

Chapter I: Introduction

Achebe and his Criticism on Colonialism

Chinua Achebe (b.1930-) is one of the most celebrated Nigerian novelists and critics who attacks on a lingering colonialism in the criticism of African literature. His “Colonialist Criticism” is critical of the failure of European criticism to understand African literature on its own original terms. Chinua Achebe attacks the sense of superiority complex as found in colonialist criticism. For it, he uses the different context of events related to his literary life. A western critic Albert Schweitzer’s *Immortal Dictum* also regards “Africans as the junior brother and Europeans as big brother” (qtd. in Achebe 1195). Chinua Achebe in his “Colonialist criticism” says, “Colonialist critics regard themselves as big brother and they see the African writer as a some what Unfinished European who, with patient guidance will grow up one day and write like early other European” (qtd.in Achebe 1196). Here, Achebe opposes strongly, the sense of Europeans regarding themselves as a senior brother and Africans as junior brother.

Chinua Achebe as an African literary person does not tolerate any kind of bitter criticism of colonialist critic to make inferior to Africa and African literature. He says colonialist critic always try to dominate the capacity of Africans. A literary journalist of Britain, named, Honor Tracy criticized *Things Fall Apart* bitterly which was written in 1958 by Chinua Achebe. Tracy says “These bright negro barristers who talk so glibly about African culture, how would they like to return so wearing raffia skirts? How would novelist Achebe likes to go back to the mindless times of his grandfather instead of

holding the modern job he has in broadcasting in Lagos?” (qtd. Achebe 195). Her criticism reveals, that Honor Tracy miss-valued the forefathers of the Africans.

Achebe does not like the word ‘mindless’ used by Honor Tracy. In “Colonialist Criticism” Chinua Achebe shows the criticism of Robert Gardiner who says “Colonialist might be inappropriate for two reasons; firstly it is associated with the various aspects with various brand demagogic outmoded rhetoric” (qtd.in Achebe 192). Robert Gardiner expresses that the colonialist trend is inappropriate for various things with outmoded things. Another critic Robert Tracy says, “People’s tendency implying that we must take the responsibility of problems and we must resist the temptation to blame others” (qtd.in Achebe 192). Robert Tracy’s analysis makes us clear that blaming only the Africans is not the right way of solution and Colonialists’ critic must take the responsibility of the problems caused by dominating the Africans. Robert Tracy adds, “Colonialist might be inappropriate for second reason, secondly, what the colonialism had done in past is sufficient repudiation on it from the commonwealth conference has rejected what the imperialism had done in the past. And to oppose the colonialism’s past work is to establish a new relationship of equality between peoples who were once slave and masters” (qtd in Achebe 192). The criticism shows, the present history of common wealth conference tries to balance or establish the equality between the common wealth and western literature. There is equality between these literatures.

Chinua Achebe also revolts against the so-called European critic’s unscientific evaluation towards Africans and African literature. The crude, unbiased, unnatural and hegemonic evaluation towards his novels is completely wrong. In “Colonialist Criticism”, Achebe strongly attacks the British administration as well. He says “British

administration enabled women to make their long journey to farm or market without armed guard secure from the menace of the hostile neighbors. The peaceful Nigerian village with harmony was dismantled after the presence of colonial rule i.e. British administration” (qtd.in Achebe192). This criticism resembles the view clearly, that British administration has been totally failed to protect women, and colonialists destroyed the peaceful environment of Nigeria. The colonialist critics pretend to say that they are more capable than African writers to understand Africa. How do the colonialists minimize the African writers and their contributions? In response Chinua Achebe states the matter in his novel, *A Man of the People* published in 1966. In this regard, a wife of diplomat of Lagos, who was Achebe’s fan before criticized him by saying, “This is great disservice to Nigeria, She also added that she loves so much Nigeria that, Achebe’s criticism towards corruption of Nigeria ignored all the brave efforts it was making left her aghast” (qtd in Achebe 1196). Her criticism states that native literary figures do not understand Africa, rather the colonialist know Africa and African people. Colonialists love Africa more than the Africans love. Such unnatural evaluation has no basis. Chinua Achebe satirizes against African writers too because they also called colonialist critics as ‘big brother’. So, Achebe calls, “African writer as the ‘Unfinished Europeans’ with patient guidance, who will grow and write like every other Europeans” (qtd in Achebe1196). Achebe’s criticism reflects the idea, those African writers also are unfinished Europeans who regard Europeans as senior writer.

Chinua Achebe revolts against the so-called European critic’s unscientific evaluation toward Africans and African literature. The crude, unbiased, unnatural and hegemonic evaluation towards his novels is totally wrong. It can be understood, that the

native novelist of Nigeria and the African themselves are deceived. Chinua Achebe strongly opposes baseless and crude claim of colonialists. The criticism clarifies, when the nationalist African writers try to make people aware about dirty politics, corruption and political disorder, the colonialist critics try to admonish them and say, such writers are not in the favor of progress of Africa. Some African writers somehow, express their feelings without understanding Africa. Achebe states, some of the African writers write out of African experience. These writers always serve the colonialists. Moreover, Achebe says, the colonialists think their language as superior than the language of the Africans. A western critic, A.D. Hope of Australia, said that, “Danish language have more happy writers today than African languages because they and their readers understand one another and knew precisely what a word meant when it was used.” (qtd in Achebe 1196). A. D. Hope’s criticism makes us clear that colonialist critics are trying to show their unnecessary and so-called proud in terms of their language. They regard not only themselves superior than Africans in terms of the culture and literature but in language as well. Achebe says, colonialist critics think, African writers are not mature to know the real problem and condition of Africa. In this context a critic named Manning Clark told him “It’s not the time for African writers to write about people in general but just Africans” (qtd.in Achebe 1193). Clark’s hegemonic criticism makes us clear about the colonialist critics are jealous towards the African writer. If the African writers will represent the inner feelings of Africans and African content, it would be great danger for colonialist. Thus, to regard themselves as superior, they minimize literary persons of Africa.

Achebe's theoretical point involves his rejection of universalism, represented by critical statements which generalize the particularity out of African literature. Achebe portrays the bitter reality in the nature of things. The work of a western writer is automatically informed by the universality. Others must try to achieve such universality. Achebe says, African fictions must be concerned with issues and themes of universalism. Universalism must be banned from the African literature until the time; people connect it with the European supremacy and European literature. Most of the African writers write without understanding African experience and of commitment to an African destiny.

Achebe gives a criticism of a Canadian novelist and critic named Margaret Laurence, who says, "African writers are interpreting their world making it neither idyllic as the views of some nationalists would have had it nor barbaric as the missionaries and European administrators wished and needed to believe need to believe" (qtd. in Achebe 1197). Margaret's criticism makes us clear that western world is making it neither idyllic nor barbaric there are people in the world who have no need for desire to change anything. Achebe sees European critics as perpetuating a colonialist attitude which African writers according to him must be earnest. Most of the native writers who wrote about African characters, whether they were made savages servants or facing impending destruction. Achebe thinks an African writer must be a person who has some kind of conception of society in which he is living and the way he wants the society to go. Both Africans and Americans have own vision. And they are equally important .The colonialist critic is not willing to accept the validity of sensibilities other than his own. Colonialist critics have written lengthy articles to prove its non-western existence largely on the

grounds that the novel is peculiarly western genre, a fact which would interest us, if our ambition was to write western genres and novels.

Literature for Achebe is a function of society; he puts literature in service for the need to alter specific things in specific places. In Chinua Achebe's view, all literatures are important whether they are African or European. Achebe says "We are not Americans, Americans have their visions; we have ours we do not claim that ours is superior; or we only ask to keep it. To levy a charge of the underdevelopment against African writers today may prove as misguided and uninformed as a similar dismissal of African art by visitors" (qtd. in Achebe 1198). From Achebe's statement, it can be understood clearly that all writers (African, European) have equal existence and values. But, Colonialist critics try to justify their ideology of regarding themselves as superiors. This type of unscientific and false evaluation towards Africa and African literature has made Chinua Achebe, sad and critical towards them. Chinua Achebe requests them to understand the African culture society in its original terms. But they disregard and minimize African novels and African literary contribution.

Concluding this overall context, it can be said that Chinua Achebe is critical towards the colonialist criticism because, the overall evaluation of colonialist towards African literature is totally false. They do not understand Africa yet; they continue to disregard Africa and African literary world.

Non-western Resistance

The term resistance means revolution or refusal, or dissatisfaction. The *Oxford Dictionary* says that resistance means "refusal to comply" (700). According to this terminology, resistance is a kind of rejection. The term non-western does not refer the

anti-western. It means not the antonym of the western. Non-western refers to the 'orient' as Edward Said says, orient refers to the previous colonies of the European countries. He states, "The orient is not only adjacent to Europe it is also the place of Europe's greatest and richest and oldest colonies, the source of its civilizations and language, its cultural contestant and one of the others" (2). Said's definition makes us clear that, non-western means not only the adjacent to Europe, it's also the former colony of Europe.

Non-western resistance means the refusal or the revolution of non-westerners against the domination of westerners. While the west hegemony takes place, the issue of non-western resistance comes automatically. And we can say the Westerners try to dominate the non-westerners in terms of culture, civilization, etc. But, Samuel Huntington states in his book *The clash of civilizations*, both culturally and civilizational the westerners try to dominate the easterners. But, the easterners are not like that, to endure the brutality of westerners. Nevertheless, they resist against the so-called civilization of the westerners. He says, "Non-western societies are resisting against the western cultural dominance the non-westerners emphasizing their own culture and argue that they are succeeding because either civilization is different from the west. It is the rejection of westernization and declaration of cultural independence from the west" (50).

Huntington's criticism weaves a concept, the society of non-western is trying to resist gradually against the cultural dominance and hegemony of the west. While the westerners dominate the orient in terms of language, culture and civilization, the orient does not endure so-called hegemony of the westerners. As a result the people of non-

western world try to revolt against it. Easterners resist against the so-called Westerners by claiming that Easterners are equally or more capable than westerners as Said says “Orient or Eastern civilization, culture has the equal values as the values of western civilization culture” (51). Edward Said’s criticism helps to promote the civilizational and economical condition of non-west. Said says, “Orient is better grasped as a set of constraint upon and limitations of thought. Than it is simply as a positive doctrine” (42). Said’s notion also states that, orient is also a better held notion than the limitations of thought and it is a strong belief as well. From the comment of Edward Said we can know, the orient has more civilized, forward and powerful notions and values, than that of occident. Therefore, we can say, the easterners also have the strong belief, civilization, culture, and notion than the occidental culture and civilization which can lead the whole world.

Edward Said in his essay “Resistance, Opposition and Representation” says, “Imperialism consolidated the mixture of the cultures, and identities on a global sale. But its worst and most paradoxical gift was to allow people to believe that they were only mainly exclusively white or black or western or oriental” (qtd.in Said 98). His criticism makes us clear, the imperialism combines different cultures in one, which is its worst aspect, that it brought the concept of binaries like occident- orient, western,-non western which is ultimately inappropriate. Edward Said’s concept helps to prove that non-western resistance is against the binarism brought by the westerners. Furthermore non-western resistance opposes the views of binaries.

Summing up this context, we can say that the non-western critics’ views refer the meaning of non-western resistance. Resistance is a concept developed in the geography of east in post-colonial era that all are equal. There is not the concept of any kind of

binarism. Non- western cultures are also as equally important as western or more than western culture. Non- westerners are not fragile anymore than that of the westerners. As Huntington says, “Economic success is largely a product of Asian culture which is superior to the west .West is socially and culturally decadent” (107). Huntington’s criticism reflects the idea that, the non-westerners can challenge to westerners in terms of culture and economy. Western economy and culture is decreasing while non- western culture is promoting. Therefore, the cultural hegemony of west can not do anything. Here, we can identify the non -western resistance through which, orient also has the power to struggle against occident if necessary.

Non -western resistance means a kind of revolution against western civilization and culture. Samuel Huntington expresses, “Non -westerners are resisting in- terms of the civilization” (6). His statement clarifies that non western resistance refers to a kind of revolution in- terms of the hegemonic attitudes of the civilization of west.

The non westerners are discriminated in- terms of the binaries. Edward Said says in his book, *Orientalism*, the westerners think themselves as rational, kind, educated, rich etc. They think non-westerners, as bestial, uneducated, irrational, cruel, poor, etc. Such kind of binaries created a ditch between the west and non -west. As a result the resistance took place in the mind of the non-westerners. Non-western resistance refers a revolution in the mind of the Africans, Asians or South Americans while the westerners tried to dominate in their culture, language in terms of binaries. Non-westerners live with an idea that they are marginalized by the westerners which seem to be intense disappointment for their identity. The writings of the non-western critics explore the harsh scenario of colonial rule projecting with bitter reality and they oppose strictly against it.

Chapter II: Non-western Resistance in Postcolonial Theory

Postcoloniality

The literary term postcoloniality means the resistance of the colonial aspects or the colonialism. Postcolonial writers like V.S. Naipaul, Leela Gandhi, Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, Ania Loomba, Samuel P. Huntington, etc, write about the opposition of the colonial aspects. In the non- western world, the previous colonizers had suppressed, dominated brutally to the culture and civilization of the non -west. As a result, after the colonial era the trend of resisting to the colonialism began through writings.

The western critics say that the postcolonial writers write the self-contradictory language, which is not logical in any respect. In this context a western critic, named, Simon Gikandi argues that, “Caribbean writers are concerned with a subject that is shifting and that often self- contradictory identity because they lack identity” (qtd. in Diana 186). Here Gikandi’s criticism makes us clear that the non-western writers cannot write because they have no identity, but on the other hand, the non-western critics directly reject the attitude of westerners. Non-western critic Ania Loomba resists against the western hegemony. She says, “Postcolonial scholars are well positioned to trace contemporary global inequities in the often confusing landscape of contemporary economics, politics and culture” (227). Here, Loomba’s criticism weaves the idea, that the postcolonial critics also have the equal existence in terms of culture, politics and

economics. In this context, a postcolonial critic, Young Said, in the content of Africa states, “The colonial state absorbed the ideology of domination of the central Rwandan state, codified, and rationalized it. It is not justifiable” (qtd. in Loomba 164). Here, Said’s criticism tells us clear that the western hegemony has badly suffered to the colonized African country Ruanda, this is injustice.

In the postcolonial era the non -western critics have analyzed the refusal of colonized people against the White supremacy or colonial supremacy, in this context a western critic, Balfour says, “Non- west is irrational child like, brutal, bestial” (qtd. in Edward Said 31). Here, Balfour’s view towards the non- west clearly shows the superiority of the west. As Homi K. Babha states that, “There is not any kind of binary opposition between the colonizer and the colonized both are bought of in a complex reciprocity and colonial subjects can negotiate the crisis of dominant discourse in variety of the ways” (qtd. in Loomba 247). Here Homi K.Babha’s criticism weaves the vision against the westerner’s concept of binarism. Babha says that there is not any kind of binary system between the colonizer and the colonized people. He says that they have equal existence. He resists the notion of colonizer’s supremacy. Bhava wants the equal self-respect of the previous colonizers and colonized people for he resists against the vision of Balfour. Frederick Cooper says, “Western hegemony denies any other kind of life of the people resisting. Resistance is a concept that may narrow our understanding of African history than expand it” (qtd. in Loomba 203). Here, his criticism reflects that, the process of resisting is not right, it does not give authority to orient rather it makes narrow, to know orient and Africa. Therefore, resisting is worthless.

At last, it can be said that post coloniality includes the subjects of resistance of the

orient against the western hegemonic values, and cultures etc. Thus; Postcoloniality includes the literary term, which resists against the suppression, hegemony and oppression of the colonial rule.

Non -Western Resistance in Postcoloniality

As we already discussed, the postcoloniality is the resistance of the colonial aspect. From 19th century up to mid 20th century, many Asian and African countries were colonized. In addition, the intellectuals and people of non- west were against the colonial rule. This colonial rule of European compelled to the African and Asian to revolt against the colonial policy. Then the trend of non- western resistance ascended. Different scholars, critics and intellectuals of non-west challenged to the westerners in terms of culture and civilization. In that context Samuel P. Huntington says, “Fundamental changes are also occurring in the balances of power among civilizations, and the Power of the west decline. As the west’s relative to that of other primacy erodes, much of its power defocused on a regional basis among several, major civilizations and their core states” (82). Here, Huntington’s criticism reveals the west’s civilization and culture is being powerless, and fragile. As a result, the previous colonial power is losing its power gradually. Huntington seems to be opposing the colonial aspects and colonial power. Critic Samuel Huntington brings a concept of a western critic who says that west has strong power from which it controls non- west. In this context he says, “West nations have hard power which is the power to command resting and on economic and military strength” (qtd. in Said 79). His criticism makes us clear that even now the west has power to command and control the non-west. However, Samuel Huntington ignores strictly to his logic. Samuel Huntington describes the baseless economic structure of the west or

previous colonizer countries. Moreover, he shows the positive aspects of the non-western countries. He states, “Non-western people are becoming educated, but western countries are losing their single economic and authority” (83). This shows, the westerners are losing their previous power in the postcolonial era. To promote the non-western and to oppose the western is also non-western resistance.

John Miller, a western critic, says the west is powerful now and it will dominate the whole world even in the 21st century. He states, “The west is overwhelmingly dominating now and will remain with leading position, in terms of power and influence well in the 21st century” (qtd. in Huntington 82). His expressed ideas make us realize that the western civilization and culture will remain in first position up to 10th decades or up to at least 100 years. However, Samuel Huntington secretly disagrees with John Miller and he says the intellectuals and scholars of the non-western resist to the colonial aspect, through schooling fragile. In that context Samuel Huntington states,

Western power in the form of European colonialism in the 19th century and American hegemony in the 20th century extended the western culture throughout much of the contemporary world. Previous European colonialism does not exist American hegemony is receding. The erosion of the western culture follows, as indigenous. Historically rooted more languages, beliefs and institutions resist themselves. (91)

Huntington’s criticism makes us clear that the European colonialism has lost its power in the cultural aspect in the postcolonial period. American power is also decreasing and the historical significance of the west is decreasing. Here, Huntington places himself on that side from which he gradually attacks over the European colonialism through the eyes of the

orient.

Samuel P. Huntington says the power struggle between the non-west and west has provided a lot of benefit to non-west. European colonialism is gradually losing its power. He states, “ As west power declines, the ability of the west to imposed western concept of human rights liberalism also declines; as a result non western civilization gets power” (92). Huntington’s concept ensures that while European colonialism is losing its strength, then its definition of human right, democracy also becomes ineffective, as a result, the colonial aspects become fragile. As a non-western critic Huntington shows in every step that the European colonization is losing power and the non-west is becoming powerful. This concept of Huntington identifies himself as a non -western critic. He opposes the cultures and values of the westerners. He revolts against the civilization of West. Overall, he resists the colonial aspects through the eyes of culture. On the other hand, Ania Loomba stands against the Western hegemony. She says, “Postcolonial scholars are well positioned to trace contemporary global inequities in the often confusing landscape of contemporary economics, politics and culture” (227). She portrays that the post colonial critics also have the equal existence in terms of culture, politics and economics.

The colonialism has suppressed the orient from centuries ago. Moreover, in latest phase, after Second World War U.S. has dominated. In this context, Edward Said says, “From the beginning of nineteenth century until the end of world war II. America has dominated the orient and approaches it as France and Britain once did” (4). Said’s evaluation explains that the Westerners are continuing to dominate orient one by one. The countries that dominate the orient have changed but the domination and suppression is continuing. First, the westerners claim that the hegemony and dominance gives the non -

west, a kind of stability. As Denus Hay says, “It is hegemony of west or rather the result of cultural hegemony at work that gives oriental’s the durability and the strength” (qtd. in Said 7). Here Denus Hay’s concepts try to portray the hegemonic reality of west. West allows dominating the orient for the stability and durability. However, Edward said strongly resists to the idea of Denus. He says the trend of hegemony is very wrong.

The Westerners are dominating the Orient. Edward Said says, “Balfour produces no evidence that Egyptians and the races with which we deal appreciate or even understand the good that is being done them by colonial occupation” (33). Here, Edward Said revolts against the colonialist claim that the colonialism stables non-west and helps to understand the colonialism.

Edward Said clarifies that the westerners or the colonialists or colonial aspects pretend to know Egypt. But in reality they do not know the races and ethnic societies that belong to Egypt. They do not know the orient even superficially. The Europeans think themselves as superior and the orient as inferior. In this context Sir Alfred says,

The European is a close reasoned, his statements of facts are devoid of any ambiguity. He is a natural logician, albeit he is by nature truth of any proposition. His trained intelligence works like a piece of mechanism. The mind of the oriental on the other hand like his picturesque streets, is eminently wanting in symmetry. His realizing is of the most slipshod description (qtd. in Said 38).

Here Alfred Lyell’s evaluation of two aspects show the colonialism always evaluates the orient and west in terms of the superiority and inferiority. However, the non-western critic strongly argues against the so-called unequal injustice evaluation of Alfred Lyell.

Edward Said says, “The colonialists have the short sight; they do not know the orient and its uniqueness. They can only show their hegemonic attitude even to the intellectual of the orient” (40). Said’s criticism makes us clear west’s looking does nothing to the easterners. Although the westerners look orient, from the eyes of the binarism their aspects is wrong and their vision is baseless. Edward said writes in his book *orientalism* the binaristic looking aspects of westerners towards the non-west. He states that the words used by Balfour (a western critic) who says that “The oriental is irrational deprived, Child like different, other, cruel, spiritual strange” (qtd. in Edward Said 40). Balfour’s notion seems like to minimize the values of the orient by using the mean word-tags, upon the identity of the west.

Edward Said says, “The way of enlivening the relationship was everywhere to stress the fact that the oriental lived in a different but thoroughly organized world of his own world with its own national cultural and epistemological boundaries and principles of internal coherence” (40). Said weaves the strong resistance against the binaristic views of westerners. He says that the oriental has the separate identity, separate national culture and epistemological boundaries, as well as the principles, which can not be affected throughout the so-called binaristic eyes of west. The former colonialists try to show their colonial work justifiable. Colonialists try to show their colonial works justifiable and right. In this regard a western critic Elie kedourie says, “Non- western nationalism is especially a condemnable a negative reaction to a demonstrated cultural and social inferiority” (qtd in Said 98). His views certainly clarify that the non-westerners’ so-called nationalism cannot provide any kind of new vision to people. It is only the negative reaction toward the colonizers/westerners only.

On the other hand, the non-western critics resist against the views of western critic in this context Hanon says, “Nationalism is for its capacity to heal the structure of colonial culture. Which confines the colonized to luminal barely human existence. Nationalism becomes process of reterritorialisation and repossession which replaces to the culture” (qtd in Ghandhi 112). Here Hannon’s notion about nationalism strongly opposes the westerner’s view about nationalism, Fanon states that the nationalism helps to protest against the colonial aspect and colonial culture. In addition, nationalism of the non-west compels to the west to be weak and to be limited in a small place or time.

Edward Said has also expressed his views on the favor of Non-West. Edward Said says that the westerners pretend to know the oriental, which is completely wrong. Edward Said brings a context of speech given by Arthur James Balfour in house of commons where Balfour says, “We know Egypt more about it” (qtd in Edward Said 32). But Said says Balfour’s comment is not dense, it is superficial. Although, the westerners pretend to know the east, they really do not understand it. The colonizer’s over pretention is false. Edward Said says, the colonizers view the Orientals or non-westerners from the eye of binarism, which is not suitable in this scientific age. This has made the non-western intellectuals to resist against the colonial values, cultures, norms and rituals. The colonialists often try to justify, to the non-west or the orient through the imagination of west. Orient’s phenomena are looked by the westerners through imagination. Imagination becomes tool for them to represent the oriental reality, which is wrong completely Said says,

Group of people living on a few acres of land will set up boundaries between Thiers land, and it’s immediate surroundings and the territory

beyond, which they call land of barbarians, this universal practice of designating in one's mind a familiar space beyond ours and unfamiliar space beyond ours which is theirs is a way of making geographical distinctions that can be entirely arbitrary. (48)

Said's criticism states the point that the Westerners think themselves as superior to non-westerners, they have the hegemonic attitude towards Orient. They regard orient's land as barbaric land and their land is civilized which is certainly wrong. The westerners only imagine and they evaluate orient, which is not suitable. Such hegemonic thinking of the colonization has made non-western critics to be resisting towards colonial aspect. Samuel Huntington brings a concept of a western critic Joseph Nye. Nye says west nations have the hard power and they control to the non-western nation from the hard power. He says, "West nations have hard power which is the power to command resting on economic and military strength" (qtd.in Huntington 82). His criticism makes us clear that even now west have power to command and control to non-west. But, Samuel Huntington ignores strictly to Nye's logic and he says that the economic power of non-western is increasing the culture, civilization is also increasing.

The colonialist's voyeuristic looking about the writings of the orient is not suitable. In this regard Stephen Salman says, "The colonialist's views about third world writings, modalities of views about third world writings, modalities of post colonialist are too ambivalent to orient and uncommon for inclusion within the field" (qtd in Gandhi 56). His criticism makes us clear that, the hegemonic looking towards; the non-western writing is totally wrong and unjustifiable. Such trend of colonialists compels to non-western writers to resist the colonial aspect. The anti- colonial nationalists have their own

vision. They think that the colonization disturbed the history of the humanity. Todorov as an anti- colonial nationalist says,

From this viewpoint, the history of humanity is confused with that of colonization that is with migrations and exchanges. The contemporary struggle for new markets for supplies of raw materials is only the end result-rendered harmless owing to it's origins in nature of that first step that led the human being to cross her own threshold. The most perfected race will unfailingly win for perfection id recognized by its own ability to win battles. (qtd in Gandhi 118)

His criticism makes us clear that the history of non-west has become totally confused and directionless due to the colonization. In addition, the perfection comes if the non-west struggles against the hegemony suppression of west. So, it is essential for the non-westerners to struggle continuously against the west. Then the anti colonialists claim that all the colonial aspects are repressive. Therefore, it is the duty of non-western critics to resist against the colonialism. As, Leela Gandhi says that, "We need to qualify the generalizing assumption that all colonial texts are repressive" (154). Here, she states that the colonial texts are repressive. While colonial texts are repressive, the theory colonial aspect itself becomes repressive. She says, "Colonialist writing was never as invasively confident or as pompously dismissive of indigenous cultures as its oppositional pairing with post colonial writing might suggest" (154). Her criticism clarifies that the colonial aspects are harmful for the native cultures, norms and values. In this context a non-western critic Leela Gandhi says,

The colonial aspects have made a history of domination gradually. This history has been continued due to the resistance and dominance. There is no denying that the colonial encounter is marked by the story of western domination and resistances to it, we also need to acknowledge that this story is endlessly complicated by the failure, inadequacy and refusal on both sides of dominance and resistance. (17)

Leela Gandhi here focuses that, due to the dominance of westerners, the resistance born. As a result, the more dominance occurred the more resistance happened. Here, she also opposes the so-called domination of westerners. The westerners claim and say that the west is the only civilization, which has substantial interests in every other civilization or region and has the ability to affect the politics, economics and security of every other civilization or region. One western critic says,

Societies from other civilization usually need western help to achieve their goals and protect their interests, westerners own and operate the international banking system, they control all hard currencies, and westerners are the world's principal customer. They provide the majority of the world's readymade goods, and dominate international capital markets. They control the sea-lanes; they are capable of massive military international. (qtd in Huntington 81)

The western author says that, westerners have the final power. Even now, they have the sufficient capacity to control the international markets, and economy. They affect the world's social security, politics, civilization and culture. But Samuel Huntington directly

disagrees with the arguments of the westerners, and he says that West is of a civilization in decline. He adds that non-west is much more superior than west in every aspect:

West is of a civilization in decline, its share of world political, economic and military power going down relative to that of the other civilizations.

The west's victory in the cold war has produced not triumph but exhaustion. The west is increasingly concerned with its international problems and needs as it confronts slow economic growth, stagnating populations, unemployment huge government deficits, a declining work ethic, low savings rates, and in many countries including the United States social disintegration drugs and crime. Economic power is rapidly shifting to East Asia. (82)

Huntington's criticism makes us clear that the westerner's claim is very wrong. The power is not in the hand of western countries but in the hand of non-western countries like East -Asian countries. Huntington justifies that the western countries are disturbed due to their internal problems and drug crimes. Social discrimination is increasing in the western geography. So Huntington strictly resists against the worthless claim.

George Clamming says that, the colonial aspect and colonial experience is a positive and real aspect, colonialism helps to make people aware and conscious. He says, "The colonial experience is a live experience in the consciousness of the people. The experience is continuing psychic experience that has to dealt with and will dealt with long after the actual colonial situation formally ends" (qtd. in Loomba 155). Lamming's criticism makes us clear that the colonialism is an essential aspect, which helps to make

people aware. Its experience is also lively. But, Ania Loomba resists against the view of Robert Lamming. Loomba says that, “Colonialism is always violently physical territories, social terrains as well as human identities” (100). Loomba seems to be opponent against the colonialism. She says that the colonialism is dangerous, violent, for even human identities. Her resistance towards colonialism shows that the strong sense of non-western resistance against the colonial aspects.

A western critic Hobsbawm says, the colonialism left a positive aspect, in the non-western world. He says colonialization created the new nations. He says “In many parts of the colonized world, not just traditions but nation themselves, were invented by colonialists. These newly created nations drastically altered previous conceptions of the communities or of the past” (qtd. in Loomba, 164). The concept of Hobsbawm clarifies the legitimacy of colonialism. He connects the significance of colonialism with the invention of new nations. He says colonialism, brought the drastic improvement even in colonized countries. However, anti-colonialists strongly reject such kind of claim. Anti-colonialism says that the colonialism gave nothing more than suffering, hegemony suppression oppression, to women also. In this context the Indian nationalist, Sri Aurobindo says,

I know my country as a mother. I offer her my devotions, my worship If a monster like colonialist sits upon her breast and prepares to suck her blood what does her child do? Does he quietly sit down to meal? Or rush to her rescue? Colonialism marshals and undercuts the female power and identity. (qtd. in Loomba 182)

Sri Aurobindo’s criticism clarifies the brutal monstrosal and hateful act of colonialist. He says the colonialist is as a monster which only knows how to suck the

blood of the mother (women as motherland). He has reflected colonialist as the brutal monster. This kind of analysis of Sri Aurobindo shows non-western resistance against the colonialism and colonial aspects. The colonialists claim that the colonization process helps to the people to be modernizing to alter their society scientifically. It leaves the positive aspects. As Nandy says, “In the process of colonization it helps to generalize the concept of the modernism .West from a geographical entity to a psychological category. The west is now every where, within the west and outside in structures and in minds” (qtd. in Gandhi 19). Here, Nandy seems to express the positive aspects or the beneficial factors of colonialism. He says that the west is trying to modernize this entire world, through colonization. However, the non-western critics are not ready to accept the claim of Nandy. Non-western critics claim that the colonization always tries to hegemonies, or dominates to the non-western countries. As Leela Gandhi says, “West attempts systematically to cancel or negate the cultural difference and values of non-west” (16). Her expressed concepts try to indicate the so-called colonialist’s negation towards the non-western norms, rituals values, and cultures. The colonizers claim that a colonial aspect has success to bring the system of the accommodation in the rest of the world. As Julia Kristeva says, “European nations are capable of accommodating the rest of the world. Colonialism becomes logically outcome or practical application of the universal ethnocentrism which characterizes much late eighteenth and nineteenth century European nationalism” (qtd. in Gandhi 118). Her concept makes us clear that the colonialism always brings the universal values and nationalism. Nevertheless, Todorov strongly resists the vision of Julia Kristiva. He states, “Colonialism has interrupted the history of human civilization” (qtd. in Gandhi 119).

The colonialist critics weave a kind of vision, that the non-west writers write about the unrecognizable terrain and distorted notions about colonialism. As Ellowen Deewen says that, “The non-westerners’ writings is unrecognizable, dismantled, terrain notions” (qtd.in Gandhi 153). Deewen’s vision tries to clarify that colonizers are not like what the non-western critic accused of them rather non-westerners’ writings are illogical worthless and destructive. On the other hand, non-western critics, bitterly attack towards the hegemonic attitude of the colonial aspects. The non-western critics resist against the view of western critic Elie Kilocurie. In this regard a non-western critic, Hanon says,

Nationalism is for its capacity to heal the historical wounds in flicked by the Manichean structure of colonial culture, which confines the colonized to a luminal barely human existence. Nationalism becomes a process of reterritorialisation and repossession which replaces to the colonial culture with a radically unified country culture. (qtd. in Gandhi 12)

Here, Hanon’s notion about nationalism strongly opposes the westerner’s view about the nationalism. Hanon states that the nationalism helps to protest against the colonial aspect and colonial culture. Nationalism of the non-west compels to the west to be limited and to be weak in a small place or time. The supporters of colonial aspects claim that the colonialism got success to expand both the military and economic power not only in Asia but also in South America, Africa and Latin America. This process helped the west to discover this world. In this regard, Roberstam and Louise Spence say, “Colonialism i.e. European powers reached position of economic, military political, cultural domination in much of Asia Africa and Latin America. This process which can be traced at least as far back as the voyages of the discover” (qtd. in Stam and Spence 109). Here, Robberstamen

and Louise try to clear that colonial aspect got unlimited success to capture the Asian, African and Latin American countries, not only that, colonial aspect got success to dominate the non west both culturally and military. On the other hand, the postcolonial critics think the colonialist attitude of dominance is certainly destructive. In this context Ania Loomba says, “Colonialism eroded many martingale or woman friendly cultures and practices or intensified women’s subordination in colonized’s lands” (129). Here, Loomba’s notion directs the way that the colonialism destroyed or dismantled the native’s cultures related to native women.

Therefore, Loomba strongly resists the colonial aspect, because it did nothing more than destruction, and erosion in the non-west cultures. The westerner’s critics tell that the globalization process of this modern world, promotes the power of the westerners. In this regard, Hardt and Negri tell: “Colonialism can only be conceived of a universal republic, a network of the powers, structures in a boundless and inclusive architecture. The colonial expansion, certainly, the expansive moments of empire have been bathed in tears and blood” (qtd. in Loomba 214). Here, Hardt and Negri tell us that the colonialism has expanded its power universally struggling with the tears and blood. However, the expansion process is increased. On the other hand, the postcolonial critics say that the globalization process cannot increase the power network of colonialism; rather it disintegrates the economy of non-west. In this regard, Indian research groups argue, “The great range of actual measures carried on under the label of globalization was not those of interaction and development rather they were the process of the disintegration under development and the appropriation” (qtd. in Loomba 219). The Indian group research finds the globalization is not the proper way that progresses

the colonialism but it, disintrigates the economic structure of the non-western countries, as a result the globalization is ruthless.

Post colonialist critics resist towards the controversial relationship between west and non-west. As Edward said says, “The relationship between the orient and occident is the relationship of power of domination of varying degree of the complex hegemony” (qtd. in Spivak 29). Here Said provides the logic that the colonialists have kept the relationship with east in terms of the relation of domination to non western which is completely fault ideology of the westerners. The westerners claim that they know all the orient. They are completely informed about the non-western values, norms, rituals and cultures. In this regard, Arthur James Balfour says,

Who has even the most superficial knowledge of history? If they will look in the face the acts with which a British. Statesman has to deal when he is put in position of the type may over great races like the habitants of Egypt and countries in the East. We know the civilization of the east. We know it further back. We know it more ultimately, we know more about it. It owes far beyond the petty. Span of time when the Egyptians civilization had already passed it's prime. (qtd. in Said 32)

His way of looking over the orient shows the hegemonic attitude of westerners as senior, knowledgeable than that of the non-west. Nevertheless, the claim of them is not true rather it is only the way of showing west powerful. It is only the pretention. This is not the base of the westerners.

It can be said that the non-westerners racist strongly against the colonial aspects, trend and colonial rule. The easterners claim that they have the equal cultural, political,

economic and the military strength of west or more than westerners. While the western critics argue on the behalf of the western power, culture, rituals and the legitimacy of the colonial rule, the postcolonial critics strongly argue against the westerners' worthless and baseless arguments. Post colonialist critics say that it is essential for easterners to oppose the colonial view and hegemony of westerners or colonizers.

The term, postcolonial theory refers to the theory, which was developed or written after the long period of colonialism. Postcolonial theory expanded after the Second World War or after 1950's decade. Postcolonial deals with the cultural identity in colonized societies. The postcolonial literature is the related term of postcolonial theory. The post colonial theory is typically characterized by its opposition to the colonialism, even it is produced during a colonial period, may defined as post colonial primarily, due to focuses on the race reactions and there effects of the racism and usually indicates white and colonial societies.

Many critics have given their vision in the favor or against the postcolonial theory. Most of the western critics argue that the postcolonial theory does not lead this world culturally or the civilizationally. On the other hand, the non-western critics argue that the postcolonial theory encourages the non-western people. The postcolonial theory opposes the expansion of the colonial legacy, colonial rule or colonial territory.

A western critic named Frantz Fanon says, "Post colonialism as a source of violence rather than reacting violently against resistors which had been the common view" (qtd. in Said 103). Here, Frantz's criticism weaves the idea that, the postcolonial theory is only related with the violence, or the cause of violence, because of which this theory is worthless. On the other hand, the postcolonial writers totally reject the idea of

the western critics. In this context, Leela Gandhi says, the postcolonial theory is a tool, which helps to oppose or resist to the so-called colonial rule. In this context she writes,

Postcolonial theory can be seen, as the theoretical resistance to the mystifying amnesia of the colonial aftermath. It is a disciplinary project to the academic task of amnesia of the colonial aftermath. It is a disciplinary project devoted to the academic task of revisiting remembering and crucially interrogating the colonial past. (4)

Gandhi's criticism makes clear that, the postcolonial theory is an effective tool of resistance of colonial past. Alternatively, she says that the postcolonial theory evaluates the colonial activities of the past. Postcolonial theory resists against the colonial past but the western critics do not accept the ruthless argument of the non-western critics. In this context, Ella Shoat says,

The term post-colonial comes with it the implication that colonialism is now a matter of past, undermines colonialism, economic political and the cultural reformative traces in the present the postcolonial inadvertently glosses over the fact that global hegemony even in the post cold war era persists in forms other than that overt colonial rule. (qtd in Gandhi 105)

Ella Shoat's argument reflects the effectiveness of the past colonialism. He says, in the form of the global hegemony, the colonial rule is still effective even in the postcolonial era. Therefore, the significant of the colonial rule has not ended yet. However, the non-western writers say that the postcolonial theory reflects the existence of the whole world. In this context a non-western critic Ania Loomba says, "Post colonial is a term that is the subject of an ongoing debate. It might seem that because the age of colonialism is over

and because the descendants of once colonized people live every where the whole world is post colonial” (12). Her ideas, describe the colonialism has been ended and in this regard, the whole world is postcolonial so the postcolonial theory is broad that it covers the whole world.

In this way, the postcolonial theory represents that kind of writing, or theories that developed after the colonial age. The non-western regards themselves as the postcolonial writers. They think the whole world is postcolonial. However, the western critics do not think colonialism is over. They think; still there is the necessity of the colonial hegemony to give the stability to this world. However, the non-western critics resist against the colonialist’s argument. They say the western critics’ claim is baseless.

In this context, Achebe experiments his idea of decolonization by presenting the imperialistic civilization as worst civilization. He says, imperialistic civilization has enclosed the African culture civilization and identity. Achebe challenges the British Administration not to dominate the natives through Nwaka, a prominent character in the novel *Arrow of God*. Nwaka arouses a question in the novel, natives have done nothing harm against the whites, so why the colonizers are continuing to dominate? In this context Achebe presents his character to resist against the British rule.

Achebe claims that the natives are not ready to tolerate any kind of hegemony of foreigners in the culture of natives. Therefore, Achebe presents a bold and patriotic character named Ujiugo, who can not tolerate the interference of the native religion. Ujiugo strongly rejects the idea of her brother Oduche to kill a snake called python. Python is regarded as a local deity in Nigeria, but getting impression from Christianity, Oduche tries to kill python. Ujiugo can be characterized as a strong rebellious character

in the novel, due to her commitment towards the promotion and preservation of her own identity and culture rather than diminishing it. Achebe seems to be resisting westerner's extreme domination. Therefore, Achebe presents a character, Ezeulu, to show his (Achebe's) own disagreement towards the colonial rule. Ezeulu as a main character refuses the existence of colonial rule to remain long. So, he strongly resists here to be Warrant Chief. Achebe as a postcolonial writer strongly resists against the British administration ruling in Nigeria through his novel *Arrow of God*. Achebe seems to be using the novel *Arrow of God* to express his dominated feelings caused by colonial rule. He uses the novel by presenting Ezeulu as a main character. Ezeulu first keeps the kind of emotional relationship towards the colonizers but while whites try to interfere the internal politics, social and cultural context, the non-western society compels to resist against white hegemony.

Ezeulu cannot tolerate the rape of white colonizers, towards the Africans or native Nigerian's nationality. Therefore, Ezeulu cannot tolerate the expansion of Christian religion and business in local area. Really, the feelings of Ezeulu and Ujiugo represent the emotions and ideas of the whole Nigerians. That is why, Chinua Achebe as a non-western writer and critique helps to universalize the sufferings of the colonized Nigerians through his novel *Arrow of God*. Every human being wants to get liberation from any kind of tyranny rule. Furthermore, the colonial rule is a worst system of rule, which dehumanizes the natives and compels them to be a slave of colonizers. Therefore, *Arrow of God* as a non-western novel explores the ideas of colonized Africans to be free from the slavery of colonizers. It is the compulsion of Nigerians to resist the colonial rule of

Britain. Through the presentation of the character, Chinua Achebe is helping the Nigerians by resisting colonial rule through his novel.

Finally, it can be said that brutal colonial rule is one of the worst rule of the world, which must be destroyed through the revolution of the courageous native people. Furthermore, the resistance of the natives helps to end the colonial rule. Achebe seems to be appealing to all the Nigerians to resist against the colonial rule and hegemonic rule of British Administration through his novel *Arrow of God*. Achebe also believes that he can get liberation, tranquil, and freedom from the colonial rule through the continuous resistance of the natives. Achebe's characters of the novel represent the overall people of the Nigeria who want liberation and freedom from so-called colonial rule through resistance. Achebe's characters also seem very energetic to struggle against the so-called colonial rule. Therefore Achebe seems to be appealing for continuous struggle if necessary; against the voyeuristic looking attitudes of westerners. The western critics are not tired up giving view about legacy of colonial rule. They claim that colonial rule was necessary to civilize the so-called barbarians. Therefore, along with Chinua Achebe, most of the African, Asian or overall non-western writers and critics publish lengthy articles writings, and books to make natives aware, about the terrible suppression of the colonial rule.

Chapter III: Non-western Resistance in Chinua Achebe's *Arrow of God*

Protest against Hegemony

Chinua Achebe's *Arrow of God*, is a prominent example of a novel which always deals with the resistance of the natives towards the suppression, hegemony and oppression of the whites. The non-western resistance is a kind of a subject in which the non-western societies and the countries protest against the white hegemony. In this regard, Chinua Achebe shows the revolution of the non-western society, towards the cultural, political, economic and social hegemony of the whites, i.e. British administration. In this chapter, the various aspects related to the resistance of the natives against the hegemony of the colonizers will be portrayed in detail. The characters like Ezeulu, Nwaka and Ujiugo resist against the cultural hegemony of the British administration. Chinua Achebe has written so many novels related with the issues of the nationality, postcoloniality, colonialism etc. Nigeria was colonized up to 1960. Achebe wrote several essays and novels before 1960 or even after the colonial period in Nigeria. In the post-colonial period, he expressed the cultural- domination, sufferings of the Nigerian people. While the white colonizers dominated the native Nigerians, they also revolted against the so-called domination and hegemony of the colonial policy. After the deep observation of colonial issues inside the novel, a question might be contextual to ask how the natives revolted in Nigeria, during colonial period? The events and the actions of characters shown in the novel, *Arrow of God* are sufficient to know about the suppression of whites and the revolt of natives in Nigeria.

Here, Chinua Achebe compares the power of the colonizers with a little boy and the colonized country with the goat. And, he looks through the eyes of the goat.

Achebe says their culture and their cultural priest is more powerful than the colonizers. In this context Achebe writes, In this context Achebe writes,

Whenever Ezeulu considered the crops and therefore, over the people he wondered if it was real. It was true he leaves and for the new yam feast, but he did not choose it. He was merely a watchman. His power was no more than the power of a child over a goat that was said to be his. As long as the goat was alive it could be his he would find it food and take care for it. But the day it was slaughtered he would know soon enough who the real owner was. No the chief priest of Ulu was more than that must be more than that. (3)

The above extract shows Achebe resists against the colonizer by saying that chief priest of Ulu was more powerful than the colonizer i.e. the little boy. The word 'slaughter' hints the symbol of the domination. According to their culture, the chief priest of Ulu will be more powerful than of the colonizer's. The main character, Ezeulu is the chief priest of Ulu. He strictly obeys the native culture, values, rituals, and life- style. He does not like any kind of presence of the white men. White colonizers are enemy in the eyes of Nigerians. They express their vision in this way,

How could he fail to tell the story as he had heard it from his own father?
Even the White man Winterbottom, understood though he name from a land no none knew. He had called Ezeulu the only witness of truth. That was what riled his enemies that the white man whose father or mother no

one knew should come to tell them the truth they knew but hated to hear.

It was an angury of the world's ruin. (7)

In the above extract 'He' refers to the chief priest of Ulu and says, the white man is regarded as his enemy and Winterbottom came to Nigeria to rule their native land.

Moreover the Chief Priest of Ulu also says, the colonizers are the cause of the destruction of the world. Therefore, the chief priest of Ulu revolts against the colonizers.

Due to the presence of whites, the natives are dissatisfied and disturbed in their own land. Connecting the voice of natives with this issue, "Their market had grown because; the white man took his merchandise there. Why did he take his merchandise there? Asked the other man, if not because of their medicine? The old woman of the market has swept the world with her broom even the land of the white men where they say the sun never shines" (20).

Here, the discussion of the two native characters shows natives are not satisfied with the expansion of colonizers' business in Nigeria. They feel the expansion of the white's business centers in local areas as injustice and revolt against it. Natives say that the colonizers want to rule in Nigeria for a long time, so they expand their business in Nigeria which is completely wrong. While the war took place between Umuaro and Okeperi, the interference of the British administration took place to end it. As described in chapter two's last page. "The next day Afo saw the war brought to a sudden close. The white man, Wintabota brought soldiers to Umuaro and stopped it. The story of what these soldiers did in Abame was still told to fear and so Umuaro made no effort to resist but laid down their arms" (29). The white's interference was not suitable and justifiable for the natives even in the context of ending war between the two rival villages of Nigeria;

Umuaro and Okperi. While the British commander Winterbottom brought the white soldiers to Umuaro to break the war between two native villages, the Umuaro's people wanted to resist against the interference of the whites. Here, the natives could not resist against the British troops with arms, but they showed their dissatisfaction against the interference of the whites. Therefore, to show the dissatisfaction is also a resistance. To show the resistance of the natives, Chinua Achebe has taken the help of the action of nature symbolically. The nature itself has become aggressive. It can be said that, Achebe compares the resistance of the natives with the condition of the nature,

Although the first rain was overdue, when it did come it took the people by surprise. Throughout the day the sun had breathed fire as usual and the world had lain prostrate with shock. The birds which sang in the morning were silenced. The air stood in one spot, vibrating with the heat; the trees hung limp. Then without any sign a great wind arose and sky darkened. Dust and flying leaves filled the air. Palm trees and coconut trees swayed from their waists; their tops gave them the look of giants fleeing against the wind, their long hair streaming behind them. (31)

Here, Achebe has shown two stages of nature. Firstly, the nature was simple as usual but suddenly the great wind blew and the sky darkened and coconuts trees swayed from their waists. The condition of the aggressive nature reflects the revolution of the natives against the whites. Before the interference of the British Administration, the Nigerians were calm, but while the colonizers interfered to the natives, they struggled violently and aggressively like whirlwind. In the same way the above extract shows that, without any sign a wind arose which shows the resistance of the natives. The giants represent the

colonizers and the whirlwind reflects the revolution. By showing colonizers as giant and natives as whirlwind Achebe seems to be resisting.

Adding another context inside the story, Achebe shows the wife of Ezeulu; Ugoye's dissatisfaction. Ezeulu wanted his son Oduche to go church, but at the same time Oduche's mother Ugoye was upset, the line shows, "Oduche's mother, Ugoye, was not happy that her son should be chosen for sacrifice to the white man" (47). Here, Ugoye's psychology against the whites and Christianity seems completely doubtful. She can not believe in the religion of the white man. Ugoye resists against the behavior and the religion of the white man or the white colonizers. Therefore, she became sad. Her feelings of sadness to send Oduche in the church, expresses her dissatisfaction towards the colonial religion and culture. Furthermore, her dissatisfaction shows her trend of resistance against the colonial aspects. The white colonizers try to ruin the cultural values of the natives. They encourage to dismantle the native believes. As Mr. Goodcountry says, "If we are Christians we must be ready to die for the faith. You must be ready to kill the python as the people of the rivers killed the iguana. You address python as father. It is nothing but a snake, the snake that deceived our first mother, Eve. If you are afraid to kill the python, it does not count yourself as a Christian" (48). In the above lines, the colonial aspects are presented to ruin or destroy the religious belief of Nigerians. Nigerians regard python (a snake) as a symbol of father, but the representative of colonizer Mr. Goodcountry says the python is nothing, but a snake, so it must be killed. The natives from the six villages declared that "Any one who killed the python would be regarded as having killed his kinsman" (32).

Thus, the declarence of the natives shows their deep belief towards their culture of

regarding python as a kinsman or father. Therefore, the so-called chief, Mr.

Winterbottom can not affect the natives' culture. In this regard, the native values and cultures resist against the values, cultures and rituals of so-called colonizers. In the novel, *Arrow of God* Achebe shows Ezeulu as the main character, who does not like the attraction of youths towards the new religion i.e. the Christianity. When, the daughter of Ezeulu asks him about the new religion showing him the church, Ezeulu resists against the request of his own daughter. Ezeulu's daughter "Akueke turned to Ezeulu as soon as she saw him. 'Father', come and see what we are seeing. 'This new religion'. 'Shut your mouth, 'said Ezeulu, who did not want anybody, least of all his own daughter to continue questioning his wisdom" (44). Here, Ezeulu seems to resist against the new religion, he doesn't like even the proposal of his daughter only to observe the new religion. In this context, Ezeulu's rejection to adopt the new religion is also the resistance. The natives say or claim that, they always hated the kings who were nominated by the British administration. And the so-called kings (nominated by the British administration) cannot be the real representatives of the natives. Rather they become the agents and the speaker of the colonial legacy. As Chinua Achebe says, in his novel *Arrow of God*, "This among a people who nominated kings. This was what British Administration was doing among the Igbos, making a dozen mushroom kings grow, where there was none before" (60). The expression of Achebe reflects the ideology of Igbo people who always resisted against the British administration by disgusting the kings made by them. The kings made by the colonial administration are like mushroom, which suck only the blood of kinsmen.

As we already discussed the natives do not like to adopt the religion of colonizers. Natives think their own religion is dearest for them. But when some people of natives try

to adopt the foreigner's religion, the natives who are proud of their own religion; show their dissatisfaction. Here the extract says, "He sent for his wife and asked her where her son was. She stood with her arms folded across her breasts and said nothing. For the past two days she had been full of resentment against her husband because it was he who sent Oduche to the church people in spite of her opposition" (61). In this Scenario, Ugoye tries to revolt against the decision of her hubby Ezeulu to send Oduche in the church. She is totally against the expansion of the Christianity in their locality; she represents the leader of those, who resist totally against the so called expansion of norms and values of Christianity.

Economic Resistance

While the colonizers try to construct the road or developmental works by discriminating the natives, they protest against it. The native's voice expresses that as the day light's chases or removes the darkness; in the same way the white tradition causes a kind of situation which tries to avoid all the native customs. So, white culture is the cause of the fade of the natives' cultures rituals, values etc. the speaker is Unachukwu.

Nweke Ukpaka says, "When the roof and walls of a house fall in the ceiling is not left standing. The white man, the new religion, the soldiers the new road they are all part of the same thing" (84). Nweke Ukpaka's analysis ensures the incoming downfall of the British Administration. He says, like the destruction of the building; the structure of the colonial rule also comes to end. Although the British colonizers are powerful in terms of canon and property, the natives want to fight against them bravely. But it is the problems of natives that they have no sufficient powerful canons. Though the natives lack their armed force, they dare to fight against the colonial supremacy that refers the resistance.

In this context Nweke Ukpaka says, “The Whiteman has a gun a matchet, a bow and carries fire in his mouth. He does not fight with one weapon alone. I know that many of us want to fight the white man. But only foolish man can go after a leopard with his bare hands” (86). Nweke’s motif is to fight against the colonial rule. So he has compared the colonizer as a brutal leopard. Furthermore, the comparison of the colonizer with the brutal leopard is the symbolic resistance shown by Achebe in his novel *Arrow of god*.

The native voices express their bitter anger against the so-called British administration, while the colonizers try to interfere the natives, in terms of cultures and economy. Afterwards, the natives protest against it regarding it as a so-called domination. In this regard, Chinua Achebe presents a character named Nweke Ukpaka tells,

We did not ask him, to visit us he is neither our kinsman nor our in- law.

We did not steal his goat or his fowl; we didn’t take his land or his wife. In no way what ever have we done him wrong. And yet he has come to make trouble for us. All we know is that our *Afo* is held high between us and him. I know that the white man does not wish the Umuaro well. (87)

Nweke Ukpaka’s criticism makes us clear that the natives have bitter aggressiveness towards the so- called domination of the colonizers. Here Nweke Ukpaka says that the natives have not done any kind of harm to colonizers yet they have to endure the suppression of British Administration. The natives want to get rid from the rule of colonizers. They want the peaceful liberation and tranquil from the paws of colonizers. They think white never want the progress of the natives. This thinking of natives makes them as the psychological revolutionary.

The colonizers have controlled the administration of the Nigeria. And they also

have captured the authority of the developmental works in Nigeria. The white agents do not pay to natives for their laborious work. As Unachukwu says, “We are not paid for the working on his road. I have heard that throughout Ulu and Igbo, wherever people do this kind of work the Whiteman pays them. Why should our own be different?” (87). Here, Unachukwu’s saying weaves the idea that, the natives who have accepted the legal existence of the colonialism will be paid, but who do not accept the legal existence of the colonizers, can not be paid. Unachukwu’s village and Umuaro village’s people strongly resist against the colonial policy and the legacy of the, British administration, so they are not paid. The colonial administrators argue the natives are innocent and foolish. But in the novel, Mr. Unachukwu says,

The white man thinks that we are foolish; we shall ask him one question. This was the question, had wanted to ask him this morning but he would not listen. We have a saying that a man may refuse to do what is asked of him but may not refuse to be asked, but it seems the white man doesn’t have that kind of saying that a man may refuse to do what is asked of him but may not have the kind of saying where he comes from. (87)

This extract makes clear that the hegemonic attitude of the whites regards the natives as the poor foolish and wiseless. They think the easterners are fragile, but the natives are not as weak as they think. Natives are also equally strong. Although the whites’ claim seems that the natives are foolish but in fact they are not foolish but wise. The whites do not know the original conditions of the blacks so their claim does not touch the root of reality. This kind of expression of the natives shows their resistance. While the westerners give the extreme punishment to the natives in their own land, the natives resist

against the hateful works of the whites. In this context, Ezeulu says in *Arrow of God*, “I think he was late in going. But the white man wouldn’t whip a grown man who is also my son for that. He would be asked to pay a fine to his age group for being late; he would not be whipped or perhaps he hits the white man first” (89). The above lines state that, Ezeulu tries to justify the disgusted works of the whites’ or British administration. Ezeulu strongly opposes against the British administration. Ezeulu’s expression makes clear to us that the way of giving punishment to natives is completely wrong. So, Ezeulu’s expression resists against the way of treatment to natives by the colonizers.

The Nigerians are very much careful about their own religion. They think, British administration wants to change their religion, but the natives think their own religion is not less -important than the religion of whites. As a proof, “A strange thought seized Edogo now. Could it be that their father had deliberately sent Odouche to the religion of the white man so as to disqualify him for the priest-hood of Ulu?” (93). The logical question of Edogo resists the religion of the whites. Edogo gives much more priority to the natives’ religion than the religion of the foreigners or the colonizers. His expression makes clear, that to adopt the Christianity is to be disqualified. Therefore Edogo’s thinking expresses that the natives are not ready to be disqualifying by adopting the Christianity.

The natives think their own personal free life is significant. They love their own identity but they think the life under the colonial rule is worse than death. They do not want to live the life under the colonial rule. So Ezeulu says, “Ogbuefi Akuebue may you live, and all your people. I too will live with all my people. But life alone is not enough may we have the things with which to love it well. For there is a kind of slow and weary

life which is worse than death.” (96). Here, Ezeulu’s expression makes us clear that the natives become happy to live with all their people. But, while the natives remain in prison, the life becomes much worse than the death. So the colonizers express their disgust towards the colonial policy of the British administration.

The colonizers had exploited the natives not only through the colonial rule but sexually as well. Such feelings are totally reflected in this line, “How widespread was the practice of the white men sleeping with native women?” (105). Such hateful crime of the colonizers shows, colonial rule is meaningless and the colonizers are useless. They only do the destructive works, therefore it is completely wrong. The representatives of the colonial rule of Nigeria i.e. Mr. Steward and Winterbottom claimed that the colonizers themselves are the locale people of Nigeria, which is nothing more than the humorous thing. The lines say, “My steward is a native of Umuaro continued Winterbottom, and has just come back after spending two days at home he tells me that the whole village was in confusion because a rather important man had been whipped by Wright. But perhaps there is nothing in it” (108). The expression of colonizer agent, tries to clarify the colonizers’ claim themselves as the original people of Nigeria, which is totally wrong. Then Ezeulu resists against the claim of Winterbottom, by saying “The gun shooting is more than a foolish grouping about” (114). The natives have understood the so-called power of the guns of British administration. The agents of the British administration try to create terror among the Nigerians. They think that, by creating terror and shooting the guns colonizers can not control the natives. The natives strongly resist against the colonizers way of shooting through guns. Ezeulu says, the power of gun can not continue the colonial rule, for all the time. So he resists against the colonial armed force and the

cannons.

The British administration got success to influence some of the natives, towards Christian religion. But, on the other hand, other natives revolted against those natives who were under the influence of British culture. Oduche was the son of Ezeulu. He was very much influenced by the Christian culture. He went to church. So he followed the ideology of Christian that it is simple to eat python. But according to the culture of the Nigerian, to eat a python is a great crime. Python is the symbol of god. In this context Oduche disregards the native culture by eating the flesh of python. His own sister Ojiugo strongly revolts against the trend of Oduche. She says to him “kill me today you must kill me. Do you hear me Eater of python? You abused our culture” (128). Here, Ojiugo’s expression helps to know her love towards her own culture. She challenges her own brother to kill herself; in this regard she strongly refuses the white culture of killing and eating python. She strongly disagrees with the ritual of Christianity. While the two brothers fight with each other the third person gets benefit from their fight. In the same way while the two villages; Umuaro and Okperi fought to each other, the whites betrayed Umuaro’s people by exploiting them. In this context Ezeulu says,

Who brought the white man here? Was it Ezeulu? We went to war against Okeperi who are our blood brother over a piece of land which did not belong to us and you blame the white man for stepping in. have you not heard that when two brothers fight a stranger reaps the harvest. How many white men went in their party that destroyed Abame? Do you know five? Now have you ever heard that five people. (132)

Ezeulu expresses clearly, the natives' internal fight, provides the profit only to the colonizers. The colonizers have killed or murdered the natives, which is totally wrong. Ezeulu requests to collaborate among the natives and he resists against the violent works of whites. Ezeulu also tells that they have only option left that is to remove the whites with struggle. The resistance of natives becomes in various ways, while the colonizers try to suppress them. In this regard, the main character of the novel, Ezeulu rejects the request of white commander to meet him in his residence. While the colonial commander sends a messenger to bring Ezeulu in the residence of white, Ezeulu directly rejects it and says the messenger of whites,

You must first return however and tell your white man that Ezeulu does not leave his hut if wants to see me he must come here Nwodika's son who showed you the way can also show him. Do you know what you are saying my friend. Asked the messenger in utter disbelief. Are you a messenger or not? Go home and give my message to your master. (140)

Ezeulu's strong mental resistance against the hegemonic behavior of the whites and their messenger symbolizes daring to protest. While the white master sends the messenger to bring Ezeulu he directly ignores it because the whites have colonized them. The religious as well as social leader, Ezeulu can not tolerate such kind of threat of white master to be present in his residence. And Ezeulu's rejection to go white colonizer's residence indicates his dissatisfaction towards the colonial rule. So he expresses his dissatisfaction against the hegemony of whites.

The natives of the poor country Nigeria regard the mask-spirits as an evil and a group of the dirty soul. In the same way they compare to the whites as the evil mask-

spirits. In this context, a character Akuebue says, “When the masked spirit visits us we have to appease its footprints with presents. The white man is the masked-spirit of today” (155). Here Akuebue’s intentions are dissatisfactory towards the behavior of the white colonizers. So Akuebue compares the whites with the masked-spirits. The Nigerian natives have a psychology; they think the whites have always dominated them. So they say the trend of white suppression is totally wrong. Nigerians claim that the source of power is Ulu. Ulu can save the existence of their generation, but due to criminal activities of the whites the natives are in the condition of terror. In this context Nwaka says, “What is the power of Ulu today, He saved our forefathers from the warriors of Abame but he can’t save us from the white man. White man is violent” (161). To present the white man as the violent person is to show the resistance. Here, Nwaka’s concept justifies that, the natives are very much careful towards the domination. The natives seem ready to fight against the whites to regain their authority.

Chinua Achebe says in the novel, “Now the fight must take place, for until a man wrestles with one of those who make a path across his homestead the others will not stop. Ezeulu’s muscles tingled for the fight. Let the white man detain him not for one day but one year so that his deity not see in him in his place would Umuaro question” (162). The above extract tries to clarify the Nigerians are even ready to struggle with the so-called colonizers. Ezeulu’s curiosity is active to struggle against the whites. Ezeulu challenges whites to struggle not only for a day or a month or for a short time but for many years, i.e. long period, if necessary. Such types of psychology of natives show their resistance towards the domination of whites. The vision of Ezeulu expresses the vision of natives. The natives do not tolerate the so-called hegemony rather they want to fight against the

natives, for the long period if it is necessary. Colonizers think that if the Chief priest of Ulu, Ezeulu became the Warrant Chief, it would be easy for them to continue the colonial rule in Nigeria for long time. So they force him to be the Warrant Chief but Ezeulu directly rejects it.

The rejection of Ezeulu to be warrant chief was itself a positive aspect to end the colonial rule. Therefore it was essential to spread the news of the rejection of Ezeulu to be Warrant Chief. The expansion of news in Umuaro village helps to resist against the whites. In this context Clarke says, “Well, are you accepting the offered or not? Clarke glowed with the I-know this will knock you ever feeling of a benefactor “Tell the white man that Ezeulu will not be anybody’s chief except Ulu” (176). Ezeulu refuses to remain the long colonial rule in Umuaro and in whole Nigeria. He says that to be the chief priest of Ulu is his original identity. He can not be the agent to continue the colonial rule for long time. Ezeulu’s strong sense of resistance to be the Warrant Chief has helped to end the colonial rule soon in Umuaro in Nigeria.

Ezeulu is very brave that he fearlessly rejected the proposal of whites to be Warrant Chief. His fearless rejection to be the colonial agent proves his strong sense of resistance. At first few people in Umuaro believed the story that Ezeulu had rejected white man’s offer to be a Warrant Chief, “How he could refuse the very thing he had been planning and scheming for all these years his enemies asked. But the story spread to every quarter of Umuaro and the very soon it was known also in all the neighboring villages” (178). The people of the same locality had not thought about the Ezeulu’s rejection to be the warrant chief. But the news spread even in other villages also. The spreading news symbolizes the rejection of the colonial rule, domination, oppression and

the suppression. After the refusal of Ezeulu to be the warrant chief a kind of encouragement came in the minds of the natives and depression or the disparity in the minds of the whites. For the reason Mr. Clarke says, "Umuaro had put up more resistance to change than any of her clan in the whole province" (179). Here even the white representatives accept the resistance of the natives in the context of Umuaro. Chinua Achebe has shown the Umuaro people very active, dynamic and very much sincere about their own authority, equality domination, suppression and hegemony. Ezeulu's refusal to be Warrant Chief is highly praised by his fellows, the other natives and the other people who always stand for justice. In this context Nwodika explains, "Ezeulu was like a puff-adder which never struck until it had first unlocked its seven deadly fangs one after the other. Ezeulu had given enough warning to the white man during four markets he had been locked in the prison" (180). Nwodika's expression explains the encouragement of Ezeulu who had totally rejected the proposal of whites to be warrant chief. While Ezeulu's 'refusal' expanded in the whole neighboring villages, the villagers gathered at the home of Ezeulu, as described in the text, "People who had nothing but good will for him" (189). The good will of people, symbolizes their fully support for the adventure of Ezeulu. The people are in the behalf of the freedom, stability and liberation of Nigeria. The locale people's 'good will' towards the refusal of Ezeulu, indicates the resistance.

The natives of Nigeria always try to resist against the religious belief of the whites. The natives have their own belief about the religion, so they did not try to kill python. The following lines say, "Why Oduche imprisoned a python in his box? It had been blamed on the white man's religion" (193). This line tries to justify the love of Nigerians towards their own civilization. Furthermore they oppose the Christianity which

focuses to kill the python. But the natives regard python as a symbol of deity. So they resist against the white's view of killing python.

Nextly, yam is associated with the culture of the native Africans. Although they suffer from starvation, yam is not taken as a food by them. Moreover, yam also represents the symbol of resistance. As Ezeulu says to Anichebe Udeozo:

We know that such a thing has never been done before but never before has the white man taken the chief priest away. These are not the times we used to know and we must meet them as they come or be tolled in the dust. I want you to look round this room and tell me what you see. Do you think there is another Umuaro outside this hut now? (210)

Here, Ezeulu's saying represents two things. Firstly, he says the yams which are associated with the culture and food. They regard yams as the symbol of protection of their culture. So they do not eat yams even at the time of the starvation. Secondly, Ezeulu explains about Umuaro. He wants to indicate Umuaro as the symbol of the protest or resistance. He adds, if it is necessary, the Umuaro people are ready to struggle against whites. Ezeulu says, the place of Umuaro represents the symbol of resistance. In the text Achebe always seems to be promoting the Igbo culture in one or other way. He presents the characters that show their respect towards their own festivals and resist against colonizer's tradition. In this context,

Good country had seen elsewhere how easy it was for a half-educated and half converted Christian to mislead a whole congregation when the pastor or catechist was weak; so he wanted to establish his own leadership from the very beginning. His intention was not was originally to antagonize

Unachukwu more than was necessary for making his point; after all he was a strong pillar in the church and could not be easily replaced. But Unachukwu did not give Mr. Good Country a chance; he challenged to Mr. Good country openly on the question of the python and so deserved the public rebuke and humiliation Mr. Good Country got. (216)

The above abstract expresses the courage of Unachukwu, who challenges the powerful British Administrator in terms of religion. Mr. Good Country was regarded as the strong pillar of colonial rule in Nigeria. Mr. Good country thought they had not any option more than adopting the Christian religion. But Unachuku, as a local Nigerian; challenges the colonial agent Mr. Good Country. Unachuku disagrees with Mr. Good Country's religion, in terms of the issue of Python. In the local Igbo belief Python is regarded as a deity. Therefore, Unachukwu cannot compromise with Mr. Good country to disregard Python. Furthermore, he challenges the Christianity not to dis-value the Python and Igbo culture. Unachuku resists against the Christian ideology and supports the ideology of Igbo culture.

Death of Obika

Even at the death of Obika the Nigerians follow the funeral process according to their native values, rituals, religion etc. They challenge the culture of the Christianity; meanwhile, they sing the mourning songs like this, "Look. Python, Look Python, yes, it lies across the way" (224). Surely, the natives involve in the funeral process of Obika, following their own traditions. They respect their culture by indicating python as a deity. Though the British administration claimed that the natives were under the influence of the Christianity, the funeral process of the natives challenges the colonizers. Culturally,

they resisted against the whites. They involve in the funeral process of Obika according to the religious and cultural believes of Nigeria. To follow the cultural believes of Nigeria and to disobey the cultural and religious believes of Christianity, in the funeral process of Obika, is also the resistance. Achebe, presenting Ezeulu as a main character, expresses his own views through Ezeulu's mouth. Ezeulu challenges to the colonizers who have come to rule in Nigeria. In that context, "Ezeulu raised his voice to summon his family to join him in challenging the trespassers" (224). The lines express the anti-colonial attitude of Ezeulu. Ezeulu wants the dismantle or destruction of the colonial structure. Therefore Ezeulu thinks the colonial rule must be ended in Nigeria. He raised his voice to someone or to defend his family to join with him in challenging the trespassers. Here Ezeulu seems to take the leadership to defend against the colonial rule. Trespassers represent the colonizers. The trespassers have seized the land of Nigerians forcefully. Therefore Ezeulu as a main character, of the novel resists against the trespassers by raising voice against them. Furthermore, in the novel, Ezeulu's voice against trespassers represents the voice of overall Nigerians against colonial rule in Nigeria. Furthermore, the colonized people want a kind of relief from the British Administration.

Ezeulu sings a mournful song at the death of his own son Obika, from his song we can clearly know the effect of the resistance he says,

I was born when lizards were in one's and twos, a child of Idemili. The difficult tear drops of sky's first weeping drew my spots. Being sky-born I walked the earth with royal gait and mourners saw me coiled across their path. But of late a strange bell has been ringing a song of desolation leave your yams and cocoyam. And come to school. And I must scuttle away in

haste, when children play or in earnest cry. Look! A Christian is on the way. Ha ha ha ha ha (225).

Ezeulu's expression clearly reveals his love towards his culture. He says, lizards were few in number but now their number has been increased. Lizards represent the dominators or colonizers. The difficult tear-drops explain about the sufferings of the natives. While the whites suppressed the natives, in such condition it was very difficult to pass the days. The life of natives was very complex.

Ezeulu, finally expresses even the whites are interrupting the natives he is confident to resist against them. So, he expresses his resistance by indicating Christians or colonizers as nothing more than a humorous thing. In addition, Ezeulu's laugh ensures the certainty of the end of colonial rule in Nigeria.

Finally, it can be said that to oppose the cultural and religious, believes and political structures of colonizers is a kind of resistance. The characters resist from the different perspectives and triangles. Their only one motto of resistance is to get the liberation and tranquil from the paws of the colonizers, or colonial rule. Furthermore, the events, circumstances and psychological aspects of the characters, all proof the resistance of the natives.

Chapter IV: Conclusion

Resistance as a Significant tool to Preserve Culture and Identity

Chinua Achebe is a non-western critic and novelist. He has shown the domination and suppression of the British administration during the colonial period in Nigeria. He has also shown the resistance of the natives against the colonial rule. *Arrow of God* is a prominent novel that reflects the two worlds. One is the world of domination; the other is the world of resistance. Here, the British colonizers represent the world of suppression. The natives of Nigeria represent the world of resistance. Achebe focuses on the sensational consciousness of the natives. Achebe's characters have a kind of political and cultural consciousness. The characters know the value of their native cultures. So, while the British administration was about to interfere the natives, they strongly resisted against the interference. Only, in the conscious society the local people know about the significance of the freedom and liberation from colonial rule. Achebe's characters also seem eager to get the liberation from the colonial rule. In fact, during the colonial rule, most of the African novelists and wrote novels that encouraged the natives not to tolerate any kind of colonial domination or colonial hegemony.

In this context, Chinua Achebe seems to be a conscious novelist. Achebe requests his character to struggle bravely to get liberation and freedom. Therefore, in the novel *Arrow of God*, the main character Ezeulu rejects strongly and bravely to be the Warrant Chief of the British administration. It is the rule of science that where there is domination, there is resistance. In this context the novel seems to be a scientific reason

based novel. While the colonial agent Winterbottom interferes in Nigeria, the natives or inhabitants resist against the colonial policy.

During the process of colonial rule most of the African countries faced a problem. That was the crisis of their culture and identity. Nigeria was also a colonized country.

Therefore, the crisis of the native culture and identity created sufferings to the Nigerians.

Due to the colonial domination the native's culture couldn't bloom as easily as pre colonial age. As a result, the colonizers got success to expand their culture in the countries of Africa. Therefore the resistance became the tool to preserve and promote the native culture and identity. Therefore, resistance is significant tool which is associated with the preservation of culture. Surely, the root civilization and culture are the basis of the identity of the African people. After the colonial period the colonizers first try to ruin the cultural political and civilizational aspects of colonized country. At that period the natives must resist against the interference in culture, and civilization.

In *The Arrow of God* Chinua Achebe, shows resistance as the significant tool for the conservation of native rituals, values, cultures civilizations and identity. Achebe shows the main character of this novel Ezeulu, seems eager towards the native values. Ezeulu sends his son Oduche under the pressure of the colonizer; here, Ezeulu's motif seems to follow his own culture. But the ruthless pressure of colonizers compels him to send his son to the church. Chinua Achebe seems appealing the natives to preserve their culture through *The Arrow of God*.

Actually, Achebe tries to arouse consciousness among natives in terms of politics and culture. While most of the countries were colonized, the more hegemony, dominations and suppressions also began. As a result there was raised a question about

the existential identity of the colonized Africans. But, during the colonial rule, the colonized Africans continued their resistance. The Africans did not want to accept the colonial rule. Such kind of resistance provided energy to the natives. Chinua Achebe as a non-western writer always took the fever of the thousands of the colonized people of Nigeria. He writes novels against the suppression of the white colonizers. Chinua Achebe presents his character, in the fever of the people of Nigeria. Achebe appeals his characters to resist against the colonial rule. In *Arrow of God*, Achebe has presented the rebellious characters. His goal to present the rebellious characters is to promote and preserve the native values, emotions feelings, rituals, and religions. In the novel, Ezeulu's wife Ugoye strongly resists against the vision of the killing the python. She says that the culture regards the python as their own kinsman. Therefore, when the white colonizers try to kill or destroy the python or snake, Ugoye strongly resists against it. Chinua Achebe presents Ugoye as a rebellious character to preserve the native's values and religions. If Chinua Achebe would not have presented the rebellious characters; the native's identity would have lost already.

From the presentation of the characters and the way to choose rebellious characters, Achebe seems to be a devotee of his native cultural values and emotions. Achebe thinks that resistance is an ultimate tool to preserve and promote the cultural identity. If all the natives had accepted and adopted the religion of the Christians, the native's values and cultures would have faded certainly. But Chinua Achebe does not want to loose the native original culture. Achebe can not think of any kinds of tools except resistance to save their native identity and values. So, Achebe appeals to all his characters including the main character to stand on the behalf of the original identity of

the natives. The nature of the chosen characters in the novel *Arrow of God* makes Chinua Achebe as a strong non western critic. It leaves a message that Chinua Achebe is serious to save natives values, norms and cultures through revolution or resistance.

In the novel, the main character represents the chief priest of Ulu, whose name is Ezeulu. Through the presentation of Ezeulu as the main character, Chinua Achebe promises to save the non- western values, cultures and religion. The chief priest of Ulu is a religious post which directs to the significance of the non- western religion.

Surely, the identity is associated with the original existence of any kind of tribe or races. If races steps towards the down fall, the native's identity or existence remains in the condition of the crisis. While their identity falls in the crisis, the race or tribe or the ethnic society began to fade. So, identity is much more significant in the existence of any tribe or ethnic society. In the context of the novel *Arrow of God*, Achebe appeals to his characters for saving their identity through the means of revolutions if necessary. Achebe thinks that to save or preserve the identity of the natives, they themselves must be energetic and rebellious towards the colonizers who want to erase or minimize the identity of the natives. Identity itself is the indicator and preserver of the culture and civilization of the natives. Thus, for the existence of their meaningful presence the natives must save their identity.

Moreover, for the sake of their identity the natives must be ready to sacrifice themselves if necessary. In the novel, *Arrow of God*, the sister of Oduche or the daughter of Ezeulu, challenges her brother Oduche (who adopts Christian religion) to kill herself. But she does not want to kill the python. She thinks, to kill the python is to kill the

kinsmen or father. In this regard, she resists against her brother and she becomes ready to sacrifice herself for the preservation of native culture.

From the presentation of the characters, Chinua Achebe strongly and energetically states that the culture and identity are associated with the existence of human civilization, so they are essential for the development of our meaningful presentation. Furthermore, we must preserve them for our future generations. While the colonizers try to dismantle the native's values and cultures, the natives have no option except resistance. Without resistance, to promote the native's values and cultures are impossible. Therefore, for the existence of the cultures the resistance is essential. And without resistance it is impossible to gain the liberation and freedom from the colonial rule. Therefore, it can be stated, the preservation of the cultures, values and rituals of natives is only possible with the effective implementation of resistance, a productive tool. We can additionally conclude that the tool, resistance is such an immense power to motivate suppressed ones, which can lead towards liberation and continuity of their own ways of living practicing their comprehensiveness.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2000.
- Achebe, Chinua "Colonialist Criticism". *Critical Theory Since Plato*. New York: Harcourt Brace, Jovanovich.1992.
- Achebe, Chinua. *Arrow of God*. London: Penguin Books. 2010. 1-229
- Achebe, Chinua. "Colonialist Criticism". *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard, Adams. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. 1992.1191-98.
- Adams, Hazard. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992.
- Ahmad, Aijaz. In *Theory: Classes, Nations and Literatures*. London: OUP.1992.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Jereth, Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. London and New York: Routledge. 2004.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness and other stories*. London: Hertfordshire press.1999.
- Diana, Brydon. "The white Inuit Speakers". *The post- Colonial Studies Reader* .Ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. New York: Routledge. 2006. 184-188.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory*. New York: CUP. 1998.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press 1998.
- Huntington, Samuel, P. *The Clash of Civilization*. Toronto and Ontario: Penguin Books. 1997.

- Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism / Post Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge. 2005.
- Malcolm, Peat and David Robinson. *Leading Questions*. London: Nelson Press. 1992.
- Oxford Dictionary*. New York, London, Delhi and Munich: Oxford University Press. 2003.
- Said, Edward, W. *Orientalism*. New York: Penguin Books.1994.
- Said, Edward, W. “Resistance,Opposition and Representation”. *The post- Colonial Studies Reader*.Ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. New York: Routledge.2006.95-98.
- Slemon,Stephen. “The Scramble For Post-Colonialism”. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Ed.Bill Ascroft,Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. New York: Routledge.2006.95-98.
- Spivak, Chakravorty, Gayatri. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*.Ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. New York: Rutledge, 2006. 28-37.
- Stam, Robert and Louise Spence. “Colonialism, Racism and Representation” *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. New York: Routledge. 2006. 109-112.

