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1.1 Preliminaries

Politics and literature have to be viewed simultaneously. Such a view guides us toward reading literature both intertextually and contextually. This study aims to understand how colony and empire have been represented in English literature, addressing both the perspective of imperialism and the resistance to it. To do this, one has to be aware of how the text interacts with itself or the main stream as well as with the biographical or historical contexts. That is to say, one has to read and/or write with the right background. And this is the starting-point – a brief survey of a historical background of both imperialism/colonialism and postcolonialism.

1.2 Imperialism/ Colonialism

The timescale of colonialism was not universal, and it varied from continent to continent. World history is full of examples of one society expanding and its occupation on the newly conquered territory. The ancient Greeks set up colonies, as did the Romans, the Moors, and the Ottomans, to name just a few of the most famous examples. European colonial expansion dominated from the fifteenth century to the twentieth, when countries such as France, Spain, Portugal and
England colonized large parts of Africa, America and Asia. So, colonialism is not restricted to a specific time or place.

The concept of "colonialism" often intersects with that of "imperialism". Although these concepts are used interchangeably, much has been said about the difference between the two. Within postcolonial criticism (the focus of the second section), scholars have distinguished between different ways of analyzing colonialism and imperialism. In his influential book *Culture and Imperialism*, Edward Said identifies imperialism as "the practice, the theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory" and describes colonialism as "the implanting of settlements and distant territory". According to Said, colonialism is "almost always" a consequence of imperialism, but he emphasizes that while colonialism has largely ended in our time, "imperialism…….lingers where it has always been, in a kind of general cultural sphere as well as in specific political, ideological, economic and social practices"\(^1\). So imperialism is a more ideologically general term than practical colonialism.

Likewise, in his widely acclaimed study *Postcolonialism: An historical Introduction*, Robert Young argues that imperialism was typically driven by ideology from the metropolitan centre and that its main focus was on the assertion of state power. Young describes colonialism, on the other hand as an activity on the periphery that was mainly economically driven. According to Young, colonialism was
not an identical venture like imperialism was, rather it was a pragmatic structure that was developed for settlement or trade.\(^{(2)}\)

Consequently, Young draws the conclusion that "imperialism is susceptible to analysis as a concept", and "colonialism needs to be analyzed primarily as a practice"\(^{(3)}\)

However, in the researcher's opinion, the pragmatic distinction that Young makes between colonialism and imperialism cannot be sustained: the practice of colonialism is always necessarily a configuration of the ideology of empire, while the imperial ideology itself is fueled by the material practices of colonialism. So, for the purpose of this thesis the two terms – imperialism/colonialism – will be used interchangeably. In addition, it is worth mentioning here, once again, that there were/are several varieties of domination, but the focus of this study is the Western/European one.

Imperialism as a nineteenth and twentieth century European mind-set nurtured the belief in an unlimited expansion of territory, power and authority. The fact that this expansion was executed without the consent of an indigenous population was justified by the perception that the colonizer was superior and the colonized inferior. Actually, the idea of expansion was marked as an act, which would result in the improvement of backward nations. The façade of the empire was a high-sounding liberal wording of civilization, development, and aid, but behind this white façade, there was the violence, cruelty, and injustice connected to imperialism. J. A. Hobson- one of the earliest
and famous European critics – attacks imperialism for its heartless economics, its export of capital, its alliance with ruthless forces, and its façade of well-meaning 'civilizing' pretexts\(^{(4)}\).

### 1.2.1 The Stages of Imperialism

Before studying and criticizing the ideological framework of colonialism, it is essential to first consider, from historical perspective, its material practices. The technological developments that marked the era of the European nation-state made it possible to reach more and more remote parts of the world, resulting in European settlement and/or political control in a wide range of countries in the Americas, Australia, Africa and Asia. Of course, imperialism, as a European phenomenon, can be divided into three colonial waves: "the age of discovery during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; the age of mercantilism during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and the age of imperialism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries"\(^{(5)}\). The Mercantilism period is subdivided into Merchant Capitalism (1497 onwards) and Industrial Capitalism (1762 onwards). During Merchant Capitalism, the barter system was used and no attempt was made to interfere with the different aspects of the native's society. However, with the advent of the second phase (Industrial Capitalism), the aims of the colonizers changed drastically. Trade was replaced by the search for raw materials, on the one hand, and markets for selling European surplus goods, on the other\(^{(6)}\). The
three colonial stages introduced Europe throughout the world by means of travelers, adventurers, explorers, missionaries, and so on. The intensified imperialist outreach in the late nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century would eventually be one of the main causes of the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. In his study on postcolonialism, Robert Young addresses these historical circumstances as follows:

By the time of the First World War, imperial powers occupied, or by various means controlled, nine-tenths of the surface territory of the globe: Britain governed one-fifth of the area of the world and a quarter of its population. 'For the first time', Lenin noted in 1916, 'the world is completely divided up, so that in the future only redision is possible' (Lenin 1968:223). With no space left for territorial expansion, the unsatiated empires turned inwards and attempted to devour each other.\(^7\)

The chaos and wars that were the result of the rivalry between the European nations caused public opinion enforced by the publication of critical reports and investigations to take up a skeptical attitude towards imperialism. This critique of imperialism did not come from within the own European ranks alone. In the twentieth century, the United States of America (being once one of the European colonies) had become the world's largest power and put political and economical pressure upon the governments of European countries to give up their colonies.
1.2.2 American Position on Colonialism/Imperialism

The American position towards the issues of colonialism and imperialism is an ambiguous one and deserves some more attention. Soon after its independence in 1776, the United States started forming its own empire. The U.S. imperial mission distinguished itself from its European counterparts by emphasizing, as its benevolent goal, the spread of American liberal democracy. Within postcolonial theory, the way in which the United States "benevolently" uses its global power in order to "uplift" and "democratize" other territories is generally criticized as equal to the condemnable nineteenth century "civilizing mission" of the European empires. Edward Said states that for several years the United States has had a string of interventions in the affairs of many countries, and overturned governments (Libya, Gulf States, Cuba, Panama, Salvador, Afghanistan, Iraq, etc). In many of these instances:

- The official line most of the time is that the United States is defending its interests, maintaining order, bringing justice to bear upon injustice and misbehavior (8).

Although the American projects of "spreading democracy" and its foreign policy on the subject of colonialism are questionable, yet these issues created an international debate that led to a quick process of European decolonization.
1.2.3 Causes of Colonialism/Imperialism

Returning to colonialism and imperialism as a European phenomenon, one would ask, what are the causes of this concept? The historical causes and nature of this imperial expansion have been the subject of much critical debate. Several theories have been advanced for these causes. Some theories emphasize the economic, i.e. the need for raw materials and expanding markets for capital investment of surplus goods. Nevertheless, according to Norman Daniel, "The classic search for raw material, and for markets for manufacturers, was only a part of the conscious motivation" (9). Other theories stress the political needs: the need to create and mobilize a sense of national identity. In 1902, J. A. Hobson described imperialism as the expansion of nationality: "Colonialism, in its best sense, is a natural overflow of nationality". (10)

However, the state of opinion that promoted colonial intervention was "much older than the current political or economic situation". (11) According to this opinion, "the myths of empire took the place of the myths of Crusade". (12) The essential and well known myth of the Crusade was that Jerusalem, and the other lands of the Near and Middle East that have once been Christian, belonged by right to Christendom, and must be restored. The difference came when the old 'legal right' to rule in territory once Christian was replaced by a 'moral right' to civilize the native people (savage race). (13)
But, according to some theories of race, racial characteristics have been attributed to biological differences. If this is right, then savagery and civilizations are fixed and permanent conditions. Again, if this is the case, then it contradicts the imperial claim of civilizing the natives. Ania Loomba comments on this by saying that "if savagery is a biological condition then improvement by social means seems pointless".\(^{(14)}\)

The Europeans thought that their imperial achievements were the result of their superior moral culture, and that it was the result of their superior religion. This idea of 'superiority' of the West and 'inferiority' of the rest is what led Macaulay to say that "a single shelf of a good European library is worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia".\(^{(15)}\) Thus, the real motives and impulses of the colonial powers are not to civilize but to dominate and exploit the rest of the world, to disfigure and efface its past and then to transform the natives to whatever ends and objectives of these powers.

1.2.4 The Impact of Colonialism/Imperialism

Western colonial expansion began during the 15\(^{th}\) century and continued for about five centuries. Since many developed and developing countries were linked through colonialism, debate about its positive and negative aspects has occurred during these centuries, and continues to the present day. Therefore, understanding, briefly, the colonial impacts is important to the development of this study.
Colonialism remains a controversial issue, as many people disagree about its effects and consequences on the colonized nations in former colonies. Advocates of colonialism, like John Staurt Mill, Patrick O’Brien, Dinesh D’Souza, and others, argue that in spite of the ugly face of colonialism, it did a lot of good to the colonized by developing industrialization and modern economy to the colonies, and by establishing political infrastructure necessary for democracy. Dinesh D’Souza, in his essay *Two Cheers for Colonialism*, says that he and the Indians function now successfully due to Western education that the British introduced to India. But, paradoxically, in the same essay, he writes that "the British came to India to govern, and they were not primarily interested in the development of the native"(16) Edward Said, though one of the main critics of colonialism, agrees that "Europeans brought modern technological changes --- to some of the natives, benefits that persisted beyond the colonial period, although not without negative aspects"(17) On the other hand, there is the view that colonialism is oppressive, immoral and evil. As a result, no possible good can come out of such evil. The researcher's view is that if colonialism did something good to ex-colonies, it was unintentional, and to serve its own needs. But on the whole, the negative impact of European colonialism was (and still is) deep and devastating in various fields. The economic exploitation, psychological uprooting and cultural disruption it caused were/are tremendous.(18) Likewise, economist, Andre Gunder Frank, has argued that colonialism leads to
the net transfer of wealth from the colonized to the colonizer, and inhibits successful economic development.\(^{(19)}\) Similarly, Walter Rodney, in *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, accuses European colonialism of "draining African wealth and making it impossible to develop more rapidly the resources of the continent".\(^{(20)}\) It is a fact that Western capitalism was built on the backs of developing countries. In *The Wretched of the Earth*, Frantz Fanon writes "European opulence has been founded on slavery. The well-being and progress of Europe have been built up with the sweat and dead bodies of Negroes, Arabs, Indians, and the yellow races".\(^{(21)}\) The physical reminders of the colonial era, in its negative side, can be seen today, especially, those concerning **boundaries and ethnic rivalry**. Most colonial borders were created with no regard for the social realities of those living in the areas. As a result, a number of boundary conflicts arose within postcolonial territories. For example, Libya-Chad, India-Pakistan, Syria-Lebanon, to mention some. Colonial powers often created situations that encouraged ethnic rivalry. For example, the conflict between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots has its roots in ethnic rivalry encouraged during British colonial rule to maintain control on the island. "By the time the British pulled out of Cyprus in 1960, they had helped cleave deep divisions between the Greek and Turkish populations."\(^{(22)}\)

The most influential effect that colonial rule had on the colonized people is that of culture, i.e. **cultural disruption**. (Therefore, It will be
dealt in greater detail subsequently). Actually, in most colonial states, the language of the colonial power became the official language. Since language is the direct expression of culture, it had played a fundamental role in conveying the imperialistic ideologies as well as the supposed cultural supremacy of the European colonizer. The Kenyan writer Ngugi Wa Thiongo claims, in his *The Language of African Literature*, that "language carries culture and culture carries---the entire body of values by which we come to perceive ourselves and our place in the world." (23) The dominating influence of a foreign culture on life of contemporary postcolonial societies is a subject which appears in many works of postcolonial novelists and critics. The Caribbean novelist George Lamming’s works talk about the enormous burden of colonial education and culture and its impact on identity formation among the colonized people. (Detail analyses about these issues are dealt with in the second chapter). As late as 1983, writing about Barbados in 1950, Lamming observed:

> Today I shudder to think how [Britain] --- could have achieved the miracle of being called Mother. It had made us pupils to its language and its institution, baptized us in the same religion; schooled boys in the same game of cricket ---. (24)

Western Education, Ngugi Wa Thiongo said, made you see the world the way the colonizers saw it: "You are likely to see their system not really as an enemy but as friendly system". (25) The aim of the colonial education system is spreading the culture and, therefore, the values of
the dominating nation on the colonized, while controlling their cultural developments. This was achieved through the teaching of the metropolitan culture with a Eurocentric method to a few subjects. The importance of these issues (language, education, culture) for the colonial power, had led Macaulay in 1835 to insist on introducing, to the Indian, an English education system. Being difficult and impossible to educate the millions whom they govern, they will initially, according to Macaulay, create

a class of persons, Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellectual. To that class we may leave it to ---- conveying knowledge [Western ] to the great mass of the population. (26)

In doing so, the imperial power not only propagated its culture, supposing it the only possible teaching, but also created an indigenous Western - oriented elite who would further diffuse the metropolitan ideology to a larger mass. Therefore, imposing a language means imposing "its systems of values", which “becomes the system upon which social, economic and political discourses are grounded.”(27) Indeed, language/culture is the means through which the Empire colonized the rest of the world, culturally even before than economically or politically, so it is not surprising that it has always been, and still is, one of the most contested sites of discussion in postcolonial studies, which will be the focus of the next section.
1.3 Postcolonialism

After decolonization, the far-reaching effects of about five centuries of colonialism slowly became visible. Postcolonialism is the general designation for the strand of thought that deals with these effects on cultures and societies. Defining postcolonialism is not an easy task, since it is a portmanteau term including a range of cultural and theoretical practices, which often have only colonialism as a common landmark. Since all the discourses coming within postcolonialism sprang initially from the appearance of the new literatures produced in the formerly colonized countries, the term refers first of all to these revolutionary practices. In fact, as colonies tried to achieve political and cultural independence from Europe in the course of the twentieth century, new literatures appeared in those countries giving voice to the still then silent colonial subject. Consequently, a new branch of studies, only later called postcolonial, developed having as its object the mass of theories, debates and issues that originated from the new confrontation taking place between the ex-colonized and the ex-colonizer, which Western theories could not account for. So postcolonial theory is the collective term for a set of theoretical implications that attempt to describe postcolonialism in all its heterogeneous forms. It can be characterized as a critique of representation that is used to expose and dismantle hegemonic power structures that have their roots in colonial discourse.\(^{(28)}\) In this context the term "postcolonial criticism" and "postcolonial critique" are also
often heard. Within the realm of this thesis, the three terms "postcolonial theory", "postcolonial criticism" and "postcolonial critique" will be used interchangeably. \(^{(29)}\)

The postcolonial field of study started in the 1980s as a site of critical narratives brought forward by a handful of literary theorists who had their roots in English literary history. Even though postcolonial theory is primarily related to the literary field, as a critique mode of thinking that is highly interdisciplinary, it has also become indispensable in other parts of the academy. Today, scholars within the various disciplines of history, sociology, women's studies, political theory and even economics are closely engaged with postcolonial theory, rendering the contemporary scope of the postcolonial field of study enormous and difficult to define. Although an interdisciplinary perspective on 'postcolonial theory' is inevitably present in this thesis, the researcher would like to stress that the postcolonial is primarily discussed within its literary implications in mind.

A chronological overview of postcolonial theory that is attempted in this section is therefore necessarily non-chronological. Moreover, the researcher would like to emphasize that it is an overview that is highly selective, because the researcher will focus specifically on the 'postcolonial' ideas conveying the methodological presuppositions that have formulated his analysis. Before attempting this overview of postcolonial theory, there is a difficulty that needs to be addressed first, that is the difficulty of the postcolonial terminology.
1.3.1 Concepts in Postcolonial Theory

Postcolonial theory has raised some problematical definitions and articulations due to the ambiguities of the prefix 'post-' in 'postcolonialism'. Some scholars say that 'post-' means 'after-'. If so, the term 'postcolonialism' applies to that which follows colonialism. However, if one defines colonialism as the way in which unequal international relations of economic, political, military, and cultural power are maintained, the colonial era is not really over. In this sense, we are in the era of 'neo-colonialism'. As Edward Said argues, "In our time direct colonialism has largely ended; imperialism....... lingers where it has always been , in a kind of general cultural sphere as well as in specific political, ideological, economic, and social practices".\(^{(30)}\)

So, postcolonialism did not start after the colonial era, nor was it restricted to a specific time or place. Postcolonialism has a long history if one considers that it begins from the very first moment of colonial contact. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin put it clearly, in The Postcolonial Studies Reader,

\[
\text{post-colonial as we define it does not mean 'post-independence', or 'after-colonialism', for this would be to falsely ascribe an end to the colonial process. Post-colonialism, rather, begins from the very moment of colonial contact. It is the discourse of oppositionality which colonialism brings into being.}^{(31)}
\]

Other critics view 'post-' as 'anti-'. To think of postcolonialism as a "discourse of oppositionality" seems to imply that this second
interpretation, 'post-' means 'anti-', is to be preferred over the first-'post-' as 'after-'. However, as Robert Young points out, there is a significant semantic gap between postcolonialism and anticolonialism. Although there is never necessarily any political disjunction between the two, the latter is often identified exclusively with nationalism, while the former is associated with diaspora, transnational migration and internationalism. \(^{(32)}\)

Yet other critics and scholars give a third meaning. They interpret 'post-' in postcolonialism as 'through' or 'dealing with'. In this case, 'post-' refers to whatever comes after it. This interpretation, in my view, is the most interesting because it highlights one of the essential characteristics of postcolonialism: the fact that it 'deals' with colonial trauma. At the heart of postcolonial criticism lies an engagement with, and resistance to, the material practice of colonialism. Bill Ashcroft et al., states that

\[
... \text{the determining condition of what we refer to as post-colonial cultures is the historical phenomenon of colonialism, with its range of material practices and effects, such as transportation, slavery, displacement, emigration, and racial and cultural discrimination. These material conditions and their relationship to questions of ideology and representation are at the heart of the most vigorous debates in recent post-colonial theory.} \quad ^{(33)}
\]

To conclude this point, one’s understanding of postcolonialism is largely determined by the way in which how he or she reads the prefix 'post-' in "postcolonialism." \(^{(34)}\)
1.3.2 Postcolonial Criticism

As a critique of representation, postcolonial criticism is always necessarily entangled with colonial modes of thinking, reading and writing, which is evident from the ideas of a set of crucial postcolonial thinkers, that the researcher would like to discuss by giving an overview of postcolonial criticism. When postcolonial criticism came to the fore in the second half of the twentieth century, it initially took as its subject matter the colonizer's representations of colonial countries and criticized these for their ethnocentric and Eurocentric biases.

1.3.2.1 Frantz Fanon

A seminal work in the early stage of postcolonial criticism was *The Wretched of the Earth* in which the French psychiatrist Frantz Fanon argued that the ex-colonized people needed to find their own critical voice, in order to function as the subject instead of the object within the representation of their culture, history and traditions. In order for them to find their voice or "identity", they first needed to reclaim their own past by detaching it from the narratives of the European colonizing power that had determined and devalued it for centuries. In his later study, *Black Skin, White Masks*, Fanon foregrounded the body as the site of difference for the postcolonial subject, a phenomenon that he articulated as "the fact of blackness". Fanon describes how in the encounter with the white man the black body is distorted and forced into a state of self-consciousness he calls a
"third-person consciousness" that coincides with a realization of his "blackness" as an indelible mark of inferiority:

And then the occasion arose when I had to meet white man’s eyes. An unfamiliar weight burdened me. The real world challenged my claims. In the White world the man of color encounters difficulties in the development of his bodily schema. Consciousness of the body is solely a negating activity. It is a third-person consciousness. The body is surrounded by an atmosphere of certain uncertainty

........................

On that day, completely dislocated, unable to be abroad with the other, the white man, who unmercifully imprisoned me, I took myself far off from my own presence, far indeed, and made myself an object.

........................

My body was given back to me sprawled out, distorted, re-colored, clad in mourning in that white winter day. (36)

1.3.2.2 Edward Said

Elaborating to some extent on the issues and discussions that Fanon had brought forward, Edward Said published his famous critical study *Orientalism* in 1978. It is about the Western representations of non-Western cultures in which Said points out the extent to which knowledge about the Orient as it was produced and circulated in Europe was an ideological accompaniment of power. Said’s text represents a decisive move forward in the transformation of how literature from the empire and colonized nations was approached. The central seminal differentials in Said’s work are related to its persistent
emphasis on the relationship between Western representation and knowledge on the one hand, and Western material and political power on the other, coupled with an approach to issues related to race, empire and ethnicity that exposed their complicities with ethnocentric ways of thinking.\(^{[37]}\) Said said that different disciplines like geography, politics, literature, history, ethnography and linguistics produced similar discourses about the Orient that established their own categories of truth and discouraged or rejected those which violate the norms of that particular discourse. Said used the concept of discourse to examine how the formal study of the Orient, along with other literary and cultural texts, consolidated certain ways of seeing and thinking which in turn contributed to the functioning of colonial power. He asserts that certain texts are accorded "the authority of academics, institutions and governments" and can create

... not only knowledge but the very reality they appear to describe. In time, such knowledge and reality produce a tradition, or what Michel Foucault calls a discourse, whose material presence or weight, not the originality of a given author, is really responsible for the texts produced out of it.\(^{[38]}\)

Said examines how this knowledge was constructed to not only determine how the Orient would be viewed and controlled, but also how this determined knowledge itself created these ways of knowing, studying, believing and writing. He emphasized how knowledge about
and power over colonized peoples are related enterprises. In this regard, Ania Loomba observes that

Said argues that representations of the 'Orient' in European literary texts, travelogues, and other writings contributed to the creation of a dichotomy between Europe and its 'others', a dichotomy that was central to the creation of European culture as well as to the maintenance and extension of European hegemony over other land. Said project is to show how 'knowledge' about non-Europeans was part of the process of maintaining power over them; thus, the status of knowledge is demystified, and the lines between the ideological and the objective blurred.\(^{(39)}\)

Said furthers this demystification by associating the expansion of Orientalism with enlightenment and its effects on the proliferation of disciplines, the universalizing character of knowledge production in Europe and the systematizing classificatory approaches adopted to 'understand' the world. Said argues that knowledge produced about the Orient, although classified as scientific and objective, was negative and stereotypical:

Along with all other people variously regarded as backwards, degenerate, uncivilized and retarded, the Orientals were viewed in a framework constructed out of biological determinism and moral-political admonishment. The Oriental was linked thus to elements in Western society (delinquents, the insane, women, the poor) having in common an identity best described as lamentably alien. Orientals were rarely seen or looked at: they were seen through, analyzed not as citizens, or even people, but as problems to be solved or confined, or – as the colonial powers openly coveted their territory – taken over.\(^{(40)}\)
On the other hand, Said suggests that it was not that Europeans individually disliked the non-Western people or cultures, but that their cultural bias and interests filtered their knowledge, as the study of the Orient was not objective but

a political vision of reality whose structure promoted the difference between the familiar (Europe, the West, 'us') and the strange (the Orient, the East, 'them')......when one uses categories like Oriental and Western as both the starting and the end points of analysis, research, public policy...... the result is usually to polarize the distinction – the Oriental becomes more Oriental, the Westerner more Western – and limit the human encounter between different cultures, traditions and societies. (41)

From this perspective, the study of the Orient is the study of Europe's 'Other', an interested political vision of reality that produces a binary opposition between 'them' and 'us'. This binary becomes essential for European identity, as Loomba points out:

... if colonized people are irrational, Europeans are rational; if the former are barbaric, sensual, and lazy, Europe is civilization itself, with its sexual appetites under control and its dominant ethic that of hard work; if the Orient is static, Europe can be seen as developing and marching ahead; the Orient has to be feminine so that Europe can be masculine. This dialectic between self and other... has been hugely influential in subsequent studies of colonial discourses..., as informing colonial attitudes towards African, Native Americans, and other non-European peoples. (42)
In this binary opposition, the relationship of dependency becomes explicit: the construction of the 'Other' as backward is necessary for the construction of the 'self' as culturally superior, which justified the exercise of domination and control as a burden to intervene in the name of progress – to civilize, to educate, to modernize and to develop.

In his later work, *Culture and Imperialism* (1993), Said makes radical claims about the nineteenth – century European novel, which according to Said, constituted "a structure of attitude and reference," (43) a point of definition in the unfolding of the imperial project (the relationship between the novel and imperialism will be dealt with in the second chapter).

However, in my opinion, the assumption of an over-simplifying binaries of colonizer and colonized, between the West and the East is the major aspect of Said's work that evoked much criticism from within and out of postcolonial field. Nevertheless, the researcher thinks that this defect does not detract from the fact that the works of Said have had a major influence on the development of postcolonial studies. He was responsible, together with Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak, for introducing a set of critical narratives that would eventually find worldwide acclaim under the name "colonial discourse theory." (44) Colonial discourse theory functions as the critical and theoretical backbone of contemporary postcolonial studies, and the term "postcolonial theory" is more or less its contemporary synonym.
1.3.2.3 Homi Bhabha

The researcher would like now to move on to discuss the ideas of the two other scholars, Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak whom one cannot ignore when talking about postcolonial criticism. The problematic view of Said regarding the relationship of domination and subordination binaries is the starting point for Homi Bhabha. Bhabha’s approach to colonial discourse is different from Said’s stand, which Bhabha sees as a static model of colonial relations. He says "There is always, in Said, the suggestion that colonial power and discourse is possessed entirely by the colonizer, which is a historical and theoretical simplification." (45) Bhabha tries to introduce a new theory. He advocates a model of liminality to dismantle the false opposition of "theory" and "political practice". He attempts to destabilize the power structures that make such binaries possible using a poststructuralist method of analysis that is called "deconstruction". (Bhabha’s ideas intersect on a different level with those of postconstructuralist thinkers – Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan and Jacques Derrida). In contemporary critical theory, deconstruction denotes a process by which language itself foregrounds the instability (or impossibility) of meaning. It is a particular method of textual criticism that involves an understanding, and often an exposure or "dismantling", of the implicit assumptions that underlie discursive practices.
Instead of victors and victims binaries, Bhabha stresses ambivalence and negotiation. Ambivalence is conceptualized as "a complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship between colonizer and colonized."(46) It is important here to remember that Bhabha sees the identities of both the colonizer and the colonized as being interdependent and implicated in each other and not as essentialist wholes. He illustrates how ambivalence works in different moments of the colonial discourse. For instance, he states that colonial discourse wants to produce subordinate subjects who reproduce its assumptions, values and behaviours, but it does not want to create subjects that are too similar to the colonizer, as this would be too threatening. This desire to create copies that are "almost the same, but not quite"(47) compels colonial discourse to be ambivalent. This ambivalence produces ambivalent colonial subjects who produce 'translated' copies of the colonizer's cultural habits, assumptions, institutions and values in a process Bhabha calls mimicry. For Bhabha, mimicry disturbs the colonizer because it is never far from mockery, "it is at once resemblance and menace,"(48) that mimics and mocks at the same time. From this potential mockery rises a threat to colonial authority:

The menace of mimicry is its double vision, which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority. And it is a double vision that is a result of what I've described as the partial representation/recognition of the colonial subject. (49)
Mimicry emphasizes the ambivalence of colonial power and knowledge; and the colonial idea of cultural essences is exposed as a fiction. That is why, according to Bhabha, mimicry is a threat to the colonial authority. Instead, culture's "hybridity" is articulated.

Hybridity, like mimicry, is an indispensable concept in Bhabha's ideas. In colonial discourse, the term "hybrid" was used abusively to refer to a person of "mixed-breed" and as such, it was part of nineteenth century European imperialist and racialist discourses. However, Bhabha re-enunciate the concept of hybridity in a positive way, emphasizing the advantages of this state of in-betweenness. From the interweaving of elements of the colonizer and the colonized, there emerges a new hybrid subject-position that challenges the validity and possibility of an essentialist cultural identity. Relevance to Bhabha's hybridity is his concept of the "Third Space." According to Bhabha, 'the Third Space' is the site where the hybrid identity is positioned: an ambivalent position-space where new cultural meaning is produced. For Bhabha,

the importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original moments from which the third emerges, rather hybridity to me is the 'third space' which enable other positions to emerge. This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority....

As he has accused Said of oversimplifying the binary opposition of colonizer/colonized, superior/inferior---- etc., Bhabha has been
criticized of using "dense, theoretical" and inaccessible language.\(^{(52)}\)

Bhabha has also been criticized for ignoring the "material forms of resistance" to colonial power, and identifying instead the "discursive modes." \(^{(53)}\) My view is that one cannot separate these two forms of resistance, because each of the two – the ontological and epistemological – has its role to resist the colonizer and liberate the colonized.\(^{(54)}\)

1.3.2.4 Gayatri Spivak

The same criticism of Bhabha has been uttered in relation to the third key thinker (among my choice) within postcolonial theory: the literary critic and theorist Gayatri Spivak. Spivak also uses the poststructuralism framework as a critical tool to rethink the oversimplified binary opposition of 'colonizer' and 'colonized'. She established her credentials with her translation and preface of Jacques Derrida's *Of Grammatology*,\(^{(55)}\) and she has since applied deconstructive strategies to various theoretical engagement and textual analyses: from feminism, Marxism to most recently, postcolonialism, refusing to be contained in one particular critical theory. In this regard, Ania Loomba writes, "Whereas Said is generally dismissive about deconstruction and skeptical about Marxism, and Bhabha is sympathetic to the former but hostile to the latter, Spivak embraced both in a largely affirmative manner."\(^{(56)}\) In her well discussed essay "*Can the Subaltern Speak?*" (1988), Spivak uses
Antonio Gramsci’s term ‘subaltern’.(57) The term subaltern ordinarily refers to any person, or group of inferior rank and station, and thus it can be employed in discussions of race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and religion. This term became popular in 1980s when a group of Indian historians, the "Subaltern Studies group", used it to rewrite Indian history.

Subaltern Studies started out by a group of young Indian historians – based in Britain – who published a series of essays that rejected Indian history as it was written so far, because it had focused exclusively on the point of view of the elite groups within Indian society. The project reflected on the role of the peasant, or 'subaltern', in Indian history, and argued for the rewriting of this history in which the subaltern could have the possibility to represent him/herself. Subaltern studies has produced insights that are indispensable to the postcolonial recent state: especially its emphasis on the history or histories of the insurgent people. (58) Spivak never particularly subscribed herself to the Subaltern Studies group, but her work continuously interacted with this project. This interaction is evident in her essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?" The essay has focused on the position of the subaltern woman through a discussion of the practice of widow sacrifice (sati) in India. In her critique, she shows that attempts to speak for the subaltern, to enable the subaltern to speak or even to listen to, can easily end up silencing the subaltern. In this influential essay, Spivak draws the attention on the example of the
British intervention and the local reaction to the practice of widow sacrifice to demonstrate how both colonial and native representations of the oppressed are similarly problematic. She examines how the British tried to prohibit the practice on the basis of their "civilizing mission" (justifying the imposition of the empire's regime), which Spivak illustrates in the sentence "White men are saving brown women from brown men", in contrast with the dominant native (male) opposition illustrated in the sentence "But they want to die" (committing a 'pure' and courageous act). In both cases of sati, the voice of the subaltern (woman) is 'spoken for'. Spivak's main argument – that the subaltern (woman) does not have the possibility to represent herself (that the subaltern cannot speak) – has received various critiques. She has been accused, by some critics, of speaking in place of the subaltern. Bruce Robbins, for example, observes that: "The critic who accused another of speaking for the subaltern by denying that the subalters can speak for themselves, for example, is of course also claiming to speak for them." 

However, in the researcher's opinion, this accusation is unjust. For Spivak, 'speaking' is necessarily an interaction between speaker and listener. So what she only claimed is that the subaltern cannot speak because (s)he is not heard. For Spivak, the voice of the widow (in the sati example mentioned above) is ignored by the colonizer and the native (male). She concludes, "between patriarchy and imperialism...the figure of the woman disappears. [......] There is no
space from which the sexed subaltern can speak.” \(^{(61)}\) Because the voice of the subaltern is not listened to, Spivak argues that the postcolonial should actively try to liberate the subaltern from the space of difference. In doing so, the postcolonial critic is not giving the subaltern a voice, but instead, allows the subaltern to speak for her/himself, because working for the subaltern is working against subalternity. Although Spivak is considered an essential figure in the postcolonial field, she is also, like Bhabha, criticized because of her dense prose and inapplicable jargon.

In conclusion, it is not surprising in the light of their substantial contributions to the field that Said, Bhabha and Spivak have been described as "the Holy Trinity" of postcolonial criticism.\(^{(62)}\) The importance of Said, Bhabha and Spivak is embedded in the centrality of these figures as means to address issues such as the role of the postcolonial intellectual, the subaltern subject, hybridity and mimicry. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to overestimate their importance at the expense of other crucial thinkers and writers in the field of postcolonialism, like Fanon, JanMohamed, Cesaire, Guha, Albert Mimmi, Lamming, Aijaz Ahmad, Ngugi, Leela Gandhi, Ashcroft, Dirlik, Nandy, Viswanathan, Young, Achebe and many, many others; but the strand of the field that emerges from the researcher's interpretation of texts in this study is based, mainly, on the works and ideas of Said, Bhabha, Spivak, and others. As mentioned earlier, these three critics and thinkers have largely determined the contours of colonial
discourse analysis and postcolonial discourse theory, through which they, and other scholars, attempt to expose the colonialist structures that are embedded mainly in literary representations and as such continue to inform political debate and social discourses.

Methodologically speaking, this study is based on a library research mainly due to its textual nature. It offers a postcolonial contrapuntal reading of creative and critical works of literature. One level of this study involves access and use of relevant material from Jayakar Library, and the Department of English at the University of Pune; Library of the Institute of Advanced Studies in English, which is the place of this research; the British Library in Pune – India; Libraries at the College of Education, Aden and Zingibar – Yemen, and Library at Aden University – Yemen. Internet research, especially for reviews is conducted. This preliminary level was fundamental to the collection, review, and assessment of secondary material. The other level of the study involved reading, analysis, and interpretation of *Heart of Darkness* and *Things Fall Apart* as primary sources. The two novels will be subjected to a postcolonial reading as has been just explained earlier in this section.

The study approaches the selected works as modes of representation crafted by Conrad and Achebe as representative writers within the colonial and postcolonial literary traditions. This work is structurally divided into two general parts: exploration and explanation. In other words, theoretical and practical. The first part is made up of
conceptual **Chapters One** and **Two** that stress, among other things, colonial and postcolonial discourses and the affiliations of Conrad's and Achebe's writings and their role in the socio-cultural, political and historical reality of East and West. **The second part** comprises of **Chapters Three** and **Four**, each deals with the research objectives and questions stated above by studying Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* in Chapter III, and Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart* in Chapter IV. **Chapter Five** is the concluding observations in which the researcher elucidates the interconnections and shared themes of his study.

**Conclusion**

Accordingly, postcolonialism necessitates a vision in which imperialism and culture are viewed simultaneously. In this regard, from the perspective of the relationship between culture and imperialism, it is an assumption of this study that cultural representations, including literature, are central first to the process of colonizing lands, and then again to the process of postcolonial resistance and reaction. It is then an assumption of this study, too, that literary representations, including narratives, have a political dimension, however highly one may value artistic qualities. Here it is essential to our discussion to review the nature of the relationship between imperialism/colonialism and culture, on one hand, and literature, on the other.
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