

## I. Introduction to Adichie as a Postcolonial Novelist

Americans have experienced the gut reality of war in their backyard not since Civil War occurred but from the very beginning of their settlement. Although the U.S. has engaged in various war excursions over the centuries, including at present in Iraq, and many Americans have lost family and friends in war, most civilians have as much experience with the mundane realities of life during wartime as they have experienced life on Mars. War has become foreign to many of us, which is a shame because, unfortunately, our literature does not reflect the real experience of war. The writers such as Earnest Hemingway and Tim O'Brien usually write from the perspective of veterans about their war experience (WWI). It is rare for other American writers to explore what life is like for civilians under the constant threat of death and destruction particularly during the Civil War but she has succeeded to write this war experience from historical perspective. the event of 9/11 in New York and the terrorist attacks against United States does not give real insurgency of war that brings peoples horrified face in history. Therefore, the writers from other countries who have experienced war have often been left behind, they explore the most mundane facts of life during war. One such writer who has taken up such kernel effects of war is Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie. Adichie in her fiction *Half of a Yellow Sun* depicts the civil war that ripped her native Nigeria apart during the 1960s. She has been described as the "twenty first century daughter of Chinua Achebe (12)" by the *Washington Post Book World* captures the horror, mystery, and insanity of war. She also delves into the personal daily struggles of her characters under the veil of death.

Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie was born in the Nigerian small city Enugu on Sep.1977, and grew up in the university town of Nsukka in South-Eastern Nigeria. She studied medicine for two years at the university of Nigeria after her completion of secondary level education. Throughout her academic life in Nigeria, she won numerous awards and also edited many university magazines. At the age of 19, she left Nigeria with a scholarship to Philadelphia's Drexel University of the United States of America to pursue degrees in Communication and political science. She later attended Eastern Connecticut University in Willimantic in order to be close to a sister, who had a medical practice there. Graduating Summa Cum Laude in 2001, Adichie then completed her master's degree in creative writing at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore.

Adichie was interested in literature since she was a child growing up in Nigeria, when she wrote many stories largely fantasies about things not in her homeland. She was profoundly influenced by the great Nigerian author Chinua Achebe. *Things Fall Apart* (1958) inspired Adichie to take her writing more seriously. She even pays her homage to Achebe in the beginning, paraphrased lines in the first novel, which echoes Achebe's literature. As a common denominator Adichie depicts the issues of postcolonial condition of Nigeria in her writings. She demonstrates the capacity to look at the family and the wider national sphere with equal regard. Her fiction asks questions about the roles played by colonialism and present day corruption in the conflicts of the land of her birth, and she refuses to simplify the problems or solutions. She gives new impetus towards the reconciliation of western values based upon local values, tastes and beliefs thereby valorizing cultural adaptation. She raises the different issues like dangers inherent in religious zeal, corruption in the society struggling for political stability, the difficulties of everyday

life in a country that is politically unstable, traditional indigenous beliefs in relation to contemporary western beliefs, and the consequences of silence, profound effects of violence, legacy and so on. In this sense, her issues are humanistic and at the same time evoking universal predicament i.e. the bitter reality of war plunged country.

Adichie started her literary career through the writing of poetry and play in 1998. She wrote a play entitled *For Love of Biafra* (1998), and a collection of poems entitled *Decisions* (1998), which are the earlier dramatized accounts of the Nigerian civil war. Her literary career became strong with the publication of her first debut fiction *Purple Hibiscus* (2003) which has its main focus on the strained relationship between the first person narrator Kambali, and her dominant father and has a military coup as a backdrop. In such scenario, it searches for reconciliation amidst the political despair of the country. Kambali's father is a violent authoritative father who allows some complexity that criticizes both British colonialism and traditional patriarchal powers for their influences on the oppression of marginalized group. But latently he adheres to the Eurocentric values. His material success is seen to go hand in hand with his seemingly devout catholicism and in this way his corrupted view of the world entangled with an imposed religion and the workings of capitalism. Thus, *Purple Hibiscus* blending the personal and the political hypocrisy shows the religious colonial mission, domestic violence and opens with images of violent breakage and ends with the knowledge of freedom and future.

Adichie's *Purple Hibiscus* was critically received. She won the Commonwealth Writer's Prize and Hurston/Wright Legacy Prize for her first novel. She published her second novel, *Half of a Yellow Sun* (2006), which explores the post-independence ethnic strife in Nigeria particularly Biafra war and situates it as the

historical precedent of the contemporary haunted setting in *Purple Hibiscus*. Her stories have appeared in different papers like *Zoetrope Allstory*, *The Iowa Review*, *Other Voices*, *Calyx*, *Wasafari*, and *Granta* and have been published online. In 2009, she published her collection of stories *The Things Around Your Neck* (2009), which is the latest writing. The collection celebrates Igbo language, folk wisdom, and other cultural markers like native foods, dress, customs, and sayings. The characters in the stories are often accomplished predecessors and they are embroiled in questions of identity and allegiance. They often face with the demands and pressures of a new cultural environment.

Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's *Half of a Yellow Sun* (2006) is the story of the years leading up to and the course of Nigerian-Biafra war of the late 1960s. Following a failed coup, Nigeria's Igbo population, centred in the east of the country, seceded to form a proto-independent state called Biafra. During war for secession Britain and Soviet Union provided considerable military assistance to Nigeria and in the ensuing conflict, hundreds of thousands of people lost their lives in fighting, under bombs and to starvation. The novel depicts the destruction led by legacy of colonialism and racism in post-independent Nigeria. The novel at the same time captures the impacts of horrific situation of civil war on the life of Igbo community peoples -- Odenigbo, Ugwu, Olanna and others.

This novel, *Half of a Yellow Sun* is a stunning one which was the winner of the Orange Broadband prize in 2007. The novel's title has been derived from the Biafran flag that constitutes *Half of a Yellow Sun* - a symbol of rebel, or the symbol of rising freedom. We get clearer description of the flag's colour from Olanna, a well educated woman of Igbo community. The mixing colours of red, black and green respectively symbolize blood of the siblings massacred in the North, mourning them, and the

prosperity Biafra would have. Thus, 'half of a yellow sun' stood for rising freedom and glorious tomorrow.

The novel centers on the issues of war, the colonial history of its origins and the national politics that fueled it through the major characters Olanna, educated, wealthy, and fresh back home (Kano, Nigeria) from London; Odenigbo, her academic 'revolutionary lover'; Ugwu, their houseboy or servant; Kainene, Olanna's twin sister; Richard, Kainene's insecure British expatriate lover and more at home in Biafra than he had ever been in England and Major Madu, an Igbo military man and lover of Kainene. From the characters' lives and behaviours in developing plot of the novel what we understand is how hard it was to be Igbo in Nigeria during wartime, and to fall the terror of ethnic cleansing. All the characters throughout the novel are haunted mentally and physically and culturally. People from different ethnicities constructed their own respective communities for not being slaughtered at the hand of enemy. Adichie's characters also face the conflict between tradition and modernity. Odenigbo takes himself as an educated and revolutionary but his mother convinces him that Olanna is a witch. As such, *Half of a Yellow Sun* is basically about the horror, mystery and insanity of civil war (1967-70) where neo-colonialism is at the service which started due to the massacre of Igbos in 1966 to create the republic of Biafra and then they fought an unsuccessful three-year war of secession.

In this regard Chinua Achebe writes:

We do not usually associate wisdom with beginner, but here is a new writer endowed with the gift of ancient story tellers, Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie knows what is at stake, and what to do about it [. . .] she is fearless, so she would not have taken on the intimidating horror

of Nigeria's civil war. Adichie came almost fully made (cover page Review).

Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's *Half of a Yellow Sun* has been diversely criticized and interpreted by the various critics from the very outset of its publication. Many critics have focused on ethnic and inter-racial conflict during Nigerian civil war. In this regard, E. Frances White views the novel from the nationalist point of view. She focuses on the futility of Nigeria's ethnic war. She also blurs the boundary of master and slave, Odenigbo and Ugwu respectively. She further argues that Odenigbo and Ugwu are a fascinating pairing, and writes:

As Nigeria descends into bloody civil war, naive Ugwu's experience helps him find his voice [ . . . ] Many of the war's most harrowing experiences are shown through Ugwu's eyes. In contrast to his servant, Odenigbo becomes more and more mute, as his idealism is dashed along with Biafra's hopes. At the beginning of the book he is a man sure of his opinions and has place in the world. By the war's end, his narrow ethnic nationalism seems empty. With no defenses against slights, to his man-hood, he sinks into alcoholism. Yet Ugwu dedicated his book to Odenigbo but for Odenigbo, Ugwu would never have learned to read, write, or challenge the injurious values he learns in school. (10)

This concept of ethnic nationalism which Odenigbo raises turns out to be a mere futility. His revolutionary vision, at the last, fades with colonialism and amnesia. Ugwu, on the other hand, though presented as a slave within the ethnic hierarchy, at last turns to be the hero of novel as he challenges the harrowing consequences caused by war.

Rob Nixon, in *The New York Times Book Review*, on the account of history that was once forgotten has been honored, appreciates the elucidation of war:

At once historical and eerily current, *Half of a Yellow Sun* takes place in the forests of Southeastern Nigeria 40 years ago; and honors the memory of a war largely forgotten. Adichie's prose thrums with life. Like Nadine Gordimer, Adichie positions her characters at crossroads where public and private allegiances threaten to collide. *Half of a Yellow Sun* [has] an empathetic tone that never succumbs to simplifying impulses, heroic or demonic [. . .] Reaching deep, [it] speaks through history to our war racked age not through abstract analogy but through the energy of vibrant detail, a mastery of small things. (17)

Adichie, in memory of war plunged Biafra, presents the history of such small things vividly that history itself speaks in its content. The most haunting events due to racial conflict like butchering of people especially Igbo and Ugwu's pathetic situation while conscripting into the Biafran army to fight against the Nigerian vandals for the sake of win-the-war project.

Another critic Donna Seaman focuses on the psychology of characters' sufferage because of the violence and consequences of war-impacts lingering aftermath as well. She portrays the neo-colonial mission:

*Half of a Yellow Sun* is Biafra's emblem of hope, but the horrors and misery and Adichie's characters endure transform the promising image of rising sun into that of sun setting grimly over a blood soaked and starving land. Adichie masterminded a commending, sensitive epic

about a vicious Civil War predicted by prejudices and stroked by outside powers hungry for oil and influence. (39)

Seaman sees the psychological pressure that Adichie employs to point out the rising of hope. *Half of a Yellow Sun* represents the rising sun which turns into the setting sun or destruction. Thus, the main focus of Seaman is on the doomed breaking of Igbo state and fate of Biafra. She sees the colonial motif in the very vicious civil war is some extent for oil.

The symbolic representation of the plot in fragmented order which moves from early sixties to the late sixties, and again early sixties to late sixties, symbolizes the chaotic situation. The book-within-the-book: *The World War Silent When We Died* is addressed to the misery of the war fated Biafrans in the context of three years' civil war in post-independent Nigeria. Similarly, the variety in content represented by the post-independent debate between main characters, the horrendous effects of the civil war resulted out of ethnic tussle between oppositions and transitional phase to modernity avoiding the tradition and blind -faith also creating disorder in the subject matter. The novel, at the same time, portrays the heart-rendering picture of Nigeria integrating starvation, malnutrition resulted to Kwashiorkor, the silent killer of children and the class -conflict in the post colonial era. Adichie employs the basic idea about the post-independent Nigeria through the disillusioned variety in form, content and characters to excavate the burden of colonialism showing violence.

The book is vast through its characters, it deals with tribal enmities, colonial and post colonial sins, the ineffectiveness of aid, disease, politics, propaganda, child soldiering, the brutality of war, grief and famine. All these themes are blended seamlessly into a gripping narrative in a strong and powerful voice. On the cover of *Half of a Yellow Sun*, Edmund White is quoted as saying, "I look with awe and envy

at this young woman from African who is recording the history of her country she is fortunate - and we, her readers, are even luckier" (3). Despite from knowing the history all too well, White was turning pages furiously, he had developed such an emotional investment in Ugwu, Olanna and Richard. There is a vast array of character, every one of the fleshed out, everyone of them interesting and credible. The description of people, their culture and traditions, their beliefs, immersed him and educated him and he has understood what it has to be for each of those three people. About a million people died in Biafra during its few years of secession. Kwashiorkor, the malnutrition caused by protein deficiency, was rife among children. According to Adichie, Biafrans nicknamed it the Harold Wilson Disease, a mocking reference to the aid given by Britain to the Nigerian forces against the secessionists. Minor irritations, within the structure notwithstanding, it is a powerful, evocative, consisting wisdom and passion. Similar to Peter Godwin's *Mukiwa* and *Empire of the Sun* by J.G. Ballard, Adichie's *Half of a Yellow Sun* sees the war from different perspectives through the spectacle of colonial legacy in African conflicts.

With references to the issues raised previously the novel can be analyzed through different perspectives in association to postcolonial legacy. At present this research will be generalization of postcolonial issues--national confrontation and cultural adoption within a group of tribes. National Confrontation here implies nationalism and pan-nationalism--the process of forming the distinct geographical and political entity, i.e. of race or community culture. Both nationalism and community construction process has been a failure at the stake so neo-colonialism is at its servitude. Because of this neo-colonialism the lives of Biafrans have been dilapidated during civil war in Nigeria and colonial legacy is lingering throughout Adichie's novel *Half of a Yellow Sun*.

Overall, the present study of postcolonial legacy on Adichie's *Half of a Yellow Sun* tries to analyze that the colonial mentality is still at work even after decolonization. To illustrate the hypothesis, this research paper has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter is the general introduction to this dissertation. The second chapter briefly develops the theoretical modality of this research paper, i.e. postcolonial studies. It explains the postcolonial debate issues--postcolonial legacy in association to nationalism/ pan-nationalism, community culture and neo-colonialism with reference to Civil War in Nigeria during the 1960s. Based on the theoretical modality discussed in chapter two, the third chapter analyzes Adichie's *Half of a Yellow Sun* in the light of postcolonialism. It will basically seek to trace the causes, behind tremendous suffering of Biafrans due to war under neo-colonial government policy. Finally, the fourth chapter includes this research paper on the basis of the textual analysis. It, indeed, comes to the conclusion as a summary of the explanations and arguments presented in the preceding chapters that prove Adichie's novel pervasive with colonial legacy.

## II. Colonization and Its Aftermath: A Postcolonial Approach

Since the last three decades, Postcolonialism has taken its place with theories such as poststructuralism, psychoanalysis and feminism as a major critical discourse in the humanities. As a consequence of its diverse and interdisciplinary usage, this body of thought has generated an enormous corpus of specialized academic writing. At the same time the relevance of postcolonial studies to our world continues to be questioned, both on the easiest grounds of being jargonistic somewhat depoliticized, and encouraging a rarefied approach to culture and literature, and on newer grounds of being unable to account for the complexities of globalization. Since the event of 11 September 2001, and the US invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, questions of 'empire' are more urgent than ever, as advocates of the 'new American empire' exhort the US to learn from European imperialism, while its critics warn that the murderous history of colonialism is being whitewashed all over again. Is a postcolonial study redundant in this new world? Postcolonialism discusses this question, situating postcolonial studies in relation to globalization and new imperial formations.

In the previous decade, postcolonial studies had already become, in the words of Stuart Hall, "the bearer of such powerful unconscious investments -- a sign of desire for some, and equally for others, a signifier of danger" (242). While many of its critics felt that the subject was not radical enough, most complaints come from conservatives who feared that it was part of the dangerous new politicization of the academy in general, and humanities in particular. Today, that trend continues and postcolonial studies are regularly held responsible for polluting an academy that ought to be safeguarding Western culture. Most recently, as the idea of empire is circulated anew, they have been blamed for giving colonialism a 'bad press'. These

critics attest to the fact that, whatever its shortcomings, postcolonial studies has managed to make visible to history and legacy of European imperialism.

Nevertheless, although much has been written under its rubric, 'Postcolonialism', itself remains a diffuse and nebulous term--a term that is the subject of an on going debate. It might seem that as the age of colonialism is over, and as the descendants of once-colonised peoples live everywhere, the whole world is postcolonial. And yet the term has been fiercely contested on many counts. To begin with, the prefix 'post' complicates matters because it implies in 'aftermath' in two senses--temporal, as in coming after, and ideological, as in supplanting. It is the second implication which critics of the term have found contestable: if the inequities of colonial rule have not been erased, it is perhaps premature to proclaim the demise of colonialism. A country may be both postcolonial (formally independent) and neo-colonial (remaining culturally or economically dependent) at the same time. We cannot dismiss either the importance of formal decolonization or the fact that unequal relations of colonial rule are *reinscribed* in the contemporary imbalances between 'the first' and 'the third' world nations. The new global order does not depend upon direct rule. However, it does allow the economic, cultural and political penetration of some countries by others. This makes it debatable whether once-colonized countries can be seen as properly 'postcolonial'.

Unlike Marxism and deconstruction, for instance, it seems to lack an 'originary moment' or a coherent methodology. Postcolonialism to delineate the academic and cultural conditions under which it first emerged and thereby to point to its major preoccupations and areas of concern.

Postcolonialism deals with the effects of colonization on cultures and societies. As originally used by historians after the World War II in terms such as the

post-colonial state, 'post-colonial' has a clearly chronological meaning, designating the post-independence period. However, from the late 1970s the term has been used by literary critics to discuss the various cultural effects of colonization.

Colonialism and imperialism are often used interchangeably. The word colonialism, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)*, comes from the Roman 'Colonial' which meant 'farm' or 'settlement', and referred to Romans who settled in others' lands but still retained their citizenship. Accordingly, the *OED* describes it as:

a settlement in a new country [. . .] a body of people who settle in a new locality, forming a community subject to or connected with their parent state; the community so formed, consisting of the original settlers and their descendants and successors, as long as the connections with the parent state is kept up. (234)

This definition, quite remarkably, avoids any reference to people other than the colonizers, people who might already have been living in those places where colonies were established. Hence it evacuates the word 'colonialism' of any implication of an encounter between people, or of conquests and domination. There is no hint that the 'new locality' may not be so 'new' and that the process of 'forming a community' may be somewhat unfair.

Colonialism was not an identical process in different parts of the world but everywhere it licked the original inhabitants and the newcomers into the most complex and traumatic relationships in human history. That single addition turned the romance into an allegory of the colonial encounter. The process of 'forming a community' in the new land necessarily meant *un-forming* or *re-forming* the communities that existed there already, and involved a wide range of practices

including trade, plunder, negotiation, warfare, genocide, enslavement and rebellions, such practices generated and were shaped by a variety of writings- public and private records, letters, trade documents, government papers, fiction and scientific literature. These practices and writings are the contemporary studies of colonialism and post-colonialism that try to make a sense of. So colonialism can be defined as the conquest and control of other people's land and goods.

The distinction between pre-capitalist and capitalist colonialisms is often made by referring to the latter as imperialism. This is somewhat misleading, because imperialism, like colonialism, stretches back to a pre-capitalist past. Some commentators in fact place imperialism as prior to colonialism (3). Like colonialism, imperialism too is best understood not by trying to pin it down to a single semantic meaning but by relating its shifting meanings to historical processes. Early in its usage in the English language it simply means 'command or superior power' (131). The *OED* defines 'imperial' as 'pertaining to empire', and 'imperialism' as the 'rule of an emperor, especially when despotic or arbitrary; the principal or spirit of empire; advocacy of what are held to be imperial interests'.

In the early twentieth century, Lenin and Trotsk gave a new meaning to the word 'imperialism' by linking it to a particular stage of the development of capitalism. In *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1997), Lenin argued that the growth of 'finance-capitalism' and industry in the Western countries had created 'an enormous super abundance of capital'. The colonies lacked capital but were abundant in labor and human resource. Therefore, it needed to move out and subordinate non-industrialized countries to sustain its own growth. Lenin thus predicted that in due course the rest of the world would be absorbed by European finance capitalists. This global system was called 'imperialism' and constituted a particular stage of capitalist

development--the 'highest stage of capitalism' in Lenin's understanding because rivalry between the various imperial wars would catalyze their destruction and the demise of capitalism

In the modern world, then, we can distinguish between colonization as the takeover of territory, appropriation of material resources, exploitation of labour and interference with political and cultural structures of another territory or nation, and imperialism as a global system. Postcolonialism is not only the stage to claim for nationalism, it has become forum for the discussion of wide array of issue. Though the colonies became independent still the oppressors of ex-colonized countries are exploiting and degrading dominated people. Only the rulers have changed the system is the same which is called internal colonization. On the other hand, though the country is politically free from colonizer, people are not able to free themselves from deep-rooted colonial past. This is called cultural colonialism or cultural legacy. David Washburn points out:

We should restrict the term postcolonial to signify after colonialism. All postcolonial societies are still subject in one way or another to overt or subtle forms of neo-colonial domination, and independence has not solved the problem. After colonialism, we elites, often in the form of dictators, frequently rose and still rise to power in postcolonial countries [ . . . ] . Too much has changed to simply revert to the old ways of life. New problems exist and will continue to do so unless one can learn to deal them in the modern context [ . . . ]. Rewinding the clock to prevent colonialism from occurring is impossible, so we must look at each issue now, in the modern context, s a separate problem which we must attack. (1-2)

Even after independence, colonization is still going on in one way or the other but in its new form. New problems have been created. Political independence has not solved the problem solely. The new approach has to be exerted to deal them in the present context.

Achebe says that ex-colonized countries must look inward to find remnants of colonialism which continue to harm the nations. We must develop the habit of skepticism, not to swallow every piece of superstition. Washburn says that ex-colonizer and ex-colonized were the unannounced characters at the time of colonialism, and postcolonial discourses, as a stage, shows the activities and the relationship of these characters. Kwame Anthony Apia declares that postcolonialism is a space clearing gesture to recognize the epistemological valency of non-European thought. It is an attempt to provincialise Europe. Postcolonial theory clears a privileged space for the voice of what Brenham has called anti-colonial liberalism.

Gayatri Spivak also gives emphasis to raise subalterns' voices. Unless subalterns come up with their own ideas and own voices no writer faithfully represents him/her. She further says that post-colonialism is the attempt to learn to speak rather than to listen. Postcolonialism encourages the oppressed people to seek their identity. Achebe writes:

Let every people bring their gifts to the great festival of the world's cultural harvest and mankind will be all the richer for the variety and distinctiveness of the offerings [. . .]. Our own criticism (sometimes-let's face it—for the good reason that we will not do the hard work that should equip us) that the task has fallen to others, some of whom have been excellent and sensitive. And yet most of what remains to be done

can be best tackled by us, the owners. If we fall back, can we complain that others are rushing forward? (1198)

Arts, culture, language, tradition should be fore-grounded to come on par with the West. For this only postcolonial literature can raise the voice of the subalterns.

Ashcroft says that all postcolonial discourses are cross-cultural; the postcolonial text is always a complex and hybridized formation; colonialism inevitably leads to a hybridization of culture; hybridity is the primary characteristics of all postcolonial societies whatever their source; it is not possible to return to or rediscover an absolute pre-colonial cultural purity. Since postcolonial literature is hybridized form, pure pre-colonial literature can't be resurrected. Still the West is continuing to suck the treasure of the mind of the non-West of enrich their languages and cultures. But the non-west can't resist retaining its purity. In this regard, Ngugi Wa Thing'O says in *Decolonizing the Mind*:

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Europe stole art treasures from Africa to decorate their houses and museums; in the twentieth century Europe is stealing the treasures of the mind to enrich their languages and cultures. Africa needs back its economy, its politics, its culture; [ . . . ] (qtd. in Parker et al. 4)

As postcolonialism is open to different ideas, it undoubtedly, derives strategies and characteristics from poststructuralism especially from Derridian deconstruction and Foucauldian discourse theory. Like post structuralism, post colonialism dismantles binaries like West/east, primary/secondary, man/woman, civilized/uncivilized and so on. It deconstructs such binaries so that it can make a room for indigenous cultural values and worldviews ignored by the so-called imperialist truths. It debunks and challenges the Western canonical texts. Moreover, it deals with the third world

people's traumatic experiences like cultural disruption, hybridity, diaspora, migration and so forth. In the beginning, it was focused upon challenging colonial ideologies imposed upon the natives. It was preoccupied with the issues concerning identity and cultural roots of the indigenous people. Cultural nationalism, therefore, came to limelight. The postcolonial writers concentrated their efforts in trying to establish the identity of the natives by highlighting their culture. They sought to construct the indigenous nationalism based on native myth and culture. The theorists like Said challenged the Western culture and attempted to construct the third world's cultural nationalism. Likewise, the writers like Chinua Achebe tried to construct cultural nationalism by exploiting the Nigerian indigenous myths and ritual. In the same manner, subaltern study group conducted researches on the cultures of the subaltern people. They were trying to create a new nationalism made of indigenous culture of the peasants. They brought subalternity into postcolonialism.

Later on, the postcolonial writers, with the rise of postmodernism and poststructuralism, realized that the terms like cultural nationalism and indigenous culture are essential. They shifted their focus to the issues of cultural displacement. As we know, the colonial onslaught disrupted the indigenous culture. It turned the natives into 'black skin having white masks' as Frantz Fanon suggests in his book *Black Skin, White Masks* (1967). It brought hybridity with respect to identity, culture, and consciousness of the natives. Fanon writes:

There is a fact: White men consider themselves superior to black men [. . .]. There is another fact: Black men want to prove to white men, at all costs, the richness of their thought, the equal value of their intellect [. . .]. How does we extricate ourselves? [. . .] If there is inferiority complex, it is the outcome of a double process: [. . .] primarily,

economic; [. . .] subsequently, the internalization -- or, better, the epidermalization -- of this inferiority. (10-11)

Fanon in this extraction brilliantly describes the extremity of colonial discourse reenacted within the territory of colonial city. But it is clear that Fanon's resolution to such discourse is violence as opposed to 'non-violence' theme of Gandhi. In the above lines Fanon developed the idea of comprador class or elite who exchanged the roles with the white colonial dominating class without engaging in any radical restructuring of society. The black skin of this comprador intelligentsia was 'masked' by their complicity with the values of the white colonial powers. We can see the resistance to neo-colonial strategy of 'comprador intelligentsia'.

They were turned into dangling people torn between the native culture and the imperial culture. This cultural displacement touched its peak in diasporas. Homi K. Bhabha, in his book *Location of Culture*, argues that colonialism not only disrupted the native culture but also the colonial culture. Referring to the in between condition of the colonized subjects, Bhabha has developed the concept of mimicry. According to him, the colonized people challenge and make the imperialist truths impure through mimicry when they use the imperialist language to express their indigenous experiences. Bhabha says, "The centre of such study would neither be the sovereignty' of national cultures, nor the universalism of human culture, but a focus on the unspoken, unrepresented pasts that haunt the historical present" (12).

With the rapid rise and proliferation of globalization, transnationalism and multiculturalism across the worlds, cultural nationalism gave into the growing influence of the West over the native cultures. These phenomena, at present, are valorized instead of the essentialist concepts like indigenous culture and cultural nationalism. The writers like Salman Rushdie, Ben Okri and Gabriel Marquez are

marching on this path. They construct ambivalent space to make a room for the indigenous culture ignoring imperial culture. In the same manner, they heavily exploit diasporas as well as multicultural experiences. Now, the postcolonial writers have realized that it is not possible to restore the pure indigenous culture; they are trying to establish a bit less hostile relationship between the native culture and imperialist culture. As colonization and its lingering legacy have brought changes in both colonizer and colonized, they have brought ambivalence in cultures. This kind of ambivalence shows the possibility of the simultaneous existence of worldviews.

With advent of education and explosion of knowledge, colonized countries across the world got unified and fought perpetually against brutal and authoritative reign of different European colonists. Under the slogan of nationalism and nationality, native people held protests and tallied demanding freedom, and sovereignty. Because of the massive protests and continual negation of colonial order and rule, many colonized countries were freed from the cruel claws of British and French colonialism. Officially, Pillars of empire, like French, British abandoned the colonies but to our utter dismay, colonized could not jettison values and norms impregnated by colonizers in their lives.

Many years after the acquisition of independence, Asian, African, and Latin American countries are being ruled on the ground of systems constructed by colonizers. Though independence was declared to promote and revive native culture, religion, education, law, language, development and economic, social, political, judiciary, linguistic and administrative fields have been following and functioning on the decolonized Asia, Asian writers and critics have attempted to show in their texts how much the native people are free and how much they are still dependent on colonizers. Postcolonialism not only uncovers how the West had constructed

ideology to manipulate and rule over the non-West but also sheds light on how and at what length colonialism and its legacy left behind by colonizers continue to affect culture, societies, politics, religion, language, education and so many other aspects of indigenous people. Concerning this hangover of colonialism in independent countries, Said states:

Imperialism didn't end, didn't suddenly become "past", once decolonized had set in motion the dismantling of the classical empires. A legacy of connections still binds countries like India, Algeria, and Nigeria to France and Britain respectively. (282)

Said's aforesaid statements clarify that though countries like India and Nigeria have attained political independence from the reign of French and British imperialism.

There does exist the connection or legacy among these countries. Said further opines, "Questions of the authority once directed at the classical empires of Britain and France are now thrown at despotic successor regimes, and against the idea that Asian or African countries remain enthralled and dependency" (266).

This notion of Edward Said makes revelation that aboriginal successors of politically independent countries have inherited the entire legacy led by their predecessors, former colonizers. In terms of colonial legacy and national independence, Said further adds:

To a very great degree the era of high nineteenth century imperialism is over. France and Britain gave up their most splendid possession after World War Second, and lesser powers also diverted themselves of their far-flung dominations. Yet the meaning of imperial pasts is not totally contained within it, but has entered the reality of hundreds of million of people where its existence as shared memory and as a highly

conflictual texture of culture, ideology and policy still exercises tremendous force. (11)

From this remark of Said, we can draw a conclusion that official decolonization or independence has not liberated people. It exposes the fact that imperial forces are still lingering in the politically independent countries.

Industrialization and urbanization brought by the colonizers had heavily changed the cultural values of the colonies. The white culture had already become a part of their life. Though Biafrans in Nigeria were second from British colonial rule, characters like Ugwa. Jomo and others prefer to talk in English as a medium of communication. Regarding educational system of autonomous countries, Albatch argues:

Most developing countries have maintained the colonial pattern of school administration and many have altered the curriculum only slightly thus retaining much of the orientation of colonial education. The old colonial era some say, is dead. Evidence? Most formerly colonial areas are now independent nations. On the ruins of traditional colonial empire, however, has emerged a new subtler but perhaps equally influential kind of colonialism. The advanced industrial nations retain substantial influence in what are now referred to as the developing areas. (452-53)

So, the colonial era is over but the legacy is still in the process but in the influential mode. The traditional colonial empire is ruined but its legacy is being perpetuated in the form of modernity, globalization, aid, peace, and security to developing countries.

One common argument among the postcolonial intellectuals is that the era of imperialism has come to an end. This occurred when European empires relinquished

their colonies during the few decades after the World War II. Nevertheless, the imperial mentality continues to function, especially in policies of former colonial superpowers, giving rise to what is known as "neo-colonialism." The use of the term neo-colonialism is often used in reaction to any unjust and oppressive expression of Western political power after the end of colonialism. Therefore, in her book *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature* Elleke Boehmer talks about neo-colonialism in this way:

[P]ostcolonial and neo-colonial, both of which refer to the post-independence period. A term for economic theory, neo-colonialism signifies the continuing economic control by the West of the once-colonized world, under the guise of political independence [. . .] Many theorists broadly agree that the decline of one sort of colonialism in the 1950s led to the rise of another, less overt, some might say more insidious, form – what has also been called a super or new imperialism. (9)

In other words, neo-colonialism means the continuing Western influence located in flexible combination of the economic, the political, and the military and ideological level in terms of technology, business and industrialization. So, neo-colonialism is a tacit understanding that shows colonialism something more than formal colonial governance are administrative structures, military forces and incorporation of the natives in the metropolitan government. But neo-colonialism suggests an indirect form of control through economic and cultural dependence. In this case, neo-colonialism signifies the continual control of former colonies through the native elites. The neo-colonial powers are alleged to exploit the colonized and their resources for the benefit of metropolis.

Scholars in postcolonial studies like Robert Young, Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffith and Hellen Tiffin agree that, in spite of the looseness of the term, 'neo-colonialism' was coined by the first president of independent Ghana and leading exponent of Pan-Africanism, Kwame Nkrumah, in his full length study of neo-colonialism, *Neo-colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. This title which developed Lenin's definition of imperialism as the last stage of capitalism, suggested that, although the countries like Ghana and Nigeria achieved technical independence, the ex-colonial powers and the newly emerging superpowers such as the United States continued to play a decisive role through international monetary bodies, through fixing prices on world markets, multinational corporations (MNCs) and cartels and a variety of educational and cultural institutions. Describing neo-colonialism as the 'last stage of imperialism,' Nkrumah wrote:

Neo-colonialism is more insidious, complex and dangerous than the old colonialism. It not only presents its victims from developing their economic potential for their own use, it controls the political life of the country and supports the indigenous bourgeoisie in perpetrating the oppression and exploitation of the masses. Under neo-colonialism, the economic systems and political policies of independent territories are managed and manipulated from indigenous bourgeoisie. (qtd. in Gupta, *Politics* 39)

Thus, Nkrumah argues that neo-colonialism was more insidious and difficult to detect and resist than the older overt colonialism. Nkrumah even divided the postcolonial states into those which were neo-colonial and which were not. According to his categorization, neo-colonial states "deprive their authority not from the will of the

people but from the support they obtain from their neo-colonial masters" (*Neo-colonialism* xv).

Nkurmah becomes aware that the independence and national sovereignty in African states were partly taken and in no substantial way they altered the relationship between the colonial powers and the colonized states. That is why, he adds:

Neo-colonialism is the worst form of imperialism. For those who suffer from it, it means exploitation without redress. In the days of old fashioned colonialism, the imperial power had at least to explain and justify at home the actions it had taken abroad. In the colonial those who served the ruling imperial power could at least look to its protection against any violent move by their opponents. With neo-colonialism neither is the case. (xi)

It means neo-colonialism is worse than direct colonialism because neo-colonizer has no responsibility. It is only after its interests.

The theory of 'dependency' stresses, on the other hand, that neo-colonialism is a continuation of the colonial order, which in the first place has caused the process of under development of the colonial world. Proponents of this school demonstrate that modern capitalism functions on the world scale and perpetuates unequal dependency linkages between the industrially developed West (core) and the primarily agricultural or semi-manufacturing economies of the new states (periphery). In their opinion, therefore, the grant of political independence to the former colonies carries little substance so long as they fail to break dependency linkages and achieve economic independence. This gives rise to what Anirudha Gupta, borrowing from Timothy Saw, calls a "contradiction between formal independence and real

dependence between the attributes rather than the substance of independence" (*Politics* 40).

Economically speaking, poverty and, indeed, ever-deepening immoderation and indebtedness of so many postcolonial nations, especially the Third World, is a structural feature of the terms of their insertion into the global economy, from which it has been simply impossible for them to "de-link" or disconnect themselves. So, Neil Lazarus writes:

To lay the blame for the destruction of the environment, the impoverishment of communities, and the exploitation of workers in Nigeria, Malaysia, Venezuela, and Trinidad on corrupt and autocratic national rulers, without also taking into account the central roles played by the massive and hugely powerful western-based oil conglomerates, for instance, would clearly be to invert reality. (20)

Therefore, for Lazarus, not only the native elites, but also the neocolonial powers persisting structural control are responsible for the problem of post-independence state. In the same line of thought, Boehmer writes that "post-independence nations have increasingly plagued by neo-colonial ills: economic disorder and social malaise, government corruption, state repression" (237). Thus, in much of the formerly colonized states, power hierarchies are maintained and the values of former colonizer remained influential. This is just a colonial economic and political rearrangement, rather than liberation.

Though there is a good deal of difference among the scholars, Anirudha Gupta, in her *Politics in Africa*, mentions some of the principal features of neo-colonialism: Firstly, neo-colonialism represents a global pattern of the dominance of economies of newly independent countries by the industrially developed West;

secondly, it underwrites the postwar monopolist control of finance, technology and markets by the trans or multinational corporations (MNCs); and thirdly, since the MNCs originated from an aggregation of capital resources for war purposes to produce more arms, their activities in third world countries sometimes assume military dimensions.

In the African context, foreign interest in local resources accounted for the concentration of imperial power and multinational investments mainly in those countries having rich oil or mineral resources.

Ideally, neo-colonialism aims at institutionalizing the process of economic exploitation of the developing countries without resorting to military or colonial means of coercion. But in practice, this does not always happen. "First, because [. . .] the MNCs themselves have originated from the merger of transnational capital to expand the arms and manufacturing industry," as Gupta writes, "and second in the context of East and West tension even the socio-economic matters assume strategic dimension in Western planning" (*Politics* 43). Hence, military competition and involvement between superpowers heavily impinges in the sphere of business and trade between developed and underdeveloped countries. Thus, the structural violence of neo-colonialism also takes the manifest form.

To make the investment safe and the African markets tied to Western needs, a new political strategy, was devised, i.e. instead of disrupting the state's authority or colluding with divisive forces, foreign finance favored the integration of African state structure. The reason behind it, as Gupta hints, can be that "in most African countries [. . .] no class had developed to take over the reliable ally of neo-colonialism." That is why, those having control over the state apparatus as soldiers,

politicians or bureaucrats can be depended upon to establish links with external capital and exploit the country's economic resources" (*Politics* 47).

So, instead of encouraging the suppression of tribal warfare, the scheme of neo-colonialism has turned to be one of supports to control the authority of African states. Even in the case of internal tribal or ethnic conflict, neo-colonizers supported the state with ammunition and military power so that conflict comes to an end and their interest protected. Adichie's *Half of a Yellow Sun* also observes the structural involvement of neo-colonial power in the post-independence violence in Nigeria.

The 'post-independence state' has often been known as 'Post-colonial state'. Its formation after independence is the clearest signal of the separation of the colonized from the imperial power. Ashcroft, Tiffin and Griffiths write, "The independence of that newly formed state is the *sine qua non* of the claim to have left the power of the colonizer behind" (193). However, in practice, such 'independence' may come to be seen as superficial because of the dominance of the idea of European concept of nation in the minds of those who led the struggles for independence. Such nationalist leaders shaped the nation following the model of former European power:

Moreover, except in situation of partition, the independent nation's boundaries were usually unchanged from the old colonial border. In Africa, for extent of independent countries such as Nigeria and Ghana broadly reflects the colonial enclaves carved out from the pre-colonial societies of West Africa (193-94).

This brought with them the problem of forcing often differing cultural groupings to live together as one nation. So, Boehmer writes, "as colonial maps were rechristened post-colonial, a rickety and even malfunctioning colonial structure was taken over virtually intact" (348-49).

So, such states usually faced instability and violence because the derivative secular notion of European nationalism could not bind the ethnic, regional and religions diversity. The growing nationalist assertiveness and attempt of self-determination in the part of minority group has also caused the situation of violence. Even the neo-colonial economic interest has played crucial role to invite such violence in the newly post-independent state.

Simply speaking, nationalism is the desire of a group of people who share same race culture, language etc. to form an independent nation. It also refers to a feeling of love for and pride in own country. Richard Handler writes that, "Nationalism is an ideology about individuated being ... concerned with boundedness, continuity and homogeneity encompassing diversity" (6). Similarly, Johnston et al. write, "Nationalism is a means of imposing cultural homogeneity within the bounds of a given territory; it is thus harnessed by a state undergoing a transition in its tasks" (10).

Likewise, John Breuilly is of the opinion that "the term 'nationalism' is used to refer to political movements seeking or exercising state power and justifying such actions with nationalist arguments" (3). Considering nationalism as a form of "opposition politics," he classifies nationalist movement based on three objectives: *separation, reform and unification*.

However, postcolonialism draws on, as Elleke Boehmer, "contrasting understanding of nationalism as a means of self-determination" (348-49). Postcolonial nationalist thinking highlights the fact that nationalism itself is essentially contradictory political formation. The theorists of nation influential in postcolonial studies like Nairn, Benedict Anderson and Partha Chatterjee point out that nation occupies the dialectic between traditional and modern; between pull to assert claims

to ancient cultural tradition and desire for democracy and equality. That is why nation/nationalism is 'Janus -faced'.

James M. Blaut, while talking about diffusionist theory of nationalism, writes the view of Tom Nairn: "Nationalism is process generated by European idea of freedom, that is, the idea that people should govern themselves in a sovereign state, and it is the diffusion of this idea which then causes the rise of national movements in non-European areas" (31). This shows that nationalism was the product of European 'Enlightenment' and 'modernization'. In the same vein, P. Chatterjee -- referring to B. Anderson who viewed nation as 'imagined community'-- writes that, "The historical experience of nationalism in Western Europe, in America and in Russia, had supplied for all subsequent nationalisms a set of modular forms which nationalist elite in Asia and Africa has chosen the ones they like" (*Fragments* 6).

After the Second World War and especially in the 1960s, the people of colonized state unified -- a sort of homogeneity in diversity -- to do away with common enemy, i.e., colonizer. Nationalism became a unifying principle. That is why, in 1950s and 1960s, nationalism was regarded as "a feature of the victorious anti-colonial struggles in Asia and Africa" (*Fragments* 4) as Chatterjee. But the paradox is later contingency of nationalism has produced highly ambivalent legacies in post-colonial world. The problem of early postcolonial nationalism has been its exclusive preoccupation with homogenous or monolithic national identities. This tendency led to the emergence of communalist and ethnic violence on a grand scale. Thus, "utopias" (170), to use Satish Deshpande's formulation, of nationalism rarely bore any relation to the "heterotopias" of diverse cultural and ethnic configuration of the newly formed nation.

The leaders of such states, who led nationalist movements against colonialism, became the leaders of corrupt, fractious and often brutal regimes. Thus, here nationalism, to borrow from Chatterjee, "gave rise to mindless chauvinism and xenophobia and serve[d] as justification for organized violence" (*Nationalist Thought* 2). That is why, Laura Chrisman, with reference to Gayatri Spivak, writes that, "[N]ationalism was [. . .] 'a reverse or displaced legitimation of colonialism,' doomed to repeat the 'epistemic violence' of colonialism it has rejected" (183).

The years immediately following independence, whether in Asia, Africa or elsewhere, were full of optimism as the barriers of colonial racism were thrown aside and the possibilities for independent social, economic and political development seemed within reach. But Tamara Shivanandan says, "In most cases, however, this optimism turned out to be ill-founded and as the hoped for social and economic freedom failed to materialize, disillusionment set in" (55). This is somehow paradoxical situation of postcolonial nation formation beyond the expectation of anti-colonial nationalist movement.

The rhetoric of anti-colonial nationalism and dreams of what independence would bring seem misguided in retrospect as many of these societies failed to obtain hoped for social and economic freedom for their people. So Tamara Shivandandan again adds:

What is to be found rather, is increasing division and oppression on the basis of class, ethnicity, religion, and gender; the failure of economy to provide even basic necessities, never mind prosperity for the mass of the people; a lack of democratic participation by the masses in political sphere; and the continued --often increasing --structural dependence,

economically, politically, and ideologically, on Western imperial powers. (42)

Similarly, referring to the renowned African historian Basil Davidson, Neil Lazarus in his article "Global dispensation since 1945," writes that, "The era of decolonization was marked by heady expectancy, dynamism, a sense of uplift and vibrant hopefulness" (31). But in the post-colonial era the gap between people and state widened rather than narrowed as might have been anticipated and was certainly hoped for.

In newly independent society, the power of state goes to the hands of indigenous elites. With reference to Aijaz Ahmad, Shivanandan writes that, "For in most cases decolonization gave power 'not to revolutionary vanguards but to the national bourgeoisie poised for reintegration into subordinate positions within the imperialist structure" (56). But these elites of recently independent nation tried to consolidate their power and wealth --to don in Ariel Dorfman's coinage, the "Empire's Old Clothes" --but failed to take the country out of dependency and to transform social structure in the interest of the mass of people. So, following Samir Amin, Shivanandan writes, "There is no doubt that the great tide of national liberation was marked by real gains for Africa, Asia and Latin America. But ... [b]y the end of post war cycle, third world states were turned back into a comprador role" (56-57). That is why, much of the analysts and writers of postcolonial societies have placed the onuses of responsibility of problems on the shoulders of indigenous elites.

The colonial rule came to an end, the 'national conflict,' embodied in rivalries for executive power between contending groups and individuals among the "elites" has taken priority over the 'social conflict' concerned with the interests of most of these new nation states. On the same track, Neil Lazarus expresses his view:

For in South, South -east ... Latin America and the Caribbean, as in Africa, leaders and ruling have come to identify their own maintenance in power as being of greater importance than the broader "social" goods of democratization, opportunity, and equality and they have increasingly used the repressive apparatuses and technologies of the state [. . .] to enforce the order and to silence or eliminate opposition [. . .] (32)

So, the new sense of uplift and regeneration proved to be of relatively short duration.

In many cases, most of such leaders received an education under colonialism, often its elite institutions, military or academic, like Sandhurst, Oxbridge, the Sorbame, and so on., which paradoxically made them conscious of and unhappy with colonial racism that held them down. So, they followed nativity to unite their people in the independence struggle. "Their culture and mentality, however, remained deeply dependent and derivative," Shivanandan writes, "and their rule far from being a search for autonomous development of their societies in effect, continued the domination and exploitation of people begun by imperialism" (57). These rulers weren't necessarily conscious agents of capitalism form the feigning: they constituted rather political elite which used state power in order to acquire west wealth at the expense of the mass of the population.

Such rules failed, in particular, to establish vital links with the poor dispossessed of their nation or to extend democratic participation to them. Strong rulers were even aided by Western of Eastern bloc powers. As a result, such societies were under some kind of authoritarian regime (often military) or one party system. There was even the elimination of opposition usually being justified on the grounds that national unity was threatened by tribalism or separatism. Shivanandan, drawing

from Raymond Betts, points out the "some 75 *coups d'etat*, military in nature, occurred in the former colonial world in the first decades of independence" (58). The example he cites were Ghana, Nigeria, Indonesia, the Philippines, Algeria, etc, to demonstrate the ubiquitous nature of such a phenomenon full of violence.

In "Making Sense of Political Violence in Postcolonial Africa," Mahmood Mamdani, with reference to postcolonial violence in Rwanda, writes:

The irony is that instead of transforming the political world created by colonialism, the world of natives and settlers, they [native leaders] confirmed it. Here then the question for postcolonial study of nationalism in Rwanda: Why did nationalism fail to transform the political edifice? (16)

Similarly, Nigeria also went under the political unrest, conflict and violence even after the helm of government went to the hand of native leaders from the British. Gita Subrahmanyam's observation made in her "Ruling Continuities: Colonial Rule, Social Forces and Path Dependence in British India and Africa," is worth mentioning. She writes, "[T]he divisiveness of regional parties and their need to seize state control meant that Nigeria's post independence history was characterized by military coups, counter-coups, secessionist movements and civil war" (85-86).

Thus, such countries' post-independence trajectories were shaped by the interactions between the structures government handed down by the colonizer and agency of political elites who variously steered their politics. In such situation, as Anirudha Gupta writes in her *Government and Politics in Africa*, "It is possible [. . .] where a handful of politicians monopolized power and misused it beyond endurance the army intervened -- in last resort in order to effect the change of government" (152).

But whatever might have been original intentions of such intervention, it appears that once army violates its own norm of keeping aloof from politics, it finds itself more or less permanently enmeshed in non-military/political affairs. That is why, as Anirudha Gupta opines, "Militarization of politics has become principle characteristics of recent African development" (*Government* 157). Such phenomenon has made the post-independence period violence prone.

This is the situation of the paradox of nationalism and the postcolonial nation formation. Adichie, in her novel *Half of a Yellow Sun*, talks about such problematic predicament of post-independence Nigeria where the failure of national leaders leads to the series of military coups and civil war. Henceforth, Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's novel *Half of a Yellow Sun* is fabricated with the varieties of issues--nation formation, neo-colonial interests, ethnic hatred among intra-racial groups, conflict between tradition and modernism and so on in relation to communal riot occurred during the Civil War in Nigeria. As per being subjected to these issues the present researcher analyzes Adichie's *Half of a Yellow Sun* under the shade of theoretical tool postcolonialism that concerns with colonial legacy.

### **III. Exploration of Colonial Legacy: A Study of**

#### ***Adichie's Half of a Yellow Sun***

Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's novel *Half of a Yellow Sun* takes place in Nigeria during the Nigerian Biafran Civil War of 1967-1970. The effect of the war is shown through the dynamic relationships of five people's lives ranging from high ranking political figures, a lecturer, Odenigbo, a British expatriate citizen, Richard Churchill, and a houseboy, Ugwu. After the British left Nigeria and stopped direct ruling, conflicts arose over how government would rule over the land. The land split and the Nigerian - Biafra war initiated. The war was the cause that annihilated thousands of Igbo people to starvation and under bombs. The cause was the effect of neocolonial supremacy of the United States, Britain and Soviet Union because those nations supported Nigeria with arms and ammunitions. The colonial legacy does not exist only in the allowances given to Nigeria by the first and second worlds but it has also long been working through under conception of characters' thoughts, language, culture, politics and everyday praxis in lives.

The structure of the novel is zigzag which moves from early sixties to later sixties and again jumps from early sixties to later sixties including the book with-in-book, many poems and the radio reports within it. This zigzag structure symbolizes the disorder in Nigeria because of the legacy of colonialism, inability of the postcolonial nation Nigeria and violence caused by war.

Adichie revolves around the war events and the massacre in relation to the lingering effects of colonialism. Despite getting independence from Britain in October 1960, individual and national identities in Nigeria remained scared by the inheritance of colonialism and foreign oppression. In 1966, Igbo military officers led a coup, which was followed by a reprisal attack against the Igbo. The massacre of the Igbo led

to the secession of southern Nigeria, the establishment of the Biafran republic, and the initiation of Civil War.

During 1901, Nigeria was under the colonial clutch of Britain. Nigeria was granted full independence in October 1960 under a constitution that provided for a parliamentary government. In October 1963, Nigeria proclaimed itself as a Federal Republic. On January 15, 1966 a group of army officers, mostly southeastern Igbos, overthrew the NPC-NNDP government and assassinated the prime minister Sardauna and premiers of the northern and western regions. It is recognized as the first military coup by the Igbos. This kind of ethnic intolerance raised tension to the Muslim Hausa community which led to another coup by largely northern officers in July 1966, which established the leadership of Major General Yoruba Gowon. The subsequent massacre of thousands of Igbos in the north prompted hundreds of thousands of them to return to the southeast where increasingly strong Igbo secessionist sentiment erupted. In the move towards greater autonomy to minority ethnic groups, the military divided the four regions into twelve states. However, the Igbo rejected attempts at constitutional revisions and insisted on full autonomy of the southeast. On May 29, 1967 Lt. Col. Emeka Ojukwu, the military governor of the eastern region who emerged as the leader of increasing Igbo secessionist sentiment, declared the independence of the eastern region as the Republic of Biafra. The ensuing Nigerian Civil War resulted into an estimated one million death before ending in the defeat of Biafra in 1970. The Biafrans could have won the war if the neocolonialism under the supervision of Britain was not at work in support to Nigerians. Throughout the novel, we can find the real characters and events that sketch the history foregrounding the ethnic and religious intolerance among different communities especially Igbo and Hausa resulted out of the legacy of colonialism in the form of neo-colonialist motif: 'divide-and-rule'.

As such the novel *Half of a Yellow Sun* incorporated to genre of postcolonialism constitutes colonial legacy concealed in the form of war cause.

Richard's journal articles the books - within-the book are highly noteworthy because to an each book. *The World Was Silent When We Died* captures the view of colonial indirect or direct support to Nigeria and denies the existence of Biafra. For this Richard writes:

The arms and advice that Britain gave Nigeria shaped other countries. In the United States, Biafra was 'under Britain's sphere of interest'. In Canada, the prime minister quipped, 'Where is Biafra?' The Soviet Union sent technicians and planes to Nigeria, thrilled at the chance to influence Africa without offending America or Britain. And from their white supremacist positions, South Africa and Rhodesia gloated at further proof that black - run governments were doomed to failure. Communist China denounced the Anglo - American - Soviet imperialism but did little else to support Biafra. The French sold Biafra some arms but did not give the recognition that Biafra most needed and many black African Countries feared that an independent Biafra would trigger other secessions and so supported Nigeria. (258)

The support that Nigeria has got from all sides especially of Britain shows that though Nigeria was decolonized, the British power is still denouncing Biafra. South Africa and Rhodesia spoke in favor of the whites. China and France did little to Biafra but did not give recognition.

Richard writes about the partition of Nigeria by River Niger into two: The North and the South having density of major different ethnic groups, Hausa-Fulani and Igbo - Yoruba respectively. He writes:

The British preferred the North. The heat there was pleasantly dry, the Hausa - Fulani were narrow-featured and therefore superior to the Negroid Southerners, Muslim and therefore as civilized as one could get for natives, feudal and therefore perfect for indirect rule. Equable emirs collected taxes for the British, and the British, in return, kept the Christian missionaries away. The humid south, on the other hand, was full of mosquitoes and animists and disparate tribes. The Yoruba were the largest in the southwest. In the southeast, the Igbo lived in small republican communities. They were non - docile and worryingly ambitious. Since they did not have the good sense to have kings, the British created 'warrant chiefs', because indirect rule cost the Crown less. Missionaries were allowed in to tame the pagans, and the Christianity and education they brought flourished. In 1914, the governor-general joined the North and the south, and his wife picked a name. Nigeria was born. (115)

It is the origination about Nigeria which is separated into two: North and South by River Niger. These two parts from the past were distinct in ethnicity and religion as well. In the North, the Hausa and Fulani were the major ethnic groups and Muslim was their religion, and in the South, Igbo and Yoruba were the major and Christianity was prevalent. The British established the colonial government or empire in the North because it was pleasantly dry, whereas south was full of mosquitoes and animists. The Igbo people were republicans and they hated monarchy or parliamentary government. There has been no cultural co-existence between the North and the South.

Despite of the pathetic condition brought out by starvation among Biafrans, the citizens are not losing their hope to win-the-war mission. The reason behind

Nigeria won the Civil War was this starvation. Nigeria made blockage for transportation of food stuffs and humanitarian aid to Biafra that created havoc among Biafrans and they starved to die causing deadly malnutritive disease like Kwashiorkor. In his book Richard writes:

Starvation was a Nigerian Weapon of war. Starvation broke Biafra and brought Biafra fame and made Biafra last as long as it did. Starvation made the people of the world take notice and sparked protest and demonstrations in London and Moscow and Czechoslovakia. Starvation made Zambia and Tanzania and Ivory Coast and Gabon recognize Biafra, starvation brought Africa into Nixon's American campaign and made parents all over the world tell their children to eat up. Starvation propelled aid organization to sneak -fly food into Biafra at night since both sides could not agree on routes. Starvation aided the careers of photographers. And starvation made the International Red cross call Biafra its gravest emergency since the Second World War.

(237)

This excerpt confronts the reader with one of the novel's central ironies: enforced starvation that crushed Nigeria's breakaway southeastern region, briefly independent and known as Biafra, also brought it the international attention that sustained its rebellion for three years. Starvation, the result of suffering, also managed the western consciousness to pierce neo-colonialism in the form of different aids. The starvation, similarly made other countries like Tanzania, Zambia, Ivory coast and Gabon to recognize Biafra as an independent state.

Adichie shows the persisting colonial interest in post independent Nigeria as a booster of violence in a subtle way. Britain as colonial power is assisting Nigeria

giving back-up in the novel. At the same time, she explores the complexities of the characters that they face during war on the inter-ethnic struggles fuelled by neo-colonial mission. The ethnic brawl between Hausa, in the North and Igbo, in the South changed into the Civil War that made Nigeria under go several political transformations in history.

Northern officers under the leadership of Major General Yakubu Gowon followed the strategy of starvation to finish off the opponent Igbos. Mrs. Maokelu, a neighbour to Olanna, opines, "Gowon sent them to bomb Awagu Market in the middle of the afternoon while women were buying and selling. He has refused to let the Red Cross bring us food, refused *Kpam - Kpam*, so we will starve to death. [. . .] Those leathers have bombed our school ! " (279). From this we can claim that Gowon's mission was targeted to eliminate the existence of Igbos. Olanna, being the eyewitness of those attacks, describes the pathetic condition of a mother: "A woman had thrown herself down near the body of a child and was rolling around in the dirt, crying. 'Gowon, what have I done to you ?" (280).

The colonial agents are the major power to brush up such tribal war. They are using the native civilians as their war instruments for their own interest-divide and rule--and the natives are behind them 'bombing' their own people. In the dialogue of Mrs. Muokelu to Olanna, it is clear, "This was done by a common civilian with his hunting gun ! You know, it is as if the Nigerians are so stupid that whatever works for them becomes stupid too. They are too stupid to fly the planes that Russia and Britain gave them, so they brought in white people, and even those white people can't hit any target" (278).

The medias also played the major role to perform such kind of historical distress in the form of cultural fragmentation in newly independence countries. Radio

Biafra collected Odenigbo's interest and support, when it commented: "These African states have fallen prey to the British - American imperialist conspiracy to use the committee's recommendations as a pretext for a massive arms support for their puppet and tottering neocolonialist regime in Nigeria?" (266). The newly independent countries like Nigeria and other African states are plotted by hegemonic interests. On the one side, they heavily criticize the violence, on the contrary, very paradoxically they recommend massive supply of arms and bullets to perform such violence. Thus, such nations are like the puppet in front of the neocolonial inheritance.

When British Empire granted Nigeria independence in October 1960 under a constitution that provided parliamentary government, the southern officers were not happy because they were searching for the Republican State. As a result, on January 15, 1966 a group of army officers, mostly southeastern Igbos committed military coup and assassinated the prime minister, Sardauna. This event became the initiation of pan-Igboism (Pan-nationalism) in Nigeria, which resulted into three years horrendous Civil War.

After the assassination of prime minister Sardauna, ethnic intolerance was marked by the sense of revenge. The Hausa Muslims in hatred of Igbos followed the same order with the help of another coup: "Northern officers have taken over. The BBC says they are killing Igbo officers in Kaduna. [ . . . ] On the radio, the breathless British voice said it was quite extraordinary that the second coup had occurred only six months after the first" (137-38). It was the real beginning of the heart rendering massacre of Igbos and the worthless Civil War. The revenge attack turned out to be finishing the opponent:

Many Igbo officers were dead. The killing were organized; [ . . . ] the Northerners picked out all the Igbo soldiers and took them away and

short them. [. . .] They killed colonel Udodi Ekechi', [. . .] Northern soldiers put him in a cell in the barracks and fed him his own shit. He ate his own shit.' Kainene paused. 'Then they beat him senseless and tied him to an iron cross and threw him back in his cell. He died tied to an iron cross. He died on a cross.' (138)

From this expression, it is clear that the revenge attack in the form of ethnic segregation among the Nigerians brought the horrendous effect of colonial legacy that of superiority complex. Similarly in the replacement of Sardauna, the Hausa soldiers killed Colonel Major Udodi in a very pathetic and barbaric way. Hausa soldiers as such were in the indirect governance of foreign policy and it also shows the fact that there is no absolute governance during the war time.

The reprisal killings of Igbo people in the North by Hausas arouse the secessionist sentiment and search for root among the Igbos. The Igbo leader, Ojukwu encourages his people to be ready to wage war against Hausa. He shouts for 'power' among the Igbos using the memory to fulfill it, for the revenge attack. He asks:

What shall we do ? Shall we keep silent and let them force us back into Nigeria ? Shall we ignore the thousands of our brothers and sisters killed in the North ? [. . .] 'If they declare war, 'he said. 'I want to tell you now that it may become a long-drawn -out war . A long -drawn -out war. Are you prepared ? Are we prepared ? 'Yes ! Yes ! Ojukwu, *nye anyi egbe ! Give us guns ! Iwe di anyi n'obi !* There is anger in our hearts ! (170-71)

Here the leader, Ojukwu is preparing his people to fight against Hausa because they had killed their siblings in the North. The mission 'power' of Ojukwu is supported by the Igbo citizens because there is the sense of reprisal on them. And Ojukwu is

confident that one day the Republic of Biafra will be established and "even the grass will fight for Biafra" (171).

*Half of a Yellow Sun* depicts people's obsession with ethnic identity and hatred towards the other varieties of ethnicities in Nigeria and the colonial legacy of hierarchy and the post war scenario of 1960s. In this regard, Biafran National Anthem declares the unification among the Igbos:

*Land of rising sun, we love and cherish,  
Beloved homeland of our brave heroes;  
We must defend our lives or we shall perish.  
We should protect our hearts from all our foes:  
But if the price is death for all we hold dear,  
Then let us die without a shred of fear (277)*

This Biafran National Anthem speaks of the people's obsession with their own distinct identity. For such identity, they are ready to sacrifice themselves.

For the separate identity of nation Biafra, Olanna during her study at refugee camp teaches about the flag which symbolizes the 'rising sun or half of a yellow sun', i.e. rising of the Republic of Biafra:

About a quarter of her class attended school. She taught them about the Biafran flag. [. . .] Red was the blood of the siblings massacred in the North, Black was for mourning them, green was for the prosperity Biafra would have, and, finally, the half of a yellow sun stood for the glorious future. She taught them to raise their hand in flying salute like His Excellency [. . .]. (281)

From this kind of symbolic representation of author and the naming of the novel's title proves that Adichie herself is advocating for the cultural differences. The flag serves

to construct the new independent nation. Flag is the representation of their unitary conscience.

All the intellectuals of Igbo-Odenigbo, Miss Adebaya, Professor Ezeka and Okeoma serve for the secession of Biafra. For their support to secession "Odenigbo had placed a long sheet of paper beside Olanna's table with WE, UNIVERSITY STAFF, DEMAND SECESSION AS A MEANS OF SECURITY typewritten at the top and a patchwork of varied signatures at the bottom" (161). Their hatred towards their own people and being separatist is enraging the issue of colonial legacy. After their secession or "imagined community formation" was declared the ethnic hatred began to grow. When the Hausas killed the Igbos in Lagos, Odenigbo knows it on reading *The Pickwick Papers* he quarrels with Miss Adebayo.

And what about our university colleagues in Ibadan and Zaria and Logos ? Who is speaking about this ? They kept silent while white expatriates encouraged the rioters to kill Igbo people You would be one of them if you didn't happen to be in Igbo land ! How much sympathy can you have ? [ . . . ] 'Don't you dare say I have no sympathy ! To say that secession is not the only way to security does not mean I don't have sympathy !' It was Miss Adebayo. (174)

Miss Adebayo, who belongs to Yoruba in the North, does not see any right decision to their secession for their security. She, in fact, is in favour of establishing peace among Nigerians. Odenigbo blames her for being one of the rioters in his ethnic hatred anger.

The violence, in the form of cultural supremacy, is more intensified by the colonial interests at the phase of decolonization. Special Julius, an Igbo man and friend to Odenigbo is radical towards those colonial agents. The homelessness

condition because of war displaced Odenigbo' Olanna, Ugwu and Baby from Nsukka to Abba, and to Umuahia. Special Julius comments on the news reporting of BBC radio:

Look at their dirty English mouth. "Astonishing move by Biafra", indeed ! They are surprised because the arms Harold Wilson gave those Muslim cattle rearers have not killed us off as quickly as they had hoped ! 'It is Russia you should blame, not Britain 'Definitely Britain. Our boys brought us some Nigerian shell cases from the Nsukka sector for analysis. Every single one had UK WAR DEPARTMENT on it. We keep intercepting British accents on the radio message too. Britain and Russia then that unholy alliance will not succeed'. (199)

The construction of separate nation in Nigeria after independence is encouraged by the Britishers. British Prime Minister Harold Wilson is directly responsible for the war cause because he supplied massive arms and ammunitions to Nigeria in the name of the UK war department. Though Nigeria is under the command of General Gowon, he is being puppet at the rand of Harold Wilson.

The colonizer, Harold Wilson's neocolonial insertion under the aegis of General Gowon, the colonized traces the inferior legacy on its servitude. Richard in response to the British empire and its' intention, writes in his book:

... [T]hat carnage was precipitated by the British colonial government when it blamed the Igbo people for the national strike, banned Igbo-published newspapers, and generally encouraged anti-Igbo sentiment. The notion of the recent killings being the product of 'age-old' hatred is therefore misleading. The tribes of the North and the South have long

had contact, at least as far back as the ninth century, as some of the magnificent beads discovered at the historic Igbo-Ukwu site attest. No doubt these groups also fought wars and slave raided each others, but they did not massacre in this manner. If this is hatred, then it is very young. It has been caused, simply, by the informal divide - and - rule politics of the British colonial exercise. These policies manipulated the differences between the tribes and ensured that unity would not exist, there by making the easy governance of such a large country practicable. (166-67)

The tribalists could have made peace consensus but the Britishers fueled them with ethnic hatred leading to civil war killing thousands of Igbos. It is the legacy of British colonial regime to rule the natives by dividing them and ruling over them forever.

Richard represents 'white man's burdens' so as to make people aware about the war effects through his book. He really wanted to write about the roped pot and Igbo-Ukwu art under the title, *The Basket of Hands*, changed into *Into the Time of Roped Pot*, but finally transformed it into *The World Was Silent When We Died* before handing it to Ugwu. The title of the book is given under the expression of Major Madu. Madu suggests Richard to depict the real picture of War's brutalities rather to claim himself as a Biafran. Richard here serves as a translator. White people always mystify and treat as story what the blacks deliver to them: "They want experienced insiders to do stories that are about more than just the number of Biafran dead" (304). Madu argues supporting kainene:

They will take what you write more seriously because you are white. Look, 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. 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. [D]elfins flown by Russian and Egyptians are bombing us everyday, [a]nd how the British and Soviets are in an unholy alliance giving more and more arms to Nigeria, and how the Americans have refused to help us, and how our relief flight come in at night with no lights because Nigerians will shoot them down during the day. (305)

The neo-colonial hegemonic attitude is still working. The whites do not believe the blacks. On the one hand, the colonial legacy of different countries is embodying in concealed way, on the other, they are supporting Nigeria with arms to eliminate the Biafrans. Madu sees the continued hegemonic sympathy on the side of Richard transforming himself as Biafran. Madu encourages Richard better to something more better than claiming self as a Biafran, the neo-colonial motif to make aware the people about the actual incident occurred during war time.

The horrified situation after the Biafran noticed the warships sent from Britain to Nigeria is self-destructive one. Major Madu makes Richard cautious of certain accident: "There is a rumour that Britain supplied five warships to Nigeria, so youths have been burning British shops and houses all over Port Harcourt today" (314). The neo-colonial interruption caused hatred between whites and blacks in Nigeria, and at the same time in the blacks of Biafra:

The novel foregrounds, the continued hegemony of a colonial signifying system. The cultural shift after the decolonization in Nigeria led to explore the transculturation revolving around the issue of Civil War. In the post - colonial

Nigeria, the American journalists situate themselves as witness the war, but the story they hear is distorted through the colonial discourses which prevent them from listening. Richard's meeting with two US journalists the Plump one and the redhead annoys him, he takes them to refugee camp to view the condition of war wounded people. But they seek something new:

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 blacks people equal one dead white person. 'There is nothing new to tell'. [. . .] The plump one said, 'I hear there's a lot of free sex here. But the girls have some kind of sexually transmitted disease ? The Bonny disease ? You guys have to be careful so you don't take any thing back home. (369)

The war is sweeping the lives of people, people are dying of hunger, disease and mystery but the foreign journalists are interested at the news of one white man if there is any. The plump one is mystifying about the sexual disease: "Bonny disease" spread among young girls in Nigeria. These journalists want to see the "real Biafrans" -- hungry Biafrans-- "Niggers are never choosy about what they eat" (370). When they see some children gathering over two roasting rats around a fire they become surprised and take photographs. Though the Biafrans were in miserable condition they did not give up their hope far win - the - war effort. Western narratives like violent, disease - ridden, uncivilized and unknowable are differentiated with urban and rural life symbolically. How the western media represented the event eye-witnessed event in their own way to depict themselves as humanists. The politics engaged in response to western media writes: "Ancient tribal hatred", the *Herald* wrote, was the reason for the massacres. *Time* magazine title its piece MAN MUST WHACK, an expression

printed a on a Nigerian lorry, [. . .](166)". It is only the distortion of reality that medias speak about. The medias represent Nigerian civil war as "ancient tribal hatred". They also make the discourse that Nigerians are prone to violence. The British and American journalists see the war incidents through a set of prejudiced assumptions about the violent and savagery nature of African people.

It is not the nature of African blacks but it is the effect of war like the event of Ugwu's conscription in Biafran soldier. The suffering Ugwu undergoes during his conscription period is the result of civil war, that is, the foreigners are unaware of this panic situation. The image of the woman carrying a young girl's severed head inside the calabash marks one distinct site on Ugwu. Ugwu wants to show the real picture of the civil war like Frederick Douglass did in his book *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglas* depicting the pathetic portraits of slavery. Ugwu in regard to that memory says, "It will be part of a big book. It will take me many more years to finish it and I will call it "Narrative of the life of a country" (424).

At the end of novel, as Richard searches for Kainene, who is missing due to the war, he "showed them Kainene's picture. Sometimes, in such, he pulled out the picture of the roped pot instead" (407). For Richard Kainene is an embodiment of native Nigeria and to the reader a figure of missing part because of three years' horrible war. Just before the war ends, Kainene crosses military lines in reach of food to bring to refugee camp, but she never returns. Despite all the efforts to find her, no trace or evidence of her is found. So Kainene is the symbol of the entire missing category in the war the war supported by the legacy of colonial rule. The war psychologically distresses Olanna because the memory haunts her every time and whenever she thinks about her sister, she is committed to find her. She is even ready

to believe *dibia*, a *blind* -faith which she rejected all the way before and says: "I do believe in it, I believe in everything that will bring my sister home" (433).

By the end of the novel, all the characters plunge into the shattered lives due to the effect of war. Odenigbo, the revolutionary Igbo man and his narrow ethnic nationalism seems empty and, with no defenses against slights to his manhood, he sinks into alcoholism. Richard becomes lonely and misses Kainene. Olanna becomes demented because of disappearance of her twin sister. Only Ugwu, the real hero of the novel is suggesting that these people have found their own voice and don't need an outsider to speak for them. He dedicates his book to Odenigbo.

The novel explicitly shows linkage between colonialism, ethnicity, and political strife of the new nation: "If this is hatred, then it is very young. It has been caused, simply, by the informal divide - and-rule politics of the British colonial exercise. These politics manipulated the differences between tribes and ensured that unity would not exist"(166-67). Relying upon the story of the Biafran Republic and the Nigerian civil war, the novel challenges the concept of the 'postcolonial' by connecting the violence in post-independence Nigeria with the centuries of colonial rule. The economic, political, and cultural domination of colonialism lingers in multiple ways long after the changing of flags. The legacy of colonialism is not relevant only in the large scale events of history but are mostly tangling in the daily praxis of citizens. From the very beginning of the novel or the novel whole as a text legacy is on input. It is written in English, and though Adichie draws upon the British literary in terms of her structure and themes and language, she's quite aware that she is African. We can clearly see how she is weaving story African stay into the British literary tradition with her mix of allusions. She mixes Igbo words and songs like "*mmuno and Nya nya oya u ga - ana. Na m metu ono uwe ya aka*", always in italics

along with references to famous British writers, such two poems in part one -- one by English poet A.E. Housman from *A Shropshire Lad* (1896:

*"Into my heart on air that kills.*

*From yon for country blows:*

*What are those blue remembered hills,*

*What spires, what farms are those ? [ . . . ] (77)".*

The second is by famous Victorian English poet Robert Browning and it is from his poem *The Pied Piper of Hamelin* (1888): "I can't forget that I'm bereft [ . . . ] (84)". If we draw upon the language and culture of the colonizer country, in this case especially Britain, is it ever possible to establish a truly independent identity ?

One of the main protagonists of the novel *Ugwu*, a thirteen years old boy comes from village to be a houseboy' of Odenigbo. Ugwu, the illiterate bush boy, always, becomes loyal to Odenigbo. He often calls odenigbo "Master" and "sah". As master Odenigbo admits Ugwu in his household work and teaches him ways of his life. Odenigbo gives priority to education and says "Education is a priority ! How can we resist exploitation if we don't have the tools to exploitation ?" (11) Odenigbo is aware of Western colonial education and teaches Ugwu about Nigeria:

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' '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.'

Odenigbo is aware that River Niger had long been existed before the white man discovered it but in Eurocentric belief to pass the exam one must write the name *Mungo Park*. Odenigbo calls its rubbish. On the one hand, Odenigbo is critical to liberal humanism to some extent. On the other hand, he excludes other ethnics of Nigeria and his own people.

African socialism successfully blurs the conventional demarcation between master and slave:

'Odenigo. Call me Odenigbo'

Ugwu stared at him doubtfully. 'Sah?'

'My name is not sha. call me odenigbo'

'Yes, sah'

'Odenigbo will always be my name. *Sir* is arbitrary. you could be the *sir* tomorrow'. (13)

Odenigbo's judgement is that there is no one superior to one another in this world. Everyone are equally born so he dislikes Ugwu calling him 'sir' because anyone can become sir in his life. But contradictorily when he makes *Division of labour* between i.e. Ugwu, inside kitchen, and Jomo's territory outside he seems as a conventional master. If we glance at the treatment, he gives Ugwu throughout the novel the master/slave bond has tied in such way that the Hegelian concept of oppositional dialecticism is disrupted.

When Odenigbo gives him excellent books to read he does not understand most of the sentences nor did he entirely understood the conversations of his Master and his friends. Ugwu thinks his Master knows every thing better than other and nobody has got English like his Marter. Odenigbo is little crazy because of his anti - colonial beliefs that he gained through educating him self in overseas. It is quite

paradoxical here. Although he looks vigorously anti - colonial agent in the initial phase of the novel but he becomes more and more mute as his, idealism is dashed along with Biafra's hopes later. Odenigbo to his nationalistic view raises his voice "To that black American led into the University of Mississippi ! "To Ceylon and to the world's first woman prime minister". To Cuba for beating the Americans at their own game !" (18) To the oppositional binary of black and white, he always celebrated the progress of blacks over whites.

From his speech spoken we can see the continuity of colonial legacy of Western world abiding over the others. He always thinks that the newly independent countries linger under the colonial pressure just his country Nigeria is going on. Because of his hatred towards the colonial whites Kainene projects him as revolutionary lover. He takes the concept of pan - Africanism as the European construction:

'You know, pan-Africanism is fundamentally a European notion'. [. . .] 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.' [. . .] 'The pan-Igbo idea existed before the white man ! Go and ask the elders in your village about your history.' (20-21)

Historically the subjectivity of blacks has been constructed in opposition to whites. Here Odenigbo is more concerned about his ethnic identity rather than the identity given to Nigerians by the whites. He views that colonial legacy is still working. He sees pan Africanism as the European construction but the pan-Igboism as the predestined one. His problem is that even after the post independent era neocolonial

elements are implicitly leading the alien world and within this world he himself is excluding the other ethnic tribes emphasizing only to Igbo tribe. He is lacking critical humanitarian features. It shows that he is governed by the superiority - complex.

Ugwu thinks that Odenigbo's English cannot not be compared to anybody but when he meets Olanna as Odenigbo's special guest he hears her English as magic. The kind of English he only hears on radio, rolling out with clipped precision: "He wished she would stumble in her Igbo; he had not expected English that perfect to sit beside equally perfect Igbo" (23). Learning English for Ugwu was his passion. He prefers to talk English instead of Igbo" 'I serve now, sah' Ugwu said, in English, and then wished he had said, I am serving now, because it sounded better (23). As the novel develops Ugwu consciousness grows more. Jomo, Odenigbo's gardener in response to Ugwu's English says - 'Dianyi, you new speak English just like the children of the lecturers.'"(93). Ugwu becomes happy to hear the compliment of Jomo because he assumes English is only for high class people. During the refugee camp, Ugwu becomes teacher under the guidance of Olanna. When war takes place to its peak, Ugwu is conscripted, his meeting with High-Tech leads them to conversation:

I do rayconzar meecon, 'High - Tech announced, speaking English for the first time. Ugwu wanted to correct his pronunciation of *reconnaissance mission*; the boy certainly would benefit from Olanna's class. [. . .] That word you call *re-con-zar* is *reconnaissance*' he said. High-Tech looked at him for a moment and laughed and offered the bottles [. . .] (358)

The growing consciousness in Ugwu's life, his interest in English accent shows his inclination towards Eurocentric academia. Physically he is bound to serve Biafra but mentally the western pedagogy is hegemonizing him. He, in fact, is unaware that

learning British education and sensibilities surpasses the issue of pan nationalism paving the way for colonial legacy.

Odenigbo, the freedom fighter, clarifies the real postcolonial situation that the large numbers of people are not recognized with this new world, they are still living on the life of cocoon, no way out, in the context. When his mother calls Olanna a 'witch'. "The real tragedy of our postcolonial world is not that the majority of people had no say in whether or not they wanted this new world, rather, it is that the majority have not been given tools to negotiable this new world" (101). He sees the early independence time as the most dangerous and evil one:

We are living in a time of great white evil. They are dehumanizing blacks in South Africa and Rhodesia, they fermented what happened in the Congo, they won't let American blacks vote, they won't let Australia Aborigines vote, but the worst of all is what they are doing here. This defence pact is worse than apartheid and segregation, but we don't realize it. They are controlling us from behind drawn curtains. It is very dangerous ! (110)

It is the utmost result out of colonialism. The legacy is on its servitude even after the independence in Nigeria in the form of defence pact. Defence pact is the worst form of colonization then apartheid and segregation. It is the cause of white evil because this kinds of policies to control 'other' are only the hidden factors and they are more dangerous than the direct invasion.

The reason behind Olanna's infatuation towards Odenigbo is his daring revolutionary nature. For this Mohammed, a Hausa man with whom she was in serious relationship, responds her: "You're a nationalist and a patriot, and soon you will marry your lecturer the freedom fighter" (46). She saw him for the first time in a

queue while buying a ticket outside the university theatre where he was shouting at the ticket seller against the hierarchy made by him between white and the native: "You ignoramus ! you see a white person and he looks better than your own people ? You must apologize to everybody in this queue ! Right now !" (29). It is burden of colonialism that the inferiority complex is still working on the side of native people. The impact of colonialism is embedded mentally among the people. It shows that the postcolonial legacy is still working.

If we observe the private life of Odenigbo and his beloved Olanna, they are engaged in sexual harassment due to colonial mentality. Odenigbo, on the one hand, is a 'revolutionary lover' who seems radical towards the British colonialism and its hand but on the other hand, he follows the very ways in his life and language he addresses to his natives. When Odenigbo sleeps with Amala, Olanna because furious then in response Olanna sleeps with Richard and then tells Odenigbo, almost certainly to make him hurt as much as she was hurt. The moment of great love is balanced by the great hatred that erupts between the twin sisters when Richard tells Kainene that he slept with Olanna. He understands the depth of Kainene's hate and hurt when she burns Richard's manuscripts. In anger Kainene scorns Olanna on phone: "Why did you do it ? You're the good one and the favourite and the beauty and the Africanist revolutionary who does not like white men, and you simply did not need to fuck him. So why did you ?' (254)

Olanna used to be proud of her idealism, after her sleeping with white man, Richard, her own sister's lover, she has lost her all respect. The perfect world of these university intellectuals has been shattered, like the country is shattered by an act of betrayal.

Quite contrarily, the twin sisters, Olanna and Kainene are daughters of Nigeria's new, corrupt elite: Their parents even try to prostitute them (Olanna to Chief Okonji) to gain economic and political advantages. Their closeness strained at the beginning of the novel by their perverse relationships with their parents, they both rebel against their parents values but cannot recognize their own similarities to each other. Their conflicts symbolize the Civil War between Nigeria and Biafra and are a warning to present day Nigerians to look beyond their differences before they descend into final, destruction. The pointlessness of the twins disagreements represents the futility of Nigeria's ethnic nationalism. Part of the book's chilling quality comes from the almost seamless way people move from thinking of themselves as Nigerians to thinking of themselves as Biafrans. The word Nigerian shifts from self-identity to epithet, comrades become vandals; and neighbours become saboteurs. People no longer see how their destinies are intertwined. Olanna and Kainene learn through the terror and shocks of war that nothing--neither sexual infidelity nor personal jealousy--should estrange them.

In the same manner, Richard Churchill, a British expatriate, though he is in illegitimate relation with a white lady Susan, later he falls in love with Kainene, an Igbo lady. Richard moves to Nigeria with plan to write about what he sees as exotic art, nineteenth century Igbo - Ukwu art. As professor Nicholas Green suggests him to go at Nsukka University, Southeast - "in the land of Igbo - Ukwu art, the land of the magnificent roped pot" (56). On the other hand, Kainene had relation with Major Madu, an Igbo soldier but she continued to differentiate the hierarchy between white and native calling him "a modern -day explorer of the Dark Continent. (62) " Metaphorically 'Dark Continent' implies Africa which is paradoxical in itself to which we can claim the traces of colonialism (62). Despite of embracing own tradition and

cultures she preferred Britishers way of life. In regard to this she says, "My father thought we were too young to be sent abroad, but he was determined that we be as European as Possible" (61). While drinking with Kainene, Richard and Major Madu, Major Udodi comments:

[. . .] I *magonu*, you know, what I am saying is that our women who follow white men are a certain type, a poor family and the kind of bodies that white men like.' He stopped and continued, in a mocking mimicry of an English accent, 'Fantastically desirable bottoms'. He laughed' The white men will poke and poke and poke the women in the dark but they never marry them. How can ! they will never even take them out to a good place in public. But the women will continue to disgrace themselves and struggle for the men. So they will get chicken-feed money and nonsense tea in a fancy tin. It's a new slavery, I'm telling you, a new slavery. But you are a Big Man's daughter, so what you are doing with him ? (81)

The irony Major Udodi marks to Kainene clearly shows the history of colonizer and colonized that the white men have been exploiting black women in the name of slavery. The old slavery system has already ended but the system in its new form has been legalized. He opines the fact of poor black girl who struggles to get little survival from the side of white people. He is also satirizing the educated people who are still following whites for their individual interest, forgetting the legacy that they are laddening upon their identifications. The legacy of colonialism and neo-colonial mission in its changed form of slavery still exist in Nigeria according to Major Udodi.

Alike Odenigbo, Major Madu is also a very representative character of the novel cum patriotic soldier of Biafra. While his first meeting with Richard he responses him:

'Well, the British have just decided to control immigration from the commonwealth, haven't they ? They want people to stay in their own countries. The irony, of course, is that we in the commonwealth can't control the British moving to our countries'. [. . .] I preferred Congo to the relative safety of England. Just because of the weather, Major Madu paused.' We weren't run well at all in the Congo. We were under the command of a British Colonel. (80)

Major Madu in association to pan-Africanism shows hatred towards the Britishers monopoly in commonwealth. Since the blacks are also a part of commonwealth but they cannot control whites coming to their lands but the whites do not let the blacks enter their countries. Major Madu, when he was serving in Congo under the United Nations, relatively liked Congo but he hated the legacy of British policy for UN soldiers.

Richard as a journalist and writer, more actively mentions about the history of different ethnic groups, and their characteristic in his book-with-in-book: *The Word Was Silent When We Died*. When his affinity develops with Kainene he transforms himself as Biafran, an Igbo speaking man. It is shown through the inquiries made by a civil defender:

The man's eyes narrowed while the large eye painted on his shirt underneath the word VIGILANCE seemed to widen. 'Are you sure you are not an agent of the Nigerian government ? It is you white people who allowed Gowon to kill innocent women and children. *Abu m onye*

*Biafra*, Richard said [. . .] 'Eh, a white man who is saying that he is a Biafran ! Where did you learn to speak our language ?' (181)

When Richard was about to Nksukka for his documents left, a civil Biafran defender on the road inquires whether he is working for Nigeria because he doubted that whites were in service to Nigeria conspirating against Biafra. In this regard, no doubt, Richard claims himself as a Biafran citizen though he is a Britisher.

Richard clearly mentions that the colonial independence necessitated Southerners the same order within them. On the other hand, the white people like Susan views the war as:

These people never fight civilized wars, do they ? So much for calling it a Civil War ! Susan paused. I rang the British Council in Enugu and I can't believe our people there are still going off to play water polo and have cocktails at the hotel Presidential ! There's a bloody war going on.' [. . .] cleared up', Nigel is leaving in two days. Nothing is going to clear up; this war will drag on for years. Look what happened is Congo. These people have no sense of peace. They'd sooner fight until the last man is down. (182)

This citation covers two kinds of reality about the whites and blacks: how the white colonizers are enjoying the period when the bloody war is going on, and how the same whites representing those blacks who are fighting for independence. The war is represented as never ending phenomena like of colonialism. Simultaneously, Susan is presenting the absurdity of colonized and colonizer stressing on neo-colonial legacy and win-the-war effort.

Like Ugwu, Harrison, the servant of Richard is crazy about the foreign life style, language and fooding behaviour. He is readily happy to cook foreign dish but he

dislikes his own native food items. Harrison says, "But Sah, I am cooking the food of your country; all the food you are eating as children. I cook. In fact I'm not cooking Nigerian foods, only foreign recipe" (73). Once Kainene comes to Richard for dinner, Harrison in response to Kainene talks about his cooking habit:

I am not cooking in my home, madam. My wife is cooking native food. I am cooking any type of European food, anything, my master is eating in his country. [. . .] 'you must have difficulty eating *native* food when you go home then. Kainene stressed the word native, and Richard held back his laughter. 'Yes madam', Harrison bowed again'. But I must manage'. (255)

Through Harrison's word, it is clear that the natives are discarding their own food items and enjoying foreign food habits, it is legacy of fooding habit embedded into the mind of colonized legalizing hegemonic policy of ruling native.

But Major Madu in rage of Hausa in the North sees no peace consensus among them because Hausas are under the shade of British, colonialism. As such Madu signals out the impossibility of mutual existence between Hausas and Igbos:

Igbo soldiers and Northern Soldiers can never live in the same barracks after this. It is impossible, impossible. [. . .] so many solid -good men - Udodi, Iloputaife, Okunweze, Okafor - and these were men who believed in Nigeria and didn't care for tribe. After all, Udodi spoke better Hausa than he spoke Igbo, and look how they Slaughtered him. (140-41)

The ethnic hatred incorporates colonial legacy but there is no sense of co-operation and mutual understanding between Hausas and Igbos. The unity among the Nigerians gets deteriorated due to fragments brought by the neocolonial policy-- 'divided and rule' the natives in Africa.

Comparatively the relationship between Richard and Ugwu in the novel examines the binary between 'a knowing western subject' and an 'ignorant other'. Kainene represents Richard, "A loner and a modern - day explorer of the Dark Continent" comes to Nigeria because of "the magnificent roped Pot" (62). Richard once reads about it in a publication titled *Colonies Magazine*. As the novel develops Richard chroniclizes the history and culture of people who could make such a wonderful pot. He attempts to erase his European identity and become Nigerian, yet his encounter with the people of Africa, his language and expression written on the book maintain a colonial legacy.

Richard is serving as a colonial observer despite his effort to blur his European identity, he epistemologically constructs and shapes Africa as an object of consumption. In Richard's final appearance in the novel, the barely suppressed racist attitude toward Major Madu come to the surface: "Come back, he wanted to say, come back and tell me if you ever laid your filthy black hand, on her" (429-30).

The novel narrates the history of colonialism and Biafra transfers from Richard to Ugwu. Perpetrating and witnessing the terror of war, Ugwu is inspired by the book *The Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*: "Even if it cost my life, I was determined to read. Keep the black man away from the books, keep us in front, and we would always be his slaves" (360). Ugwu becomes the colonial voice that Richard represents fades into the background, marking the exit of the Western subject from the narrative boundary.

The ravageous situation of war that destroys the lives of many people, is never ending process. The ongoing brutalities of war at the end has been realized by all the characters. When the lives get worsened they pray for peace but there is no way out of war, His Excellency, the leader of Biafra realizes there the fact of peace consensus with Nigeria:

I take this opportunity to congratulate officers and men of our armed forces for their gallantry and bravery, which have earned for them the admiration of the whole world. I thank civil population for their steadfastness and courage in the face of overwhelming odds and starvation, "I am convinced that the suffering of our people must be brought to an immediate end. I have therefore, instructed an orderly disengagement of troops. I urge General Gowon in the name of humanity to order his troops to pause while an armistice is negotiated.

(412)

At the end, the only solution to the civil war is to accept the co-existence and to form unity among the diversified ethnic groups. War is barbaric in nature. Nothing exists fair in war, everything collapses. So the demand of peace must be acknowledged before the 'things fall apart'. Self realization of coexistence is seen as an option to reduce the legacy of colonial rule. But still legacy goes on working intrinsically dominating the decolonized people.

Thus, Adichie's treatment of civil war through the realization of unity among all the African black people searches for decolonization in true sense within Nigeria. She evokes the history and legacy of colonialism, neocolonial interest and nationalistic views to make the people from postcolonial nations aware of their own inability and legacy of colonization. The novel clearly presents the transformation of colonial intentions representing the idea of ethnic, religious and cultural superiority within one nation i.e. Nigeria in the context of post - independent era.

#### IV. Conclusion

Nigerian novelist Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie in *Half of a Yellow Sun* attempts to erase the impact of Eurocentric belief of colonialism embodied upon the black community in African context. The characters in this fiction oppose the lingering situation of colonialism but they have not become successful to resist it. To enrage the civil war the Western neocolonial policy with massive supports of arms and ammunitions and political advices to Nigeria proves that even during the post-independent period Nigeria is still under the rule of British colonial legacy. The novel centers on the issue of Nigerian Civil War during the Nigerian - Biafran War of 1967-1970. Following the end of colonial rule, the country, Nigeria plunges into a civil war when Biafrans, who are in majority (Igbo), struggle to establish an independent sovereign nation, the Republic of Biafra. With the support of Britain and the United States, northern Nigerian engages in a brutal crackdown on Biafrans. Many Biafrans are slaughtered or are forced to flee from their Homes. The country dissipates into different ethnic groups. The hatred grows up within Nigerians themselves resulting into ethnic violence. The characters in the fiction - Odenigbo, Olanna, Ugwu, Kainene, Richard, Major Madu and others-- undergo extreme brutalities caused by war resulted out of Western interference into their political matter. Their personal lives are a backdrop to the epic drama that is occurring in Nigeria, highlighting themes of reconciliation, independence, and identity.

In the post-independent scenario of Nigerian politics, Adichie traces the foreign intervention politically encouraging the locals to cause riot through ethnic hatred. It shows the neocolonial interest of the 'first world countries' to have control (politically, socially and ideologically) over the 'third world nations'. The intense competition between two ethnic groups, Hausa and Igbo, reaches to ethnic

polarization. Due to this politicization of two different natives within one nation, Hausa group comes to power in the first election disappointing Igbos and Yorubas. The first coup is the result of ethnic intolerance or superiority - complex when Igbos premier overthrow the Hausa government assassinating the prime minister Sardauna and the second coup is the organized reprisal attack from the side of Hausa. From 1968 onward, the war falls into a form of deadlock, with Nigerian forces unable to make significant advances into the remaining areas of Biafran control. Nigeria cuts off humanitarian aids to Biafra, resulting in hundreds of thousands of civilians dying from starvation and disease. Many lives and resources are lost during the war and even today there are still tensions between the different ethnic and religious groups of Nigeria. The motive of revenge is still undergoing. The negotiation of power play between major ethnic groups and changing ethnic balance cultivates the virtually unstoppable civil war in post-independent Nigeria. This is how, the disorder caused in Nigeria by war in this fictional work is the neocolonial supervision and mesmerizing colonial legacy in the form of ethnic strife.

To sum up, *Half of a Yellow Sun* digs up a representation of colonial legacy even after the independence of Nigeria from colonial clutch. The characters in the novel are resisting against Eurocentric beliefs but they fail to resist what whites constructed about them. Despite this they are westernizing themselves through the means of global academic policies, the policy and system that the whites have provided to the rest of the world. It is evident that Western colonialism is still at work in different form. The turbulence caused in Nigeria is not only by internal affair of war but also because of neocolonial interest of the West in Africa. Thus, Adichie focuses on the lingering situation of colonial legacy not only in the direct political support of the First and Second Worlds to Nigeria but also in the daily life activities

of the characters. The characters, on the one hand hate white conscience but on the other hand their life style such as educational system, fooding habits, dress -up style and several other activities cannot detach them from colonial legacy.

## Works Cited

- Achebe, Chinua. "An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*".  
Massachusetts Review (1977): 1190-1205. Rpt. in *Hopes and Impediments,  
Selected Essays*. New York: Anchor, 1989. 1-20.
- Adichie, Chimamanda Ngozi. *Half of a Yellow Sun*. London: Harper Collins  
publishers, 2007.
- Albatch, G. Philip. "Education and Neocolonialism." *The Postcolonial Studies  
Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. London and  
New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Ashcroft, Bill Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, eds. *The Postcolonial Reader*.  
London and New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London. Routledge, 1994.
- Blaut, James M. *The National Question*. London: Zed Books, 1987.
- Bohmer, Ellek. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. New York: OUP, 1995.
- Breuilly, John. *Nationalism and the State*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press,  
1885.
- Chatterjee, Partha. *Nation and Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*.  
Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993.
- , *National Thought and Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*. Minneapolis:  
University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- Chrisman, Laura. "Nationalism and Postcolonial Studies" *The Cambridge Companion  
to Postcolonial Literary Studies*. Ed. Neil Lazarus. New York: Cambridge UP,  
2004. 19-40
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin White Masks*, Trans. C.L. Markmann, New York: Grove  
Press, 1967.

- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory*. New York: Colombia University Press, 1998.
- Gupta, Anirudha. *Government and Politics in Africa*. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1975.
- - -, *Politics in Africa*. New Delhi. Vikas Publishing House, 1988.
- Hall, Stuart. 'When Was "The post-colonial" ? Thinking at the Limit', in I. Chambers and L. Curti (eds), *The Post -colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons*, London and New York: Routledge, (1996): 242-259.
- Handler, Richard. "Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec." *Directions in Anthropological Writing: History, Politics, Cultural Criticism*. Eds. E. George and James Clifford Marcus. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1988. 6-18.
- Johnston, R.J. et al. "Nationalism, Self-determination and the World Political Map: An Introduction." *Nationalism, Self-determination and Political Geography*. Ed. R.J. Johnston, David B. Knight and Elenore Kofman. London: Croom Helm, 1988. 1-17.
- Lazarus, Neil. "The Global Dispensation Since 1945." *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*. Ed. Neil Larzarus. New York: Cambridge, 2004. 19-40.
- Madami, Mahmood. "Making Sense of Political Violence in Postcolonial Africa" *Identity, Culture and Politics*. 3.2 (2002): 1-24.
- Nixon, Rob. "A Biafran Story". *The New York Times Book Review*. New York, Vol. XIV No.15 (2007).
- Nkurmah, Kwame. *Neo-colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. London: Nelson, 1965.
- Said, W. Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New Yourk: Alfred A. Inc.,1993.

-- -, *Orientalism*. New York: Penguin, 1994.

Seaman, Donna. "Half of Yellow Sun: Tales of Postcolonial Africa." *Booklist: Read Alikes* 39.1 (2007): 1-2.

Shivanandan, Tamara. "Anti-colonialism, National Liberation, and Postcolonial Nation Formation". *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*. Ed. Neil Lazarus. New York: Cambridge. 2004. 41-65.

Subrahmanyam Gita. "Ruling Continuities: Colonial Rule, Social Forces and Path Dependence in British India and Africa." *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* 44.1 (2006): 66-92.

Thing'o, Ngugi Wa. "On the Abolition of the English Department." *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge. 1995. 438-42.

Washburn, David. *Political Discourse: Theories of Colonialism and Postcolonialism: Trying to Regain Ethnic Individuality*. Available: [http://www.usp.nus.edu.sg/post/poldiscourse/washburn 1.html/](http://www.usp.nus.edu.sg/post/poldiscourse/washburn%201.html/).

White, Frances E. "Half of a Yellow Sun: While the World Watches." *Woman's Review of Books* 24.3 (2007): 1-10.