

THE DEADLOCK OF THE POST-COLONIAL INTELLECTUAL:  
THE RE/PRESENTATION OF "THE OTHER"

İLKEM KAYICAN  
106611032

İSTANBUL BİLGİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ  
KÜLTÜREL İNCELEMELER YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Kaya  
2009

The Deadlock of the Post-colonial Intellectual: The Re/presentation of  
“the Other”

Postkolonyal Entelektüelin Çıkmazı: Ötekinin Temsili/ The Deadlock of  
the Post-colonial Intellectual: The re/presentation of “the Other”

İlkem Kayıcan  
106611032

Tez Danışmanının Adı Soyadı (İMZASI) : Prof.Dr.Ayhan KAYA  
Jüri Üyelerinin Adı Soyadı (İMZASI) : Doç.Dr.Halil NALÇAOĞLU  
Jüri Üyelerinin Adı Soyadı (İMZASI) : Bülent SOMAY

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih : 11 .09.2009

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı :141

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)  
1)Postkolonyal Entellektüel  
2)Mağdun  
3)Temsil  
4) Exile  
5) Mimicry

Anahtar Kelimeler (İngilizce)  
1) Post-colonial Intellectual  
2) Subaltern  
3) Temsil  
4) Sürgün  
5) Taklit

## ABSTRACT

This study aims to present an examination concerning the question of the Other from the perspective of post-colonial intellectuals who are geo-biographically Orient. The intellectuals selected in this study are all great contributors of post-colonial theory and post-colonial fiction with their groundbreaking interventions concerning the representation of the Other. The research prominently seeks answers to the paradoxes of the post-colonial intellectual as represented First World Elite who speaks or writes the Third World. In this context Edward Said and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak in theoretical arena, Salman Rushdie and Hanif Kureishi with their narratives in post-colonial literary fiction are exposed to multi-sided analysis referring to their representations of the Other and their own autobiographical delineations. Moreover and inevitably, the study involves significant post-colonial theorists' arguments such as Franz Fanon, Homi K. Bhabha and Robert Young.

It can be claimed that the post-colonial Other/minority despite of all the "benevolent" interventions of the liberal projects of White Western dominant is still be mentioned and represented through his/her ethnic/colonial legacy; either as degraded or exotic. Therefore the hybrid/subaltern tries various way outs in order to achieve self-assurance and "recognition". In this sense the research crucially aims to examine the dialogical relationship between the in-between/hybrid intellectual's representations and the post-colonial Other's constant identity formation. Overall, the study intends to pursue answers by asking; "To what extent these post-colonial intellectuals' displacements of the "difference" of the Other manifests the actual experiences of the Other *per se*?"

## ÖZET

Bu çalışmada doğdukları yer ve biyografik özelliklerinden ötürü “Doğulu” kabul edilen koloni dönemi sonrası yazarların “Öteki” sorununu temsil biçimleri irdelenecektir. Çalışmada yer alan yazarlar “Öteki” sorununu temsillerinde postkolonyal teoriye ve postkolonyal edebiyata yenilikçi müdahalelerde bulunan entellektüellerden seçilmiştir. Araştırma öncelikli olarak Birinci Dünya Entellektüeli olarak temsil edilip eserlerinde Üçüncü Dünya öznesi üzerine yazan ya da konuşan entellektüellerin çelişkili durumlarını analiz edecektir. Bu bağlamda teori alanında Edward Said ve Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, kurgusal edebiyat alanında Salman Rushdie ve Hanif Kureishi hem eserlerindeki Öteki temsillerine başvurularak hem de otobiyografik anlatılarına değinilerek çok yönlü bir analiz yapılacaktır. Bu entellektüellere ek olarak önemli çalışmalarıyla postkolonyal teoriye ciddi katkılarda bulunmuş koloni sonrası entellektüelleri olan Franz Fanon, Homi K. Bhabha ve Robert Young gibi yazarların teorilerinden yararlanılacaktır.

Bilindiği üzere Beyaz Batılı’nın tüm “iyi niyetli” liberal müdahalelerine rağmen postkolonyal Öteki hala etnik ya da kolonyal kimliğine vurgu yapılarak tanımlanmaktadır ki bu durum onu “bastırılmış” ya da “egzotik” olmaktan kurtaramaz. Bu sebeple çift kimlikli/madun kendi kimliğini kendi belirlemek ve “tanınmak” gayesiyle çeşitli çıkış yolları aramayı sürdürmektedir. Bu bağlamda bu araştırma arada kalmış/çift kimlikli entellektüelin temsilleri ile sürekli kimlik arayışında olan postkolonyal Öteki arasındaki diyalojik ilişkiyi analiz etmeyi amaçlamıştır. Kısacası bu çalışma postkolonyal entellektüelin Ötekiye ait “farklılık” kavramına müdahale ederken bu durumun Ötekinin kendi mevcut deneyimlerine ne derecede etki ettiği sorusuna yanıtlar bulmayı amaçlamıştır.

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to express the deepest appreciation to my supervisor Professor Ayhan Kaya, for his guidance and invaluable contribution. I feel indebted to him for his continued support, patience and understanding in every stage of this study.

I am also deeply thankful to Assistant Professor Halil Nalçaoğlu for his consistent encouragement; he has inspired me a lot since the beginning of my master's study and shared his time and ideas to improve the study with helpful comments and contributions.

I would also thank my beloved friend Canan Tanır who generously shares her time and ideas during every step of this study. I also owe too much to Mustafa Kaya who bears all my ups and downs throughout this process.

I thank to Yalım İldem who kindly shares his understanding and efforts during the busiest period of the study. Last but certainly not least I want to thank especially my dearest mother Sevim Kayıcan and my precious sister Nihan Kayıcan for their support and understanding in every step I take.

## Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION .....	2
GENERAL SCOPE.....	2
THE BACKGROUND: HYBRIDITY, IDENTITY POLITICS AND THE SUBALTERN .....	6
THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY .....	21
CHAPTER I .....	27
POST-COLONIAL INTELLECTUAL AS A SECULAR CRITIC: DECOLONIZING THE COLONIAL DISCOURSE .....	27
1.1 INTRODUCTION .....	27
1.2 EDWARD SAID: CELEBRATION OF EXILE AND “THE SECULAR CRITIC” AS A POST-COLONIAL THEORIST .....	36
1.3 GAYATRI CHAKRAVORTY SPIVAK: THE POSITION OF PUBLIC INTELLECTUAL .....	52
1.4 CONCLUSION .....	62
CHAPTER II.....	67
POST-COLONIAL FICTION WRITER: MANIFESTATIONS OF MIMICRY AND HYBRID RE/PRESENTATIONS .....	67
2.1 INTRODUCTION .....	67
2.2 SALMAN RUSHDIE: PERCEPTION OF EXILE AND MIMICRY.....	74
2.3 HANIF KUREISHI: IS THERE AN AUTO-ORIENTALISM?.....	94
2.4 CONCLUSION .....	114
AFTERWORD.....	120
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	133

## INTRODUCTION

### GENERAL SCOPE

In the age of post-colonialism thanks to the theoretical and literary *accounts* the question of the other have begun to be analyzed leading to the disclosure of all the suppressed tragic and traumatic stories of the minorities, others, inferiors, immigrants. The works of hybrid intellectuals in the literary field such as Salman Rushdie, Hanif Kureishi, Anita Desai, Monica Ali and in theoretical arena Homi Bhabha, Edward Said, Gayatri C. Spivak, Stuart Hall have made great contributions to the questioning of otherness in the sense of decolonizing the colonialist discourse. Both the political representation of the other in theories and the hybrid characters' narrations in the literary works opened up a philosophical discussion and a new way of literary criticism concerning the other's perception and recognition in a Western dominant society. It is obvious that this has caused a kind of enlightenment for the critics and theoreticians as well as a kind of *abuse of the other question*. While the enlightenment could be defined as the development of new postcolonial literary approaches towards otherness, the abuse; which is heavy in its meaning, may be considered as the misrecognition, misinterpretation or transgression of the other in universal terms. Simply put, the abuse stems from the interpretation that the other is a subject/agent who is *inevitably* looking for an *identity* by trying to eliminate his/her in-betweenness.

On the other hand, it proceeds from an interpretation, which develops itself from a priori demand of recognition and understanding of the other in a westernized hegemonic globalised world. To illuminate this point, the gaze and the desire of the colonial subject clashes with the narrative practice of the other's

identification process which the critic does. Hence, such a narrative marks the other's otherness and inferiority along with developing a kind of *tolerance* in the eye of the colonialist individual while strengthening the superiority of the dominant. Moreover, such a tolerance towards the alterity of the colonized subject leads to the reduction of his/her ontological self into imagery. Leaving aside the postcolonial subject/agents as a group, this thesis would rather focus on the exilic situation of concerning intellectuals including their homelessness, displacement and hybridity and their positions –if they exist- in the middle of this constant debate. Accordingly, the study will embrace an analysis of the narratives and discourses of the intellectual hybrids considering their biographies and taking into account the roles of their ongoing identity/identification while *writing*.

It is undeniable that *a priori* demand of minorities has been under stress and under discussion for many years since the identity politics began to flourish. In the name of identity politics, the socially and politically constructed identity of each individual has clashed with the Foucauldian will to power and there occurred a new system of “solidarity” which split the minorities into tiny groups, and this marks the otherness of the other. Solidarity which is a word that nests a kind of sameness and familiarity between the entities becomes risky to attribute when the other question is analyzed especially after modernity. The reason for this is hidden in the following reference of Anselm K. Min in his essay called “From Difference to the solidarity of Others: Sublating Postmodernism”, “there is a shift from a politics of identity to a politics of difference, from an insistence on sameness to a celebration of difference” (in Min 2005: 830). At this point there comes a paradox

which is that the same era asks us to negate the difference or sublimate the difference which is somehow in contradiction with human nature which constantly seeks solidarity among the ones who are alike. Accordingly, solidarity of difference leads the minorities, inferiors or the ones who are excluded to underline their differences taking the question to another aporia which is the exotification of their selves in a multicultural, globalised Western ground. When such a case is considered colonized others may celebrate such exotification as it is a kind of recognition by the colonialist subject however when it comes to the responsibility of the critic, of the intellectual, such an attempt does not sound like a positive production.

It is a common belief that the contributions of hybrid writers' and intellectuals', whose hybridity will be analyzed later, have opened a new era in favor of the oppressed groups on a dominant Western ground. In the field of Humanities and the Social Sciences the works of such intellectuals are breaking new ground and the novels from the margins are winning distinguished awards. Despite all of this, the study argues that under such portraits of intellectuals, by which is meant those who were born in "non-Western" territories but educated in distinguished European or American schools, exposed to Western life style, media and popular culture, produce different kinds of orientalist representations thanks to their exilic situations. The state of being homeless or in exile, as the words call, belonging nowhere and "perpetual wandering", inevitably keep these intellectuals creative and productive. This requires an ethical questioning however what is to be concerned by asserting all this is what kind of solidarity has been born out of

such works of art? Moreover, does this presumed solidarity take the question of the other one step ahead? The reason of this question is to determine whether the memorial *look* of these writers differs when their biographies are considered. Simply put, to what extent does an individual remains able to fathom the condition of the other when s/he has a Western oriented postcolonial past? Can s/he start to analyze the Eastern from an Eastern gaze without falling into an authentic approach? Or does s/he produce an eclectic look to the other trying to overcome his Western style by reflecting the paralysis of the Eastern with his “narrated” national historical legacy? All these questions lead the research to a point where it is necessary to group these intellectuals as Edward Said and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak as theoreticians, Salman Rushdie and Hanif Kureishi as novelists.

Since the publication of Edward Said’s *Orientalism* in 1978) postcolonial *writing* has been criticizing the Western representation of the Orient which evokes the issues like the misrepresented other, misrecognised condition of the related subject/agents along with the question of their subjectivity. Keeping these in mind this thesis is going to ask; Do these writers’ representations take the issue of Other’s *recognition* or *representation* forward? Should their works bare such a responsibility concerning universal codes? Have the related works been able to touch any universality? At this point two more questions are raised including the responsibility of critics, which Said mentioned in many of his works, and also such a point stresses the identity as a socially constructed entity. Constructed identity which is not in a way of coming out with a single representation of the Other but with the politics of difference. The politics of difference, which along

with the concerning attempts, leads to the constant formation and process of identities. Nevertheless, it still requires an examination if such a transformation causes the identity to escape from the “center” in Derridian sense, by presenting itself an advantage of constant becoming, liberated from the centre. Furthermore, it can also be asked if the critic reaches a destination in his/her examination of the Other, or if s/he transcends the position of the postcolonial condition which is *being* the other? In the course of this study these and other such questions will be exposed to multi-sided interrogation, considering the hybrid intellectuals’ literary works and theories. While doing this, the study will strongly avoid considering the concerning intellectuals as a group of collective identities or stereotypes, rather it will focus on the experience of being hybrids in First World Academy but writing on and as Third World Others. Bhabha states that “space of writing interrogates the third dimension that give profundity to the representation of self and other,” (Bhabha 1994: 48) therefore it will be unfair if the post-colonial hybrid intellectual’s attempt is considered as an act of hostility, however it is also clear that his/her position/less may conclude in a failure when a progressive course of the other question is regarded.

## **THE BACKGROUND: HYBRIDITY, IDENTITY POLITICS AND THE SUBALTERN**

In order to set a general analysis for the concerning hybrid intellectuals it should be noted that their position/lessness within all these socially constructed historically oppressed, postcolonial subject/agents had better be considered along with the differences from where they write, from how they use the language, from which identities they speak. The terms, which are very delicate and multi-conceptual in meaning such as “difference,” “identity” and “language”, are

exposed to transformation when the hybrid intellectuals are considered. To start with their identification process (psychoanalytically) Bhabha in his interview with Jonathan Rutherford states that “identification is a process of identifying with and through another object, an object of otherness, at which point the agency of identification-the subject- is always itself ambivalent, because of the intervention of that otherness (Rutherford 2003: 211). This process of identification is obviously operative for hybrid intellectuals because when post-colonial literary theory is considered they write on a shifting ground from where they are theorizing the present with their native/colonial past luggage looking to the future. The hybrid intellectual “...with the problems of transmuting time into space, with the present struggling out of the past, ...attempts to construct a future” (Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin 2002: 35). Here, their attempt to construct a future is a challenging idea. All the intellectuals who are at the center of this study refer to the philosophers such as Derrida, Foucault, Fanon, Hegel who are the ones that avoid constructivist ideas. I believe that their attempt is not to construct a future but rather to cogitate a future, theorize a future. Upon this release, it can be claimed that this shifting ground and the transforming nature of their works mostly depend on their own identification process. It is apparent that they hold crucial means of power which may cause them to eliminate their own otherness, (eg. using the colonizer’s language exclusively, having prestigious positions in respected European and American Universities, being metropolitans etc.) however it is the case that they still carrying the partiality of colonization on themselves. Through this, Bhabha’s claim about identification makes sense, “The question of identification is never the affirmation of a pre-given identity, never a *self*-fulfilling

prophecy – it is always a production of an image of identity and the transformation of the subject in assuming that image” (Bhabha 1994: 45). The images that appear *there* when we invoke the names Spivak, Said, Kureishi, Rushdie, accommodate a multiplicity of singularities and differences. Additionally, such a plurality of differences and singularities reject definition with a fixated identity which determines the heart of their approaches.

These shifting singularities, within themselves expose a kind of constant transformation of identities. The study believes that the space which allows for such transformation is the *hybridity*, hybridity that does not act as a signifier and points to any hyphenated identity or a perfect mixture of two given ethnicities in an individual. However hybridity could point a third space, as Bhabha suggests, where the *partial* assumption of the stereotype is still in function with a temporality. It inevitably sounds like a controversy, yet the temporality in function results in a displacement of the partial stereotype which prevents a prospective authenticity, the authenticity which is immanent in the stereotypical representation. In his interview with Jonathan Rutherford, Bhabha clearly states that; “the process of cultural hybridity gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognizable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation” (Rutherford 2003: 211). Naturally such a space which is far from blood and guts fundamentalism, mystical and primordial essentialism harbors a kind of emancipation for the postcolonial subject/agents. Moreover, it can be claimed that from such a space postcolonial hybrid intellectuals produce alternatives concerning representations and recognition of the Other. It is on the other hand still paradoxical if Radhakrishnan’s argument about hybridity is

considered; he claims hybridity is "...in a frustrating search for constituency and a legitimate political identity". This is a claim one should still bear in mind about hybridity when the hybrid immigrants scattered all around the "imagined communities" (borrowing the term from Benedict Anderson) are counted. Before specifically focusing on the hybrid intellectual position I would rather lay out the present discussion on hybrid subject/agents in general, as it will set the scene from where the hybrid intellectual speaks or writes.

In order to set a general perspective the study requires starting with the grand discipline that shelters all the bulk of arguments: Post-colonialism. It is this narrative that is under widespread pressure from itself due to the fact that post-colonialism has been nesting huge numbers of people who are under pressure. The pressure faced by post-colonialism results from the critical approach towards this "discipline" or "position" or "state" that have been contested for a long time. Mostly, the pressure stems from the various interpretations of post-colonialism; playing with its post- or changing the word by intervening its hyphen post-colonialism, post/colonialism has been exposed to many transformations concerning its stance, content and approach. The term becomes ambiguous when it scrutinizes subjects, whether historically, epistemologically, politically or culturally. Another debate centers on whether to interpret post-colonialism as a "perspective" or "condition" or sometimes even as a "strategy". Regard to this, Rahdhakrishnan claims that "The challenging and complex question is how to enable a mutually accountable dialogue among the many locations that have something important to say about 'the after' of postcoloniality" (1993: 752). At this very point there comes the question of "the condition" after of post-

colonialism in a growing ground of the globalised and capitalized world. For centuries, and increasingly in recent ages, global capitalism, through all the trade, transportation, communication, and technological advances, gathers different peoples together into a common social and commercial space. These means have been compelling all those people to find ways of living together with those who are different, creating appropriate economic, political, and cultural conditions under which different human groups can live with a minimum of justice and peace. Keeping in mind all these practical realities, the sociological outcome of this process has brought a more challenging and more difficult dilemma while trying to create a way out, to eliminate the spatial and in/visible borders between the majorities and the minorities.

When the minorities or ethnic groups within multicultural nation-states are considered, the matter become much more tense and crucial. Should they try to internalize the culture of the dominant society they will loose their own identities, should they not; they will be always in conflict with the crowds and remain as *other* or *alien* in the eyes of the rest. The Former can be called the assimilation process that many ethnic groups are subjected to or experience somehow under the pressure of the dominant society and this assimilation mostly results in contradictory practice in the path of seeking an identity. The latter can be turned into a harsh adventure in which the individual positions him-herself as a threat both for her-himself and the majority. Such an account inevitably calls for the distinction between the self and the Other which sets the shifting ground that bears the concepts such as subjection, subjectivity, representation, recognition, identification, performance, position, periphery, center and so on. Under all these

concepts, where the subject/agent positions him-herself stands there as the primary motive. Are the concerning groups that stated as majorities (colonialists) in one hand and minorities (others/the colonized) on the other, able to position themselves on a still ground? Alternatively, are they exposed to a constant becoming/transformation during these shifting conditions, which is binding, especially for the colonized subject/agent? As stated above it is the focus of another study to analyze these various positions of minority subject/agents; however it is one of the aims of this study to examine the hybridity and its functions and productions in today's global/nationalist world scale.

In order to set satisfying remarks for the queries above a brief account of the past needs further cracking because the process that brings the humanity to post-colonialism can hardly be ignored concerning the paradox of the question of Other today. Regard to this need, Stuart Hall argues that,

the post-colonial perspective re-reads 'colonisation' as part of an essentially transnational and transcultural 'global' process – and it produces a decentered, diasporic or 'global' rewriting of earlier, nation-centered, imperial grand narratives. Its theoretical value therefore lies precisely in its refusal of this 'here' and 'there', 'then' and 'now', 'home' and 'abroad' perspective (qtd. in Hargreaves and McKinney 1997: 5).

Therefore such a post-colonialist perspective derives from the extending globalization idea however, in such a post-colonial perspective everything within time and space melts and there people should welcome a pseudo-integrated process. ``Pseudo`` because such post-colonization within globalization does not benefit from the wealth of ex-colonized land but it creates an illusion which suggests

that diasporic cultures belong, in equal measure, to each of the spaces in which they participate. However, they tried to eliminate the space between the colonized and colonizer or the self and the other or the dominant and the inferior in favor of creating a “collective”.

It should not be underestimated that all these arguments function from the space where modernist ideas have) already been left behind, Essentialism has been expired and the Western-centered myth has already discredited; “...there is loss of the sense of an absoluteness of any Western account of History” (Young 2006: 19). There are no binaries anymore and deconstruction, which indicates a critique of modernism, involves not just a critique of the grounds of knowledge in general, but specifically of the grounds of Occidental knowledge. The nature of such process inevitably shakes the Cartesian line between the binaries. The Cartesian thought, which has constructed the Western notion of “I think therefore I am,” assumes we are all ontologically affiliated to somewhere, and this has been weakened. From Derrida’s decentered perspective to Deleuze’s Rhizome idea “to be” has been shattered into *becoming* multiplicities and pluralities. Rather than depending on “either...or’s” such a ground provides the freedom of movement to produce (with) “and...and...and’s.” Therefore when talking about *collectives*, today it is obvious that even individuals within the collective have multiple identities with multiple connections with different groups. The clear imperative, then, is to shift from a politics of identity to a politics of diversity, from an insistence on sameness to a celebration of difference. The celebration which still indicates the hybrid position/lessness. Nevertheless, there are crucial drawbacks of this position/lessness for the hybrid individual within a nation state or a

multicultural society. To show a cause; “This political jerrymandering of a heterogeneous people into nation-state identification for purposes of control and domination unfortunately creates longterm disturbances that last well into the post-colonialist/nationalist phase” (Radhakrishnan 1993: 753). So, such interventions, to control or dominate or integrate or assimilate the ex-colonized in the purposes of the nation- state building, which also widely refers to “imagined community” of nationalism, creates its own paralyzed subjects/agents. On the other hand, the politics of difference, which does not seem as innocent as its content, articulates its positive projects into the capital and engenders the *exotification* of the other through commodification. Moreover politics of diversity has not yet accomplished its aim of erasing racism and/or its metonymies as it has no room for interrelationships and the inteaction of different struggles. In the light of these realities it is to be asked if this paralysis is mostly connected to the term “hybridity” and whether the paralysis of related individuals is a natural outcome of hybridity. If it is, how does it transform the hybrid subject/agents? Is the statement of Nehru “I have become a queer mixture of the East and the West, out of place everywhere, at home nowhere” (qtd. in Young 2001: 348) a thing to be celebrated or not? Or as Radhakrishnan argues the problem is not about hybridity *per se*, but rather with specific *attitudes to hybridity*.

In the previous sections it is reflected that the hybridity which Bhabha theorizes touches upon a more philosophical and psychoanalytic state of the notion, however the hybridity that Radhakrishnan defines by also referring to Gramsci includes a practical, political aspect which has a discrepancy pointing

that "...postcolonial hybridity is in a frustrating search for constituency and a legitimate political identity" (1993: 753). It is important to the postcolonial hybrid to compile a laborious "inventory of one's self" (in *ibid*). It is obvious that the point of "inventory of one's self" is a condition that can convey a reference to a process which include a constant search for a reasonable representation of the postcolonial self in a multicultural and/or globalised land. However the discrepancy stems from the word "legitimate political identity" because it can hardly be denied that a hybrid individual within a multicultural/nation state is granted the same rights as the dominant *rest*. Despite such a reality, the crucial problem is formed in the encounter of the colonizer with the colonized through the means of globalism, capitalism and media. When we ignore these elements, (globalization, capitalism, media) which is actually an impossible task, such an encounter can be examined within the principal dynamics of identity. These principal dynamics are primarily subject to the ways in which the 'self' and/or 'hybrid individual' is treated by the 'other' and/or majority society. And this process consider itself a destination where recognition or mis-recognition of the other, which is expected to be given by the majority, stands. On such a ground hybrid position as an identity is still in a perpetual construction process with a dialogical relationship with the majority 'other' because it is the common fact that self can define itself in *relation* with an other "just as the colonized has been constructed according to the terms's of colonizer's own self-image, as the 'self-consolidating other'" (Young 1996: 17). Young's example clearly shows the dialogical nature of identifying one's own self, however it also reflects a pivotal dilemma of today's postcolonial world: in the relation between colonized-

colonizer, colonized can never escape the “object” position. On the other hand, when the problem is considered the other way round, while the colonized is constructing his/her own self can s/he become a subject? Unfortunately, no. This pretentious “no” stems from the parameters that are in function during the concerning self-construction process of the Colonized/Hybrid. This aporia begs the study to make a conceptual bridge between the hybridity and subalternity which can be an illuminating point for the course of the problem.

Subalternity, which I use hesitantly and with great attention despite its off handed use in postcolonial studies, evokes a different perspective when Spivak’s use, by borrowing the term from Gramsci, in her distinguished article “Can the Subaltern Speak?” is considered. While she is extending the idea of subalternity in her article, “Scattered Speculations on the Subaltern and the Popular,” she explains that in terms of old application of the word,

" Subalternity is a position without identity. It is somewhat like the strict understanding of class. Class is not a cultural origin, it is a sense of economic collectivity, of social relations of formation as the basis of action.... Subalternity is where social lines of mobility, being elsewhere, do not permit the formation of a recognisable basis of action." (2005:3)

It is obvious that “subaltern” is evolved from a term that was used for defining a kind of “class” formation in Gramsci and Ranajit Guha as Spivak noted. As the nature of the word calls up Spivak’s Marxist reference on this argument based on class formation which was taken from a passage of *Eighteenth Brumaire* “same group of people are, are not, a class, depending upon whether they have consciousness” (2005: 3). The example Spivak embraces from Marx to legitimize the idea is as follows: “small peasant proprietors in France are a class as a

constative but not as a performative” and she goes on from Marx to say “they cannot represent themselves but they must be represented” (ibid). It is clear in this sense that the subalternistic features such as lack of social mobility and self-representation have concluded in synecdochism of the term by proliferating towards the social and cultural spheres covering the groups like migrants, diasporas, the colonized,. Accordingly those terms have become a metonymy for oppressed, excluded, degraded, migrant, minority. Moreover, Spivak, in her aforementioned article, examined the itinerary of the term “subaltern,” and her comment on Ranajit Guha’s use of the word is significant because for the early Guha subaltern is the name of a space of difference (which is significantly important), and was interchangeably used for ‘people’. Upon this reference when it is connected to the subaltern position without an identity, this is still controversial with the “popular” applications of the term when the concerning groups are considered. Nevertheless, as Spivak proceeds on the example in Marx’s *Eighteenth Brumaire* the concerning class can still be a class without being able to represent itself “because of the absence of infrastructural institutions, which are the condition and effect of class-consciousness, ‘they could not make their class-interest count’, to have what they are saying and doing be recognized as such”. Although such an argument seems to consider the subaltern’s position as a degraded category it doesn’t change the reality that they are still a collectivity as unrepresented groups, and today Spivak ironically states that “as the political passes into management, our conjuncture needs ‘people’, a pluralized general category that has no necessary class-description” (2005: 6). In the popular sense of the subalternity it is obvious that the term hardly manages to avoid

defining its agents as subjects which is an obstacle for the concerning individuals. Moreover, in the course of subalternity from Gramsci to Marx, according to Spivak, “bringing of the subaltern from the deduced subject of crisis to the logic of agency” inevitably does not make the picture more attractive. I defend this point by quoting Spivak further as she claimed agency “was the name I gave to institutionally validated action, assuming collectivity, distinguished from the formation of the subject, which exceeds the outlines of individual intention.” In that sense subaltern/ity which bears agent position immanently carries a negative connotation. As it was put above the nature of the agency as Spivak defined it melts the individuality and the subjectivity leading to a collectivity “which is where a group acts by synecdoche: the part that seems to agree is taken to stand for the whole” (2005:7). Such a position asks the individual to put aside his/her subjectivity and, by sharing the same predicament, engage in an action validated by the very collective. In such a way the resistance through which the unrepresented group seeks representation or recognition is considered a threat from the perspective of the dominant. Therefore, either their historical past or their ethnic/national legacy hardly provide an opportunity for colonized/hybrid/subaltern to speak or stand as emancipated *subjects* because it is the difference this time that leads the colonized/hybrid to form a collective by setting his/her alterity as a motive to be recognized. Such a defining operation of colonized/hybrid/ subaltern has concluded in a “nativist” project

“through a nostalgia for a lost or repressed culture idealize the possibility of that lost origin being recoverable in all its former plenitude without allowing for the fact that the figure of the lost origin, the ‘other’ that the colonizer has repressed, has itself been constructed in terms of the colonizers own self-image” (Spivak qtd.in Young 1996: 168).

Moreover, as Young paraphrases this reference in his end-note; "...the colonial subject forms a metonymic mirror image of Europe as sovereign subject". Therefore the colonized/hybrid's self-fulfilling phrase in a dialogical relationship, which is a positive project in identification, by articulating into the politics of diversity clashes back on to himself/herself and remains between the position of being subject-/agent. In addition, subalternity can be one of the outcomes of such in-betweenness. Moreover, such a condition has taken the position of ex-colonized/hybrid/subaltern half a step ahead as they consider this a project to gain *power* and set their existence in front of the dominant other. However, this can hardly be considered a progressive process for the subaltern position because within their collective they remain agents failing to form multiplicity of singularities. Therefore the activation of singularity is required to form a multiplicity in order to stand as subjects within a society. It can be observed that it is neither hybridity nor subalternity that is in play during all the related processes but it is the differences which acts significantly within the positions of subalternity and hybridity. To illuminate this argument it is also necessary to call back Guha's interpretation of subalternity, individuals who are defined by Guha as "people" occupy the space where the difference stands. Guha, who also borrowed the term from Gramsci, interprets subalternity as a kind of collectivity where there is no social mobility, conscious, self-representation or position "without identity," however there is still something very striking in Guha's remark which is the one defining subaltern position as "the space of difference". Thanks to Spivak in the evolution of the subaltern position wherein she relates the content of the position to unrepresented groups with identities in today's globalised

and multicultural nation-stated world so the collectivities are able to break up into individuals where differences may act to procure positive outcomes. However it is the case that a subaltern/colonized/hybrid who has been exposed to media, popular culture, and public space hardly constructs his/her subjectivity equally (like) in the same way as the--a colonizer/dominant. The subaltern/colonized/hybrid who faces his/her *difference* through the means that were mentioned (media, popular culture, public space) along with the encounter with the dominant other puts the difference into function where it “slides into ‘culture’, often indistinguishable from ‘religion’” (Spivak 2005: 8), and the group activates the synecdochism in a diverse way to form a collectivity. In their struggle for subject-ship the colonized/hybrid/subaltern individuals can neither put their differences aside (the case where they still remain agents and become invisible) nor they can take the difference as the crucial element to construct their selves (the case that leads to extremes and still leaves them in agent position).

Upon all these assertions this study supports that the hybrid/subaltern position is also the space where abundant positions emerge at the same time. This hopeful perspective stems from the idea of difference that is inherent to the related positions of hybridity and subalternity. Hence, despite all of these obstacles this study still carries optimistic interpretations in terms of the identity of the subaltern/hybrid/colonized from where “difference” is born. It is not the difference upon which capital has produced “exotific” elements of the concerning subject/agents and where cultural difference *sells*. It is not the difference which “in the commodification of language and culture, objects and images are torn free of their original referents and their meanings become a spectacle open to almost

infinite translation” where *infinite* functions in a negative way through the consuming nature of the capital. (Rutherford 1990:11). It is also not the difference which the centre constructs upon the polarities like culture/nature, man/woman, colonized/colonizer and it is not the difference which centre develops a hierarchial scheme depending upon the concerning singularities of an individual as *listed* features. Rather, this study considers “difference” as a way which dismantles the binaries and their hierarchies such dominant and subordinate, and destroying the polarities along with their inherent references, such as inequality and discrimination. As Rutherford’s words clearly explain, “we can use the word difference as a motif for that uprooting of certainty. It represents an experience of change, transformation, and hybridity...” (ibid: 10). This “difference” is the one that is born out of the margin between the polarities, the margin that threatens the fixity of the centre as well as the static position of the concepts. The margin which inherently keeps the difference functioning as “a supplement, marking what the centre lacks but also what it needs in order to define fully and confirm its identity. It is then an integral though displaced part of the centre, defining it even in its non-identity” (ibid: 22). Following on this, the margin is productive in the sense of presenting the opportunities to bear multiplicities of identification directions. On the other hand the experience of the subordinates, which has caused many locations in cultural politics, has produced a variety of negatory reactions such as racism, oppression of the minorities, strict prejudices and these are all responses of the centre to the marginal. However, it is the margin, also, which has created the resistance and deconstructed the concerning foundationalist productions. It is a potentially timeless/spaceless fertile land from which to evolve new identities and

new subjectivities while transforming its own. The Margin, “just as it invades the centre with its own difference, so it too is opened up to its internal differences” (ibid: 24). While Homi Bhabha is explaining his understanding of cultural difference he strikingly asserts that, “with the notion of cultural difference, I try to place myself in that position of liminality, in that productive space of the construction of culture as difference, in the spirit of alterity or otherness”, upon which it could be clearly claimed that the place of margin is the very field where all kinds of otherness and/or alterity has room for expression and transformation.

## **THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

The post-colonial theorists/authors in this study all lay down deconstruction and displacement of binary oppositions such as East/West, colonized/colonizer, minority/majority, dominant/immigrant and Self/Other. They are all selected in terms of their contribution to contemporary post-colonial theory who are aware of all the relatively “positive” intentions of the dominant and “nativist” resistance of the hybrid subaltern. Except Hanif Kureishi all the post-colonial intellectuals are Orientals in birth but defined hybrids in their cultural identities. By this way the study is going to have the opportunity to discuss both the advantages and the paradoxes which stem from their bio-geographical histories considering their texts as entities that reflect their ideological stance. In order to reach this point the study is going to start with revisiting *Orientalism* (1977) which is the milestone that opened the way to contemporary representations which “decolonize the colonial discourse” whose representatives can be listed as Homi Bhabha, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Stuart Hall and Salman Rushdie. However apart from this reason my study revisits the text obviously for two reasons. First, because it opens

an era which leads West to face its own fundamentalism and dominance in the construction and recognition of the Other. Second *Orientalism* at the same time turns into an argument which legitimizes the “native project” of the suppressed and letting West face its own “fault” paves the way for exocitification and authentication of the East this time in disguised notions of “respect” and “tolerance” under liberal politics of diversity. In this context the study examines the role of the post-colonial hybrid intellectual who are very well aware of the discrepancies above.

In the first chapter the study successively examines two different “burdens” of post-colonial intellectual through Edward Said and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. First, accepting the exile as “the condition of the soul” the intellectual fails to represent the actual diasporic subaltern who do not have a home to return to. Second, while the post-colonial intellectual theorizing the Other negotiates the role of the native informant which is the role assumes that the post-colonial theorist/author speaks *for* the entire community or culture from which s/he comes from. In order to illuminate these inquiries it should be noted that the study approves organic bound between the text and the writer especially when the heterogeneous conception of cultural text are narrated through the post-colonial theorists/writers. In this sense Edward Said’s “worldliness” of the text “is a key principle for post-colonial societies and runs counter to the ‘unworldly’ abstraction of much contemporary theory” (Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin 2002: 209). Accordingly Edward Said who devoted selected works for the interrogation of intellectual’s position will set the ground to furnish the study with required

parameters to examine the role of post-colonial intellectual. His introducing of the “critical distance” and “secular critic” is going to help the study to present analyses for the representation of the Other regarding post-colonial critic’s “responsibility”. On the other hand, in the same chapter Edward Said’s perspective of the celebration of exile will stand for one of the paradoxes of the post-colonial intellectual. The study will refer to his own autobiographic essays and through this, we will be able to see that post-colonial writer’s pluralistic vision resides in his/her in-betweenness however we will examine that it is also the space where the intellectual’s private position juxtaposes with the hybrid subaltern’s actual exile. In addition to this, it is the fact that the intellectuals in this study are constantly accused of being Western oriented in their representations due to their articulation of European theories. Edward Said is one of the leading figures in this sense accordingly it will be questioned if this paradox creates a burden in the representation of the Other or it is the natural outcome of the post-colonial writer’s heterogeneous rhetoric.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak is going to be the next example to examine another burden in the representations of the post-colonial hybrid intellectual. This burden stems from the intellectual’s authoritative voice in representing the subaltern. The examination of this burden will be done in reference to Edward Said’s “critical distance” of the intellectual as the expansion of this distance through a conductive voice may generate hierarchical relationship between the writer and the observant object which marks the subjection of the subaltern. In the course of post-independence evolution, the formerly colonized writer who is currently a residence in First World has often been accused of “expressing” the

Other in order to achieve cultural translation however through Spivak's post-structuralist interventions we shall see the significant misconception of such an approach. Through her criticisms of great Western post-structuralist intellectuals Foucault and Deleuze in her distinguished article "Can the Subaltern Speak?" along with the Colonial intervention of Britain concerning "Sati" Spivak concludes that such liberation projects of the West fail to let the Subaltern's self-expression. In contrast to White Western position, underlining the hybrid positionality of the post-colonial intellectual we will interrogate to what extent the post-colonial critic's interventions and representations contribute to the "recognition" and "belonging" of the subalterns.

The second chapter of the study is set for the representations of post-colonial fiction writers who have considerable recognition by international audience in terms of both their own self-assurances and their cross-cultural delineations in their narratives. Salman Rushdie as a first-generation South Asian in Britain and Hanif Kureishi as a second-generation British born writer will provide us with relative and contrastive identification processes of the Other. Situating Roland Barthes' arguments about relation between the historicity of the author and the text we shall offer various stereotypes concerning the subaltern through autobiographical inferences of Salman Rushdie and Hanif Kureishi. By this way the study can observe different positionalities of post-colonial intellectual by referring to Homi Bhabha's mimicry. Mimicry is a notion that can be operated as resistance by both the colonized and the colonizer hence it will be exposed to examination from the aspect of Rushdie's and Kureishi's dissimilar

representations. In the contrast of their generations we shall see that while Rushdie narrates the transfer of culture and formation of cultural identity in terms of East-West opposition and colonized-colonizer dichotomy, Kureishi as a 'post-migrant' faces the reader "the new empire" within Britain offering representations to show the difficulties of accommodating the cultural difference of the stigmatized with the lived experience of diversity within multicultural Britain. In this chapter the study will still keep examining the positionality of the post-colonial writer in terms of the reciprocal relationship between the subaltern and the representations. Accordingly the third space which is the "hybrid" stance of the writer will haunt throughout the chapter considering Bhabha's description. He states that "...the importance of hybridity is that it bears the traces of those feelings and practices which inform it, just like a translation, so that hybridity puts together the traces of certain other meanings and discourses" (in Rutherford 1990: 211), so the translation through hybridity lets the cultures and identities merge and creates new spaces. In this context it will be illustrated how Rushdie forms a transformative bridge replacing the centre-periphery dichotomy. On the other hand Kureishi as younger generation immigrant is a representative of a slightly different cultural translation who lead us to observe the eclectic identification of the immigrants in the communities in a disturbing kind. Rather than transformative, Kureishi narrates flat negative and positive stereotypes and unlike Rushdie he replaces the old diasporic rhetoric of nostalgia with the "...the idea of a comforting homeland (against the threatening nation-space in which the diaspora finds itself) that is always present visibly and aurally (Mishra 2007: 187). In this context the study is required to refer the writers' autobiographical

narrations in order to show the varieties in their representations of the diasporic subaltern, by this way we shall see the difference in their expressions of resistance concerning the subaltern's "colonial desire". Kureishi's schizophrenic shifts in representing both his home of origin Pakistan and his home Britain will enable us to trace answers if Kureishi's is an auto-orientalism which may stem from his uncontested 'Englishness' and mimicry.

This research in overall analysis will avoid a closure as the post-colonial theory continues to emerge new narratives and theories concerning the question of the Other. In this sense we cannot ignore the ground-breaking contributions of all the post-colonial theorists/authors analyzed in this study; their displacements, reciprocal deconstructions, projects of merging constructed notions shakes the Western hegemony in "defining" and "placing" the Other. Hence the study requires not a conclusion but an afterword in order to display that there is a lot more to be considered and examined when the positionality of the post-colonial writer is examined in relation to the Black/Subaltern/Diasporic/Migrant/Hybrid subject's "representation" and "identification". The study in overall suggests questioning to what extent those post-colonial texts offer "re/presentations" in order to engender new cultural spaces for the subaltern or if the texts just remain as texts which leave the subaltern in the abstraction and oscillation of the literary/theoretical concepts.

## **CHAPTER I**

### **POST-COLONIAL INTELLECTUAL AS A SECULAR CRITIC: DECOLONIZING THE COLONIAL DISCOURSE**

#### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

In the current age of massive globalization, communication, transportation and migration where the distances, borders or “spaces between” do not count; the plurality of ethnicities, cultures and identities are the core issue within the nation-states. Forming a unity within a territory by embracing different ethnicities with various identities, which have been carrying different histories along, has promoted solidarity through political means like unity in language, unity in common shared values and common rights. However, it is the case that all such attempts, which led to the unity in spite of all differences, have not still erased the term “difference” within an individual when s/he encounters the other. In this point it should be clarified that while doing such an argumentation the study excludes the White Western dominating individuals who form the hegemony but include the ones who are born with a colonial legacy or born as subaltern/suppressed/hybrid/inferior due to their culturally constructed identities.

On such a ground it is the natural outcome of the process that the common historical background of the White Western shared codes clash with the others’ who have been raising upon an essential inferiority of their colonial history. Additionally, under the influence of multiculturalism and postmodernism the Western intellectual ethos today is dominated by philosophies and politics of difference. Identity and unity have been questioning due to the drawbacks of the practice of afore concepts. Hence in such a case "White Westerners" have less

challenges in forming unity and solidarity however when the others are concerned; their articulation to such a collectivity in a nation state naturally brings along a cleavage both in their position and the organization of the nation state unity. The reason for this takes place where “difference” is operative when the individual from hegemonic society encounters the other. It is an inevitable fact that race, skin color or cultural codes, which are the parameters that make the other different, are also the elements, which lead them to form their own solidarity. Moreover, it should also be emphasized that it is not the only one solidarity of the inferiors/postcolonials/subalterns/hybrids but there are also solidarities depending on the various collective differences of the subaltern subject/agents. To make it clear; one of the solidarities of difference has naturally come out from the different kind of theoretical turn in academy and post-colonial era which is Orientalism. It means Orientalism as a practice whose subjects and agents have been clearly represented by Edward Said has been now haunting and penetrating through the geographies and subjects because of the migrations and diasporas proliferating and transcending the national borders. Therefore it now covers the public space and private space without a distinction however it stands somewhere between where we can separate the post-colonial subject/agents who are subjected to Orientalism and post-colonial intellectuals who criticize, or refer to Orientalism consciously or unconsciously. Accordingly, by revisiting Orientalism the study is going to discuss the transformation of the solidarity and otherness along with the different responses that have been given to such a practice by subject/agents and post-colonial intellectuals.

In this chapter the controversial experiences of post-colonial individuals

and post-colonial intellectuals are going to be examined. The reason of such questioning lies on the very delicate space between the public and private. As it is the case, the seeking for recognition and representation of a migrant/subaltern or post-colonial individual living in a Western country within multicultural regulative forces cannot easily escape from still feeling degraded or inferior. As it is stated in the previous chapter in terms of identity politics to take side of the politics of sameness or politics of difference both have discrepancies.

To clarify which subject/agents are operative while talking about the drawback of both politics of sameness and politics of difference, it can be claimed that the ones with a particular legacy of colonialism and an origin out of Western territory are set for this chapter's core. However it should not be overestimated that this study avoids addressing a particular group of ethnicity in a specific territory rather it points out the individuals who are migrants or diasporic and have dispersed through geographies in the world. Simply put it addresses the Black Men of Fanon or Orient of Said or Hybrids of Salman Rushdie and Homi Bhabha and such.

In his work Said is pretty clear about which people he is pointing as Orientalists and it is coherent which subjects are *subjected to* Orientalism. As Said very well put in his distinguished work that;

The Orient that appears in Orientalism, then, is a system of representations framed by a whole set of forces that brought the Orient into Western learning, Western consciousness, and later, Western Empire. ... Orientalism is a school of interpretation whose material happens to be the Orient, its civilizations, peoples and localities. (Said 1977: 203).

This argument above which was written three decades ago shows the centre of the practice however what matters today is the current transformation of the material of Orientalism. Is it possible to claim that the interpretations of the Orient have changed? Are these interpretations still operative despite of the entire postponed regulations dependant upon dominating/dominated binary? To make it more clear has anything changed through equality or freedom based neo-liberal politics and nation-state formations? The answer is pretty obvious yet requires an analysis through some example arguments. As Clifford states “Since 1950 Asians, Africans, Arab Orientals, Pacific Islanders and Native Americans have in a variety of ways asserted their independence from Western cultural and political hegemony and established a new multivocal field of intercultural discourse”(1994: 256)), it is the dramatic turn in history where “the empire writes back” (Salman Rusdie); the ones who have set the agents of the observations for Western anthropologists and social scientists has now started to write their history back. However, the practice of this decolonization process has had an italic framework within nation-states through the disclosure of inequalities despite of its egalitarian discourse. The problem of recognition and representation of the subaltern/hybrid/colonial subject/agents is still surviving. Still today orientalism should be considered as the indication of the ambiguity that has been formed through the globalization era which includes the transportation, immigration and transformation of the subaltern/hybrid/colonial subject/agents. Moreover it is not only that the Orient has transformed through globalization but also the critique of Eurocentric history has changed through the view by “not positioning itself outside ‘the West’ but rather uses its own alterity and duplicity in order to effect

its deconstruction” (Young 1996, 19). However with the articulation of decentralization and decolonization of European thought and hegemony is still “incapable of respecting the Being and meaning of the Other” because the practices of various ethnic groups and immigrants within nation-states are still suffering with the question of representation and recognition along with latent orientalism of the dominant. Accordingly there is still a dominant and suppressed to mention, there is still a binary between the West and East, colonial and colonized, dominating and dominated but this is the space where post-colonial intellectual emerges and points these tensions of suppressed groups as it will be discussed in the forthcoming sections of the chapter.

As to turn back to Young’s argument the alterity and duplicity of the Orient which is operative in the decolonization process leads the issue to get more complicated. In such a case the individuals within a nation-state both resist assimilation and fail in integrating therefore they posit their alterity in the centre and retreat their own communities. It is the outcome of the failure of the “nation”, as Benedict Anderson states nation’s disputable emergence in his distinguished work *Imagined Communities*;

the century of the Enlightenment, of rationalist secularism, brought with its own modern darkness.....[Few] things were (are) suited to this end better than the idea of nation. If nation states are widely considered to be 'new' and 'historical', the nation states to which they give political expression always loom out of an immemorial past and...glide into a limitless future. What I am proposing is that Nationalism has to be understood, by aligning it not with self-consciously held political ideologies, but with large cultural systems that

preceded it, out of which--as well as against  
which--it came into being. (in Pecora: 313)

Accordingly the case of the immigrant/colonized/subaltern within a nation-state is not only considered ideologically but also culturally. Therefore the operation of this cultural aspect can stand as a resistance tool which leads them to ask for recognition and representation in a nation-state. Nationalism and nation-state condition should not be *imposed* as a solution for integration and regulation for multicultural societies that include people who have migrated from the third-world territories because such a condition makes the subaltern/hybrid/colonial subjects not internalize but exposed to the practice. Bhabha presents this in his celebrated article "Introduction: Nation and Narration" that "a particular ambivalence that haunts the idea of the nation, the language of those who write of it and the lives of those who live it" (Bhabha 1990: 1) and it also will be illuminating to refer to Bhabha in his article "The Space of People" within the book *The Location of Culture* that "deprived of that unmediated visibility of historicism—'looking to the legitimacy of past generations as cultural autonomy'—the nation turns from being the symbol of modernity into becoming the symptom of an ethnography of the 'contemporary' within modern culture" (1994: 146). Therefore the space of people where the modern culture and Enlightenment points the nation as representative is also the space that is full of paradoxes;

The barred Nation *It/Self* , alienated from its self-generation, becomes a liminal signifying space that is internally marked by the discourses of minorities, the heterogeneous histories of contending peoples, antagonistic authorities and tense locations of cultural difference" (ibid: 148).

This argument supplies the very contradiction which is immanent to the practice of the nation-state; despite of all attempts to assure “sameness” of rights in political space the a priori archaic generation of the Western territory’s history does not let the "historically displaced people" to integrate. This “of all time narrative of the West” constantly clashes with the performatives of the colonized and historically displaced within the nation-state. Their alternative ways to “be” and be emancipated from this narrative also represent a reaction to the new form of Orientalism which is latently or evidently travels and penetrates through the territories. And as Said explains in a long passage that Orientalism;

Therefore is not a mere political subject matter or field that is reflected passively by culture, scholarship or institutions; nor is it a large and diffuse collection of texts about the Orient; nor is it representative and expressive of some nefarious ‘Western’ imperialist plot to hold down the ‘Oriental’ world. It is rather a *distribution* of geopolitical awareness into aesthetic, scholarly, economic, sociological, historical and philological texts; it is an *elaboration* not only of a basic geographical distinction (the world is made up of two unequal halves, Orient and Occident) but also of a whole series of “interests” which, by such means as scholarly discovery, philological reconstruction, psychological analysis, landscape and sociological description, it not only creates but also maintains; it is, rather than expresses, a certain *will* or *intention* to understand, in some cases control, manipulate, even to incorporate, what is a manifestly different (or alternative and novel) world; it is, above all, a discourse that is by no means in direct, corresponding relationship with political power in the raw, but rather is produced and exists in an uneven exchange with various kinds of power, shaped to a degree by the exchange with...power moral (as with ideas about what ‘we’ do and what ‘they’ cannot do or understand as ‘we’ do) (1977: 12).

The aim to revisit Orientalism is to refer the new face of the discourse that is born through relatively progressive intention of the pluralist capital nation-states highlighting the difference of its immigrant/diasporic subject/agents in the sense of the *richness* of the land. In this point arouses Orientalism because the subaltern, hybrid, colonized, immigrant citizens within the nation state are being recognized by being integrated with their cultural differences. However, such a case causes them to have been presented as commodities through a “diversity” discourse. It is the point where subaltern/hybrid/colonial subjects hold on to their differences and retreat their own communities as to erase their suppressed history and "write back the empire." However, this relative inclusion of nation-state still cannot provide a satisfactory condition for its citizens because there comes the core of the issue which exists at the space where the historically dominating encounter his Other. The retreat of colonized subject/agents into their communities which provides them the comfort of social-belonging also creates nationalisms and the pluralistic condition of the nation-state concludes in the conflicts between these nationalities.

In Foucauldian terms and in terms of identity politics such an attempt is referred to “will to power” which comes out when the group has been threatened by assimilation and disappearance. Therefore like the power which is a part of society or a crucial element of governmentality produces another element which is “resistance”. Resistance which I argue that the critical consciousness of the immigrants, post-colonials, hybrids and such whether they fulfill consciously or unconsciously, intentionally or unintentionally. Likewise orientalism which has been transforming as it is put above leads immigrants, post-colonials, hybrids to

react back to find a way out and this is a performative reaction against the dominant society. However the problem is that uprising nationalism which sometimes lead to extremes are very much alike what Said puts in Orientalism and as Young interprets;

If Orientalism involves a science of inclusion and incorporation of the East by the West, then that inclusion produces its own disruption: the creation of the Orient, if it does not really represent the East, signifies the West's own dislocation from itself, something inside that is presented, narrativized, as being outside. (1996: 139)

The relation which Young develops is very much alike to the condition of the communities which gather around their “difference” because when a group form a community they inevitably, intentionally or unintentionally “exclude” something/someone while trying to lead an “inclusion” of their power into the dominant. The disruption here is that they create their own “exclusion” within the society. This paradox which includes the Westerners and the post-colonials, immigrants and hybrids has been the centre of issue which has been subjected to criticism by various intellectuals.

As to turn back the core of this chapter which is the discussion of position of the post-colonial intellectual it calls for the analysis of the “intellectual” by referring to the post-colonial theorists per se. The intention here is to question the drawback which occurs when the resistance of the post-colonials, immigrants and hybrids differ from the resistance of post-colonial intellectual. Everybody would agree that this is not so surprising however there is a contradiction when the post-colonial critic falls into an illusion of orientalising his/her own observation

objects, moreover his/her displacement may lead to a detachment from the public when s/he acts as the “voice” of the the post-colonials, immigrants and hybrids. Then it will be questioned if exilic, displaced and homeless which are the notions that have been attributed to the post-colonial critic providing him/her with productivity lead to universality, foundationalism and institutionalism.

## **1.2 Edward Said: Celebration of Exile and “The Secular Critic” as a Post-Colonial Theorist**

Edward Said in his work *Representations of the Intellectual* presents a comparison between the role of intellectual in 1800s and modern intellectual of the twentieth century. From his analysis it is clear to conclude that the mission of an intellectual was to stand as an example in front of the society by acting as an element that lead the society to be in solidarity. He exemplifies this by referring to Matthew Arnold “...the role of intellectuals is supposed to be that of helping a national community feel more a sense of common identity, and a very elevated one at that (1994: 22). Accordingly, it is obvious that the intellectual of those times should “quieten the people down, to show them the best ideas and the best works of literature constituted a way of belonging to a national community...” (ibid) which is a task that was demanded in a ground where the governments tried to establish democracy within a restlessness of people who were difficult to govern. It is the interpretation of Said that this was a necessary one. However the role of the intellectual has also undergone various criticisms through changing conditions of the nations, the societies and the cultures. Moreover the dramatic impact of globalization along with the grand theory deconstruction most of the intellectuals left behind the discourse of collectivity as Said refers to Benda;

“intellectuals should stop thinking in terms of collective passions and should concentrate instead on transcendental values, those that were universally applicable to all nations and peoples (1994: 23). It is apparent that there still stands a risk of supporting a “collective” from the aspect of intellectual position; Benda also agrees that he is talking about European men and “shoulds” for intellectual calls for a solidarity which may refer to a collectivity in terms of intellectual position. Accordingly although universalist position of intellectual sounds as a positive project there still remains a question if s/he writes or speaks from a space which is equally distant from the given entities such as Europe, Africa, Asia or the West. Said’s suggestion to that kind of drawback is “never solidarity before criticism” (ibid:24); the reason for such a suggestion lies under Said’s vision of skeptical mind of intellectual rather than being in patriotic consensus with the rulers. One could come to such a conclusion from Said’s attachment to Walter Benjamin and Gramsci because he considered the choice of intellectual either to be allied with the stability of the victors and rulers, or considering such stability as an experience of subordination articulated with the memory of forgotten voices and persons. In this point what Said suggests should not be misunderstood as if he is asking to choose between the representation of dominant norms or minority victimization. What he tries to word is rather than taking a side between the two, intellectual’s task “is explicitly universalize the crisis, to give greater human scope to what a particular race or nation suffered, to associate that suffering with the sufferings of others” (1994: 33). What he clearly brings forward is that the skeptical look of the intellectual should be operative for all the aspects of intellectual’s concern, s/he should avoid being attached to sharp-

cut positions because if s/he takes the side of the dominant it would be promoting idealistic codes of the nation and society. Therefore intellectual would sound “triumphalist” and supporter of authority which is a position lacks critical mind. On the other hand if the intellectual takes on the mission of being the “voice” of the oppressed which inevitably leads intellectual to transcend the public and become a hero. Such a position would damage the credibility and reliability of the intellectual but interestingly Said puts in the previous chapter titled *Representations of the Intellectual* that

I think, that the intellectual is an individual endowed with a faculty for representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion, as well as, for a public. And this role has an edge to it, and cannot be played without a sense of being someone whose place it is publically to raise embarrassing questions, to confront orthodoxy and dogma (rather than to produce them), to be someone who cannot be easily be co-opted by governments or corporation, and whose *raison d’etre* is to represent all those people and issues that are routinely forgotten or swept under rug. (1994:9)

This definition reminds the position of a journalist who stands for injustice and chases after inequalities in the society and is a “friend” of the oppressed which sounds romantic for an intellectual. Yet, it does not mean that intellectual should avoid standing against injustice and inequality within the society however in relation to Said’s view it seems controversial for intellectual as to prevent himself from taking exact parts between the choices. Moreover it does not mean to be too political, intellectual should know what he is against yet he should keep skeptical and critical while defending a part. Said himself reveals that “And just because

you represent the sufferings that your people lived through which you yourself might have lived through also, you are not relieved of the duty of revealing that your own people now maybe visiting related crimes on *their* victims (ibid) so “intellectual must speak out against that sort of gregariousness...” (1994:33). Therefore what is meant in terms of the position of the intellectual according to Said is clearly the very hybrid position and it is also meaningful that Said himself after these last assertions in the chapter of “Holding Nations and Traditions at Bay” devotes the next one to the “Intellectual: Exile”. But before going in-depth of this exilic gesture it is not yet adequate of Edward Said’s understanding of the intellectual.

Although *Orientalism* is the book which more than any other has cemented Said’s reputation, it is the collection of theoretical essays, *The World, the Text and the Critic* (1983), which provides the lens through which his work can be read most profitably, the key to his significance to contemporary cultural and literary theory. In this book and later in *Representations of the Intellectual* (1994), one can clearly realize Said’s aspect and interrogation while he is writing. In addition, it is the approach that post-colonial discourse was based on which is the theoretical investigation that was inherited partially by Bhabha and also Spivak.

Edward Said considers the “worldliness” of the text as the core of writing. As he puts; “my position is that texts are worldly, to some degree they are events, and, even when they appear to deny it, they are nevertheless a part of the social world, human life, and of course the historical moments in which they are located and interpreted” (1991:4). It can be claimed that for Said texts are entities and the world from which the text originated, the world with which it is affiliated,

is crucial not only for interpretation but also for its ability to make an impact on its readers. Texts are beings and they have material presences with their own cultural and social backgrounds so this analysis leads him to touch upon the position of the intellectual as a secular critic. The reason for this is that it propounds a form of criticism called secular criticism, which opposes to “priest-like” gesture and using complex language and specialization, rather he defends the way what he calls an amateurism of approach, avoiding the retreat of intellectual work from the actual society in which it occurs. From his analysis in *Representations of the Intellectual* it can be concluded that no matter how much intellectuals may believe that their interests are of ‘higher things or ultimate values’, the morality of the intellectual’s practice begins with its location in the secular world. Moreover it is affected by ‘where it takes place, whose interests it serves, how it jibes with a consistent and universalist ethic, how it discriminates between power and justice, what it reveals of one’s choices and priorities’ (1994:89). These lines apparently the ones which he extends his idea of secular critic in his book *The World, the text and the Critic*; “the realities of power and authority—as well as the resistances offered by men, women and social movements to institutions, authorities, and orthodoxies—are the realities that make texts possible, that deliver them to their readers, that solicit the attention of critics” (1991:5).

It is not difficult to observe the traces of Gramsci’s organic intellectual from such interpretations of Edward Said, the strong bonds he has with such kind of intellectual is also stated by himself; “Certainly what Benda says about intellectuals resonates harmoniously with more recently Gramsci’s notion of the

organic intellectual allied with an emergent class against ruling class hegemony” (1991:14-15). It means that Edward Said does not deny his presence within the dominant ideology however what he aims is to develop a self-inspired and organic consciousness by using his positionality and by creating strategies for such purpose. Accordingly this is the very positionality that sets up the parameters of the “decolonizing the colonial discourse” project which includes Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Stuart Hall including most of the other alike post-colonial theorists. However it is also problematic if these theorists are able to create bonds with their own communities which they are writing about, to and from. And it is another question if they can harmonize their own historical and cultural legacy with the dominant by calling attention to the matter of representation and recognition of public individuals who they are writing about. Bill Aschcroft in his book *Edward Said* states that “But the essence of Said’s critical spirit is the refusal to be locked into a school, ideology or political party and his determination not to exempt anything from criticism” (2001: 34) and as Robert Young paraphrases Said “according to Said, criticism must distance itself from the dominant culture and assume an adversarial position (1996: 136). This is apparently the oppositional approach of post-colonial criticism which sets the migrant/subaltern/hybrid/post-colonial individuals as their observant objects however as the queries show above there is a dilemma between the rhetoric that intellectuals operate and the language that individuals use in terms of trying to “gain” their recognition and representation. It is the space where the perception of exile differs between these two. And the resistance which is the natural outcome of such a cultural and political condition takes different outbursts when the

individuals and the intellectuals are concerned. Hence when it comes to analyze “the exilic condition” of the intellectual depending on Edward Said’s perspective it can be claimed that it is operative for the other post-colonial critics as secular critics. These critics in their own positions as a powerful and prestigious academics are to engage constantly on the one hand with the academic discourse which, in a sense, gives them intellectual birth and from which they speak, and on the other hand with the extensively marginalized position of their own constituencies. Upon such analysis it will be revealed where the clash between the perception of exile by the individuals and intellectuals comes from.

Both in his book *Representations of the Intellectual* and *The World, the Text and the Critic* Edward Said more than once refers to Auerbach’s reference to a twelfth-century Saxon monk called Hugo of St. Victor to describe the intellectual’s worldliness as;

(..) The man who finds his homeland sweet is still a tender beginner; he to whom every soil is as his native one is already strong; but he is perfect to whom the entire world is as a foreign land. The tender soul has fixed his love on one spot in the world; the strong man has extended his love to all places; the perfect man has extinguished his.  
(cited in Said 1991:7)

This reference gives the idea of exile which is representative of Said’s idea about intellectual and his/her perspective. It can also be concluded that this is the condition of exile which should be operative for the secular critic with a critical consciousness for Said. It also stands for the “*plurality* of vision” which is generally attributed to the exilic and hybrid critic since they are aware of at least two cultures; “Because the exile sees things both in terms of what has been left

behind and what is actual here and now, there is a double perspective that never sees things in isolation” (Said 1994: 44). It is the common narrative that post-colonial critics are the ones who generally accepted as “exilic” due to their biographic or geographic histories but interestingly Edward Said’s approach has been criticized for being very Eurocentric and it is obvious from his examples including Conrad, Adorno and Swift. These examples set a paradox when the other way of exile is concerned. For example the example of Auerbach’s *Mimesis* which sets the originating point of his rhetoric of exile a Jewish refugee from Nazi Germany, wrote his great work in Istanbul, where the very lack of access to all the books that he might have looked up enabled him to write a study of such an extended vision. *Mimesis* itself is not, says Said, ‘only a massive reaffirmation of the Western cultural tradition, but also a work built upon a critically important alienation from it’ (1983:8). It is not a mistake to exemplify the exilic condition of a Westerner in an Eastern land which engenders a magisterial and pluralistic look on both cultures however it is the paradox of Said that he never mentions the experience of the exile which has been the core reason of suffering diasporic people who are forced to or obliged to live in foreign lands. This paradox also raised in Ashcroft’s book;

While the dislocated and displaced ‘European’ exile has been accommodated, celebrated and allowed a new ‘home’, the position of the ‘other’ exile has been highly problematic. The dilemmas and plights faced by diasporic peoples throughout the world have received at best cursory attention in the West. Rather than accommodation, these ‘new’ exiles are seen as a threat to the old order. (2001: 46)

This dilemma is operative not only for Edward Said but also for most of the post-intellectual theorists as they are writing about the diasporic depending upon their autobiographical references. It is the case that the same paradox above has always possessed one's mind after reading each profound work of them. It cannot not be claimed that they do not accept the tragic aspect of exile; Said himself starts his chapter "Intellectual Exile: Expatriates and Marginals" within *Representations of the Intellectual* by saying that "Exile is one of the saddest fates" (1994: 35). Furthermore, he gives examples from unaccommodated exiles, like Palestinians and the new Muslim immigrants in continental Europe and concludes that "... while it is an *actual* condition, exile is also for my purposes a metaphorical condition" (ibid: 39). It is indeed the *metaphorical* condition which constantly harbors *actual* feeling of detachment, homelessness and displacement for the migrant/postcolonial/hybrid/subaltern individual however the case is different for the intellectual. Inevitably while exile is the reason for sufferings of the afore subjects Edward Said admits that it is the productive motive for the intellectual;

"so while it is true to say that exile is the condition that characterizes the intellectual as someone who stands as a marginal figure outside the comforts of privilege, power, being-at-homeness (so to speak), it is also very important to stress that that condition carries with it certain rewards and, yes, even privileges. So while you are neither winning prizes nor being welcomed into all those self-congratulating honor societies that routinely exclude embarrassing troublemakers who do not toe the party line, you are at the same time deriving some positive things from exile and marginality" (1994: 44).

Accordingly, it is right to say that exile for the intellectual is the productive space that they can justify their constant formation of their subjecthoods, they belong “nowhere” and “everywhere” at the same time. On the other hand it is crucially the very challenging and at the same time favorable project for the post-colonial critic because through such a “privilege” they can overcome their colonized and inferior past also they are recognized by the West. Moreover as Clifford refers Edward Said himself; “the more one is able to leave one’s cultural home, the more easily is one able to judge it, and the whole world as well, with the spiritual detachment *and* generosity necessary for true vision” (1994: 263) and by this “true” vision they are able to become subjects in a Western-centered ground. However this leads the study to the same inference that the productivity and abundant of these exilic intellectuals depend on a more romantic vision of exilic situation, it means they are as secular critics are able to create strategies to escape from the hegemony and invent their own spaces. They are willing to be exilic although it starts as an inevitable and sufferable condition of their own national, communal, and cultural heritage. As Edward Said refers one more to Auerbach “... in his essay’s final words he maintains that the ascetic code of willed homelessness is ‘a good way also for one who wishes to earn a proper love for the world’” (1991:7) so this “optimistic” approach to a painful process to be an exile not matter “actual” or “metaphoric” sounds highly priest-like and detached from not “places” but the “people”. It is the point that should be turned back in the forthcoming sections of the study.

In the book *Letters of Transit: Reflections on Exile, Identity, Language and Loss* which André Aciman collected essays of hybrid critics where Edward

Said's article "No reconciliation Allowed" pictures his "saddest fate" representing the condition of being opposed both from West and the East. This essay is full of autobiographical references which shows the drawbacks of constructing an identity as a child who is "a Palestinian going to school in Egypt, with an English first name, an American passport, and no certain identity at all" (1998: 96). This is the disadvantaged reality of hybrids in the portrait of Edward Said, it is true that their exilic presence excludes them from wherever they step in, and it is the reason for their constant existential interrogation. However, it is the paradox when the exilic intellectual starts to celebrate such in-betweenness sounding as overlooking the current bleeding process including the ones in public who are dispersed all around world have been passing through. Said very well explains this paralytic existence of a hybrid "But although thought to believe and think like an English schoolboy, I was also trained to understand that I was an alien, Non-European other, educated by my betters to know my station and not to aspire to being British. The line separating Us from Them was linguistic, cultural, racial and ethnic" (ibid: 97) this is a perfect portrait of Beur in France, Turk in Germany, Indian in Britain and such. This is the crisis of today's migrant/diasporic/post-colonial/hybrid individual who oscillates between being a stranger despite of his/her citizenship in a Western country or not that but rather trying to face the "tolerance" and "respect" of the dominant because s/he is "different" or "exotic". So what should a post-colonial critic do? It is a question which is risky and dodgy to find exact answers however the examination to observe the difference between two exiles is quite necessary for the post-colonial intellectual. The celebration of post-colonial critic's exile does not suit to the one

which is experienced by their observant objects so the way both “resist” differ in the practice. Post-colonial critic with his/her institutionalized and acknowledged power has the opportunity to turn his/her pain into a productive tool and celebrate it however the subaltern facing the everyday conflicts that stem from his/her identity are far from accomplishing such an optimistic approach. Nico Israel in his book *Outlandish* sets very fruitful questions in this sense such as “Does writing of displacement present a case of the reverse, of imagined alterity, both on the part of the writer and on the part of the community in which s/he is settled? How does the positionality of the displaced writer interact with questions of racial, national, and gendered ‘belonging’; with the representation of landscape, seascape, and memory, with the process or predicament of globalization?” (2000: 11).

These are the questions which require a substantial examination of critics within distinguished cases however the imagined alterity which Nico states lead both the writers and readers to think deeply about the position of post-colonial critic and the question of “otherness”. The term “imagined alterity” which apparently refers to Benedict Anderson’s “imagined communities” also forms a solidarity or attachment between the writer and his/her observant objects that is constructed on their “difference” from the hegemony or the dominant. However the “alterity” of wording the displacement is questionable when it is compared to the individuals’ because of the reason that was put above which is the difference in the perception of exile from both parties. This paradox needs further examination which is going to be held below.

Aijaz Ahmad who is one of the oppositional figures who strongly criticizes the positionality of “metropolitan” post-colonial thinkers which can be listed as

Edward Said, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Homi Bhabha and Salman Rushdie discusses the “privileging the migrant intellectual” as;

... the ideological ambiguity in these rhetorics of migrancy resides in the key fact that the migrant in question comes from a *nation* which is subordinated in the imperialist system of intra-state relationships but, simultaneously, from the *class*, more often than not which is the dominant class within that nation—this in turn, makes it possible for that migrant to arrive in metropolitan country to join not the working classes but the professional middle strata, hence to forge a kind of rhetoric which submerges the class question and speaks of migrancy as an ontological condition, more or less. (1994: 12-13).

Accordingly, it can be claimed that Edward Said with his metaphorical analysis of exile and migrancy of the intellectual attributes these terms a “universality” which he founded on the Western Canonic writers and this is another aspect which distance the subaltern/migrant people from the metaphoric exilic experience. In *The World, the Text and the Critic* where he describes the privilege of not being attached to anywhere he states that;

...writers like Lawrence, Joyce, and Pound, who present us with ‘the breaking ties with the family, home, class, country, and traditional beliefs as necessary stages in the achievement of spiritual and intellectual freedom’: these writers: ‘then invite us to share the larger transcendental [affiliative] or private systems of order and value which they have adopted and invented’ (1991:19).

The contribution of these writers to the literary history cannot be denied however when the praise given in this reference is compared to Saidian perspective of Orientalism it hardly gave credit to the diasporic or the migrant

who does not have a home to return to. It is obvious that one must also refrain from the essentialist attributions to the post-colonial individual who are subalterns due their subordinated histories however a critic who articulates himself such rhetoric (like in Orientalism) is expected to touch on the material facts of those communities rather than just only considering exile as “a condition of the soul” (Ahmad 1994:86). Ahmad goes further “No firm generalization can be offered for so large and complex phenomenon, involving so many individual biographies” (ibid). Such an accusation does not only cover Said’s definitions or theories but also theorists like Spivak, Bhabha and Rushdie and such. There is an abundant archive, which criticizes this dilemma or paradox of those critics. However, the responses vary when each critic is considered. Said in his article “No reconciliation Allowed” talks about his own homelessness as;

Having allowed myself gradually to assume the professional voice of an American academic as a way of submerging my difficult and unassimilable past, I began to think and write contrapuntally, using the disparate halves of my experience, as an Arab and as an American, to work with and also against each other” (1998:103)

it is obviously a painful process to reach to and constitute your productivity on such a difficult identification however there still remains the question of “how much does such a critic lead subjects, whom he constructs his theory on, to come to such a destination” or “Does s/he have to?”. It would be challenging to give confirmative and satisfactory answers to such questions especially because of the space these intellectuals write *from*.

Like Aijaz Ahmad the space of First World Academic who writes on Third World is harshly put into debate by Arif Dirlik in his well-known essay “The Post-colonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism” (1994). He discusses the ‘post-coloniality’ of the post-colonial intellectuals and very much alike the arguments above, his concern emphasizes the “the language of postcolonial discourse which is merely the language of First-World post-structuralism” (Dirlik 1994: 341). The discourse’s representatives are accused of representing the social, cultural and political effects of colonialism whether or not they are perceived or perceive themselves to be the operators of academic definition of ‘post-colonial studies’. Dirlik points out the distance between the ethnic subject’s experience and the postcolonial intellectual in a long paragraph;

the term *postcolonial*, understood in terms of its discursive thematics, excludes from its scope most of those inhabit or hail from post *colonial* societies. It does not account for the attractions of modernization and nationalism to vast numbers in Third World populations, let alone to those marginalized by national incorporation in the global economy...It excludes the many ethnic groups in *postcolonial* societies (among others) that, obviously unaware of their hybridity, go on massacring one another. It also excludes radical postcolonials. (Dirlik 1994: 337)

It is not easy to disavow the identifications that Dirlik made about the postcolonial intellectuals however it is also not easy to infer the paradox of Dirlik which mostly stems from the ambiguity of post-coloniality itself. It is clear that both First World and Third World are the two spaces within post-colonial discourse and whether the intellectual is a residence of those two spaces the main problem arises from the grand mediator which is the language of the colonizer and the

discourse of the dominant. It is mainly because of this problem that postcolonial intellectuals are charged with sounding Occidentalist in the sense of proliferating neo-colonialist representations and their discourse “characterized as ‘protean forms of imperialism’ (Parry in Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin 2002: 176). Their hybrid articulations of both First World and Third World are considered as “...reintroduction and reincorporation of native ‘difference’ into a new hegemonic totality...” (ibid: 177).

In the light of these oppositional criticisms, Said’s *constructive*, universalist exilic position contradicts with the everyday experiences of the native however it is the point Edward Said himself accentuates that the secularity of the intellectual can create a solution for this paradox. “Just as two geographical entities, the Occident and the Orient, in Said’s terms ‘support and to an extent reflect each other’, so all the post-colonial societies realize their identity in difference rather than in essence” (ibid: 165). Accordingly, it can be claimed that the postcolonial intellectual voluntarily refers to Occidental theories to understand its structure in order to articulate it into native’s constructed inferiority and displace its *written* colonial objectification or agency into new subjections. It is clear that these justifications still cannot efface the paradox of post-coloniality of post-colonial intellectual; the distance between the space from they write or speak and the rhetoric they operate still create discrepancies when the diasporic/hybrid/migrant/native subjects’ current *state* is considered. Said’s “secular critic” seems to create “good post-colonial intellectuals” but it is obvious that critiques of the West continue to haunt in their representations hopefully

serving for emerging “hybrid texts” without suppressing the native experience or without turning into “priest-like” discourses for the intellectual who speak *for* the suppressed. Such a portrait of intellectual needs further examination which will be animated through one of the leading figures of post-colonial theory; Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak.

### **1.3 GAYATRI CHAKRAVORTY SPIVAK: THE POSITION OF PUBLIC INTELLECTUAL**

It is the fact that the hybridity of the intellectuals’ position proliferates within their discourse and their response to the question of other. There is a discrepancy either if these intellectuals speak *for* them or if they speak only in terms of their own positionality. Nevertheless, it does not mean that there has always been a critical distance of the intellectual about what or whom s/he analyzes, such a critical distance could be a function but it is also an aspect which is generally left ambivalent. Patrick Williams in his article “Said and the Problem of Post-colonial intellectuals” (2000) quotes Dick Pels’ interpretation of Bourdieu;

We have an epistemological detachment as soon as we start to observe and this is at the same time a social detachment because we, more or less, pull out ourselves from the world completely. Such “objective observer” position is not only exceptional from the social perspective but also it is fed by concrete social privileges” (in Doğu-Batı Magazine: 127)

Accordingly, it is the fact that position of the intellectual is an issue which is always complex and disputable however it is obvious that an intellectual have privileges even if s/he rejects to get use of them. Spivak can be a good example

for such a rejection because when the question of exile is pointed to Spivak in one of her interviews, she states that

I'd like to say that an exile is someone who is obliged to stay away—I am not that sense an exile. The space I occupy might be explained by my history. It is position into which I have been written. I am not privileging it, but I do not want to use it. I can't fully construct a position that is different from the one I am in (1990: 68).

Spivak's response seems realistic enough when the question of post-colonial critic's positionality is considered. She has been the one who addresses Western scholars and invites them to give up using those privileges. Likewise she puts in her work *Outside the Teaching Machine* that "To understand how the agency of post-colonial is effaced in order to register the people as marginals cultural studies should benefit from the specialism but at the same time it should resist to and operatively restrict the specialist's dominance" (1993:74). The claim here "cultural studies....should restrict the specialist's dominance" is meaningful because it points out another paradox which is significant for post-colonial critics.

It cannot be denied that since the turning point of identity politics in 1980's is considered post-colonial critic has always prevented himself/herself from essentialist or normative definitions of the self especially when it comes to the subjects who share the same history with him/ her. To put more clearly as Spivak mentions, it is the "the position which she has been written by her history" as the academy or politics today focuses on the identity rhetoric of "I am neither this nor that" or "I am not only this but also that". A critic notably a hybrid critic, who has theorized the question of the *other* all through his/her life, is expected to

speak not *for* but *from* the public space by strongly avoiding a deep “exclusion” of some *people* or *communities* while s/he writes from his/her private room. Spivak because of such susceptibility makes her distinguished contribution to the post-colonial and cultural studies by the term “subaltern”. Stephen Morton in his book *Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak* explains this choice of her as ; “...Spivak proposes the word subaltern to encompass a range of different subject positions which are not predefined by dominant political discourses” (2003: 45), this shows that she is talking from the space of all subjects who have the similar inferiority in a society. This perspective may be accused for creating a collectivity however it is away from totalisation, it is because she tries not to define different positions and exclude the others. The roots of the term subaltern has been discussed in the Introduction however Spivak herself makes it more clear in her interview published in the US journal *Polygraph*:

I like the word ‘subaltern’ for one reason. It is truly situational. ‘Subaltern’ began as a description of a certain rank in the military. The word was used under censorship by Gramsci: he called Marxism ‘monism,’ and was obliged to call the proletarian ‘subaltern.’ That word, used under duress, has been transformed into the description of everything that doesn’t fall under strict class analysis. I like that, because it has no theoretical rigor. (Spivak 1990: 141)

It can be seen that Spivak tries not to set descriptive lines between the identities but rather pulls these lines toward the margins taking them from the centre which is a task mostly attributed to *exilic* or *homeless* critics. Nevertheless, it is the question if this means a privileging.

The position above, which means the task of post-colonial critic to speak from the public space, is not an easy project because there may arise a misunderstanding of becoming the *spokesman* of a community, an identity, a group or a society. However, Spivak is one of those intellectuals who put a lot of effort not to *use* her privileges and tried not to have such a misleading position. She warns the people about the tendency of some intellectuals to direct the communities which is apparently related to dominance of the scholar as she mentions above. In another interview she claims that “there is an impulse in literary critics and other kind of intellectuals to save the masses, speak for the masses, describe the masses” (1990:56), “one ought not to patronize the oppressed” (ibid:57). This is the intentional “distance” which does not matter to be critical, social, positional, or intellectual but it is obvious that it is dangerous. It is a distance, which causes the intellectual to cut off the organic ties between his/her self and his/her own observant objects and puts him/her in a hierarchical position. Spivak agrees with such a claim as she clarifies her intention by giving example from her own analysis,

In Melbourne I ended my talk with an account of the suicide of a teenage woman in Calcutta in 1926. What I was doing with the young woman who had killed herself was really trying to analyze and represent her text. She wasn't particularly speak to me. I was representing her, I was reinscribing her. To an extent, I was writing her to be read, and I certainly was not claiming to give her a voice,... (ibid).

It is because of this point of view that Spivak constantly calls attention to the subalterns' own project for their own representation notably emphasizing Third-World Women. It is because of the same reason she writes her respected and the

most distinguished article “Can the Subaltern Speak?” She is an intellectual who is committed to articulating the lives and histories of the disempowered groups and she strongly avoids exploitation of such groups while questioning their representation in an appropriate way. Stephen Morton proves such positionality of Spivak that;

Indeed, as Spivak’s writing demonstrates, the experience of social and political oppression in postcolonial societies such as India cuts across differences in class, region, language, ethnicity, religion, generation, gender and citizenship. Because of these differences, there is a risk that any general claims or theoretical statements made on behalf of disempowered subaltern populations by educated, metropolitan-based intellectuals will overlook crucial social differences between particular subaltern groups (1993: 46).

The ethical dilemma to write about or on disempowered and subaltern groups remains as a challenge for all post-colonial thinkers as their discourse carries the risk to be perceived as speaking for them. Accordingly it is always an “issue” for Spivak which one can conclude from “Can the Subaltern Speak?” In this article, which is difficult to follow but a unique example of deconstruction, Spivak criticizes French intellectuals Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze depending on their text “Intellectuals and Power: a conversation between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze” and British colonialism of nineteenth century just because they speak for the Oppressed. The situation is even more tragic because according to Spivak in both projects of Deleuze’s, Foucault’s and British colonialism’s *benevolent* intention of liberating the subaltern to speak for themselves contradictorily make them fall into a deeper silence.

Spivak starts her argument by faulting Deleuze and Foucault for missing the difference between two different types of representations when the disenfranchised groups are considered. Spivak based this fault on Deleuze's attribution of theory; "There is no more representation; there is nothing but action—action of theory and action of practice which relate to each other as relays and form networks" (Spivak 1988: 275). Deleuze made this argument to articulate the theory and practice therefore comes to conclusion that theorizing is a production and not surprisingly "intellectual labor is like manual labor" (ibid). In this point intellectual labor one of which is representation as Deleuze puts above, could be done through theory as it is operating like practice however Spivak takes attention to two different types of representation which makes Deleuze's articulation problematic;

Two senses of representation are being run together: representation as 'speaking for', as in politics, and representation as re-presentation, as in art and philosophy. Since theory is also 'action', the theoretician does not represent (speak for) the oppressed group (ibid).

It is obvious that one way to stop exploitation of oppressed groups is political representation however as it is put in the previous sections of the study it does not guarantee that the interests of some specific minorities or subaltern groups will be recognized or their demands will be considered even if the political representation is gained. Therefore, if Deleuze talks about one type of representation which is the one in politics it means that the other one is ignored because the political representation generally denies the other type of representation that is re-presentation of the real. For all these reasons "For Spivak, the problem with Foucault and Deleuze is that they efface their role as intellectuals in representing

the disempowered groups they describe” (Morton 2003:57). In the introduction the history of the term “subaltern” is presented as it is inherited from Gramsci who uses the term for a kind of class formation which Spivak makes it clear referring to Marx’s *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* that they are small peasant proprietors in France who do not have a “class instinct”. As Spivak puts “... the collectivity of familial existence, which might be considered as the arena of ‘instinct’, is discontinuous with, though operated by, the differential isolation of classes” (Spivak 1988:276) hence their social and economic conditions prevent them from having class-consciousness. For this reason “the (absent collective) consciousness of the small peasant proprietor class finds its ‘bearer’ in a ‘representative’ who appears to work in another’s interest (Spivak 1988:276) whom in this context Spivak points Deleuze and Foucault who are intellectual elites operate as proxies to speak for the oppressed, for the subaltern. It means when Deleuze and Foucault remark in their conversation that “...the person who speaks and acts ... is always a multiplicity, ‘no theorizing intellectual [or] party or ... union’ can represent ‘those who act and struggle’ (qtd. in Spivak 1988: 275) they overlook the *re-presentation* (which is aesthetically) and lead the oppressed to be represented (which is politically) *by* political proxy who *speaks* on their behalf. It is the fact that Spivak criticizes Deleuze and Foucault to speak for the oppressed that include factory workers, prisoners and psychiatric institutions in the West and she emphasizes in the beginning of her article that their mistake stems from their misbelief which is “intellectuals must attempt to disclose and know the discourse of society’s Other” (Spivak 1988:271). In this point the same

---

paradox of the intellectual is emphasized by Bourdieu in his book *In Other Words*,

The fact of being or feeling authorized to speak about the 'people' or of speaking *for* (in both senses of the word) the 'people' may constitute in itself, a force in the struggles within different fields, political, religious, etc. ... (Bourdieu 1990:150)

Accordingly intellectual's desire to voice the oppressed, even if s/he points out the potential of the autonomous power of a particular group, still creates an essentialist point of view because the intellectual distances himself/herself from that particular group. Moreover, it avoids the people to read and have a critical look on the theory but rather force them to perform the theory in practice. In such a case the intellectual consciously or unconsciously posits himself/herself as a "conductor" who represents the people's reality not being able to re-present their experiences. Hence, their conflation of two different representations put them in the position of political proxy of the subaltern which is the one for Spivak that the intellectuals should strictly avoid doing.

Likewise in the example of Deleuze and Foucault , Spivak observes the same rhetoric in First World Intellectual Women who speak for "Third World Women", it is the case that they apply the European theories of representation to the lives and histories of Third World Women and such an attempt is inevitably italic. Their narratives suppress the subaltern voice and rather than let them speak for themselves pull them into silence. Spivak argues that this is the "...first-world intellectual masquerading as the absent nonpresenter who lets the oppressed speak for themselves" which means that their challenging positionality that is being

oppositional critic misses what Said mentions “the critic’s institutional responsibility”. Towards the end of her article, Spivak points out the similar operation which was fulfilled by British colonialism in the nineteenth century India when the government prohibited *Sati* which is a ritual that means “widow sacrifice”; “The Hindu widow ascends the pyre of the dead husband and immolates herself upon it” (Spivak 1998: 298). It cannot be denied that this volunteer suicide has discrepancies in terms of human rights and it is also problematic when the widow owns her tradition but not oppose her own condition however what Spivak argues is meaningful in terms of colonized-colonizer relation. The idea that “White men are saving brown women from brown men” (ibid: 298) sounds too much dominating and does not touch the subject’s consciousness. Indian women chose to die but she was silenced by benevolent colonialist because as Spivak quotes from J.D.M Derrett ‘The very first legislation upon Hindu Law was carried through without assent of a single Hindu’ (ibid). Accordingly the case is not the one which say “if they want to die let them” issue, it is the case which the male dominated European world speak for Third World women by blocking up to have their own subjectivity and consciousness.

Moreover Spivak avoids being unrealistic by suggesting that the subaltern should be supplied by conditions which they can speak, contrarily she is too aware of the current paralysis of representation and self-determination of the subaltern,

On the other side of the international division of labour, the subject of exploitation cannot know and speak the text of female exploitation even if the absurdity of the nonrepresenting intellectual making space for her to speak is achieved. (Spivak 1988: 289).

This is not only a feminist matter it is also the exclusion of the subaltern subjects in the process of their own construction of subjecthoods in various similar cases. Furthermore, if the same task is carried by the critic the responsibility and critical distance meant to be deteriorated. She clearly puts in her article that “subaltern cannot speak” however critic’s position does not include to be the voice of the subaltern. As Robert Young summarizes her approach of being a critic referring to her work *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Towards a History of the Vanishing Present* (1999) that,

The task of the critic is to ask who is presented, who is not, to show the dissimulation in imperialist history of the ‘mechanics of the constitution of “facts”’ to utilize the methods of literary analysis to demonstrate the indeterminacy of the distinction between truth and fiction in such histories, as well as to construct counter-narratives (Young 1996: 159).

This attitude of the critic includes his/her plurality in vision and theory along with the critical consciousness of Said’s intellectual which is the one Spivak embraces, and defines herself as “*bricoleur*” (1998: 281), She has tools which she uses for variety of purposes and she mentions that “being an Indian by birth and citizenship, I find this inquiry and the terms of this inquiry somewhat get articulated into a place from which I can speak *to others*” (Spivak 1990:68).

For all these reasons, she has always kept in mind all the differences which are based on historical, cultural, political and economic parameters of a particular geography, group, ethnicity or society, it is inevitably the privilege of her Indian heritage however it is the privilege that most of the post-colonial intellectuals

have. Therefore, to prevent the paradox of speaking for the subaltern, “the intellectuals should start to “unlearn” this privilege as their loss and mark their theoretical positionality as any investigating subject ought” (Spivak 1998: 296-297).

#### **1.4 CONCLUSION**

The post-independence state of colonial societies has opened new phases concerning the representation of the oppressed which continues to be intervened through post-colonialist discourse today. The turn in the existentialist discussion of the Western subject through Enlightenment is also exposed on the subaltern subject which leads a mutual deconstruction of culturally and historically constructed positions of the colonized and the colonizer. In this respect Said’s *Orientalism* played a leading role in order to shake the position of the dominant/colonial discourse which *defines* the space of the Eastern Other over its hegemony, it should be noted that *Orientalism* confirms the dialogical relationship between the two entities; the Occident and the Orient. The intellectuals from there on culturally and politically generate new theories basing their approaches on the recognition and the representation of the Other. There emerge various discourses which concentrate on the position of the native subject within multicultural globalized world. Neither politics of sameness that operates through the nation-states nor the politics of difference which leads mis-representations of the native subject generating neo-orientalist perceptions overcome the agency of the Other.

The bundles of theories and policies have sought ways for letting the subaltern speak and let them be recognized. Flaubert’s figure of Oriental Woman Kuchuk Hanem, who was represented as silent and mute both in speech and

presence in Said's Orientalism, is argued in Spivak's "Can the Subaltern Speak?" that the silence is still operative for the native/hybrid/diasporic subject.

In such ground, the post-colonial intellectual's exilic position has contributed the Other question in a generous and productive way which is put over Edward Said above. However their position has been also opposed from many different perspectives. Some of them are charged with underlining colonial discourses through modernist post-structuralist arguments within monolithic voice of First World Academy while some others are accused of speaking "for" the oppressed which exploits the critical distance which Said argues. These two objections are examined through Edward Said and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. It can be concluded that the metaphoric exilic situation of the intellectual furnishes him/her at the same time with productivity. The universalist attribution of the term by Said causes a discrepancy when the everyday experience of the migrant/diasporic subaltern subject within the post-colonial societies or within nation-states are considered. The post-colonial's optimistic exile position hardly overlaps with the everyday reality of the subaltern Other. The strategic space which is represented as secularity of the critic by Said is expected to overcome the *indifference* of the theory/theorist when it comes to the task of touching the public space. Accordingly the displaced distance between the public and the private space of the critic suggests an intellectual position which resembles Gramsci's organic intellectual who articulates the crisis of the public into his/her intellectual work. However when the native subject is considered, the space where post-colonial hybrid intellectual emerges representations using mainstream theories is

regarded as ‘exorbitation’ of their own roles and suppression of ‘native’ voices” (Parry in Rajan 1997: 598). Furthermore it is discussed through Edward Said that despite of the accommodation of productive exile of the post-colonial intellectual and despite of his/her related representations, the dilemmas of the diasporic subjects throughout the world are still in existence. However it cannot be denied that post-colonial intellectual’s exile, which is emerged through his/her hybridity, is itself an advantaged space leading to *understand* the dominant discourse in order to deconstruct its hegemony and create new subjectivities for the suppressed groups. It is concluded above that it is still the paradox of decolonizing the colonial discourse project if the secular-exilic-hybrid postcolonial critic’s “objective”, “pluralistic”, “hybrid” vision buries the native’s split existence into post-modernist abstraction leading neo-colonialist discourses to emerge.

Gramsci’s organic intellectual which is referred by Edward Said obviously connected to the position that Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak occupies. She is very well aware that the hybrid positionality of the post-colonial critic may cause misunderstandings as to speak *for* the indigenous who are constantly perceived as the subject/agents that *need* to be represented. Basing her critic on this dilemma, she discusses the suppressing discourse of colonialism in order to silence the Other. Within the project of decolonizing the colonial discourse it should also be noted that Spivak’s intervention in terms of recalling the notion of “subaltern” by borrowing it from Gramsci opened a distinguished phase concerning the post-colonial theory. It is discussed above that Spivak avoiding essentialist connotations brings the notion ‘subaltern’ to be able to touch various inferior

positions. Moreover it is examined above that post-colonial critic should strictly avoid priest-like narratives in his/her representations in order not to mark the critical distance between himself/herself and his/her observant subjects. It is clear that such an approach can never challenge the discourse which connotes the subjection of the subaltern to the dominant or to another mediator in order to be represented. Nevertheless, Spivak concludes from the position of the 'subaltern' woman that the silencing of the muted subject will continue and the subaltern has no space to speak from even if the critic escapes such *role*.

Edward Said and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak are two leading figures who brilliantly furnishes the post-colonial theory with ground breaking representations of the Other. Their culturally hybrid positionalities in a postmodernist context hardly avoid creating diffusive and paradoxical discourses on the other hand the same hybrid positionality lead them to create compromising stances for the subaltern. Despite of all these, it is the main concern of the chapter if the post-colonial intellectual and his/her representations victimize the oppressed more through Western oriented theories by creating neo-orientalist metonymies. It is showed that First World Academic in his representations of the Third World will continue to animate the theories of the West in order to create counter-narratives in representation of the other. In the final analysis, it is obvious that the counter partiality of resistant and oppositional identification of the post-colonial critic achieves to displace both the essentialist narratives of the dominant and the subaltern thanks to his/her exilic and hybrid gaze. However there remains the deadlock if this displacement of narratives by the post-colonial critic is able to generate a political move concerning the "belonging" and "recognition" of the

post-colonial subject/agent, or it is better to interrogate if it is the responsibility of the post-colonial critic to accommodate legitimate political spaces for the post-colonial subject/agent.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **POST-COLONIAL FICTION WRITER: MANIFESTATIONS OF MIMICRY AND HYBRID RE/PRESENTATIONS**

#### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

The post-colonial and diasporic literary criticism has created various bundles of suggestions, narratives and counter-narratives concerning the colonized/colonizer, dominant/dominated, and superior/inferior. It can be claimed that the prefix “post” has never been referred to an end to colonialism or imperialism. It is because of this fact that theorists are still pointing at and recycling the issues of representation, recognition, self, identity, identification, authenticity, hegemony and such which are the cores of the reconciliation and/or of not the surface but the depth of the binaries indicated above. Nevertheless, in the examples of Edward Said and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak it is pictured in the first chapter what ways of those bundles of theories or philosophizing narratives of the bio-geographically Orient intellectuals handle the facts of the Oriental, Diasporic, Immigrant, Subaltern subject/agents. It is undeniable that the substantial examination of the paradox of their private positionality and its articulation into the public requires boundless pages of work. Moreover another difficulty lies under the fact that their choice of form which is “essay” does not provide a safe place to come to a clear destination which is the situation that is owed to their celebrated exilic space that is argued in the previous chapter. However, it is obvious that their indisputable pluralistic and loaded contribution to post-colonial literary theory arms one with a satisfying critical consciousness. It is because of this critical look that this study calls for a discussion of the space of

fiction writers within the same area. The reason for such a need is not because their positionality very much differ from the essayists like Said, Bhabha, Spivak, Fanon, it is not because the fiction provides one with clear answers, or it is not to form another collective within the same discipline but to engender an extension to the concerning inquiries of the post-colonial literary theory and the relation between the critic and the Other. However before the in-depth analysis of the post-colonial fiction writers Salman Rushdie and Hanif Kureishi the research is going to discuss if there is any difference between writing essay and writing fiction referring to Roland Barthes' arguments in his work *Roland Barthes* (1977) and *Writing Degree Zero* (1984) when the relation of the writing and the author is considered.

It can hardly be argued that a form or a genre appoints a position for the writer/author but it would also be naïve to conclude that an intellectual chooses to write in a particular genre among literary forms just because s/he tends to. Or as Roland Barthes once argues writer is not in control of choosing his/her own form of writing but it is determined through the history and the historical legacy of the writer himself/herself. In his book *Writing Degree Zero* he states,

‘It is not granted to the writer to choose his mode of writing from a kind of non-temporal store of literary forms. It is under the pressure of History and Tradition that the possible modes of writing for a given writer are established; there is a History of Writing’ (Barthes 1984: 16).

Keeping this remark in mind it is required to refer some examples of particular cases of the writers. In terms of essay Spivak has a clear explanation that she

prefers being an essayist to being a book writer. In one of her interviews collected in *The Post-Colonial Critic* she answers the question if it is a deliberate strategy to be an essayist rather than a book writer as; “I don’t know that it’s a deliberate strategy, it’s possible that I’ve made a virtue out of necessity. I’m afraid of writing books, because I’ve found myself changing my mind so much...” (Spivak 1998: 48). On the other hand Mustapha Ben T. Marrouchi states in his article titled “The Critic as Dis/Placed Intelligence: The Case of Edward Said” that “As a practice of writing, the essay is generated from fragments outside established classifications which refuse a fixed center or totalizing scheme. Its composition consists of a heterogeneous series "hinged" together by stubbornness, subversion, and containment (Marrouchi 1991: 64) and he further declares that The Saidian essay

... is distinguished by a fragmentary, aphoristic critical *écriture* where one finds something of the argument, what Barthes aptly called "reflective text," one that goes to the extreme of destroying its own discursive category. The displacement of the structural analysis of narrative by the readerly/writerly distinction appears to have also precipitated an internal shift (ibid:63)

These arguments are highly evaluative in terms of the analysis below because it is a challenge to posit the writer/author in a stable place along with his/her piece in a particular genre especially when the post-colonial writer/author is considered. Although Spivak points at her changing mind as the reason to choose writing essay, or Said considers essay as the “..principal way to write criticism” (Said 1991: 26) it is going to be illustrated below that there is something transcending these technical issues linked to what Barthes states above.

In the light of Barthes' remark it can be claimed that the thing beyond the text itself is the historicity of the author/writer. The work or the piece of the post-colonial writer/critic/intellectual can be accounted as the outcome of his/her historical legacy referring to his/her exilic and hybrid identification especially depending upon what Barthes explains further in his work that "any mode of writing available to the author as vacillating between freedom and remembrance" (ibid: 17). Hence the vacillation is an immanent mode when the writers analyzed in this study are considered, or it can be argued that this vacillation is the "gift" of the post-structuralist era along with another grand theory deconstruction which are the very theories that have been appropriated by Said, Spivak and Bhabha. Moreover the same oscillation of the writer can also be clearly followed from Graham Allen's book *Roland Barthes* in which he releases significant biographic and theoretical details of the writer. Allen after explaining the great influence of Sartre on Barthes states "The modern writer, it would seem, has no viable form for writing, and no viable political allegiance" (2003:14). Upon such a remark, various examples can be illustrated from various writers including the ones who are the focus of this study who shatter the necessity of viability in the act of writing however it can be concluded that it is that deconstruction of viability which furnishes those writers with pluralistic themes and ideas within their works. However it is not the question of viability of the texts and it is not about the issue of writing essay/theory or fiction but it is the act of writing itself because if the history and traditions are the parameters that establish the literary form of the writer it can be claimed that the writing has a personality itself which is very much attached to the author/writer's biography. As Roland Barthes makes it clear

“now here is an example of a mode of writing whose function is no longer only communication or expression, but the imposition of something beyond language, which is both History and the stand we take in it” (1984: 3) so, it is put in different sections of this study that the main concern should be the discussion of “from where the post-colonial/exilic critic/writer/author writes” which is similar to what Barthes shows above. And if the writing is a personality in itself which is connected to the writer’s historical legacy and traditions, the literary theory has been already encountered the hybrid form of writing which are mostly given by the writers who are hybrids themselves. However if the exilic situation of a writer has been turned into a universal category which is discussed in “Edward Said and Celebration of Exile” it would not be surprising to conclude that hybrid nature of a writing may also be attributed to the idea of “post-modern writer”. It is obvious that such inferences may sound naive and may pull the study into an abyss.

Accordingly, what should be noted that there is not one history or not one narrative and it can be argued that writer is still in function if to choose to be released from his historical legacy or to be attached to his memory. However, it will be illustrated in the examples below nevertheless one tries to escape, there still remains a trace of personal history which is strongly operative in the personality of the writings of post-colonial/Diasporic writers. In addition, even if they ignore, reject or manipulate there still stands their histories not matter it is embraced, deconstructed or authentically reflected through their act of writing. On the other hand it should not be overlooked that the capitalization of History in Barthes argument is meaningful which calls what Said says the texts are worldly

that means the personality of the text can hardly escape from the “worldliness” of the History, in his autobiographical essay “no Reconciliation Allowed” he states,

The net result in terms of my writing has been to attempt a greater transparency, to free myself from academic jargon, and not to hide behind euphemism and circumlocution where difficult issues have been concerned. I have given the name “worldliness” to this voice, by which I do not mean the jaded savoir-faire of the man about town, but rather a knowing and unafraid attitude toward exploring the world we live in. (qtd in Aciman 1999: 109).

It is clear that not matter it is an essay, criticism or fiction (putting the technical differences aside) a texts are entities “..they are events and circumstances... they are nevertheless a part of social world, human life, and of course historical moments in which they are located and interpreted” (Said 1991:4). It is also the argument of this study that this personality of the text can hardly be considered independent from the history of the author/writer. Such a statement does not either mean to regard the author/writer as the centre in the process of interpretation or criticism nor totally confirms what Barthes remarks as “the death of the author”, the text one way or another constructively or deconstructively touches the historical legacy of especially the post-colonial/diasporic writer/author.

The texts beyond their own existentialisms, which are bodied in the language and also positioned in a genre, theoretical essay and fiction that are the two concerning styles of this study. Among these two, essay or theoretical work can undoubtedly convey the traces of both History and historical legacy of the author however, when fiction is considered such events within a specific fiction piece has autobiographical references. However, it can be argued that almost all

the fiction pieces more or less carry bits of the author's own experiences. Hanif Kureishi remarks this argument in his autobiographical essay "Something Given: Reflections on Writing", "Writers are often asked if their work is autobiographical. If it seems to me to be an odd, somewhat redundant question—where else could the work come from, except from the self?... (Kureishi 2002: 8-9). Likewise such an attitude is clearly illustrated by Barthes himself in his notable work *Roland Barthes* which lies between the autobiography through which he criticizes his own previous works and a fictionalized account of a character referred to variously as "RB" 'he' and the first person (I and me). The text begins with the statement "It must all be considered as if spoken by a character in a novel" (Barthes 1977: 1) and while Graham Allen interprets the manner, he explains that Barthes is "alerting the reader to the instability both of the object of the text ('Roland Barthes') and the subjective voice writing the text ('Roland Barthes') (Allen 2003: 146). And if Roland Barthes leads us to read his autobiography as if asserted through a fiction character it can be claimed that reverse could be considered which is that a fiction character's narrated experience could give references to the author's own reality. This means that fiction nevertheless is limited with author's own reality, even if it is ficted it is still leached through author's ideological existence. Moreover through this examination Barthes takes away the text's limits from the centeredness of its particular genre and a particular producer, who is the author, to the margins of the fiction which is narrated through the fictive characters but still cannot escape from author's existence. Such an argument remarks that it is an ambiguity which

parameters are operative to differentiate the text's reality also the author's from the fiction. The author is dead and it cannot be denied what Barthes put as,

We know now that a text consists not of a line of words, releasing a single 'theological' meaning (the 'message' of the Author-God), but of a multidimensional space in which are married and contested several writing none of which is original: the text is a fabric of quotations, resulting from a thousand sources of culture (Barthes 1986: 52-3).

Accordingly, there are two crucial points to be highlighted in this point; first, if it is post-colonial/diasporic writer one can hardly escape from referring to the auto history behind the author/writer no matter s/he expresses narratives through essay or fiction. On the other hand text can never convey single messianic words but fusion of words, writings and narratives each of which outcome of the History and the histories. If Mustapha Ben T. Marrouchi's statement about Saidian essay is recalled the readerly/writerly deconstructed internal shift is a proliferative aspect that is operative in post-colonial fiction writers. For all the reasons above this chapter is devoted to the post-colonial fiction writers Salman Rushdie and Hanif Kureishi whose works are the significant examples to illustrate the blending of historical and critical conscious with the literary form of fiction. The chapter is also going to show not only writing essay but also writing fiction is in a close relationship with everyday realities when the question of Other is considered.

## **2.2 SALMAN RUSHDIE: PERCEPTION OF EXILE AND MIMICRY**

While the act of writing resides it should not be underestimated that fiction furnishes the reader with various tools such as irony, satire, image, symbolism and metaphor which are very loaded in Rushdie's writing. However this still does not

efface the fact that those tools are posited to mention the historiographic realities as *Ruhdie* shows us, the very rich text full of metaphors and satire clearly classified as fiction had caused a great crisis within the Islamic World and Britain which has turned into a global political issue. Accordingly it can be claimed that fiction despite of all its veils like metaphors, ironies, satirical references in fact uncover political realities or analyze them as much as a theoretical essay. Writing is a resistance especially when the post-colonial texts are considered, in his book *Homi Bhabha* Huddart states that “Literature is not political discourse, of course, but it has political implications that derive from its subtle transformations of realist representation: these transformations are evident in many postcolonial literatures (Huddart 2006: 42). Hence *Ruhdie*’s *The Satanic Verses* is a great example for such an argument being a novel of migration as *Ruhdie* calls himself (Rushdie 1991: 394). The social and political themes within the novel will be discussed in the forthcoming section but it should be noted that *The Satanic Verses* is not a novel with ficted narratives, it is still a fiction but livingness and actuality of the characters and their experiences stand as a perfect life-like picture of the very grievances of the immigrants/exiles/hybrids. It bears both the representation and representation that Spivak has been appointed as the necessities to present the question of Other. It is a distinguished “hybrid” text that leads to the penetration of centers and peripheries, subjectivity in and out of place, self and the Other, West and East, London and Bombay. Above all, it is a work where the writer and the public encounter interrogating their own existentialisms, subjectivities, deeds and experiences however there still remain more

interrogations necessary in terms of post-colonial diasporic existentialism which will be discussed in short.

In the section “Edward Said: Celebration of Exile” it has been discussed that Said perceives the exile or diaspora as a metaphorical statement considering it as a privilege of the exilic intellectual, Salman Rushdie does not very much differ from Said in his perception which is an argument needs further cracking. This perception can be illustrated through the character Imam in *The Satanic Verses* who is an exile who despises London but is forced to live there until he returns in triumph to a revolution in his homeland. It is worded as,

Who is he? An exile. Which must not be confused with, allowed to run into, all the other words that people throw around: émigré, expatriate, refugee, immigrant, silence, cunning. Exile is a dream of glorious return. Exile is a vision of revolution: Elba, not St Helena. It is an endless paradox: looking forward by always looking back. The exile is a ball hurled high into the air. He hangs there, frozen in time, translated into a photograph; denied motion, suspended impossibly above his native earth, he awaits the inevitable moment at which the photograph must begin to move, and the earth reclaim its own. (Rushdie 1989: 205)

The nostalgic tone of these lines demonstrates the position of Rushdie himself; exile is the space from where one always looks back which pulls him/her into the historiography of the past while trying to move on for the future so exile seems ascetic for Rushdie. The metaphor of “hanging” is very meaningful in terms of being an immigrant, expatriate, diasporic however within a constant suffering to “reclaim” his/her own identity or positionality. The search for an essence seems in vain, because as Rushdie himself puts in his essay “Günter Grass” within his book

*Imaginary Homelands* that “migration...offers us one of the richest metaphors of our own age. The very word metaphor, with its roots in the Greek word for ‘bearing across,’ describes a sort of migration, the migration of ideas into images. Migrants—borne-across humans—are metaphorical bearings in their very essence” ( Rushdie 1991: 278). If the concept is a metaphor it is inevitably a representation of its essence, its actual; so for a migrant the predicament to look for a secure, stable place to identify himself is constant. It is obvious that diasporic postcolonial subjectivity stands for a geographical and cultural exchange where one gains something but loses some other things at the same time, this is why Rushdie starts his essay “Imaginary Homelands” with a description of a photograph from his past and says “...it reminds me that it’s my present that is foreign, and that the past is home albeit a lost home in a lost city in the mists of lost time (ibid: 9) . The thing which is operative here is the author’s own voice who is Indian born English confirming the exile as a metaphor like Said however the touching tone of the remark leads the reader to be able to “imagine” the condition’s frustration.

“Imaginary Homelands” is an essay of which every line can be taken as a reference to the positionality of diasporic writer who writes outside of his/her native land. Rushdie in this essay asks the very core of this study: when writers describe their native lands from a distance, from the world they have left “...does the distance open any other doors?” (ibid:13). Inevitably it opens new doors as these re-descriptions of India and Pakistan (for Rushdie), or South Asian migrant in Britain has been read by so many people and it is obvious that thanks to the Western reader they take their places as best-sellers in the run. Rushdie himself

confirms the privilege, “Our identity is at once plural and partial. Sometimes we feel that we straddle two cultures; at other times, that we fall between two stools, but however ambiguous and shifting the ground may be, it is not an infertile territory for a writer to occupy.” (Rushdie 1992:15). However when it comes to the question of politics as Rushdie refers to Milan Kundera “the struggle of man against power is the struggle of memory against forgetting” (ibid), it is undeniable that these re-presentations of the subaltern challenge the current representations of the policies and the politics and the subaltern author himself/herself bravely embraces his/her “oppositional” position. The contradictory is hidden in the space where these re-presentations and geo-biographical state of the author is articulated, it is going to be shown how successfully Salman Rushdie pictures the grievances of the migrants and the ambiguity of the mimicry of the migrant subaltern. Yet, the queries in the very beginning of this study which are how the parameters which are positioned in Orientalism itself become de-colonization, or de-orientalisation projects of the subaltern writer and if the counter-narratives really *counter* are still operative in this chapter. Moreover, there is another inquiry to be concerned especially in the case of *The Satanic Verses* that while the author’s transformation and bio-geographical exile leads to a constant productive identity formation what kind of transformation these re-presentations cause within the “self” of the subaltern *per se*. In the forthcoming section such questions will be put under examination referring to Salman Rushdie and his *The Satanic Verses* however it should be noted that unlike the Satanic Verses Affair the study does not set the focus as religion but exile and diaspora which is actually Rushdie himself set as the core themes in the book. In his open letter to Rajiv Gandhi, the

prime minister of India then, Rushdie insisted that “*The Satanic Verses* isn’t about Islam, but about migration, metamorphosis, divided selves, love, death London and Bombay” (qtd in Israel 2000: 158).

The opening scene of the *The Satanic Verses* stands as one of the most striking image of being an exile or migrant with a colonial past. The coming together and falling apart of Gibreel Farishta and Saladin Chamcha, who are the protagonists of the novel, get on an Air-India jumbo jet which is taken over and then blown apart by Canadian Sikh terrorists. Their fates are conjoined as they miraculously survive the crash and fall down on an English beach. The setting where these two Indian actors meet is very meaningful because the Sussex-cottage where they land is owned by Rosa Diamond who is eighty-eight year old immigrant in England bearing an Argentinian origin. She constantly tells her memories and dreams of the romantic moments of her life in the Argentine pampas in 1930s during the times of increasing British Commercial and its influence. However what should be noted is the re-presentation of exile in Rushdian sense through Rosa;

As she grew weaker she poured more and more of her remaining strength into her own dream of Argentina, and Gibreel's navel felt as if it had been set on fire. He lay slumped in an armchair at her bedside and the apparitions multiplied by the hour. Woodwind music filled the air, and, most wonderful of all, a small white island appeared just off the shore, bobbing on the waves like a raft; it was white as snow, with white sand sloping up to a clump of albino trees, which were white, chalk--white, paper--white, to the very tips of their leaves. (Rushdie 1989: 157-58).

As it is in the character of Imam, Rosa Diamond's exile harbours a deep "longing" for the native past so it turns out to be a paradox when Rushdie's perception of exile is considered. The reason for such an attitude of Rushdie may stem from his experience of the shift between embracing the exile as an idiom for "...a useful tool with which to work in the present" (Rushdie 1991:14) and considering it as the metaphor of constant loss which causes one to struggle to catch the present through the lenses of nostalgia. It can be claimed that exile for Rushdie is the space where ascetic and melancholic state are engaged into the pleasure of its ensured privilege which is to survive in the present.

In the book the in-betweenness of the migrant, the diasporic subject can hardly be analyzed apart from the theme of "transformation" and "hybridity" which is very well connected to the Bhabha's notion of mimicry. Within the relationship between the two protagonists Gibreel Farishta and Saladin Chamcha Rushdie furnishes the reader with binaries of the post-colonial identification including resistant versus toady (Saladin's surname Chamcha means toady in English) and nationalist versus assimilated. Characters are both Indian actors whereas Gibreel is a superstar in his country (India) by playing the role of gods in "theologicals," or films based on religious subjects, Saladin has had less spectacular success in England by lending his voice to television commercials and a situation comedy called *The Aliens Show*. Saladin Chamcha, which is the Anglicized name for Salahuddin Chamchawala, has spent his life ridding himself of all traces of his Bombay accent with the intent of fitting into Western society. Even as a boy, he dreams of London, spelling it out: *Ellowen deeowen*. It is partly his desire to leave India behind stems from his conflict with his father, Changez.

For Chamcha, his return to England signifies turning his back on his heritage, he has become westernized, from his flawless accent to his trophy wife, Pamela Lovelace. From even such a short account Saladin's despairing effort to "exist" can obviously be observed. His marriage at the same time serves a satisfying picture, which stands for the desperate efforts of an immigrant to "be" more and more the Other.

Pamela has a "function" in Saladin's life and it requires further discussion. In his foreword within Fanon's *Black Skin, White Masks* Bhabha describes three stages to understand the *process of identification* in the analytic of desire. He assures that, ... the very place of identification, caught in the tension of demand and desire, is a space of splitting. The fantasy of the native is precisely to occupy the master's place while keeping his place in the slave's *avenging* anger (in Fanon 1998: xv-i). Such an argument seems like to be written to explain the paralysis of the subaltern who is bodied in Saladin in *The Satanic Verses*. His "project" including his pale-skinned wife Pamela represents to Saladin everything British. Through her existence, he feels his transformation is complete. The marriage is insensitive because he neither loves nor respects her, but he does not allow himself to see this because he needs Pamela to complete his role as a Western man. Rushdie clearly states this intention,

and understood that she had become the custodian of his destiny, that if she did not relent then his entire attempt at metamorphosis would fail. "Let me," he begged her, wrestling politely on her white rug that left him, at his midnight bus stops, covered in guilty fluff. "Believe me. I'm the one. (Rushdie 1989: 52).

Fanon devoted a chapter for such a “project” of the colonized in his book *Black Skin, White Masks* in the chapter “The Man of Color and White Woman”, he diagnoses this attitude as a wish “... to be acknowledged not as black but as white” (Fanon 1998: 63). He goes further that “...who but a white woman can do this for me?... I marry white culture, white beauty, white whiteness. When my restless hands caress those white breasts, they grasp white civilization and dignity and make them mine” (ibid). It seems that Pamela stands as a performer of the identification process in Saladin’s life; her existence is nothing more than a step for Saladin in his becoming “British more than a British” project, his colonial desire is translated into his obsession of being the colonizer. Chamcha has transformed himself to such a degree that he has lost all sense of his self and his heritage, he has created precisely the type of life he set out to create, but it is an artificial life. He is so out of touch with himself that he does not realize that he is unhappy or that he does not love his trophy wife. He is trying to be someone whom he is not. This is not a surprising act for a post-colonial immigrant who is so involved in Other’s authenticity rather than his/her. Constructing the state of self-hatred as the centre parameter to develop into an identity is one way of resisting the immanent split of the self and it is one of the ways for a post-colonial immigrant to be recognized by the colonizer and to turn his partiality into *fullness*. It seems that such a presence is the one Ruhsdie avoids confirming. Hence, he leads his character to face his own misleading identification process. The first clue of this could be inferred the time when Chamcha returns India for business and winds up in bed with the dark-skinned, Indian Zeeny Vakil. In Zeeny, he sees the part of himself he left behind. Chamcha thought he hated that part of himself and

is surprised to find himself embracing Zeeny Vakil. Zeeny tried to persuade him to re-claim his Indian heritage but Saladin does not compromise. However, it is a turning point for him because with this paradox in mind he gets into the plane heading to London and survives the crash with Gibreel Farishta where they land Rosa Diamond's house and there his transformation begins. As it is put above while Rosa Diamond occupies Gibreel with her exotic Argentine pampas stories Saladin was dragged into a police van where he is stripped naked reveal that his body, from the waist down, is that of a goat. He has also been given an exceedingly large phallus and cloven hooves. Half human half goat Saladin's presence now is completely hybrid. His self-denial of these two halves within one self invades him contrary to his own choice, it is obvious that Rushdie is totally conscious while using this demonic view for Saladin. Rushdie clarifies this scene in his defense-like essay against the crisis of his book "In Good Faith" that, "When Saladin Chamcha finds himself transformed into a goatish, horned and hoofy demon, in a bizarre sanatorium full of other monstrous beings, he's told that they are all, like him aliens and migrants, demonized by the 'host culture's' attitude to them. (Rushdie 1991: 402). Discrimination and prejudice help create a negative self-image in minorities and a negative self-image creates all sorts of negative consequences for the individual. He literally becomes that negative image, which he has been taught from prejudiced people in both England and India. The scene in the back of the police van is a darkly humorous look at the demonic image that prejudiced people project on foreign immigrants. Chamcha's demonic looks are merely a symbol of the way he feels he is perceived with his dark skin and foreign language. His transformation into the devil has less to do

with religion than with social prejudice and represents Rushdie's biting commentary on the treatment of ethnic immigrants by the Western world. It can also clearly be inferred from the conversation between one of the other "aliens" and Chamcha in the sanatorium, "They describe us.... That's all. They have the power of description, and we succumb to the pictures they construct" (Rushdie 1989: 178). These lines, which summarize the colonial history and the endless paradox between the colonized and the colonizer along with Saladin's controversies, disclose the post-colonial theory of Bhabha's mimicry. It is not surprising that within this long history of colonialism, subaltern subject keeps resisting in the way to find an identity, and the resistance in question is therefore a *partial* presence for Bhabha. He suggests that the partiality of presence in colonial discourse leads to a kind of drive to become authentic; authentically British perhaps. It might also be implied that this could always slide into being more British than the British which validates what Fanon ironically argues, "For the black man there is only one destiny. And it is white" (Fanon 1998:12). Colonial subject is not alone to develop such a resistance; it is the product of a mutual relation with the colonized. The argument can be figured from Lord Thomas Babington Macaulay's notorious parliamentary "Minute on Indian Education"(1855) which has been referred to in numerous works concerning post-colonial discourse, he declares that "...the need to form a class of persons Indian in blood and color, but English in tastes, in opinions, morals and intellect" (in Israel 2000: 165). It seems that colonialism generated its own mimic subjects, very much alike Bhabha warns us that

[T]hey are also [...] the figures of a doubling,  
the part-objects of a metonymy of colonial

desire which alienates the modality and normality of those dominant discourses in which they emerge as ‘inappropriate’ colonial subjects. A desire that, through the repetition of *partial presence*, which is the basis of mimicry, articulates those disturbances of cultural, racial and historical difference that menace the narcissistic demand of colonial authority. It is a desire that reverses ‘in part’ the colonial appropriation by now producing a partial vision of the colonizer’s presence. (Bhabha 1991: 88).

It proves that post-colonial immigrant is not a subject only but also an object to be manipulated and intervened which makes mimicry a strategy. It is “...a desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of *a difference that is almost the same but not quite*” (Bhabha 1991:86) so it should be noted that the “menace” of the colonized becomes controllable moreover it constantly leads the colonizer to acknowledge the difference. Due to the mimicry, “the synchronic panoptical vision of the dominance (ibid) always screens the self of the Other. It is the situation that colonial discourse necessarily draws the colonized into its circulations of identification and disavowal. Accordingly, Saladin Chamcha in *The Satanic Verses* “...desires not merely in the place of the White Man but compulsively seeks to look back and down on himself from that position” (Bhabha in Fanon 1998: xx).

Gibreel Farishta, the other protagonist in *The Satanic Verses*, is both similar to Chamcha and his polar opposite. They are flip side of the same coin, functioning as literary foils. Farishta is the face of the gods in Indian film. His good look makes him a natural for Indian film, yet if he lived in England, he too would be banned from the screen as Chamcha has been because of his too-much-

ethnic look. India, Farishta's homeland as well, has been good to him. He is rich, successful, admired and beloved by women however he is in the same plane with Saladin because he has lost his faith. He is nearly killed by a bout of seemingly inexplicable internal bleeding, during which he loses his religious faith. He blames God for punishing him with the illness and upon his recovery; he turns his back on Allah. Unlike Chamcha, Farishta is unable to live an artificial life, he thinks he cannot be dishonest to himself; he cannot portray gods as he does not have faith anymore.

Farishta was born as "Ismail Najmuddin" in British Poona, Gibreel moves to Bombay when he is thirteen to work with his father as a food carrier. Babaseheb Mhatre takes Gibreel in after his parents die and arranges for him to work in the movies. Eventually becoming a star in theological movies, Gibreel begins to sleep with many different women, including Rekha Merchant, and rises to enormous fame. He meets Allie Cone who is "climber of mountains, vanquisher of Everest, blonde yahudan [Jew], ice queen" (Rushdie 1989: 33) and falls in love with her. One of the tragic moments before his flight to London to find Allie takes place just after his discharge from the hospital, the scene is so striking to picture,

He got out of the limousine at the Taj hotel and without looking left or right went directly into the great dining-room with its buffet table groaning under the weight of forbidden foods, and he loaded his plate with all of it, the pork sausages from Wiltshire and the cured York hams and the rashers of bacon from godknowswhere; with the gammon steaks of his unbelief and the pig's trotters of secularism; and then, standing there in the middle of the hall, while photographers popped up from nowhere, he began to eat as fast as possible, stuffing the dead pigs into his

face so rapidly that bacon rashers hung out of the sides of his mouth. (Rushdie 1989: 32)

Gibreel's over-reaction and hunger can be associated with his great effort to come over his own devotion to Indian and faithful self, this detachment from the thing which led him to construct his identity now rejected by his own. However, during the novel it can be traced that one of Gibreel's definitive characteristics is that he gets away with everything and is entirely effortless in his approach to life, he hates England and English people. Inevitably Gibreel stands for the other side of the coin, while Chamcha tries to become what he is not Gibreel has never reconciled with his colonial past. Gibreel is the one who is blind to the his own hybridity and his "liminality of cultural identity" (Bhabha 1991: 170). His hatred of English reaches its peak when he turns into Arcangel Gabriel with his supernatural visions and insanity, his agonistic self shouts

He would show them -- yes! -- his power. -- These powerless English! -- Did they not think their history would return to haunt them? -- "The native is an oppressed person whose permanent dream is to become the persecutor" (Fanon). English women no longer bound him; the conspiracy stood exposed! -- Then away with all fogs. He would make this land anew. He was the Archangel, Gibreel. -- And I'm back! (Rushdie 1989: 372)

It is obvious that Gibreel with his double narrative throughout the novel is representing another mimicry who is so attached with his national roots, Bhabha comments on this as such "...the national narrative is the site of an ambivalent identification; a margin of the uncertainty of cultural meaning that may become the space for an agonistic minority position" (Bhabha 1991: 167). When the

continuist national history articulates into the fissures of the immigrant's self of which s/he is aware marks the discursiveness of the colonial identity and develops into a resistance from where violence or hatred engenders. This lunatic resistive manner of Gibreel could also be concluded from his intention to change the England's weather into tropical one, Rushdie utilizes the metaphor of the tropical country of India to furnish the reader also with the colonizer's gaze of the East. In this scene Gibreel thinks that a dose of strong passion will be good for the stuffy, stiff Brits believing that England's weather makes its people so indifferent to wrong or right. It is what Rushdie intentionally registers Fanonic quote "the return of the repressed", through Gibreel's stereotypical character "we learn the ambivalence of cultural difference: it is the articulation through incommensurability that structures all narratives of identification, and all acts of cultural translation" (Bhabha 1991: 168). Accordingly Gibreel's supernatural efforts in vain tries to displace the colonizer's earthly difference with his own Orientalistic metaphor,

What remained now of that morality fearing  
God? Where was He to be found? -- Only  
down below, in English hearts. -- Which he,  
Gibreel, had come to transform.

Abacadabra!

Hocus Pocus!

But where should he begin? -- Well, then, the  
trouble with the English was their:

Their:

In a word, Gibreel solemnly pronounced,  
their weather (Rushdie 1989: 375).

In the light of these accounts from the novel Rushdie's re-presentation of immigrants concerning post-colonial identification; their encounter with racial prejudice and police brutality, the life of South Asians and West Indians in London ghettos, and the kind of subcultures sprouted by cultural migration are given through sub-plots and embedded stories in *The Satanic Verses*. Rushdie also focuses on other aspects of the immigrant's experience, the tendency of first-generation Indians in England to hold on to their heritage; the defiant ways of second generation AngloAsians who must make a place for themselves in Britain despite their skin color and parental prohibitions; and the "Uncle Tomism" of an immigrant such as Saladin who at one point of his life is willing to do anything to be accepted by English society. Ongoing adventures of Saladin Chamcha represent the struggles of ethnic minorities to fit into their new homelands while retaining pride in their roots. The Shaandaar Café which is one of the significant settings of the novel is the center of Indian culture in London and represents Chamcha's ethnic roots. Chamcha is at first horrified to find himself surrounded by the very people he has spent his life running away from. As he settles in, he begins to appreciate his roots and through the younger generation of Mishal and Anahita, who are daughters of Sufyan Family in Indian community in London, he finds a blending of his two cultures. His desire for Mishal in the book symbolizes his desire to find a balance within himself between Eastern and Western cultures. Such a transformation is fulfilled when he sees a tree which has been bred from two different species of trees on a gardening show. He sees it take root and thrive in the English earth and he takes from this hope for his own hybrid life,

-- Such distinctions, resting as they must on an idea of the self as being (ideally) homogeneous, non-hybrid, "pure", -- an utterly fantastic notion! -- cannot, must not, suffice. No! Let's rather say an even harder thing: that evil may not be as far beneath our surfaces as we like to say it is. -- That, in fact, we fall towards it *naturally*, that is, *not against our natures*. -- (Rushdie 1989: 449).

This is the conclusion of Saladin Chamcha's transformation. A new optimism colors his perspective and Chamcha gets to work reclaiming his legal status and his bank accounts, he enjoys his favorite cultural pursuits whereas Gibreel kills himself, gets drowned due to his insanity and *evilish* intentions.

It is obvious that such a closure marks the optimist perception of exile and hybridity of Rushdie the author himself. However it should be noted that despite of this optimistic perception of hybridity the searching of "I" haunts throughout the novel. In almost every chapter one can quote to a question of "What kind of Idea I am?", "What kind of idea is he? A man or a mouse?", "What kind am I?" and so on (Rushdie 1989: 99,107,388,525) that sounds in a subjective mode of exilic autobiographical "I" which calls Roland Barthes' dualism of fiction and autobiography. It is the relationship and double narrative of Chamcha and Farishta that Rushdie reveals his identification transferring the experience of the post-colonial/diasporic/exilic immigrants. Rushdie remarks his intentions while writing *The Satanic Verses* in his essay "In Good Faith", "Like many millions of people, I am a bastard child of history. Perhaps we are all, black, brown and white, leaking into one another, as a character of mine was once said, *like flavours when you cook*" (Rushdie 1991: 394). It takes the study to refer to the beginning of the

chapter which is that the history and the historicity of the author shapes what is to be “written”. Through the transformation of Chamcha and Gibreel what Rushdie seems to occupy is the hybrid fullness of the subaltern, each splits within the two characters, Rushdie at the end celebrates the exile’s doublings which leads to the reconciliation of exile’s discursiveness. The binaries which frequent the novel such as East/West, colonized/colonizer, translated man/untranslated man, Self/Other, immigrant/settler which are also the notions that represent the incommensurability of the colonial narratives (national narrative versus post-colonial narrative) concerning the identification of the subaltern are the representations of the constant bickering of the post-colonial discourse.

It is apparent that literature is not political discourse but, it has political implications that derive from its subtle transformations of realist representation, these transformations are evident in many postcolonial literatures. Rushdie embraces this aspect of his narrative and despite of all the curses and negative criticisms of his work insists that, “

... I have, all my life, attempted this process of literary renewal is the result not of the self-hating, deracinated Uncle-Tomism of which some have accused me, but precisely of my determination to create a literary language and literary forms in which the experience of formerly colonized, still disadvantaged peoples might find full expression. If *The Satanic Verses* is anything, it is a migrant’s-eye view of the world” (Rushdie 1991: 394)

Accordingly, *The Satanic Verses*, Rushdie’s most important of all, by covering such political and tense issues cannot be considered apart from the theory and Rushdie himself as a fiction writer seems very salient of the theory. It can be claimed that his writing is itself a mimicry in terms of post-colonial discourse.

Thanks to the experiences narrated through the images, metaphors and satires in *The Satanic Verses* the reader can get the picture of the agonies, pains, dualities, controversies of a post-colonial diasporic individual. Therefore, the national narrative of India, Indian names, authentic symbols along with puns with a perfect use of English and Englishness stands as a significant example of mimicry. Huddart explains in his book *Homi Bhabha* that, “Bhabha brings insights from literary theory to his analysis of mimicry, and literary theory shows us that representations construct the world as well as mirroring it” (Huddart 2006: 39). Therefore presentations which are evoked by *The Satanic Verses* equip the reader with a mirror of double foils concerning metaphor of post-colonial migrancy. The mimicry of the text itself pointing “*subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite*” deconstructs the colonial construction of the hierarchy between the colonized and the colonizer because “...the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an *ambivalence*; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference. (Bhabha 1994: 86). Mimicry is a conscious resistance therefore Rushdie (taking into account of the fact what Barthes mentions about the fiction and autobiography) with his counter-narrative within the perfect use of dominant’s language produces a mimicry so it can be claimed that by this way colonized can constantly reproduce and feeds narrations “almost but not quite” which keeps the question of other and his/her self always in ambivalency .

Rushdie’s high intellectuality and its products concerning the post-colonial discourse and literature can be natural outcomes of his own mimicry and hybridity. Rushdie like many other post-colonial intellectuals who have been

mentioned in this study are mimics, their intentional, conscious resistances that stem from their historical and geo-biographical legacies furnish them with an optimistic self-constitution. Due to the displacement of constructed narratives and clichés, which have operated by them per se, lead them to be able to posit themselves in the margin by using a counter-hegemonic language from which they can get the privilege of in-betweenness. Bhabha in his interview with Jonathan Rutherford clarifies the cultural hybridity through the psychoanalytic analogy, "... hybridity puts together the traces of certain other meanings or discourses. It does not give them authority of being prior in the sense of being original: they are prior only in the sense of being anterior" (Rutherford 2003: 211-12). *The Satanic Verses* structuring the metaphor of migration as its focus reveals hybrid realities which are open to dualities and ambivalences of the concerning binaries. It is mostly because of the literary metaphor that the novel is read as a challenge towards the authorities but Rushdie clarifies his intention as, "Yet the only way I can explain matters, the only way I can try and replace the non-existent novel with the one I actually wrote, is to tell you a story" (Rushdie 1991: 397).

If what Rushdie occupies is compared to Said's and Spivak's one can obviously examine the relation between the personal historicity and the act of writing. His optimistic view of the exile and his conscious resistance operating through his own mimicry can hardly be considered liberated from the theory. Rushdie embraces his in-betweenness by writing not *for* but about the hybrid subalterns. His Fanonic references is very meaningful in this sense because while Fanon clearly states his wish as "I want the world to recognize, with me, the open

door of every consciousness” (1998: xx), Rushdie in his autobiographic essay “Imaginary Homelands” (1982) concludes it by saying out loud “For God’s sake, open the universe a little more”. These contemplations are the bearings of being a subaltern within global, multicultural “imagined communities” (Benedict Anderson), “to be somewhere and nowhere” discourse leads to create “imaginary homelands”. The national narratives conflicts with a postmodernist approach of identity which seems to be operated by post-colonial theory and intellectuals. However while this paradoxical identity formation surrounds the hybrid subaltern intellectual with a prerogative and suggests it as an optimistic project covering the hybrid subaltern in general still cannot escape from marking the notions of “inferiority”, “difference”, “agency”, “submissiveness” and such, which are the codes that are embedded in Orientalism. It seems that the post-colonial literary discourse with its intellectuals who produce and reproduce it needs to face the discourse’s own existentiality by interrogating if the works are representations or just texts. And one more to be pointed if they represent the Other or transgress the notion through so-called representations. This argument is going to be put under examination in the conclusion after an analysis of Hanif Kureishi who is slightly different from Edward Said, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Salman Rushdie in terms of “defining” his identity.

### **2.3 HANIF KUREISHI: IS THERE AN AUTO-ORIENTALISM?**

Hanif Kureishi stands for a “different” example when the post-colonial intellectuals who have been analyzed so far are considered. Born in London of an Indian father and an English mother Kureishi is a reproduction of Saladin in Rushdie’s *The Satanic Verses*, not biographically but idiosyncratically. This does

not mean that Kureishi is so deeply involved in assimilating into the White Britain like Saladin Chamcha, desiring to “be” one of them however he clearly reflects his not in-betweenness but doubleness through his autobiographical writings “The Rainbow Sign” (in *My Beautiful Laundrette and Other Writings* 1996) and his *Dreaming and Scheming: Reflections on Writing and Politics* (2002). The reason for focusing on Hanif Kureishi and his representations of the subaltern is to observe the post-colonial identity from a writer’s gaze who clearly defines himself as British despite his South Asian heritage. Unlike the previous optimistic and nostalgic discourse of exile and diaspora Hanif Kureishi with his narrative which embeds the popular and media images presents different but still virtual practices of South Asian diaspora in Britain. Moreover his cultural translation inevitably displays both the mainstream look and minority community look through negative and positive stereotypes that have been actual in the “new empire within Britain”. However Kureishi’s descriptions furnish the reader satiric, ironic criticism of the community which is trapped between their aims; climbing the social ladder through the capital and at the same time reserving their traditions within the White Britain. This means that Kureishi rather than discussing the dilemma between the colonized/colonizer represents the discord between the generations within communities. It leads his works to be read as metropolitan experience of diasporic subjects which cause them to produce new diasporic subjectivities. These arguments will be exemplified through his stories and autobiographical writings below but it should be noted that Kureishi’s discourse is centrally concerned with the differences between first-generation immigrants’ and their children’s values and beliefs which puts him in a different position from the

other intellectuals discussed above. It means that Kureishi's post-colonial condition has not led him to argue the existentialist concerns of the immigrant who is torn apart between countries but rather immigrant's eclectic identification within his/her new land which is Britain. Accordingly his delineations and characters does not shift between geographies but settle in Britain and speak from there so this leads the study to ask whether and how much his writing critically reflects the majority, how far it questions or challenges neo-colonial ideologies and perceptions. Moreover to what extent his writing is objective to and independent from the mainstream having stated that 'for me and the others of my generation born here, Britain was always where we belonged, even when we were told—often in terms of racial abuse—that this was not so' (Kureishi 1996: 135).

It is undeniable that Kureishi in *My Beautiful Laundrette*, which is a screenplay written in 1985 and was filmed in 1986, successfully represents the dichotomies of Asian immigrant community divided on class lines through negative and positive stereotypes. Unlike his late works focusing on British Muslim Identity, *My Beautiful Laundrette* pictures the corruption and retrograde within the community. The text clearly displays the eclectic political and public identity formation of second-generation immigrants. The plot without requiring a closure in the concerning issues furnishes the reader with the conflict between first-generation immigrant perceptions of identity formation against the second-generation's. Omar as the protagonist having a socialist father (Papa) who constantly curses to be in "that" country is given the responsibility of running his uncle Nasser's dilapidated laundrette. Under the influence of Thatcherism when

the country is so involved to be multi-cultural through the assimilation of the immigrants, Nasser Family in *My Beautiful Laundrette* stands for the representatives of the capital ethic avoiding to discuss the ethnic or identity problems. They rather construct their survival on the ethos of competitive individualism and the erosion of social responsibility of Thatcher's England. Uncle Nasser who is so ambitious with the money insists, "I'm a professional businessman not a professional Pakistani. There's no such thing as race in the new enterprise culture" (Kureishi 1996 41). There are so many ironic and satiric voices in the work rising from Asian community; when Papa requests his brother Nasser to give his son Omar a job he offers him the job to wash cars in his garage. Nasser's "man" Salim clearly puts the mentality behind "Your uncle can't pay too much. But you'll be able to afford a decent shirt and you'll be with your own people. Not in a dole queue. Mrs. Thatcher will be pleased with me" (Kureishi 1996: 15). This eclectic vision of the first-generation Asian community is portrayed through exploitative, venal, passionate uncle Nasser and Salim. Yet despite the critique of their pitiless ethos Uncle Nasser's genuine desire to support his brother and nephew cannot be overestimated which is the thing Kureishi intentionally re-presents. To be with "their own people" is one of the *rules* to create an "ethic" inside while climbing the social ladder within White Britain, it echoes in Salim addressing Nasser "You're too busy keeping this damn country in the black. Someone's got to do it" (ibid). The high-living Nasser is a negative stereotype with an exuberant passion for his white mistress Rachel, he is the one who represents the Asian immigrant that ignores the power of racism in the face of his capitalist success. He does the same to his nephew Omar, attracted by his

business genius he furnishes him with the launderette. Omar as a second-generation British Asian contrarily negating to be with “his people” calls to help renovating the launderette his former school mate Johnny who is a white, working class, ex-National Front member. In this point one can clearly articulate this representation to Kureishi’s autobiographical references concerning his identity formation which is quite isolated from his Asian-side of himself, in the essay “Bradford” he puts his position clearly

We were frequently referred to as ‘second-generation’ immigrants’ just so there was no mistake about our not belonging in Britain. We were ‘Britain’s children without home’. The phrase ‘caught between two cultures’ was a favorite. It was a little too triumphant for me. Anyway this view was wrong. It has been easier for us than for our parents. For them Britain really had been a strange land and it must have been hard to feel part of a society if you had spent a good deal of your life elsewhere and intended to return...” (Kureishi 1996: 135)

It is the fact that the ethnic commitment in second-generation immigrants is not as nostalgic as it is in the first-immigrants in Britain because the younger generation has a little amount of first-hand knowledge about South Asia which is mediated through variety of sources. Accordingly, Hanif Kureishi’s memory as a London born Indian has been manipulated through public and media prejudice in White Britain which he re-presents in *My Beautiful Launderette*. Ruvani Ranasinha in his book *South Asian Writers in Twentieth Century Britain: Culture in Translation* explains the paradox between two generations,

In their formative years, until they are able to make 'independent' observations, this generation's knowledge of the culture of 'origin' tends to be filtered through their parents' perspectives. It is based on the eclectic *bricolage* of whatever elements of the culture exist within the parental home or British Asian household. (2007: 224)

This is the dilemma of the young generation Asians in Britain, they are in a flow of unbalance Otherness stuck between their Asian community and the ongoing mainstream perception of themselves. They can not even become a subaltern due to their resistance toward the traditions at home and their desire to feel themselves British, on the other hand most of the families are willing to efface the ethnic heritage's traces by insisting to *make* their children British . In an interview Hanif Kureishi describes his upbringing as mono-cultural: 'I was brought up really as an English child . . . my father was very Westernized—he wasn't a practising Muslim, for example, he didn't believe in arranged marriages or practices that would have conflicted with what was around us. I wasn't influenced by Asian culture at all.' (in Ranasinha 2007: 231). Therefore it is where Kureishi's narrative becomes anxious about "his people" despite of his contrary characterization in *My Beautiful Laundrette* between money-grabbing Nasser and left-wing father Papa. Papa insists Omar that "...For us education is power...must have knowledge. We all must, now. In order to see clearly what's being done and to whom in this country" (Kureishi 1996: 18,53) which brandishes that not all of the first-immigrant British Asians are capital oriented however throughout the novel this kind of voice fades by the narrative. Omar's socialist father, addicted to alcohol declines into poverty and it marks uncle Nasser's ethic that money is the power

and mobility, rather than education, along with the fact that “he’s not a professional Pakistani but a professional businessman” ignoring the race and identity problem in Britain.

*My Beautiful Laundrette* is a striking example that stands for a different view of cultural identity concerning the Asian community, it recalls what Stuart Hall suggests concerning “modern black cinemas” as the emergent space of “new post-colonial subjects” (in Rutherford 2003: 222). Comparing to Rushdie’s representations in Kureishi through his screenplay one can conclude the conversion in the view of the subaltern/post-colonial subject. It is obvious that European presence cannot be overestimated in the younger generation, the desire to go back home does not exist anymore and the homelessness discourse is displaced by the trans-cultural discourse of the new generation. Hall reminds that the former European presence “is that which, in visual representation, has positioned the black subject within its dominant regimes of presentation: the colonial discourse,...,the romance of the exotic, the ethnographic and travelling eye, the tropical languages of tourism...(ibid: 233). However such an Orientalism is displaced by the globalised individual who loses his/her attachment with his past or ethnic roots and constitutes himself/herself within the new enterprise culture such Omar does in *My Beautiful Laundrette* ignoring what his Papa suggests and becomes his Uncle Nasser’s “man”. Johnny’s performance within this controversial characterization represents the intermixed interaction between the community and the dominant culture. Johnny is the one who is both welcomed by Uncle Nasser and Papa, however his position is used by them. While Uncle Nasser gives him one his properties due to his success in the launderette with

Omar, Papa calls him to persuade Omar to return to college. Above all, because of the homosexual relationship between Johnny and Omar white, working class, National-front member Johnny devotedly help his love despite of all his inner struggle. In these representations, it can be observed that there is a new penetration of European presence, thanks to Kureishi's geo-biographical position the re-presentations of the immigrant and the dominant are not supplied through the dominant Western discourse but through the mutual displacement of both the Western and Colonial subject. Although Kureishi himself foregrounds his protagonist as an "in-between", it is an ambiguous point because the in-betweenness of the immigrant seems to be deconstructed letting emerge "new black subjectivities" through his narrative. Hall in his essay "New Ethnicities" celebrates the new black cinema grounding his argument that the re-presentations in these films open "a new phase" marking the shifted political representation of the black subject. He finds Kureishi's cultural representations in *My Beautiful Laundrette* very "riveting" as it deconstructs "essentially good black subject" (in Morley ed. 1997:444). According to Hall,

they mark the movement from black groups asserting their right to represent themselves and countering negative images with positive ones, to a more complex agenda of a new 'politics of representation' that eschews positive images and 'engages rather than suppresses *difference*'. In this way it entails 'the end of the essential black subject': the idea that a subject is constituted by 'authentic', fixed, pre-existent essences or characteristics. It registers instead 'the recognition of the extraordinary diversity of subjective positions, social experiences and cultural identities which compose the category "black"' (in Ranasinha 2007: 237).

Likewise another critic of Kureishi Mahmood Jamal's suggestion that "*My Beautiful Laundrette* was popular with European audiences because 'it says everything they thought about us but were afraid to say'" (ibid) is meaningful in terms of a back up what Hall argues above; rather than re-presenting fixed old bad white subject and good black subject the narrative moves beyond the dichotomy of positive and negative stereotypes. In this sense the text uncovers both the diverse, conflicting and retrograded perspectives of Asian community members and the racist discourse of the dominant society. It cannot be denied that Kureishi's *My Beautiful Laundrette* is an example for marking the shift in the political move within post-colonial writers in terms of the changing cultural and political parameters. His works' appearance within the British media underlines this "change" as *The New York Times* suggests his works "opened the *surprising, hitherto obscure* world of London's Indian and Pakistani immigrant cultures to public scrutiny" (in Ranasinha 2007: 237). Furthermore, as Hall concludes in his essay "Cultural Identity and Diaspora" "the vocation of modern black cinemas allow us to see and recognize the different parts and histories of ourselves, to construct those points of identification, those positionalities we call in retrospect our 'cultural identities' (in Rutherford 2003: 237). It means that through those representations the fixedness of the 'selves' around which the immigrant or the dominant structured marking either "they are or they are not" discourse points that it is a more complex process than people have imagined. Homi Bhabha is another post-colonial intellectual remarks the erosion of the black subject pointing the displaced solidarity within the collective; he invokes this dilemma by asking,

How do strategies of representation or  
empowerment come to be formulated in the

competing claims of communities where, despite shared histories of deprivation and discrimination, the exchange of values, meanings and priorities may not always be collaborative and dialogical, but may be profoundly antagonistic, conflictual and even incommensurable? (Bhabha 1994: 2)

*My Beautiful Laundrette* in this sense fits the framework above, the values and the signifiers which generate the solidarity of the post-colonial immigrant communities are challenged through the new individualistic determinants such as class, gender and prosperity.

It is the case that Kureishi's narrative in *My Beautiful Laundrette* breaks the narrated objectification of the innocent immigrant revealing that not only the race but also the ethnicity, gender, and class are constitutive in the politics of recognition and politics of difference. The work is a turning point in the sense that subaltern subject inevitably enters in a relationship also with the particular notions of the dominant. As Spivak has shown it is impossible for the 'native informant' residing within the metropolis to avoid complicity with dominant structures (in Ranasinha 2007: 228) which is the experience of the Nasser Family in *My Beautiful Laundrette* and Kureishi himself. However the inquiry if Kureishi transgresses the Other through his narrative is still in function. When the British director of the movie Frears' comment is considered the "ethical" aspect of the representation of Kureishi becomes ambiguous; he argues, "it was astonishing because [Kureishi] got it so right. That someone could be so right, so confident about it, make the jokes, be so on the inside" (in *ibid*: 237), this is a pretentious and questionable claim for the director or anyone which means to confer the

authenticity of the work. It is obvious that the negative stereotyping of the ethnic minorities through the metropolitan experience of the post-colonial immigrant is one of the central issues in the narrative; it can also be clearly traced from the scenes in the movie that the Asian minority is pictured somehow irritating and abusive of the luxuries, alcohol, drugs, pornography. It should also be noted that there are scenes that face the White British with the looseness of being racist toward the immigrant in the group of “chaps” who do nothing apart from bullying the immigrants on the streets, idle and wanderers. The accuracy in these representations can be accepted however, the critical distance in Kureishi seems problematic when the weight of the concerning voices are considered. Kureishi’s narrative can even be considered as Orientalist and transgressive when his description of Pakistan in his autobiographical essay “The Rainbow Sign” (1986) is concerned, moreover his representation of the Muslim identity in Britain in the short-story “My Son the Fanatic” (1997) is obviously fixed and far from being negotiated. These are the arguments require further analysis in the forthcoming section of the study.

“The Rainbow Sign”, which Kureishi divides in three chapters as “England”, “Pakistan” and “England”, displays a variety of contradictions. It is a discursive text in itself, which most likely overlaps the identity crisis of Kureishi himself. There is a lot of ebb and flow in his representation of Britain, British, Pakistan and Pakistani in “The Rainbow Sign”. One can hardly miss the swapping and mingling sound of Orientalism and nostalgia. In the third chapter named “England” one part he accuses British-Pakistanis of involving into Uncle-Tomism

to climb the social ladder by doing businesses and of “taking advantage of England” (Kureishi 2002: 47), which is very well suits his representations in *My Beautiful Laundrette*. However, a few pages later one can clearly infer the cordial ties of him with Pakistan and its people

I will never forget the hospitality, warmth and generosity of the people in Pakistan; the flowers on the lawn of the Sind Club, the sprawling open houses, full of air and people and the smell of spices; the unbelievable brightness... First you offer them your hand and they grasp it. The clasped hands are slapped then with their spare hand as an affirmation of initial contact. ... they crack you on the back at least three times with their open palm. These are not negligible taps, but good healthy whacks, demonstrating equality and openness (ibid: 51,52).

It is really a difficult task to analyze Kureishi’s self-assurance when this autobiographical essay is considered, in the narrative above and in the other descriptions of Pakistan one can clearly examine the European presence in Orientalist reproductions as Stuart Hall mentions above. One can feel like reading a “travel diary” of a Western subject in the sections he describes Pakistan, it comes and goes between exotification and degradation. People in Pakistan from Kureishi’s gaze

Shadowing the British, drank whisky and read *The Times*; they praised others by calling them ‘gentlemen’; and their eyes filled with tears at old Vera Lynn records. ... acres of wasteland. Here, all along the railway track, the poor and diseased and hungry lived in shacks and huts; the filthy poor gathered around rusty stand-pipes to fetch water...” (ibid: 41)

The actuality of the representation including mimicry of the post-colonial Pakistanis and the poverty inside the country cannot be denied however, the

diverse representation in the course of the essay furnishing the reader with the criticism of all the positionalities within multicultural England and colonial Pakistan turns out to be the controversial representations of Kureishi.

It is undeniable that he is historically in-between which he admits in the beginning of the text. When he tells when he was in Pakistan; “As someone said to me at a party, provoked by the fact I was wearing jeans: we are Pakistanis, but you, you will be always be a Paki... and therefore the fact that I couldn’t rightfully lay claim to either place” (ibid: 34). And later in the text he negates his Britishness, “it’s still difficult to answer the question ‘where do you come from?’ I have never wanted to identify with England” (ibid: 53) but he concludes that “It is strange to go away to the land of your ancestors, to find out how much you have in common with people there, yet at the same time to realize how British you are,…” (ibid). The schizophrenic discourse of the post-colonial subject above is not surprising, their identification marks not what they are but what they have become and are becoming; it is also constitutive of the extra-territorial condition of the post-colonial intellectual. Ranasinha examines the position of British-born writers and offers a clear account; “Paradoxically they are simultaneously heralded as ‘objective’ outsiders on cultural borders ‘looking in’: observing their countries and cultures of ‘origin’ and destination with the detachment of distance and revealing ‘true’ insights” (Ranasinha 2007: 272). However it can be claimed that this is an eristic point in Kureishi; despite of his relatively dialogic and diverse

depictions in *My Beautiful Laundrette* his celebrated ‘elliptical brilliance about being at once British and Asian’ in “The Rainbow Sign” (ibid.) vanishes through his Orientalist rhetoric and authoritarian voice. His successful narrative of his British oriented in-between self-assurance cannot be overestimated however, his stereotyped characterizations with their violently “constructed” elements exhausts the post-colonial hybrid language effacing the periphericity of post-colonial counter-narrative. In this sense what Ranahinsa argues for Kureishi’s films can also be operative for his texts

his ironising and subversion of certain stereotypes makes him vulnerable to accusations of reinscribing others and underlines the precariousness of his position in trying to move beyond the positive/negative binary. (2007: 238).

From Homi Bhabha’s perspective beyond refers to a relatively positive spatiality, it “signifies spatial distance, marks progress, promises the future...” (Bhabha 1994: 4) he clarifies further as “to dwell in the beyond is also...to be part of a revisionary time, a return to the present to reinscribe our human, historic commonality; *to touch the future on its hither side*” (ibid: 7). It is obvious that Hanif Kureishi furnishes the post-colonial literature with successful delineations of the traumatic metropolitan experience of the immigrant however post-colonial intellectual’s experience of “writing from the margins through creating a counter-hegemonic language” is not clearly viable for him. The reason for this lies behind his position as a writer who writes the identity formation of historically

suppressed people with an unbalanced distance toward the Other. This fact is much more revealed through his texts, which is about the Muslim Identity in Britain.

One of the distinguished examples of his depiction of fundamentalist Islam can be observed in his “My Son the Fanatic” (1997) which is a short story and a screenplay that is very promising in picturing the identity crisis of the South Asian immigrant in Britain. Story’s protagonist Ali as a Hindu British brought up by his father according to the norms of British culture passes through the process of assimilation till he starts to question his own culture’s values and traditions comparing to the society which he lives in. He is a student studying accounting at a university in England. His father, Parvez, is a taxi driver and works at night to supply Ali with books, computer and everything he needs. Ali is also excelled in cricket, swimming and football that are the very means of a power in popular culture which is somehow a milestone that shapes the significant customs of a dominant Western society. In addition, he even has an English girlfriend. Accordingly, he does not seem to have strong or direct ties to his native culture and identity. He is just at the edge of adopting the Western way of life and thought including language, customs and traditions that go completely opposite the ways of his own culture. His life before he experiences the crisis of identity proves that he is well assimilated into the main culture. However, the prejudices of the hegemony, which constantly reminds and constructs his otherness, lead a split in his identity formation. This burden flourishes in Ali’s experience as a protest against the main society through defining his own self by sticking to his

religious beliefs, rejecting assimilation under common, accepted, dominant culture. Up to the point he starts realizing the power relations he has been a successful individual but then suddenly starts disposing all his belongings and the means, he replaces these with growing a beard, praying during the day, cursing alcohol and pork which are the sins according to the rules of the Koran. In this point his heavy struggle with his father Parvez who loves Scotch, Jazz and bacon-butties starts. Ali realizes that what community yearns for is unity but not difference, either in appearance or in language, religion, culture and identity. Ali faces this reality as he more interacts with the culture, instruments of media, popular culture and the native citizens which are the means that lead him see what exactly the dominant culture is seeking. In view of this thesis; his protest against this fact appears as strong as them and he positions himself against the assimilation in a Western country; very much justified in his following words when he is arguing with his father; “The Western materialists hate us”, “Papa, how can you love something which hates you?” (Kureishi 1997: 126). Parvez as a Hindu who lives in England is poor and is driving his taxi at night to make more money than the daytime. His main aim is to provide his son a good education, so that he can easily become an appropriate part of the social puzzle. Through this project, he can also elude to articulate into the main stream as a lower-class ethnic minority so that Ali acts as the main medium for Parvez to take both himself and his family to a successful assimilation. Accordingly the story states very well the contentions within the diasporic subject in a multicultural dominant land however it is the representation of Islam in Kureishi’s characterizations which seems fixed and away from renegotiation. In the story while Parvez as Westernized-Pakistani

stands for the enlightened, unpretentious voice of reason that is easily confirmative of the dominant means to climb the social ladder, Ali is defined as deluded with his indoctrinated relative self-determination. When such a characterization is articulated into Kureishi's "Islam" in his autobiographical essay "The Rainbow Sign" the monological aspect of his narrative is revealed:

I saw the taking-up of Islam as an aberration, a desperate fantasy of world-wide black brotherhood; it was a symptom of extreme alienation. It was also an inability to seek wider political view or cooperation with other suppressed groups—or with the working class as a whole... (Kureishi 2002: 31).

It cannot be denied that fundamentalist Islam and its members avoid the idea of plurality and the state of democracy within the globalized and pluralistic world moreover and tragically their attitude lead Islam to be perceived as a "divisive" identity. However, the problem in Kureishi's representation of Islam and the fundamentals is his "absoluteness"; "...Kureishi invents a polarity between radical orthodox Islam and detached liberal individualism with no recognition of the spectrum of attitudes in between" (Ranasinha 2007: 241) as he operates in "My Son the Fanatic". It should be noted that his views on Islam within "The Rainbow Sign" was written short time after Rushdie's Satanic Verses affair so to some extent his violent descriptions can be inferred as the outcome of his close ties with Rushdie and his position as a "writer" and as a reflection of this he also writes "My Son the Fanatic".

On the other hand in the "The Road Exactly: Introduction to My Son the Fanatic" he dialogically states the discrepancies of being too liberal or too fundamentalist,

“For the fundamentalist, as for all reactionaries, everything has been decided. Truth has been agreed and nothing must change. For serene liberals on the other hand the consolations of knowing seem less satisfying than the pleasures of puzzlement, and of wanting to discover oneself” (Kureishi 2002: 220).

This is exactly what Kureishi accomplishes in the story “My Son the Fanatic”; he gives the picture of two extremes and lead the public/reader to question their own position as a part of a society. The last lines put Kureishi’s and the work’s rationale; Parvez feels sick of observing Ali’s *transformation*, beats him up after his pray at home and Ali asks “So, who is the fanatic, now?” (Kureishi 1997: 131). Therefore the piece can be considered as a very good critical example which reflects the binary between national identity vs. ethnical identity and assimilation vs. detachment however it can hardly be mentioned that the narrative moves *beyond* these binaries. As Ranasinha puts above Kureishi fails to fill the gap with in-betweens while representing binary extremes.

As a final analysis, Kureishi is difficult to analyze concerning the post-colonial discourse in general. In *My Beautiful Laundrette* and also in his other works his dialogical representations are not very well open to new *becomings*. It is obvious that he is a gifted writer to bring forth the issue of identity crisis of the Asian immigrant to Britain and more importantly to British Media however his characterizations along with his own self-assurance creates a conflict concerning the position of post-colonial intellectual. His subalternity is far from being in-between and hybrid which are the metonymies of being Other in post-structuralist and post-modernist and post-colonial literary discourse. His positionality can hardly stand as a mimicry which deconstructs the dominant’s self, it rather

transgresses the Other through his British oriented hyphenated self-constitution. It does not mean that he must be criticized to embrace his Britishness, however his testimonies of his own identification in his autobiographical writings rather than representing the intentional ambiguity of hybrid or homeless writer leads the reader to a dubious analysis in the face of some constructed stereotypical depictions of the countries (England and Pakistan) and its people. In the light of these arguments when the same questions of the Salman Rushdie chapter are recalled; “Does the author’s transformation and bio-geographical exile leads to a constant productive identity formation?” “What kind of transformation these representations cause within the “self” of the subaltern *per se?*”, it can be claimed that Hanif Kureishi and his fictions do not dwell among the histories of the post-colonized but picture the current crisis of metropolitan immigrant within the communities failing to move *beyond* the related binaries. It should also be noted that his re-presentations generate the new black subjectivities as Hall remarks above. It is undeniable that his re-presentations are successful in the sense of turning the fixed essential innocent black subject up side down avoiding the exotification and the tolerance however these new subjectivities rather than suggesting productive identity formations underlines the insecure space of the immigrant’s split referring an exploitive fixed self. This is a case that rehearses the “stains” which are attributed to the Other by the main stream.

It is another fact that when the history of the writer and the narrative bound is considered Kureishi’s positionality seems rational as a British-born Indian who passed through Western formation both in the family and at school. Yet, it can be traced from his autobiographical writings that he also suffers from his hyphenated

identity as it is illustrated above however the outcome of this condition is far from being an exile in Saidian sense or it does not have the critical distance like Rushdie. Kureishi has an “ironic distance” (Ranasinha 2007: 236) which leads both the dominant and the immigrant to face the defective elements of their identity formation or identification emphasizing the reciprocal awry perceptions. Unlike the previous post-colonial intellectuals in this study, Kureishi does not privilege the exilic condition but he structurally privileges the corruption of the South Asian community within multicultural Britain.

Hanif Kureishi’s unstable depiction placed both in his works and his autobiographical essays make it difficult to interpret his works politically. Moreover the problems in his characterizations and his own mimicry give the impression that his literature is more close to the main stream than to the marginalized space of the post-colonial intellectual. It is not very surprising when his self-determination is regarded,

I would say that I was a British writer...For people like me and Caz (Caryl Phillips), we are British writers. There is nothing else we could be. It is quite difficult, though, because what that entails is another view of Britain. Of Britain as being a genuinely plural, multi-cultural place, where, somehow, everything gets different. I think that is quite difficult for people, English literature having been English, as it were, in the strict sense for so long. (Personal Interview of Bronwyn T. Williams, 1995. See bibliography).

Likewise, Kureishi asserts in “The Rainbow Sign” that “So there was always going to be the necessary return to England. I came home...to my country (2002: 52). This quotation comes just after the paragraph where he describes a

photograph of his father “in a house ‘contained fragments of his past’, he took the photograph with him to England that he would need to protect *himself* and make him stronger” (ibid. emphasis is mine). It is obvious that this double vision provides a picture of shifting self of a diasporic/migrant subject however it fails to refer to a constant in-between identity formation and positive transformation, it should not though. If Kureishi is to be regarded as a post-colonial writer his hybridity, calling back the definition of hybridity by Bhabha (see Rushdie Chapter), puts the traces of certain other meanings and discourses not in the sense of being prior as anterior but in the sense of being prior to one another.

It is put several times previously in the chapter that Kureishi’s self representation and mimicry is really a challenge to come up with conclusions referring to the hybridity of the post-colonial intellectual or the intentional ambiguity of the mimicry of the post-colonized. He does not have a mimicry marking the notion “almost but not quite”, he rather and controversially almost blends into the *ground* creating diverse and multiple criticisms of the Other which leaves his position in an abyss. Consequently, it remains as a question if Kureishi through his re-presentations furnishes the post-colonial literature with Occidental and neo-colonial ideologies despite of his successful “translations” of minority for the majority.

## **2.4 CONCLUSION**

In contrast to the first chapter the section above is devoted to the fictive narratives of hybrid writers Salman Rushdie and Hanif Kureishi who are two important representatives of post-colonial literature. It is claimed in the introduction that even if the texts are works of fiction the historicity and

histography of the writer harbours autobiographical references. Depending upon their own testimonials it is claimed that in their particular narrative fictional “I” overlaps with their autobiographical first person “I”. It means that in the light of their fictional narratives the reader can observe the identity formation/transformation of post-colonial migrant/diasporic self. However it should be noted that there are different perspectives between Rushdie and Kureishi concerning post-colonial literary discourse.

Rushdie as a first-generation immigrant furnishes the reader with the nostalgia and frustration of being an “exile” emphasizing its privilege, and through his characterization the diverse negative stereotypic portraits unlike flat characters are exposed to a constant metamorphosis. His depictions do not give the impression that the historically suppressed characters are trapped into living with their deficient self-constitutions. Rushdie opens a space within post-colonial literature where the national/ethnic perfectly engages into a reciprocal relationship with the dominant avoiding a hierarchal relationship. His own mimicry reflects on his works and creates permanent “menace” which constantly bothers the colonial and concludes in a mutual deconstruction of the constructed identities of both colonized/colonizer. Rushdie’s narration is also an indicator of his hybrid texts and his hybrid self which he clearly expresses in his autobiographical essay “Imaginary Homelands”;

...Indian writers in these lands like others who have migrated into the north from the, south are capable of writing from a double perspective: because they, we, are at one and the same time insiders and outsiders in this society. This stereoscopic vision is perhaps

what we can offer in place of 'whole sight'  
(Rushdie 1991: 19)

Therefore his narrative circling back from the past to the present, inserting the national narrations into dominant's current political discourse and exposing the binaries to a mutual displacement makes Rushdie an example of post-colonial hybridising. His mimicry, which stands for an intentional resistance, obviously contributes the notion itself holding "converse Anglicisation" (Ranasinha 2007: 112) which is not totally westernized but partially colonized. It is well-known that mimicry is part of the subaltern identification that leads resistance or criticism toward the object of desire. In this sense Rushdie's mimicry does not create a subversive and agonistic positionality but generates a critical distance toward the each element of the binaries by letting emerge a marginal stance that also displaces the essentialist condition of the centre and periphery. Rushdie achieves to re-present the existentialist transformations of the subaltern who is equipped with the immanent split stemmed from the colonial heritage and these transformations critically fulfilled through transformed images and ironies; it means not only the characters are exposed to the change but the images, symbols and notions which circles them are also included in this process. In his representations the permanent search of identity remains as a key element which let the process of identification as an endless process deconstructing self's essentiality and accentuating the constant "becoming" of the "I".

Hanif Kureishi as a British-born Indian promisingly reflects the conflicts of the South Asian immigrant community within multicultural England. It is stated above that his narrative unlike Rushdie does not articulate the histories of

the colonial and the colonized but re-presents the identity crisis of westernized metropolitan immigrant. Although his dialogical characterization in his particular works such as *My Beautiful Laundrette* and “My Son the Fanatic” his narrative is not as hybridized as Rushdie. This is a natural outcome of his historicity as he is furnished with second-hand narrations of his origin and his ethnic devotion creates an added ethnic dimension and cultural experience which are consisted of some visits to Pakistan. Therefore in an already transformed context within England by immigrants, both Kureishi’s self-constitution and his re-presentations of immigrants do not reflect the hybridizing of the migrant and the dominant culture in the sense as Rushdie. The immigrant characters’ immanent split and diversity do not expose to a horizontal transformation so it leaves both the narrative and the writer far from Rushdie’s *stereoscopic* vision. In this sense Kureishi including his autobiographical testimonies re-presents a moody positionality which is perceptible for colonized however controversial for post-colonial intellectual. His style in the narratives of the two geographies Pakistan and England in “The Rainbow Sign” as Orient and Occident unites in an Occidentalist tendency. It also puts his mimicry into question not being resistant in the sense of representing an ambivalence which constantly disturbs the dominant Other but it rather creates dubious pictures of Kureishi’s position as a post-colonial writer. Accordingly his mimicry does not produce difference within operating as “converse Anglicization” but stands as “almost anglicized” positionality. The interrogation of identities in Kureishi’s fictions cannot be overestimated as to serve for new generation’s cultural productions within capital-oriented, liberal and individualistic Britain of 1980s however, the vacillation of

hybrid individual and search for self project fade under the materialistic desires of both the communities and the dominant. Therefore Kureishi's re-presentations show "...the degree to which he is working/writing within the main stream British culture and the degree to which he has adopted the British cultural traditions" (Ranasinha 2007: 268).

In the final analysis, Rushdie as a "hybrid" first-generation writer constantly resists to the homogenized idea of the dominant culture (British) by asserting processes of cultural hybridization, insisting on that not only the subaltern/immigrant but also English cultural identity is also transformed through encounters with transnational migrant communities and so we are all plural beings. Unlike first generation writer Hanif Kureishi who foregrounds his narratives on networks, Rushdie frequently refers back to the roots and origins exposing himself and his characters to an enduring productive transformation. Moreover Kureishi's re-presentations rather than travelling between geographies focuses on the diversity and conflicts of immigrants within their communities in England. Therefore the homelessness discourse of the post-colonial intellectual is not underscored in Kureishi when his mimicry is considered. The nostalgia and hybridity of home-colonised cultures are nearly effaced in Kureishi which does not deconstruct the mainstream perception effectively but mirrors it.

When the relation between remembering and forgetting is considered neither Rushdie's nor Kureishi's positionality is considered as "oppositional" in a political sense however their experience concerning the memory is inevitably shapes the self of these two writers. This can be underscored through the striking difference of their mimicry; Rushdie's resistance is obvious underlining the

*difference* of hybrid self, being rootless, emerging reciprocal transformation both in the colonized and colonizer. Kureishi's resistance is rather toward cultural difference in a sense that underlining it which posits him closer to the neo-colonial multicultural mainstream, referring to the revival of European presence in post-colonial literature. These arguments lead the study to recall Rushdie's question if the post-colonial writer's distance open new doors; it can be concluded that it clearly does. However it should be noted as a last but not least analysis that post-colonial intellectual's stance and positionality matter in a great deal in order to open new phases concerning "the subaltern". The de-colonization project of post-colonial literature has started various new discussions and phases concerning the identification of the subaltern/hybrid/diasporic/immigrant self, same discourse has deconstructed the historically constituted narratives and displaced constructed positions. Thanks to the writers such as Salman Rushdie and Hanif Kureishi that the subaltern's diverse traumatic experiences are interrogated and re-presented however there remains the reality that the metonymies of Orientalism is surviving through neo-colonial hegemonic practices of the day-to-day experience of those individuals. Therefore the positionality of the post-colonial intellectual should be kept interrogated in terms of if creating re-presentations but not only texts which is genuinely transformative and interventionist criticism of the contemporary state without falling into re-producing occidental parameters or metonymies of Orientalism.

## AFTERWORD

The movements, the attitudes, the glances of the other fixed me there, in the sense in which a chemical solution is fixed by a dye I was indignant, I demanded an explanation. Nothing happened. I burst apart. Now the fragments have been put together again by another self. (Fanon 1993: 109)

The bound that connects the diverse diasporic/hybrid writers of this study is most prominently formed through their encounter with mainstream, mostly white dominant culture which incites them to create, artistically or politically express, and explore their cross-cultural identities. The space of cross-cultural identity operates as the joiner of the “fragments” which is born into “another self” of the post-colonial hybrid intellectual. This new self of the hybrid essayist/writer embracing the “homeless” position as the ground of intermingling of his/her colonial past and post-independence subject formation paves the way for the new representations of the Other question. It is the fact that these writers define their cultural identity through direct response to their cultural contact or various receptions of the colonial mainstream. In this respect the study focused on the post-colonial intellectual who was born in Non-Western territory but institutionalized through First World Academy and inquires the mutual cultural transformation of the intellectual and their observant objects. Situating the post-colonial critic as the mediator of the new representations, the “hybridity” of their texts illuminates the shifting space of the new emergences concerning the post-colonial theory.

It is because of the reasons above the study starts with illuminating the brief but not limited account of the current political condition of the diasporic individual and various approaches to the question of recognition which shapes the process of the cultural translation of the post-colonial subject. Setting the different perspectives of the other question along with the discrepancies of the suppressed, which they survive on, the study is able to reflect dialogical relation between the post-colonial intellectual and their texts which developed on the issue. Considering Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1977) as the landmark on colonial studies which is a turning point for the representation of Other giving rise to original interventions into the debate of these issues, the study revisits the text. In accordance to this revisit the research selects intellectual figures from formerly colonized countries writing in colonial languages, particularly English, who write in counter-hegemonic discourse using "...counter-discursive tools appropriated from the colonizers" (Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin 2002: 199), by this way both their hybrid positions are revealed and the paradox within are examined. In their texts their implementations of the Western theories into the project of decolonizing the colonial discourse inevitably puts those intellectuals in the centre of various implications like Eurocentricism and Westernization which is an argument to be considered. In order to illuminate these varied discussions the study refers to Edward Said's understanding of "intellectual" and "secular critic" and his "worldliness" of the texts to present that texts are entities which have organic bounds with the cultural world, history and human life of the time they are interpreted. It is well-known that the post-colonial literature and its theory proliferates on the existentialist discussion of the Other and the political

representation of the suppressed groups. Accordingly, the representatives of the discipline with their bio-geographical conditions and with their ground-breaking theories are the parameters to make claims for the situation of the Other today. Hence, the study approving the organic bound between the writer and the text interrogates the space from where the post-colonial intellectual represents the Other.

In the light of the arguments in Edward Said's prominent works about the intellectual reveals that intellectual in general should be furnished with the critical distance and skeptical look to analyze and represent his/her subject of discussion. Edward Said has never attributed these claims to specifically the post-colonial intellectual rather he refers to the universal condition of the intellectual. His arguments conclude that the position of the intellectual harbors general aspects such as not to take exact parts, not to form uncritical solidarities, being secular and being oppositional by referring to the dominant. Although Said connotes a universalistic perception of the intellectual the study argues that it is Said's historicity which furnishes him such perspectives. It means, thanks to his own "hybridity" he is able to come to such multi-sided conclusions about the critic and the intellectual. In this respect Edward Said himself clearly approves the privilege of being homeless and exilic in order to achieve "critical" and "secular" pluralistic analyses however it should be noted that this detachment in the name of homelessness and exile is metaphoric. Situating this argument as the ground to uncover the dilemmas of the post-colonial intellectual the study shows that such a position of the intellectual clashes with the post-colonial diasporic Other's actual

situation. Edward Said's constructivist approach to these existentialistic terms constantly turns back as the paradox of the post-colonial intellectual. Tracing such paradox enables the study to examine various approaches and stances developed in accordance to the same dilemma referring to the intellectuals' own works, claims and representations. The paradoxical positionality of Edward Said inevitably provides us the fact that the exilic state of the post-colonial intellectual is also the productive space which supplies him/her the critical distance and the "contrapuntal" perspective escaping from essentialist or fundamentalist conclusions. However this fact does not end the discussions about such positionality of the post-colonial intellectual as still it is one of the debated issues within the post-colonial theory.

Edward Said's suggestions about the intellectual also reveal some other problems concerning especially the post-colonial critic. It is the fact that hybrid critic concerns about the representation and recognition of the suppressed groups depending upon his/her own colonial past which is then concluded in his/her current "productive" hybrid identity. In this respect the rhetoric of the post-colonial intellectual should escape from "priest-like" analyses which prevent the Others from their own interrogation of identity. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, who obviously approves her post-coloniality, shows that texts which speak *for* the Other are the ones that lead the exploitation of them. The oppressed subject/agents who have historically subjected to "definitions" of their selves by the dominant are left in the same degraded space even when somebody from their position "represent" them. Spivak's distinguished contribution with the term subaltern

through her article “Can the Subaltern Speak?” discloses this hardcore controversy of the representations of the intellectual in terms of burying the subaltern into a deeper silence while trying to open a liberated space for their own self-expression. Through such a remark, the study argues that the critical distance between the post-colonial intellectual and the subaltern is significant in relation to the identity formation of the subaltern. Theorists or writers should avoid acting as a political proxy and a “conductor” of a particular group in order not to misuse their given privileged positions. However it should be noted that Spivak does not underscore the problem from the post-coloniality of her space, she criticizes it in terms of colonizer’s controversial liberation project *of* the subaltern. West or Western dominant discourse in their liberation projects of others fall into an illusion as their benevolent intentions stresses their own superiority once more. However, Spivak with an Indian heritage is furnished with the tools which she can speak not *for* but *to* others. It does not mean that she has the *right* to speak but it is her hybridity which enables her speak toward the margins from her counter-hegemonic private position. It should be noted that Spivak’s positionality represents the framework of hybrid post-colonial critic who produces critiques of the Other question aiming to transform the societies and institutions within which they function. In this sense the post-colonial theorist intersperses the European discourse theory into his/her colonial past by appropriating what it requires from European theory. Spivak’s intervention and her positionality clearly approves such argument and at the same time she is aware of the paradox of the post-colonial critic’s privilege in representing the Other. Hence she proposes the “unlearning” the marginality that is attributed to the post-colonial critic in a sense

negotiating between the binary opposition of centre/margin. This approach is the one that gives us the positionality of the post-colonial intellectual who does not construct his/her discussions on either native subjectivity or metropolitan impulse of dominance. Instead, we can clearly observe the interaction and displacement of both history of the colonized and the colonizer within the identification of post-colonial intellectuals' works. However the transformation that is aimed through these works to what extent accomplishes a cultural translation within the post-colonial society and post-colonial individual remains ambivalent.

The ambivalence above is traced not only in the theoretical arena of the post-colonial question but also in the fictive representations of the hybrid writers. The interaction between the writer's bio-geographical history with the characters in his/her works reveal that the fiction also can well be considered in articulation with the theory leading to political moves in the question of the Other. The split in the identity of the Other and its manifestations are successfully narrated through Salman Rushdie and Hanif Kureishi. The frustration of the homelessness and the eclectic formation of the diasporic migrant are differently delineated through these first-generation immigrant and second-generation immigrant writers of post-colonial literature. In this respect the study offers a connection between Homi Bhabha's mimicry and Salman Rushdie's fictive and autobiographical writings representing the existentialist shift in the post-colonial Other. Their connection shows us that the "colonizer" and the "colonized" are not separated entities that define themselves independently. They both self-consciously contest the nativism of the authentic culture offering reciprocal relation in order to form a cultural

identity for the post-colonized diasporic subject. Through such theoretical insight Rushdie's own claims and his characters show us that identity for post-colonial subject is a constant formation embracing both the historical colonial past and the current post-modern hesitancy. Following Said's "optimist" project Rushdie also approves the exile as a productive space from where new subjectivities emerge and interacts. Moreover the nostalgia and the frustration of "longing home" is never ignored in his narratives. On the other hand while picturing the great strain of the diasporic self, Rushdie narrates significant examples of Homi Bhabha's mimicry. Rushdie in the sense of mimicry reveals that the reforms, disciplines and regulations which were intentionally exposed on the colonized in order to lead "appropriations" of the Other conversely creates the tool which has the effect of menacing the colonial authority. Accordingly my study argues that the reciprocal relationship in the process of identification cannot be denied, especially for the subaltern the pre-given, scripted, ahistorical identity formation has already been postponed paving the way for transformative and pluralistic identities. In this respect I refer to Rushdie's characters Saladin and Gibreel contrasting the leading binary oppositions concerning the identification and reception of the post-colonial subaltern. Despite of Rushdie's misinterpretations of *The Satanic Verses* we can conclude that his intentions offer a successful cultural translation forming a double vision of both the colonized and the colonizer. His resistance through his mimicry does not operate only for the aspect of post-colonial immigrant but it also "menaces" the pre-colonizer society. Juxtaposing Rushdie with Kureishi reveals the fact that second-generation immigrants within already transformed dominant ground with the metropolitan impulse of the mainstream re-present different kinds

of stereotypes. The reciprocal relationship between the colonized and the colonizer is relocated into the relationship between various sides of the problem due to the experience of 1980s in Britain. The struggle of the post-colonial diasporic subaltern continues within their communities inside their new “land”. Kureishi’s narrative shows us that the agency of migrants’ ethnic past and its encounter with the contemporary capitalist mainstream within the integration of their new land create the best examples of mimicry. However the characterization and delineation of Kureishi does not offer a dialogical and mutually transformative re-presentations, they rather mirrors the negative and positive stereotypes within dilemmatic underpinning of debated issues. Furthermore, when Kureishi’s self-assurance is compared to his *style* both in his fictive and autobiographical narratives, the political move of his mimicry remains dubious. I argue that Kureishi is aware of the exilic narration of the post-colonial immigrant however he operates his resistance not through the “optimist” phase of this narration but through confirmation of his colonial partiality. The new self in Fanon’s quote above runs also in Kureishi and in his characters but in a sense of giving priority to the European presence recessing orientalist metonymies to proliferate. The study suggests that certain typologies in Rushdie and Kureishi intersect however due to the social and political change within the colonizer land (Britain) the imaginarieness of new homelands are not required in Hanif Kureishi’s re-presentations. Hence, it gives us the conclusion that writer’s secularity in post-colonial context is also transformed through the race politics and fracturing of common Black identity. The new generation immigrant in Hanif Kureishi including himself does not embrace the nostalgia of home anymore, their new

selves in articulation with the media, popular culture and capitalist opportunism bring us converted subalterns who try to overcome their immanent split through class-consciousness. On the other hand Kureishi's successful cultural translation in terms of the Other question fails in his re-presentations of Muslim Identity and his autobiographical writings concerning the delineations of Pakistan and Pakistanis. His shifting between diverse positionalities are trapped in being more close to his Britishness in the sense of breaking the in-betweenness of post-colonial writer as I argue in the second chapter. Concerning both Rushdie and Kureishi it can be concluded that the bio-geographical history of the writer constitute the parameters which is embodied in their re-presentations. Although the differences between Rushdie and Kureishi including the contrasts of their mimicry is far from Edward Said's or Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's "oppositional" stance.

Situating all the arguments above the study still offers questions to be examined if these productions and re-presentations remain just as texts which cut out the 'worldliness' of the writings leading to the exploitation of the discussion subjects. In all these ground breaking theories and fictive productions of the post-colonial discourse, the effort to deconstruct the desire of the colonized to domesticate the exotic Other remains. However the study argues that Black Man's desire to take place of the White Man is both conformed and displaced in all these texts. It is argued in various sections of the study that the hybridity of the post-colonial subaltern, the in-betweenness of their diasporic selves are suggested to emerge new subjectivities which provide them with pluralistic vision. The critical distance, the critical consciousness and the perpetual wandering that equip the

post-colonial writer are embedded into the postmodernist vacillation which gives us the rhizomatic suggestions concerning the question of the Other.

All these ideas are optimistic and provide plurality of approaches by deconstructing the consistencies of the colonial rhetoric. However it is obvious that there is still the question of the subaltern and this study argues that Orientalism is still an issue, not itself per se but its metonymies are still in function, one can call it racism, the other nationalism or multiculturalism or politics of diversity or tolerance towards differences or exoticism and list can be expanded. A kind of ambiguity seem to haunt when these intellectuals who are the great contributors of the post-colonial theory and literary discourse are considered, the study constantly asks if their inquiries concerning the “liminality” of the cultures and persons mark what they try to efface. The critical distance or existentialist distance of the post-colonial essayist/writer inevitably open new doors: they *write back* the western hegemony deconstructing the colonial mindset. However I still insist to keep examining to what extent these re-presentations transform the post-colonial subaltern. I believe that the intellectuals’ own displacements and reinscriptions considering the representation, recognition and identification of the subaltern cannot annihilate the fact that frustrated hesitancy of the current actual hybrid identity is in a search for legitimate constituency. The post-colonial intellectuals’ hybrid positionality and their mimicry inevitably create resistance yet lead the question of other remains ambivalent. Depending upon these queries this study is concerned with the role of the post-colonial intellectual

and writer/public bound in terms of their producing representations or just texts.

Ranasinha argues this paradox and concludes that,

“If the mainstream media foregrounds representational rather than textual complexity, at present, postcolonial literary criticism remains confined within the parameters of the textual paradigm, evading the significance of the material historical contexts of literary production and consumption” (Ranasinha 2007: 270).

The reference above reveals that the “imperialistic” understanding or capitalist “marketing” will be operative through all the literatures. However I believe that still the role of the post-colonial intellectual including his historiography and ideology can contribute the current politics concerning the question of Other. Their hybrid stances and “optimistic” homeless rhetoric create paradoxes however it can obviously lead us to keep interrogating both positions of the colonized and the colonizer. If we call Georg Simmel’s “stranger” the importance of the hybrid positionality of the post-colonial intellectual sounds so meaningful in order to allocate socio-political representations by touching the grievances of the subaltern,

The unity of nearness and remoteness involved in every human relation is organized, in the phenomenon of the stranger, in a way which may be most briefly formulated by saying that in the relationship to him, distance means that he, who is close by, is far, and strangeness means that he, who also is far, is actually near. For, to be a stranger is naturally a very positive relation; it is a specific form of interaction (Simmel: 1 see bibliography)

This study approves that hybridity of the post-colonial intellectual becomes a phenomenon as Simmel argues above however not only in a positive manner but also in a manner which is informed and shaped without ignoring the demands of the mainstream. My study argues throughout the research that the ambiguity and the paradox of the post-colonial intellectual reside in that space where the subaltern individual's actual frustration clashes with the abstract narrative of the writer. However what I intend to show is that the production and consumption of these narratives are stitched out of real life stories and connected not only to political realities, but also to shifting social and cultural moods. In this respect, the intellectuals in my study do not form solidarity but have commonality with their insistence to remain critical and skeptical toward not only the suppressive history of dominant colonizer but also nativist projects of the colonized. Their resistances within their theories or fictive narratives are the manifestations of their mimicry and of their hybridity which operate through ambivalent and universal nature. Their counter-hegemonic and marginal responses to the national politics and to relatively progressive politics of the dominant unsettle assumed unity and fixity of the centre. Regardless of all these cultural transformations of the post-colonial writer/author, the objectivity of the intellectual fades under the postmodernist abstraction when the actuality of the representation problem of the subaltern is concerned.

It is my suggestion to ask borrowing from Fanon "What does the post-colonial discourse want?" It cannot be denied that the discourse which was introduced by Said's Orientalism is deconstructed and reinscribed through counter-narratives of

the post-colonial intellectual paving the way for displacing colonial hegemony. The interaction of post-colonial intellectual's ethnic colonial heritage and the Western theory leads him/her to stand as cultural translator engaging the subaltern experience into cloistered European theoretical and literary establishments. Finally, my study argues that the vital interventions of the post-colonial intellectuals concerning the constant existentialist search of the subaltern testify the achievement however; the post-colonial discourse should also keep its own existentialist interrogation in order not to reproduce the objectification of the subaltern engendering new manifestations of orientalism to proliferate. This study reintroduces that the post-colonial intellectual acting as an objective outsider responds the question of Other from the cultural borders looking in the problem to *change* the constructions of dominant ways of knowing. Due to these reasons, 'worldliness' of the post-colonial intellectuals' representations is significant and obviously their original interventions are expected not to undercut the question of the Other through the abstraction of the theory/narrative

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aciman, André, ed. *Letters of Transit Reflections on Exile and Memory*. New York: New, 1999.
- Ahmad., Aijaz. *In Theory Classes, Nations, Literatures (Cultural Studies)*. New York: Verso, 1994.
- Anderson, Benedict. "Imagined Communities." *Nations and identities Classic Readings*. Ed. Vincent P. Pecora. Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 2001. 309-17.
- Arif Dirlik, "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism," *Critical Inquiry* 20 Winter 1994: 328-356
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, eds. *The Empire Writes Back*. Oxon: Routledge, 2002.
- Ashcroft, Bill. *Edward Said*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Barthes, Roland. *Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes*, trans. Richard Howard, London: Macmillan, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Writing Degree Zero*, trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith, London: Jonathan Cape, 1984.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "Introduction: Nation and Narration" in *Nation and Narration*. Homi K. Bhabha ed. London: Routledge, 1990. 1-7. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Third Space: Interview with Homi Bhabha". *Identity Community, Culture and Difference*. Ed. Jonathan Rutherford. Mahwah: Lawrence And Wishart Ltd, 2003. 207-221.

Clifford, James. "On Orientalism" in *The Predicament of culture : Twentieth-century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1994.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks (Pluto Classics)*. New York: Pluto P, 1998.

Graham, Allen,. *Roland Barthes*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora". *Identity Community, Culture and Difference*. Ed. Jonathan Rutherford. Mahwah: Lawrence And Wishart Ltd, 2003. 222-237.

\_\_\_\_\_. "New Ethnicities" in *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. Ed. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen. London: Routledge, 1996. 441-49.

Hargreaves, Alec C., and Marc McKinney. "Introduction : the post-colonial problematic in France." *Post-colonial cultures in France*. Ed. Alec C. Hargreaves and Marc McKinney. London: Routledge, 1997. 3-25

Huddart, David. *Homi K. Bhabha*. New York, N.Y: Routledge, 2005.

Israel, Nico. *Outlandish*. California: Stanford UP, 2000.

Kureishi, Hanif. *My beautiful laundrette and other writings*. London: Faber and Faber, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Love in a Blue Time*. London: Faber and Faber, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Dreaming and scheming reflections on writing and politics.*

London: Faber and Faber, 2002.

Marrouchi, Mustapha Ben T. "The Critic as Dis/Placed Intelligence: The Case of Edward Said." *Diacritics* Spring 1991: 63-74.

Mishra, Vijay. *Literature of the Indian Diaspora Theorizing the Diasporic Imaginary (Routledge Research in Postcolonial Literatures)*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Morton, Stephen. *Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Pierre., Bourdieu., *In other words essays towards a reflexive sociology*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford UP, 1990.

Radhakrishnan, R. "Postcoloniality and The Boundaries of Identity" *Callaloo*, Vol. 16, No. 4, On "Post-Colonial Discourse": A Special Issue. Autumn 1993, pp.750-771.

Rajan, Rajeswari Sunder. "The Third World Academic in Other Places; Or, the Postcolonial Intellectual Revisited." *Critical Inquiry* Spring 1997: 596-616.

Ranasinha, Ruvani. *South Asian Writers in Twentieth-Century Britain Culture in Translation (Oxford English Monographs)*. New York: Oxford UP, USA, 2007.

Rutherford, Jonathan, ed. *Identity Community, Culture and Difference*. Mahwah: Lawrence And Wishart Ltd, 2003.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Representations of the intellectual the 1993 Reith lectures.*

London: Vintage, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The World, the Text and the Critic*. London: Vintage, 1991.

Salman., Rushdie., *The Satanic Verses*. New York, N.Y: Viking, 1989. Print.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Imaginary Homelands*. New York: Penguin (Non-Classics), 1992.

Simmel, Georg. "Stranger." Web. 21 June 2009.

<[http://www.infoamerica.org/documentos\\_pdf/simmel01.pdf](http://www.infoamerica.org/documentos_pdf/simmel01.pdf)>.

Originally in Kurt Wolff (Trans.) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. New York: Free Press, 1950, pp. 402 - 408.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 'Can the Subaltern Speak?', in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, London: Macmillan, 1988. pp.271–313.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Scattered Speculations on the Subaltern and the Popular", *Postcolonial Studies*, 8:4 2005, 475 – 486.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The post-colonial Critic : Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. Ed. Sarah Harasym. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Williams, Bronwyn T. "A State of Perpetual Wandering": Diaspora and Black British Writers." 1999. Web. 23 June 2009.

<<http://www.postcolonialweb.org/diasporas/williams1.html>>.

Williams, Patrick, and Laura Chrisman, eds. *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall, 1993.

Young, Robert. *White Mythologies Writing History and the West*. London: Routledge, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Postcolonialism An Historical Introduction*. New York: Blackwell, 2001.