

DOKUZ EYLÜL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF AMERICAN CULTURE AND LITERATURE
AMERICAN CULTURE AND LITERATURE PROGRAM
DOCTORAL THESIS
Philosophy of Doctorate (PhD)

COLONIALISM, GLOBALIZATION AND RESISTANCE
IN JEAN RYHS' *WIDE SARGASSO SEA*, ARUNDHATI
ROY'S *THE GOD OF SMALL THINGS* AND JOHN
UPDIKE'S *TERRORIST*

Hafize Gül KOPARANOĞLU

Supervisor
Assist.Prof.Dr. Nilsen GÖKÇEN

İZMİR - 2011

DOCTORAL THESIS
TAPPROVAL PAGE

University : Dokuz Eylul University
Graduate School : Graduate School of Social Sciences
Name and Surname : Hafize Gül KOPARANOĞLU
Title of the Thesis : Colonialism ,Globalization and Resistance in Jean Rhys's Wide Sargasso Sea, Arundhati Roy's the God of Small Things and John Updike's Terrorist
Defence Date : 30.09.2011
Supervisor : Assist Prof.Dr.Nilsen GÖKÇEN

EXAMINING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

<u>Title,Name and Surname</u>	<u>University</u>	<u>Signature</u>
Assist Prof.Dr.Nilsen GÖKÇEN	DOKUZ EYLÜL UNIVERSITY	
Assist Prof.Dr.Nuray ÖNDER	DOKUZ EYLÜL UNIVERSITY	
Assist Prof.Dr.Füsun ÇOBAN DÖŞKAYA	DOKUZ EYLÜL UNIVERSITY	
Prof.Dr.Atilla SİLKÜ	EGE UNIVERSITY	
Prof.Dr.Dilek DİRENÇ	EGE UNIVERSITY	

Unanimity ☒ ()
Majority of votes ()

The thesis titled as "Colonialism ,Globalization and Resistance in Jean Rhys's Wide Sargasso Sea, Arundhati Roy's the God of Small Things and John Updike's Terrorist" prepared and presented by Hafize Gül KOPARANOĞLU is accepted and approved.

Prof.Dr. Utku UTKULU
Director

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this doctoral thesis titled as “Colonialism, Globalization and Resistance in Jean Rhys’ *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things* and John Updike’s *Terrorist*” has been written by myself without applying the help that can be contrary to academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that all materials benefited in this thesis consist of the mentioned resources in the reference list. I verify all these with my honour.

Date

.../.../.....

Hafize Gül Koparanoğlu

Signature

ÖZET

Doktora Tezi

Jean Rhys'ın *Wide Sargasso Sea* (*Geniş Geniş Deniz*), Arundhati Roy'un *The God of Small Things* (*Küçük Şeylerin Tanrısı*) ve John Updike'in *Terrorist* (*Terörist*) isimli Romanlarında Sömürgecilik, Küreselleşme ve Direniş

Hafize Gül KOPARANOĞLU

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı

Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı Programı

Sömürgecilik her ne kadar geçmişte kalan bir düşünce olarak gözükse de, küreselleşme olarak kılık değiştirerek günümüze kadar gelmektedir. Bununla birlikte, küreselleşen dünya kolonyal ve sonrasında post-kolonyal diye adlandırılan köşelerden direniş stratejilerini içermektedir. Edebiyat, kolonyalizm ve küreselleşme ideolojisinin ve insanların bu ideolojiye gösterdikleri direnişin izlenebileceği en önemli alanlardan biridir. Bu tezde, batı uygarlıklarının sürekli genişleyen emperyalizme karşı sosyoekonomik, kültürel ve politik direniş biçimleri olduğunu ileri sürüyorum. Bu sebeple, hegemonya altında "susturulana" dikkat çekerek, bu tez, farklı milletlerden, kültürlerden ve etnik gruplardan üç yazarın baş kahramanları yoluyla direnişi nasıl sunduklarını göstermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Jean Rhys'ın *Geniş Geniş Deniz* romanındaki baş kahraman Antoinette, egemen sömürgeci ideolojiye kendi kültüründen çözümler bulmaya çalışarak direnir. Aynı zamanda söylemi yoluyla da ataerkil topluma ve sömürgeciliğe karşı direniş göstermektedir. Arundhati Roy *Küçük Şeylerin Tanrısı* romanında, baş kahraman Ammu, egemen sistem ve ideoloji tarafından kast sistemi içinde susturulmuş kadını ve "dokunulmazları" sömürgecilik ve asimilasyon bağlamında protesto eder. John Updike'in *Terörist* romanında okur, 11 Eylül'den sonra, çok kültürlü Amerika ile yüzleşir ve Updike, ABD'deki Müslüman toplumunun karşılaştığı zorlukları;

bu küreselleşen dünyada farklı bir direniş tipine dönüşen terörü kendi kültürüne yakın olma çabasındaki başkahraman Ahmad üzerinden sunar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sömürgecilik, Postcolonyalizm, Küreselleşme, Direniş, Öteki.

ABSTRACT

Doctoral Thesis

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

**Colonialism, Globalization and Resistance in Jean Rhys' *Wide Sargasso Sea*,
Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* and John Updike's *Terrorist***

Hafize Gül KOPARANOĞLU

Dokuz Eylül University

Graduate School of Social Sciences

Department of American Culture and Literature

American Culture and Literature Program

Although colonialism seems to be an idea of the past, its subtle forms have survived to the present disguised especially as globalization. The global world, however, involves strategies of resistance to colonialism from the colonized corners of the world which have come to be called post-colonialism. Literature is one of the important areas in which the ideology of colonialism, globalization and the resistance that the people show against this ideology can be best seen. In this dissertation, I put forward that there are socioeconomic, cultural and political resistances to ever-expanding imperialism of western civilizations. Therefore, by calling attention to “the silenced” under the hegemony, this dissertation aims to show how three writers from different nationalities, cultural backgrounds and ethnic groups reveal resistance through their protagonists. In Jean Rhys' *Wide Sargasso Sea*, the protagonist Antoinette resists the dominant colonial ideology by trying to find solutions from her culture. She also shows her resistance by her discourse against patriarchy and colonialism. In Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*, the protagonist Ammu protests against colonialism and assimilation in which women and “untouchables” in the caste system are silenced by the dominant system and ideology. In John Updike's *Terrorist*, the reader faces multicultural America, after September 11, and Updike presents the difficulties that the Muslim society

in the U.S faces by portraying Ahmad, the protagonist who wants to be close to his culture by resisting the dominant ideology with a different kind of resistance: terrorism in the global world.

Key Words: Colonialism, Postcolonialism, Globalization, Resistance, The Other.

**COLONIALISM, GLOBALIZATION AND RESISTANCE IN JEAN RHYS’
WIDE SARGASSO SEA, ARUNDHATI ROY’S *THE GOD OF SMALL THINGS*
AND JOHN UPDIKE’S *TERRORIST***

APPROVAL PAGE	ii
DECLARATION	iii
ÖZET	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
CONTENTS	viii

INTRODUCTION	1
--------------	---

CHAPTER ONE

COLONIALISM

1.1. COLONIALISM	10
1.2. COLONIAL DISCOURSE THEORIES	12
1.3. READING COLONIAL DISCOURSE: COLONIALISM and REPRESENTATION	13
1.3.1. Representation: The construction of a Stereotype	13
1.3.2. Representation of the Other before European Expansion	17
1.3.3. Representations of the Other in the Period of British Colonization	18
1.4. COLONIAL LITERATURE	22

CHAPTER TWO

POSTCOLONIALISM

2.1. POSTCOLONIALISM	25
2.2. POSTCOLONIAL LITERATURES AND POSTCOLONIAL THEORY	27
2.2.1. Power Relations	32
2.2.2. Language	33
2.2.3. Hybridity	35
2.2.4. Mimicry	36

CHAPTER THREE
GLOBALIZATION

3.1. GLOBALIZATION	38
3.2. HISTORY OF GLOBALIZATION	38
3.2.1. The Marshall Plan	42
3.3. THE REPRESENTATION OF OTHER IN GLOBAL WORLD	44

CHAPTER FOUR
IN-BETWEENNESS and RESISTANCE in JEAN RYHS' *WIDE*
***SARGASSO SEA*, ARUNDHATI ROY'S *THE GOD of SMALL THINGS* and**
JOHN UPDIKE'S *TERRORIST*

4.1. JEAN RHYS' WIDE SARGASSO SEA: CREOLE CULTURE, VODOO AND BLACK MAGIC	48
4.2. ARUNDHATI ROY'S THE GOD OF SMALL THINGS: UPPER INDIAN CASTES AND RECLAIMING THE PAST THROUGH STORYTELLING	71
4.3. JOHN UPDIKE'S TERRORIST: THE RELIGIOUS OTHER, VIOLENCE AND DESTRUCTION	95
CONCLUSION	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY	117

INTRODUCTION

Literature has often been a means of voicing the injustices of dominant groups towards others that cannot find themselves other sites within the power structure. As such, literature functions as the arena where the silenced majorities subvert the narratives that justify their domination and thus resist both the textual and actual strategies of power. Although almost in all literature one could find traces of resistance, a particular kind of literature is primarily dedicated to demonstrate and foreground the injustices of the system established to serve the continue dominion of certain groups. Resistance literature involves texts that employ those textual strategies which altogether fall under the heading of resistance.

These strategies are used especially at times when power struggles reach a summit, such as the colonial and postcolonial periods. According to Barbara Harlow, “[l]iterature . . . is presented by the critics as an arena of struggle” (Harlow, 1999: 2) between colonial and postcolonial texts, where colonial texts represent marginalized groups in a manner that authors of postcolonial texts find necessary to resist. While the colonial texts depend on an inferior representation of the colonized subjects, as the texts of these marginalized groups, postcolonial literature offers a challenge to these representations. Homi Bhabba suggests that representation is fundamentally countered by resistance. Colonizers construct and enforce a fixed representation onto colonial subjects and while adhering to this representation, colonial subjects “exceed . . . the frame of image” (Bhabha, 1994: 70), illuminating their divergence from the constructed representation, and hence prove their resistance. The postcolonial writer feels the need to voice a reaction from the oppressed, silenced, excluded person by breaking the silence of the characters that are once dehumanized in the colonial discourse in multiple ways.

Colonial discourse was based on the hierarchical difference between the West and the non-West. In this discourse the West and the non-West were polarized as opposites, and there is little doubt as to which side one belongs. No matter what pretext they project, the West here acts as an actual invader of “less developed”

people's lands. The cultural hegemony follows only after the military invasion begins in order to break the resistance from within and find cooperation among the local elite. Colonialism then employs the already-existing hierarchies within the colonized communities such as racism, sexism and classism. Until the assimilation process is complete, colonialism involves two distinguishable and visible categories, the colonizer and the colonized. In representations of the Other, colonialist literature rejects the opportunity to accept the alterity, that is, "instead of seeing the native as a bridge toward syncretic possibility, it sees him as a mirror that reflects the colonialist's self-image" (Bhabha, 1994: 65).

Postcolonialism, on the other hand, develops as a result of and as reaction to the assimilation and internalization of the colonial discourse by the colonized. Postcolonial discourse is not directed at a clearly distinguishable and visible outside force, but one that has been diffused and internalized by the cultural hegemony of the West. The relationship between the colonizer and the colonized often becomes blurred, complex and contradictory. The Self-Other dialectic is not simply the identification of people from one nation in relation to all others. As McLeod notes, "even the most seemingly Orientalist text can include within itself moments when Orientalist assumptions come up against alternative views that throw their authority into question. Texts rarely embody just one view," and "even the most seemingly Orientalist text can articulate 'counter-hegemonic' views within itself" (McLeod, 2000: 51). The terms "ambivalence" and "mimicry" describe contradictions that arise in interpretations of discourse. In the case of ambivalence, the colonized are considered the "other" of the Westerner, (or the "colonizing subject") essentially *outside* Western culture and civilization. Yet, on the other hand, the discourse of colonialism attempts to domesticate colonized subjects and abolish their radical "otherness," bringing them *inside* Western understanding through the Orientalist project of constructing knowledge about them. The construction of "otherness" is thus *split* by the contradictory positioning of the colonized simultaneously inside and outside Western knowledge (McLeod, 2000: 52-3).

The Self/Other discourse focuses on the beliefs and adaptations of both the colonizer and the colonized. Mimicry is a form of ambivalence in which the colonized people are taught the language and the fundamental values of the colonizers to make them "useful" to the colonizers' ends. Mimic men are people who have accepted the colonizers' values and way of life yet they are not accepted as equals by those who have colonized them. As an example, McLeod refers to "Fanon's French-educated colonials depicted in *Black Skin, White Masks* (who) are described as 'mimic men' who learn to act English but do not look English, nor are accepted as such" (McLeod, 2000: 54). Bhabha discusses the ambivalence created through "the desire for a reformed, recognizable other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*" (McLeod, 2000: 86). According to Bhabha, a mimic man belongs to "a class of interpreters between us and the Millions that we govern—'a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes and opinions, in morals and intellect'—in other words a mimic man" (Bhabha, 1994: 87). Bhabha elaborates, stating that "the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence" which, "in order to be effective . . . must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference . . . [which] is therefore stricken by an indeterminacy. . . . Mimicry is thus the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which 'appropriates' the Other as it visualizes power" (Bhabha, 1994: 86).

It should not be considered, however, that postcolonial era is totally free from the internalized and externally imposed hierarchical discourses between the West and non-West. Just as the demarcation between the colonizer and the colonized is blurred and complex with ambivalence surrounding their relationship, postcolonial period and its literary strategies are often beset by new and subtle forms of colonialism. Once it has established its hegemony, colonial power may not need a military component; rather it is by means of more diffused, both atomic and gigantic strategies deeply ingrained in everyday habits and discourses that the West continues its domination. Therefore, since Western hegemony during the postcolonial era seems to depend rather on the consent of the oppressed groups than on an enforced program and employs divergent, subtle and cultural, rather than linear, obvious and

military methods, the resistance strategies should likewise have to be varied, refined and wide-ranging. The adversary that postcolonial writers find before them is a global force. In a way, although colonialism seems to have reached an end long ago, it continues under the name of globalization in today's world. Since the oppression still continues, albeit in disguise, one of the arenas of resistance against the hegemony of the dominant culture is literature.

Therefore, in order to show the forms of resistance in selected works in this dissertation, a detailed analysis of representation and colonialism are given in the first chapter. The second chapter is on postcolonialism and its representations. The analysis of globalization and its literary representations will be given in the third chapter and last part consists of the resistance that the main characters of Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*, and John Updike's *Terrorist* show.

The concerns of "Chapter One/Colonialism" are the ideology of colonialism and the reflection of this ideology in literature. One of the main concepts in this chapter is representation; the detailed analyses of this concept aim to highlight and clarify the dynamics of perceptions in cultural encounters where the particular approach of participants to each other is prepared by the lenses that representation provides. Since Colonialism is an encounter between peoples and cultures, which depend on the relationships of power and domination, one of the significant features of colonial encounters between cultures and people is the representation of the "other." Representations consist of conceptions "produced" and "reproduced" by both of the participants in the encounter to describe the attitudes of each other. Miles states that "[r]epresentations are created basically with the purpose of developing a strategy for separating the self and the other" (Miles, 1990: 11). Representations of the non-Western or colonial "other" in Western culture, which were maintained in the works of European literature, were challenged and dismantled by postcolonial writers and critics. Therefore, many postcolonial writers have revisited the texts of the colonial masters (or mistresses) such as William Shakespeare, Daniel Defoe, and Charlotte Bronte. Since postcolonialism itself as a whole can be taken as an attempt

at rewriting the fictions created by colonialism, many postcolonial writers employ rewriting as a literary strategy in dealing with the literary fictions.

Chapter Two “Postcolonialism,” provides a study of post colonial condition, the ideology of post colonialism, and the argument of postcolonial writers and theorists who are important in determining the postcolonial stance. Postcolonialism depends on asserting the identity against and difference from the imperial centre once the independence accomplished. Therefore, once liberation has been accomplished, there appears the need of constructing a national identity. In order to achieve this, first and foremost, the postcolonial writers grapple with constructing a language and producing a voice for the depiction of colonial experience independent of the impositions of the European centre. These writers subvert the language and culture of the master from within by developing strategies to tackle power relations. For instance, as this chapter will examine closely, these writers scrutinize their in-betweenness and hybrid Creole cultures as vantage points for resistance. Located at the liminal positions, the postcolonial cultures, seasoned in the discourses of their colonial masters, turn the efforts of assimilation on their head by mimicking and hybridizing the colonial language and culture. The literary examples come particularly from the Indian and Caribbean writers who want to give voice to the ignored, dehumanized others as in the discourse of colonial times.

In Chapter Three: “Globalization” it has been suggested that globalization has appeared today as a new kind of colonialism depending on a system of economic, cultural and political inequalities. At the beginning of this chapter, a brief history of neo-colonialism together with its major components is given. As in the period of colonialism, the impact of contemporary neo-colonial domination is reflected in literature. The ideology of the colonization continues to be influential in contemporary world through its new faces and dimensions. Globalization or neo-colonialism has revived the ideology of colonization which has appeared as the cultural and economic hegemony of the American culture as the new standard bearer of the Western culture. Neo-colonialism is a system in which power belongs to those who control the international economic system. In this system, power relations,

which depend on economic rivalry between cultures and nations, create economic and cultural inequalities resulting in the silencing of the dependent side and giving the dominant side the right of representing the other. This era is marked by an ever-increasing influence of the media and other widening information technologies that disseminate Western, especially American domination. In the globalized world, the lines that distinguish the Western subject and the non-Western object of hegemony are doubly blurred, for the latter inhabits also the Western nations. Therefore, the media and information technologies propagate their messages inside the Western territories. In American society the media, which influence both the politics and the political public opinion, function as one of the mediums of creating hegemony. This influence of the media such as television, radio, newspapers is called “agenda-setting function of mass communication” (McCombs and Shaw, 1984: 66). The “agenda-setting” media shows that through “stereotyping,” “image-making”, media have an “ideological” role with the power of controlling and manipulating people (Mc Combs and Shaw, 1984: 64). Therefore, media has become a tool for presenting the dominant culture’s reflections in terms of power relations.

Chapter Four demonstrates the above-mentioned forms of power relations in selected literary works of varying time periods and geographies of the postcolonial period. The selected novels by Jean Rhys, Arundhati Roy and John Updike are analyzed in terms of resistance to the dominant ideology. Both three novelists in their novels *Wide Sargasso Sea*, *The God of Small Things* and *Terrorist* give voice to the protagonists of the novels who belong to previously silenced groups in order to show their varying responses to the unequal relationships in their social environments. All three authors seek to question assumptions about dominant culture, examine what happens when two or more cultures come into contact. What binds these three novels is the ambiguity about the success of the resistance strategies. Instead of presenting postcolonialism as a success story pitted against the oppression of embedded in the colonial discourse, they rather remind us that unequal power relations are an ongoing process renewed and regenerated by different tools and mechanisms, and as such they disallow any satisfactory sense of conclusion and victory against them. These seemingly quite disparate three novels thus show that despite occurring in different

parts of the world, the discourse of colonialism and its effects still have multiple impacts on the social organization in which many of the protagonists are represented as silenced and excluded outcasts. The novels are of interest to us not as pointing at paths of success in their stories but because their authors have managed to explore territories that had been neglected and silenced in the earlier discourses.

The first novel selected for analysis, Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*, which is the rewriting of the colonial novel *Jane Eyre*, opens the issues that are related to postcolonialism. While the former novel provided voice for the white woman Jane, it fell short of voicing the story of Rochester's former wife who was confined in the attic as a monstrous mad woman. Rhys' novel fills in this gap, reflecting the experience of women in patriarchal and colonial societies during the mid nineteenth century. Rhys provides a voice for the colonial "subject" who is under control and whose life is unknown in *Jane Eyre*. By such an intervention into the earlier text, Rhys "writes back" from a site of resistance to the colonial discourse. By providing the Jamaican Creole Antoinette with a story, Rhys foregrounds some essential issues of postcolonial writing. Antoinette is the representation of the in-between people both because she is a mixture of white and non-white races and also because she occupies a middle position in her social environment. As the whole question of the "other" is central to this novel, Antoinette is portrayed as outsider in the island communities in terms of her sex, her language, and her culture. Her white skin and English cultural heritage mark her as a member of colonial exploiters, while her gender and Creole background mark her as marginal in the island. Her desire to fit into both the island community and the English culture results in fitting into neither. Therefore, by examining the power relations between the colonizer and colonized, silenced and voiced, Jean Rhys transforms and politicizes the unknown story of Bertha-Antoinette and challenges the monocentric Western narrative and reminds her readers of the hidden narratives behind the unified narrative of the West.

In *The God of Small Things*, Arundhati Roy chooses a South Indian Syrian family to examine the intricate workings between patriarchy, caste system, and the western values. Having an Indian background, Arundhati Roy represents the

problems of postcolonial Indian culture through her female character Ammu whose portrayal embodies the multiple and interwoven forms of oppression such as racism, sexism and the caste discrimination and the possibility of resistance strategies. Faced with the intricately related patterns of oppression in her community and family, Ammu resists by challenging the limits her life with her marriage to a man outside her community. However, this forbidden intercommunity marriage proves to bind her further in the network of multiple oppressions, especially the sexism of patriarchy enhanced by colonialism. Her second resistance is against the caste system in which Ammu finds herself in love with an Untouchable Velutha. The story of Ammu is told by her daughter Rahel who illuminates the unknown parts of the story. Thorough storytelling, the scattered narratives come together by presenting multiple situations in moving back and forth in time, and Rahel becomes the voice of her outcast mother Ammu. Therefore, the novel can be read as a protest against patriarchy that snuffs out the dreams of a woman and ultimately her life. In this section, the protagonist Ammu's resistance against the cast system and the patriarchy in postcolonial India and the in-between situation of her twins will be analyzed.

The last section of this part will consist of John Updike's Nobel Prize winner novel *Terrorist*. Although the British Empire is no longer the colonial power it once was, its American progeny has adopted the colonial mindset and created colonies within. Like the "barbaric" colonized subject in colonial period, Muslim-Americans in the post 9/11 America, are seen as terrorists. Immediately after 9/11, the nation has turned more patriotic with the politics of President George W. Bush, and on cultural front, commentators argued that 9/11 would change the nation's viewing, reading and media habits. Being a witness to the terrorist attack of 9/11, Updike, like Rhys and Roys, sets out to unveil the issues related to the resistance of the inbetween individual. Focusing on the underlying situations, John Updike, with his protagonist Ahmad, shows the attitudes towards the Muslim people in the United States after the September 11th attacks. Like Antoinette, Ahmad is torn between the American culture and his adapted Muslim culture. Ahmad is represented as the other in his society as he is Muslim and a stereotype as the Muslim person represented in the mass media; violent, dangerous threatening. While Updike voices the Muslim

culture, he chooses a protagonist who reacts to such stereotyping by owning up to a terrorist identity. In a way, the novel can be read as a counter positioning or juxtaposition between the axes of voice and storytelling versus violence and terrorism.

In conclusion this study frames the resistance strategies selected from the postcolonial period to the global. To understand the post colonial period it is important to focus on colonialism in which the critics/writers of colonial period endeavor a unique opportunity to create colonial situation that best fit their theories or opinions of colonialism.

1. COLONIALISM

According to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), colonialism derives from the Roman “colonia.” In her book *Colonialism / Postcolonialism* Ania Loomba cites the term “colonia” as:

a settlement in a new country[,] . . . a body of people who settle in a new locality, forming a new community subject to or connected with their parent state; the community so formed, consisting of the original settlers and their descendants and successors, as long as the connection with the parent state is kept up. (Loomba, 1998: 1)

However, the definition of colonialism indicates more than this citation. Ania Loomba finds this expression insufficient, for colonialism includes an “encounter” between two different groups, the “natives” and the “newcomers,” in the name of “forming community” which is, in fact, a process of “re-forming” or “unforming” the native communities (Loomba, 1998: 2). It describes the condition in which the “control of other people’s lands and goods” is materialized by means of direct colonial rule (Loomba, 1998: 2). Hence, Loomba states that colonialism can be considered as a set of practices such as trade, war, negotiation, genocide, enslavements, and revolts which occur in the process of the “conquest” and “control” (Loomba, 1998: 2).

Although colonialism is prevalent all over the world, it is a Eurocentric movement which, for Said, can be summarized as the “contest between white and non-white” in understanding colonialism and imperialism (Said, 1994: 21). With the rise of the Renaissance, European colonialism, which can be counted as the biggest colonial movement, has affected the entire world. The history of the European colonial expansion to Asia and Africa began in the sixteenth century and it caused drastic changes in the economies of the countries conquered and dominated. After the conquest, European colonizers settled on the conquered lands, employing unfree labor for the natural resources’ exploitation and utilization which bettered the profit of ruling class in Europe. In other words, the concept of Colonialism is used as a method of expanding a country's ownership of land, resources, and economic

advancement. As the colonies lack capital but are rich in raw material and human power, for the colonizer colonization is an extremely profitable enterprise. The flow of the raw material to the mother country and the travelling of the raw material and human power as slaves produced and maintained an increasingly imbalanced economic relationship which results in the development of the industries of the colonizer countries.

This economic inequality between colonizers and the colonized underlies the roots of capitalism. Thus the subordination of the colonized countries leads to the growth of industrialism and capitalism (Loomba, 1998: 4-5). Colonies had two functions. They were the sources of slaves, and markets. Colonies not only provided for the “consumption” in European countries, but they also became markets for European commodities. This organization, which created an imbalanced system of relationships, structured usually by varied types and levels of “direct” force, required a “flow” of raw materials, and people between colonial and colonized countries. Therefore, colonized parts of the world became the sources for slave labor and slaves produced goods to be used or consumed by the colonizing powers. They were transported from Africa to America to be employed in plantations for the production of sugar to be consumed in Europe. Materials, such as cotton, were carried to European cities in order to be processed and then to be sold back to the colonies (Loomba, 1998: 3-4). Thus, colonialism became a profitable commercial process, saving wealth and riches to Western nations by the economic exploitation of the colonized people. These practices which created colonizers the gainful side, formed the economic inequality that was necessary for the birth of capitalism. Obviously, the growth of industry and capitalism in European countries caused “an enormous superabundance of capital” which was used for the subordination of “non-industrialized” countries. Due to the relationship between colonized countries and the “metropole,” which formed a condition of dependence, Lenin and Kautsky—the Marxist thinkers—classifies European colonialism as a system of “imperialism” (Loomba, 1998: 5-7) and British Empire is a fine example with its imperial, economic, and political structure.

Although “colonialism is used interchangeably with ‘imperialism,’ . . . they mean different things” (McLeod, 2000: 7). While imperialism is an ideological term which supports the legitimacy of the economic and sometimes military control of one nation by the other, colonialism is a form of practice which comes from the ideology of imperialism and mainly concerns the settlement of one group of people in a new land. Even though it seems that colonialism is over today, imperialism still continues as Western nations, like America, are involved in imperial actions increasing their wealth and power by the lasting economic exploitation of other nations.

1.2. COLONIAL DISCOURSE THEORIES

In order to understand and evaluate the process of colonialism, many theories have been developed. The main concepts in these theories are based on representations and modes of perception. In colonial power relations, it is always through the eyes of the colonizers that the colonized is represented; thus the colonized is always the other and the lower. It is these representations that determine dominant modes of perception. Theories of colonial discourse explain the ways that *representations* and *modes of perception* are used by the colonial power to keep colonized peoples subservient to colonial rule. Colonial texts are the sources in which the writers demonstrate how colonialism hints at certain ways of seeing and understanding the world and one’s place in it by justifying the subservience of colonized peoples to the superior colonizers. Colonial discourse legitimizes the colonizer as it justifies the idea that it is right and proper to rule others, a process that can be called colonizing the mind. In colonizing the mind, language is the main tool which works by causing people “to internalize its logic and speak its language; to perpetuate the values and assumptions of the colonizers as regards the ways they perceive and represent the world” (McLeod, 2000: 18).

Colonial encounters are marked with the representations of the other, which are created by the colonial participants to find out a scheme for defining and reacting to the other. Representations are among the major concepts that need to be looked into for an analysis of the impact of colonialism reflected in literature.

1.3. READING COLONIAL DISCOURSE: COLONIALISM AND REPRESENTATION

In a dominated society, the determining factor is power. Concerning the European colonialism, a certain kind of culture and literature has been created by and interpreted according to the rhetoric of European imperial idea. Therefore, books of travelers and adventurers, letters, speeches, documents that make up colonial literature, reflect the codes of the “controlling culture,” sets of attitude and conceptions about authority (New, 1978: 102-106). These sources had become the staples of colonial discourse by the beginning of the eighteenth century, giving the novelists working with the themes and the style of these genres an access to a tradition of discussion on colonial issues.

Images, descriptions, and judgments which portray people according to “real” or imputed “differences” in contrast with the Self, based on the “dialectic” between the Self and the Other, are named “representations” (Miles, 1990: 19). The representation of the other is significant for an understanding of the relationships of power between the participants in colonial encounters. As colonialism brought different people in contact each other, the desire to define the other is at the centre of the discourse. The definitions of the colonized subject in the colonial mind are always stereotypical, homogenous, and inferior. Colonial power exerted its domination not only by means of material, military and technological superiority but also by means of the manipulation of the colonized subject’s representation in discourse. The control of the colonized subject’s representation was an effective instrument of coercion.

1.3.1. Representation: The Construction of a Stereotype

Representation is a method in colonization which has arguably provoked the need for resistance, but in order for one to discern why the colonized would need to resist representation, it is necessary to understand what exactly representation is. Throughout his book, *The Location of Culture* (1994), Bhabha uses Said’s theories

in order to provide an understanding of the practice of representation; specifically, he uses the well known theory of Orientalism. In the introduction to *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha mentions Renée Green, as African American artist, whose “questions open up an interrogatory, interstitial space between the act of representation –who? what? where? –and the presence of community itself . . .” (Bhabha, 1994: 5). One of the questions Green raises in her interview with Elizabeth Brown, which is crucial to the understanding of representation, is “who’s representing who?” (Bhabha, 1994: 4). It is essential to recognize that within the context of colonization, it is the colonizers who represent the colonized; Said makes it clear that in Orientalism it is the “non-Oriental” (Said, 1994: 21) who identifies the “Orient” (Said, 1994: 21). One is therefore led to question why exactly colonizers are able to represent colonial subjects, and the answer to this question lies in the notion of power. Said argues: “The relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of complex hegemony” (Said, 1994: 5); thus, he makes it clear that because colonial subjects lack authority, colonizers who have the supremacy take the responsibility of representing colonial subjects. In other terms, colonization is justified by representations. Said clarifies this idea of representation on the basis of power by discussing the remarks made by Arthur James Balfour, a politician and a statesman in the British Parliament, “lectured in the House of Commons on the ‘problems with which [they] have to deal in Egypt’” (Said, 1994: 31). In *Orientalism*, Said declares that “Balfour nowhere denies British superiority and Egyptian inferiority” (Said, 1994: 32), and he justifies British supremacy through the idea of power and knowledge. According to Balfour “supremacy is associated with . . . knowledge of Egypt. . . . Knowledge to Balfour means surveying a civilization from its origins to its prime to its decline – and of course, it means being able to do that” (Said, 1994: 32). Therefore, it is apparent that the Occident represents the Orient simply because their position of authority permits them to do so.

It is evident that colonial representation is only possible because of the difference of power between the colonizer and the colonized; furthermore, it is also important to acknowledge the fact that representation in reference to authority

further widens the gap between the colonizer and the colonized. In other words, the practice of representation simultaneously increases the power of the colonizer while further making inferior the colonized; this notion of representation is the primary reason why it is necessary for the colonized to resist identification.

According to Bhabha, colonial discourse which “employs a system of representation,” is a “form of governmentality that in marking out a ‘subject nation,’ appropriates, directs and dominates its various spheres of activity” (Bhabha, 1994: 70). It is the representation of the colonized constructed by colonizers that “justifies conquest and establishes systems of administration and instruction” (Bhabha, 1994: 70). Therefore, Bhabha makes it clear that representation works as an “apparatus of power” (Bhabha, 1994: 70) which restricts the autonomy of the colonized; the practice of representation of the colonizers is a means of gaining full control over the colonized. Representation in and of itself is not what makes the colonizer inferior; rather, it is only when representation is exercised stereotypically that it can be used as a means of depriving one of authority.

Colonial discourse, which has been established as a system of representation, “seeks authorization for its strategies by the production of knowledge of colonizer and colonized which are stereotypical” (Bhabha, 1994: 70). Bhabha emphasizes the stereotypical nature of representation by examining the following statement from *Orientalism*: “the stereotype ... [is] the lenses through which the Orient is experienced, and they shape language, perception, and form of the encounter between East and West” (Bhabha, 1994: 73). Essentially, stereotypical representation is not used to present an accurate depiction of colonial subjects, but rather to simply ensure their inferiority.

The phrase stereotypical representation leads one to assume colonizers present erroneous depictions of the colonized. However, despite the identification of the colonized, in the context of colonization, it is not this perception that leads Bhabha to label representation as stereotypical. Bhabha argues, “The stereotype is not a simplification because it is a false representation of a given reality. It is

simplification because it is an arrested, fixated form of representation that, in denying the play of difference . . . constitutes a problem for the representation of the subject” (Bhabha, 1994: 75). Therefore, representation is considered stereotypical because of its tendency to identify subjects in a fixed manner and because of its disallowing of an adequate representation of the colonized. Dealing with the first part of this statement, it is necessary to understand what it means to represent subjects in a way that is fixed. According to Bhabha, “fixity . . . connotes rigidity and an unchanging order” (Bhabha, 1994: 66), and Said further explains the notion of “fixity” by using terms such as “boxed in, [and] imprisoned” (Bhabha, 1994: 71). It is evident that to identify a subject in a fixed manner means providing a permanent and a definite portrayal of that subject which does not account for change or difference.

In *Orientalism*, Said discusses stereotypical representation in a way that clearly allows one to understand its fixed nature;

the Orient is the stage on which the whole East is confined. On this stage will appear figures whose role it is to represent the larger whole from which they emanate. The Orient then seems to be, not an unlimited extension beyond the familiar European world, but rather a closed field, a theatrical stage affixed to Europe. (Said, 1994: 63)

First of all, the use of the words “stage” and “theatrical stage” implies that the colonized are forced to become actors who need to fulfill the specific identity created for them by colonizers. The idea that the Orient is recognized as a “closed field” makes it clear that the identification of colonial subjects is considered to be total; in other words, an image created of the colonized is acknowledged as a complete portrayal of their identity (Said, 1994: 63). To sum up, stereotypical representation is understood to be a method that identifies subjects in a fixed manner because it creates specific and conclusive images of the colonized.

1.3.2. Representation of the Other before European Expansion

The discourse of Greco-Roman Empire, which has been culturally and economically powerful in the areas that are Greece and Italy today, should be accepted as the precursor of European representations of the other (Miles, 1990: 22). With the knowledge of the geographical expansion of human existence, the notion of the “unity of human species,” which depended on the common qualities of human beings separating them from “gods” and “animals,” was developed among the Greco-Romans. However, it did not prevent the continuity of “class” and “sexual” separations and the perception of “barbarian as the other,” who stayed outside the boundaries of the Greco-Roman people (Miles, 1990: 23).

When the Greco-Roman Empire and its colonies are considered, it is obvious that the other is portrayed as the “barbarian” who is considered to be deprived of a exact Greco-Roman character as he/she is thought to be lack of apprehensible “speech” and “reason” abilities (Miles, 1990: 14). With the imperialistic activities of Europeans in the Mediterranean and North Africa in the fifteenth century, the literary representations of Africans bear a stark contrast to those of the European origin. The representation of the “imagined” other portrays Africans as “primitive,” “wild,” “mysterious,” and “exotic” (New, 1978: 107-109). The “captured” and “enslaved,” “mercenary” Africans, (New, 1978: 14), were described by physical qualities such as color of skin, type of hair, shape of face. European discourse invariably identifies Africans with blackness and the Greco-Romans with whiteness. The binary opposition of blackness and whiteness is accepted as the foremost difference between Greco-Romans and the Africans. Therefore, “blackness” was regarded in a negative way because of the “white/black contrast” in Greco-Roman culture (Greenblatt, 1990: 19).

The representations of these oppositions are seen in the European literary works. William Shakespeare in his tragedy *Antony and Cleopatra* dramatizes the Western representations of the other. In the play, the African queen Cleopatra is portrayed as a woman who uses her beauty, charisma, cultural habits such as

witchcraft in order to attract and control the Roman ruler. With these representations, the Western qualities of “order,” “civilization,” “reason” (Miles, 1990: 15) are contrasted with the believed insufficiency and primitiveness in the African character. These representations guide us to understand the two “different worlds” with different moral qualities and standards, and different life styles (Charney, 1968: 93). Antony, the ruler of the Roman world, and Cleopatra, the queen of Egypt, are presented as the metonyms for Rome and Egypt. Especially, more recent critical perspectives of *Antony and Cleopatra* focus on the political and racial issues within the play, and these often identify Cleopatra as the colonized other. One example of this conclusion is found in Song’s *Racial Otherness: The Representation of Colored Minorities in Shakespeare and Restoration Drama*: “[Shakespeare] continuously stereotypes her [Cleopatra] as sexually unrestrained and wicked, one of the most popular stereotypes exercised against colored people in the sixteenth and seventeenth century western world” (Song, 1995: 171).

These types of critical conclusions include the assumption that Shakespeare and his entire society shared a negative perception of the way women of color were perceived. Those critics who have proposed a colonial explanation of this play often cite Philo’s opening speech to substantiate their claim that Shakespeare’s dark-skinned Cleopatra is ridiculed as both racial and sexual other. Being a citizen of the Roman Empire, and as a representative of Western world, Philo portrays the Egyptian queen with her “tawny front,” and refers to her as “gipsy” and “strumpet” (Shakespeare, 1994: 4). In other words, Shakespeare’s dark-skinned Cleopatra serves as a stereotypical construct of a foreign identity with a dehumanizing agenda in the reader’s mind.

1.3.3. Representations of the Other in the Period of British Colonization

The discovery of the New World gave birth to an important renovation in the frame within which Europeans produced and reproduced representations. European conquest and control which was followed by a colonial settlement in the New World resulted in the creation of a “discourse of primitivism” (Loomba, 1998: 108).

Europeans presumed that the lands where the settlement took place were “yet unformed,” and the inhabitants of the New World were “unknowing” and without even a culture of their own. The discourse of primitivism represented them as a “*tabula rasa*, ready to take the imprint of European civilization” (Greenblatt, 1990: 17).

By the fifteenth century, economically and politically powerful “ruling classes” in Europe began to establish “city and nation-states” in Northern and Western Europe. Those states started to expand their lands in different parts of the world in a “system of international trade” which was very much related to “colonial settlement.” As a matter of fact colonization started a new age of encounter with native peoples based on the rivalry for territory among European nations, the arrangement of rights of “private property,” the need for “labor force,” and the necessity of “conversion to Christianity.” It is evident that colonial enterprise which altered the natural balance of the regions that are dominated, converted other places and other peoples into commodities that could satisfy to the needs of the colonizers (Miles, 1990: 20, New, 1978: 106).

During the course of European colonization, particularly from the sixteenth century on, travelers’ accounts of their experiences proved to be one of the major supplies for representations. As a result of the invention of the printing machine and “the emergence of book” as an article of commerce, travelogues began to be published all over Europe (Miles, 1990: 21). Travelers’ stories were influential in determining the standards of “civilized behavior”—according to which the characteristics of the other were described—and thus in maintaining the “status quo” of the colonial centre. In the course of colonization, the non-European other was generally represented as a lesser being despite the fact that European attitude towards the people of different parts of the world varied. Westerners defined the Asian with the words “barbarous,” “tyrant,” or “infidel” without mentioning their physical features, yet they represented the African, Native American and Indian people according to physical features specifically “the color of skin,” “hair form,” and “nudity” (Miles, 1990: 21-22).

In addition, the representations of “indigenous” peoples recreated the image of the medieval “wild man” (Miles, 1990: 22). Westerners thought that they deserved this label because of the great gap between the Indians and civilized life. Along with the “strange and often repellent” character of the Indians, the one to which Europeans gave importance was their language. Europeans thought that Indian speech was “unfamiliar” and very close to “gibberish” (Greenblatt, 1990: 17). This perception of Indian speech in European culture came from the thought that Indian language was “non-existent” in the eyes of the Europeans. (Greenblatt, 1990: 18).

Although there were attempts of recognition of the Indian as a member of a “lettered culture,” he/she could not escape from being represented as the wild man who was distinguished with his black skin, “untamed aggression,” “sexuality” and “bestiality” (Miles, 1990: 24). Consequently, in the years of European conquest and settlement, the ascription of “cannibal” was attached to the representation of the other. One of the best examples for the theme of the representation of the colonial other as the wild man is Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, which bears close parallels to the colonial development of the founding of the first successful English colony in America. It fostered a rich discourse of colonial possibility: “the historical moment of *The Tempest* coincides closely with a burst of sermons and pamphlets sponsored by the Virginia Company, promoting the colony as an object of messianic national destiny and spiritual renewal” (Gilles, 2000: 188). In *The Tempest*, Shakespeare dramatizes the encounter between two different cultures a “lettered” and an “unlettered” one, through the connection between a European powerful Prospero, and a savage, Caliban, who is “deformed,” “lecherous,” “idle,” “treacherous,” “rebellious,” “violent,” “devil-worshipping” (Greenblatt, 1990: 23-26). Also, the rapist image attached to the black men is reflected in Caliban’s motivation for the rape of Miranda, which can be interpreted as an attempt to capture power on the island by reclaiming Prospero’s rule over both the racial and gender other. The play investigates the limits and potential of colonial relationships by sustaining the discourse that the literary products of colonial encounter will later use to develop and challenge colonialism as an ideology.

From this ideological point of view, *The Tempest* can be seen as an instrument of exploitation in which Prospero acts as a European imperialist and Caliban as an oppressed victim. Caliban is portrayed as a subhuman monster, a slave controlled and educated in order to be used by his European master (Greenblatt, 1990: 23-26). Greenblatt asserts that “utterly reject[ing] the uniformitarian view of the human race, [the play] seems to suggest that all men are not alike” (Greenblatt, 1990: 26). Whether Prospero represents a Renaissance magus and Caliban a wild man, or Prospero a civilized man and Caliban a natural man, Prospero is superior to Caliban and Prospero’s culture and values are superior to Caliban’s wild nature. Cultural and linguistic colonization are represented through Prospero who always rebukes, tortures and threatens Caliban to gain the power in Caliban’s island.

There is no doubt that colonization, once the first “contact” and settlement” has taken place, is often maintained and upheld with the objective of integrating “indigenous” people into “the civilization” (Miles, 1990: 26). In the age of European expansion, “environmentalism” and “racism” were the ideas that were used in order to explain the difference between West and its others. In the discourse about the other, based on the self/other duality, Environmentalists suggest that “climate” is the unique determinant of both physical appearance and cultural characteristics. According to them, the explanation for the black skin color and the attached laziness of the African was the heat of the sun. With this approach, the earlier ideas of “blackness” as the result of “God’s damnation” lost its currency (Miles, 1990: 29).

The discourse of racism on the other hand, began to be effective with the improvements in science and “secularization” of culture during the nineteenth century. The notion of race, which emerged in the sixteenth century to describe European history and nation construction, came to refer to an organic category of individuals who demonstrated distinct characteristics. Racism, unlike environmentalist argument, which asserted the precedence of environmental factors such as climate and life style, presented race as the “source” of all characteristics of a population. Race, the source of all “biological” and “cultural” variations, was at the same time the causal factor of “psychological” and “social” faculties and

“cultural” features playing an important role in achievement of progress on the way to “civilization” (Miles, 1990: 39-40). It is obvious that in both ideas, the “discourse” about the other has turned towards a “discourse of civilization” (Miles, 1990: 33).

1.4. COLONIAL LITERATURE

The colonial encounters between various cultures and Europeans are inevitably reflected in the language and representation of literary texts, which involve the construction of the binary opposition between a “European self” and a “non-European other.” The construction of European culture was required in the creation of colonial authority (Loomba, 1998: 72-74). In addition to travelers’ narratives—which constituted the earlier model for European colonial literature—and Shakespeare’s plays, Daniel Defoe, Jonathan Swift, Charlotte Bronte and Joseph Conrad were among the writers whose works illustrated how the language of Empire functioned in the colonies. As a newly developed literature genre: English novels in the eighteenth century take the attention to the colonization. Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) depicts the adventures of an Englishman who is the only person surviving a shipwreck. Robinson Crusoe is introduced as the source of powerful European who has the ability, and right to direct, control and name the black native Friday who is represented as the binary opposition of civilization. Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (1726) appears as a counter example satirizing the accounts of European travelers. With the setting Brobdingnag, located in the north-west coast of North America as a “land of giants,” the book represented “the colonized world as a place inhabited by the subhuman, savage and the surreal” (New, 1978: 108). In the nineteenth century, the idea still continues, and examples of colonial representation of the savage, evil, subhuman non-European other still reflects the dominant European perspective. Charlotte Bronte’s Jamaican Creole character Bertha Mason in *Jane Eyre* (1847), whose portrayal confirms English superiority. Likewise, Joseph Conrad, in his *Heart of Darkness* (1899), reflects a Western ideology of colonialism and imperialism in which the colonizers leave the comforts of Europe to wander through the primeval forest in order to change the

native's world. Besides destroying the cultural identity and traditions of the Africans, colonizers exploit, enslave, dehumanize, and demonize the natives, whom they regard as savages.

These literary products fashioned the European representations of the other by imposing Western values on the natives, presenting European culture as superior and as a measure of human values, and, thus, to maintain colonial authority (Loomba, 1998: 85). The devaluing of native literatures and languages by European colonial ideologies created an inclination of imitation in colonial writers, in any genre that parent culture recognized as acceptable (New, 1978: 110). The most significant example of those writers who reflected colonial dependency and devotion was the Indian-born Rudyard Kipling. He made British imperialism the subject of his art with his patriotism and loyalty to Empire.

When the setting in the works of colonial literature is taken into consideration, the image of wilderness was presented as the ultimate contrast of the Western civilization. The image of wilderness, which produced the desert-island/savage-jungle stereotypes, created a sense of danger and excitement and, of course, a temptation for adventure and conquest. In the novels or the travel narratives which told tales of emigrations to the New World, the relationship between binary oppositions, of empire/colony was represented in terms of the images of domesticity and the state. While empire was personified as "mother country" and represented the metaphor "home," "the daughter country" underlined the condition of dependency with the implication that "domestic convention regarded daughters as possessions, whose filial duty would take precedence over any 'unladylike' desire for independence" (New, 1978: 112-115).

However, there were many writers amongst the colonists and the colonized who explored the imposition of the status quo with its political norms and values, which had a direct impact upon the manifestation of representations and stereotypes in literature. These writers, using subversive strategies, such as irony and mimicry together with local speech, criticized the dominant discourse of the colonizer and

produced their own colonial perspective independent of imperial country (New, 1978: 118). Obviously, by the twentieth century, a different sort of colonial literature was emerging with the use of vernacular languages and alternative forms, this time by the native writers from colonies. It indicated the first steps taken in the direction of postcolonial literature.

2. POSTCOLONIALISM

Postcolonialism which emerged as a reaction to colonialism has also affected the history of human beings. It provides a framework in which to analyze, reread, contextualize, and redefine texts, imagery, events, and theories developed to support, reinforce, justify, and establish colonialism. It revisits the colonial institution through the eyes of the colonized, challenging attitudes, concepts and entire frames of references and the colonizer/colonized relationship. In general, "Postcolonial" has been the stage following "independence" that is differentiated with attempts of constructing a "national literary history." Nevertheless, European "imperial domination," still continues to shape contemporary world and literature. Thus, it is more proper to use "postcolonial" to define cultures impacted by the ideology colonialism from the "process" of colonization till today (McLeod, 2000: 2-3).

African countries, Australia, India, Canada, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Singapore and, to some extent, the USA have postcolonial literary traditions. The literatures of these countries, except their unique local qualities, are classified as "postcolonial" because they share "experience" of colonialism and emerge from the "tension with the imperial power" by means of asserting their identities against and "differences" from the "imperial centre" (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 2).

The opposition of "place and displacement" is also one of the most important characteristics of postcolonial societies whether they have been created by an experience of "settlement" or "intervention." It describes the particular "crisis of identity" in postcolonial condition, a process of struggling for recuperation or construction of efficient "identifying" connection among the "self" and "place." There are mainly two reasons for the "alienation" and loss of the "sense of self" which could have been damaged by "dislocation" as the outcome of "migration," "expatriation," "slavery," or by "cultural denigration" as the consequence of the domination of the native character or "culture" by a more influential "racial" or "cultural" structure. (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 9).

Concepts such as “Hegemony,” “language,” “place and displacement” are related to colonial experience. Therefore, a special concern with these items is the distinctive feature of postcolonial literatures. The problem of “coloniality” is still important in postcolonial countries even after independence has been politically accomplished. Since the imperial hegemony continues to dominate the literature in postcolonial countries, “writing back to a centre” is the task of postcolonial literatures during when the colonial structure is broken down. This hegemony is managed via the “literary canon” of British culture and “Received Standard English” which propose the language of the south-eastern England as a “universal” standard. By the control of language, hegemony is maintained. The system of education in the imperialistic ideology offers a “standard code” of the dominant ideology’s language whereas it “marginalizes” other versions. Therefore, language performs in the continuance of a “hierarchical structure of power” in the structure of which the notions of “truth,” “order,” and “reality” are instituted, and continuation of colonial power is provided. With the emergence of postcolonial literatures and the use of “vernaculars” as linguistic “variants” within English texts, this “power” was rejected by the writers of postcolonialism (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 6-8).

Language is an important factor in the identity crisis in postcolonial societies, which emerges as the consequence of the gap between “place” and the imposed “culture” and “language,” both of which fail to depict the “new,” postcolonial circumstance. The language is marginalized by the dominating colonial culture’s language which brings the “linguistic alienation” of the self in the “new place”. In order to depict their personal “experience” of colonialism, postcolonial writers sought ways of overwhelming this enforced “gap” which was the result of the “displacement” of the indigenous language by English in the period of colonization. Therefore, they used strategies of subversion, such as “abrogation” and “appropriation,” for the interrogation of the premises to which English language was connected: its aesthetical standards and social norms, the traditional literary genres, and the “political and cultural” imposition of “centre” on “margin” (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 10-11).

The emergence of “English Literatures,” namely postcolonial literatures, was the result of the “dialectic” between location and dislocation. The “experience” of “new” location dissimilar with its material features and thus the following difficulties, forced native speakers as well as colonizers to use a “language” in which the expression of their feeling of “Otherness” would be possible (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 11).

2.1. POSTCOLONIAL LITERATURES AND POSTCOLONIAL THEORY

The term “postcolonial” stands as problematic within current critical discussions because of its value-laden meaning. It should not be taken to stand for “after colonialism”; rather, it should be accepted as the “study and analysis of European territorial conquests, the various institutions of European colonialism, the discursive operations of empire, the subtleties of subject construction in colonial discourse and the resistance of those subjects” (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 187). Postcolonial studies are concerned with examin[ing] the process and effects of, and reactions to, European colonialism; it takes a look at “responses (resistant or otherwise)” to colonization (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 188-89). Therefore, the answer to the question “what is postcolonial theory?” is not a simple one, for this field is highly heterogeneous and diversified. The binary opposition colonizer/colonized was actually one of the major items of imperialist discourse. Postcolonial theory seeks then to disentangle the ideological nature of the definitions and representations of colonized subjects in colonial discourse. The many different tendencies and concerns within this current of thought and the debate over the appropriateness of the term do not favor a precise definition. According to Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin:

[Postcolonial theory] emerges from the inability of European theory to deal adequately with the complexities and varied cultural provenance of post-colonial writers. European theories themselves emerge from particular cultural traditions which are hidden by false notions of the ‘the universal’. Theories of style and genre, assumptions about the universal features of language, epistemologies and value systems are all radically questioned by the practices of post-colonial writing. Post-

colonial theory has proceeded from the need to address this different practice. (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 11)

Postcolonial theory has had a considerable impact on contemporary academic practice and criticism mainly because it assesses the significant ways in which European imperialism, a phenomenon that affected almost the entirety of the earth, affected the political, economic and cultural life of all the countries that were formerly under imperial rule. The growth of Postcolonial literatures depends on the task of asserting local and national “difference” from Britain with an interrogation of the ideological presumptions created by English literature studies. English studies as an academic discipline, including “language,” “education” and “cultural” integration, was a political and national project necessitated with the enlargement of the imperial power. In postcolonial cultures, declaration of “difference” from the colonial centre came as a reaction to English language studies. The postcolonial task was to “break the link between language and literary study,” with the disconnection of “English departments” in academies as “linguistics” and “literature,” which administered their studies within a national framework (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 4).

In the national frame, the development of postcolonial literatures includes few steps. At the first step, which co-occurred with the course of colonization, literature was produced in the language of the centre by the “literate elite.” The literature at the initial step favored the centre through the celebration of the home, the metropolitan and the devaluation of the native and the provincial. At the second, literature was produced under the “patronage system” of imperial culture. The upper class member natives, educated in the English system, became the privileged group by their writing in the language of the dominant culture (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 5-6). The common feature of these former postcolonial literatures is that they lack the potency for “subversion.” Since literature as an institution in colonized societies was allied with the imperial power, any type of writing from a different viewpoint that could be harmful to colonizing centre was prohibited. This atmosphere was not convenient for writers for a comprehensive treatment of “anti-imperial” themes in previous post-colonial cultures (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 6).

A solution to this problem is proposed by “postcolonial literary theory,” which developed from the inadequacy of “European theory” for a sufficient study of the complexities of the experience of writing in postcolonial cultures. “Postcolonial literary theory” is a response to the “monocentrism” of European culture which is based on philosophical practices and frameworks of representation that claimed to be universal. In the first years of the twentieth century, subjugated peoples started to question and rebel against imperialism. World War I contributed to the rise of nationalism in the colonies and elicited throughout the Empire a great disillusionment with Europe and its culture. World War II, which changed the power configuration of the world, marked a new step towards decolonization, and nationalist movements in the colonies consolidated. With the nationalist forces, the British colonies acquired a new consciousness of their status and started to demand economic and political autonomy. King states that “not only did the war radically weaken British prestige and power, stimulate the local economy and bring about rapid social changes, but as war aims became defined, the defense of Empire was replaced by ideals of independent democratic states” (King, 1980: 23). Indeed, the ethnocentric nature of imperial policy bluntly contradicted the democratic ideals that prevailed at the time. Britain, which had played the role of championing democracy, could not continue to uphold an imperial policy. Thus, the ideological system on which imperialism had been built dramatically imploded.

WWII brought industrialization and modernization to the new nation-states, and with their advent, nationalism became stronger, and a mood of cultural pride and assertion spread. Nationalist governments encouraged the creation of schools and universities that fostered syllabi with local content. The teaching of national literary traditions at the newly opened national schools and universities was of fundamental importance inasmuch as they contributed to the consolidation of a new national identity and a sense of cohesion. Actually, the expansion of local education as part of the policy of nationalist governments was the foundation of the development and study of national literatures, for it created the necessary market for national writing and encouraged scholarly study of such works (King, 1980: 48).

Since the phenomenon of a national production was taking place at the same time in several former British colonies, the community of writers and scholars belonging to these nation-states acquired an awareness of their importance and realized that they were part of a new historical phase. A system is developed by linking the literary and intellectual circles of these nations, and an active and enriching exchange of ideas and critical tendencies took root. “Commonwealth Literature and Literary Studies,” the forerunner of “Postcolonial Literature and Literary Studies,” thus became a new literary field and an area of study on an international scale. The purpose of the critics, scholars and writers that adopted this name was to find a place in the curricula of English departments at home and abroad for the new nation-state literatures and criticism, which, until that time, had been totally disregarded. As McLeod asserts, the Commonwealth network “laid the foundations for the various postcolonial criticisms that were to follow, and to which much postcolonial critical activity remains indebted” (McLeod, 2000: 16).

In the early 1950s, studies of colonialism emerged reflecting the revolutionary spirit of decolonization movements in the aftermath of Second World War. During this period, the most known early postcolonial literary representatives are Aimé Césaire and his student Frantz Fanon. The basic theory of Césaire’s famous work, *Discourse on Colonialism*, is that modern colonial conquest entailed the imposition of capitalist social relationships and a colonial way of thinking or discourse, and his student Fanon furthered Césaire’s ideas on the significance of colonial discourse.

In the *Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon explains how colonizers force colonial discourses of inferiority on the colonized as factors of a process of dehumanizing them in order to legitimize colonial rule. He points that the colonized and the colonizer are created by the of colonial discourse dialect. For Fanon, this dialectical relationship means that the decolonization of the colonized entails the decolonization of the colonizers and the discourses they use to justify their rule. It is necessary to state that for both Césaire and Fanon, decolonization is not basically a process of destroying colonial discourse; it also involves demolishing unequal and exploitative

social relations of capitalism that colonial discourses sought to legitimize as normal and natural. Therefore, in much of the early postcolonial literature, it is claimed that resistance against the propagation of colonial discourses must also resist and drive out the oppressive relationships of capitalism. The works of Césaire and Fanon were recognized by scholars such as Edward Said. His book *Orientalism*, which was published almost twenty years later, was one of the first studies questioning culture, colonialism and empire. The relationship between culture and colonial discourse is the main focus of his work in which he argues that Orientalism--as a colonial discourse-- is constructed by the West as an institution for dealing with the Orient, “dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring and having authority over the Orient” (Said, 1994: 3). In linking culture, colonialism, and critical discourse analysis, Said’s work quickly became the classic text for the postcolonial studies.

While Said’s work was influential, it was also criticized, and these criticisms opened spaces for the emergence of several different trends. In 1981 some scholars who have known with the *Subaltern Studies*, aim to criticize and open Orientalist discourse by involving debates of peasant agency and colonial resistance in relation to India. Since that time, Subaltern scholars such as Ranajit Guha, Gyan Prakash, Partha Chatterjee, Dipesh Chakrabarty, and Gyatri Chakravorty Spivak have focused on the relationship between culture, colonialism, and dominant discourse.¹ They argue that the agency, the voice of subaltern is only available by a strategy of understanding or criticizing colonial documents for the silences and absences.

It is Homi Bhabha who has challenged and crushed Said’s view of colonial discourse in 1980s. Also, Antonio Gramsci and Michel Foucault are interested in ambiguity, tension and the meanings of nationhood, gender, race and sex in colonial discourse. In 1994, and in response to the criticisms of Orientalism, Said published

¹ See, for example, *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements*, ed. Gyan Prakash; Ranajit Guha, *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*; Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*; G.C. Spivak, “Can the Subaltern Speak?”, in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* 217-313.

Culture and Imperialism by expanding his ideas he had initiated in his earlier work *Orientalism*. In this work, he argues that the histories and cultures of the colonies and the metropole overlapped and are mixed up in each other. He suggests that rather than reading texts separately and isolating them according to their special history of identity, a text should be read from a comparative perspective by recognizing race, class, and gender. He also emphasizes the importance of recognizing the interdependence of various histories on each other, such as slavery, Islamic fundamentalism, the caste system as well as the interaction of contemporary societies with each other.

We must be able to think through and interpret together experiences that are discrepant, each with its particular agenda and pace of development, its own internal formations, its internal coherence and system of external relationships, all of them coexisting and interacting with others. (Said, 1993: 32)

To sum up, the concerns of postcolonial theorists are numerous and complex. Owing to the flexibility of the term “postcolonial,” a great number of issues fall under the umbrella of postcolonial theory. The theorization and deconstruction of cultural forms such as literature, the analysis of power relations between the new nation-states and the former empire, questions of subalternity, alterity, in-betweenness, hybridity, the constitution of identity and linguistic and textual issues generated by the imposition of colonizer’s language and systems of representation are to be counted among the major ones.

2.1.1. Power Relations

The nature and dynamics of the power relations established between the colonizer and the colonized are of great concern for postcolonial theorists who consider literary works as cultural artifacts that reflect how the colonizer and the colonized see each other, how they conceive their position in society and how the colonial subject’s identity was constructed in imperial discourse in order to justify domination. Many postcolonial scholars have undertaken the task of analyzing and establishing connections between the representations of the non-Western subject in

Western texts and the presuppositions of imperialist ideology. They examine as well the ways in which postcolonial writers have been countering the representations of formerly colonized peoples, thus challenging imperialist and neo-imperialist assumptions about their identity, history, geography and culture. In this respect, Gareth Griffiths states that

the literary text, and the emergence of literatures in English in post-colonial countries, . . . continue to be viewed as crucial evidence, since writing, literacy, and the control of literary representations are vital in determining how the colonizers and colonized viewed each other, and how the colonized established or renewed their claims to a separate and distinctive cultural identity. (Griffiths, 1996: 164)

Postcolonial theory particularly deconstructs the hierarchical and binary vision of the world present in imperialist discourse. European metropolises established hierarchical relations with the subjects of distant colonies, territories and dominions based on essentialist assumptions of their identity in which the colonizer became the centre of value and authority and the colonized a powerless and marginal “other.” As Griffiths affirms,

[t]he colonizer was always and inescapably the Self to the marginalized Other of the colonized. By ‘knowing’ the Other, the colonizer asserted his right to determine what that Other could or should be. In other words, the colonized could be literary moulded into whatever best served the economic and political purposes of the colonizer. (Griffiths, 1996: 165)

2.1.2. Language

In order to understand the power dynamics, it is important to focus on how language operates. Language is central to the postcolonial experience, and therefore, the analysis of linguistic issues is particularly enlightening when it comes to the study of the literary production of former colonies. European colonization developed along two clearly defined lines: settler and invaded colonies. In the case of English

settler colonies like United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, “land was occupied by European colonists who disposed and overwhelmed the indigenous populations. They established a transplanted civilization which eventually secured political independence while retaining a non-Indigenous language” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 1989: 25). European languages and culture overpowered those of the first nations, which were silenced and marginalized. But the settlers were confronted with the fact that their language was inappropriate for their new environment and experience in the colony. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin maintain that inasmuch as these settlers had “no ancestral contact with the land, they dealt with their sense of displacement by unquestioningly clinging to a belief in the adequacy of the imported language” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 1989: 25).

In the case of invaded colonies like India and the colonized parts of Africa, “indigenous people[s] were colonized in their own territories” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 1989: 25). The linguistic resistance was greater here than in settler colonies. The colonizing powers imposed their language upon the colonized people and native languages. Nevertheless, contrary to settler colonies, in invaded colonies, indigenous linguistic and cultural forms proved to be too solidly established to be wiped out. Despite their being marginalized from official culture, they continued to exist. For the writers of an invaded colony, the challenge was thus to reconcile two conflicting views of the world: namely, their own and the colonizer’s. Ashcroft et al. further note that in invaded societies,

where indigenous people were colonized on their own territories, writers were not forced to adapt to a different landscape and climate, but had their view which was implicated in the acquisition of English. Whether English actually supplanted the writer’s mother tongue or simply offered an alternative medium which guaranteed a wider readership, its use caused a disjunction between the apprehension of, and communication about, the world. (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 25)

It must be remembered that in many invaded colonies, once the British system of education was established, speaking a local language in a colonial school

was strictly forbidden. This tyrannical linguistic policy, obliging members of local elite groups to be educated and trained in the colonizer's languages, was a means of control and subjugation. The aftermath of this linguistic policy was that vernacular languages were made to bear the stigma of backwardness. After decolonization, writers and intellectuals were faced with a linguistic dilemma: whether to write in the colonizer's language, which had become a current means of communication in certain spheres, or in indigenous languages.

To replace the colonizer's language and text, Ashcroft *et al.* in his book, *The Empire Writes Back* (1989) presents "subversive strategies" which are namely "abrogation and appropriation" through the use of metonymy. For Ashcroft et al. postcolonial writers seize "the language of the center" (English, French, Portuguese, etc) and by abrogation and appropriation they replace it. In other words, Ashcroft et al. reminds an entire reconstruction of the colonizer's language by postcolonial writer's to fit their own environment, to write their linguistic and cultural differences. Appropriation means that postcolonial writers redesign the imperial language. Postcolonial writers seek to terminate all the privileges attached to the mastery of the colonizer's language. To redesign the language, postcolonial writers must fill in the gap with their own language, culture. This process is referred to as "appropriation" and consists in making the colonizer's language fit colonized people's experience. The conscious use of metonymic elements, like untranslated words, allusions, glossing, and interlanguage, confirms the post colonial writers' will to inscribe their cultural differences in the imperial language which also brings the hybridization of postcolonial writings.

2.1.3. Hybridity

The dictionary definition of the word "hybrid" includes "a person whose background is a blend of two diverse cultures or traditions" and "something heterogeneous in origin or composition" (Merriam-Webster online Dictionary, 2005). It is used to describe various different images of border existences between two competing identities, and is associated with terms such as "the third space,"

wherein the translation and negotiation between identities occur (Bhabha, 1994: 115). It is the space of postcolonial cultural mixing between colonizers and colonized. Hybridization involves the blending of native and foreign cultural practices such that the hybridized end-product retains elements of its component parts.

On the problem of hybridity, Homi Bhabha provides the example of an Indian community which is using the Bible to suit its own purposes. In “Signs Taken for Wonders” one of the articles of *The Location of Culture* (1994), he offers his view of the hybrid: “Produced through the strategy of disavowal, the reference of discrimination between the mother culture and its bastards, the self and its doubles, where the trace of what is disavowed is not repressed but repeated as something different – a mutation, a hybrid” (Bhabha, 1994: 111). For Bhabha, then hybrids are very much like bastards that spring up from the space in-between. What he accounts are the transformations that took place in colonial India after the reception of the Bible by the Hindoostanee population which had been contaminated by a foreign language (English) and a religion (Christianity).

2.1.4. Mimicry

Mimicry involves the imitation of white cultural practices by Black subjects. Homi Bhabha states that European colonization only produced “mimic men” whose “partial presence . . . articulates . . . disturbances of cultural, racial and historical difference that menace the narcissistic demand of colonial authority” (Bhabha, 1994: 88). Thus Fanon’s *Black Skin, White Masks*, which cautions Blacks against the desire to become mentally Whites, is an instance of futile mimicry because a Black person will never become a White person. The uncomfortable situation exposed by Fanon in *Black Skin, White Masks* fits in the definition that Homi Bhabha gives to the word “mimicry” which “emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal . . . the sign of a double articulation . . . which appropriates the other as it visualizes power” (Bhabha, 1994: 86).

Bhabha shows how subversion surpasses the limitations imposed by power which does everything it can to contain it. The tools that Bhabha uses to describe subversion are mimicry, sly civility, colonial nonsense, and hybridism. Postcolonial writing is no longer imperialistic, colonial or postcolonial in essence because it develops in what Bhabha refers to as “the third space.” This space is a no man’s land because it is a culturally integrated domain. The integration is so effective that every time a writer from Africa or from another colonized world writes, he or she does so from at least two perspectives: the colonized and the European ones, which both share the ownership of Bhabha’s third space.

3. GLOBALIZATION

Globalization, in general, is the “integration of the world economy” through the flux of “capital,” “goods” and “people” throughout the world. New developments in science and technology have made the flux of “information” beyond “national” borders possible and raised the speed of the flow of these elements and “commodities within countries” (Temin, 1999: 76). However, globalization, which has developed “furthest” in the fields of “capital and product markets,” has been an “uneven” practice for a long time. The “balances of power” inside and between countries have been changed by the opportunities that it produced (Boyce, 2004: 105-106). The “undesirable” domination of globalization is one of the consequences of the integration of nations “globally into a capitalist modernity”. It affects “economic,” “social,” “political,” and “cultural” balances within and between the participants (Dirlik, 2002: 3-4). So, it creates financial, cultural and political inequalities.

Today, globalization has emerged as a “new kind of colonialism” (Dirlik, 2005: 9). While colonialism can be described as the invasion of a land by means of exploitation of material and natural resources, domination of political and cultural structures by means of “direct” colonial control. Nevertheless, globalization is an “economic system” of dominance and invasion that does not demand direct military and political power (Loomba, 1998: 6).

3.1. HISTORY OF GLOBALIZATION

It has been argued that the greatest impacts of globalization occurred in the mid-twentieth century; however, globalization is an age old concept which cannot be marked by any single event in history. Globalization can be tracked back to the treaty that split the world between Spain and Portugal, the Treaty of Tordesillas, or attributed to the expansion of the British Empire around 1600 AD, when the British imposed English as the common language (Lee, 2006: 1-9). Other scholars believe that the first hints of globalization appeared several millennia ago when the Chinese and Greek thought of the world as a single place with a unitary populace. Regardless,

globalization has existed for many centuries in the form of “trade, immigration, and the exchange of information and ideas” (Arnett, 2002: 774).

According to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), the idea of “global activity” as a “by-product” of the period of European expansion begins in the seventeenth century. However, “to globalize” came out to be in use in the second half of the twentieth century with the aim of defining economic movement. From this point of view, globalization is the practice of creating a “single global economy,” with the flux of “goods,” “capital,” “labour,” “people,” and “knowledge” (Temin, 1999: 76-77).

The definition above implies that “investment” is not difficult all over the world, but there were shocks and economic crises which affected the process of globalization in the twentieth century (Temin, 1999: 76).

The story of globalization in the twentieth century is of its ebb and flow. Ebb during the first half of the century and flow during the last half. The ebb during the turbulent period of world wars and the Great Depression, sometimes called ‘The Second Thirty Years War.’ (Temin, 1999: 77)

Therefore, the development of globalization is analyzed in three periods: the period before the First World War and its consequence Depression, the period of the Second World War (years between 1913-50), and the post-war years (Temin, 1999: 78).

Before World War I, there was a widespread progression of globalization. The emergence of globalization, “modern capitalism” as a “socio-economic system,” coincided with the Industrial Revolution in Britain and extended to the west of Europe and its “offshoots of the Americas and Oceania.” Globalization was a new system of economic activities basically managed through “market exchange,” depending on “private property relations in labor, capital, land and ideas” (Sachs, 1999: 92). The subsequent imbalance between Europe and less developed societies in Africa, the Middle East, and Russia resulted in the “direct imperial rule” of Europeans.

Conventional empires such as Russia, Ottoman, China, and Japan attempted at rearrangements according to the Western institutional model with “market reforms, financial systems, commercial law, modern infrastructure (telegraphy, railroads, internal canals, and oceanic ports), and even parliaments” (Sachs, 1999: 92).

By the twentieth century the European powers, together with an “imperial” America, dominated the world by globalization. In the success of Western globalization, the industrial progress of European nations had a vital role. The construction of the “cable line” in 1866, and “the steel ships” and “steam turbines” lowered the price for the transportation of “grain” and “coal” overseas. Therefore, technological improvement both enhanced the variety of commodities and made it possible to merchandise them at a lower price. Capital flowed freely in Western societies. Britain was the chief “capital exporter.” France and Germany were also active in “capital flow.” However, the United States was seen on the stage only at the end of the period before the First World War (Temin, 1999: 77-80).

Adding up the “flow of capital,” people have rushed before the period of the First World War. There has been a great “mass migration” before the First World War. Temin states,

Thirty million people immigrated to the US between 1860 and 1920. Migrants from western and southern Europe went also to other countries in the New World, from Canada in the north and to Argentina in the south. Even as workers in western Europe sought higher wages in the New World . . . Ireland, Italy, and Poland provided a reservoir of labour for Britain and other industrialized European countries. (Temin, 1999: 79)

This system of capitalist globalization, which depended on European imperial expansion, was traumatized by the First World War leading to several unexpected events. The political and economic damage in Europe subsequent to the war was great. The accompanying economic unbalances caused an atmosphere of unsteadiness during the 1920’s, which played an important role in the emergence of the Great Depression in the 1930’s and the resurgence of “German militarism” led by the

ideology of Nazism. The Ottoman and Russian empires broke down as the result of losses in the field of battle and economic disorders. After the breakdown of “Tsarist Russia,” Bolshevism was founded. Nevertheless, Europeans succeeded in “holding on” to their colonies in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East till the end of the Second World War. With the Ottoman Empire’s losing its possessions in the Middle East and Germany’s in Africa, European colonial expansion was accelerated (Sachs, 1999: 93-94).

In the 1920’s Europeans were dealing with the rebuilding of the “global economy” that had existed before the First World War. Europeans witnessed some difficulties such as “military defeat,” “debts,” the need for large amounts of money for “reparations,” and “economic chaos” which was followed by “a series of hyperinflations” in “post-war” years (Sachs, 1999: 94-95). The First World War and the following political, financial, and military troubles decelerated the process of globalization. The Second World War caused a far more intensive “destruction” in Europe that resulted in the disentanglement of “imperial powers,” in the years between 1940’s and 1980’s, and other severe conditions such as Japan’s emerging as the “communist power” (Sachs, 1999: 95).

European powers which had experienced an “internal conflict” during the war years cooperated to accomplish “stability” within and outside the borders of Europe in the years following the Second World War. Britain and The United States, which emerged from the war as the “world leader,” shared the task of establishing new global organizations. The IMF and World Bank were founded in order to solve the problems faced in the continuation of unchanging “exchange rates” and “payments systems.” The U.S. widened its aid program for the west of Europe, through the Marshall Plan, in order to support the adaptation of market institutions and “free-trade” systems (Temin, 1999: 83).

3.1.1. The Marshall Plan

The Marshall Plan, or formally the “European Recovery Program” (ERP) was the primary project of the United States for the restoration of Europe and promotion of European economic development, after the Second World War, principally by means of collaboration with “American banks.”²

Truman brought the Marshall Plan into force on April 3, 1948 and founded the “Economic Cooperation Administration” (ECA) to conduct the agenda. Other countries who took part in the Marshall Plan and signed an agreement for instituting the “Organization for European Economic Cooperation” were Austria, Denmark, France, West Germany, Belgium, Great Britain, Iceland, Italy, Greece, Luxembourg, Sweden, the Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, the United States, and Turkey. The name was later changed as the “Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.” However the Soviet Union and the states in the Eastern Europe did not take part in the plan, since the Soviets considered the plan as a threat against its control over eastern European countries. Greece and Turkey, the countries which were thought to be in the threat of “communist expansion” took the first substantive aid in 1974. The mission of supporting the anticommunist groups in Greece and Turkey, which had been materialized by United Kingdom at first, was taken over and operated by the United State because of its prosperity. The United Nations also set in motion a chain of aids nearly all of which were financed by the United States.

The Marshall Plan aid was channelized to the nations of Europe. The monetary funds were distributed in cooperation with the local governments. The implementation of aid was carried on in two ways. First, the aid was primarily employed by European countries for importation of processed and raw materials from the U.S., which had accomplished the fastest economic development during the war years. Trade was indispensable for a long-standing financial stability.² Second, money was channelized

² <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marshall_Plan>.

³ In the beginning, importations consisted of basic needs such as food and fuel, but later they were replaced by the reparation demands as it was purposed beforehand. For more information see “Marshall Plan.” Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marshall_Plan>.

through “counterpart funds” which were either invested into “private enterprises” for the industrialization and reconstruction, or used for the “Technical Assistance Program” in training European engineers and businessman in the United States.³

The Marshall Plan, which was completed in 1951 but later proceeded globally, had major “economic and political” consequences. Europe had an enormous development, both industrial and economic, in the years between 1947 and 1952. Besides it relieved the harsh living conditions in the post-war years, decreased poverty and starvation, and furthered a comparatively undisturbed social atmosphere for the reparation. The Marshall Plan was influential in the “integration” of European nations as well as crucial for protecting the “peace,” “prosperity” and “political stability” in Europe. (Temin, 1999: 83). The U.S was the party which benefited most from the Marshall Plan though it was designed for the reconstruction of Europe. The years after the Second World War were marked by the “unchallenged” American hegemony, which revitalized the process of globalization through its “economic and political configurations” (Dirlik, 2002: 5). The U.S and Europe recovered quickly from the “wartime depression” with their “advanced capitalist economies” and proceeded with rapid financial and technological growth in the course of “market-based” liberal trade. “European integration” made the way for the constitution of the European Union “single market,” and then “monetary union” in the 1990’s (Sachs, 1999: 97).

In the process of globalization, the concept of “American Aid” played an important role as a fundamental part of the United States foreign policy. “Foreign aid” has been one of the invariables of American “foreign policy,” and ever since 1945 American governments have given out large quantities of “foreign aid” with the intention of realizing a chain of several “foreign policy goals” including “political influence” and financial growth. This mission has been carried out by means of “multilateral organizations”⁴ such as the World Bank, local “development banks,” the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the United Nations.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Robin Hannel describes the inequality created by the corporations of globalization: “The WTO, the IMF, and World Bank –the three most important internal economic institutions—are often described as ‘institutions of global governance’” See Robin Hannel. “Imperialism, Human Rights, and

In this project of foreign aid, the United States has been criticized because of moving in accordance with its own self-interests even for “humanitarian” purposes or with explanations such as to further “democracy,” “human rights,” and “environmental protection.” American economic strength was the factor which prompted American international influence, and the governments of the United States were in the view that foreign aid was “a good investment mainly for American people.” All were the initiatives of American foreign policy: the Marshall Plan and the aid programs, the American influence in the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in the following years, the forceful requirement for other countries to gain access to the American market in order to get “international” recognition, the perception of the United States as the example of “economic success” for the world, and the widespread disbursal of its resources by “private lenders” (Galbraith, 1992: 117). All these were carried out through financial assistance, given by means of investments which were considered a less expensive and intrusive means of reshaping the world in America’s image.

The practice, which started with the Marshall Plan and has continued in other poorer countries until today, can be explained as the “economic colonization” of modern world which is steadily becoming dependent on American global economic policies. Globalization is also noticeable by the political, cultural and economic “oppression,” “exploitation,” and “inequality” as in the “encounter between the colonizer and the colonized”. Like colonial times “the single power” rules the world and other countries serve as the rings of the global chain (Dirlik, 2002: 9, 13, 16, 17, and 23).

3.2. THE REPRESENTATION OF OTHER IN GLOBAL WORLD

“Third Worldism” emerges as the modern Postcolonial critical theory in the system of globalization. “Diasporic intellectuals,” “nativist traditionalism” and “national liberation struggles” of the countries which are once colonized, yet want to participate in globalization, react against globalization, (Dirlik, 2002: 10-11) and unlike the colonial world where hegemony was obtained through invasion of a land by means of abusing material and natural wealth, in a global world the media functions as

one of the basic means of creating hegemony dominated by American political, economic, and military control. In American society, the media serves as the main “sources of political information” with diverse forms of organizations and activities which affect not only political public opinion but also the way politics is handled (McQuail, 2000: 37). The giant effect of the “mass media” over politics and human relations is the result of the process of acquiring knowledge through media. Television, newspapers, radio, social networks shape the public mind and influence the history. This influence of the “mass-media”—namely the power to produce “cognitive change” in public opinion, to “structure” the way of conceiving, “attitude,” “behavior”—is called “agenda-setting function of mass communication” (McCombs and Shaw, 1984: 64-66).

The process of cognition, which includes “attention,” “awareness,” and “information”, is the mass media’s most important feature as it determines attitude and knowledge about political affairs. This process is regulated through the concepts of “stereotyping,” “status-conferral,” and “image-making”.⁵ Since knowledge is mostly gained from the mass media, it is a “second-hand reality” as reality loses its meaning due to the fact that media decides things to be covered and broadcasted. As a result of this, the public’s knowledge becomes an “edited” one (McCombs and Shaw, 1984: 66-67).

In his article, Stuart Hainsworth concentrates on the agenda setting function of the mass media shows. According to him, the media have an “ideological” role with the power of controlling and manipulating people. He says “The role of the media has to be taken into account within the context of the theory of hegemony due to of the value of the media and the public-imposed powers it yields”⁶. The media distribute the “dominant ideology”. In this perspective, Gramsci’s “theory of hegemony” is

⁵ “Status-conferral” is the ability of the media to influence the prominence of an individual (object) in the public eye. The concept of “stereotyping” describes the prominence of attributes such as “all Scots are thrifty”. Because of its overemphasis on a few “selected traits, it has been criticised as an invalid characterization. Thus the media have also been criticized for the continuation of stereotypes in newspapers, magazines, movies and on television. Lastly, the concept of “image-making” refers to the manipulation of the “salience” of both objects and attributes in order to increase public familiarity. See Maxwell E. McCombs and Donald L Shaw, “The Agenda-Setting Function of the Press,” *Media Power in Politics*, ed. Doris A. Graber (Washington D.C: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1984), 70.

⁶ For more information visit <http://www.cultsock.org/index.php?page=contributions/gramsci.html>.

significant since it shows how hegemony is created by means of the media. Antonio Gramsci applied hegemony to refer to the predomination of “one social class over others”. Hegemony consists of both “political and economic control” and the power of the “dominant class” to externalize “its own way of seeing the world” so that the “subordinated” classes adopt it as “common sense” and “natural” (Chandler, 2010: n. pg.). The common “consensus” is that the concept of “reality” as presented by the dominant classes is the one reasonable “way” of perceiving the world. Therefore, any group who has an “alternative” perspective is “marginalized”.⁷

The “Gramscian” hegemony theory principally suggests that “the cultural leadership” of the dominating social class in the construction of “generalized meanings” hence, the “consent” of the subordinated social classes to the existing organization of “social relations”. On hegemony, Strinati states

[d]ominant groups in society, including fundamentally but not exclusively the ruling class, maintain their dominance by securing the ‘spontaneous consent’ of subordinate groups, including the working class, through the negotiated construction of a political and ideological consensus which incorporates both dominant and dominated groups. (Stillo, 1999: n.pg.)

As it is seen, hegemony is provided and preserved by the consent of dominated classes. Yet, hegemony has always the potential for being endangered because “consent” is no a stable “peaceful” process. It is possible that the dominated resist “hegemony” and thus the “consensus” is interrupted.⁸ As a consequence, a period of “intellectual”, “physical”, “moral”, and “cultural” oppression emerges. (Stillo, 1999: n. pg.). Hegemony is the process of unceasing “struggle” against various resistances to the dominant ideology, and thus among “ideologies” rivaling for hegemony.⁹ Curran *et al.* argue that media institutions from a Gramscian point of view are considered being,

⁷ See Daniel Chandler. <http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/marxism/marxism10.html>.

⁸ See “Cultural Effects. Gramsci: Hegemony.” n. pag. 22.June.2010. <http://www.cultsock.ndirect.co.uk/MUHome/cshtml/index.html>.

⁹ Ibid.

locked into the power structure, and consequently as acting largely in tandem with the dominant institutions in society. The media thus reproduce the viewpoints of dominant institutions not as one among a number of alternative perspectives, but as the central and “obvious” or “natural” perspective. (Chandler, 2010: n. pg.)

Gramsci’s hegemony theory is important in enlightening the motives behind “racial representations”, which appear in the mass media, as they reflect the relationship between “culture” and “ideology” which is directed by the dominant culture (Mistry, 1999: n. pg.). There was a strict relationship between culture and literature starting from the period of colonization when literature was the representative of the dominant (Eurocentric) culture. This relationship is partially maintained through the media today. Therefore, the power belongs to the media in creating and supporting the ideas with “agenda-filled” and inclined writings and publications (Hainsworth, 2010: n. pg.). To conclude the dominant, preconditioned “racial representations”, present in the productions of popular culture such as on television, in newspapers, and in cinema, verifies Gramsci’s view (Mistry, 1999: n. pg.) that the media plays a vital role in constructing devices of oppression.

4. IN-BETWEENNESS and RESISTANCE in JEAN RHY'S *WIDE SARGASSO SEA*, ARUNDAHI ROY'S *THE GOD of SMALL THINGS* and JOHN UPDIKE'S *TERRORIST*

4.1. JEAN RHY'S *WIDE SARGASSO SEA*: CREOLE CULTURE, VODOO AND BLACK MAGIC

Being herself a Creole from Dominica, Jean Rhys was mainly concerned with asserting the cultural identity of the natives through her Creole heroine Antoinette. Her response to Brontë's novel came one hundred and nineteen years after the first novel's publication, to unveil the other side of the equation—the theme of empire that was repressed in *Jane Eyre*. In other words, Rhys continued her side of the story by giving voice to all those characters (mainly Bertha) who were originally silenced and excluded by Brontë. Antoinette's narrative spells out a different ideology and, by extension, a different representation of reality. The two novels together cover a period from the aftermath of slavery in Jamaica to the 19th century aristocracy in England.

Obviously, Rhys is interested in and not satisfied with the description of the Creole woman in *Jane Eyre*, and it seems to have stimulated her to write her story. Through her direct experience and knowledge of Dominica, Rhys imagines and describes the Creole woman's past life in Jamaica which was omitted in *Jane Eyre*. In a way, Jean Rhys seems to anticipate Edward Said's idea that although the Creoles were also of Western descent, they were "orientalized" by the Occidental. While Jean Rhys admired Charlotte Brontë and *Jane Eyre* which she had read in her childhood, she was always troubled by the characterization of Bertha. She voiced her displeasure in a letter to her friend Selma Vaz Dias in 1958:

I've read and re-read *Jane Eyre* . . . the Creole in Charlotte Brontë's novel is a lay figure—repulsive which does not matter, and not once alive, which does. She's necessary to the plot, but always she shrieks, howls, laughs horribly, attacks all and sundry—*off stage*. For me . . . she must be right *on stage*. She must be at least plausible, with a past,

the reason why Mr. Rochester treats her so abominably and feels justified, the reason why he thinks she is mad and why of course she goes mad, even the reason why she tries to set everything on fire and eventually succeeds. I do not see how Charlotte Brontë's madwoman could possibly convey all this. (Gregg, 1995: 82)

Rhys felt a personal challenge in Charlotte Brontë's negative depiction of Bertha Rochester, the madwoman in the attic, and the resulting *Wide Sargasso Sea* is Bertha's submerged history. Even the title of the novel is significant as a metaphor with far-reaching meanings. Deciding on this title has come to Rhys after a considerable concern. In a letter to her publisher in 1958, Rhys tells about how she decided to give her novel its title:

This is to tell you something about the novel I am trying to write provisional title "The First Mrs. Rochester." I mean, of course, the mad woman in "Jane Eyre." . . . I was thinking of something else and had a title for it, hadn't read "Jane Eyre" for years and nearly forgotten Creole. . . . I have no title yet. "The First Mrs. Rochester" is not right. Nor, of course is "Creole." That has a different meaning now. . . . I thought of "Sargasso Sea" or "Wide Sargasso Sea" but nobody knew what I meant. (Rhys, 1984: 153-54)

What "nobody knew" is this: Sargasso Sea refers to the area of water among the America, Europe and Africa. It is covered with a layer of sargassum, defined in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, as "any seaweed of the genus *Sargassum*, with berry-like air-vessels, found floating in island-like masses, esp. in the Sargasso Sea of the N. Atlantic" (1224). The origins of the sargassum in the Sargasso serve as a metaphor for the origins of many Afro-Caribbeans: it was torn from a land mass and thrown into a new geographical area to survive. Marking this, scientists think that the seaweed first came from the shores of the West Indies, after it had been torn loose by wind and waves. Currents bring the sargassum into the center of the Sargasso where, through the force of the winds and currents within the Sea, it generally lives out the rest of its life. The sargassum is forced to adapt itself to life at sea. Likewise,

Caribbean people and slaves, brought from Africa, had to adapt themselves to European rules and ways of life in order to survive.

Rhys tries to foreground the situation of those people by describing the complicated relationships among the society. In order to bring about the understanding of the society, she gives the reader clues about British, Creole, African Caribbean, living in the British Caribbean colony, and the colonial relation to the metropolis based on the historical background. Therefore, Rhys shows the situation of the Creole who as the former white slave-owner's descendant, is estranged from the Afro-Caribbeans, and as white West Indians, is also estranged from the English. Knowing the fact that this double alienation is never told in *Jane Eyre*, Rhys believed there were many "Berthas" and that in writing *Wide Sargasso Sea*, she was rehabilitating them all. She wrote in an unpublished letter to Vas Diaz,

But I believe and firmly too that there was more than one Antoinette. The West Indies was (were?) rich in those days for those days and there was no "married woman's property Act." The girls (very tiresome no doubt) would soon once in kind England be Address Unknown. So gossip. So a legend. If Charlotte Bronte took her horrible Bertha from this legend I have the right to take lost Antoinette. And hot to reconcile the two and fix dates I do not know—yet. But I will. (Rhys, 1984: 271)

It shows that while admitting the truth that there were Creole women, like Bertha, Rhys was distressed about the people who had not understood their situation. Rhys was troubled by Bertha's not being alive because she was a representative of Rhys' own class—white Creole women. Since its publication, great numbers of people had read *Jane Eyre*, and Rhys could not reconcile her own knowledge of Creole society with this widely read and believed portrayal. That Bronte's character was fictional did not alter Rhys' insistence that justice be done to Bertha. In fact, it may have strengthened her resolve, for she believed the link between fact and fiction, between truth and legend, to be an important factor in the images people have of themselves and of others. Because of what she knew to be true about Creole society,

Rhys wanted to right the “Creole scenes” that she felt Bronte had gotten all wrong. As she cannot rewrite the Creole scenes, Rhys creates Bertha/Antoinette’s entire story from the beginning. The novels which show the backstage of the colonial enterprise arise with the postcolonial understanding. These are the works in which the subjugated people themselves are given voice and existence. This shift in the point of view can be seen in Rhys’ *Wide Sargasso Sea*. By re-writing *Jane Eyre*, Jean Rhys emphasizes the role of the subordinate people by giving them voice and enabling them to speak for themselves.

In her novel, Rhys consciously reverses the order of narrative perspective in *Jane Eyre*. She reconstructs Antoinette Mason’s early life, the initial years of her marriage to Rochester, and the decaying family estate in Dominica. Furthermore, Rhys empowers Antoinette by giving her voice and allowing her to narrate her own story. Antoinette is the same woman who appears in Bronte’s novel as the voiceless Bertha, Rochester’s demented wife. Changing Antoinette’s name to Bertha in Bronte’s novel is part of a broader colonial behavior that tends to alienate the natives from their roots, traditions, culture, language and identity, as a way of imposing the dominant and disorienting habits of the Western world. According to Frantz Fanon, “Colonialism is not simply content to impose its rules upon the present and the future of the dominated country. Colonialism is not satisfied with merely holding the people in its grip and emptying the natives’ brains of all form and content, but is turned to the past of the oppressed people to distort, disfigure and destroy it” (Fanon, 1963: 210).

Edward Said emphasizes the importance of recognizing the interdependence of various histories on each other and of literature and the continuous progress of history. The English stayed in Jamaica for two centuries from 1655 and 1855, during which time “they enslaved the aborigines and exploited their land for their own personal interest” (Cundall, 1971: 6). As the aboriginal population declined due to the abuse and disease, slaves from West Africa were transported as “replacement.” Even after the emancipation of slaves in 1834, slaves were not completely free, for they were still not allowed to own land. Instead, they became indentured servants for

the whites (Bigelow, 2011: n. pag.). By hiring black servants for life, the English were attempting to restore slavery in an indirect way. In order to understand the complex relationship between the English and the Jamaicans, as well as among the English people themselves in Britain, it is important to provide a brief background of the social stratification in both England and Jamaica. The social stratification in England during the nineteenth century consisted of various layers and classes whose interests were either collusive or contradictory. As it is shown in Bronte's novel *Jane Eyre*, there is a disparity between the upper social class and the working class, which parallels, to a certain extent, the inequality between the English ruling class and the enslaved natives in Jamaica as represented in Rhys' novel. This correspondence between the English working class and slaves in Jamaica is mainly premised on their relationship with the English ruling class which, in both cases, is marked by dominance and submission. In Jamaica, there were three racial categories: the whites were the elite who controlled everything, the blacks were mainly slaves, and finally the browns or Creole who belonged neither to the whites nor to the blacks, but were somewhere between the two.

It is in this in-between category that Rhys locates her characters. *Wide Sargasso Sea* opens with the lines which describes the complicated relationships among people in the Caribbean area and between the colony and metropolis: "They say when trouble comes close ranks, and so the white people did. But we were not in their ranks. The Jamaican ladies had never approved of my mother, 'because she pretty like pretty self' Christophine said. She was my father's second wife, far too young for him they thought, and, worse still, a Martinique girl" (Rhys, 1966: 17). From the start, Antoinette and her family exceed racial categories of colonialism. They spill beyond the confines of white society and are certainly not part of the black society.

Yet their whiteness is also suspect. "We" in the above quote refers to the Creoles, who are not included in "the white people." "Trouble" seems to signify the Emancipation Act in 1833. Even after this event, "the white people" could stay in their ranks; however, Creoles like Antoinette's family are not regarded "the white people." "White Creoles" are separated from the English settlers within the context

of the island's histories and cultures. They descend from a superior class which no longer exists. Furthermore, as Antoinette's mother, Annette, shows as she is from Martinique, one of the former French Caribbean colonies, it is suggested that she also cannot blend in the Jamaican community. Just as Rhys says in her unfinished autobiography, *Smile Please* published posthumously in 1979, about the circumstances in the West Indies "it would all get twisted, as everything gets twisted in the West Indies" (Rhys, 1979: 85), the values of colonialists on which the plot and characters in *Jane Eyre* are based, are turned upside down. It seems that one of the problems of the Creole is that it is hard for her/him to identify with both English and Caribbean people. These socially and historically shaped complex relationships, for example, are non-existent in the text of *Jane Eyre*. Rhys fills in the blanks with her descriptions of these complicated relationships among British, Creole, African Caribbean living in the British Caribbean colony, and the colonial relation to the metropolis based on the historical background.

The situation of the Creole in Jamaica was, in certain ways, similar to the situation of the middle class that people like Jane Eyre inhabited in England. Both groups were undefined and both occupied an anomalous space in society. While the Creole oscillated between the whites and the blacks, the English middle-class was somewhere between the upper class and the working class. The ambiguity of Creole's status is represented in Rhys' novel through Antoinette who grows up at the time of emancipation in Jamaica and is caught in identity between the English colonialist and the black native. The experience of Antoinette is one of forced dependency and exclusion in patriarchal society represented by Rochester, who is the dominating figure in his homeland and in the colonies. In his attempt to dominate Antoinette, Rochester embodies a typical colonial and oppressive master. His relationship with Antoinette is based on absolute hierarchical distinction between the ruler and the ruled.

Although some critics like Robert Smith and Robert Hudson believe that it is the slave who makes history and not the master, both sides—the oppressor and the oppressed—contribute to the formation of history. Imperialism, after all, is a

cooperative venture. Both the master and the slave participate in it, and both grow up in it, albeit unequally. This interrelated relationship looks more or less dialectical, in that, if there was no capitalism, colonialism and imperialism, there would not have been any slavery, oppression and resistance. Oppression is an immediate consequence of domination. As violence increases on one side, resistance intensifies on the other to maintain equilibrium in the equation. History, which has so far been traced through the relationships between English and non-English as well as between male and female subjects, emphasizes the notion that the powerful side is the one whose voice is heard at the cost of obliterating the other, powerless side. The other is introduced into the European world in terms of sex, class and race origins and is often given a different status: marked sometimes by savagery, sometimes by madness, and at others by a transgressive sexuality. Similarly, by reversing and reconstructing a narrative perspective to demonstrate and emphasize the oppressed voice, Rhys makes the reader gain a different point of view that is not expressed in the colonial text.

The unequal relationships between men and women, as well as between the colonizer and the colonized, stem from the unequal distribution of power in England and Jamaica. Rhys' novel broaches the issue of colonialism and its inevitably devastating effects on the international world. The oppression of both women and colonized people by the white male ruling class signifies that both are powerless under the total domination of the white overseer who tends to treat them as others. The narrative of Rhys' novel dissolves the constraints of the unified imperialist discourse and dispels the assumptions advanced through Jane's voice regarding the image of the western self as superior to a colonial other who is often deemed primitive and not quite human. She obliterates the way in which the West contradistinguishes itself from the colonial others by projecting them as less intelligent and backward. Thus, the image that Rhys gives the Creole woman is the complete opposite of the one conferred on her by Bronte. As Coral A. Howells points the Creole woman turns from a "speechless raging monster" into a "speaking woman" (Howells, 1991: 108).

In order to understand this shift, it is important to show the deliberate difference in the presentation of the two female characters in *Jane Eyre*. While Jane is the main narrator of her story, the Jamaican Bertha Mason is deprived of this privilege in Brontë's novel, a narrative decision which renders her as a voiceless and selfless woman. In the novel, Bertha is differentiated through her inferior class and race, which in turn justifies her being totally silenced, isolated, and dehumanized. All information about her is rendered through the accounts of other characters, mainly her husband Edward Rochester and the servants; we never hear her voice. It is in this silence in the narrative that a significant strand of European imperialist ideology manifests itself. In the works of colonial Western writers, colonized people are reduced to powerless and speechless objects and are forced to submit to the will of others, as we will see in the case of Bertha. Whereas, from the postcolonial perspective, Jean Rhys reverses the order of the narrative perspective and allows her Jamaican heroine Antoinette to narrate her story from her own perspective, thus empowering her against colonial domination by granting her a voice and enabling her to represent herself. The power of language and the ability to narrate one's own story becomes Antoinette's strategy of survival which is an act of self-assertion in a world dominated by the white man's ruling class where she is silenced by the dominant colonial power. Therefore, the novel emerges from the voices of those who were originally deprived and silenced.

To free Antoinette/Bertha, however, Rhys first reconstructs her island setting. In doing so, she may seem to be reproducing many of the stereotypes Europeans have had about the islands. The jungle is dense, exotic, mysterious, and sexual in nature. Antoinette feels at home in this wild atmosphere, even linking the garden behind the damaged Coulibri with the Garden of Eden. She says that it was "large and beautiful as that garden in the Bible . . . But it had gone wild. The paths were overgrown and a smell of dead flowers mixed with the fresh living smell" (Rhys, 1966: 19). For her husband in contrast, the island is first excessive and then tiresome. He says in the days after his marriage, "Everything is too much . . . Too much blue, too much purple, too much green. The flowers too red, the mountains too high, the

hills to near” (Rhys, 1966: 70). His reactions to the island also reproduce a stereotype: a European other who is a complete stranger to the island.

Besides her treatment of Antoinette and Rochester, Rhys revises Bronte’s text by breaking up the authority of the imperialist discourse permeating Jane’s narrative. To do so, Rhys uses a triadic narrative technique in which the narration is not rendered by one absolute speaker but is, instead, dispersed among three voices to dilute the intensity of the colonial perspective. This triadic narrative technique is apparent throughout the second part of Rhys’ novel, in which Rochester’s imperialist discourse is constantly interrupted from within by Antoinette’s and Christophine’s assertive voices. Furthermore, Rhys dispels the constraints imposed on the Creole woman in the earlier novel and constructs an adequate space for self-expression by correcting Bronte’s representation of her and her land. Finally, the effect of Rhys’ re-writing of Bronte’s text is to affirm, through Antoinette’s voice, that “There is always the other side, always” (Rhys, 1966: 128).

Wide Sargasso Sea begins with Antoinette’s childhood recognition that she and her family are different from everyone else in Jamaica, and hence outsiders:

They say when trouble comes close ranks, and so the white people did. but we were not in their ranks. The Jamaican ladies had never approved of my mother, “because she pretty like pretty self” Christophine said. She was my father’s second wife, far too young for him they thought, and worse still a Martinique girl. When I asked her why so few people came to see us, she told me that the road from Spanish Town to Coulibri Estate where we lived was very bad and that road repairing was now a thing of the past. (My father, visitors, horses, feeling safe in bed—all belonged to the past.) (Rhys, 1966:17)

Since her childhood, Antoinette’s feelings of rejection and marginality in relation to her family and to the people around her are intensified by her experience as a Creole. As a child, Antoinette notices that nobody comes to visit them, and that the Jamaican ladies do not approve of her mother, who is originally from Martinique.

In fact, Annette, Antoinette's mother, is doubly rejected. She is isolated from the black women, who consider her as an outsider, and excluded from the white community because of her being a French West Indian woman in a British West Indian colony. In Antoinette and her mother, the reader can feel a deep yearning for human contact and security. Antoinette acknowledges: "My father, visitors, horses, feeling safe in bed – all belonged to the past" (Rhys, 1966: 17) before the decline of the family estate. Antoinette and her Creole mother are ostracized by expatriate whites and despised by their black servants. They are literary suspended between the two races and isolated from both, the blacks calling them "white cockroaches" and the whites referring to them as "white niggers." Antoinette's undefined race is a major dilemma in her life as she declares: "So between you I often wonder who I am and where is my country and where I belong and why I was ever born at all" (Rhys, 1966: 102).

The rejection of mother and daughter by their "community" refers basically to the socio-economic and political changes that have taken place after the abolition of slavery. As old colonizers, Antoinette and her mother are caught up between the former slaves who do not want them any more in the island and the new colonizers who are still coming from England to replace the old ones. Despite the abolition of slavery, the human relationships in the historical context of *Wide Sargasso Sea* are constructed, for the most part, within a complicated system of racial and class differences. Antoinette's nurse, Christophine, for instance, is a wedding gift to Annette who chooses to remain with the Cosways and later on with the Masons even after emancipation. Annette says: "Christophine stayed with me because she wanted to stay. She had her own very good reasons you may be sure. I dare say we would have died if she'd turned against us and that would have been a better fate" (Rhys, 1966: 21). Christophine's good reasons mark a relationship of intense dependency, for she moves from being a slave to become Antoinette's nurse, which in a sense indicates the continuity between slavery and post-slavery conditions. Regarding other freed persons, Annette says angrily, "They stayed, because they wanted somewhere to sleep and something to eat" (Rhys, 1966: 22). This also shows that the abolition of slavery did not eliminate the master/slave relationship of the past

because it did not ameliorate the situation of blacks in the West Indies, and neither did it offer them better choices. Instead, slaves became indentured servants for the same master, a relation which enforced class and racial inferiority years after emancipation.

Selwyn R. Cudjoe states that in *Wide Sargasso Sea* Rhys “describes the way members of white society saw their position being eroded following emancipation as they became the hated other. The colonizer had become (or certainly was made to feel like) the colonized” (Cudjoe, 1980: 19). This law provided for four years of “apprenticeship” for the freed slaves, which was supposed to facilitate the transition and defuse the expected backlash from plantation owners and slaves alike. However, this period merely extended the slaves’ suffering, for the economy collapsed as a result of the disrupted agricultural system and the desperate plantation owners found new ways to punish and mistreat their new employees. The Cosways poverty in this period, together with the lack of male protection and the foreign status of Antoinette’s mother, means that they live estranged from both blacks and new whites, and held in contempt by both.

When Annette’s horse is poisoned, effectively cutting her off from the outside world, she says “Now we are marooned” (Rhys, 1966: 18), a statement that quite clearly links the family to the famous groups of Maroons. Mary Emery states in her article: “Original inhabitants of the islands, the Maroons, or Caribs, who survived the genocidal tactics of the colonizers, fled to the mountains where they carried on persistent guerrilla warfare . . . In San Domingo, the Maroons attempted to destroy their oppressors by poisoning not only the whites but their disobedient followers” (Rhys, 1966: 426). It seems ironic that a white woman who lives on a former plantation estate in a way aligns herself with the Maroons who fought the former plantation owners, but her isolation as a Martinique woman in Jamaica and the ostracism she suffers at the hands of the Jamaican white Creoles make her a victim of white society also. Rhys deliberately has Annette Cosway liken herself to the Maroons; a strategy to find a place for white Creole women in a hybrid West Indian society.

Rhys symbolizes the split between the black and white world in Jamaica by constructing a polarity between black and white mother figures for Antoinette: her white mother and the black housekeeper, Christophine. The neglect and disapprobation of white society, and the lack of parental affection, serve as forces that drive Rhys' protagonist to search for love and warmth in the black community. Rhys allows her white Creole protagonist to find happiness only within the black West Indian culture; Christophine, like Antoinette's mother, is originally from Martinique and consequently regarded as a foreigner by the Jamaican blacks, yet she alone among the characters (partially because of her unique status as an Obeah woman) manages to convert her subaltern status into power. Her experience of alienation enables her to sympathize with Antoinette's loneliness, and she attempts to alleviate it by providing Antoinette with a black friend:

I never looked at any strange negro. They hated us. They called us white cockroaches. Let sleeping dogs lie. One day a little girl followed me singing, "Go away white cockroach, go away." I walked fast, but she walked faster. "white cockroach, go away, go away. Nobody want you. Go away."

When I was safely home I sat close to the old wall at the end of the garden. It was covered with green moss soft as velvet and I never wanted to move again. Everything would be worse if I moved. Christophine found me there when it was nearly dark, and I was so stiff she had to help me to get up. She said nothing, but next morning Tia was in the kitchen with her mother Maillotte, Christophine's friend. Soon Tia was my friend and I met her nearly every morning at the turn of the road to the river. (Rhys, 1966: 23)

Tia provides a brief episode of friendship and companionship in Antoinette's childhood, but her relationship with Tia teaches her that racial differences can provide impassable obstacles in her world. Antoinette admires Tia for her capacity for survival—"fires always lit for her, sharp stones did not hurt her bare feet, I never saw her cry" (Rhys, 1966: 23)—but her meetings and games always take place on Tia's territory, and "Late or early we parted at the turn of the road" (Rhys, 1966: 23), as if their relationship were off-limits.

Indeed, despite Antoinette's yearnings to be a part of the black Creole community, Rhys emphasizes that race and history divide Tia and Antoinette. When Tia tricks Antoinette out of a few old pennies, given to her by Christophine, Antoinette reacts automatically by calling her a "cheating nigger." This racist slur prompts an answering stream of racist insults from Tia, obviously learnt from her elders, in which she declares that Antoinette's family is impoverished beggars: "Plenty white people in Jamaica. Real white people, they got gold money. They didn't look at us, nobody see them come near us. Old time white people nothing but white nigger now, and black nigger better than white nigger" (Rhys, 1966: 24).

As if to show Antoinette's reduced status on the social scale, Antoinette has to wear Tia's dirty dress after Tia steals her clothes. Tia's speech makes a perceptive distinction between the old planter class and the new English investors in post-Emancipation Jamaica, the neo-colonists like the Mason family, who are now the new elite, or "real white people," because they are wealthy. The old plantation owners, such as the Cosways, now inhabit a tenuous position in the Jamaican social hierarchy, because their poverty "lowers" them into "white niggers" a status that the blacks consider lower even than themselves. These sneers are fitting revenge for the years of enslavement and exploitation by the plantation owners.

Antoinette sees Tia only once again, and this meeting confirms that while they share so many childhood experiences and desires, the racial history of the island prevents the children's full intimacy. The burning of Coulibri is the culmination of a brief period of prosperity after Antoinette's mother marries Mr. Mason; he uses his wealth to restore the estate and introduce a neo-colonial order. Mason carelessly speaks in front of a new house servant of his plans to import indentured East Indian laborers to work on the plantation, and she reports this to her fellow workers. That night an angry group of laborers torches the Coulibri great house and forces the family to flee. As Antoinette watches her home destroyed, she clings in vain to Tia and the memories of the past:

Then, not so far off, I saw Tia and her mother and I ran to her, for she was all that was left of my life as it had been. We had eaten the same

food, slept side by side, bathed in the same river. As I ran, I thought, I will live with Tia and I will be like her. Not to leave Coulibri. Not to go. Not. When I was close I saw the jagged stone in her hand but I did not see her throw it. I did not feel it either, only something wet, running down my face. I looked at her and I saw her face crumple up as she began to cry. We stared at each other, blood on my face, tears on hers. It was as if I saw myself. Like in a looking glass. (Rhys, 1966: 45)

The lives of the two Creole girls are linked through their personal and colonial pasts, but at present it is a link of mutual suffering and violence. In the confrontation between white and black in the West Indies, even the children are contaminated by the colonial history that still endures; the whites still bear the marks of brutality (“blood on my face”), while the blacks still carry the memories of suffering (“tears on hers”). While Tia and Antoinette can recognize themselves in the other, they cannot cross the boundaries of race and class. Rhys portrays this tragedy of alienation; both children are uncomprehending of the forces that control them and their reactions to each other, but both must suffer as victims of an inhumane colonial structure. The breakdown of Antoinette’s and Tia’s friendship is perceived by critic Teresa O’Connor as “a symbol of the breakdown of the relationship between the whites and blacks following the abolition of slavery” (O’Connor, 1986: 198). Antoinette returns to her loneliness and isolation, especially when the few people in her life abandon her all at once. It appears that Rhys cannot foresee a healing of the split in West Indian society, nor can she envisage a home for the white Creoles who have chosen to live in this post-Emancipation world.

If this friendship with Tia exposes the destructiveness of racial barriers in the colony, the tragic fate of Antoinette’s mother shows the commodification of women in a patriarchal colonial society. After the death of Antoinette’s father, Cosway, and after the abolition of slavery, the family estate declines, and the blacks most violent revolt comes only after Annette’s marriage to the new English colonialist, Mr. Mason. Annette’s second marriage saves her momentarily from social and economic

ruin by restoring her to the status of the planter class, but leads to her destruction later on. Shortly after their marriage, one of the natives observes that Mr. Mason came to the West Indies “to make money as they all do. Some of the big estates are going cheap, and one unfortunate’s loss is always a clever man’s gain” (Rhys, 1966: 30). Mr. Mason represents a typical English imperialist who still seeks to dominate the economic life of the colonies even after plantation slavery has formally ended. Annette tries to warn her husband that the blacks will not accept a new English imperialist. She repeatedly begs that they should leave the island. Yet, as Edward Said states in his book *Orientalism* “the Orient [represented by Annette] was weaker than the West [represented by Mason], which elided the Orient’s difference with its weakness” (Said, 1994: 204), Mr. Mason does not listen to his wife; he believes that his knowledge of the black people is superior to hers. His unwillingness to listen to Annette indicates an oppressive relationship, in which the dominant male character tends to believe that he is right and everyone else wrong.

It is a relationship that lacks trust and mutual understanding between the old colonizer, Annette, and the new one, Mr. Mason, an opposition which foreshadows the relationship between Antoinette and Rochester. Besides ignoring his wife’s point of view, Mr. Mason also refuses to listen to Aunt Cora’s warning to avoid discussing his plan of hiring new blacks in the presence of a black servant. The advice is excellent, but he does not want to believe anything that contradicts his sense of self-interest. This selfish imperial desires lead to the blacks’ violent revolt against them, which culminates in the burning of Coulibri. Annette loses her mind on the violent night of destruction at Coulibri when her beloved son, Pierre, dies. She hurls curses on her husband, calling him a cruel stupid fool: “I told you what would happen again and again . . . You would not listen, you sneered at me, you grinning hypocrite, you ought not live either, you know so much, don’t you?” (Rhys, 1966: 40).

Her anger is directed at Mason, who refuses to understand the depth of the black’s hatred for them, but he spirits her away to the country where she is virtually held prisoner by two black caretakers. This development is another ironic reflection of colonial times, inverting the exploitation of black slaves by their white masters,

and it also prefigures the future imprisonment of Antoinette in a world of strangers. When women lose their monetary value or beauty in such a society, or refuse to observe conventions, they can always be labeled as mad, then locked away and forgotten about. Mr. Mason has plans for Antoinette, which require her isolation from people she knew. Therefore, for Antoinette's part, it is not madness but after her recovery she, like her mother, is temporarily "imprisoned" by Mr. Mason, albeit in a convent, in order to protect and prepare her for a financially advantageous marriage. Antoinette recognizes the suppression of life that existence demands: "The convent was my refuge, a place of sunshine and of death" (Rhys, 1966: 56). This benign attempt at protection by Mason is only a way of preserving Antoinette as an innocent and unspoiled girl in order that she will fetch a higher price on the marriage market. In her new persona by naming as Antoinette Mason, she will be disposed of according to the patriarchal norms of English society.

Part I of *Wide Sargasso Sea* ends with the comforting words of one of the nuns to the troubled Antoinette: "Soon it will be tomorrow morning" (Rhys, 1966: 61). However this promise is in contrast to the opening paragraph of Part II, which paradoxically begins with an ending: "So it was all over, the advance and retreat, the doubts and the hesitations. Everything finished, for better or for worse" (Rhys, 1966: 65). These images of war seem inconsistent until the next sentence where Rochester, Antoinette's new husband, assumes control of the narrative. *Wide Sargasso Sea* is the only novel that Jean Rhys constructs with multiple perspectives, and that allows a male character to tell his side of the story. While this shift creates a more sympathetic understanding of Rochester's actions, the change in narrative perspective also temporarily distances the reader from the protagonist. Antoinette seems even more dehumanized and victimized by circumstances beyond her control, not even able to narrate or interpret the events of her marriage and honeymoon. Yet, Rhys shows us that Rochester an unlucky second son trapped in the British system of primogeniture is also a pawn in the capitalist-colonial system, so that the relationships between exploiter and exploited, master and servant, are far more complicated and interdependent than they might seem. The definitions of colonizer and the colonized depend on a process that turns each side into the Other, and Rhys

illustrates that none of them is capable of understanding or being sympathetic to the Other in a hierarchical power structure. Rhys practices a strategy that embodies the conflict between the victim and the victimizer to show their mutual suffering and humiliation.

The control of the narrative by Rochester's male voice enacts a political act of dominance by the British imperial force over the West Indian colony, which is paralleled by the dominance of the man over the woman in a patriarchal society. Rochester's intervention also signals the narrative dominance of the resistant colonial text by the traditional European form. The plot of *Jane Eyre* begins to direct Antoinette Cosway's development for she must become the creature portrayed by Charlotte Brontë. Therefore, Rochester's male voice embodies the English literary tradition which Rhys wants to undermine with her novel; in Part II, he asserts his dominance over the female colonial's counter-narrative. Much like Mason's disastrous stance of benevolent paternalism, Rochester's reactions to the island dramatize the fact that English visitors and new immigrants lack the understanding of island culture and its people. Unlike Antoinette, who has learnt long ago to live in her environment without making it obey her, Rochester sees himself facing a hostile force which may prove unbending in front of his will to dominate. Antoinette has learned to have no illusions about her place in her beloved island, in contrast to Rochester who as the typical colonizer, wishes to subdue or own the land, exactly as he wishes to subdue or own Antoinette:

"I feel very much stranger here," I said. "I feel that this place is my enemy and on your side."

"You are very much mistaken," she said. "It is not for you and not for me. It has nothing to do with either of us. That is why you are afraid of it, because it is something else. I found that out long ago when I was a child. I loved it because I had nothing else to love, but it is as indifferent as this God you call on so often." (Rhys, 1966: 104)

While she feels that she has been traded like a piece of merchandise in this marriage, we discover that Rochester also feels manipulated and bought. As the

second son of English man, Edward Rochester will not inherit the family wealth, and he considers himself slighted both by his father and his elder brother. In the case of Rochester, Rhys portrays how the hierarchical organization of British patriarchy and its inflexible inheritance system fed into the colonial system: second sons who could not expect to inherit the family wealth frequently enter the colonial service to support themselves. Rochester, therefore, feels victimized by a society that has regarded him as second-rate since birth and it is this circumstances that has brought him to Jamaica as the selected husband for Antoinette:

I have not bought her, she has bought me, or so she thinks. I looked down at the coarse mane of the horse . . . Dear father. The thirty thousand pounds has been paid to me without question or condition. No provision made for her (that must be seen to). I have a modest competence now. I will never be a disgrace to you or to my dear brother the son you love. No begging letters, no mean requests. None of the furtive shabby manoeuvres of a younger son. I have sold my soul or you have sold it, and after all is such a bad bargain? The girl is thought to be beautiful. And yet... (Rhys, 1966: 70)

In the world of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, the discourse of Antoinette and Rochester is in a violent conflict. While Rochester maintains a white male imperialist stance, Antoinette attempts to preserve the integrity of her own self. The result is that both stand in a binary cultural opposition. Rochester is incapable of seeing Antoinette's moral superiority. Being brought up to respect and fear English society and its rigid mores and class system, he is aware that Antoinette does not fit the pattern of a model English lady. He lacks the self-confidence and independent judgment that would allow him to value her for her beauty and dignity; instead, he finds her exotic and alien, as in the description he gives of Antoinette's eyes: "Long, sad, dark alien eyes. Creole of pure English descent she may be, but they are not English or European either (Rhys, 1966: 73). Unable to appreciate the gifts that she brings him, he uses them against her in order to assert control over her. In this way, he can feel himself master of the situation, instead of the paid servant; in other words, in order to avoid being the victim, he becomes the victimizer. It is their joint tragedy that no one

can envision a relationship built on equality rather than hierarchy and exploitation. Their relationship follows the patterns provided by colonial history as it replicates the old master- slave relationship: “Their marriage, an exchange of property and sexuality, repeats master/slave relations; husband and wife enact the traditional rites of possession and revolt” (Emery, 1982: 427).

Rochester’s lack of understanding is challenged by imposing Christophine, a strong and independent black woman who seems unaffected by the divisions of race and class. Her freedom is in ironic contrast to Antoinette’s lack of freedom as a white Creole woman. Indeed, Christophine is disgusted to hear that English law makes wives into their husband’s dependants and deprives them of economic independence: “She spat over her shoulder. ‘All women, all colours, nothing but fools. Three children I have. One living in this world, each one a different father, but no husband, I thank my God. I keep my money. I don’t give it to no worthless man” (Rhys, 1966: 109-110). Ironically, this black servant is freer than her mistress. Christophine is also not deceived into believing that the Emancipation laws have brought any justice to the islands. She realizes that the new face of postcolonialism has enslaved the blacks as effectively as the old times. “No more slavery!” She had to laugh! “These new ones have Letter of the Law. Same thing. They got magistrate. They got fine. They got jail house and chain gang. They got tread machines to mash up people’s feet. New ones worse than old ones – more cunning, that’s all” (Rhys, 1966: 26).

Intelligent, brave and imposing as she is, Christophine poses a threat to the white establishment, and also to Rochester’s plans for complete control of Antoinette. Antoinette’s inability to regain control of her life in Part II is signalled by Rochester’s almost complete control of the narrative perspective. She is able to tell her story only for a brief episode when she visits Christophine for a love potion.

“It was a song about a white cockroach. That’s me. That’s what they call all of us who were here before their own people in Africa sold them to slave traders. And I’ve heard English women call us white niggers. So between you I often wonder who I am and where is my

country and where do I belong and why was I ever born at all...”
(Rhys, 1966:102)

This desperate outburst from Antoinette is a consummate expression of the historical and social forces that create the sense of alienation and marginality that white Creoles feel, caught between a hostile black Creole community that resents their former power and English pretensions, and a contemptuous English society that regards them as uncultured and alien. Granbois, once one of the few places where Antoinette felt she belonged now becomes somewhere else she becomes unhappy and when Christophine leaves, Antoinette has no refuge left.

The conclusion of Part II brings the “real” death of Antoinette Cosway, the formerly unwritten story of the consequences of English patriarchy and imperialism, while Part III tells the story of the death “people knew about.” The reader witnesses how Antoinette Cosway turns into Bertha Mason that Charlotte Bronte constructed. The last section of *Wide Sargasso Sea* brings Antoinette into confrontation with Rochester’s cold English world, the center of imperial values and a prison house for the white Creole woman. Rochester’s recedes from the narrative in this final section, having successfully destroyed Antoinette’s identity and all her links with the past. An unknown outsider’s voice—Grace Poole, summarizes the time that has passed since Antoinette’s arrival in England. The reader learns from Grace that Antoinette’s sense of freedom and defiance apparently live on in Bertha Mason. It appears that male society’s only solution to the existence of beautiful young women, who will not conform, like Antoinette and her mother, is to isolate them from others.

When she is confined to the attic of Thornfield Hall, Antoinette’s sense of alienation is compounded when Rochester begins to call her Bertha. Antoinette struggles to restore her own identity. She is aware of the importance of her true name for her sense of identity, insisting that “Names matter, like when he wouldn’t call me Antoinette, and I saw Antoinette drifting out of the window with her scents, her pretty clothes and her looking glass” (Rhys, 1966: 180). Edward Brathwaite explains that in West Indies “People feel that a name is so important that a change in his name

could transform a person's life" (Brathwaite, 1974: 237). This is a final blow to Antoinette's identity, because she cannot recognize herself as Bertha Mason.

Yet despite her restricted life at Thornfield Hall, Antoinette once again resumes control of the narrative, and her supposedly insane perspective provides a perceptive critique of the society that expels her. At night, symbolically the time for the eruption of the suppressed unconscious in dreams, she steals the keys from the drunken, sleeping Grace and explores the house, which convinces her that "It is, as I always knew, made of cardboard" (Rhys, 1966: 180), because, as she realizes, it is based on "Gold . . . the idol they build worship" (Rhys, 1966: 180). At the expense of Antoinette in this case, Rochester, the representative of the Western ideology is only interested in his being rich. Therefore, Antoinette's realization is a good description of a society that is built on exploitation.

Antoinette has no place to go in this patriarchal society in which man protecting man. On her brother's visit to Thornfield Hall, Antoinette gets angry with Richard's lack of communication. Grace Poole considers Antoinette's physical attack on her brother Richard Mason inexplicably violent; the reader understands her motivation perfectly on hearing Grace's description of the occasion:

I was in the room but I didn't hear all he said except "I cannot interfere legally between yourself and your husband." It was when he said "legally" that you flew at him and when he twisted the knife out of your hand you bit him" (Rhys, 1966: 184).

That white man's law is a protection for the rich and powerful against the poor and helpless. In Richard's eagerness to take back Antoinette, he did not ensure that Antoinette was independently provided for in the marriage agreement with Rochester. As a result he is directly responsible for her present condition, and therefore deserves her attack.

Out of Antoinette's troubled dreams comes the solution to her suffering, and the means to expose the fragility of English society structures. Her final dream in the novel is not just a warning, like earlier dreams, but a prophecy: it provides her with

the scenario for escape. When she was working at cross-stitch in the convent, Antoinette would sign her name to the piece “in fire red” (Rhys, 1966: 53); now the burning of Thornfield Hall is revealed to her in her dream vision as her final signature piece, in which she will destroy the cardboard world with her favorite fiery red, “the colour of flamboyant flowers” (Rhys, 1966: 185). Antoinette finally learns how to avenge the wrongs perpetrated on her by a patriarchal world, as Tia learned to strike back at a colonial society that silenced and exploited her. Patriarchy and colonialism have colluded to transform Antoinette Cosway into Bertha Mason and her final act of destruction strikes at the heart of both these power structures. For Thornfield Hall is the concrete manifestation of Rochester’s inheritance from his father, and the culmination of the Rochester’s fortunes made from colonial wealth, Antoinette’s final act of defiance overturns the past history in which she was the helpless watcher of Coulibri’s destruction. Antoinette, like slaves in Jamaica, shows a colonial struggle in England. Just as the black mob burnt down Coulibri, Antoinette’s home, as the symbol of white exploitation and colonialism in Jamaica, so Antoinette will burn down Thornfield Hall, Rochester’s home, as the symbol of white male domination and exploitation in England, with its clear connections to the structures of colonialism. The decision to burn down Thornfield Hall is a triumph for her because it signifies definite self-assertion. In other words Antoinette’s last act is a fatalistic attempt to reject the constraints of the imperialist discourse.

This act of destruction is also an act of reconciliation, then, the political message of which seems to be that white Creole women have more chance of rapport with black Creole women than with their English counterparts. So Rhys transforms the tragedy of Jane Eyre into the personal and political triumph of a woman who overcomes persecution and exploitation in order to return to her island heritage, or as Helen Tiffin states, Antoinette’s final act “is a ceremonial, a religious reconciliation of a woman and her land” (Tiffin: 1995: 340). Antoinette is nowhere so sure of her actions, and so close to home as when she sets out a construction of wealth—Thornfield Hall of British imperialism. In this way an act of self-destruction achieves wider political dimensions, and an act of apparent madness is revealed as completely logical.

Wide Sargasso Sea does not end with the death of Antoinette Cosway, but with her decision to seize the initiative and boldly confront her own destiny at last: “Now at last I know why I was brought here and what I have to do. There must have been a draught for the flame flickered and I thought it was out. But I shielded it with my hand and it burned up again to light me along the dark passage” (Rhys, 1966: 190). Rhys leaves her protagonist a tiny ray of light to guide her hopes. For Antoinette, at least, the darkness of ignorance, despair and death are finally illuminated by the light of self-knowledge and revolt, yet this final intervention on her part brings death as its consequence. Jean Rhys envisions no way in which the colonial white West Indian woman can escape her imprisonment in the prevailing social structure, except through death and destruction. Antoinette can return to her beloved islands and the friends of her childhood only in death and dreams. Indeed, in such a repressive world order power can be seized from others by force; we are reminded of Frantz Fanon’s words that “[d]ecolonization is always a violent phenomenon” (Fanon, 1963: 35).

Ironically, the novel ends with a common narrative device for romance novels: “Wide Sargasso Sea concludes with a dream come true” (Emery, 1990: 425), but the dream brings with it no tactic for successful socialization nor does it unite the hero and heroine in a romance. This is a dream of destruction, rebellion and patriarchy that keep her captive, and undermines the literary forms that were designed to contain her narrative of resistance. And yet Rhys had to limit her text within the parameters of the narrative that Charlotte Brontë constructed; even though Rhys transforms and politicizes the story by portraying the other side, Antoinette Cosway must die because Brontë decreed it. In this sense, both Rhys and Antoinette are still held captive within the imperial master narrative, even if they partially manage to re-direct its focus and undermine its monolithic force.

Antoinette does not manage to heal the split in their lives between the West Indies and England, past identity and present, childhood and adulthood. While Rhys shows in the structure of the novel that personal and political history are intimately related. Antoinette does not fit the mould of English womanhood; she was also

portrayed as outsider in the islands communities. Her white skin and English cultural heritage mark her as colonial exploiters, while her gender and Creole background mark her as marginal in the island. Her desire to fit into both the island community and the English culture, results in fitting into neither. For “white cockroaches,” or “white niggers,” there is no place in a racially segregated and hierarchical society. Therefore, Antoinette’s resistance to the dominant power is to achieve self-recognition along with cultural liberation.

4.2. ARUNDHATI ROY’S THE GOD OF SMALL THINGS: UPPER INDIAN CASTES AND RECLAIMING THE PAST THROUGH STORYTELLING

Like other postcolonial writings, Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things* shows that colonialism has brought changes that have in turn led to the emergence of new means of oppression throughout the world. In the portrayal of her protagonist Ammu and her situation in life and society, Roy presents particularly the dissatisfaction of women in postcolonial India. By choosing a South Indian Syrian Christian family to examine the workings of patriarchy, caste politics, Eurocentrism, and Marxism in a postcolonial society, Roy depicts postcolonial Indian society as continuing the colonization of women. *The God of Small Things* tells the tale of disintegration of a family, a tale of callous casteism of a supposedly casteless Christianity, of abuse of Marxist ideology as practiced by the people of Ayemenem, a small province in Kerala¹. The narrative in *The God of Small Things* resolves around both an understanding of the marginalization of Ammu and is an attempt to make hear her voice. Therefore, the novel is a protest against patriarchy that destroys the dreams of a woman and her life, and like Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Ammu’s short life can be read as a protest against patriarchy and colonization.

¹ Kerala, the setting for the novel, has been called one of the more liberal states in India and one in which the position of women is comparatively positive. Vanessa Baird in *Respect and Respectability* reports that “on paper the women of Kerala are much better off than their sisters in the rest of India” (1)

Ammu is the daughter of an upper-caste traditional family that is highly respectable, once economically powerful and politically influential. Ammu's father was an Imperial Entomologist; her grandfather, Reverend John Ipe, was called out of respect "the Little Blessed One," and Chacko, Ammu's brother, the last in the patriarchal line of the family, is a highly influential landlord and a Rhodes Scholar who attended Oxford. The family owns a pickle factory, rice and rubber plantations. Ammu, the daughter of this prestigious upper caste family, cannot avoid being subjected to male oppression at her paternal home. In this family, caste, gender, and the mix of English and Indian culture all blend to cast Ammu in a role in which she needs to be the voice of oppressed women. Sharing a second class position in her family along with her mother, Ammu tries to break the chains that tie her down to the strict rules of the caste system by marrying outside her caste only to be disappointed again by her husband's abuse. Coming back to her paternal home with her precocious twins, Estha and Rahel, Ammu is expected to bow down to the dictates of her destiny. But her last act is a total rebellion against the norms that shape her social environment: she has an affair with an Untouchable, but not only she and her lover Velutha but also her children pay dearly for this final transgression.

Although it seems that *The God of Small Things* is narrated by an omniscient, third-person narrator, the story unfolds in relation to Rahel's, and later Rahel and Estha's, memories. Estha and Rahel share their memories throughout the novel, as one twin engages memories of the past, the other shares those memories. It is actually Rahel who narrates the memories of the past to tell the horror, terror, and oppression the twins face as children. She reconstructs the family's story, sifting through her and her twin brother's memories and challenging the version that condemned their mother and caused their suffering and finally offering an alternative narrative for the reader, for she has not "pickled, sealed, and put away" her memories like her twin (Roy, 1997: 183). In Arundhati Roy's novel, storytelling thus becomes the tool that defies the social norms that confine individuals in roles that they are unable and/or reluctant to perform and restrict their free self-expression.

The novel presents its tragic tale of transgression and violent punishment by splitting the story into two separate but intertwining narrative strands: one moving back in time to revisit the past, and the other moving forward, both strands being set in motion by Rahel's return to Ayemenem at the beginning of the novel. The first narrative strand retrospectively recounts the life-changing events of a two-week period in the year 1969 in the lives of the twins: the death by drowning of their half-white English cousin Sophie Mol, the killing of Velutha, (and a year later the death of Ammu as well), and the separation of the twins who had once "thought of themselves together as Me, and separately, individually, as We or Us" (Roy, 1997: 2). The second strand tracks the slow and tortured reconciliation of the trauma-scarred twins when they meet again twenty three years later, through a shared recollection of the events comprising the first strand. The dual narrative structure allows Roy to capture the chronological movement of memory as it reconstitutes moments from the past and "imbue[s] them with new meaning" (Roy, 1997: 32). As the novel progresses, while she fills in the missing plot and narrative of her family's life, simultaneously her ability to engage in memory in a way that leads to understanding becomes more prominent. As the novel goes back in time to unravel the happenings, the story that emerges tells of the doomed desire between the upper-caste Ammu and the lower caste Velutha.

As the title of the novel suggests, Arundhati Roy allows "small things" to have voice and narrate their stories. As such, "small things" in the title of the novel points towards Roy's concentration on the people and aspects of life that have been trodden under, rejected, and rendered invisible and insignificant by the large and dominating systems. Fred Dallmayr in *But on a Quiet Day* comments that Roy's concern with the small and ordinary lives is in fact an inversion of the general cultural preoccupation with bigness or greatness. Anurahda Dingwaney Needham in *The Small Voice of History in Arundhati Roy's the God of Small Things* analyzes Roy's "deployment of the small—that is subordinated or subaltern subjects—to be integral to Roy's critique of dominant existing social and political arrangements and modes of writing" (Needham, 2005: 371). Upon being asked about the meaning of the title, the author answered that "To me the god of small things is the inversion of

God. God's big thing and God's in control . . . in these small events and in these small lives the world intrudes . . . the world and the social machinery intrudes into the smallest, deepest core of their being and charge their life" (Simmons, 2005: 4). Nazma Malik argues that "*The God Small Things* is about the violence inherent in traditional and modern Indian Western hierarchies and institutions (the big things) that have got together to deny freedom and dignity of the 'small things,' in order to maintain themselves" (Malik, 1999: 164). "The God of Small Things," therefore, stands for the oppressed and incarnates the despair and suffering of those trapped in the games of power.

With its opposition of big things versus small things, Roy's novel demonstrates that postcolonial dynamics also involve multi-dimensional forms of oppression, enhanced and layered by the experience of colonialism over the already existing dynamics of local forms. While in the local Indian culture, the inequalities between men and women, rich and poor, upper and lower caste already exist, Colonialism has added to this, new forms of inequalities such as those between West and East, white and non-white, Christian and Hindu, ... etc. Thus, Roy's novel depicts the workings of postcolonial hierarchies in which every level has its assigned position with its advantages from and invested interests in the system, except maybe the casteless and children. In this system oppression reproduces itself because the members of each level feel satisfaction when they can pass part of their frustration and humiliation of oppression on to the lower levels.

Sidone Smith states that the past can never be "articulated outside the structures of language and storytelling" (Smith, 1987: 45). As language is the medium through which history is both preserved and transmitted, and is one of the tools which is seen as "a fundamental site of struggle for postcolonial discourse" (Ashcroft, 1989: 283), Roy's choice of using her local language Roy uses her own local language as a way of struggle. She supports the value of the small things as in the example of her own local Malayalam language, in the language of big English, and she opposes the Standard English of the canon. Therefore, the novel's varied and imaginative language is an important part of Roy's activism—a deconstruction of

English. Full of Malayalam words, invented and misheard/misremembered English words *The God of Small Things* questions the hegemony of English language and consequently, English colonial power. Her attack on English resonances throughout the world, cracking the hierarchical power structures that places First World above Third and big above small.

As the First World colonizes the Third, the hegemony over the language with their English introduce their own form of social control to India, colonialism has become intertwined with the caste system, producing a hybridization that further served to impose order on a social system that already was extensively ordered. This "hybridization" is not to be taken in Homi Bhabha's sense of the term: unlike hybridity, which Bhabha speaks of as the space *between* cultures, this overlapping of caste and colonialism provides a space in which both sets of cultural values are operating simultaneously. As a result, those that inhabit this hybridized space exist under the domain of not one but two hierarchical/oppressive social systems that have been synthesized to some extent.

Since the notion of caste is central to *The God of Small Things*, a brief discussion of the caste system and its worldview is needed. Until the twentieth century, class was a concept of little consequence in India, where society was mainly structured in terms of caste in which there was a strict social stratification—more rigid rules than class concept. The Portuguese who arrived in India in the 16th century, first employed the term “caste” coming from the Spanish and Portuguese word “casta” which means “race, breed or lineage” (Elliot, 1997: n. pg.). Even if the precise origins of the caste system are not very well established, it is thought that this social structure was rooted in racial prejudice on the part of migrant Aryans who settled in India and wanted to preserve their racial purity by keeping the darker-skinned indigenous people separate (Brown, 1994: 21).

Indians refer to caste as jati. The concept derives from the Hindu religion, the most important one in India, where religion is a vital bonding and dividing force between people and groups, and a major bearer of values in social, economic, and political life, as well as

personal belief. . . . In India religious community has been essential to daily life and self-perception. It is an enfolding framework; and dress, diet, social customs as well as rituals and beliefs are ordered by it. (Brown, 1994: 18)

A society organized by caste is rigid and hierarchical, for caste is an accident of birth. Caste not only dictates social position but also dietary habits, social interaction, marriage and rituals. In India, there are about 3.000 castes and 25.000 subcastes defined by a specific occupation. The various castes or jatis can be classified into four hierarchically ordered categories or varnas: Brahmins or priests, Kshatriyas or warriors, Vaishyas or traders and Shudras or cultivators. It must be pointed out that the multiple jatis grouped under the four varnas are locally organized groups and vary from region to region. While the former categories or varnas fall under the classification of Touchables, there are the Untouchables who are outside the caste system (Eliot, 1997: n. pg.). Individuals are born into a definite caste and cannot change it; however, they can renounce the caste system and become casteless.

The concepts of purity and pollution are central to the understanding of the caste system. In caste custom, the purity of the body is of fundamental importance. Bodily contact with polluting substances or individuals should be avoided; otherwise, the polluted individual must undergo ritual physical purification. Social groups are vertically ordered according to their degree of association or contact with polluting agents. Individuals belonging to jatis that come in contact with polluting elements such as garbage, waste, leather and dead bodies are considered to be polluted by nature and, therefore, they are to be kept separate from such polluting elements (Brown, 1994: 19). This is the case of Untouchables, whose condition is considered by Hindus as a punishment for misbehavior in a previous life. Particularly in the past, Untouchables were not allowed to drink from the same well as Touchables, and they could not hand food to touch Touchables. They had to announce their presence by calling out and even their shadow was believed to be polluting (Brown, 1994: 20). Even if nowadays discrimination on the basis of caste is forbidden, there are still

powerful and deeply ingrained prejudices. Touchables and Untouchables still live in clearly delimited and separate areas (Brown, 1994: 20).

The caste system, deemed a hierarchy of purity, is grounded upon two apparently contradictory concepts: “separation and interdependence” (Brown, 1994: 20). The concepts of purity and pollution explain the dynamics of the caste system, since in order to preserve the purity of higher castes; the tasks associated with pollution are performed by and confined to the lower castes. The caste groups that perform menial polluting jobs are kept separate, but, at the same time, they are needed, since no other caste group will perform those tasks inasmuch as it will imperil their purity. The dynamics of the caste system depends on the existence of the impure castes. Society is structured in such a way that, in theory at least, each caste needs the service and skills of the others. The higher castes offer protection and employment to the lower castes which, in turn, offer their skills and services. In this way, castes or jatis are said to complement each other and to enjoy definite spheres of activity so that everybody has a place in society.

From the interdependence of jatis there emerged a system of patron-client relationships established between families belonging to different castes. The upper caste and economically powerful families have lower caste families as clients to whom they offer protection in times of shortage or crisis. Each caste group then has its own place in the community, whose normal functioning depends on the many caste groups working separately but interdependently. “By such means natural resources can be used, labor organized, and an elementary type of security created for the economically weaker” (Brown, 1994: 20). Partha Chatterjee argues that, theoretically, “[t]he ideal fourfold varna scheme was meant to be a noncompetitive functional division of labor and did not imply a hierarchy or privilege” (Chatterjee, 1993: 174).

Caste is not the only system of hierarchies established at birth. While race of course produces a set of issues different from caste, Jenny Sharpe's observations on the "use" of racial categorization provide a helpful model for discussing caste in

postcolonial India. Sharpe states that “[r]acial explanations occur when historical conditions make it difficult to presume the transparency of race—which is to say, ‘race’ is all the more necessary for sanctioning relations of domination and subordination that are no longer regarded as ‘natural’”(Sharpe, 1993: 5). Ammu's actions even before her affair with Velutha reveal her disregard for conventional social divisions in her society—she marries, and then subsequently divorces, a Hindu man whom her parents have never met, much less approved of. Through these actions, Ammu is effectively exposing the "transparency" of a class- and caste-based social structure. Her rebellion shows that she does not believe that these categories are factors that should dictate one's actions without question, because by using her marriage to subvert the expectations of her parents and her community, Ammu challenges the beliefs that underlie such social expectations. This shows that, at least to Ammu, these expectations are not part of the "natural" social order, which is why her actions enrage her family. Ammu's rebellious decisions call into question the social foundations that keep her family securely in power, and two of these seemingly solid foundations—the assumed inequality between castes and between races—are shaken as a result.

Another fundamental hierarchical difference exists between men and women, and the first environment in which this difference is imposed on and internalized by people is the family. In Ammu's family, the Ipes too, it is possible to observe the establishment and workings of patriarchy. The oppression on women starts from birth by not having equal conditions of living given by the family in which the male members of the family have the full control over the female members. Women, who are oppressed, are forced to forfeit their freedom; so they adjust themselves to life as the “other” whereas men can claim subjectivity for themselves. In this regard, Ammu, like Antoinette, resists the ideology to claim her subjectivity by challenging her objectification by men.

British Colonialism in India enhances the indigenous forms of oppression on women. The Ipes, upper class Syrian Christians, are admittedly "Anglophiles"—people who, in Chacko's account, are in a state of mind that makes them like the

English (Roy, 1997: 51). Pappachi, for example, reveres the English so much that when Ammu tells him of the indecent proposal of her husband's English boss, he cannot believe that an Englishman could ever covet another man's wife. This family has been conditioned to believe that the English are at the top of the moral and social spectrum, and the Ipes therefore emulate English behavior and raise their family accordingly: for example, Chacko is sent to Oxford, the quintessential English location of higher education. However, these beliefs are interlaid with the influence of caste, which explains the precarious position Ammu, as a woman, inhabits in her family. From the first pages of the novel, Roy presents Pappachi's mistreatment of his wife and daughter as an example of male suppression. A product of colonial education, Pappachi beats his wife, refuses to have her assist in the family pickle-making business. Thus, in an attempt to ensure that women remain on the periphery, men block women such as Mammachi from engaging in their own economic activities. This stance explains Pappachi's resentment of "the attention his wife was suddenly getting" (Roy, 1997: 46) for her successful pickle-making, and accounts for Mammachi's violin lessons when her teacher, Launsky-Tieffenthal, "made the mistake of telling Pappachi that his wife was exceptionally talented and in his opinion, potentially concert class" (Roy, 1997: 49). Like her mother, Ammu depends on her father. When Ammu completes high school, Pappachi "insist[s] that a college education was unnecessary expense for a girl" (Roy, 1997: 38), but sends her brother Chacko to Oxford University. This gender-based bestowal of education leaves Ammu vulnerable. Furthermore, her fate is already decided because society views women as only fit for domestic work; hence, "[t]here was very little for a young girl to do in Ayemenem other than wait for marriage proposals while she helped her mother with the housework" (Roy, 1997: 38). Although her father has to raise a dowry if a suitor is found for her, he cannot manage it as he has just retired from employment and cannot raise enough money for it. She is expected to help in the kitchen and wait for a marriage proposals to liberate her from the "clutches of her ill-tempered father and bitter, long-suffering mother" (Roy, 1997: 38). The marginalization of Ammu, by both Pappachi and society, results in the predicament that befalls her.

At eighteen, she makes a plan to escape the oppressive and violent paternal home; she goes to Calcutta to spend the summer at a relative's home. In a wedding party there, she meets a young Hindu, an assistant manager of a tea estate and, hoping to change her life, decides to marry him. Nonetheless the cycle of violence continues in her marriage. Unable to escape male dominance as she has escaped her father's authority which resulted in her becoming subjected to her husband's violence and abuse, and knowing the fact that she will not be welcomed by the family, Ammu goes back to her parents during Pakistani Aggression in 1965. When she returns to the parental home, she has to submit to her father's authority once more. Again, like India, she and the twins prepare themselves for another betrayal. Ammu's father does not believe her story and she remains with her twins unwelcomed at her parents' place. Her dilemma is manifested by the fact that the twins do not have a surname "because Ammu was considering reverting to her maiden name, though she said that choosing between her husband's name and her father's name didn't give a woman much of a choice" (Roy, 1997: 37). Ammu realizes that her identity remains founded on either of the two oppressors. Ammu's return to her family's house should have provided escape for both herself and the twins, but, instead, she is condemned for being divorced, a condition considered by Mammachi to be "far worse than Inbreeding" (Roy, 1997: 59). The oppression that Ammu and the twins experience at this home is driven both the lack of opportunities for a divorced woman with twins and by the patriarchal nature of the family is still present even after Pappachi; it is her brother Chacko who, after Pappachi's death, exerts his authority over Ammu and her children. Ammu is aware that she returns "[t]o everything that she had fled from only a few years ago. Except that now she had two young children. And no more dreams" (Roy, 1997: 42). The act of Ammu's crossing her creed line by marrying a Hindu and divorcing him is not a mere object to be tolerated at their times. When she oversteps the caste line she is excluded. Therefore, because of her status as a divorcee and because her children derive from an intercommunity marriage, they are subject to further discrimination, condescension and contempt.

Her decision represents her first violation of the “Love Laws” (Roy, 1997: 33) that forbid intercommunity marriages. An ancient scholar named Manu is believed to write The Love Laws which outlines highly specific rules for marital relationships: by marrying a woman of lower caste, a man does not lose his status but a woman does by marrying a man of lower caste. A woman loses the right to her dowry if she marries a man of her own choice from a lower caste. The most outrageous of choices a woman could make is to choose an Untouchable, which is absolutely forbidden. Judged by these rules, both Ammu’s first marriage and her relationship with Velutha are unacceptable along caste lines. Ammu's decision to marry outside of her caste already transgresses boundaries and sullies her family's image. But her affair with Velutha, an Untouchable, is an unforgivable offense.

Velutha is known as “Vellya Paapen’s son” (Roy, 1997: 68), a “Paravan” (Roy, 1997: 71) who works as a “carpenter” (Roy, 1997: 247) for Paradise Pickles & Preserves, but this does not prevent him from becoming a figure of attraction for Ammu, a member of an upper caste. As a Paravan, Velutha should be one who engages in unskilled labour and who should not “touch anything that Touchables touch” (Roy, 1997: 71). However, Velutha proves himself to be different from this typical image of a Paravan; he is a “factory carpenter . . . in charge of general maintenance . . . [even though] Paravans were not *meant* to be carpenters” (Roy, 1997: 74) and he is the one who “touch[es], [e]nter[s] [and] [l]ove[s]” (Roy, 1997: 74). The unusual-different representation of Velutha as an Untouchable undermines not only the power of the Love Laws but also the patriarchal authority. Therefore, as an uncanny figure, Velutha proves that he can destroy the typical representation of an Untouchable and be presented as someone who engages in skilled labor and have relations with an upper caste. His image, perceived as different and thus uncanny, dislocated the typical representation of an Untouchable as a central image and in turn undermines the authority of the Love Laws and patriarchy who implements this representation.

The idea of the "Love Laws" encapsulates the unspoken laws ingrained in the lives of the characters. Mammachi, Pappachi, his unmarried sister Baby Kochamma, and Police Inspector Thomas Mathew operate under the belief that caste and class are

vital to Indian culture and must be maintained. To them, caste operates as a "transhistorical category of difference," something intrinsic to humanity (Sharpe 5). The narrator describes these laws as timeless, as something that has been a part of society since the beginning of time:

it actually began thousands of years ago. Long before the Marxists came. Before the British took Malabar . . . before Vasco da Gama arrived . . . long before Christianity arrived in a boat and seeped into Kerala like tea from a tea bag. That it really began in the days when the Love Laws were made. The laws that lay down who should be loved, and how. And how much. (Roy, 1997: 33)

With Colonialism, Love Laws are adapted to include the British and Indian relationships. As such, a British man can lay claim to an Indian woman whatever caste she belongs to or whatever her marital status is. When Ammu's husband, in order to keep his job, asks her to prostitute herself to Mr. Hollick, Ammu's husband's supervisor, who has already "bequeathed" light skinned children "on tea-pickers whom he fancied" (Roy, 1997: 41), Ammu realizes that she will never be happy with her alcoholic, lying and wife-abusing husband. More importantly, Mr. Hollick's request that Ammu should stay with him for a few days shows that some whites who stay in India during the post-independence period still consider Indian women as things to be exploited.

In the case of Ammu, both patriarchal and colonial discourse co-operates with each other in which white man abuses the Indian man and woman alike—the non-white body as "other"—and man abuses woman—the female body as "other." Mr. Hollick, a white man and the tea estate manager, who demands sex with Ammu in exchange for keeping her husband in employment, is an example of a white man who considers local women as sexual objects. Therefore, Mr. Hollick's proposal signifies the exploitation of local women by whites who remain in India after the country has gained her independence. In addition, Ammu's husband's views of her as a pawn to be used in his efforts to keep his employment and the physical violence he applies on her when she resists the proposition show his failure to treat Ammu as

a human being in the patriarchal setup. Ammu's husband serves as an agent of Colonial power in addition to his superior role as a male in the family. Colonialism, even when it is officially over, increases and exacerbates the existing hierarchy between men and women, making women doubly oppressed under the cooperation of the two patriarchal systems of caste and colonialism.

Women often internalize and naturalize patriarchy to such an extent that even mothers do not question their own assumptions about their discrimination against their daughters. Mammachi is not sympathetic to her daughter Ammu's experience with her abusive husband even though Mammachi herself had been given "beatings with brass vases" by her husband (Roy, 1997: 51). She is more than kind to her divorced son, and the family shows love and affection to Chacko's ex-wife and daughter. Not only her mother but also Chacko and Ammu's spinster aunt Baby Kochamma are no better in understanding her and her twin children Estha and Rahel. Critics R.S Sharma and Shashi Bala Talwar state that as Rahel and Estha are products of an intercommunity marriage the Ipe family treats them as strangers (48). As they are from Ammu, the twins could not take the love from the family that they expected. The Ipe family never approves that marriage and the products of that unwanted relation are not given so much attention and love. The dilemma in family's behavior towards their grandchildren is given with the arrival of Sophie Mol, Chacko's inter-community daughter. Roy presents the different views by comparing Sophie Mol and the twins: "Littleangels were beach-coloured and wore bell-bottoms. Littledemons were mudbrown in Airport-Fairy frocks with forehead bumps that might turn into horns" (170). The demon image portrays how the family thinks about Rahel and Estha. Although they are both children of inter-community marriages, Sophie Mol deserves the most attention and is "[l]oved from the beginning" (130) because of her Britishness. When Sophie Mol comes, Rahel feels the same exclusion her mother feels in her own family. Although Rahel desperately wants to feel the love of the family, her uncle, aunt, and grandmother show her that it will not happen. Therefore, because of the patriarchal nature in which daughters and sons are not treated equally, Estha and Rahel become victims of the mistreatment which has been paid to their mother both by her family and by society.

The mistreatment in the family is explicit in Baby Kochamma's response to Ammu, which is also an index of the general feeling towards her in the casteist, patriarchal society presented in *The God of Small Things*. In India, inter-community marriages, inter-caste marriages, or marriages of lovers who meet each other independently and marry, are called "love marriages," where love implies sex. Hence, Baby Kochamma and the members of the Ipe family strongly disapprove of Ammu's marriage.

A married daughter had no position in her parents' home. As for a divorced daughter—according to Baby Kochamma, she had no position anywhere at all. And as for a divorced daughter from a love marriage, well, words could not describe Baby Kochamma's outrage. As for a divorced daughter from an inter-community love marriage—Baby Kochamma chose to remain silent on the subject. (Roy, 1997: 45)

While divorced women are unfairly treated, divorced men live their lives as if everything is the same and nothing has happened. The divorced daughter is unwelcome in her parents' house whereas a divorced son is welcomed and becomes the inheritor of the family fortune. Chacko marries Margaret without even the knowledge of his family. He lives in England on the financial support of his family, for he cannot afford to support neither himself nor a wife. This marriage does not last long, and after the divorce he returns to India. While she is a mere "Shopkeeper's daughter" as far as Mamachi is considered, Chacko is "proud and happy to have had a wife like Margaret. White" (Roy, 1997: 136). Her being white means much to the anglophile Baby Kochamma, too. On Margaret's visit to Ayemenem with her daughter, Baby Kochamma coaches the twins and makes a rule that they should speak only in English. Every time she catches them speaking in Malayalam, she punishes them by making them write at least a hundred times that they will speak only in English.

The novel abounds with further examples testifying to the fact that postcolonial India retained many characteristics from the British occupation, and the

"British" and "Indian" elements can no longer be distinguished from one another. This can be seen in Pappachi's photograph, in which he wears "khaki jodhpurs though he had never ridden a horse in his life" with "an ivory-handled riding crop lay[ing] neatly across his lap" (Roy, 1997: 50). The imitation of an English gentleman who keeps horses epitomizes Pappachi's status as an Anglophile. But it is not only Pappachi who subscribes to ideas merging that which is traditionally Indian with the Western. It seems that the similarities between English and Indian patriarchal structures fit perfectly with the sensibilities of Chacko, who plays "Comrade, Comrade!" but then uses his power as the factory owner to seduce female workers (Roy, 1997: 63). Chacko's behavior demonstrates the theme visited throughout the novel of the marriage of Indian and English value systems: the Ipe family does not simply ape English values; they fuse values derived from caste politics with the newer English model, and effectively support a hybridized category of "anglicized" Indians. Roy's language and borderless storytelling technique² offer an alternative model to combat female stereotypes oppressed by patriarchal and casteist Indian society.

Chacko is also conscious of the historical forces that had made him and his family become anglophiles and develops a sense of double-consciousness and the drive to mimicry. The Indian Ipe family is described as mimicking English traditions in many ways. Here, mimicry is not necessarily used as act of subversion (as in Bhabha's sense of the term) but almost as unconscious subservience to colonial order. Chacko describes it best:

Chacko told the twins that, though he hated to admit it, they were all Anglophiles. They were a family of Anglophiles. Pointed in the wrong direction, trapped outside their own history and unable to retrace their steps because their footprints had been swept away. He explained to them that history was like an old house at night. . . . "To understand history," Chacko said, "we have to go inside and listen to

² Baneth-Nouailhetas observes the connection between the novel's emphasis on memory and its formalistic qualities: "The importance of memory, recollection and their corollaries (the sense of foreboding or of déjà vu, or expectation or of familiarity) is somehow hammered into the reader through the stylistic characteristics of this text . . . in a spiraling narration that brings the past to bear on the future, and the present to reconstruct the past" (144).

what they're saying. And when we try and listen, all we hear is a whispering, because our minds have been invaded by a war. The very worst sort of war. A war that captures dreams and re-dreams them. A war that has made us adore our conquerors and despise ourselves.” (Roy, 1997: 51)

The war Chacko refers to is the battle within consciousness that, according to Hegel, results in a master-slave relationship; in it, the Indian people became the objects of desire of the British colonial power and only existed as long as they satisfied the colonizer's demands. Despite his anglophilia, he is acutely aware that they only exist for and through the colonizer. He is aware that many Indians, among them the Ipe family, have been trapped in a master-slave relationship established by the British colonizer and have been seduced into defining themselves according to the colonizer's ideological representations of them.

Chacko continues to explain to the twins the consequences of colonialism: “Our dreams have been doctored. We belong nowhere, we sail unanchored on troubled seas. We may never be allowed ashore. Our sorrows will never be sad enough. Our joys never happy enough. Our dreams never big enough. Our lives never important enough. To matter” (52). The colonizer's and colonized subject's modes of consciousness come together in Chacko and Margaret Kochamma's relationship. Despite their love, both of them are conditioned by stereotypes: for Margaret, the exotic Chacko represents a break in her life, and for him, she embodies the supposed British superiority. Indeed, for Chacko, Margaret's love means his legitimization and acceptance by the white British world. Their relationship is then, a synthesis of the two modes of consciousness that participate in master-slave relationship. Sophie Mol, their daughter is the product of this union and, therefore, symbolizes the dramatic meeting of the colonizer's and the colonized subject's worlds. The child is a hybrid product that results from the complex encounter of two cultures brought into contact within the framework of power relation, and her death figuratively represents the failure of the colonial project.

The overlap of English colonial and Indian pre-colonial structures leaves Ammu in a space that is marginal in more ways than one, in what Roy calls "the penumbral shadows between two worlds" (Roy, 1997: 44). The meeting ground is "quite literally neither the one nor the other," and the result is the creation of a "third space" which is simultaneously marginalized from both larger cultures, but also productive in its own way: this "third space" is the location where both larger cultures begin to be changed (Bhabha, 1994: 53). Therefore, although Ammu's experiences never coincide with the expectations of her culture, it is this sense of disjointed-ness that is productive. The fact that Ammu does not allow herself to be restrained by race- gender- or caste-based expectations signifies that she inhabits the third space of which Bhabha speaks. This third space is not entirely freeing (as the reader learns from Ammu's seeming acquiescence to the orders of her family to split up the twins [Roy, 1997: 286]). However, it is not only silence and marginalization that results from operating within the "third space"; Roy, by creating a character like Ammu also attempts to effect changes in the dominant culture. By creating a character that occupies this position in her culture, Roy is able to elucidate a depiction of the unique position of Indian women, revealing that residing in this third space, although it carries the risk of rejection from the dominant culture's hegemonic structures, does allow room for women to exercise personal agency.

In addition, Ammu recognizes the falsity of her family's Englishness, then she is also inherently calling their Indian-ness into question since their identity has been so thoroughly infused with English customs. Ammu resists mimicking the colonizer unlike the major characters who do this owing to their internalization of the colonizer's representations of their identity. Celia Britton states that the family suffers "a particular kind of alienation that involves imitating and identifying with the European Other and, hence, losing autonomous perspective on reality" (britton, 1999: 83). In this family, Ammu is in fact the only member who is not alienated and thus autonomous because she is the only adult family member who revolts against anglophilia; she explains the twins that Papachi was

[i]ncurable British CCP which was short for chhi-chhi poach and in Hindi meant shit-wiper" (50). Chacko said that the correct words for

people like Papachi was Anglophile. He made Rahel and Estha look up Anglophile in the Reader's *Digest Great Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. It said: Person well disposed to the English. Then Estha and Rahel had to look up dispose.

It said:

- (1) *Place suitably in particular order*
- (2) *Bring mind into certain state*
- (3) *Do what one will with, get off one's hands, stow away, demolish, finish, settle, consume (food), kill, sell.*

Chacko said that in Papachi's case it meant (2) *Bring mind into certain state*. Which, Chacko said, meant that Papachi's mind had been *brought into a state* which made him like the English. (50-1)

Ammu considers her father as a collaborationist, someone who willingly accepted English rule. Chacko, on the other hand, develops the sense of double-consciousness and the drive to mimicry. He and Baby Kochamma force the seven-year-old twins to speak English as for wealthy high-caste Indians; mastery of English is a source of pride and status marker. In the postcolonial India, English still occupies a central position. The character's attitude towards English is the result of the colonizer's employment of the language. The characters of the novel associate it with Westernization, superior education, and wealth. English thus becomes not only a status marker but also an object of desire inasmuch as it is a metaphor for Western white identity. The characters' mimicking drive then acquires a linguistic dimension to identify with the colonizer. In this respect, Celia Britton argues that the subject "who wants to be white will be whiter as he gains greater mastery of the cultural tool that language is" (88). Therefore, Baby Kochamma's pride in her mastery of English, Chacko's showing his knowledge of English are rooted in the belief that language and identity are interdependent concepts. They are persuaded one of the principal elements that define their identity is their linguistic skills and performance, without the full awareness that they have internalized Western essentialist conceptions. For example, Baby Kochamma's envious reverence for Margaret Kochamma and admiration for Sophie Mol illustrates the inherited colonial deference for the British

world. She develops the obsessive concern with her family's performance in English. Her sense of superiority based on her linguistic accomplishment is one of the reasons for her being disillusioned with convent life; she simply "felt she spoke much better English than everybody else" (25). Chacko is also obsessed with his performance in English whereas Ammu, despite her concern with her twins' performance in English, Ammu possesses none of Baby Kochamma's and Chacko's linguistic chauvinism.

Ammu makes sarcastic comments about her position as a woman in India. For example, Ammu knows that she has no legal standing, "thanks to [her] wonderful male chauvinist society" (Roy, 1997: 56). Ammu's criticism of both patriarchy and Indian society places her in a role that threatens her society, because she challenges the assumptions that her status as upper-caste, Indian, and female necessarily correlates with certain expected behaviors. A woman in Ammu's position traditionally serves as one means of holding together the fabric of her society: through marriage to the "right" man (meaning, desirable caste, family, and career), a woman can secure the position of her family and hopefully even strengthen it. What gives Ammu a difference from others in the society is that Ammu's disregards these kinds of concerns that pervade the thoughts of Baby Kochamma and Mammachi. When she learns of Ammu's relationship with Velutha, one of the first things Mammachi thinks is that Ammu "had defiled generations of breeding . . . and brought the family to its knees. For generations to come, forever now, people would point at them at weddings and funerals. At baptisms and birthday parties. They'd nudge and whisper. It was all finished now" (Roy, 1997: 244). Mammachi's thoughts are testament to the strength of her belief in the caste system—it is what dictates her reaction to the news of Ammu and Velutha's affair. Mammachi could not be expected to react in any other way, because in her eyes it is Ammu's duty to uphold the family's name and status, and her actions have done the exact opposite. Her first violation (marrying a Hindu) infuriates her family, but the major tragedy of the novel (her affair with Velutha) results from her utter disregard for her expected role as guarantor of her family's social status. This helps to explain why Ammu and Velutha's relationship is so problematic. Both characters have personal traits that

place them in the role of rebels: Velutha is described as having "a lack of hesitation. An unwarranted assurance. . . . The quiet way in which he offered suggestions without being asked. Or the quiet way in which he disregarded suggestions without appearing to rebel" (Roy, 1997: 73). Ammu resists being categorized according to her nationality or her gender. When Margaret Kochamma asks if all Indians smell one another, Ammu replies sarcastically, and then asks, "Must we behave like some damn godforsaken tribe that's just been discovered?" (Roy, 1997: 171). The narrator informs us, "Ammu had not had the kind of education, nor read the sorts of books, nor met the sorts of people, that might have influenced her to think the way she did. She was just that sort of animal" (Roy, 1997: 171). Described as such, it would be possible to conclude that Ammu's actions throughout the novel can be attributed to an essential element of rebelliousness in her character, instead of attributing them only to her frustration with her social position. In fact, it is the combination of both her personal characteristics and her social position that produces a character that is able to choose to rebel. Education and literature were not necessary catalysts for Ammu's way of thinking because the source of her frustration is so prevalent in her life. Roy reveals the extent of Ammu's dissatisfaction and provides a reason for her actions that extends beyond her character to include social structure.

Because of Ammu's heightened awareness of her own position, she cannot be examined as simply an objectified subaltern Indian woman. It seems that Ammu's knowledge of her own position is one of the causes of her demise. Her rebellion against caste and gender subordination that is encapsulated in her visit to the police station ends in defeat, and her attempt to defy social stratification causes the police officer to further objectify her (shown when he taps her breasts with his baton as if he is "choosing mangoes from a basket") and reinscribe her role (Roy, 1997: 10). She cannot shake her status as a woman in an upper-class family status or the ingrained caste system, because organizations such as the police have a more significant function than simply investigating crimes: they are there to protect the dominant culture. Ammu's rebellion can be compared to the Naxalite marchers at the beginning of the novel—and as threatening as the marchers appear to people such as Baby Kochamma, Ammu's subversive act can be seen as much more dangerous to the

status quo. The Naxalites represent a faction of society that, while violent and threatening, is still a faction of the Communist party (which was the ruling party at the time). They also still abide by traditional forms of rebellion, utilizing fear tactics and ridiculing the bourgeoisie. The Naxalites could be seen as, in Comrade Pillai's words, "mechanics who serviced different parts of the same machine" (Roy, 1997: 248). However, Ammu and Velutha's affair can be seen as a challenge to one of the core structures in Indian society: the caste system.

Although the Love laws are made for avoiding the transgression and threats to caste and race system; the fact that the Love Laws are not to be questioned is resulted in Velutha's death. He is brutally punished for his defiance of the Love Laws. "The thud of wood on flesh. Boot on bone. On teeth. ...The muted crunch of skull on cement. . . . goosebumps where the handcuffs touched his skin" (Roy, 1997: 292, 294). Unjustly murdered by policeman, Velutha's death is an episode of the oppressive Touchable violence against an Untouchable that preserves the social order of Ayemenem. No matter who is in power in India, the governmental system (and here the Communist party in India is included) works *around* the caste system. For this reason, Ammu's subversion transcends a protest against the government: she and Velutha break the unspoken, ingrained social laws that have dominated India for centuries. However, Ammu's rebellion is rather easily repressed at the police station, and she appears to acquiesce to the wishes of others: "*Maybe they 're right*, Ammu's whisper said as she packed his trunk and hold-all. *Maybe a boy does need a Baba*" (Roy, 1997: 286). After the traumatic affair with Velutha, Chacko as an authority over her, orders her to leave Ayemenem. Without economic resources, she is forced to leave the twins behind in the care of male patrons: Estha is sent to live with his father in Calcutta and Rahel remains under Chacko's protection. Ammu then moves to New Delhi where she leads a miserable life and faces extreme hardship. Lacking education and economic means, she is unable to make her way in the world and finally dies. No one counted on the possibility that Ammu would betray her class and caste and come to Velutha's defense. It is unclear what Ammu hoped would be the outcome of her decision to go to the police; however, it is her "Unsafe Edge" that provides the impetus for this decision (Roy, 1997: 44). Before the terror, Ammu has already felt the scorn of her family for being divorced and having half-Hindu

children: "a woman that they had already damned, now had little left to lose, and could therefore be dangerous" (Roy, 1997: 44). Years later, it is Rahel who considers her mother's resistance commendable and her daughter's discourse gives Ammu's story a voice.

Patriarchy is not to be tampered with is the message Ammu's family sends out to her. She dies in her thirties, fighting the patriarchal laws "that lay down who should be loved and how. And how much" (Roy, 1997: 31). Ammu and Velutha both end up dead by the end of the novel, and the family is fractured as Estha and Rahel are separated for twenty-three years. When thirty-one year old Rahel returns to Ayemenem, to her twin brother, the twins first repair their relational identity, and then they attempt to heal themselves by remembering the stories of Ammu and Velutha's lives through shared storied memory. On their returning to their childhood home, on Estha's part, "he knew that Rahel had come," for "with her she had brought the sound of passing trains, and the light and shade . . . that falls on you if you have a window seat. The world, locked out for years, suddenly flooded in, and now Estha couldn't hear himself for the noise" (Roy, 1997: 12, 16). Likewise, Rahel "could feel the rhythm of Estha's rocking, and the wetness of rain on his skin. She could hear the raucous, scrambled world inside his head" (Roy, 1997: 22). Indeed, Rahel does not know how to understand their relationship, which is based on distance and connectedness. It is not until, as adults, the reunited twins attend the Kathakali performance³ at the temple that they begin to reclaim their relationship. "Drawn by . . . memory," Rahel goes to the temple, and soon after she senses her twin's arrival: "She didn't turn her head, but a glow spread inside her. *He's come*. She thought. *He's here. With me*" (Roy, 1997: 183, 222). The emphasis Roy places on Estha's arrival through the italics and separation of the words "with me" suggests a rejoining of the minds and souls, and thus, reclamation of the connected relationship they shared as children. And what joins them is "a story" performed by Kathakali men,

³ Kathakali, originating in Kerala during the sixteenth century, is a dance-drama where players act out classical Indian stories. In *The God of Small Things*, the Kathakali dancers perform poolside, entertaining tourists at a large hotel across the river from Ayemenem. However, when they perform in the temple in Ayemenem, "they danced to jettison their humiliation" caused by the "truncated swimming-pool performances" (218). Therefore, the performance Rahel and Estha attend is an attempt "to ask pardon of their gods. To apologize for corrupting their stories" (218).

the story of Karna, an abandoned child and his mother, which prompts the paired twins to turn to the “memory of another mother” (Roy, 1997: 222). As the reunited twins watch the dancers dance “[t]o apologize for corrupting their stories. For encasing their identities. Misappropriating their lives” (Roy, 1997: 218), they recognize themselves in both the dancers and the story. As they watch the Kathakali men perform the death of Dushasana—Dushasana “clubbed . . . to the floor. . . . hammer[ed] . . . until [he] was stilled” (Roy, 1997: 223, 24)—they see a reenactment of Velutha’s beating being played out before their eyes. The twins recognize this connection: “It was no performance. . . . they had seen its work before. Another morning. Another stage. Another kind of frenzy. . . . The Brutal extravagance of this matched by the savage economy of that. They sat there, Quietness and Emptiness, frozen two-egg fossils. . . . Trapped in the bog of a story that was and wasn’t theirs” (Roy, 1997: 224). It is necessary that they experience this event together, for they can begin to deal with their stories in their memory. As they walk home together Estha and Rahel become “We and Us” (Roy, 1997: 225), reclaiming their relation. Coming back allows the twins to begin to explore their memories of the past, and to re-understand and remember the lives of those who have died. Therefore, as many critics have noted, Rahel summons their joint memories to relate their stories, as well as their dead mother’s twenty-three years after the ‘stories’ told by their aunt Baby Kochamma, and by the police, who were instrumental in disrupting their lives. As she does this, Rahel is able to revise the oppressive, recorded history of the past. Rahel vocalizes a version of the family’s shared past—a storied memory that embodies the interpersonal memories that include her own, her mother’s and her brother’s.

However, Roy’s choice to end the novel on a hopeful note, in an intimate scene in which she and Velutha are happy, signals to the reader that her actions were not futile. While the chronological order of the novel indicates that Ammu is broken by the effects of her affair with Velutha, the novel closes on a scene which suggests intimacy and hope—further signifying that the transgression of social boundaries in order to exercise personal agency takes precedence over conforming to the multiple restrictions placed on Ammu’s life. She is aware of the cost of her decision—she knows that Velutha’s arms are “the most dangerous place she could be” (Roy, 1997:

319); however, she consciously chooses to risk the danger. This exemplifies how, despite the multiple forms of repression operating in her life, Ammu reveals her own agency and therefore embraces her role as one who, in Roy's own words, chooses to battle the ways in which society "divides itself" (Roy, 1997: 91).

Although Ammu and Velutha's stories end poorly, there is hope at the end of *The God of Small Things*. Rahel and her brother now embody their mother's memory and through them and Rahel's storytelling they can focus on love rather than great sorrow. The novel, with all its going back and forth in time in narrating the events, ends with Ammu and Velutha connecting in their attempt to follow their dream, and believing in the promise of tomorrow. It is only after the twins come together, and remember together, that they can express their grief in order to refocus their memory and their healing story on life, hope and "Naaleey" Tomorrow," the words the novel ends with (Roy, 1997: 321). In the final scene, the twins uncover the secret of their mother, which allows them to focus on their memories of love. Additionally, recalling Ammu and Velutha's love scene at the end allows Roy to demonstrate her hope that basic human rights—rights that allow such a love story—should and will extend to all people. Therefore, Roy, demonstrates the power of shared storied memories to provide a space for healing, hope, forgiveness and tomorrow, while also resisting dominant systems of oppression. Relying on the social function of memory, Rahel and Estha come to find peace and forgiveness that is only located in their interpersonal relationships, their connectedness to each other and to others and their act of relational remembering that provides counter-memories and new ways of understanding the past. Rahel successfully brings Ammu and Velutha's history to life; she revises the oppressive official history by sharing her mother's silenced story. Roy thus uses storytelling as an act of resistance and as the voice of the outcasts in the oppressive, patriarchal, caste-based history.

4.3. JOHN UPDIKE'S *TERRORIST*: THE RELIGIOUS OTHER, VIOLENCE AND DESTRUCTION

John Updike published *Terrorist* in post 9-11 era as a testament to the ways in which power relations are shaped in a globalized world. 9-11 attacks came as a shock to those who expected the end of history as Fukuyama had foreseen after the end of the Soviet Union. As opposed to his thesis that the world had reached a level of tranquility and balance, another theory was gaining ground, one that was held by Samuel Huntington. Samuel Huntington states that there is always a conflict around the world, and there will be no more clashes of ideologies but the clash of civilizations. He says “[i]t is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural” (Huntington, 1993: 22). As the most designated characteristic of civilization is religion, he clearly points towards the conflict between Christianity and Islam or, in other words, Western and Eastern civilizations. His idea has found strong supporters especially after the September 11 terrorist attacks in the United States.

In the post-9/11 hysteria, books about Islam and movies that perpetuate Arab and Muslim stereotypes often serve to confirm and reinforce the image of Muslim as a terrorist. The efforts by the West to classify and define the Muslim amount to what Edward Said termed Orientalism. In his book *Orientalism* (1978), Said examines the process of the West's institutionalized representation of the Orient by which Westerners come to know and construct their other. It is not only the act of representation but also the cultural and ideological hegemony created by the institutionalization of this discourse that creates “an accepted grid for filtering through the Orient into Western consciousness” (Said, 1978: 6). As Said argues, “[t]o have such knowledge of such a thing is to dominate it, to have authority over it” (Said, 1978: 32). However, unlike colonial times in which hegemony was obtained through invasion of a land, in the global world dominated by American political, economic and military hegemony, it is the media which function as one of the mediums of creating hegemony. In American society the media are the main

“sources” of “political information” with diverse forms of organizations and activities which affect not only political public opinion but also the way politics is handled (McQuail, 2000: 37). From this perspective, 9/11 events have created Neo-Orientalist writings in which Muslims and Arabs are potential terrorists and enemies of the West. Also, Islamophobia, the belief that most Muslims are religious fanatics and have violent tendencies towards non-Muslims, creates the image that all Muslims are hostile to the West and to the United States and are intent on damaging and destroying democratic modernity. Syed Farid Alatas states that “[t]he media tends to portray Islam as oppressive; . . . outmoded; . . . anti-intellectualist; . . . restrictive; . . . extremist; . . . backward; . . . causes conflict; . . . and dangerous (Alatas, 2005: 46). Because of the fact that Islam is seen as an ideological opponent, the West and United States generalize these negative meanings to Muslims especially in post-9/11.

Terrorist represents an effort to revisit the scene of terrorist violence and to resolve it by confronting September 11’s attacks. John Updike, having eyewitnessed the 9/11 from the window of a relative’s Brooklyn Heights apartment, sets the novel in New Jersey, which once offered itself to Irish, Jewish and Italian immigrants, and takes the attention to the changing population of the city which was once a home to the white immigrants from Eastern Europe, is the place where “those who occupy the inner city now are brown, by and large, in its many shades” (Updike, 2006: 12). The town’s population is poor black, Hispanic and Arab-American and the locale is described as ugly and dilapidated. Updike’s *Terrorist* plays out as an amalgamation of the narratives circulated by the media in post-9/11, and he represents the difficulties that the Muslim society in the United States faces as an ethnic group after September 11 events in America. In the post-9/11, Updike gives voice to a silenced boy and represents Ahmad’s character as a stereotype of young American Muslims as portrayed in American media. The Muslim youth is pushed by the mainstream culture to the margins in the United States. Ahmad, then, becomes as sub-altern like the native populations of former colonies. The ultra-conservative rightwing ideologies of the mainstream culture become disconcerting for him, and he thinks that his faith is threatened by the society around him. His fears of the total annihilation of his culture push him to an extreme identification with his Muslim

identity. When social realities, including social conflicts force individuals to resist, ideologies may become the site of social struggle; therefore, by pointing out the effects of Islamic radicalism on a young impressionable mind, Updike introduces to his readers the concept of terrorism as a new type of resistance in a global world with a detailed description of Ahmad and his situation.

Updike's protagonist, Ahmad Ashmawy Mulloy, an 18-year-old boy, is born to a white Irish-American, non-practicing Christian mother Teresa and an Egyptian Muslim father Omar, who "decamps,"—to quote Ahmad—when Ahmad is three years old. Although Ahmad is left at a young age by his father, he does not blame him for this act. Ahmad's replacing of "leaving" with "decamping" suggests forgiveness to his father because he does not feel his father left him of his will but only due to his inability to make it in America's capitalist society. Ahmad idolizes his father to such a point that at a young age, he chooses Islam and forms a close relationship with a local mosque's imam Rashid with whom he studies the Qur'an regularly. Instead of identifying himself with American values, Ahmad chooses what is absent: a father and his world. When Updike introduces Ahmad in the first pages of the book, he is already struggling with anti-American thoughts; thus any evidence as to how and when his choice took place is not provided within the confines of the novel. Ahmad's deep interest in religion makes him an easy tool for Rashid, who manipulates him in a terrorist attack to blow up the Holland Tunnel. Yet Islam is not the only social environment that promises Ahmad a father figure; he can in fact find some other older male figures who present positive role models and choices of reconciliation his alien-ness with America. In Jack Levy, the Jewish teacher at Central High School, who tries to stop Ahmad from this attempt, Updike presents an antithesis to Rashid. He is not a WASP; in fact, the culture Jack Levy belongs to occupied only one generation ago as marginal a position as Ahmad's Muslim culture does at present. Having been brought up with a cultural legacy of marginalization, Jack Levy both sympathizes with and understands the young boy and is able to provide for him as a model for finding a place in American society without losing his self-respect, integrity, identity and culture. The novel thus can be read as a conflict between these two older figures for the control of Ahmad. While Jack is working

hard for a bright future for Ahmad, while Shaikh Rashid is working to destroy that future.

Nonetheless, the future America offers for an American Muslim after the 9/11 events, does not promise much hope for individuals like Ahmad who are trapped between two cultures and identities. Ahmad belongs to a culture which is considered non-white especially after the 9/11 events. Although Arabs are considered “white” according to the US Census Bureau, unlike the non-WASP European cultures which are considered under the umbrella of ethnicity, Arabs have increasingly become a part of race groups. Thus, Ahmad’s mixed heritage is a constant reminder of race: his non-WASP status identifies him not with other ethnicities but other races. Although he is different from other Muslims in the United States, not born into or raised in the faith or taught Arabic as a first language, he is portrayed as an Arab-American, thus, attributed brownness and its displeasures are central to the novel. His hybrid identity is described with his color, darker than “the freckled, blotchy pink of his red-haired mother,” while it is paler than his father’s skin, which is “perfectly matte, like a cloth that’s been dipped, olive-beige with a pinch of lampblack in it.” Ahmad is, in fact, “dun, a low-luster shade lighter than beige” (Updike, 2006: 13). Updike focuses on the difference of the Muslim outsider, excluded by society, and like Jean Rhys and Arundhati Roy, Updike suggests that those in-between people have reasons for a resistance in the post-9/11.

Ahmad is isolated from the outside world. He is uncomfortable in any of the worlds he lives in. As a young Muslim, he decides to resort to his strict religious training for answers, and as a result of his beliefs, he decides that American society, which ostracizes all the Muslim Americans as a suspect of terrorism, is evil. Ahmad’s position as an outcast sets him apart from the other characters in the novel and he chooses his way by committing to Islam. Updike captures the conflict within Ahmad early in the novel with the binary opposition of We/They and West/East. As the society excludes Ahmad, Ahmad pushes away the society as well: “‘Devils,’ Ahmad thinks. *‘These devils seek to take away my God’*” (Updike, 2006: 3). The targets of Ahmad’s hatred are those from the high school community: girls with

tattoos; boys with “dead-eyed” looks, and teachers who “lack . . . belief” (Updike, 2006: 3).

From the beginning of the novel, the young Muslim character sets himself in opposition to the materialistic values of American capitalism and consumer culture. According to Ahmad, the West is the enemy and the “infidels . . . [who] think safety lies in accumulation of the things of the world . . . they are slaves to images, false ones of happiness and affluence” (Updike, 2006: 4). The complexities of the clash between American materialistic culture and the Islamic culture affect Ahmad’s identity. When asked if he hates the American way, Ahmad replies that “I of course do not hate all Americans. But the American way is the way of the infidels. It is headed for a terrible doom” (Updike, 2006: 39). Ahmad is wrestling with ideas crucial to his understanding of himself and the society. In an interview with Louise Witt (2006), Updike explains why he presents Ahmad as in-between. According to Updike,

[Ahmad is] a boy who is trying to be good and trying to make sense of his life in an American environment, which doesn’t make much sense to him. He sees the rather hedonistic, materialistic, pleasure-now side of America, which strikes him as worthy of condemnation, and is certainly evil in his mind. I’m trying to get the terrorist out of the bugaboo category and into the category of a fellow human being. (Witt, 2006: n.pg.)

Ahmad demonstrates the deep ambivalence felt by American Muslims towards the West, which shows itself through a moralizing cultural critique. He portrays America as rich materially whereas they are poor in spiritually. They are restless and intellectually low, and democratic yet conformist. Ahmad’s supporting of Islam cannot and will not let him accept Western values, ethics, attitudes and Western social-political standards and practices. As Ahmad says: “Western culture is Godless . . . and because it has no God, it is obsessed with sex and luxury” (Updike, 2006: 38). Ahmad’s Islam presents him a critique of economic and social concerns which alienate him in society.

Although Updike seems like a Neo-Orientalist by endorsing at first glance the image of the Muslim as a terrorist, at a deeper level, he demonstrates the other side of the coin which to say, it is also the American society that creates those kind of subalterns who find in acts of terrorism ways of voicing their discontent towards the society that ostracizes them. Consequently, the mainstream American society jeopardizes its own future with its bigoted treatment of the people of Arabic origin in post 9/11 period. As opposed to the expectations that America would achieve its rhetoric of liberalism and democracy by widening its scope, new groups are added to the already-existing race categories that face racism and oppression. In this new post-9/11 America, race still remains a central challenge. What is more, the adding of the Muslims to this bottom category does not help those who already occupy those levels. In other words, although the main focus of racism seems to have shifted for a time from Blacks and Hispanics to Muslims, such racial groups, which occupy the lowest strata in racial stratification, did not win an ideological advantage when Americans turned their attention to the people of Middle Eastern descent. Rather, the Arab-Americans, who had been designated as “white” before are pushed down to the lower status of racial difference. In other words, the terrorist attacks just expanded the list of those whom Americans could distrust.

For Ahmad, America is not only a cultural adversary but a political enemy. Unlike many of his schoolmates, he would never consider joining the American Army, the advice that Jack Levy gives him. To this suggestion, Ahmad says “the army would send me to fight my brothers” (Updike, 2006: 41). He could not be persuaded by Bush’s discourse about “fighting for civilization” as “civilization” arises from Mesopotamia—largely corresponding Iraq today—which is widely considered to be the cradle of civilization. From this perspective there is no need to fight for it and Ahmad resists this idea. Therefore, although his teacher tries to show him the American way stating that “or to fight for your brothers, it could be. Not all Iraqis are insurgents, you know. Most aren’t. They just want to get on with business. Civilization started there. They had an up-and-coming little country, until Saddam” (Updike, 2006: 41), Ahmad thinks he will not be one of them by joining the army. Ahmad’s feeling of being left outside the dynamics of American politics can also be

observed in his conversation with Joryleen about the president. Ahmad uses “your” president to refer to Bush although he is a citizen of America by birth. Yet he rejects altogether the spirit that dominates American culture and politics. He says, “it makes no difference which President is in. They all want Americans to be selfish and materialistic, to play their part in consumerism. But the human spirit asks for self-denial. It longs to say ‘No’ to the physical world” (Updike, 2006: 72).

Because of his belief in Islam, Ahmad thinks of people of other religions as “weak Christians and nonobservant Jews” (Updike, 2006: 3) because they “lack true faith; they are not on the Straight Path; they are unclean” (Updike, 2006: 3). By upturning Arundhati Roy’s caste discourse in presenting the society with two groups: clean-unclean, Updike shows how a Muslim-American thinks about American society. The unclean part consists of his school friends, teachers, and his family—namely who are not Muslim, and the clean part consists of his Muslim friends. Updike uses the divergent styles of Ahmad and other students as a way to portray how lower middle class people of Middle Eastern descent fall in post-9/11 America. Ahmad also opposes his teachers and criticizes them whom he thinks “puffy” with “bad breath” and “unclean” (Updike, 2006: 3). He criticizes them because “their lives away from the school are disorderly and wanton and self-indulgent” (Updike, 2006: 4). Ahmad differentiates himself by wearing “a clean white shirt everyday, like some preacher” (Updike, 2006: 9) to show how all other religion, except for Islam, is unclean. By showing himself as a clean Muslim boy, he in a way takes attention to the unclean American society: “tattooed girls and sauntering boys with dead-eyed looking” (Updike, 2006: 3).

Sexuality plays a significant part in demarcating the boundary between clean, pure and unclean. Although Ahmad is attracted to Joryleen, one of his classmates, with her “smooth body, darker than caramel but paler than chocolate” (Updike, 2006: 15), he never shows his interest in her because his Islamic teachings confirm: “[w]omen are animals, Ahmad has been warned by Shaikh Rashid, and he can see for himself that the high school and the world beyond it are full of nuzzling—blind animals in a herd bumping against one another, looking for a scent that will comfort

them” (Updike, 2006:10). He wants to be near her, but is repelled by the vague language in the Qur’an regarding male-female relationships. Ahmad’s rejection of his bodily desire makes him more excluded from his friends. As a result, he determines, “high school and the world beyond it are full of nuzzling—blind animals in a herd bumping against one another, looking for a scent that will comfort them” (Updike, 2006: 10). Therefore, Ahmad hardly thinks like a typical teenager charged up with hormones. Because of Ahmad’s sexual puzzlement, Ahmad tries to give another direction to his feelings. With the help of Shaikh Rashid’s connections, Ahmad takes a job which is to drive a delivery truck for Excellency Home Furnishings, and on driving, he generally “feels clean . . . cut off from the base world” (Updike, 2006: 157). Also he likens the feeling to his boyhood dreams of flying, which caused him to “sometimes awake with an erection, or more shamefully still, a large wet spot on the inside of his pajama fly” (Updike, 2006: 156). After sexual awakening, he consulted the Qur’an nonetheless he could not find an answer. Ahmad’s devotion to Islam is in a way an attempt to negotiate the difficulties of adolescence.

To show those difficulties, Updike presents Tylenol, his school friend with whom Ahmad’s physical and moral weakness is compared. Tylenol is an African American who repeatedly calls Ahmad “Arab” instead of using his name. He says “Black Muslims I don’t diss, but you not black, you not anything but a poor shithead. You no raghead, you a shithead” (Updike, 2006: 16). That kind of othering from the lowest racial categories is much similar to the one Antoinette confronts in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Like Antoinette’s position as “a white nigger” in the eyes of Tia—her black friend, Ahmad’s position presents an extreme level of denigration. Updike, by representing Ahmad’s African-American friends and Ahmad’s Muslim-American identity duality, puts forward the idea that Muslim-Americans are lower than the African-Americans in that society. For example, Updike’s presenting Tylenol as athletic, muscular, and a typical bully highlights Ahmad’s lack of physical weakness, which shows itself in a fight with Tylenol at school.

The rescuer from this fight is Jack Levy a 63 year-old Jew who represents the ordinary American. He is the guidance counselor at Ahmad’s high school, and a

fatherly figure whose job it is to point kids in the right direction. However, Jack feels inadequate in his job because of the huge gap between his generation and the new one. Thus, he fails to understand the way the younger generation thinks and loses his ability to affect their lives. Jack finds in Ahmad the possibility to save his true image as a counselor when he attempts to become a paternal figure to the fatherless young boy. On learning that Rashid is the job finder and knowing the fact that Ahmad is far more capable than of accepting a job moving furniture, Jack wants him to leave that job. Nevertheless, the boy wants nothing to do with him and views Jack's help as an insult to his religion. In the first consultation with Ahmad when Jack asks Ahmad which surname he prefers to be called—"Mulloy or . . . Ashmawy" (Updike, 2006: 36), Ahmad answers "[m]y mother attached her name to me, on my Social Security and driver's license, . . . But when I am out of school and independent I will become Ahmad Ashmawy" (Updike, 2006: 37). It is also in this conversation that Jack learns the existence of imam who finds for Ahmad the job "to drive a truck" (Updike, 2006: 41) in his free-time.

The novel shows Ahmad faced with the choice of the ways represented by Jack and Rashid. Rashid stands at an obvious advantage here because of combining the characteristics of Ahmad's father: he is both a Muslim outsider and provides the paternal authority and clear-cut rules of guidance of the patriarchal institution of Islam, which Ahmad lacked in his life. Ahmad's dedication to Islam reaches the point where he basically becomes a fundamentalist, literally believing every word imam Rashid tells him and reacting strongly against the various aspects of American culture with which he comes in contact. Ahmad judges regularly: "Infidels, they think safety lies in accumulation of the things of this world, and in the corrupting diversions of the television set. They are slaves to images, false ones of happiness and affluence" (Updike, 2006: 4). His criticism gets to the point where Ahmad pits himself against all others around him in a defensive mode that shuts him off from the world around him except for the Mosque and his job arranged by the imam. In a way, Ahmad's decision to be a terrorist stems from his cultural resistance to the mainstream culture and its religion.

His preference of Rashid's help is thus a consequence of the negative attitudes of the society in post 9/11. One of the examples is given in Ahmad's mother's talk with his school teacher Mr. Levy. When Mr. Levy tells her that he has tried to call the phone number on Ahmad's school records and he gets a recording saying that it had been disconnected, she says "We had to, after Nine-Eleven, . . . [w]e were getting hate calls. Anti-Muslim. I had the number changed an unlisted even if it does cost a couple dollars a month more. It's worth it, I tell you" (Updike, 2006: 79). Ahmad, embarrassed, interposes his mother by stating that there are only two or three calls. He says "no big deal. Most people were cool. I mean, I was only fifteen when it happened. Who could blame me" (Updike, 2006: 79). Nonetheless, Ahmad as a mature boy is aware of the fact that society blames everyone with Arabic ethnic background, an oppression which gets him closer to Rashid.

Ahmad's relationship with his mother is also in conflict. Raised in a single-parent home, Ahmad views his mother negatively because she does not measure up to the standards of Muslim women. He is most critical of her revolving door relationships with various boyfriends over the years and her overtly flirtatious manner. Early in the novel, Ahmad thinks that he often saw her less than one hour a day, since she works odd shifts as nurse's aid at a local hospital. Later, Teresa tells Jack at Ahmad's graduation that the only present he wanted was for her to not look "like a whore" at the ceremony" (Updike, 2006: 116). Although he does not admit it to himself or anyone else, Ahmad seems to blame his mother for growing up without a father or sibling for support. After Ahmad begins working and gets even greater distance from his mother, he begins grouping her with other Americans, whose vices are easy to identify. He thinks to himself that she is a "typical American, lacking strong convictions and courage and comfort they bring" (Updike, 2006: 167). Ahmad labels Teresa a "victim of the American religion of freedom," which enables her to do whatever she likes with no real consequences (Updike, 2006: 167). He disparages his mother for lacking the courage and comfort that accompany strong beliefs, yet cannot see his own frailty and doubts as similar weakness. She sees his turn to "Allah" as an attempt to find paternal guidance, explaining to Jack, "I guess a boy needs a father, and if he doesn't have one he'll invent one" (Updike, 2006: 117). Moreover, the sexual suppression comes from Islamic beliefs are also questioned by

her mother. She questions why he does not have girlfriends like other boys of his age and Ahmad answers his mother: "Mom, I'm not gay, if that's what you're implying" and with her mother's response "How do you know?" Ahmad being shocked only can say "I know" (Updike, 2006: 144). Even his teacher Jack thinks that "It doesn't seem quite right" that a good-looking kid like her son would not have a girlfriend (Updike, 2006: 166). Teresa is also suspicious of Rashid labeling him "kind of creepy," basically equating homosexuality with creepiness as he and Ahmad's intense religious study conducted over the years.

Ahmad's mother feels inadequate in making a strong impact on her son. For Ahmad's interest in Islam and Rashid is a result of his need for a father. It is possible to direct criticism at the mainstream American culture here because it is this culture's patriarchal formation that causes a gap in Ahmad. While promoting patriarchal values on the one hand, American culture acts as a cruel and distant stepfather that discriminates against the racially different children in his family on the other. Young people like Ahmad thus seek other fathers who adopt them and who do not throw their differences at their faces. Since he is in search of a father, his mother's religion does not hold any appeal for Ahmad. His mother is unable to help her son with his problem of identity because identity in patriarchal cultures is shaped around the identity of the father, to which she also acquiesces. She says "My son is above it all. . . . [H]e believes in the Islamic God, and in what the Koran tells him. I can't, of course, but I have never tried to undermine his faith" (Updike, 2006: 85). After she talks with Jack, a disgusted Ahmad realizes that Jack "now thinks himself entitled to play with her son a paternal, friendly role" (Updike, 2006: 94). Jack thinks of himself as playing an important part because he believes that Ahmad feels the need of father figure. For Ahmad, the invented father referred to is Islam, with the Imam. Jack's literally becomes the white man's challenge to supplant Islam as the guiding force. Nevertheless, Ahmad circumvents Jack's guidance and prefers Rashid's guiding hand, among other Islamic influences in his life.

Shaikh Rashid is presented as an Islamic Imam who incites Muslims to commit acts of violence and promoting hatred of Jews and Christians and who describes democracy and America as un-Islamic. He is the only source of the Islamic

teachings, and his dangerous guidance results in Ahmad's attempt to be a terrorist. Nonetheless, it is his environment—his school, outcasting of his schoolmates, the conditions that they are faced in the post 9/11—that makes Ahmad a terrorist. Imam Rashid controls and manipulates this isolated teenager. For example, it is Imam Rashid who teaches Ahmad how to be intolerant, one sided, block minded. On Ahmad's visit to Jack, being annoyed with the repressive attitudes of Rashid, Jack asks " 'Did the imam ever suggest that a bright boy like you, in a diverse and tolerant society like this one, needs to confront a variety of viewpoints?' . . . 'Shaikh Rashid did not suggest that sir. He feels that such a relativistic approach trivializes religion, implying that it does not much matter' " (Updike, 2006: 39).

Rashid is not the only one Ahmad believes and takes lessons from. There is also the Islamic-American fanatic Charlie, who Ahmad identifies as another authority figure despite his young age. In turn, Charlie uses his affiliation with Islam to further influence the teen, planting ideas that will ultimately convince Ahmad to agree to serve as a suicide bomber. Often when Charlie probes Ahmad about the teen's commitment to life and death, he ends by calling Ahmad "[g]ood boy," clearly playing a paternalistic role. Later, when Charlie feels that Ahmad has committed to serve, he invokes the nickname he gave the boy when they first met, saying "[m]adman, you're a good brave kid" (Updike, 2006: 189).

Updike avoids presenting the Islamic people and culture per se as prone to terrorism. What he successfully demonstrates is that certain power groups both in the West and in the Islamic world compete for domination and both manipulate young people like Ahmad for their conflict of self-interests. This is most evident in both sides' willingness to use militaristic means and technology for destruction no matter what their origin. Rashid is willing to use innovation and modern technology to destroy the West because, as he says, "[t]hey take from Muslims their traditions and a sense of themselves, the pride in themselves that all men are entitled to" (Updike, 2006: 188). It is people like Rashid and their ability to turn the weapons of the West against it that pose a threat to Homeland Security officers in America. According to one of those figures in the novel, Hermione, who is working with the Secretary for Homeland Security, "there are some imams . . . that distinctly bear watching. They

all preach terrible things against America, but some of them go beyond that. I mean, in advocating violence against the state” (Updike, 2006: 134). What Hermione said turned out to be true. Shaikh Rashid instructs Ahmad to consider his American fellows as enemies and urge him to use his time in America as preparation for jihad:

‘There is a way,’ his master cautiously begins, ‘in which a mighty blow can be delivered against His enemies.’ . . . ‘A way,’ Shaikh Rashid repeats, fastidiously. ‘It would involve a *shahid* whose love of God is unqualified, and who impatiently thirsts for the glory of Paradise. Are you such a one, Ahmad? . . . [I]t has been seen to that you have all the skills you need. . . . We have, in our war for God . . . technical experts equal to those of the enemy, and a will and spirit overwhelmingly greater than his. (Updike, 2006: 234)

By using Arabic terms, Updike shows his skill to be the voice of the “Muslim other”. Although he is not from that origin, he presents Arabic language to link his protagonist with his culture like Rhys does with Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Roys with Ammu and her twins in *The God of Small Things*. In many of the talks among Rashid, Charlie and Ahmad, Updike successfully refers to the Qur’an. It is clear that Updike has done a detailed research for the Qur’an; it is quoted, sometimes in phonetically rendered Arabic. He, as if he is Arab-American, uses the language effectively like an ethnic writer does. He chooses to give examples from suras. For example, if his conversation with Charlie from the mosque is taken into consideration, Charlie asks Ahmad whether or not he is with Jihad. Ahmad answers “The answer is “how could I not be? The prophet urges it in the Book. Mohammed is Allah’s apostle. Those who follow him are ruthless to the unbelievers but merciful to one another” (Updike, 2006: 183). Furthermore, Updike compares American hero with an Islamic fanatic to highlight Islam’s challenge to the heroic narratives of the past. It is in a comparison to George Washington by Charlie, talking to Ahmad that the challenge is issued. “That was Georgie. He leaned to take what came, to fight guerrilla-style: hit and hide, hit and hide. He was the Ho Chi Minh of his day. We were like Hamas. We were Al-Qaida. The thing about New Jersey was . . . the British wanted it to be a model of pacification—winning hearts and minds you’re heard of

that” (Updike, 2006: 181). He goes on to claim that “the jihad and the Revolution waged the same kind of war” (Updike, 2006: 286). In the figure of George Washington, the white male hero becomes a thing of the past because the U.S. is not the fighter in the face of oppression any longer. The Islamic terrorist now fills the role of George Washington according to Ahmad’s friend. It serves as a talk for the boy to commit to becoming a suicide bomber and overtake the role of the hero. Jack’s position is thus that of defender of the legacy of George Washington, the father of the country.

Ahmad’s critique of America is most radical when he condemns America as a nation where one’s freedom is curbed. For Ahmad, it is freedom, which is one of the major tenets and most cherished of American democracy and values, that Ahmad sees lacking in America. The boy sees the country as “lacking strong convictions and the courage and comfort they bring. . . . freedom above all, though freedom to do what and to what purpose is left up in the air” (Updike, 2006: 167). Ahmad thinks American people are deceived by a false sense of freedom which is useless in any meaningful way. It is the freedom to consume, to make themselves better and more pliable slaves to the system. In a way it would not be wrong to suggest that for Updike, too, it is this sort of freedom against which Ahmad embodies a threat. In a globalized world and in a nation that boasts of being made up of almost all the nationalities around the world, turning against a large population outside has high risks especially from the affiliates inside. Such an atmosphere will eventually alienate some people within the national boundaries and help them identify with the anti-American Islamic groups worldwide. The dominant rhetoric of patriotism in the post 9/11 America that divided the people all around the world between us and them ostracized many people in the country. Such rhetoric was based on the process of “other”ing certain nationalities in the world and minorities inside and inspiring fear related to them as potential terrorists. Terrorism then is a byproduct of the globalized capitalism which feeds upon small scale wars and conflicts along with the cultural hegemony of the West over the non-West.

While terrorism engenders a strong sense of injustice and violence on the part of the politically weaker group, Islam in this case, it produces a strong and prevalent sense of fear in the dominant culture, America in this case. Updike's novel chronicles the world of fear in which the white American male has an object to combat, transnational terrorism. Fear is one of the topics of the text where it issues a challenge to the freedom of American society. The references to "syberattack," "worst-case-scenarios," and the way "a few pounds of Semtex or TNT" which could take out a bridge or local building fill the text with a sense of doom that is palpable to the characters (Updike, 2006: 132-133). And the threat these scenarios offer is a direct assault on America: "An open society is so *defenseless*. Everything the modern free world has achieved is so *fragile*" (Updike, 2006: 132). The change envisioned by the fear and threat of terrorism is one in which "[w]e can never be happy again—we Americans" (Updike, 2006: 132). The voices of the media seem to be taken literally and repeated throughout the text to set the scene. Fear dominates the landscape and the society is forever changed, at least, that is the challenge being issued for the white male to defeat. The American system creates its inverted image in a type of terrorist whom American society strongly believes that he/she believes in Islam.

Ahmad becomes the expected terrorist, driving a truck into the city loaded with enough explosives to destroy the Lincoln Tunnel heading into New York. Jack discovers the plan and surmises the boy's route to the city, placing himself at the optimal point to join the boy in the cab of the truck. A conversation ensues in which Jack attempts to convince the boy not to carry out his terrorist plan. Ahmad begins to see the irony that all of those that played fatherly roles in his life and set him on his task, his absent father, the imam and his Muslim friends, are gone and a "tired Jew in clothes as if he dressed in the dark has taken their place" (Updike, 2006: 290). Jack, and not Shaikh Rashid, is ready to die with him: "I don't think I'll get out. We're in this together, son" (Updike, 2006: 296). Jack prevents the atrocity by forcing Ahmad to see the humanity of those around him that will die if he triggers the explosives. It figures as the moment when Jack truly becomes the father figure of Ahmad's life and guides him to the safety of society. To convince him to drop his terrorist idea Mr.

Levy says to Ahmad, "Hey, come on, we're all Americans here. That's the idea; didn't they tell you that at Central High? Irish-Americans, African-Americans, Jewish-Americans; there are even Arab-Americans" (Updike, 2006: 301). Jack even assures Ahmad of his support if he aborts his suicidal mission and surrenders to the police: "Let's get this truck back to Jersey. They'll be happy to see it. And happy to see you, I regret to say. But you committed no crime, I'll be the first to point out . . . they'll probably lift your license, but that's O.K. delivering furniture wasn't your future anyway" (Updike, 2006: 308).

In the end, Mr. Levy succeeds in turning Ahmad from his path but for Ahmad still, the city people are living for self-advancement and self-preservation. Ahmad, on the other hand, is not changed. As the opening of the novel, the novel closes with Ahmad's inner thought that "These devils, Ahmad thinks, have taken away my God" (Updike, 2006: 310). Although this sounds like a sense of defeat, Ahmad is at least for the present saved from being a terrorist. Jack not only saved Ahmad, and the city of New Jersey, but also provided him with prophetic advice regarding his future: "I know this may sound premature, but I wasn't kidding about you making a good lawyer. You're cool under pressure. You talk well. In the years to come, Arab-Americans are going to need plenty of lawyers" (Updike, 2006: 309). Jack tries to show the greatness of the nation to own him back. The last line of *Terrorist* echoes the opening, but in the later scene, Ahmad thinks, "*These devils . . . have taken away my God*" (Updike, 2006: 310). The devils have taken away his angry, misguided God and replaced it with a God who rejoices in creation, not destruction.

Although the reader is left with the impression of the superiority of the secular, westernized, and the Jewish Jack over the fundamentalist, eastern Muslim Shaikh Rashid, Updike represents the underlying conditions in which a subaltern wants to choose to be a terrorist as an act of resistance in the global world. It is the mental anguish Ahmad experiences which Updike ties to the young man's intense faith, subaltern position in an eliminative society and longing for a father figure.

CONCLUSION

From the colonial times to the global, the resistance strategies find its place in many literary products. Thus, this study has investigated how the selected writers reflect their protagonist's resistance towards the dominating culture's ideology in their novels. Although written in different periods, Jean Rhys in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Arundhati Roy in *The God of Small Things*, and John Updike in *Terrorist*, give voice to the silenced, oppressed, and in-between characters and make their stories heard. All the three protagonists share the common in-between-ness, exclusion and try to find ways to make their voices heard by society through resisting the dominant ideology. Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Ammu in *The God of Small Things* and Ahmad in *Terrorist* are oppressed with the practices of dominant system. The oppression, which dates back to the colonization of the non-West by the West, continues in the globalized world albeit in different and more subtle ways. Therefore, Antoinette and Ammu quest for emancipation both from male and social domination whereas Ahmad quests for emancipation from social domination. The cultural hybridity of these protagonists make them feel torn between the two cultures while Antoinette's and Ahmad's occupying also a genetically hybrid position excludes them from the society more. The resistance they show is seen in both in their actions and discourse.

In *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Jean Rhys's protagonist Antoinette, who acted as "the mad woman in the attic" in the former text *Jane Eyre*, shows her resistance towards the dominating colonial and patriarchal culture. By rewriting *Jane Eyre*, and challenging the Euro-centric view of the former novel, Rhys brings the white Caribbean voice to the forefront by giving Bertha/Antoinette the voice that is limited in the earlier text. Rhys examines the issues of colonialism by bringing to light the former text's instability and subjectivity, and by showing the underlying reasons behind Antoinette's "madness." Rhys demonstrates the multilayered working of hierarchical systems and their intermingled and cooperative construction. Aiming at demonstrating this complex network of relationships, this dissertation has discussed the negative effects of patriarchy and colonialism and their oppressive practices on the subaltern in the context of the unequal power relations between colonizer and the

colonized, between white and black, and as well as between men and women. These unequal relations have been discussed in terms of master-slave relationship, which emphasizes the domination of the white ruling class and the submission of women and the colonized natives.

Due to her being of French and English descent, Antoinette finds no place in society. Hers is an exclusion from both the new colonialists such as her husband and the ex-slave black population of the island. The racial slurs from both sides—the blacks call her “white cockroach” and the English women “white nigger”—testify to her rejection and exclusion from both levels of society, which have their own reasons to hate her: For the blacks she is a representative and reminder of slavery and racial oppression, and she is a reminder of race mixing and contaminated whiteness for the newly arrived whites, who are to some extent guarded from the hatred of the black population because they individually are not related to slavery days. The experience of Antoinette in patriarchal society is one of forced dependency and exclusion. Her marriage is constructed on such dynamics. Her husband Rochester is the dominating English colonialist figure who endeavors to convert her into an English lady by changing her name to Bertha. In his attempt to dominate Antoinette, Rochester represents a typical colonial and oppressive master. His relationship with Antoinette is based on absolute hierarchical distinction between the ruler and the ruled. Antoinette’s narrative reflects her desire to assert her cultural identity by challenging Rochester’s imperialist assumptions. This resolve is shown in her refusal to cooperate with the imperialist discourse and to assimilate herself to its images which reduce her to a lunatic woman, belonging to a wild tropical land. The discourse between the couple is thus in violent conflict. While Rochester maintains a white male imperialist stance, Antoinette attempts to preserve both her integrity as a woman in the face of patriarchal oppression and the possibility of hybrid identities that will negotiate the legitimacy of the liminal space between the oppressor and the oppressed. As they represent two opposed centers of consciousness, there is a wide gap between Antoinette and Rochester. Antoinette’s resistance is also textually expressed; in Rhys’s novel, it is her who tells her story and gives the reader her side of things. Antoinette’s resistance by invading his narration to confront his imperialist

ideology is the result of her challenging his superiority and by emphasizing her point of view. What appears as a result of her storytelling is that it is in fact Rochester who is on the verge of madness, invaded by fears and insecurities, but since he is empowered both by patriarchy and colonialism, her voice is suffocated under his. The novel opens up new horizons by showing her active resistance to the discourse of the white male ideology of imperialism, as voiced through Rochester's consciousness, in many of its dialogues.

The conflict between Antoinette and Rochester's discourses brings to the surface power relations between the two, which are gender driven and culturally based. Each one of them tries to superimpose meaning and ultimately a contradictory ideology through a mode of language. Antoinette's subversion of the imperialist discourse is also evidenced by the high value she attaches to her identity. Even when confined to the attic of Thornfield Hall, Antoinette struggles to restore her identity. Rhys dispels the constraints imposed on the Creole woman in *Jane Eyre*, and constructs an adequate space for self-expression, by correcting Brontë's representation of her. The effect of Rhys' re-writing is to affirm through Antoinette's voice that "[t]here is always the other side, always" (Rhys, 1966:: 1966: 128).

Particularly focusing on the superimposition of Western power structures and the colonial heritage, Arundhati Roy conveys the Indian postcolonial experience in *The God of Small Things*. The author depicts three major interlinked power structures that work in the spheres of caste, gender and race. *The God of Small Things* projects resistance while seeking to empower the marginalized and excluded. As the title suggests, it is about small things, small people, and small events that make up a small village called Ayemenem in Kerala. These small things exist in the face of the big people and the mighty Gods who threaten to crush them at every step. Among the cast rules and the patriarchy, Ammu, Estha, Rahel and Velutha represent small people and subaltern positions within the dominant structure of the novel's social world. Ammu's subaltern position is prescribed both by her gender and her subjectivity as a divorced single mother.

The resistance that Ammu shows against the patriarchal oppression and rigid caste system first results in an unhappy marriage with a Hindu man, and then a forbidden relationship with an Untouchable Velutha. Ammu and Velutha's challenge of the "Love Laws" (Roy, 1997:, 1997: 33) represents a political statement against caste custom. Ammu's transgression of the "Love Laws" is determined as well by an acute awareness of her subordinate position and the oppression she endures at the hands of the patriarchy. Her affair with the Untouchable is indeed a political statement against her subjection to male oppression. Ammu becomes the agent of her own destiny. In doing so, she affirms and legitimizes her desire for a man that, according to caste custom, she is never to touch let alone have intercourse with. In this light, her relationship with Velutha is a conscious act of rebellion by which she resists the strict rules of caste. Her victory is her defiance of tradition of caste and her refusal to internalize negative images and representations of female sexuality that pervade patriarchal discourse.

Even if the main events of *The God of Small Things* are set more than twenty years after the Independence of India, Roy shows that there are still fixed modes of consciousness that engender a feeling of inferiority and the drive to mimicry. Ammu's family, the Ipes, show a drive to mimicry owing to their internalization of the colonizer's ideological representation of their otherness. Their drive to mimicry finds expression in their concern with and attitude towards the English. In addition to being a status marker, English, defined by Celia Britton as a "cultural tool" (Britton , 1999: 88), is for them an object of desire and identification as it is also a metaphor for western white identity. Baby Kochamma's and Chacko's pride in their mastery of English is indeed the result of their belief that their linguistic skills and performance in the language of the former colonizer are a fundamental component of their identity. In other words, mastery of standard English gives them an illusory whiteness. Unlike Baby Kochamma and Chacko, who believe in the link between language and identity, Roy's manipulation of English shows that for the author, "language is a material practice and as such is determined by a complex weave of social conditions and experience" (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 1989: 41). In order to "abrogate the privileged centrality of English" (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin,

1989: 51), Roy transgresses its rules and standard use and subverts meaning. By reshaping and experimenting with English, the language of imperial domination, Roy undermines the legitimacy of a standard code. Moreover, Roy's appropriation of English is instrumental in signifying and legitimizing cultural variance and expressing a definite way of being in the world. It is mainly through her use of twins' language that author effectively appropriates English and makes it "bear the burden" (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 1989: 10) of the post colonial experience. As a matter of fact, Roy's reinvention of English is metonymic of the post colonial voice, challenging a former instrument of colonial power, and it constitutes an act of resistance.

John Updike with his protagonist Ahmad presents the idea that the act of resistance to the dominating system continues in the global world in which the ideology of colonization appears as the cultural and economic hegemony of European and American cultures. Neo-colonialism is a system in which power belongs to those who control the international economic system. In this system, power relations, which depend on economic rivalry between cultures and nations, create economic and cultural inequalities resulting in the silencing of the dependent side and giving the dominant side the right of representing the other. In this respect, the media, as a means of forming a stereotype, becomes an important element. The representation of the other is mainly achieved through the media where, especially after the 9/11 hysteria, books about Islam and movies that perpetuate Arab and Muslim stereotypes often serve to confirm and reinforce the image of Muslim as a terrorist.

Like Roy and Rhys, Updike gives voice to the in-between character Ahmad and presents the other side of the coin by giving the reasons behind one's choosing terror in terms of resistance in the global world. Ahmad Ashmawy Mulloy is the son of an Irish-American mother and an Egyptian exchange student who abandoned his family when Ahmad was three, leaving the boy with a void that he tries to fill with a fervent devotion to Allah. At the age of eleven, Ahmad becomes interested in Islam, which is his way of trying to recapture the missing part of his life represented by his

absentee father. The absence of the father figure makes Ahmad closer to Imam Rashid whereas the school teacher Jack Levy is another volunteer.

Ahmad's exclusion from the society is another reason for his closure to Islam. Since after the 9/11 events, all the Muslims are seen as potential terrorists, Ahmad is outcast from his environment both in his school and society although he is an American born citizen. Like Antoinette he is the target of derogatory words from his friends. From the beginning of the novel, the young Muslim character sets himself in opposition to the materialistic values of American capitalism and consumer culture. He deems America as materially rich but spiritually poor. Sure of his belief that the American godless society does not fulfill his needs, he turns towards Islam, and this exclusion brings him closer to Imam who imposes on him the idea to become a terrorist as a testimony of his devotion to his religion. Like Rhys and Roy, Updike gives voice to a subaltern and the shows the reasons why one chooses such an act to resist the dominating ideology. Updike's representation of the new downtrodden minority in the West evokes a similar awareness about silent groups who develop methods of resistance against a system that denies their entitlement to their differences and warns about the dangerous results of labeling and ostracizing that go on both outside an inside the centers of globalized world.

To conclude, in bringing together these three seemingly quite different novels, this study shows that, despite occurring in different parts of the world, the discourse of colonialism, perpetuated in the discourse of globalization, still has multiple effects on the individuals who are cast out, excluded and left on the margins, unable to attach themselves to any viable identity and to develop any forms of social belonging. It is their in-between position, feeling neither this or that, inability to find a positive and affirmative response from their immediate environments, that drive them to seek out various ways of resistance, to which the authors of these novels in question also contribute by their representation of such characters, by giving them voice and identity, and by thus challenging the long-held discourses of the intricate webs of varying forms of hegemony.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alatas, S. F. (2005). Is Objective Reporting on Islam Possible? Contextualizing the 'Demon'. *Covering Islam: Challenges & Opportunities for Media in the Global Village*. Singapore: The Center for Islamic and Malay Affairs.

Al-Leithy, A. (2009). Stereotyping Islam: A Critical Study of Terror in John Updike's Terrorist. *Engaging Terror: A Critical and Interdisciplinary Approach* (203-208). Florida: Brown Walker Press.

Ashcroft, B., Gareth G., and Tiffin H. (1998). *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ashcroft, B., Gareth G., and Tiffin H. (1989). *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge.

Arnett, J. J. (2002). The Psychology of Globalization. *American Psychologist*, 57.10: 774-783.

Azim, F. (1993). *The Colonial Rise of the Novel*. New York: Routledge.

Balvannanadhan, A. (2002). Re-Membering Personal History in *The God of Small Things*. *Commonwealth Essays and Studies*, 25.1: 97-106.

Banerjee, M. (2008). Whiteness of a Different Color? Racial Profiling in John Updike's Terrorist. *Neohelion*, Vol. 35 Number 2: 13-28.

Baneth-Nouailhetas, E. (2007). The Structures of Memory. *Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things* (142-54). Editor Alex Tickell. London: Routledge.

Barsamian, D. (2001). Arundhati Roy. *Progressive*, Vol. 65 Issue 4: 33-40.

Beonit, M. (1998). Circular Time: A Study of Narrative Techniques in Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. *World Literature Written in English* 38.1: 98-106.

Bhabha, H. K. (1985). Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority Under a Tree Outside Delhi, May 1817. *Race, Writing, and Difference*. Ed. Henry Louis Gates, Jr. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bhabha, H. (1990). *Nation and Narration*. New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Brathwaite, E. K. (1971). The Development of Creole Society in Jamaica, 1770-1820. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brathwaite, E. K. (1974). The African Presence in Caribbean Literature. *Slavery, Colonialism, and Racism*, Vol. 103, No. 2: 73-109.

Brewster, A. (1995). *Literary Formations: Post-colonialism, Nationalism, Globalism*. Victoria: Melbourne University Press.

Britton, C. M. (1999). *Edouard Glissant and Postcolonial Theory: Strategies of Language and Resistance*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Brown, J. M. (1994). *Modern India: The Origins of an Asian Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boyce, J. K. (2004). Green and Brown? Globalization and the Environment. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 20.1: 105: 128.

Bigelow, B. C. (2011). *African Americans*.
<http://www.everyculture.com/multi/A-Br/African-Americans.html> (19 Oct.2011).

Cabaret, F. (2002). Classification in *The God of Small Things*. *Reading Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things* (75-90). Editors Carole Durix and Jean-Pierre Durix. Dijon, France: Editions Universitaires de Dijon.

Cainkar, L. (2004). Post 9/11 Domestic Policies Affecting U. S. Arabs and Muslims: A Brief Review. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 24:1: 247-50.

Campbell, E. (1990). Reflections of Obeah in Jean Rhys' Fiction. *Critical Perspectives on Jean Rhys* (59-67). Ed. Pierrette M. Frickey. Washington: Three Continents Press.

Charney, M. (1968). The Imagery of Antony and Cleopatra. *Shakespeare's Roman Plays* (79-141). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Chandler, D. (2010). *Marxist Media Theory. Gramsci and Hegemony*. <http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/marxism/marxism14.html> (10 May 2010).

Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chomsky, N. (2003). *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance*. New York: Holt.

Chowdhury, K. (2006). Interrogating "Newness" Globalization and Postcolonial Theory in the Age of Endless War. *Cultural Critique*, 62: 126-161.

Coombes, A. E. and Avtar B. (2000). Introduction: the Conundrum of Mixing. *Hybridity and Its Discontents: Politics, Science, Culture* (1-15). Editors Avtar Brah and Annie E. Coombes. London: Routledge.

Cundal, F. (1971). *Historic Jamaica*. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation.

Cudjoe, S. (1980). *Resistance and Caribbean Literature*. Ohio: Ohio University Press.

Dallmayr, F. (2006). But on a Quiet Day... A Tribute to Arundhati Roy. *The Logos Reader* (149-165). Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky.

Dirlik, A. (2002). Historical Colonialism in Contemporary Perspective. *Public Culture*, 14.3: 611-615.

Dirlik, A. (2005). The End of Colonialism? The Colonial Modern in the Making of Global Modernity. *Boundary*, 2 32.1:1-30.

Elliot, A. (1997). Caste and the God of Small Things.
<http://www.english.emory.edu/Bahri/caste.html> (18 June 2008).

Emery, M. L. (1982). The Politics of Form: Jean Rhys's Social Vision in *Voyage in the Dark* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*. *Twentieth Century Literature*, Vol. 28, No. 4: 418-430.

Emery, M. L. (1990). *Jean Rhys at "World's End": Novels of Colonial and Sexual Exile*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Fanon, F. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press.

Ferguson, M. (1993). Sending the Younger Son Across the Wide Sargasso Sea: The New Colonizer Arrives. *Colonialism and Gender from Mary Wollstonecraft to Jamaica Kincaid: East Caribbean Connections*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fishman, J.A. (1977). *Language, Ethnicity, and Intergroup Relations*. New York: Harcourt Brace J.

Friedman, S. S. (2005). Paranoia, Pollution, and Sexuality: Affiliations between E. M. Forster's *Passage to India* and Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. *Geomodernisms: Race, Modernism, Modernity* (245-61). Editors. Laura Doyle and Laura Winkiel. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Galbraith, J. K. (1992). *The Culture of Contentment*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Greeg, V. M. (1995). *Jean Rhys's Historical Imagination: Reading and Writing The Creole*. Chapel Hill: University of N. Carolina Press.

Greenblatt, S. J. (1990). *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Gikandi, S. (2002). Globalization and the Claims of Postcoloniality. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 100.3: 627-658. Duke University Press.

Gilber, S. M. and Gubar S. (1979). *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Gilles, J. (2000). The Figure of the New World in *The Tempest*. *The Tempest and Its Travels* (180-200). Editors Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Greene, R. (2004). Colonial Becomes Postcolonial. *Modern Language Quarterly* 65.3: 23-41.

Griffiths, G. (1996). The Post-colonial Project: Critical Approaches and Problems. *New National and Post-colonial Literatures: An Introduction* (164-177). Editor Bruce King. Oxford: Clarendon.

Hainsworth, S. (2000). *Gramsci's Hegemony Theory and the Ideological Role of the Mass Media*.
<http://www.cultstock.org/index.php?page=contributions/gramsci.html> (25 July 2010).

Hall, S. (1985). Religious Ideologies and Social Movements in Jamaica. *Religion and Ideology* (269-96). Eds. R. Bobcock and K. Thompson. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hannel, R. (2004). *Imperialism, Human Rights, and Protectionism: A Question and Answer Session on Globalization*.
<http://www.zmag.org/globropes.htm> (04 Aug. 2009).

Harlow, B. and Mia Carter. (1999). *Imperialism and Orientalism A Documentary Sourcebook*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hartnell. A. (2011). Violence and the Faithful in Post-9/11 America: Updike's Terrorist, Islam, and the Specter of Exceptionalism. *MFS Modern Fiction Studies*, 57.3:477-502.

Huntington, S. (1993). "The Clash of Civilizations." *Foreign Affairs*, 72.3: 22-49.

Howells, C. A. (1991). *Jean Rhys*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Lee, R. E. (2006). *Globalization, Language, and Culture*. Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers.

Loomba, A. (1998). *Colonialism/Postcolonialism: The New Critical Idiom*. New York: Routledge.

James, L. (1978). *Jean Rhys*. London: Longmans.

King, B. (1980). *The New English Literatures: Cultural Nationalism in a Changing World*. London: Macmillan.

Krishnaswamy, R. (2002). Criticism at the Intersection of Postcolonialism and Globalization Theory. *Diacritics* 32.2: 106-126.

Malik, N. (1999). The God of Small Things: A Study of English Influence on Indian Culture. *Explorations: Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things* (162-167). Editors Indira Bhatt, Indira Nityanandam. New Delhi: Creative Books.

McCombs, M. E., Shaw D. L. (1984). The Agenda-Setting Function of the Press. *Media Power in Politics* (63-72). Editors Doris A. Graber. Washington D.C: Congressional Quarterly Press.

McQuail, D. (2000). Media Genres and Texts. *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory*, (331 – 355). London: Sage.

McLeod, J. (2000). *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester University.

Meyer, S. L. (1990). Colonialism and the Figurative Strategy of Jane Eyre. *Victorian Studies*, 33.2: 247-68.

Mistry, R. (1999). *Can Gramsci's Theory of Hegemony Help Us to Understand the Representation of Ethnic Minorities in Western Television and Cinema?* <http://www.theory.org.uk/ctr-rol6.htm> (15 May 2010).

Miles, R. (1990). *Racism*. New York: Routledge.

Needham, A. D. (2005). 'The Small Voice of History' in Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. *Interventions: The International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, Vol. 7 Issue 3: 369-391.

New, W. H. (1978). *Awakened Conscience*. Delhi: Sterling.

O'Connor, T. F. (1986). *Jean Rhys: The West Indian Novels*. New York: University Press.

Olster, S. (2006). *The Cambridge Companion to John Updike*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oswald, D. O. (2006). Understanding Anti-Arab Reactions Post-9/11: The Role of Threats, Social Categories, and Personal Ideologies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 35 Issue 9: 1775-1799.

Pritchard, W. H. (2000). *Updike: America's Man of Letters*. South Royalton, VT: Steerforth.

Rhys, J. (1966). *Wide Sargasso Sea*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc.

Rhys, J. (1984). *The Letters of Jean Rhys*. Editors. Francis Wyndham and Diana Melly. New York: Viking Penguin Inc.

Rhys, J. (1981). *Smile Please: An Unfinished Autobiography*. London: Penguin Books.

Roy, A. (1997). *The God of Small Things*. New York: Random House.

Roy, B. (2009). The Title of "The God of Small Things": A Subversive Salvo. *ANQ*, Vol. 22 Issue 3: 56-63.

Rody, C. (1993). Burning Down the House: The Revisionary Paradigm of Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*. *Famous Last Words: Changes in Gender and Narrative Closure* (300-26). Ed. Alison Booth. London: University of Virginia Press.

Sachs, J. D. (1999). Twentieth Century Political Economy: A Brief History of Global Capitalism. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 15.4: 90-101.

Said, E. W. (1989) Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors. *Critical Inquiry*, 15.2: 205-225.

Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf.

Said, E. W. (1994). *Orientalism*. New York: Random House.

Said, E. W. (1997). *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. New York: Vintage Books.

Said, E.W. (2000). *The Edward Said Reader*. Ed. Moustafa Bayoumi and Andrew Rubin. New York: Vintage Books.

Schiff, J. A.(1995). Updike Ignored: The Contemporary Independent Critic. *JSTOR* 67.3: 531-52.

Scholte, J. A. (2000). *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. London: MacMillan Press.

Shakespeare, W. (1993). *The Tempest*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Shakespeare, W. (1994). *Antony and Cleopatra*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Sharma, R.S. and Shashi B. T. (1998). *Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things: Critique and Commentary*. New Delhi: Creative Books.

Sharpe, J. (1993). *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.

Simmons, J. (2005). *Arundhati Roy*.
<http://website.lineone.net/~jon.simmons/roy/> (24 July 2009).

Slemon, S. (1996). Post-colonial Critical Theories. *New National and Post-colonial Literatures: An Introduction*. Ed. Bruce King. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, S. (1987). *A Poetics of Women's Autobiography: Marginality and the Fictions of Self-Representation*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Spivak, G. C. (2003). *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Spivak, G. (1994). Can the Subaltern Speak? *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory* (66-111). Editors Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. New York: Columbia University Press.

Stillo, M. (1999). *The Life and Work of Antonio Gramsci*.
<http://www.theory.org.uk/ctr-gram.htm#life> (27 June 2010).

Song, W. (1995). Racial Otherness: The Representation of Colored Minorities in Shakespeare and Restoration Drama. Unprinted Doctoral Thesis. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 55.

Talib, I. S. (2002). *The Language of Post-Colonial Literatures: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.

Temin, P. (1999). Globalization. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 15.4 (76-89). Editor Tim Jenkinson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tiffin, H. (1995). Post-colonial Literatures and Counter-discourse. *The Post-colonial Studies Reader* (95-98). Editors Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, Helen Tiffin. New York: Routledge.

Updike, J. (2006). *Terrorist*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Wilson, K. (1998). *Arundhati Roy and Patriarchy – a rejoinder*.
<http://www.angelfire.com/in/SASG/aroy> (08 April 2009).

Witt, L. (2006). *Why Updike Delved into Suicide Killers' Psyches*.
<http://today.msnbc.msn.com/id/13581725/ns/today-books/t/why-updike-delved-suicide-killers-psyches/> (25 August 2010).