**Chapter One**

**Introduction: Critique of Bhabha’s Hybridity in Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun***

The present study carves out a picture of Chimamanda Adichie's *Half of a Yellow Sun* in which the central characters Ugwu, Olanna, and Richard suffer identity crisis due to being culturally hybridized. The representation of these characters counts for in the present study in the sense that they are different from each other and depict the people of Nigeria in aftermath of the Biafra War. This dissertation aims at reading Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* through the neo-Marxist criticism that critiques Homi Bhabha’s concept of hybridity. Bhabha’s reading to the postcolonial texts is partial in the sense that he sees the cultural hybridity as a dominant product in the postcolonial nations as depicted in the postcolonial literature. Though there are issues such as class, and intraracial conflict in the postcolonial nations as pictured in Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun,* Bhabha’s perception to Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* is confined to hybridity pervasive the characters posed in the text.

Hence Ugwu, Olanna and Richard suffer double consciousness in terms of class, culture and nationality respectively. The notion of hybridity by Homi Bhabha that applies in reading to Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* is interrogated as the Bhabhian hybridity does not incorporate the issues such class, and intra-ethnic conflicts. Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* traces all the multifaceted stories about Nigeria that thus she offers a counterpart. In the speech with the same name the writer highlights different problems that the people in Nigeria suffer in the aftermath of the Postcolonial Independence situation. There are distinct sorts of hazards emerged in the lives of the people from all walks of life in Nigeria regardless to ethnicity, class and race. The quagmire that results in destroying many types of properties in Nigeria is the point that Adichie stresses more. The remnants of the colonial rule in Nigeria seem to have triggered issues of class and ethnicity in the postcolonial Nigeria. The sense of *othering* in terms of race and ethnicity is the lingering feature in the postcolonial Nigeria.

While focusing Homi Bhabha’s notion of hybridity, he describes a “separate’ place, a space of separation […] which has been systematically denied by both colonialists and nationalists who have sought authority in the authenticity of ‘origins.’ It is precisely as a separation from origins and essences that this colonial space is constructed” (1181). This “space of separation” arises through “Entstellung,” which is the “process of displacement, distortion, dislocation, [and] repetition;” this process may occur by the colonial powers as they seek to cement their power in colonized lands, or it may occur as the post-colonial people try to separate themselves from their colonizers (Bhabha 1169). Thus, in order to effectively illustrate a new and emerging African postcoloniality, it becomes necessary to write in a new method to properly communicate to colonial and post-colonial citizens.

Adichie, in *Half of a Yellow Sun*, is keen in giving voice to marginal identities, raising gender issues and breaking taboos; giving a new, contemporary interpretation to longstanding themes; engaging with hybridization and multiculturalism; challenging social and literary conventions; presenting a multi-layered, hybrid personality; and reflecting national and political engagement. But most importantly she seems to trigger the slumbering Nigerian consciousness in the Post Independence Nigeria. People do not seem integrated in terms of their identity. Rather they are in the flux of adaptability to suit their status. Thus, Adichie much prominently highlights the issue of hybrid personality as well as their dilemma in the transitional phase of Nigeria.

Adichie makes a point in writing in *Half of a Yellow Sun* about the “other Africa”, about people belonging to the empowered, middle-class: two twin sisters, daughters of a wealthy businessman and a university professor. The author feels strong about the fact that Africans must write their own stories and not let the West do the naming and labeling for them. The key character, Ugwu, a houseboy from a poor village emerges as the conscience of the novel and finally gets to be the one to write at the end a book on the war, rather than Richard, the Englishman who has been taking notes throughout the conflict.

While looking at the critical bits of the African literature in general, it can be asserted that since Africa, in Eurocentric eyes, has been seen as a wild and savage place where people were suffering hunger but were unable to take care of themselves because of their uncivilized and brawly nature, the subject of “authentic African Literature” has always been debated and being called an “African writer” has been contested.

Similarly the term third-generation refers more to an emerging literary trend since the authors belonging to this generation are relatively young and their works, which have already received international acclaim, are continuously being published. Some distinctive features though can already be traced since the texts contain similar themes and formal characteristics, and focus on a new, contemporary type of identity. In this climate of ruined postcolonial promise, their novels are questioning what it means to be Nigerian and, by extension, African. Hereby Adichie is from the third-generation African young writers as well. Therefore her narrative does seem to overwhelmingly get concerned with the similar themes.

Starting in the late 1980s, this recent third-generation literature negotiates an identity immersed in Nigeria's current political and socio-economic situation, a present permeated by a trans-national consciousness and by hybrid cultural forms. Nigeria is felt, today, like a hybrid state, a nation of multiple nations merged to form the basis of nation-ness. Therefore, unlike the writers from the previous generations whose texts offered a unitary identity, the recent Nigerian novels present multi-layered individuals, composed of various cultural elements and traditions, thriving into a hybrid, multicultural environment and performing an identity that doesn't necessarily conform to the rules imposed by society.

The anti-colonial nationalism, the postcolonial angst and the sense of loss that define the first generation becomes a marginal discourse and is replaced by a fusion of numerous cultural, political, and economical discourses, a multicultural frame where each individual is able to negotiate its identity, to struggle for agency, to claim ownership from the past and, simultaneously, from other cultures, from multiple ancestries and histories.

The search for a new identity and agency is similar to the postcolonial theorist Achille Mbembe's claim that Africans should find an unconventional way to define their identity, away from the two dominant paradigms that defined the past: Afro-radicalism and nativism. Both alienate the individual from the self because of their baggage of slavery and colonization and both promote a discourse of dispossession by the other. The third generation moves away from the sense of alienation and victimhood that permeated the self-writing of the first two generations, since both models proposed dichotomies of white versus black, civilized peoples versus savages and Christianity versus paganism.

Obi Nwakanma, in his research called 'Metonymic Eruptions: Igbo Novelists, the Narrative of the Nation, and New Developments in the Contemporary Nigerian Novel' points out to the overwhelming presence of writers of Igbo origin both in the first and in the third generation of writers, and asserts their role in defining the canon of contemporary Nigerian national literature. He cites Homi Bhabha and his term "Dissemination" as a main feature of the narrative of the postcolonial nation, implying the scattering of people beyond frontiers and boundaries and defining the postcolonial novel as the product of the migration of memory. The term seems to define the Igbo novelists, the most dispersed ethnic group, since they keep searching for a coherent meaning of the idea of the nation. Obi Nwakanma believes that “Biafra's secession brought with it the sense of ambivalence, dislocation, and marginality that Igbo writers started to associate with their sense of nation and national belonging” (5). The flourishing of poetry and drama testifies nothing other than the deep ambiguity Igbo felt about the nation and accounts for the absence of imaginative figuration about Nigeria till 1985 and the ambivalence the ironic stance that characterizes Nigeria's contemporary fiction.

In 1914, the British colonial powers divide the newly created territory of Nigeria in northern, eastern and western regions associating each with one of the three different major ethnic groups, the Igbo in the southeast, the Hausa-Fulani in the north and the Yoruba in the southwest, and ignoring the presence of other 250 smaller ethnic groups. The consequences of the divide-and rule policy which is closer to a dictatorship than to a democracy, based on regional and ethnic affiliation challenged the consolidation of Nigeria as a nation-state after 1960.

Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* opens before the war when middle-class life at Nsukka University is rich and full of revolutionary rhetoric and hope. The characters come from all classes. Kainene and Olanna, the twins of nouveau rich Igbo parents, represent many of the period's social contradictions: one a tough businesswoman, the other a free spirit. The houseboy Ugwu, moved directly from the village into the university town of Nsukka and strikes a contrast with the snobbish Professor Ezeka. There is Odenigbo's mother, a practitioner of traditional magic; Harrison, a misguided gardener obsessed about pleasing nonexistent colonial masters; good British, bad British; Muslim playboys and ignorant Americans. Thus the narrative focus shifts between Ugwu, the houseboy of Odenigbo, the revolutionary mathematician; Olanna, the woman who becomes Odenigbo's wife; and Richard, an English ex-pat who falls in love with Nigerian art and then with Kainene, Olanna's twin sister. At first the story builds up more like a soap opera, with betrayals, troublesome parents, familial disputes and lot of humor around Odenigbo's pretentiousness, Ugwu's attempts to reconcile his village upbringing with life on campus, Olanna's ability to make everyone fall in love with her and Richard’s impotence. All the characters have their weaknesses and Adichie uses their shortcomings to make them seem more real and thus more lovable: Ugwu does not know enough; Olanna, beautiful and educated, knows sometimes too much and, while visiting her relatives in Kano, she is ashamed to feel crossed by their poverty; Richard is white and British and struggles with the general perception of his strangeness and his desire to belong to Biafran society.

Likewise Adichie in *Half of a Yellow Sun* manages to create a historical support to her fictional world by making Ugwu observe Odenigbo’s obsession with international politics and register some of his Africanist and anti-Western views. Thus, Odenigbo's blame on the United States and Belgium for the killing of Congo’s former Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba constitutes one of Adichie's ways of providing realist historicisation to her story. She accompanies the description of the various episodes of the war with ideological and political interpretations of the main issues through the consciousness of the characters, through the intellectual discussions Odenigbo and his friends have often at his house and through the explicit metatext offered in the Book. The writer explicitly exposes through these conversations the political orientation of the novel’s historiographical mission. Such an example is the scene in which the coup of January 1966 is being discussed:

'The BBC is calling it an Igbo coup,’ [someone] said. ‘And they have a point. It was mostly Northerners who were killed.’ ‘It was mostly Northerners who were in government,’ Professor Ezeka whispered, his eyebrows arched, as if he could not believe what was so obvious. ‘The BBC should be asking their people who put the Northerners in government to dominate everybody!’ [Odenigbo] said. Ugwu was surprised that Master and Professor Ezeka seemed to agree. (125)

Moreover, there is another instance found in the reaction the poet Okeoma had after the killing of Igbo people in the north, when he comments about the recall of the British ambassador to Nigeria: “'Why is he coming to tell us how to put out a fire, when it is he and his fellow British who collected the firewood for it in the first place?'” (158) Odenigbo offers also his ideas about peace and secession: “Secession is the only answer. If Gowon wanted to keep this country united, he would have done something long ago” (186). And finally, Richard considers the secession as an appropriate historical moment for proposing to Kainene, because “his was a new start [...] not only because secession was just, considering all that the Igbo had endured, but because of the possibility Biafra held for him” (168). In this way, Adichie conveys through three different points of view what she thinks about Biafra’s involvement in the war and what this new nation represented for its citizens: a promise of social, political and cultural fulfillment. The background of these arguments is the negative consequence of Great Britain's divide and rule policy. Each character interprets the reality the way she perceives it so there are as many versions of the same period of time as there are characters.

Likewise another way of conveying what she thinks about Biafra’s involvement in the war is through the Book “The World Was Silent When We Died”, the title of which is already a criticism to the role of the West in the conflict. Similarly the next aspect that Adichie keeps under silence is the importance of the role the discovery of oil plays in deciding the course of the war and the allegiance of the international community. The oil is mentioned in the novel, but only in a superficial way and only after the war has effectively begun:

Richard was surprised when he heard the announcement that the federal government had declared a police action to bring the rebels to order. Kainene was not. ‘It’s the oil,’ she said. ‘They can’t let us go easily with all that oil. But the war will be brief. Madu says Ojukwu has big plans. He suggested I donate some foreign exchange to the war cabinet, so that when this ends, I’ll get any contract I bid for’. (180)

When Port Harcourt with its refineries is about to fall in the hands of federal forces, the importance of the oil comes forth. Introducing a paratext, Adichie manages to offer a piece of historical information but re-orders the events transforming into a consequence what at the time is perceived as a cause: “They had been talking about the fall of Port Harcourt for the past two days. So had Lagos radio, although with a little less glee. The BBC, too, had announced that the imminent fall of Port Harcourt was the fall of Biafra; Biafra would lose its viable seaport, its airport, its control of oil” (304).

In this way Adichie in *Half of a Yellow Sun* insists in presenting both privileged, middle-class characters and characters belonging to the peasantry because she believes it's important to show the differences created by class in Biafra. The writer's interest in class comes as a response to the stereotyped view of Africa. There are of course Biafrans who have absolutely nothing and watch their children starve to death, but there are also people who can afford to leave because they have money or people who can afford to eat during the war.

Hence Richard’s part of the novel is more contemplative, the Englishman's focus being mainly the Igbo-Ukwu art and his love for Kainene. He is the typical colonizer even in the postcolonial situation in Nigeria. He works as a journalist and is eager to write about the on-going activities in Nigeria. In this regard, Edward Said says in his *Orientalism* the scholars from the West create the fiction about the people of the east through their lens and presents them as exotic and barbaric. The colonizers always take the stance of the westerners’ perspective in the course of presenting the easterners. Hence Richard, who claims to be Biafran, is engaged in managing to write about the aftermath of the Biafran war. He has been in Nigeria with a mission to rule the Nigerians by imparting knowledge to the people of the Biafran Igbo community.

Similarly the way Ugwu is shaped and his relationship with Odenigbo raises also a class issue and comes as a response to the assumed impossibility of relations between different classes:

I’ve always been interested in class and questions about class.[...] People treat their drivers or their servants as if they were not really human. In this book I wanted to show the way class shapes lives. But I also wanted to point to the possibility of different relationships. So the book’s radical Professor Odenigbo treats his houseboy as a person and with kindness. He has respect for him. (37)

Most often the postcolonial critics forget to raise the issue of class in the horizon of perception. Hence the class is a crucial matter to be analyzed in the association of lingering colonialism in the postcolonial independence Nigeria. Adichie does seem much interested in the issue of class in the sense that she has carved out a beautiful picture of people from different classes in her *Half of a Yellow Sun*. Ugwu represents the downtrodden people of Nigeria, Odenigbo stands for the middle class and Olanna is on the behalf of the tycoons of the Igbo community. These characters interact with each other in the course and they thus impart views in the line of their respective class.

By speaking of Odenigbo as ‘master’, Ugwu identifies him in terms of his position of superiority as employer and emphasizes the importance of Odenigbo to the narrative. Being very interested in class, Adichie creates a character that is acutely aware of the class difference between him and Odenigbo. Moreover, Ugwu’s perception of Odenigbo is substantially sensorial and his description of his master’s physical aspect is rendered through the senses of sight, sound and smell respectively. The houseboy is confronted from the beginning with historical discourses that he can only listen and watch bemused:

There are two answers to the things they will teach you about our land: the real answer and the answer you give in school to pass. You must read books and learn both answers. I will give you books, excellent books.' Master stopped to sip his tea. 'They will teach you that a white man called Mungo Park discovered River Niger. That is rubbish. Our people fished in the Niger long before Mungo Park's grandfather was born. But in your exam, write that it was Mungo Park.' 'Yes, sah.' Ugwu wished that this person called Mungo Park had not offended master so much. (11)

However, Ugwu is interested in Odenigbo’s ideological views which play an important role in drawing the attention of the neo-Marxist critics whose inclination is towards class rather than hybridity in the context of the postcolonial Biafra country. Adichie constructs, through the daily conversations of Odenigbo's intellectual circle, a discourse around ethnic and national identities. The houseboy notices soon enough Odenigbo's Africanist and anti-Western views: the revolutionary professor blames the United States and Belgium for the killing of Congo’s former Prime Minister and questions the western knowledge when he points out that “the people who drew the [world map] decided to put their own land on top of ours”, and that “[o]ur people fished in the Niger long before Mungo Park’s grandfather was born” (10). Using the pronoun “our” indicates a binary opposition of black and white, which soon after moves on to a tribal-ethnic opposition when Odenigbo argues that the only authentic identity for the African is the tribe: “I am Nigerian because a white man created Nigeria and gave me that identity. I am black because the white man constructed black to be as different as possible from his white. But I was Igbo before the white man came” (20).

At the beginning, Ugwu presented Odenigbo always in favourable terms, as he should have been considering that Ugwu was an inexperienced and easily impressionable young boy who benefited from Odenigbo’s liberal ideas. But the above mentioned passage, in which Ugwu uses the word “unmasterly” to describe Odenigbo's broken spirit, marks an important shift in Ugwu’s psychological development. The young man is now able to observe Odenigbo from outside the ‘servant-master’ relationship. This change in perception is noticeable also in Ugwu's shift from a preoccupation with Odenigbo and Olanna to a focus on his own thoughts and responses. According to Homi Bhabha, ambivalence pervades the “boundaries of colonial ‘positionality’-the division of self/other-and the question of colonial power-the differentiation of colonizer/colonized” (1171). The differences between the colonizers and the colonized people remain differences in the levels of power each group holds; while the colonizers control the “invention of history” and have “mastery” over the colonized people, the colonized group has access to “fantasy [and] psychic defence” (1171). Imperialism seeks to undermine the native culture and place the colonizers’ culture in its place, attempting to erase the native culture for political and economic profit. However, this disavowal of the native culture is often justified through the focus on imperialism’s supposed “civilizing mission” of “civilizing” the native people by Christianizing them. Thus, colonization destroys, among other things, the intellectual agency and power of the indigenous population, while the colonizers gain control over their subjects’ narratives of identity and origin.

Furthermore, Bhabha says that hybridity remains the only way the colonized people may gain some power and control over their colonizers. Bhabha explains that “hybridity is a problematic of colonial representation…that reverses the effects of the colonist disavowal, so that other ‘denied’ knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority” (1176). Through the use of hybridity, the colonized people become able to reverse the “formal processes of disavowal” which their colonizers practiced; thus, “the violent dislocation, the Enstellung of the act of colonization, becomes the conditionality of colonial discourse” (1177). By employing hybridity, such as the various forms of hybridity engaged within the novel, as the text expresses the cultural and social hybridity of postcoloniality through the formal hybridity of class and nationality thus allowing historical hybridization to occur, then the colonizers’ racist and discriminatory images of the colonized people are undermined. Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* focuses Richard who is nationally hybridized. He is neither Biafran nor is he completely British. He is in dilemma. His identity is under question. He cannot be associated with either of the races white and black. Along with him there are other two characters Ugwu and Olanna who are entangled to the bond of ambivalence. Ugwu a simple boy from the rural part of Nigeria is presented as a servant to Odingebo in the beginning grows mentally and becomes a very conscious personality who finally gets to write about the current happenings in the country. He is class-conscious but feels difficult to differentiate whether he is from a working class or middle one.

Similarly Olanna a girl from Nigerian elite is proud of being different from the rest of the Igbo people. She is educated, rich and fluent at speaking English. However, she is racially black. She does not seem to accept that she is Nigerian in the sense she is extremely impressed with the western lifestyle and does show her impression through different activities. No doubt she is linguistically very sound at English which she uses as a tool to win the different battle in distinct manners. According to Friedrich Jameson, any third-world narrative must grapple with the colonialism and imperialism that occurred within in their nation. The postcolonial citizen, seeking to describe his own personal narrative, wrestles with his identity creation. The postcolonial citizen tries to form his own identity, but ultimately recognizes the ways colonialism has affected his identity and attempts to reconcile the historical past of colonialism with his present moment. Thus, the postcolonial citizen becomes able to create his own identity, while simultaneously forming a national history and identity. Duchies’ *Half of a Yellow Sun*, through Ugwu’s narration, understands the need to explore the history and identity of one’s nation in order to adequately express one’s own personal history. Thus, the ways in which the novel’s characters interact and overlap allows for the combination of fiction with history. This mixing and melding of history, identity, and storytelling occurs through the social interactions within the novel, mostly occurring relationally to Ugwu. Thus, the social and cultural hybridization occurring within the text directly influences Ugwu’s narrative, and hence, allows new postcolonial narratives to become prominent, while marginalizing colonial narratives.

Dare Owolabi, and Omolara Kikelomo Owoeye state in the journal article “Globalization and Nigeria’s Socio-Political Landscape in the Novels of Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie” that in Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun*, the socio-political history of Nigeria, as seen in an era of globalization, is treated especially as this affects multi-ethnic Nigeria and Nigerians.

Although Adichie may not have proffered “any solution to Nigeria’s myriad of problems as enunciated in the two novels examined here; she, however, succeeds like many other contemporary Nigerian writers to employ history and contemporary social issues to chronicle societal as well as global problems”(Dare Owolabi, and Omolara Kikelomo Owoeye 27).

From whatever angle the works of Adichie are considered, the purpose of literature can be seen to be achieved. Whether her works are looked at “as a mode or method of expression” (Egudu, 1) which stresses the beauty of language in a literary composition, or the communication of thoughts or ideas or the experiences giving rise to them (Egudu 13), Adichie is seen as a leading light in modern Nigerian literature as she has, no doubt, proved herself as a 21st century star of the Nigerian novel, brilliantly deploying her literary and creative skills to reflect Nigeria and portray her as she was and is to the rest of the world. Through thorough research, “Adichie digs up those issues that have continued to dog Nigeria’s footsteps in her bid to develop in an era of globalization” (Dare Owolabi, and Omolara Kikelomo Owoeye 28).

Adichie’s resort to history in *Half of a Yellow Sun* throws illuminating lights on the Nigerian nation; to inform the world of what was and what still is in the Nigerian society especially in the world that is fast becoming a global village. This “may be necessary in this era of globalization where the history of nations is fast fading away and particularly in Nigeria where the study of history and civic education is becoming anachronistic” (Dare Owolabi, and Omolara Kikelomo Owoeye 28). In the novel *Half of a Yellow Sun* Adichie’s preoccupations include those issues that have come to plague Nigeria, arising mainly from globalization. As Onukaogu and Onyerionwu note:

Socially and culturally, Nigerians continue to approach a globalized agenda, increasingly being influenced by the West. Motivated by an ever-increasing accessibility to the media of popular culture, traditional ways are on the brink of suffering a knock-out from the rampaging and rampant elements of the imported cultural format. (97)

In Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun*, it is the horrifying Nigeria’s civil war and its attendant difficulties and ethnic prejudices and mistrust. Although occurring earlier, its effects keep reverberating by the present global realities. Generally, Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* borders on Nigeria and Nigerians’ myriad of problems to help the world have a more realistic view of the Nigerian situation. Moreover, Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* can be said to be a representation of current Nigerian literature in English, which Rebecca Okon Usoro describes as “ […] the literary piece written by Nigerians in English language, but with the reflection of the life pattern of the Nigerian people […] though written in English, has over the years relayed the different stages of developmental strides of Nigerian survival as a viable nation in the world polity” (quoted by Dare Owolabi, and Omolara Kikelomo Owoeye 29-30). Hence Nigeria as a colonized nation has undergone myriad challenges for her independent and sovereign existence in the global scenario.

Adichie thus emphasizes events rather than character, from sociological and historical perspectives. *Half of a Yellow Sun* addresses issues in Nigeria from the historical angle as the author takes her setting, events and even some of the characters from history and specifically, the Nigerian civil war period. Events that have impacted seriously on Nigeria either in the past or in our contemporary period are given serious attention in *Half of a Yellow Sun*. These events are social problems and the civil war. These are events that have left ineffaceable marks on the psyche of Nigerians; a psyche that has been brutalized by the unwholesome social vices in Nigeria’s past and present and especially the horrors of war which have left us traumatized, making a sense of real patriotism a mirage, especially as depicted by Biafran soldiers who see Nigerian soldiers as vandals, which all Biafrans call their former compatriots.

Similarly Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie’s bold treatment of sex and sexuality is not unconnected with the modern Nigerian writers’ exposure to the multimedia with their attendant corruption of the youths. She is one of those modern Nigerian novelists in the 21st century that have been accused of exhibiting astonishing liberties in the area of the blatant depiction of sexuality. Adichie is described as one of the worst culprits who are simply responding to a generational fad that is possibly the influence of the West and globalization. No history of Nigeria is complete without the reign of the military which has ruled Nigeria for the better part of her existence as a sovereign nation. Those inglorious interventions in the politics of Nigeria have left many bruised. The Nigerian press can tell the story better with the arrest, detention and killing of journalists and harassment of their family members. This is part of the disillusionment evident in post-colonial African literature especially from the mid-sixties as writers appear to be unanimous in acknowledging the fact that “independence had brought new problems which Africans could not blame on colonization” (Gogura, 96). Although the issue of military intervention may not have been given detailed treatment in either of the novels under study as “Achebe does in Anthills of the Savannah, their influence is still not unfelt in the two novels” (Dare Owolabi, and Omolara Kikelomo Owoeye 31).

Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* presents the Biafran War as an instance of state failure twice over-first, a Nigerian failure so severe that it led to civil war and a breakaway republic and, second, the Biafra’s own collapse under attack from Nigeria and its international allies. This presentation appropriates the terms of political science in the service of a counter discourse: in *Half of a Yellow Sun*, the question of who is best qualified to analyze and to manage the failed state is up for grabs.

In addition to revising political scientific hierarchy, *Half of a Yellow Sun* supplements the most habitual literary approach to portraying political subjectivity. The novel performs a makeover on the home, which appears less as a private venue for the generation of public individuals than, alternatively, as the setting for a kind of ad hoc professional training. “By simultaneously politicizing and professionalizing the household, furthermore, *Half of a Yellow Sun* performs a kind of gesture familiar to readers of postcolonial novels” (John Marx 611). When it domesticates coffeehouse congregation, in sum, Odenigbo and Olanna’s salon does more than simply reverse Jürgen Habermas’s formula of private people coming together as a public to debate the common concern. Adichie’s emphasis on the scholarly aspect of political dialogue confirms what Habermas himself avers, namely, that the era of “bourgeois representation” is over (Habermas 37). Instead of salvaging the public sphere, *Half of a Yellow Sun* offers a model for reproducing the feel of the seminar or colloquium when the universities are all closed down. And indeed, though the war forces them to relocate more than once, and to less welcoming abodes each time, Odenigbo and Olanna continue to preserve a space for political argument among experts. They welcome new interlocutors and encourage old ones to stop by as they are able. When Okeoma visits from the front, Olanna recaptures the salon’s civility by inviting him to read one of his poems and asking, “Please remove your grenade while we eat” (quoted in John Marx 614).

Ugwu is the houseboy whom Odenigbo and Olanna raise as a son and invigilate like a promising graduate student. After a time of intense preparation, he demonstrates his membership in the class of people who “know Book” by writing a volume of his own (129). His labor is a secret until the novel’s final lines, however. Only then does it become clear that Ugwu, the boy readers have watched develop over the course of some four hundred pages, is the author of the book within a book whose composition appears in sections at the end of several chapters of *Half of a Yellow Sun*, in a different typeface from the main narrative, under the heading, “The Book: The World Was Silent When We Died.” Ugwu is the answer, in other words, to a good old-fashioned question of “What matter who’s speaking?” (Foucault, Language 138).

This author-function is complicated by the various disciplines and styles of writing employed in “The Book.” One chapter speaks in the manner of colonial history when it chronicles the disastrous implementation of indirect rule among the “non-docile and worryingly ambitious” Igbo (115). Another approaches civil war from the standpoint of international politics in considering what it meant that “Biafra was ‘under Britain’s sphere of interest’” (258). A third foregrounds the economics of state failure, what commentators call the resource curse, and the foibles of neocolonial planners “too interested in aping the British” (205). Even greater stylistic range appears in an initial section that recalls the memoir of witnessing-it describes a woman fleeing massacre in northern Nigeria, holding a calabash with a “child’s head inside: scruffy braids falling across the dark-brown face, eyes completely white, eerily open, a mouth in a small surprised O” (quoted in John Marx 615-6).

Odenigbo shows Ugwu how the library can be used to “decolonize our education” by explaining how to read against the grain (75). “How can we resist exploitation,” he catechizes his pupil, “if we don’t have the tools to understand exploitation?” (11). Ugwu internalizes what he is told: although he may not understand Odenigbo’s argument that “America was to blame for other countries not recognizing Biafra,” Ugwu reproduces “Master’s words [. . .] with authority, as though they were his” (295). He persists in this mode when composing his book: the last chapters of the novel find Ugwu listening attentively “to the conversations in the evenings, writing in his mind what he would later transfer to paper” (399).

Homi Bhaba generalizes the position of hybridity in the sense that he along with other theorists of his line simply associates in-between-ness with globalization. They view that hybridity is everywhere due to the fact that people are dynamic and they share cultural, social, economic matters with each other in the global village. Therefore, nothing remains pure and original within. Rather everything whether concrete or abstract gets blurred. Hence the neo-Marxist critics such as Rumina Sethi, Benita Parry, Amir Acheraiou, Arif Dirlik and many others interrogate the viewpoint of the theorists who simply take hybridity as the byproduct of globalization for granted.

After all the succeeding chapter as planned will deal with the postcolonial theorists and intellectuals whose proposition moves around the center of hybridity, productive relationship between the colonized and the colonizers, the impact of postcolonial literature, and the relevance of the African postcolonial literature in respect of Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie’s novel *Half of a Yellow Sun*. In the same vein the pertinent extracts to back up the major thesis will be analyzed to merge with the theoretical line. Similarly the third chapter copes with the neo-Marxist critics such Amar Acheraiou, Rumina Sethi, Benita Parry, Arif Dirlik and so on who perceive the stance and views of the postcolonial theorists like Homi Bhabha, Edward Said. by associating that with hybridity and orentalizing process of the West. Thus very vibrantly the neo-Marxist critics observe the problematic positions of the different facets of postcolonislism. They strongly advocate the incorporation and uprising of the class and social issues in the postcolonial studies along with hybridity. Most importantly they critique of the interpretation and association of hybridity with productive and fruitful implications. On the whole these neo-Marxist critics express their resentment against the negligence of resistance and people’s rapid resentments in the writings. Finally this chapter highlights the importance of economic and political issues to be studied and incorporated in the postcolonial studies which are pervasive in Chimamanda Adichie’s text, *Half of a Yellow Sun.* Finally the fourth chapter poses a critical deduction with the brief mentioning of the key aspects of the aforementioned chapters.

**Chapter Two**

**Bhabha’s Notion of Hybridity: An Interrogation**

Homi Bhabha argues that a new, hybrid conception of culture is necessary to develop a truly international culture, and to dismantle systems of cultural dominance, but he argues that this new concept should be centered on “cultural difference” rather than “cultural diversity.” Bhabha, drawing on post-structuralist theory, cites the inability of language to accurately represent the world, and therefore claims that all cultural statements and systems are constructed in this contradictory and ambivalent space of enunciation. For Bhabha, this space is a “Third Space” in between cultures that are often thought of as diametrically opposed. This space is a site where cultural differences can be articulated and postcolonial people have the possibility to renegotiate their own identities outside of externally-imposed binaries.

Similarly Bhabha views hybridity in the interview on “The Third Space” as an implication of cultural diversity. To him cultures are diverse and that in some sense the diversity of cultures is a good and positive thing and ought to be encouraged. Bhabha mentions in the interview: “It is a commonplace of plural, democratic societies to say that they can encourage and accommodate cultural diversity” (208). Bhabha thus accords the notion of hybridity that comes from the two prior descriptions: “I’ve given of the genealogy of difference and the idea of translation, because if, as I was saying, the act of cultural translation (both representation and as reproduction) denies the essentialism of a prior given original or originary culture” (211). Thus he further states that all forms of culture are continually in a process of hybridity. Similarly he clarifies that the importance of hybridity is not to be able ti trace two original moments from which the third emerges rather hybridity is the third space which enables other positions to emerge.

Bhabha views: “This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood through received wisdom” (211). In this way Bhabha details his concept of hybridity. He mentions that the importance of hybridity is that it bears the traces of those feelings and practices which inform it, just like a translation, so that hybridity puts together the traces of certain meanings or discourses. He makes clear that the process of cultural hybridity gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognizable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation.

Homi K. Bhabha, one of the leading postcolonial theorists and critics, builds on Said’s concept of the Other and Orientalism. In his works such as *The Location of Culture* (1994), Bhabha emphasizes the concerns of the colonized:

On the one hand, the colonized observe two somewhat distinct views of the world: that of the colonizer (conqueror) and that of himself or herself, the colonized (the one who has been conquered). To what culture does this person belong? Seemingly, neither culture feels like home. This feeling of homelessness, of being caught between two clashing cultures, Bhabha calls unhomeliness, a concept referred to as double consciousness by some postcolonial theorists. This feeling or perception of abandonment by both cultures causes the colonial subject (the colonized) to become a psychological refugee. Because each psychological refugee uniquely blends his or her two cultures, no two writers who have been colonial subjects will interpret their culture(s) exactly alike. (Quoted in Guevara 205)

Hence, Bhabha argues against the tendency to essentialize third-world countries into a homogenous identity. One of Bhabha’s major contributions to postcolonial studies is his belief that there is always ambivalence at the site of colonial dominance. When two cultures commingle, the nature and the characteristics of the newly created culture change each of the cultures. This dynamic, interactive, and tension-packed process Bhabha names hybridity. Bhabha himself says that “hybridization is a discursive, enunciatory, cultural, subjective process having to do with the struggle around authority, authorization, deauthorization, and the revision of authority. It’s a social process. It’s not about persons of diverse cultural tastes and fashions. As a result, says Bhabha, a feeling of unhomeliness develops in the colonized” (quoted in Guevara 205-6).

The colonized writer must create a new discourse by “rejecting all the established transcendental signifieds created by the colonizers. Such a writer must also embrace pluralism, believing that no single truth and no metatheory of history exist” (Guevara 206). No doubt how true and valid the colonizers make sure to make their writing about the colonized, it seems almost impossible. The perception and vintage point of the colonizer differ in the course of looking at objects around being in the colonized country due to having the sense of superiority complex.

*The Location of Culture* is Bhabha's a seminal work in which he gives many of the definitions of the notion of hybridity and accounts of the diverse aspects of this concept. The most comprehensive part of it concerning the definition of the notion of hybridity in Bhabha‘s works is the following excerpt from-“Signs Taken for Wonders” in which Bhabha says: “Hybridity is the sign of the productivity of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities; it is the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal (that is, the production of discriminatory identities that secure the pure and original identity of authority)” (4). Hybridity is the revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects. It displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination. It unsettles the mimetic or narcissistic demands of colonial power but reimplicates its identifications in strategies of subversion that turn the gaze of the discriminated back upon the eye of power. For the colonial hybrid is the articulation of the ambivalent space where the rite of power is enacted on the site of desire, making its objects at once disciplinary and disseminatory – or, in my mixed metaphor, a negative transparency. In *The Location of Culture* Bhabha further defines:

Hybridity as―the name of […] displacement of value from symbol to sign that causes the dominant discourse to split along the axis of its power to be representative, authoritative as well as―a problematic of colonial representation and individuation that reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal, in a way that ―other denied ‘knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority – its rules of recognition. (162)

To elaborate more on this definition, Bhabha adds: “it is not a third term that resolves the tension between two cultures or the two scenes of the book, in a dialectical play of recognition” (162). The interpretation Werbner has of Bhabha‘s definition of hybridity, “as―doubling up of the sign, a splitting which is less than one and double,‘is that―[t]he same object or custom placed in a different context acquires quite new meanings, while echoing old ones” (136).

Bhabha opines how marginal culture survives in his famous book, *The Location of Culture*. He says agency is important and asks whose voice is talking. He proposes that we reconfigure discourse of cultural difference because discourse of victimhood is unuseful. Enlightenment first denied coevalness. Now technology denies the denial of coevalness. Technology allows simultaneous study. Bhaba says coevalness is not enough. We must re-conceive history, as well as time, and cultural signs. He reminds us that “culture as a strategy of survival is both transnational and translational” (247). Transnational because contemporary postcolonial discourses are rooted in histories of cultural displacement; translational because spatial histories of displacement complicate our understanding of how culture signifies and what is signified by culture. Cultural translation becomes a “complex form of signification,” which a postcolonial perspective can help decipher because it resists binary structures of opposition, holistic forms of social explanation, and “forces a recognition of the more complex cultural and political boundaries that exist on the cusp of these often opposed political spheres–the hybrid location of culture” (248).

Similarly Bhabha explores the role of the postcolonial perspective in postmodern discourse, critical theory, and historiography and calls for “a radical revision of the social temporality in which emergent histories may be written, the rearticulation of the ‘sign’ in which cultural identities may be inscribed” (246). He challenges us to consider hybrid locations of cultural value embedded in historical traditions of cultural contingency and textual indeterminacy, which give agency to the subaltern subject, which if understood would “transform our understanding of the narrative of modernity and the ‘values of progress’” (249). No longer can we take a unified sense of culture community for granted, a people from various cultures “produce incompatible systems of signification and engage distinct forms of social subjectivity” (252). Bhabi calls for us to step outside the “sentence” or discourse of victimhood when we discuss marginal communities. He calls for a epistemological focus of culture to a focus of culture as enunciation, which is a “more dialogical process that attempts to track displacements and realignments that are the effects of cultural antagonisms and articulations—subverting the rationale of the hegemonic moment and relocating alternative, hybrid sites of cultural negotiation”—his ultimate objective being a “process by which objectified others may be turned into subjects of their history and experience” (255). According to Bhaba, what is created in the enunciative present is ambivalence, which opens up “new forms of identification that may confuse the continuity of historical temporalities confound the ordering of cultural symbols, traumatize tradition” (257). We must move “beyond theory,” claims Bhaba, to “create space for the contingent, indeterminate articulation of social ‘experience’ that is particulary important for envisaging emergent cultural identities” (257). After all, it is “a representation of social experience as the contingency of history—the indeterminacy that makes subversion and revision possible” (257).

Moving “beyond theory” of binaries, victimhood, centrality, etc. will help us understand how this location of culture is a means of historical agency that sits among another subversive strategies such as mimicry, hybridity, sly civility, to produce subaltern agency that “negotiates its own authority” (265). Although it may come across as social contradiction or antagonism, the “problematic of contingency strategically” in fact “ allows for a spatial contiguity…to be (re)articulated in the moment of indeterminacy,” which allows agent to “emerge into the social realm of discourse” (268-71). As Hannah Arendt reminds us, this indeterminacy is created in part because the subaltern agent is always a site of tension between the who of the individual self and the what of the subjective realm. Yet, this tension is productive; “it is the contingency that constitutes individuation—in the return of the subject as agent—that protects the interest of the inter-subjective realm” (272). As Bhaba explains, this site produces “a process of re-inscription and negotiation—the insertion or intervention of something that takes on new meaning—[which] happens in the temporal break in-between the sign, deprived of subjectivity, in the realm of the inter-subjective realm” (274). What ultimately emerges is the “process of agency both as a historical development and as the narrative agency of historical discourse” (275). This process can be articulated as a moment of revision in which the subaltern agent enacts (re)orders symbols in order to appropriate signs originally deprived of the subject in order to create subjectivity aiming at rediscovering truth—an this process is a theoretical form of political agency. This form of political agency, what Das calls a historiography of the subaltern, is made possible by the strategic use of ambivalence and the historical use of historical contingency and makes possible the interrogation of modernity.

African literature dissolves and polarizes into a situation akin to what Achebe seems to be hinting at when he says: “I'm an Igbo writer, because this is my basic culture; Nigerian, African and writer ... no, black first, then a writer. Each of these identities does call for a certain commitment on my part” (quoted in Appiah et al. 19). Here culture and experience rather than language becomes the essence of literature. Ngugi's claim to linguistic rejection on the grounds that the linguistic indigenization of African literature rids Africans of so-called corrupt foreign “thought-processes and values of [their] adopted tongue” is equally enfeebled by the fact that there are countless instances in history where people of one and the same language and culture have been divided over everyday issues of central importance, and have even gone to war over them” (quoted in Kwaku Asante-Darko 5). Contrary to the claims of the proponents of the rejection of foreign languages as a medium of African literature, the stylistic legacy bequeathed to post-colonial writers found meaningful expression in the works of Negritude writers.

Far from constituting an expression of freedom, the rejection of European values as advocated by post-colonial African critics and writer has meant the imposition of prohibitions and inhibitions which tend to coerce individuals into sticking to limited choices in matters of cultural values and language. It, therefore, has implications for marriage, profession, migration, food, and dress. It might close the door to profitable hybridization and universalism. Again, Mphalele, for instance, indicates the inevitability of imitation and hybridization in these terms:

I personally cannot think of the future of my people in South Africa as something in which the white man does not feature. Whether he likes it or not, our destinies are inseparable. I have seen too much that is good in western culture -- for example, its music, literature and theater – to want to repudiate it. (Quoted in Kwaku Asante-Darko 6)

The choice to imitate foreign languages and cultures in African literature continues to provide a unifying center for the myriad of African languages and cultures for which the political and legal implications of a return to pre-colonial multilingualism and culture diversity are neither desirable nor possible.

The history of hybridity lays its foundation at the lingering legacy of the Greek history of human civilization. Amar Acheraiou in *Questioning Hybridity, Post colonialism and Globalization* mentions:

As the historical evidence shows, shortly after taking possession of Persia, Alexander encouraged marriages between the Persian nobility and the Greek soldiers and officers. Alexander himself married a Persian woman, Roxane, the daughter of the defeated Persian king Oxyartes, captured by Alexander the Great in 327 BC. It goes without saying that Alexander’s marriage with Oxyartes’s daughter was a political alliance intended to tighten his grip on his Eastern Empire. At the same time, in his promotion of interracial marriages and his effort to blend East and West into a common civilization, Alexander also projected hybridity as a universal norm. (3)

The practice of hybridity is not a new issue. Rather its practice among human beings goes much earlier to the human civilization. The interracial marriage seems to have been a means of integrating two different races of people. How hybridity in the domain of human civilization turned into a universal phenomenon much earlier is still a burning issue of research at the moment is the point of remark here. “Hybridity is […] itself a hybrid concept” (21), according to Robert Young in *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* (2005). Over the last two decades, the unstable notion of hybridity has been the focus of a number of debates and has given rise to many publications.

Vanessa Guignery in edited book *Hybridity: Forms and Figures in Literature and the Visual Arts* describes: ‘The term, which is often discussed in connection with “such notions as métissage, creolization, syncretism, diaspora, transculturation and inbetweenness, has become a buzzword in cultural and literary studies, and is at times used carelessly to describe a disparate body of subjects in widely differing domains” (1). Vanessa Guignery further says that the word “hybridity” has its origins in biology and botany where it designates a crossing between two species by cross-pollination that gives birth to a third “hybrid” species. While Darwin praised the fertility of the process of cross-pollination, others pointed to the risk of degeneration when the term was applied to the field of genetics and racial interbreeding.

Mikhail Bakhtin develops a linguistic version of hybridity that is related to the concepts of polyphony, dialogism and heteroglossia. For Bakhtin, the process of hybridization-hybridization is the dynamic on-going process while hybridity is the end result-entails the combination of two languages and undermines the notion of a monological authoritative discourse:

What is hybridization? It is a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor. (358)

Bakhtin further distinguishes between intentional and unintentional hybridity. In the case of the former, discourse is double-voiced and one voice deliberately ironizes and unmasks the other within the same utterance: “Intentional semantic hybrids are inevitably internally dialogic […]. Two points of view are not mixed, but set against each other dialogically” (360); thus authoritative discourse is undone, which has social and political implications. In the case of unconscious or organic hybridity, “the mixture remains mute and opaque, never making use of conscious contrasts and oppositions” (360). In this regard, Adichie notes how characters interact with each other by using the language of the colonizer and somewhere their native Igbo in order for accomplishing the dialogic function.

Hybridity stands in opposition to the myth of purity and racial and cultural authenticity, of fixed and essentialist identity, embraces blending, combining, syncretism and encourages the composite, the impure, the heterogeneous and the eclectic. In *Imaginary Homelands* (1991), Salman Rushdie describes his novel *The Satanic Verses* (1988) in a way which offers an interesting perspective on the concept of hybridity:

*The Satanic Verses* celebrates hybridity, impurity, intermingling, the transformation that comes of new and unexpected combinations of human beings, cultures, ideas, politics, movies, songs. It rejoices in mongrelization and fears the absolutism of the Pure. Mélange, hotch-potch, a bit of this and a bit of that is how newness enters the world. It is the great possibility that mass-migration gives the world, and I have tried to embrace it. *The Satanic Verses* is for change-by-fusion, change-by-conjoining. It is a lovesong to our mongrel selves. (394)

Rushdie here points to the operation of blending, fusion or coalescence which overturns both binary structures and the mistaken belief in an idealized form of purity. To Rushdie hybridity is commendable and positive. It is a reliable means of change. Transformation is fertile and a sort of affirmative action for bringing differences together for the purpose of reformation.

Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin argue that “hybridity and the power it releases may well be seen as the characteristic feature and contribution of the post-colonial, allowing a means of evading the replication of the binary categories of the past and developing new antimonolithic models of cultural exchange and growth” (183), and they view hybridity as “the creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonisation” (118). Hybridity presents itself as an alternative discourse that subverts the very idea of a dominant culture and a unique canon, and invites a re-examination of power structures. For Homi Bhabha in *The Location of Culture* (1994), hybridity is a “disruptive and productive category” (quoted in Hutnyk 81) which shifts power, questions discursive authority and suggests that colonial discourse is never wholly in control of the colonizer. Dominating discourses are thus revealed to be fractured, which opens the ground for their subversion:

Hybridity is the sign of the productivity of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities, it is the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal (that is, the production of discriminatory identities that secure the ‘pure’ and original identity of authority). Hybridity […] displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination. (Quoted in Bhabha 112)

The discourse of colonial authority is revealed to be double-voiced rather than monological as it inscribes the very trace of the Other. For Bhabha, cultural differences are not synthesized into a new third term but continue to exist in a hybrid “Third Space of enunciation” (37), a zone of exchange and negotiation. Bhabha thus resituates the monolithic categories of race, class and gender in terms of borderlines, crossings, in-between spaces, interstices, splits and joins, and proposes to find the location of culture by focusing on that border area, that liminal, in-between space.

The Bhabha’s proposition pertaining to hybridity proves true that it is productive and the consequence of the colonial power. To entail this statement, Adichie further explains: If we learn irrigation technology, we can feed this country easily. We can overcome this colonial dependence on imports” (88). The knowledge imparted about irrigation is the contribution of the colonizers. Their technology embodies the potentials to empower the colonizers to grow the corns and plants on their own in abundance. It hence justifies the Bhabha’s view about hybridity that is the productivity of the colonial power. Now the Nigerians are enriched with the western technology and eastern pride and zeal which eventually help them to get rid of the colonial oppression.

The concept of hybridity is intrinsically linked to the notion of identity for multi-cultural individuals, migrants and diasporic communities, and the present volume analyses the ways in which literary and artistic works represent people of multiple identities and mixed origins who experience their hybridity with more or less serenity and whom society welcomes with varying degrees of benevolence. These “in-between” people or hyphenated communities occupy a displaced position which can provoke a sense of fragmentation, dislocation and discontinuity, both in terms of space and time. As suggested by Paul Gilroy in *The Black Atlantic* (1993), “they have no secure roots anymore which could fix them in place, in a nation or an ethnic group; instead, they travel along contingent cultural routes which can take them imaginatively or physically to different places and into contact with many different people” (quoted in Vanessa Guignery 4-5). Travel and migration are the means of progress and broadness.

In the same vein, while focusing Bhabha’s broader perspective towards hybridity, it is indispensible to say in theory, the West enforces its perception of ‘Other onto the East, reshaping the identity of the later entirely. Upon applying this to Colonial India, a relationship between the British and Indian cultures is revealed whereby the former plays a monopoly on the ‘link between knowledge and power’ leaving the Indian subordinated in his own nation. The product of such a relationship is what Homi Bhabha names a ‘hybrid cultural space’. Indian culture is forced to engage with the dominant British powers of Colonial rule creating a new mixed-cultural state. The inevitable question remains: How does the individual of British-India not only locate but also empower themselves within this new state. Jessica Massucco in her paper seeks to explore how British-Indian individuals deliberately utilize elements of British identity with the intent to empower or elevate themselves in their own community. Bhabha notes:

The borderline engagements of cultural difference may as often be consensual as conflictual; they may confound our definitions of tradition and modernity; realign the customary boundaries between the private and the public, high and low; and challenge normative expectations of development and progress. (*The Location of Culture 3*)

The normative pattern of development and progress is challenged by the intermingling of the cultures from multidimensional spectrum. Bhabha advocates that the tempo of progress and advancement increases in proportion to the intensity of hybridity. If the cultures from diverse zones get mingled, they are probably to shape a new and fertile ground for betterment. Concerning this line Kipling’s *Kim* seems relevant. Reading Kipling KimBhabha’ that within *Kim* the ‘fracturing of Imperial identity and power’ is symbolized “‘when Kim dissolves in tears under the stress of his inner conflict” (Gilbert 125). Hybridity here may act as a tool for empowerment in Kim’s relationship with society, but it also weakens him internally through the loss and confusion of the Self. Even if being British can be said to be empowering in Colonial India, it remains that hybridity prevents the individual from maintaining clear relationships with larger groups. Instead there forms this ‘inner conflict’ of the Self. Adichie’s character Richard is a bit similar to Kim who speaks Igbo so fluently and is accustomed to the Igbo culture. However, he is English and Kim is Irish despite his good adjustability with the Indian way of life and languages. Richard is also confused about his identity and is encountering different situations wherein he feels alienated in the Igbo community. In this regard, Adichie describes his situation: “Did you come to Nigeria to run away from something?’ she asked finally. ‘No,’ he said. ‘I’ve always been a loner and I’ve always wanted to see Africa, so I took leave from my humble newspaper job and a generous loan from my aunt and here I am” (62). Why Richard has come to Nigeria is not clear. He is in dilemma about his mission to the African continent. Though he can understand and speak the Nigerian languages and is in affair with a Nigerian girl, Kainene, he does not seem confident to make sure he is the real part of the colonized country. He feels alienated in the sense that he is English and there is no other English to accompany him.

Likewise Marwan M. Kraidy defines hybridity in a metaphorical manner. He says: “Hybridity has become a master trope across many spheres of cultural research, theory, and criticism, and one of the most widely used and criticized concepts in postcolonial theory” (2). Hence he emphasizes the importance of hybridity in the domain of the postcolonial theory. To him, hybridity is a tool to ease the method of criticism and literary reading to the postcolonial texts. In this way, Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin take hybridity in a bit different way. They say: “As one of the most widely employed and disputed terms in postcolonial theory hybridity has become a master trope across many spheres of cultural research, theory, and criticism” (118). While some see hybridity as a site of democratic struggle and resistance against empire, others have attacked it as a neocolonial discourse complicit with transnational capitalism, cloaked in the hip garb of cultural theory. Marwan M. Kraidy defines: “Hybridity has also been the target of attacks alleging that the concept reflects the life of its theorists more than the sites and communities these theorists write about” (2). Several studies have employed hybridity to describe mixed genres and identities, however, sustained treatments that theorize cultural hybridity as a communicative space or practice and thus place hybridity at the heart of communication theory as a field, remain rare.

Kraidy avers that “understanding hybridity as a practice marks the recognition that transcultural relations are complex, processual, and dynamic” (3). In addition to failing to grasp the ontological complexity of cultural interactions, a merely descriptive use of hybridity also poses the risk of undermining the political potential that hybridity might or might not have. Politically, a critical hybridity theory considers hybridity as a space where intercultural and international communication practices are continuously negotiated in interactions of differential power. There is always a situation of negotiation while two or more than two cultures interact with each other. They constitute a new space which is reformed and tolerable to the concerned parties who are the culture practitioners.

Homi Bhabha displaces hybridity from its racialized connotation to the semiotic field of culture. He explores hybridity in the context of the postcolonial novel, celebrating it as the pliability of the subaltern and as the contamination of imperial ideology, aesthetics, and identity, by natives who are striking back at imperial domination. He emphasizes hybridity’s ability to subvert and reappropriate dominant discourses. Thus, Bhabha affirms that, “The social articulation of difference, from the minority perspective, is a complex, ongoing negotiation that seeks to authorize cultural hybridities that emerge in moments of historical transformation” (2). Bhabha proceeds to argue that what he refers to as “cultures of postcolonial contra-modernity” are in fact “resistant to . . . oppressive assimilationist technologies . . . but they also deploy the cultural hybridity of their borderline conditions to ‘translate,’ and therefore reinscribe, the social imaginary of both metropolis and modernity” (6). One of the chief manifestations of this reinscription is found in Bhabha’s analysis of mimicry as a hybridizing process. In his landmark essay, “Of Mimicry and Man,” (1994), Bhabha argues that “the ambivalence of mimicry-almost but not quite-suggests that the fetishized colonial culture is potentially and strategically an insurgent counter-appeal” (91). Bhabha’s version of hybridity, imbued with political potential, has attracted virulent attacks from materialist critics. Bhabha’s work has been equally influential and contested. Moore-Gilbert (1997) devotes a full chapter to Bhabha, arguing that one of Bhabha’s most original contributions is to have emphasized “the mutualities and negotiations across the colonial divide” (116), as opposed to Said’s focus on the colonizer and Fanon’s emphasis on the colonized. On the other hand, “Bhabha’s Lacanian grounding and his focus on the semiotic domain has made him the favorite target of materialist critics such as Aijaz Ahmad” (quoted in Marwan M. Kraidy 4-5). The materialist critics who suspect the Bhabha’s proposition and stance regarding hybridity that Bhabha associates with the third space and claims this third space as a positive and productivity for the colonial power are Amar Achereiou, Marwa M. Kraidy, Arif Dirlik, Paul Meredith, Rumina Sethi and Benita Parry. These critics interrogate the position of Homi Bhabha pertaining to the practical uses of cultural hybridity and further these materialist critics observe the cultural and social resistance by the colonized in the postcolonial situation which are often ignored by the postcolonial writers like Homi Bhabha, Edward Said, Gyatri Spivak Chakravorty and so on. Hence the postcolonial reading to Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* is intended to focus on questioning the understanding of hybridity and surface postcolonial observations of the postcolonial writers in this context.

Bhabha’s third space yields a ground for two groups: the ruler and the ruled. Those who are culturally hybridized become the exploiting agency as represented by Olanna, Richard and Ugwu in Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun.* Thus this research dramatizes the hybridized situations as remarkably posed in Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* and shows how the novel critiques the Bhabha’s concept of hybridity. The dissertation supports its main point by bringing in the views and criticisms advanced by neo-Marxist critics such as Arif Dirlik, Benita Parry, Rumina Sethi and Amar Acheraiou.

**Chapter Three**

**Interrogation of Hybridity in Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun***

This research poses a question to the application of Homi Bhabha’s notion of hybridity that applies here to dramatize the postcolonial themes in Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun*. The concept of hybridity is much concerned with its cultural aspect. Hence cultural hybridity has received a great deal of critical attention in both cultural and postcolonial studies and most contemporary approaches maintain, rightly so, that no culture or people can lay claim to purity. When we say that all cultures are hybrid, we mean that whenever cultures come into contact with each other, whether through trade, marriage alliances, or war, they are inevitably transformed by their proximity with cultural and racial otherness. The transformations and mutual influences occurring during these exchanges are usually uneven and differently perceived by the actors involved in the cultural encounters.

It is commonly recognized that powerful and dominant cultures, especially in colonial contexts, are more likely to impact significantly on the less powerful and subjugated cultures. Of course, there is also much historical evidence to the contrary. The colonial power is deep-rooted even in the postcolonial stage in the colonized country in the sense that they are presumably impressed with the language and culture of the colonizers in such a way that they cannot detach themselves from. Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie in her novel, *Half of a Yellow Sun* carves out the similar picture in which the Nigerians mimic the English in terms of language and dressing up. Adichie thus presents: “You can see Heathgrove from here,’ she said, pointing. ‘The iniquitously expensive and secretive British secondary school my sister and I attended. My father thought we were too young to be sent abroad, but he was determined that we be as European as possible” (61). Hereby Kainene a young girl from the elite Nigerian family interacts with Richard, an English journalist makes it clear that she is different from the rest of the Nigerians. She reveals a long background of her education and bringing up. She indeed feels proud of having attended British school. In one sense she discards the Nigerian schooling and language in general. The impression of the colonial power overwhelmingly reflects deep-rooted in the elites of the colonized country. Just in contrary to this Richard does not even attempt to share his response to the African culture and people. He does not seem to bother as perhaps he is no more interested in Kainene intrinsically.

To strengthen the aforementioned claim to illustrate how the impact of the colonial power has ever had the upper hand seems crucial. Amar Aheraiou mentions in his book, *Questioning Hybridity, Postcolonialism and Globalization* the dominating impact of the colonial nation over the colonized country:

The tremendous cultural influence exerted by Persia on ancient Greece after Persia was conquered by Alexander the Great is a good illustration. Broadly speaking, being in the position of power and domination, colonizing nations have both the means and the ambition to impact deeply upon indigenous cultural, political, and socio-economic structures. This is hardly surprising, given imperialism’s impulse to attain cultural hegemony while imposing on the colonized its political and economic domination. In order to achieve cultural domination, colonizers across history adopted various methods, which often combined exclusionary and inclusionary practices, modes of coercion and collaboration, negation and incorporation of difference. (17-18)

Within colonial politics, inclusive practices usually consist of integrating a section of the colonized population, the aristocracy or elite, into colonial culture and institutions. The exclusionary practices, on the other hand, involve the political, social, and economic marginalization of the majority of the natives alongside downgrading the colonized languages and customs. Denying the majority of the colonized peoples political participation and basic social and economic rights is a defining feature of imperial domination, modern and ancient alike. Adichie in this regard asserts how the Nigerian language and culture that are of the colonized are ignored and less valued even by the colonized in the postcolonial Nigeria. She mentions: “My fellow women are jealous, but is it my fault that their sons have empty brains and my own son won the white people’s scholarship?” (27-28). The colonized develop the sense of inferiority complex. Hence winning the white people’s scholarship is a marker of rationality and intellect. The Nigerians are having psychological tussle regarding the trifle achievement for instance scholarship to study in the Western universities. The colonized feel proud of being awarded with the scholarship as they take their education system less advanced than theirs. Though it is a kind of imperial domination, nobody generally seems to suspect the cheap generosity and liberalism extended by the imperialists through different illuminating acts.

This political and socio-economic marginalization generally goes hand in hand with the cultural alienation and narcissistic debasement of the colonized. Amir Aheraiou supports this point, “In both French and British empires, for instance, the native cultures were usually systematically marginalized and debased” (18). An evidence of this colonial marginalizing practice can be seen in the occlusion and exclusion of the native languages and literatures from the colonial educational curricula. These colonial exclusions are premised on various considerations; some of these are strictly economic and political, others have a cultural and ideological basis. In this latter case the marginalization of the colonized cultures, languages, and, more broadly, the native systems of producing knowledge may be said widely to proceed from European cultural arrogance and racial prejudice; both feed on myths of supremacy which disqualify the native cultures and languages as worthy instruments of knowledge and civilization. The native culture and languages are indeed the tremendous sources of knowledge; they are generally debased and ignored even by the people of the colonized nation in the postcolonial situation. Adichie points out the similar case in *Half of a Yellow Sun*:

‘I am interested in African herbs, Harrison.’

‘But sah, they are bad, from the witch doctor. They are devilish.’

‘Of course,’ Richard gave up. He should have known that Harrison, with his excessive love for all things non-Nigerian, was not the right person to ask. He would ask Jomo instead. (73)

The African countries are so rich in natural resources and minerals. They need to be properly utilized and consumed for the right purposes. They should be exploited for the further prosperity of the African countries. Poverty can be alleviated and dependency can be lowered. But the colonized who have been made to depend upon the foreign imports despise the native products and methods of healing which keep them to suffer the imperial domination the Nigerians in this concern hardly understand. That native cultures and civilizations have been consistently marginalized and devalued by colonial powers is an irrefutable historical fact. Amar Acheraiou adds here that, “It is, nevertheless, important to remark that the deliberate marginalization of the dominated cultures by no means suggests that imperial cultures were unaffected by native cultures” (17-18). Despite the innumerable endeavors by the colonizers not to get affected by the dominated cultures, they fail to retain their purity and originality. To some extent they do get affected which reflects in the Richard’s thoughts and visions. Adichie thus elucidates: “What does the press know, really? Madu replied in English. He always did that; since Richard’s Igbo had become near-fluent, Madu insistently responded to it in English so that Richard felt forced to revert to English” (136). Hereby it gets clear that Richard speaks Igbo as he has been staying in Nigeria for a long time. Whatever the purpose he has got, he speaks Igbo almost fluently. At the deeper level, he respects Igbo. But he is forced to interact in English by the people of Nigeria as they do not let him assimilate with the native culture.

To elaborate further on the cultural, political, and ideological interactions and métissage within Ptolemaic Egypt, it is crucial to observe that the process of hybridization emerging from these colonial encounters is ambivalent and profoundly unbalanced. For example, bilingualism, the living proof of hybrid cultural and linguistic identity, is more common among the Egyptian elite than among the Greeks. Amar Acheraiou states that “only a small number of Greeks learned the Egyptian languages and dialects, while most of the Egyptian elite had to assimilate Greek language and culture in order to achieve social promotion” (21). It is the elites who take more benefits from the lessons and social practices left and taught about how to rule and dominate by the colonizers. Hence this situation can be connected to the condition of Olanna and Kainene who belong to the elite class in the Igbo tribe, Nigeria and have got hybrid impression of cultures: Igbo and English. Their English is fluent and they imitate the life style of the English. Adichie evidently expresses the similar theme: “Olanna dances like white people!’ Mama Oji said, laughing. ‘Her buttocks do not move at all!” (332). Olanna does not only speak fluent English but also dances like white people. It further entails the meaning that she is overwhelmingly influenced by the western dance, music and culture in general. She represents the elite class in Nigeria. Hence it becomes pretty clear that the elites of the colonized nation imitate the colonizers more and do attempt to dominate the rest of the people in the postcolonial phase.

Amar Acheraiou very explicitly comments the role of hybridity: “A hybridization that is moved by concrete cultural, ideological, economic, and geopolitical considerations, all aiming at imperial domination and supremacy” (23). According to him the secondary role of hybridization may be anything but the primary motive of this process is to practice imperial domination and supremacy over the people of the postcolonial country. Abugu Benjamin a reviewer comments “Prosperity and education are the goodies that European colonizers claim they have brought to the colonized but what results are civil war, death and destruction” (15). The Biafra war seems to have been the design of the colonizers.

Acheraiou goes back to the history of the integral relationship between the colonized and the colonizers and thus gets to assert:

In the nineteenth century, both Britain and France, taking the ancient Greeks and Romans as imperial models, used the colonized elites as intermediaries in order to maintain their control over the native populations. Thus, as in the Greek and Roman empires where the local elites were incorporated into the imperial system, so, too, within modern empires the indigenous aristocracy participated in colonial rule in ways that gave this rule a hybrid cast. (60)

Richard who in Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* represents the colonial power and Olanna and Kainene-the native elites are used as tools by the British to rule the people in Nigeria even in the postcolonial independence situation of Nigeria exemplify how the imperialism works in the postcolonial nations. Adichie on the top of relevance to this colonial power states in *Half of a Yellow Sun*:

Richard knew his type. He was like President Nixon’s fact finders from Washington or Prime Minister Wilson’s commission members from London who arrived with their firm protein tablets and their firmer conclusions: that Nigeria was not bombing civilians, that the starvation was overflogged, that all was as well as it should be in the war.

There isn’t a propaganda machine,’ Richard said. ‘The more civilians you bomb, the more resistance you grow.’ (371)

Hence it gets crystal clear that resistance to the colonial power by the people of the postcolonial countries becomes as much vibrant and aggressive as they are forced to suffer the bombing and destructions. Richard is here in dilemma concerning his position. On the one hand he represents the colonizers and he claims to have been a fair journalist and is now simply rendering his duty as a reporter of the Biafra war on the other. Pertaining to this proposition Acheraiou’s commentary sounds immensely pertinent.

Moreover, Acheraiou highlights the power relationship between the colonizers and the colonized in the modern context. He says: “Modern colonial ideology and rule, based on coercion and negotiation, incorporation and rejection of difference, and progressive and archaic practices, were widely hybrid, mixing ancient Greek and Roman as well as native structures of power” (62). Nowadays the modern colonial ideology is functioning in the postcolonial countries. The hybrid nature of the contemporary imperialism can be associated with the colonial domination prevalent in the postcolonial Nigeria. Hence Adichie mentions:

‘Of course I asked because you are white. They will take what you write more seriously because you are white. Look, the truth is that this is not your war. This is not your cause. Your government will evacuate you in a minute if you ask them to. So it is not enough to carry limp branches and shout power, power to show that you support Biafra. If you really want to contribute, this is the way that you can. The world has to know the truth of what is happening, because they simply cannot remain silent while we die. They will believe a white man who lives in Biafra and who is not a professional journalist. (305)

The people of the colonized nation trust the white more even in the postcolonial situation. The entire Igbo community generally confides in the writing and reporting by the white journalists. Richard a white man is supposed to be more trustworthy and the entire task of writing depends upon him. He is pleaded to impart the true information about the Biafra war to the world. Hence the dependency of the colonized intellectually upon the colonizers in the postcolonial situation is the marker of the lingering colonial domination.

In this way Acheraiou in *Questioning Hybridity, Post colonialism and Globalization* imparts information about the upper hand of the westerners in the eastern nations. Hence he avers:

The preservation of European overseas colonies depended on a display of both cultural arrogance and military domination. The same holds true in today’s globalized world, as the maintaining of neocolonial privilege enjoyed by Western societies is broadly predicated on power inequality, negative portrayal, and geopolitical marginalization of non-Europeans. (66)

The lingering colonial domination has turned as a planned goal of globalization. Nowadays cultural arrogance and military domination have become as the means to deliver the colonizers’ domination and supremacy. Adichie does present the similar endeavor frequently made by the colonizers. She emphasizes the cultural arrogance rendered through the social interaction of the character, Richard in *Half of a Yellow Sun*:

‘Good afternoon,’ Ugwu said.

‘Who are you?’ the soldier asked. ‘Are you an idle civilian?’

‘I am a teacher.’

‘A teacher? *Onye nkuzi?’* He swung his gun back and forth.

‘Yes,’ Ugwu responded in English. ‘We organize classes in this neighbourhood and teach the young ones the ideals of the Biafran cause.’ He hoped his English sounded like Olanna’s; he hoped, too, that his affection would frighten this soldier into not asking him any more questions. (296)

Hereby Ugwu uses English as a tool to heighten his social position. He takes English as a language of power. He is convinced that the person he is interacting with will be impressed when he speaks English instead of the native language. He wishes he could speak English like Olanna who is from the elite class of the colonized country. This affection for and glamour of English implies the cultural arrogance that retains imperialism. Despite being sure about the fact that the soldier cannot understand Igbo, Ugwu speaks English. This is a new kind of colonization in a new form.

Acheraiou in *Questioning Hybridity, Post colonialism and Globalization* further comments hybridity by analyzing its impact:

In both modern and ancient times mixed-race offspring were for the most part caught in what I have called the space of the impossible. As conceptualized in this study, the space of the impossible is a site of extreme psychological, cultural, and racial alienation in which the duplex, unique identity of mixed-blood offspring is subject to a double denial: it is tacitly or explicitly rejected by both sites of identification–the Western and non-Western–of which hybrid subjectivity is constitutive. (79)

Acheraiou explains the space of impossible that is the child of the biracial parents in both ancient and modern times. The hybrid child does not feel glorified and empowered as stated by Bhabha in his *The Location of Culture*. Rather s/he feels alienated in the space of impossible. S/he gets entrapped to the labyrinth. Both the western and eastern cultures reject such hybridized personalities. Adichie in *Half of a Yellow Sun* demonstrates the space of impossible by portraying Richard who claims to be the part of the Igbo community and sometimes expresses his cultural arrogance as well by associating him with his English nationality and race. Hence Adichie mentions his position:

Richard exhaled. It was like somebody sprinkling pepper on his wound: Thousands of Biafrans were dead, and this man wanted to know if there was anything new about one dead white man. Richard would write about this, the rule of Western journalism: One hundred dead black people equal one dead white person. ‘There is nothing new to tell, ‘he said. ‘The area is occupied now.’ (369)

Hereby Richard on one hand is trying to do the philanthropic act by reporting the extant consequences of the Biafra war in order to let the world know the actual plight of the black people. On the other hand he is expressing his cultural arrogance just by comparing the black with the white. He is valorizing the value of the white and at the same time he is degrading the lives of the black. Eventually it gets pretty clear that he is in dilemma. He is therefore not accepted by all the black with the open heart everywhere. Rather most of those whom Richard encounters suspect him and fairness of his profession. Pertaining to this trait of Richard Adichie describes:

An official came out of the unfinished terminal building nearby and shook Richard’s hand. ‘Don’t write too much, oh! Don’t give away our secrets,’ he joked.

‘Of course not,’ Richard said. ‘Can I interview you?’

The man beamed and flexed his shoulders and said, ‘Well, I am in charge of customs and immigration.’ Richard hid a smile; people always felt important when he asked for an interview. (309)

Indirectly Richard is not welcome to write about the current haps and mishaps of the colonized country. The officer implicitly warns Richard not to reveal the secrets of Nigeria. Richard hides his smile when the officer mentions he is in charge. It further indicates that Richard does not want to accept a black to hold such a prestigious position. Richard may think that only the white deserve to work as officers.

Frantz Fanon implies that “whatever their efforts to bleach themselves white, blacks are inescapably embedded in their blackness; a blackness racially and socially constructed by the Europeans who expect that ‘not only must the black be black; he must be black in relation to the white’” (quoted in Amar Acheraiou 81). Olanna and Kainene in Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* do wish to be associated with white Europeans, Richard. They prioritize the white people and their whiteness. What accent Olanna, Kainene, Ugwu speak English in, they remain black. This blackness is their identity and originality which they need to valorize. However, they imitate the lifestyle of whites but their imitation does not lead them to have complete change in their physic.

Amar Acheraiou quotes Homi Bhabha who redefines culture, discourse, and identity as fluid and ambivalent, rather than fixed and one-dimensional. While emphasizing the hybridity of all cultures, Bhabha closely links the notion of hybridity to the spatial metaphor of the third space. As theorized by Bhabha, the third space is interchangeable with hybridity, or more precisely, hybridity is the third space:

All forms of culture are continually in a process of hybridity. But for me the importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original moments from which the third emerges, rather hybridity to me is the ‘third space’ which enables other positions to emerge. […] the process of cultural hybridity gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognizable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation. (211)

Acheraiou critically analyzes the Bhabha’s concept of hybridity and concludes that Bhabha has simply generalized hybridity just by associating with the third space which is spatial. The flux of hybridity is a very obvious idea that Bhabha puts forward. Bhabha hereby seems to have failed to look into other aspects of hybridity such as cultural domination and colonial supremacy closely embedded with hybridization. How the colonizers’ culture affects the cultural belonging of the colonized even in the postcolonial nation seems to have been overlooked in Bhabha’s reading to hybridity. Acheraiou further comments Bhabha’s position:

Bhabha’s above proposition contains a cluster of theoretical, ideological, cultural, and utopian projections that Bhabha associates with the third space. In its actual formulation, the third space, like hybridity, is posited as a site of subversion, is placement, newness, renegotiation of cultures and identities, and multiple positionality. (81)

The Bhabha’s concept of hybridity should be questioned in the sense that he has tried to define hybridity in a steady and simple way. He seems to have failed in connecting hybridity with the hegemonic imposition and cultural arrogance of the colonizers.

To pursue the critical examination of the theory of hybridity and the third space in relation to colonial discourse, it can be argued that hybridity, as conceived by Bhabha, is not only a key feature of colonial cultures, but is also deeply inscribed in the very structure of colonial discourse and power. In his discussion of colonial cross-cultural encounters Bhabha consistently deploys the concept of hybridity mainly to highlight the ambivalence of colonial discourse and power. He argues on this premise that it is the very hybridization produced by colonial power which precisely undermines colonial discourse and authority: “The effect of colonial power is seen to be the production of hybridization rather than the noisy command of colonialist authority or the silent repression of native tradition […]. [It] enables a form of subversion […] that turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds of intervention” (154). For Bhabha colonial discourse is essentially a heterogeneous, ambivalent structure through which colonial rule is at once established and contested, done and undone. In short, in Bhabha’s conception colonial rule and discourse are systems in which coercion and negotiation, authoritarianism and consensus are simultaneously at work. Building on the assumption that colonial discourse is ambivalent and heterogeneous, Bhabha further considers hybridity as a privileged means of resistance and subversion with a strong liberatory potential for the colonized or subaltern subjects.

According to Bhabha, then, hybridity is the fundamental tool by which the colonized resisted and subverted the colonizer’s cultural, political, and ideological domination. Adichie quotes the interaction between Odenigbo and Ugwu in this context in order to make clear how the language of the colonizer proves a reliable tool to resist the colonizer’s cultural domination. She thus avers: “‘Your father should have borrowed!’ Master snapped, and then, in English, ‘Education is a priority! How can we resist exploitation if we don’t have the tools to understand exploitation?’” (11). Language of the colonizer indeed becomes prominent provided that the colonized want to understand the nature of domination. It is a tool to resist exploitation and further it empowers one to remain alert and independent by reading the diplomatic plots weaved by the colonizers. Hence linguistic hybridity proves fertile and productive in the sense it helps the colonized express resentment against all sorts of hegemony.

Robert Young glosses the concept of hybridity and describes saying that hybridity works simultaneously in two ways: “organically”, hegemonizing, creating new spaces, structures, scenes, and “intentionally”, diasporizing, intervening as a form of subversion, translation, transformation” (25). Young, here, recycles and adapts Bakhtin’s notion of ‘organic’ and ‘intentional’ hybridity to emphasize the double consciousness entailed in the process of hybridization. In this regard Amar Acheraiou in *Questioning Hybridity, Post colonialism and Globalization*, comments: “Robert Young rehearses Bhabha’s views of hybridity as a vehicle of subversion, translation, and transformation, without, however, telling us how this transformative potential of hybridity translates into concrete geopolitical terms” (102). Young does not seem to have defined hybridity in a critical way. Rather he has simply restated what Bhabha already said. Acheraiou thus defines hybridity:

métissage in its manifold expressions (cultural, biological, administrative, and technological) is a fundamental agent of development and progress for all civilizations, I cannot but support this immemorial practice. Moreover, because I firmly believe that hybridity could and should be utilized to fight racial hatred and ‘intolerance’; that it can and ought to be used as a means to achieve a race-blind planetary solidarity… (103)

Both politically and ideologically, postcolonial conceptualizations of hybridity are indeterminate, open-ended to the extent that their agency can be employed in the service of hegemonic power structures as well as anti-hegemonic modalities. Thus hybridity proves both positive and negative to the colonized. Adichie’s characters in *Half of a Yellow Sun* which have literarily put on different gowns can be quoted in order to make sure how hybridity sometimes empowers the colonized to critically analyze the colonial discourse. Adichie thus quotes:

There are two answers to the things they will teach you about our land: the real answer and the answer you give in school to pass. You must read books and learn both answers. I will give you books, excellent books.’ Master stopped to sip his tea. ‘They will teach you that a white man called Mango Park discovered River Niger. That is rubbish. Our people fished in the Niger long before Mango Park’s grandfather was born. But in your exam, write that it was Mango Park.’ (11)

The colonial discourse has become a productive ground for the people of the colonized nation to exercise their brains by looking at different dimensions of knowledge so far imparted by the colonizers. Odenigbo is sharing his critical perception with Ugwu stating that there are two answers and the student should make sure which the right answer is. Mango Park indeed did not discover Niger River but is mentioned in the books taught to the students of the colonized nation at missionary schools. Odenigbo hence inculcates the sense of criticality and analysis to the Ugwu’s mind so that his general sense perception can change. Hereby language of the colonizers which is the crucial aspect of culture seems to be cooperating with the colonized like Odenigbo to analyze the colonial discourse critically.

Aijaz Ahmad blames postcolonial scholars, specifically Bhabha, for developing a theory of postcoloniality that is completely disconnected from the material colonial context and post-independence realities of the former colonies. This is no doubt a serious discrepancy, since colonialism and post-independence are after all what postcolonialism is supposed to focus on in the first place. Ahmad writes: “Between postcoloniality as it exists in a former colony like India, and postcoloniality as the condition of discourse by such critics as Bhabha, there would appear

to be a considerable gap” (10). Ahmad is right in highlighting the postcolonial scholars’ detachment from the concrete daily preoccupations of millions of peoples in the former colonies. We may even state that in the postcolonial discourse on hybridity and, more specifically, in its emphasis on Diaspora as its very embodiment, looms a strategy of displacement, if not usurpation. Amar Acheraiou in *Questioning Hybridity, Post Colonialism and Globalization* states: “More concretely, migrant postcolonial practitioners promote a Diaspora-centric narrative of culture and identity that appears to function as a metonymy for the global postcolonial condition. In a sense, this minor narrative of diasporic identification turns out to be hegemonic and totalizing” (108). Acheraiou does believe that the fiction created by the diaspora writers is dominating and generalizing. They use their imagination and attempt to capture the sufferings and pains of the colonized being in the West which indeed creates milieu to suspect such narratives. Acheraiou thus supports Ahmad’s position regarding the postcolonial literature. Adichie in *Half of a Yellow Sun* empowers Ugwu to write about the aftermath of the Biafra war instead of Richard which may be due to the fact that she deliberately wants the Nigerians in Nigeria to write about the postcolonial life. Thus she quotes Ugwu:

“The World Was Silent When We Died”. It is a good title.’

‘Yes, it is. It came from something Colonel Madu said once.’

Richard paused. “The war isn’t my story to tell, really.’

Ugwu nodded. He had never thought that it was.

‘Can I give you a letter, in case you see Eberechi, sah?’

‘Of course.’ (425)

Richard hereby realizes to tell the story of the Biafra war is not his duty. Further he accepts the truth that he cannot be a right person to extend commendable representation. Of course the writing that comes through a white man’s eyes may be biased. Considering these facts Richard quits the intention of writing. Ugwu is indirectly inspired to accomplish the job of writing about “The World Was Silent When We Died”. Adichie seems to have been successful by carving out such characters which through lessons in respect of representation can be imparted to the world. Similarly Karin Barber, a specialist in Yoruba popular culture, offers a critique of postcolonial criticism that is particularly enlightening in this respect. She notes that postcolonial criticism has:

promoted a binarized, generalized model of the world which has the effect of eliminating African-language expression from view […] Despite intermittent claims to specificity, this model blocks a properly historical, localized understanding of any scene of colonial and post-Independence literary production in Africa. Instead it selects and overemphasizes one sliver of literary and cultural production– written literature in the English language – and treats this as

all there is, representative of a whole culture or even a whole global ‘colonial experience’. (3)

Barber’s reproach is aimed at postcolonial practitioners who focus on and canonize postcolonial writers in English to the detriment of those working in African and Asian vernaculars as well as in French, Spanish, and Portuguese. She justly draws attention to these exclusionary practices, bringing to light the discrepancies evidenced in the ideological choices and critical methodologies of postcolonial practitioners. Her commentary is likely to focus the postcolonial writers in English. The degree of prominence the postcolonial writers in English, is intensified and those voices delivered in African and Asian vernaculars are generally unheard. On this ground, the writing of Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, who writes in English in the postcolonial nation, can be interrogated. Acheraiou in *Questioning Hybridity, Post colonialism and Globalization* further makes it clear:

By promoting hybridity theory Third World postcolonial scholars hoped to be accepted as equal cultural and epistemic agents of knowledge; a privilege that colonialism massively denied to the colonized. In this, hybridity theory reads as a kind of writing back or mediated dialogue between the postcolonial migrant intellectual and the former colonizing nations. By laying emphasis on their hybridity the postcolonial migrant scholars wished to be recognized as genuine traitsd’ union between the former colonies and former Western colonial powers. (111)

Richard in Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* is carved to act as a postcolonial migrant scholar to write on “The World Was Silent When We Died”. He is preparing to write about the Biafra war. He is about to be the agent of knowledge for the world. Similarly the culturally hybrid characters such as Olanna and Kainene typically stand for the colonized elites who seem to have been destined with the opportunity of learning English abroad. Their education has made them think and act differently in the sense that they are in ambivalence. But they are in one way or other culturally colonized even in the postcolonial phase. In this regard Adichie states:

What do you think accounts for the success of the white man’s mission in Africa, Richard? Odenigbo asked.

‘The success?’ Odenigbo unnerved him, the way he would brood for long moments and then abruptly ask or say something unexpected.

‘Yes, the success. I think in English,’ Odenigbo said.

‘Perhaps you should first account for the failure of the black man to curb the white man’s mission,’ Kainene said.

‘Who brought racism into the world?’ Odenigbo asked.

‘I don’t see your point,’ Kainene said.

‘The white man brought racism into the world. He used it as a basis of conquest. It is always easier to conquer a more humane people.’

‘So when we conquer the Nigerians we will be the less humane?’

Kainene asked. (402)

The above conversation between Odenigbo and Kainene makes it clear that the culturally hybrid Kainene does not show readiness to accept the fact that the English indeed cultivated the discriminatory sense of racism in Africa. She is mentally colonized that she cannot see beyond the training imparted to her. She represents the colonized elite class in the postcolonial Nigeria. The colonized elite, who had been induced by the colonizers to join the imperial enterprise, actively participated in the colonial project of hybridization or policies of assimilation, in the process gaining social, economic, and political privileges. The colonial masses were not explicitly invited to assimilate in the way the elite were, neither, it would seem, did they wish completely to turn Western and thus lose their cultural and religious roots.

Olanna and Kainene represent the colonized elites, whereas Ugwu stands for the colonized mass. Hence, of course Ugwu wishes to lose his cultural and religious root which is evident when he speaks English in the Igbo community in order to make sure he is different from the rest of the people. English speaking is hereby associated with the sense of superiority. Odenigbo is a revolutionary Nigerian who thinks of the colonial discourse still prevailing in the postcolonial Nigeria. Despite the fact that Odenigbo sounds radical, he is expressing the resentment of the common Nigerians whose identity and culture has ever been ushered by the colonizers.

Migrant postcolonial scholars risk revelation as beneficiaries of class inequality entertained by the very structures of power that hybridity discourse sets out to break down. Amar Acheraiou quotes Shalini Puri who states “in what sounds like a defense of hybridity discourse that ‘class equality is part of the unconscious of liberal discourses of hybridity” (85). She further asserts that these very liberal discourses of hybridity “attempt to create a space in which to explore and reinvent an aesthetics of equality” (85). The hybridity veils the rift that is in terms of class in the colonized nation. Therefore hybridity is a dangerous tool to study the genuine situation of the all colonized. Rather the class differences should be taken account for presenting the true and trustworthy picture of the postcolonial nation. Adichie does show the differences that are extant in terms of class in the colonized Nigeria in the postcolonial era. She displays:

‘What bigger picture?’ Master asked. ‘The bigger picture of the white man! Can’t you see that we are not all alike except to white eyes?’ Master’s voice rose easily, Ugwu had noticed, and by his third glass of brandy, he would start to gesture with his glass, leaning forwards until he was seated on the very edge of his armchair. Late at night, after Master was in bed, Ugwu would sit on the same chair and imagine himself speaking swift English, talking to rapt imaginary guests, using words like *decolonize* and *pan-African,* moulding his voice after Master’s, and he would shift and shift until he too was on the edge of the chair. (20)

There are two things to be taken notice of: racial rift and class rift. The race conflict is between the white and the black. Hereby Odenigbo advocates the similarities between the black and white. Meanwhile he is teaching Ugwu English not only for empowering Ugwu so that the latter can resist the exploitation done by the white but also for the former’s benefit. Odenigbo wants Ugwu to speak English perfectly so that he can help heighten the social status of his master which indeed can be analyzed at the micro level. Amar Acheraiou strengthens the claim that postcolonial practitioners overlook the cultural domination and racial supremacy embedded with the colonial discourse in the postcolonial countries. Acheraiou thus states in *Questioning Hybridity, Post colonialism and Globalization*: “Postcolonial inattention to the global hybridities of resistance and domination combines with its evasion of the issues of class, race, and neocolonialism . . .” (171). He further criticizes the concept of Bhabha’s hybridity. To Acheraiou, with the annexation of hybridity discourse by neoliberal ideology, the third space, which Bhabha defines as the privileged site of enunciation, in turn appears as the locus of ultra-liberalism and global hybridities of power and domination. In short, “the third space becomes a grey area of global power and geopolitical representations; an area where hegemony is, contrary to the assumptions of the postcolonial promoters of hybridity discourse, not contested or subverted, but asserted with force and brutality” (181). It is a hybridity whose foundation is not abstractly spatial, but concretely materialist and profoundly ethical; it is a hybridity with as many centers of consciousness as geographical points of origin; all these converge in the same defining, ever-expanding moment of global resistance, solidarity, and articulation of an alternative ethics of doing and being on a larger planetary scale.

Marwan M. Kraidy in his paper on “Hybridity in Cultural Globalization” quotes Werbner (1997) who summarizes this point of view when she writes:

All cultures are always hybrid. . . . Hybridity is meaningless as a description of ‘culture,’ because this ‘museumizes’ culture as a ‘thing.’ . . . Culture as an analytic concept is always hybrid . . . since it can be understood properly only as the historically negotiated creation of more or less coherent symbolic and social worlds. (15)

Since all culture is always hybrid, then hybridity is conceptually disposable. Werbner further writes that “Too much hybridity . . . leaves all the old problems of class exploitation and racist oppression unresolved” (20). Van der Veer puts it this way, “the hybridity celebrated in Cultural Studies has little revolutionary potential since it is part of the very discourse of bourgeois capitalism and modernity which it claims to displace” (104). The use of hybridity is thus criticized as being politically suspicious because it allegedly lends legitimacy to a corporate rhetoric that frames cultural mixture as a market to be taken by capital, and at the same time elides accusations of economic domination and assorted forms of imperialism.

Arif Dirlik in *Critical Inquiry* hence speaks in the line of critiquing the postcolonial writers who basically limit their study of the colonial discourse just by associating with the hybridity as third space in Bhabha’s terms. Dirlik in his paper, “The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism” reveals his stance:

My goal in the discussion below is twofold: to review the term post- colonial, and the various intellectual and cultural positions associated with it, in the context of contemporary transformations in global relationships, and to examine the reconsiderations of problems of domination and he-gemony as well as of received critical practices that these transformations require. Postcolonial is the most recent entrant to achieve prominent visi- bility in the ranks of those "post" marked words (seminal among them, postmodernism) that serve as signposts in(to) contemporary cultural criti- cism. (329)

The goal, indeed, is no less than to abolish all distinctions between center and periphery as well as all other binarisms" that are allegedly a legacy of colonial(ist) ways of thinking and to reveal societies globally in their complex heterogeneity and contingency.

The appeals of post- coloniality seem to cut across national, regional, and even political boundaries, which on the surface at least seems to substantiate its claims to globalism. It is not any reflection on the abilities of postcolonial critics to suggest that they and the critical orientations that they represent have acquired a respectability dependent on the conceptual needs of the social, political, and cultural problems thrown up by this new world situation.

Dirlik critically analyzes the stance of the postcolonial critics who are from the Third World countries like Homi Bhabha, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and thus unveils his perception of such postcolonial writers:

The Third World, far from being confined to its assigned space, has penetrated the inner sanctum of the first world in the process of being 'third-worlded'-arousing, inciting, and affiliating with the subordinated others in the first world. It has reached across boundaries and barriers to connect with the minority voices in the first world: socialists, radicals, feminists, minorities. (335)

Dirlik very genuinely unveils the third world writers’ ambivalent authorial position. Such writers in the guise of third world mouthpieces write from the First World. How their writings could be validated and can genuinely capture the sufferings and agonies of the colonized from the first world is under the erasure. In this vein, the colonized in Nigeria do suspect the authorial position of Richard in Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun*:

It was your people who stole the land,’ Kainene said, and laughed. Richard was surprised to hear the husky tone of her laughter. He was even more surprised at how familiarly Major Madu behaved, the way he sank into the sofa, got up to flip the album in the stereo, joked with the stewards serving dinner. Richard felt left out of things. (79)

Despite the fact that Kainene is in love with Richard, she suspects Richard and his white race. She here explicitly reveals her heart and mind that the white people robbed her country. Somewhere she is not fully convinced that Richard’s writing will capture things and happenings of Nigeria in an unbiased manner. It is a similar situation to that Arif Dirlik points out.

Although First and Third World positions may not be interchangeable, they are nevertheless quite fluid, which implies a need to qualify if not to repudiate binary oppositions in the articulation of their relation- ship. Hence Arif Dirlik in “The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism” opines:

Local interactions take priority over global structures in the shaping of these relationships, which implies that they are better compre- hended historically in their heterogeneity than structurally in their fixity. These conclusions follow from the hybridness or "in-betweeness" of the postcolonial subject that is not to be contained within fixed categories or binary oppositions. (336)

It is also misleading in his opinion to classify as postcolonial intellectuals as widely different politically as Edward Said, Aijaz Ahmad, Homi Bhabha, Gyan Prakash, Gayatri Spivak, and Lata Mani. In a literal sense, they may all share in postcoloni- ality and some of its themes. Dirlik reads Said's situation as “a Palestinian intellectual does not permit him to cross the borders of Israel with the ease that his in-betweeness might suggest (which also raises the question for postcolo- nial critics of what borders are at issue) [. . .]” (338-9). Dirlik finds the Said’s horizon of perception and thus criticizes the latter by associating him with the parochial space, Israel due to being Palestinian. Dirlik strongly suggests that the postcolonial writers should cross the border of the parochial nationalism in order for receiving global validity of their writing.

In drawing attention to the language of postcolonial discourse, Dirlik seeks, however, to deconstruct postcolonial intellectuals' professions of hybridity and in-betweeness. The hybridity to which postcolonial criticism refers is uniformly between the postcolonial and the First World, never between one postcolonial intellectual and another. Dirlik states: “But hybridity and in-betweeness are not very revealing concepts in the former case either. Whereas postcolonial criticism quite validly points to the over- determination of concepts and subjectivities” (342). He comments the current role of the postcolonial criticism due to the fact that personal concepts and opinions are over emphasized by the postcolonial critics. Likewise Dirlik avers regarding the relationship between language and hybridity:

To insist on hybridity against one's own language, it seems to me, is to disguise not only ideological location but also the differences of power that go with different locations. Postco- lonial intellectuals in their First World institutional location are en- sconced in positions of power not only vis-a-vis the "native" intellectuals back at home but also vis-a-vis their First World neighbors here. My neighbors in Farmville, Virginia, are no match in power for the highly paid, highly prestigious postcolonial intellectuals at Columbia, Princeton, or Duke; some of them might even be willing to swap positions and take the anguish that comes with hybridity so long as it brings with it the power and the prestige it seems to command. (343)

Dirlik critiques the practice of the linguistic hybridity that postcolonial theorists like Homi Bhabha, acclaim the cultural hybridtiy to be productive and pervasive in the sense that this linguistic hybridity enhances the colonial power and marginalizes the language of the colonized. Thus the colonized become powerless and the colonizers even in the postcolonial situation hold linguistic and in general cultural power. The colonized imitate the language and life style of the colonizers due to which there is no balance between the colonizers and the colonized in terms of power. This hybridity does not only make the people of the colonized nation powerless but the same formula applies to the postcolonial intellectuals in the first world as well. Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* pictures the similar situation wherein the people of the colonized nation imitate the language of the colonizers:

It would have been easier if Miss Adebayo showed jealousy, but it was as if Miss Adebayo thought her to be unworthy of competition, with her *unintellectual* ways and her too-pretty face and her mimicking-the-oppressor English accent.[. . .] it was arrogant of America to insist that the Soviets take their missiles out of Cuba while theirs remained in Turkey, Sharpeville was only a dramatic example of the hundreds of blacks killed by the South African state every day-but she suspected that there was a glaze of unoriginality to all her ideas. (51)

The Nigerians mimic the oppressor English accent. They do not always speak English in the Igbo accent. Rather they attempt to imitate as they think the colonizer’s English accent is better and is perhaps the accent of maintaining social status among the common Nigerians. It deepens the ditch of power imbalance due to the linguistic hybridity.

Paul Meredith in his paper on Hybridity in the Third Space: Rethinking Bi-cultural Politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand quotes Robert Young who states: “In colonial discourse, hybridity is a term of abuse for those who are products of miscegenation, mixed-breeds. It is imbued in nineteenth-century Eugenicist and scientific-racist thought” (2). In fact the concept of hybridity occupies a central place in postcolonial discourse. It is celebrated and privileged as a kind of superior cultural intelligence owing to the advantage of in-betweeness, the straddling of two cultures and the consequent ability to negotiate the difference. This is particularly so in Bhabha’s discussion of cultural hybridity.

Paul Meredith in his paper on “Hybridity in the Third Space: Rethinking Bi-cultural Politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand” states: “In presenting Bhabha’s conceptual model, I am aware of criticism that his formulation is problematic. He has been admonished for neglecting to adequately conceptualize the historical and material conditions that would emerge within a colonial discourse analysis framework” (2-3). Hence Meredith is critical to the Bhabha’s neglecting approach to the material and historical aspects while theorizing and formulating the concept of hybridity. Meredith strongly advocates the impact of class differences that are correlated with the material and economic condition in the postcolonial situation. In this regard the picture of the class differences as carved by Adichie in *Half of a Yellow Sun* in the postcolonial Nigerians is indeed the issue of serious postcolonial criticism. Adichie thus presents: ‘Your master has told me how well you take care of him, Ugwu,’ she said. Her Igbo words were softer than her English, and he was disappointed at how easily they came out. He wished she would stumble in her Igbo; he had not expected English that perfect to sit beside equally perfect Igbo” (23). The relationship between the master and the servant triggers the issue of the class differences in the declared independent Nigeria. The country is independent and the people of the elite class are independent but the common people of the colonized nation are still in the pool of poverty and discrimination wherein someone is the ruler and the rest are the ruled. This imbalance of power extant between the people of two different classes in the colonized nation seems to have been neglected by the postcolonial intellectuals in the first world.

Some of prominent spokespersons of the colonized cultures of the world are Rumina Sethi whose popularity is due to her text, *The Politics of Postcolonialism* and Benita Parry who is a materialist critic and is renowned for her text, *Postcolonial Studies*. Rumina Sethi in *The Politics of Postcolonialism* states:

Postcolonial identities cannot be recuperated by recounting cases of ambivalence or the simultaneous presence of sameness and difference, but by emphasizing historically specific acts of resistance. These ‘acts’ could be those of movements resisting colonial powers, of national integration movements, or acts of resistance to new imperial controls over recklessly globalizing economies. Postcolonial studies, by addressing representations of alterity and the ambivalent relations between centre and periphery tends to lose its historical-material reality and begins to reproduce itself in purely theoretical terms. (8)

To resist the new imperial controls is a must in the postcolonial nation. The case of hybridity or the presence of similarities and differences cannot help recover the postcolonial identities. Rather they can be gotten back by the acts of resistance. The very resistance can be in different forms. It can be the national integration movements against new imperial controls in the name of globalization which is often done by controlling the economic resources of the native country. In the same vein Adichie indicates similar situation in her novel, *Half of a Yellow Sun* wherein the people of the colonized nation express their resistance and resentment against imperialism:

Of course we are all alike, we all have white oppression in common,’ Miss Adelbayo said dryly. ‘Pan-Africanism is simply the most sensible response.’

‘Of course, of course, but my point is that the only authentic identity for the African is the tribe,’ Master said. ‘I am Nigerian because a white man created Nigeria and gave me that identity. I am black because the white man constructed *black* to be as different as possible from his *white*. But I was Igbo before the white man came. [. . .] ‘But you became aware that you were Igbo because of the white man. The pan-Igbo idea itself came only in the face of white domination. You must see that tribe as it is today is as colonial a product as nation and race.’ (20)

How the people of the colonized nation are critical and conscious that they are reviewing the process of the identity they have ever been associated with. They are implicitly resisting against the white domination and interference in the history of their civilization. Odenigbo, a university lecturer inculcates the sense of complete resistance against any kind of imperialism. He stresses importance and necessity of pan-Africanism that helps oppose the white domination. Rumina Sethi in *The Politics of Postcolonialism* severely critiques:

Bhabha’s idea of the self-as-other and the other-as-self–both of which serve to make colonialism a very problematic category in which ‘slippage’, ‘excess’ and ‘difference’ between binaries cannot be easily dismissed–has provoked his critics to ask how, if it can be perceived only as a process of rapidly eroding self-images, identity can be visualized at all. (9)

Sethi here makes it clear that Bhabha’s concepts of hybridity and ambivalence similarly indicate the dismembering of fixed and ‘pure’ categories which is a symptom of the borderless world we live in. Hence Bhabha’s concept of hybridity is simply couched in a quagmire of jargon. Therefore, postcolonial studies falls short of its transformative and transgressive potential. Stating more clearly Homi Bhabha has ignored the transformative potentials of the postcolonial studies in the theorizing process of hybridity.

Sethi in *The Politics of Postcolonialism* quotes the critical reading made by Arif Dirlik who observes postcolonialism in this way:

It is claimed that ‘postcolonialism’ fails to counter imperialism in the guise of its new avatar, globalization, and as a result tends to conflate the local experiences of particular countries with a sweeping postcolonial sensibility acquired by postcolonial theorists as they migrate to centres of the global corporate world. (340).

Hereby it becomes crystal clear the postcolonial theorists seem to have failed to strengthen postcolonialism in order for countering imperialism that is pervasive in the guise of globalization. Moreover, the postcolonial theorists are directly or indirectly subordinating imperialism as they stay in the first world wherein all the centers of the global corporate world are established. Therefore it can be stated that postcolonialism as a discursive construction, freed from its third-world location, is then easily transferred across the Atlantic to reside in the classrooms of advanced capitalist countries that have a homegrown postcolonial population of their own, made up of ethnic groups and migrants. How the advanced capitalist countries can help resolve the problems of the colonized nations as they suffer the ethnic and migrant conflicts in their own nations is a serious issue.

In this way Sethi in *The Politics of Postcolonialism* asserts: “Postcolonial approaches pose a powerful challenge to dependency theories–which view underdevelopment as a result of the exploitation of the ‘peripheries’ by the wealthy ‘core’ countries–by suggesting that the colonizer–colonized relationship is a two-way street, since the contamination of both cultures is mutual” (19). The dependency of the colonized nations upon the core or advanced capitalist countries helps contaminate the cultures of both the colonizer and the colonized in the sense that either of them gets bound to learn languages and other cultural practices from each other. The colonized feel happy to learn the language and culture of the superior and the colonizers learn the former’s culture and language to rule and dominate in an easy and comfortable manner. In this regard Adichie in *Half of a Yellow Sun* poses Richard as a colonizer and Ugwu as a colonized engaged in learning languages of either side for ease and betterment. Thus she presents Richard: “Richard wished he hadn’t said he was a writer and so he added, as if to make up her saying he was a writer, ‘I’m fascinated by the discoveries at Igbo-Ukwu. The bronze castings” (64). Richard expresses his interest and zeal in the Igbo art and culture. “He speaks Igbo near fluent” infers that he is making a perfect suit to rule upon the Ibgo community. He is preparing to write about the Igbo people and the newly emerged Biafra country. Hence it gets pretty clear that he is working as an agent of imperialism. He is contaminated as he is in love with Kainene from the elite family of the black race. He is after all managing to learn a lot about the native people of Nigeria.

Similarly Adichie brings about the efforts and pride of Ugwu here to show how he is engaged in learning English, the language of the colonizer. Adichie thus says:

But he was pleased that he had mentioned the festival to Mr. Richard, because it meant an opportunity to see Nnesinachi before she left for the North. To think how impressed she would be when he arrived in a white man’s car, driven by the white man himself! She would certainly notice him this time, he was sure, and he could not wait to impress Anulika and his cousins and relatives with his English, his new shirt, his knowledge of sandwiches and running tap water, his scented powder. (86)

Ugwu expresses his happiness simply because he has been able to explain the Igbo festival to the white man. He is more pleased in the sense that he speaks English, is wearing western dresses, and is eating western food items for instance sandwiches. His pride is dominant in his psyche because of the tremendous impact of colonial discourse. He carries on those impressions in his behaviors and activities. Thus he is a contaminated figure that represents the entire cultural contamination of the people in the colonized nation.

To sum up, there are primarily two related objections neo-Marxist critics pose against postcolonial studies: the Eurocentric agenda and location of its proponents and the displacement of activism in its conception. Instead of originating in the Third World, Postcolonial Studies has flourished in Britain, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and now the United States. To say that postcolonialism has become a first-world discourse is not entirely off the mark. Rumina Sethi, in *The Politics of Postcolonialism* speaks in the same line:

It did impact the western academy in a big way, concerned as it was with issues of imperialism, nation, race, empire, diaspora and minority cultures. Postcolonial studies rapidly became a booming discipline with new centres and institutions opening up in western universities alongside a glut of journals and conferences with special focus on postcolonialism. (20)

The dominant role and grip of postcolonialism is in the west rather than in the Third World. The new academic institutions intensively prioritize the issues such nation, race, empire, diaspora and minority cultures in the curriculum. Though postcolonialism is the academic domain of the colonized nations, it is given higher space and prominence by the western universities which seems ironic and surprising. Hence the role Richard is honored with to work as a journalist to write about the newly declared Biafra country indicates that this job should be propelled to the colonized from the Biafra country since the goal of writing is to let the world know the genuine sufferings and trauma of the people in the aftermath situation. However, Richard, the Englishman who has been taking notes throughout of the conflict finally cannot get to write a book on the war. Since Africa, in Eurocentric eyes, has been seen as a wild and savage place where people are suffering hunger but are unable to take care of themselves because of their uncivilized and brawly nature. Therefore the African writer, Adichie at the end empowers Ugwu to write the book on the war. Pertaining to this condition Adichie in *Half of a Yellow Sun* creates a live picture of this astonishing act:

‘It can’t be just one million.’ Madu sipped his beer. ‘Will you go back to England?’

The question annoyed him. ‘No’.

‘You’ll stay in Nsukka?’

‘Yes. I’m joining the new Institute for African Studies.’

‘Are you writing anything?’

‘No.’ (429)

Richard and Madu are interacting and thus the former gets irritated when he is asked whether he will go back to England. Richard expresses his interest in joining the new Institute for African Studies. It becomes clear that he is not writing anything about the war. The information that Richard does not write about the war pleases the Nigerian people. They want their people to write about the war as it is certain to carry on truth and genuine reporting.

Almost till the end of Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun*, the reader inclines to believe that Richard Churchill is the author of The Book and finds out only on the very last page that the real author is Ugwu. It seems easy to be misled since Richard is depicted as a struggling writer, in love with the Igbo culture and history, and he is the one who chooses the title: “The World Was Silent When We Died”. By contrast, Ugwu is merely a simple houseboy who can barely read or write when he first arrives at Odenigbo's house, and seems rather unfamiliar with Nigerian politics. Adichie creates deliberately this type of confusion to point out that during the colonial period talking about Africa's history is the prerogative of the white colonizer. And since Africa is described as the “dark continent”, there is no history worth mentioning. By being the author of The Book, Ugwu takes back the right to tell his own history, which is already preserved through storytelling and oral tradition. Throughout the entire novel, Richard is striving to write something that will link him to the African tradition, and his drafts receive different titles, all alluding to the Igbo past and culture: “The Basket of Hands”, or “In the Time of Roped Pots”. But eventually he gives up when he realizes that, as a Western subject, “The war isn't my story to tell, really” (425). Something that Ugwu has known all along: “Ugwu nodded. He had never thought that it was” (425). The houseboy keeps the same title for The Book, “The World Was Silent When We Died”, words that has not come originally from Richard, but from something Colonel Madu, the Igbo army major, says to him and he recalls: “The world has to know the truth of what is happening, because they simply cannot remain silent while we die” (305). The final title, therefore, comes from a true Biafran and not from Richard. His only contribution is the articles he writes for the Propaganda Directorate upon Colonel Madu's request. But he has not asked to write these articles because he's one of the “experienced insiders”, as Richard is “thrilled” to being referred to, but because he is white. Colonel Madu confirms “Of course I asked you because you are white. They will take what you write more seriously because you are white […] They will believe a white man who lives in Biafra and who is not a professional journalist” (305).

The outlining of Richard's character might be also interpreted as part of Adichie's representation of a postcolonial society. Richard's point of view differs from that of Susan, his former girlfriend, or of the American journalists who are racists and keen to discredit everything that doesn't belong to Western culture. Furthermore, Rumina Sethi quotes Loomba in *The Politics of Postcolonialism* blames postcolonial studies as it:

is the discipline that has still not embraced many of the economic and political issues relating to postcolonialism largely because it is taught in the English departments of universities where an emphasis on cultural studies is predominant. As a discipline it includes the study of postcolonial theory and postcolonial literature. (27)

Sethi objects to the limitation of postcolonial studies to the cultural studies. She wants and advocates postcolonial studies should be associated with the economic and political issues. Without studying the economic and political issue of the colonized nation, the genuine problems and intraethnic and intraracial tussles cannot be studied and analyzed. In this regard Adichie’s character Olanna in *Half of a Yellow Sun* should be brought here in order for demonstrating the conflict and crisis extant in terms of class and hybridity in the Biafra country. Adichie thus presents: “Olanna did not want Baby to touch those children in their torn clothes, milky mucus trailing from their noses, but she didn’t say so; it shamed her that she felt that way” (128). Hence Olanna’s sense of class superiority becomes crystal and how she is so hybridized that she thinks in the line of the colonizer. The western colonizers usually hate the people of the third world countries but pretend not to do so in order for presenting themselves as rational and modernized citizens of the West. No doubt there are two classes of people: haves and have-nots. The former live luxuriously, whereas the latter are bound to lead a very filthy life. In the postcolonial Nigeria the people are divided into haves and have-nots. Sethi opines that the postcolonial theorists should take account of the economic and political matters of the colonized nation as well. Olanna in Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* is from the elite class in the colonized nation. The bitter truth is that these upper class people in the colonized nation in the postcolonial situation work as agents for success of the imperialist new form of colonization. This is why postcolonialism should advocate marginalized voices and resistance movements across the world which can help the really suffered people in the colonized nation be noticed and certain affirmative action can be made for emancipation of the poor.

Likewise Benita Parry in *Postcolonial Studies* critiques Homi Bhabha stating that Bhabha rejects the notion of the colonial relationship as a symmetrical antagonism on the grounds that the ambivalence of the colonial presence and the object it constitutes ‘makes the boundaries of colonial positionality–the division of self/other–and the question of colonial power–the differentiation of colonizer/colonized – different from both the Hegelian masterslave’ dialectic – or–the phenomenological projection of “otherness” In a related vein, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak states: “I am critical of the binary opposition colonizer/colonized. I try to examine the heterogeneity of “colonial power” and to disclose the complicity of the two poles of that opposition as it constitutes the disciplinary enclave of the critique of imperialism” (quoted in Benita Parry 14). Spivak simply looks at the binary relationship just by associating with the colonial power. It is obvious that there are both colonizer and colonized in the presence of colonial power and they stand against each other by virtue of being opposite. Spivak seems to have neglected to incorporate the issue of economy and politics predominantly pervasive in the colonized nation.

Parry further says that the story of colonialism which she reconstructs is of an interactive process where the European agent, in consolidating the imperialist sovereign self, induces the native to collude in its own subject(ed) formation as other and voiceless. Thus while protesting at the obliteration of the native’s subject position in the text of imperialism, “Spivak in her project gives no speaking part to the colonized, effectively writing out the evidence of native agency recorded in India’s two-hundred-year struggle against British conquest and the Raj–discourses to which she scathingly refers as hegemonic nativist or reverse ethnocentric narrativization” (20).

Instead of recounting a struggle between a monolithic, near-deliberative colonial power and an undifferentiated oppressed mass, this reconstruction displays a process more insidious than naked repression, since here the native is prevailed upon to internalize as self-knowledge, the knowledge concocted by the master: “He (the European agent) is worlding their own world, which is far from mere uninscribed earth, anew, by obliging them to domesticate the alien as Master’, a process generating the force ‘to make the “native” see himself as “other” “ (20). Ugwu though is native and is in his own nation, is forced to feel different from the rest of the people in the Biafra country. He imitates the western people and expresses his inclination for their language and association. Hence it makes clear that he is othering his language and identity which further implies that he is *othering* his self. Adichie in Half of a Yellow Sun thus enlivens the *othering* process with evidence:

We will teach mathematics, English, and civics every day,’ Olanna said to Ugwu and Mrs Muokelu a day before the classes began. ‘We have to make sure that when the war is over, they will all fit back easily into regular school. We will teach them to speak perfect English and perfect Igbo, like His Excellency. We will teach them pride in our great nation.’ (291)

Hence Ugwu and Olanna are convinced that to speak English perfect is the insignia of being different. They on this ground do not put their Igbo vernacular at par excellence. Their psyche has changed and now they advocate the need and value of English. No doubt, the knowledge of many languages is commendable. But they respect English as it is the language of the colonizer. Parry’s perspective towards the effective role of the colonizer to retain imperialism through the agents like language, culture and such other means hereby gets justified.

**Chapter Four**

**Conclusion: Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* Exposes the Limitations of Bhabhian Hybridity**

The present research on Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* focuses the postcolonial reading by critiquing Homi Bhabha’s position to hybridity or third space that Bhabha associates with the productivity and prominence for the progressive development of the entire human world. His approach to generalize the application and association of hybridity as well as its impact upon both the colonized and the colonizer in the postcolonial situation is subject to severe criticism to the neo-Marxist critics.

Bhabha in his *The Location of Culture* delivers that this third space is the sign of productivity of colonial power. To him this hybridity or third space displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination. Through the lens of hybridity or third space, Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* is concluded to have characters from both the West and the colonized nation whose identity is blurred, since they have been influenced by both side’s culture and language. Their identity in terms of purity and originality is under erasure and suspect. They suffer this identity crisis on the one hand and they use the language of either side’s as a tool to ease their life affair and mission on the other.

Richard, a journalist, from the West is the agent of imperialism or in one sense he is the colonizer and, Olanna, Kainene, Ugwu who represent the people of the colonized nation are culturally hybridized. They are so contaminated that they do not speak only languages of other but imitate the accent and lifestyle as well. They are neither completely Nigerian nor are they fully English. Consequently they are in dilemma and thus suffer in-betweeness. Their ambivalence pushes them to suffer crisis of integrated selfhood or identity.

Hence the current research critiques Bhabha’s general concept of hybridity in Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* since his notion of hybridity has certain limitation through which this postcolonial text can be read. Bhabha along with other postcolonial intellectuals is criticized due to the fact they seem to have neglected the economic and political issues in their postcolonial reading to the colonized nations depicted in postcolonial texts even in the postcolonial situation.

Rumina Sethi, Arif L. Dirlik, Amar Acheraiou, Benita Parry, Aijaz Ahmad like other neo-Marxist critics look into the issues such class, resistance, economy, and other political and racial aspects along with the cultural arrogance and race supremacy which are indeed the crucial things as byproducts of imperialism. Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* does pose a scene with the characters like Olanna and Kainene who come from the elite family in Nigeria. How these upper class Nigerians work as agents to retain and pervade the cultural arrogance and class domination of imperialism is the core aspect of the current study.

Despite many endeavors to decolonize the third world by strengthening the position of democracy, human rights, human decency, and advocacy for sexual equality, imperialism is still holding its control in the colonized nation. Rumina Sethi in *The Politics of Postcolonialism* comments the negligence of the postcolonial theorists or intellectuals who reside in the First World and write about the Third World such as Homi Bhabha, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Edward E. Said and so on as these theorists and writers without crossing the borders are working with their imagination. They have neglected the real sufferings and pains still extant in the colonized nation. They seem to have failed to capture the resistance, resentment, and protest against the lingering colonialism in their native country. Instead these postcolonial intellectuals seem to be glorifying the agents of imperialism that is in operation in the guise of globalization.

Arif Dirlik, Rumina Sethi, Benita Parry, and other neo-Marxist critics blame such postcolonial intellectuals not to be enjoying the equal prestige and position in the First World despite their high pay and income.

The major characters like Odenigbo, Ugwu, Madu in Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* representing the people of the colonized nation resist the cultural hegemony and foreign knowledge. Richard, the struggling journalist from the West is opposed while he is interviewing the people of the Igbo Biafra and is making notes in order to write the book on the Biafra war. Furthermore, Adichie finally makes Ugwu write the book “The World Was Silent When We Died”, in order to let the world know the sufferings and traumatic plight of the Igbo people simply because he is a true patriot and represents the proletarian class as well.

Although Odenigbo is highly educated black, Adichie in *Half of a Yellow Sun* honors Ugwu with the responsibility to write the book on the Biafra war for the genuine, reliable and true mouthpiece of almost all sorts of sufferings and problems existing in terms of class, race, ethnicity, and nationality as he is a dynamic character; he has grown a man from a child; he has become a writer from a barely literate boy. This gradual change has boosted up his personality in such a way that he gets to write of the Biafra country.
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**Abstract**

The primary focus of the study in Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* is to question the position of Homi Bhabha in his *The Location of Culture* wherein he states that hybridity demonstrates the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination. The present research critiques Homi Bhabha’s concept of hybridity as it neglects the economic and political issues of the colonized nations. Furthermore, it does not seem to interrogate the western hegemony, cultural arrogance and class supremacy implicitly imposed through the globalizing agents which are indeed working to retain imperialism in the colonized nations even in the postcolonial situation.

Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* is studied in the line of postcolonialism that is boosted up with the intellectual and academic supports of the postcolonial theorists like Homi Bhabha, Edward Said, on one hand, and the very text is critically analyzed through the lens of neo-Marxist critics such as Rumina Sethi, Arif Dirlik, Amar Acheraiou, Benita Parry, Aijaz Ahmad and others on the other, who interrogate the position of the postcolonial theorists and intellectuals for their negligence to the issues like class, resistance, economy, and other political and racial aspects which are vibrant remnants in the colonized nations. Thus the study shows how Adichie’s *Half of a Yellow Sun* dramatizes the situation wherein Olanna and Kainene from the elite family and Richard working as an agent in the guise of journalist to retain and pervade the racial domination suffer the crisis of cultural belonging, and Ugwu, Odenigbo, Madu representing the Nigerian mass resist the cultural domination and racial supremacy of the West.
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