

Chapter-I: Introduction

Peter Carey's *Oscar and Lucinda* and Imperialism

This research attempts to explore the effect of imperialism in colonial Australia during nineteenth century presenting the noble view of Peter Carey through his postcolonial resistance inhibiting the Victorian canon, hijacking them for another possibility to construct the new history through the power struggle between periphery and centre. Carey attacks imperialism using the tool of imperialism itself. Writing the novel *Oscar and Lucinda*, a novel of persuasion holding firm belief, point of view not accepting the canon but altering it with other possibilities. To accomplish the goal of the possibilities Carey problematizes the Australian official history as the imperial version of history. Then, it encompasses various representation and ideas of centre-periphery relation.

Carey's *Oscar and Lucinda* denies the legitimacy of official version of Australian history. So, it not only unveils the falsity of the imperial history but initiates to seek the way to write Australia's secret history, which refers to the Aboriginal version of Australian history, including the history of their oppression by Whites. This unflattering aspect of Australian history was completely repressed by official historians until the 1970s.

In *Oscar and Lucinda*, Peter Carey makes the use of traditional devices of Victorian historical fiction combining fact and fiction, and historical characters and fictional ones. The action takes place in Australia and England, mostly during the 1860s, that is to say, during Victorian era, which is characterized by its canon. He chooses to inhibit the genre and to recreate the period. He spends most of the pages of the novel red hiring love story between Oscar and Lucinda and takes several elements from the Victorian novels including thematic preoccupation with orphans, inheritance

and gambling. His recreation can be realized when the unnamed narrator, the great grandson of Oscar retells his family history like a knowledgeable observer. A series of events was narrated by him to create illusion of reality, carefully managing the text, served to underscore its intended objectivity.

The novel apparently seems post-colonial as Carey, inhibiting the Victorian canon; wants to undermine and to deconstruct its basic assumptions that are Victorian beliefs are acted out to their logical conclusion in the novel and shown not to work. Carey adopting post-colonial strategy, writing back to the centre attacks English imperialist literature that naturalized imperialism. There might therefore seem to be good reason, in post-imperial age to get rid of it. Moreover, Carey has worked through the fiction against imperialism but some traces of it are adopted by him or he could not totally abandon western imperialism and decide which bits of it can be disconnected from dubious contexts and recycled for new purpose.

In some cases English literature and church of England seem not working for the services of imperialism but in 19th century Australian context injustice against aborigines is placed in a Christian context of guilt and vengeance. It is because ideologies can be extracted from structures, Christianity need to be considered along with a literary tradition as same of legitimate values. Despite, some passages *Oscar and Lucinda* seems undoubtedly condemning institutionalized Christianity in 19th century Australia.

But, the novel is not a mere attack on English discourse. On the extradiegetic level, it deconstructs three myths put forward by official Australian history: that of Australia as the lucky country that of the saintly missionaries comes to save the heathen blacks, and the intrepid and heroic explorer who opened up the country for settlement and civilization. Parallel to this undertaking, but on an intradiegetic level,

the protagonist, the grandson of Oscar also writes back to a personal centre. He rewrites his family history, his dreaming to borrow the aboriginal concept in order to refute the imperial version his overbearing mother had imposed on him, his siblings and her husband. The protagonist also briefly offers a space in his text to another monodiegetic narrator Kumbaingiri Billy who writes back to official Australian history by narrating bloody episode of Australian's secret history.

Carey was a part of generation of Australian writers who moved away from realism towards international models, by his own accounts. He was first influenced by William Faulkner's hybrid mixing of fable. Irony, satire and fantasy in his novels can now be seen as akin to post-colonial novelist such as G.G. Marquez, Salman Rushdie and Michael Ondaatje. Australian identity and historical context play a part in several of his literary works like *Oscar and Lucinda*, Carey's story telling created a world that dismantled a reader's assumption about time, reality, history and characters. Carey mixes freely historical and fictional characters and narrates the stories of different sectors places and castes, and time of the 19th century Australia in his novel *Oscar and Lucinda*.

Prestigious Booker prize winning novel *Oscar and Lucinda* (1988) is set in England and Australia in the nineteenth century concerning the issues of unexplored effect of British colonialism upon settler whites and aborigines by merging the historical with fictional, addressing contemporary Australian preoccupations by transforming the Victorian novel in other ways for another possibility. He plays with Victorian intertext by transforming the famous Victorian author George Eliot into characters in the novel; she was famous for flaunting social mores that imprisoned Victorian women.

Oscar and Lucinda deals with the Victorian era of full-blown empire: territorial expansion, occupation and colonial expedition inspired by reading the English people became well cooked in reading and interpretational. Mythic and narrative patterns such as quest for Promised Land or biblical river, gave to uncertain journey a direction and a path. During the period, Australia was suffering from lack of national heroes, this gap in national mythology was supposed to be fulfilled by the civilizing missionaries, as an agent of imperialism, Oscar was thought to be hero of that time who came to Australia carrying the mission to civilize and develop church across that desert. Moving from initial first person narrative into the third person omniscient narrative point of view, he was insight into thoughts, feelings, and motives of his main characters none of where he has ever met it draws attention to this functionality and highlights the fact that he is a construct, like the past he is constructing.

On the other side of the world, a kindred spirit also bucks against society's mores. Lucinda Leplastrier does not fit the model of an educated, middle class young Australian lady. Ostracized for their individualistic traits, Oscar and Lucinda meet through their passion for gambling, on a ship bound for Australia. A strange yet close relationship rows between these odd and enduring characters. Lucinda has dream of building a glass cathedral to send her ex-lover, the Rev. Dennis Haslet in his isolated native village. To prove his love for her, Oscar offers to take it. However, unable to resist a wager, Lucinda bets her fortune that he will not succeed.

Oscar's way to Australia is full of coincidences, distancing, ignorance, accidents and an amounting to blindness and it achieves nothing except his own destruction and a large amount of suffering to others. Oscar is seen in relation to two different social systems in Australia, the aboriginal and the settler society with whom

he interacts in different ways. Lucinda, like her mother is an ardent feminist, convinced that the liberation of women would come through the building of factories.

When Oscar meets Lucinda, for the first time he feels cherished by a woman, deeply in love with her Oscar, wants to make her happy by building a glass Church to be transported overland to a distance settlement. Ironically, their innocent but loving relationship becomes a scandal; the overland trip with glass church is soiled by cruelty and murder; and after being seduced a journey's end by the great-grandmother of the narrator, the disillusioned Oscar welcomes death.

Thus, Peter Carey in *Oscar and Lucinda* demonstrates the effect of British colonialism to settlers and aborigines in Victorian era in Australia, narrating the stories of the period mixing the fictive and historical events and characters of the of the contemporary period by presenting himself as atheist of the imperial myth, the Victorian canon resisting them for the arbitrary possibilities. He plays on them to attack the imperialism adopting the post colonial strategy writing back. Moreover, he advances himself in a post colonial rewriting of history and literature to encounter subversion and the breaking of imperial rules with complicit post colonial rules to transform the erstwhile colonial subject into new winner in the power struggle between periphery and centre.

Peter Carey's most critically acclaimed novel *Oscar and Lucinda* (1988) has won the Booker Prize and the Franklin award in 1988. As one of the most celebrated works of its author, it has been analyzed by many critics and reviewers. Branali Tahabildar compares this novel with Graham Swift's novel *Waterland* and in, "Glass and Water: Love and Sexuality", says Peter Carey and Gramham Swift use water imagery, Carey uses glass imagery to specifically reveal the nature of love between *Oscar and Lucinda* . . . (28).

K. H. Petersen judges the novel as a “Gambling on Reality”.

According to him, to call *Oscar and Lucinda* a historical novel set in nineteenth century seems harmless enough one looks in vain for battles or generals. During this periods Australia suffered from a lack of military heroes, because it suffered from a sad lack of wars (the one against Aborigines did not count), but this gap in the national mythology was filled by the explorers who gained heroic status in the public imagination and became the subject of hero worship.

Tuner Grame analyzes this novel as a means of “nationalizing the author” (166). According to him, “The history of media construction of Carey as a national celebrity, who writes novel for a living ,raises questions about the process of ‘nationalization’ writers may undergo as they are admitted to the Australian literary canon” (92).

Sue Ryan Fazilleau compares *Oscar and Lucinda* with Edmund Gosse’s novel *Father and Son* (1904), reads it under the title Bob’s Dreaming: Playing with Reader Expectation in Peter Carey’s *Oscar and Lucinda*. Before embarking on his tale, Carey recognizes his debt to Edmund Gosse, author of the autobiographical novel *Father and Son*, in his acknowledgement. This novel describes Gosse’s childhood in the 1850s and 1860s and the way he was brought up by his father, well-known zoologist and member of the Plymouth Brethren, group of fanatical evangelists. Carey thanks Edmund Gosse “from whose life I borrowed Plymouth Brethren, a Christmas Pudding and a father who was proud of never having read Shakespeare” (i). Philip Gosse was proud of never having read Shakespeare because he represents literature, with its allusions, metaphors, and allegories that all demand an effort of interpretation. The Plymouth Brethren preached literal reading and forbade critical interpretation of the

Bible. The narrator of *Father and Son* declares that his parents believed they infallibly divined God's will through prayer.

They had no doubt that the answers they received by this method of direct communication expressed God's will and not their own thoughts on the subject. They believed that only the Plymouth Brethren would be saved on Judgment Day and that everyone else, all those who did not have the privilege of being custodians of the truth, would be condemned for the unforgivable sin of misinterpretation.

None of the critics cited above views the novel *Oscar and Lucinda* as deconstructing the myth of imperialism. This researcher, hence, will study the significance of deconstructing the myth of imperialism in Carey's *Oscar and Lucinda*.

The novel is a converse of colonial discourse. Inhibiting in the Victorian canon it tries to deconstruct the nineteenth century's imperial and colonial enterprises of British Empire. It undermines the basic assumption of colonial text as literature is a means of service to imperialism. As a post-colonial text, it subverts the Victorian canon and its concept showing multiple possibilities within. So it is a breach of center/periphery relations.

Oscar and Lucinda was published in 1988, year of the Australian bicentenary of white occupation. It is itself a bicentennial monument to the white Christian cultural heritage, but it also contains a plea to keep aside a place in the national historical records where Aboriginal voices can erect their own monuments in honor of the shared Australian past. This novel is one step in the process of replacing Australian history with a multiplicity of Australian histories, each told by its owners and their descendents. Each of these histories does not necessarily suit everyone. Thus Carey contributes to accomplishing the task of post-colonial writers which, according to Hyden White, is "not simply to contest the message of history, which has so often

relegated individual post-colonial societies to footnotes to march of progress, but also . . . to reinscribe . . . the heterogeneity of historical representation” (*Post-colonial* 365).

Postcolonialism is a need in nation or groups which have been victims of imperialism and Britishers, like the Aborigines in many fields in Carey’s *Oscar and Lucinda*. According to Simon, the post-colonial desire of decolonized communities is for identity. Post-colonial literature is also inevitably implicated what Helen Tiffin calls it “affected by the imperial process” (Ashcroft et al., 2). Post colonialism as she says: “the need in nations or groups which have been victim of imperialism” (Tiffin 19), presenting the arguments that most post-colonial critics oppose the notion of Simon, she again says that the postcolonialism has its disposal various ways of subverting form within the dominant culture such as irony, allegory, and self reflexivity.

Chapter-II: Methodology

One of the most vexed areas of debate within the fields of Post-colonial theory has to do with the term post- colonial itself. The debate lies in two parts: debates about the post and debates about colonialism.

Colonialism comes under debate because the world is already predicated within a concept of imperialism a concept that is itself predicated within larger theories of global politics and which changes radically according to the specifics of those larger theories. According to Wolfgang Mommsen, the original meaning of imperialism was not the direct or indirect domination of colonial or dependent territories, whether in Europe or overseas. For Edward said on the otherhand, imperialism means the practice, the theory and the attitudes of dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory, colonialism is almost always a consequence of imperialism (in short imperialism for the ideological force and colonialism for the practice) whatever they actually mean by the term, post colonial theorists generally think of imperialism as constituting the larger political force that drives specific act of colonialism or colonization. One of the difficulties of defining colonialism is that it is difficult to distinguish it from imperialism. Frequently two terms are treated as synonymous. Both involve political and economic control over a dependent territory. Elleke Boehmer in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature* makes the distinction between imperialism and colonialism:

Imperialism can be taken to refer to the authority assumed by a state over another territory. Colonialism involves the consolidation of imperial power, and is manifested in the settlement of territory, the exploitation or development of resources, and the attempt to govern the indigenous inhabitants of occupied lands. (2)

According to Boehmer, imperialism draws attention to the ways that one country exercises power over another, whatever through settlement, direct or indirect mechanism of control. Colonialism on the other hand gives the sense of direct exploitation and domination over native people and their lands.

Colonialism is a broad concept that refers to the project of European political domination from the 16th to the 20th centuries that ended with the national liberation movements of the 1960s. Turning to the etymology, the term colony comes from the Latin word 'colonus' which means farmer. This root also reminds that the practice of colonialism usually involved the transfer of population to new territory, where new arrivals lived as permanent settlers while inventing political allegiance to their country of origin. Franz Fanon in his *The Wretched of the Earth* provides the similar view, "In the colonies, the foreigner coming from another country imposed his rule by means of guns and machines. In defiance of his successful transplantations in spite of his appropriation, the settler still remains a foreigner" (33). The mentioned remarks suggest that how a new settler or the foreigner dominates or colonize the people conducting his own rules and regulations forcefully over the native people, and the land owned by them.

This slippage in the concept of the colonial and its cognates becomes a problem when the post part of the post-colonial is brought into equation. According to some theorists, after sustained anti-colonial struggle finally brings about national independence a new kind of state formation comes into being. This new formulation is the post colonial state; states thought to be at least institutionally free of foreign control, and are possessing now a greater measure of political autonomy than it did under colonialism. Then, the one way traffic of imperial centre to colonial periphery is reformulated as a genuine circulation of people, so that members of various cultural

and national backgrounds, ethnicities, religious and language move more freely across international borders than they used to, in the process of developing new structures for group identification and collectivity

In spite of the continuation of political and economic domination of the empire, both post-colonial condition and nations/state are little different from each-other. As there occurred post colonial nations like Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, but on a crude scale that ranges from oppressor to oppressed within contemporary international relation, the political location of such nation may differ fundamentally, and this raises a question as to whether both kinds of ex-colonial states ought to be thought of equally as post colonial nations. Further, the term of nation and nationhood themselves are monolithic ones and they conceal important differences between constituent groups within the post colonial. For example, white settler Canadians may be differently located within post colonialism from the aboriginal of first Nation Canadians whose land they retain the question of land claims and native resistance is an enduring one, and many people in both communities consider Native Canadians to remain under a condition of political colonialism in their own postcolonial country. However, the term postcolonialism has to be seen as problematic at the beginning by the lack of consensus over how colonialism is structured within a concept of imperialism and by a lack of consensus on what it is that makes the term colonial meaningful, that is by a lack of consensus over what it might mean to be post of the colonial moment. If the colonial relations still prevail between and within modern nations, if the practices , theories and attitudes of dominating metropolitan centers, according to Said, remain in place after European colonialism has formally ended, then at some level contemporary 'post colonialism' however they are convinced, must take place within a structure of contemporary and

continuing imperial relations. For many theorists, this means that a critical practice that calls itself postcolonial must necessarily be confused in its political theory and compromised in its political aims. Here is how Anne McClintock puts the case:

The post-colonial . . . is haunted by the very figure of liner development that it sets out to dismantle. Metaphorically, the term 'post-colonialism' marks history as a series of stages along an epochal road from "the pre-colonial" to 'colonial' to 'post- colonial' an unbidden, if disavowed commitment to liner time and the idea of development . . . metaphorically poised on the border between the old and new, end and beginning, the term heralds the end of a world era but by evoking the very same trope of liner progress which animates that era If post-colonial theory has sought to challenge the grand march of western historicism and its encourage of binaries, the term post-colonialism nonetheless reorients the globe once more around a single binary opposition: colonial and post-colonial. (10-11)

A number of concepts from political to critical theory are run together under the name of post-colonial if not by individual post-colonial theorists, then at least within general field of post-colonial critical studies. They have their relation with other critical theories methodology, social object or political goals like; feminism history, race, gender and sexuality. Postcolonialism is an umbrella thrown up many heads against a great deal of rain, as well as confusing because of its relation with other critical theories.

One of the most salient features of postcolonial critical discussion is the ambiguity of debate over the extent to which any given post colonial theory or critical practices really opposed to colonialism. McClintock discusses how an unintended

‘colonialism’ crops up in critical postcolonialism. According to him, postcolonialism is intimately connected with the great progress myths that promulgated and sustained European empire building, and with the assumption about history, culture and human development that underpinned those myths. Observations of this kind about the unintended political consequences of a great many critical positions that take place under the post colonial umbrella are very common in contemporary critical debate. Vijay Mishra and Bob Hodge use the term “complicit post-colonialism” (11). To identify such compromised critical positions and social locations and, as discussed, the structure of disciplinary relations that produces such commentary comes about because the discipline of postcolonial studies houses so many different kinds of theoretical and critical work, and such a wide range of assumptions about what the terms of post colonial criticism actually mean. And so, theorists who consider themselves part of the field of postcolonial studies may understand themselves to be working towards a description of imperial or colonizing cultures and their literatures at different moments, for example, or towards a description of specific colonized or ‘post-colony’ cultures and their literature or description of specific minority groups and individuals variously located within and across colonial or postcolonial cultures or towards a description of what a comparative study of specific post-colonial conditions in specific locations should look like or towards a description of a global condition of post coloniality.

One of the principles for theorizing post-colonial text is the principle of reading for resistance. Such a practice is so ubiquitous in post colonial criticism as to make a general description of it impossible, but one of the most sustained engagements with the concept is advanced by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin in their influential *The Empire Writes Back*. They begin with the proposition that

“Language is a medium of power” (16), this means they argue, that post colonial literary language has to “seize the language of the imperial centre and replace it in a discourse fully adapted to the colonized place” (16). This, they suggest, happens first by an abrogation or refusal of normative standards of the imperial culture the standard of correct grammar, syntax and pronunciation and then by an appropriation of the colonized language appropriately adapted to the cultural and political ends of the colonized. They discuss many strategies by which they see this broad structure of literary existence taking place in postcolonial writing. For example; some time it involves the exorbitant rewriting of canonical literary text from the other side of colonial divide.

The attempt to find a common denominator in post-colonial literature is made by Helen Tiffin who claims that the “subversive anticolonialist . . . characteristic of post-colonial text” does not die in the construction or reconstruction of national cultural identify but rather in the reading and rewriting of the European historical records (95) one of the many ways postcolonial literature accomplishes this task, Tiffin maintains it through the use of what she calls, “canonical counter discourse a strategy where by a postcolonial writer takes up a character, characters or the basic assumption of British canonical text unveil its (colonialist) assumption subverted in the text for post colonial purpose” (97).

Tiffin sees this kind of literary revolution (97) in *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1996), by Jamaican born writer Jean Rhys. The novel is a post colonial response to Charlotte Bronte’s *Jane Eyre* (1847) that writes back to Bronte’s novel by, among other things, reinterpreting Bertha Mason, Rochester’s West Indian wife. Bronte portrayed Bertha, the descendent of white colonial settlers, as an insane, drunkard, violent and lascivious woman, who tricked Rochester into marriage and whom her husband must

keep locked in the attic for her own and everyone else's protection. In contrast, Rhys's novel depicts Bertha as a sane woman driven to violent behavior by Rochester's imperialist oppression. Rhys's narrative then unmasks the colonialist ideology in forming Bronte's narrative.

Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin have a theory of literary resistance that has to do with an inevitable hybridization within, and "continuity of Pre-occupations", between these cultures affected by the imperial process that is grounded in commonwealth studies strategy of collectivized literary intervention into the Anglo-centric English department Monologue (2). Since no text has been as influential as theirs in advancing the claim of common-wealth or postcolonial literary studies. To place at the table 'the empire writes back' itself has to be seen as the primary factor bringing about a disciplinary moment in which this specific part of its own argument is no longer as necessary as it once was, for the location of non-British, non-American literary writing in most departments of English has somewhat changed. Each of its three authors has subsequently refined his/her theory of postcolonial literary resistance in the published work. The question remains open, however, exactly how textural resistance ought to be theorized.

Colonial discourse analysis is a branch of postcolonial critical theory which challenges Euro-centric historicism and takes its cue from Michel Foucault's dismissal of a Marxist's theory of ideology in favor of a notion of discourse at heart, a notion that considers social subjects, social consciousness to be formed not through ideologies that have their base in economic or class relations but "through a form of power that circulates in and around the social fabric, framing social subjects through strategies of regulation and exclusion and constructing forms of knowledge which

make possible that which can be said and that which cannot” (29). The problem with Foucault is that it overlooks these processes of social formation.

The ur-text of colonial discourse analysis is Edward Said’s *Orientalism* which provides a foucauldian reading of those British and French scholarly treatises and fantastic projections onto the orient in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In *Orientalism* Said argues that although there indeed were and are peoples who actually live in a space Europe known as the orient, this space was in fact never anything other than an idea, a creation with no corresponding reality what brought that purely conceptual space into being, argues Said, is a European “style of thought based on ontological and epistemological distinction made between the orient and the occident Said’s name for that style of thought is Orientalism” (2).

Orientalism in short is a Foucauldian discourse that shows how such a discourse worked in a particular location and at a particular time. Said’s book made possible the critical idea that colonial relations in general might be interwoven with-produced by and productive of a colonial discourse that one could analyze through textuality.

Elleke Boehmer in his book *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature* writes: “Imperialism can be taken to refer to the authority assumed by a state over another territory authority expressed in pageantry and symbolism, as well as in military power” (2). It is better to define colonial and colonialist literature because here my concern is with postcolonial literature, which came into existence as reply to the colonialist literature.

Elleke Boehmer defines colonial literature in his introduction to the *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature* as: “a more general term which can be taken to mean writing concerned with colonial perceptions and experiences, written mainly by

metropolitans, but also by Creoles and indigenes, during colonial times” (2). Colonial literature includes literature written both in Britain as well as in the rest of the Empire during the colonial period. Colonial literature was written in colonial period, which is over. Now they do not capture land directly. That period invented a new type of literature, which is still continuing. So it is relevant to mention that type of literature that is known as colonialist literature. Boehmer says “Colonialist literature in contrast was that which was specifically concerned with colonial expansion. On the whole it was literature written by and for colonizing Europeans about no-Europeans lands dominated by them” (3). He further says colonialist literature embodies the imperialists’ point of view.

But postcolonial literature came after the classical empire ended. Classical empire means land colony by west in the late nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century. Boehmer defines Postcolonial literature as something “which critically scrutinizes the colonial relationship. It is writing that sets out in one way or another to resist colonialist perspectives” (3). He further says:

To give expression to colonized experience, postcolonial writers sought to undercut thematically and formally the discourses, which supported colonization—the myths of power, the race classification, the imagery of subordination. Post colonial literature, therefore, is deeply marked by experience of cultural exclusion and division under empire. Especially in its early stages it can also be a nationalist writing . . . postcoloniality is defined as that condition in which colonized peoples seek to take their place, forcibly or otherwise, as historical subjects. (3)

Empire is unique in each case. We cannot generalize it. Empire in Australia was different from empire in Africa, which was again different from India. In postcolonial

studies, native should be taken as a collective form referring to the indigenous inhabitants of colonized lands.

Writing has power. It is an act to get control over the object. This period is under the power of word. We see the textural battle over any subject. “Colonial settlement too was expressed textually. Writing in the form of treaties was used to claim territory. The text, a vehicle of imperial authority, symbolized and in some cases indeed performed the act of taking possession” (Boehmer 13). Writing served as an instrument of rule, as a means of collecting information and exercising power. Postcolonial literature made possible and created channels for the exchange of colonial images and ideals.

The resistance to imperial domination is through textual form. This mode of resistance does not demand weapons, which are expensive as well as of reach of poor third world. West is already powerful in war and weapon. “Indeed, interpretation of other people on the basis of a known symbolic system is something that is common to all cultures when they come into contact with one another” (14-15). Interpretation of other culture with the known western symbolic system is really a misleading. It is happening in each case when west tries to interpret non-west society, culture, values as well as social custom and symbol. Non-European cultures, values and norms are measured with European measuring units, which resulted in complete failure. The work of interpretation is done using the imported symbols. Ellake Boehmer says:

Nineteenth-century writers of empire, therefore, were heirs to long-established traditions symbolic interpretation. They, too, sought to interpret the obscure by using symbols exotic in signification and yet manageable, domestic able The aim was to legitimize colonial rule in an indigenous idiom. Through the medium of translation, so

gaining command over a variety of texts, British administrators hoped to undermine the native monopoly on legal knowledge, and together the information needed to impose their own authority. (18-19)

Having more knowledge means they supposed to have more control over the object. But this theory did not help them for all time. In first phase of their colony, they applied this theory and somehow became successful. But, later, their knowledge over the native did not work. Because the fact or nature of the native did not remain static but their knowledge about native remained static and unchangeable. Whatever they collected they supposed as universal.

Native people were killed, behaved badly, and forced to do hard labors, settlers set war against the savages. This example from *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature* is sufficient to show the condition of a native:

The 5 million inhabitants of lower and upper Peru at the time of conquest had declined to 300000 at the end of Eighteen century. Where there were 70,000 Native Americans in British Columbia in 1835, 20,000 remained in 1987 . . . European slave trade (1650-1850) as the populations of Europe and Asia more than doubled, the population of Africa remained static. (20)

The west thought itself superior and they perceived native people as lacking power, self-consciousness or ability to think and rule themselves. Natives those who could revolt against the settlers were killed and the only way to show their anger was to remain indifferent which most of the natives did. In Hindu religion this age can be compared with *Kaliyuga*, where all the established religious, cultures and customs are violated and a new one is imposed. Colonialist and colonialist writing differs in aim

as well as in number. Colonialist texts are in greater number and anti colonial texts are in few numbers.

British writer's realistic novels are of British imperial domination even if they were not directly written about imperialism, because in their novels rest of the world is overlooked. Non-west was assumed to be insignificant and secondary to the metropolis. "Important signifiers for imperial values were laid down in the novel's representation of space" (24-25). In their writing social ladder was represented geographically. "Colonies were also places of banishment of unlawful practices, oppression, and social disgrace, dark lands where worthy citizens might not wish to stray" (26).

This image gives western view of colonized land. In one way they show the hatred to the colonized land but simultaneously they are in favor of colonization. Many British novels are full of the description of the images of riches and trade. British were supposed to be the center of trade. Land that belongs to the sea is source of products like, silk, ivory and manpower (slaves). To Europe the empire is potentially a place of the rich and freedom. Colonialist books were written informing what was like to be abroad in the colonies.

It was in the nineteenth century that the economic supremacy and political authority of Britain became global. Britain, it was believed, had destiny and a duty to rule the world, or at least that one-quarter of the earth's surface over which the Europe extended.

According to Boehmer, the definition of imperialism itself has changed over time:

Some one hundred years before the partition of Africa, colonial policy in Asia was aggressive, ideological and, imbued with a sense national

and Christian mission; in another word it prefigured formal imperialism . . . throughout the nineteenth century, they argued, the official mind of imperialism was reactive and defensive, not formally expansive. (30)

The British national imagination too grows extravagantly imperial in its idioms and scope. Imperialism was not something that only took place aboard. It gave birth to the nationalist empire. It worked to consolidate imperial sentiment by popularizing empire in the press and in imperial societies.

There are several other things that remained unnoticed or ignored. There were evil motives under colonialist writings. Colonialist believed Christianity would secure the happiness, progress and set free to dark tribes. But their supposed mission was only their excuse for their colonial activity. They thought only the method “giving a European education in Indians because of the attendant benefits of encouraging “civilized” behavior and hence profitable trade among former “savages.” (36)

Prosperity, material improvements, treasure were the most desirable prizes of expansion. The empire had become a great obscure web of economic exchange and flow of goods and money. It was the profit motive that certified Britain at the center of world economy. Referring to Anthony Trollope, Boehmer writes:

Anthony Trollope showed himself to be a convince proponent of the creed that labor only can civilize. Where religion, philanthropy, and liberal ideas had failed, work on European lines was the only salvation for African people living in ‘idleness and dependence on the work of woman’. (38)

This shows how Europe tried to justify the empire. They wanted to prove empire as need of time and they were not encroaching the non Europe but going beyond it for

some purpose, cause behind their shoulder as if they had taken the tender of civilizing the native through Christianity. Christianity became an argument in favour of colonization. Natives worked all the time yet natives were stamped as lazy and idle. Colonizers only gave order to the natives they themselves never lifted their luggage themselves it was all black or natives who served white or Europeans. Colonization solved the problem of overpopulation in Europe. In fact, colonization converted beggars to the landlords. It added new list of need and desires among the British public. Colonization changed their food habits; they liked Indian spice and developed a taste for tea in middle class Europeans. Colonialist writes want to justify their need of colony, as quoted here:

A colonizers work, therefore, could be justified because it was imperial, which meant historically important, involving good government, Palladian-style expansionism and peace under the law. It was work that could, once again, be portrayed as selfless and serious and grand. (42)

But all these practices and colonialist efforts to justify colonialism are proved futile. Europe consulted non-European texts to comprehend the beyond. Europe colonized religion before starting out on their travel. Boehmer's concept about colonialist discourse is relevant to mention here:

Colonialist discourse can be taken to refer that collection of symbolic practices including textual codes and conventions and implied meanings Colonialist discourse, therefore, embraced a set of ideological approaches to expansion and foreign rule. Sometimes called Orientalist or Africanist, depending on the categories of representation involved, colonialist discourse thus constituted the

system of cognition-interpretative screens, glass churches-which Europe used to found and guarantee its colonial authority. (50)

Postcolonial theories of discourse are associated with the work of Michael Foucault and Louis Althusser concerning the involvement of textual practices in relation to power. Postcolonial literatures are eternally changing. Postcolonial writers neglected women and indigenous people at the beginning of independence. Writers have noticed postcolonial and structuralist critical theory meeting and mingling in late 20th century western academy.

Postcolonial indigenous writing is the quest for personal and cultural identity. Postcolonial indigenous writers believe that writing is an integral part of self-definition; through writing they reconstruct their self. Boehmer says “Postcolonial indigenous writers see themselves as till-colonized, always invaded, never free of a history of white occupation” (229). When indigenous writers talk about history, the history of colonized society also hovers in their mind. They emphasize the importance of their own spiritual traditions. Indigenous writers focus their energies on revising the language, narrative styles, and historical representations of the colonialist or invader. Their aim is not to replace white with black. Rather it is to accentuate hybridity: to write indigenous stories using so-called “white form” novel. Indigenous writers, “try to embrace the inevitability of their impurity at all levels” (*Boehmer* 230). Writing novels, for indigenous writer, is usually western form but domestic contents. Early post independent writers tended to identify with nationalist causes and to support the need for communal harmony.

Following the linguistic model, most of the poststructuralist critics, too, seem to give emphasis on textuality of the text. We can hear the echoes of the principals of a number of major theories of literature in Derrida’s ascertain that there is nothing

outside the text, nothing except the text. To alienate the text from the existential reality means to assign it the full power than the actuality itself. This simply means that language does not reflect a particular actual context. But language, however, is used to create a certain context as Edward Said believes that all reality is textual. Said asserting the power of the text, writes in *Crisis in Orientalism*, that, “people, places and experiences can always be described by a book so much so that the book (or text) acquires a greater authority, and use, even than the actuality it describes” (93). He further points out, “Such texts can create not only knowledge but also the very reality they appear to describe” (94). This is to say that language used to create text instead refers to itself rather than reflecting the context external to it.

The notion of textuality, as Said writes in *The World, the Text and the Critic*, is based on the assumption that text “does not take place anywhere or anytime in particular. It is produced by one at no time” (4). Said’s point, here, is that “Textuality has become the exact anti-thesis and displacement of what might be called history” (4). But going to this extent of alienating the text from space and time in order to assign the textness in a text poses the question of the text whether it is possible to create any text. In other words, text is produced by an agent and does take in a space and time. The only question is how far it can stand in its own terms without aligning itself with the actual historical context. Said, therefore has made an attempt to explore the worldliness of the text. He argues, “texts are worldly, to some degree they are events, and even when they appear to deny it, nevertheless, a part of social world, human life, and of course, the historical moments in which they are located and interpreted” (4). Here, Said endeavors to show “the connection between texts and the existential actualities of human life, politics, societies and events” (5).

His insistence is that “The realities of power authority as well as the resistance 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 the critics” (5).

Texts, according to Said, cannot be free from social and political sphere of an era. Different types of conflicts and contradictions, which are at play in the society, are the heart of the text in a contextualized form. Texts, thus, do to some extent; represents social realities, as ideology, according to Bakhtin School, is inseparable from language. Marxists show relation between literature and social practices. This type of approach leads to a radical contextualizing of literature, which eliminates the old divisions between literature and its background, text and its context. Either of the poles, on insisting on the total alienation of the text from any references and the other viewing the text as a social reference, does not seem to solve the riddle of the relationship between the text and its reference in determining the meaning of the text. A mid way suggestion, to solve this problem, would be to regard the text as a form of discourse where meanings become decipherable through communicative relations.

Said, criticizing the hermeneutic critics for their “undue emphasis on the limitless of interpretation”, views that any text is not merely a “network of colliding forces but also that a text is its being in the world; it, therefore, addresses anyone who reads it” (33). Although Said does not regard circumstantiality and referentiality as the sole determining factor for a text, he respects worldliness in a text. For him, a text is not a text, which fails to create its own context and solicit the world’s attention because “language is in and of the world” (38). If language for Said stands between man and vast indefiniteness, it must correspond to some sort of relationship between man and circumstantial reality. From this notion Said developed an idea for dealing

with the text as significant from in which “worldliness, circumstantiality as well as historical contingency are considered as being incorporated in the text and infrangible part of its capacity for conveying and producing meanings” (39). This means that a text has specific situation placing restraints upon the interpreter and his interpretation not because the situation is hidden within the text as mystery but rather the situation exists as the same level of surface particularly as the textual object itself.

But to regard text as a form of discourse is not to displace it from the center of interest. The text in this context becomes even more powerful because the language used to produce the text not only reflects the reality but it also creates text’s own reality by which it can achieve more power and authority over the reality itself. Such texts or discourse produce a tradition of knowledge “whose material presence, weight”, according to Said, “not the originality of a given author, is really responsible for the texts produced out of it” (*Orientalism* 94).

Postcolonial writers write to give expression to colonized experience. They write to destabilize the discourse, which supported colonialism directly or indirectly. It directed by the wish to express themselves. In these days we can experiences Empire textually, through newspapers, articles, novel or any other form of writing. In this sense, Empire is a textual exercise. Boehmer writes,

Colonial settlement too was expressed textually. Writing in the form of treaties was used to claim territory. The text, a vehicle of imperial authority, symbolized and in some cases indeed performed the act of taking possession . . . writing served also as an instrument of rule, as a means of collecting information and exercising power. (13)

After colony people experienced an intense need to create new worlds out of cold stories. The business of colony proved complete failure. The traditional method of

telling stories was oral one and it was followed by textual form because they cannot tackle the western weapons and economy.

English studies, cultural analysis, anthropology can be seen as affiliated with the empire and, in a manner of speaking, even contributing to its method for maintaining Western ascendancy over non-western natives.

In an introduction to *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory A Reader* Padmini Mongia writes:

It is a historical marker referring to the period after desalinization as well as term signifying changes in intellectual approaches, particularly those which have been influenced by post-structuralism and deconstruction. Secondly, in the last twenty years, the term has been deployed to replace what earlier went under the names of third world or common wealth; literature, to describe colonial discourse analysis, to detail the situations of migrant groups within first world stakes, and to specify oppositional reading practices. The problems surrounding issues of definition and the purview of postcolonial theory reflect the difficulties of engaging with such notions as representation, identity, agency, discourse and history. (2-3)

The postcolonial literatures are the product of interaction between imperial social and cultural and indigenous social and cultural practices.

Edward Said in introduction to his book *Culture and Imperialism* defines culture as “a concept that includes a refining and elevating element, each society’s reservoir of the best that has been known and thought” (xiii). Edward Said says, “Imperialism means thinking about, setting on, controlling land that you do not possess that is distant, that is lined on land owned by others” (5). Here, Said gives his

clear idea about imperialism; Imperialism includes all activities not only controlling the land even to think about controlling comes under this umbrella term.

Now English literature is not the sole property of the England or English people. It has become the common property of the world. Former colonized country got influence from colonizer but even colonizer also got some influence from colonized people, from native people or culture.

Previously non-Africans write about Africa but this is an attempt by African themselves to narrate the African approach. There are no mediators and the message comes directly from Africa to the world. There is no manipulations, no derivations, no changes we see Africa and its independence. For Whites and Europeans; the lesser number or subject peoples were to be ruled; science, learning, history emanated from the west” (26-27). Postcolonial writing is a written reply against written document of white people. It is a book about injustice done by imperialism.

Westerners may have physically left their old colonies in Africa and Asia, but they retained them not only as makers but as locals on the ideological map over which they continued to rule morally and intellectually Moreover, it focuses not on what was shared in the colonial experience, but on what must never be shared, namely the authority and rectitude that come with greater power and development. (27-28)

Colonial adverse effect remained even after freedom. After freedom, the expectations, which people cooked in their colonial period, were proved futile and useless. Even in some cases they found is completely hopeless and worse. Decolonization did not bring any change in their life style and living standard did not go up. In the name of freedom new elite class emerged replacing old settler ruler. They followed one to one

method of ruling from western ruler. They frequently came in touch with western getting suggestion in different ruling matters. “One began to hear and read how futile it was to support revolutions, how barbaric were the new regimes that came to power, how this is an extreme case decolonization had benefited world communism” (30). Said adds: “West is an enemy, a disease, an evil . . . in which the formerly silent native speaks and acts on territory taken back from the empire” (34-35). Now these writers can truly read the great colonial masterpieces, which not only misrepresented them but also assumed they were unable to read and respond directly to what had been written about them.

Writing about the evils of west to the non-west is just like the filing the case in international intellectual court. Standing the witness in the witness box with fact which was previously did not get chance to speak frankly and freely. Now to speak the truth about colony is a job just to state the fact without fear. Westerns think the time was such and it was compulsion for them. They say the argument is already over and want to deny the blame to them as colonizer. They want to justify their point. It is just reopening the case file, which is already buried by west in dusty storehouse. Said in his book cultural and imperialism says, “It is a kind of historical necessity by which colonial pressure created anti colonial resistance” (45). In fact, it is the colonial suppression, which gave birth to the strong anti-imperialist feeling.

After the Second World War people became more conscious about Nationalism and all that writings have some nationalistic deep feeling rooted message, which strengthen the colonized party to resist the colonization. Now different parts of the world gathered together and all the experiences, knowledge slowly knitting into one intellectual state, which will be the true bond of the entire colonized world. It has helped to widen the scope or the horizons of their imagination. “Europe and the

United States together were the center of the world, not simply by virtue of their political positions, but also because their literatures were the ours most worth studying” (54).

Now many part of the world is geographically free and through geographical control they controlled culture and history but now slowly geographical decolonization is leading to cultural and historical de-colonization; which is now ongoing. To dismantle is easy but to construct is very difficult and invites hard labor. Same kind of difficulty is now facing by ex-colonized countries.

Postcolonial studies sketch the interacting experience that links imperialists with the imperialized. The study of the relationship between culture and imperialism doesn't demand the chronological study it can be attempted through description. After world war second scholars, historians, activists have been in both for against the subject.

This is the age of colonialism as well as resistance to it. This age belongs to a period of theoretical elaboration, of the universalizing techniques of deconstruction and structuralism. Said says; “from the late eighteenth to the middle nineteenth century, when the cultural riches of India, China, Japan, Persia and Islam were firmly deposited at the heart of European culture” (234).

Here we can realize that the influence is two-ways. Not only Europe influenced the orient but also even Europe got influenced from Africa or the Orient. The culture, which Africa got from Europe and was supposed to be imposed to Africa was already influenced by Africa. In this sense Africa is getting its culture back from Europe. The difficulty, Africa facing, is because of the inequality between Africa and Europe in economic and cultural fronts. At present thinking about cultural exchange

involves thinking about domination and forcible appropriation. One side gains and another loses; one side is triumphant and another defeated.

Anti-colonial or anti-imperial activity, thought and revision has challenged the western empire. “Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam held the view the western culture could be helpful in ending colonialism” (236). Europe gave the colonies their modernity and argues about the well-being and the progress of Europe which is built up with the sweat and the dead bodies of Negroes, Arabs, Indians, and yellow races. In this aspect Europe is the creation of third world:

The west needed those territories to furnish Europe with manpower and resources for a war of little direct concern for Africans and Asians For the successful nationalist parties that led the struggle against the European powers, legitimacy and cultural primacy depend on their asserting an unbroken continuity leading to the first warriors who stood against the intrusive white man. (238)

It is the assertion and the commitment, which leads the natives to the success. It not something done and completed regular supervision and monitoring is must.

Edward Said in his famous book *Orientalism* writes, “ The orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences . . . Orient has helped to define Europe” (1). Said defines orientalism as “a way of coming to terms with the orient that is based on the Orient’s special place in European Western experience” (1). Western society got the Orient as the source of its civilizations and languages and its cultural competitor.

He further writes in his introduction to the *Orientalism*: “Anyone who teaches, writes about, or researchers the Orient-and this applies whether the person is an

anthropologist, sociologist, historian, or philologist- either in its specific or its general aspect, is and Orientalist, and what he or she does is Orientalism” (2). This broad aspect includes even that man who observes orient is also and Orientalist. In past times Orientalism discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the orient that means making statement about it, by teaching it, setting it, ruling over it. Orientalism studied as western style as a western style for dominating, reconstructing, and having authority over the orient.

Europe studied and their study was believed as unquestionable authority. “European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self” (3). Said in his introduction to *Orientalism* writes, “To speak of Orientalism is to speak mainly, of a British and French cultural enterprise, a project whose dimensions take in such disparate realms as the imagination itself, the whole of India” (4).

When we talk about the relationship between East and West it is not very good it is antagonistic and aggressive. Said says, “The relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degree of complex hegemony” (5). The Orient was Oriental not only because it was discovered to be oriental in all these ways considered commonplace by an average nineteenth-century European, but also because it could be that is, submitted to being-made oriental. Orient lost its prestige by the frequent misinterpretation of west. West created a myth.

Foucault’s theory of discourse owes to the theory of German philosopher Nietzsche. Nietzsche argued that all knowledge is an expression of the “will to power” and that we use language to suit our aim (Selden 100). He believes nobody can speak of “absolute truths”; that is all language activities are related to our will to power. Foucault developed a theory of discourse in relation to the power structures

operating in society. His main thesis is that discourse is involved in power. He views that discourses are rooted in social institutions and that social and political power operates through discourse. The discourse, therefore, is inseparable from power because discourse is the ordering force that governs every institution. This enables institutions to exercise power and dominate. Those who possess the authority to define discourse exclude others who are not in power.

M. H. Abrams in *Glossary of Literary Terms* writes:

Discourse has become the focal term among critics who oppose the deconstructive concept of a “general text” that functions independently of particular historical condition. Instead they conceive of discourse as social parlance, or language-in-use, and consider it to be both the product and manifestation not of a timeless linguistic system, but of particular social conditions, class-structures, and power relationships that alter in the course of history. (262)

Foucault believes we can never possess an objective knowledge of history, “because historical writings are always entangled in tropes” (102). Discourses are produced within a real world of power struggle. Discourse is used as a means to gain or, sometimes even to subvert power. For Foucault, discourse is a central human activity. He is interested in the process how discursive practices change over time.

The written discourse or the texts are meant to be addressed to the reader/critic. So, they are not meaningful until they are actualized and made present by the reader or critic. Text, being emanated from the author, is meant to be verbal message, which needs to be deciphered by the critic. This helps to formulate an opinion that to engage in an interpretation of a text is to take part in a dialogue with another. Bakhtin School, held similar opinion that, “every utterance is potentially the

site of a struggle: every word launched into social space implies a dialogue and therefore a contested interpretation” (75). In such a situation, it is impossible to establish a single authoritative meaning because language “is always contaminated, interleaved, opaquely colored by layers of semantic deposits resulting from the endless process of human struggle and interaction” (75). All interpretations become a power struggle.

Discourses, according to Foucault, are produced in which concepts of madness, criminality, and sexual abnormality and so on are defined in relation to sanity, justice and sexual normality. Such discursive formations massively determine and constrain the forms of knowledge, the types of normality and the nature of subjectivity, which prevail in a particular period. Foucault argues that the rules and procedures, which determine what is considered normal or rational, have the power to silence what they exclude. His main point, here, is that meaning of any discourse depends on who controls it. For example, the scientist who first claimed, ‘The earth revolves around the sun’ was punished and his truth was ignored because for the people who were in power had another version of truth: ‘sun revolves around the earth’. So truth can be proved wrong by power. People recognize particular piece of philosophy or scientific theory as true, only if it fits the description of truth laid down by the intellectual or political institution of the day, by members of ruling elite or the existing ideologues of knowledge. Every system of knowledge, we may say, establishes rules for exclusions and discriminations and it always implies taking sides. The discursive practices, however, have no universal validity but are historically dominant ways of controlling and preserving social relations of exploitation. Foucault’s interest is in historical dimension of discursive change. Systems of knowledge establish rules and procedures governing the particular epoch by exclusion

and regulation. Foucault regards the nature of discourse as an event in time since it is not only that which represents struggles or systems of domination, but the object through which and with which we struggle—the power we seek to possess. For him, as for Nietzsche, any attempt to produce and control discourse will be to power. Every instance of discourse embodies the power struggle, as Foucault himself argues, “discourse is a violence that we do to things” (60). Truth itself becomes not an unchanging universal essence but a perpetual object of appropriation and domination.

In “Truth and Power” Michael Foucault revisits the major theoretical trends and questions of his career. He is a thinker who knows no bounds of subject or field. His ideas stretch from literature to science, from psychology to labor. He deals in a currency that is accepted everywhere: truth and power. Foucault spends much of his career tracing the threads of truth and power as they intertwine with the history of human experience. He especially loves to study asylums and prisons because they are close to an encapsulated power structure. Using techniques gathered from psychology, politics, anthropology, sociology, and archaeology, Foucault presents a highly politicized analysis of the flow of power and power relations.

To speak of a post-colonial discourse in Foucault’s sense, is to invoke certain ways of thinking about language, about truth, about power and about the interrelationship between all three. Truth is what counts as true within the system of rules for a particular discourse; power is that which annexes, determines and verifies truth. Power is not only repression it is something positive:

In defining the effects of the power as repression, one adopts purely juridical conception of such power, one identifies power with a law which says no power is taken above all as carrying the force of a prohibition [. . .] what makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact

that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. (Adams 1139)

The basic problems for non-west is that power, as west, has exercised power is juridical and negative rather than as technical and positive. Foucault's ideas gravitate toward the ultra-highly complex and similarly politicized, leaving one to wonder what the real-world impact of his notions might be. The interviewers apparently shared this inquiry, and asked how all of Foucault's analysis of power relations could be used in life, and, specifically, what is the role of the intellectual? Foucault responds with a discussion of the intellectual, who he says has gravitated from a universal intellectual to as specific intellectual. Foucault sees scientists and scholars who remain cloistered in their field as specific intellectuals, and cites the writers of old as the universal intellectuals, "The intellectual par excellence used to be the writer: as a universal consciousness, a free subject, he was counterposed to the service of the State or Capital-technicians, magistrates, teachers" (1142).

Even writers have been co-opted in modern society by the structure of the regime the group that rules the society, including government and business. The society now looks to the University for its Knowledge because of the intersection of multiple fields of study. This has incorporated even written of genius and the elevation of the absolute savant. The absolute savant, "along with a handful of others, has at his disposal, whether in the service of the State or against it, powers which can either benefit or irrevocably destroy life" (1143). Writers who are sanctioned by a powerful structure now affect reality rather than simply tromping around in ideological terrain. It would seem that an intellectual could not be effective without

the support of some structure, but Foucault makes an argument for individual efficacy.

The structure is successful because it creates truth, and it is in this recognition that individuals can succeed. In this regard Foucault says:

The important thing here, I believe, is that truth isn't outside power, or lacking in power Truth isn't the reward of free spirits, the child of protracted solitude, nor the privilege of those who have succeeded in liberating themselves. Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it includes regular effects of power. (1144)

Each society creates a regime of truth according to its beliefs, values, and mores. Foucault identifies the creation of truth in contemporary western society with five traits: the centering of truth to economic and political forces, the diffusion and consumption of truth via societal apparatuses, the control of the distribution of truth by political and economic apparatuses and the fact that it is the issue of a whole political debate and social confrontation. Individuals would do well to recognize that ultimate truth. Truth is the construct of the political and economic forces that command the majority of the power within the societal web. There is no truly universal truth at all; therefore, the intellectual cannot convey universal truth. The intellectual must specialize, specify, so that he/she can be connected to one of the truth-generating apparatuses of the society. As Foucault explains it:

“Truth” is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements. “Truth” is linked in a circular relation with systems of powers

which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it. A “regime” of truth. (1145)

Because of this, Foucault sees the political problems of intellectuals not in terms of science and ideology, but in terms of truth and power. The question of how to deal with and determine truth is at the base of political and social strife.

Chapter III: Textual Analysis

Deconstructing Myth of Imperialism in *Oscar and Lucinda*

Oscar and Lucinda as a fictional construct scrutinizes to abandon western culture looking it critically how is naturalize imperialism and decide which part of it can be disconnected from dubious context and recycled its requisites for new purpose. Carey focuses on the colonial period of Australian history. The action takes places in Australia and England. Mostly, during the 1860s in Victorian era, when the colony was a liminal presence awareness: where progressives went to try out their new ideas far from the stultifying social atmosphere of mother country.

Carey chooses to recreate the period and to inhibit the canonical genre that characterized it. He adopts the classical post-colonial strategy writing back to the centre not, incidentally, back in the sense of 'for' the 'centre', but 'back' in the sense of 'against' the assumption of the 'centre' to a prior claim to legitimacy and power. He deconstructs three myths put forward by official history: that of Australia the lucky country that of the saintly missionary comes to save the heathen blacks, and that of the heroic explorer who opened up the country for settlement and civilization. The narrator of *Oscar and Lucinda* sets out to rewrite his family history because he is unsatisfied with the oppressive version of history:

These bishops were, for the most part bishops of Grafton. Once, there was She would not tell the bishops that my great-grandfather's dog collar an act of rebellion. They would look at Victorian clergy man. They would see ramrod back, the tight lips, the pointed nose, the long stretched neck and never once, you can set, guess that this was caused by Oscar Hopkins holding his breath trying to stay still fro two minutes(1)

The narrator makes it clear that his mother has imposed it on the whole family during his childhood. He calls this version of story was used to embarrass and her family which tells Oscar was a stereotypical Victorian clergy man but he doubts on the legitimacy of the history and declares to the untrue. He describes the church Gleniffer and forwards his father's view about church and mother that his father did not like church very much and his mother's habit. He writes "my father did not get drunk, but one, after drinks, my two beers, he told me that my mother walked around the perimeter of St John's like a dog pissing around the fence" (3). The father of narrator goes to St. John's for praying but he gets inside him something bad, something traumatic feeling that he spoke out, oh, Christ, said. Jesus, Joseph and fucking Mary, (5). That made narrator's mother upset. Carey, here, shows repressed and suppressed feeling of people which results negative impact that we can see in narrators father who is representative of the past in the novel. It's simply and illustration of the fact that official histories are sometime not be believed. The narrator's aim is to set the record straight, apparently not so much on his detail of local history. He is going to contradict the imperialistic maternal version of history that reduced the rest of the family to silence.

The imperial version of history is under attack in the novel. The history is under attack in the novel. The history as progress is firmly dismissed at the very beginning of the novel by the two parallel chapters "The Advent Wreath" set in the 1930s and 'Christmas Pudding' set on Christmas day 1856. The former is update of the later only in term of material culture: it is concerned with fuse wire instead of Christmas pudding, but otherwise the essence of the scenes is the same: they exemplify great sins, which to most of us seem ridiculous (eating Christmas pudding and swearing), and the terror and retribution (beating or praying). In fact, in the

chapter named “Christian Stories”, Carey goes a step further and suggests that a definite progression has taken place: he outlines the firm and fundamental belief of narrators family, which are no different from those of Oscars’ father and he adds we had none of the doubt the 1860s (75). Darwin obviously has less impact on narrator’s mother than he did on Oscar’s father, who at least struggled with the ideas. Oscar also uses science to reinforce his religious beliefs. When a friend told Oscar that he had seen an angel, Oscar did not believe him, ‘but when he saw that the sign was the mathematical symbol for “therefore it follows”, he changed his mind (9).

Carey transforms the Victorian novels in other ways in *Oscar and Lucinda*. He plays with the Victorian intertext by transforming the famous Victorian author Mary Ann Evans into a character in his novel. Evans was famous for flaunting the social mores that imprisoned Victorian women. However this anti-conformism did not spillover into her fiction where her heroines, although they may have chafed under the social constraints that reduced them to playing infantile roles, generally, had to submit to their fate. In *Oscar and Lucinda*, Lucinda’s mother, Elizabeth Leplastrier, is a personal friend of Mary Ann Evans and used to belong to the circle that met around and George Lewes Elizabeth, an intellectual and a feminist, comes to Australia with a aim of putting into practice her theory that women would find social and economic emancipation in factory work. Even though, she allows herself to be side-tracked from this aim, she does raise daughter according to the anti-conformist principle of Evans groups. In a letter to her mentor, she laments that Lucinda, the result of this type of modern creation, simply does not fit in the backward colony and states that her real place is at home in England. She implies that Lucinda is the perfect product of Evans’ own progressive theories. Ironically, when Lucinda does finally make the trip home

and meets her mother's friend, the latter dislikes this colonial product of her own teachings.

Even George Eliot . . . was sued to young ladies who lowered their eyes in difference to her own. Lucinda did not do so. The two woman looked eyes and George Eliot mentions . . . “a quite peculiar tendency to stare.” It may well have been this, not her bits and pieces accent, her interest in trade, her lack of conventional skills, her sometimes blunt opinions, or her unlady like way of blowing her nose-like a walrus, said George Eliot- that made her seem so alien. (204)

This is subversion of the image of the canonical Victorian writer. The contemporary Australian reader feels doubly smug: about her own politically correct attitude on the issue of woman's rights and about the implicit moral superiority of Australian heroine over the British icon. But, the smugness is punctured later in the narrative when Carey's subversion spills out of classical post-colonial bounds and challenges the conventional reading practices.

The direct reversal of the imperial story is reserved of the interaction of white society with the aborigines and the land, and this is exemplified by the expedition made by Jeffris. Through this depiction, Carey deconstructs the colonial myths of the heroic and adventures explorer who braves all sorts of danger to advance the cause of civilization Jeffris' aim is to make himself a name by cartography:

Mr. Jeffris had put names to several largish creeks. He had set the heights of many mountains His party found the Bellingens River at a place where Narcoo man judged they would do the least amount to damage. This was at Urunga, a wounded place in any case. In those days, it was called Bellingen Heads (479).

By imposing new names on the places that already have aboriginal names and writing up his exploits in a journal that he hopes, will become part of Australian history. He hacks his way through the landscapes and the Aborigines with stunning brutality and then later writes his Aboriginal Victorians into silence by using the consecrated imperialist language of his time: They are reduced to “treacherous knaves” who have to be “dispatched” (472).

The narrator of *Oscar and Lucinda* acknowledges this injustice by offering a space in his narrative to a descendant of the victims and allowing him to tell his people’s version of that particular history. The narrator’s version of his family history may have turned out to be as exclusive and negative as his mother’s version was for the rest of the family, but it offers a narrative space to and co-exist peacefully with another version that the Aboriginal victims. Thus, Carey makes a space in his story for Australian’s.

The narrator introduces the Aboriginal version of Jeffris’ expedition by quoting his oral sources:

When I was ten, Kumbaingiri Beilly told the story of “how Jesus came to Bellingen long time age” He must have heard it when he was very young and now I think about it seems probably that its course is not amongst the Kumbaingiri but Narcoo blacks whom Mr Jeffris conscripted at Kempsey to guide the party, on the last leg of its journey. But perhaps it is not once story anyway. The assertion that “our people had not seen white people before” suggests a date earlier than 1866 and more complex parentage than I am able to trace. (467)

Nevertheless, he inserts it directly into his narrative as we realize it, when he handovers his authority and narrative space to homodiegetic narrator. Carey lifts the

issues of second world colonialism and presents, church and industry of imperial enterprise. It is ludicrous because of their marginalized position in settler's society.

In *Oscar and Lucinda*, the protagonists Oscar and Lucinda are both victim and destroyer and colonizer and colonized themselves. Oscar represents misguided England missionary who comes to Australia with the well intention but arrogant aim of imposing his Christian stories on this alien place that is already full of Aboriginal stories, he is too deaf to hear. He is a pawn in Bishop Dancer's power game, and Lucinda is a woman of her own, conducting herself according to the feminist ethos of her mother, Admirable though that ethos is, it is derived from and directed at British society:

My daughter lives in a fairy world I have made for her, and they would not tolerate her in open society in New South Wales where they hate woman like us with a passion you would not believe without see their resentful little eyes. It would chill you, Mariam . . . we must return home. (88)

As a result, Lucinda suffers agonies from what she calls the voodoo, man in a group on a street corner of a hall. Both, she and Oscar are obviously victims of themselves, as they both sound Victorian Model and from the point of view of Aborigines, they appear representative of church and industry with all the forces of destruction which those institution work upon them.

Their destroyer aspect is part of the Aborigine's version of the story which Carey has successfully built into the book. In the father's rewriting of the Mother's story, Oral Aboriginal sources supply vital details. For example: murder of Jeffries by Oscar which were inaccessible to settler inquires, but Carey is not careful to appropriate Aboriginal culture and he lets the story flow and its sources disappear into

different levels of narratives. The glass Church gliding down the river is watched closely by Aborigines who already know potential destruction. They had been introduced to glass. They saw it was “the white man’s dreaming” and they learned:

There was an accident. One of the boxes fell straight away the white fellows opened up this box It was glass. Up until the time they had not seen glass. There was glass windows down in Kempsey and port Macquarie, but these fellows had not been to those places. They saw the glass was sharp. This was the first thing they noticed that it cuts .Cuts trees. Cuts the skin of the tribes. (77)

So, the glass church combines in its construct in and purpose, the two driving forces behind the Empire, Christianity and manufacturing industry to justify murder and conquest.

Carey criticizes the misbehavior and crudity as well as hypocrisy but the target of the criticism is seen as typical Victorian features: rigid sexual morality, religious hypocrisy, smugness, prudery, intolerance, a high pressure to conform. We weep for and rage against the treatment meted out to Oscar and Lucinda. In fact, the novel includes most of the feature of the history and textually opposing oral to written formulations but does so by inhibiting the absences or the oppositional positions in the imperial textual records. History is also made from the edge of the society. It is not only of planned transfer of mid-Victorian society’s vision itself. It is not difficult to locate the gasp, coincident, misunderstanding and accidents, which propel the story forward. The religious spectrum of mid-Victorian society is carefully outline from the evangelical movements of Rachabits and Plymouth Brethren, through high, broad, and low faction of the Church of England to Puseyism and Anglo Catholicism. The exploitation and mismanagement of Church are main butts of the satire in the novel.

Oscar is carefully situated in this spectrum moving from the extreme fringe of the Plymouth Brethren into the Church of England without shedding his extreme fundamentalist belief.

Carey presents Oscar as a creative character who wants to strongly condemn the uncreative work of thinking that life should be passed at, slow and meaningless manner. Oscar revolts against tyranny of his father who wants to make him pure Anglican by pouring false statements. Theophilus has warned him not to test the pudding but Oscar tested it that made his father angry. Theophilus acted as if his son were poisoned. He brought him to the scullery and made him drink salt water. Oscar gaged and struggled. His father's eyes were wild. Oscar's struggle does not work, he is compelled to drink salt water until he vomits, then only his father throws the remained of pudding into the fire, " Oscar had never been hit before. He could not bear it. His father made speech. Oscar did not believe it. His father said the pudding was the fruit of Satan" (12).

Carrey's treatment of the false instruction makes Oscar revolutionary. Oscar believes those things, which are scientifically proved. He begins to doubt everything after the taste of pudding which was called the fruit of Satan but it was not so. After having it his father made him fool by forcing him to drink salt water he vomited the falsity of Anglican religion. The narrator presents the periodic scene by describing. The way of Oscar's praying:

The boy was standing at a kink in the path at the top of the combe with two spilling, brimming buckets hanging from the ends of his long pale wrist. He was praying that his papa would not die He had a pain pushing down his thigh, in his calf too. It pulsed in his left buttock and left testicle. (20-21)

Through this exaggeration and his mocking to Anglican Church and Oscar, Carey drops irony to the religion and nineteenth century Priest way of teaching, throughout the novel *Oscar and Lucinda*, Oscar is driven to the point of near paralysis by his conflicting view about religion. His hopscotch-like board with various symbols, “ a structure for divining the true will of God” (31), dictates that he must live in an Anglican household, creating a foreseeable rift with his father, a Minister of Plymouth Brethren. As Oscar sees it, God continues to step in and determine his fate in the form of other equally random means of assertion. One flip of a coin tells him to go to New South Wales and other to take a job “at Lucinda’s glasswork” (338). Yet he feels the presence of God so strongly in his life:

Our whole faith is a wager, Miss Leplastrier. We bet-it is all in Pascal and very wise it is too We bet there a God we bet our life on it. We calculate the odds, the return, that we shall sit with the saints in Paradise. Our anxiety about our bet will make us before dawn in a cold sweet we are out of bed and on our keys, even in the midst of winter. And God sees us, and sees us suffer. (262)

Oscar consciously commits sinful acts: he gambles obsessively and has pre-marital sex. Understandably, Oscar’s inability to stop gambling is the source of much anxiety and neurosis throughout the novel, for both himself and his friends.

For anonymous narrator, God and the past seem to serve the same purpose; that is, Oscar’s crisis is only crucial in its role in the narrator’s lineage. Carey goes on describing other necessary aspects of Oscar and Lucinda’s meeting. ‘The carrying of a prayer book, the propulsion of the compulsive from a doorway, and the ventilation system of a ship-elements which, like the novel’s title, are meant to mislead the reader into thinking that Oscar and Lucinda are the narrator’s grandmother is not in

fact Lucinda as he announces: "I love Lucinda Leplastrier" (508), but copulates with Miriam:

It had been three in the morning. He had come out to draw more water and had found her there, in her Chinese-gown. His penis was a hard rod against the softness of her stomach. He felt Satan take his soul like an overripe peach with a yielding stalk . He nuzzled her long white neck. He touched and broke away, touched and broke away, moaned and begged his God's forgiveness while the clock in the kitchen struck the hour. (136)

He does all these things first and begs for God's forgiveness, sometimes he thinks that "there is no God" (438), shortly before he disappears into the water forever in attempting to float downriver the glass church he and Lucinda have built.

The Church as one of the authorities of the imperialism represents the white man's dreaming. The service to the church and its member causes great harm to the Aborigines, Carey tactfully passes the narration to account for the violence befall upon them Carey lets both narrators speak partly. For example the destiny of Aborigines caused by church and Jeffris' massacre of Aborigines is narrated by Kumbaigiri but the extradiegetic narrator does not presume to appropriate it himself by retelling it as part of his-story: it belongs to Aborigine and is told by their decedents, not by a white historian.

The extradiegetic narrator resumes his textual acknowledges the territorial rights of the Aborigines to the place where Oscar kills Jeffris by pointing out that, although, the whites calls it Bellingien Heads, its real name is Urunga the narrator once more surrenders the floor to Kumbaigiri Billy in chapter 104, "Marry Magdalene". He reveals that the woman, who was being raped all day in the tavern at

Bellinghen Heads / Urunga was Kumbaingiri's aunt. In a mixture of reported speech and free indirect discourse we learn that it was this person who showed them how to go about transporting their church to boat Harbour and where to get the necessary equipment. Ironically, it is thus an aboriginal who takes over from the white explorer and makes the realization of Oscar's imperialist undertaking possible:

‘Kumbaingiri Billy was not in that tavern or any other tavern ever. But the woman on the other side of the torn curtain was his father's sister and she had been abducted by cedar cutters about a years before that time and was as reduced had miserable as any human might ever be. Kumbaingiri's father's sister was about twenty years old. She said the tavern was quiet when Oscar made his speech. She said he had a face that torn and peeling link the trunks of the paper barks which grow in swampy land around the Bellingens. She saw great unhappiness, he reckoned, was most likely her own. (495)

Kumbaingiri Billy tells in his own word, quoted by the narrator end of his aunt's story through voice of her descendent, it is the Aboriginal victim who describes how Oscar converted her to Christianity with his stories. She believes, he is a good man and dose not seem to resent him having imposed on her a Christian have that denied the value of her Aboriginal culture and identity, it is her descendent who points out, to the narrator, Oscar's imperialist attitude: “It was damn silly name for a Kumbaingiri and if you want my opinion, Bob, it was an ignorant to talk us Kooris in that way” (496). Whites have always assumed the right to rename the other. It is about the time the other was accorded the same right. As Kumbaingiri gives the narrator nick name calling him “Bob” whether this is his real name or perhaps in the same vein as the nickname most white gives him: “come –and-get it Billy” (474). However, the

extradiegetic narrator implicitly gives his real of approval by choosing to leave it in his narrative. The homodiegetic story of Kumbaingiri Billy comes to be a breach of the dominant narrative code of omniscience.

Carey, here, makes the narrator respect the aboriginal version of that episode of his-story which overlaps their-story, a respect he does not show for any other version. In this way the narrator sets himself apart from the imperialist approach to history, including his mother's version. This brings us back to the very first chapter of the novel, where he mentions the unreliability of official versions of history with reference to "Darkwood" (2) and the way a white massacre of Aborigines was written out of the Historical Society's account. At the time of 1970s, this appeared to be just an illustration, but it has turned out to be more than that. It clarifies the whole points of the novel, that its inclusion in the whole narrative is source of legitimacy of post-colonial rewriting of history.

By taking the reference of Aborigines and Christianity, Carey plates injustice against Aborigines in Christian context of guilt and vengeance. Elizabeth, Lucinda's mother, fearing that has been implicated in "something terribly wrong" (89) and Lucinda wants to rid of "the great guilty weight of her inheritance" (457), fortune acquired from the blood of the blacks'. Postmodernist uncertainties do not operate within the novel where aborigines are concerned. There is no space for other, equally valid ways of telling the story of their death and dispossession. Oscar tells the explorer Jeffries who kills aborigines who get in his way, that if that were his country, he would be feared to see his coming and pray to god to forgive him.

Oscar's vengeance is recounted in biblical terms: "He prayed: Oh God, give me the means to smite the enemy" (487), and, an axe being to hand, he uses it. Percy Smith, a gentle, kind Christian who begins the assault with a tomahawk, is confident

that in the circumstances god will forgive their violence. “We have killed an evil man It has done me a power of god, I can’t tell you” (494). The narrator here wants to clarify that for Christian it allows anyone who does not follow the same religion of they neglect the behavior of them that is a false and cruel act of colonizers. Not only Percy Smith but also Oscar himself killed the aboriginal women whom the cedar cutters abducted and raped.

These all events and incidents prove that there was extreme and double exploitation upon aborigines, by white settlers and Britishers during the period of colonization of Australian. But the situation of Kumbaingiri, Black aborigines and white settler tribes was worse:

The old camp consisted of seven weatherboard huts, built in a row. They were constructed after the style of the so-called ‘shelter sheds’ which are still the feature of school playgrounds around Australia. They were black places, each with a single ‘room’, a single door, three steps, and one window. In these huts the surviving members of the Kumbaingiri tribe, lived and died. (474)

Carey has portrayed such a picture of the colonial Australia. He reconstructs the history of Australia and miserable condition of Australian aborigines. The novel concerns the British colonization of Australia and destruction of the aborigines. Oscar’s way to Australia is full of coincidences, misunderstandings, ignorance, accidents and an innocence amounting to blindness, and it achieved nothing except his own destruction and a large amount of suffering to others, particularly the Aborigines.

Chapter-IV: Conclusion

The novel *Oscar and Lucinda* gives the vivid details of new possibilities: the emergence of new culture and history after rejecting west-made culture and history which naturalizes imperialism. The criticism of imperialism and its elements is executed to justify as they are outdated. It is a part of Peter Carey's project to call attention to and resist this historical and cultural situation. He does so mainly by reimagining or recreating a version of Australia that compels the reader's attention, makes them agree that the centre of literature is language and language dwells in the world at large. Hence, Carey works to dismantle the centre/periphery opposition of imperial culture.

Carey chooses to inhibit the Victorian canon and borrows several elements to work through it. Then, he successfully works out with two protagonists as typical Victorian presenting them loveable and likeable. They are portrayed so because in the nascent level imperialism lies within them. Relating them to the colonial history of Australia, he creates double standard that they are victimized and victim as well as colonized and colonial themselves. Then, Oscar and Lucinda are seen in relation to two different systems in Australia, the Aboriginal and settler society and they interacts them in different ways. Oscar's was of Australia is a full of misunderstandings ignorance accidents, and an amount of blindness who achieves nothing except his own destruction a large amount of suffering to others especially Aborigines of Australia.

The issues are mixed at the level of personal history, already hinting at a degree of complexity which will force the imperial colonial linear version to diversify. The narrator of the novel gets completely unsatisfied with his mother's

oppressive version of family history and at the same time national history with new and noble ideas of his imagination fetching some historical fact of the past to present.

Oscar and Lucinda seems to be signaling the need for move a ways from the imperial enterprises: they were used in Victorian times as instruments for oppression, and were constructed Imperialism within Oscar and Lucinda. These are actually based on ideologies of the western culture. Carey does not show the total rejection of 'the Brit thing' but drops irony upon them.

Carey makes mockery on powerful Anglican Church which by the end of the novel turned to be the glass church clearly becomes the symbol of both love and sin. Fusing the dual nature of glass church with the exploiting nature of colonialism/imperialism shows the destruction of Aborigines while delivering it in Bellingen River.

The novel is an account of colonial past of Australia, Carey through the description the old country carries over the meaning from the imperial myth, ascription of dimensionality of history of post-colonial Australia.

It shows the process of replacing Australian history with a multiplicity of Australian histories each told by its owners and their decedents. These stories do not suit everyone but at least, Aboriginal voices can raise their own monuments in honor of the shared Australian past.

Carey contributes to the task of post-colonial writer, compromisingly working on the message of history which once was exclusive for the post-colonial society. He, tactfully, puts him in the spectrum of historical representation it is necessary because there was still colonization as the Aborigines were facing double colonization. Carey, here, to avoid the risk of naturalized imperialism/colonialism and to from their own

identity, let's the settlers and Aborigines tell their stories shifting the narration from their own decedents to capture in the history which are based on the facts.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. USA: Harcourt Brace, 6th Ed. Bangalore: Prism Books, 1993.
- Ashcroft, Bill. Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. Eds. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Postcolonial Literature*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 202.
- . *The postcolonial Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. New York: OUP, 1995.
- Carey, Peter. *Oscar and Lucinda*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1988.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1968.
- Foucault, Michael. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. Vol.1. New York: Vintage, 1980.
- . "Truth and Power." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1992: 1135-45.
- Gosse, Edmund. *Father and Son*. London: Penguin Books, 1996.
- Graeme, Turner. "Nationalizing the Author." *Australian Literary Studies* 16.2 (1991): 91-96.
- Hutcheon, Linda. "Circling the Dawbspout of Empire." *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashorft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Jach, Antoni. "An Interview with Peter Carey" *Mattoid* 31.2 (1988): 24-36.
- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the*

- Colonial Context*. New York: Routledge. (1995): 10-11.
- Mishra, Vijaya and Bob Hodge. "What is Post (-) colonialism?" *Textual Practice* 5.3 (Dec. 1991): 407.
- Mongia, Padmini. ed. *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory A Reader*. New Delhi, 1997.
- Petersen, K. H. "Gambling on Reality." *Australian Literary Studies* 15 (1991): 107-16.
- - - . "Interview with Peter Carey." *Morning Hobart*, 19 March 1986.
- Ruth, Brown. "English Heritage and Australian Culture." *Australian Literary Society* 17.2 (Oct. 95): 133-34.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf, 1993.
- - - . *Orientalism*. England: Penguin, 1995.
- - - . *The Word the Text, and the Critic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Satre, Jean Paul. Preface. *The Wretched of the Earth*. By Frantz Fanon. New York: Grove Weidenfield, 1968. 7-31.
- Selden, Ramen. *A Readers Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*.
- Spivak, Gayatri. *Postcolonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*, ed. Sarah Harasym. New York: Routledge, 1993. 62-63.
- Tahbildar, Bernali. "Glass and Water: Love and Sexuality in Oscar and Lucida and Waterland." *English* 97.2 (1997): 27.
- Tiffin, Helen. *Post-Colonial Literature and Counter-Discourse*, *Kunnappi* 9.3 (1987): 18.
- Wachtel, Eleanor. "We Can Really Make Ourselves Up: An Interview with Peter Carey." *Australian and New Zealand Studies in Canada* 9.2

(1993): 103-5.

White, Hayden. "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." Eds.

Hazard Adam. *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Florida: University Press
of Florida, 1986.