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Abstract
One of the most successful writers, who rose to grasp the reins of the concept of diaspora, is V. S. Naipaul, giving it a new and different shape. He is known for his great ability in investigating various types of diasporas successfully.

This research aims at studying diaspora in general, its findings, causes, victims, and outcomes. Then, it moves to analyze diaspora in Naipaul's real life. It, finally, analyzes diaspora in Naipaul's The Enigma of Arrival.

First, the research strives to make a general perusal of the concept of diaspora. It gives a definition of the concept and its etymology. Next, it investigates the most important features of diaspora in the light of various scholars' theories and viewpoints. Then, it moves to cover different types of diaspora, respectively the Jewish, victim, labor and imperial, inventing, trade, and cultural diasporas.

Then, the most significant Naipaulian fingerprints in molding diaspora are investigated. It also reveals the reason behind choosing Naipaul as the case of study. It, moreover, analyzes the traumas of identity loss Naipaul has undergone, due to his successive diasporas. It, additionally, studies Naipaul's struggle in dealing with oblivion and his seeking resort in diaspora for the sake of innovation.

In the light of diaspora, this study moves to analyze one of the most significant works of Naipaul, The Enigma of Arrival.

Finally, the research adopts the task of summing up the study and the main findings, and giving recommendations and suggestions for further study.
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Introduction
It is believed that a home is not dead, but a living and like all living things must obey the laws of nature by constantly changing due to different aspects. Accordingly, it has become to acquire a new understanding after the rise of diaspora studies.

The term ‘diaspora’ is defined as the dispersal of a group of people from its original homeland, having been derived from the Greek verb Speir (to sow) and the preposition dia (over). When applied to humans, the ancient Greeks thought of diaspora as migration and colonization. By contrast, for Jews, Africans, Iraqis, and Armenians, the expression acquired a more brutal perspective. Diaspora signified a collective trauma, a banishment, where one dreams of home, but lives in exile.

In actual fact, the confusion in laying a specific definition for diaspora is due in part to a traditional misunderstanding and misapplication of the term ‘diaspora’. Thus, until the late 1960s, the Encyclopedia of the social sciences did not mention the term ‘diaspora’ at all, while common people and experts alike have been relating this term only to the Jewish exile outside the holy Land.

However, later in the last decade of the twentieth century, after the field of study became organized, the experts agreed upon a definition of the term ‘diaspora’, which is a socio-political formation, created as a result of either voluntary or forced migration, whose members regard themselves of the same ethno-national origin and who reside as minorities in one or several host countries. Members of such ethnics maintain regular or occasional contacts with what they regard as their homelands and with individuals and groups of the same background residing in other host countries. To show a unified identity, diasporans show solidarity with each other and with their entire nation, and they are organized and active in the cultural, social, economic, and political spheres. Among their various activities, members of such diasporas establish trans-state networks that reflect complex relationships among the diasporas, their host countries and homelands.1

Moreover, William Safran, one illuminating critic in this field, proposed further understandings of the features of diaspora. Accordingly, diaspora should include dispersal to two or more locations, collective mythology of homeland, alienation from hostland, idealization of return to homeland, and ongoing relationship with homeland. The diasporans also believe they are not accepted in their host societies, and so remain partly separate. Safran additionally believes that diaspora relations with homeland should be supported with a continuing interest in events in the
homeland. There should be also identification with the homeland in terms of religion and/or language. Furthermore, a diasporan should visit the country, invest in the country’s economy, provide political support to the homeland, and lobby on its behalf with hostland decision-makers.2

In actual fact, the notion of ‘homeland’ has been of crucial significance to the definitions and characteristics of diaspora. A ‘homeland’ is the concept of the place, with which an ethnic group holds a long history and a deep cultural association, or a country in which a particular national identity began. Yet, this might be problematic concerning V. S. Naipaul, for the concept of ‘homeland’ is a complex one in his life as well as his works, since he has been frustrated by the cultural failure of his homelands, both Trinidad and India, to transcend to a standard level of sophistication.

In consequence, Robin Cohen, on illuminating theorist in this field, has recently proposed a solution to the somewhat problematic notion of ‘homeland’. Cohen suggested three versions of homeland: ‘solid’, meaning the unquestioned need for a homeland; ‘ductile’, which is an intermediate idea of homeland, indicating a softer and more flexible understanding of homeland, presenting the possibility of finding a similar homeland in diaspora; and the third version is ‘liquid’ homeland, indicating a postmodernist rendition of virtual home. It is a type of homeland, which has lost its conventional territorial reference points, to have become in effect, mobile and multi-located settlements, as in the case of Caribbean people.3

Nevertheless, one may pose a query about the difference between the traditional understanding of migration and the recently investigated diaspora. Fundamentally, one major aspect of migration that makes it distinct from diaspora is that there is a formation of a new society, rather than the homeland, with new identity and culture. Furthermore, in migration, its members tend to gain a new collective identity, different from their nativeland’s. Another individualizing aspect of migration is that the newcomers begin forming a new nativism, striving to become so assimilated with the hostland’s identity, to the degree that they feel superior to their citizens in the hostland. On the other hand, members of a diaspora tend to stick to their homeland’s identity and culture, and try to embrace their fellow migrants of the same diaspora community.4

In this pertain, Cohen has presented a systematic, comprehensive, and adjustable study, concerning types of diaspora. The following typology is clearer than the history and development of diasporas,
because some diasporans take dual or multiple forms, as Naipaul, making the task harder to comprehend under traditional migration studies. Thus, the following types best fit any diaspora study. They are victim diaspora, labor diaspora, trade diaspora, imperial diaspora, and cultural diaspora. Each type takes an ethnic group as a sample of study.5

The founding diaspora, the first type, is perfectly reflected in the historical condition of the Jews. After the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple in 580 B.C, the notion of victim diaspora had been formed. Afterwards, the Jews were brought to Babylon, after abandoning the land promised to Moses, to embrace the so-believed curse of eternal dispersion, seeing Babylon as a symbol of afflictions, isolation, and insecurity of living in a foreign place, cut off from their roots and their sense of independent identity. Centuries later, the coexistence of the Jews with the Christians was not an easy task, for the latters believed that Jews are forced to wander, because of their part in the killing of Christ, who in turn condemned them to eternal restlessness, from which, the image of the Wander Jew became part of the Christian myth, so deeply rooted that even the Jews themselves absorbed it to an actual display. Going back to the medieval centuries, the Crusaders did not confront the Jews, who murdered their god, softly. They began to slaughter the Jews in massive numbers on their way to Jerusalem. The Crusaders concluded the genocide when they arrived in Jerusalem in 1099 by gather all the Jews they could find into a convenient synagogue and burned them alive.6

Next, the victim diaspora is one of the most important types of diaspora, perfectly represented in the case of Africans and Armenians. In fact, the African diaspora has been in fierce battle, through centuries, with a gloomier diaspora than that of its fellow Jewish, for the Africans were believed to be the most inferior race of human beings, to the extent that this belief was deeply implanted in the African unconsciousness. However, on their behalf, the Africans strove to temper their depressing life by creating a number of myths about their sublime origins, as Guiana and Ethiopia, which was designated as symbols of mythical origin of valor and virtue, resistance to slavery and its suffering and humiliation.7 Another representative of victim diaspora is Armenia. It is believed that the first account of Armenian diaspora occurred when Maurice, the Byzantium emperor, transported 10000 Armenians to Cyprus, 12000 to Macedonia, and 8000 to Pergama. As a matter of fact, the gloomiest part of Armenian history began in the late nineteenth century, when they faced the Ottoman genocide, killing 300000
Armenians between 1894 and 1896. Afterwards, during the First World War, the Armenians witnessed the most traumatic phase of their history, when in 1915, the Turks initiated their mass deportation and genocide, killing over 1500000. Thus, the Armenian diaspora is considered the result of one of the most tragic events of human history, probably more catastrophic than that of the Jews. In fact, the entire Armenian community of the world is composed of survivors of their progeny. All were touched by the massacres.

In actual fact, some diasporas are not necessarily a consequence of forced migration or genocide at home, but some leave their homeland in search of work, producing the labor diaspora. The diasporans of this type, actually, move across international borders to work in one country, while remain citizens in another. The best example to be taken in this respect is the Indian indenture system, by which perhaps two million Indians were transported to various colonies of European power to provide labor for the plantations. In this respect, the recruiters needed to stand the harsh circumstances they were facing, like the horrific journey to the destination land, in addition to the inadequate legal protection made for the workers. Though the indenture was only for a fixed period, as supposed, many indentured Indians had undergone similar conditions to those of the former African slaves.

However, at its simplest, where settlement for colonial or military purposes by one power occurs, an imperial diaspora can be aid to have resulted. France, Spain, Germany, and Portugal have formed imperial diaspora, but Britain is distinct in this respect, because since the seventeenth century, huge numbers of the population have been departing their homeland. There are various reasons for this diaspora, as exiles for religious or political causes, poverty, unmerciful landlords, and so forth, but the majority of emigrants left because wider opportunities were available abroad than the British Isles.

Concerning the inventing diaspora, some diasporans in the hostland believe themselves to have the right to possess a homeland, a sense which prompts them to create one after it has been list. Here the case of the Sikhs is proposed. Hence, the Sikhs in diaspora created an imaginary homeland to which they long and devote their loyalty. The supporters of this cause believe that the only chance of survival of the Sikhs as a separate community is to create a state in which they form a compact group, where the teachings of Sikh religion is compulsory, and where
there is an atmosphere of respect for the tradition of their Khalsa forefathers.11

As for the trade diaspora, it refers to networks of merchants set up to buy and sell their goods along established trade routes, and furthermore, the merchants form one community live as outsiders in another region, learn the language, the customs, and the commercial practices of their hosts, and afterwards start the exchange of goods, as the Chinese and Lebanese traders.12

Regarding the cultural diaspora, the Caribbeans best fit this type, because despite the different destinations and experiences of the Caribbean peoples at home and abroad, they remain without a bond to a real homeland with independent identity and culture, being designated as people of ‘deteriorized diaspora’, who have lost their conventional territorial reference points, to have become in effect mobile and multi-located cultures with uncertain homes.13

Next, after a general perusal of diaspora typology, it is a necessity to survey its authority in a writer, whose life was a struggle with diaspora, to the degree that one observes all his fictional characters suffer from this homelessness, whether physically or intellectually. He is V. S. Naipaul, born in 1932 in Trinidad.

What is interesting in Naipaul’s encountering of diaspora is his comprehensive investment of this aspect in his fiction, that one observes the six types of diaspora mentioned earlier are present in his fiction, and even in himself. To understand one reason behind Naipaul’s seeking resort in diaspora is first to consider his early youthful romance with the idea of becoming a writer, which was implanted by his father.

In 18890s, Naipaul’s grandparents had been brought to Trinidad from India under the system of indentured labor. Later, Naipaul’s father, Seepersad, was schooled to become a pundit, but failed to do so, instead strived to become a writer. In 1943, Seepersad was able to writer and publish Gurudeva and other Indian Tales, but its fame did not surpass the expectations, and remained within the borders of that small territory. In other words, Trinidad was not a fertile soil to embrace writers, but instead buries them with their talent and reputation.14

Thus, Naipaul anticipated his future in Trinidad, and along with a whole generation of would-be writers fled to England. He abandoned his homeland in quest of a heritage of literary innovation that might provide him with the audience he could never hope to secure at home. Furthermore, another fundamental reason behind Naipaul’s obsession
with diaspora is his early colonial education, which had oriented him
toward England, encouraging him to dismiss his indigenous
environment.15

Nevertheless, he is considered the metropolis favorite interpreter of
the Third World, because he seems to satisfy the need for the history that
has been written from the standpoint of the colonizer and the colonized,
since in the first place, he belongs to the colonized, while he later gained
a metropolis-like identity, certifying him to blend between two
perspectives.16

Diasporically, Naipaul has undergone the influence of many
preceding travel writers, as James Anthony Froude, Anthony Trollope,
and mainly Joseph Conrad. In fact, Naipaul turned to these Victorian
writers, because his colonial upbringing adapted him with an imperial,
romanticized England. Moreover, he admired the way the Victorians had
turned travel writing into a vehicle for substantial political and moral
commentary.17

One crucial aspect of diaspora studies is the notion of identity, which
Naipaul has lost, because his grandparents left India under the indenture
system, while he was born in Trinidad, later to inhabit London. This
successive diaspora experiences left Naipaul struggle through a maze of
identity losses. His anxiety is attributed also to his troubling sense for
being outside the English center as a writer, and the fear of being
rejected.

It is a necessity, after all, to examine the depth of diasporic sense in
Naipaul’s writings. But first, it is wise to know that Naipaul’s career is
divided into three phases, which are respectively ‘mediation’,
‘alienation’, and ‘syncretism’. In accordance with these three stages of
Naipaul’s writing, this analysis would be devoted to ‘syncretism’, which
spans the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s, represented by The Enigma of
Arrival (1987). In this phase, Naipaul reconciles his new and old world
identities, and comprehends the world as a changing one of diverse
realities and irrationalities.18

The Enigma of Arrival is a plotless, autobiographical novel, in which
action has been replaced by mediation on various experiments and
perceptions. However, with this stream of thoughts, the reader comes
across the usual themes of diaspora literature, as unbelonging,
restlessness, global movement and migration, journeys and crossing of
various kinds of borders, arrivals and departures, homeland and hostland,
and so forth. Likewise, the narrator is a diasporan figure uprooted,
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wandering, roaming the globe physically and imaginatively. Like the author, the narrator left Trinidad and moved to England in his youth and now, as an old man, resides in a rented cottage at a rural estate in Wiltshire, struggling with the experience of being “in the other man’s country.” The narrator describes himself as “always a stranger, a foreigner” (The Enigma: 55) and speaks of the disorders caused by his personal state of diaspora as well as by the historical experience of colonialism in Trinidad.

The novel’s main theme is that the only way to perceive the essence of the world and its real construction is through diaspora experiences. As mentioned earlier, the narrator is originally from Trinidad, has been a diasporan wandering for many years, without feeling at home, disillusioned and depressed. As he begins to understand where he is, he also realizes that his notions of the hostland have been wrongly influenced by his colonial education and readings in English literature. He must learn to modify his visions, to understand what he is actually seeing rather than what he expects to see. People and places need to be seen in context and studied closely to get at the truth, yet they keep changing. Nevertheless, from the beginning, the narrator speaks of his tropical island and of Trinidad, thus making the reader aware that he is both a fictional character and autobiographical. Increasingly, the reader becomes aware that the narrator is Naipaul and that it is his life in Trinidad and London, and the books and trips are his own. His is not clear at first, because the narrator refers to his personal events in a distancing manner as if his past were fiction, something imagined by the author as background. This is, in fact, a strategy employed by Naipaul to stress his diasporic sense and experience that even his real self is in exile and detached from what he expected to be or to do. By the last section of the book, the distance between the narrator and author collapse as the reader is informed how the book came to be written, leaving the audience in maze that whether the people and events described are real or not.

After decades of struggle with diaspora and search of identity, it seems that finally Naipaul in the novel admits partly his transformation into an English writer and person, yet he continues to despise his Third World ancestry. Moreover, he seems to damn his destiny for belonging to that regressive part of the world. He believes that, accordingly, a fascination with decay

Had been given me as a child in Trinidad partly by family circumstances: the half-ruined or broken-down houses we lived in, our
many moves, our general uncertainty. Possibly, too, this mode of feeling went deeper and was an ancestral inheritance, something that came with the history that made me; not only India, with its ideas of a world outside men’s control, but also the colonial plantations or estates of Trinidad to which my improvised Indian ancestors had been transported in the last century- estates of which this Wiltshire estate, where I now lived, had been the apotheosis. Fifty years ago there would have been no room for me on the estate; even now my presence was a little unlikely. (The Enigma: 52)

Naipaul draws an irony of his diaspora between two estates: the colonial plantation that had been his grandparents’ destiny, and the English manor long sustained by the wealth drawn from such foreign properties. In this respect, the England he inhabited in childhood fantasy was never real and never existed, as has been observed, standing as a lifelong rebuke to Trinidad and the Third World for all they could never be.

Nevertheless, one important touch of diaspora feature, that of longing for homeland, is obvious in the novel. In fact, the narrator confesses that on his arrival in England, he loses his “dream of future”. (The Enigma: 134) The diasporan experiences a split of self from the world of the hostland. For the divided self of the diasporan, the past becomes more real than the present or the future, and the author thus writes books with great sympathy about that past, the past of the land of his ancestors and the past of colonies and empire: about Trinidad, the Caribbean and West Indies, India, and other regions of the developing world.

In the novel, there is a state of agony about home, leading to a reaction that always makes the diasporic nerves constantly on edge, exploding into paranoia. For Naipaul, as for diaspora itself, the novel is all about journeys and ships. It is about the first journey after which there are no other; it is about later journeys parodying earlier ones:

… that journey back to England so mimicked and parodied the journey of nineteen years before, the journey of the young man, the boy almost who had journeyed to England to be a writer in a country where the calling had some meaning… . (The Enigma: 95)

This is, in fact, a reflection of the primal journey of his people during indenture. For diasporic reconstruction, the past cannot be forgotten through an act of willed amnesia; but the ship has gone, and the diasporic
subject must now re-map the new hostland, master the landscape, and engage with the nation's prior history.23

In truth, the search for his identity is closely related to his responses to Trinidad, a response that reaches its most hysterical level whenever he encounters his society. As he reaches further and further back into the psychological trauma of his origins to explain his present, what emerge are not facts but, as the psychoanalysts would say, "scenes in fantasy."24 Such scenes are animated through a creative process, and The Enigma of Arrival can be read as an attempt to explain the primal fantasy of Naipaul's origins.

Nevertheless, Naipaul is far more adjusting in accepting his history and his Indian-Caribbean background. He tries to give something back to his society, to reconcile himself with his past, and celebrate his original homeland. In 1960, after he wrote A House for Mr. Biswas, he returned to Trinidad and seemed in a celebratory mood toward his country:

Everything I saw and felt and experienced then was tinged with celebration… . If there was a place, at this stage of my career, where I could fittingly celebrate my freedom, the fact that I had made myself a writer and could now live as a writer, it was here, on this island which had fed my panic and my ambition and nurtured my earliest fantasies. And just as in 1956 at that first return, I had moved from place to place, to see it shrink from the place I had known in my childhood and adolescent, so now I moved from place to place to touch it with my mood of celebration, to remove from it the terror I had felt in these places for various reasons at different times. Far away in England, I had recreated this landscape in my books. The landscape of the books was not as accurate or full as I had pretended it was; but now I had cherished the original, because of the act of creation. (The Enigma: 151-2)

Such sentiments are a long way from the horror of the island he expressed in The Middle Passage. They certainly reflect an attempt to qualify his earlier view of the society, so that he could move on, with less remorse and psychological trauma than he felt previously:

It was odd; the place itself, the little island and its people, could no longer hold me. But the island with the curiosity it had awakened in me for the larger world, the idea of civilization, and the idea of antiquity; and all the anxieties it had quickened in me the island had given me the themes that in the second half of the twentieth century had become important; had made me
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metropolitan, but in a way quite different from my first understanding of the world, when I had written "Gala Night" and "Life in London" and "Angela". (The Enigma: 153)

His acknowledgment of his debt to his original home, his recognition that it still embraced him and the realization that he could not arbitrarily renounce his emotional association with his original landscape, were necessary acts of cognition before a new beginning could be made.25
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Conclusion

Finally, Naipaul seems to remain roaming, without being bound to a homeland, a restless for good. However, Rob Nixon believes that it seems that Naipaul sees his home in death, since, in close succession, his brother, his sister, and Indira Gandhi (whom he deeply esteemed) all pass away; so the writing becomes shadowed by alertness to death as the terminal arrival.

Thus, Naipaul tries to display, through his work, the nature of his diasporic identity, which often seems paradoxical, because he lives in a voluntary diaspora in metropolitan London. He tries to relocate himself and reconstruct his identity. However, the fact is that by attempting to
erase his past, he makes futile attempts to identify and to place himself not only in metropolitan England, but also in Trinidad, his place of birth, and then in India, his ancestral country.
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