go in another direction.

He loses all his believes and trust in anything and now cannot know what to do, where to go; he cannot associate anything with anything else; his in-betweenness is underlined in his being half naked, neither fully dressed nor fully naked. He does not know how to act anymore and has no control as he explicitly indicates earlier in the

novel: "Everything falling apart. I don't know how to fix this" (2734). And running across a street, his suitcase opens up with everything in it flying around and away from him. He checks the suitcase again just to see what has just happened. His identity he has packed in it is completely lost. Shingi, his mother, Mugabe, Zimbabwe are all gone:

> This identity splitting at the very conclusion of the novel shows that the protagonist's ludic engagement with multiple identities turns against himself as he no longer knows who he is, losing any touch with reality [. . .] He thus symbolically returns to his initially vacant identity [. . .] The scene confirms the nothingness at the centre of his identity. (Pucherová 166)

Just as Pucherová asserts about the ending of the novel, the deterritorialization of the narrator's identity turns out to be a destructive one for him who belongs nowhere and has no territorialized identity. This kind of deterritorialization of identity is obvious as we never learn even the narrator's name as it becomes a void. Just as stated by Comrade MFH, "Zimbabwe was a state of mind, not a country," his identity embedded in the notion of home embodying Zimbabwe is deterritorialized. This deterritorialization takes place as a self-destruction since he cannot get rid of the aforementioned normative state of mind. That is how his deterritorialization of identity and home ends up in a destructive sense of loss, as he fails to deterritorialize himself by revising his views and senses of home and identity, but sticks to everything Zimbabwean that he is taught to construct in his mind and imagination. Out of the narrator is nothing left.

"[M]igrancy and exile; as Edward Said points out, involves a 'discontinuous state of being,' a form of picking a quarrel with where you come from" claims Iain Chambers (2). As quoted by Chambers, the very phrase of the "discontinuos state of being" refers to the deterritorialization of the migrant in that she or he is subject to transmutation, undergoing a detour from the Oedipus. The itinerary is imagination, and through the migrant or diasporic networks, collectively and individually at the same time, the deterritorialized is always on the move, peregrinating away from the oedipal constellations, therefore is contentious.

However, the narrator in *Harare North* comes up against these perceptions of the deterritorialized identity through his resistance to change by means of his formerly acquired rigid segmentarity. On the horizon of deterritorialization of identity and home

does he stay perpendicular. In between principles and blithe actions, he only resorts to the topology of the oedipal nature of the Mugabe government and the image of her mother instead of moving to the margins, ignoring any thing transnational and thus the rhizomic nature of the local and transnational communities. That is why he averts the –scapes of the diaspora, and while paying efforts to possess everything, he loses every thing that is his own. With nothing to be imagined, that is, his mother's grave that helps him territorialize himself in Zimbabwe and the Mugabe government, whose *arcana imperii* the narrator avoids seeing, the narrator loses his identity, his home, his belief, his principles. He is deterritorialized absolutely to the point of self-destruction.

CHAPTER 4

DETERRITORIALIZATION IN *THE OTHER HAND*

The aim of this chapter is to discuss the deterritorialization of identity and home in Chris Cleave's *The Other Hand,* published as *Little Bee* in the U.S. It will be argued that in contrast to the deterritorialization in the case of the unnamed narrator in *Harare North,* in *The Other Hand,* which can be considered a coming-of-age novel, deterritorialization is not experienced as a destruction of selfhood. The narrator Little Bee's deterritorialization of identity reflects how she can position herself in relation to Nigeria and the UK, echoing Appadurai's and Deleuze and Guattari's approach to deterritorialization as a radical break from an essentialist identity. She embodies a transnational identity, belonging to both the UK and Nigeria while not being embedded in either. There are two narrators, Little Bee, a Nigerian teenage refugee girl, and Sarah O'Rourke, an editor-in-chief of a women's magazine, yet this study focuses on the former's deterritorialized identity and home: Deterritorialization in her identity and home mainly takes place through her transition from childhood to young adulthood in the detention centre, her crosscultural transition from Nigeria to the UK, and her acquisition of English as a means of survival while forgetting her Nigerian English.

Little Bee escapes the probability of a brutal death and rape in Nigeria by hiding on a ship to go to England. Upon her arrival, she is arrested and detained for two years. After being released with other refugee women accidentally, she goes to Andrew and Sarah O'Rourke's house in Surrey. As the story unfolds, it becomes clear that their acquaintance is a result of one catastrophic event that took place when Sarah and Andrew were on holiday in Nigeria two years earlier. Whilst walking on the beach, the couple see two girls, Little Bee and Nkiruka, running from the woods, chased by armed men who work for oil companies and have destroyed the girls' village and killed everyone in order not to let their atrocities be known. The couple want to protect the girls and the leader of the band wants Andrew and Sarah to cut one finger in exchange for the girls' lives. Whereas Andrew hesitates at first and eventually cannot do it to

save Nkiruka, Little Bee's elder sister, Sarah immediately cuts her middle finger with a machete. However, girls are taken away and Nkiruka is brutally raped and killed by those men from whom Little Bee is able to escape later on. When Little Bee goes to the couple's house, Andrew, who has been in a deep depression since that day on the beach in Nigeria, thinks he feels delusional and hallucinating and cannot bear the remorse over his lack of courage to save the girls and hangs himself. After the funeral, Little Bee shows up and starts living with Sarah and Charlie, her son, in their house occasionally visited by Sarah's lover, Lawrence, who works for the Home Office, until she is deported from the UK back to Nigeria, where she in the end reveals her real name, Udo, meaning peace, and peacefully gets rid of her horror and cries with joy even when taken away by soldiers. It is because she has deterritorialized her identity and home and now can see everything globally as she crosses boundaries and sees all human beings as equal and a member of global community and transnationally since she does not have a sense of essentialist identity and has ties and a sense of belonging that go beyond the national.

In the beginning of the novel, Little Bee exclaims that she would prefer to be a British pound coin over being an African girl so that she could be welcomed everywhere and would not have to see unpleased faces that see her coming. She begins her narrative with a striking wish:

> Most days I wish I was a British pound coin instead of an African girl. Everyone would be pleased to see me coming [. . .] A pound coin can go wherever it thinks it will be safest. It can cross deserts and oceans and leave the sound of gunfire and the bitter smell of burning thatch behind. When it feels warm and secure it will turn around and smile at you. (Cleave 24)

The comparison between an African girl and a British pound coin shows that in the globalized world where money can "cross deserts and oceans" and still assert its presence, an African girl is not so lucky as a coin. The reference to global economy and where the African is positioned indicates how the refugees, who are not welcomed in Britain, are perceived. Little Bee expresses her own conditions continuing this juxtaposition: "Of course a pound coin can be serious too. It can disguise itself as power, or property, and there is nothing more serious when you are a girl who has neither" (Cleave 24). It clearly shows that the world is run according to money, not people. Little Bee has no power or property when she flees Nigeria. Moreover, she

challenges the globalization discourse which implicity promises freedom amongst people all over the world whereas global capitalism puts the emphasis on finance and therefore ignores the lives of people who are powerless and impoverished. Her challenge is clear when she says

> A pound is free to travel to safety, and we are free to watch it go. This is the human triumph. This is called, globalisation. A girl like me gets stopped at immigration, but a pound can leap the turnstiles, and dodge the tackles of those big men with their uniform caps, and jump straight into a waiting airport taxi. Where to, sir? Western civilisation, my good man, and make it snappy. (Cleave 33)

She challenges the promise of globalisation in the quotation above by illustrating the discrimination against the migrant subaltern even before entering the "West." She thus highlights the hypocritical way of perception in globalisation. Instead of the most celebrated understanding of globalization, which follows the pattern of fraternity amongst all human beings, the novel is critical of the supranational corporatist perception of globalism, associating the text with a "thoroughgoing critique of the violent and uneven impact of globalized neo liberalism" (Woolley 174). It is seen in a crystal-clear way in her case, as she is given no value as long as she has no economic power; and in this respect, globalization is contested at the level of the monolithic "Western civilization," which Little Bee equates with global capitalism. "The country to which Little Bee travels is one in which the machinery of national citizenship not only co-exists with the forces of global neoliberalism, but sovereign power and transnational capital here interpenetrate and overdetermine one another" (Hart 33). Therefore, she, upon her arrival in the UK, is met with a marginalizing wall that categorizes her as the other. However, Little Bee invents her own identity without relying on these categories, deterritorializing her identity. Even her name is invented by herself and it suggests that she is one little bee, and without knowing her direction she moves from one hive to another one. The imagery of bee and hive is worthy of mention in that every bee belongs to a specific hive and is subject to a queen. Yet, Little Bee in the novel has no specific place, moving in between two different hives. Therefore, she moves to and fro and invents her own hive, which is both her identity and home that resembles a collage, again challenging the normative and essentialist reception of identity, expressing it in an unorthodox and heterogenous way. This heterogeneity can be taken into account as what Deleuze and Guattari call

"heterogenesis." It can be likened to a collage in that her reception of identity is like what she thinks is similar to rainbow, with different colours, yet in harmony. In that sense, in the global context Little Bee imagines it is possible that the identity is an amorphous and heterogenous whole that is not clear-cut. It is not far-fetched to claim then that the deterritorialization of identity in the transcultural context of *The Other Hand* turns out to be a reinvention of identity as she does not carry a stable identity or a strict sense of identity and she, as in the metaphor of bee, takes from flowers, i.e., cultures and peoples, and carries to her hive, that is, her home and identity, which bears extracts from both the country of origin and the host country. In other words, her performance of identity and home describes the rhizomic nature of these terms in view of the fact that there is no specific point of identity and home to put a finger on. It is laid bare when she thinks she would create an idea of a refugee flag if there were one: "then the flag I would make would be gray" (Cleave 1098). Through the imagery of a gray flag that represents refugees, it is obvious that refugees are in a liminal world, for which gray as an amalgam of the dichotomous identities and congregation of the liminal stands. Moreover, she furthers this gray zone when she utters that "I think that old gray brassiere would make a fine spectacle, flying in the long colorful line of flags. I would fly it between the Stars and Stripes and the big red Chinese flag" (1098). Accordingly, the "old gray brassiere" is reminiscient of the oppressed of the patriarchal and capitalist global economy and identity politics. However, the way she presents the flags encompasses the poles of that economy, with allusions to the flag of the US and PRC.

Little Bee, in between cultures and detained for two years, resorts to imagination, by clinging both to the "girls back home" and to the books and magazines and newpapers that were given to her and she read in the detention centre to get a better grasp of England and the English ways:

> And this woman they released from the immigration detention centre, this creature that I am, she is a new breed of human. There is nothing natural about me. I was born – no, I was reborn – in captivity. I learned my language from your newspapers, my clothes are your cast-offs, and it is your pound that makes my pockets ache with its absence. Imagine a young woman cut out from a smiling Save the Children magazine advertisement, who dresses herself in threadbare pink clothes from the recycling bin in your local supermarket car park and speaks English like the leader column of The Times, if you please. I would cross the street

to avoid me. Truly, this is the one thing that people from your country and people from my country agree on. They say, *That refugee girl is not one of us. That girl does not belong*. That girl is a halfling, a child of an unnatural mating, an unfamiliar face in the moon (117-129, original emphasis)

She directly tells that she has reinvented herself as a "new breed of human" who has "nothing natural." The issue of naturalness brought up here actually alludes to the delusional perception of identity as the essence of being a human. She therefore feels reborn but this time there is no mother to give birth to her and she creates her identity without roots. In this respect where she is reborn is an important aspect of her deterritorialized identity since she is reborn in "captivity," i.e., in the immigrant detention centre, by coming from Nigeria and reading about England without being in England, which we can receive in her case as a "non-place." This makes Little Bee a non-territorial person before reinventing herself. This reinvention of identity as deterritorialized by a child is illustrated by Caryl McLaughlin as follows:

> One way in which children show agency is in the formation of distinct transcultural identities. The recent identification of childhood as an ontological category distinct from adulthood amounts to a reassessment of children as "autonomous and creative beings producing social reality and culture." (49)

In the light of the quotation above, it can be held that Little Bee shows an exemplary agency for the formation of identity in the transcultural context as she produces her own way of seeing life by diverting from and challenging pre-set categories. She this way delivers a radical break from the essentialist and traditional understanding of identity as she diverts from the mainstream and so-called "natural" way. With the help of the collapse of the understanding as to identity and belonging, Little Bee deterritorializes her identity as a heterogenous and distinctive individual: She transcends the modern boundaries of identity based on cartographical assumptions. And this portrayal of Little Bee as a deterritorialized individual "challenges the assumption of homogeneity among refugee children – indeed, among refugees in general," and as such she comes up against "the tendency in the West to impose a fixed identity on refugees that condemns them to victimhood and passivity" (McLaughlin 50). As a result, she negotiates the cultural differences between Nigeria and Britain, between Sarah and "girls back home," at times being alienated from them both, by

addressing the British readership and referring to the "girls." And as is suggested by McLaughlin, she resolves the abovementioned tendency that presupposes orthodox identities, which are deconstructed via her individual agency as a non-territorial one. Besides, the problematization of language is present in the novel, clear in her learning of the Queen's language despite the possibility that people will cross the street upon seeing her. It reveals the adaptation on the one hand and still an evidence of the dissociation between the two worlds, two languages that encounter but cannot meet each other, evident in the alternating narratives of Sarah and Little Bee, which is what Slavoj Zizek calls the "'parallax gap', which occurs in 'the confrontation of two closely linked perspectives between which no neutral common ground is possible' (2006, p. 4)" (qtd in Wooley 181). Because of this ambivalent world structure at work, they are part of the whole but cannot come together, as is clear in the motif of a coin. Little Bee tries both to cover and to reveal the gap using the Queen's English as a source of empowerment for her story. The use of such English is a "way of situating herself in an 'alien' World" (Savu 94). Moreover, if she did not use that English, her narrative "would get lost in this great ocean of wonders because it would seem as if your country was an enchanted federation of miracles" (Cleave 81). Sarah, on the other hand, with the same intention, collects stories of refugee girls to lay bare the circumstances under which they live and struggle to survive: "Our problem is that you only have your own story. One story makes you weak. But as soon as we have one hundred stories, you will be strong. […] We need to collect the stories of people who've been through the same things as you" (3541). "One hundred stories" complement the "halfling" state of Little Bee, in an attempt to accentuate the two dissociated but interdependent worlds. It also helps the recognition of the two worlds and the two hands of Sarah and Little Bee, by means of "sharing the narrative space" (Woolley 181). The use of the Queen's English and Sarah's intention to collect stories can be seen as "an investment both in the communicative channels opened up by globalization, which would permit the stories of Little Bee and others like her to traverse the globe, and in the power of storytelling to motivate people into acts of solidarity" (Woolley 181). And it bears the cause of bringing together the two poles of the gap, in order to curb the compartmentalization of peoples. That is how her deterritorialized transnational identity is comprised.

However, as she has no power or property, she needs another capital, which is either to look good or to speak English well. Unlike Nkiruka, who "[becomes] a woman in the growing season, under the African sun," she becomes "a woman under white fluorescent strip lights in an underground room in an immigration detention centre" (Cleave 117). For this reason she cannot accept her femininity, alluding to the issue of "naturalness": "I made myself undesirable. I declined to wash, and I let my skin grow oily. Under my clothes I wound a wide strip of cotton around my chest, to make my breast small and flat" (105). The main motive for her to hide her femininity is to protect herself, also a reminder of the deeply traumatic experience on the beach. Therefore she chooses the latter option and learns to speak the "Queen's English," during which process she comes to lose the "best tricks of [her] mother tongue," and exposes the cultural difference in language:

> For example, the Queen could never say, *There was plenty wahala, that girl done use her bottom power to engage my number-one son and anyone could see she would end in the bad bush. Instead the Queen must say, My late daughter-in-law used her feminine charms to become engaged to my heir, and one might have foreseen that it wouldn't end well.* It is all a little sad, don't you think? (45, original emphasis)

It is sad for her because she comes to cut her ties with the very thing that ties her to her past and parents, the very medium of communication with them, her mother tongue. As the Queen has the power and financial capital, and even has had her picture imprinted on the British pound coin that can travel anywhere, she needs her share of power and capital that compels her to learn English to get away from the detention centre and survive in Britain, with the intention of telling her story, voicing the unvoiced. Furthermore, the voice she articulates in Queen's English also becomes a means of challenging the aforementioned reception of identity that presents the African refugee as an exoticized "Other;" she, makes use of the dominant linguistic sphere in order to reveal the gaps in it and emphasize the "cultural hybridities[32]":

> Excuse me for learning your language properly. I am here to tell you a real story. I did not come to talk to you about the bright African colours. I am a born-again citizen of the developing world, and I will prove to you that the colour of my life is grey. (Cleave 129)

[32] Here it is of significance to remark Bhabha's approach to hybridization of cultures. According to David Huddart, "for Bhabha there are no cultures that come together leading to hybrid forms; instead, cultures are the consequence of attempts to still the flux of cultural hybridities" (4).

In her address to the "sophisticated people" of England, the narratee as identified by her, she challenges the essentialist view of the "Other" in her deterritorialized identity by describing it as grey, as is discussed earlied in this chapter. From this standpoint, though she distances herself from the "you" as the English reader, she also does not define herself in direct relation to Africa, whose "bright" colors she does not intend to talk about. Likewise, her in-betweenness is laid bare when she reveals that she does not fit the traditional and homogenous categories of home and identity, which is based on the cartography and stereotypes:

> Is it my fault if I do not look like an English girl and I do not talk like a Nigerian? Well, who says an English girl must have skin as pale as the clouds that float across her summers? Who says a Nigerian girl must speak in fallen English, as if English had collided with Ibo, high in the upper atmosphere, and rained down into her mouth in a shower that half drowns her and leaves her choking up sweet tales about the bright African colours and the taste of fried plantain? Not like a story-teller, but like a victim rescued from the flood, coughing up the colonial water from her lungs? (129)

She challenges the biased stereotypes, and "she is aware that it is precisely the fixity of such assumptions about identity that prevents her from being an acceptable part of society" (McLaughlin 62-63). She questions the prejudices against both groups. Besides, this kind of radical and affirmative respresentation of deterritorialized identity helps Little Bee refuse to be regarded as a passive and silenced victim. "Little Bee challenges the politics of subject formation that necessitates the making of "the other"—the non-Western, the female, the poor, all of which have been relegated to the global periphery and to static entities without agency" (Savu 91). So, it can be purported that the deterritorialization of identity and a fixed sense of belonging challenges the stereotypical refugee portrayal extant in the West "to impose a fixed identity on refugees that condemns them to victimhood and passivity" (McLaughlin 50). Little Bee highlights the expected role of a Nigerian girl speaking in pidgin English and puts the emphasis on the skin colour while deterritorializing the conventional cultural paradigms and belonging by introducing the "complex politics of her globalized, postcolonial identity" (McLaughlin 60). "Through her performance of linguistic nativity, Little Bee questions the equation of whiteness and ownership of language and the implicit white world's devaluation of blackness" (Savu 94): In spite of the fact that her speech pushes her to a central space of Englishness, her physical

features present her as African, "speaking their own history: a gendered history of violence." In a similar vein, after confessing to Sarah's lover, Lawrence, that she witnessed Andrew O'Rourke's suicide but did not do anything to stop him, she exerts a distance between herself and the stereotypical category of refugee girl often pictured as victimized and pacified: "Now you think I'm a sweet little girl, do you? In your mind you still don't think I really exist. It does not occur to you that I can be clever, like a white person. That I can be selfish, like a white person" (Cleave 2710). Not meeting the western expectations from her, that is to say that being a black African refugee, she has to speak in "broken" English, be passive, she challenges the constructed images of a Nigerian refugee girl as well.

Added to that, thanks to her deterritorialization of her identity, she can see herself both from the margin and from the page. Appadurai's emphasis on the break with modernity and modern and grounded perceptions is thus made clearer: She can see things by means of different lenses and perspectives as she widens her horizons of imagination and pays efforts to turn imagination into collective actions. Similarly, Appadurai's accentuation of the global flows of deterritorialized collectivities is of a crystal-clear refusal of nation-state as a vantage point for conventions of modernity. Therefore, as can be recalled from Appadurai's recognition of the aforementioned deviance from the project of modernity, and as seen in his emphasis on imagination that makes global collectivities possible, present migrations create a space for that refusal. Woolley connects Appadurai's standpoint based on "contemporary mass migrations in conjunction with 'the rapid flow of mass-mediated images, scripts, and sensations'" with that of *The Other Hand* now that the transnational relations flourish through the mediascapes in the novel form (172). As such, similar to Appadurai, Hardt and Negri's category of Empire and its workings is worth mentioning since they too take migrations and "flows of population" from the "third World" as "liberating" projects that "have destroyed old and new boundaries" (Hardt and Negri 363). Although it is, to some extent, easy to claim that Little Bee and Sarah cross the boundaries of nation-states and Little Bee is eventually deported and her actions are limited, it is possible to assert that the direct encounter with the modern nation-state confined to a geographical sphere and the struggle of the characters against it reveal the importance of the -scapes and imagination so as to cross the boundaries of the

epistemological register of modernity through a global approach that includes every colour, "which provide communal access to global 'repertoires of images [and] narratives' (1996, p. 33) disseminated through growing electronic means and upon which diverse constituencies draw" (Woolley 173). This way it becomes plausible to question the boundaries.

As well as distinguishing herself from the British as discussed earlier, she also distinguishes herself from the Nigerian. Now that she has acquired the Queen's English, she imagines that she will tell her story in England to the "girls back home." That is how she does not cut her ties completely. "Girls back home" refer to her sister and her friends that used to live in her village before it was pillaged and many people murdered. Via the "girls back home" that function as "either encouraging or reprimanding her, and ultimately acting as a kind of chorus that provides solace for the imprisoned girl" and "[frame] her story" she again expresses the distantiation of herself from both cultures (Buonanno 32). Yet, the frame of the story in the "dominant discourse" and her address to the British is written with the aim of "making an impact" so that her and others' voices can be heard, while the "girls back home" are of the function of the "Greek chorus" in the narrative, "a foil in whose imagined reaction the cultural dissonance experienced by Little Bee can be made explicit," according to Cleave (Q&A). It is important to note here that what the "girls back home" project into "horror" is juxtaposed with that of the British: Horror, for the former, is a "disease" and they are "sick with it" whereas it is, for the latter, "something you take a dose of to remind yourself that you are not suffering from it" (Cleave 660). That is why Little Bee resorts to the Queen's English to make an influential story, as a reminder of the alien, through the encounter with the other in their own linguistic register. As she "scrub[s] off" her Nigerian past, she comes to reinvent it with the help of imagination drawing on the girls' would-have-been reactions.

She sees in one of the newspapers detention centre officers read that there is a "topless" woman. She exposes the linguistic difference as follows:

> But if I was telling this story to my big sister Nkiruka and the other girls from my village back home, then I would have to stop, right here, and explain to them: topless does not mean, the lady in the newspaper did not have an upper body. It means, she was not wearing any garments on her upper body. You see the difference?
> – *Wait. Not even a brassiere?*

– Not even a brassiere.
– Weh!
And then I would start my story again but those girls back home, they would whisper between them. They would giggle behind their hands. Then, just as I was getting back to my story about the morning they let me out of the immigration detention centre, those girls would interrupt me again. Nkiruka *would say, Listen, okay? Listen. Just so we are clear. This girl in the newspaper photo. She was a prostitute, yes? A night fighter? Did she look down at the ground from shame?*
– No, she did not look down at the ground from shame. She looked right in the camera and smiled.
– What, in the newspaper?
– Yes.
– Then is it not shameful in Great Britain, to show your bobbis in the newspaper?
– No. It is not shameful. The boys like it and there is no shame. Otherwise the topless girls would not smile like that, do you see?
– So do all the girls over there show them off like that? Walk around with their bobbis bouncing? In the church and in the shop and in the street?
– No, only in the newspapers.
– Why do they not all show their breasts, if the men like it and there is no shame?
– I do not know.
– You lived there more than two years, little miss been-to. How come you not know? – It is like that over there. Much of my life in that country was lived in such confusion. Sometimes I think that even the British do not know the answers to such questions.
-Weh! (Cleave 69-81, italics in the original)

In this imaginary scene about how she would have tried to explain the content of newspapers, the key term to understand Little Bee's deterritorialized identity is "confusion." She is not only distant from the British, but also the Nigerian, even if she can predict how they would respond to her narrative. First, she needs to win against the linguistic barrier and then try to explain it to the girls. Yet, as she delves into solving the intercultural confusion, she gets lost now that she has learnt the Queen's English and wiped off her Nigerian English. Therefore, she does not even imagine the girls speaking in a complete pidgin English apart from "bobbis" and "Weh." In addition, she explicates her difference from the other girls in the detention center who cannot speak on the phone to request a taxi and ask Little Bee for help. After a few tries by the other girls that are hung up on by the taxi station since they speak in "broken" English, she takes the phone and tells that they are cleaners: "I know you do

not pick up refugees. We are not refugees. We are cleaners. We work in this place" she says on the phone and the one on the other side of the phone first asks for confirmation, whether they are really cleaners, and then satisfied, he says "[be]cause if I had a pound for every bloody immigrant that got in the back of one of my cabs and didn't know where they wanted to go and started prattling on to my driver in Swahili and tried to pay him in cigarettes, I'd be playing golf at this very moment instead of talking to you'" (Cleave 227). He now believes that they are cleaners as Little Bee does not "talk like one of them" (ibid.). However, when the cab comes to the detention centre, another cultural difference becomes the case. As Little Bee once sees, one detention officer calls a musician on a CD box as "What a cock," which she thinks stands for the musician's hair. "It was like a cockerel's comb, you see. So a cock was a cockerel" and the cab-driver has the same hair. And she thinks she needs to compliment the driver and says "Hello, I see that you are a cock" (824). With a "sour expression" on his face, the driver utters "Don't they teach you monkeys manners in the jungle?" (ibid.). Then the driver leaves immediately with the "tyres of his taxi [squealing] like a baby when you take its milk away" (ibid.). So, it can be taken into account that though Little Bee has learnt the Queen's English perfectly, her "cultural apprenticeship" is still in the making as she accepts this as her problem whilst learning English (Savu 94): "Every word can defend itself. Just when you go to grab it, it can split into two separate meanings so the understanding closes on empty air" (Cleave). Speaking very good English provides her with some advantage; nonetheless, in terms of cultural understanding that congregates people into groups and subgroups in a hierarchy, she is still in-between.

The climax of her deterritorialized identity and home is made explicit at the end of the novel when Sarah and her son Charlie accompany Little Bee. The ending scene is on a beach while Charlie wearing a Batman costume and mask is playing with some Nigerian kids. Charlie asks Little Bee her real name and finally she reveals her original name. It is Udo, which means peace. She asks Charlie what peace means and explains to him that "[p]eace is a time when people can tell each other their real names" (Cleave 3719). However, interrupting the peace, the soldiers come slowly pacing towards them, "with their rifles in their hands." Little Bee throws herself forward stating that she is the one that they are looking for so as to protect Charlie. Children

run away and as Little Bee is taken away, she cries with joy because the kids are playing together though at first they are surprised at Charlie's blond hair. Resonating with the Wordsworthian understanding, which puts forward that children do not embrace the conventional and disrupt the socially accepted, the children all play now with no discrimination "in the sparkling foam of the waves that broke between worlds at the point. It was beautiful, and that is a word I would not need to explain to the girls from back home, and I do not need to explain to you, because now we are all speaking the same language" (3731-3743). In this respect, she gets rid of one of the cargoes she has carried all along: horror and hope. She leaves the former on that beach and looks at the future as bright. For Udo, everything as to identity and consequently home is deterritorialized as she becomes a globalized (one that accepts the earth as the homeland in this case) and deterritorialized (one that deviates from conventionalism and essentialism) persona, and her home becomes a world where kids speak the same language of love that recognizes no discrimination. That is why even though she is arrested by the soldiers and to be imprisoned, her sense of identity and home is to pierce through the prison walls since deterritorialization of them itself is already the destruction of the conventional walls of a strict sense of home and identity.

Little Bee's deterritorialization of identity and home results from her loss of them first and gaining a "reborn" identity and home in the global sense, challenging the normative forms of the notions of home and identity. Through her explicit agency in identity-formation she comes to reveal that identity in the global sense is all about exceeding the boundaries of nation-states and acting via different scapes. As the novel itself is a mediascape, it helps the "[r]e-imagining [of] the experience of globality from the perspective of a refugee, *The Other Hand* [that] illuminates, and seeks to lessen, the gulf separating 'our world and yours' through the encounter between Sarah and Little Bee and their interwoven narrative voices" (Woolley 169). Moreover, it contributes to the presentation of a Janus-like face of globalisation compartmentalized in accord with neo-liberalism on the one hand and the presentation of globalization, on the other, as the "hopes of this whole human world [that] could fit inside one soul" (Cleave 3707). Sarah and Little Bee achieve this by "undergo[ing] a change from passive, albeit sympathetic, witnesses to what Rita Felski has called 'embedded and embodied agents'" (Savu 91). Via this agency can they adjust the whole world into

their souls, at a disjuncture with modernity. This intersecting and disjuntive global approach therefore deterritorializes Little Bee's identity and home basing them on the globe, including both countries as well as all others. In a nutshell, deterritorialization of identity and home is the consequence of transcending the common and conventional modern understandings of identity and home.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This thesis offers an analysis of deterritorialization of identity and home in Brian Chikwava's *Harare North* (2004) and Chris Cleave's *The Other Hand* (2008), both of which "received a good deal of critical praise" (Perfect 157). Although these two novels differ from each other in many ways, when read together, help understand the intracommunal and extracommunal relationships that migrants, particularly refugees and asylum-seekers, come to face.

The main difference between these novels is that the unnamed narrator of *Harare North* comes to London, seeking asylum, not as a victim but as one who commits acts of torture and killing. He is not positioned against the Oedipus of Zimbabwe shaped and embodied by Mugabe, whom the narrator looks up to as a paternal figure. Moreover, he is a direct product of the Mugabeist discourse. In *The Other Hand*, however, Little Bee escapes death and rape in Nigeria, upon the brutal rape and killing of her sister Nkiruka. During her imprisonment in the detention center, she comes to see the world in transnational glasses, questioning her sense of belonging and identity. The juxtaposition between the two narrators of these novels is an important feature of this thesis in that through it we can analyze how ideoscapes shape the way immigrants perceive their identities and homes. Accordingly, the unnamed narrator in *Harare North* defines his sense of identity and home only in terms of belonging to Zimbabwe and following Mugabeist politics. Similarly, he cannot accept anyone into his life just as he believes he cannot get rid of his hardened belief in Mugabe. On the contrary, Little Bee cannot grow a strict sense of belonging to any place. Her position as non-territorial makes her see through how international politics work, what life is for a refugee, since she has nobody to turn to, except for Sarah and Charlie, a motivation for her deterritorialization as both a nomad and an orphan, as in the Deleuzeo-Guattarian conceptualization. Thus, she can look at herself from the margin.

70

It should also be added that gender emerges as a major issue in both novels in their treatment of migrancy. The unnamed narrator makes use of his position as a man in order to manipulate others as a paternal figure. He is therefore after "possessing" and manipulating, having power over others in the novel. In the end, he becomes the head of the house and mimics Mugabe in his actions. The novel puts the emphasis on his overtly patriarchal imaginary world's castration as an irregular immigrant in the UK, who cannot achive his goals. His continuous resistance to change and this castration in the end lets him loose his ties to Zimbabwe and Mugabe; however, his deterritorialization of identity and home results in self-destruction. Little Bee, in contrast, always feels under threat, as a teenage refugee girl, clear in her search for a place and way to kill herself in case unknown men come. Therefore, when Sarah supports her as a woman, she feels relieved of the pains she has to take so as to protect herself. Sisterly bond they create deterritorializes both characters' sense of belonging and contributes to their questioning of themselves and how they are positioned in a patriarchal society, both as women and as a refugee in the case of Little Bee.

Furthermore, both novels lay emphasis on the importance of imagination. *Harare North* gives an account of how the unnamed narrator takes shelter in the memory of the past home as a member of the youth militia called the Green Bombers and idealization of Zimbabwe, which later in the novel is described as "a state of mind." Moreover, his dreams in which he always witnesses his mother's reactions reveal his inner world in contrast to what he claims himself to be whereas Little Bee as an in-between character lives with Sarah and always dreams of her deceased friends, "girls back home." Always referring back to families and friends in their past homes, the unnamed narrator and Little Bee reflect their transformation through the comparison between where they were and where they are now.

These two novels are studied in relation to deterritorialization of identity and home to explore the novels' treatment of what refugees undergo, what kind of dangers they encounter and how they are transformed in accord with their position both in the country of origin and in the host country. The concept of deterritorialization is a fertile ground to analyze these novels in that they offer rich material for the study of the transformation of the individual as immigrant and the problems they come to face during their stays in the UK.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, Sara. *Strange Encounters Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*. Routledge, 2013.

Albertsen , Niels, and Bülent Diken. "Organlı / Organsız Toplum." *Göçebe Düşünmek: Deleuze Düşüncesinin Sınırlarında*, edited by Ahmet Murat Aytaç and Mustafa Demirtaş, Metis Yayınları, 2014.

Amanpour, Christiane, and Robert Mugabe. "Transcript: Christiane Amanpour Interviews Robert Mugabe." *CNN*, Cable News Network, 24 Sept. 2009, edition.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/africa/09/25/zimbabwe.mugabe.amanpour.transcript/index.html.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. Verso Books, 2006.

Appadurai, Arjun. "Arjun Appadurai 'Flows of Globalization.'" *Vienna Humanities Festival*, Vienna Humanities Festival 2016, 6 Oct. 2016, www.humanitiesfestival.at/rueckblick/.

Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. University of Minnesota, 1996.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Jewish Writings*. Schocken Books, 2007.

Bauman, Zygmunt, and Benedetto Vecchi. *Identity: Conversations with Benedetto Vecchi*. Polity, 2004.

"Beyond 'Culture': Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference." *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*, by Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, Duke University Press, 1997, pp. 33–51.

Bloch, Alice. *The Migration and Settlement of Refugees in Britain*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*. Oxford University Press, 2005.

Boym, Svetlana. *The Future of Nostalgia*. Hachette UK, 2008, *Google Books*, books.google.com.tr/books?id=EHk4DgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=the+future+of+nostalgia&hl=tr&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjZ--T9voPqAhUQmYsKHd5FBGUQ6AEIKDAA#v=onepage&q=the%20future%20of%20nostalgia&f=false.

Brah, A. *Cartography of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. Routledge, 1997.

Buonanno, Giovanna. "Writing Young Refugees in Contemporary English Fiction: Chris Cleave's The Other Hand." *INTERACTIONS: Ege Journal of British and American Studies* , vol. 29, no. 1-2, 2020, pp. 27–36.

Castles, Stephen, et al. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. Guilford Press, 2014.

Chambers, Iain. *Migrancy, Culture, Identity*. Routledge, 2005. This edition was published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2001

Chigwedere, Yuleth. "The Wretched of the Diaspora: Traumatic Dislocation in Brian Chikwava'sHarare North." *Journal of the African Literature Association*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2017, pp. 169–182., doi:10.1080/21674736.2017.1374505.

Chikwava, Brian. *Harare North*. Vintage Digital, 2009.

Cleave, Chris. *The Other Hand*. Kindle ed., Sceptre, 2009.

Cleave, Chris. "LITTLE BEE Author Q&A." *Chriscleave.com*, chriscleave.com/little-bee/the-true-story-behind-my-new-novel/. Accessed 20 May 2020.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Guattari Félix. *A Thousand Plateaus*. University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Guattari Félix. *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Guattari Félix. *What Is Philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell, Columbia University Press, 1994.

Deleuze, Gilles, et al. "Introduction." *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, University of Minnesota Press, 1983, pp. xv-xxiv.

Donato, Katharine M., and Douglas S. Massey. "Twenty-First-Century Globalization and Illegal Migration." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 666, no. 1, July 2016, pp. 7–26, doi:10.1177/0002716216653563.

Fanon, Frantz, and Homi K. Bhabha. "Remembering Fanon: Self, Psyche and the Colonial Condition." *Black Skin, White Masks*, Pluto Press, 2008, pp. xxi-xxxvii.

Forna, Aminatta. "Review: Harare North by Brian Chikwava | An Elegy for Easterly by Petina Gappah." *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 24 Apr. 2009, www.theguardian.com/books/2009/apr/25/brian-chikwava-petina-gappah.

Foucault, Michel. "Preface." *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, by Gilles Deleuze and Guattari Félix, University of Minnesota Press, 1983, pp. xi-xiv.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Harvard Univ. Press, 2001.

Hart, Matthew. "Representing Immigration Detention and Removal." *English Language Notes*, vol. 49, no. 1, 2011, pp. 29–50., doi:10.1215/00138282-49.1.29.

"Imaginary Homelands." *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*, by Salman Rushdie, Granta Books, 2010, pp. 9–21.

Kaplan, Caren. "Deterritorializations: The Rewriting of Home and Exile in Western Feminist Discourse." *Cultural Critique*, no. 6, 1987, pp. 187–198. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/1354261. Accessed 15 June 2020.

Kaplan, Caren. *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement*. Duke University Press, 2006.

Kriger, Norma J. "Robert Mugabe, Another Too-Long-Serving African Ruler: A Review Essay." *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 118, no. 2, 2003, pp. 307–313. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/30035743. Accessed 15 June 2020.

Koser, Khalid. *International Migration: a Very Short Introduction*. Langara College, 2017.

Lorraine, Tamsin. "Lines of Flight." *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition*, edited by Adrian Parr, Revised ed., Edinburgh University Press, 2010, pp. 147–148.

MacGonagle, Elizabeth. *Crafting Identity in Zimbabwe and Mozambique*. University of Rochester Press, 2013.

Mbembe, Joseph Achille. *On the Postcolony*. University of California Press, 2012.

Mclaughlin, Carly. "Childhood, Migration, and Identity in Chris Cleave's The Other Hand." *Transcultural Identities in Contemporary Literature*, 2013, pp. 47–67., doi:10.1163/9789401209878_004.

Mutman, Mahmut. "Signs in Flow: Transnationalism, Media and Racism." *Journal of International Communication*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2013, pp. 2386–2399.

Papastergiadis, Nikos. *The Turbulence of Migration: Globalization, Deterritorialization and Hybridity*. Polity Press, 2007.

Parr, Adrian. "Deterritorialisation / Reterritorialisation." *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition*, edited by Adrian Parr, Edinburgh University Press, 2010, pp. 69–72.

Perfect, Michael. *Contemporary Fictions of Multiculturalism: Diversity and the Millennial London Novel*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Pucherová, Dobrota. "Forms of Resistance against the African Postcolony in Brian Chikwava's Harare North." *Brno Studies in English*, vol. 41, no. 1, 2015, pp. 157–173., doi:10.5817/bse2015-1-10.

Savu, Laura E. "Bearing Wit(h)Ness: 'Just Emotions' and Ethical Choices in Chris Cleave'sLittle Bee." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, vol. 55, no. 1, 2013, pp. 90–102., doi:10.1080/00111619.2012.656207.

Seem, Mark. "Inroduction." *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, by Gilles Deleuze and Guattari Félix, University of Minnesota Press, 1983, pp. xv-xxiv.

Smith, Daniel, and John Protevi. "Gilles Deleuze." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Stanford University, 14 Feb. 2018, plato.stanford.edu/entries/deleuze/.

Soysal Yasemin Nuhoğlu. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. The University of Chicago, 1997.

Stagoll, Cliff. "Becoming." *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition*, edited by Adrian Parr, Edinburgh University Press, 2010, pp. 25–27.

Standing, Guy. *The Precariat: the New Dangerous Class*. Langara College, 2019.

Thornton, Edward. On Lines of Flight: A Study of Deleuze and Guattari's Concept. PhD Dissertation. Royal Holloway, University of London, 2018.

Unat, Nermin Abadan. *Bitmeyen Göç: Konuk İşçilikten Ulus-Ötesi Yurttaşlığa*. 3rd ed., İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2017.

Unutulmaz, K. Onur. "Gündemdeki Kavram Çözmen Entegrasyonu-Avrupa'Daki Gelişme Ve Britanya Örneği." *Küreselleşme çağında göç: Kavramlar, tartışmalar*, edited by Ihlamur-Öner S. Gülfer. and Öner N. Aslı Şirin, İletişim, 2012, pp. 135–160.

Upstone, Sara. *Spatial Politics in the Postcolonial Novel*. Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009.

Woolley, Agnes. *Contemporary Asylum Narratives: Representing Refugees in the Twenty- First Century*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Young, Eugene B., et al. *The Deleuze and Guattari Dictionary*. Bloomsbury, 2013.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TÜRKÇE ÖZET / TURKISH SUMMARY

Göç konusu hem göçmenlerin hayatlarını hem de göç edilen ülke ve halkının tepkilerinin ortaya konduğu çeşitli mecralarda önemli ölçüde dikkat çekmiştir. Mezkûr konu çokkültürlülük, İngilizlik ve ötekilik konularına, hem olumlayan hem kötümser, birçok farklı yaklaşımın olduğu 2000 sonrası Londra romanında da sıkça işlenmiştir. Bu konular beraberinde göç esnasında dönüşüme tabi tutulan kimlik ve ev kavramlarının da sorgulanmasını gerektirmiştir. Göç sürecini dolayısıyla ilk takip eden, yerinden edilme / olma, gelinen ülkeyle bulunan yerleşikleşmiş bağların kaybı ve gidilen ülkedeki muameleden kaynaklanan dışlanmadır. Kimlik ve ev açısından bu arada kalmışlık yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma mefhumuyla açıklanabilir. Deleuze ve Guattari'nin ve Arjun Appadurai'nin kavramsallaştırmaları göçmenlik bağlamında hem katılaşmış ve özcü kimlik ve ev algısından özgürleştiren bir deneyim hem de bazen öz-yıkım olarak kimlik ve ev anlayışının yersizyurtsuzlaşmalarını / topraksızlaşmalarını anlamak açısıdan verimli olmuştur. Bu tez Brian Chikwava'nın *Harare North* ve Chris Cleave'in *The Other Hand* romanlarını Deleuze ve Guattari'nin ve Arjun Appadurai'nin göçmenlik, özellikle mültecilik ve düzensiz göçmenlik bağlamında, yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma kavramları ışığında mukayeseli olarak tahlil etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. İlk romanda fanatik bir Mugabe taraftarı olan isimsiz anlatıcı, kimliğine ve evine dair sahip olduğu ve düşündüğü her şeyi yitirerek öz-yıkımcı bir yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma deneyimlerken, ikinci romandaki

iki anlatıcıdan biri olan Little Bee küreselleşme mefhumu üzerine düşünür ve bilinçli bir şekilde özcü alımlamalardan azade yeni bir kimlik ve ev duygusu yaratır.

Yeni milenyum romanı, özellikle de Britanyalı romancılar sıkça kimlik ve göç mefhumlarıyla ilintili bir yazın üretmiştir. Salman Rushdie, Caryl Philips, Monica Ali, Timothy Mo, Zadie Smith, Hanif Kureishi, Mohsin Hamid, Andrea Levy ve Gautam Malkani göçle bağlantılı olarak kimlik ve ev kavramlarını tahlil eden bazı meşhur romancılardır. Michael John Perfect *Contemporary Fictions of Multiculturalism: Diversity and the Millenial London Novel* [Çağdaş Çokkültürlülük Yazını: Çeşitlilik ve 2000 Sonrası Londra Romanı] adlı eserinde iki bin sonrası Londra romanının kompakt bir nüvisini sunmaktadır. Bu tez nispeten az bilinen romancılarından Brian Chikwava'nın ilk yazınsal metni *Harare North* (2004) ve Chris Cleave'in *The Other Hand* (2008) romanları etrafında şekillenmiştir. Bu mukayeseli tahlilin aslî saiki her iki romanın yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma mefhumu bağlamında tartışılan göç konusu ve karakterlerin ev ve kimlik algılarının dönüşümüne odaklanmalarıdır. Mezkûr romanlardaki anlatıcı karakterler farklı ülke ve geçmişlerden gelip cinsiyet farklılıklarının yanı sıra göç sebepleri konusunda da farklılaşmaktadırlar. *Harare North* romanındaki isimsiz anlatıcı İngiltere'ye geldiği vakit Zimbabve diktatörü Robert Mugabe ile fanatik bağlara sahip Green Bombers adlı paramiliter gençlik örgütünün eski bir üyesi olarak kimlik ve ev algısında değişime direnç gösterirken *The Other Hand* romanının iki anlatıcısından biri olan Little Bee'nin aidiyet, kimlik ve ev algısı sürekli yapım aşamasında ve dönüşüme tabidir. Dolayısıyla yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma iki vakada farklı izleklere sahiptir. Perfect'in bahsi geçen kitabında bulunan "London as a Safe Haven? Asylum, Immigration and Missing Fingers in Chris Cleave's *The Other Hand* (2008) and Brian Chikwava's *Harare North* (2009)" adlı

bölüm bu iki romanın en detaylı edebi analizidir. Her iki roman birbirinden birçok noktada farklı olsa da eksik parmak imgesinin kaybın bir temsili olduğunu tartışmaktadır. Perfect'e göre kayıp parmak imgesinin ötekilerin toplumdan dışlanmışlığının okura anlayış eksikliğini ve başkalarının acılarına karşı yaygın yaklaşımı göstermek olduğunu tartışır. İngiliz göç ve sığınma siyasetinin, göçün ve çok etnili Londra'nın tarihsel ve politik arkaplan bağlamlarının bir ekspozesini inceledikten sonra İngiliz sığınmacılık ve göç sisteminin çok etnili Londra'yı ve İngiltere'deki çokkültürlülüğü nasıl etkilediğinin genel bir portresini çizer. Dahası, travmatik sonuçlara ithafen detaylandırdığı madeni paralar ve eksik parmaklar metaforları aracılığıyla göç sırasında kayıp konusuna odaklanır.

Bu tezde, temel argüman Deleuze ve Guattari'nin ve Arjun Appadurai'nin yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma kavramsallaştırmalarından gelir. Onlara göre, mezkur mefhum sabit ve epistemolojik olarak kabul görmüş normları aşar. Bu açıdan, Deleuze ve Guattari'nin ifadeleriyle Oedipus totalitesinin ve iktidarın ademi merkezileştirilmesidir. Ancak, kolektiviteler vurgusu bu noktada üzerinde durulmaya değerdir, zira yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma devrimci bir eylem olarak bilinçli ve kitlesel hareketler gerektirir. Yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma kavramı göçmen yazınında ve göç sosyolojisinde, Appadurai ve Caren Kaplan'ın eserlerinde de görüldüğü üzere dikkat çekmiştir. Bu kavram dolayısıyla göçün kişiyi geldiği toplumdaki konumlanımına bakmaksızın gittikleri toplumun çeperine yerleştirebilmesi açısından göçmen kontekstine rahatça uyarlanabilir. Çeperde ya da marjinalize edilmiş bir diyasporada göçmen aslında bir yandan marjdan bakarak iktidar ilişki ve ağlarını, kimlik ve kültür politiğini daha net görebilir ve dolayısıyla kendi kimlik ve ev algısı dönüşebilir. Appadurai'ye göre, yersizyurtsuzluk /

topraksızlaşma bazen yerleşik bir kimlik konseptinden radikal bir kopuş olarak kimliğin dönüşümü demektir. Bu açıdan dönüşüm küreselleşmenin bir sonucudur ve küresellik bağlamında Appadurai diyasporalara ve diyasporik kitlelerin yeni geçmişlerini ve yeni evlerini nasıl tahayyül ve yeniden tahayyül ettikleri üzerine çalışır. Yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma kavramıyla mekanlar kümesiyle, etnomekan, finansalmekan, ideomekan, medyamekan ve teknomekan kavramlarıyla inceler ve bu kavramlar aracılığıyla göçmenliği yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma üzerinden tahlil eder.

Bu çalışmanın ilk analitik bölümünde *Harare North* romanındaki isimsiz anlatıcının ev ve kimliğinin yersizyurtsuzlaşması / topraksızlaşması incelenmiştir. Romanda Zimbabveli anlatıcı sığınma talebiyle İngiltere'ye gelir ve bu talebi karşılanmaz. Anlatıcı, Mugabe'nin katı bir taraftarı olarak diyasporayı "yozlaşmış" olarak eleştirir ve değişmemeye özen gösterir ki böylelikle hakiki bir yerli olarak kalabileceğini düşünür. Ne ki, değişime karşı sürdürdüğü bu direnci onu daha da dogmatik ve ortodoks bir hale sokar, ve nihayetinde onun bu arada kalmışlığı yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma olarak öz-yıkımının müsebbibi olur.

Üçüncü bölümde ise, bu konu ABD'de *Little Bee* başlığıyla yayımlanan *The Other Hand* romanında incelenmiştir. Bu romanda iki anlatıcı olsa da bu bölüm temel olarak kendisini Little Bee [Küçük Arı] olarak adlandıran Nijeryalı mülteci bir genç kadına odaklanmaktadır. Kendini adlandırarak ulusötesi hareketinde yeni bir kimlik yaratır. Kimlik ve ev algısı yersizyurtsuzlaşır / topraksızlaşır ve romanın sonunda ev ve kimliğini yeniden kurup yapısal ulus-devlet ve arada kalmışlığın ötesine geçtiği zamana kadar Little Bee de arada kalmışlığını sürdürür.

Deleuze ve Guattari'ye göre, yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma Oedipus'un, yani hegemonik ve ideolojik üstyapının yapıbozumudur. Oedipal süper egonun insanların oedipalize olmalarının sebebi olduğunu öne sürerler. Bu kişiler süje olarak bilinçdışı bir şekilde belirli bir alana, devlete, aileye konumlandırılır. Deleuze ve Guattari'ye göre, kişiler böyle mekanlardan, baskıdan ve ideolojik / oedipal yükten kaçınmalıdırlar. Bu düşünürler ayrıca süjeyi çoğulluklardan yoksun bırakma ve kişiyi bölgeselleşmiş tutmak için inşa edilen lineer bir hatta yaşama noktasına kadar bastırarak yerleşiklikten ve bölgeselleşmeyle işleyen Oedipus'tan kurtulmanın yollarını ararlar. Bu minvaldeki bir ideolojik bölge algısından kurtulmanın yollarını tararlar. Yalnızca kaçarak ya da uzaklaşarak birisi bölgeselin baskısından kurtulabilir. Elbet bu bölgesellik fiziksel mekandan ibaret değildir; epistemolojik alanı da içinde barındırır. Yine de bu noktada *territory* [bölge]'nin yersizyurtsuzlaşmanın / topraksızlaşmanın doğrudan doğruya karşıtı olmadığını not etmek gerekir. Deleuze ve Guattari *territory*'yi yersizyurtsuzlaşmanın / topraksızlaşmanın dönüştürücü vektörü olarak ele alırlar. Diğer bir deyişle, territory değişim düzlemi olabilir ancak bu aşkınsal değildir; halihazırda bir değişim ya da değişim potansiyeli her *territory*'de mevcuttur. Ancak yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma zaman ve mekanda bir kırılma yaratır.

Yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma bu açıdan gözün açılması, bir uyanış demektir. Deleuze ve Guattari'ye göre beşeri bilimler ve sosyal bilimler süjelerin iktidar gerçekliklerini görmesini engeller ve böylece süjeler ehlileştirme icraatine dönüşür ve uyumlu, uysal ve edilgen süjeler yaratır. Aynı minvalde, bu tarz bir hareketlilik zihnin kolonizasyonudur ve kişileri kendilerine gösterilenle yetinmeye ve taklit etmeye iter. Bu ise Oedipal olanı süje yaratımının çıkış noktası kılar. Bu haseptendir ki Oedipus'un *territory* olduğu, ve her tür Oedipalizasyonun ya da

bölgeselliğin, devletin failliğinin, paranoyanın ve iktidarın bireylere nevroz yüklediği söylenebilir. Bölgeselleşme kodifikasyondur bu açıdan; *territory* ise kodlar kümesinden müteşekkildir. Oedipus ideoloji olarak görülebilir bu noktada. Oedipal bölgesel kodifikasyon aracılığıyla Oedipus bir bütünlük, bir totalite içerisinde süjeler üretir. Öte yandan yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma totalitenin yıkımıdır. Oedipal politiğe karşılık Deleuze ve Guattari devrimci bir çerçeve ve iktidar faillikleri ve inançları yıkmayı amaçlayan Anti-Oedipus çizer.

Arjun Appadurai yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma mefhumunu küreselleşme kontekstinde ele almıştır. Çalışmasında öncelikle genişletilmiş zamanı geçmiş zamandan ayırır. Geçmişin artık yalnızca bellek ile dönülebilecek bir alan olmadığını ve bireyin genişletilmiş zamanı hayali bir geçmişle ayrıntılandırabileceğini ileri sürer. Başka bir ifadeyle, yersizyurtsuzlaşmış / topraksızlaşmış ve küreselleşmiş süje geçmişi hafıza ile geri getiremez çünkü artık hatırlamanın ötesinde bir tarihin içinde farklı bir süreç vardır. Bu doğrultuda zaman algısı ve geçmişe yönelik yaklaşım da yersizyurtsuzlaşmış / topraksızlaşmıştır. Bu bağlamda vurgu hafızadan ziyade muhayileye yapılmıştır.

Toplumsal ve kültürel pratiklere dönüşen muhayileye yapılan vurgudaki değişim Benedict Anderson'ın ve Salman Rushdie'nin çalışmalarında da mevcuttur. Burada muhayileye yapılan vurgunun sunduğu, muhayilenin esasında hayal kurmak, kaçıp yabancı ya da dışarıda olana karşı sığınak yaratmak amacı gütmediğidir. Dışlayıcı ya da yalnızca bireysel değildir. Toplumsalı yönlendirir, şekillendirir ve böylelikle evvelden gelen tüm muhayile algılarının yerine geçer. Ve küreselce şekillendirilir. Muhayilenin küresel olanla işteş bir ilişkiselliğinin bulunduğunu söylemek yanlış olmayacaktır. Ancak bu işteşlik yersizyurtsuzlaşmış / topraksızlaşmış

küresel sahnede düalistik değildir. Yeni küresel kontekst, mevcut merkez-periferi karşıtlığı üzerinden anlaşılamayacak kadar karmaşık, örtüşen ve kesişimsel bir düzen olarak görülecektir. Muhayile ve küresel olan uçtan uca bağlanan bir spektrum oluşturmaz; aslında, tek bir spektrumdan ziyade kesişimsel şebekeler ve karşılaşmalar ağıdır.

Ezcümle, Appadurai'ye göre yersizyurtsuzlaşmış, yerinden edilmiş ve günümüz etnomekanlarını yaratan popülasyonlar bir his olarak yerelliğin yaratımına dahil olmuşlardır. Şu da öne sürülebilir ki yerellik küresel olanla ilintili olarak üretilir ve bu yüzden yerellik tikel bir varlıktan ziyade çoğulluklar olarak yaratılır. Sonuç olarak mevzubahis yerellik, küresel yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma akımlarına, örtüşen ve kesişimsel küresel kültürel politiğin işteş doğasına bağlı olarak mekanlar ile işlenmelidir.

Bu çalışmada işlenen diğer konular olan ev ve kimlik mevzuunda ise genel bir çerçevenin ardından mezkur düşünür ve akademisyenlerin yaklaşımı serimlenmiştir. Kimlik mevzuu ekseriyetle ulusal kimlik üzerinden değerlendirilmiş ve ardından göçmen kimliği üzerine yoğunlaşılmıştır. Ev mefhumu da benzer bir şekilde göçmenlik bağlamında incelenmiştir.

Ulusal kimliğe dayalı toplumsal katmanlaşma öteki olanı sessizleştirir ve statüko böylelikle sürdürülebilir kılınır. Deleuze'ün yaklaşımı bize bölümlendirilmiş bölgeselliğin epistemolojik zeminde nasıl işlediğini göstermektedir. Oedipus akış halinde olan kimliği sabit ve doğal olarak temsil etmeye çalışır. Katı bölgesellik aracılığıyla kendisini korumaya ve süjeleri katı bölgesellikte tutmaya ihtiyaç duyar. Dahası, ulusal kimlik, dil, eğitim gibi insanlara aidiyet duygusu yaratma aygıtlarıyla benzer *lebenswelt* özelliklerini barındıran milyonlarca bilinmeyen diğerlerinin

82

oluşturduğu ağlar aracılığıyla oluşturulur. Bir ulusal kimlikten bahsetmek bu bağlamda aslında başka ulusal kimlikten bahsetmek anlamına gelir çünkü bir kimlik başka bir kimlikle ilintili konumlanmaktır. Bu elbette farklı ulusların konumlanışları arasında karşıtlık oluşturur. Bu minvalde kolonyal sömürünün arkasındaki temel argümantasyon ulusal ve ırksal kimliklerin katmanlaşmasıdır. Kolonyal zihniyet kolonize halkların madun altı bir mekanı oluşturduğunu tahayyül ederdi ve kendilerine tayin edilenin dışında bir kimlik talebi hakkından mahrum bırakılırlardı. Dolayısıyla ifadede pasifleştirirler ve kendi varlıklarını öne sürme çalışmaları ya kısıtlanır ya da hegemonik kimlikçe belirlenir.

Appadurai'nin göçmen kimliği konusuna yaklaşımına değinirsek, yersizyurtsuzlaşmış / topraksızlaşmış göçmenler mücadeleye dönüşen bir hissin inşası, toplumsal bir mülkiyet olarak mekanlar aracılığıyla bölgesellik yaratmaya gereksinim duyarlar. Bu mücadelenin birçok farklı biçimi vardır ve yersizyurtsuzlaşmış / topraksızlaşmış kitleler müphem bir mekan ve kolektiviteyle kendilerini özdeşleştirerek bir kimlik kazanımına giderler. Hem kayıp hem aidiyet hissi bu açıdan belirleyici sorular sunar. Ek olarak medyanın etkileri hem gelinen hem gidilen ülkelerde ideolojik bir aygıt olarak işlemesinden ötürü yadsınamaz. Böyleliktedir ki yersizyurtsuzlaşmış / topraksızlaşmış kitleler yeniden yer-yurt edinmenin yollarını ararlar.

Ev ise tam olarak birisinin geldiği köken yer değildir. Ev, evde hissedilen, kişinin yeniden yer-yurt edindiği yerdir. Benedict Anderson'un hayali ve toplumsal inşa olarak ulus mefhumundan hareketle evin de ideolojik bir aygıt ve kişinin milyonlarca tanımadığı kimselerle paylaştığı spesifik bir toprak parçasına aidiyet hissettiği bir

alandır. Elbet bu alan ontolojik mekana da içkindir zira kişinin diğerleriyle doğrudan, bizzat dahil olduğu, psikolojik, fiziksel, ekonomik ağlar da mevcuttur.

Göç sırasında göçmen sabit düşünülen ev ve kimliğinden belirli bir kopuş ve bir dönüşüm tecrübe eder. Ayrılma eyleminden kaynaklı bu dönüşüm hasebiyle göçmen mekanını sorgular. Evvelden yerleşik mekanın aksine artık içinde bulunulan mekan ev ve kimliğe yaklaşımını tersyüz eder. Bu şekilde bir dönüşüm yerinden olma, yerinden edilme, daha doğru bir ifadeyle yersizyurtsuzlaşma demektir.

Yersizyurtsuzlaşma ve göç yeni bir fenomen olmasa da yirminci yüzyılın ikinci yarısından başlayarak günümüze değin süren göç dalgaları kitle açısından öncüllerinden daha yüksek kitleleri bünyesinde barındırmıştır. Birçok sebepten yerlerinden edilen kimseler müphem dönüşümler ve mekanlar arasında sıkışıp kalmıştır.

Tezin ilk analitik bölümünde işlenen, kimliğin ve müteakip evin dönüşümü Brian Chikwava'nın *Harare North* romanında mekan değişiminin direkt bir sonucudur. Bu çalışmada bu romandaki birinci şahıs anlatıcının kimliği, karakterin baştaki öz algısı, diyaspora ilişkileri, Zimbabve'ye dair bölgesel ve Oedipal bağların kaybı ve nihaî olarak kendisini ve kimliğini yitirmesi işlenmiştir. Özet olarak, *Harare North* adlı romanda yirmili yaşların başındaki anlatıcı, polise rüşvet vererek Greem Bombers adlı paramiliter örgütün üyesiyken karıştığı muhalefet partisi üyelerine yönelik öldürme ve işkence eylemlerinden kendini aklamak amacıyla kaçarak İngiltere'ye gelir. İş bulup 5000 dolar biriktirmek ister. Gatwick Havalimanı'na varır varmaz on gün sürecek şekilde göz altında tutulur. Bu sırada sığınma başvurusu yapar ve ironik bir şekilde muhalefet partisi üyesi olduğu için Zimbabve'de hayatının tehlikede olduğunu öne sürerek salınır. Yine de kendisine sığınmacı statüsü verilmez. Ardından kuzeni

Paul'un eşi Sekai anlatıcıyı karşılar. Ancak anlatıcıya göre Sekai kendi kimliğinin temelini oluşturan Zimbabve karakteristiklerinden uzaklaşmış ve asimile olmuştur. Onların evinde kaldığı süre boyunca kendisinin istenmediği belli edilir anlatıcıya ve anlatıcı hem Sekai'nin ona karşı davranışlarından hem de Robert Mugabe'ye karşı muhalif tutumundan rahatsız olur. Bir süre sonra Brixton'da, Afrikalı göçmenlerin yaşadığı bir evde kalan eski arkadaşı Shingi'nin yanına geçer. Bu evde diğer göçmenler de vardır: Evdeki kuralları koyduğu ve kirayı topladığı için evin reisi olarak görülen Aleck, Shingi ile aynı odada kalan Farayi, Aleck'in çocuğunun annesi ve reşit olmayan, para kazanmak için çocuğunu sığınma başvurusunda kullananlara kiralayan Tsistsi. Bu evde ve Brixton'da hayat anlatıcı için bir hayal kırıklığına dönüşür çünkü iş bulamaz; bulduğu zamanlarda ise süreklilik sağlayamaz ve girdiği işlerden kovulur. Bu sırada kandırıp kullandığı Shingi'den beslenen bir asalağa dönüşür. Anlatıcının evin diğer sakinleri üzerinde oynadığı oyunlar yüzünden ev dağılınca anlatıcı kimliğini oluşturan her şeyi kaybederek yavaşça delirir. Mugabe'ye olan katı inancı, Zimbabve ve Zimbabve kültürüyle olan bağlarının yanısıra, annesinin mezarının yıkımıyla ve arkadaşı Shingi'ye dönüşerek kendi öz-algısını yitirir.

İkinci analitik bölümde ise Chris Cleave'in ABD'de Little Bee başlığıyla basılan *The Other Hand* romanındaki evin ve kimliğin yersizyurtsuzlaşması / topraksızlaşması işlenmiştir. Brian Chikwava'nın romanındaki anlatıcı karakterin deneyimlediğinin aksine büyüme romanı sayılabilecek *The Other Hand*'de yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma benliğin yıkımı olarak işlenmemiştir. Anlatıcı karakterlerden biri olan Little Bee'nin kimliğinin yersizyurtsuzlaşması / topraksızlaşması, Appadurai'nin ve Deleuze ve Guattari'nin yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşmaya özcü bir kimlik anlayışından radikal bir kopuş olarak yaklaşımını yankılayan bir şekilde Nijerya ve

İngiltere'ye göre kendini nasıl konumlandırdığını yansıtır. Her ikisinde yerleşikleşmeyerek Hem İngiltere hem Nijerya'ya aidiyet duyarak ulus ötesi bir kimlik benimser. Bir kadın dergisinin baş editörü Sarah O'Rourke ve Nijeryalı genç bir mülteci kadın Little Bee anlatıcılardır. Ancak bu çalışma Little Bee'nin kimlik ve evinin yersizyurtsuzlaşmasına / topraksızlaşmasına odaklanmıştır: Evinin ve kimliğinin yersizyurtsuzlaşması / topraksızlaşması temel olarak onun çocukluktan genç yetişkinliğe cezaevinde geçmesiyle, Nijerya'dan İngiltere'ye kültürlerarası geçişiyle ve Nijerya İngilizcesini unutarak standart İngilizce'yi hayatta kalma aracı olarak dili edinmesiyle bağlantılı şekilde tahlil edilmiştir.

Little Bee, İngiltere'ye giden bir gemide saklanarak korkunç bir ölüm ve tecavüzden kaçar. Varışını müteakip tutuklanır ve iki yıl boyunca cezaevinde tutulur. Başka bir mülteci kadının çabalarıyla, illegal bir şekilde göçmenlerin özel cezaevinden kazara çıktıktan sonra, Andrew ve Sarah O'Rourke'un evine gider. Hikaye çözümlendikçe tanışıklıklarının, bu çiftin iki yıl önce Nijer Deltasında tatil yaparken meydana gelen yıkıcı olaydan kaynaklandığını öğreniriz. Sahilde yürürken çift iki kız çocuğunun ormandan kendilerine doğru koştuğunu görür. Kızlar petrol şirketleri için çalışan ve kızların köyünü yağmalayıp ölümcül faaliyetlerinin bilinmemesi için herkesi öldüren silahlı adamlarca takip edilmektedir. Çift, kızları korumak ister. Silahlı grubun lideri çiftten kızların hayatları karşılığında bir parmaklarını kesmelerini ister. Andrew ilkin tedirgin olup Little Bee'nin ablası Nkiruka için bunu yapamayacağını idrak ederken, Sarah derhal parmağını bir maket bıçağıyla keser. Yine de kızlar götürülür, Nkiruka tecavüze uğrar ve öldürülür. Little Bee kaçmayı başarır. Ve Little Bee çiftin evine gittiğinde plajdaki o günden beri ağır bir depresyonda bulunan Andrew halüsinasyon gördüğünü düşünür ve kızları kurtarmak için yeterince cesur

86

olamadığı için duyduğu pişmanlığı atlatamaz ve kendisini asarak intihar eder. Cenazesinden sonra, Little Bee ortaya çıkar. Sarah ve oğlu Charlie ile, Sarah'nın İçişleri Bakanlığında çalışan sevgilisinin de sıkça ziyaret ettiği evde sınırdışı edilene kadar yaşar. Ancak Nijerya'ya gönderildiği vakit gerçek ismini açıklar. Gerçek ismi Udo'dur ve barış anlamına gelir. Bu olay üzerine korkularından sıyrılır ve hatta askerler kendisini götürürken sevinçten ağlar. Romanın sonunda Little Bee kimliğini ve evini yersizyurtsuzlaştırmış / topraksızlaştırmıştır ve artık her şeyi küresel olarak görebilmeye başlamıştır çünkü sınırlar aşmış, insanları eşit ve küresel toplumun bir parçası olarak ulusötesi bir şekilde görmektedir. Özcü bir kimlik algısından azadedir ve ulusalı aşan aidiyetleri ve bağları vardır artık.

Bu tez çalışmasında bu iki romanın mültecilerin deneyimlediklerinin, ne tür tehlikelere maruz kaldıklarının ve geldikleri-gittikleri ülkelere göre kendilerini nasıl konumlandırarak dönüştüklerinin tahlili amaçlanmıştır. Yersizyurtsuzlaşma / topraksızlaşma mefhumu göçmen olarak bireyin dönüşümü açısından ve İngiltere'de kaldıkları süre boyunca karşılaştıkları sorunların çalışılması adına zengin materyal sunarak bu romanların tahlili için verimli bir zemin oluşturmaktadır. *Harare North* romanındaki birinci şahıs anlatıcının Mugabe hükümetini ve kendisini taklitle kurduğu Oedipal bağlar okura Oedipus'un yarattığı süje üretiminin açık bir tablosunu çizmektedir. Devrimci, postkolonyal bir seyir vaadeden Mugabe iddialarının aksine fikirsel olarak ortodoksiye bulaşmış ve kolonyal hükümetleri taklit eden bir diktatörlük oluşturmuştur. Bu alanda yapılan çalışmalarda önemli bir kavram olan taklit, Mugabe'nin kolonyal hükümeti taklidi, anlatıcının Mugabe'yi taklidi ile bir hiyerarşik iktidar zinciri oluşturmuştur. Bu açıdan esasında karakterin isminin olmayışı, okura aktarılmayışı manidardır, zira anlatıcının küstahlık ve kibirlilik derecesinde her şeyi

çok bildiğini iddia etmesi ancak naiflikten kurtulamaması, postkolonyal hükümetlerin iki yüzlülüğü, her şey arada kalmışken kendisini bir cepheye konumlandırması anlatıcıya bireysellik atfetmeyi namümkün kılar. Bu vesileyle bu çalışmaya Achille Mbembe'nin *On the Postcolony* eseri bağlamında detaylı bir çalışma yapılabilir. Afrika'da bulunan postkolonyal hükümetlerin ve iktidarların nasıl işlediğine yönelik bir bakış açısı sunması açısından önemli bir kaynak oluşturmaktadır. *Harare North* romanında da benzer bir şekilde Mugabe'nin mikroevreni olan anlatıcı, İngilizlere karşı söylemini sürdürürken kolonyal iktidarları taklit eden Mugabe'yi taklit ederek ironik bir portre çizer.

The Other Hand romanında ise anlatıcılardan biri olan Little Bee bu ağların farkındadır. Bu farkındalığı sağlayan Nijerya'daki travmatik deneyimlerinin yanısıra göçmenler için yapılan cezaevinde büyümesidir. Ne İngiltere ne Nijerya olan bu eşik bölgede her iki ülke arasındaki mesafeyi hissetmiş ve gayribölgesel denilebilecek bu alanda ulusalın ötesinde bakabilmeyi öğrenmiştir. Küreselleşmenin ikircikli noktalarını ve çıkmazlarını, özellikle küresel kapitalizm bağlamında değerlendirerek ortaya koymuştur. Küreselleşme söyleminin farklılıkları içeren bir mefhumdan ziyade para odaklı ve iki yüzlü olduğunu bu arada kalmış eşik bölgede idrak etmiştir. Romanın sonunda çocukların ten renklerine ve ekonomik durumlarına bakmaksızın birbirlerine sarılıp oynadığını görünce kendi ideal küresel dünyasını ima eder. Bu yüzden sonunda kendi fiziksel yıkımı olsa da mutluluktan ağlar çünkü ideal dünyasını görmüştür. Yine de bir yandan ideal dünya bir yandan ölümün aynı sahnede sunulması küreselleşmenin muğlak ve müphem konumunu yeniden sorgulamayı olanaklı kılmıştır. *Harare North*'daki anlatıcının aksine Little Bee'nin yersizyurtsuzlaşması /

topraksızlaşması öz yıkım değil öz yaratım olarak şekillenmiştir ve kendi çoklu aidiyetleriyle birlikte hem Udo hem Little Bee olarak kalabilmiştir.

APPENDIX B: TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ■

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname   : KAYGISIZ
Adı / Name   : İSMAİL
Bölümü / Department : İNGİLİZ EDEBİYATI

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English) : The Deterritorialization of Home And Identıiy In Brian Chikwava's *Harare North* And Chris Cleave's *The Other Hand*

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE**:**   **Yüksek Lisans /** Master   ■   **Doktora** / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.   ■

2. **Tez** <u>**iki yıl**</u> **süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of <u>**two years**</u>**.** *   ☐

3. **Tez** <u>**altı ay**</u> **süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of <u>**six months**</u>. *   ☐

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.
  A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature   ....   **Tarih** / Date . . . .