

I. Identifying Nationalism in Zimbabwe

This research attempts to analyze the sense of nationalism which is developed in Lessing during her four visits to Zimbabwe from 1982 to 1992 after the independence. While revisiting her homeland Lessing evokes her childhood memories in an isolated farm and the bush, her parents and brother, African traditions and white customs. She was exiled from Southern Rhodesia for 25 years because of her opposition to the white minority government but when she returned to Zimbabwe after its independence all the past memories come in her mind like a film. Zimbabwe is her mother land where she spent her childhood and youth therefore nationalist consciousness is increased when she returned to her home land. While revisiting Zimbabwe she meets with the local people both blacks and whites, politicians, journalists, talks about new nation Zimbabwe. All are excited but are worried about unity among the common people because the racial discrimination has not been ended which creates the problems in national unity. In other words, nationalism is in crisis because of the racial discrimination. Lessing was exiled to London because she raised the voice for the blacks being a white. But when she returned to Zimbabwe, even she is not accepted as a Zimbabwean because she is white. She is considered as "other" in her homeland by the blacks. The case is same with all the whites living in Zimbabwe. Therefore, nationalism is in crisis by the racial discrimination.

Lessing, in this novel, shows different types of nationalism. Some times nationalism is used and utilized by the people especially by the political leaders for their benefits or for the specific purpose. Political leaders by using the term nationalism unite the people to fight against the common enemy. Especially in the time they unite the people showing hatred over the common enemy by using the term nationalism. In Zimbabwe ten years of civil war the black leaders like

Mugabe and Nkomo used the same policy. They united the blacks to fight against the whites by using the term nationalism. While uniting the blacks, they create the hatred towards the whites. Mugabe scolds the whites and white government which was ruling in Zimbabwe. In doing so, he created the hatred in minds of blacks towards Britain and British government. Their ten years of civil war was the result of that hatred. They, to make their fighters excited sometimes inferiorize the whites as Nkomo in one speech said to his fighters:

The white people are not cleverer than you. You are only believing what the whites have been telling you. Did you know that for centuries the people of Europe - that means white people - were considered backward and primitive by the Arab world?

When the Romans invaded Britain, the way you were invaded by the whites, they called them stupid and backward and savage.

And we were . . . (69)

Nkomo tells his fighters that though the white considered themselves to be superior and black Zimbabweans considered themselves to be inferior because it is taught by the whites. Blacks believe what the whites say but the reality is whites make the discourse. He gives the historical background when the whites were invaded by the Romans in the past they were treated as inferior therefore black Zimbabweans should not consider themselves to be less. It is only discourse made by them.

In the same way people like Mugabe too scold the whites to take their war in the peak. His method of uniting the comrades was to scold the whites, showing the exploitation and hatred done or undone by the whites so that his army can fight with more vigour and excited ness. He said in one interview:

We have been exploited, we have been ground down, we have had our country stolen from us. But it is they who have to be

given tender loving and care [...]. They pillaged, they murdered, they raped, they burned. When I asked the black people about their life this time some people start weeping or cursing the whites or both, for these savages wounded Zimbabwe. (146)

Blacks are exploited by the whites and their country is stolen from them. They have no mercy for the natives and they don't care about the economy. The whites captured almost all the land which belong to the blacks. They use the blacks in their farmhouse giving minimum wage and exploited them. Killing, rapping, burning the house are common for the whites which results that life of blacks become nothing higher than the animals. Blacks suffered a lot by the whites but the whites and their government has no concern for the betterment of their life. It results unity among the exploited blacks who fought against the ruling government. Therefore exploitation here is used by Mugabe to develop the feeling of nationalism. Blacks united themselves under the flag of nationalism. Therefore nationalism becomes the unifying symbol for the black Zimbabweans.

But if we see the situation of the whites and their government we find nationalism working on them to unite themselves against the blacks but in opposite way. They too unite the common whites against the blacks as done by the blacks. The white minority government ruling in Zimbabwe unites the whites giving the name nationalism. The common whites or the second generation of whites feel themselves to be the Zimbabweans but the problem is, they have the colonial mind filled by the rulers who think themselves to be superior and ruler, who have the right to rule over the blacks and civilize them. The whites were led by Ian Smith, the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia. When the blacks started the civil war under the leadership of Mugbe and

Nkomo by using the term nationalism and national unity white government too counter-attack them with the same slogan. By saying nationalism is in trouble, white government united all the whites to raise their voice to save the nation from crisis. People like Harry, Lessing's brother are the people who fought in the civil war from the government side. For the people like Harry "nationalism should be alive and it is they who can keep it alive"(216). Therefore the slogan nationalism united both blacks and whites differently. If we analyze the people like Smith we find that nationalism becomes a means to secure their power because he gives the speech about nationalism but uses it to keep himself in power. He neither involved himself in war nor has any positively towards Zimbabwe. He is only a British ruler whose work and job is fixed by British government from London.

Therefore, When we analyze the leaders both blacks and whites they are more or less the same. They utilize the word nationalism for their benefit and encourage the people to sacrifice their life for what? Simply either to keep them in power or to get power. What ever it may be, nationalism has been misused. If we see the history of the world, especially in the Third World the term nationalism has frequently been misused and the same happens in case of Zimbabwe as well. Here, violent or the negative form of nationalism 'Jingoism' has been applied. The concept of Jingoism will be discussed in the next chapter therefore it would be an attempt to show how it has been applied here. Mugabe in his political speech not only civilize the Britain but also the neighboring country South Africa. In his one political speech he said:

We are all convinced that southern Rhodesia was the best place on earth, and their administration worse than that of any other country. Britain wanted to be the master but they are bloodthirsty

and proudly people. Every white has pride in their blood, but their country Worse in the world. (272)

What Mugabe is trying is he is trying to unite the people, he needs more comrades for war and they are united against the whites more and more when they develop negativity towards Britain in general and whites in particular.

Nationality, ethnicity and race are always conflated in the African culture. To understand Zimbabwean nationalism ethnicity and race are to be understood. Zimbabwe is mostly populated by the blacks but was ruled by the minority of whites. Native blacks are the owners of the land. The whole Zimbabwe belongs to them but when the British invaded over it the land and all Zimbabwe is snatched from them. Nothing is given to the blacks except brutality. Whites always inferiorize them taking as "less than us" (96). Slowly the racial conflict takes the shape of war which flourished when it was linked with nationalism. The whites have a feeling that, "Africans are uncivilized because they are blacks and do not speak English" (77). What do they mean is the blacks are to be civilized and only the whites can civilize the blacks. When they colonize Zimbabwe they owned everything including land which was only the means of survival for the blacks. Therefore when Mugabe promised them to return back their land they started the war of independence. For them it is their war to get their land back. One black rural farmer said:

The whites stole our land, and now we want it back land the soil, the earth, had been taken from us. Through out the war of liberation Mugabe was making a promise, that when the whites are defeated, every black person would have land. (90)

The farmer is right that he has lost the earth, the soil and they are fighting to get it back. Here every blacks are promised to give their land back, therefore land becomes a symbol to unite them.

For Lessing the situation is not favorable before the civil war and even after the civil war. Being a daughter of white farmer she raised the voice, dedicate herself to the liberation of the blacks. Because of the political activity she was exiled to London for 25 years. Even after the liberation when she returned to her homeland, she was neglected and treated like other by the blacks assuming that she is white. Therefore, her feeling of nationalism is weaken by her own people. For Lessing nationalism is feeling which emerges in individuals mind for their country. Nationality and nationalism are related with the nation. For her if there is not a presence of nation, there will not be nationality. Her nation is Zimbabwe and her nationality also evolve around it.

It is undeniable that one of the essential human needs is the need to belong to a permanent country. Belonging to a particular country allows one to eliminate, minimize the feeling of loneliness. The virtue of this form of satisfying the need of belonging is like belonging to a family, it imposes on us no requirements of fulfilling any condition, it requires from us no merits or achievement and is given to us unconditionally. The feeling of belonging to a national community shapes the national identity and national culture. A sense of nationality has often been expressed through the idioms of kinship or home and that both idioms denote something to which one is nationally tied. If we analyze it from Lessing's point of view the case is exactly the same because she also wanted to create her identity belonging to a particular country Zimbabwe. Being excluded from her home land makes her lonely as she wrote "When I was young I was infinitely separated from Europe. Except through literature. When I came to England and became prohibited, the Africa I know was out of reach. Separation of my landscapes has always been my fate" (305). Throughout her life neither she is purely British nor Zimbabwean. So being without any national identity makes a person having without any identity. Belonging to a

particular country is like belonging to a particular family, person being in a family feels himself/herself to be secure, the case is same in the national level as well but when individual is taken out of the country he/she is socially and psychologically insecure. Opposite is the case, with the person living inside the country. Therefore nationality gives the security to individual.

When we locate the concept of nationalism in Zimbabwe, we must need different versions of nationalism as discussed by the critics. For example civic nationalism is exercised in those areas where there exist the civil society. Civic nationalism promotes the belief that society is united by the concept and importance of territoriality, citizenship, civil rights and legal codes, transmitted to all members of the group. So this version of nationalism is not existed in the Zimbabwean common people, neither with Lessing. There are many things like civil rights, legal codes, citizenship, concept of territoriality which are lacking in Zimbabwe as required by the definition. Another version of nationalism which is called Ethnic nationalism is very suitable and adoptable for Lessing in particular and the natives or Zimbabwe in general because according to the definition of Ethnic nationalism, it is determined by descent. Here boundaries are not chosen rather they are inherited. The bond is that of blood instead of land. It is generally assumed that ethnic nationalism incorporates a more collectivistic identity. In the novel, *African laughter: Four Visits to Zimbabwe*, ethnic nationalism is more powerful than civic nationalism because the natives of Zimbabwe are united with the ties of blood. Lessing too is connected to the Zimbabwean soil with the blood relation, her family, brother, father all lives in Zimbabwe and she also spent her early part of life in Zimbabwean soil therefore ethnic nationalism is more powerful than other forms of nationalism in this novel.

However, nation is considered to be "an imagined community" and nationalism as a discourse that validates that construction. But for Lessing her nation Zimbabwe is not imagined community. It is her mother land which has long history of straggle and existence. The people of Zimbabwe both blacks and whites have their own history of survival. When the British came, the country was dry with few people in it. They were on this adventure for the sake of the empire. Within a short time there was a town with banks, churches, hospital, schools and of course, hotels of the kind whose bars, then as now, were as important as the accommodation. Then the Africans were asked to sign on the paper. They did not know they were about to lose their country. They easily signed away their land when asked, for it was not part of their thinking that land, the earth can belong to one person rather than another. So both people for blacks and whites Zimbabwe is not an imagined community rather it is a real community where people have the sense of belonging under the umbrella of nationalism.

African laughter: Four Visits to Zimbabwe is a book about memory where she shows her nationalism. Lessing while revisiting her homeland evokes her childhood on an isolated farm and the bush, her parents and brother, African traditions and white custom. Being a daughter of British white father, she was neglected and treated as "other" by the black Zimbabwean people though she loves them. It's culture, its people, its land and wild all are dear to Lessing. But the psyche of the blacks had not been changed even after the independence, therefore, she is other in her own homeland.

Different critics interpret this novel differently but my interpretation and quest is different than those because this research will not show the novel as trauma, nostalgia or any sociological discourse neither it describe the novel as travel literature nor the of Marxist or of post-colonial rather my research will

be concentrated on how the feeling of nationalism has been developed on Lessing while revisiting her homeland and how she has the attachment to the country after being exiled for 25 years. She loves Zimbabwe; its culture, its people both blacks and whites. Her opposition to the white minority government being a white is also an example of nationalism. But the xenophobic mind of the black Zimbabweans and their psyche of not accepting Lessing as Zimbabwean will also be discussed in my research.

II. Nationalism

This section seeks to shed light on the introductory concept of the term nation and nationalism. Nationalism is considered to be the policy of asserting the interest of one's own nation, viewed as separate from the interests of other nation or the common interest of the all nations. Human beings have formed groups of various kinds around criteria that are used to distinguish us from them. One of these groups is the nation many thousands, indeed millions, have died in wars on behalf of their nation, as they did in World War First and Second during twentieth century, perhaps the cruelest of all centuries. This section examines the various facets of the concept of nation and nationalism.

Oxford English Dictionary defines nationalism as the desire by a group of the people who share the same race, culture, language etc. to form an independent country or a feeling of love for and pride in their country which builds up that our country is better than any other country. Where as *English Literature A-Z* defines nationalism as the emotion or the doctrine according to which human egotism and its passion are expanded so as to become identical with the nation-state. It is obviously not the same things as a race or the state. It may be provisionally defined as a body of people who feel them to be naturally linked together by certain affinities which are so strong and real for them that they can live happily together, are dissatisfied when disunited, and can not tolerate subjection to people who do not share these ties. The occupation of a defined geographical area with a character of its own is often assumed to be one to constitute a nation. Undoubtedly the most clearly marked nation have commonly enjoyed a geographical unity, and have often owned their nationhood in part to these fact, and the love of the soil on which they have been bred, and of its characteristics landscapes. But geographical unity is by no means essential to nationhood. It is possible to imagine a nation widely scattered like the Greeks, over areas of very

different characters, and yet retaining a strong sense of its unity. Geographical unity may help to make a nation, but it is not indispensable nor is it main source of nationhood.

Again unity of race is often supposed to be an essential element of nationhood. Yet there is no nation in the world that is not of mixed race; and there has never been a race (Teutonic, Slavonic, Celtic or the like) which has succeeded in including all its members within a single national unity. Racialism (that is, the belief in the fundamental antipathy between races) much more than nationalism has been the enemy of peace and those who speak of the national spirit as the source of war are generally thinking of the racial rather than the national idea. What turned the national movement in Germany into a curse and a danger to Europe was, owing mainly to the race idolatry of German historian and philologists, it was turned from a national into a racial movement. Racialism, with its assertion of the existence of fundamental antipathies between races, and of the inherent superiority of one race to another, is the very antithesis of nationalism; for the national principle begins by recognizing that nation may be, and maintains only that whenever a coherent body of people have developed, by dwelling together, ties of affinity which make it easy for them to understand one another, they have a right to enjoy their own modes of life in freedom.

The third factor in nationality, which is far more important than race, is unity of language; unquestionably unity of language is a binding force of the utmost importance, more especially because the colour and quality of language largely determined the color and quality of the thought of those who use it. Yet, unity of language does not necessarily bring national unity, and disunity of language does not necessarily prevent it. Unity of language though it is of great potency as a nation-building force, is neither indispensable to the growth of nationality, nor sufficient of itself to create it.

It is probable that the most potent of all nation-molding factors the one indispensable which must be present whatever else be lacking, is the possession of a common traditions, a memory of sufferings endured and victories won in common expressed in song and legend, in the dear names of great personalities that seem to embody in themselves the character and ideas of the nation, in the name also to sacred places wherein the national memory is enshrined. As Ernest Renan in his *Nation and Narration* remarks:

Nationality is an elusive idea, difficult to define. It can not be tested or analyses by formulae, least of all must it be interpreted by the brutal and childish doctrine of racialism. Its essence is sentiment; and in the last resort we can only say that a nation is a nation because its members passionately and unanimously believe it to be so. (43)

They can only believe it to be so if their exist among them real and strong affinities; if they are not divided by any artificially maintained separation between the mixed races from which they are sprung; if they share a common basis of fundamental moral idea ,such as are must easily implanted by common religious beliefs; if they can glory in a common inheritance of tradition, and their nationality will be all the stronger if to these courses of unity they add a common language and literature and common body of law. If these ties, or the majority of them, are lacking the assertion of nationality ca not be made good. For ever if it be for the moment shared by the whole people, as soon as they begin to try to enjoy the freedom and unity which they claim in the name of nationality, they will fall asunder, and their freedom will be their ruin.

Nationality, since it is not solely or ever mainly based upon racial homogeneity, can be nursed into existence even where most of the elements of unity are to begin with lacking. But it is a tender plant ; an any attempt to force its growth with undue speeds must lead to disaster. The nationality is in fact not a necessary

condition of civilized human life and not a natural and obvious mode of political organization; during the greater part of the world's history, and over the greater part of the world's surface, the very idea of it has never existed. It is a conception, and a mode of political organization.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2005) has defined nationalism focusing on two phenomena: attitude that the members of a nation have when they care about their national identity and the actions that the members of a nation take when seeking to achieve self-determination. The first definition centers on the common origin, ethnicity and cultural ties. Nationalism seeks similarity out of differences, and emphasizes on unity. Nationalism is indeed a feeling of unity with a group beyond one's immediate family and friends. It is purely based on abstract theorization, so nationalism is a mental construct.

Anshuman Mondal, however, characterizes nationalism as a political movement. For him "nationalism is a form of cultural politics. It is political because it is a movement which desires to seize, control or break away from and create its own start"(22). Eric Hobsbawm also considers "nationalism as a political principle and national unit should be congruent" (9). Thus, the structure of homogeneity as imagined by nationalism remains the same all the time. This political movement holds that a nation usually defined in terms of ethnicity or culture has the right to constitute an independent or autonomous political community based on a shared history and common identity.

Nationalism is also an ideological movement. A person who agrees to it is Anthony Smith for whom "nationalism is ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity and identity for a population which some of its members deem to constitute an actual and potential nation" (9). Besides in M. Freden's opinion, "nationalism is an ideology about individuated being. It is an ideology in which social

reality concerned in terms of nationhood is endowed with the reality of natural things" (750).

M. Crawford Young elaborates nationalism as an ideology that claims that a given human population has a natural solidarity based on shared history and a common destiny. This collective identity as a historically constituted people crucially entails the right to constitute an independent or autonomous political community. Nationalism highlights the popular sentiments evoked by the idea of the nation.

Many theorists however agree on a single point that a nation is a community of people who share some belief and thus they are bounded by some culture, economy, etc. They are guided by collective consciousness. This collectivity of persons, to Hobsbawm, has the same ethnic origin and generally speaks the same language and possesses a common tradition. As regards to all history of nationalism, the theorists have their own distinct argument according to Anthony Smith:

History of nationalism is decidedly modernist. It starts in the last quarter of the eighteenth century from the partitions of Poland and the American revolution through the French revolution to the reaction to Napoleon's conquest in Prussia, Russia, and Spain. Nationalism according to this view, was born during these forty years of revolution. (87)

Grosby locates the history of nationalism from the viewpoint of England. It according to him begins with England in the 16th and 17th centuries and France in the 18th century. For him religion, law, and language are the formative factors of nationalism. Anthony Smith further contends that, "dating the nation goes in hand in hand with shaping of nation" (34). For him nationalism is typically a product of modernity or modernization.

The history of nation and nationalism begins with the age of patriotism from where it may have started from. This sense of patriotism leads to the unification

movement leading to the sense of territorially bounded community but unfortunately, this reached to the false Zenith along with the development of fascism and Nazism between the two great wars. Just after it, the development of nationalism in the form of ethnicity, religion and liberation movement knocked at the door of nation, finally in the era of conflict and globalization, the nation moves towards the end or towards an era of post-nationalism. There are fierce arguments about the types of nationalism. For Margaretta Mary Nikolas, there are typically two types of nationalism (a) civic nationalism (b) ethnic nationalism.

Civic nationalism is exercised in those areas where there exist a civil society. It expects that it belongs to the same society community guided by the same law and that the territory and people must belong together. For civic nationalism the vital bond is law. It is in another word a pursuit, as Nikolas describes :

Towards attaining a unified culturally homogeneous group housed within already existent specific political boundaries. The starting point for civic nationalism is the state and the pursuit by this state of its own nation congruent with its territorial borders. (11)

Nikolas further elaborates that civic nationalism promotes the belief that society is united by the concept and importance of territoriality, citizenship, civic rights and legal codes, transmitted to all members of the group. That is the reason why Smith remarks that "citizenship" is the foundation of civic nationalism. (136)

Moreover civic nationalism is believed to be complementary to liberal democracy. It is likely to have advocated the high culture. Viewed in this way as Anthony Smith claims civic nationalism is very far from accommodating the group claims of different cultures. This failure has led to the empowerment of ethnic nationalism

Ethnic nationalism refers to nationalism as determined by descent. Here boundaries are not chosen rather they are inherited. In other words, the bond is that of blood instead of law. It is generally assumed that ethnic nationalism incorporates a

more collectivistic identity. To Nikolas, ethnicity is an element that can provide this required similarity or ethnic homogeneity .it promotes the belief that communities are formed on the basic of ethic of ethnicities.

In comparison to the civic nationalism, the principle of ethnic nationalism has become more powerful. This is particularly due to the formative factors of this nationalism. In Nikolas's view:

The elements that are the core of ethnicity and ethnic nationalism memory ,value ,myth and symbolism draw from blood ties ,bonds to the land and native traditions inferring that ethnic nationalism represents that which is subjective within nationalism. (13)

Nothing is more attaching to human beings than blood ties .it is due to this reason, ethnic nationalism has become vibrant than civic nationalism .civic nationalism's failure to incorporate the general public sentiments and suppression of high class people towards the minority class ,ethnic nationalism often said to have taken negative positive to civic nationalism John Hutchinson has suggested that ethnic nationalism to be a reactionary nationalism, constructed as negative .another theorist to support civic nationalism is Ernest Galliner .He focuses on civil society.

According to Margareta Mary Nikolas civic nationalism and ethnic nationalism are not actually set against each other. She said

Civic and ethnic nationalism are not . . . part of a dichotomy of nationalism set against one another but are intermingling components of the one ideology and subjectivity of modern nationalism. (30)

Taking her view into consideration, both civic and ethnic nationalism are the two sides of the same coin. In short, for both posit that communities are to be culturally homogeneous, or the nation should be a homogeneous unity, and congruent as well, so they have taken only a different route to achieve that goal.

Many theorists on nation and nationalism have agreed on the point that, for whatever and how, nation is a construct. Anthony Smith, for instance, posits that “the nation is socially constructed” (78), thus he has emphasized on social engineering as formative factor for nation. This factor also includes skill and imagination. Eric Hobsbawm agrees on a social construction of nation but with different points. He believes:

Nations are construct of fabrications of the social engineers, like technical inventions. They are planned and put together by elite craftsman. There is no room for emotion or moral will’, not even on the part of the masses. The latter are passive victims of elite social designs, which seek to channel their newly released energies. Nations and nationalisms are the modern panel at circumstance. (81)

Quite related with social engineering are religion and media which play a greater role in the construction of nation. As far as religion is concerned, Stevan Grosby is one to notify this fact for him:

Religion sustains the nation, because the worship of such a god, as the god of the land, unifies the land and its inhabitants into a culturally relatively conform territorial communities of the nations.

The role of religion as a factor in the emergence and continuation of the relatively territorial cohesion of the previously culturally fragmented societies into nation. (82-83).

Moreover, centrality is the product of the collective consciousness. Living under the same geographical area or speaking the same language, living in the same condition of a conflict free unity, they are as assumed by nationalism, the inhabitants of a relatively uniform territorial culture. As Anshuman Mondal believes “It seeks to unify the disparity of culture within a certain delimited boundary”(27). Moreover nationalism according to him is an expression of homogeneity. It is assumed that in

order to become a nation as Robert Young believes "the people of a nation should resemble each other as closely as possible" (60).

Nation particularly in the era of political liberation is taught with the problematic relations between nationalists elite seem to speak on behalf of the people but function to keep people disempowered do not recognize the role played by less privileged individuals or group in resisting colonial rule"(qtd. in John McLeod.108). Similarly, in Guha's view nationalism supports elitism and fails to bear witness to the different activities and arguments of the people.

The nationalism viewed as constructed discourse lies deep at ambivalent level. Homi K. Bhabha comes at front to notice such ambivalence. He believes that nationalist representations which are highly unstable and fragile constructions can not promise the unity they promise due to two ambivalent positions such as pedagogic and per formative. The promised idealized unity and homogeneity collapse in the struggle between pedagogic and per formative double temporality.

As a result of double narrative movement: pedagogic and per formative, and the necessity of both narrative at the same time in nationalism in order to exist, the nation is split by what Bhabha calls the conceptual ambivalence. There fore the nation can not give what it promises. The result is that it always remains in crisis.

Homi K. bhabha's argument is that the differences within the soul concept hinder the goal that this concept hopes to achieve. Though nationalism attempts to obtain essence origin and homogeneity, its inability to combine the failure of national ideology. Anthony Eastrope gets himself involved in these arguments. Bringing idea from Derrida, he claims that:

The unity which nation, on this showing conceives itself to be is impossible; within the register of philosophic discourse (more or less) Derrida could refer to the impossibility of any such self presence to the

priority of the difference as its condition of as its condition of
existence. (22)

Besides, this interplay of difference, the postcolonial nationalism has also faced many such contradictions. Its main problem has been its exclusive preoccupations with homogeneous or monolithic national identities, a tendency, according to Elleke Boehmer, that in recent year "has led to the emergence of communist movement world wide and ethnic conflict on a grand scale" (349).

Since the early 1980s, the resurgence of scholarly interest in the figure of the nation has been characterized by a sustained critical interrogation of it. It is not generally accepted that the nation is not a primordial category, fixed and unchanging. Rather it is the product of a specific historical movement, born as the European world slowly emerged into modernity, from cradle of what Eric Hobsbawm calls "the dual revolution" at the end of the eighteenth century, one which transformed it's the political contours of Europe, the other which transformed its economic field of production, each of them trailing in its wake the great social upheavals that lay the basis for the kind of the world.

Many thinkers give their own views about the most debatable term nation. The field of study of nation can be divided into two main camps; those who believe that the nation is primarily a cultural category, are called culturalist and those who consider it to be primarily a political category are called statist. For the culturalist the nation can be defined as a cultural community which exist above and beyond any political organization of it into a state; it is therefore pre-political. These cultural communities, which Anthony D. Smith terms ethnic, provide the basis for modern nations. They are more or less culturally homogeneous on the basis of what he terms a myth-symbol, complex which forms a fund of shared historical meanings to which very possessor of that culture has access, which bonds a people together and which lies that people to a historic territory or home land .The nation is therefore a

collectivity of meaning, a bond embedded in history through common myths, symbols narratives and other cultural forms, all of which enable a people to know itself as a communality as opposed to other who don't have access to this fund of historical mimesis. This ethnic therefore, placed upon tern formations that create modern nations. Thus the nation could be seen as the product of modernity only is so far as the era of nationalism succeeded in uniting the community on a pre-political basis. For these scholars, if politics is important it is only because it is the expression of a pre-existing nation the nation exists objectively regardless of whether it is organized politically or not.

For statist, on the other hand, the nation is primarily a political category. Earnest Gellner points out in the opening sentence of his *book Nation and Nationalism* is primarily a political principal principle which holds that the political and national unit should be congruent" (1).The statist believe that the figure of the nation emerges as a solution to the –political problems faced at the end of the eighteenth century as a result of increasing modernization, the industrial and French revolutions and the massive sociopolitical problems at the end of the eighteenth century as a result of increasing modernization the industrial and French revolutions and the massive socio-political upheavals they engendered ,and of transformations in the relationship between the state and 'society Geller points out that "nationalism emerges only in milieus in which the existence of the state is already very much taken for granted and in so far so statist believe nations to be the result of nationalist political, the existence of "politically centralized units has a definitive rather than merely expressive impact upon the formation of nations".(4)

It is not surprising that definitions of nationalism have attempted to combine its multiple aspects. Each of these aspects is constructed and does not constitute a "natural" element. Thus Emerson (1960) defined nationalism as:

A community of people who feel that they belong together in the double sense they belong share deeply significant elements of a common heritage and they have a common destiny for the future . . .

[it] has become the body which legitimizes the state. (95-96)

So it would be more exact to argue that, identity and position by means of a cultural also develop the sense of nationalism, generates and love towards the national. A nation is simply there. The geographic borders that are united by ties of blood, language and cultural all of which are believed to be spontaneous expressions of some national essence limit it. Anderson says that the concept of "nation in the contemporary world designates a number of controversial issues. No critics interested in discussion before there prevailed no notion of nation before the Anglo-Saxon period"(74). The Germanic tribes planted the first seeds of nationalism in the Anglo-Saxon world when they attacked the Romans. Basically the notion of nationalism developed towards the eighteenth century after the development of the print capitalism, the French Revolution and the American Declaration of Independence. Critics like Ernest Renan, the eighteenth century historian adopt the romantic attitude about nation. Renan contends that the nation is not something that can be objectively defined. People argue that nation is a dynastic principle. Renan defines nation in terms of spiritual consciousness as he writes:

A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle. Only two things actually constitute this or this spiritual principle. One lies in the past, one in the present. One is the possession in the common of a rich legacy of memories; the other is present day consent, the desire to live together [...]. The nation, like the individual, is the culmination of a long past of endeavors. Sacrifice, and devotion of all cults, that of ancestors is the most legitimate, for the ancestors have made us what we are; a

heroic past, great man, glory[...] this is the social capital upon which one bases a national idea[. . .].(19)

Renan contends that the sacrificial past plays immaculate domain in the formation of nation. The heroic past teaches people to perform still more or sacrificial deeds to be made live in the future. He implies the fact that " nation is not something"(20). They had "their beginnings and they will end"(20). Furthermore Renan discusses about who creates nation and he says" a large aggregate of men, healthy in mind and warm of heart, creates the kinds of the moral conscience which we call a nation"(20). Joanna Sullivan in his article *The Question of National Literature for Nigeria* contradicts with Renan who argues," nineteenth century nationalist theatric, which mused romantically upon the consent and will of the people who desires to live together with warmth of heart"(71).He opines that twentieth century criticism has stressed the homogenous idea of nation. Benedict Anderson's *Imagined communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* marks an important landmark in dealing with the discussion and debates concerning the nation. Anderson agrees with Tom Narin who also emphasis the controversies inherent in the concept of nation and nationalism, Anderson quotes Narin as:

Nationalism is the pathology of modern developmental history, as inescapable as neurosis in the individual, with much the same essential ambiguity attaching to it, a similar build in capacity for decent into dementia rooted in the dilemma of helplessness trust upon most of the world and largely incurable. (qtd. In Anderson 5)

Despite the underlying ambiguities related to nation and nationalism, Anderson defines nation"[...] as an imagined political community, and imaginary as both inherently limited and sovereign"(6). Anderson elaborates his definition saying that "nation is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them or even hear them, vet in the minds of each

lives the image of their communication"(6). He further argues that nation is "larger than primordial village which used to have face to face contacts are imagined"(6).He adds "the nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them encompassing perhaps a billion living human being has finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie other nation"(7). No doubt, the recent views like European confederation and the antique Christian conception of Christian planate are oneness of the world due to variable difficulties.

Nation" Is imagined as sovereign because the concept was born in an as in which enlightenment and revolutions were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm"(7). No nation could be under the shadow abstract orthodoxical god after enlightenment. The people of a nation sought for freedom from any cult that would define human being as sinners since the fall. Also they couldn't believe that the rulers were sent by god. This loss of belief was decisively demonstrated beheading of the king of France, Louis XIV. At last Anderson justified that "nation is imagined as community because regardless of actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship"(7). It is this "fraternity makes it possible [...], for so many of people not so much to kill ,as willing to die such limited imagines"(7).

The critical use of the phrase nation state is interesting. Nation-state in modern sense is a political community differentiated from other such communities from the reason that it is autonomous concept, having its legal codes and governmental structures, head of a state boundaries, system of military defense etc. The nation state has it's symbolic features which serve to present its identity in unified terms: a flag , national anthem ,a popular self image etc.to be an autonomous nation –state , nationality , ethnicity, culture or language do not suffice ; it implies the political , social and economic modes of organization. Thus, nation- states have political autonomy, different norms and codes with regard to their system relations and

relatively independent economic identity. Sullivan's dichotomy between nation and state clarifies underlying differences and relations between them. Defining the state he says "the state is marked by tangible, observable, recognizable set of facts. The state has borders, central government, population, an economy and bureaucracy, all of which to maintain and perpetuate continuity "(69). On the other hand, nation constitutes itself through the will and the imagination the citizens of the state. The health of the nation depends on the each citizen's desire to identify with entire population of the nation despite racial, ethnic or religious differences

However, the concept nationalism has different meaning relating various level of analysis: nationalism "as an ideology, a movement the process of nation and nation state building and individual's political orientation"(Sullivan. 71). Moreover, several different types and intensities of nationalism are distinguished in disconnected ways. A prime example is that the notion nationalism is often focused with other national orientations, such as national pride. Similar view can be found Koterman and Fashbach's 1989 study in the United State; a nationalist is characterized as someone who thinks that the first duty among others is to honor national history and heritage. Any way we consider nationalism as an individual's attitude. An attitude is a particular among of affection for a certain object that is "simply a person's general feelings of favorableness or unfavorableness "(54). National attitude differs in the type (positive or negative) and strength (moderate, very and extremely positives of negatives) of affections. • We derive six expectations from this simple implication.

The one neutral five positive national attitudes can be distinguished on their basis of the difference in type and strength of affection. The basis neutral national affection is the national feeling (feeling of belonging to one's people and country). The five positive national attitude are national liking (like one's people and country), national preference (preferring one's people and country over others), national

superiority (feeling that one's people and country are superior to others) and finally, nationalism (feeling absence of belonging to a particular nation with common origin, wanting to keep that nation, as pure as possible and deriving to establish and or maintain a separate independent state for that particular nation. We assumed that individual's national attitude can be inferred from the responses of agreement, disagreement to particular statement regarding one's country and people. Nationalism is thus expected to be one of the five different positive attitudes towards one's country and people. Nationalism preference and national superiority include – contrary to national feeling, liking and pride from of intern – group comparison and even discrimination (nationalism). It can then be inferred that a positive national attitude gives an individual a (moderated very or extremely positive) national identity, and it also severs to satisfy the need for a sense of positive self – identity. The first determinant is previously experienced national emotions. Finlyson cautioned that" to study nationalism and ignore its effective, emotional aspect would be folly"(146). A national emotion is a strong feeling relating to one's country and people, and is accompanied by physical reaction and change in readiness for action. National emotion is intensity (Marcus and Mackven, 1993). National emotion is expected to influence national attitude not only directly but also indirectly through their influence on national beliefs. In general, national emotions, coupled with rudimentary belief are often developed early in life. Emotions are acquired through experiencing emotional events such as national rituals.

National emotions, national belief; national behaviors, attitude towards ethnic minorities, and attitude towards foreign people and country can be explained an important part of the individual's national/ political/ socialization. We expect that individual first acquired national feelings through national emotion developed through national rituals and initial motivation signals from parents. Because individual need to have a positive sense of identity, they will be motivated to perceive predominately

favorable, characteristics about their country and fellow nationals (because they have no realistic choices of country and people, and also few realistic options to alter their circumstances). This motivates them to develop positive belief .

About one's country and people, and also to develop through this belief a national feeling when people develop national liking they will continue to strive for a sense of positive identity because they will be motivated to continue participation in national rituals, and hence strength their own positive national emotion. They also will be motivated to receive positive information about their country, people, history and symbols (e.g. reading literature that honors the deeds of a national hero). In school they may be taught in a single national history and culture that contradicts those of out groups. These emotions and new belief may result in "national pride". Because individual will continue to strive towards a positive self- identity, they will tend to observe more similarities among fellow nationals than with other non-nationals and also to develop less position or even negative attitude towards other nationalist. The positive attitude towards other country and people May also be supported by highly positive information about them, and negative information about other countries and people that may be received from parents or others relatives, teachers, or mass media personnel; by reading, hearing, seeing information directly from mass media or from political leaders emphasizing national successes in comparison to others. Once the negative attitudes towards the others nationalist living in the country and foreign countries and their people have developed, individual will tend to be less open to any contradictory information about these groups and countries, and will also tend to ignore , reject distort or forget this kind of information. People with a low sense of positive self identity are more motivated then others to develop such negative emotions, belief and attitudes toward minorities and foreign people and countries.

Perceptions of competitions and conflict with these minorities and foreign countries and people especially but not exclusively received from political leader, mass media and military serve trainers may enhance the favoring of one's country and people this may result in development "national preference" the stronger the preference becomes the more negatives attitude towards others may become. National preference then leads to national superiority. National superiority may be acquired individually however, it can also be conditioned by parents or other relatives, participation in service organization with nationally orientated religious affiliation, national symbols such as a flag or the head of the state(such as through enormous human reconstruction of the national flag at athletics events and huge portraits of national leaders on billboards). Reading news papers that express national superiority, listening to and or singing national songs frequently, and observing (directly through mass media) statements of political leaders emphasizing national superiority.

Individual may develop the attitude of nationalism. Nationalism developed when the contents of national socialization maintain a common origin ancestry or pure as possible and to establish or maintain a separate independent state. If necessary, incorporating within the border of that state all group that is considered to belong to that nation. This action might force other nationalities or nation and ethnicities inside the country to leave, leading to the end of all international cooperation. These messages will be the most attractive for people who have a very low sense of positive identity or suffer from crisis.

One of the strangest foci for resistance to imperial control in colonial societies has been the idea of nation. It is the concept of a shared community, one which Benedict Anderson calls an imagined community (Anderson 15) which has enabled post colonial societies to invent to self image through which they could act to liberate themselves from imperialist oppression however Fanon was also one of the earliest

theorists to warn of the pitfalls of the national consciousness, of its becoming an empty shell a travesty of what it might have been .The danger of national bourgeoisie using nationalism to maintain its own power demonstrates one of the principles dangers of nationalism that it frequently takes over the hegemonic control of imperial power, thus replicating the condition it rises up to combat. It develops as a function of this control, a monocular and sometimes xenophobic view of identity and a coercive view of national commitment.

Now most recently flurry of theoretical activity has made the nation and nationalism one of the most debated topics of contemporary theory. We have sought to illustrate the importance of this attempt of re-theorizing nationalism through the wry of Timothy Brennan and Homi K. Bhabha. .As Brennan notes "the rising number of studies on nationalism in the past three decades reflects its lingering almost atmospheric insistence in our thinking "(64). We could also say that the interest in nationalism throughout the world reflects the growing disillusionment in postmodern Europe with nationalism and its excuses .post colonial societies are increasingly wary therefore of that neo-universalism internationalism which subsumes them within mono-centric or Europe dominated networks of politics and cultures. Although nation, like race has only the most tenuous theoretical purchase in political practice it has continued to be what Anderson describes as "the most universally legitimate value in the political life of our time" (Anderson 12). while nationalism operated as a general force of resistance in the earlier times in post-colonial societies, a perception of its hegemonic and 'monologic' status in growing .From the point of view of literary theory ,nationalism is of special interest since its rise ,a Brennan and Bhabha note is contemporaneous with the rise of the most dominant modern literacy forms, at least in European and European influenced cultures –that of the novel .These of the "fictive quality of the political concept itself"(Brennan61).In this sense the story of the nation and the narrative form of the modern novel inform each other in a complex,

reflective way. Like wise, Mike Featherstone says that a nation is an abstract collectivity. It is true that "a nation is primarily a cultural community "(Dziemidok 84).A common culture lies at the basis of ethnic and national identity unifying a given groups. Dziemidok admits that “both an ethnic community and nation are collectivities which are defined by relative identity and relative distinctions and unifying force” (Huntington 28).love for one’s own nation and culture often turn into hatred towards others nation and culture. Supporting this Sinisa Males Evic argues:

Nationalist ideology defends our right to collective difference. It seeks to provide us with the meanings, souls, and positive, emotion of solidarity, affection and love. Group's membership is a precondition for solidarity .However, too much affection towards group members (cultural group of very often leads to animosity and hostility towards those who don’t belong to it. (581)

Besides, since the nation is "an imagined political community "(Anderson 15) and "a discursive formation "(Foucault 385), it is "potent side of control and domination within modern society "(Ashcroft etal. 150).such nation formation can not lesson the plight of the minorities and the downtrodden. It only represents and consolidates the interests of the dominant power groups' .Thus, in the contemporary theory of nation and nationalism there exist the political interest of the power groups. A nation can not remain within the definite political entity having internal heterogeneities and differences .So in the age of globalization and modern diversity our main concern should not be “whether we have national but what kind of nation we have, whether that is, they insist on an exclusionary myth of national unity based on some abstraction such as race, religion or ethnic exclusivity or they embrace plurality and multiculturalism”. (Ascroft etal.155)

Another concept of nationalism has been developed in 19th century. It is also considered as a negative or violent form of nationalism which is called “Jingoism”.

Jingoism is defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as “extreme patriotism in the form of aggressive foreign policy” (831). In practice, it refers to the advocacy of the use of threats or actual force against other countries in order to safeguard what they perceive as their country’s national interests, and colloquially to excessive bias in judging one’s own country as superior to others—an extreme type of nationalism. The term originated in Britain, expressing a pugnacious attitude towards Russia in the 1870s. During the 19th century in the United States, journalists called this attitude spread-eagleism. Jingoism did not enter the U.S. vernacular until near the turn of the 20th century. This nationalistic belligerence was intensified by the sinking of the battleship USS Maine in Havana harbour that led to the Spanish American war of 1898.

The chorus of a song by G.H. Mac Derm (Singer) and G. W. Hunt (song writer) commonly sung in British Pubs and music halls around the times of the Russo-Turkish war gave birth to the term. The lyrics had the chorus:

We don't want to fight but by jingo if we do

We have got the men,

We have the money too

We have fought the Bear before, and while

We're Britons true

The Russians shall not have Constantinople

The phrase "by jingo" was a long established minced oath, used to avoid saying "by Jesus". Referring to the song, the specific term "jingoism" was coined as a political label by the prominent British radical George Holyoake in a letter to the *Daily News* on 13 March 1878. The term eventually caught on in the United States Of America.

Early uses of the term Jingoism in the U.S.A. were connected to the foreign policy of Theodor Rossevelt, who was frequently accused of jingoism. In an 8

October 1895 *New York Times* interview, he responded. "There is much talk about jingoism. If by jingoism they mean to a policy in pursuance of which Americans will with resolution and common sense insist upon our rights being respected by foreign powers then we are 'jingoese'."

The policy of appeasement towards Hitler led to satirical references to the loss of jingoistic attitudes in Britain. In the 28 March 1938 issue of *punch* appeared an E.H. Shepard cartooned entitled *The Old-Fashioned Customer*. Set in a record shop, John Bull asks the record seller (Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain): "I wonder if you have got a song I remember about not wanting to fight but if we do . . . something ,something ,something . . . we have got the money too" (31). On the wall is a portrait of the Victorian prime Minister Lord Salisbury. The term crops up in popular culture, notably films. In a review for a latest film in the Rambo series, author David Morrell describe the character of Rambo: first Blood part II and Rambo III as being a "Jingoistic character". Jingo is also the title of a novel by Terry Pratchett, depicting a pointless war between two great states over a tiny island.

So after analyzing all the definitions of nation and nationalism, its area and different opinions and claims by different critics we conclude that nationalism can not be defined by fixed definition. It is not a fixed term which can be covered by single definition rather it a mental construct and abstract term. Nationalism is a feeling which germinates in the mind of individual belonging to the particular country. It varies from place to place and person to person. Individual belonging to the particular nation in particular geographical area may have different opinion than the person another locality. In the someway there is no fixed idea about how much area does it cover. Does it limit itself to the national level or it goes beyond the national limitation is still a matter of debate among the critics. Though there are some violent a negative forms of nationalism which sometime cause national disaster in the world history. In some countries, political leaders and kings snatched the power by using nationalism

which for them is only a means to be authoritative as done by done by Hitler and somehow Gyanendra as well. Therefore, there is also group of intellectuals who do not hesitate to say that it is a fake concept which should be erased from the people's mind and there should be the concept of 'Global citizenship'.

III. Nationalist Consciousness of Lessing in *African Laughter: Four Visits to Zimbabwe*

Having known the fact that this novel *African laughter: Four Visits to Zimbabwe* aptly recounts the story of the writer's visits to Zimbabwe in different times. As she was a prohibited immigrant, she revisits her homeland after the independence. So, this book is mainly the description of her revisiting homeland in 1982 to 1992. Since the novel has subsumed manifold issues on the assumption that it expounded the events of war devastated Africa in general and Zimbabwe in particular. People associate their identity with the desire for reorganization, sovereignty, liberation and protection over time and space. They build up as such desire by identifying themselves with reference to their territories or boundaries mainly for the sake of protection, freedom, solidarity among them. But the fact is that too much affection and love towards own nation, at times, generates animosity and hostility other nations. by exposing pre and post colonial situations, cultural dislocation, anxieties, identity crisis, violent event and the traumatic life of the Zimbabwean people, Lessing in the novel dramatizes the identities created by ethnicity culture and the split arbitrary demarcation of national boundaries as fake concept that functions no positive act.

When Lessing returns back to her homeland in 1982 after 25 years, she cried and wept for along time, past memories comes in her mind like a film as she wrote:

When I returned to the country where I had lived for twenty five years, arriving as a child of five and leaving as a young woman of thirty, it was after an interval of over twenty- five years. This was because i was prohibited immigrant. You can not be forbidden the land you grow up in, so says the web of sensations, memories, experience that binds you to that landscape. (11)

For Lessing every individual has right to live in his/her country, has right to liberty. Individual belonging to a particular nation has right to protest the government if it is against the peoples will. No government can snatch the individual's right to live in his / her country merely because he/she is protesting for people's right to live. Lessing was a victim of the then white minority government which seize her right to live in Zimbabwe merely because she not in their side. When Lessing was declared as a prohibited citizen and was not allowed to live southern Rhodesia, she cannot believe in her eyes then the preparation began. Her love for land and its people were so much so that she responses like this:

I was unjustly excluded form my own best self. I dreamed the same dream, night after night. I was in the bush, or in Salisbury, but I was there illegally, without papers. My people that is, the whites, with who after all I had grown up, were coming to escort me out of the country, white to my people, the blacks, amiable multitudes, I was invisible.

(12)

Here, two things are noteworthy, according to Lessing she was excluded from her own best self. She was taken out from the land which was her own. The word own creates the feeling on to the readers mend that she loves southern Rhodesia and thinks itself to be her own. Another is, her address to both blacks and whites as my people: she refers Rhodesia as my own land and people both blacks and whites as my people. So the feeling nationalism and love towards its people is so much deep in her heart that she feels everything belonging to southern Rhodesia, is her own.

When the British came to Zimbabwe in 1890, they did not have any mission except collecting the riches and rule over the natives. They (natives form southern Rhodesia) were unable to understand the foreigners policy "the African did not know they were about to lose their country. They easily signed away their land, the earth our mother can belong to one person rather than another"(4). In the beginning they did

not take much notice of the ridiculous invaders, though they sensed the warning of evil times. soon they found they had indeed lost everything, they were pursued and forced to work as servants and laborers, and when they refused, something called a Poll Tax was imposed, and when they did not pay up- they could not, since money was not something they used- then soldiers and policemen came with guns and told them they must earn the money to pay the tax. This tax, a small sum of money was the most powerful cause of change in the old tribal societies. When the atrocity of the British was exceeding, because of the foreigners exploitation the natives were uniting slowly and gradually among themselves.

Feeling of nationalism was emerging in the peoples mind because of the colonization. Anti- colonial movements turn out to be national movement in southern Rhodesia. The nationalist movement of southern Rhodesia, encouraged by the success of their northern allies, formented trouble most successfully, everywhere. The whites would have compromised and shared power with the blacks. But the minorities of the whites, let by Ian Smith were determined to fight for white supremacy. There was no date for the start of that war," which slowly simmered into one of the nastiest conflicts of our time" (7). The blacks were not wholly united, they were too, infinitely divided. Not only were three different armies with different leaders and ideas, there was division in the armies themselves. Robert Mugabe's army was only one, but was the most extreme, communist, or Marxist, and white the war went on most people thought that majority of the blacks would choose Joshua Nkomo or Bishop Muzorewa, moderates and democrats. Here we find nationalism is taken as a weapon utilized by the freedom fighters in the struggle against foreign rulers. War against a common enemy unites the people form different localities, blacks though they are from different geo-political background united themselves being variation among them.

The young nation Zimbabwe came in to being in 1980. It took ninety years for its independence. The first decade of Zimbabwe's history was a tale of violence and discord; was contradictory, ebullient, and always surprising. But the concept of the local black people about Zimbabwe is different, they think that "this was still God's own country"(14). Every individual consider his/her country to be superior and more than other country as thought by the common Zimbabwean people. When Lessing returned to Zimbabwe in 1982, she "went out into the dry scented air and wept".(14) She was so much emotionally attached by that country that she could not control herself, tears-ducts that she hardly saw the streets. She was so happy on her own in the streets of the town that was once her big city.

Lessing returned back to Zimbabwe from England for nation building because it was a devastated country because of the ten year civil war. Most of whites left the country and the black do not have any idea about neither bureaucracy nor do they have any experts in administration, there was socio-economic chaos. Racial discrimination and the gap between poor and rich were very much therefore the nationality was in trouble. then she realized that the true nation state is not built but rather grows from below, starting from the top, from community which include the baggers whom she meet on the streets begging something to eat or from Joshua or Matthew or Luke or John who once worked in her father's farm. The message here is that she must learn the importance of ordinary citizens, though they are not significant in themselves, but the novel is dedicated to their significance. They are not just anyone, their story are the story of nation, their quarrels are national crisis, their deaths a national disaster. Here, Lessing not only talks about the common and poor people of Zimbabwe, indeed she talks about the political leaders like Robert Mugabe who was elected as the first prime minister after the independence. So, her aim is to pressurize the leaders because the nations don't pre-exist but are created by the states and by nationalists. Mugabe and his co-workers create the nation, but for the nation to

have legitimacy, it must be already existing. So it is that Lessing discovers a nation among the beggars, poor blacks on the street or from Joshua or Matthew or Luke.

The description of farm and the bush, African traditions and white customs, her parents and brother is told in detail by Lessing but the book does not limit itself up to here, it is indeed a memory where she memorizes everything about Zimbabwe that she knew living in Zimbabwe. Her memory draw back her to the past of her childhood where she played in the bush with her brother and friends therefore like every writer Lessing too has a myth-country" the bush I was brought up in, the old house built of earth, the grass, the lands around the hill, the animals, the birds. Myth does not mean something untrue, but a concentration of truth, this land is my myth country"(35). For Lessing Zimbabwe is her myth country, the nationalist feeling is every were inside her mind regarding Zimbabwe. She is proud of being Zimbabwean; she likes to be called Zimbabwean rather than to be called British. The nation Zimbabwe is in her imagination, a nation-state unlike the village must be imagined. Because one member can know more than a small fraction of his fellow members, the nation-slate can never be seen whole except in the imagination. Her brother Harry's claim is also the same as he said to Lessing" I have never seen Zimbabwe as a whole there are always fractions"(37) he clearly believes that the nation-state might be artificial, it is essential. He acknowledges the fictional nature of communal identities. Whether based on ethnicity, nationality or race, identity must be invented and re-invented. The national consciousness is fostered by print literacy and associated with newspapers and the novel as genre. Like the members of a nation, the characters in the realist novel share a world of specific landmarks that are circumscribed by common horizons. Here Harry and Lessing are the characters but they are not fictional but are real.

Zimbabwean nationalism is weaken by the racial discrimination because there is a conflict among the native blacks and white not only in the political level but also

in the social, religious and economic level. There is racial discrimination; whites considered blacks as barbaric and uncivilized object. Whites treat blacks nothing more than animals which are to be trained, "they are less than us".(48) After supper when Lessing and her white friends talk with each other, she found most of her white friend dislike the blacks these lines by Lessing also clarifies the fact:

He got a bit tight and talked about the innate inferiority of the blacks. Not all of them, though and it is interesting to try and guess which old Rhodie will start spouting racialism when they have had a drink or two [...]. When they were good they were very good, skilful, adaptable, full of expertise, but the rest were limited, unintelligent, with that kind of complacency that can only go with stupidity. (50)

The psychology of the whites to treat and see the blacks has been changing day by day. Among whites, there are two groups one group is liberal while majority are hard line whites who according to Lessing are merciless and brutal to treat the blacks. The colonial mindset of the hard line white treat blacks as inferior race which are to be civilized. But as mentioned above liberal whites likes the blacks and think they are very good people but the problem in Zimbabwe is that those hard-line whites are the state holders. Lessing is in confusion whether they treat the blacks as inferior after being the state holder or are they same before it. But what results is national crisis, when whites treat blacks as inferior blacks, too united themselves against the common enemy for the emancipation. Ten years of civil war and the independence of Zimbabwe is the result of that racial hatred.

Lessing's brother Harry, in the novel appears as a national figure who believes individual's identity remain strong when the national identity is stronger. He was a freedom fighter in the bush war, he is indeed second generation white who too have consciousness about their nation Zimbabwe. but there are many differences between blacks and whites regarding their nation because people like Harry wanted to establish

the white supremacy or they wanted to keep the white government alive he lost his hearing power in the war because of the sound of bombs, people like him believe that the nation Zimbabwe remain unless and until there is white government. They have knowledge about civilization and whites are educated people. Though they don't have any sympathy over the blacks but regarding their country they too are equally conscious and want to save it from the war. All the whites are not of colonial mindset the second generation whites like Harry throw themselves in war from the white side or the government side to protect the country from devastation and chaos. His love to his country can be seen when he say "I can never belong to England everyone who live here and earned his right to be here with blood I have right to live here, this is my country"(56). Here, Harry is right to show how much he loves his country. Though majority of the whites consider Zimbabwe as a foreign land but people like him consider it as their nation and claim right to live there. it is not only the blacks country, it is a country of whites, it is also a country of Harry and Doris Lessing as well. But I think his brand of nationalism is one which shuts other people out: which define us against them. to call ourselves us is to draw a psychological as well as physical boundary around ourselves and those who claim the same national identity. Though he loves Zimbabwe, its land and wild but being a white and treating the blacks as other has not gone from his mind.

Lessing while exploring the nationalist consciousness among the Zimbabwean people does not depict the people of high or the ruling elite only, her characters are real and their stories are true. They are from Robert Mugabe to black Gore who works in the garden. Gore is true nationalist figure who fought in the civil war from Mugabes side he is worried about the post- colonial Zimbabwe; he was comrade in Mugabes army. He fought in the civil war because, for him his country was seized by the foreigners. So he fought for the emancipation of his country, Gore is worried about the new generation of Zimbabwe who according to him will forget Zimbabwe

as he report to Lessing " only old people like me will remember Mutare was called Umtali. And he shook, with laughter, the marvelous African laughter born somewhere in the gut, it is the laughter of the poor people".(80) Laughter is vital thing in Lessings depicts the laughter of the poor people. Gores argument is shocking for Lessing. She is worried about the new generation of Zimbabwe that one day they will forget Zimbabwe i e, there will not be any nation. Like Zimbabwe and no nationality Zimbabwean, Gores argument is justified when Lessing encounter with the old woman and her son Paul one restaurant. They work in Swedish relief organization. Their conversation clarifies the fact vividly.

'Look Paul, said the woman." I keep trying to explain it to you. We want to do something to help the country. It's our country too now, and we want [...] It's our country, its their country was the reply [...] but as the children left, the parents said, 'now you've got your Zimbabwe, I hope you'll like it. (84-85)

So, the old generations of Zimbabwe have love towards their country and they want to do something for it but the younger generations are attached by the European glamour. People like Paul's mother want to do something for their country because they have a feeling to do something to help their country. But people like Paul are neither conscious to support their country nor do they are emotionally attached to it. Therefore, it is concluded that the feeling of nationalism is more in the older people rather than the younger one. Gore too belongs to the older generation therefore he, too has same kind of feeling and Lessing also belongs to the older generation.

In the war of Liberation or in the Bush war the liberation leaders like Mugabe also develops the nationalist conscious among the blacks. Though their intention may be different but what they did was they give the slogan of nationalism to unite the blacks therefore nationalism become uniting tie to the common people, it has become the bond to the people which unite them together to fight against the common enemy.

Most of the native blacks did not give their own land and majority of the people were uneducated and below the poverty line. So what Mugabe and his colleague did was they promised the blacks in their political speech to give land " land, the soil, our mother, the earth, this is what had been taken from the blacks. Throughout the war of liberation, the Bush war, Mugabe was making a promise that when the whites were defeated, every black person would have land "(90). what comrade Mugabe meant was that they would be part of communal schemes and settlements, but every black wants to own land as the whites do, to have and to hold and to pass on to heirs. Comrade Mugabe was fighting a hard war and his was only of the armies. He did not know he was going to win. Perhaps even in the midst of such uncertainties it would be wiser for guerilla leaders not to make impetuous promises. It is not possible for every black person to own land or even live on the land. There will never be enough land, particularly with the population doubling, at such short intervals. but when the war ended, every black person who had supported Mugabe because of his promises, and many who had not, waited for land, and for paradise to begin, but this paradise was in fact I think is an anarchist's utopia only two years after liberation there was a careful, cautious, thoughtful policy of buying up white farms as they became available, settling selected people on them, but only when elementary services had been guaranteed. The rhetoric that accompanied this policy was as senseless and torrential as in any communist country, but luckily there was a connection between what was happening and the words to describe it.

The middle class and working class Zimbabweans are worried about the post colonial Zimbabwe rather than upper class. The middle class educated people like doctor, politician, lawyer, civil servants, and journalist were much worried about the betterment of their nation once Lessing was called for an interview in one newspaper in Zimbabwe. The journalist was a young lady who was the representative figure of nationalist consciousness. Lessing describes the situation like this:

I went off and was stopped by a young woman dressed in a wonderful combination of smart re suit, black heels half a yard high, and a head cloth in my colors.' will you give me an interview for my newspaper?' she wanted to know. We sat opposite each other in the press pavilion, and chatted about this and that. Then she asked, what do you think about Zimbabwe? We were getting on pretty well, so I risked, at the moment it is breaking my heart. She at once sobered out of her smiling professionalism, and says yes, I agree, but perhaps a positive message? "Viva Zimbabwe, I say. For no reason at all, there are tears in my eyes, and, I see, in hers too. We realize we might easily begin crying. (109)

These professionals are worried about Zimbabwe because they have a feeling that this is their country. As Lessing describes the situation when she says Viva Zimbabwe, both are full of tears. It is tear for their country. They are optimistic that at least Zimbabwe is going in right path. The journalist is also curious about asking the question of Zimbabwe. Both people are attached by this country therefore most of the time they talk about Zimbabwe when they talk about the war, they talk about the emotional atrocities of war was brutal to the common people. There was no room left for the common people. The war was terrible "the white's enjoyed the war, for it was their war. The blacks suffered in the war, but the whites didn't care about that" (17). So, in the war time, Zimbabwe divided in to three parts a) the white side, b) black revolutionist led by Megabe, c) common black people. The whites were fighting for the restoration of their power and the blacks were fighting against the whites for their land, country. But the situation of common people ws worse in Zimbabwe they have to support which side comes in their house. Both sides punish the common people for supporting other side but none the side realize the compulsion of the common people. Therefore the nationality in the civil war time was weakened because each group considers other group to be enemy.

The nationalistic and patriotic feeling is highly imbued with the white man, though his name is not mentioned here but Lessing describes him as a white man born and brought up here who is in love with the dream of Zimbabwe and he was supporting it when to do so meant ostracism from his own kind. He cannot endure any blemish on his love. He believes that a person who loves his/her country should not hesitate to sacrifice his/her life for the country if needed, as he said to Lessing:

To be in love with a country or a political regime is a tricky business.

You get your heart broken even more surely than by being in love with

a person. You may even lose your life. A woman, a political activist

spent her days and nights working to undo the white regime in South

Africa. Needing arrest, she went to visit Nigeria, to see her dream

made flesh, found it was run by others, and committed suicide. (156)

Who are those other people who run the state is not mentioned clearly in the novel. But according to the white man, the woman committed suicide because it was just an opposite of what she had expected regarding the nation. Loving the nation is more deadly than loving an individual. You get your heart broken even more surely than by being in love with a person. So love towards an individual and love towards the country are totally different things. People easily sacrifice their life for their country. There are many examples in world history that thousands of people give their life to the country if they think the country needed it.

After the liberation of Zimbabwe from ten years of civil war there was still racial discrimination which caused the national disaster, in other words, a nation was in crisis. But Lessing wants to end the racial discrimination which is in both peoples' minds since the invasion of the British. Lessing spread the message that we are not black or white, we are people" (162). What Lessing means here is that there is no discrimination, no black or white. All are people that mean all are equal, nobody is

superior to anybody. The feeling of nationalism is strengthening when there is no discrimination. If all people are treated equally and given the equal opportunity than only nationalism become stronger.

Garifield Tood, ex-prime minister, now a hero of revolution, magnificent, white haired, eighty years old and alive with energy and optimism is a true nationalist who dismisses what everyone else is talking about, the corruption scandals, he said "this Zimbabwe is our Zimbabwe and we love it with a fierce innocence. The unity accord has made us and our country whole and perfect"(191). He refers Zimbabwe as our Zimbabwe which once was considered to be only whites but now it no longer remains whites only. it is owned by blacks also and 'our', Garfield Todd got badly burned when working on one of his ancient cars: restoring old cars is his hobby. When he was in hospital Robert Mugabe and Joshua Nkomo, former enemies, went together to visit him. Garfield Todd, still pretty ill, was being gentled out of bath. the security guards tried to hurry in nurse into getting her patient quickly out of the bath on either side of Todd's bed that day Lessing was very excited and said "that was the best of Zimbabwe. I tell you, that is Zimbabwe" (194). In the war time both were enemies and were ready to kill each other for their supremacy which causes the nation in crisis but as soon as the war ended atrocities and casualties of both side have been forgiven. Now here is whole Zimbabwe existed and both side leaders are in a way to develop their nation.

In the chapter entitled Granite, Lessing describes the man who is attached by the granites. Therefore my purpose here is to include his story so that his feeling of nationalism can be described. As Lessing describe this man of about forty adores Zimbabwe, chiefly because of its granite. Granite is radioactive. But Zimbabwe, chiefly because of granite, whole mountain ranges of it or great up thrusing single smooth mountains, or tall clumps of balancing boulders. Photograph of granite never give any real idea of it. It has a sparkle to it, liveliness. This man says that when he is

away from Zimbabwe he feels exiled from granite. It is the oldest rock in the world says he: it came bubbling up from the world's secret in terror, slowly rising through layers of other rock to surface here." He can't live without granite . . . therefore he cant live without Zimbabwe" (179). Here, he is found to be a true nationalistic figure. To be nationalistic it is not necessary to sacrifice yourself to the country neither you should fight against the foreign enemy nor be link yourself in any political parties. It is a feeling which emerges inside your heart. This man, he is not involved in any political wing, nor fought in the civil war. He is a researcher and scientific but truly a product of Zimbabwean soil. He loves its land and mountain, especially granite. As mention earlier he can't live without Zimbabwe and granite what does it mean? Truly, he can't live without his nation therefore he is a real nationalistic figure.

People are worried about Zimbabwe because it is suffering form AIDS.

Officially Zimbabwe is not supposed to have a problem with AIDS. The minister of health has announced publicly that talk of AIDS is put about by ill- wishing whites to destroy the infant tourist industry. This has filled doctors, or anyone with information, with despair and rage. Doctor says that half the children brought to the outpatients are HIV positive. Fifty percent of the army and the police force are HIV positive. AIDS is the joker in the pack, just as it is in every African country south of the Sahara. Some groups of people are working to minimize the AIDS patients. They are working in the various sectors to make people conscious about HIV positives; they are known as AIDS workers. They are nationalist figures we know their dedication to their nation if we heard their conversation:

I don't know what is about this country. It just gets you. I've worked a lot of third world countries but this one. You really care what happens to it- perhaps because they have a chance of making it. But I think it is the people. I don't want to leave them. I now when they send me on somewhere else, I m going to spend half my time worrying about

what's going on here, if they are getting it together. Why do you get so fascinated by this place? That's easy. (236)

In this conversation, one thing is clear, the first AIDS worker is worried about Zimbabwe and he is ready to cure the country by abolishing AIDS. AIDS cannot be cured but can be minimized if awareness is among the common people. He knew people are suffering from HIV but he doesn't want to leave the country mainly because he loves the people of Zimbabwe. As he said he spent half of his time what's going on here. He is so fascinated by this place. When the question is asked why he got so fascinated by this country? He simply said it's easy. He maybe means it's easy because people like him love the country because of no reason.

The most important man to unite Zimbabwe, who brought the nationalistic feeling among the majority of the blacks, is Robert Mugabe. Mugabe is the product of an authoritarian culture. He was educated by the authoritarian Catholics. People, who taught him, and fellow pupils, say he was clever, always reading, didn't mix easily with others, but watched and listened: "A typical intellectual" (277). He was brought up under white supremacy, which was like living under a cold lid like a frozen sky. His culture, his people were always criticized, disprayed, despised, when they say now. But it is our culture, it is our custom' as a last word. What are you hearing is self-respect, a people's pride that has survived decades of contempt. When Mugabe became part of the liberation struggle, it was British rule he opposed, and the language of Marxism was common to all liberation movements then. It was Samora Mahel who finally made him a communist, and that was quite late in his career. Because the Soviet Union made the mistake of backing Jashua Nkomo, Mugabe was oriented towards china, whose history since 1949 has been continuous, successive, waves of mass murders- millions upon millions killed for ideological reasons. He led an army that fought not only against Smiths forces, white and black but sometimes

against the armies of opposing political groups, Bishop Muzorewa Nkomo- for white these armies had the same aim, they often competed for future power.

Mugabe was put in detention by Smith. To be detained or a prisoner was a harsh experience. The prison was the scene of hundreds of executions, many of them Mugabe's friends and comrades. All kinds of atrocities were committed by Smith's men, who talked about but have not been officially exposed. This is because of the need to bury the past and its mistakes. Smith refused Mugabe permission to visit his son- his only child- when he was ill, and when the child died he was not allowed to attend the funeral. It is sometimes argued that this was the stupidest thing Smith ever did. When Robert Mugabe, with such a history, to be this combination of Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson, Gandhi? But people do expect this: comrade Mugabe, like God, is on every body's side. And he does sometimes behave with magnanimity.

In the civil war Robert Mugabe led the black side; he united the army and makes people politically active against the colonizers. He united the people with the slogan nationalism. Nationalism becomes the uniting factor to the black people and it is Mugabe who took the war to the heights. After the liberation when Mugabe was elected as the first prime-minister, the country was in chaos, all the old structures have already been destroyed and new structures are being in progress. There was a fear of racial discrimination and politico-economic chaos but Mugabe brings everything in order as much as he can. He has done everything not for himself but for Zimbabwe. His speech after the liberation is the evidence as he said "But we won Zimbabwe for us, the comrades who have sacrificed their lives are national heroes" (315). He gives credit to the freedom fighters for the independence of Zimbabwe.

Lessing was so much fascinated by Zimbabwe, not only from its scenery but because of various reasons. She was attracted by its people, land and wild she was a prohibited immigrant and spent her later part of life in England. She describes when she was young she was infinitely separated from Europe except through literature.

When she came to England and became prohibited, the Africa she knew was out of rich "separation of my landscapes has always been my fate"(305). When she returned to Zimbabwe in 1982 after the independence, the country was in transitional period. There was racial discrimination. Blacks are considered to be lower than whites and blacks too did not treat whites as Zimbabweans. They are taken as the foreigners. Lessing found herself to be alienated in Zimbabwe. Blacks treat her not Zimbabweans which worried her. She is a true nationalist figure for whom Zimbabwe is a life long passion. When she meets with Jacks, the school teacher, she every time talks about Zimbabwe in various topics including politics, literature, economy, its land, forest and trees. She said to the teacher:

The country around here had stayed in my mind for thirty years as an ideal of what forest could be, with musas a trees perhaps hundreds of years old, and full of every kind of animal. I was experiencing that suspensing of probability that accompanies moments unforeseen when you begin a journey, a pilgrimage moment when things slide into place: It had never ever, entered my mind that there was a generation in Zimbabwe which didn't know how their country had been, and so recently. (343)

When Lessing was exiled to London, her mind was always hunted by her native country. She was worried about the people who did not know how their own country had been. After her arrival in Zimbabwe in 1982 different people said differently. Majority of the blacks treated her as a foreigner white. But she cannot convinced the people properly that she is not other but Zimbabwe's product. for her Zimbabwe is the most attractive place " where you think these are shores in Greece, Sicily, wild pale rocky hills and islands and the blue water and the blue sky, and with all the attraction appear even in the town itself". (381)

Similarly, in the last part of the novel, Lessing gives little more history of Zimbabwe. How was it in the past and how it come to be known as Zimbabwe has been describe in this part which I think would be contextual to mention here to show the nationalistic touch.

Southern Rhodesia became a self –governing colony in 1924, though both defense and native policy remained subject to British supervision. When the proposed federation of southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland failed, because of the opposition of the blacks, Northern Rhodesia demanded independence at the same time but was refused, unless the whites promised to grant black majority rule within a reasonable period. The whites rejected this and Britain applied sanction. Ian Smith, on behalf of the whites of southern Rhodesia proclaimed themselves independent of Britain, in a unilateral Declaration of Independence, Known as UDI. Minor acts of Sabotage, riots, protest, had been going on in southern Rhodesia for years, but the UDI in 1965 can be regarded as the beginning of the war of independence, as the various parties were ZANU, Zimbabwe African National Union, under Joshua Nkomi, who had spent over ten years in a detention camp, in remote and desolate place, without amenities. These armies and other lesser army's sometimes collaborated with each other, and sometimes did not during the gverilla war against the government forces, a confused scene not made any clearer by the numbers of black soldiers fighting for the government- a majority of the government forces were black. when it ws at last acknowledge by the whites that they could not win this war, Britain negotiated peace terms which included an election in which all the blacks voted, and for the first time. They voted for Robert Mugabe and ZANU and Mugabe became Prime Minister. Joshua Nkomo was offered the job of president but refused.

Nationalism doesn't mean to have a positive feeling towards your country and you love your country. Sometimes nationalism is used and utilized by the people especially the political leaders for their benefit or for the specific purpose. Political

leaders by using the term nationalism unite the people to fight against the common enemy. Especially in the time of war they give the slogan of nationalism to against the common enemy here they show their nationalism and show hatred towards other nations. In Zimbabwean ten years of civil war the case was same. If we see the matter deeply black leaders like Mugabe and Nkomo use the same policy. They united the blacks to fight against the whites by using the term nationalism. But what do they do is while uniting the blacks they create the hatred towards the whites. Mugabe scolds the whites and white government which was ruling in Zimbabwe in doing so, he creates the hatred in the minds of blacks towards Britain and British government. Their ten years of civil war was a result of that hatred. They to make their fighters excited sometimes inferiorize the whites as Nkomo in one speech said to his fighters:

The white people are not clever than you. You are only believing what the whites have been telling you. Did you know that for centuries the people of Europe- that means white people-were considered backward and primitive by the Arab world? When the Romans invaded Britain, the way you were invaded by the whites, they called them stupid and backward and savage. And we were. . . (69)

Nkomo tells his fighters that though the white considered themselves to be superior and you which means black Zimbabweans considered themselves to be inferior because it is taught by the whites. Blacks believe what the whites say but the reality is whites are making the discourse. He gives the historical background when the whites were invaded by the Romans in the past they are treated as inferior therefore black Zimbabweans should not consider themselves to be less, it is only discourse made by them.

In the same way people like Mugabe too scold the white to take their war in the peak his method of uniting the comrades was to scold the whites, showing the exploitation

and hatred done or undone by the whites so that his army can fight with more vigour and excitedness. He said in one interview:

We have been exploited, we have been ground down, we have had our country stolen from us. But it is they who have to be given tender loving and care [...]. They pillaged, they murdered, they reaped, they burned. When I asked the black people about their life this time some people start weeping or cursing the whites or both, for these savages wounded Zimbabwe. (146)

For Mugabe it is the whites and their rule which destroyed Zimbabwe. They have no mercy for the natives and they don't scare about the economy. The whites captured almost all the land which belong to the blacks they uses the blacks in their farmhouse giving minimum wage and exploit them. Killing, raping, burning the house are common for the animals. Blacks suffered a lot by the whites but the whites and their government has no concern for the betterment of their life. It results the unity among the exploited blacks who fought against the ruling government. Therefore exploitation here is used by Mugabe to develop the feeling of nationalism. Blacks too are united themselves under the flag of nationalism. Therefore nationalism becomes the unifying symbol for the blacks Zimbabweans.

But if we see the situation of the whites and their government we find nationalism working on them to unite themselves against the blacks as done by the blacks. The white minority government ruling in Zimbabwe unites the whites gibing the name nationalism. The common whites or the second generation of whites feel themselves tot be the Zimbabweans but the problem is they have the colonial mind filled by the rulers who think themselves to be superior and ruler, who have the right to rule over the blacks and civilize them. The whites were led by Ian smith, the prime-minister of southern Rhodesia. When the blacks started the civil war under the leadership of Mugabe and Nkomo by using the term nationalism and national unity

white government too counter-attack them with the same slogan. By saying nationalism is in trouble, white government united all the whites to raise their voice to save the nation from crisis. For the people like Harry, Lessings brother are the people who fought in the civil war from the government side. for the people like Harry" nationalism should be alive and it is they who can keep it alive"(216). Therefore the slogan nationalism united both blacks and whites differently. If we analyze the people like Smith gives the speech about nationalism but used it to keep him in power.

He neither involved himself in war nor have any positivity towards Zimbabwe. He is only a British ruler whose work and job is fixed by British government from London.

Therefore, when we analyze the leaders both blacks and whites they are more or less the same. They utilize the word nationalism for their benefit and encouraged the people to sacrifice their life for what? Simply either to keep them in power or to get power. Whatever it may be, nationalism has been misused. If we see the history of the world, especially in the third world the term nationalism has frequently been misused and the same happen in the case of Zimbabwe as well. Here, violent or the negative form of nationalism 'Jingoism' has been applied. The concept of Jingoism is cleared in the previous chapter therefore I would not go to define it rather I would try to show how it has been applied here. Mugabe in his political speech not only criticizes the Britain but also the neighbouring country South Africa. In his one political speech he said:

We are all convinced that southern Rhodesia was the best place on earth, an their administration worse than that of any other country. Britain wanted to be the master but they are blood thirsty and proudy people. Every white has pride in their blood, but their country....worse in the world. (272)

Mugabe is trying to unite the people, he needs more comrades for war and they are united against the whites more and more when they develop negativity to wars Britain in general and whites in particular.

Nationality, ethnicity and race are always conflated in the African culture. To understand Zimbabwean nationalism ethnicity and race are to be understood.

Zimbabwe is mostly populated by the blacks but was ruled by the minority of whites.

Native blacks are the owners of the land, the whole Zimbabwe belongs to them but when the British invaded over it the land and all Zimbabwe is snatched from them.

Nothing is given to the blacks except brutality. Whites always inferiorize them taking as "less us"(96). Slowly the racial conflict takes the shape of war which flourished when it was linked with nationalism. The whites have a feeling that Zimbabweans, "Africans are uncivilized because they are blacks and do not speak English"(77).

What do they mean is the blacks are to be civilized and only the whites can civilize the blacks. When they colonize Zimbabwe they owned everything including land which was only the means of survive for the blacks. Therefore when Mugabe promised them to return back their land they started the war of independence. For them it is their war to get their land back. One black rural farmer said:

The whites stole our land, and now we want it back land the soil, the earth, had been taken from us. Through out the war of liberation Mugabe was making a promise, that when the whites were defeated, every black person would have land. (90)

The farmer is right that he has lost the earth, the soil and they are fighting to get it back. Here every blacks are promised to give their land back therefore land becomes a symbol to unite them.

IV. Conclusion

It is very difficult to conclude any literary work in general and widely distinguished work like *African laughter: Four Visits to Zimbabwe* in particular. Various critics and researchers consider African laughter as a master piece which evokes socio-political situation of Zimbabwe in its pre and post-colonial period. Cultural anxieties and dislocation, racial discrimination and its aftermath have created nationality in trouble which has been portrayed by Lessing astonishingly. This book is a memoir where Lessing describes her past where memories of childhood, her family relation, its people, land and wild comes in a novel as flash back. Vocal dimension, myriad possibilities and multiple points of view, an attempt is made to view nationalism as perennial source of terrifying violence.

Mainly the characters in the novel are not factious but are real and the story is also a real story. In *African Laughter: Four visits to Zimbabwe* Lessing reaffirms her emotional and intellectual connections to Zimbabwe, the land that nurtured, infuriated, inspired and ultimately rejected her. The land she still finds so overwhelmingly beautiful, so astonishingly fruitful. Southern Rhodesia the land of her childhood, whose people black and white continues to haunt her imagination and stalk her dreams. Lessing loves Zimbabwe, its people blacks and whites, its land and the bush, is blind lover of nation and nationality.

Writing about the different characters and their nationalist consciousness, she depicts the characters like Harry her brother whose only aim in life is to see Zimbabwe prosperous and literate. While writing about the bush war and Zimbabwean ten years civil war there are many national heroes who knowingly or unknowingly contributed in developing and preserving nationalism. There are few names in the novel which are to be remembered like Robert Mugabe, Joshua Nkomo who spent their whole life for the betterment of their nation and nation building. especially Mugabe is a towering figure in the novel, is exposed as an ardent and rigid

nationalist who spent almost all his life either in the jungle or in the detention camp so as Nkomo. Their desire is to free the nation and so the feeling of nationalism got linked to self-respect and national power.

Nationalism is something problematic especially in the context of third world country like Zimbabwe because it has been defined in such a way as if it were for the betterment of the poor people but the reality is opposite. They give the slogan of nationalism to the common people but can not do anything except preserving their political power people like Ian smith, as described by Lessing falls in such a category. Smith, the while leader of southern Rhodesia wanted white (his) government and white supremacy. He was always against the blacks and their rights. By giving the name of nationalism he tried to unite the whites against the blacks. Even the people like Lessing are the victims are his atrocity. He excluded Lessing herself for 25 years when she opposed the white minority government saying nationalism is in trouble.

The natural beauty of Zimbabwe, its culture, people both blacks and whites, the political corruption, war of independence all has been described by Lessing in dazzling narrative of vivid detail. The novel is totally dedicated to Zimbabwe and its people therefore it is an attempt to define nationalism and nationalist consciousness among the people who are just taking the fresh air of freedom.