acknowledgement casts these issues as conclusions rather than premises. C. K. Stead's *The New Poetic*, and, more recently, Marjorie Perloff's discussion of the dynamics of the relationship between artist and audience in *The Futurist Moment*, are just two instances which confirm that this debate is ongoing. This brief note in *Forever England* acknowledges issues which might have been seen as a vexatious oversight by some, but it does not address them. The effect of this strategy is far more vexatious than a clear omission would have been.

Light appears to have heeded Edward Said's warning against the dangers of an oppressive critical orthodoxy, which threatens to dupe professional critics into "blithely predetermining what they discuss, heedlessly converting everything into evidence for the efficacy of the method" (26). From her initial acknowledgement of the 'devoutly theoreticist reader' through to her personal admissions of her own class biases in her "Afterword," Light appears to struggle with the potential disjuncture between her subject matter and the conclusions it leads her to, and the more radical politics of academic criticism in general—and feminist critiques in particular—against which she holds some of these conclusions. Although *Forever England* is a great success at what it sets out to do, it would have been stronger overall if it had not succumbed to the temptation of making too many concessions to those with whom it does not agree.
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As we now begin to encounter a second generation of postcolonial writers, it is worthwhile to look back and examine, the work of those who first struck for independence in the artistic world. Of necessity, we are talking mainly of writers in English who directly confronted the issues of pride and inferiority in the face of a long history of English literature. Viney Kirpal compares the works of those who voyaged to the centre and those who stayed at home in the periphery. Her critical work, *The Third World Novel of Expatriation*, reveals similarities among the novels of writers in her regions of study, India, West Africa, and the Caribbean.

To contain the highly emotional dialectic of home versus émigré writers, Viney Kirpal chooses a strongly structured critical approach.
Each of eight chapters deals with an explicit way of analyzing the writing under study. Evidence for each theme is presented in a rigorous, if rather stiff, manner, amply showing that the themes are valid and important tools for analysis.

The book is divided into three untitled parts, a device for which there is no obvious justification and which appears to be unnecessary in such a short volume. Part One, comprising the first two chapters, is a lucidly written discussion of the expatriate condition itself, using various novels as examples of what any expatriate might encounter. The works of James Joyce and Henry James are brought into the discussion, as they are in other chapters, recognizing that expatriation is not a uniquely Third World condition. Many references are cited on colonialism and expatriate writing, making these chapters a good reference for readers wanting to pursue the subject further.

Part Two embarks on a literary exploration of the sociology of expatriation, touching on subjects of great sensitivity. Chapter Three explores “The Migrant Experience: Love, Marriage, Divorce Between the Two Races.” Kirpal makes a strong case, based on selected works, for the white woman representing the horrors of European oppression, the home-country woman representing the integrity of the homeland, and the black man representing Third World characters intolerably torn between the two. With one minor exception, she bases the chapter entirely on the works of male writers, excluding some female writers who create more complex social situations. An example is Buchi Emeheta, who is cited in other chapters to support other thematic propositions. The racially based discussion is valuable, because the representation is undoubtedly in the novels; a critical analysis in this decade might be more valuable for discussing the differences among various male and female writers.

The remaining two chapters in Part Two examine the conflicting attractions of the motherland and the adopted land for expatriate writers. Kirpal more fully develops her overall themes of the nostalgic love/hate relationship the expatriate writer has with the motherland, and the more balanced relationship displayed by writers who stayed in their countries of birth. Her explorations of this theme are among her most important contributions. The “stay-at-home” writer (her appellation) maintains a critical view of the motherland, while remaining confident of indigenous values. The expatriate writer gradually loses contact with home values and establishes them as ideals in dramatic opposition to the evils of the adopted land. Kirpal finds that these extremes do not serve fiction well, gradually impoverishing the works of expatriate writers.

Part Three addresses explicit literary techniques. The most interesting theme upon which Kirpal expands is the widespread use of allegory by expatriate writers. She states:
Allegories have been produced by literary artists since times immemorial but expatriate novelists seem to construct them as a rule. All the Third World immigrant writers examined in this study have written allegories. . . . In their works, there is seen a gradual loss of solidity represented in the metaphoric forfeiture of stone, pebble, fossil, earth and roots. (136)

This seemingly outrageous proposition is well supported. Kirpal's differentiation between expatriate and stay-at-home writers leads clearly into her contention that expatriate writers are working from a diminishing resource of creativity, relying increasingly on the didacticism of allegorical tales. While acknowledging that other writers sometimes use allegory, she maintains that "the persistent creation of fiction with allegory as a structural principle seems to be peculiar only to expatriate novelists" (139). Her supporting references are drawn from the best novelists, including Salman Rushdie (expatriate) and Wole Soyinka (stay-at-home).

Expatriate writers are unlikely to agree with Kirpal's conclusions in her final chapter, "Towards Silence." The last few chapters of her book lead clearly to her conclusions; however, the writers most often cited near the beginning of her book are not so often cited towards the end. Several writers from other regions are brought into the discussion, obscuring the focus on Third World novelists. Nevertheless, Viney Kirpal has taken a position that demands discussion. Her arguments are persuasive. Are there expatriates who want to take up their own defence?

JUDITH UMBACH