According to the Oxford English Dictionary the word colony is derived from the Latin word ‘colon-us’ which is used for a farmer, a cultivator, a planter, or a settler in a new country. Colonia had thus the senses of a farm, a landed estate, and a settlement. It was especially used for a public settlement of Roman citizens in a hostile or newly conquered country, where they, retained their Roman citizenship, received land, acted as garrison being mostly formed of veteran soldiers who had served their time; hence it was applied to the place so occupied, or to town, which were raised to the same rank and privileges. Among the nine Roman colonies in Britain, were London, Bath, Chester and Lincoln. According to Ania Loomba:

\[ \text{The term colony comes from the Roman ‘Colonia’ which meant ‘farm’ or ‘settlement’ and referred to Romans who settled in other lands but still continued their citizenship.} \]

The history of colonialism starts with the Romans in England, the historical phenomenon of colonization is one that stretches around the globe and across time, including separate people such as the Hittites, the Incas and the British.

The land based empires include the Mongol empire stretching from the western pacific to Eastern Europe. The empire of Alexander
the great, the Umayyad Caliphate, the Persian Empire, the Roman Empire and the Byzantine Empire. The Overseas Empires include Ottoman Empire which was created across Mediterranean, North Africa to South Eastern Europe. It existed during the time of European colonization. European colonization can be broadly divided into two large waves:
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The Age of Exploration and the beginning of the Columbian Exchange, and the second beginning of the second part of 19th century started with the New Imperialistic period. European colonialism began in the 15th century, with Portugal’s conquest of the Ceuta. Colonialism was led by Portuguese and Spanish exploration of the America, and the coasts of Africa, the Middle-East, India and East Asia. The latter half of 16th century witnessed the expansion of the state throughout Ireland. It was not until 17th century that Britain, France and the Netherlands successfully established overseas empires in direct competition with Spain and Portugal and with each other. In the 19th century the British Empire grew to become the largest empire on the globe. There are various types of colonies such as Settler, Dependencies, Plantation, and Trading Posts.
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Settler colonies include thirteen states of United States of America. Besides these, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina and Soviet Policies in Siberia which arose from the emigration of people from a metropolis or mother country. In Dependencies the colonizers did not arrive as part of a mass emigration, but as administrators over existing sizeable native populations, having control by use of threat or force. The examples of Dependencies are British Raj, Egypt, the Dutch, East Indies, and the Japanese colonial empire; and Matzos of the America, French Algeria or Southern Rhodesia. The white colonizers imported black slaves and these are called as plantation colonies. These are Barbados, Saint Dominique and Jamaica. Trading posts engage in trade rather than for colonization. They are Macau, Malacca, Deshima and Singapore.

Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin argue that:

*The term colonialism is important in defining the specific form of cultural exploitation that developed with the expansion of Europe over the last 400 years. Although many earlier civilizations and colonies, and although they perceived their relations with them to be one of a central imperium in relations to a periphery of provincial, marginal and barbarian cultures, a number of crucial factors entered into the construction for Post-Renaissance practices of Imperialism.*

According to Ania Loomba colonialism can be defined as the conquest and control of other people’s land and goods. Colonialism in this sense is not merely the expansion of various European powers into ‘Asia, Africa or the Americans from the sixteenth century it has been a recurrent and widespread feature of human history.’

Denis Judd argues in his book *Empire: The British Imperial Experience from 1765 to the Present* that:
“No one can doubt that desire for profitable trade, plunder and enrichment was the primary force that led to the establishment of the imperial structure.”

He further argues that colonialism was first and foremost part of the commercial venture of the western nations that developed from the late 17th century and early 18th century. Colonialism was a lucrative commercial operation, bringing wealth and riches to western nations through the economic exploitation of others. Colonialism and capitalism share mutually supportive relationship with each other.

Colonialism is sometimes used interchangeably with Imperialism. As Peter Childs and Patrick Williams remark ‘Imperialism is an ideological concept which upholds the legitimacy of the economic and military control of one nation by another. Colonialism however, is only one form of practice which results from the ideology of Imperialism, and specifically concerns the settlement of one group of people in a new location. Imperialism is not strictly concerned with the issue of settlement, it does not demand the settlement of different places in order to work. Further they define imperialism as “the extension and expansion of trade and commerce under the protection of political, legal and military controls.” Elleke Boehner defines colonialism in her book Colonial And Post Colonial Literature (Oxford University Press, 1995) “as the Settlement of territory, the exploitation or development of resources, and the attempt to govern the indigenous inhabitants of occupied lands.” Colonialism is the extension of nation’s sovereignty
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over territory beyond its borders by the establishment of either settler or administrative dependencies, colonies in which the native population is directly controlled and ruled. Colonizers generally dominate the resources, labour and markets of the colonial territory and also impose their own socio-political, cultural, religious, linguistic structures on conquered population. The term also refers to the set of beliefs that the colonizers are superior to those of the colonized.

The relationship of colonialism is based on binary opposition of colonizer/colonized, center/periphery, occident/orient; Abdul Jan Mohammad argues that the relationship of the colonizer and the colonized is based on binary opposition of white/black, masculine/feminine, beautiful/ugly so on and so forth, wherein the colonizers are seen as superiors whereas the colonized as inferiors.

Albert Memmi in his book *The Colonizer and the Colonized* argues that the colonized imitated their masters /colonizers. He argues:

*The colony follows the cadence of his traditional holiday, even religious holidays, and not those of the inhabitants. The weekly day of rest is that of his native country, it is his nation’s flag which flies over the monuments, his mother tongue which permits social communication. Even his dress, his accent and his manners are eventually imitated by the colonized. The colonizer partakes of an*
There were many reasons which motivated the colonizers towards colonizing foreign lands. Basically these nations established colonies to gain economic profits. In the early 1800s, the Industrial Revolution began in Great Britain, and new market and raw materials were needed to uphold the new industries. The colonizers depended on their colonies for raw materials to be used in their factories so that they could produce a growing number of manufacture goods. They then exported these manufactured goods to their colonies which served as new markets. Though there was desire for economic profit, yet nationalism was the cause for colonization. After the French Revolution, European nations had a strong sense of national pride and felt that in order to prove themselves as a strong world power; they should gain control over other countries. By obtaining power over foreign lands, the colonizers were able to strengthen their military. This further increased their status as a world power. The colonizers used the idea of the ‘White man’s Burden’ to help justify their colonization of foreign lands. It was the job of the white people to teach their superior ways of living to the inferior people of other places.
Because of white supremacy the Europeans also spread their religion to backward nations. Britishers thought that it is better for the human race if they colonized it. Their colonization was considered as a better duty toward God, Queen and their country. Colonialism created a traumatic and the most complex relationship between the natives and the colonizers. Ania Loomba comments on this predicament:

*The process of forming a community in the new land necessarily meant un-forming, re-forming the communities that existed there already and involved in a wide range of practices including trade, plunder, negotiations, warfare, genocide, enslavement and rebellion.*

These colonized people were treated brutally by the colonizers. The colonized people suffered physically, psychologically, socially and morally in the process of colonialism. Frantz Fanon expressed the pains, suffering and agonies of the colonized people in the following words:

*Colonized people are not only those whose labour has been appropriated but those in whose soul an inferiority complex has been created...*

Colonialism is a system of political, economical and cultural domination forcibly imposed by a technologically superior foreign minority on an indigenous majority. The colonizers assumed that the nation state and an industrial capital economy were the most advanced forms of human organization. It depended on economic exploitation and political oppression. The white settler colonies, especially, established new traditions like the gentleman farmer identity for lower class immigrants – to promote self esteem and respect. They established an elite caste system and perpetuated their political and economic supremacy. The colonies experienced master/slave relationship between
the colonizer and the colonized. The colonies were extensions of the metropolitan state. The colonizers were limited to small numbers as administrators, traders, missionaries and trade. The economic advantages were only for Europeans. Thus the term ‘Neo-colonialism,’ came into existence. The beginning of colonialism marks the beginning of an era of cultural invasion and territorial expansion. It reconstructed the economics of the conquered colonies drawing them into complex relationship with their own slaves and labourers as well as raw materials. These were transported to manufacture goods in the metropolis. The colonized people moved not only as slaves but also as labourers, domestic servants and travelers and the colonizers as administrators’ soldiers, merchants, and travelers. The colonizers were administrator’s soldiers, merchants’ writers, missionaries, teachers and scientists. There was economic imbalance in this system. Ngugi Wa Thongo says that decolonization is a process and it has to be completed. Post modernism is a term which includes all kinds of Isms, Discourses and Theories. And one of the off shot of post modernism is colonial and post colonial literature.

The development of a postcolonial mode of discourse as direct derivative of post-modernist theories of knowledge and culture creates a historical crisis for the study of decolonization.

Modernism – Post Modernism
Structuralism – Post Structuralism
There is a need to liberate the discourse from the hegemonic connotations and neo colonialist entanglements of such terms as ‘Commonwealth Literature’, New English Literatures, and ‘New Literatures in English ’or‘ Third World Literature. Aime Cesaire in his book ‘Discourse on colonialism’ claims that Colonialism not only exploits but dehumanizes and objectifies the colonized subject, as it degrades the colonizer himself.\(^{10}\)

Colonialism is like an alevora plant which serves as a medicinal plant, as well as produces thorns. Colonialism has pessimistic as well as optimistic effects on the indigenous people, land, and sources. Diderot was one of the most famous critics of European colonization. In his Historic ‘Dex Deux Indes’ he challenged that the primitive people have benefited from European civilization and argued that the European colonists were uncivilized ones. Diderot argues that ‘The European traders have proved themselves dangerous as guests.’\(^{11}\)

There was a great difference between colonizers and colonized and the towns to which they belonged. In The Wretched of the Earth, Frantz Fanon writes:

\begin{quote}
The native town is a hungry town, starved of bread, of meat, of shoes, of coal, of light. It is a town of niggers and dirty Arabs. The look that the native turns on the settler’s town is a look of lust, a look of envy, it expresses his dreams of possession: to sit at the settlers, table to sleep in the settlers’ bed, with his wife if possible.\(^{12}\)
\end{quote}

The colonial world was divided into three world theories. The first, the second and the third world.
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World Theories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First World</th>
<th>Second World</th>
<th>Third World</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>African</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Owing to the three world theory, binaries such as colonizer colonized, first world/third world, the west and the rest of the world came into existence. It has been an ideological view of Eurocentric critics who believed in such a categorization of the world. Aijaz Ahmed, the famous critic, in his book *In Theory Classes, Nations, Literatures*, remarks that:

>The social collapse of the common countries has, of course, complicated this matter of the three world theory a great deal, and it is likely that the category itself may now be abandoned altogether more out of confusion, than anything else, to be replaced simply with eclectic play, thus refurbishing the already hegemonic academic philosophies of ‘Difference.’

The three world theory based on colonial countries and once colonized countries have no relevance in the present times where the world has emerged into a global village. Critics on the economic and political advantages accruing to developed nations via globalized capitalism have referred to the colonized countries as neo-neocolonialists and see these colonized countries as a continuation of the domination and exploitation by the colonizers merely utilizing different means. Despite decolonization in the 1960s-70s many former colonies remain under strong western influence there by giving birth to colonialism. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin define the third world, First, Second, Fourth as:
The term Third world was first used in 1952 during the so-called cold war period, by the politician and economist Alfred Sauvy, to designate those countries aligned with neither the United States nor the Soviet Union. The term ‘First World’ was used widely at the time to designate the dominant economic powers of the west, whilst the term ‘Second World’ was employed to refer to the Soviet Union and its satellites, thus distinguishing them from the first world. The wider political and economic base of the concept was established when the first world was sometimes used also to refer to economically successful ex-colonies such as Canada, Australia and less frequently South Africa, all of which were linked to a first world network of Global capitalism and Euro-American defense alliances. The term fourth world’ is also now more commonly employed to designate those groups such as pre settler indigenous peoples whose economic status and oppressed condition, it is argued, place them in an even more marginalized position in the social and political hierarchy than the other post-colonial peoples.  

The effects of Colonialism can be seen as: The total or partial erosion of the colonized culture, the mediation of the identity and subjectivity of the colonized, the total rejection by some elements among the colonized of everything western. The categorization of the world into ranks, such as first world, second world, the west and rest with all the subsequent stereotyping and prototyping that follows. The emergence of bourgeoisie classes in the colonies, models themselves after their master, who endeavor to maintain their status quo by getting closer to western culture. The emergence of societies with a lot of contradictions and split loyalties. Advocates of colonialism argue that colonial rule benefits the colonized by developing the economic and political infrastructure necessary for modernization and democracy. They point to such former colonies as the United States of America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong and Singapore as examples of Post-colonial success.
**POST COLONIALISM /POST COLONIAL THEORY:**

Post-colonial theory is a set of theories in philosophy, film, political sciences and literature that deals with the cultural legacy of colonial rule. It deals with literature produced in countries that once were colonies of other countries, especially of the European colonial powers Britain, France and Spain and also includes countries still in colonial arrangements. Edward Said’s book *Orientalism* is considered to be the source book. Stephen Sleman, one of the intellectual founding figures of post colonialism has compared post colonialism to suitcase blown open on the baggage belt.

The term has generated much debate among scholars and this makes it difficult to fix the exact meaning of the term. The hyphenated term ‘post-colonial’ is a particular historical period or epoch, like those suggested by phrases such as ‘after colonialism,’ ‘after independence’ or ‘after the end of empire.’ The prefix ‘post’ in the term also continues to be a source of vigorous debate amongst critics. In simple words ‘post’ means after. Post-colonial stresses the articulations between and across the politically defined historical periods of pre-colonial colonial, and post-colonial.
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Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin define the term post colonial as:
‘Post Colonial’ had a clearly chronological meaning, designation the post-independence period. However, from the late 1970s the term has been used by literary critics to discuss the various cultural effects of colonization. The term has subsequently been widely used to signify the political, linguistic and cultural experience of societies that were former European colonies.

The study of the controlling power of representation in colonized societies had begun in the late 1970s with texts such as Said’s *Orientalism* and led to the development of colonialist discourse theory in the works of critics’ such as Bhabha and Spivak. Spivak for first time used the term post-colonial in her collection of interviews and recollections published in 1990 called *The Post Colonial Critic*. The term was a potential site of disciplinary and interpretative contention almost from the beginning, especially the implications involved in signifying the hyphen or its absence.

Theorists like Edward said, Homi Bhabha, Gayatri C. Spivak had great contributions to the development of colonial and post colonial theory. Edward Said was influenced by Foucault, Homi Bhabha by Jacques Lacan and Louis Althusser and Gayatri Spivak by Derrida. Aijaz Ahmed asserts that when the term colonialism can be pushed back to the Incas and forward to the Indonesian occupation of east Timor, then it becomes a trans historical thing always present and always in process of dissolution in one part of the world or another. According to Homi Bhaba the word post in post colonialism or post modernism or post feminism represents:
The beyond is neither a new horizon, nor a leaving behind of the past… Beginnings and endings may be sustaining myths of the middle years; but in the fin de siècle, we find ourselves in the moment of traits where space and time cross to produce complex figures of difference and identity, past and present, inside and outside, inclusions and exclusions. For there is a sense of disorientation, a disturbance of direction, in the beyond’ an exploratory, restless movement caught so well in the French rendition of the words au-delà-here and there, on all sides fort/da hither and thither back and forth.¹⁶

The word ‘beyond’ for Homi Bhaba signifies spatial distance, it marks progress, it promises the future. Bhabha further continues his argument and says that the present can no longer be simply envisaged as break or a bonding between the past and the future, no longer a synchronic presence. He also says that:

*If the jargon of our times-post modernity, post coloniality, post feminism-has any meaning at all, it does not lie in the popular use of the ‘post’ to indicate sequentiaity-after feminism, or polarity-anti-modernism. These terms that insistently gesture to the beyond, only embody its restless and revisionary energy if they transform the present into an expanded and ex-entire site of experience and empowerment.* ¹⁷

The term post colonial either hyphenated or without has many meanings. There is an ongoing debate on the post-colonial. Whereas Homi Bhabha says that the term is not only used for sequentiality such as ‘after but is used beyond the boundary which becomes the place from which something begins its presenting in a movement not dissimilar to the ambulants, ambivalent articulation of the beyond.’ Bill Ashcroft and others in *The Empire Writes Back*, describe the term ‘Post Colonial’ as: The term which is used to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day. The present piece of poem which is taken from David Punters Book ‘Past Colonial Imaginings: Fictions in New World Order’ is self
explanatory, the way in which colonized subjects were treated by the colonizers and the desire of the marginalized to take a gun in hand and to shot the colonizers. Basically the Blacks, the way in which they suffer due to colonization.

The poem runs as:

After thousands of years
Like the same beaten-up questions
The same beaten-up man is
Still being asked
‘Who are you?
‘Where do you live?
What’s your name?
The prisoner who patrols
A motionless octagonal cell
Holds there grenades captive the same time.
Every where outside
Of forest of iron bars has spread its
Stranglehold
Like a magnates’ invisible lines of force.
And this is the solid proof of the success
Of a massive build up of arms.
That as soon as we have a gun in our
Hand enemy heads begin to appear all around us.  

Spivak says that the people from former colonies are able to communicate with each other because they share something which is common to them that is the colonization of native land by the colonizers. And should these colonized countries consider themselves feel lucky enough that they were civilized by the colonizers? Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak says the answer to this question is no. The colonizers also differed in their modes of interacting with the local populations and these differences have a profound impact on racial discourses and identities.

The study of post colonialism starts with Edward Said’s landmark work *Orientalism* in 1978 and leads to the development of what came to be called ‘colonist discourse theory’ in the work of critics such
as Gayatri C. Spivak and Homi Bhabha. The term ‘post-colonial’ was not employed in the early studies of colonial discourse theory, rather it was first used to refer to cultural interactions within colonial societies in literary circles. The term Post – colonial literatures appeared in the second issue of New Literatures Review in 1977, and was recognized, through informal acceptance of the term amongst literary critics. The relationship of Prospero and Caliban is taken as exemplifying the relationship between colonizer and colonized by Aime Cesaire and has been re-read as master slave relationship from Shakespeare’s ‘The Tempest.’

POST – COLONIAL THEORY:

Post-colonial theory deals with the reading and writing of literature written in previously or currently colonized countries, or literature written in colonizing countries which deals with colonization or colonized people. It focuses particularly on the way in which literature by the colonizing culture distorts the experience and realities, and inscribes the inferiority of the colonized people. It also deals with the literature by colonized peoples which attempts to articulate their identity and reclaim their past. Frantz Fanon in Black Skin, White Masks says: ‘[a] man who has a language consequently possesses the world expressed and implied by that language.’

Freedom from colonialism is not only to sign the declarations of independence nor just to lower and raise the flags. But it is for the change in minds a challenge to the dominate ways of seeing. People from all the parts of empire need to refuse the dominant languages of power that have divided them into master and slave, the orient and occident, the centre and periphery, if progressive and lasting change is to be achieved.
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The colonizers used to consider their literary texts to be the best and insisted on rest of the world, basically the colonized countries to read them. Here the sender in colonial periods or during colonization is the Britishers /white /colonizers as they represented the centre. The colonized people serve the purpose of the receiver. They received the text and considered it to be the best. Hence the relationship of sender and receiver ran successful till the colonized countries achieved their independence or understood the significance of independence. As it is said the post colonial theory is based on subversion and resistance. These once colonized countries after gaining their independence or realizing the need of independence started writing back to the empire. It is not only to write back but also to achieve identity and re-identify themselves. The sender took the position of Receiver and the Receiver / the colonized took the position of sender / colonizer. This writing back paradigm took place during colonialism, and still continue in the post colonial period.
Using the work of Fanon and Said and later Bhabha and Spivak these texts were primarily concerned with writing back to the center, actively engaged in a process of questioning and ‘travestying colonial discourses in their works.’ Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin attempted, albeit problematically, to bring the oriental insights to bear on readings of post colonial texts. In recent the Holy Trinity of Said, Bhabha and Spivak has become the focus for much commentary and debate in post colonialism, collectively this has helped create ‘post colonial theory’ as a separate discipline, sometimes at the expense of criticism of post colonial literature.

The readers of present day experience ‘empire’ textually, though the medium of nineteenth and twentieth century novels and periodical, travel writings is scraps of doggerel. ‘Empire was itself, at least in part, a textual exercise.’

---
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*Introduction*
These are the certain characteristics that are shared in common by post modernism and post colonialism.

*Empire is itself the strangest of all political anomalies. That a handful of adventures from an island in the Atlantic should have subdued a vast country divided from the place of their birth by half the globe; a country which at no very distant period was merely the subject of fable to the nations of Europe.*

The adventure tales and triple-decker novels were the best selling. Both definitive Victorian genres were infused with imperial ideas of race pride and national Prowess in the late 18th century British India. In the transcription of the Islamic Sharia and the Hindu Shastras, writing served also as an instrument of rule, as a means of collecting information and exercising power which blend the ancient religious’ laws and the modern scientific knowledge as taken to be the most effective way of administering India. According to Bill Ashcroft and others the term post colonial reading is defined as: ‘A way of realizing texts of both metropolitan and colonial cultures to deliberate attention to profound and inescapable effects of colonization on literary productions, anthropological account, historical records; administrative and scientific writing. It is a form of deconstructive reading most usually applied to works emanating from the colonizers and reveals its colonialist ideologies and processes.’

Post colonial theory deals with cultural identity in colonized societies. The dilemmas of developing a national identity after colonial rule; the ways in which writers articulate and celebrate that identity, the ways in which the knowledge of the colonized subordinated people has been generated and used to serve the colonizer’s interests; and the ways in which the colonizer’s literature has justified colonialism via images of the colonized as perpetually inferior people, society and culture. The
colonized people reply to the colonial legacy by writing back to the centre, where the indigenous people write their own histories and legacies using the colonizer’s language for instance the English, French, Dutch so on and so forth for their own purposes. Through their writings they are writing back to the centre. These indigenous people are trying to subvert, remap and re-identify themselves. Indigenous decolonization is the intellectual impact of post colonial theory upon communities of indigenous peoples thereby generating their post colonial literature.

**ISSUES IN POSTCOLONIAL THEORY:**

There are some issues in post colonial theory which need to be discussed here. The present theory is built around the concept of otherness. There are various issues related with the term such as otherness includes double-ness, both identity and difference. The western concept of the oriental is based, as Abdul Jan Mohammad remarks, on the Manichean allegory based on division of the world as mutually opposite. If the west is ordered, rational, masculine, good, then the orient is chaotic, irrational, feminine, and evil. It is in this sense to reverse this polarization is to be complicit in its totalization and identity destroying power. Colonized people are highly diverse in their nature and in their traditions, and as beings in cultures they are both constructed and changing. So that while they may be ‘other’ from the colonizers, they differ from one another and from their own past. For instance, a country like India where people from different communities were rulers such as Dravidians, Aryans, Mughals. They should not be totalized or essentialised through such concepts as black consciousness, Indian soul, aboriginal culture and so on and so forth.
This totalization and essentialization is often a form of nostalgia which has its inspiration more in the thought of the colonizers than of the colonized. The colonized past is different and they are different than their past, which they can reclaim but never reconstitute, so that can be revisited and realized in partial fragmented ways. The post colonial theory is also built around the concept of resistance. Resistance as subversion, opposition, mimicry and so on but with that haunting problem that resistance always inscribes the resisted into the texture of the resisting. Resistance carries with it meanings such as freedom, liberty, identity, individuality etc. The ideas which have not been held or held in the same way, in the colonized cultures view of humankind. Another issue with the post colonial theory lies in the fact that the writings by colonized peoples need to reconstitute the identity. And they may have to take the help of colonizing publishing house, advertisizing, and production of books. These may well require a centralized economic and cultural system which is ultimately either a western import or a hybrid form, writing local conceptions with that of western. In most cases the concept of producing national or cultural literature is foreign to the traditions of the colonized people who had no literature or writing at all or did not see art as having the same function as constructing and defining cultural identity or where for instance, people like west transported into wholly different geographical political/economic/cultural world. India is exception with many divergent sub-cultures. It is in this sense that the identity of the colonized thus becomes the hybrid identity, which is created or an attempt is made to constitute and represent their identity. The concepts like identity and nationality are difficult to conceive or convey in the cultural traditions of colonized people. Again the problem of reclaiming
and reconstituting identity in a language that is new but was not its own language, and genres which are now but were not the genres of the colonized. Literature may be produced in such a style that the inhabitants of a particular colonized area, the language use does not read like standard English in which literature, the standard literary allusions and common metaphors and symbols may be inappropriate and or may be replaced by allusions and tropes which are alien to British culture and usage. It may become difficult for others to recognize or respect the work as literature. It is difficult to define which literature is good or irrelevant from culture’s point of view and which strong ideals to accept. The concept of hybridity is important in post colonial theory in referring to practices from the colonizing and the colonized cultures. Again hybridity is an important concept in post colonial theory because it is able to breakdown the false sense that colonized cultures- or colonizing cultures, for that matter, are monolithic or have essential, unchanging features.

**POST COLONIAL LITERATURE:**

Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin in *The Empire Writes Back* define Post-Colonial literatures as:

> Writing by those peoples formerly colonized by Britain, though much of what it deals with is of interest and relevance to countries colonized by other European powers, such as France, Portugal and Spain. The semantic basis of the term ‘post-colonial’ might seem to suggest a concern only with the national culture after the departure of the imperial power. It has occasionally been employed in some earlier work in the area to distinguish between the periods before and after independence.²⁴

Scholars like Tiffin, Brydon and Hulme implicitly or explicitly follow the definition of post colonialism as given in *The Empire Writes Back* without further problematizing its implications. The African
writer Ngugi-wa-Thiongo in ‘Post-Colonial Politics And Culture’ (1993) points to the continuities of colonial structures in post-colonial Kenya, especially in cultural politics such as language instruction in schools and at universities. He argues that resistance to undemocratic structures as well as its repression used similar strategies as it did under colonialism. Ngugi’s post colonialism implicitly means ‘after colonialism, Niyi Osundare’s critique in ‘How Post-colonial is African Literatures?’ (1994) engages more directly with postcolonial literary theory as discourse. Bill Ashcroft and others in the book *The Empire Writes Back* (1989) say that the new literatures are seen as essentially deconstructive and subversive and based on resistance and representation.

*Hence it has been the project of post-colonial writing to interrogate European discourse and discursive strategies from its position within and between two worlds [...]. Thus the rereading and rewriting of the European historical and fictional record is a vital and inescapable task at the heart of the post-colonial enterprise. These subversive manoeuvres, rather than the construction of essentially national or regional alternative, are the characteristic features of the post-colonial text. Post-colonial literatures/ cultures are constituted in counter-discursive rather than homologous practices.*

The literature of colonized countries interrogates the European discourse by re-reading and rewriting the European historical and fictional record. Frantz Fanon distinguishes three stages of development among colonial literature. First, that of an ‘unqualified assimilation’ to European standards, followed by a second phase where intellectuals try to overcome their alienation from their own land by identifying themselves with their own people. Their resistance is reflected in a harsh, vigorous, rhythmic, florid and colorful style. But such writing focuses more on the past than the present, and although a rehabilitation
of the past is necessary, it tends to exoticise and to use a formulaic traditionalism that perceives national culture as static. Thus remaining alienated from the people and their dynamics. Writers must move onto stage three, the ‘fighting phase,’ and become awakeners of their people rather than eulogizers of their lethargy. National culture develops only through people’s struggle. As political objectives become more precise, literature loses its former floridness. Poetry gives way to prose which addresses the writers’ own people rather than foreigners. National liberation is pre-conciliation for the development of both national culture and a more universal consciousness.

Since post colonialism is about ‘post colonial writing’ and not about discrete national literatures, it requires a comparative framework based on some common ground shared by all ‘Post colonial’ literatures. This is provided by the concept of a ‘common colonial experience’ that is held to be the determining force that has shaped ‘post colonial literature’ to the present day. The literatures which are written by Canada, New Zealand and Australia and those written by India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Nigeria, differ because their first language makes them so.

1st Group
Though these colonized countries produce post colonial literatures but these nations can be distinguished from each other on the basis of their first language as English and the group of nations where English is a foreign language to them. The literature produced by second group of nations utilized English in the tension between two (or more) language system and cultures. This has been pointed out by A. Shrivastav Commonwealth Review of (1989, pp.5-10). With the name ‘Commonwealth Literature’ using M. Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism, Ron Blaber considers the relation of post colonial writing to the traditional literary canon. Bakhtins idea is that every society is fundamentally heteroglot, that is populated by plurality of languages in dialogue struggle with another. In some societies certain languages tend to attain dominance over the others. Thus approaching monoglossia. The literary cannon also aims at monoglossia by excluding, marginalizing and appropriating certain fields of discourse through decontextualisation and the development of a passive, monolithic reading practice. The heteroglossic backgrounds of present –day readers, for instance, their familiarity with other media such as television or comics challenged the canon’s monoglossic claims. Blaber Ron recommends shifting the focus of teaching practice from the text to reader response and other media, thus promoting a more pluralist approach to culture. Post colonialism which does not have a long-
established canon to define, might in turn promote a broader perspective on cultural studies. Timothy Brennan in ‘Preface’ to *Modern Fiction Studies* (1989) Special Issue: ‘Narratives of Colonial Resistance’ suggests that a critical approach to the third world literature which tries to create a more deliberate sense of historical grounding, especially with regard to narratives of colonial resistance. The reading strategy, he suggests, includes not only an analysis of critical reception (or neglect) of certain third world writings and the question of how aesthetically dissonant features can challenge the prevalent institution of literature, but also comprises re-evaluation and possible re-denomination of already common critical categories, such as ‘exile writing.’ It would also have to consider acts of colonial resistance, within Europe itself and involve the theoretical self-questioning by critics engaged in these works of colonial and postcolonial studies.

**POST - COLONIAL STUDIES:**

Since 1970s the field of post colonial studies has been gaining prominence. With the publication of Edward Said’s influential book *Orientalism* which is thought to be the rise of these studies in western Academy. The growing body within the academy of the term ‘post colonial’ sometimes hyphenated was consolidated by the appearance of the book *The Empire Writes Back: Theory And Practice In Post Colonial Literatures* in the year 1989 by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. Since then the terms such as ‘Third world’, ‘Commonwealth’ which were used for the former colonies of Europe have now become rarer, instead the term Post colonial studies is being used. Though there is considerable debate over the precise parameters of the field and the definition of the term ‘post colonial.’ The
interactions between European nations and the societies they colonized in the modern period are still debatable. It is also the study of historical transition, a cultural location, a discursive stance, an epochal condition distinguished by the entry into metropolitan culture of other voices, histories and experience and an achieved transition. The signification of the term post colonial has enabled a diversity of studies-and indeed both the subjects of inquiry and the theoretical positions are bewilderingly varied. The term post colonial is said to displace or supersede the other terms such as Third World Commonwealth, serves to include both the capitalist trajectory of the imperial project and the capitalist nature of contemporary globalization. The term came to signify something remote from self-determination and autonomy. By deploying categories such as hybridity, mimicry, ambivalence and so on, all of which laced colonized into colonizing cultures; it has become a reconciliatory rather than a critical, anti-colonialist category.

The larger intellectual conflict inhabited by post colonial studies is intimated in the counter attacks launched by ‘post’ critics on antagonists they see as reconstructed Marxists. Judith Butler in sociality chastises an ‘orthodox left’ for discounting the importance of the cultural and seeking to separate Marxism from the study of culture. Fredric Jameson has proposed that it is not a ‘model’ but ‘a starting point and a problem, something as un-dogmatic as an imperative simultaneously to grasp culture in and for itself, but also in relationship to its outside, its content, its context, and its space of intervention and of effectivity. Terry Eagleton has written:

Culture is the child of a one parent family, having labours its sole progenitor… at least one reason for trying to make some sense of much derided base/superstructure image is that, in a kind of Copernican iconoclast, it at
least succeeds powerfully dislodging culture from its idealist supremacy.26

The debate surrounding the status of settler countries as post colonial suggests that issues in post colonial studies often transcend the boundaries of strict definitions. Bill Ashcroft and others deal with the terms and concepts important to post colonial studies, such as liminality, hegemony, authenticity, subaltern etc in their book *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies* (1998) in order to enable the students and research scholars to consider the often differing ways in which terms are used, their ancestry or conceptual evolution, and the reasons why they remain important flags in the cultural debate.

Arun P. Mukherjee in *Interrogation Post Colonialism: Some Uneasy Conjectures* 1996 - 1998 tackles the question of the institutionalization of ‘Post Colonial Literature’ at Canadian Universities. Every investigation of the academic field has to begin with specific working conditions: Post Colonial Theory. Mukherjee’s argument provided for English 4000: Post Colonial Literature. It is the instrument which sees the hidden similarities among these discrete texts from diverse areas of the world. Post colonial theory claims to be applicable to so many different texts that it generalizes, unifies and thus is devoid of any analytical power. It focuses on the paradigm of writing back or Resistance, on the relationship between the colonizers/colony, centre/periphery which results in trivializing the differences between various colonial experiences. And thus according to Mukherjee ignores contemporary social problems that may not be simply a result of European colonialism and hence reduces the literatures under consideration to the needs of the metropolitan academic contest with a hope that the term may be further simplified and become descriptive rather than evaluative.
**DISCOURSE:**

The term ‘discourse’ has become common in various fields such as critical theory, sociology, linguistics, philosophy, social psychology, so on and so forth. The term was used for common knowledge. It is also used widely in analyzing literary and non-literary texts and is often employed to signal a certain theoretical sophistication in ways which are vague and sometimes obfuscatory. It has the widest range of possible significations of any term in literary and cultural theory, and in the theoretical text, it is the term which is least defined.

The Collins Concise English Dictionary 1988, defines the word Discourse as:

*Verbal communication, talk, conversation. A formal treatment of a subject in speech or writing; a unit of text used by linguists for the analysis of linguistic phenomena that range over more than sentence; to discourse means the ability to reason (archaic) to discourse on/open: to speak or write about formally, to give forth (music) (archaic) 14th century from medieval Latin discurseis: arguments from Latin, a running to and fro from discurrere.*

The Longman Dictionary of the English Language, 1984 defines discourse as: ‘a conversation, especially of a formal nature; formal and orderly expression of idea in speech or writing; also such expression in the form of sermon, treatise etc; a piece or unit of connected speech or writing.’ (Middle English: Discourse, from Latin: Act of Running About) Similarly in the Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary the
word discourse is defined as: ‘communication in speech or writing a speech or piece of writing about a particular usually serious subject; a discourse ‘on/upon the nature of life after death.’

From the above definitions discourse can be defined as an act of speaking or writing, talk or conversation, a formal treatment of subject in speech or writing a unit of text, used by linguists for analysis, the ability to reason, formally speak/write on upon. It may also refer to conversation of formal nature, expression of ideas through speech/writing. But in Collin Robert’s Concise French Dictionary, 1990 the word discourse is defined as: ‘Discourse: a) speech; tous cesbeaux discourse: all fine talk (pejorative); suis moi sans faire de discours: follow me and no arguing; perdre son temps en discours: to waste one’s time talking; b) discours - direct/indirect: direct/indirect speech/linguistic); c) discours (philosophical treatise). Discourir: fairundiscours to discourse to hold forth upon; to chat (pejorative).’

The meaning of discourse changes from one academic discipline to another. For instance, when linguists talk of a discourse of advertising, they are referring to something quite different than the social psychologist who talks of a discourse of racism. David Crystal attempts to pin down the meaning of discourse within linguistics by contrasting its use to the term text. He says:

“Discourse analysis focuses on the structure of naturally occurring, spoken language, as found in such discourses as conversation, interviews, commentaries and speech. Text analysis focuses on the structure of written language,
as found in such texts as essays, notice, road signs and chapters. But this distinction is not clear cut, and there have been many other uses of these labels. The particular ‘discourse’ and ‘text’ can be used in a much broader sense to include all language units with a definable communicative function whether spoken or written. Some scholars talk about spoken or written discourse,’ other about ‘spoken or written text.’

Discourse as a term is largely defined by what it is not, what it is set in opposition to; thus the term discourse is often characterized by its difference from a series of terms such as Text, Sentence and Ideology—each of these term marks the meaning of discourse. For Geoffrey Leech and Michael Short the term:

“Discourse is linguistic communication seen as a transaction between speaker and hearer, as an interpersonal activity whose form is determined by its social purpose. Text is linguistic communication (either spoken or written) seen simply as message coded in its auditory or visual medium.”

None of the above definitions, picked up from dictionaries or the disciplinary context of the utterance of the term which are used in contrast to discourse, produces a simply/clear cut meaning of the term, but rather only serves to show the fluidity of its meanings. As Michel Foucault puts it:

Instead of gradually reducing the rather fluctuating meaning of the word ‘discourse’ I believe I have in fact added to its meanings: treating it sometimes as the general domain of all statements, sometimes as individualizable group of statement, and some time as regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements.
Sara Mills in her book on Discourse published in 2007 provides a detailed analysis of the term ‘discourse’ by Foucault. She says that first definition that Foucault gives is the widest one: ‘the general domain of all statements; that is all utterances or texts which have meaning and which have some effects in the real world count as discourse.’ The second definition that he gives ‘an Individualizable group of statements is one which is used often by Foucault when he is discussing the particular structure within discourses, that is groups of utterances which seem to be regulated in some way and which seems to have a coherence and a force to the in common.’

Mikhail Bakhtin sometimes uses discourse to signify either a voice as in double-voice discourse or a method of using words which presumes authority (this usage is influenced by the meaning of the Russian word for discourse, Slovo). Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin in their book *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies* argue that the term discourse:

“This is a much used word in contemporary theory and in post-colonial criticism is mostly employed in such terms as Colonial Discourse, which is specifically derived from Foucault’s use of the concept. Discourse was originally used from about the sixteenth century to describe any kind of speaking, talk or conversation, but became increasingly used to describe a more formal speech, a narration or a treatment of any subject at length, a treatise, dissertation or sermon. More recently, discourse has been used in a technical sense by linguists to describe any unit of speech longer than a sentence. However, the
Bill Ashcroft and others discuss the term discourse and then move on to the colonial discourse. And further they add that discourse is important because it joins power and knowledge together.

Foucault’s view of the role of discourse is even wider and more pervasive. He argues that discourse is the crucial feature of Modernity itself. So, Discourses are groups of statements which have some institutionalized force as they have strong influence on the way that individuals act and think. Foucault’s study begins with the immense talk of dismantling the theme that knowledge is an expression of (peoples) ideas. Foucault's work has been crucial to the development of a range of different theories which have been broadly grouped under the term ‘discourse theory,’ and it is for this reason that Foucault work stands as primary work in this field. Foucault allows challenges, many of the preconceived notions that one has about different subjects such as sexuality, madness, discipline, subjectivity, language etc. Foucault describes literature as:

\[ A \text{ silent deposition of the word upon the whiteness of a piece of paper, where it can possess neither sound nor interlocutor where it has nothing to say but itself, nothing to do but shine in the brightness of its being.}\]
LITERATURE AS A DISCOURSE:

The study of discourse does not differentiate between the literary and non-literary texts. Though discourse theorists are keenly aware of the institutionalized differences that exist between two sets of texts. History texts are privileged in their relation to truth, autobiographical writings are supposed to be authentic in their relation to the authorial voice. But the literary texts have a complex relation to both truth and value, providing a truth about human society and human condition and doing so within functional and therefore ‘untrue’ form.

Foucault’s work has helped a number of theorists to consider the way that English literature as a discipline works. Foucault himself states: ‘Literary criticism and literary history in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries constituted the person of the author, and the figure of the oeuvre using, modifying and displacing the procedures of religious exegesis, biblical criticism, hagiography, historical or legendary ‘lives,’ autobiography or memoirs.’

IDEOLOGY AS DISCOURSE:

Much of Foucault’s work on discourse has been an open discussion and dialogue within the term ‘ideology.’ He says:
“The notion of ideology appears to me to be difficult to use for three reasons. The first is, whether one wants it be or not, it is always in virtual opposition something like the truth... the second in convenience is that it refers, necessarily. Thirdly, ideology is in a secondary position in relation to something which must function as the infra-structure or economic or material determinant.”

Structuralist’s analysis focused largely on mapping out the rules. Governing the production of texts and systems of signification; theorists like Roland Barthes and Foucault were interested not only in structures which could be found in cultural artifacts, for instance texts, but also in the large-scale structure which could be traced in discourse itself.

MICHEL FOUCAULT AND THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE (1992):

Michel Foucault made an important assertion in his *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, which was written in the year 1972, that the discourses are not simply groupings of utterances, grouped around a theme or an issue nor are they simply sets of utterances which emanate from particular institutional setting but that discourses are highly regulated groupings of utterances or statements with integral rules which are specific to discourse itself. Discourses he says must also be seen to be regulated by relation with other discourses. The focus of Foucault’s *The Archaeology of Knowledge* is largely on the relation of:
Texts and discourses to the real, and the construction of the real by discursive structures. There is a strong sense in which the real characterized as a set of constructs formed through discourse. 39

Thus Discourses are sets of sanctioned statements which have some institutionalized force which means that they have a profound influence on the way that individuals act and think and moreover discourses are those groupings of statements which have similar force, that they are grouped together due to some institutional force / pressure or because of similarity of provenance or context or because they act in a similar way.

COLONIAL DISCOURSE THEORY:

Discourse theory can be used with a strongly political focus particularly with colonial and post colonial discourse theory, the critical study of the writings produced within the period of British imperialism and the effect of those texts on colonized societies. This work is generally termed ‘post-colonial discourse theory,’ which is largely informed by psychoanalytical theory rather than discourse theory and is more concerned with the effects. The colonial enterprise has had on current social structures and discursive formations. Said in Orientalism focuses on a number of features that recur in texts about colonized countries and that these cannot be attributed simply to the individual author’s beliefs, but are rather due to a larger scale belief system structured by discursive frame works, which are given credibility and force by imperial power relations. Peter Hume describes colonial discourse as:

An ensemble of linguistically- based practices unified in their common deployment in the management of colonial relationship. Underlying the idea of colonial discourse...is the presumption that during the colonial period large
parts of the non-European world were produced for Europe. Through a discourse that imbricated sets of questions and assumptions, methods of procedure and analysis and kinds of writing and imagery.  

Colonial discourse not only refers to a body of texts with similar subject-matter but also refers to a set of practices and rules which produced those texts and the methodological organization of the thinking underlying them. In Orientalism Edward Said described the discursive features of that body of knowledge which was produced in the 19th century by scholars, travel writers, poets, novelists, which effectively represented the orient as repository of western knowledge, rather than as a society and culture functioning on its own terms. The term ‘Orient’ was produced in relation to the west and was described in terms of the way it differed from the west. Every new text that was produced/written about the orient reinforced particular stereotypical images and ways of thinking. Edward Said argues:

_Every one who writes about the orient, must locate (Themselves) vis-a-vis the orient, translated into (their) texts; this location includes the kind of narrative voice(they adopt) the type of structure( they build) the kind of images, themes, motifs that circulate in their (texts) all of which… speaking on its behalf._

Colonial discourse, thus indicates a new way of thinking in which cultural intellectual, economic or political processes are seen to work together in the formation and dismantling of colonialism.

It enlarges and widens the studies of colonialism by examining the intersection of idea and institution, knowledge and power between these countries. Colonial discourse from the intersections where language and power meet, language is more than simply a means of communication. It constitutes our views by cutting up and ordering reality into meaningful units.
To Ania Loomba colonial discourse is concerned with:

“How stereotypes, images, and knowledge of colonial subjects and cultures tie in with institutions of economic administrative, judicial and biomedical control.”

The images of African, Turkish, Muslim, barbarians, and men of Inde had circulated for a long time before colonialism. These images coincide with the construction of the ‘other’ in colonialist discourse such images are considered by discussions of colonial discourse as the product of timeless opposition between western and non-western peoples and ideas.

POST-COLONIAL DISCOURSE:

To go for Foucault’s and Said’s sense of post-colonial discourse is to invoke certain ways of thinking about language, truth and power about interrelationships between them. Power is that which determines and verifies truth. Truth is never outside power, the production of truth is a function of power. Power is invested in the language because it provides the terms in which truth itself is constituted.

Feminist theorists are concerned to analyze power relations and the way that women as individuals, as members of groups negotiate relations of power. In recent times, feminist work has moved from viewing women simply as oppressed group, as victims of male domination, and has tried to formulate ways of analyzing powers it manifests in itself and as it is resisted in the relations of everyday life. Femininity as discourse is so persuasive that rather than seeing, for instance, conduct books and advice manuals for women as being
straightforward indicators or signs of the degree of women’s oppression; instead they can be seen as merely an indication of the scale of the problem posed by women and their resistance to being counselled in this way.

Fabian argues that the terms which are applied to colonized countries such as backward, primitive, feudal, and ‘medieval’ developing country and colonized countries is set within a past period of British historical development or western progress and is therefore not permitted to exist on its own terms. It is represented as existing only in an underdeveloped parody of British civilization a state which Homi Bhabha has described as being one of ‘mimicry’.

Hulme focuses on the discourse of oriental civilization and the discourse of savagery which he locates in texts. There are accounts of cannibalism and barbaric practices, there are also positive evaluations of certain aspects of the other culture. Hulme argues that these differences are motivated by differences of context. Those cultures which resisted colonial incursions were described as barbaric cannibals, and the colonial powers felt justified in their attempt to exterminate them. Those who accepted the colonial rule and perhaps collaborated with the colonial authorities in establishing settlement, were characterized as peace loving and civilized.

Peter Hulme describes the differences in discursive structures in texts which describe colonized countries and those were the countries maintained their own independent governments and yet traded with the west.

Discourses change over time-depending on the economic and social conditions within which they are generated. Thus a text that deals with the settler life within the security of the civil times in Delhi during
the colonial period naturally differs markedly from a description of the exploration of West Africa. Spivak and others form the subaltern group of Studies. Spivak is one of the post-colonial theorists, whose work has been important in challenging Said’s notion of the homogeneity of colonial discourse. Spivak locates herself theoretically more within deconstruction and Marxist Feminism. Her focus on the possibility of alternative voices being recoverable within discourses, which simply seem on the surface to be simple colonialist texts, that has been instrumental enforcing critics to rethink their interpretations of colonial texts.

Gareth Griffiths in ‘Imitation, Abrogation and Appropriation: The Production of the Post Colonial Text, 1987, in this essay focuses on post colonial texts produced in the 19th century and early 20th century. He argues that English as the language forced upon the colonies and imperial colonial discourse constitute and perpetuate each other. For the colonies post colonial literary production this resulted-at least during the early stage-in an imitation of dominant cultural standards. To go beyond the colonial imagination then requires remaking and appropriating this discourse for the need of the marginalized. It also means, re-reading of all post-colonial texts must inevitably occur as part of that process.

Jan Mohammed and David Lloyd in the essay ‘Introduction: Toward a Theory of Minority Discourse, in the special issue on ‘The Nature and Context of Minorities Discourse, 1987 focus on minority discourse as a strategy of survival identity preservation and political critique. They ask for a coalition of Minorites that, without obliterating cultural difference, recognizes their common political subject position and struggle for re-empowerment. As ‘minority’ individuals are always
treated and forced to experience themselves generically,’ they often transform this negative position into a positive one through conscious collective literary articulation. Minority intellectuals remain doubly alienated due to their marginalization within hegemonic institutions on the one hand and their relatively privileged position compared to non-intellectual minority individuals on the other. They suggest that this alienation must be overcome by a combination of theoretical and practice struggle, for instance a critique of tradition Universalist/Eurocentric humanism and its disciplinary division. To avoid assimilations into hegemonic structures, minority discourse should always retain its flexibility and remain aware of the social conditions of cultural productions.

**POST COLONIALITY AND GLOBAL CAPITALISM:**

‘That world situation created by transformations within the capitalist world economy, by the emergence of what has been described variously as global capitalism, flexible production late capitalism, and so on terms that have disorganized earlier conceptualizations of global relations, especially relations comprehended earlier by such binaries as colonizer/colonized, first world/third world and the west and the rest.’

Though there has been the three world theory concept but with the emergence of global capitalism and as insisted by the post colonial critics the term ‘Third world’ was quite vague in encompassing within one uniform category vastly heterogeneous historical circumstances and in locking in fixed positions, structurally of not geographically societies and populations that shifted with changing global relationships. The identity of post coloniality is no more structural but discursive and it has been released from their fixity of third world location as has been pointed out:
In a world situation in which severe inequalities persist in older colonial forms or in their neocolonial reconfiguration, moreover, the unified temporality of ‘Post coloniality’ risks reproducing the colonial discourse of an allochronic other, living in another tie, still lagging behind us the genuine post colonials.  

Post coloniality tries to solve the problems which are thrown by global capitalism. As the crisis of the colonized countries has become inescapably apparent during the decade of the eighties, so have the effects of global capitalism.

Post coloniality, in the particular direction it has taken as discourse, also resonated with the problems of the contemporary world. It addresses issues that may have been present all along in global studies but are now rephrased to attune to issues in global capitalism.

Post coloniality appeals because it disguises the power relations that shape seemingly shapeless world and contributes to a conceptualization of that world that both consolidates and subverts possibilities of resistance.

**RESISTANCE DISCOURSE:**

The concept of resistance for the first time was put forward by Selwyn Cudjoe and Barbara Harlow in their books, *Resistance and Caribbean Literature* and *Resistance Literature* respectively. For them, ‘Resistance’ is:

An act or a set of acts, that is designed to rid a people of its oppressors, and it so thoroughly infuses the experience of living under oppression that it becomes an almost autonomous aesthetic principle. Literary Resistance, under these conditions, can be seen as a form of contractual understanding between text and reader, one which is embeded in an experimental dimension and buttressed by a political and cultural aesthetic at work in culture. And ‘resistance literature’ in this definition, can thus be seen as that category of literary writing which emerges as an integral part of an organized struggle or resistance or national liberation.
The above definition of ‘resistance’ fails to address three major areas of critical concern.

The first problem arises with the political concern, the centre/periphery notions of resistance can actually work to reinscribe centre/periphery relations. The second problem is with literary texts that literary resistance is simply somehow in the third problem is that it has to set aside the very persuasive theory of power which Foucault puts forward in his *The Archaeology of Knowledge* the theory that power itself inscribes its resistances and so, in the process, seeks to contain them. There in the literary text as a structure of intentionality and there in the social text as a communicative gesture of pure availability.

Jenny Sharpe has written a wonderful article in *Modern Fiction Studies* entitled “Figures of colonial Resistance.” Jennys article, involves a reconsideration so the work of these theorist like Spivak, Bhabha, Mohammed and BenitaPerry each of whom has worked to correct the critical ‘tendency to presume the transparency of literary resistance in colonial and Post-Colonial writing. Each of them worked to examine the ways in which resistance in writing must go beyond the mere questioning of colonialist authority. Jenny Sharpe points out two
important points. First that one can never easily locate the sites of anti-colonial resistance as resistance itself is always in some measure an effect of the contradictory representation of colonial authority and secondly that resistance itself is therefore never purely resistance never simply there in the text or the interpretative community, but is always necessarily complicit in the apparatus it seeks to transgress. Sharpe argues that literary resistance is necessarily in a place of ambivalence between systems between discursive worlds. Timothy Brennan in his book on Salman Rushdie and Third World argues that the Third World resistance writer, the world resistance text is necessarily self produced as doubly emplaced and mediated figure. He uses the term ‘Third-World Cosmopolitan’ between First and the Third Worlds, and within ambition of a first world politics. Spivak, Bhabha and Sharpe argues that:

Resistance texts are necessarily double, necessarily mediated, in their social location is in fact nothing less than an argument for the emplacement of ‘Second World’ Literary texts within the field of ‘Post-Colonial’ for if there is only a space for a pure Third and Fourth World Resistance outside the first world hegemony, then neither you have to return to the baldly un-theorized notion which informs the first position in the debate over literary resistance, or you have to admit that at least as far as writing is concerned, the ‘field’ of the genuinely post-colonial can never actually exist.50

Timothy Brennan suggests a critical approach to Third World Literature which tries to create a more deliberate sense of historical grounding especially with regard to narratives of colonial resistance. The reading strategy he suggests includes not only an analysis of critical reception or neglect of certain Third World Writings and the question of how aesthetically dissonant features can challenge the prevalent institution of literatures, but also comprises a re-evaluation
and possible re-denomination of already common critical categories, such as ‘exile writing.’ It would also have to consider acts of ‘colonial resistance’ within Europe itself and involve the theoretical self-questioning by critics engaged with these works.

Amilcar Cabral stresses the importance of culture for colonial oppression. He argues that culture is the vigorous manifestation on the ideological or idealist plane of the physical and historical reality of the society that is dominated or to be dominated. Culture is simultaneously the first of a people’s history and a determinant of history. Accordingly, culture is central to national liberation. The colonizers have always understood its significance for resistance and thus aimed at cultural alienation by either assimilation or by dividing the indigenous population into native elite and popular masses. In the African context liberation therefore depends on a re-Africanisation of national culture, a growing awareness of African cultural heritage to assure culture its central role in national liberation.

Change resistance, adaptation and transformation are irresistible ingredients of human society. They open new vistas of knowledge. Indian Writing in English beginning with Raja Rammohan Roy who highlighted the plight of widows, darkness of superstition, ignorance and backwardness to the present day authors trying to establish their identity in the scheme of things in the globalized world. This trend is seen to a great extent in the contemporary Indian Writing in English including the diasporic writing. The works of other prominent authors such as Rabindranath Tagore, Aurobindo Ghosh, Sarojini Naidu, Mulk Raj Anand, Kamala Das, Ved Mehta, R. K. Narayan, Khushwant Singh, Nissim Ezekiel, Dom Moraes, Amitav Ghosh, Vikram Seth, Arundhati Roy, Ruskin Bond and many others like Salman Rushdie, V.
S. Naipaul, Meher Pestonji, Kavery Nambisan and others. Indian Writing in English has realistically and faithfully captured the Indian consciousness and it definitely had an impact on the social milieu, thereby giving a veiled direction to the Indian independence struggle and at the same time exerting a much wider influence on many other countries of the world still struggling for freedom, democracy, equality and justice.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL RESISTANCE:**

Resistance is anything that slows or stops movement or keeps movement from happening. A consideration, the phenomena of resistance led to one of the corner stones of the psycho-analytical theory of the neurosis - the theory of repression. The theories of resistance and of repression, of the unconscious, of the etiological significance of sexual life and of the importance of infantile experiences-these form the principal constituents of the theoretical structure of psycho-analysis.

**RESISTANCE AND TRANSFERENCE:**

The transference is made conscious to the patient by the analyst and it is resolved by convincing him that in his transference attitude he is re-experiencing emotional relations which had their origin in his earliest object-attachments during the repressed period of his childhood. In this way the transference is changed from the strongest weapon of the resistance into the best instrument of the analytic treatment.

**RESISTANCE AND ANTI-CATHEXES:**

Resistance presupposes the existence of what is called anti-cathexes. An anti-cathexes of this kind is clearly seen in obsessinace neurosis. It appears there in the form of an alteration of the ego, as a
reaction-formation in ego, and is affected by the reinforcement of the attitude which is the opposite of the instinctual trend that has to be repressed as for instance—pity, conscientiousness and cleanliness.

The first of the three ego-resistances is the repression resistance; there is a necessary relation between repression and resistance. Transference resistance succeeds in establishing a relation to the analytic situation. Ego resistance proceeds from the gain from illness and is based upon an assimilation of the symptom into the ego.

Resistance proceeds from ego, which clings to its anticathexes. It is hard for the ego to direct its attentions to perceptions and ideas (which it has up till now made a rule of avoiding or to acknowledge) as belonging to itself, impulses that are the complete opposite of which it knows as its own. The fight against resistance in analysis is based upon this view of the facts. Resistance is unconscious, as so often owing to its connection with the repressed material one makes it conscious. The ego is promised rewards and advantage if it will give up resistance. If ego has decided to relinquish its resistances it still has difficulty in undoing the repressions; and one called the period of strenuous effort which follows after its praise worthy decision, the phase of ‘working through’ the dynamic factor which makes working. It must be that after the ego’s resistance has been removed the power of the compulsion to
repeat- the attraction exerted by the unconscious prototype upon the repressed instinctual process has still to overcome. There is nothing to be said against describing this factor as the resistance of the unconscious.

There are two very famous wars which were fought against colonialism through resistance. Aba ‘women’s war’ first termed ‘riots’ and Kenya’s resistance war, Mau Mau. The Aba Women’s War started in November 1929, as Igbo women in Eastern Nigeria rose up in mass protest against a new British decree that women should be included in the census head-count. They believed this meant they would soon be taxed, an action they feared because they already felt taxes imposed on their men and caused their poverty. They also resented the imposition of indirect Rule and the chiefs that the British selected to carry out British rule. Indirect rule took away their power. On 24th Nov. 1929, Igbo women stayed protests against taxes and British appointed leaders, using a traditional Igbo form of protest known as ‘Sitting on man.’ During the ritual women would sing and dance, ridiculing the man they were campaigning against. During the Aba women’s war, around 25,000 women sang and danced, then began looting and attacking symbols of European domination such as trading stores and Barclays Bank. They also broke into the prison and released the prisoners. The war lasted for a period of approximately two months.

Another war was Kenya’s resistance war Mau Mau. It was a war against the Britishers. J. C. Carothers, who was born in South Africa and went to medical school in England, wrote a treatise called ‘The Psychology of Mau Mau, Describing the Efforts of the Ki Kugu in Kenya to Resist European Rule’. African mind and behavior was governed wholly by the emotions of the moment.
Resistance has become a much used word in post-colonial discourse, and indeed in the discussion of colonized countries and Third World Politics. For instance the armed rebellion, inflammatory tracts, pugnacious oratory and racial cultural and political animosity-resistance has invariably connoted the urgent imagery of war. The armed rebellion from Indian mutiny to the resistance movements in Kenya, Zimbabwe and other African states, became the very focus of self determination from the indigenous demands. Resistance is armed ideological rebellion against the centre/power by the periphery. The following passage poses the problem quite clearly:

What does it really mean to resist? Does the term ‘resistance’ adequately describe cultural relationship cultural oppositions or cultural influences in the era of globalization? Given the widespread feelings of opposition in colonized communities, ‘resistance’ enacted as violent military engagement, a national liberation struggle, or, for that matter, even as a program of widespread social military, is surprisingly rare.

Resistance is defined by Bill Ashcroft in his book on ‘Post Colonial’ the post-colonial Transformation as a word which adapts itself to a great variety of circumstances and few words show a greater tendency towards cliché and empty rhetoric, as it has become
increasingly used as a catch all word to describe any kind of political struggle. Further, he adds that resistance is a form of defence by which an invader is ‘kept out,’ the subtle and sometimes even unspoken forms of social and cultural resistance have been much more common.

One can resist without violence or without opposing. Gandhi has been an effective example of ‘passive resistance’ against the British rule in India.

The most fascinating feature of post-colonial societies is a ‘resistance’ that manifests itself as a refusal to be absorbed, a resistance which engages that, which is resisted in a difficult way, taking the array of influences exerted by the dominating power, and altering them into tools for expression a deeply held sense of identity and cultural being. This has been the most widespread; most influential and most quotidian form of ‘resistance’ in post-colonial societies...this engagement colonial discourse has rarely been regarded as ‘resistance’ because it is often devoid of the rhetoric of resistance.’

Post-colonial Transformation has been the most powerful and active form of resistance in colonized societies. The reason is that resistance has been so relentless, and integral part of the imaginations of these societies which have been colonized. All colonial discourse is based on the concept of otherness or binary opposition of colonizer/colonized, Civilized/ uncivilized, white/Black, so on and so forth.

*African slaves were unable to transport their culture with them to the plantations in any coherent way. Members of*
different language groups were placed together on plantation either through the exigencies of the system or to prevent conspiracy. The resulting heterogeneity limited what could be shared culturally. Yet Afro-American cultures took on a form generated from this heterogeneity, a dynamism adapted to the physical and social conditions with which they had to deal. In this process both the slaves and non-slaves populations absorbed aspects of the various African heritages. What developed was a culture of such creative adaptation that its transformative capacities were able to resist absorption into the dominant culture.  

Barbara Harlow mentioned that the word ‘resistance’ (Muqawamah) was first applied in a description of Palestinian Literature in 1966 by the Palestinian writer and critic Ghassan Kanafani. For him, Resistance Literature invoked a distinction between an ‘occupied’ people and a people in exile. Such literature was seen to be identifiable and significant accompaniment to the project of political, military and social striving for national liberation.

The writer gets himself into an impasse, however, when the claims that no research into such literatures can be complete unless the researcher is located within the resistance movement itself inside the occupied land. The writer is writing but for whom and to whom the writer is writing. For such writers and for Harlow resistance literature is an identifiable accompaniment to the activities of resistance movements.

For Selwyn Cudjoe, in Resistance and Caribbean Literature, resistance is an act of complex acts designed to rid a people of its oppressors be they slave masters or multi-national co-orporations.
Literary resistance for Cudjoe is a category of literary writing which emerges as an integral part of an organized struggle for national liberation. The relationship between literature and political struggle is much more specific, direct and functional. Literature is functional and with this description resistance Literature and resistance in literature, also includes political resistance of its material function, with history and cultural resistance which were not accompanied by any clear political agenda.

*This conflict between the imaginative and the didactic power of resistance literature and the question of the authenticity of its cultural basis, re-emerges wherever this issue of resistance is broached...yet this indestructible cultural resistance is apparently unable to take on new forms of expression even when circumstances change. According to Cabral the masses are those who retain the culture of the people, remaining untouched by the culture of the colonizer, a view which might find some difficulty with Caribbean people's culture, at fluidly syncretistic African-based form which absorbed influences from many sources.*

Another form of counter-discourse is called canonical counter discourse or writing back which operates within the discourse of literature itself. It’s a writing back paradigm that operates and it’s again re-reading and re-writing of the powerful allegories of European cultural. The best example is the ‘Tempest’ in which the relationship between Prospero and Caliban and Prospero and Miranda provide the relationship between the centre and periphery.

**POLITICAL RESISTANCE:**

The advent of Indian independence brought about a new awareness amongst creative writers like Mulk Raj Anand and Raja Rao, who captured in their fiction, the protest against colonial rule and recorded sensations of the independence movement. They realized that
independence from colonial rule would be meaningless without attaining social and economic independence for a complete transformation. The slowly emerging political resistance faithfully revealed in Indian English fiction, became an important factor revealing the political message. After a long span of subjugation by British imperialist, nationalism became a pre-occupation of the writers. Indian English novelists became sensitive without being self-conscious, audacious without being coy.

Their novels depict political oppression of the individuals. National events influenced these novelists. It is the duty of the Indian writers that in their writings they should fully express and depict the changing realities of Indian life and while encouraging the scientific and rationalistic tendencies in literature they should lend full support to the progressive movements. The novelist himself becomes the crusader and reveals to the reader the conscious and unconscious urges of a society resistance and the close link of the artist is only the co-author of a magnificent creation know as the culture of people. Through literature and environment reflected multidimensional consciousness and awareness of a society which is seeking realization of an objective. The novelists reflect the culture of people and their demands of life and the contemporary society. Art has never been on the side of the purists.\textsuperscript{55}

Their intention was to highlight the progressive forces of the contemporary society and underline the tension in the mind of people. They used the novel as a medium of self-analysis. With the Gandhian revolution, resistance crept into Indian English literature. Gandhi was not against the culture of the west but against the blindness with which it was accepted. He said: ‘I must take care that I am not empowered by the glamour of the west. I must not mistake the glamour for true light.’\textsuperscript{56}
Mulk Raj Anand keenly observed the evils of different types prevalent in our society. These evils could be economic, social or religious in nature. The greatest hurdle in the development of man is seen in the artificial distinctions between human beings-based on caste, creed and wealth. Man should realize and accept the profound importance of his fellow beings disregarding all considerations of class, caste, creed, race, religion and wealth. The greatest need of our troubled times is the en-gender among men a genuine respect and love for all, and to have faith in the ability of man and to uphold his dignity.

ETHICAL, MORAL AND RELIGIOUS RESISTANCE:

Religion has been depicted by Indian English novelists in various ways. As man is scared of calamity, so in order to give solace to his troubled mind, he turns to religion and to its tradition and rituals. The novelists through their resistance reveal an urge to replace blind faith and superstition by reason and science. There have been religious resistances in the country to awaken the slumbering masses to reason. It is the effort of the novelists to set religion and reason close to one another. Their objective is rationality, not blind faith or disbelief. Religion seems to flourish where reason sways but nevertheless, it is not opposed to the religious sentiments. Reason opposes only extremes. In the present era there has been a tendency towards man’s loss of faith in God. Scientists are of the view that man is part of the universe and God is a myth. Man is a part of nature is an illusion; a God who is not part of nature is an illusion, a God who is a part of nature is a superfluity. During the renaissance too, traditionalism and orthodoxy were being questioned and “people were awakening against orthodoxy.”

57
RESISTANCE AND POST COLONIAL LITERATURE:

The Romantic Literature was produced in Great Britain from the mid to late eighteenth century to the early 19th century and the themes that emerged from British Romanticism were the glorification of nature and the immortality love through class boundaries. Victorian literature of 19th century possessed qualities of the Age of Enlightenment a period which can be said to be parallel to Queen Victoria’s reign.

The writer produced the text with certain intentions and to accept post-colonial literature only by its temporal and political designation does not give justice to the artist whose intentions may subsequently be ignored. A Post colonial novel text has a greater value and intends to have a greater impact than merely its plot when a writer writes a text, it is written with specific intentions. And the intention behind writing a post-colonial text is based on as either a representative voice or resistance against the colonial powers. If a post colonial text manages to escape the valueless fate of many novels of the late 20th century, it is then subject to more problems within the theoretical genre of post colonial studies. A post colonial text acts as representative of its respective nation and it serves as a symbol of resistance against its colonizer. Within these categories the authors depict the life of a newly independent nation, speak out against the kind of oppression of its
colonizers, express desire for an ideal ‘pre-colonial’ society or extol the beneficial consequences of empire. There is a great difference between Romantic Literature, Victorian Literature and Colonial and Post Colonial Literature. The Post colonial authors and scholars are well and self-aware of the existing style and movement that is known as post-colonial.

Post-Colonial literature and Post Colonial studies have the ability then to control self-consciously the direction and definition of its label. In other words post colonialism is a definition in progress. This definition further problematizes post-colonial literature because without a solid source, what exactly constitutes post colonial work and whether that work gives justice to post colonial literature.

The two ideas that surface in post-colonial theory and literature are representation and resistance. The work of art which is produced by the writers adequately represents an indigenous people or how they react to the oppressing colonizers. Edward Said in Orientalism (1978) argues that the idea of post-colonialism needs the dynamic between itself and its colonizers in order to define its existence. The other colonized, is an integral part of European material civilization and culture. *Orientalism* represents that part culturally and even ideologically as mode of discourse with supporting institution, vocabulary, scholarship, imagery, doctrines, colonial bureaucracies and colonial styles. The relationship between the colonizer and the
colonized may impose an intellectual rather than political domination over the post-colonial nation while political freedom may exist; the intellectual freedom is far from reality with the language of the empire serving as another form of colonization.

Resistance literature uses the language of empire to rebut its dominant ideologies. Resistance theory in Post-colonial literature refutes the very notion that idea of representation also connotes further subjugation. The colonized nation is ‘writing back’ to the centre, speaking either of the oppression and racism of the colonizers or the inherent cultural better-ness of the indigenous people. Helen Tiffin applies this point best in her essay. ‘Post-Colonial literature and counter Discourse’ that the post-colonial literatures, cultures are thus constituted in counter discursive rather than homologous practices and they offer fields or counter discursive strategies to the dominant discourse. Thus the counter discursive nature constitutes post-colonial literatures rather than a unifying style or theme. Counter-discourse fails to recognize that by existing simply to react against or to resist dominant ideology it is marginalized into an idea that cannot stand on its own. Helen Tiffin further states that the counter-discourse exists only in its determining relations with its material situation. The concept of either cannot exist without its relationship to its reference point. The basic question which arises here is what is the fate of post-colonial literature? Is this literature only a subset or a reaction to the already existing dominant discourse in English Literature?
There is a paradox of marginalization and empowerment which seems to co-exist with the ideas of marginalization or empowerment. Tiffin offers another idea in the study and assessment of post-colonial literature. The idea involves a compromise between complete separation from the empire and the complete dependence upon the empire for its existence. She states that:

\[
[\text{post}] \text{ – colonial cultures are inevitably hybridized, involving a dialectical, relationship between European ontology and epistemology and the impulse to create or create independent local identity.}^{58}
\]

Further she states that neither writer is simply overwriting back to English canonical texts but to the whole of the discourse field within which such a text operated and continues to operate in post-colonial worlds. It seems as though colonial institutions in literature such as language and narrative style are necessary for a body of work to reach an academic audience. The writer potentially being able to reach a larger audience, he/she enables himself/herself to voice the emotion, frustrations and the triumph of his people to a group of scholars and students not yet exposed to his nation and race.

The writers like Farida Karodia, Meher Pestonji and Kavery Nambisan through their fictional world try to represent the indigenous lifestyle, resist colonial acts of authority and oppression, through their textual transmission, or they accomplish both.

**RESISTANCE IN INDONESIAN AND ARAB LITERATURE:**

There are few exceptions of Iraqi writers and artists. The continuous bloodshed in Iraq has failed to elicit any poetry or proof from the Arab men of letters. Political writers expanded and analyzed the literature. Writers and artists did not channel this harrowing Arab tragedy into creativity, and neither did they attempt to engage with it. If
these writers write against the centre/power it might be misconstrued as advocating or commemorating the dictator’s bygone era. The question which arises here is where is the Iraqi war literature or literary productions of the war.

The Arab writers who recounted the history of the tribal wars were responsible for preserving a period that would have disappeared into the folds of history had it not been for their written accounts. There was no shortage of written expression during wars of independence in the Middle East Lebanon’s 1948 war had its own poets and writers, in fact, all the wars that were fought on its soil, including the Civil war following the Israeli invasions of 1982, had produced literary works.

Iraqi novelist Shaker Al Anbari believes that there is a substantial amount of contemporary writing in Iraq. Particularly poetry and novel which are published in daily newspaper. Arab intellectuals do not understand the nature of the events taking place in Iraq because of the superficial mode of thinking prevalent in the Arab world. Iraqi poet Mohammad Mazlum states that in Lebanon a war is fought against Israeli and it’s supported using a blatant resistance that has its own course and conduct.

Mazlum believes that the Arab writers have dealt with war as viewed from arm unilateral perspective. In light of this bloodshed and the scattered ruins that remain literature seems to be turning its back on the war. Syrian poet Jawdat Hassan says that the war first broke out, he felt as though it was being fought in a remote place. He said he was against war and against writing about it. But he also says that he believed that mere act of writing is an act of resistance in one way or the other regardless of the subject one writes about provided that the writing is of the highest aesthetical standard. Syrian poet Abid Ismail
sought to find reasons for estrangement between Arab writers and the unfolding events in Iraq. He says that with the exception of Iraqi writers, no one seems to care. In Lebanon there is no dictator that the US sought to remove and the identity of resistance in Lebanon is clearer than it is in Iraq. On writing about the war Ismail says that for Iraq sufficient time has elapsed and there should have been a literature that deals with the war not just a literature that rises out of particular occasions. There are rhetorical poems published in official Iraqi newspapers that express resistance to the occupation and that regard the war from an ideological aspect that fails to take into account other more essential dimensions.

The Syrian writer Nadia Khost’s in (from the No-fy Zone) min Mantiqt al Khatar al Javi where she writes about an Iraqi woman whose house is targeted in an air strike in which she loses her daughter, her home and some of her neighbours. Through this woman, and the author’s use of a delicate narration the story conveys a real element of the Iraqi tragedy. Thus one can find lots of resistance literature in Indonesian and Arab Literature.
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