This chapter examines the debate on postcolonial theory, specifically produced by the Indian scholars, which has taken deep roots in the name of cultural studies, subaltern studies, and even in some areas of feminist studies. It would be necessary to review the existing debate on the term "postcolonial" as well as the various departures that it makes at the level of theory and issues. Postcolonial theory is generally defined as a reaction to the inadequacies that the western theory set through its postulations on the theme of nationalism and particularly of eastern, anti-colonial nationalism. Therefore, the idea of inserting a brief debate on the dominant streams of thought on the issue of nationalism has been considered. The chapter therefore tries to start with presenting the main ideas of these western schools and then shifts to what postcolonial theory holds for the Dalit feminist perspective and its implications for the Dalit politics as a whole.

Contemporary Debate on Nation:

To unravel the debate on nation is cumbersome. The first part of the present chapter makes use of the demarcation already made between the views of primordialists/nativists and modernists to make the debate wieldy. The contemporary debate on the nation has almost deserted old perspectives on the divinity and necessity of the nation. The debate in the contemporary times has been, shifted to more complex studies of the nation. These modern groups of scholars can be placed in two schools; the "primordialists" and the "modernists". The first school alleges that ethnicity and ethnic history played a major role in carving out the modern nations and the second school holds that modern capitalism, industry, and communications have been completely responsible for the appearance of the nations. The contradictions between these two schools of thought are still considered relevant in the academic world.
Kedourie's text *Nationalism* (1960)\(^1\) can be identified as the text which inaugurated the contemporary epoch of scholarship on the nation. He treated it with a great amount of skepticism due to his resentment towards German Nazism. He also traces most of the noteworthy contributions to nationalist theory in German Romantic philosophy. For him nationalist politics is "ideological" in the sense that they are based on a search for an idealized social coherence and an Utopian community rather than on the everyday social obligations of self-defense, distribution of justice, and adjudication of law.

The fundamental argument of the modernists' is that there is an analytical reality at the back of the modern nation's emergence, from the end of the eighteenth century to the present that depends on particular socio-economic, bureaucratic and industrial innovations. The nation, according to this version is thus essentially a creation of the uniquely modernizing, and industrializing capitalist West. It is communication, market and education which play the key roles, not the ideological gadgets or political manipulations. In the modern times Earnest Gellner is considered as one of the prominent voices that adopted the modernist versions of the nation. His text *Nations* and *Nationalism* (1983)\(^2\) expresses faith in industrial society, and its economic and technological forces, which emerged in Europe at the end of the 18\(^{th}\) century, as launching the process of making the nations. He sees that agrarian society is incapable of adopting the nationalist principle. He sees a relation between nationalism and the processes of colonialism, imperialism and de-colonization also. The motives behind the European conquest of the world is industry and trade and not political expansions of the empire. Military orientation of conquering the nations was totally absent. Colonialism is merely an upshot of economic and technological superiority. The European imperialism lasted only between 1905 and 1960. It collapsed with the decline of their technological and economic strengths.

Gellner then comes to what he calls the weaknesses of nationalism. For him nationalism is defined as something which tries to bring polity and culture together. Here culture is an entity, which is often recognized by language. The old agrarian cultures, or the ruling cultures of the dominant groups become futile and yielded to the industrial
Thus, it is not the case that nationalism imposes homogeneity (as Kedourie argues) but that it is the objective requirement of homogeneity, which emanates due to industrialization that is replicated in nationalism. It is a new culture all together.

Gellner does not think that nationalism is altogether an ideological artifact. Neither, he says, is it the waking up of a dormant force, which was always there. According to Gellner, if we accept the idea that nation always existed, we are accepting the social metaphysics that it is created by some other force (for example God) and its driving wheel is not in the hands of human beings. For him, nationalism is in reality the consequence of a new form of social organization based on deeply internalized, education-dependent high cultures, each protected by its own state. Further it uses some of the pre-existent cultures, generally transforming them in the process, but it cannot possibly use them all. He divides the cultures into savage and cultivated varieties, and analogizes into agrarian and the industrial man. National education and communication systems are necessary to keep this industrial man alive and only an effective state can do it. He acknowledges that it is not feasible to have a single cultural and educational 'gold fish bowl for the entire globe'. He also explains the old and the new, the agrarian and the industrial need not be merged together now. This is because the 'arrival-time of industrialism in various communities " was different and also the application of the elements of the agrarian world made these differences more severe. He concludes that not internationalism as the world scholars of Left and Right predicted, but it's, opposite i.e., nationalism emerged because: “The differential timing of its [industrialism] arrival divided humanity into rival groups very effectively."

To a oft-repeated, "What is a Nation?" he explains both 'will' and 'culture' which are considered as crucial determinants of a nation are important to grasp but not sufficient. In this debate also he moves his analysis to nationalism. He asserts that nationalism creates nations not the other way round. The cultures that it claims to revitalize or preserve are its own inventions. He declares that the popular opinion of nationalism as "essentially, the general imposition of a high culture on society" is the
basic deception and self-deception practiced by nationalism. Whatever romantic ideals may mushroom, he feels that nationalism is simply the modernized form of political life.

The other primordialist school advances the idea that the power of ethnicity and ethnic history is vital in understanding the modern nation-state. They explain that the modern nation-state is unimaginable without its ethnic foundations, though they agree that such foundations could be largely romanticized or exaggerated. Anthony Smith is the leading exponent of this school and poses a challenge to the modernists that if the nation is most important of all “invented traditions”, “why does this ‘invention’ so often and in such different cultural and social settings appear to strike such a deep chord and for so long?...Clearly there is more to the formation of nations than nationalist fabrication, and ‘invention’ must be understood in its other sense of a novel recombination of existing elements.” Smith concentrates on ethnic, or pre-modern ethnic community. Ethnic, as a concept comes up with its legends of collective descent, common memories, common culture and love for homeland. He proposes two brands of ethnics. The first one is the lateral aristocratic ethnics that assimilate outlaying and lower-class cultures through expanding bureaucracy. The "old" nations like England, France, and Spain are the examples of this first kind. The second kind includes the more numerous vertical demotic ethnics. They are passive, religiously defined communities, motivated by intellectuals into a political state. Most of the new nations liberated by recent de-colonization come under this group.

It is important to notice that Smith, like various other scholars who insist on ethnicity, does not believe in the "primordial" essence of national communities claimed by ethnic and racial nationalists. He argues that the ethnic communities are in reality constructed and are consolidated by the modern state, but analyses that they are built by successive generations of a population out of shared memories of the past and visions of the future. They are not made-up by intellectual demagogues out of thin air. Nations are fabricated from bits and pieces of history that remains stuck in collective life. The segments are then put together in new ways by modern nationalists in search of an
independent state. Ethnicity is thus a constantly evolving one. This continuous state of evolution does not, however make it a fiction any way.

Gellner's modernist thesis, with its focus on issues of industrialization has been quite effective in deflating the major claims of ethnic nationalism. On the other hand, the primordialists stress on the ethnic rudiments of nationalism is vital in understanding the inviolability of the anti-colonial nationalisms waged against the west. But, still, Smith's division between the demotic (mostly non-western) and civic (mostly western) forms of ethnic coherence could be applied to defend the popular western opinion of non-western nationalism as illogical, spontaneous and communal and the western as the moderate and ideal one.

Benedict Anderson has changed Gellner's original thesis by proposing that "imagining" and "creation" are more appropriate terms than Gellner's "invention" and "fabrication". This is because there may ultimately be no community, national or otherwise that is not imagined, and hence invented in some sense. The "deep, horizontal comradeship" that is able to generate personal sacrifice for the sake of nation-state may be quite modern and constructed. It is definitely different from any earlier sense of community. Anderson, thus completely accepts the modernist perspective that the nation-state is a function of specific socio-economic conditions, like print capitalism. But he also perceives that the national sense of community that appears contains ethnic themes. These ethnic themes are as valid as any other elements that constitute it.

In his most renowned text *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (1991) Benedict Anderson defines the nation as an imagined community, which has seen light with the collapse of feudalism and the rise of capitalism. Feudal hierarchies allowed bonds to exist across national or linguistic boundaries. The bourgeoisie shared interests across the class lines within a bounded geography. Thus a community was created which never met and never necessarily had similar interests. Novel forms of communication like books, journals became conduits for creating such shared culture, jargon and interests. 'Print-capitalism' made possible
the emergence of 'mechanically reproduced print languages', which led to the creation of certain standardized languages. These languages reached varied/diverse sections of people. Anderson writes thus, 'the convergence of capitalism and print technology on the fatal diversity of human language created the possibility of a new form of imagined community, which in its basic morphology set the stage for the modern nation' (1991: 46).

However, Anderson says that in the case of those nations like new American states of the late 18\textsuperscript{th} and early 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries, language did not play a role in their imagination of nation. They were first to define themselves as nations. The Spanish-speaking creole communities of South and central America improved the idea of nationness and absorbed the native exploited non-Spanish speaking people into their idea of imagined community. Why should these landowning classes do this? Anderson says that the Creoles were denied a rightful place in the imperial administration and therefore wanted improvement of their status. Also the Creoles enjoyed certain privileges of European culture as the metropolitans. In the words of Anderson, Creoles were 'simultaneously a colonial community and an upper class' (1991: 58). Thus their nationalism had seen light out of both dispossession and privilege.

In Europe, language played a key role in creating national consciousness. Literate middle class and intelligentsia played a crucial role. It assumed an all-inclusive and popular shape predicated on language identity. It also deployed a democratic rhetoric. It was then taken away by the ruling European dynasties. The rulers forged this nationalism. This Anderson called 'official nationalism.' The rulers attempted to forge the new identification with the subjects they ruled. This 'official nationalism' was, according to Anderson, an 'anticipatory strategy' by the rulers who took away this kind of nationalism into their hands due to the fear that they might be excluded from new communities struggling to be born (1991: 101). This is a 'reactionary and conservative nationalism', which also spread to Asia and Africa. In these colonies the rulers and the ruled were to participate in the ruling where 'Indians Anglicized.'
Nation-state was the final form that nations took, which were born after the First World War and ended after the Second World War. Nation-states born out of anti-colonial struggles come into this category. They drew from the European models already existing. By this time the American and European experiences were everywhere modularly imagined. This was partly because the European languages-of-state they employed were the legacy of imperialist official nationalism (1919: 113). The native bilingual intelligentsia played a crucial role in forging national consciousness because they were bilingual and also since they enjoyed access to modern Western culture in the broadest sense, and in particular, to the models of nationalism, nation-ness, and nation-state produced elsewhere in the course of the nineteenth century (1992: 116). Briefly the anti-colonial nationalism saw light and was structured by European political and intellectual history. Thus it is a creation of the colonizer's language and ideas.

Postcolonial scholars found all these theoretical propositions immensely dissatisfying and contradictory to the truths that the eastern nation states and nationalisms upheld. In this present thesis the scholar tries to look at what postcolonial studies have to say and then verify whether such claims are genuine. The rest of the chapters are based on the explorations made to find out the veracity and repercussions of such overwhelming claims. The present chapter is thus a kind of introductory one that attempts to register the capabilities and incapacities of the same. This is done mainly by what is traditionally called the review of literature.

**Debating PC Studies:**

First of all, it becomes imperative to look at some of the ideas existing on colonialism before entering into the debate on postcolonial studies. Since modern colonialism is an extremely vast phenomenon it is impossible to make any hasty summaries. *The Oxford Dictionary of Sociology* defines colonialism as "The establishment by more developed countries of formal political authority over areas of Asia, Africa, Australia, and Latin America" But this definition forgets that colonialism existed before the modern time and also fails to make any qualitative differentiation
between the colonialisms operated in these different lands. New colonialism is different in the sense that it was accompanied by capitalism, which changed the economic structures of both the colonized and the colonizers. Earlier, colonialisms were apparently -- characterized by extracting gifts, heavy revenues or by looting the land. But the new colonialism was more enormous and more encompassing. People were made to move as slaves or indentured laborers, riches of the colonized land reached the metropolitan cities of the colonized as raw material and the colonized lands became markets for the consumption of these finished goods. As a result the native raw material, people and markets were subjected to exploitation. It was industrialization, which had operated as a catalyst of these transformations. Eventually, new economic-imbalances replaced the old ones. Naturally new socio, economic, legal set-ups were introduced which would assist such domination both practically and ideologically. Thus, colonialism of modern times is associated with the radical change of both the economic and social settings of the colonized land. So, it can be said that colonialism facilitated capitalism and vice versa.

The term imperialism is also often used as synonym for colonialism. A Dictionary of Sociology explains this development thus: "More recently, it has been used increasingly (now almost exclusively) to refer to the domination of colonial by more developed countries, and hence as a synonym for colonialism." So, Ania Loomba writes that it is "best to understand not by trying to pin down to a single semantic meaning but by relating its shifting meanings to historical processes." Thus, the purpose of the existing study is not to re-present the fights between the colonized and the colonizer in a chronological order. It is to winch various foundational questions about the postcolonial (PC from henceforth) literature produced by the Indian scholars and put into question the authenticity of their concepts and theories. Such an attempt craves for a radical prerequisite namely the re-definition of colonialism itself. It is in this context that the Dalit feminist scholar sees the importance of considering the question of internal fissures seriously. It is quite crucial if we do not want to restrict the meaning of the term postcolonial as a state existing in the once colonized societies after the mere technical transfer of power, which is generally called independence. For this purpose it is argued in this chapter that casteism in India, which preexisted the British colonial rule, is in fact the
first wave of colonialism, which was able to survive even after the end of the distant colonialism, that is the British colonialism. Addressing these fissures becomes inevitable since the postcolonial condition did not result in the automatic liberation of the dalits. It is useful to adopt the understanding that Ania Loomba forwards that, “Colonialism is not just something that happens from outside a country or a people, not just something that operates with the collusion of forces inside, but a version of it can be duplicated from within” (120). Such a broadened definition of colonialism would equip the Dalit feminist theory to address the facts and implications of contestations that took place historically between the differently colonized people.

It is possible to perceive the Dalit question in a non-conservative fashion only when we can also see the issues of internal fissures, colonialism and questions of nation and caste patriarchy from angles set by these re-definitions. When one becomes aware of caste oppression as the first wave of colonialism, then the Dalits’ fight against caste oppression can be understood in broader terms. Their struggles can no more be relegated as mere caste fights. In this sense the fights of the Dalits against the caste oppression can be treated as nationalist fights and Dalits as national subjects. And now it is definitely time to question why and how the anti-caste Dalit fights have not, so far, been treated as nationalist fights by the Indian social scientists? Is it because their fights are mostly mistaken as colluding with the foreign colonizers? Or is it because these fights are interpreted as fights that merely target a fragment of the problems of the nation? In other words, is it because they are seen as making quarrels only with one problem that the nation faces when the nation as a whole is struggling for bigger causes? Is it because the leaders of such movements are dominantly presumed as fake leaders and false gods? All these myths are in circulation regulating the psyche of Indian supremacist social science praxis. Hence, such re-definitions as proposed above, predictably, would give rise to many anxieties. One among them could be that such a re-definition of viewing the dalit movement, as a nationalist one, would liquidate the very definition of nationalism and colonialism. The intention of the chapter is precisely to snatch the banner of nationalism that the upper castes religiously hoist and take possession for themselves.
The Origin of PC Theory:

Coming back to the issue of the origin of postcolonial theory, it is the essential contradiction between the propositions of the two western streams of thought, namely, modernists and primordialists, which is sited as a reason for the surfacing of postcolonial theory. The PC writers themselves start their apologia for their theory by showing the inadequacies of western theories, the babies of Enlightenment (both liberal and Marxist and their various tributaries). They try to prove that it is quite impossible to understand the non-western nations and nationalisms within the theories set by the schools, which are the products of Enlightenment Reason. Replicating the mode of argument set by the text Orientalism, they even tell us that it is difficult to understand eastern nationalisms with the aid of western theories because even the interpretations of the same are structured within the ambit of western ethnocentric theorems. Thus the term postcolonial is applied not only to indicate a certain periodization but more importantly to a methodological revisionism. Thus this academic project has projected itself as a blanket term for the critique of western knowledge and power, especially those that emanated from the Enlightenment period. It is also projected as an all encompassing term that envelops various critical approaches which target Euro-American thought in areas as wide-ranging as Political Science, Anthropology, Literary Studies, Sociology and so on. It can also be said to have displaced what is known as Commonwealth or Third World literature.

Western studies on the nation predominantly assume that both the nation-state and nationalism are offshoots of western Reason and originally emanated in Europe. Thus the issue of non-western tendencies to the nation and nationalism has become specifically crucial for the non-western postcolonial scholars who have surfaced since the 1950s. Franz Fannon’s work Black Skin and White Masts is said to have instituted the postcolonial theory. Wretched of the Earth of the same author is also treated as very important. Gayatri Spivak and Homi Bhabha brought out postcolonial theory basing on the Jacques Derrida’s philosophic deconstruction. These theorists interpreted this theory of representation to include identity (whether personal, racial, national or linguistic).
They focused on the socially and textually imagined and constructed characters of race, nationality and ethnicity. By the late 1980s, the first volume of *Subaltern Studies: Writings on South Asian History and Society* surfaced.

**Verifying the Applicability of PC Theory in India:**

It is with the launching of the Subaltern Studies that the PC theory made its grand entry into the Indian social and political theory. They are committed to more or less the same aims as other PC intellectuals. It is the complicity and resistance of the Indian nationalist thought with the western knowledge system, which is deconstructed by the postcolonial writers of India (but mostly settled as NRls (Nonresidential Indians) in the West or shuttling between the West and India on academic junket). They remain in many ways reliant on the very structures they are interested in dismantling. Thus they tend to often subvert the dualisms and binaries without questioning the validity of these dualisms and binaries themselves. In their studies of nation-states and nationalisms, they declare that they reject both the western interpretations of eastern nationalisms and eastern nationalist theories themselves. What they therefore claim is to deconstruct the very foundations of western philosophy.

Homi Bhaba argues that “the term postcolonial is increasingly used to describe that form of social criticism that bears witness to those unequal and uneven processes of representation by which the historical experience of the once-colonized Third World comes to be framed in the West.” Thus, for him postcolonial is only an intellectual exercise to direct the focus on imbalances in modes of representation. But Aidoo, on the other hand, sees the concept as a ‘pernicious fiction’ and ‘a cover-up of a dangerous period in our people’s lives.’ It is mainly projected as an umbrella term that includes various critical perceptions, which deconstruct European ideological and theoretical suppositions on the east. There are, however, extremely conflicting views about this term and the theory that goes with it. At the same time the glamour of this field does not seem to surcease so easily. Due to the continuing craze for PCS it is important to interrogate
postcolonial theory as Hazel Carby has proposed it as a sign and as a 'locus of contradictions.'

Therefore it is apt to start this discussion by looking at Edward Said's work *Orientalism,* a seminal text which came to be known as a foundational text of postcolonial theory (which deals in a more profound manner with the ideology of colonialism than Fannon's text, *Black Skins and White Masks*). His main emphasis is that Orientalism is a discourse by which “European culture was able to manage- and even produce- the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period.” For him Orientalism is embedded in the very structures and circumstances that made European colonialism and imperialism possible. Many texts of Orientalism constructed the Orient and established control over it. Said explains that these cultural texts play a crucial role in the deployment of colonial ideology. *Orientalism* generated an analysis of literary, cultural and other texts which foregrounded their foundations in the sociopolitical worlds in which they were born. Said drew from Michael Foucault's "discourse" and Antonio Gramsci's "hegemony" to analyze the development of European power Vs knowledge archetype and their western epistemologies, which he jointly addresses as "Orientalism". These western paradigms and epistemologies are fed in various forms and modes of representation. Said describes fiction and journalistic writings as exhibiting these critical features. They reflect the European's image of the East. They do not really represent the Orient but, as Said says, "In any instance of at least written language, there is no such thing as a delivered presence, but a re-presence, or a representation. The value, efficacy, strength, apparent veracity of a written statement about the Orient therefore relies very little...on the Orient itself (21). Such an imperialist perception about the east is internalized by the non-western people and there is a threat that the east's view of itself is changed- Said warns!

A series of texts saw light following the formula that *Orientalism* set the colonized's subjective experiences ought to be saved from the knowledge frames of the west. PCS emerged as an approach following this methodology. As part of such a
realization Gayatri Spivak and Homi Bhaba came up with the volumes titled *Europe and Its Others* in the first part of 1980. In 1982, a volume *The Empire Strikes Back* was produced. In 1988 the first volume of *Subaltern Studies* was produced which claimed to clean off the 'elitist bias characteristic of much research and academic work' in South Asian Studies. All this meant a fundamental reassessment of modes of knowledge production in the academic disciplines.

Thus, the task of deconstructing the existing western theories and concepts occupied the greatest attention of the so called third world intellectuals. The major challenge that they posed to the West was in the area of modernity, a post-Enlightenment ideology. The earlier critiques of colonialism tried to focus their theoretical analysis on economic plunder and based their analysis on dualisms of self/other that shaped knowledge in areas such as literature, history, anthropology etc. But these theories failed to understand various dimensions because they mostly remained within the imperial epistemological structures that they wanted to dismantle. Nationalism also, a narrative which posed the greatest threat to colonialism, nevertheless, attached to the narratives of modernity as a liberating force and accepted the universal notions of freedom, liberation etc. produced and determined by western Reason. It grew to depict the nation-state only as a better replacement of the colonial state. Postcolonialists see this phenomenon as a problematic thing. They see even nationalism as being ensnared by the same structures and ideologies against which it is believed to have been fighting. Thus, the PC mission is to understand the 'link between the structures of knowledge and the forms of oppression of the last two hundred years'. Thus, the mission of PC theory is to deconstruct western philosophy, a deconstruction of the very ways and terms by which its knowledge has been erected.

Another explanation (adjacent to the above reason) that is often cited for the emergence of PCS is the inadequacy of political concepts and their inability to cope with contemporary realities. The belief in western Reason, and notions like progress, community, nation-state etc seems to be disintegrating with the growing pressures like increased mobility of the people, fundamentalism, secessionist movements etc. This
preset agonizing history of the east is pre-determined by the models given by the west. They thus try to explain the sad stories of how the east has been perpetually bounded and fed on western Reason, which poses itself as the only fate and haven for the world's nation states. Gyan Prakash for instance describes PC criticism as critiquing the 'historicism that projected the West as History'. Subaltern Studies take up the studies of colonialism and nationalism seriously and claim to offer an anti-foundationalist historiography. They claim to go beyond the colonial, nationalist and the Marxist historiographies, which resort to foundationalist arguments. As an alternative they rely heavily on the multicultural argument, which some suspect to be a baby of postmodernism.

Study of Culture:

In contemporary times, the study of the culture of the postcolonial world has assumed great importance by extending Fanon's definition of culture as an aesthetic expression of the spirit of the given people. Culture has become a central intellectual concern around which postcolonialists try to flesh out their theory. Thus, postcolonial and cultural studies have become identical and have begun to have specific approaches towards the issues of nation, nationalism, gender, postcolonial identities and so on. These approaches are outlined by the imperialist and the cultural rather than the political or economic dynamics of colonization. They focus on historical or sociological versions of specific anti-colonial nationalist struggles. The problem of hegemony is another dimension, which is not adequately attended to in this shift to multicultural expressions and interdisciplinary scholarships. Thus hybridity becomes both a determining feature and the theme of postcolonial theory.

Gender, however, occupies a respectable place in PC studies. With the emergence of the feminist studies, the relation between gender and nation, its interdependence, exclusions etc have become a fascinating area within this field. It is curious to realize how the category called Indian woman so neatly fits into the PC frames. Insertions of the study of Indian woman appear to be (though not very often, since there
are not many essays written on this in the *Subaltern Studies Volumes* smooth, though often, gender seems to be an additive or an extra added to the project. Though not all the texts, which deal with gender and nation, can be identified as postcolonial studies, it is an interesting trend to note that both the Indian feminists and the PC studies share almost the same beliefs (as it is indicated, for instance, through the deconstruction of the text like *Women Writing in India* or *Recasting Women* in the following chapter). It is true especially in the case of those feminist writings, which deal with the intricacies of colonial history and *Indian women* predominantly from the Cultural Studies angle. Their theory shuffles between the counters of culture and colonialism, leaving the vast area of caste and economic relations of production. As a result caste patriarchy, a system, which sets the rules for survival for millions of Dalit women, is, not put to analysis. More fundamentally, they tend to ignore the fact that the Hindu patriarchy, which they try to deal with in their text is essentially caste patriarchy. There is no such thing as patriarchy in India, which has no caste dimensions anywhere in its operations. Therefore, when they slice away an analysis of castedness, the determining force of Indian patriarchy, what they do is ignore the collaborations that they (*upper caste women*) have historical made with it. They also expurgate what it has meant for the *rest* of the Indian women.

**Limitations of PC Theory:**

As mentioned above colonialism is a vast, heterogeneous phenomenon, which negates any hurried attempts at generalizations. But, unfortunately, this precaution is not heeded by most of the scholars of PC theory. More importantly, they pick up the argument of heterogeneity of colonial or postcolonial experiences, and regional variations whenever they have to make excuses for their work for exclusively writing *upper caste* versions and their histories, for excluding the versions of the marginalized communities like dalits, for not inserting their realities even when there is a real need to do so. For instance, they go on producing bulky essays on their respective communities with the excuse that they are only the histories of those particular communities and therefore *obviously* have nothing to say about the *others*. Here, the concepts of heterogeneity and regional variations become handy justifications. But they do not follow the same
rationale when they make grand theoretical generalizations, which bring all the colonial and postcolonial experiences of the much less privileged people like those in African nations or Dalits and other women onto the same rubric. Here what they apply is the logic of homogeneity. In other words they make convenient use of both heterogeneity and homogeneity. To put it briefly, heterogeneity becomes an excuse to write exclusive histories on the upper castes without bothering about the interruptions that the other voices make and the cause of homogeneity becomes handy to bring all the people of the land (even all the other once colonized countries) into the fold of PC studies. Thus the Dalit women, though not imparted any recognizable subjectivity becomes the PC subject and she is granted of no other identity. Ultimately, it is the upper caste narrations and their valor which passes for the national.

This penchant for the claims of superiority of oppression is very much visible in the following texts. For instance, the editors of “Recasting Women” or "Women Writing in India", or Partha Chatterjee in his ‘Derivative Discourse’, base their arguments on the theoretical generalizations related to colonialism or postcolonialism without bothering to explain why their works do not include the voices and realities of the Dalits. The argument here is not that there cannot be any general theory on western colonial rule/thought. But the point is that these generalizations must match with the pre-colonial particularities and multiple authenticities (which are on the verge of extinction) of the colonized land. Does the PC projects offer this space to barred subjects like the Dalits? Can it take in studies that explore those ways in which caste oppressions of the pre-British colonial era managed to seep through the British colonial period and sustain intopostcolonial times? How does it address the clefts created through caste, gender, and other-genders (both men and women of exploited communities)? Will such an adjustment wither away the postcolonial project itself since it shifts the burden of the onus of proof of oppression on the upper castes along with the British colonialists? The Indian PC theory is by default unequipped to do this. Thus, in this work what the scholar has tried to do is to deconstruct some of the writings of the PC scholars (which deal with caste, gender and nation) in order to prove this point. The effort has, also been to record the skepticism of Dalit feminism towards the same.
According to Dalit feminism, the aftermath of British colonialism can be described as a dialectical concept that marks the broad historical facts of decolonization and the achievement of independence, and also the nation coming to terms with the economically and politically supremacist imperialist powers of the world. Throughout this process caste, gender and casteist patriarchy finds new expressions; they are thoroughly reconstituted through all of these phases. They are adjusted and, re-formulated. The implications of such reformulations during the British colonial period bear upon the present: the so-called postcolonial era. Thus 'postcolonial' does not mean that the nation in question is completely broken away from its pre-foreign colonial set up. It means that, the postcolonial does not necessarily hold a transformed historical or cultural situation. For a Dalit feminist, the term postcoloniality comes to mean only the physical liberation of the Indian subcontinent from the alien colonialists. The old oppressive caste and casteist patriarchal systems nevertheless continue and are reconstituted to fit the new political needs.

Postcolonialism is often portrayed as tricontinentalism, as a specific historical happening, which occurred in the three continents, Africa, Asia and the Americas. Though they are ready to acknowledge the differences that exist among the colonial experiences of all these nations, they do not see these differences as fundamental or specific to that particular continent or nation. These differences would not be thought of as hurdles in drawing generalizations. Postcoloniality, from the beginning, is situated between very simplistic parameters, but claims to embody a rich theory that coalesce epistemological, and politico-cultural interests. The more enormous it became the hazier became the traces of the realities of the -others within/ internal others. Thus caste/caste patriarchy, which is intrinsic to the British-colonial experience, became a muddled memory for the nation. Nation is imagined and re-imagined on the forgetfulness of these realities. Dalit feminist critique of postcolonial theory now implies, according to this logic, a travel towards the integrated province of political theory related to nation, colonial experience, caste, caste patriarchy and the notion of independence. It demonstrates that each dimension of colonial/postcolonial experience is casteised in a
gendered way and gendered in a castiest way. It challenges the whole political thought process, which presumes that the nation is an innate body.

The overwhelming presence of this theory in the academic world can be understood by the fact that some intellectuals project postcoloniality as a universally applicable formation. In *The Empire Writes Back* the three Australian authors applied the term postcolonial ‘to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day’.22 This is too simplistic an argument since these authors have put USA on the same register along with the other Asian and African countries. It is impossible to think of colonialism as having produced the same and equal effects on USA and Africa. Hence, the definition of ‘postcolonial’ should be as varied as are the nations. One more limitation is that this term is increasingly applied to address the marginalized constituencies in the first world, hence hijacking all specific forms of local dissent. One more point is that even if one feels that ‘postcolonial’ should ideally address the combinations of material, economic, social and cultural practices that the native people hold after the elimination of the physical presence of a colonizing nation, it would be a simplistic formula because the dominant colonizing nation may continue its control over the freed nation even after its physical removal. For instance, as is explained in the text *Orientalism*, the West inscribed its codified knowledge about the populations under colonialism even after it actually left the colonies.

*Can the Subaltern Speak?*

The question of agency is still an unsolved riddle for the postcolonialists. Spivak for instance declared that it is impossible to retrieve the agency of the subaltern. Benita Parry charged Spivak for having maintained ‘deliberate deafness to the native voice where it is to be heard’.23 She accuses Spivak’s theory of mounting itself from a ‘theory assigning an absolute power to the hegemonic discourse in constituting and disarticulating the native’.24 Parry writes, "Since the native woman is constructed within multiple social relationships and positioned as the product of different class, caste and cultural specificities, it should be possible to locate traces and testimony of women’s
voice on those sites where women inscribed themselves as healers, ascetics, singers of sacred songs, artisans and artists, and by this to modify Spivak's model of the silent subaltern.\textsuperscript{25} Parry's provocative essay has generated a host of responses. Spivak, in response, pointed out the dangers of the 'identitarian ethnicist claims of native or fundamental origin'.\textsuperscript{26} What is the point of having separate plans of native historiography if the SS\textsc{pcs} sets itself against the idea of invoking a native voice? They are supposed to accommodate as much authentic specificities as are feasible since they argue from a multicultural and multirepresentational terrain. Also it should be noted that what Benita Parry means by 'native voice' is not that of fundamentalism in the hindutva sense. This native voice means the voices of the of those who are not heard so easily; for instance Dalits, Tribals or Hindu widow women lurking in pilgrimage camps etc. One more reason for which one can probably consider Spivak's response to Parry as inadequate is the example that she has taken as the subaltern subject, namely that of the \textit{sati}, in her essay where she talked of the impossibility of salvaging the agency of the subaltern.\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Sati} is virtually a silent subject (in a sense that a woman becomes a \textit{sati} only when she ritually ascends her husband's pyre and eventually dies) and therefore it is quite problematic to project \textit{sati} as an example in order to establish the mute status of the subaltern.

Taking yet another PC scholar for analysis; Bhabha argues that the colonial text transmits the voice of the native. According to him, the colonial text is essentially hybrid, in the sense that it already contains the voice of the subaltern, though, ambivalently. The discursive text is already fissured in the act of enunciation and it is in these gaps that the voice of the subaltern can be found. The method of tracing out these subaltern voices is by deconstructing the texts and languages of the colonialists. Ray Chow concludes that what Bhabha restores in the name of deconstructing the colonial text to trace the subaltern voice in their gaps is nothing but the mere revival of an old functionalist notion of equilibrium.\textsuperscript{28} Now the Dalit feminist contemplation can be as follows: "How does Spivak endorse the Subaltern Studies project without sharing a belief in their essential theme of retrieving the subaltern to its agency?" Another problem that immediately rises is not only whether the subaltern can speak or not, but also if the subaltern's speech will
be read properly by the PC intellectuals who are mending it and theorizing upon it? Also, why should anybody believe that it is the subaltern's true voice especially when there are a multiple range of gaps? Is not it finally a wilful interpretation of the PC intellectual at work? Both the claims of Spivak and Bhabha that the subaltern cannot speak and that the subaltern speaks but in the gaps of the discursive text of the colonizer fulfills two unsettled but absolute tasks object constitution and subject configuration. Thus, it would be ultimately the PC intellectual who is left with total sovereignty over the historic material he/she interprets.

**Postcolonial Status as a Privilege and the Danger of New Orientalism;**

At this juncture the PC project is charged with dodging the specificities of identity. Aijaz Ahmed argued that the term postcolonial is "simply a polite way of saying not-white, not-Europe, or perhaps not-Europe-but-inside-Europe". If such is the definition the un-migrated native subaltern, who has not yet managed to escape colonial or postcolonial treacheries (by, for instance, settling away in the west) becomes disqualified from being enumerated in the ambit of PCS. Aris Dirlik makes this point clear by attributing postcolonial theory to the third world intellectuals who have entered the western academia. Though it is true that some first world intellectuals also deal with this field of study, it is necessary to remember that PCS is predominantly forwarded by the third world intellectuals. It may be absurd to argue that Dirlik's view essentialises third and the first worlds since, after all PCS itself is predicated on the binary of the west as dominating and the east as postcolonial.

We come across some precautions also given to those who are doing PCS. Among these the precaution given by Spivak deserves immense attention. The concept the "Third World" has attracted attention in this context. It is Spivak who made strong resistance to the usage of the term 'Third World.' All the marginalized regions are bunched into a single 'generalized margin' as the 'Third World.' Constructing all these countries as the Third World and therefore as a 'new object of investigation' for the purpose of 'institutional validation and certification' would, she argues, 'complicities in
the perpetration of "new orientalism". Such a fear sounds genuine since PCS is situated in the western academia (though it claims to target the west) and carries the potential possibility of being re-subjected to the western academic gaze. Appiah is unkind to the PC intellectuals unlike Spivak and argues that 'postcoloniality is the condition of what we might ungenerously call a comprador intelligentsia: a relatively small, Western-style, Western-trained group of writers and thinkers, who mediate the trade in cultural commodities of world capitalism at the periphery'.

PCS as a Babe of Postmodernism?

Many of the intellectuals who oppose PCS are also apprehensive about postmodernism. Appiah is one who has voiced the fear that postcolonialism is actually a postmodern project. He explains that the 'post' in both postcolonialism and postmodernism operates as a 'space-clearing-gesture' in order to create the market for cultural products that offer themselves as new. Thus, for them, PCS remains a part of cultural intellectual commodification. Arun Mukherjee explains that those PC texts which are pampered by the western academy are the ones which share the ideology of postmodernism. A question such as "Is postmodernism an inadequate methodological, political and theoretical tool?" craves for another context to be answered. But a question that can be posed immediately is "Why does PC disguise its postmodern credentials?"

The Dalit feminist scholar does not want to be caught up in the capricious fights of classical Marxism and postmodernism. She would rather try to understand the implications of such cryptic collaboration between PC and postmodernism.

The Question of World Capitalism

It is unsurprisingly, the Marxist scholars who reacted to the PC apathy towards the material realities. Dirlik and Ahmad posed their theories against PC theory and its sites of production. The metropolitan academy encourages PC projects since the
contemporary PC theory refuses to tackle its relation with global capitalism. For Dirlik, much of the PC theory does not attribute to capitalism a determining status, and thus evades applying Marxian tools to infer truth. PC theory is patronized by the western academy due to its apathy towards Marxism. He concludes that the intellectuals who propagate PC theory are the beneficiaries of global capitalism and hence they don’t want to critically address it. They deploy PC theory in ways which disguise these motives. Aijaz Ahmad also tries to explain the relation between manufacturing PC theory and the sites of its production. All the metropolitan PC theory is already compromised due to its association with the first world. Terry Eagleton also declares that postcolonial thought permits one to “talk about cultural differences, but not - or not much - about economic exploitation”.

*The Question of Native Intelligentsia:*

What is important in the works of Fanon is his sensitivity to the question of what he prefers to call the "pitfalls of national consciousness" which has led to the emergence of the newly oppressive class divisions within new nations. He also addresses the racial bases of the nationalist thought in the colonial world. It was again Fannon who contributed the concepts “comprador” class or “intellectual native bourgeoisie” to describe the elite class of natives who collaborated with the economic and socio-cultural practices of the white colonizers in his text *Black Skin and White Masks.* Said also refers to Fanon’s "critical nationalism" which explains how "the future would not hold liberation but an extension of imperialism." If the elite class of the native land take no part in the liberation struggle. But Fannon has taken a sympathetic view of the native elite class. The hegemonic classes’ complicity with colonialism should be understood as more than mere vulnerability. As the proceeding text tries to analyze it is not the result of pitiful ensnarement of the elite of the colonized between "double consciousness" as W.E.B. Dubois has noted in the context of Africa. But in the context of India this collusion is to be understood as a willful employment of both the old (caste) and new (modern) hegemonic ideas by the dominant castes in India. Thus Fannon fails to
adequately address the question of social and economic cleavages preexisting the advent of colonialism.

There are very few intellectuals of the day who have problematized the question of pre-British colonial inequities. This dimension is exclusive to the Indian context, which have been having the unique system called caste. For instance, Partha Chatteerjee's defense of the hindutva nationalists as the true nationalists to put forth the indigenous brand of nationalism could be offered as a proof that the Indian elite did not collaborate with the colonial masters. With this Hindu nationalism can easily pass for true Indian nationalism. But the Dalit feminist contention is that the nationalist fights did not take place during the historical nationalist period between the pure categories of western colonizers and the Indian colonized. At least in the Indian context, the pure categorization of the colonizing west and the colonized, innocent east would not bring the social scientist closer to many realities. There is a need to turn PCS to the internal colonialism namely caste colonialism which is not yet “post”. In other words PC theory should be rigorously inward looking and introspective. The question then is whether post-colonialism can still serve as a relevant and legitimate theoretical frame to the Indian context.

**Evading Specificities and the Politics of Nativism:**

Moreover, the Indian PC writer needs a humble, collaborating native but not a questioning one. For instance, Partha Chaterjee was trying to prove that the Indian nationalists tried to, and became successful to an extent, in producing an autonomous nationalist thought. Any other reality, which challenges such an assumption, is chased out of the boundaries of these texts. A native sample that is not pure (because it does not yield to the frames set by PC theory) is therefore an impure specimen. It is doomed only towards two fates; one to be branded as a betrayer (of the nation and the nationalists) or as an incapable category which cannot resist western Reason. For this reason alone, we do not find a place given to Ambedkar in Partha Chatterjee's text *Nationalist Thought & The Colonial World* though Ambedkar tried to offer nationalist thought within the
indigenous frames of dhamma also. If indegeniety of thought is the parameter for Chatterjee to consider the first two Hindu nationalists in this text (Bankim and Gandhi) then Ambedkar could have easily qualified, given that Partha did try to respect this category also. But the PC writer is extremely alert. Ambedkar, a man whose place rightly is in the inner domain becomes a corrupt sign, who broke up the innocence, the virginity of his identity because he transgressed the boundaries set by the inner domain. It is the Hindu natives who are given the privilege of subjectivity which equips them with ontological consistency with which to combat the dominant western images about themselves. But the Dalits are denied such subjectivity and therefore are not given the chance of gathering the ‘surplus value of the oppressed’ the way the upper caste nationalists are freely allowed to. In other essay "Nation and its Outcastes" Chatterjee includes only those historic Dalit voices which could not assert in the contemporary language and therefore were never destined to break with the inner domain. The logic is that a questioning or challenging category of Dalit cannot represent an absolute totality of the other like the non-resisting traditional category of Dalit. Thus, in the PC articles written on caste and caste patriarchy, whatever snatches of theory we get are fabricated around the rudimentary subjecthood of the others; full fledged subjecthood is given short shrift. The Dalits are allowed only this rudimentary status in the sense that they are made to stick to only the fringes that this inner domain offers them while the upper caste nationalists always emerge from the colonial and postcolonial green room with fresh make ups as true nationalist subjects and agents.

Simon During’s bold definition of post-colonialism as "the need, in nations and groups which have been victims of imperialism, to achieve an identity uncontaminated by universalist or Eurocentric concepts and images" would ignore the greatest historical nationalist struggles that the Dalits and Tribals in India have been doing for the land both against the alien (neo)colonialists and the internal colonialists mostly with the help of the very universalist ideologies of equality or justice produced by western Reason. What the nativist argument does for the Indian reality is to legitimize the anti-human codes, impressions and images that casteism has produced time to time. Certainly, in the debates of PC, it is the upper caste nativism that is taken into account, not the more
diverse Dalit or tribal nativisms, which could be translated as authentic Indian nativism. For instance, the self-styled Subaltern Studies ways of writing history declared its aim to be that of bringing out native voices but ends up by doing contrary to what they claim. For example, what Ranajith Guha does is to produce a series of Kashmir Sanskrit texts in the name of invoking the native historiography. Dirks writes on this, "...I do not share all of the proposals of Ranajit Guha, whose resort to Sanskrit sources for indigenous political theory and historical consciousness seems to betray a general commitment to writing subaltern history against the grain in most other contexts." The search for the uncontaminated self thus carries the potential of exhuming the fossils of some aspects of the caste structure, which the Dalit movement of the yester-years buried with greatest efforts. Thus the very central claim of SS, that it would talk for the ‘subaltern’ essentially failed on two plaines one, when Spivak categorically argued that it is not feasible to retrieve the subaltern voice but that it can only be represented. The second plane where the SS intellectuals failed is clearly self-evident - the writers more often than not failed to do what they promised in their project.

Chatterjee's two essays on 'Indian women', for instance project only upper caste hindu women. If the intention is to portray this category of women as one of the 'native female communities', then why did he place them under the titles 'Nation and Its Women' or 'Women and the Nation'? If he merely wants to explain that it is a writing focused only on the upper caste women, then, he should have titled the essays as essays on upper caste women but not as 'The Nation and Its Women' or "Women and the Nation". The problem is that they do not try to incorporate the multiple histories as much as they claim to. As a result, they end up re-producing or substantiating the Hindu revivalists and the upper caste women as the true subaltern voices. It is difficult not to appreciate this cunning.

Hybridity.44

Hybridity is introduced in PCS as a vital notion to address what is called the fractured or conflict-ridden subjectivities. But still they habitually deal with the
'postcolonial condition' in a generic sense. Identities still remain nonspecific like the postcolonial subject, postcolonial woman or the subaltern. Such definitions do not allow space between divergent kinds of colonial contexts and categories whose forms have been reconstituted by the British colonial rule or kept relatively intact and untouched by it. Another privilege that Postcolonial studies enjoy is its non-recognition of the importance of location. It does not count the specificities of locale as crucial. Too much dependency on poststructuralism, literary and cultural criticism, stress on the individual, a tendency of ruthless homogenisation is, to a degree, responsible for this vagueness. Chrisman thus warns, "It is as important to observe differences between imperial practices- whether it be geographical/ national...or historical...as it is to emphasize what all these formations have in common." But PC theory does not pay attention to the implications of differences between the colonial practices in the lives of different colonized subjects. Thus the privileged upper caste Indian who occupies a prestigious NRI position transfigures himself as a disadvantaged postcolonial hybrid subject in their literature.

Coming back to the meaning of hybridity, it is Mary Louise Pratt who proposes a term 'transculturation' to analyse the process of inter-cultural negotiation and selection that takes place between the colonized and the colonizer. They have meeting points, which she calls the 'contact zones'. According to this argument the colonized and the colonizer do not fit into the opposite fixtures of self and the other. She depicts these 'contact zones' as the social daises where 'desperate cultures meet, clash, grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination.' Such contact zones are also guarded by some colonial arrangements to discourage the same in order to prevent any hybridization. It is true that the upper caste intellectuals tried to claim lineage with their colonial masters through the help of these 'contact zones' and understandably such attempts were resented by the latter. The essential point of Bhabha’s argument lies here. He believes that such contacts have actually transformed the colonized subject into a hybrid one. But unlike Pratt, Bhabha celebrates this 'inter-cultural negotiation' as a conscious game-play of the colonized, which need not always be regulated by the principle of domination and subordination. But what Aime Cesaire
believes is totally opposite. He says "has colonialism really placed civilizations in contact? ...I answer no...No human contact, but relations of domination and submission...". It is evident that hybridity should mean different things for the African and the Indian lands. Cesaire’s view of hybridity mirrors the Dalits’ experience not that of the privileged upper castes. Thus the issue of 'coming into contact' with the colonized and thus honing split subjectivities is not true for all the colonized people. It is rather interesting to observe the similarities between the colonized people of Africa and dalits regarding hybridity. It is important also to note that Cesaire’s tone infers that having such 'contact zones' is in fact a privilege. This privilege was available to the upper castes in India and not available to the dalits and to most of the Africans.

There are also two kinds of hybridities at our disposal set through the texts ‘Intimate Enemy’ and Bhabha’s writings. According to Nandy it is a willful phenomenon consciously carried on by a super intellectual like Gandhi. Bhabha holds a view exactly opposite to this. He conceptualizes hybridity as a flow in due to the contact of the colonized with the colonizer. It is not a painful experience either, as Fannon explorations would suggest, but it is a kind of partly pleasant process. Such opposing views on hybridity, on the one hand indicates the looseness of the concept and on the other hand its unmatchability with dalit realities. The problem becomes more severe due to the absolute frames that both the authors use, and their depiction of them as absolute happenings. They do not portray these hybridities as relative phenomena or as one happenings among many. They see all the colonized and postcolonial experiences through this prism.

Ultimately, (and predictably) both land up offering us un-'Reason'able excuses for their failures to answer many gripping questions. This is not due to the rigidity of the concept. They acknowledge, in an indirect tone, from the beginning, the incompetence of the concept to withstand various emergent challenges that would come. It is also not due to the little-ness of the concept to take on mega questions, which obviously crop up in dealing with an enormous subject like colonial encounters. Bhabha links up his version of hybridity to the mind (as an occurrence taking place in the mind). Nandy’s excuse is more elusive. He does not care to answer certain questions because they emanate from
the knowledge frame that he denies. His answer sounds 'beyond' Reason. The ahistoricity, which surface throughout his text thus cannot make his intellectual exercise a convincing one. (This is actually a more refined inference that the scholar tries to extract from Nandy's excuse. His tone does not give any meaningful reason how he could write such a text without offering the reader any convincing answer). Myth, ahistoricity, unprovability (therefore un-contestability), psychological reductionism etc become legitimate paraphernalia of Nandy's political theory. Ultimately the text sounds as if it is meant to pass time (a more detailed analysis of Nandy’d ideology can be found in the following pages).

Bhabha has insisted on the concept of hybridity to explain postcolonial subjectivity to describe the fundamental effects of colonialism and colonial discourse. He insists on the mutuality of subjectivities that spot the relation between the colonizer and the colonized. For him all the cultural structures and standpoints are constructed in the ambivalent and opposing space that he addresses as the "Third space of enunciation". Identity is untenable because it emerges from this "Third Space" which is both ambivalent and opposing. He perceives it as an empowering identity because it "displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination" (p.112). He defines hybridity as "a problematic of colonial representation...that reverses the effects of the colonialists disavowal, so that other "denied" knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority". Hybridity of colonial discourse thus reverses the structures of domination in the colonial situation. It depicts a process in which the single tone of colonial authority weakens the operation of colonial power by engraving and unveiling the sketch of the other so that it discloses itself as double-voiced: "The effect of colonial power is seen to be the production of hybridization rather than the noisy command of colonialist authority or the silent repression of native traditions". Thus when the effects of colonial power is seen as the production of hybridization, Bhabha continues that it "enables a form of subversion...that turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds of intervention" (154). Thus Bhabha perceives hybrid as a vigorous moment of challenge against a dominant cultural power. He translates this moment as a hybrid displacing...
space' which divests 'the imposed imperialist culture, not only of the authority that it has
for so long imposed politically, often through violence, but even of its own claims to
authenticity'. Later he has extended his concept of hybridity to include forms of
counter-authority, which intrudes to effect: "the 'hybrid' moment of political change.
Here the transformational value of change lies in the re-articulation, or translation, of
elements that are neither the One (unitary working class) nor the Other (the politics of
gender) but something else besides which contests the terms and territories of both."
Thus, here he poses hybridity as cultural difference itself. Its 'hybrid counter-energies',
in Said's terms, challenge the central cultural norms with their unstable bewilderments
bred out of their 'disjunctive, liminal space'.

Bhabha's version of hybridity has privileged the idea of migrancy and exile
against the non-migrant one. The experience of migration became emblematic of the fluid
and porous identities. This notion of hybridity has liberated the frame of colonial
discourse from the binary oppositions between self and the other. Thus the colonial got
an autonomous space within the boundaries of hegemonic discourse. And also naturally
Bhabha's notion of hybridity privileged migrated intellectual over the un-migrated,
stagnant postcolonial subject. Aijiz Ahmad points out that it would release the hybrid
subject from markers of any gender, class or race. He explains that Homi Bhabha's
view of hybridity carries the dangers of ahistoricity and aspecificity of a hybrid subject.

Many PC writers brought hybridity as a concept to address the issue of inert
mixturing. They argue that the colonised always tried to hybridise the European ideas
with their own indigenous views. Here they applied hybridity as a powerful anti-colonial
tool. In responding to Fannon's psychoanalysis of the black traumatic subjecthood
Bhabha writes about the 'disturbing distance in between' the colonized and the colonizer.
Against Fannon, he argues that the division between black skins and white masks is not
neat and clear. He writes: "It is not the Colonial Self or the Colonised Other, but the
disturbing distance in between that constitutes the figure of colonial otherness- the White
man's artifice inscribed on the Black man's body. It is in relation to this impossible
object that emerges the liminal problem of colonial identity and its vicissitudes." Thus
for Bhabha, this image of black skin and white masks presents an ambivalent identity, it is the way colonialism operates and colonized people respond. In other words when Fannon explains that the colonial experience of the subject, where he is impelled to mimic the coloniser is a traumatic experience, Bhabha believes that the act of mimicry operates to undercut colonial hegemony.

As noted, the act of mimicry is another conceptual idea that Bhabha applies to understand the relation between the colonized and the colonial masters. He interprets this act as exercised by the colonized. It both aids the colonizer and creates a "menace." It aids the colonizer because it helps create "a recognizable Other." It also becomes a threat because it highlights the colonial subjects difference from the colonizer. Thus a gap or "slippage" is produced by this difference that ultimately fixes the colonial subject as an incomplete “partial presence” which menaces the colonial power by producing another knowledge of the colonizer’s cultural norms that the colonizer is rejecting to acknowledge. Thus this "partial presence" operates as a menace to the “'normalized' knowledges and disciplinary powers." The colonized may not be conscious of this effect. Thus, the postcolonial writing is not a menace due to its opposition to colonial discourse but because of its disruption of colonial authority.

Bhabha also extended the same argument against Said’s Orientalism. He resists Said’s argument that Orientalism is overwhelmingly dominant over its subjects. For Bhabha, colonialism is a relational one where the colonizer and his counterpart affect and influence each other. This relation is not a stagnant one but undergoes a constant change. They interact from unstable terrains. Bhabha thus addresses the complex dynamics of colonial relations and discourages both the colonialists' and nationalists' claims to a unified self. He rejects that there is any unified self either for the nationalists or colonialists. But ultimately, Bhabha also claims universality and homogeneity for this hybrid and ambivalent colonial subject. He solves this contradiction by locating hybridity as a characteristic of a person’s inner life. In the outside world he/she is placed in the mega identities of gender, class etc. When this process of hybridization is located as a characteristic of individuals inner self, the claims of the nationalists or the colonialists for one 'unified self becomes possible. Thus Bhabha is able to easily
universalize the colonial subject's hybrid status because of his semiotic and psychoanalytic approach to the problem.

But hybridity was also used by the upper caste colonized subjects against the oppressed within. Clearly then, the colonial experience of all subjects would not fall into the category of hybridity. In the ever-growing cosmopolitan trends in transnational politics, hybridity definitely offers luxurious benefits to the more privileged hybrid people than the unhybridized colonized subject. Hybridity practically and technically transforms the colonized into preferable and unpreferable subjects. Colonized subjects need, therefore, to be shifted from the psychoanalytical terrain to the outdated terrains of class, caste, gender and caste patriarchy to include the unhybridized experiences of the unhybridized subjects like Dalits. Bhabha's psychoanalytical approach is rendered reductive and irrelevant when called upon to explain the experience of Dalits. All the experiences of colonization need not be hybrid. Certain populations are exempted from the process of hybridization and often unevenly hybridized if they ever had the fortune to be so. Is not the hybrid identity after all a privileged one which not many marginalized communities of the nation can afford? The realities of Dalits are drowned in the verbose postcolonial psychoanalytic approach of the hybridized NRI intellectuals. Benita Parry describes Bhabha's work thus: "what he offers us is The World according to the Word." Hybridity should be located properly by situating it in ideological and institutional structures in which they were originally placed.

The postcolonial dislocations, fissured identities, and alienations and psychological agonies of the migrated people should be taken care of by the academics. They deserve their share of sympathies and theoretical interpretations. But due to the extremely privileged access of the Indian upper caste intellectuals to the western academia, the postcolonial academic field is overflowing with their own experiences, narrations and histories. Their transnational privileged experiences came to be largely believed as the true postcolonial testimonies. The majority of the Indian people, at least the Dalits and Tribals (from whom the fruits of modernity were forcibly snatched time and again by the hindutva ruling sections) dwell outside the boundaries of the nation and
trans-nation. Since they were not allowed to forge their indigenous identities into the hybrid identities they remained aloof from the transnational experience about which the PC writers argue and fight for with great amount of dramatic passion.

Moreover, diasporic experiences are to be signified by the markers of class, caste, gender and casteist patriarchies. The PC theorists prioritize the elite hybrid identities to the indigenous ones. Moreover it is completely invalid to compare the transnational experience of the Dalit woman who migrates to the Gulf countries to work as domestic workers to that of the upper caste woman who moves to the US with her green card holding husband. True, both of them undergo alienation and, loneliness. But the PC writers have to keep in mind that there are oceans of differences between these two types of ‘daughters of independence.’ In other words, the experiences and agonies generated by the migration of Dalits as labourers to the Gulf are quite dissimilar from another enormous migration, that of Hindu castes from independent India to western dreamlands like US or U.K. If there are Dalits who migrated to the West, their diasporic experiences too would carry the caste tag with it...it will also have caste dynamics and the PC writers should take note of that fact too! But the experiences of the Dalit women in the Gulf countries is too far for the PC intellectuals to place in the ambit of transnational hybrid postcolonial theoretical frames. They may protest that the Gulf is not an ex-colonial power. But in that case USA also never ruled India directly. If they take the question of migration seriously they have to take the Dalit women’s migration also. Such an attempt would obviously sketch a different theory for them.

The Indian PC writers constructed their hybrid experiences over the less privileged peoples of India. They, however, forgot to place them in the discourse of postcolonial dislocations. Ashcroft correctly notes: 'the assertion of a shared postcolonial condition such as hybridity has been seen as part of a tendency of discourse analysts to de-historicize and de-locate cultures from their temporal, spatial, geographical, and linguistic contexts, and to lead to an abstract, globalized concept of the textual that obscures the specificities of particular cultural situations.' Also the current propositions of hybridity fail to address the colonial experience of those sections who
actually received the major brunt of colonialism\postcolonialism and who never had the chance to negotiate with the colonizers like their privileged upper caste co-colonised communities. They were not enrolled and represented in the nationalist projects of the upper castes. Thus they are always depicted as having uniform, levelled colonial experiences as against the ambivalent, hybrid upper caste\class experiences.

Another reality is that the historical accounts of the former (the hybrid postcolonial subject) outnumber the latter (the stagnant subject) in the PC theory. There is an immediate need to address this gap. At the same time one should be careful to prevent the hijack of the anti-colonial movements in the name of one true national self. Another issue that assumes great importance in this context is the ways in which the upper caste performed their hybridities and mimicry. The advantages of hybridity and mimicry are posed against the indigenous people. For instance the chapter "Women" in this dissertation would explain how Sarojini Naidu, as capable person at mimicking, can be seen as a perfect example of the hybrid subject (for she studied in the West, never knew her language despite the fact that she was valorized as the symbol of Indian womanhood and culture) was able to divert the women from the chambers of women's movement for political rights on the basis of protective discrimination to that of mainstream nationalist fight (which refused to entertain any question on women's rights till India gets independence) the moment the un-hybridised Dalits also started to fight for preferential treatment. But this question of the misuses of hybridities and the capacity to mimic the upper caste at the political plane against the Dalits and other exploited sections is not found place in the theories of postcolonial hybridities. Bhabha, finally, connects this violation of the historical integrity of the theoretical tradition in his texts to his attitude of 'reckless historical connection'. Such recklessness appears too costly for dalits.

Bhabha evokes a series of discussions on the act of mimicry. He sees it as a way of escaping control. Communication always carries slippage, gaps between what is said and what is heard. The process of replication is never complete. Bhabha suggests that colonial authority is rendered ‘hybrid’ and ‘ambivalent’ by this process of replication,
thus unwrapping spaces for the colonized to subvert the master discourse. Thus a text can produce only a changed meaning. Robert Young notes that Homi Bhabha does not address the question of gender in his idea of hybridity. Young writes that Bhabha "seems to regard the troubled structures of sexuality as a metaphor for colonial ambivalence" and his arguments on colonial desires "invoke the structures of desire without addressing the structures of sexuality". Such analogies between gender and the colonial subjects tend to erase the specificities of diverse caste specific colonial experiences among the women. The colonial subject is usually embodied as Hindu male, Hindu woman, upper caste. In the analogies that are often drawn between them the existence of Dalit women get blurred. The growing tendency of drawing parallels between the Dalit, the colonized and upper caste women are done at the cost of Dalit women. It also ignores the fact that she suffers, multiple forms of oppression. Bhabha's hybridity would not be able to address the casteist misogyny, for that matter any act of direct violence, because such an understanding cannot accommodate ambivalence but starts its scrutiny by first overthrowing any such ambivalences.

The concept of hybridity in 'Intimate Enemy':

Nandi's text 'The Intimate Enemy' is where he deals with hybridity. Modern colonialism won its greatest victories through its secular hierarchies which are incongruent with the traditional order. And in the very next sentence he writes "These hierarchies opened up new vistas for many, particularly for those exploited or cornered within the traditional order. To them the new order looked like-and here lay its psychological pull]-the first step towards a more just and equal world." (IX). Is it that the Dalits were too ignorant to understand the deeper implications of modernity? Or were they less patriotic and selfish to not deny the lure of modernity? Such a realization that the marginalized sections put their faith in modernity does not prevent Nandy from valorizing the Indian tradition and its vulnerabilities during British colonialism.

And only after the emergence of the Second World War did it become obvious that "the drive for mastery over men is not merely a by-product of a faulty political
economy but also of a world view which believes in the absolute superiority of the
human over the nonhuman and the subhuman, the masculine over the feminine, the adult
over the child, the historical over the ahistorical, and the modern or progressive over the
traditional or the savage." So, hierarchy is something brought forward by this western
Science and Reason. This realization set the people to criticize the Universalism offered
by the West and look for "plurality of critical traditions" in defense of "non modern
cultures and traditions." Nandy does not explain why these non-modern Indian culture
and tradition did not offer liberation for those who were cornered within the traditional
order till Western Reason launched it. And also to what extent we can call these practices
as 'traditions' when they are able to compete with contemporary western Reason by
offering solutions to the big contemporary questions of human domination and so on.

The West has become the model everywhere for the world's people. This is the
second colonaztion where it enters through the minds of the people. Thus the
conventional anti-colonialism could also be an "apologia for the colonization of minds."
So, Nandy explains that his text is not a story but a "cautionary tale."" Thus like many
postcolonial intellectuals of India he also deconstructs the criticism of colonialism which
are themselves infected by the western Reason which sustains colonial domination.
Nandy, expectedly says, "The West has not merely produced modern colonialism, it
informs most interpretations of colonialism." (XII). A brilliant exploration indeed! But
what Nandy brings as his essential justification for such a seemingly brilliant academic
proposal is "innocence". He applies this in the notion of "authentic innocence" explained
by Rollo May according to which the child uses its innocence and also colludes with evil.
According to Nandy it is actually this 'innocence', which has ultimately defeated
colonialism not the historical forces or the internal contradictions of capitalism. And just
before explaining this concept of "innocence" Nandy inserts a few words on internal
colonialism. "I have said at the beginning that these pages justify innocence. This
statement should be amplified in a world where the rhetoric of progress uses the fact of
internal colonialism to subvert the cultures of societies subject to external colonialism
and where the internal colonialism in turn uses the fact of external threat to legitimize and
perpetuate itself." (XII). Thus he takes refuge in psychoanalysis and inserts an abrupt
departure. Foucault’s great contribution that 'knowledge is not innocent' becomes invalid in this awkward juxtaposition of child's innocence's with fully matured self-conscious upper caste ideologues political warfares.

Therefore, like Anderson who recognized only the elite class as the true imitators of the western nationalism, and Partha Chatterjee who fought against Anderson's postulation and proceeded in his argument to prove the upper castes struggles as the true nationalist fights not the mere imitations of the west (analysis regarding this can be seen in the next chapter), Nandy also sees the internal colonialism as the true fight against the external colonialism and its leadership which fought with innocence is the real nationalist fight (it is also surprising to notice that both Partha Chatterjee and Nandy claimed 'innocence' to the Hindu subject they were studying, i.e., to the views that their subjects expressed, to the activities they have taken up etc.). Nandy, also like Partha Chatterjee, did not care to look at who were oppressed in this internal colonialism and what were their fights and pathos. He continued to justify the complicity of innocence with that of evil. Thus he is able to see hinduism as Indian-ness and forgives its sins its child-like complicity with evil. Thus it is unnecessary to clarify every time in this chapter that what he is talking about is an upper caste story, about them alone.

He labels those nationalists who took recourse to western universalism as 'ornamental dissenters.' The Dalit ideologues who relied on the western liberal ideology are not even mentioned here for, their fights are first of all not admitted as nationalist fights at all. Thus they are not counted as even ornamental or even as fake dissenters. By this time Nandy becomes aware of the lopsidedness of his argument and makes a statement “I do not therefore hesitate to declare these essays to be an alternative mythography of history which denies and defies the values of history.' If one has to combat these myths, she has to, the author says resurrect 'more convincing myths.' (XVIII). He also comes up with the biases of his own myths which are as follows:
1. His version of hybridity or the 'dialect' between the classical, pure and on the other hand, the folksy and 'low-brow' is the first myth. This attempt is ‘an unheroic Indian coping with the might of the West’.

2. He has taken many aspects of Indian selfhood for granted. He has also tried to make claims for an alternative universality.

3. Finally, a facility that he made use of is the language which suffers from sexism and rejects to correct it because he is too old for that. That means he does not want to correct any pitfalls that the standardized language carry with it.

Attaching innocence to their readings, or making reckless, mythical accounts of history become an inevitable task for Nandy, Bhabha, and Partha Chatterjee since they are aware that their versions are prejudiced. Otherwise nobody would understand how Nandy (even Partha Chatterjee in his essay on ‘Bankim’s moment of Departure’ where the nationalist is justified for having criticized the colonizers for portraying the Hindu religion as a singular faith and also making use of such facility to propose his nationalist scheme of national religion) can see Hinduism as one religion and also as a hybrid religion.

/.

The Psychology of Colonialism: Sex, Age and Ideology in British India

Nandy defines colonialism as a "shared culture" and tries to discover some of the psychological forms of colonialism in the rulers and the ruled. First certain codes which both the parties can share will be created. These codes will change the original cultural priorities on both sides. These codes will remove the subcultures which were considered important to each of these cultures previously. Thus new priorities will be formed. In this way colonialism as a state of mind unleashes "an indigenous process released by external forces" (3). Secondly, the culture of colonialism deduces a different style of administering dissent. It sets a culture in which the colonized will feel obliged to resist the colonizers within the psychological limits created by the latter. The first essay titled
The Psychology of Colonialism' examines, in the context of these processes, how the colonial ideology of the Raj was premised on the cultural meanings of two significant categories of institutionalized discrimination in Britain, sex and age. And also explains how these meanings fought their traditional Indian counterparts and their new personifications in Gandhi.

He first draws a homology between sexual and political supremacy with which he explains Western colonialism’s domination of the colonized. Colonialism matched with the sexual stereotypes of the West and their psychology. Such a culture created a kind of cultural consensus in which the socioeconomic and political dominance denoted the inequality between the sexes. He explains that colonialism proper can be said to have started "once the two in the British-Indian culture of politics, following the flowering of the middle-class British evangelical spirit, began to ascribe cultural meanings to the British domination" (6). This had started particularly, Nandy explains, when the British and the 'exposed sections of Indians' digested the colonial role definitions and started desiring for reforms. When the homology between the sexual and political dominance, was drawn the 'battle for the minds of men' was won by the Raj. Identification with the oppressor is crucial to this cultural co-optation. Thus civilizational mission is an inherent strategy for colonialism by which it makes the colonized feel as the other.

Then he comes to the homology between childhood and the stage of being colonized. New definitions of childhood (which saw light in seventeenth century Europe) conceptualized the latter as an inferior version of the adult. This according to Nandy had a direct relationship to the doctrine of civilization and progress prominent in Europe. Like a child, the colonized also should be taught and directed towards destinations set by the adult/colonizer. According to Nandy Modern Europe also delegitimized old-age. The un-productive, un-performing old person is seen as socially irrelevant. Thus the old-India or the 'past' of India becomes irrelevant. Thus the European Orientalists explorations of India as having glorious past is solved. The old/past becomes irrelevant.
But the Indian Hindu scriptures had already supplied demeaning definitions of woman, childhood and old age. They define woman as essentially inferior to man and the Dalit as naturally inferior to the upper castes. They say that the upper castes should treat the Dalit of even seventy years as a child (detailed debate regarding the Hindu scriptural sanctions for such treatments can be seen in the chapter "Hindu Religious Nationalism and the Dalit Woman"). The inferior versions of childhood must have entered only in 17th century in Europe but in India they were already so old at the time of British colonialism that such notions became so embedded in the mind-set of Hindus. More fundamentally such notions cut across the caste planes also. The postcolonial intellectuals need not slog to master the western texts in order to explore various dimensions of fake universalism, or the treachery of Reason of the West. A more introspective view towards their own Hindu texts will offer them more rich material to be deconstructed. Nandy would be able to see more horrifying homologies built between lowercasteness and sex and child. In fact it is misleading to even explain that there is a homology between sex, childhood and lowercasteness. According to the Hindu scriptures the lower caste people are too low even to be equal to their women and children. Thus, it is more truthful to first subject the Indian 'Reason' to scrutiny before finding faults with western Reason.

Since Nandy’s major argument is that “colonialism is first of all a matter of consciousness and needs to be defined ultimately in the minds of men”(63). He argues that colonialism resulted in a cultural and psychological pathology in both the colonizers and the colonized. He writes that anti-colonial fights took two shapes in India; one was, Marxist which was caught in the West's own auto-critique and the other was psychological resistance where an alternative ideology and strategy to the West was constructed. Nandy recognizes this second form of psychological anti-colonial warfare as Gandhism (what Partha Chaterjee identifies as inner domain).

After critically evaluating various Hindu ideologues (except one, the Indian Christian Michael Madhusudan Dutt) and how their views have internalized the colonial ideology Nandy finally comes to show Gandhi as an incarnation of "transcultural protest
against the hyper masculine world view of colonialism”. It insists on the hybridity and psychology in Gandhi’s ideology and his political strategies. Nandy invokes Gandhi’s idea that Indians subjection to the glittering of modernity is the root cause for the nation’s colonial subjection. He tries to reinterpret the Gandhian problematic in Adorno’s terms. Gandhi escaped from the seductions of modernity due to the non-complicit innocence of non-violence in his strategies like Satyagraha. Nandy perceives these Gandhian ideas of resistance taking place in mind of an individual. This psychological resistance is alien to the colonizers and thus succeeded in disorienting them. Now the problem is what all would go into the formation of such alternative strategies and fights? For this Nandy does not offer a total revival or going back to the past. He looks at modernity from a dialectical view and offers the creation of counter-modernity through the transformative potential of the transculturations of gender and hybridity. This creation of counter-modernity can be done by establishing a new tradition drawn from a dialectical mixture of classical and folk knowledges, the pure and the mixed, the high and the low, the masculine and feminine or modernity in a hybridized from as an answer. He points out that Gandhi applied this new tradition by adding politically incompatible forces. This is a political philosophy specific to Gandhi. Nandy explains Gandhi’s success of demonstrating a critical awareness of Hinduism and colonialism from the culturally authentic view: "The alternative to Hindu nationalism is the peculiar mix of classical and folk Hinduism and the unselfconscious Hinduism by which most Indians, Hindus as well as non-Hindus, live. It is that liminality which Kipling resented. It is that liminality on which the greatest of Indian social and political leaders built their self-definitions as Indians over the last two centuries." (104).

'Liminality' according to Nandi is not only the condition of being the diasporic postcolonial migrant as Bhabha suggested but amounts to an authentic state of Indianess itself. Thus Nandy tries to see the authentic nationhood as an unselfconscious hinduiness. We find no answer to: How can he club all other non-Hindu communities into this unselfconscious Hinduism? Why should all other communities feel bound to this unselfconscious Hinduism? Nandy’s opinion, actually unconstrained by the cleavages of caste or the effects of communal liminality on religious minorities, that all Indians,
irrespective of religious and caste backgrounds, dwell in an 'unselfconscious Hinduism', poses the question of the collusions of postcolonial discourse with Hindutva ideology even if it looks superficially hybrid or secular. Nandy explains his intentions behind such conceptual priorities, 'I do not therefore hesitate to declare these essays to be an alternative mythography of history which denies and defies the values of history' (1983: XV).

2. The Uncolonized Mind: A Post-Colonial View of India and the West

The second essay examines four sets of polarities, which according to him have informed most discourses on the East and West in colonial and post-colonial times. These polarities are the universal Vs the parochial, the material (realistic) Vs spiritual (un-realistic), the achieving (performing) Vs the non-achieving (non-performing), the sane Vs insane. He also touched upon a fifth set which cuts across these four: a self-conscious, well-defined Indianness Vs a fluid open self-definition. On one plane he tries to show that the two ends of these polarities meet if the central problem is coping with or resistance to oppression. On another plane he tries to show that the parochial, the spiritual, the non-performing and the insane can sometimes turn out to be better versions of the universal, the realistic, the efficient and the sane.

His argument is that when the psychological and cultural survival is at risk all these polarities shatter and become partly immaterial. At that time the victim gets a fuzzy awareness of the larger whole. This awareness transcends the system's analytic categories and strands them together. Thus, the victim may become aware that, under oppression, the parochial, spiritual, and non-achieving could protect some forms of Universalism, non-oppressive world, civilizational goal of freedom and autonomy than the opposite polarities. These paradoxes are inevitable because the dominant idea of rationality is co-opted by institutionalized oppression. When such a co-optation takes place both resistance and survival demands some access to the larger whole. This process may look self-defeating in the light of conventional reason. But this could be another way of restating the ancient wisdom.
Thus this attempt of finding space in the larger whole is a hybrid attempt. Though the victim realizes the sanctity of one side of the polarities with which he identifies, and the villainy of the other side that he opposes, he has to, as Nandy writes somewhere try to get place in the larger whole. This may appear self-defeating but results in the restatement of ancient wisdom. But doesn't this self-defeat define the newly gained meaning of this re-stated 'ancient wisdom'? One may not be able to measure, naturally the ancientness and wisdom-ness of this restated wisdom when the victim enters into this sphere with this 'vague awareness' where the existing analytic categories are stranded. To put it simply, when everything becomes so mixed up in this process, and by the time of the entrance of the victim into this 'larger whole' the 'ancient wisdom' may change its form and content as well.

Conclusion:

Modes of thinking of the PC ideas are borrowed from practices of western theory writing. Even when they subvert the ideas of the former they tend to do it according to these modes. Also, this theory is mostly taught in western educational institutions. Always their theory is constricted to the colonial past. They linger always in the history of colonialism than the postcolonial, global or neocolonial present. World history is fixed in the context of colonialism. Contemporary world realities are often interpreted in pure cultural terms and most of the times their work delimits itself to the critical review of English literatures.

One more serious criticism is as Dirlik concludes 'Postcoloniality is the condition of the intelligentsia of global capitalism.'59 In this essay Dirlik develops on Jameson's idea that, postmodernism is a 'cultural logic' of late capitalism. In this sense postcolonialism which builds itself on it is also congruent with capitalism. Dirlik argues ferociously that postcolonialism is another name for postmodernism which tries to camouflage the activities of world capitalism. One more spurious feature of PC theory of India is that the Indian PC writers try to give new life to Hindu revival ideology with the
application of postmodernism as their theoretical frame. They celebrate this post-material
disgust by overthrowing all the feasibilities of economic analysis in the interpretation of
the political and the cultural. So, Dirlik writes, "While capital in its motions continues to
structure the world, refusing it foundational status renders impossible the cognitive
mapping that must be the point of departure for any practice of resistance...." The Dalit
feminist persuasion thus suspects the Postcolonial writers as agents of global capitalism
and Hindu xenophobia.

Through this ideological system they are building a space for the cultural
supremacy of the upper castes. In order to transfigure the dominant hindutva ideology
into a legitimate form they carefully filter matter and archival sources. Thus they openly
reflect the Hindu supremacist ideologies, encode the frustrations, and tensions within the
colonized situations but maintain absolute silence about internal hierarchies. Without
banning all the meaningful interventions that dalit and other movements made to the
nationalist politics, it is not feasible to dump on the readers of the world a uniform picture
about the Indian nationalist struggle or thought. Such a neat and tight segregation of the
Dalit subject from the postcolonial discourse is not possible without a trained faith in the
hindutva imagination of the Indian nation. Thus PC theorists’ obsession to aver to patent
tradition is a major area of contention for Dalit feminism.

The Indian upper caste social scientist scholars make use of the provision created
by Gayatri Spivak: "unlearning once privileges as one’s lose." They have perhaps
unlearnt too much. The PC writers especially those who are settled in the West are
equipped with double-edged privileges. One is to make use of the material privilege that
emanates from recent-historical colonial past (by making use of most of the academic
opportunities offered by the West to the postcolonial people like the Commonwealth),
and the second is to take no note of their upper caste privileged identity in the native land.
In other words, they maintain an ontological blindness. Thus, now a social science
scholar, who wants to understand questions like caste and nation will no more be able to
deal with them simultaneously. She will be able to see only nation or caste; she cannot
see them together for they are erased in the postcolonial political texts.
It is also true that not all the people in the colonized land are equally colonized or for that matter equally liberated. The affinities and fights between the upper caste communities and all the 'others' are characterized by at least two realities, one how much each community is colonized and secondly, and more importantly, to what extent the communities in question want to come out of it. The fights of the upper castes with colonialism is certainly different from the fights that the others within this nation have had. The upper castes are not victims of long severe famines, political exclusion and cultural ostracizations of colonialism like the Dalits.

Consideration of internal colonization is important if 'post colonialism\independence' is to be anything more than a mere technical transfer of power. The postcolonial writers erase all the pre-British colonial history of the land. British colonialism should not be targeted as the cause for all the negative things existing in the 'postcolonial\nations. British colonialism did not come to act on a plain screen. By the time it entered, the land was already having a system of supremacy, legal codes, own modes of economic extractions everything structured by caste ideology with certain regional variations. Thus a pre-British colonial past and the search for it need not always be a romantic journey. What Spivak opines is also not always true. She explains that pre-colonial is re-constituted by the history of colonialism (of course she tells this with an intention of restricting the urge for 'lost origins\') But such an assumption bears more problematic implications for dalit feminism since as Henry Louis Gates concludes that for Spivak, all discourse is colonial discourse (1991:466). It would be a too reductive reading indeed! PC writers perceive the world with a preoccupied idea that it is divided into colonized and colonizing. Aijaz Ahmad raises his objection correctly that "colonialism... becomes a transhistorical thing, always present and always in the process of dissolution in one part of the world or the other". Thus colonialism becomes a self-ordained historical signifier to replace all other markers in the PC literature.

The Dalit question was, as a result, gravely under theorized within the nationalist discourse and therefore in the postcolonial discourse. Consequently, vital questions like-
how does the oppression on Dalit women hook up with the operations of British colonialism, and how the pre-British colonial realities tries to entangle with it remain imposed. The relation between these two systems of oppression cannot be understood unless caste and caste patriarchal processes are evaluated as severely as the nationalist ones are, and also as the nationalist questions.

Portrayal of the ‘other’ is central to the formation of Hindu culture and also to the PC theory. Now, the impetus to tighten the hold over academics and theory through the versions convenient to them also supply a new skeleton through which they interpret what they come across. Hence, Dalits are relegated to the lowest preference in their analysis both because of the Dalits faith and association with western Reason, and also because this furnishes a justification for imagining Dalits as outsiders of the real nation. Insisting on the centrality of hinduness to nation-ness is a mere renewal of the idea of Dalits as outsiders. Discourse plays a crucial role by processing the information about the communities in a new and convincing jargon. It is not possible to read the upper caste nationalist texts without keeping in mind that casteism, transfigured as true nationalist assignment. It was a pivotal part of the political representation of Hindu to the world, the PC literature endorses this.

Casteism also facilitated the process of colonial extraction of cheap labour from the Dalits. Economic disparities became acute and have been maintained by the ideologies of the caste. Indentured labour became a malicious site to extract both the sexual and physical labour of these communities. PC studies are incapable of taking up studies on such issues. Under the dire conditions of colonialism, traditional occupations were destroyed and people were allowed to move to urban areas in search of money. But they have to always move with their caste tags. Colonialism thus does not override and dissolve caste differences but continues to nurture upon, and solidify them. That is why caste segregation allowed colonialism to expand and find the labour for cheaper wages with a virtual absence of any rights.
Thus the supposedly outdated extraction of labour continued to operate powerfully as an integral feature of the British colonial system. Caste is the foundation on which the division of labour is pressed into the British colonial system. The ideology of the racial superiority for the West found a ready match in caste. The task in front of the nationalists and the British colonialists was then to arrange the civil society in ways without rupturing this settled imagination. Forcing people into these altered setups became easy because the executioners or the supervisors of these tasks were not the distant enemies like Britishers but the intimate ones, the Indian upper caste people. Thus, the process of identifying the people and allocating roles became much easier. The upper caste people were hand in glove in exploiting the labour and sexualities of the Dalits. The changed socio, political conditions of the land made the upper caste people keen and intense in their attitudes towards the Dalit communities. Thus, unlike what Dirks argues, if caste was produced in modern versions during the British colonial period it was not due to the sole racist colonial interests of the British officials. It also, became feasible because of the upper caste peoples’ aid and execution of the same. It is also to be noted that violence was readily opted for wherever necessary indicating the existence of caste rule in various parts of the land even during the British colonial times. British colonialism did not necessarily lead to an end or even to the decrease in the caste specific violence. Hulme feels that postcolonial is a descriptive but not an evaluative term. But in the Indian context where the majority of the communities are located at the other end of postcolonial privilege, existing at the fringes of the nation, the application of the term postcolonial even in the descriptive sense is not feasible.
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