Unit 2
Approaches to the Study of Indian Diaspora

Contents

Learning Objectives

This unit will help you to:

- understand the various ways in which Indian diaspora has been studied;

- analyse specific studies and the perspectives on Indian diaspora;

- look at Indian diaspora in the context of multiculturalism; and

- get an overall framework in which to place some of the studies on Indian diaspora.

2.1   Introduction

In this second unit of our course on Diaspora and Transnational Communities, we will try and see various ways in which scholars have attempted to look at Indian diaspora. Indians have been migrating out of India for centuries but the settlement of Indians abroad started taking place rather concretely only during the colonial period. Thus, migration out of India can be seen in three phases: ancient, colonial time, and contemporary period. Scholars have looked at the Indian diaspora from various points of view— literary, demographic, from the perspectives point of geo-politics and from an anthropological point of view. We will try and analyse very briefly some of the perspectives and approaches through studies undertaken by various scholars.

These studies range from early migration of East Indians who have settled in Trinidad and how they have continued to keep up with their traditions to one where the diaspora is seen in terms of the adaptative strategies they have used. We will also be looking at some of the interactive and situational analysis in our study of urban ethnicities in a place like London. This we hope should give you a fair idea of the range of studies and the various perspectives adapted by scholars to study the Indian diaspora. Following these sections we will be looking at Indian diaspora in the context of multiculturalism, both in relation to their country of origin and the country of destination or their host countries. In this regard we will be examining the ideas of civilisational and settlement societies. In our final section we will attempt to give you a general framework in which you can place some of these perspectives.

2.2 The Study of Indian Diaspora

Indian diaspora can be seen in three sequential phases in global historical terms. Firstly, the ancient and mediaeval Indian monarchs and traders, from the east and west coast of India, who tried to reach out and established contacts with the Middle East, eastern and northern Africa and with Southeast Asia. The expansion during the ancient period has given rise to the historical imaginary entity called 'Greater India' which was a staple of our post-independence history books, something we hastily revised after encounter with the new nationalistic countries of Southeast Asia. The mediaeval period of Indian diaspora was mainly connected with trade; this phase has been very well documented historically but the anthropologist would find more meat and sensitive delineation in novels like *In an Antique Land* by Amitav Ghosh and Salman Rushdie's *The Moor's Last Sigh.* In these fictional works the magic of hybridisation that cast a spell over mediaeval Indian diaspora is brilliantly evoked.

The second period belongs to the nineteenth century emigration of the labouring population to plantation territories of the colonial world. This emigration from India also included traders and white-collar workers to the British, Dutch and French colonies. The scholarly depiction of this phase of the Indian diaspora argues that colonialism is strongly implicated in the process of migration. In fact, some scholars extend the colonial implication to the third phase of Indian diaspora, the emigration from India in the present century to industrially developed countries of the West and to the oil-rich countries. This forms an organic linkage with the colonial diaspora. It seems reasonable to point out this connection now, because in what follows we shall be concerned mainly with putting the contemporary Indian diaspora in a post-colonial context.

Box 2.1: Post-colonialism

Post-colonialism (also known as post-colonial theory) refers to a set of theories in philosophy and literature that grapple with the legacy of colonial rule. As a literary theory or critical approach it deals with literature produced in countries that were once, or are now, colonies of other countries. It may also deal with literature written in or by citizens of colonizing countries that takes colonies or their peoples as its subject matter. Post-colonial theory became part of the critical toolbox in the 1970s, and many practitioners take Edward Said's book Orientalism to be the theory's founding work.

Post-colonialism deals with many issues for societies that have undergone colonialism: the dilemmas of developing a national identity in the wake of colonial rule; the ways in which writers from colonized countries attempt to articulate and even celebrate their cultural identities and reclaim them from the colonizers; the ways knowledge of colonized people has served the interests of colonizers, and how knowledge of subordinate people is produced and used; and the ways in which the literature of the colonial powers is used to justify colonialism through the perpetuation of images of the colonized as inferior. The creation of binary oppositions structure the way we view others. In the case of colonialism, distinctions were made between the oriental and the westerner (one being emotional, the other rational). This opposition was used to justify a destiny to rule on behalf of the colonizer, or 'white man's burden'. (Source:http://en. wikipedia. org/wiki/Post-colonialism)

There are many diverse angles of viewing the Indian diaspora. The one angle which attracts the general public in India itself is concerned with the investment capacity of the NRIs (Non-Resident Indians). In the wake of liberalization and structural changes in the Indian economy ushered in since 1991, it has been pointed out that the overseas Indians compared to the overseas Chinese investments in mainland China are five times behind in their investments in India. Observations such as these have led to the economists' interest in migration, remittances and capital flows (Nayyar, 1994). Also, in the same perspective of viewing NRIs, viz., Indians emigrating and settling in the USA as entrepreneurs, the ethnic identity and feeling of the Indian diasporics have been compared with the similar entrepreneurial gifts of the Chinese, the Japanese and the Jews in the United States. (Kotkin, 1993). In the transnational framework, the economists are viewing the Indian exodus to the affluent countries of the West not as 'brain-drain' but as 'brain-banks'.

The Literary Point of View: An academically influential and forcefully articulated point of view on the Indian diaspora emanates from the writings of literary critics and creative writers, e. g., Salman Rushdie and V. S. Naipaul, belonging to the Indian diaspora. We will cite the views of Tejaswini Niranjana who teaches English literature in the University of Hyderabad, India, because her statement is as representative as any of this genre:

At a time when both in India and in many overseas communities the stakes in defining oneself as 'Indian' are being re-examined, at a time when the terrain of identity has become a crucial location for engaging in cultural politics, it seems increasingly important to analyse the many complex ways in which different groups of people claim 'Indianness' and the different kinds of significance attached to this claim. For this kind of analysis, I would argue, the construction of 'Indian' identities in Trinidad, Guyana, Surinam, Fiji, Mauritius, Tanzania or South Africa(or even, to mention a different kind of context, in the Gulf countries, for example) is as relevant as the NRI identities being shaped in the metropolitan, post-colonial diaspora. An interesting problem that remains by and large untheorised is the one about what slippages occur, and what their significance is, when a notion like 'Indian culture', shaped within the social imaginary in India, is deployed in a context where 'Indians' are not culturally hegemonic (Niranjana, 1994:3-4)

A couple of comments on this kind of angle on the Indian diaspora may be made here. Firstly, though the question of identity is inescapable and recurs in many contexts, it is the discipline of social psychology which can adequately deal with it, and that point of view remains largely outside our present area of discussion. Secondly, not only the Indian diasporics in metropolitan countries but even those of the nineteenth century vintage were part of a larger politico-economic framework that shows a great deal of continuity from the colonial to the post-colonial period. The kind of distinction which Niranjana makes between the NRIs and what have sometimes been called the People of Indian Origin (PIOs) is very thin, since both these diasporic streams are caught up in the same contemporary currents of post-coloniality, globalization and transnationality.

The Demographic Perspective: Demographers have shed light on some of the basic parameters of the Indian diaspora: the numbers involved, fertility rates (Muthiah & Jones, 1983), the role of linguistic and religious variables in the immigrant population, marital trends, etc. There has been considerable

difference of opinion on the quantum of the Indian diaspora globally. An extremely conservative estimate (Clarke et. al. 1991) for the year 1987 puts the figure at about 8. 6 million South Asians living outside Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka. On the other hand, the Report of the High Level Committee on the Indian Diaspora (2001) estimated that there were some 19 million people of Indian origin (both PIOs or non Indian passport holders, and NRIs or non-resident Indians with Indian passport). It is noteworthy that the latter estimate, though more than double of the former, did not include other South Asians. Of course one reason for the discrepancy between the earlier and later figures is the considerable emigration, especially in the last decades of the twentieth century, to the U. S. A. and to West Asia. However, it is still very difficult to give an accurate estimate, more so in view of the fact that most estimates do not divulge their sources. The largest population of overseas Indians is in the UK, followed by the USA, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia and South Africa. In countries like Guyana, Surinam, Trinidad & Tobago, Mauritius and Fiji, Indians constitute nearly half of the total population.

Some of the demographic data on migrants in Australia suggest sociologically interesting issues for Asian, as also South Asian, immigration. In 1991 nearly 7 million Australians or 42% of the population was born overseas or had one or both parents born overseas. The Asia-born constituted 4.6% of the total population (British and Irish 7%; European born 6.5%; Middle East born 1.2%). The percentage of Asians in the population as a whole (including local born) had increased to 7.4% by mid-1995. Up to two-thirds of all second-generation migrants were marrying outside their ethnic group so that by the year 2000, 40% of the Australian population are ethnically mixed. These projections certainly include South Asians, though the exact quantum of South Asian ethnics in this melting pot cannot be easily ascertained. However, the general point of interest here is that the so-called 'untranslatability" of Indian culture abroad is a very relative matter, subject to the history and socio-economic background of the migrants and the policies of the host society. Again, building on the demographic profile of the South Asian population, it is interesting to note that Hindi-speakers and Hindus predominate among Fiji Indian migrants to Australia (the so-called 'twice migrants') than among immigrants from India. Another issue that merits investigation is the manner in which the Hindu religious category cuts across the nationality of birth (Malaysian, Sri Lankan, Fijian, Indian). A sub-set of the above: what is the interaction and complex of attitudes among and between Tamilian Hindus from Malaysia, Sri Lanka, India and Fiji? This comes as close as one would wish to being an experimental situation for a comparative study of Tamil nationalism. Similarly, it would be sociologically rewarding to study the implications and consequences of the fact that Anglo-Indians from India and Ceylon Burghers from Sri Lanka were permitted to enter Australia earlier than the bulk of other South Asians. How are they placed — status-wise and in terms of ethnic distance — relative to other Indians and Sri Lankans is a question worth asking.

The Geographical Aspect: From the geographers' viewpoint the distribution of the Indian diaspora can be divided into six zones. : Africa and Mauritius, West and Southeast Asia, the Pacific, the Caribbean, North America, and Europe. One of the earliest comparative surveys by an anthropologist of Indian communities abroad was an article published by the late Chandra Jayawardena in the *Geographical Review* (Jayawardena, 1968:426-449). It is

natural for the international relations specialist and geographers to be getting interested in disporas and ethnic movements and communities across the globe as they influence politics both within nations and across nations as these ethnicities move across territories. The fact that the ethnic conclaves engage among themselves across the territories makes some question the role of nation-states. We will talk about some of these substantive issues in our Book 2.

Anthropological Understanding: Anthropological concerns today typically cut across and challenge the disciplinary boundaries like the ones presented above. The process of ethnicity emerging from nation-building finds its extreme in the present 'transnational' world in which people having national identities, such as Indian, Chinese, etc., migrate elsewhere and 'become' ethnic groups whose home nations remain durably in their self conception and political behaviour. Benedict Anderson calls this the 'ethnicization of existing nationalities' practicing 'long distance nationalism'. Some 'purist' politicians have advocated the applying of what they call the 'cricket test'. The cricket test doesn't hold in many situations as people might start out by waving their national flag but when it comes to being pitted against another ethnicity or race they might feel one with their regional affiliations. So Indians will be waving a Pakistani flag, when the Pakistanis are pitted against a non-Asian team such as the English or the West Indian.

Reflections and Action 2.1

1. Would you say that Indian diaspora is more adaptive than preservationist in their host country. If you do so, explain with substantive reasons.

2. How is the new Indian diaspora which has been migrating out of India since independence different from the earlier migrants who went as plantation workers?

2.3 Studying Indian Diasporic Communities: Some Perspectives

Besides the anthropological interventions in a variety of studies dealing with the Indian diaspora, there now exists a fairly coherent tradition of primarily anthropological studies in this field (Jain, 1993:52-57) We will take up three studies, each for the decades of the 60s, 70s and 80s, to get a sense of different perspectives that have been used to study the Indian diaspora.

Cultural persistence: Study of East Indians in Trinidad

The first study we have in mind is Morton Klass's monograph, 'East Indians in Trinidad: A Study in Cultural Persistence'. This is a community study, emphasising the continuities which existed in the cultural patterns and institutional structure of second-and-third generation population of East Indians in the village Felicity of central Trinidad, with the culture and social structure of eastern India (eastern Uttar Pradesh and western Bihar) from where their ancestors came. The macro-framework for this study (Klass, 1961) is provided not by a detailed look at the formation of the particular community in historical terms but through a sketch of the history of East Indian migration to Trinidad. Institutional areas of East Indian life, such as family and kinship, caste and religion are viewed in terms of cultural persistence. As has been observed in later studies of the Indian diaspora, the approach of the sixties fails to make the nexus between the Indian

community in adaptation with the wider socio-economic and political dynamics of the host society.

Socio-Cultural Adaptation; Tamils in Malaya Rubber Plantations

An approach of the 1970s period may be illustrated with reference to the monograph on the Tamilian rubber estate workers on a plantation we will call 'Pal Melayu' on the west coast of Malaysia—then the Federation of Malaya (Jain, 1970). This is a study of socio-cultural adaptation. The theoretical framework adopted here is of structural-functional paradigm, along with the situational approach, which is used to ananlyse the ongoing social processes. The book sought to study the adaptational social processes on Pal Melayu in terms of an interaction over time between 'work' and 'community' as sub-systems of social relationships in a 'total institution'. The macro-structure was delineated both in terms of the historical formation of the community in question and a notion of the changing plural society of Malaya.

Transnational Analysis: Study of Urban Ethnicity

A good example of the study of the 1980s where a structural-functional closure of the sort attempted in the community studies mentioned above was not possible because of the different range, magnitude and variations in the diasporic population in the monograph, 'London Patidars: A Case Study in Urban Ethnicity' (Tambs-Lyche, 1980). Set firmly in the empirical tradition of Fredrik Barth's transactional analysis, this monograph chooses to adopt a theoretical rather than historical framework. The emphasis throughout is on the choices which London Patidars make within the homogeneous value-set which they, as a caste, adopt in their adaptations to life and opportunities in London. Tambs-Lyche uses the game theory to analyse and delineate the opportunities and choices available and adapted by the enterprising community of Gujarati origin. Though they are encompassed in a homogenous circle of caste values and expectations, he feels they find a niche in the larger British society. The macro-structure too is handled within the framework of a transactional theory; Tambs-Lyche makes the important point that, seen from a local perspective, immigrants form an 'encompassed society' within the wider British society. Seen, however, in terms of their international kin and friendship networks, Britain is the encompassed society. Their assessment of it as an environment to be 'exploited' depends on the range of economic opportunities available to them in different countries. From this point of view the London Patidar study should also be treated as a forerunner of studies of 'twice' or 'thrice' migrants in the Indian diaspora.

A comment may here be added on the approach to ethnicity in Tambs-Lyche's work and beyond. Ethnicity, following the lead of Barth and associates, is very much defined as the social organization of culture difference. Barth has recently written (Barth, 1994) that his concept of culture right from the time of the publication of 'Ethnic Groups and Boundaries' would appear to have been a post-modernist one. In substantiating this claim, it is pointed out that culture has been characterized by him as continuous rather than discontinuous; it is wrought by variation and flux; it is contested rather than being assumed to be homogeneous ; and, finally, though culture was seen mainly as a boundary-making mechanism, its content was not altogether unimportant. Such a statement of the relationship between ethnicity and culture would be a subject of our synthesis in what follows.

2.4 Indian Diaspora and Multicultaralism: Civilizational and Settlement Societies

In this section we will examine the nature of plural or multicultural society, both in the host countries where the Indian diaspora has settled and in terms of the pluralism of Indian soceity, from where they have migrated; understand the difference and similarity between home and abroad, we will examine the idea of civilizations and settlement societies.

The question we pose is a comparative one: In what way are plural Indian societies similar or different in the countries where Indian immigrants have settled? We shall speak of civilizations a little later, with India as our focussed example (cf. Cohn, 1971), but the starting-points in our notion of the settlement societies come from J. S. Furnivall's celebrated discussion of the plural society in Burma and the Dutch East Indies (Furnivall,1948). In his terms, a plural society exists when a country under colonial rule shows the following broad cultural, economic and political characteristics. Culturally it comprises groups which are institutionally disparate and do not share the same basic values and way of life. Economically, these separate social entitites, have interaction mainly in the market-place, in buying-and-selling type of relationships. Politically, these disparate but economically interacting segments are held together by a superordinate authority — the colonial rulers. To paraphrase Furnivall broadly, these plural societies do not have a common social 'will'. The segments may mix (as in the market place) but they do not blend.

We build the concept of settlement societies basically after Furnivall's characterization, but also augmented by the theorists of plantations in the New World who spoke of plantation societies in contrast to rural societies as "settlement institutions"(Thompson, E. T., 1959). Settlement society is a polythetic category in the sense that not all instances of such societies have every characteristic which can be conceived of as belonging to this type. In other words, in actual instances of such societies, there may be some characteristics present in one case but not in another. Among the characteristics of settlement societies are: (1) a short history (basically post-1492) marked by recent massive immigration, (2) presence of native populations, which is variable in number, (3) colonialism or dependent status of one kind or another, (4) a correlation between economic and ethnic relations in such a way that if the economy is buoyant inter-ethnic relations are better and vice versa, (5) the settlement society is also a geo-political entity in the sense that in the New World Mexico and Latin America can be contrasted with the Caribbean, the USA and Canada. The former provide examples of civilizations, and the latter of settlement societies. In the Old World, India, China, much of Europe and parts of Africa can be contrasted with island societies, the former being seats of civilization while the latter are settlement societies.

With regard to our notion of civilizations, we should like to make a clarification at the outset. Since our take-off point in a civilizational theory of Indian diaspora (Jain, forthcoming) is the Indian or Indic civilization, the generalizations attempted here apply, in the first instance, to what Louis Dumont has called the "non-modern civilizations" (Dumont 1975). European civilizations in much of their pre-Renaissance history are part of that conceptualization. For us the proposed dialogue or dialectic between settlement societies and civilizations has primarily a heuristic value.

25

Empirically, the history of civilizations would be marked by a settlement society configuration and the future of settlement societies would lend itself to a civilizational design. Furthermore as in the case of European and North American or so-called 'western' nations, there is the development of a technologically advanced civilization. The present analysis focuses on the symbolic rather than political or technological frontiers of civilizations.

In relation to civilizations which, as we shall presently suggest, may be conceptualized as sustained by an interaction between a great tradition and several little traditions, the settlement societies form a dialectical relationship. According to Professor R. Thornton of the University of Witwatersrand, multi-culturalism in South Africa lends itself historically to a civilizational conceptualisation around a model of three city-states and their hinterland. This is in contrast to the modern European and North American conceptualisations of a network of urban-industrial centres and rural-agricultural areas. From our point of view, Thornton's position is a valid and useful point of departure for examining conquest states such as the collection of three city-states in South Africa. The point of arrival, on the other hand, especially throughout the 19th and 20th centuries (and more particularly in the present day Republic of South Africa) is a conceptualisation of multi-culturalism as a consequence of settlement societies dynamics. The crucial population element in this dynamics is the Indian South African community. Unlike both the Whites and the Blacks who contest indigenous versus settler statuses in South Africa, the Indians have regarded themselves as belonging to South Africa in the sense of citizenship and political status in general and yet not based their claims on any other than the 'settler' status (the small numbers of Indians in the population is, of course, a crucial variable but not the dominating one). The example of multi-culturalism in the U.K. suggests a complex relationship between a civilization (in this instance a long-established centralized state and a cohesive nation-state) and settlement society (the large numbers of Asian and African diasporic elements). Here, firstly, the settlement society is not coterminous with the nation state but is a part thereof. Secondly, the notion of diaspora itself may refer either to a place or a people, depending on the context of the discourse.

The dialectical rather than oppositional relationship between civilizations and settlement societies has a definite historical effect. As the example of late capitalism at the end of the 20th century and the ushering in of the 21st century clearly shows, a feedback such that the dynamics of settlement societies can energize/refurbish civilizations has high probability. The civilizational teleology of development and cultural evolution throughout the twentieth century thought seems to us as having been a mirror-image of the nineteenth century social evolutionism. The dialectical relationship such as advocated here between civilizations and settlement societies has the potential of reversing the hallowed centre-periphery relationship paradigm, in cultural terms, of the world-system theorists.

In this discussion it is not possible to detail the theoretical parameters of settlement societies, but it may be useful to bear in mind that one can postulate a distinction between the elementary structure of such societies and their complex forms. Most of the island societies of nineteenth century Indian diaspora, viz., Mauritius, Fiji, Trinidad & Tobago, etc., belong to the elementary type while societies like the USA., Canada, South Africa and Australia, the kind of societies that have been written about as "New Societies" (Hartz 1964), represent the complex structures.

The point of origin for the Indian diaspora has been the Indian civilization. The civilizational side of the dialectic has so far, in this paper, been assumed and not spelt out. It would seem valid to say that during a process of interaction between the great tradition and several little traditions over the millennia, a civilization like India cannot be said to lack a common will. The self-same religious, architectural, anthropomorphic and social structural patterns and symbols recur in India as a palimpsest, in the sense that an original text is written over several times by a variety of interpretations, (Lannoy, 1971). These may be predominantly 'Hindu' in origin but which effectively cut across religious, communal, ethnic and caste groups. As such, what Cohn (op. cit.) characterises as the study of cultural communication in understanding the Indian civilizations has been much helped by the concepts of Great Tradition and little traditions and of universalization and parochialization (cf. Marriott, 1955; Singer, 1972). The long history of civilization distinguishes it from the short time-span of the settlement societies. Besides the former having a sort of common cultural will, it also enables a synthesis of various disparate cultural elements which is a 'blend' rather than a mere 'mixture'. The symbiosis between Muslim and non-Muslim cultures in India is an evidence of this process. Nevertheless, there are two main criticisms of the particular way in which the process of cultural communication in Indian civilization has been conceptualized by the anthropologists of the Chicago School. Firstly, though lip service is paid to the mutual interaction between the Great Tradition and little traditions, in fact, the former are treated as hegemonic over the latter. The difficulty seems to be that in this civilizational teleology, acculturation which is an asymmetrical and hegemonic process has been emphasised over and above "interculturation" which is perhaps a much more prevalent and powerful process over time (Jain, 1986). A critique of the 'sanskritization' process of cultural change in India reveals that a number of protest movements were simultaneously active, perhaps more active during the last one hundred years of Indian history than the movements of change imitating cultural practices of the higher castes. The second big gap in the culturally asymmetric paradigm of cultural change in India is that the politico-economic factors of change, viz., those involved in building the Indian nation (in the last two hundred years) and the Indian state (in the last fifty years), are completely marginalised. In sum, the prevailing anthropological models of the process of Indian civilization would revert to the paradigm of a cultural persistence type of analysis if employed in the context of diaspora. We believe that the dialectic between civilisation and settlement society, the one complementing the other, and the one feeding back into the other as a process in real time, provides a dynamic frame in the study of Indian diaspora.

Before concluding this section of our presentation, let us note that one salient contrast between studies and frameworks for the studies of settlement societies and for civilizations has been the accent on political economy in the former and culture in the latter. As our earlier remarks would imply, there is need for each perspective to be augmented by the other. In the settlement societies framework, researches by anthropologists like M. G. Smith on pluralism and plural society ideas have sought to blend the Furnivallian politico-economic framework with reflecting pluralism refers to universalistic, uniform, incorporation, the kind of situation which should ideally exist in a country like the USA.

Conversely, sociologists like John Rex (Rex, 1982) assimilate a politico-economic viewpoint in their analyses of race relations in plural societies. Relevant to

the study of the Indian diaspora is Rex's postulation of a continuum between the 19th century and 20th century emigration and settlement of people from India in territories overseas. This follows from Rex's argument that in the modern world migratory movements take place according to the need of different economies for labour and a major movement of this kind is the migration of men and women from post-colonial to metropolitan societies. Where this happens, metropolitan labour movements and metropolitan political parties seek to establish barriers to such movements of a racist kind. In so far as these are effective, what one sees is racial discrimination on a world-wide scale, designed to ensure that the hard-won freedoms of the metropolitan workers shall not be shared, even if this means a permanent division of the world into rich and poor nations. As post-colonial societies get control of their own destinies, and either eliminate racism or direct it against new targets, this division between rich white and poor coloured and black nations may come to be the most important form of racism in the modern world. What is true of the working classes is true also, if to a lesser degree, of white collar workers and professionals of the post-colonial countries migrating to metropolitan nations. The general point, of course, is that there is an organic linkage between immigration and settlement of Indians abroad in the 19th century and those who have migrated to the industrially advanced countries in the present century. And furthermore, this bears the marks of colonialism and racism.

2.5 The Universe of Discourse: A Framework

We have already spelled out, briefly, the distinction between civilizations and settlement societies. We now locate the above distinction in a wider field of forces which is comprised not only of empirical cases that contextualize the Indian diaspora but also the intellectual/analytical currents which flow in this field. This combination of descriptive and analytical perspectives is suggested by the fact that there now exist, in the study of the Indian diaspora, not only anthropologists and sociologists of metropolitan (western) countries, and not even the 'Indianists' so-called of Indian and western vintage, but diasporic scholars themselves who bring to bear- in the changed circumstances of the admissibility of a subjective or agent-oriented viewpoint in the social sciences- an experiential and creatively articulated dimension. Let me present this field of forces, with its magnetic polarities, in the following schematic table:

FIELD OF FORCES

	A	B
Societal Correlate	Settlement Societies	Civilizations
Historical Conjuncture	Late Capitalism	Early Capitalism
Evolutionary Thrust	Models of Development	Models for Development
Intellectual Current	Post-modernism	Modernism
	Reverse Orientalism	Valorization of Tradition
	Fragmentation Deconstruction	Holism (Gandhian and Marxist Approaches)
	Deterritorialisation	Multiple Territorialisation
Subliminal Currents	New Age Religions	Economic Liberalization and 'Consumption of Modernity'

To explain this table briefly, the polarity between civilizations and settlement societies has already been discussed. That between Late and Early Capitalism is largely self-evident. The distinction between models of and for development can be explained by the fact that while in A there has been satiation with high-tech and there is concern for sustainable development and environmental preservation, in B there is still a shortfall, not only real and material but also perceived and felt, between the technological progress attained and sought to be attained. In that sense, even where a question-mark is raised over the adoption and import of western technology, there is continuing and deep concern with models for development rather than a distant and somewhat dispassionate interest in what kinds of developmental models are available and need to be implemented. In other words, in A the interest in developmental models may not be for urgent implementation but as knowledge-packages. In coming down to the third set of polarities, viz., those referring to intellectual currents, the distinction between the post-modernism of A and continuing modernism of B is noteworthy. It means in effect that while the duo traditional-modern, or the modernity of tradition or the modernization of tradition theses still define the terms of discourse in B, in A on the other hand the idioms of collage and surrealism are adopted at an even flatter and more popular levels than was the case in late modernism (Jameson, 1984). In post-modernity the dead-hand of globalization has replaced the affect-prone particularities. As such, the holistic notion of 'tradition' in either the unconsciously imperialistic redaction continues to haunt B. In A, on the other hand, the critique of Orientalism has not only managed to throw the baby of tradition out with the bathwater of colonialism and imperialism but a kind of 'reverse-Orientalism' has taken its place. In the context of studies of diaspora, let me give one example. In the description and analysis of the formation of settlement societies, there is virtual absence of considering what in the older literature, would be called the pioneering spirit, adventure and entrepreneurial skills of the founding fathers. The besetting sin of these founding fathers was the fact that they happen to have been largely of the Nordic races. Thus, in the literature on plural societies, multiculturalism, and diaspora generally the inadmissibility of notions such as that of "New Societies" (cf. Hartz, 1964) has become patent; it has become a postmodernist blasphemy to dilate on the contribution of the Whites.

Another element of the post-modernist ambience in A is reflected in the carryover from the discourse of deconstruction and fragmentation in the social sciences to diasporic studies. The crisis of representation in ethnography has been projected on to the studies of migration and settlement. These currents stand in contrast to the holisms of B, prominent among these being the Marxist notion of totality (cf. Jay, 1984) and, in the context of Indian civilization, Gandhian views of swaraj (self-government) and self-sufficiency. The deterritorialization thesis enunciated and elaborated by diasporic Indian intellectuals in the USA (Appadurai, 1990, 1991, 1993; Gupta 1992 and Gupta and Ferguson 1992) and in Australia (Mishra 1995), is a particularly acute manifestation of the pains and dilemmas of the diasporic intellectual/academic in settlement societies. They emphasise transnationality, hyphenated identities and diasporic deterritorialization of immigrant populations. The argument is sustained by the examples of displaced peoples and refugees all over the world, and the provenance of global and transnational organizations, such as the Red Cross, Amnesty International, etc., is cited as proof that identities and loyalties of diasporics, including the Indians in the "complex" settlement societies (read USA or even Australia) have become fragmented

and deterritorialized. When anthropologists like the ones cited above take up the theme of identity and begin theorizing on a global scale it becomes necessary to take note and state what the situation appears to be like from the Indian angle. Stated somewhat bluntly, the deterritorialization thesis seems to have unmistakably psychological roots, and the many personal interludes in the writing at least of Arjun Appadurai cited above would seem to bear this out. In this genre of anthropological or literary writing there are symptoms of an intellectual or academic disease where a splintered rather than a split identity of the intellectual/academic is projected on to the nation-state or 'country' of adoption, viz., the USA or Australia. In his article, 'Patriotism and its Future', (1993) Appadurai draws a contrast between 'belonging to' or 'loyalty for' on the one hand, United States of America, and on the other, America. The former (USA) is portrayed as the persecutor (preserver of whiteness and of the contrast between the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant and the others). It has the 'land of the immigrants' ideology and it consciously or unconsciously panders to the image of the 'tribalism' of the non-white groups. The latter (America) is the 'ethnoscape' of real freedom; it is just a node in diaspora and the epitomy of deterritorialization without the fetters. In this scenario the former is all bad and the latter good to utopian perfection.

We do not here wish to contest the subjective preferences of the author/ authors concerned, but let us say that depending on the vantage point of the 'intellectual' concerned, if the USA or Australia based (our Pole A), the glass looks half-empty, and if India or counter-diaspora based (our Pole B), the glass looks half-full. For instance, from the vantage point of an Indian academic, an equally plausible case can be made for multiple territorialization (m. t. for short) rather than d. t. The advantage of an m. t. perspective would be: (a) the economic dimension of immigration and settlement, e. g., the class background and investments in India of the diasporics would be studied,(b) the policies of the host society and the nation-state dimensions of the statuses of the diasporics would become clearer. Thus, for example, in Australia, multiculturalism, immigration quotas, English versus non-English speaking backgrounds and steps being taken to remedy the latter would be in the ken of one's study, and (c) the distinctive politics of the settlement society diasporics, e. g., their ethnic politics, perception of the 'niche' of opportunity, etc., would become clearer.

In my Field of Forces Table, the last set of contrasts between A & B is in terms of subliminal currents. This is an especially useful index because it shows how the elements of each sub-field are present in the other. Thus while tradition and holism are largely unrepresented in A, yet the existence of New Age religions, e. g., the marginalised but necessarily complementary (to economism in general) current of movements like the Hare Krishna play a role in settlement societies. On the other hand, if one took a realistic view of the currents of globalization and economic liberalization which are moving civilizational sites like India, China and Mexico the burgeoning middle classes and consumption of modernity by them (Breckenridge, 1995) belong to the twilight zone between early and late capitalism. Any particular instance of Indian diaspora will then be placed at different points in relation to this field of forces but with an area where the interpenetration between the sub-fields would be present.

2.6 Conclusion

It seems clear that there are dialectical, dialogical and reformist implications of the paradigm for the study of the spread and settlement of India minorities in the post-colonial context. It is apparent that analyses in terms of imperialism and colonialism which created a lot of heat in the 1960s through the 1980s are in dire need of being framed in the context of transnationality and globalisation which equally affects Indian populations in the former colonies and the metropolitan centres.

There is no doubt that in our analyses the historical and spatial aspects of particular diasporas should be taken into account but it is doubtful if a broad distinction between the POIs and NRIs is a useful tool in the cultural analysis of the horizontal or lateral dimensions of the Indian diaspora in a post-colonial context. In a certain sense, the *longue duree* perspective inherent in our heuristic distinction between civilizations and settlement societies subsumes, at an analytical plane, the distinctions between the past, present & the future of Indian diasporas. And yet another kind of relativity gets built into this theoretical perspective resulting from the locationality of the analyst. We have already had occasion to refer to this in respect of deterritorialisation and multiple territorialisation theses. However, this duality should be transcended in terms of the multi positionality view of the Indian diaspora. In writing about diaspora in general, one of the six characteristics mentioned by Safran is that "(the diasporics) continue to relate, personally or vicariously, to the homeland in one way or another, and their ethno-communal consciousness and solidarity are importantly defined by the existence of such a relationship" (Safran, 1991:84). This 'homing instinct' is viewed by different, though complementary, perspectives of the 'imaginary' and the 'imagined' by the diasporic Indians and the Indians respectively. The empiricism of the latter and the emotional/mythic attitude of the former are both grist to the mill of the Indian politics of globalisation. If the Indian Indians try and take a 'realistic view' of the economic opportunities and networks of the diaspora, the diasporic Indians display a dogged attachment to the religious, linguistic, culinary and performative aspects of Indianness. Although there are resistance movements against racist and gender discrimination by the Indian diasporics (of. Brah, 1996 for U.K. : and Niranjana 1994 potentially in Trinidad & Tobago), there is overwhelming evidence of a largely pacifist orientation of 'settler citizenship' among the diasporic Indians the world over.

2.7 Further Reading

Jain, R. K. 1970. *South Indians on the Plantation Frontier in Malaya*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Brah, Avtar 1996, *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*, London & New York: Routledge.

Klass, Morton 1961, *East Indians in Trinidad: A Study of Cultural Persistence*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Motwani, Jagat K. et. al. (ed.) 1993, *Global Indian Diaspora: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*, New York: Global Organization of People of Indian Origin (GOPIO).