



Post-Colonial Literature

Essays on

Gender, Theory and Genres

Sukalpa Bhattacharjee

The essays in this volume seek to represent the incoherent currents of Literary and Cultural theory threatening the privileged status of the text and cultural practices. The central argument progresses through a celebration of multiple possibilities of genres and subjectivities which draw on the selective enterprises of many a author, critic and theorist who have tried to map a terrain for a moment of postcolonial emergence. The work examines the in-between spaces of various postcolonial subject positions and locations. Significantly, the work provides no conclusion but only an apology for what happens in this multi-faceted, many voiced and specific enterprises of postcolonial writing, is now a matter of speculation and critical interrogation 'at the present times'. The book is step towards a dialogic encounter with *otherness*.

Rs. 375

Sukalpa Bhattacharjee currently teaches English in North Eastern Hill University, Shillong. She has published in the areas of Postcolonial Studies, Human Rights, Multi-Ethnic Literature of the United States and Women's Studies. Currently she is engaged in translating Narratives from NE-India.

ISBN 81-87606-62-2

**POST-COLONIAL LITERATURE
ESSAYS ON
GENDER, THEORY AND GENRES**

SUKALPA BHATTACHARJEE

AKANSHA PUBLISHING HOUSE
NEW DELHI-110059 (INDIA)

AKANSHA PUBLISHING HOUSE

R 37-B, Vani Vihar, Uttam Nagar

New Delhi-110059

Email: ektabooks@yahoo.com

Ph. : 9212065579 / 9811582579

Showroom

4649/21B, Ansari Road

Darya Ganj

New Delhi - 110 002

Post-Colonial Literature: Essays on Gender Theory and Genres

© *Author*

First Edition 2004

ISBN 81-87606-62-2

All rights reserved. Including the right to translate or to reproduce this book or parts thereof except for brief quotations in critical reviews.

[The responsibility for the facts stated, conclusions reached etc. is entirely that of the Author. The publisher is not responsible for them, whatsoever.]

PRINTED IN INDIA

Published by M.P. Misra for Akansha Publishing House, New Delhi
and Printed at Tarun Offset Press, Delhi.

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	vii
1. Between the Post and Colonial: An Exegesis of the Hyphen	1
2. Subjectivity and Literature: The Post-colonial Space	29
3. Tracing the Subaltern Women's Voice	46
4. Woman in Postcolonial Culture	58
5. Representing the Other: Genre and Gender	69
6. The Postcolonial and the Postmodern: What lies in-between?	84
7. Diaspora and Migrancy: The Possibilities of an In-Between Literature	101
8. Writing a Postscript or an Apology?	122
<i>Index</i>	129

1

Between the Post and Colonial: An Exegesis of the Hyphen

There has been a shift of paradigm in the field of critical discourse with the emergence of the erstwhile colonized countries which are appropriating the universalising Eurocentric discourse. This new field of critical discourse formed what is known as the 'Post-Colonial', marking an empirical break with the epistemology of the Colonial regime. However, the "Post" in Post-Colonial has been under serious scrutiny with particular emphasis on the politics of the 'hyphen' between "Post" and "Colonial". Therefore, examining and interpreting the "Post" in Post-Colonial is the first step towards any study of the Post-Colonial.

Several post-colonial critics and theoreticians have attempted at explaining the predicament of the post-colonial condition. Edward Said, Frantz Fanon, Homi K. Bhabha, Aijaz Ahmed and Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak are some of these critics and theoreticians, whose critical and theoretical positions need to be examined closely against the question of nation, nationality, Identity and Gender. In addition, the rise of various genres, as a manifestation of the Post-Colonial encounter need to be addressed. The argument in this introductory Chapter shall conclude with a short discussion on the problem of pedagogy of 'English Literature Texts' and 'Use' of the English language in Post-Colonial countries.

The prefix "Post" in the descriptive term Post-Colonial is the distinctive mark of a shift towards a rupture and a discontinuity that disfigures the ontology of a subject constituted in terms of "Reason". "Post" can be best deciphered in contrasting a colonial

discourse with what lies at its interior, a subjectivity that subverts its own ontology. "Reason" in its enlightenment predicament gives birth to a subject foreclosed within a discourse that sets out the terms of a hegemony, in all its manifestations. "Post" is a metaphor of subversion of the interior of a discourse while it itself remains at the exterior. "Post" is the breakdown of the stable semiology in which an alternative ontology is foregrounded in the discourse. The entire process, metaphorically called the "Post" can be reconciled at the background of the phenomenon called "Colonization". This background disappears in the understanding of the "Post", but the "Post" itself originates from an ontology of a colonial paradigm. In other words, "Post" is elliptically related to the colonial backdrop, which provides for a stage of massive disorientation of coloniality. Colonialism in itself does not generate the stage for such a disorientation, but there are certain material forces that transverts the bounds of colonialism, that are dormant within it. But the nature of change is such that those dormant forces within are released by a stroke of history, an agency that propels the inner dialectics of a particular paradigm. Even such a paradigm is historically constituted, which can be located in a concrete historical situation. In other words, it can be identified with certain human efforts that release the forces of change, and articulate the change in the discourse. Therefore, an agency is never independent of a discourse that traces out the change. This is how, both "Colonial" and "Post-Colonial" become historicist categories.

Therefore, the Post in Post-colonial asserts that the "Colonial" and the "Post-Colonial" are separated from each other and that they cannot be referred to a unilinearity of a chronological order that can mark them as self same identities. The border separating 'Post-Colonial' and 'Colonial' is always already contaminated by their radically to each other. As mentioned earlier, "Post" signifies the 'difference-within' of colonialism itself, to an excess in its economy of the same, to an 'otherness' within, which cannot be reduced to the same, to the colonial self's own dislocation. Situating alterity and difference within colonialism itself, "Post-Colonialism" thus exposes colonialism's own limits - the temporal and spatial limitations and the (in)significance of its claims to Universality.

“Post” has a double signification in “Post-Colonial” in the sense that it indicates a space beyond ‘Colonial’, while still referring back to ‘Colonial’. “Post” marks the relation between what is ‘Colonial’ and what is beyond it. It is a relation between what is given/present and what is not given/present. So “Post-Colonial” would mean neither ‘Colonial’ nor non-colonial’, but a space between -a ‘hyphen’ to mark an ‘outside’ which is ‘inside’ of any supposed ‘inside’ on either side of the hyphen. This ‘hyphen’ marks such an irreducible outside and at the same time, it is the trace of a movement of displacement, which indicates an irreducible alterity. This ‘hyphen’ is the “spacing” that turns the inside out of all ‘interiority’ just as it marks irreducible outside. In other words, the ‘hyphen’ in ‘Post-Colonial’ marks the irreducible outside, the ‘Post’ from the presence of an inside, the ‘Colonial’. Moreover, the ‘hyphen’ indicates that the ‘Post’ is a movement from the inside ‘Colonial’ into a radical alterity which is not present.

Between ‘Colonial’, and Post-Colonial the hyphen acts like a knife that severs itself to perpetuate the signs ‘Post’ and ‘Colonial’, as two different beings and then arranges the fragments together in such a way that the two neither go together nor separate. The presence of the two, which are made incompatible can be articulated only if they are fragmented in a discourse in which the reduction of the two into one needs their mutual opposition in reducing. Therefore, in ‘Post-Colonial’, the reduction of the ‘Post’ and ‘Colonial’, into one always paradoxically calls forth both so that their opposition/difference goes along with the discursive reduction. The coinage ‘Post’ hyphen ‘Colonial’ becomes the formal presentation of these binary opposition between ‘Post’ and ‘Colonial’ in a discursive formation that renders one as the difference of the other, both legible yet effaced.

To understand it better, if ‘Colonial’ means a fixed authoritative meaning’, then ‘Post-Colonial’ can be seen in two simultaneous acts -firstly, the hyphen as a separation of the ‘meaning’ and the ‘authority’ vested in it and secondly, the “Post” spacing the separated entities as binary opposites, one as the *difference* of the

other. Meaning is deferred to authority, while it is different than authority prolonging into 'weaving of difference', which means deferring the colonial meaning from its presumed authority.

'Post-Colonial' is a supplement where it constitutes the trace of 'colony' as well as crosses it into its different, the opposite. 'Post-Colonial' maps the radical alterity between the 'Colonial' and the 'Post-Colonial'. This radical alterity between the 'Colonial' and its opposite is the crossing of the border of both and this constitutes the 'Post-Colonial', which is radically as 'other' of both. However, it is not a simple inversion of the 'Colonial' for the "Post" which names a radical alterity is not a present thing, but a *difference* that defers 'Colonial' infinitely in "spacing" it with a hyphen. This "spacing" can be named as 'Post' and hence the term 'Post-Colonial' is generated out of the deferral of the union between 'Post' and 'Colonial'.

This displacement of meaning from its fixed position and the appearance of it in an unauthorised space turns into an erasure, the trace of which maps the post-colonial space, the hyphen marking the 'Post' as an exterior of what is 'Colonial' making this exterior the interior of the supposed 'colonial' interior. Such a difference interweaves the relationship between the inside and outside which in the language of Derrida:

(. . .) governs nothing, reigns over nothing and nowhere exercises any authority. . . . Not only is there no kingdom of [spacing], but [spacing] investigates the subversion of every kingdom which marks it obviously threatening and infallibly dreaded by everything within us that desires a kingdom, the past or future presence of a kingdom.²

Therefore, 'Post-Colonial' as *differance* is neither a concept nor a thing, but a space marking the non-presence of the present, the 'hyphen' or the 'authority' that is characteristic of a 'Colonial' presence. 'Post-Colonial' subverts every such 'kingdom', more explicitly places one in a 'nonpresence', which marks the dissolution of the difference between the 'Colonial' and the 'Post-Colonial'. The 'Non-presence' restores the presence, but such

restoration is only a repetition, a circularity that does not reproduce the self-same 'colonial' space. Thus the 'non-presence' marks the fulfillment within desire, desire ahead of fulfillment. The "Post" situated in the 'present' cannot differentiate between the future of 'Colonial' and the 'Post' of the present in 'Colonial'. What is marked between the future (present) and the past (present) is the hyphen. What is marked in this hyphen between the future and the present, between the past and the present is only a series of temporal differences, without any central present. Therefore, 'Post' as the future of a past, which is 'colonial', marks only hyphen, a non-presence, the difference between the post' and the 'colonial'. The 'Post' is never present in the 'Post-Colonial' except that it is a desire to be fulfilled in the present. But " fulfillment is summed up within desire, desire is (ahead of) fulfillment"³ and hence "Post" as the future of colonial past marks a desire in which present can only mark the fulfillment of becoming "Post", but that is never fulfilled in present. Thus "Post" is infinitely deferred in the desire of a future, a future or the past in which the present is always deferred. So "Post-Colonial Space" would signify a series of temporal differences without a central present of the "Post" of which past and future would be but modifications. Here, a question arises as to what is the ontological status of this "Post"? "Post" on the one side of the hyphen and "Colonial" on the other protract the difference, the suspension of which can only be the present. Present as 'real' falls in the gulf between the past and the future, but the present is suspended in the gulf/abyss'. A suspension of this "suspension" is only a Dream, which in Derridean language would mean:

Dream, being at once perception, remembrance and anticipation (desire), each within the others, is really one of these ... a presence both perceived and not perceived ... a medium (medium in the sense of middle), neither nor, what is between extremes...⁴

Thus "Post" is without a reference, it is a mere referent, what is only written as a sign without a concealed reality, without any world behind it. Hence, in "Post" there is only mimesis of the past

when the past is lost. Past is mimed without assigning a cognitive validity in the free play on signs that move in a discourse and makes a passage from the past to the future, from remembrance to desire. In 'Post-Colonial', the present stands at the exterior of the remembered past, only to appear as an unfulfilled desire. Therefore, it is neither desire nor fulfillment, neither future nor present, but a state in between the two which looms large and situates the 'Post-Colonial' in the hyphen. This situation of the 'Post-Colonial' in the hyphen is an inscription of the irreducible opposites and the same time an exclusion of their relationship. This relationship generates a process in which both ends are marginalised. "Post" as well as "Colonial" producing an identity - 'Post-Colonial', which is doubly marginalised. It is marginalised from both the ends as well as by a 'non-presence' at the centre. Therefore one can say that the "Post-Colonial" breaks up the central whole of an identity, by breaking the centre and at the same time producing an exterior that marks the difference of identities at the margin, the marginalised. When marginalisation is past, it looks with a desire to transgress from this marginalised state and falls within the vacuum of the centre, an abyss that suspends a union forever of the "Post" and the "Colonial". In other words, the "Post" of the "Colonial" continues with the already produced marginal identities and reinforces it by the act of 'transgression' by which such identities are reproduced in the same process.

In the *differance* of 'Post-Colonial' categorizing a genre in culture and literature and critical discourse would mean a deferral from the lost subjectivity of the colonial past that fails to locate itself in a 'present' marked by a desire to unfetter itself from the colonial discourse, but again fails to unfetter itself from the 'Space' of a displaced discourse in which they lie at the exterior or the margin. From such a marginal position the 'subject-in-waiting' cannot reinscribe themselves in the fractured 'space'. So, their discourse remains a fractured discourse with a fractured being. Therefore, "Post-Colonial" signifies a fractured identity which has been fractured as the 'Post' of its past remembrance and that which desires to attain full subjectivity. This desire ripples out in a

discourse, which is self reflexive and which speaks on its own behalf to forge its own identity and culture. Eventually this discourse challenges the very power-relations responsible for its creation. Kwame Anthony Appiah, a post-colonial intellectual from Ghana has sought to find a relation between the “Post” in “Postmodern” and the “Post” in “post-Colonial”. He finds that the “Post” in “post-Colonial” like the “post” in postmodern, “signals a space-clearing gesture.” One could perhaps infer that in either case it is an exposition of the ‘Centre’s’ own contradiction within, which has given its radical other an opportunity to question and challenge its claims to University.

The second part of the present chapter focusses on the “Post-Colonial” emergence and examines the position of few critics and theoreticians who have considerably influenced “Post-Colonial” discourse.

II

Considering that the ‘Post-Colonial Space’ is a project rather than a fact, the question arises as to how post-colonial intellectuals define their political identity or constitute their work as post-colonial? What is involved in such an interrogation is the ideological interest of post-colonial intellectuals, which assigns a certain institutional space to their works. Post-colonial literary theory claims to replace the Euro-centric critical praxis and proposes strategies of interpretation for adequately dealing with the complex and heterogeneous literary corpus of post-colonial societies. According to Ashcroft, Tiffin and Griffiths, “they emerged in their present form out of the experience of colonization, and asserted themselves by foregrounding the tension with the imperial power, and by emphasising their differences from the assumptions of the imperial centre”.⁵

But the problem is that post-colonial literary theory in its initiative to liberate the thinking, literature and epistemology of the colonized gives birth to another kind of hegemony by yoking together heterogeneous elements and experiences of colonized countries which are distinctly different from one another. For

example the African condition is quite different from the Indian experience of colonial rule, which is in turn quite different from a settler colony like Australia. This forms a very serious problematique, as liberation from one kind of 'epistemic' 'Centre' paradoxically gives birth to another, 'Centre' diluting and dissolving heterogeneous cultures and experiences. However, the prefix in "Post-Colonial" unfortunately still marks an empirical cut only, a chronological break and one needs to examine the 'Post' beyond such a narrow limit. Anne McClintock has raised objections to the term post-colonial on the ground that it is "homogenizing" and "seldom used to denote multiplicity".⁶ She states that, on the one hand, the term "Post-Colonial" is too "premature [a] celebration"⁷ of the end of a first world imperialism that in fact continues to operate in as powerful if not more dubious present day structure of neocolonialism. On the other hand, the term "post-Colonialism" overestimates a historical triumph of the west, third world cultures, "while profoundly affected by colonization are not necessarily primarily pre-occupied with their erstwhile contact with Europe".⁸ There is an obvious contradiction between McClintock's insistence that forms of western imperialism and global capitalism continue to control the third world, and her belief that most third world cultures are "primarily" unconcerned with (and therefore presumably outside) this kind of structuring and control. The penetration of the first world into the third world must not be looked and elided in the same breath. The term 'Post-Colonial' is a guard against precisely such double gesture and willful historical amnesia`.

Keeping in mind that the post-colonial is an emergence of the erstwhile colonized subjects in their defiance and transgression of the currents of the dominant discourse, vis-a-vis the problematic of giving birth to another totalising discourse, in creating a space of encounter with the colonial discourse, one could examine and interrogate of few representative post-colonial theorists. Post-Colonial theory underlines the fact that "The colonial encounter and its aftermath whatever may be its form throughout the post-colonial world, provides a shared matrix of reference and a shared

set of problems of post-colonial cultures.⁹ By homogenizing the colonial discourse, post-colonial theory has imposed a form that includes only the following features: (i) place and displacement; (ii) colonizer and colonized; (iii) dominated and dominating; and (iv) hybridity and syncreticity. Being reductive in its theoretical construction, this theory interrogates European discourse only from a particular stance. Aijaz Ahmed observes that post-colonial framework makes it extremely difficult to speak of any fundamental difference between national formations.

‘Post-Colonial’ theory tends to be over determining and ignores other important aspects of cultural formations outside the colonialist preoccupation, which are created in response to ones own cultural needs and desires to interrogate ones own “class structures, our familial ideologies, our management of bodies, and sexualities ... our silences.”¹⁰ Critics such as Bhabha, Spivak and Jan Mohamed working within the European critical tradition also disagree on many points with the post-colonial literary theory. Bhabha has directed attention to the disruptive articulations of the colonized as inscribed in the colonial discourse.

“(Minority discourse) is not simply the attempt to invert the balance of power within an unchanged order of discourse, but to redefine the symbolic process through which the social imaginary-Nation, culture or community -become “subjects” of discourse and “objects” of psychic identification.”¹¹

Jan Mohamed proposes the alterity of the theoretical construct and disagrees with Bhabha. He writes that faced with an incomprehensible multifaceted alterity, the European theoretically has the option of responding to the other in terms of identity and differences. Furthermore, he argues that the “other” exists as such prior to and independent of the colonial encounter. Similarly Gayatri Spivak’s counting on her identity as a post-colonial subject questions the very basis of the binary frame of the post-colonial discourse. In examining these post-colonial theorists, one needs of analyse the ‘genealogy’ of the post-colonial intellectual, his or her social interest and desire, his or her politics of location or “affiliations”. According to Edward Said, the “social identity” of

the modern intellectual emerged as an interrogation of the “two formidable and related powers engaging critical attention. One is the culture to which critics are bound filiatively ..., the others is a method or system acquired affiliatively. . . .”¹² Said uses the complex dialectic between “filiation” and “affiliation” to explore the role played by “place” in the production of critical work. The question is what sort of knowledge are these theoretician aiming to produce by participating in the First World Institutions? Are these theories adequate enough to liberate the colonized from the ‘western episteme?’

Here it would be relevant to read Kwame Anthony Appiah’s understanding of the ‘Post-Colonial’:

Post-Coloniality is the condition of what we might ungenerously call a comprador intelligensia: a relatively small, western thinkers, who mediate the trade in cultural commodities of world capitalism at the periphery. In the west they are known through the Africa they offer; their compatriots know them through the west they present to Africa and through an Africa they have invented for the world, for each other, and for Africa.¹³

Such inadequacies come to be felt more deeply in the new era of vastly intensified globalization, resurgent neo-colonialism and racism, and the rise to unprecedented prominence of expatriate Third world intellectuals located or seeking location in western Universities.

Any examination of the exercise of the “Post” in “Post-Colonial” brings one to confront the question of what constitutes the ‘Post-Colonial space’. Addressing the question of post-colonial ‘space’ one would have to produce writing that is “non-centralized” and “local”.¹⁴ Despite the fact there have been attempts by post-colonial theorists to conceptualize “location”, “position” and “address”, they have not questioned the extent to which their theoretical production still operates within and reiterates or reproduce metropolitan problematics. Their work has largely followed two trajectories:

1. One line of thinking follows the tracks of Edward Said's *Orientalism* and shows how there has been attempts to analyse the way the west has represented the "other". There have also been more specific analyses of the way contemporary radical political theories in the First World, for example, Marxism, Feminism, have conceptualized the subjects and movements in the Third World.
2. Recently, a slightly different kind of work has emerged. This work attempts to "represent" post-colonial subjects, movement and texts in the first world. This forms the second line of thinking.

The development of critical theory as posited by Edward Said would be discussed here while the aforesaid second point would be elaborated and analysed with evidences from texts in the discussion to follow.

In *Orientalism*, Said wants to hint at the fact that the west's apparent pursuit of knowledge is always an aspect of its pursuit of power. He states:

The representation of orientalism in European culture amount to what we call a discursive consistency, one that has not only history but material (and institutional) presence to how for itself Such a consistency was a form of cultural praxis, a system of opportunities for making statements about the Orient. My whole point about this system is not that it is a misrepresentation of some Oriental essence . . . but that it operates as representations always do, for a purpose, . . .¹⁵

In explaining the politics of representation, Said argues skilfully as to how:

... to a very large extent the Orientalist provides his own society with representations of the orient. (a) that bear his distinctive reprint, (b) that illustrates his conception of what the orient can or ought to be, (c) that consciously contests someone else's view of the orient, (d) that provides orientalist discourse with what at that moment, it seems most in end of and (e) that

responds to certain cultural, professional, national, political and economic requirements of the epoch.¹⁶

Said observes that 'knowledge' -never raw and unmediated or simply objective -is what the fine attributes of orientalist representation, 'distribute' and 'redistribute'.

In spite of the brilliant observations regarding how "the east" in caricatured in order to be dominated, Said has not succeeded in writing about a western projection which could include all of the east as he had claimed in *Orientalism*. His polemics were in fact restricted to the Arab world. Some points among many problems raised in his books are: How could any research or generalisation about Islam etc. not be part of the will to power of the west? How does change happen etc. In *Culture and Imperialism*, Said recurs to Barthes' view that all representations are deformations, that they are all false but that some are less false than others. He is quite capable of praising some authors for good work done by them but doesn't state how to judge them. Even in his own literary criticism he asks his authors to see with 'our' eyes. That this kind of anachronistic argument imitates what it appears to criticize and therefore plunging into the 'Nationalism' trap seems inescapable. Said is not attempting to prove that the novel caused Imperialism nor vice-versa, only that they are integrally related and this is once again not something original, since scholars have studied how art related 'o its cultures for some time. Said's internal contradictions are striking and some of this might have to do with how writing from within the United States of America.

Even if we assume for a while that one could use the dialectic between "filiation"¹⁷ and "affiliation"¹⁸ to understand the predicament of Post-Colonial intellectual, a major point needs to be reckoned with. Frantz Fanon showed long ago how Colonialism renders problematic the very notion of a national culture. He states that:

A national culture under colonial domination is a contested culture whose destruction is sought in systematic fashion. It very quickly becomes a culture condemned to secrecy. This

idea of clandestine culture is immediately seen in the reactions of the occupying power which interprets attachment to traditions as faithfulness to the spirit of the nation and as refusal to submit.¹⁹

Fanon's perspicuous analysis of the predicament of "national culture" and of the post-colonial intellectual is quite relevant because given the problematic notion of a national culture the native intellectual either becomes an "assimilator", a mimic or turns "substantialist" or nativist, by embracing the substantified native culture. In either case, Fanon says that there is no taking of the offensive and no redefining of relationships.

However, one wonders as to what Fanon would suggest to usher in an international dimension "which could form an aspect of a post-colonial encounter. Fanon believes that "National consciousness" can usher in "international consciousness" which 'grows and grows'. Fanon further states: "this meshing of the national with the international consciousness creates a larger entity. . . . If a man is known by his acts, . . . then we will say that the most urgent thing today for the intellectual is to build up his nation."²⁰ So the intellectual concentrates on the "inside" space of the nation in order to prove beyond: "outside", to the globe.

But the question is how to build up a national consciousness on the anvil of the problematic of the national culture discussed earlier. Of course Fanon's idea of an "international consciousness" raises an interesting problem for many post-colonial theoreticians like Said who are already firmly positioned within the international community, who are in fact exiled from their nation. They are already writing from outside. In the same vein one could see how Homi K. Bhabha questions himself "how does the post structuralist attention to *écriture* and textuality influence my 'experience' of myself?"²¹ He goes on to answer:

Not directly. I would answer, but then have our fables of identity ever been immediated by another? Have they ever been more (or less) than a detour through the world of God, or the writ of law, or the name of the Father, totem, the fetish, the

telephone, the superego, the voice of the analyst, the closed ritual or the weekly confessional. . . .²²

Looked at this way, theory is just one of the technologies of identity. But Bhabha's attempt to rewrite the problematic of identity in the light of post structuralism makes clear that theory is a special or even a privileged technology of identity for intellectuals. The account of identity as a detour, particularly a detour through heterogeneous discursive and systematic codes and mediums is already a theoretical account. Bhabha attempts a redescription of the problematic of post-colonial identity from the postmodern perspective, which insists that the question of identity can never be seen beyond representation.

The problem of identity turns out to be a "discursive" problem rather than an ontological or an epistemological one. As Bhabha describes it, the desire for the other is 'doubled' by the desire in language, which splits the difference between self and 'other' so that both positions are partial; neither is sufficient unto itself. The demand for cultural and individual authenticity is always already contaminated by being subject in its articulation, to the play of doubling and repetition which leaves no subject positions pure, which hybridizes all languages, cultures and peoples. The question is how does Bhabha situate the specificity of the post-colonial experience within the hybridization.

As mentioned, the site of enunciation of difference - cultural, sexual, racial - turns out to be ambivalent, undecidable and hybrid. The demand for fixity - whether racial, sexual or cultural - is constantly disturbed by the desire for identification, by the spilling of the subject of enunciation by the drama of recognition and disapproval. The presence of the post-colonial migrant in the metropolis is a paradigmatic instance of the hybridization of culture, language and people.

There is, however, an unresolved ambiguity in Bhabha's theory of hybridity. On the one hand, he uses post-colonial texts to show how the historical experience of colonialism produces ambivalences and undecidabilities in the process of enunciating

differences—cultural, sexual and racial; on the other hand, the elements of post-structuralist theory he deploys has the effect of erasing the specificity of the post-colonial experience. If Bhabha claims to use the post-colonial experience as an illustration of the disseminated space of post-modernism, then he must account for the specificity of that experience. When Bhabha translates the post-colonial narrative of detour into the figures of theory, he is in fact, making a story-line out of the figures of theory. He ends up privileging the post-colonial migrant because the story-line needs an anchoring figure. What is paradoxical is that the figures of theory that emerged in the critique of totalizing theories are themselves tending to become totalizing. For a theory is totalizing when it attempts to rewrite or recode alterity and heterogeneity into the ‘economy of the same’, as hybridity is the product of the enunciative and iterative structure of language and of the logic of desire and identification. Bhabha does not seem to realize that he is using the figures of theory in a foundational way. If according to the dictates of theory, all experiences and narratives are in dissonance with it and should be recorded into its language, the result would be what Derrida called the endless inventions of the same. Bhabha’s theoretical desire to make heterogeneous narrative cohere by recoding them in the language of theory results in the crossing of the question of post-colonial identity as a problem. In Bhabha’s discourse the question of post-colonial space as a field of possibilities, and as an epistemic and political problem, refuses even to be formulated. Again Bhabha’s reading of mimicry as an “artful revenge” as a subversion of the metropolitan assumption of purity and priority, is based on the racial and cultural politics of contemporary Britain. One would have to relate it to one’s own position within the genealogy to understand it. Similarly, Aijaz Ahmed’s endorsement of the categorisation of ‘the Third World’ is as he himself called it, a polemial one, with no theoretical status whatsoever. In response to Fredric Jameson’s “Third world literature in the era of multinational Capital”, which argues for a “theory of the cognitive aesthetics of third world literature”. Ahmed writes:

Conversely, however, I hold that this term, 'the third world', is, even in its most telling deployments, a polemical one, with no theoretical status whatsoever. Polemic surely has a prominent place in all human discourses, especially in the discourse of politics, so the use of this term in loose, polemical contexts is altogether valid.²³

Ahmed suggests that books written by prolific writers from Africa, Asia and Latin America, that are available in English, must be taught as an antidote to the general ethnocentricity and cultural myopia of Humanities as they are taught in the United States, under the label. Third world literature.

Ahmed's suggestions are acceptable as part of the post-colonial encounter which paves the way for deconstructing the Euro-centric hegemonised text. But he limits such an encounter only to the level of polemics when he stresses that 'The Third World' is a polemical concept, and one cannot surely conceive of a project of post-colonial encounter only at the level of polemics. It is an encounter at the level of epistemology.

In the same essay, later Ahmed argues on the point of the epistemological impossibility of a 'Third World literature'. And when one refers to Jameson, one finds him defining the so called third world in terms of its 'experience of colonialism and imperialism', and this category necessarily follows from the concept of a 'nation'. With nationalism as the peculiarly valorized ideology. Jameson states that all third world texts are necessarily ... to be read as ... national allegories' and Ahmed endorses that:

the theory of the 'national allegory' as the meta text is inseparable from the larger three worlds theory We too have to begin, then, with some comments on 'the third world' as a theoretical category and on 'nationalism' as the necessary, exclusively desirable ideology.²⁴

But in doing so Ahmed himself enters into a jigsaw puzzle. He says: "Jameson's division of the first and second worlds is in terms of their production systems while the third category is defined purely in terms of experience of externally inserted phenomena.

Ideologically their classification divides the world between those who make history and those who are mere object of it.”²⁵ Ahmed rightly points out that if the “first world is Capitalist, the second world Socialist, how does one understand the third world? Is it pre-capitalist, transitional? Transitional between what and what? But rather there is also the issue of location of particular countries within the various ‘worlds’.”²⁶

Ahmed further suggests that if one draws on Jameson’s categorisation of ‘Third world’ then the primarily ideological formation available to a left wing intellectual will be that of nationalism and only then perhaps one could assert that all third world texts are national allegories. But in conceptualising nationalism, one would again enter into the problem of defining a ‘National culture’ in country which was colonized for a long period and going by Frantz Fanon’s observation as discussed earlier, Ahmed himself is in a contradictory position in trying to find a category of ‘Third World Literature’.

Similarly in one’s examination of the question of gender in the critical discourse, one is confronted with a serious problem. In examining Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak’s stand on the current theories of colonial discourse, it is relevant to recall Benita Parry’s objection to Spivak’s obliteration of the role of the native as historical subject and combatant, possessor of another knowledge and producer of alternative traditions. In Parry’s view,

it is the appeal to the equal aspects of native tradition which furnishes the colonized with an alternative representational framework of form of language from which to fashion a combatant subjectivity of self.²⁷

Parry observed that compared to Bhabha, Gayatri is more cynical on the question of rendering the native subject any voice.

What Spivak is doing is that she is categorising a group as the subaltern (sexed) woman, who she says has been ‘historically muted’ as a consequence of the “planned epistemic violence of the imperialist project”, where the native was prevailed upon to internalize as self knowledge, the knowledge concocted by the

master. By bringing in the category of the subaltern (sexed) woman, Spivak is able to project the marginalized subject in her everyday lived experience of power where marginalization is more acute and concentrated. She is a subaltern "Other" of the post-colonial "Other", in the genealogical hierarchy. Spivak also renders it possible to see how a subaltern woman is a victim even of her fellow women from the emancipated class. One reads the limitations involved in bringing all woman under the slogan of Feminism, which is another manifestation of the 'Western episteme' and how a discriminating reading is indispensable in understanding a marginalised subject position adequately.

But Spivak's theoretical position is highly problematic as she fails to visualize how the subaltern sexed woman can be liberated from the tentacles of the dominant discourse. Spivak observed that "one never encounters the testimony of the women's voice-consciousness", "There is no space from where the subaltern (sexed) subject can speak", "The subaltern as female cannot be heard or read", and "the subaltern cannot speak."²⁸ Perhaps Spivak is ignoring the poetics of silence when says that 'the subaltern cannot speak' and thereby ignored how silence at times can speak more than words. One could draw on Althusser's concept of "interpellated subjectivity."²⁹ In recent times James C. Scott has researched into how 'hidden transcripts' can be more effective in resisting domination, by its strategy of indirect confrontation with the agencies of domination.³⁰

Besides, by stating that one never encounters the testimony of the women's voice-consciousness, Spivak denies a unified consciousness to the native subject. She states that:

no perspective critical of imperialism can turn the 'Other' into a self, because the project of imperialism has always already historically refracted what might have been the absolutely other into a domesticated other that consolidates the imperialist self. A full literary inscription cannot easily flourish in the imperialist fracture of discontinuity, covered over an alien legal system masquerading as Law as such, an alien ideology established as only truth and a set of human science busy

establishing the native as self-consolidating other.³¹

One wonders whether the subaltern subject will ever be liberated as the subaltern is supposed to be the ideal figure, who survives actively even joyously on the assumption that the effective instruments of domination will always belong to someone else, and never aspires to have them³², according to Gramsci, who coined the world 'Subaltern'.

Thus from the examination of the observation of the various post-colonial theorists and critics, one finds that although they have been aware of the ideological Eurocentricity and the institutional power of theory, they have not been able to find a way of posing that itself as a problem to be overcome. Perhaps in the academic space of the metropolis the question of cultural difference and hybridity is conflated with the question of post-colonial spaces or the decolonization of the mind.

Having examined the efforts of some of the Post-Colonial theorists, and their endeavour to encounter the Euro-centric discourse, one now needs to look at the rise of some of the genres in art and literature and their manifestation in various forms, which is significant in tracing a post-colonial encounter at the level of politics and culture. There has been an attempt to reconstruct the fractured identity of the subjects who underwent the "epistemic violence of the imperialist project",³³ through the creation of a "socio-cultural space" for articulation.

An emergence to create a socio-cultural space within the hegemonising discourse and institution has found expression in various ways in recent times. New social movements and the emergence of various suppressed ethnic and gendered groups have given birth to new art forms and has witnessed a reversal, of the Centre-periphery relationship as well as the individual's quest for an identity, in locating oneself within the genealogy.

New social movements are new, because marginalised groups articulate their claims through such movements against the dominant discourse. In contrast to 'old' essentialising discourse of identity in terms of race, caste, language, religion, etc., the 'new'

articulates an identity in terms of 'empowerment' against their marginalised position. Within the epistemic framework of dominant discourse a marginalised identity is appropriated by a universalisable criterion of justice. In contrast to this, a marginalised identity with its contextual claims articulated through specific social movement(s) carves out an autonomous ontology of its own that marks its self-empowerment. This is the ontology of a post-colonial identity situated in new social movements—inaugurating a fundamental indeterminacy to the relations of power, by suspending the basis of totalisation of identity into one 'whole'. Specific cases of new social movements and the emergence of marginalised and gendered groups could be traced in women's movements, Eco-feminism, the concept of feminist-Geography, and Negritude movement. Nadine Gordimer's fiction covers the period from the late 40s to the early 90s, and during this period she has acted as chronicler of events and their effects on the people who were caught up in them. She has searched ruthlessly for a viable moral standpoint for whites in South Africa. She has attempted to visualize possible alternatives to roles of the white both in the present oppressed South Africa and in a future liberated South Africa. Gordimer has specifically searched out a role for the white women of South Africa, who must change South Africa, their own country but whose ruling ideology they do not agree with.³⁴ Also a group of South African women are contesting some of the implications of the current terms 'Post-colonial', 'post-apartheid' and 'post-feminist' with prison narratives. Prison writing offers a model of literature responding strongly, with all the resources of one particular, limited human identity, thrown back upon itself, to a particular punitive expression of a given, State's power to curb dissent. Imprisonment can become a very inflexible cosmic metaphor, but it is also a term for a physical incarceration of the body which can be conjugated with some variety through different societies, history and geography. Therefore, women have felt the necessity to transgress and geo-political borders of countries and continents, set by the colonizers, to usher in the liberation of the oppressed subjects of the world. A feminist geography recognizes a transbordered geography which would allow for an Asian woman

or African woman to come together with her European counterpart.

Then there is the Negritude movement which sought to restore the distorted image of Africans and their countries, both politically and at the level of aesthetics. Therefore, post-colonial identities are constructed by their own self articulation and they are thus relieved of the dilemmas of being constructed by the 'Other'. These movements reverse the fixed Euro-centric relationship of Centre and periphery and the subjects at the periphery rise against the centre to decentre it. A new centre is formed at the periphery which 'writes back' to the centre. This is how the social movements create a 'space' for post-colonial encounter.

The areas of Art, painting and popular culture have also significantly contributed towards the creation of a 'space' for post-colonial encounter. The form and content of popular cultures have been based on an experience of domination and fractured identity and so, the thrust has been towards locating sights/sites of power. 'Third Theatres', street dramas are particularly popular in the Indian Subcontinent and political propogandas are also promoted through these to expose the rule in the emerging post-colonial countries. These forms reveal how the post-colonial experience has structured everyday life of the subjects.³⁵ Kajri Jain has shown how pictorial calendars form a ubiquitous part of the visual every day in urban India and how these calendars "in their capacity as subjects of exchange and as functional objects might provide a space for the co-existence in the presence of pre as well as Post-Colonial Cultural Practice."³⁶ Folk culture is based on an emerging consciousness regarding folk traditions, which must be reconstructed and presented to resist the vitiating culture propagated by Cable Televisions. Folklore of the emerging post-colonial countries is pregnant with descriptions of how the 'other' robbed the community of its rich tradition and culture and turned it rootless. The evolution of new genres of painting, cinema, art and folk culture in post-colonial countries has direct link with the choice ingredients for a 'national' history. It is a history that stands apart from the western history of colonisation and colonial legacies intricately enmeshed with nationalist impulses and moorings. Art

and popular culture of the erstwhile colonized countries is seen to have given birth to a dominant nationalist canon which always had to be positioned against the west whether the emphases be on points of observation or difference.

In the post-colonial scene with changed patterns of patronage, practice and profession, a set of radically altered ideas about 'art' and 'artist', tradition and 'progress' very clearly block the colonial phase of history—both in the perceptions of the artists and in those of later critics and art historians. The post-colonial scene not only brought into being a new social entity of artists, with a heightened self-awareness of individuality, identity and nationality; but also produced a special discursive and institutional space for 'art' in middle class society.

English language and literature, which bears the legacy of Imperialism and which is related to the Post-Colonial subjects, sense of displacement in terms of culture and power has created a great problem in the field of pedagogy. Gauri Vishwanathan in her book *Masks of Conquest*³⁷ has researched into the institution, practice and ideology of English studies introduced in India under British colonial rule. She draws on the Gramscian insight of the relations of culture and power and that cultural domination works by consent and precede conquest by force. Vishwanathan observes that 'power', operating concurrently at two clearly distinguishable levels, produces a situation where Gramsci writes, "the supremacy of a social group manifests itself in two ways, as 'domination' and as 'intellectual and moral leadership.'³⁸ Terry Eagleton comments on the transformation of literature from its ambivalent "original" state into an instrument of ideology:

... a vital instrument for the insertion of individual into the perceptual and symbolic forms of the dominant ideological formation. What is finally at stake is not literary texts but literature - the ideological significance of that process whereby certain historical texts are severed from their social formation defined as "literature", and bound and ranked together to constitute a series of "literary traditions and interrogated to yield a lot of ideological presupposed responses."³⁹

The hegemony of English language and literature in post-colonial societies is an extension of cultural imperialism. In some Indian Universities, there have been attempts to introduce 'Commonwealth literature' in the syllabi to allow for the study of literary work from post colonial countries but the rubric "Commonwealth literature" proved to be a homogenising term as Meenakshi Mukherjee observes in her essay in *The Lie of the Land*⁴⁰ lumping all non-British English literature together. Besides the experience of the subjects of all post-colonial countries is not identical and a study of the texts to other post-colonial countries will not be fruitful unless the "mutually interesting histories of those texts/world"⁴¹ and the Indian experience is made visible.

Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak observes⁴² that in spite of obvious difference, the predicament of the teaching of English literature in post-colonial India is similar to the situation in post-colonial Kenya.

Ngugi Wa Thiong'O writes:

Its (colonialism) most important area of domination was the mental universe of the colonized, the control through culture, of how people perceived themselves and their relationship to the world.

To come out of this state of 'colonial' through culture, Ngugi wrote in his native language Gikuyu to trace his cultural roots. The view of Papua New Guinea's writers are vitally important to note regarding the use of English language. John Kasaipwalova, whose writing was prominent in the first wave of Papua Nea Guinea literature considers the choice of English as political. He writes:

in the sense that this is what we've inherited, but this is not going to last . . . sooner or later. . . . we will be in schools learning Bahasa Indonesia, English is just the fact of predicament at the moment. . . .⁴⁴

Steven Winduo another young writer writes:

Writing in English is a political issue in the sense that I'm using that language to bring the other languages to that level also . . .

Thus in most cases English is either used out of choicelessness or out of a sense of cultural displacement. However, in either cases, the post-colonial countries are carrying the 'burden of English' as Spivak puts it. If this be the fact, that English novel has been born out of British Imperialism, then the syllabi of English departments in post-colonial countries are ever in dilemmas as to how the various English novels are to be taught, while the novels included in the syllabus actually celebrate the triumph of imperialism. The syllabus is meant to serve some purpose by way of rendering a perspective and Meenakshi Mukherjee has pointed this out very rightly in her essay 'Mapping the Territory. Framing a Course.'⁴⁶ What purpose does a novel like *Heart of darkness* serve as far as the course of English departments in post-colonial countries are concerned? Are the teachers able to impart the triumph of imperialism? Are the students able to identify themselves with the imperial experience? The answer is no and this forms the problem of pedagogy of English literature texts in post-colonial countries. To resolve this problem if the syllabus is made to include only texts of other post-colonial countries and the texts written in ones own country, the translation of which is available in English, the problem is, under what rubric should they be taught. Aijaz Ahmed has discussed the problem of categorising them under the little 'Third World Literature' while subscribing to the same and Meenakshi Mukherjee has rightly objected to the rubric 'Commonwealth literature'⁴⁷ which swells up the course, but is highly homogenising as it yokes together, the cultures of various countries which are not identical. Therefore, how is one to teach the non-canonical texts, the teaching of which can alone resolve the problem of pedagogy to some extent.

Therefore, in interrogating the 'post' in post-colonial one is able to confront the question of what it means and costs to be a post-colonial subject. If the 'post' signifies a deconstruction of the 'Centre' constituted in terms of Reason, one has to locate his subject position in relation to the deconstructed centre. Once one is able to locate oneself within the genealogy, one is able to create a 'socio-cultural space' for interrogating the currents of the dominant discourse. In this space, which is a 'post-colonial space',

one is able to articulate one's predicament of a post-colonial subjecthood. The articulation can either be in the form of an ordered language or in the form of 'silence'.

Several critics and theorists, who have their social-cultural roots in post-colonial countries, but who are writing from the metropolis have tried to theorize the post-colonial space. While they have been able to substantially interrogate the Euro-centric hegemony of culture and epistemology, they have not been able to come out of their own positional contradictions. They have been trying to project the fractured identity of the erstwhile colonized subjects, but in theorising their subject position, they are entering into the institutional power of theory of the First World intellectuals and in the process the "post-colonial spaces" are shattered and a decolonization of the mind overlooked.

Thus the post-colonial approach is not above limitations. It is giving rise to another centre of hegemony in the name of deconstructing the Euro-centric hegemony. However, the post-colonial approach seems to be the most suitable in terms of which one may locate oneself in relation to the hegemonic centre and identify a shared consciousness characterised by a fractured epistemology and an oppositional stance towards post and continuing experience of colonialism in the era of Neocolonialism. This approach alone allows for transgressing the geo-political boundaries and establishing a solidarity with neo-colonized subjects of the world. The post-colonial approach is most suitable in mapping a transbordered cultural geography of resistance.

After examining the 'post' in 'post-colonial', the critical position of a few representative critics and theoreticians, and the emergence of some genres in art and culture as a part of the post-colonial encounter, what one finds is that the post-colonial subject is not being liberated. Instead one is being caught within the colonial nexus of various forms of hegemony. Even post-colonial discourse is not focussing adequately on the question of recovery of the lost self of the fractured subjectivity. Therefore it would be interesting to study the process that goes into the construction of post-colonial subjecthood in following discussions. It is to be noted

however that the study would focus more on the individual woman because she is twice marginalised - firstly as a colonized subject, secondly as a victim of the patriarchal symbolic order within the post-colonial genealogy. However the discussion would begin with a general study of the construction of post-colonial subjecthood and then it would be particularised to the study of the construction of female subjecthood, drawing on textual evidences from the global post-colonial literary scene.

REFERENCES

1. Jacques, Derrida. 'An Interweaving of inside/outside, or dialectic of identity and difference in the same'. ['Post-colonial' is the dialectic of 'Post' and 'Colonial']. *Speech and phenomenon*, Evanston, North-Western University Press, p. 77).
2. Jacques, Derrida, (1982). *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. Alan Bass. Chicago, Chicago University Press, p. 210.
3. Jacques, Derrida. *Dissemination*, trans. Barbara Johnson, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. 210.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 210.
5. Bill, Ashcroft, Gareth, Griffiths and Helen, Tiffin, (1989). *The Empire Writes Back - Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literature*, Routledge, p. 2..
6. Anne, McClintock, (1987). "The Angel of Progress, Pitafall of the Term Post-Colonialism", *Social Text*, 31/32, pp. 84-98.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 84-98.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 84-98.
9. Stephen, Slemon. (1988). "Post-Colonial Allegory and the Transformation of History" *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, XXIII, 1, pp. 157-168.
10. Aijaz, Ahmed, (1987). "Jameson's Rhetoric of Otherness and the 'National Allegory'" *Social Text*, 17, pp. 3-25.
11. Homi K. Bhabha, (1983). "Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism" in the *Politics of Theory*. ed. Francis Berker, Colchester, p. 200.
12. Edward, Said. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Alfred A. Kropf), p. 273.
13. Kwame Anthony Appiah, (1991). "Is the Post-in Post-modernism the Post-in Post-Colonial?" *Critical Inquiry*, 17, p. 33.

14. Edward, Said, (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*, (New York: Alfred A. Kropf), p. 5.
15. Edward, Said, (1978). *Orientalism*, (New York: Vintage), p. 273.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 273
17. Edward, Said, (1983). "Secular Criticism", *The World, the Text and the Critic*, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press), pp. 24-25.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.
19. Frantz, Fanon, (1968). *The Wretched of the Earth*, Trans. Constance Farrington. New York: Grove Weidenfeld, p. 238.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 238.
21. Homi K., Bhabha. "Interrogating Identity"/CA Documents 6, p. 9.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
23. Aijaz, Ahmed, (1992), *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literature*, New York: Verso, p. 96.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-126.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-126.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-126.
27. Benita, Parry, (1987). "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse." *Oxford Literary Review*, pp. 1-2, 27-85.
28. Gayatri Chakraborty, Spivak. (1988). "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interepretation of Culture*, eds. Gary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (Urbana: University of Illinois Press), p. 271.
29. James C., Scott, (1990). *Domination and the Arts of Resistance - Hidden Transcripts*, Yale University Press, pp. 2-4.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 2-4.
31. Gayatri Chkraborty, Spivak. "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism, *Critical Inquiry*. Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 243-61.
32. Antonio, Gramsci, (1971). *The Prison Notebooks*, (New York: International Publications), p.55.
33. G.C., Spivak. "Can the Subaltern Speak?", pp. 283-287.
34. Kwame Anthony, Appiah, (1991). "Is the Post in Postmodernism the Post in Post-colonial?" *Critical Inquiry*, 17, pp. 336-357.
35. Henri, Lefebvre, (1991). *Critique of Everyday Life* Trans. John Moore, Verso, London, p. 97.
36. *Journal of Arts and Ideas*, Vol. 27-28, March 1995, pp. 57-83.

37. Gauri, Vishwanathan (1989). *Masks of Conquest Literary Study and British Rule in India*, USA, pp. 1-5.
38. Antonio. Gramsci, (1971). *The Prison Notebooks* (New York: International Publishers), p. 55.
39. Terry, Eagleton, (1976). *Criticism and Ideology* (London: New Left Books), p. 117.
40. Rajeswari, Sunder Rajan (ed.). (1992). *The Lie of the Land*, English Literary Studies in India, OUP, pp. 229-244.
41. *Ibid.*, pp. 246-259.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 246-259.
43. Ngugi, Wa Thiong'O, (1993). *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*, Portsmouth, Nlt: Heinemann, p. 128.
44. Kasipwalova, (1993). Interview with Gilian Gorle on 27.9.92 in the article 'Writing in English: Freedom or Frustration? Some Views from Papua New Guinea'. *Kunapipi*, Vol. 15, No.2, p. 128.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 130. Winduo's Conversation with Gilian Gorle on 22.10.92.
46. Rajeswari, Sunder Rajan (ed.), (1992). *The Lie of the Land: English Literary Studies in India*, OUP, pp. 229-244.
47. *Ibid.*, pp. 229-244