

Identity in the Colonial Lands: A Critical Overview of the Postcolonial Studies

Serap Türkmen*

Post-colonialism, being an academic shuttle that we can call new is an interdisciplinary movement that attempts to reshape the past, the present and the future of those colonized countries. While its point of departure was analysing the lost identities, labours, languages.... Etc and making a counter attack from the academic angle, it moved beyond the point of departure and turned out to be a rich and multilateral interdisciplinary area under which one can probe into many concepts and issues with new approaches and views. For example, the concept of nationalism, race, identity, and language, marginality are all being delved into, each time deciphering new things through postcolonial academic studies. If we wish to categorize Post-colonialism in terms of the issues it preoccupies, we shall discern that it has an affiliation with many disciplinary branches ranging from philosophy, sociology, psychology (with its sub branches), international affairs, economy, history...etc. It is for this particular reason that it is called as a new 'interdisciplinary' field in the academic surroundings. Some academicians even further the argument and say that Post-colonialism rather than being a separate discipline per se it, by giving reference to many disciplines and dealing with the inherent problems of the disciplines, 'disciplines the disciplines' Given its desire and attempt to reveal the reality, question the unquestionable, we can profess that Post-colonialism is an inevitable movement in accord with Post-modern era.

One of the concepts that Post-colonialism dares to delve into is identity, which is the locus of this paper. What makes identity the main interest of this paper is the desire to foreground through colonialism how the identity is died down, not vanished but put into position that neither dead nor alive. A circumstance, which is against the principles of logic: the impossibility of the third condition.

So the paper is made up two parts with their sub-sections. The first part will talk about the identity issue with reference to the Colonizer, the Colonized and the Colonial process. In the second part I would like to touch on the Postcolonial studies, themselves, in so doing, I will try to look from a critical angle to the postcolonial studies.

Dying Identities

“New World” was the name they employed for the colonies. They had re-constructed these lands especially what they saw as asymmetric at first sight, however, they did not call this drive as a reconstruction, because they did not accept the lands’ former construction and inhabitants, for them, these lands were virgin. In the process of this reconstruction the ones that went through this shift were the roads, the institutions, the schools, administrations, languages but also the inhabitants, the people of the lands. Suddenly they were forced to become something else. This was the beginning of the story...

The colonized, Becoming Something Else.....

Identity is one of the indispensable components of colonialism, if we consider colonialism as a body; identity constitutes its spirit while the economic exploitation is its corporal body. The colonizer coming to the virgin lands with the feeling of colonial desire and obsession to have cheap profit in his heart finds himself ready to defame the inhabitants, regard them as “the other”. And he starts his policy by deterritorializing and reterritorializing as Robert Young put in his article *Colonialism and Desiring Machine*, with reference to Deleuze and Guattari:

...It has to operate through a double movement because it must first of all do away with the institutions and cultures that have already been developed. The basic need of capitalism is to engineer and encounter between the deterritorialized wealth of capital and the labour capacity of the deterritorialized worker. The reduction of everything, including production and labour to the abstract value of money enables it to decode flows and deterritorialize the socius. Having achieved a universal form of exchange, it then reterritorializes –institutes or restores all sorts of residual and artificial imaginary or symbolic territorialities such as nation, states or families.....deculturation and acculturation by which the territory and cultural space of an indigenous society must be disrupted, dissolved, and then reinscribed according to the needs of the apparatus of the occupying power.¹

At first sight the ground of being “the other” is the difference. Foucault in one of his theory, *heteropology* helps us to elucidate the issue of “the other”. Heteropia is a look to the other spaces, better to say, to the counter places and this look is mostly a critical look. This look regards those foreigners as “the other” and always bears a certain mistrust and rancour for these places. For example the Turkish Bathes for the west is a heterotopic example. Foucault incorporates the colonies to his theory, heteropology, and cogently helps us understand the identity formation in these heteropic places.²

In all these places the subjective view that sets the places looks at his surrounds, strange objects that envelops him in a critical way. The production of this look is: the knowledge concerning the others who belong to these places. The very look, then, constructs the identities, selves with respect to its asymmetric concern.³

In the colony what is asymmetrical, rather what is merely different proves to be pathological. In order to legitimise their maltreatment, the colonizers tries to project the other not only different but also dangerous, primitive, aggressive, lazy.... Etc. The aim is making people feel that colonialism is not an unfair perpetration, rather, it is a necessary drive, for, and these people do not deserve these lands by virtue of their notorious traits. Also, the drive, after all, will promote their life standards. This is for their interest.

In the colony there was an exertion to define, rather pathologies the Africans.⁴

The heteropic and the pathological view being the underlying element of his mindset, the colonizer even fears being with the other, because,

If the colonizer gets to know these people and face with them he violates the border between “the self” and “the other” and becomes primitive, mad, that is pathological too.⁵

Thus as opposed to the common belief, the colonizer, although living among them, actually does not know the colonized or does not bother to know his collocutor. There is certain disparateness between them; the colonizer keeps this distance on purpose. George Lamming, in his introduction to his novel, *In the Castle of My Skin*, talks about the distance making the point effectively:

We had lived as a black majority under the fearful domination of a minority of white sugar planters and merchants. There was evidence of considerable miscegenation, but there was always a rigid code of separate development. Blacks divided along the lines of complexion, and all were kept severely at a social distance from the white world. The island has never really overcome this barrier; and a concordat of silence descends on any crisis which appears to have its origins in race and colour.⁶

The point is that the colonized means little to the colonizer. Far from wanting to understand him as he really is, the colonizer is preoccupied with making him undergo the change dictated by him.⁷ Thus, the data concerning the colonized and their life styles stems from the fantasy of the colonizer. Then the fantasy transmits to the subsequent generation through hearsay, scenarios, stories of the old hand colonizers. And the process proceeds on as mentioned.

These hearsay are most of the time the stereotypes. “They are all lazy” is one example. By establishing him ‘lazy’ the colonizer decides that laziness is constitutional in the very nature of the colonized. It becomes obvious that the colonized whatever he may undertake, whatever zeal he may apply could never be anything but lazy.⁸ Calling a nation or even a group of people with a single characteristic can or should nowhere to be found but in mythology. The totalising was made on behalf of science and rational thinking, after all,

people were being aware of these clichés through anthropologies, history books, memoirs, literary books.....etc regardless of the fact that totalising it self is against the nature of science and rationality, because, after all, the identities are dynamic, not stable. Identities are social constructions that are not created once and for all, the construction is an ongoing process, furthermore what we call “social” is a dynamic unity, therefore, one cannot profess the fixity of them.

It is for this particular reason that the totalising stereotypes need to be reinforced by repetition.⁹

Another element of formulation of the colonized is that they are never considered as individual beings. Albert Memmi calls the process as *Depersonalisation Through The Mark of Plural*. To him, the colonized is entitled only to draw in an anonymous collectivity. “They are this, they are all the same, and if colonized servant does not come in one morning, the colonizer will not say that she is ill, he will say, “You cannot count on them”. He refuses to consider personal, private occurrences in his maid’s life.... His maid does not exist as an individual.¹⁰ The very motive behind this collective fantasy- as Robert Young named- must also lie in practicality. Dealing the colonized individually does not enable them to create easy stereotyping, or else they would have had to fabricate individual stereotypes one by one for each.

So, it is in way objectification of the self as Aime Caseire put it in his book, *Discourse on Colonialism*. The colonized being turned into an object, accordingly, does not deserve to be treated as humane. So, in order for a true legitimisation he has to accuse the colonized resorting poor discourses so that people can regard him right in his action. The clichés obsessed on the colour of the skin had already been entrenched before the exploitation of the colonized. As a matter of facts these clichés helped the ideologies being accepted and therefore existed, thus the clichés are not only the result of the colonization but also the

infrastructure of It.¹¹

The colonized while being re-inscribed does not voice out. He cannot cope with what he is being subjected to as colonialism harms his self.¹² He lives totally in oblivion. And consequently his state of being helps his portrait to be entrenched. Being opposed to the stereotypes that he was named he as time elapses internalises them.

The accusation disturbs him and worries him even more because he admires and fears his powerful accuser. "Is he not partially right?" he mutters. "Are we not all a little guilty after all? Lazy, because we have so many idlers? Timid, because we let ourselves be oppressed. Wilfully created and spread by the colonizer, this mythical and degrading portrait ends up by being accepted and lived with to a certain extent by the colonized. It thus acquires a certain amount of reality and contributes to the true portrait of the colonized...He ends up recognizing it as one would a detested nickname which has become a familiar description."¹³

Namely the discourse that blurs, better to say, that effaces reality not only envelopes colonizers and the others but also the colonized himself. Discourse, in this case, rather than being an epistemological reality, changing the episteme, is also an ontological being that creates while immolating the former (pre-given identity).¹⁴ In the colonial system everything bears effects of racial discourse. The black skin of the colonized itself turns into a discourse, a text engraved the stereotypes on it.

So the process is fulfilled through participation of both sides after the colonized being forced to internalise his new identity. As a matter of fact, he finds himself in an unidentified circumstance. On one hand he is forced to abandon the all what constitute him and behave in a certain manner, because after being deculturated he is left with no other chance but emulate the colonizer as a sole model in front of him. However, when he attempts to do so, he is rejected. The colonizer does not want him, because for the ground of his exploitation he states the difference, rather the distance between the colonizer and the colonized. To them the difference is what feeds the colonial system, what legitimise and postulates it. So instead of his former identity he is offered with nothing-he will neither be like the colonizer nor himself,

namely he will be existence and non-existence, a kind of third condition, which is against the principles of logic. He will be something else, different from the colonizer but not similar to the colonized. Thus, he lives in a complete oblivion. With the advent of-better to say invading- colonialism he suddenly turns out to be a man with nothing. All at once, he is casted out from his history, memory, and citizenship. Trying to make sense what is happening he just watches, just like an unconscious patient being operated under medical lights.

Homi Bhabha names the colonized's state of being as *ambivalent*. To me it is more than ambivalence, it is chaos. In the wake of the inscription of identities the question rising to the minds is; the maintenance. How much stable these dictated identities? Homi Bhabha with his theory *hybridity* talks about the improbability of the direct construction of the selves. The model presented by the colonizer does not meet the colonized immediately, the colonized employ the model, as he perceives it, namely the construction of the self in the true sense of the word is not possible for him. Being partly agreed with him, I would like to resort to his theory for our concern, maintenance. To me the identities are inscribed, however, when it comes to their maintenance we see them fragmented, instable, temporal. As identities are dynamic and subject to change, even if the elements that constitute the given identity are stable, this time they yield to the time. Moreover, the models, rather the fabrications, offered by the colonizer are not stable. When analysing the stereotype we find them contradictory:

The traits ascribed to the colonized are incompatible with one another. He is depicted as frugal, sober, without many desires and, at the same time, he consumes alcohol, meat...etc.; as a coward who is afraid of suffering and as a brute who is not checked by any inhibitions of civilization. At the basis of the entire construction, one finally finds a common motive; the colonizer's economic and basic needs, which substitutes for logic which shape and explain each of the traits he assignees to the colonized.¹⁵

Thus, now that the particular manners dictated by the colonizer are not that particular as such, then we can claim that the identities somehow inscribed are not permanent, not stable

as thought. After all claiming that “the colonizer offered and the colonized gave in and the identity formation process was fulfilled” would be an easy, rather reductionism claim, for the concept of identity is a complicated issue that needs to be analysed more profoundly.

The Colonizer, Colonized by the Colonized...

The identity issue is mostly handled within the sphere of the colonized. However, the colonial identity goes beyond the colonized. It is, as Homi Bhabha puts, between colonized and colonizer. The issue is aligned with the colonized as the colonized in the colonial system is the victim, yet, when we make an analytical reading we shall bear witness that the colonizer is victim too, in that he also face with the same problem: waning identity.

The colonialist identity for the colonizer breaks out with his arrival to the colonial lands. On arriving he goes into a sudden shift of identity. Being a mediocre man in his own country, the colonizer suddenly turns into a master, giving orders, earning money which he cannot otherwise dream about, having facilities exclusively at his disposal.

He has a concrete economic and psychological position within the colonial society in relation to the colonized...

He partakes of an elevated world from which he automatically reaps the privileges....

He enjoys the preference and respect of the colonized themselves who grant him more than those who are the best of their own people...¹⁶

So, running into these privileges all at once, he goes through shock and out of his intoxication he, like the colonized, finds himself in a state of oblivion. An oblivion to the extent of making him blind and deaf as to not recognize that the privileges are at the expense of the inhabitants who are struggling against the hardships under his nose.

Colonizer’s identity is an unfulfilled identity. Unless there is the colonized we cannot talk about figure of the colonizer. The colonized is complementary part of him, as Albert Memmi put, in his book *The Colonizer and The Colonized*; they depend and produce each other. As aforementioned, the heteropic place is constructed in accordance with a definite place.¹⁷ There has to be a stable place to look from, and all the same there has to be a place

to look at. Likewise the colonizer needs the colonized to postulate his superiority, after all, the postulated binary opposition is made up of two elements. So, the idea that regards the colonizer as, absolute, self-sufficient is a parochial view.

The colonizer being aware of his sin passes through a conflicting feeling. On one hand, he does not want to part with the privileges and on the other hand, he does not want to face with his misdeed so, he resorts to justification. He tries to convince the accusing eyes that what he did was not unfair, he was right, people should sympathize with him because the colonized deserved this, what else he could do, so in a way he lies the ground of his stereotyping, colonizing “the other”. However, I am not sure as much as Albert Memmi whether he runs through convincing himself.¹⁸ As time elapses he furthers his agony and with Memmi’s marvellous analysis he,

Pushes himself to wish the disappearance of the usurper, whose very existence causes him to take the role of usurper, and whose heavier and heavier oppression makes him more and more an oppressed himself. Nero, the typical model of a usurper is thus brought to persecute Britannicus savagely and to pursue him. But the more he hurts him, the more he coincides with the atrocious role he has chosen for himself. The more he sinks into justice the more he hates Britannicus... The colonial system while killing the colonized materially kills the colonizer spiritually.¹⁹

May be the psychological agony he goes through is the very ground of his hatred against the colonized. Also, the identity he was offered, rather given as a consequence of this oppression can be another ground of his hatred, because he is called “the colonizer”, “the usurper”, he is an illegitimate man, of course it is not a tenable, appreciative identity. Namely, just like the colonized, he is to be enveloped with an undesired identity, he is forced to accept his new name. In this case, he is equal to the colonized, he is victim too. While the colonized is idle, uncivilized, bad he is the colonizer, cruel, illegitimate, looter. He is no longer an ordinary, honest citizen. He is now a usurper. So, system consumes each side.

Gaining the wealth, running into affluence he faces with another problem: preserving

the status quo. It is a general fact that in a war not only the defeated side but also the victorious side lose, because this time he is confronted with preserving his victory from the exasperated defeated. Likewise, the colonizer is to maintain the status quo by keeping on manipulating, keeping on identifying the colonized. He suffers from the feeling of trepidation. So, he does not entirely enjoy from what he has, considering also his negative identity. Thus, from now on the only boast he will feel about his identity and belongings is the respect and admiration from the colonized whom regards the colonizer model, which he can never reach.

The colonial identities in the colonial system are not always clear-cut and stable. This aforementioned argument is also true of the colonizer or any other subject within the system. Being not independent from each other, the colonial identities can be fragmented, indeterminate, in an ongoing process of completion. This circumstance is what Homi Bhabha warns us against, in his theory, hybridity:

Hybridity shifts power, questions discursive authority, and suggests that colonial discourse is never wholly in the control of the colonizer. Its authority is always reinflected, split, syncretized and to an extent menaced by its confrontation with its object.²⁰

So we should not be inflexible while analysing the identities, rather we should distinguish between the possible types of hybridity. For example we should take into account the assimilation by force, internalised self- denial, politically being assigned from the higher rank, social or collective conformism, cultural emulation.... Etc which are the very types of hybridity when dealing with colonial identities.²¹

In the colonial system each component, irrespective of the role he played, faces with the problem of identity. The younger generation of the colonizer, for example, being born into the colonial system, better to say colonial family, is destined to be a colonizer or identified as colonizer. Just as the colonized is identified with a number of stereotypes from his birth, he also is constructed with stereotypes of an illegitimate master. In the colonial system everybody within the border has to pay a price, identity.

The Female Identity: A Virtual Reality?

When we are talking within the context of colonial system and identity, we should not pass without touching on the female figure in the system. The female identity has virtual reality. At first sight it seems that she does not speak, or does not have any role, or may be does not exist.

The virtual reality of female existence is valid for both as a colonizer and colonized. Gayatri Chakravarty Spivak, in one of her article *Can Subaltern Speak?* makes the point effectively. She renders that woman in the colonial system does not speak as she is not given the right to do so. She is colonized both by the patriarchy and the colonizer. She is in a way squeezed by this *double colonization*.

Between patriarchy and imperialism, subject-constitution and object-formation, the figure of the woman disappears, not into a pristine nothingness, but into a violent shuttling that's the displaced figuration of the "third-world woman" caught between tradition and modernization, culturalism and development.²²

As a role she can only be assigned with child breeding. She raises child for the colonizer or- for the colonized, in so doing, provides the proceeding of the system in terms of quantity. The length woman constitute in this paper symbolizes the length she constitutes in the colonial system.

The Attempts To Decolonise The Colonized.....

Post-colonialism provided us with new interdisciplinary area, new visions, and new modes of thinking. Discourse analysis is what became popular with postcolonial investigations and became one of the linchpins of it:

Colonial discourse analysis can look at the wide variety of texts of colonialism as something more than mere documentation or "evidence" and also emphasize the ways in which colonialism involve not just military or economic activity, but permeated forms of knowledge which, if challenged, may continue to be the very ones through which we try to understand colonialism itself.²³

Also involving in these studies we find a cheer in ourselves to delve into wide range of

studies. Nonetheless, this does not mean that we will not criticize even Post-colonialism it self. After all, this is what Post-colonialism orients us to.

I wish to start with Postcolonial intellectuals' stance against the identity problem, which I will try to suggest that it, is a homogenizing look. Gayatri Spivak, in her article *Can the Subaltern Speak* implies that as the subaltern cannot voice out we the intellectuals should represent them²⁴. This also reminded me of Karl Marx saying about the colonized countries, "They cannot represent themselves so, they should be represented"²⁵. So the very attempt to represent them whether it is with good intentions or not, tend to bear a totalising, rather homogenizing approach to the colonized. When talking about the colonized we have criticized that the colonizer does not want to see the colonized individually so in his stereotypes the colonized is figured as a mass. Likewise, the intellectuals who assign themselves with protecting, revitalizing the colonized regard them as a mass. When we talk about the rights of "those who cannot speak", we indirectly inscribe another stereotype too. This is also true of the colonizer, the female figures, the colonial system, in brief anything concerned with humanity. As far as I am consigned this is not a rational rather academic view.

When delving into reading one can easily comes across some criticisms concerning post-colonialism's complacency:

Colonial discourse analysis as a general method and practice has reached a stage where it is itself in danger of becoming oddly stagnated, and as reified in its approach- and therefore in what it can possibly produce at the level of investigation- as the colonial discourse that it studies. We have reached something of an impasse with regard to the theoretical questions raised in the study of colonial discourse, and this has meant certain complacency about or neglect of the problems of the methodologies that have been developed. In other words we have stopped asking questions about the limits and boundaries of our own assumptions. It is true that we now generally acknowledge the operation of conflictual structures within colonial discourse: but this very textual ambivalence prevents us from standing back reconsider colonial discourse itself as an entity.²⁶

So postcolonial movements are facing the problem of turning into mere critics of each

other. To me, it is quite appreciative, as long as it is pursued together with novel, original ideas; as long as it is by-products of the academic achievements, after all, the knowledge comes out through dialectical processes, through brainstorming. Thus, this very tendency is even a must for an interdisciplinary field. However, what sounds to me problematic and drive me to be agree with Robert Young is that if this tendency becomes an overarching exert, then, it renders postcolonial studies to be parochial, furthermore, stagnated. These studies should not be mere critic of the first world, they should get ahead from various angles: history should be written again, new anthologies, anthropologies should be emerged, the disillusionment after independence should be effaced, new psychoanalytical, social theories s.etc should be implemented and any activity in the intention of these regulations should be incorporated into postcolonial studies.

Otherwise they face with being a straitjacket as John Thieme warns us against.²⁷ The language employed in postcolonial studies is another issue that seems to be not the point, yet, basically very important. Sometimes the texts are too difficult to understand even to the extent of obfuscating the meaning and blurring the minds. This also confines the access to the studies to a small academic group while excluding the rest.

As for the objectivity of postcolonial studies which are being challenged, rather questioned by some critics. Edward Said being the core of these discussions, for example, is said to be conclusive rather than persuasive and as Robert Young put it he allows no alternatives. So, sometimes the critics look over the text with doubts in their minds. Nonetheless, the doubtful stance sounds me pre-conditioned. After all postcolonial studies came out to be the voice of the oppressed but soon became a cornucopia of wide range of studies, being aware of this point of departure, one can have an inclination to blame it for being partial, one sided. However, being doubtful, prejudiced against the texts are needless, after all, one can understand what is partial and impartial by simply involving in the studies,

by simply reading even.

Conclusion

In brief, identity, being one of the crucial issues of postcolonial studies, should be handled within the variety of angles. The approach centering the colonized at the core is a parochial view of it, the truth is that the colonized, the colonizer and any figure in the colonial system are facing with identity problem, because, in the course of colonial oppression every identity is reconstructed, therefore, postcolonial studies, while looking into the matter, should take this under scrutiny.

Moreover, identity comes to the fore, also, as an issue that post-colonial studies are criticized with, for postcolonial studies take up the issue with a totalising manner. Besides identity, there are some issues that turn to projector to the postcolonial studies themselves concerning the issue of objectivity, language, stagnation and homogeneity.... etc However, it is doubtless to say that, these criticisms will pave the way for further studies and richness.

* M.A. Department of English Language and Literature, Fatih University.

Bibliography

Bhabha, Homi. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse", October 28 (1984)

Bhabha's Hybridity Child, Peter and Patrick Williams Eds. An Introduction To Postcolonial Theory (Singapore: Pearson Education-Longman, 1997)

Lamming, George "Colonialism and The Caribbean Novel" eds Gregory Castle Postcolonial Discourses: An Antology (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001)

Loomba, Ania *Colonialism Post-colonialism*, tr. Mehmet Kucuk (Istanbul: Ayrinti Press, 2000)

Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and The Colonized* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1991)

Nalcaoglu, Halil. (2002) "Heteropia, Colony and The Other Places: Meditations On Michel Foucault's Short Text" vol 19 *The East-The West*, 19, 123-138

Shoat, E *Notes On The Post-colonialism*, Social Text: 31/32

Spivak, Gayatri. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason, Toward A History of The Vanishing History* (London: Harvard University Press, 1999)

Thieme, John *Post-colonial Contexts, Writing Back To The Canon* (London: Continuum

Press,2001)

Urhan, Veli *Michel Foucault And Archeology of Knowledge* (Istanbul: Paradigma Press, 2000)

Young J.C. Robert, “*Colonialism and Desiring Machine*” eds Gregory Castle Postcolonial Discourses: An Antology (Oxford:Blackwell Publishers, 2001)

Notes

¹ For the further see Young J.C. Robert, *Colonialism and Desiring Machine* eds. Gregory Castle Postcolonial Discourses: An Antology (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), p.82

² For the analysis of the theory and the example-The Turkish Bathes-see, Nalcaoglu, Halil.(2002) “*Heteropia, Colony and The Other Places: Meditations On Michel Foucault’s Short Text*” vol 19 *The East-The West*, 19, 123-138

³ *ibid.*, p.,128

⁴ for further analysis concerning psychoanalysis and psychology’s pathologising the other see, Loomba, Ania *Colonialism Post-colonialism*, tr.Mehmet Kucuk (Istanbul: Ayrinti Press, 2000) p.165-167

⁵ Loomba, Ania *Colonialism Postcolonialism*, tr.Mehmet Kucuk (Istanbul: Ayrinti Press, 2000) p.162

⁶ Lamming, George “*Colonialism and The Caribbean Novel*” eds Gregory Castle Postcolonial Discourses: An Antology (Oxford:Blackwell Publishers, 2001), p. 278

⁷ Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and The Colonized* (Boston: Beacon Press,1991), p., 83

⁸ *ibid.*, p.,81

⁹ Homi Bhabha talks over the issue by shedding light on it with reference to Freuden Fetishism, the argument is quoted in : *Bhabha’s Hybridity Child*, Peter and Patrick Williams eds. An Introduction To Postcolonial Theory (Singapore: Pearson Education-Longman, 1997) p.,124

¹⁰ *ibid.*, p., 85

¹¹ Ania Loomba talks about the issue with reference to R. Miles within the context of race for this part see Loomba, Ania *Colonialism Postcolonialism*, tr.Mehmet Kucuk (Istanbul: Ayrinti Press, 2000) p.137-8-9-140-141

¹² *ibid.*, p., 16

¹³ Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and The Colonized* (Boston: Beacon Press,1991), p., 83d

¹⁴ Michel Foucault in one of his works, *This Is Not Pipe* talks over the relationship between the reality and discourse. The name of the book stems from Magritte’s painting. In the painting there is a pipe and at the bottom of the painting there is a writing saying: This is not pipe! Foucault at first sight there seems to be a contradictory relationship between the painting and the writing, which is basically not, as the pipe in the painting is not real but painting, what is to our interest here is that Foucault on this painting discusses that there is a false relationship between what is said and what is seen, namely the distance between discourse and the reality is problematic. There is a fight for hegemony, which one will outweigh the other ...for further explanation see Urhan, Veli *Michel Foucault And Archeology of Knowledge* (Istanbul: Paradigma Press, 2000) p.,16-17-18-19

¹⁵ Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and The Colonized* (Boston: Beacon Press,1991), p., 83

¹⁶ *ibid.*, p.,10-11-12

¹⁷ Nalcaoglu, Halil.(2002) “*Heteropia, Colony and The Other Places: Meditations On Michel Foucault’s Short Text*”vol 19 *The East-The West*, 19, 129

¹⁸ Albert Memmi claims that the colonizer may gets trough the people however he does not succeed convincing himself and as a result of this, he pleads guilty deep in his heart. But as the case is consigned with psychology and as we cannot talk about psychology with rigid terms, I should not say that he decidedly convince himself or not. Moreover looking the matter individually the case can be different from person to person.

¹⁹ The Colonizer And The Colonized, 53

²⁰ Bhabha, Homi. “ Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse”, October 28 (1984)

²¹ Shoat, E *Notes On The Postcolonialism*, Social Text: 31/32, p., 99-113

²² Gayatri Spivak in the article focusing on a case study, a satti woman elucidates the issue. Satti is a Hindu practice, which force the woman to burn herself together with her husband after the husband’s death. It is a kind of self-immolation. There is no way of getting rid of this practice because if the woman does not do this she will be subjected to another kind of immolation from the public. On this practice Spivak talks about woman as a silent object who has no choice for her life, who is pressed under the patriarchy for the interpretation and further analysis for woman’s role in colonialism and patriarchy and also for the extract above see Spivak, Gayatri. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason, Toward A History of The Vanishing History* (London: Harvard University Press, 1999)

²³ Young J.C. Robert, Colonialism and Desiring Machine eds Gregory Castle Postcolonial Discourses: An Antology (Oxford:Blackwell Publishers, 2001), p. 77

²⁴ quoted from: Ania Loomba, *Colonialism Post-colonialism* trans. Mehmet Kucuk, (Istanbul: Ayrinti Press, 2000)

²⁵ quoted from Edward Said’s prominent work, *Orientalism*

²⁶ Young J.C. Robert, Colonialism and Desiring Machine eds Gregory Castle Postcolonial Discourses: An Antology (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), p.78

²⁷ John Thieme in the introduction of his work *Postcolonial Context*, an edition claims that Postcolonial studies while were criticizing Western assumptions as being straitjacket now threatened to become straitjacket too, as they no longer bear differences and varieties in itself for this comment and the ground of this comment see, Thieme, John *Post-colonial Contexts, Writing Back To The Canon* (London: Continuum Press,2001)