Chapter – 8
Decolonising the Mind and Language

Mulk Raj Anand’s creative oeuvre shows brilliant, critical acumen to comprehend the anti-colonial imaginings in one of the most powerful ways. The narrative of this focus is spread all through his works which clearly hinges around post-colonial, the anti-colonial and the decolonisation. Our earlier analysis of various novelisations does take into consideration the characters and the narrators pointing clearly in a new direction. The colonisation of mind, language, space, culture, peoples – always provoked Anand to explore the nuances which establish the colonisation and then to explore those ways and means which provide resistance to unstoppable colonisation. The path taken up by Anand is indeed full of challenges and opportunities and that is why and how his specific novelisations continue to have appeal for generations of readers.

Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffith, Helen Tiffin in their path-breaking The Empire Writes Back focused on “four major models”. The first one is, “national” or regional model; the second is “race-based models which identified certain shared characteristics across the various national literatures”; the third is rather complex which focuses on “linguistic, historical and cultural features across two or more post-colonial literatures”; and the forth one is “more comprehensive” and embraces “hybridity and syncreticity as constitutive elements” (15). The overlapping of these four models is recognized as a natural phenomenon which operates in the specific society. Of all the models, the fourth one is closer to Anand’s novelisations.

While discussing the “Indian literary theories”, these three writers do focus on the “traditional criticism and contemporary use” of Indian languages and literatures and this is considered as “a debate about decolonization”. The traditional perspective provides “alternative aesthetic” model especially that of “dhvani-rasa (suggestion-emotion)” which is considered more important than “imported concerns with ambiguity, symbol, image” in an attempt to reconstitute the Indianness (117). Yet another explication is put forth:

‘The writer remains within his tradition but thus so critically rejecting the idea of pure unalloyed tradition and embracing the contradiction of his own position as a mark of creative potential and not of a cultural decline
or of a continuing colonial domination’ (119).

In the context of languages and discourses, it is vital to understand how the languages specific to a society get “altered and hybridized by the presence of alternative discourses, especially that of English in an age of rapid language change and mass-media influence on everyday speech and habits” (119). Here, the most important point to understand is whether the process of hybridization is to be deplored or resisted; the anti-colonial discourse has preferred to both deplore it and resist it.

Ngugi wa Thiong’o in his Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature has aptly stressed on the urgent importance of decolonizing the very thought processes so that the specter of colonisation would be erased completely. Talking about Africa, he is conscious of “the great struggle between the two mutually opposed forces in Africa today: an imperialist tradition on one hand and a resistance tradition on the other”. He attributes the region to the spread of imperialism supported by similarly linked forces: “The imperialist tradition in Africa is today maintained by the international bourgeoisie using the multinational and of course the flag waiving native ruling classes” (2). Indeed the African tradition is very close to the Indian tradition and all other colonisation. There is fast spreading imperialism and there is also ubiquitous resistance in one form or the other. All the struggles of resistance and the profound articulations made by the intellectuals and writers do give a strong base to the anti-imperialist value system. Maybe, Anand and Ngugi wa Thiong’o think about decolonisation in almost similar ways, as Thiong’o observes: “The sum total of all these blows no matter what their weight, size, scale, location in time and space makes the national heritage” (2). It is this national heritage which is explored by the post-colonial theory; the first clear formulations of which have been laid as (anti) colonial discourse by Edward Said in his famous Orientalism.

The ongoing discussion which has many roots in Anand’s works needs to be reconstituted in the perspective of various forces represented by imperialism, neo-imperialism, neo-liberal globalization fabricated as Structural Adjustment policy of Liberalisation, Privatisation, Globalisation Thiong’o has made a powerful comment: “Imperialism is total: it has economic, political, military, cultural and psychological consequences for the people and the world today. It could even lead to holocaust” (2). This is further elaborated and dialogized in a mood of total resistance, as being a way of “liberty from theft” for all those who refuse to accept
“the ultimatum: accept theft or death”. Here, his articulation of “the cultural bomb” is indeed profound:

But the biggest weapon wielded and actually daily unleashed by imperialism against that collective defiance is the cultural bomb. The effect of a cultural bomb is to annihilate a people’s belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievements and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland….Possibilities triumph or victory are seen as remote, ridiculous dreams. The intended results are despair, despondency and a collective death-wish. Amidst this wasteland which it has created, imperialism presents itself as the cure and demands that the dependent sing hymns of praise with the constant refrain: “Theft is holy” (3).

The colonial, the colonised past of Africa, Asia, Latin America is specific in many ways and also similar in many ways. The articulations made by Anand and Thiong’o are clear pointers towards an understanding which need to decolonise and echo Fanon’s “but dream to change the world” by the “Wretched of the Earth”.

Language plays one of the most crucial roles in colonisation as well as decolonisation. Ashcroft, Griffith and Tiffin aptly Observe: “one of the main features of imperial operation is control over language. The imperial education system installs a ‘standard’ version of the metropolitan language as the norm, and marginalizes all ‘variants’ as impurities” (Ashcroft et al 7). The denigration of new language use which is used as “english” as being impure is to misunderstand the dialogisation which has gone into the making of the “linguistic code, english, which has been transformed and subverted into several distinctive varieties throughout the world” (8). The analytical reason behind marginalization of the other languages is found in: “The language of these ‘peripheries’ was shaped by an oppressive discourse of power”. However, the variation the diversity, the beauty is also significant: “Yet they have been the site of some of the most exciting and innovative literatures of the modern period and this has at least in part been the result of the energies uncovered by the political tension between the idea of a normative chord
and a variety of regional usages” (8). Bakhtin appreciates such social tendencies which he calls as “heteroglossia” and “heterogeneity” which maybe seen in multivoicedness as well as polyphony.

The use of English/english language as a medium of literary production has been the centre of profound interaction and churning. Chinua Achebe, in 1964, in “The African Writer and the English Language”, expressed himself as questioning himself:

Is it right that a man should abandon his mother tongue for someone else’s? It looks like a dreadful betrayal and produces a guilty feeling. But for me there is no other choice. I have been given the language and I intend to use it (qtd. in Thiong’o 7).

Thiong’o finds a serious paradox in the position of Achebe and he asserts that ‘Achebe himself, ten years later, was to describe as this “fatalistic logic of the unassailable position of English in our literature”’ (7).

However, Achebe asserts in the same vein:

I feel that the English language will be able to carry the weight of my African experience. But it will have to be a new English, still in full communion with its ancestral home but altered to suit new African surroundings (qtd. in Thiong’o 8).

The position taken by Chinua Achebe, Raja Rao, Mulk Raj Anand and many other eminent writers is almost on the same frequency. The literary history is a witness to the fact that the multivalent use of English/english is used to ‘transcend colonial alienation’ as well as colonial domination (Thiong’o 27). “Since writing in english in India is now more than a century and a half old it is to be hoped that even if the future decrees that it will be replaced entirely by writing in Indian vernacular languages (and this is far from certain, or even likely) that the work already written will justify the continued study and criticism of this corpus as one of the most fascinating bodies of work to have been produced out of the colonial encounter” (Ashcroft et al 123). This vital comment establishes the local use of a European language for profound expression; however, the focus on “colonial encounter” is central to the whole understanding of the book which takes its title from the famous writer’s, Salman Rushdie’s, epigramatic comment: “… the Empire writes back to the Centre…..” Indeed the anti-colonial literary and critical
productions in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean have written back to the powerful colonial centre.

Meenakshi Mukherjee in her “Interrogating Post-Colonialism” in her book co-edited with Harish Trivedi _Interrogating Post-Colonialism: Theory, Text and Context_ has made a very apt comment:

Postcolonialism is not merely a chronological label referring to the period after the demise of empires. It is ideologically an emancipatory concept particularly for the students of literature outside the western world, because it makes us interrogate many aspects of the study of literature that we were made to take for granted, enabling us not only to read our own texts in our own terms, but also to re-interpret some of the old canonical texts from Europe from the perspective of our specific historical and geographical location…. In this swing of the pendulum, marginality is valorized, oppression almost turns into empowerment (3-4).

Speaking as one of the “confident global intellectuals”, Mukherjee establishes one of the strongest ways to interrogate the existing modes of thinking, writing and all those aspects linked with subverting the subverters through an entirely novel ways of articulating the new metaphor. Speaking metaphorically, this highly talented Indian critic has raised a pertinent question: “Are we sure that the fibres of every civilization have the necessary length or elasticity to be successfully processed in the theoretical mills of technologically advanced countries, or do we need to devise appropriate technology for them?” (10). Indeed, one of the most important issues concerning the very concept of post-colonial theory has been raised here and this rhetorical style itself provides the answer that the due and correct technologies, specific to the specific, concrete social realities have to be devised. In this context, Arun P. Mukherjee’s statement is worth quoting: “Now I believe that theory is not born of an immaculate conception but emerges out of the conditions of living” (“Interrogating Postcolonialism: Some Uneasy Conjunctures” 14 (13-20) in _Interrogating Post-Colonialism: Theory, Text and Context_). There can be no “prefabricated grid”, no “homogenization” (14), as opined by Ashcroft and others in _Empire Writes Back_ that the concept shares “a common condition” (23). To make the point further clear, it is essential to go back to _The Empire Writes Back_: 
The symptomatic readings of texts which follow serve to illustrate three important features of all post-colonial writing. The silencing and marginalizing of the post-colonial voice by the imperial centre; the abrogation of this imperial centre within the text; and the active appropriation of the language and culture of that centre. These features and the transitions between them are expressed in various ways in the different texts, sometimes through formal subversions and sometimes through contestations at the thematic level. In all cases, however, the notions of power inherent in the model of centre and margin are appropriated and so dismantled (83).

The attempt of Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffith, Helen Tiffin in writing this eminently seminal book *The Empire Writes Back* may not be pinned down as an attempt to homogenize every community, society, text. The comments of some of the critics appear to be derogatory and need to be duly revised. The analysis of the above quote shows that the writers have fairly tried to provide “three important features of all post-colonial writings”; herein the word “all” could have been avoided by the writers; maybe could have been ignored by the critics. It is a fact of life that the appearance of the book in 1989 and its going into a good number of reprints and editions clearly shows that the broad approach does not call for denunciation the way it has been articulated. However, the later critics, including Mukhrjee and others have very legitimate right to further interrogate and explicate post-colonialism. It is good that neither the attempt of Ashcroft and others is unproblematic nor that of Mukhrjee and other critics is unproblematic. This position is very close to Bakhtinian thought which persuades us to understand the heterogeneous voices and thus warns us against homogenization.

Some important insights developed by Mukherjee with respect to Anand’s *Untouchable* become important when she focuses on the point that Anand has used the novel form, the Western form, to articulate Indian reality. She adds that she “became curious about comparing the novel’s version of the situation of the untouchable with that of the versions of untouchables themselves” (16). Using the contrapuntal discourse, Mukherjee claims that the claim of Mahatama Gandhi to “speak for all Indians” and all “untouchables” is not correct and that the “contestation had all been suppressed in Indian historiography and Indian literature and the
untouchable opponent of Mahatama Gandhi, i.e. Dr. Ambedkar, vilified as a stooge of the
British” (16). She even quotes from Dr. Ambedkar to focus that the movement for independence
was organised by a coterie of big capitalists and big landlords and that Gandhi was no exception
and that the terms of “resistance” and “subversion” need to be seen afresh so that one can also
battle out the “homegrown oppressors” so as to establish that this theory is actually “discourse of
liberation” (17).

This discourse of emancipation and liberation from feudalism, imperialism, colonialism,
neo-colonialism, parochialism, fundamentalism has also been seen by Anand in the mode of
decolonising the mind when he says in “A Dialogue with Mulk Raj Anand” in P.K. Rajan’s
Studies in Mulk Raj Anand: “As Indian English literature is a new departure, a new kind of
creative expression of the people who have not already come into literature, the criticism of my
novels would have to be by internal evidence of the novels themselves…[novels] have to be
studied in order to get the background of the collective unconscious of our people, or the
incoherence of the background…. The connection between my life and my writing is more
intimate than in other novelists. I write as I live. My life is my message. My past is my future”
(95). Indeed, Anand aptly lays claim to a new way of looking at literature, criticism and all this is
to be foregrounded in the historical conciousness, in the historicity of the event/ experience/
expression. He says eloquently: “I write as I live. My life is my message. My past is my
future” (emphasis added). This is a major departure and a significant achievement for the
novelist of the stature of Mulk Raj Anand. Anand refuses to follow the colonial/ racist yardsticks
of literature and criticism. He also departs from the conservatism steeped in the conservative
Indian academy: “One kind of critic is the Indian academic professor steeped in the orthodox
Indian tradition who regards any departure from the past to be sacrilegious. And therefore
nothing which does not approximate to tradition can past muster. On the other hand, my own
novels have completely departed from tradition, under the impact of Dr Iqbal’s revolt against
both established Hinduism and Islam and the background of Indian religious decadence” (96).

Anand is not fascinated by unified, homogenized self: “I am interested in the various
selves of men and women” (96). He looks forward to heterogeneity of the selves and accordingly
wants to establish dialogue with the multiplicity of voices. He also refuses to be cowed down by
the “orthodox critics” of “Leeds and London, Birmingham, Oxford and Cambridge” because:
They think Indian English literature is, or ought to be, English literature. It is not; and cannot be because it has a quite different background. Different influences. And many of the things which are in the languages of India have come into Indian English writing. The words themselves have often been evoked by echoes of the mother tongue. Therefore the whole motive force of Indian-English literature has to be judged from the internal evidence of the milieu to which it belongs and from which it comes. It is not for sale in New York, nor for sale in London. It is for the expression of the silent Indian people in decay showing possible renewal of those who have no mouths yet. I have tried to give mouths to the silent (96-97).

To provide voice to the voiceless; to create awareness amongst the educated and uneducated; to rouse and raise the conscience and consciousness of the marginalized; to understand the diversity and heterogeneity and to respect it fully, Anand launches himself on the path of this great task during the colonial and post colonial period so as to help the people decolonise their minds. He recognises: “There are many conflicts in any writer. And, especially is this so in writer of the new kind of emergence such as is in Indian-English writing” (97). This understanding that the life is not unilinear, that the society is not only under the yoke of British imperialism but is also full of many contradictions and therefore the person involved in the vital task of conscience-raising has to understand the contradictions and the conflicts and re-present the same through refraction and dialogisation. For him, to create “a philosophy of the human person, which is miscellaneous… is not doctrinaire thought”, is the same, as Bakhtin is seriously concerned about the “image of man” far away from the “reifying devaluation of man” (Bakhtin PDP 62). What we find in Anand’s novels and non-fiction material; Bakhtin also explores Dostoevsky’s novels at almost the same frequency. Here is one eminent example:

In Dostoevsky’s larger design, the character is a carrier of a fully valid word and not the mute, voiceless object of the author’s words. The author’s design for a character is a design for discourse. Thus the author’s discourse about a character is discourse about discourse. It is oriented towards the hero as if toward a discourse, and is therefore dialogically addressed to him. By the very construction of the novel, the author speaks
not about a character, but with him (PDP 63).

Just as Anand elaborately understands the conflicts and the contradictions in the feudal, colonial, superstitious, conservative, orthodox society; so do his characters try to understand the social trends, reflect and refract on them to create a new awareness which may be associated with decolonising the space and mind from the colonial regime and concerned with provision of basic amenities to the general mass of the people in the post-colonial period. Thus, there is coming together of the design of the author and the character, what Bakhtin calls “design for discourse”. This new philosophical articulation as well as the new novelistic craftsmanship of Indian-English literature may be considered as the major landmark as well as the benchmark of decolonisation as well as Bakhtinian conceptualisations. That is how, Anand eloquently speaks, “Life does not admit itself to a linear approach. The approach is much more complex. Incoherent”. So, the urgent need: “One has to empty oneself out of all borrowed ideas and feelings. One must feel everything afresh. One must get out of the claustrophobia of bookish thought. One must open to all experience. One must live in action” (“A Dialogue with Mulk Raj Anand” 101-02).

The impact that the writings of Anand make on the reader is that of openness, openendedness, heterogeneity, presence of contradictions and conflicts, historicisation of the reality, resistance and hybridisation. The characters of Anand do not obfuscate their personalities through surrender and subjugation; but on the other hand question the colonizer and his brutal ways. Homi K Bhabha in “Signs taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority Under a Tree Outside Delhi, May 1817” has observed:

Through the natives’ strange questions it is possible to see, with historical hindsight, what they resisted in questioning the presence of the English – as religious mediation and as cultural and linguistic medium…. To the extent to which discourse is a form of defensive warfare, then mimicry marks those moments of civil disobedience within the discipline of the master become the site of hybridity – the warlike sign of the native – then we may not only read between the lines, but even seek to change the often coercive reality that they so lucidly contain (Bhabha 101, 104).

Bhabha clearly opts for the enlarged context, “historical hindsight” in order to understand
the questions which are raised by the native against the English. These questions are of varied nature: religious, cultural, linguistic; which are also presented through the tone and temper of religion, culture, language – the ones which are so brilliantly inherent in the history and tradition of the native. These signs of revolt, of hostility become “signs of spectacular resistance”. Bakhtin, Anand and Bhabha seem to be articulating their anti-colonial dialogue, what Benita Parry prefers to call “textual insurrection against the discourse of colonial authority” which she finds “located in the natives’ interrogation of the English book…” (37). The insurrection, the insurgency may be built up by a sign, a song, a banner, a motto, a text; and may also be created through, in the view of Anand, by opening oneself to all the experience and by emptying oneself of the “borrowed ideas and feelings”. The construction of the native as an insurgent, may look like a war metaphor yet Anand and other writers of “textual insurrection” do mean to convey the knowledge and power of the anti-colonial discourse which has helped built up strong resistance against the coloniser as well as the proponent/s of neo-liberal imperialist globalisation.

In the context of our ongoing discussion on decolonising the geographical space and the mind, one important comment of Benita Parry on Bhabha’s anti-colonial discourse is important for us to deepen our understanding of Anand’s novelisations:

Bhabha reiterates the proposition of anti-colonialist writing that the objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a racially degenerate population in order to justify conquest and rule. However because he maintains that relations of power and knowledge functions ambivalently, he argues that a discursive system split in enunciation, constitutes a dispersed and variously positioned native who by (mis) appropriating the terms of the dominant ideology, is able to intercede against and resist this mode of construction (41).

The brilliant articulations made by Said, Bhabha, Spivak, Parry and others do focus on the marginalisation of the “Other”, “the native” and their portrayal as inferior and degenerate clearly smacks of the racist colonialist ideology. It is remarkable to add here that Anand incisively interrogates the Indian casteist racism against the untouchables in the person of Bakha in *Untouchable*, to mark one of the strongest facts that the upper castes in the Indian hierarchical social system considered the untouchables as inferior and degenerate. The feudal and colonial
tendencies work at the same frequency. By abrogating the race, the caste, the class, the post-colonial novelist like Anand and the critics like Said, Bhabha, Spivak, Parry and others speak the language of Bakhtinian dialogics and polyphony.

Ngugi wa Thiong’o, like Anand, the Indian novelist, Margaret Atwood, the Canadian novelist and many others who have spoken on Thomas Macaulay (“Minute on Indian Education”) argue very strongly against the indoctrination by the coloniser, as he says:

African [read Indian, Latin American, the Caribbean and others] children who encountered literature in colonial schools and universities were thus experiencing the world as defined and reflected in the European experience of history. Their entire way of looking at the world even the world of the immediate environment, was Eurocentric. Europe was the centre of the universe. The earth moved around the European intellectual scholarly access. The images children encountered in literature were reinforced by their study of geography and history, and science and technology where Europe was, once again, the centre (Ngugi wa Thiong’o 93).

Colonialism always tries to establish its hegemony through its superiority wherein the discourse of power is engineered through the discourse of racism, white hegemony and scientific knowledge. Further, this centralization is meant to create uniform slots making others to be slotted uniformly. As already discussed (Chapter 1), Bakhtin strongly pinpoints the thesis of hegemony attained by the forces of centralization; however, there is a strong under current in Bakhtin that the forces of decentralization, de-hierarchicisation are also ubiquitous and are relentlessly working to decentre, to deform, the powerful imperial centre. The use of History as well as the Educational State Apparatus, as per the “Minute on Indian Education” by Thomas Macaulay, is subtle as well as open in order to colonize the minds of the people at the early stage of their childhood. The mental abrogation of the tradition, the milieu, the flora and fona, the folk dance and the folk song and all that is traditionally and historically associated with the native has been one of the strongest strategies of colonisation, the world over, about which Ashcroft and others say in the very first para of their seminal book: “More than three – quarters of the people living in the world today have had their lives shaped by the experience of colonialism”
(Ashcroft et al. *The Empire Writes Back* 1). The colonial attempt to create and implant Eurocentric thought, tradition has been strongly resisted by Anand, the novelist as well as the critics who have been strongly advocating for a space for themselves. Thiong’o rightly observes: “Every language has its own social and cultural basis and these are instrumental in the formation of mental processes and values judgments” (99). We have talked about language, mental processes and culture in the above analysis; however, Thiong’o aptly wants us to add the new instrumentality called “values judgments”; the idea and the concept being very close to Bakhtinian axiological approach which tends to clearly abrogate neutrality and establish the value system, i.e., evaluation of a situation, event, idea, person, society, system; thereby challenging exploitative social and value system. The whole focus of the colonizer on imposing British history culture values system on India or Eurocentricity on Africa has helped the colonizer, in the whole history of colonisation, to subjugate the local, the native; and equally strong has been the force of interrogation and decolonisation which may even call for kissing the gallows.

Ngugi wa Thiong’o has been a strong advocate of not allowing the syllabuses prevalent during colonialism to continue unabated into the independence era. Therefore, based on the various proceedings of the conferences and seminars, he advocates: “(i) *A people’s culture is an essential component in defining and revealing their world outlook*…. (ii) A sound educational policy is one which enables students to *study the culture and environment of their own society first*, then in relation to the culture and environment of other societies…. (iii) *For the education of today be positive and to have creative potential for Kenya’s future it must be seen as an essential part of the continuing national liberation process*” (101).

Even in the period of Global village, Communication Information Technology, the three points raised above by Ngugi deserve to be taken as the most central to ensure decolonisation of the mind of the people during independence period so as to embark upon one of the strongest breakthroughs in holistic development. By this way, the people can unleash new synergies to create a social system which is sans exploitation, subjugation, oppression of any kind on the people.

Focusing on the social relevance of the novels Margaret Atwood says in *Second Words*: “If writing novels – and reading them – have any redeeming social value it’s probably that they
force you to imagine what it’s like to be somebody else. Which, increasingly is something we all need to know” (qtd. in Howells 2). It is the social orientation which helps create a new literary consciousness and the one which redeems the social values. That the genre of novel is so crucial for Bakhtin, Anand, Atwood; this in itself is an important benchmark. Atwood clearly says:

Any knife can cut two ways. Theory is a positive force when it vitalizes and enables, but a negative one when it is used to amputate and repress, to create a batch of self-righteous rules and regulations to foster nail-biting consciousness to the point of total block. Women are particularly subject to such squeeze plays, because they are (still) heavily socialized to please. It is easy to make them feel guilty about almost anything (“If you can’t say something Nice” qtd. in Tewari “Dialogics of Change: Novelisation in Surfacing” 15).

Atwood firmly concludes by committing herself to: “We can’t afford this silencing or this fear”. Atwood’s thought process and a combatant discourse are clearly indicative of the fact that the colonisation of even independent Canada of Atwood and colonisation of independent India of Anand are the stunning realities which cannot be overlooked or understated by the writers who are opposed to oppressions of all sorts.

Bart Moore-Gilbert in his brilliant Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics wants to “contextualize the emergence of postcolonial theory in terms of the formerly dominant institutional modes of analysis of the complex relations between the cultures and (neo-)colonialism” (3). For us, in agreement with Moore-Gilbert, it is essential to go along with Anand to understand “formerly dominant institutional modes of analysis” as well as the dominant institutional apparatuses and their operational tactics through the concepts of post-colonial theory including “identity, politics, purpose and status” of this new thought pattern. He raises an important question mark: “Postcolonial criticism or postcolonial theory?” (5). (And this happens to be first chapter of his exploration. However, the basic premise is: “Postcolonial criticism and theory alike comprise a variety of practices, performed within a range of disciplinary field in a multitude of different institutional locations around the globe” (5). He enlists a large number of literary locations as a part of “short history as a practice in the western academy” so as to mark the areas for himself. He agrees that “colonial discourse analysis” takes
into consideration “history, politics, sociology and other art forms” in order to understand as well as mark as to what constitutes the context, production, reception (8). In an important comment, he opines that “the work of Said, Bhabha and Spivak, MacKenzie and Jacoby… reinforce a divide between postcolonial criticism and postcolonial theory” (15). He also considers Aijaz Ahmad’s In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures as a very subtle and major attack on postcolonial theory (17). “In some ways, In Theory is as comprehensive an attack on postcolonial as MacKenzie’s” (17). He opines that the critique of Ahmad “explores the implication of the institutional locations and affiliations of figures like Said”, to imply that they stand away from the actual struggle; it is also like the “contemporary international division of labour authorized by global capitalism” wherein the raw material is supplied to the western academy by the intellectuals in the Third World and the finished product is churned out by the West (18). Moore-Gilbert basically focuses on Said, Spivak and Bhabha to study the different valencies at which these theoreticians establish in varying degree, the contexts and practices of the postcolonial theory. Whereas Said’s Orientalism laid the foundation, in 1978, of a new discourse called the postcolonial discourse, Bhabha and Spivak further enlarged upon Said’s formulations and also enhanced their meaning. We do not have space to go in for detailed analyses, but suffice it to say that the theory and criticism, as articulated in the previous pages, is very important for us to study the novels of Anand in whom the period of colonialism and the period of independence are both vital arenas to study the social, economic, political, cultural nuances as well as configurations of struggles which help coin the novelisations.